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Abstract

Low-power wide area networks (LPWANs) have been identified as one of the top emerging wireless technologies due to their autonomy and wide range of applications. Yet, the limited energy resources of battery-powered sensor nodes is a top constraint; specially when adopting single-hop topologies since nodes located far from the base station must transmit in high power levels. On this point, multi-hop routings in the uplink are starting to gain attention due to their capability of reducing the energy consumption of such nodes by enabling lower power transmissions to closer hops. Nonetheless, \textit{a priori} identifying energy efficient multi-hop routings is not trivial due to the unpredictable factors affecting the communication links, and the large areas covered by LPWANs. In this paper we present a proof of concept in this regard. Specifically, we propose \textit{epsilon multi-hop} (EMH), a simple reinforcement learning (RL) algorithm based on \textit{\epsilon}-greedy for enabling reliable and low consumption LPWAN multi-hop topologies. Results from a real testbed show that multi-hop topologies based on EMH achieve significant energy savings with respect to the default single-hop, which are accentuated as the network operation progresses.
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1. Introduction

Low-power wide area networks (LPWANs) are wireless networks conceived for providing extensive communication ranges, reducing end devices’ (STAs) energy consumption and diminishing the operational cost with respect to traditional cellular networks. Hereof, they are envisioned to be a key communication technology for a vast variety of Internet of Things (IoT) applications. LPWANs reach such extensive coverage range and low power operation by using the sub-1 GHz unlicensed, industrial, scientific and medical (ISM) frequency band, and by sporadically transmitting packets at low data rates, which allows to achieve very low sensitivities.
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Most LPWAN solutions like LoRaWAN \(^1\) or SIGFOX\(^2\) are designed based on star topologies, where STAs directly transmit to the base station or gateway (GW), making them to heavily rely on transceiver’s capabilities (e.g., available transmission powers, antenna gains or data rates). While this approach facilitates network designs and provides a robust centralized management, it usually leads to shortening the lifetime of STAs located far from the GW since they are most likely required to transmit using high power levels. In addition, the inclusion of STAs with limited transmission power is greatly compromised due to such range constraint. Moreover, long-range single-hop topologies lead to interference and packet collisions among uncoordinated devices, which importantly affects the reliability and scalability of networks with a huge number of nodes \(^2\) \(^3\).

Although there is scarce literature on the topic, recent works reveal that multi-hop topologies can importantly extend networks’ lifetime by providing significant energy-savings to the STAs located farthest from the GW \(^4\) \(^5\). For example, authors in \(^6\) present a novel LPWAN protocol stack enabling multi-hop communication in the uplink (HARE) that is able to achieve important energy savings in a real testbed. One of the key challenges of multi-hop, however, is how to find both energy efficient and reliable routings in a distributed way. Such difficulty results from the lack of global information that is required in order to make proper decisions. Instead, by exploiting the traditional centralized management of LPWANs, where a global view of the network is always available at the GW (i.e., number of nodes, RSSI values, etc.), the system is able to foresee if multi-hop routing strategies can improve LPWAN performance, and if so, reconfigure the network accordingly.

![Figure 1: Examples of single-hop and multi-hop topologies. Note that STA s9 will most likely be able to transmit in a lower power level when multi-hop is adopted since its next hop (i.e., s7) is closer than the GW.](image)

Indeed, it is difficult and fuzzy to determine a priori the most energy efficient multi-hop routing for a given LPWAN. The main reason is that the performance of a routing depends

\(^1\) Sigfox main website: [https://sigfox.com/](https://sigfox.com/)
on too many factors such as the operation modes of the nodes (at microprocessor and radio modules) and the network deployment (e.g., nodes’ location, running applications or environmental conditions). Hence, while deterministic rule-based solutions are not accurate for identifying energy efficient routings, machine learning approaches are appealing for such a task; specially when considering the scalability issues involved in huge LPWANs. Notwithstanding, a learning-based routing algorithm, if not properly set, could also entail significant extra consumption, and be consequently counterproductive since highly energy consuming topologies may be occasionally adopted \[5\]. Therefore, the trade-off between the energy savings achieved with the most efficient routing and the cost of learning such a routing should not be overlooked.

As in any exploration/exploitation problem, reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms like $\epsilon$-greedy are appropriate due to their ability to cope online with such a tradeoff: i) to select the routing providing the best known results (i.e, exploiting), or ii) to broaden the knowledge about the performance of unexplored routings (i.e, exploring). In this paper, we present results from a real testbed for assessing the energy savings achieved with epsilon multi-hop (EMH), a Multi-Armed Bandits (MABs) $\epsilon$-greedy-based algorithm for learning energy efficient uplink routings in LPWANs. Namely, we assess the performance of EMH in an LPWAN operating under the HARE protocol stack, showing that it results in significant energy savings with respect to the single-hop approach.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a general overview of the main LPWAN solutions and corresponding challenges. Multi-hop communication in the uplink for LPWANs is motivated in Section 3 by means of a large LPWAN analytical use case. Then, in Section 4 we depict the EMH algorithm. The testbed and performance evaluation of EMH is assessed in Section 5. We conclude with some final remarks at Section 6.

2. Overview of LPWANs

2.1. Communication challenges

Most of emergent LPWAN technologies only rely on the capabilities of low communication layers to achieve large single-hop coverage areas. That is, they do not consider the possibilities provided by multi-hop schemes already existing in other wireless networks. Star topologies are therefore predominant in LPWANs, where one central element (i.e., the GW) is the single responsible for configuring and managing the whole network. While simple and
robust, this approach does not seem the most appropriate to face the following challenges [7]:

- **Scalability**: since the propagation ranges are much higher, LPWANs cause interference at much larger scale, creating bottlenecks in highly dense scenarios.

- **Reliability**: most existing channel access mechanisms of LPWAN technologies resort to the use of ALOHA, which does not require much coordination between the AP and STAs [8]. However, as the number of devices attempting to access the channel increases, so does the collision probability. In contrast, time division multiple access (TDMA)-based medium access protocols avoid contention by allocating STAs to different time slots at the cost of reducing sending opportunities and causing latencies.

- **Flexibility**: current LPWAN networks are deployed, operated and managed in a completely uncoordinated manner, hindering new application purposes and/or possible network reconfigurations/upgrades.

- **Energy efficiency**: battery-powered LPWAN devices are currently lacking of strategies beyond the PHY layer to extend their lifetime, such as adaptive power control or advanced low duty cycle techniques combined with grouping strategies.

- **Quality of Service (QoS)**: since channel access is still randomized to some extent, no real guarantees in terms of QoS can be offered in LPWANs, unless granting dedicated slots in alternative TDMA-based protocols.

### 2.2. Current technologies

A number of LPWAN technologies have emerged in the last years to offer an extended communication range operating at low energy consumption in unlicensed frequency bands. Table 1 summarizes the most significant ones and depicts their main features. However, only some of them are able to combine long range links and heterogeneous network topologies:

- **HARE**, unlike other LPWAN technologies, is able to adopt uplink multi-hop communications without affecting data transmission reliability in those circumstances where a notable energy consumption reduction can be obtained [6]. Multi-hop paths between end devices and the GW also involve intermediate STAs, which must be awake during the periodic association stages to execute the own distance vector routing protocol.
Table 1: Unlicensed spectrum LPWANs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proprietary</th>
<th>PHY layer</th>
<th>Link layer</th>
<th>Network layer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Peak data rate</td>
<td>STA power output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARE on Zolertia RE-Mote</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>50 kbps</td>
<td>≤14 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGFOX</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>600 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingenu (IEEE 802.15.4k)</td>
<td>2.4 GHz</td>
<td>19.5 kbps</td>
<td>78 kbps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telensa</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>500 bps</td>
<td>62.5 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoRaWAN</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>0.3 - 50 kbps</td>
<td>≤13 dBm EU ≤27 dBm US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightless-N</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightless-P</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>200 bps - 100 kbps</td>
<td>≤17 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7AP</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>9.6, 55.55, or 167 kbps</td>
<td>≤17 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-SUN (IEEE 802.15.4g)</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz &amp; 2.4 GHz</td>
<td>50 kbps - 1 Mbps</td>
<td>≤14 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE 802.11ah</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>100 bps - 40 Mbps</td>
<td>≤30 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETSI-LTN</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>30 bps - 50 kbps</td>
<td>≤14 dBm EU ≤27 dBm US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless M-BUS</td>
<td>Sub-1GHz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.4 or 66.6 bps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **LoRaBlink** incorporates multi-hop bi-directional communication enabling sensing and actuation. Messages are distributed from the sink to nodes using flooding. Messages from nodes to the sink use a directed flooding approach.

- **D7AP** networks consist of gateways and endpoints, and can optionally contain sub-controllers, thus also enabling tree topologies. While gateways are permanently listening for packets, sub-controllers are allowed to sleep and are mainly used to relay packets. Lastly, endpoints can transmit asynchronously and wakes up periodically to listen to possible incoming data.

- **IEEE 802.11ah** includes in its specification a two-hop mode by means of using relays. Consequently, when transmitting to a closer relay instead to the AP, STAs can reduce the transmission power level and use higher data rates, thus also shortening the transmission time.
3. Motivating multi-hop routing in the uplink for LPWANs

To further motivate the potential advantages of multi-hop routing vs single-hop, we use the Distance Ring Exponential STA Generator (DRESG), an analytical framework that allows estimating the energy consumed by the STAs in an LPWAN enabling multi-hop topologies in the uplink. In particular, we present a use case where the lifetime of an LPWAN consisting of thousands of STAs is clearly improved through a multi-hop approach.

3.1. DRESG framework for LPWANs

All the STAs in DRESG transmit their payloads in packets that are sent to their respective parents. Parent STAs then aggregate their payloads with the ones received by their child (or children), and transmit their packet (or packets) to their corresponding parents. This pattern is repeated until reaching the GW. Depending on several factors such as the transceiver specifications, the distance to the GW, the path loss model, or the number of packets to transmit, STAs may be set with different optimal transmission power and data rate levels. DRESG structures are composed of rings of STAs located at different distances in a tree-based manner. Such structures can be fundamentally defined by two parameters:

- **Number of rings** ($N_r$): STAs belonging to the same ring are placed at the same distance to the GW. The last (furthest) ring is located at the maximum distance provided by the theoretical coverage range. Such range is computed assuming that the GWs transceiver operates at maximum transmission power and minimum data rate.

- **Tree children ratio** ($c$): number of STAs of an adjacent higher ring from which an STA (i.e., tree parent) may receive packets. Note that the children ratio does not determine the network topology. In this regard, a topology children refer to the STAs in lower adjacent or non-adjacent rings from which an STA (i.e., topology parent) actually receives packets. That is, different topologies may exist for the same DRESG structure as shown in Figure 2(a).

Regarding the energy consumption model, only transmitting (TX) and receiving (RX) energies are considered in DRESG since an ideal TDMA MAC is assumed for simplicity. The

---

2All of the source code of DRESG is open, encouraging sharing of algorithms between contributors and providing the ability for people to improve on the work of others under the GNU General Public License v3.0. The repository can be found at [https://github.com/sergiobarra/DRESG_lpwan](https://github.com/sergiobarra/DRESG_lpwan)
selectable (i.e., programmable) transmission power and data rate levels depend on the specifications of the nodes’ transceivers. Similarly, the sensitivity capabilities of the transceivers determine the maximum achievable data rate given a certain transmission power. In this regard, DRESG identifies the less energy consuming transmission configuration (i.e., transmission power and data rate combination) for every child-parent connection given a network topology.

3.2. Uplink routing models: a use case

Due to the fact that in DRESG all the STAs in a ring transmit to parents placed in the same destination ring, three main routing models can be considered:

- **Single-hop**: every STA (regardless of its ring \( r \)) transmits its data packet directly to the GW, which is placed at ring 0. No RX energy is consumed in single-hop since there are no parent STAs in the network.

- **Next-ring-hop**: each STA in ring \( r \) transmits its data packet (or packets) to its parent node, which is placed in the next ring towards the GW (i.e., \( r - 1 \)).

- **Multi-hop (generalization)**: each STA in ring \( r \) transmits its data packet (or packets) to its parent node in ring \( r - \vec{\delta}(r) \), where \( \vec{\delta}(r) \) is a vector of \( N_r \) elements representing the hop length of each ring, i.e., the number of rings separating the source and destination nodes. Accordingly, \( \vec{\delta}_{\text{SH}}(r) = r \) and \( \vec{\delta}_{\text{NRH}}(r) = 1 \), for every ring \( r \neq 0 \), since every STA transmits directly to the GW in single-hop, while every STA transmits to a parent located in the lower consecutive ring in next-ring-hop. For instance, the single-hop and next-ring-hop topologies of the LPWAN shown in Figure 2(a) can be represented by \((1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)\) and \((1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\), respectively.

An optimal-hop routing is referred as the most energy efficient routing given in a DRESG network. Namely, optimal-hop is the routing that minimizes the energy consumption of the bottleneck STA (i.e., the STA that consumes the most). Since all the STAs placed in the same ring consume exactly the same amount of energy, we refer to bottleneck ring or bottleneck STA indistinctly.

In Figure 2(b), the bottleneck consumption for the different routing models is shown.\(^3\) For the given DRESG network structure (with \( N_r = 6 \) and \( c = 5 \)), as expected, the bottleneck

\(^3\)For the sake of saving space, the full DRESG evaluation setup (e.g., transceiver’s specifications) corresponding to the use case shown in Figure 2(b) is available at https://github.com/sergiobarra/data_repos/tree/master/barrachina2018towards.
(a) Possible DRESG topologies. Single-hop, next-ring-hop and optimal-hop topologies are represented with arrows. The latter topology provides the most efficient routing, which is defined by $\delta_{OH} = (1,1,3,4,2,2)$.

(b) Transmitting, receiving and total energy ($e_{tx}$, $e_{rx}$ and $e$, respectively) consumed by the DRESG LPWAN above. Single-hop’s bottleneck STA (at 6th ring) is one consuming the most. Instead, optimal-hop’s bottleneck (4th ring) consumes the least.

Figure 2: Use case of an LPWAN consisting of 3906 nodes with a DRESG structure defined by $N_r = 6$ and $c = 5$.

in single-hop is placed at the furthest ring (i.e., 6th ring). Instead, the bottleneck in next-ring-hop is placed at the 1st ring because the STA in $r = 1$ must receive and aggregate all the payloads of the network. Note that the energy consumed by the bottleneck in optimal-hop (at the 4th ring) is deeply reduced (more than 10 times with respect to single-hop and multi-hop), being the most appropriate routing model for extending the network lifetime.
4. EMH: Enabling learning-based uplink multi-hop routing

Once we have seen that multi-hop schemes can theoretically extend the lifetime of an LPWAN, in this Section we argue the need of learning proper routings for obtaining even greater energy savings in real LPWANs and present the novel EMH approach. To do so, let us define some terms regarding the uplink routing for the sake of facilitating further explanation.

Any routing can be represented by a vector \( \vec{r} \) of size \( n - 1 \), where \( n \) is the number of nodes (GW and STAs) in the network, and whose element \( r(s) \) is the network address of the parent of STA \( s \). The GW address is always set to 0 for simplicity. In Figure 1 it is shown an uplink routing example with the corresponding routing vector \( \vec{r} = (0, 0, 2, 4, 4, 2, 7, 7) \). For instance, the parent of \( s_5 \) is \( s_4 \), i.e., \( r(5) = 4 \). The set \( R = \{ \vec{r} \} \) is composed of all the possible uplink routings that can be given in the network. We assume that every STA in the LPWAN is capable (if required) to successfully communicate with the GW in a single-hop manner.

4.1. The need of learning

Due to the fact that the network performance depends on multiple factors such as nodes’ deployment, protocol stack, hardware, or environment conditions, it is hard and fuzzy to redefine proper uplink routings beforehand. Therefore, even though experimentally tuning routing parameters can importantly enhance the energy savings in distributed approaches [6], in most of the cases its performance is sub-optimal. Moreover, such tuning approach comes at the cost of flexibility since the resulting configuration is deeply tied to the scenario.

In this regard, the problem of identifying the optimal routing can be modeled as a finite-horizon MAB problem due to its exploration/exploitation nature (i.e., the trade-off between exploring new knowledge or exploiting gathered knowledge) and the need of maximizing the lifetime of battery constrained STAs. While over-exploring prevents from maximizing the short-term reward, exploiting only partial knowledge prevents from identifying the optimal routing and maximizing the long-term reward accordingly.

We propose EMH as a centralized learning-based routing approach that enables the GW to stochastically compute the routing table according to a MAB’s \( \epsilon \)-greedy procedure. The goal of EMH is to minimize the energy consumption of the bottleneck STA by exploring different uplink routings. While simple to implement, this algorithm effectively serves to

---

4The addressing system in HARE follows the Rime format [9] consisting of two 8-bit numbers but for the sake of representation simplicity we will indistinctly refer to an STA’s identifier and address.
evaluate the impact of the different explored routings on the network’s lifetime in a real-
time manner.

4.2. The EMH approach

The well-known \( \epsilon \)-greedy method sets the randomness in action selection through a pa-
rameter \( \epsilon \) that determines the probability of exploring a new action (already explored or not) rather than exploiting a previously explored one [10]. The simplicity of \( \epsilon \)-greedy together with the fact that no memorization of exploration specific data (e.g., counters or confidence bounds) is required [11] are its main advantages with respect to other MAB methods. However, an important disadvantage of \( \epsilon \)-greedy is the complexity of determining what are the optimal initial value and updating function of \( \epsilon \).

In the EMH algorithm, a principal variation is included with respect to the regular \( \epsilon \)-
greedy method: each action is explored just once\(^5\). Namely, since LPWAN deployments are characteristically static, we assume that the average energy consumed by the STAs given a certain uplink routing does not significantly vary over time. Thus, we are able to set a deterministic (experimental) payoff to every routing by exploring it just once.

With respect to the testbed presented below in this work, the reward or payoff \( (p) \) provided by any possible action or routing in \( R \) may vary according to the channel condition (e.g., people crossing by or changing weather conditions). Therefore, in order to ensure enough accuracy of the payoff estimate \( (\hat{p}) \), we average the reward of each explored routing by measuring its corresponding energy consumption \( K \) times. The pseudocode containing the main steps of EMH is depicted in Algorithm 1.

4.2.1. Estimating the single-hop RSSI

The number of existing possible uplink routings for LPWANs of \( n \) nodes is given by Cayley’s formula, i.e., \( |R| = n^{(n-2)} \). Hence, it grows extremely rapidly for large networks\(^6\). In this regard, exploring routings without any predefined discrimination criteria could have a negative impact on the EMH performance. For instance, if considering a network deployment like the one shown in Figure 1 an alternative routing with \( \vec{r}(1) = 9 \) would be clearly sub-optimal since \( s_9 \) is located much further from the GW than \( s_1 \). Consequently, \( s_1 \) will

\(^5\)Note that exploring one routing takes several energy consumption measures since they are averaged for improving the estimation accuracy.

\(^6\)In graph theory, Cayley’s formula states that for every positive integer \( n \), the number of trees on \( n \) labeled vertices is \( n^{(n-2)} \).
Algorithm 1: Implementation of EMH in HARE. $U(A')$ is a distribution that randomly chooses any unexplored routing in $A'$ uniformly at random.

1. **Input:**

2. $K$ # Number of averaging measures

3. **Initialize:**

4. $t := 0$

5. $\hat{p}(\vec{r}) := 0$ for $\forall r \in \mathcal{R}$

6. $\epsilon := \epsilon_0$

7. **while** active **do**

8. \[ \vec{\gamma}_t \leftarrow \text{estimate_rssi()} \] Estimate RSSI perceived from each STA

9. $A_t \leftarrow \{ \vec{r} \in \mathcal{R} \mid \vec{\gamma}_t(s) \geq \vec{\gamma}_t(s') \text{ for } \forall (s,s') \}$ Apply RSSI constraint

10. $A'_t \leftarrow \{ \vec{r} \in A \mid \hat{p}(\vec{r}) = 0 \}$ Unexplored routings

11. $\vec{r}_t \begin{cases} \text{Explore: } \vec{r} \sim U(A'_t), \text{ with prob. } \epsilon \\ \text{Exploit: } \arg\max_{\vec{r} \in (A_t \setminus A'_t)} \hat{p}(\vec{r}) \text{, otherwise} \end{cases}$

12. $\bar{e}_b(\vec{r}_t) \leftarrow \max_s \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K e_{s,k}(\vec{r}_t)$

13. $\hat{p}(\vec{r}_t) \leftarrow 1/\bar{e}_b(\vec{r}_t)$

14. $\epsilon \leftarrow \epsilon_0/\sqrt{t}$

15. $t \leftarrow t + 1$

16. **end**

most likely suffer from higher energy consumption with respect to the original routing with $\vec{r}(1) = 0$.

In order to avoid exploring such naive routings, we apply a so-called **RSSI constraint** stating that any children-parent link $(s,s')$ can only be performed if the RSSI received at the GW from the children is less or equal than the one received from the parent, i.e., $\vec{\gamma}(s) \leq \vec{\gamma}(s')$. Thus, we are able to significantly reduce the number of possible routings from $\mathcal{R}$ to $A \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ by excluding those ones that do not comply with the **RSSI constraint**.

Accordingly, a preliminary step is conducted in each $\epsilon$-greedy iteration $t$. Basically, the GW estimates $\vec{\gamma}_t$ in the association phase, when STAs transmit directly to the GW (i.e., in single-hop manner) asking for being associated to the network. With such metric, the algorithm is able to discern what routings comply with the **RSSI constraint** and identify the set $A$. EMH re-estimates $\vec{\gamma}_t$ in each iteration just in case the channel conditions have significantly changed since the network initiation.

**4.2.2. Exploring or exploiting**

Once $\vec{\gamma}_t$ is estimated, the algorithm decides whether to explore an unexplored routing or exploiting the best known one according to the $\epsilon$ parameter. Specifically, with probability
(1 − ϵ) the algorithm picks the most energy efficient routing from the set of explored ones. That is, the already explored routing providing the highest estimated reward ̂p. Instead, with probability ϵ, the algorithm picks uniformly at random an unexplored routing in A′.

4.2.3. Estimating the payoff

After routing ̂r_t is selected, the GW starts collecting the energy consumption measures of the STAs during K HARE operation cycles. An important trade-off exists in this regard: the larger K, the more accurate the estimated payoffs, but the longer the time to identify the most energy efficient routing. The latter also entails the risk of exploring high consuming routings during larger periods of time.

After every cycle k, STA s estimates the energy consumed during the cycle (e_{s,k}), generates a payload including the corresponding value, aggregates the payloads received from its children (if any), and transmits the packet/s with the payload/s to its parent. Once the K-cycles data collection phase finishes, the GW is able to determine the average energy consumed by every STA. Then, it sets the payoff estimate ̂p corresponding to the current routing ̂r_t as the inverse of the bottleneck node’s average consumption.

4.2.4. Updating the ϵ value

Once the payoff corresponding to the current routing ̂r_t is estimated, the algorithm updates ϵ. In our experiments, we use a time-dependent exploration rate ϵ_t = ϵ_0/√t with ϵ_0 = 1 as suggested in [12]. This ϵ setting entails substantially exploring in early stages and frequently exploiting afterwards, which is convenient for avoiding payoff local minimums. After updating the ϵ value, a new iteration begins with the single-hop RSSI estimation.

5. Evaluation

In this Section we evaluate the performance in terms of energy savings of the single-hop (SH) and EMH approaches. We first describe the testbed used for conducting the experiments along with the STAs’ energy consumption model. Then, we compare the performance of the aforementioned approaches.

5.1. Testbed

5.1.1. Deployment

The performance evaluation of EMH and SH was performed in an indoor testbed located in one office building from UPF facilities. 9 Zolertia RE-Mote development boards / nodes [13] acting as STAs were deployed throughout the offices and the main corridor, maintaining
their placement for all executed tests (see Figure 3). Another Zolertia RE-Mote played the role of GW and was connected to a PC for logs generation. All devices ran Contiki 3.0 OS [14] as operating system and HARE as wireless communication protocol stack like tests from [6]. The selected radio duty cycle (RDC) sublayer was X-MAC, which defines sleeping periods for receivers and strobed preambles for transmitters [15].

The largest single-hop distance from the GW to STA #9 was 45 meters; being this range determined by previous coverage tests. All operational tests were conducted considering no mobility and with the same STAs’ placement (see Figure 3). All STAs were powered by an 800 mAh battery except the GW, which was permanently powered by the PC.

STAs transmitted packets of 43 bytes every 2-minute iteration period in a time division multiple access (TDMA) basis. In addition, the GW broadcast the routing at each iteration period so the STAs were able to identify their next-hop (or father) and keep it until a new iteration was started.

Although LPWANs are characteristically composed of a huge number of STAs located in outdoor scenarios, the presented testbed is sufficient to conduct a proof of concept providing significant results as shown below. In fact, since the RSSI levels perceived by the GW are the main parameters used by the $\epsilon$-greedy approach, the actual position of the STAs and the channel conditions are always mapped to such parameters. That is, EMH is transparent to the actual LPWAN deployment.

5.1.2. Energy estimation

The total energy ($e$) consumed by an STA is employed by two main elements: the microprocessor ($e_\mu$) and the radio power module ($e_r$). Specifically,

$$e_\mu = V_{DD}(t_{CPU}I_{CPU} + t_{LPM}I_{LPM})$$

and

$$e_r = V_{DD}(t_{RX}I_{RX} + t_{TX}I_{TX} + t_{SL}I_{SL}),$$

where $V_{DD}$ is the supply voltage. The duration and current consumption corresponding to the operational states of the microprocessor and the radio module are $t$ and $I$, respectively. Table 2 lists these states and the values of current consumption corresponding to the Zolertia RE-Mote. Notice that $I_{TX}$ value grows according to higher $P_{TX}$ transmission power levels (with a $P_{TX}$ operational range going from -16 to 14 dBm). We use the energest() function from Contiki to estimate the time an STA spends

---

7To the best of our knowledge, HARE is the only well tested LPWAN protocol stack specifically designed for adopting uplink multi-hop communications.

8Note that larger LPWAN deployments have not been considered since they are expensive and hard to monitor. Nonetheless, the HARE protocol stack operation was already validated in outdoor environments [6].
in each of the possible operational states.

Table 2: Current values of the Zolertia RE-Mote platform at the different operational states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational state</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing (CPU)</td>
<td>$I_{CPU} = 13$ mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low power mode (LPM)</td>
<td>$I_{LPM} = 0.4$ µA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving (RX)</td>
<td>$I_{RX} = 19$ mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitting (TX)</td>
<td>$I_{TX} = 39 - 61$ mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping (SL)</td>
<td>$I_{SL} = 0.12$ µA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Results

In order to assess the energy efficiency of SH and EMH, we use two main metrics: the cycle bottleneck energy in iteration $t$, i.e., $e_b(t)$, and the cumulated bottleneck energy until $t$, i.e., $E(t)$. While the former refers to the energy consumed by the STA that has consumed the most in iteration $t$, the later refers to the cumulated energy consumed by the STA that has historically consumed the most since iteration 1 to $t$. Therefore, the metric $e_b(t)$ serves to assess the performance in terms of energy efficiency of the routing being applied in iteration $t$, and assigning its corresponding reward. Instead, $E(t)$ allows us to estimate the lifetime of the network since it is directly related to the remaining energy in the STA that has historically consumed the most. Note that, regardless of the considered packet transmission frequency (1 packet every 2 minutes in this setup), a similar lifetime value in terms of iterations would
be obtained since STAs consume very little when being in sleeping mode (0.12 μA). That is why we represent time in the x-axis of the plots in Figure 4 in iteration units.

5.2.1. Cycle bottleneck energy

While in EMH unexplored routings are stochastically picked in exploration iterations according to probability $\epsilon$, in SH the same routing is used throughout all the experiment, i.e., $\vec{r}_t = \vec{0}, \forall t$. Accordingly, as shown in Figure 4(a), the cycle bottleneck tends to decrease as the experiment evolves when implementing EMH.

(a) Average bottleneck energy for SH and MH. The curve 15pA-EMH refers to the average value corresponding to 15 consecutive measures of $e_b$.

(b) Saving ratio evolution.

Figure 4: Results of applying EMH in the testbed deployment shown in Figure 3.

Regarding the payoff of each action, we can see significant variability for the same routing
both in SH and EMH. The main cause is the dynamic nature of the communication channel, which affects the routing performance. Specifically, once a communication link \((s, s')\) is assigned between a pair of nodes \(s\) and \(s'\), and depending on the channel condition, several transmissions may be required to successfully deliver a packet due to channel errors and collisions. In this regard, retransmissions entail important extra energy consumption in HARE networks due to the fact that both the transmitter and receiver must wake up again for retrying the communication. Such phenomena is more frequent in SH because of the higher collision probability when a single ring is established. Besides, in this type of routing, the bottleneck STA is normally located far from the GW because of its lower SINR.

Nonetheless, by gathering \(K\) energy measures per each routing, the GW is capable of estimating the corresponding payoff with sufficient accuracy to decide whether the routing is efficient or not. In fact, the tendency curve 15\(pA\) EMH plotted in Figure 4(a) clearly shows the considerable energy reduction of the bottleneck STA with respect to SH, and its trend to slowly decay as more efficient routings are explored.

In Figure 3 it is shown (in green) the most energy efficient routing that the LPWAN explored during the \(T = 110\) iterations. We note a clear multi-hop-like topology where packets are transmitted to closer STAs, which entails higher SINR values and corresponding reliability. Besides, the staggered wakeup pattern of HARE in multi-hop topologies allows reducing the channel contention and decreasing the packet losses due to interferences accordingly.

However, since most of the energy consumed by the STAs is due to the operation in RX state, parent nodes tend to consume more energy as they need to wait and decode packets from children. Hence, a balanced routing as the presented in this proof of concept is required. Besides, the dynamics and interrelations among STAs and the channel make it very difficult to determine beforehand whether a routing is energy efficient or not. In fact, in our experiments, we noticed that some routings following multi-hop approaches were clearly not energy efficient because, even though the average node consumption was low, one of the STAs consumed a lot compared to the rest. That is why learning is critical, specially for LPWANs with a huge number of STAs, where lots of different routings can be potentially established.

5.2.2. Historic bottleneck energy

The metric that maps the better to the lifetime of the network is \(E(t)\) because of its direct relation with the remaining battery energy of the bottleneck STA. That is, any routing approach can be assessed in terms of energy saving by measuring its corresponding \(E(t)\),
which is defined by

\[ E(t) = \max_s \left( \sum_{t'=1}^t \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K e_{s,k}(\vec{r}_{t'}) \right). \]

In order to compare the SH and EMH routing approaches, we show in Figure 4(b) the saving ratio between the energies consumed by the historic bottleneck of SH and EMH approaches at iteration \( t \), i.e.,

\[ \rho(t) = \frac{E_{SH}(t) - E_{EMH}(t)}{E_{SH}(t)}. \]

At the beginning of the experiments, due to the small amount of iterations performed and the frequent explorations, the routing heavily influences the historic bottleneck of EMH, and the saving ratio \( \rho \) fluctuates accordingly. Instead, when the LPWAN is running for about 30 iterations, we note a more stationary behavior, where EMH clearly outperforms SH in terms of energy saving. Specifically, we achieve about 7% of saving in 110 iterations and this trend keeps growing with the time.

6. Conclusions and future work

Lowering energy consumption is critical for LPWANs due to their aim of extending the network lifetime up to years. In this regard, multi-hop routings in the uplink are starting to gain attention in the field. However, it is hazardous and sometimes counterproductive to predefine static routings prior the deployment of an LPWAN.

In this paper we have proposed EMH, a centralized \( \epsilon \)-greedy algorithm for finding energy efficient routings in an exploration/exploitation approach. That is, while the network is normally operating, unexplored routings are stochastically chosen and assessed according to the bottleneck energy payoff function. Results from a HARE testbed with real LPWAN devices show that EMH achieves important energy savings with respect to single-hop topologies. Besides, this improvement is accentuated as the network operation progresses.

In this regard, we envision that the use of centralized learning-based multi-hop routing will result in high energy savings in massive LPWANs (with up to thousands STAs) for two main reasons. On the one hand, multi-hop approaches are able to reduce the single-hop bottleneck energy consumed by those STAs located far from the GW, which are more likely to suffer from low SINR and other issues like hidden and exposed node problems. On the other hand, with simple learning-based routing algorithms like EMH, we are able to find
energy efficient multi-hop routings that diminish the contention among STAs and build more reliable communication links.
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