Went over these on Friday. Could not pinpoint the factor of 2 offset; your expression for \rho(x) seems correct. One thing I noticed was a Binomial r.v. could be a better fit with the mean and variance you expressed(even though this wouldn't fix the offset of the mean).

The other thing to consider might be (if I'm not mistaken this was discussed for the WCNC) should we use maximum TF or average TF; if its the latter maybe our expressions might get closer.

so I haven't fixed the issues so far :-/ but still if you wanted to have a brief discussion I should have some time in the afternoon. In any case I'll let you know if something later comes to my mind.

-It would be nice if you could normalize Fig. 1 in the experiments from avg? histogram to pmf's

-It seems that the delay is actually bimodal distributed (and max TF to some extent for the edge node), that is there is also a notable probability that the delay will be very small- not sure if it could be worth consideration modelling PL or TF component as a bimodal distribution. Well it seems to me that PL should be uniformly distributed for long runs, hence probably TF is the associated factor of that. Good point about the correlation though, defining a joint pmf on PL and TF and using that might help.

- I think thats on you agenda but are there any showcases where the WCNC approach doesn't do that good (hence notable room for improvement)

Scott, gave a little more thought; I read over again and I think the paper assumptions TF, CF are correct; once the pipeline is established those give the delay in being able to pump another packet from the same flow  (limited by access frequency of channel of a node (CF) and assignment probability of particular flow at that node (TF) ). The DF also makes sense; as well as the max-flow min-cut hence max TF argument. Only parts missing as I said before might be averaging for DF's (we can leave it like that for the moment) and competing flows for the propagation delay; I think some factor like TF\_p might be necessary with two differences: now it should be average TF\_p along path not max., and the actual TF\_p values are less than TF; we can assume TF/2 for simplicity. And for the avg TF along the path if we were to assume TF/2 one rough approx for TF\_p could be TF/4 or max(1, TF/4).