

A Near-Optimal Category Information Sampling in RFID Systems

Xiujun Wang, Zhi Liu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Xiaokang Zhou, Yong Liao, Han Hu, Xiao Zheng, Jie Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract

In many RFID-enabled applications, objects are classified into different categories, and the information associated with each object's category (called category information) is written into the attached tag, allowing the reader to access it later. The category information sampling in such RFID systems, which is to randomly choose (sample) a few tags from each category and collect their category information, is fundamental for providing real-time monitoring and analysis in RFID. However, to the best of our knowledge, two technical challenges, i.e., how to guarantee a minimized execution time and reduce collection failure caused by missing tags, remain unsolved for this problem. In this paper, we address these two limitations by considering how to use the shortest possible time to sample a different number of random tags from each category and collect their category information sequentially in small batches. In particular, we first obtain a lower bound on the execution time of any protocol that can solve this problem. Then, we present a near-OPTimal Category information sampling protocol (OPT-C) that solves the problem with an execution time close to the lower bound. Finally, extensive simulation results demonstrate the superiority of OPT-C over existing protocols, while real-world experiments validate the practicality of OPT-C.

Index Terms

RFID systems, category information sampling, execution time, lower bound, near-optimal protocol.



1 INTRODUCTION

Radio frequency identification (RFID) technology, with many shining advantages such as non-line-of-sight detection and low manufacturing costs, has been used in many applications, ranging from object tracking and positioning [1], [2] to supply chain control and scheduling [3]–[5]. Typically, these applications track objects belonging to various categories, such as types of drugs in a pharmacy, topics of books in a library, or brands of food in a supermarket. Whenever a tag is attached to one of these objects, information related to the category of the object (called category information) can be written to this tag to make it readily available to RFID readers in an offline manner (without consulting a remote reference database) [6], [7]. Such category information on tags can be either static data (e.g., the brand of a garment) or dynamic data (e.g., continuous sensory readings from a tag's integrated sensor) [8]–[10].

- Xiujun Wang is with the School of Computer Science, Anhui University of Technology, Ma'anshan 243032, China, and also with the Anhui Engineering Research Center for Intelligent Applications and Security of Industrial Internet, Ma'anshan 243032, China (e-mail: wxj@mail.ustc.edu.cn).

In RFID systems for such applications, tags are systematically classified, with all tags within the same category sharing identical category information. In an ideal scenario, assuming all tags are present and functioning correctly in an interference-free environment, querying a single random tag per category would provide a comprehensive view of the category information. However, practical realities necessitate a departure from this ideal. Overreliance on a single random tag per category is often insufficient, primarily due to the potential absence of the selected tag. Missing tags may result from various factors, such as their location beyond the reader's detection range, signal interference, or hardware malfunctions [7], [11]. For instance, a tag may become unresponsive when obstructed by signal-shielding materials like metal surfaces or when its backscattered signal lacks sufficient power or becomes corrupted, rendering it undetectable [12], [13].

Therefore, in this paper, we consider the practical RFID system with missing tags and study the Category Information Sampling Problem (the CIS problem), which is to use the shortest possible time to randomly choose a user-specific number of tags from each category and read them. Here, we afford users the flexibility to specify in advance how many tags they would like to randomly choose from each category, which can be used to mitigate collection failures caused by missing tags or for other practical objectives (e.g., data consistency verification and the estimation of category-specific statistics). This problem holds significant relevance to real-time monitoring of tagged objects and the on-the-fly analysis of their category data within RFID systems. For instance, consider a supermarket that organizes food products based on their expiration dates, with these dates recorded on attached tags as category information. Due to signal interference or hardware issues, certain tags might be missing. In such cases, swift sampling of expiration dates from randomly selected tags within each category enables real-time tracking of food quality. Similarly, in a bustling logistics center, shipping items are classified by their destination addresses, written on attached tags as category information. Given the rapid movement of these items, some tags may be missed if they exit the reader's detection area. To ensure timely collection and analysis of shipping addresses, it's imperative to sample multiple tag addresses from each category, rather than relying on just one tag. Numerous real-world situations present similar contexts where multiple tags convey identical or similar data, necessitating immediate tracking and analysis [6], [7]. In addition, it is essential to note that various practical RFID scenarios may prompt readers to read multiple tags randomly selected from each category, going beyond the core objective of addressing missing tags. These supplementary purposes encompass tasks such as verifying data consistency and estimating category-specific statistics [7], [9], [14].

In essence, the investigation of the CIS problem within RFID systems holds the potential to significantly enhance the efficiency and reliability of RFID systems, catering to a wide array of critical applications. This empowers users with the capability to fine-tune their tag selection strategies to address challenges like missing tags and extend their applications to encompass broader objectives such as data validation and statistical estimation.

1.1 Prior Art and Limitations

Numerous protocols exist for extracting data from a tag subset, denoted as P , in RFID systems [9], [10], [15]–[18]. These protocols often employ Bloom filters or their variants to distinguish the desired subset P from the entire tag population and subsequently retrieve information from the tags within P . For example, ETOP [15] employs multiple Bloom filters to filter out non-target tags within the subset P . Similarly, TIC [10] reads a subset P of tags in multi-reader RFID systems, using a single-hash Bloom filter to eliminate irrelevant tags. However, it is important to note that transmitting Bloom filters and addressing hash collisions can still be time-consuming [19].

To the best of our knowledge, for RFID systems with multiple categories of tags, TPS [6] and ACS [7] are the only two works that collect category information from randomly sampled tags. TPS [6] capitalizes on the fact that all tags of the same category have a common category-ID (indicating which category they belong to) to collect category information from one random tag of each category. Specifically, it hashes all tags into slots of a communication frame based on their category-ID and finds those homogeneous slots that are occupied only by tags of the same category. Since the category information of the tags in the homogeneous slots is the same, it selects and reads one tag in each homogeneous slot. However, TPS takes a long time to execute because it transmits many useless empty slots in each frame. ACS [7] follows TPS, but uses arithmetic coding to compress each communication frame to reduce transmission costs. With ACS, the reader compresses a frame into a binary fraction and sends it to all tags; each tag decompresses the fraction to recover the frame. Even so, the execution time of ACS is still long and unsatisfactory since it compresses many useless empty slots in each frame; and the arithmetic encoding is too complex for ordinary RFID tags to support [20].

Ultimately, existing tag sampling protocols suffer from three primary drawbacks:

1. Absence of Execution Time Benchmark: There is no known lower bound on the execution time of any protocol that can solve the CIS problem. Establishing such lower bound is crucial for measuring protocol performance and determining the potential for improvement.

2. High Execution Times: Current sampling protocols exhibit unacceptably high execution times, failing to meet the lower bound. This is particularly problematic for RFID systems, where efficient category information retrieval from numerous tags is vital for real-time monitoring and analysis. Achieving execution times close to the lower bound enables us to predict the minimum time required for specific sampling tasks and allocate precise time windows to optimize system efficiency.

3. Neglect of Missing Tags: Existing protocols primarily focus on randomly selecting one tag from each category. However, this approach often falls short because some tags in each category may be missing due to factors like moving out of the reader's range, hardware issues, or signal interference. Consequently, it is more practical to sample a user-specified number of tags from each category, a reasonable requirement that the current protocol inadequately address.

In addition, it's worth noting that several concurrent tag identification protocols [21]–[24] have been developed to recover signals from collided tags using parallel decoding techniques




Fig. 1: Ensuring High Success Probability with a Small Reliability Number. Note: (a) The success probability demonstrates rapid growth as the reliability number c_k increases, even when a substantial portion (70%) of tags in P_k are missing ($\alpha_k = 0.7$). (b) This graph illustrates the reliability number c_k that can secure a high success probability of 0.99, as α_k varies from 0.05 to 0.9.

and specialized equipment like USRP. For example, the Buzz protocol [21] is a pioneering approach that effectively coordinates tags to measure their channel coefficients and reconstructs the transmitted signal of each tag. In recent [24], a novel protocol named CIRF is proposed to address challenges posed by noisy channels, which can introduce errors when recovering tag signals. CIRF leverages multiple antennas to enhance robustness against noise and uses block sparsity-based optimization techniques to restore signals from collided tags. However, these advanced protocols excel in identifying all tags at the physical layer and primarily focus on comprehensive tag identification rather than random sampling from a subset of tags.*

1.2 Technical Challenges and Contributions

This paper addresses the Category Information Sampling Problem within the context of RFID systems, where the tag population is categorized into K distinct subsets denoted as P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K . The primary objective is to randomly select a user-defined number of tags, denoted as c_k , from each category P_k and assign them unique reporting orders for sequential reading while minimizing the execution time. The parameter c_k , called the reliability number, serves as a user-adjustable parameter aimed at mitigating collection failures caused by missing tags. Additionally, it's worth mentioning that the user-adjustable parameter, c_k , holds a broader spectrum of applications beyond addressing missing tag issues, as it could be employed for tasks such as category statistics estimation and security enhancement [7], [9]–[11], [14].

Please note that the significance of selecting a suitable value for c_k becomes apparent when considering the issue of missing tags. Sampling a single tag from category P_k carries the risk of encountering missing tags. Hence, users can set c_k to substantially increase the success

*. We recognize the extensive research in classical statistics on optimizing device subset sampling for failure identification or estimation purposes [25]–[28]. These studies often apply Bayesian methods to assess statistical similarities among various devices, with the aim of determining optimal sample sizes for tasks such as failure detection and estimation. However, it's crucial to emphasize the distinction between our CIS problem and these classical approaches. In our scenario, we do not engage in the optimization of sample size c_k for identifying missing tags within each category P_k and do not assume any prior knowledge of statistical tag similarities. Instead, our objective is to generate a simple random sample (SRS) of size c_k for each category P_k , where c_k is predetermined by system users, and to assign unique reporting orders to the sampled tags.

probability, which represents the likelihood that at least one of the c_k randomly selected tags is not missing, as illustrated in Fig. 1.[†]

Addressing the studied problem entails overcoming two major challenges to achieve a near-optimal solution:

Challenge 1: Deriving a Non-Trivial Lower Bound on Execution Time

Previous research on the CIS problem has proposed protocols for addressing it [6], [7]. However, these works have not ventured into the domain of lower bound derivation, which serves as a fundamental benchmark for assessing the performance of these protocols. Deriving this lower bound necessitates addressing two technical problems:

(p-1) Analyzing Required Information for Random Tag Selection and Reporting Orders Assignment: This analysis entails dissecting the information that the reader must transmit to achieve the random selection of a user-defined number of tags from each category and assign unique reporting orders to each selected tag. It aims to identify the essential data within the reader’s broadcasted message and how it contributes to solving the CIS problem at the tag side.

(p-2) Determining Minimum Bits for Information Representation: This step involves ascertaining the minimum number of bits to represent the information needed for (p-1), considering all possible tag populations and categories. It seeks to maximize bit utilization while accommodating constraints arising from the problem’s inherent nature and practical considerations within RFID systems.

It’s worth noting that previous research in this field has not provided solutions to these intricate challenges. Given the practical significance of the CIS problem, we are motivated to tackle these problems. Unlike conventional RFID research, which relies on established lower bounds from communication complexity theory [11], [32], [33], our work is uniquely demanding, as we must develop lower bounds from scratch due to the absence of pre-existing references.

Challenge 2: Achieving Near-Optimal Execution Time in Solving the Problem

Prior studies [6], [7] have proposed protocols for randomly selecting a single tag from category P_k . However, these protocols adopt the global hashing approach, which slot all tags in the entire population into different communication slots but exploit only the homogeneous slots (a small fraction of all slots) to select tags and read their category information. This method inevitably leads to a high number of collisions and empty slots due to hash collisions, resulting in significant transmission overhead. Consequently, these protocols fall short of approaching the derived lower bound on execution time.

In contrast, our proposed two-stage protocol, OPT-C, departs from this global hashing approach. OPT-C comprises OPT-C1 and OPT-C2. OPT-C1 rapidly selects slightly more than c_k

[†]. While our paper primarily focuses on efficiently selecting and assigning unique reporting orders to c_k random tags from each category P_k for sequential reading, it’s vital to clarify how users can choose a smaller value for c_k to ensure a high success probability when addressing missing tag issues. First and foremost, it’s noteworthy that the rate of missing tags, denoted as α_k (representing the percentage of missing tags within P_k), typically remains below 0.9. This observation is substantiated by continuous monitoring conducted by RFID readers within their operational range, which serves as a critical measure to mitigate the risks of substantial economic losses and security threats [11], [29]–[31]. As c_k increases, the success probability ($1 - \alpha_k^{c_k}$) experiences rapid escalation. Even in an extreme scenario with $\alpha_k = 0.9$, selecting $c_k = 44$ guarantees a high success probability of 0.99. Second, α_k can be efficiently estimated through an RFID counting protocol with a minor time cost $O(\log(\log(|P_k|)))$ [32]. These two factors enable users to practically opt for a smaller c_k to maintain a high success probability. We provide an analytical solution for determining the value of c_k corresponding to any desired success probability in Appendix A.

tags from each category P_k , while OPT-C2 refines the selection process to choose exactly c_k tags and assign unique reporting orders. These stages introduce two technical problems:

(p-3) Designing a Bernoulli Trial for OPT-C1: OPT-C1 necessitates the design of a Bernoulli trial capable of swiftly selecting slightly more than c_k tags randomly from category P_k . Each tag simultaneously receives a threshold value τ from the reader and uses its local hash value to determine its selection status. This process entails performing a Bernoulli trial in parallel on all tags within each category. However, the number of tags selected by a Bernoulli trial is a random variable, not a fixed number. Consequently, this aspect poses a challenge, demanding the careful design of a Bernoulli trial with an appropriate threshold value of τ . This ensures that the probability of selecting slightly more than c_k tags is sufficiently high while maintaining almost negligible execution time costs. Please note that, as the Bernoulli trial operates in parallel on all tags, the communication overhead of OPT-C1, involving only the transmission of a hash seed and a threshold value, remains minimal.

(p-4) Designing a Refined Sampling Protocol for OPT-C2: OPT-C2, tasked with the selection of exactly c_k tags and their assignment of unique reporting orders, presents an intricate challenge. It requires ensuring that OPT-C2 operates with an execution time close to the derived lower bound. Achieving this requires a lot of time and efforts to get a near optimal answer, as detailed in subsequent sections.

In summary, this paper contributes the following:

- We obtain a lower bound on the execution time for the CIS problem.
- We propose a near-OPTimal Category-information sampling protocol (OPT-C) that solves the problem with an execution time close to the lower bound.
- We conduct real-world experiments to verify the practicability and validity of OPT-C; we have also run extensive simulations comparing OPT-C with state-of-the-art protocols, and the results clearly show that OPT-C is much faster than existing protocols and is close to the lower bound.
- We implement the OPT-C protocol on commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) devices and test it in a real RFID system alongside other state-of-the-art C1G2-compatible tag sampling protocols. The experimental results indicate that the actual implementation of OPT-L (denoted by OPT-C_{IMPL}) achieves an average reduction in execution time of 37% compared to other protocols.

The subsequent sections of this paper are organized as follows: Section 2 defines the CIS problem and presents the lower bound on execution time. Section 3 delves into the OPT-C protocol and establishes its near-optimality. Section 4 focuses on the real-world implementation of OPT-C in RFID systems. Section 5 presents the simulation results for OPT-C, showcasing its superior performance. In Section 6, we present experimental findings that highlight the practicality and efficiency of OPT-C's implementation. Finally, Section 7 offers concluding remarks.

2 LOWER BOUND ON EXECUTION TIME

This section first defines the Category Information Sampling Problem and then obtains a lower bound on the execution time required by any protocol that can solve the problem. To arrive at this lower bound, we employ encoding arguments, a technique commonly used to analyze space constraints in data structures [34], along with convex optimization techniques [35]. Our analysis primarily focuses on the communication exchanges between the reader and the tags

when dealing with different input scenarios. The ultimate goal is to determine the minimum number of communication messages needed to effectively handle all possible instances.

2.1 System model and problem formulation

We focus on a typical RFID system [7], [11], [29]–[31], [36] that consists of a reader R and a population S of N tags. Reader R connects to the backend server via a high-speed link to obtain computing and storage resources, but it can only communicate with tags via a low-speed wireless link. A tag in population S has an ID (96-bit ID), which is a unique identifier for both itself and the associated physical object, and a category-ID, which indicates which category it belongs to. Tags with the same category-ID carry the same category information. In short, each tag $t \in S$ has a unique ID (also represented by t), a category-ID t^G , and a piece of category information. According to category-IDs,[‡] population S is partitioned into K categories (K disjoint subsets): P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K , where each category P_k consists of tags having category-ID k , $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. Moreover, let n_k denote the size of category P_k , i.e., n_k is the number of tags in P_k , and let c_k denote the reliability number pre-specified by the user for category P_k , i.e., c_k is the number of tags that should be randomly selected from category P_k . Tab. 1 lists the symbols used in this paper.

Initially, reader R knows the IDs and category-IDs of all tags in S , but R has no knowledge of their category information or which of them are currently missing. Reader R wishes to randomly select c_k tags from each category P_k , $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, and collect their category information.[§]

Definition 2.1: Given an RFID system as described above, the Category Information Sampling Problem (the CIS problem) is to design a protocol A between the reader R and the tags such that the following two objectives are achieved on each category P_k , $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

- (I) Every subset of c_k tags from P_k has the same probability $1/\binom{n_k}{c_k}$ of being chosen to become the sampled subset T_k ;
- (II) Each tag in the sampled subset T_k is informed of a unique integer from $\{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$, known as the reporting order of the tag.

Note: the second objective (II) is necessary for collecting category information from the c_k tags in T_k because reader R can only read the data on the tags sequentially one by one. Fig. 2 provides an example of this problem.

‡. In RFID applications, tags are typically categorized based on various criteria, such as shipping destinations or storage locations. Users have the flexibility to customize the category-IDs of tags and pre-write these category-IDs into the User memory of the tags [37]. Subsequently, the reader can query a specific category-ID, denoted as k , to select all tags with the corresponding category-ID k . This customization allows for a flexible and application-specific categorization approach, which serves as the initial condition for the CIS problem studied in this paper.

§. In this manuscript, we assume that each tag's category-ID is stored as a substring in the User memory bank of the tag [37]. The required length of this substring to represent K different categories is $\lceil \log_2(K) \rceil$ bits. Additionally, we assume that tags within a specific category, denoted as P_k , are pre-written with an identical substring corresponding to the decimal value of “ k ”. This pre-written substring uniquely identifies the category to which the tags belong. To solve the CIS problem, we use a pre-query mechanism. Here, the reader initiates a query for a specific category-ID k to select all tags within category P_k . Following this pre-query, reader R is responsible for randomly selecting c_k tags from category P_k and assigning unique reporting orders to these selected tags. These reporting orders are used for collecting category data from each selected tag, as tags can only be read sequentially one by one.

*. Note that, U also represents the set of all possible IDs, i.e., $U = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} 000 \cdots 00, & 000 \cdots 01, & \cdots, & 111 \cdots 11 \end{array} \right\}$.

TABLE 1: Symbol Definitions

U	The set of all possible tags with ID values ranging from 0 to $\Upsilon - 1$, where $\Upsilon = 2^{96}$ *
S	A tag population of N tags from U .
t	A tag in S which has a unique 96-bit ID (also denoted by t), a category-ID $t^G \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, and a piece of category information.
K	The number of categories in S .
P_k	The k -th category of tags in S ($P_k \subset S$) in which all tags share the same category-ID k and are written with the same category information related to P_k .
c_k	The reliability number used for category P_k , representing the user wants to select c_k tags randomly from P_k .
n_k	The size of category P_k , i.e., the number of tags in P_k .
\mathbb{P}	A partition over the universe U according to the written category information on tags, and $\mathbb{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K, U - S\}$ $\forall i \neq j, P_i \cap P_j = \emptyset, \bigcup_{k=1}^K P_k = S$. Note that $U - S$ is the remainder set containing all tags that do not appear in S .
R	A reader, who initially knows only the ID and category-ID of each tag t in S and wants to select a few random tags from each category P_k and assign them unique reporting orders.




Fig. 2: An example of the Category Information Sampling Problem in an RFID system with missing tags. Suppose $c_1 = 1$, $c_2 = 1$, $c_3 = 2$. Then the Category Information Sampling Problem requires the reader to randomly select one tag from P_1 and read it, randomly select one tag from P_2 and read it, and randomly select two tags from P_3 and read them. Note that the three tags: t_2, t_5, t_6 are missing, but the reader does not know this fact.

2.2 A lower bound on execution time

The following theorem establishes a lower bound on the communication time between the reader R and tags, and then obtains a lower bound on the execution time, T_{lb} .

First, we present some notations needed in the proof. Let U represent the universe of all possible tags with ID values ranging from 0 up to $\Upsilon - 1$, where $\Upsilon = 2^{96}$; As each tag owns a unique ID, U also represents the universe of all 2^{96} possible IDs. Let us call $U - S$ (i.e., $U - \bigcup_{k=1}^K P_k$) the remainder set, and consider the set-family $\mathbb{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K, U - S\}$. Given a tag population size N and K category sizes: n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K , the universe U can be arbitrarily partitioned into category P_1 of n_1 tags, category P_2 of n_2 tags, \dots , category P_K of n_K tags, and the remainder set of $\Upsilon - N$ tags, denoted by $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K, \Upsilon - N}$, i.e., partition \mathbb{P} has $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K, \Upsilon - N}$ different possibilities. In the following, we use $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}$ to represent the number of possible partitions over the universe U , because $\sum_{k=1}^K n_k = N$ and $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K, \Upsilon - N} = \binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}$.[†]

When exploring the lower bound of protocol execution time, we take the communication time

†. $\sum_{k=1}^K n_k = N$ comes from the fact that a tag in S belongs to one category and $\bigcup_{k=1}^K P_k = S$.

between reader R and tags as the primary determinant, since R has a high-speed connection to the backend server but communicates with tags via a low-speed link slowly [6], [11], [15], [36]. In addition, we omit the computation time of reader R since the backend server can provide computation assistance very quickly, and our lower bound is still valid even with computation time included.

Theorem 2.2: Any protocol A that solves the Category Information Sampling Problem described in Definition 2.1, must satisfy the following two inequalities

$$|A| \geq \Gamma = \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(e)c_k, \quad (1)$$

$$T_{\text{lb}} \geq T_{96} \times \Gamma/96, \quad (2)$$

where T_{96} is the time cost of transmitting 96 bits between reader R and tags, $|A|$ represents the number of bits communicated between reader R and tags during A 's execution, and T_{lb} represents the lower bound of A 's execution time.

Proof: Let M denote the complete set of communicated messages between reader R and tags during A 's execution. Then, $|A|$ equals the number of bits contained in M . Clearly, if protocol A can solve the CIS problem with K given category sizes: n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K , it must take care of all the $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}$ different partitions. Therefore, in order to obtain the required lower bound, we will study how many bits are needed for message M to handle all these partitions. Below is a roadmap of our proof.

- First, we model the decision process on each tag $t \in S$ and explain how message M helps t to decide whether it is sampled or not, and if so, what its reporting order is.
- Second, we analyze how a specific value v of message M can help solve the CIS problem and how many different partitions it can handle;
- Third, since there are $\binom{\Upsilon}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}$ different partitions to be handled when solving this problem, we can obtain the lower bound on M by analyzing how many different values the message M must have to handle all these partitions.

As a starting point, we model each tag's decision process and describe how each tag changes its state after protocol A 's execution (i.e., after receiving message M). In this way, we lay the foundation for our proof. Without loss of generality, we denote the internal decision process on each tag $t \in S$ by a function $F()$. Initially, each tag $t \in S$ is in the same state, which means it doesn't know whether it needs to report or not, and if so, what its report number is. After receiving message M , tag t takes a category-ID k ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$), M , and its ID (also represented by t) as the three input parameters to function $F()$, and then computes $F(k, M, t)$ to decide whether it will be a sampled tag in category P_k (the k -th category), and if so, what its reporting order is. More specifically, without sacrificing generality, we assume the following decision rules on tag t .

- ▶ If $F(k, M, t) = 0$, tag t identifies itself as a non-sampled tag in category P_k .
- ▶ If $F(k, M, t) = i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$, tag t identifies itself as a sampled tag in category P_k and takes i as its reporting order.

Clearly, message M is the parameter that determines the behavior of the K functions: $F(k, M, \bullet)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. That is, a specific value v of M (M is used as the second parameter of function $F()$) uniquely determines how function $F(k, M, \bullet)$ maps the $\Upsilon = 2^{96}$ tags from U into the range $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$.

Next, we analyze the number of different partitions that a specific value v can handle. Let $S_{k,i}^v$ represent the set consisting of those tags from U that have function $F(k, v, \bullet)$ equal to i , or namely the following:

$$S_{k,i}^v = \{t | t \in U \text{ and } F(k, v, t) = i\},$$

$$k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}. \quad (3)$$

Then, v can handle any partition $\mathbb{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K\}$ that is constructed by (s1)-(s5):

- (s1) Choose one tag from each of the c_1 sets: $S_{1,1}^v, S_{1,2}^v, \dots, S_{1,c_1}^v$, choose $n_1 - c_1$ tags from $S_{1,0}^v$, and group these n_1 tags into the first category P_1 .
- (s2) Delete the chosen n_1 tags from the $c_2 + 1$ sets: $S_{2,0}^v, S_{2,1}^v, \dots, S_{2,c_2}^v$. Note that (S1) has put these n_1 tags into the $c_1 + 1$ sets: $S_{1,0}^v, S_{1,1}^v, \dots, S_{1,c_1}^v$.
- (s3) Choose one tag from each of the c_2 sets: $S_{2,1}^v, S_{2,2}^v, \dots, S_{2,c_2}^v$, choose $n_2 - c_2$ tags from $S_{2,0}^v$, and group these n_2 tags into the second category P_2 .
- (s4) Delete the chosen $n_1 + n_2$ tags from the $c_3 + 1$ sets: $S_{3,0}^v, S_{3,1}^v, \dots, S_{3,c_3}^v$. Note: (s1) and (s2) have put these $n_1 + n_2$ tags into the $c_1 + c_2 + 2$ sets: $S_{1,0}^v, S_{1,1}^v, \dots, S_{1,c_1}^v, S_{2,0}^v, S_{2,1}^v, \dots, S_{2,c_2}^v$.
- (s5) Repeat the same process for P_3, P_4, \dots, P_K .

By the above (s1)-(s5) and the definition of $S_{k,i}^v$ in (3), it is clear that, the tag chosen from $S_{k,1}^v$ will be the sampled tag with reporting order 1, the tag chosen from $S_{k,2}^v$ will be the sampled tag with reporting order 2, \dots , and the tag chosen from S_{k,c_k}^v will be the sampled tag with reporting order c_k . These c_k tags together form the sample subset T_k for category P_k , while the $n_k - c_k$ tags chosen from $S_{k,0}^v$ are the unsampled tags in P_k .[‡] Therefore, v achieves the objectives required by the CIS problem (see Definition 2.1), and we can say that v is able to handle all the partitions created by this five-step process (s1)-(s5).

TABLE 2: The values of two functions: $F(1, v, \bullet)$ and $F(2, v, \bullet)$ over each tag in the universe $U = \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}$.

$t \in U$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Function $F(1, v, \bullet)$	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Function $F(2, v, \bullet)$	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Let us use an example to illustrate how a value v of M handles multiple partitions. In this example, we assume the universe U contains 7 tags, $U = \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}$, i.e., each tag has a unique

[‡]. Let us explain (s1). Assume that t_1 is the tag chosen from $S_{1,1}^v$, t_2 is the tag chosen from $S_{1,2}^v$, \dots , t_{c_1} is the tag chosen from S_{1,c_1}^v , and $t_{c_1+1}, t_{c_1+2}, \dots, t_{n_1}$ are the $n_1 - c_1$ tags chosen from $S_{1,0}^v$. t_1 will be the sampled tag with reporting order 1 in P_1 since $F(k=1, v, t_1) = 1$; t_2 will be the sampled tag with reporting order 2 in P_1 since $F(k=1, v, t_2) = 2$; \dots ; t_{c_1} will be the sampled tag with reporting order c_1 in P_1 since $F(k=1, v, t_{c_1}) = c_1$. These c_1 tags together form the sample subset T_1 for P_1 . The $n_1 - c_1$ tags: $t_{c_1+1}, t_{c_1+2}, \dots, t_{n_1}$ chosen from $S_{1,0}^v$ will be unsampled tags in P_1 since $F(k=1, v, t_{c_1+1}) = F(k=1, v, t_{c_1+2}) = \dots = F(k=1, v, t_{n_1}) = 0$.

ID from 0 to 6. The tag population S contains $N = 5$ tags of U , and S is divided into two subsets (two categories) P_1 and P_2 , with $|P_1| = 3$ and $|P_2| = 2$. We consider the CIS problem that requires randomly picking $c_1 = 1$ tag from P_1 and $c_2 = 1$ tag from P_2 . Moreover, suppose that a specific value v of message M uniquely determines two specific functions, as shown in Tab. 2. By this table, we have $S_{1,0}^v = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, $S_{1,1}^v = \{4, 5, 6\}$, $S_{2,0}^v = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and $S_{2,1}^v = \{5, 6\}$. Then, v can handle the partition $\mathbb{P} = \{P_1, P_2\} = \{\{0, 3, 5\}, \{1, 6\}\}$, because only tag 5 is picked from P_1 and is assigned reporting order 1 ($F(1, v, 5) = 1$), and only tag 6 is picked from P_2 and is assigned reporting order 1 ($F(2, v, 6) = 1$). Tags 0 and 3 in P_1 are not chosen because $F(1, v, 0) = F(1, v, 3) = 0$; tag 1 in P_2 is not chosen because $F(2, v, 1) = 0$. Besides, v can solve any partition \mathbb{P} constructed as below:

- (1) Choose one tag from $S_{1,1}^v$, two tags from $S_{1,0}^v$, and group these three tags into category P_1 ;
- (2) Choose one tag from $S_{2,1}^v - P_1$, one tag from $S_{2,0}^v - P_1$, and group these two tags into category P_2 .

In general, let $s_{k,i}^v = |S_{k,i}^v|$ ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, c_k\}$), and we can find the following fact for the CIS problem with K category sizes: n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K and K reliability numbers: c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K .

★ **FACT-1:** *There are $\binom{s_{k,0}^v}{n_k - c_k} \prod_{i=1}^{c_k} s_{k,i}^v$ different ways to choose tags from $S_{k,0}^v, S_{k,1}^v, \dots, S_{k,c_k}^v$ to create a category P_k that can be handled by value v ; and $s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v$ satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^{c_k} s_{k,i}^v = |U - \bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} P_j| = \Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j$.*

Let us first see why **FACT-1** is true for category P_1 . Since all tags in U have not been chosen yet, we can choose exactly one tag from each of the c_1 sets: $S_{1,1}^v, S_{1,2}^v, \dots, S_{1,c_1}^v$, and choose $n_1 - c_1$ tags from $S_{1,0}^v$ to create P_1 . So, there are $\binom{s_{1,0}^v}{n_1 - c_1} \prod_{i=1}^{c_1} s_{1,i}^v$ different ways to create P_1 that can be handled by v , and $s_{1,0}^v, s_{1,1}^v, \dots, s_{1,c_1}^v$ satisfy $\sum_{i=0}^{c_1} s_{1,i}^v = \Upsilon$. Following a similar analysis, we can show that this fact is also true for P_2, P_3, \dots, P_K .

With **FACT-1**, the number of partitions that v can handle is

$$\prod_{k=1}^K \left(\binom{s_{k,0}^v}{n_k - c_k} \prod_{i=1}^{c_k} s_{k,i}^v \right), \quad (4)$$

which can be proven to be less than or equal to

$$\prod_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{(n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!} \left(\frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k} \right)^{n_k} \right] = \Phi. \S \quad (5)$$

Finally, because there are $\binom{N}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}$ different partitions to process, and a specific value v of message M can handle at most Φ of them, we know that message M needs to have at least

§. A detailed proof of the inequality (4) \leq (5) is in Appendix B.

$(\binom{N}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K})/\Phi$ different values [34]. Let's further analyze $(\binom{N}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K})/\Phi$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\binom{N}{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K}/\Phi &= \left(\prod_{k=1}^K \binom{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k} \right) / \Phi \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\binom{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}}{\frac{(n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!} \left(\frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k} \right)^{n_k}} \approx \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{(n_k - c_k)! n_k^{n_k}}{n_k! (n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}} \\
&\geq \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{\sqrt{2\pi} (n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k + 0.5} e^{-(n_k - c_k)} n_k^{n_k}}{e n_k^{n_k + 0.5} e^{-n_k} (n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}} \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^K (\sqrt{2\pi}/e) ((n_k - c_k)/n_k)^{0.5} e^{c_k}. \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, the approximation in the second line comes from $(\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j)^{n_k} \approx (\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j)^{n_k}$, which is true because $\Upsilon \gg \sum_{j=1}^K n_j = N$ (A real RFID system usually contains less than 10^8 tags, i.e., $N \leq 10^8$, so $N \ll \Upsilon = 2^{96} \approx 8 \times 10^{28}$); the inequality in the third line comes from $(n_k - c_k)! \geq \sqrt{2\pi} (n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k + 0.5} e^{-(n_k - c_k)}$ and $n_k! \leq e n_k^{n_k + 0.5} e^{-n_k}$, which is based on Stirling's Formula (see Lemma 7.3 in [38]).

Taking the logarithm of (6), we can find out that message M must contain $\log_2(\prod_{k=1}^K (\sqrt{2\pi}/e) ((n_k - c_k)/n_k)^{0.5} e^{c_k}) \approx \sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(e) c_k$ bits. This leads to the lower bound T_{lb} on the execution time of protocol A .[¶]

□

3 A NEAR-OPTIMAL PROTOCOL FOR THE CATEGORY INFORMATION SAMPLING PROBLEM (OPT-C)

Motivated by the lower bound established in Theorem 2.2 we introduce OPT-C, a near-optimal category information sampling protocol with the capacity to approach this lower bound. Tab. 3 provides a comparative illustration of OPT-C's theoretical superiority over existing state-of-the-art sampling protocols.

Generally, OPT-C's design revolves around two fundamental stages: In the initial stage, OPT-C employs a coarse sampling process to select approximately c_k tags from each category P_k . This process creates a Bernoulli sample from the tags within P_k , with tags chosen independently in parallel. However, the drawback of this method is that the resulting sample size fluctuates as it becomes a random variable, rather than a fixed quantity. To mitigate this variability and ensure selection of precisely c_k tags from P_k , OPT-C introduces a second stage, comprising a refined sampling process. In this phase, exactly c_k tags are selected one by one from the Bernoulli sample generated in the first stage. This process results in a simple random sample from category P_k , with each selected tag assigned a unique reporting order.

The core design concept underpinning OPT-C can be summarized as follows: *On one hand, directly creating a random sample containing precisely c_k tags from category P_k would effectively resolve the CIS problem. However, this approach proves time-consuming when applied to categories with a large*

[¶]. Hence, the lower bound is mainly related to K and the K reliability numbers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K , as it increases when c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K and K increase. However, it remains relatively independent of the change of n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K . A detailed explanation is given in Appendix F.

TABLE 3: Theoretical comparisons of existing category information sampling protocols

Protocol	Total execution time	Requirements on tags
TPS [6]	unknown (no closed form expression for the total execution time)	Each tag supports (1): a hash function and (2): the operation that counts the number '1's in a bit-array.
ACS [7]	unknown (no closed form expression for the total execution time)	Each tag supports (1): a hash function, (2): the operation that counts the number '1's in a bit-array, and (3) the arithmetic coding algorithm that decompresses received frames.
OPT-C (our solution)	$\sum_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{ec_k}{\log_2 \left(\frac{96}{\log_2 n_k} \right)} + \log_2 c_k \right]$	Each tag supports (1): a hash function and (2): the operation that counts the number '1's in a bit-array.
The lower bound	$\sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(e)c_k$ (The theoretical performance limit for any category information sampling protocol)	

number of tags. The collective decision-making required among all tags within P_k is the reason for the time inefficiency, as it ensures that exactly c_k of them are sequentially included in the sample. On the other hand, a Bernoulli sample is created quickly by independently conducting Bernoulli trials on all tags within P_k in parallel. However, the downside is the inherent variability in the number of tags within this sample, rendering it a random variable rather than a predetermined constant. Hence, within OPT-C, we adopt a hybrid approach. Firstly, we design a coarse sampling protocol that promptly generates a random sample containing slightly more than c_k tags from P_k using Bernoulli trials. Subsequently, we introduce a refined sampling protocol that randomly selects exactly c_k tags from this previously generated sample, one after another. Importantly, this refined sampling process incurs a time cost that approaches the lower bound, ensuring efficient execution.

To distinguish the tags selected by OPT-C1 and those further chosen by OPT-C2 for reporting, each tag t in the population S assumes one of the following four statuses:

- **Unacknowledged state:** Every tag $t \in S$ is initially in this state, signifying that it has not yet decided whether to report or not.
- **Unselected state:** A tag t enters this state when it decides not to report its category information.
- **Selected state:** A tag t enters this state when it chooses to report its category information but has not yet received a unique reporting order.
- **Ready state:** A tag t enters this state when it has decided to report its category information and has been assigned a unique reporting order.

3.1 The design and analysis of OPT-C1

OPT-C1 contains K communication rounds: $\mathbb{I}_1, \mathbb{I}_2, \dots, \mathbb{I}_K$, where each round \mathbb{I}_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, generates a random sample of a little more than c_k tags from category P_k . In each round \mathbb{I}_k , reader R sends a random seed to all tags in P_k , and then each tag in P_k performs a Bernoulli trial to determine whether to enter the selected state or the unselected state. The detailed steps

are given below.

Step1: Reader R broadcasts two parameters $\langle r, c_k \rangle$ out to all tags, where r is a suitable random seed chosen by reader R , and c_k is the reliability number.

Step2: Upon receiving $\langle r, c_k \rangle$, each tag t in category P_k computes function $h(t) = H(t, r) \bmod n_k$, and if $h(t) \leq c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$, tag t changes its status from the unacknowledged state to selected state; otherwise, t enters the unselected state.

In Step1, we call a random seed r **suitable** in the sense that, at least c_k and at most $c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}$ tags from P_k change their status from the unacknowledged state to the selected state when they use r . We claim that reader R can always find a suitable random seed r , because: (i) Given any random seed r , the probability that it is a suitable random seed is higher than 0.4 (see Theorem 3.1); and (ii) with a probability almost equal to 1, reader R tests no more than 6 random seeds until a suitable one is found (Theorem 3.2).

TABLE 4: The hash values and states of the tags in a category $P_k = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{12}\}$ when using random seed r_1 (A) and r_2 (B) in OPT-C1.

(A) Using random seed r_1			(B) Using random seed r_2		
	$h(t) = H(t, r_1) \bmod 12$	State after OPT-C1		$h(t) = H(t, r_2) \bmod 12$	State after OPT-C1
t_1	11	unselected	t_1	0	selected
t_2	6	selected	t_2	8	unselected
t_3	3	selected	t_3	2	selected
t_4	4	selected	t_4	11	unselected
t_5	3	selected	t_5	3	selected
t_6	5	selected	t_6	9	unselected
t_7	6	selected	t_7	4	selected
t_8	1	selected	t_8	7	unselected
t_9	1	selected	t_9	6	selected
t_{10}	0	selected	t_{10}	5	selected
t_{11}	2	selected	t_{11}	10	unselected
t_{12}	2	selected	t_{12}	7	unselected

Check an example to see how OPT-C1 works for a category P_k . Suppose a category P_k contains 12 tags: $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{12}\}$, and we want to select $c_k = 2$ tags randomly from P_k . Now, assume that reader R tries to use a random seed r_1 for this job, and part (A) of Tab. 4 gives the hash values of the 12 tags when using the random seed r_1 . Then, by step 2 of OPT-C1, tag t_1 enters the unselected state because its hash value $h(t_1) = 11$ is larger than $c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k} = 2 + 3\sqrt{2} \approx 6.24$, while all the other tags enter the selected state because their hash values are all less than 6.24. So, random seed r_1 is not suitable because the number of selected tags is 11 which is not within the range of $[c_k, c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}] = [2, 10]$. As mentioned before, reader R can predict the result of using random seed r_1 since it has the full knowledge of the IDs and category-IDs of tags and can pre-compute tags' hash values when using r_1 . Therefore, R will not broadcast r_1 , but will try another random seed r_2 . The hash values of the 12 tags when using r_2 are given in part (B) of Tab. 4. Then, by step 2 of OPT-C1, we can observe that tags $t_1, t_3, t_5, t_7, t_9, t_{10}$ enter the

selected state because their hash values are less than $c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k} = 2 + 3\sqrt{2} \approx 6.24$, while the other 6 tags enter the unselected states as their hash values are larger than 6.24. Random seed r_2 is suitable because it brings 6 tags of P_k to the selected state, and $6 \in [c_k, c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}] = [2, 10]$. So, finally, reader R will broadcast r_2 to tags. Sometimes a random seed comes to be suitable, and sometimes it does not. However, we shall show in Theorem 3.1 that the probability of an arbitrary random seed being a suitable random seed for round \mathbb{I}_k (i.e., for category P_k) is greater than 0.4. As a result, on average, the reader R only needs to attempt 2.5 trials to find a suitable random seed (see Theorem 3.2).

Theorem 3.1: Let r be an arbitrary random seed, then there is a probability greater than 0.4 that r can bring at least c_k tags and at most $c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}$ tags of P_k to the selected state.

Proof: For illustration, let t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n_k} be the n_k tags in P_k . We define n_k random variables: X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n_k} , where $X_i = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, n_k$, if tag t_i changes its status from the unacknowledged state to selected state and 0 otherwise. Because $h(t_i) = H(t_i, r) \bmod n_k$ is a hash function that maps a tag $t_i \in P_k$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n_k$) uniformly at random to an integer in $\{1, 2, \dots, n_k\}$ ¹¹, we can get $\Pr(X_i = 1) = \Pr(h(t_i) \leq c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}) = \frac{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}{n_k}$.

Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} X_i$. Then, $E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} 1 \times \Pr(X_i = 1) = c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$. Since each tag $t_i \in P_k$ computes its hash function $h()$ independently, we can know that X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n_k} are independent random variables. Then using the Chernoff bounds shown in (4.1) and (4.4) of Ref. [38], the following two inequalities are true for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$:

$$\Pr(X > (1 + \delta)E[X]) < (e^\delta / (1 + \delta)^{1+\delta})^{E[X]}, \quad (7)$$

$$\Pr(X < (1 - \delta)E[X]) \leq (e^{-\delta} / (1 - \delta)^{1-\delta})^{E[X]}. \quad (8)$$

Next, we put $E[X] = c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$ and $\delta = \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}$ into (7), and then get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X > (1 + \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})) &= \Pr(X > c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}) \\ &< \left(\frac{e^{3\sqrt{c_k}/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})}}{(1 + 3\sqrt{c_k}/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}))^{1+3\sqrt{c_k}/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})}} \right)^{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}} \\ &= \frac{e^{3\sqrt{c_k}}}{(1 + \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})^{c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}}} \leq \frac{e^3}{(1 + \frac{3}{1+3})^{1+6}} = 0.3996. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The inequality in (9) is due to the fact that $c_k \geq 1$ and function $e^{3\sqrt{c_k}}(1 + \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})^{-c_k - 6\sqrt{c_k}} = \mu(c_k)$ decreases as c_k increases.**

11. Here, for analytical convenience, we slightly modify the hash function $h(t_i)$ to be $h(t_i) = (H(t_i, r) \bmod n_k) + 1$, which changes its value domain from $\{0, 1, \dots, n_k - 1\}$ to $\{1, 2, \dots, n_k\}$. By doing this, we avoid the annoying 0 in the value domain and can say $\Pr(X_i = 1) = \Pr(h(t_i) \leq c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}) = \frac{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}{n_k}$.

** Appendix C gives the proof that $\mu(c_k)$ is a decreasing function.

Similarly, putting $E[X] = c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$ and $\delta = \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}$ into (8), we can get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(X < (1 - \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})) = \Pr(X < c_k) \\
& \leq \left[\frac{e^{-3\sqrt{c_k}/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})}}{(1 + (-3\sqrt{c_k})/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}))^{1 + (-3\sqrt{c_k})/(c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k})}} \right]^{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}} \\
& = \frac{e^{-3\sqrt{c_k}}}{(1 + \frac{-3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})^{c_k}} \leq \frac{e^{-3\sqrt{1}}}{(1 + \frac{-3\sqrt{1}}{1 + 3\sqrt{1}})^1} = 0.1991.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The inequality in (10) is due to the fact that $c_k \geq 1$ and function $e^{-3\sqrt{c_k}}(1 + \frac{-3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}})^{c_k} = \rho(c_k)$ decreases as c_k increases.^{††}

Finally, based on (9) and (10), we can obtain $\Pr(X < c_k \text{ or } X > c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}) < 0.5987$, and the conclusion. □

Theorem 3.2: The probability that reader R can find a suitable random seed within 6 tests is almost 1, and the average number of tests is less than 2.5.

Proof: Given sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , and also a set \mathcal{H} of functions from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} . That is, $\mathcal{H} = \{h_r : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} | r \in \mathcal{R}\}$. A random hash function h_r can be created by selecting r randomly from \mathcal{R} ; and r , also known as a random seed, is a unique identifier for a function in \mathcal{H} [39]. Thus, a random seed r in \mathcal{R} can be considered as equivalent to a hash function in the set \mathcal{H} .

Let $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_I\}$ denote the set of all possible hash functions. According to Theorem 3.1, more than 40% of the functions in \mathcal{H} are capable of selecting at least c_k tags and at most $c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}$ tags for category P_k . So, the probability that none of the 6 different functions chosen independently and uniformly at random from \mathcal{H} is suitable is less than $(1 - 0.4)^6 = 0.0467$. To find a suitable function, the average number of tested functions is less than $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 0.4 \times 0.6^{i-1} \times i = 2.5$. □

Theorem 3.2 is verified using real IDs from the universe U in Section 5.2. Next, we shall show OPT-C1 can pick any l -subset of P_k with the same probability, where $l \in [c_k, c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}]$, and then we analyze the communication cost of OPT-C1.

Theorem 3.3: Let P_k^s be the subset of l tags selected by round \mathbb{I}_k from P_k , then P_k^s has the same probability of $1/\binom{n_k}{l}$ to be any l -subset of P_k .

Proof: Every tag has the same probability to be in P_k^s , and $|P_k^s| = l$, so P_k^s has the same probability of being any one of the l -subsets of P_k . As P_k has $\binom{n_k}{l}$ l -subsets, the probability that P_k^s equals to a particular l -subset of P_k is $1/\binom{n_k}{l}$. □

Theorem 3.4: Let $|\text{OPT-C1}|$ represent the communication cost of OPT-C1, then we have $|\text{OPT-C1}| = \sum_{k=1}^K (\log_2(96/\log_2 n_k) + \log_2 c_k)$.

Proof: In each round \mathbb{I}_k , reader R needs to send two parameters: r and c_k . According to Ref. [40], a $(2 \log_2(n_k))$ -bit random seed r is sufficient to describe a universal hash function. However, RFID systems can further reduce this cost because the 96-bit IDs of tags contain a high percentage of random bits, each drawn independently and uniformly at random from $\{0, 1\}$. Note that the

^{††}. Appendix D gives the proof that $\rho(c_k)$ is a decreasing function.

validity of this fact has been verified not only by real experiments with real tag IDs in Section 4.1 of this paper, but also by numerous existing RFID protocols that rely on this fact, e.g., [6], [10], [11], [29]–[31]. Therefore, we can pick a $\log_2(n_k)$ -bit substring of tag t 's ID, and take the value of this substring as the hash value $h(t)$. This approach costs us at most $\log_2(96/\log_2 n_k)$ bits, because we can describe the starting position of a substring with $\log_2(96/\log_2 n_k)$ bits. \square

3.2 The design and analysis of OPT-C2

OPT-C2 contains K communication rounds: $\mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_K$. Each round \mathbb{Q}_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, will randomly draw c_k tags from those that entered the selected state during round \mathbb{I}_k of OPT-C1 and assign them a unique reporting order from 1 to c_k .

First, we list some notations used by OPT-C2. Let P_k^s represent the set consisting of those tags in category P_k that entered the selected state during round \mathbb{I}_k of OPT-C1. Let T_k^r denote the set consisting of tags that enter the ready state during round \mathbb{Q}_k . Besides, we use cnt to denote a local counter held by each tag $t \in P_k^s$ to store its reporting order, and cnt is initialized to 0.

Second, we describe the tags' states when OPT-C2 starts. After OPT-C1 has selected slightly more than c_k random tags from P_k , we have the following 3 initial conditions for round \mathbb{Q}_k .

- (1) The number of tags in P_k^s is within $[c_k, c_k + \sqrt{c_k}]$, i.e., $|P_k^s| \in [c_k, c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}]$ (by Theorem 3.1);
- (2) $T_k^r = \emptyset$ (no tag is in the ready state when OPT-C2 starts);
- (3) Reader R knows which tags in category P_k are in P_k^s (R can predict the tags' states as it knows the 96-bit IDs and category-IDs of all tags).

Based on these initial conditions, the job of round \mathbb{Q}_k is to randomly pick exactly c_k tags from P_k^s and assign them unique reporting orders in $\{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$.

Third, the detailed steps of round \mathbb{Q}_k are as follows. **Step1:** Reader R broadcasts two parameters $\langle r, |P_k^s| \rangle$ out to all the tags in P_k^s , where r is a random seed and $|P_k^s|$ is the size of P_k^s . Note that, unlike OPT-C1, OPT-C2 does not require a suitable random seed, and any random seed will do.

Step2: Upon receiving $\langle r, |P_k^s| \rangle$, each tag t in set P_k^s computes function $h(t) = H(t, r) \bmod |P_k^s|$.

Step3: Reader R broadcasts a vector \mathbf{F} of $|P_k^s|$ bits, where each bit $\mathbf{F}[i]$ is set to 1 if $|T_k^r| + \sum_{i=0}^{i-1} \mathbf{F}[i] < c_k$ and exactly one tag t from P_k^s has $h(t) = i$, otherwise $\mathbf{F}[i]$ is set to 0.

Step4: Upon receiving \mathbf{F} , each tag in P_k^s checks $\mathbf{F}[h(t)]$. If $\mathbf{F}[h(t)] = 1$, t sets $cnt = cnt + \sum_{i=0}^{h(t)} \mathbf{F}[i]$ and changes its status from the selected state to ready state; otherwise, t sets $cnt = cnt + \sum_{i=0}^{|P_k^s|-1} \mathbf{F}[i]$ and stays in the selected state.

Step5: Reader R , who knows the IDs of all tags in P_k^s , can predict which tags in P_k^s will enter the ready state and move them from P_k^s to T_k^r .

Step6: If $|T_k^r|$ is equal to c_k , reader R stops round \mathbb{Q}_k and informs all tags in the selected state to enter the unselected state; otherwise, R repeats steps 1-5.

We take an example to show how OPT-C2 runs. Suppose, when round \mathbb{Q}_k starts, 5 tags: t_1, t_2, \dots, t_5 from category P_k stay in the selected state, and $c_k = 2$. Thus, initially, $P_k^s = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_5\}$ and $T_k^r = \emptyset$. Let's look at the first iteration of steps 1-5 in round \mathbb{Q}_k . In step 1, R broadcasts a




Fig. 3: A running example of OPT-C2.

random seed r_1 and $|P_k^s| = 5$ to all tags in $P_k^s = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_5\}$. Assume that in step 2, the hash values of the 5 tags are: $h(t_1) = h(t_4) = 2$, $h(t_2) = h(t_3) = 0$, and $h(t_5) = 3$. Then, the reader will create a vector $F = [0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$ in step 3 and send it out. In step 4, since $F[h(t_5)] = 1$, tag t_5 takes 1 as its reporting order and enters the ready state; since $F[h(t_1)] = F[h(t_4)] = F[2] = 0$, tags t_1 and t_4 update their local counter cnt to 1 and stay in the selected state; since $F[h(t_2)] = F[h(t_3)] = F[0] = 0$, tags t_2 and t_3 do the same thing as t_1 and t_4 . In step 5, reader R moves t_5 from P_k^s to T_k^r because tag t_5 is now in the ready state. Lastly in step 6, since $|T_k^r| = |\{t_5\}| = 1 < c_k = 2$, R repeats step 1-5. The second iteration is executed similarly to the first. Fig. 3 provides a graphic example of the this process.

Following, we analyze OPT-C.

Theorem 3.5: After round Q_k , exactly c_k tags are in the ready state, and each of them is assigned a unique reporting order ranging from 1 to c_k . Moreover, T_k^r has the same probability of $1/\binom{n_k}{c_k}$ to be any c_k -subset of P_k .

Proof: First, by step 6 in Q_k , we can observe that reader R stops when T_k^r contains c_k tags from P_k^s . Also, since each tag always records the number of tags that move from P_k^s to T_k^r in its local counter cnt (step 4 of OPT-C2), it is easy to determine that the counter cnt on each tag takes a unique integer from $\{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$. Thus, when Q_k ends, we can conclude: $|T_k^r| = c_k$ and each tag in T_k^r is assigned with a unique reporting order.

Second, we analyze the probability that T_k^r equals to a particular c_k -subset of P_k^s . Each tag in P_k has the same probability of being included in P_k^s , and each tag in P_k^s has the same probability of being included in T_k^r , so each tag in P_k has the same probability of being included in T_k^r . Furthermore, since P_k has $\binom{n_k}{c_k}$ different c_k -subsets, the probability that T_k^r is equal to a particular c_k -subset of P_k is $1/\binom{n_k}{c_k}$. □

Theorem 3.6: Let $|\text{OPT-C2}|$ represent the communication cost of OPT-C2, then we have $|\text{OPT-C2}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^K e \times c_k$.

Proof: Suppose P_k^s contains l_k tags when round Q_k starts. Since OPT-C1 uses a suitable random seed to put tags into P_k^s (Theorem 3.1), we have $l_k \in [c_k, c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k}]$.

First, let's look at the first iteration of Q_k . In step 1, reader R sends two parameters: r and

$|P_k^s|$ to create hash function $h()$; In step 3, R sends a $|P_k^s|$ -bit vector \mathbf{F} . As mentioned earlier in Theorem 3.4, a $(2 \log_2(|P_k^s|))$ -bit random seed r is sufficient to describe a hash function [40].[‡] So, this costs us $3 \log_2(|P_k^s|) + |P_k^s| \approx |P_k^s|$ bits.

Next, we analyze the expected number of tags in P_k^s that are moved to set T_k^r in the first iteration. For any tag $t \in P_k^s$, the probability that t occupies the bit $\mathbf{F}[h(t)]$ exclusively is $(1 - 1/|P_k^s|)^{|P_k^s|-1} \approx e^{-1}$. Hence, there are on average $e^{-1}|P_k^s|$ tags that are moved from P_k^s to T_k^r , and then we have $|P_k^s| = (1 - e^{-1})l_k$ and $|T_k^r| = e^{-1}l_k$ at the end of this iteration.

Following a similar analysis as the first iteration, we find that $|P_k^s| = (1 - e^{-1})^J l_k$, and $|T_k^r| = \sum_{i=1}^J e^{-1}(1 - e^{-1})^{i-1} l_k$ hold true at the end of the J -th iteration, $J \geq 2$. In order to ensure that $|T_k^r| = c_k$ (i.e., exactly c_k tags enter the ready state), reader R needs to perform I iterations to make $|P_k^s| = (1 - e^{-1})^I l_k$ equal to $l_k - c_k$. The total number of bits transmitted in these I iterations is $\sum_{i=0}^{I-1} (1 - e^{-1})^i l_k = e l_k - e l_k (1 - e^{-1})^I = e c_k$. Note that the last equality is due to the fact that I satisfies $(1 - e^{-1})^I l_k = l_k - c_k$. Applying this result to the K rounds $\mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_K$ completes the proof. \square

3.3 The analysis of OPT-C

OPT-C first executes OPT-C1 and then OPT-C2. So according to Theorem 3.5, OPT-C solves the CIS problem. Its overall communication cost and execution time satisfy the following theorem.

Theorem 3.7: Let $|\text{OPT-C}|$ denote the communication cost of OPT-C, then we have $|\text{OPT-C}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^K (\log_2(\frac{96}{\log_2 n_k}) + \log_2 c_k + e c_k)$. Moreover, the execution time of OPT-C is within a factor of $\frac{e}{\log_2(e)} \approx 1.88$ of the lower bound T_{lb} shown in (2).

Proof: From Theorem 3.4 and 3.6, it is clear that $|\text{OPT-C}| = |\text{OPT-C1}| + |\text{OPT-C2}| \leq \sum_{k=1}^K (\log_2(\frac{96}{\log_2 n_k}) + \log_2 c_k + e c_k) + \log_2 c_k + e c_k$. Then, the execution time of OPT-C is less than $\sum_{k=1}^K (\log_2(\frac{96}{\log_2 n_k}) + \log_2 c_k + e c_k) / 96 \times T_{96}$, where T_{96} is the time cost of transmitting a 96-bit string from reader R to tags. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\log_2 \left(\frac{96}{\log_2 n_k} \right) + \log_2 c_k + e c_k \right) / 96 \times T_{96}}{\sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(e) c_k / 96 \times T_{96}} \\ & \approx \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K (e) c_k}{\sum_{k=1}^K \log_2(e) c_k} = \frac{e}{\log_2(e)} \approx 1.88, \end{aligned}$$

we know that the communication cost of OPT-C is within a fact of 1.88 of the lower bound. Note that the first approximation in the above derivation is due to the fact that $\frac{\log_2(96/\log_2 n_k)}{c_k} < \frac{3.85}{c_k} \ll e$ for $\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, and $\log_2(c_k) \ll c_k$.^{*} \square

Hence, the execution time of OPT-C is mainly determined by K and c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K , it is near-optimal in theory.

[‡]. A universal hash function mapping to $\{0, 1\}^m$ requires at least $2m$ bits to represents and can perform nearly as a truly random hash function in practice.

^{*}. In a real RFID system, a category P_k usually contains hundreds of tags, i.e., $n_k \geq 10^2$; and part (b) of Fig. 1 indicates that we need to randomly choose $c_k \in [4, 44]$ tags from P_k to ensure a high success probability of 0.99.

4 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OPT-C IN REAL RFID SYSTEMS USING COTS DEVICES

To assess the feasibility and performance of the OPT-C protocol, we have implemented it in a real RFID system, utilizing readily available COTS RFID devices. This implementation, denoted as OPT-C_{IMPL}, is achieved via reader-end programming without requiring any hardware modifications to the COTS tags. Importantly, OPT-C_{IMPL} exclusively relies on tags' EPCs and the standard `Select` command, as mandated by the C1G2 standard [37]. This ensures seamless integration into real-world RFID systems.* OPT-C_{IMPL} encompasses two fundamental functionalities, denoted as **F-1** and **F-2**, which are outlined as follows:

- **F-1: Generating Hash Values for Tags without Overburdening COTS Tags:** To achieve this function, we conduct a thorough analysis of the bit composition within the 96-bit IDs (EPCs) of COTS tags. This analysis reveals that the IDs of COTS tags typically contain a sufficient number of random bits. Drawing inspiration from established software implementations of hash functions on COTS tags, as found in references [42], [43], [46], [47], we successfully generate the required hash value on each COTS tag. Importantly, this is achieved without imposing any additional computational burden on the COTS tags. Further details are in Section 4.1.

- **F-2: Designing an Efficient Algorithm to Generate Appropriate "Select" Commands for Swiftly Selecting Tags with Hash Values Below a Given Threshold τ :** The straightforward approach to selecting all tags with a hash value no more than τ would involve issuing $\tau + 1$ individual `Select` commands, each designated by an integer i ranging from 0 to τ . However, this approach proves time-consuming, requiring τ individual "Select" commands. Therefore, we harness the tag filtering function provided by the "Select" command [37], [42], [43] to design a more efficient method that can generate a significantly smaller number of `Select` commands for choosing all tags with hash values no more than τ . We specifically design a method called **SelGen**, which can generate no more than $\lceil \log_2(\tau) \rceil + 1$ `Select` commands for selecting all tags with hash values no more than τ from each category P_k . Further details are in Section 4.2.

- With these core functionalities, we effectively implement the proposed OPT-C protocol in a real RFID system consisting of COTS devices. The details are in Section 4.3.

4.1 Generating Hash Values on COTS Tags

This section, we present our approach to generating hash values for COTS tags, a key aspect of the OPT-C protocol. We have observed that the 96-bit IDs (EPCs) of COTS tags typically contain a substantial number of random bits. This observation serves as the foundation for achieving functionality **F-1** without requiring any hardware modifications to the COTS tags.

*. **Implementation Rationale:** It is crucial to emphasize that despite OPT-C's utilization of the FSA protocol as the underlying MAC protocol, we deliberately chose to employ the standard `Select` command instead of modifying the FSA protocol. This decision stems from the limited software interface provided by major COTS device manufacturers for reprogramming the FSA protocol to meet our specific requirements [37], [41]. Moreover, the reprogramming of the `Select` command has demonstrated its efficiency and widespread acceptance within the RFID research community for implementing various other tag management protocols [42]–[45].




Fig. 4: Real-world experimental scenario with densely deployed COTS tags in a small area.

To validate this insight, we conduct practical experiments using an Impinj Speedway R420 reader in conjunction with a diverse set of 200 COTS tags. This set includes a variety of widely used COTS tags: 100 ALN-9630 tags, 50 NXP-Ucode7 tags, and 50 Impinj-ER62 tags. Fig. 4 shows the real RFID system. After collecting the IDs of these tags, we pursue two critical tasks:

1. Quantification of Entropy for IDs (EPCs): To perform a systematic analysis, we partitioned each tag’s EPC into 24 subarrays, each comprising 4 bits. Subsequently, we quantified the empirical entropy of these subarrays, shown in Fig. 5. Notably, the 21st, 22nd, 23rd, and 24th subarrays exhibit entropies of 3.97, 3.98, 3.95, and 3.94 bits, respectively. This indicates the presence of more than 3.9 independently and uniformly distributed random bits in each subarray.

2. Generation of Hash Values from Random Bits: We delineate the approach for generating hash values using these identified random bits. Let P_k represent a subset of tags ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$), encompassing any n_k of the 200 COTS tags, and let $\mathcal{L} = \lceil (\log_2(n_k)) \rceil$. We expound on how to generate a hash value ($h(t)$) for each tag $t \in P_k$ using its EPC (composed of 96 bits denoted as $A[1], A[2], \dots, A[96]$). It’s noteworthy that the subarrays spanning from the 21st to the 24th position ($A[81], A[82], \dots, A[96]$) are recognized to contain approximately 16 random bits, which are deemed 16 independent and uniformly distributed random bits. Consequently, to create the hash value $h(t)$ for tag t , we execute the following two steps:

Step 1: Randomly select an integer \mathcal{I} from the range $81, 82, \dots, 96 - \mathcal{L} + 1$.

Step 2: Employ the decimal value of the bit array: $A[\mathcal{I}], A[\mathcal{I} + 1], \dots, A[\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{L} - 1]$, as the hash value $h(t)$ specific to the tag t in question.

This approach ensures the generation of hash values without overburdening the COTS tags, aligning with the requirements of the OPT-C protocol.[†]

4.2 Efficient Generation of `Select` Commands for Hash-Based Tag Selection

Building upon the generated hash values in Section 4.1, we propose an approach for the efficient generation of `Select` commands, designed to select tags in a category P_k whose hash values are less than or equal to a specified threshold τ . This approach fulfills functionality **F-2**.

[†]. It’s crucial to note that the number of random bits, \mathcal{L} , utilized for generating the hash value depends on the value of n_k (representing the number of tags within category P_k). Since the number of tags within the reader’s interrogation range typically remains below 10^5 [7], [10], [11]. Consequently, the value of n_k is significantly smaller than 10^5 . Thus, the utilization of these 16 random bits effectively suffices for generating the required hash values, aligning with the OPT-C protocol’s stipulated requirements.




Fig. 5: The entropy of 200 COTS tag IDs.

As defined by the C1G2 standard [37], a COTS RFID reader (R) can employ a `Select` command to specify a particular group of tags for an upcoming tag inventory process. The `Select` command defines a filter string against which tags are compared to determine if they meet the criteria, and only the matching tags are included in the upcoming inventory. Consequently, for a given threshold value τ , reader R can execute $\tau + 1$ `Select` commands, each using a filter string i to select tags with hash values equal to i , where $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \tau\}$. However, due to the common prefixes shared by hash values within $\{0, 1, \dots, \tau\}$ in binary form, the number of `Select` commands can be significantly reduced. For instance, when using a 4-bit array to represent the hash value of each tag, a single `Select` command with the filter string “000*” can select tags with hash values not exceeding 1. This is because the tag with a hash value of 0 (0000₂) and the tag with a hash value of 1 (0001₂) share the same unique prefix “000*”.

To address this optimization, we introduce a method, called **SelGen**, which generates no more than $\lceil \log_2(\tau) \rceil + 1$ `Select` commands to choose all tags with hash values not exceeding τ . Specifically, assume that each tag uses a \mathcal{L} -bit array in its EPC memory as its hash value[‡], and $(\tau_{\mathcal{L}}, \tau_{\mathcal{L}-1}, \dots, \tau_1)$ denotes the binary form of τ ($\tau = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \tau_i 2^{i-1}$), the **SelGen** method proceeds as below:

- (1) Reader R initializes an empty set \mathbb{S} .
- (2) For each $i \in \{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L} - 1, \dots, 1\}$
- (3) If $\tau_i = 1$, R generates a `Select` command using “ $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}\tau_{\mathcal{L}-1}\dots\tau_{i+1}\underbrace{0}_1\underbrace{**\dots*}_{i-1}$ ” as the filter string and adds this command to \mathbb{S} .
- (4) If $\tau_{i-1} = \tau_{i-2} = \dots = \tau_1 = 1$ or $i = 1$, R generates a `Select` command using

$$\text{“}\tau_{\mathcal{L}}\tau_{\mathcal{L}-1}\dots\tau_{i+1}\underbrace{\tau_i}_1\underbrace{**\dots*}_{i-1}\text{”}$$

as the filter string, adds this command to \mathbb{S} , and ends the loop.

The filter strings generated in step (3) of **SelGen** can select any hash value less than τ . This is because, for any value $x = (x_{\mathcal{L}}, x_{\mathcal{L}-1}, \dots, x_1) < \tau = (\tau_{\mathcal{L}}, \tau_{\mathcal{L}-1}, \dots, \tau_1)$, there exists an index $j \in \{\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L} - 1, \dots, 1\}$ such that $\tau_{\mathcal{L}} = x_{\mathcal{L}}, \tau_{\mathcal{L}-1} = x_{\mathcal{L}-1}, \dots, \tau_{j+1} = x_{j+1}$, and $\tau_j > x_j$. Since step (4) shall select the value τ , we know that **SelGen** can ensure the selection of all tags with hash values not exceeding τ . Moreover, **SelGen** generates at most a total of $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \tau_i + 1$ `Select`

‡. Each tag uses the bit array $A[Z], A[Z + 1], \dots, A[Z + \mathcal{L} - 1]$ in its EPC to generate its hash value.

commands, corresponding to the number of ‘1’s in the string $(\tau_{\mathcal{L}}, \tau_{\mathcal{L}-1}, \dots, \tau_1)$ plus one. Therefore, the number of `Select` commands in \mathbb{S} is no more than $\lceil \log_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}) \rceil + 1$.[§]

4.3 Implementation of OPT-C

In this section, we detail the implementation of the OPT-C protocol, denoted as OPT-C_{IMPL}, using the hash value generation method discussed in Section 4.1 and the `Select` command generation method (**SelGen**) explained in Section 4.2.

Let S represent the tag population, which comprises 200 COTS tags categorized into K distinct groups: P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K . Each category P_k contains n_k tags selected from the population. The OPT-C_{IMPL} implementation is built based on the functionalities **F-1** and **F-2**. Specifically, we first employ the last 16 bits ($A[81], A[82], \dots, A[96]$) in each tag’s EPC to generate the hash value, denoted as $h(t)$, for every tag t in a category P_k , where $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.[¶] Second, we employ the **SelGen** method to implement the two main stages of the OPT-C protocol in a real RFID system as follows.

- *Implementing the first stage of OPT-C:*

The initial stage, OPT-C1, encompasses a coarse sampling process that draws roughly c_k tags from each category P_k (where $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$). The primary objective is to select all tags with a hash value that does not exceed the defined threshold $\tau = c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$. To accomplish this, the reader R generates a hash value for each tag t in P_k by extracting $\lceil \log_2(n_k) \rceil$ bits from the tag’s EPC. Subsequently, the **SelGen** method is invoked with a threshold set at $\tau = c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}$ to create a set of `Select` commands, designated as \mathbb{S}_k^I , capable of selecting all tags with hash values not exceeding τ . R then executes the commands in \mathbb{S}_k^I to select a set, P_k^s , comprising slightly more than c_k tags from P_k (refer to Section 3.1 for further details).

- *Implementing the second stage of OPT-C:*

The second stage, OPT-C2, involves a more refined sampling process, which precisely selects c_k tags from P_k^s and assigns them unique reporting orders. To implement OPT-C2, the reader R generates a hash value for each tag t within P_k^s by extracting a hash value containing $\log_2(|P_k^s|^2) \leq 2 \log_2(c_k + 6\sqrt{c_k})$ random bits from the tag’s EPC.^{||} Subsequently, R leverages the **SelGen** method to produce a set of `Select` commands, denoted as \mathbb{S}_k^{II} , which selectively pick precisely c_k tags from P_k^s . Each chosen tag is implicitly assigned a unique reporting order in the form of a unique

§. We would like to provide details on the structure of the `Select` commands generated by **SelGen**. As per the C1G2 standard [37], a `Select` command utilizes four fields: MemBank, Pointer, Length, and Mask to define the filter string (see **Appendix E**). Thus, when each tag in a category uses the $A[\mathcal{I}], A[\mathcal{I} + 1], \dots, A[\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{L} - 1]$ in its EPC memory bank as its hash value, step (3) of **SelGen** adds: `Select`(MemBank = 1, Pointer = \mathcal{I} , Length = $\mathcal{L} - i + 1$, Mask = “ $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}\tau_{\mathcal{L}-1} \dots \tau_{i+1}0$ ”) to \mathbb{S} . Similarly, step (4) of **SelGen** adds: `Select`(MemBank = 1, Pointer = \mathcal{I} , Length = $\mathcal{L} - i + 1$, Mask = “ $\tau_{\mathcal{L}}\tau_{\mathcal{L}-i+1} \dots \tau_{i+1}\tau_i$ ”) to \mathbb{S} . Note that step (4) is used to end the loop when all the unprocessed bits are 1s or when all bits has been processed.

¶. In scenarios where tags may occasionally lack a sufficient number of random bits, a practical solution is available. Additional random bits can be conveniently pre-written into the User memory of the tag to ensure the creation of the necessary hash value. This approach has been adopted by several leading works in the RFID systems domain, as evidenced by references [43], [48]–[50].

||. The rationale for generating a $\log_2(|P_k^s|^2)$ -bit hash value for each tag, ranging from 0 to $|P_k^s|^2 - 1$, is as follows. When \mathcal{N} objects are hashed to integers in $\{0, 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}^2 - 1\}$, the probability of at least one pair of objects sharing the same hash value is no more than $\binom{\mathcal{N}}{2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^2} \leq 0.5$. Consequently, the probability of no two objects sharing the same hash value exceeds 0.5. Taking this into consideration, by adopting the hash value range $\{0, 1, \dots, |P_k^s|^2 - 1\}$, we can easily identify an index I from the set $\{81, 82, \dots, 96 - \mathcal{L} + 1\}$ that guarantees that exactly c_k tags within the set P_k^s have hash values not exceeding τ . Here, τ is designated as the c_k -th smallest hash value among all the tags in P_k^s .

integer. Finally, R executes the commands within \mathbb{S}_k^{II} to select exactly c_k tags from P_k^{s} . Please note that these c_k tags constitute the set T_k^{r} (see Section 3.2).

5 SIMULATIONS

In this section, we evaluate OPT-C's performance with two state-of-the-art category information sampling protocols: TPS [6] and ACS [7]. We also verify Theorem 3.2 using 96-bit IDs from the universe U to show that reader R can find a suitable random seed rapidly in practice.

All simulations are conducted based on the C1G2 standard [37] to measure communication times for the tested protocols. Our setup includes a transmission rate of 26.7 kbps from reader R to the tags, with a $302\mu\text{s}$ interval between consecutive transmissions. Therefore, reader R requires $T_{96} = 3897.5 \times 10^{-6}\text{s}$ to transmit a 96-bit string to the tags. Subsequently, the time needed to send an f -bit string to the tags was $\frac{fT_{96}}{96}\text{s}$.**

We refrain from evaluating the success probability, specifically the likelihood that at least one of the c_k sampled tags from P_k is not missing. This is because all three protocols exhibit the same success probability while demonstrating distinct execution times with identical reliability numbers. However, in cases where an equal running time budget is assigned to all tested protocols, OPT-C surpasses others in success probability. This is attributed to its capability to sample a greater number of tags within the same time frame, as depicted in Figs. 6, 7, 8, and 11.

5.1 Simulation results for execution times

Fig. 6 shows the results of the three protocols in Scenarios 1 and 2. Please note that the lower bound T_{lb} in the two figures is drawn according to (2) in Theorem 2.2. From this figure, we can observe: (1) the execution time of OPT-C increases with K , which is consistent with its theoretical time shown in Theorem 3.7; and (2) the execution time of OPT-C is significantly less than the other protocols, and is actually close to the lower bound of execution time. For example, in Scenario 1, when $K = 100$ (the number of categories is 100) the execution times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 1.5s, 3.3s and 6.1s, respectively; in Scenario 2, when $K = 100$, the execution times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 0.6s, 1.2s and 2.2s, respectively. Generally, in Scenarios 1 and 2, OPT-C reduces the execution time by a factor of about 2.1, and is within about 1.88 times of the lower bound T_{lb} .

Next, for Scenarios 3 and 4, we show the results of the three protocols in Fig. 7. This figure tells: (1) the execution time of OPT-C remains unchanged with the increase of the K category sizes, which is consistent with its theoretical time shown in Theorem 3.7; and (2) the execution time of OPT-C is much less than other protocols, and close to the lower bound. For example, in Scenario 3, when $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_K = 100$, the execution times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 0.3s, 0.6s and 0.8s, respectively; in Scenario 4, when $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_K = 100$, the execution

** Please note that, the time required for the reader R to access the selected tags for their category information is not included in the protocol's execution time, as this cost remained consistent across all protocols. Let T_{CI} denote the time required for a tag to transmit its category information. The total time for collecting information from all categories is $\sum_{k=1}^K T_{\text{CI}} \times c_k$, which remains constant regardless of which protocol is used.




Fig. 6: Performance comparisons for Scenarios 1 and 2 with varied K (the number of categories).




Fig. 7: Performance comparisons for Scenarios 3 and 4 with varied n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K (category sizes).




Fig. 8: Performance comparisons for Scenarios 5 and 6 with varied sample size $c_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, K$.

times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 0.7s, 1.6s and 2.2s, respectively. Generally, in Scenarios 3 and 4, OPT-C reduces the execution time by a factor of about 2.2, and is within about 1.88 times of the lower bound T_{lb} .

Lastly, for Scenarios 5 and 6, we show the results of the three protocols in Fig. 8. This figure demonstrates: (1) the execution time of OPT-C increases with the K sample sizes, which is also indicated by its theoretical time shown in Theorem 3.7; and (2) the execution time of OPT-C is much less than other protocols, and is close to the lower bound. For example, in Scenario 5, when $c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_K = 50$, the execution times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 1.1s, 3s and 4.4s, respectively; in Scenario 6, when $n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_K = 100$, the execution times of OPT-C, ACS, and TPS are 5.7s, 11.9s and 21.3s, respectively. Overall for Scenarios 5 and 6, OPT-C reduces the communication time by a factor of about 2.6, and is within about 1.88 times of the lower bound




Fig. 9: The number of tested random seeds in Scenario 7 ($n = 10^3$, $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$) for the basic sampling problem.[‡] (a) Average Number. (b) Maximum Number.




Fig. 10: The number of tested random seeds for Scenario 8 ($c = 50$, $n \in \{100, 120, \dots, 10^3\}$) for the basic sampling problem.[‡] (a) Average Number. (b) Maximum Number.

T_{lb} .

The experimental results of scenarios 1-6 show that OPT-C significantly outperforms the other two protocols in terms of execution time and can approach the lower bound T_{lb} .[‡] This verifies the theoretical result in Theorem 3.7. There are two reasons why OPT-C is superior: its novel coarse sampling protocol, which can select a little more than c_k tags from each category P_k at an almost negligible time cost (see Theorem 3.4), and its refined sampling protocol, which can extract exactly c_k tags from these already selected tags with a time cost that is near the lower bound (Theorem 3.6).

5.2 Verifying Theorem 3.2

We investigate the number of tests required by reader R to find a suitable random seed (in OPT-C1) with 96-bit ID from the universe U , in order to verify two facts: (1) the probability of finding a suitable one within 6 tests is close to 1; and (2) the average number of tests required is under 2.5 (i.e., to verify Theorem 3.2). In particular, we compute how many random seeds should be tested in order to solve the basic sampling problem of selecting at least c and at most

[‡]. The OPT-C protocol demonstrates favorable scalability within for RFID systems with a large number of tags, as its execution time only grows linearly with the K sample sizes which are usually not excessively large, as indicated by Fig. 1.

[‡]. In the basic sampling problem, there is only one category P of n tags from U , and the objective is to select at least c and at most $c + 6\sqrt{c}$ tags randomly from P .

$c + 6\sqrt{c}$ tags randomly from a single category P of n tags. Any n -subset of U can be P . Given fixed values of c and n , we conduct 10^3 independent trials to calculate the actual numbers of tested random seeds for finding a suitable one. Each trial includes 6 steps:

- (1) Initialize a variable x to be 0.
- (2) Generate the category P by randomly choosing n tags from the universe U (i.e., choosing n IDs from the 2^{96} different IDs).
- (3) Pick a random seed r , and compute the corresponding hash values $H(t, r) \bmod n = h(t)$ for each tag $t \in P$.*
- (4) A tag $t \in P$ enters the selected state if $h(t) \leq c + 3\sqrt{c}$.
- (5) Calculate the value of l , which represents the number of tags that enter the selected state
- (6) If $l \in [c, c + 6\sqrt{c}]$, stop the trial and report the value of x ; otherwise, set $x = x + 1$ and return to step (3).

We conduct 10^3 trials in two typical scenarios, referred to as Scenario 7 and Scenario 8. These scenarios feature varying relationships between the parameters n and c . Scenario 7 maintains n at 10^3 and increases c from 1 to 10^2 , while Scenario 8 keeps c at 50 and varies n from 10^2 to 10^3 . The results for Scenarios 7 and 8 are presented in Fig. 9 and 10, respectively. These figures reveal that the average number of tested random seeds is below 1.15, and the maximum is always under 6, thereby verifying Theorem 3.2 in practice.

6 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we present the results of our experiments aimed at evaluating the real-world performance of the OPT-C_{IMPL} protocol against state-of-the-art C1G2-compatible sampling protocols within a real RFID system. These experiments are conducted using an Impinj R420 reader, denoted by R , and a collection of 200 COTS tags, specifically ALN-9630, NXP-Ucode7, and Impinj-ER62, all of which are compliant with the C1G2 standard [37].


Our experimental setup involves integrating the Impinj R420 reader with a 900 MHz Laird polarized antenna. This reader, R , operates in dense Miller 8 mode and is connected to a laptop computer equipped with an Intel i7-7700 processor and 16GB of RAM via an Ethernet connection. Varying quantities of tags, ranging from 40 to 200, are placed at a distance of approximately 1.5 meters from the antenna. For a visual representation of the physical configuration of the RFID system, please refer to Fig. 4. The implementation of OPT-C_{IMPL} is carried out in C# using the Octane SDK .NET 4.0.0 [41], running on the laptop to control the reader for tag recognition.

Our investigation of existing literature on RFID tag sampling [6], [7], [46]–[48] leads us to identify the DTS protocol proposed in [48] as the sole state-of-the-art tag sampling protocol that can be directly implemented on COTS RFID devices (i.e., fully C1G2-compatible). The DTS protocol facilitates the random selection of tags from a subset with user-specified probabilities. However, the DTS protocol cannot guarantee to select precisely c_k tags from each category P_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, K$), as each tag is independently chosen with a fixed probability. This leads to the

*. Note: a random seed r is actually the starting position of a $\log_2(n)$ -bit substring in the 96-bit ID of tag t , and the decimal value of this substring is the hash value for t , see Theorem 3.4.

TABLE 5: Parameter settings for the three real scenarios

Real Scenario	The number of categories	Category sizes	Sample sizes
I	$K \in \{2, 4, \dots, 10\}$	$n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_K = 20$	$c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_K = 5$
II	$K = 8$	$n_1 = n_2 = \dots = n_K \in \{10, 15, 20, 25\}$	$c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_K = 4$
III	$K = 8$	For each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, if $k \bmod 2 = 1$, $n_k = 20$; if $k \bmod 2 = 0$, $n_k = 30$	$c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_K \in \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$

Fig. 11: The practical communication time of RandomSelect, DTS, and OPT-C_{IMPL} for Real Scenarios I, II, and III.

possibility of selecting more than c_k tags in practice (as discussed in section 4.2.2 of [48]). To address this, we enhance the DTS protocol by introducing a trimming mechanism to deselect surplus tags when more than c_k tags are chosen from category P_k , ensuring equitable comparisons.[†] In addition to DTS, we design a baseline tag sampling protocol called RandomSelect. This protocol selects each sampled tag using an individual `Select` command, and is fully C1G2-compatible.[‡]

We assess the performance of the three protocols (RandomSelect, DTS, and OPT-C_{IMPL}) in 3 typical real scenarios (Scenarios I-III). Each scenario is characterized by variations in one of three key parameters, which include K (the number of categories), n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K (category sizes), and

[†]. In the DTS protocol, reader R begins by pre-writing a random bit array into the User memory of each tag in category P_k , ($k = 1 \sim K$). R then employs a random selection method to choose tags from P_k . This selection process involves randomly picking a '1' from the pre-written array, serving as the mask for the 'Select' command. By using this mask, R can select multiple tags from category P_k . To ensure the selection of exactly c_k tags from P_k , R manages this by either deselecting surplus tags when more than c_k tags are initially chosen from P_k or selecting additional tags from P_k through extra `Select` commands when less than c_k are initially chosen from P_k . This process allows reader R to achieve the desired selection of c_k tags from category P_k . Once the selection of c_k tags is successfully completed, reader R proceeds to assign a unique reporting order to each selected tag. This assignment is facilitated by executing a standard inventory process, where each selected tag is associated with a singleton slot (equivalently to assigning unique reporting orders).

[‡]. The RandomSelect protocol begins with reader R randomly selecting c_k tags from category P_k by drawing c_k EPCs from the pool of EPCs associated with tags in P_k . Subsequently, reader R executes c_k individual `Select` commands, with each command utilizing the EPC of the corresponding selected tag as a mask. Once the selection of c_k tags is successfully completed, reader R proceeds to assign a unique reporting order to each selected tag. This assignment is accomplished through the execution of a standard inventory process, where each selected tag is associated with a singleton slot.

c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K (sample sizes or reliability numbers). The detailed parameter settings for Scenarios I-III are listed in Tab. 5. For each scenario, we conduct 10 trials and record the average practical execution times of the three protocols. Here's how we conduct the trials in each scenario:

- **Step 1:** We manually pick $N = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k$ tags from the universe \mathcal{T} of 500 COTS tags and divide them into K categories: P_1, P_2, \dots, P_K , where P_k contains n_k tags ($k = 1, 2, \dots, K$) assigned with the same category-ID k .
- **Step 2:** We let the reader R execute one of the three tested protocols over this tag population to sample c_k tags from each category P_k and assign unique integers to the sampled tags. We record the time taken by each protocol.
- **Step 3:** The reader R pauses and waits for us to manually select another N tags from \mathcal{T} for the next trial.

The experimental results from these three real scenarios offer substantial evidence supporting the superior performance of OPT-C_{IMPL}. In particular, Fig. 11 demonstrates that OPT-C_{IMPL} consistently outperformed DTS and RandomSelect in terms of average communication time. For instance, in Scenario I, OPT-C_{IMPL} achieves approximately 63% of DTS's average communication time and 57% of RandomSelect's average communication time. Similar trends can be observed in Scenarios III and V, where OPT-C_{IMPL} outperforms DTS and RandomSelect, achieving around 62% and 57% of their respective average communication times.

The superior performance of OPT-C_{IMPL} can be attributed to the OPT-C protocol, which offers two key advantages: **(1) Coarse Sampling Stage:** OPT-C_{IMPL} follows the first stage of OPT-C, employing a specially designed threshold and tag hash values. This allows OPT-C_{IMPL} to sample slightly more than c_k tags from category P_k using fewer than $\lceil \log_2(c_k) \rceil + 1$ Select commands. **(2) Refined Sampling Stage:** OPT-C_{IMPL} follows the second stage of OPT-C, using a specifically designed hash value range and threshold. This enables OPT-C_{IMPL} to draw exactly c_k tags from category P_k and assign them unique reporting orders using fewer than $2\lceil \log_2(c_k) \rceil + 2$ Select commands.

In summary, the number of Select commands used by OPT-C_{IMPL} for the CIS problem is at most $\sum_{k=1}^K (3\lceil \log_2(c_k) \rceil + 3)$, with each Select command employing a filter string of $O(\log_2(c_k))$ bits. In contrast, the state-of-the-art DTS protocol [48] demands approximately $\sum_{k=1}^K O(\sqrt{c_k})$ Select commands and an additional operation involving pre-writing a lengthy bit-vector into each tag's user memory before sampling tags.[§] The RandomSelect protocol necessitates $\sum_{k=1}^K c_k$ Select commands, each utilizing a 96-bit array as its mask.

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have studied the Category Information Sampling Problem in practical RFID systems with missing tags. Our primary objective is to use the shortest possible time to randomly

[§] By section 4.2.2 of [48], the DTS protocol samples each in P_k independently with a fixed probability of $p_k = c_k/n_k$. Let X_k denote the number of sampled tags from P_k by the DTS protocol. Then $|X_k - c_k|$ represents the additional tags that DTS protocol must further select or unselect to ensure exactly c_k are drawn from P_k . By the second formula in Theorem 1 of [51], we know that $E[|X_k - c_k|] \geq \sqrt{n_k p_k (1 - p_k)} / \sqrt{2} = \sqrt{n_k (c_k/n_k) (1 - c_k/n_k)} / \sqrt{2} = O(\sqrt{c_k})$. Hence, on average, DTS needs to execute $O(\sqrt{c_k})$ Select command to ensure exactly c_k tags are drawn from category P_k .

select a few tags from each group and collect their category information. For this target, we first obtained a lower bound on the execution time for solving this problem. Then, we presented a near-optimal protocol OPT-C, and proved that OPT-C can solve the studied problem with an execution time close to the lower bound. Lastly, we verified the practicability and validity of OPT-C with real experiments, and compared OPT-C with the state-of-the-art solutions through extensive simulations to demonstrate its superiority.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bernardini, A. Buffi, D. Fontanelli, D. Macii, V. Magnago, M. Marracci, A. Motroni, P. Nepa, and B. Tellini, "Robot-based indoor positioning of uhf-rfid tags: The sar method with multiple trajectories," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 70, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- [2] K. Ngamakeur, S. Yongchareon, J. Yu, and S. U. Rehman, "A survey on device-free indoor localization and tracking in the multi-resident environment," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1–29, 2020.
- [3] T. Liu, C. Wang, L. Xie, J. Ning, T. Qiu, F. Xiao, and S. Lu, "Rf-protractor: Non-contacting angle tracking via cots rfid in industrial iot environment," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 390–399.
- [4] H. Wang, S. Chen, and W. Gong, "Artifact: Mobility improves accuracy: Precise robot manipulation with cots rfid systems," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops and other Affiliated Events (PerCom Workshops)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 436–437.
- [5] H. Cai, G. Wang, X. Shi, J. Xie, M. Wang, C. Qian, and S. Chen, "When Tags 'Read' Each Other: Enabling Low-cost and Convenient Tag Mutual Identification," *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks (TOSN)*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1–22, 2022.
- [6] J. Liu, S. Chen, Q. Xiao, M. Chen, B. Xiao, and L. Chen, "Efficient information sampling in multi-category rfid systems," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 159–172, 2018.
- [7] C. Chu, J. Niu, H. Ma, J. Su, R. Xu, and G. Wen, "An efficient information sampling method for multi-category rfid systems," *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, 2021.
- [8] "Wireless Identification and Sensing Platform WISP". [Online]. Available: <https://sites.google.com/uw.edu/wisp-wiki/home>
- [9] X. Xie, X. Liu, K. Li, B. Xiao, and H. Qi, "Minimal perfect hashing-based information collection protocol for rfid systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 16, no. 10, pp. 2792–2805, 2017.
- [10] Liu, Xuan and Yin, Jiangjin and Zhang, Shigeng and Xiao, Bin and Ou, Bo, "Time-Efficient Target Tags Information Collection in Large-Scale RFID Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 2891–2905, 2021.
- [11] K. Liu, L. Chen, J. Huang, S. Liu, and J. Yu, "Revisiting rfid missing tag identification," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 710–719.
- [12] S. A. Ahson and M. Ilyas, *RFID handbook: applications, technology, security, and privacy*. CRC press, 2017.
- [13] Alcaraz, Juan J and Vales-Alonso, Javier and Garcia-Haro, Joan, "RFID reader scheduling for reliable identification of moving tags," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 816–828, 2012.
- [14] Q. Xiao, S. Chen, J. Liu, G. Cheng, and J. Luo, "A protocol for simultaneously estimating moments and popular groups in a multigroup rfid system," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 143–158, 2019.
- [15] Y. Qiao, S. Chen, T. Li, and S. Chen, "Tag-ordering polling protocols in rfid systems," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1548–1561, 2015.
- [16] S. Liao, H. Yang, J. Zhao, D. Li, and J. Li, "An abnormal information collection protocol for large-scale rfid systems," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 19, no. 22, pp. 10829–10836, 2019.
- [17] J. Zhao, H. Yang, W. Li, D. Li, and R. Yan, "An information classification collection protocol for large-scale rfid system," in *International Conference on Wireless Algorithms, Systems, and Applications*. Springer, 2018, pp. 660–670.
- [18] X. Wang, Y. Gao, Y. Yang, X. Zheng, X. Wu, and W. Zhao, "An efficient protocol for the tag-information sampling problem in rfid systems," *Mobile Networks and Applications*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 1974–1985, 2021.
- [19] S. Lumetta and M. Mitzenmacher, "Using the power of two choices to improve bloom filters," *Internet Mathematics*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 17–33, 2007.
- [20] Q. Lin, K.-W. Wong, and J. Chen, "An enhanced variable-length arithmetic coding and encryption scheme using chaotic maps," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 86, no. 5, pp. 1384–1389, 2013.
- [21] Wang, Jue and Hassanieh, Haitham and Katabi, Dina and Indyk, Piotr, "Efficient and reliable low-power backscatter networks," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 61–72, 2012.

- [22] Hu, Pan and Zhang, Pengyu and Ganesan, Deepak, "Laissez-faire: Fully asymmetric backscatter communication," *ACM SIGCOMM computer communication review*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 255–267, 2015.
- [23] Jin, Meng and He, Yuan and Meng, Xin and Zheng, Yilun and Fang, Dingyi and Chen, Xiaojiang, "FlipTracer: Practical Parallel Decoding for Backscatter Communication," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 330–343, 2019.
- [24] Benedetti, David and Maselli, Gaia, "Robust RFID Tag Identification," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 21, p. 8406, 2022.
- [25] Mathews, Paul, *Sample size calculations: Practical methods for engineers and scientists*. Mathews Malnar and Bailey, 2010.
- [26] Lenth, Russell V, "Some practical guidelines for effective sample size determination," *The American Statistician*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 187–193, 2001.
- [27] Kleyner, Andre and Bhagath, Shrikar and Gasparini, Mauro and Robinson, Jeffrey and Bender, Mark, "Bayesian techniques to reduce the sample size in automotive electronics attribute testing," *Microelectronics Reliability*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 879–883, 1997.
- [28] De Santis, Fulvio, "Using historical data for Bayesian sample size determination," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, vol. 170, no. 1, pp. 95–113, 2007.
- [29] W. Zhu, X. Meng, X. Peng, J. Cao, and M. Raynal, "Collisions are preferred: Rfid-based stocktaking with a high missing rate," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 1544–1554, 2020.
- [30] Y. Zhang, S. Chen, Y. Zhou, and Y. Fang, "Missing-tag detection with unknown tags," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 1297–1310, 2020.
- [31] X. Liu, S. Chen, J. Liu, W. Qu, F. Xiao, A. X. Liu, J. Cao, and J. Liu, "Fast and accurate detection of unknown tags for rfid systems—hash collisions are desirable," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 126–139, 2020.
- [32] Zhou, Ziling and Chen, Binbin and Yu, Haifeng, "Understanding RFID Counting Protocols," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 24, no. 01, pp. 312–327, 2016.
- [33] A. Rao and A. Yehudayoff, *Communication Complexity: and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [34] Goswami, Mayank and Grønlund, Allan and Larsen, Kasper Green and Pagh, Rasmus, "Approximate range emptiness in constant time and optimal space," in *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. SIAM, 2014, pp. 769–775.
- [35] Cambini, Alberto and Martein, Laura, "Generalized convexity and optimization: Theory and applications". Springer Science & Business Media, 2008, vol. 616.
- [36] X. Wang, Z. Liu, Y. Gao, X. Zheng, Z. Dang, and X. Shen, "A near-optimal protocol for the grouping problem in rfid systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, pp. 1–1, 2019.
- [37] EPCglobal, "EPC Radio-Frequency Identity Protocols Generation-2 UHF RFID Standard, Specification for RFID Air Interface Protocol for Communications at 860 MHz - 960 MHz, Version 2.1", 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.gs1.org/sites/default/files/docs/epc/gs1-epc-gen2v2-uhf-airinterface_i21_r_2018-09-04.pdf
- [38] M. Mitzenmacher and E. Upfal, "Probability and computing: randomization and probabilistic techniques in algorithms and data analysis". Cambridge university press, 2017.
- [39] M. Hayashi and T. Tsurumaru, "More efficient privacy amplification with less random seeds via dual universal hash function," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 2213–2232, 2016.
- [40] M. Mitzenmacher and S. P. Vadhan, "Why simple hash functions work: Exploiting the entropy in a data stream," in *Nineteenth Acm-siam Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2008.
- [41] "Octane SDK .NET," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://support.impinj.com/hc/en-us/articles/360010077479-Octane-SDK-Installation-Instructions>
- [42] Lin, Qiongzhen and Yang, Lei and Duan, Chunhui and An, Zhenlin, "Tash: Toward selective reading as hash primitives for Gen2 RFIDs," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 819–834, 2019.
- [43] An, Zhenlin and Lin, Qiongzhen and Yang, Lei and Lou, Wei and Xie, Lei, "Acquiring Bloom Filters across commercial RFIDs in physical layer," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1804–1817, 2020.
- [44] Liu, Jia and Yu, Xi and Liu, Xuan and Chen, Xingyu and Liu, Haisong and Wang, Yanyan and Chen, Lijun, "Time-efficient range detection in commodity RFID systems," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1118–1131, 2022.
- [45] Xie, Xin and Liu, Xiulong and Wang, Junxiao and Guo, Song and Qi, Heng and Li, Keqiu, "Efficient Integrity Authentication Scheme for Large-scale RFID Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2022.
- [46] Hu, Qiwen and Xie, Xin and Liu, Xiulong and Li, Keqiu and Wu, Jie, "Bringing the Functionality of Tag Sampling to Reality for COTS RFID Systems," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 1254–1258, 2019.
- [47] L. Yang, Q. Lin, C. Duan, and Z. An, "Analog on-tag hashing: Towards selective reading as hash primitives in gen2 rfid systems," in *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, 2017, pp. 301–314.

- [48] Xie, Xin and Liu, Xiulong and Zhao, Xibin and Xue, Weilian and Xiao, Bin and Qi, Heng and Li, Keqiu and Wu, Jie, "Implementation of Differential Tag Sampling for COTS RFID Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 1848–1861, 2020.
- [49] Liu, Kanghuai and Yu, Jihong and Cui, Haochen and others, "On Batch Writing in COTS RFID Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2023.
- [50] Xie, Xin and Liu, Xiulong and Wang, Junxiao and Guo, Song and Qi, Heng and Li, Keqiu, "Efficient Integrity Authentication Scheme for Large-Scale RFID Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 5216–5230, 2023.
- [51] Berend, Daniel and Kontorovich, Aryeh, "A sharp estimate of the binomial mean absolute deviation with applications," *Statistics & Probability Letters*, vol. 83, no. 4, pp. 1254–1259, 2013.
- [52] F. Topsøe, "Some bounds for the logarithmic function," *Inequality theory and applications*, vol. 4, no. 01, 2007.

APPENDIX

A. An analytical calculation of c_k to guarantee a given success probability

Assume that $\alpha_k \in (0, 1)$ represents the rate of missing tags in category P_k , which can be estimated very rapidly with a time cost of only $O(\log_2(\log_2(|P_k|)))$ [32]. When only one tag is selected randomly from P_k , the success probability is $1 - \alpha_k$, i.e., the probability that the randomly selected tag is not missing is $1 - \alpha_k$. However, if we choose c_k tags randomly from P_k , the success probability increases rapidly to $1 - \frac{(\alpha_k |P_k|)^{c_k}}{|P_k|^{c_k}} \geq 1 - \alpha_k^{c_k}$. This can be explained as follows: as long as one of the c_k randomly selected tags from P_k is not missing, we can successfully collect P_k 's category information. So the success probability is equal to the probability that at least one of the c_k randomly selected tags is not missing (i.e., equal to $1 - \frac{(\alpha_k |P_k|)^{c_k}}{|P_k|^{c_k}}$). Furthermore, given a small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, to guarantee a high success probability of $1 - \varepsilon$, we only need to randomly choose $c_k = \ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) / \ln(\frac{1}{\alpha_k})$, because $\alpha_k^{c_k} = \alpha_k^{\ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) / \ln(\frac{1}{\alpha_k})} = \varepsilon$. In addition, based on the inequality (4) of Ref. [52]: $\ln(1 + z) \leq \frac{2z}{2+z}$, $-1 < z \leq 0$, we can obtain that $\ln(\frac{1}{\alpha_k}) \geq \frac{2(1-\alpha_k)}{1+\alpha_k}$. Subsequently, since $c_k = \ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) / \ln(\frac{1}{\alpha_k}) \leq \ln(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \frac{1+\alpha_k}{2(1-\alpha_k)}$, we can observe that c_k remains small even when α_k is relatively large and ε is relatively small.

B. Proof of the inequality: (4) \leq (5)

Clearly, (4) can be represented by a function $g(s_{1,0}^v, s_{1,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v)$ of variables: $s_{k,i}^v$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, c_k\}$. Note that category sizes n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K and reliability numbers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K are pre-given. Furthermore, $g(s_{1,0}^v, s_{1,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v)$ can be expressed as the product of K functions: $f(s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v) = \frac{(s_{k,0}^v)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!} \prod_{i=1}^{c_k} s_{k,i}^v$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$. We can find the maximum value of each of the K functions by studying the following maximization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \ln(f(s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v)) \\ & s.t. \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^{c_k} s_{k,i}^v = \Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j, \\ s_{k,i}^v \geq 0 \quad (i = 0, 1, \dots, c_k). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the function $\ln(f(s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v)) = \ln(\frac{(s_{k,0}^v)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!}) + \sum_{i=1}^{c_k} \ln(s_{k,i}^v) = (n_k - c_k) \ln(s_{k,0}^v) + \sum_{i=1}^{c_k} \ln(s_{k,i}^v) - \ln((n_k - c_k)!)$ is a non-negative linear combination of $c_k + 1$ concave functions:

$\ln(s_{k,0}^v), \ln(s_{k,1}^v), \ln(s_{k,2}^v), \dots, \ln(s_{k,c_k}^v)$.[¶] Thus, $\ln(f(s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v))$ is also concave [35]. So we can use the method of Lagrange multipliers to discover that its maximum value is $(n_k - c_k) \ln\left(\frac{(n - c_k)^{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}}{n_k}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{c_k} \ln\left(\frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}\right) - \ln((n_k - c_k)!)$, which is obtained when $s_{k,i}^v = \frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_k$, and $s_{k,0}^v = (n - c_k) \frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}$. Since function $\ln(x)$ is monotonically increasing, we know

$$f(s_{k,0}^v, s_{k,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v) \leq \frac{(n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!} \left(\frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}\right)^{n_k}$$

. Multiplying the maximum values of the K functions together gives us

$$\prod_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{(n_k - c_k)^{n_k - c_k}}{(n_k - c_k)!} \left(\frac{\Upsilon - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j}{n_k}\right)^{n_k} \right] = \Phi,$$

which is the maximum of $g(s_{1,0}^v, s_{1,1}^v, \dots, s_{k,c_k}^v)$. This leads to the inequality (4) \leq (5).

C. Proof of the fact: $\mu(c_k) = e^{3\sqrt{c_k}} \left(1 + \frac{3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}\right)^{-c_k - 6\sqrt{c_k}}$ is a monotonically decreasing function of c_k

Let $x = \sqrt{c_k}$, then the function $\mu(c_k)$ can be rewritten as: $\mu(x^2) = e^{3x} \left(1 + \frac{3x}{x^2 + 3x}\right)^{-x^2 - 6x} = e^{3x + (-x^2 - 6x) \ln\left(1 + \frac{3x}{x^2 + 3x}\right)}$. Since $c_k \geq 1$ and $x \geq 1$, proving that the derivative of $\mu(x)$ is less than 0 will be enough to show $\mu(c_k)$ is a monotonically decreasing function. The derivative of $\mu(x)$ is analyzed as below:

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu(x)/dx &= 3 - (2x + 6) \ln\left(1 + \frac{3x}{x^2 + 3x}\right) \\ &\quad - (x^2 + 6x) \frac{x^2 + 3x}{x^2 + 6x} \frac{(2x + 6)(x^2 + 3x) - (x^2 + 6x)(2x + 3)}{(x^2 + 3x)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{6x + 9}{x + 3} - \frac{12}{2 + 3/(x + 3)} = \frac{-27}{(x + 3)(2x + 9)} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality in the above derivation is based on the inequality (3) of Ref. [52]: $\ln(1 + z) \geq \frac{2z}{2+z}, 0 \leq z < \infty$.

D. Proof of the fact: $\rho(c_k) = e^{-3\sqrt{c_k}} \left(1 + \frac{-3\sqrt{c_k}}{c_k + 3\sqrt{c_k}}\right)^{-c_k}$ is a monotonically decreasing function of c_k

Let $x = \sqrt{c_k}$, then the function $\rho(c_k)$ can be rewritten as $\rho(x^2) = e^{-3x + x^2 \ln\left(\frac{x^2 + 3x}{x^2}\right)}$. So, since $c_k \geq 1$ and $x \geq 1$, proving that the derivative of $\rho(x)$ is less than 0 will be enough to show $\rho(c_k)$ is a monotonically decreasing function. The derivative of $\rho(x)$ is analyzed as below

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho(x)/dx &= -3 + 2x \ln\left(\frac{x^2 + 3x}{x^2}\right) \\ &\quad + x^2 \frac{x^2}{x^2 + 3x} \frac{(2x + 3)x^2 - 2x(x^2 + 3x)}{x^4} \\ &\leq -3 + 2x \left(\frac{\frac{3}{x}}{2} \cdot \frac{2 + \frac{3}{x}}{1 + \frac{3}{x}}\right) - \frac{3x}{x + 3} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

[¶]. Function $\ln(x)$ is concave since its second-order derivative is $\frac{d^2 \ln(x)}{dx^2} = (-1) \frac{1}{x^2}$ which is below 0.

The inequality in the above derivation is from the inequality (3) of Ref. [52]: $\ln(1+z) \leq \frac{z}{2} \cdot \frac{2+z}{1+z}$, $0 \leq z < \infty$.

E. The `Select` command

According to the C1G2 standard, the reader R is capable of using a `Select` command to pick a specific group of tags for the upcoming tag inventory. Every tag has a flag variable `SL`, and the `Select` command will turn the `SL` of matched tags to `asserted` (true) and the `SL` of unmatched tags to `deasserted` (false). Only the asserted tags will remain active and respond to reader R in the upcoming tag inventory. A `Select` consists of six mandatory fields, which are explained below.

- The Target field allows the reader to modify the tag's `SL` flag or inventory flag. In `OPT-CIMPL`, the reader R sets Target= 100_2 to change the `SL` flag.
- The Action field specifies the action to be executed by the tag. There are eight different action codes available in Table 6-30 of [37]. In `OPT-LIMPL`, the reader R sets Action to be 0. This means that the matched tags shall assert `SL`, while the unmatched tags shall deassert `SL`.
- The MemBank field indicates the memory bank to which a tag will look for comparison with the Mask. As the hash values are stored in *EPC memory*, reader R sets MemBank= 1.
- The Pointer field records the starting bit in the selected MemBank, and the Mask will be compared to the bit string starting at this position.
- The Length field specifies the length of the Mask in bits.
- The Mask is a user-specific bit-string that must match the content of a specific position in a MemBank.

Overall, a tag will compare Mask with the Length-bit long string that starts at the Pointer-th bit in its MemBank to determine whether it is a matched or unmatched tag.

F. Explanation of Lower Bound Factors

The lower bound on execution time in Theorem 2.2 is predominantly influenced by two key factors: the number of categories, denoted as K , and the reliability numbers c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K . Here, K signifies the number of different categories (disjoint subsets) in the tag population S and is a crucial parameter characterizing the distributional information of S . On the other hand, c_k ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$) specifies the number of tags that the system user intends to randomly draw from category P_k and assign unique reporting orders to. To elaborate on this result, consider the following points:

- The reliability numbers c_k ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$) directly impact the lower bound. The larger the number of tags that reader R needs to draw from P_k and assign unique reporting orders to, the greater the amount of information R must transmit to handle these selected tags. For example, informing 100 tags of a unique reporting order from $\{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$ is typically more challenging than informing 10 tags with unique reporting orders from $1, 2, \dots, 10$ since the former encompasses the latter as a subproblem.

- Another significant factor contributing to the lower bound is K , representing the number of categories. As the reader needs to process an increasing number of categories, more information must be transmitted by R to handle each category effectively. For instance, sampling 1 tag from each of 100 categories is generally more complex than sampling 1 tag from each of 10 categories, as the former includes the latter as a subproblem.

Please note that the parameters n_1, n_2, \dots, n_K (representing the number of tags contained in each of the K categories) do not significantly influence the lower bound. The fact that the lower bound on communication time mainly depends on K, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_K indicates that the primary overhead of the sampling problem potentially lies in the communication cost of assigning the c_k randomly selected tags from P_k unique reporting orders from $\{1, 2, \dots, c_k\}$ (as specified in Requirement (II) of Definition 2.1 in the manuscript). This insight has further guided us to develop a two-stage protocol to address the sampling problem in Section 3. In the first stage, roughly c_k tags are drawn from P_k with minimal communication cost. Subsequently, in the second stage, a unique reporting order is assigned to exactly c_k of these previously selected tags.