A Critical Review on Use of WSN in GPS

Rabindra Nath Shaw, Assistant Professor Department of Electronics, Electrical and Communications, Galgotias University

ABSTRACT

Here we make many deviations from past studies. Our contribution to designing a standardised technique of building local coordinate systems in the first phase is to utilise a new parameter, the multiplication factor, which may govern the number of master and slave nodes in sensor networks and the degree of connectedness between master nodes. In the second step, we create a transformation matrix between two local coordinate systems to effectively integrate them into a global coordinate system using homogeneous coordinates widely employed for transformation. Computer charts. Our methodology may successfully avoid the possible flip ambiguity issue, considering the transition of reflection between two Cartesian coordinate systems. Another key difficulty with GPS-free localization methods is the performance effect of various parameters. Specifically, a set of parameter-setting rules for the proposed method is constructed using a probability method. A simulation analysis is done on a particular numerical example to verify the mathematical analytical conclusions of the parameter-setting recommendations.

Keywords: WSN, GPS, Review.

INTRODUCTION

Entered computing, sensor and integrated systems enable the implementation of huge networks with hundreds and even thousands of extremely tiny, low cost, battery-powered and wirelessly-connected sensor and actuator nodes in the field of low energy cost wireless communication. Wireless Sensor Networks may work for a long period of time, and can find a wide range of applications in the fields of environmental monitoring, forestry fire protection, biological monitoring and control of habitats, intelligent agriculture, smart architecture and houses, defence of military objectives, prevention of terrorist attacks, individual health monitoring, etc. [1]. Imagine a sensor network dispersed throughout a huge structure or region like a forest or a battleground[2]. Typical tasks for these netways are to send a message to a node in a given location, without knowing how many nodes are there and how it can be reached, and to collect sensor data (for example from nodes in a given region such as the level of sound, light, radiation, temperature or humidity) and to track events in the vicinity of sensors such as vehicles moving in the field. Most of these activities need knowledge of the nodes' placements or at least their relative locations. For instance, the sensor nodes would determine the location of tracked cars relative to their own locations for a vehicle tracking application.

With a network of thousands of nodes, the location of each node is unlikely to be exact. Although GPS localization algorithms can be used in a few metres to establish node positions, the expense of GPS equipment and the lack of accessibility of GPS signal in constrained spaces preclude them from being employed in large-scale sensor networks. Due to measurements of pairwise spatial interactions between the nodes [3,4], the localization challenge in wireless sensor networks is how to locate data on all or a portion of sensor nodes. The localisation techniques of WSNs may usually be classed according to three features in the literature: I information needs of the solution schemes: proximity localization, range-based localization and angle-based localization; (ii) the hardware requirements of solution schemes: absolute localization and relative location; and (iii) the kind of network structure: mobile and static network.

GPS

The capacity for self-location is a very desired characteristic of wireless networks of sensors. Sensing data is not helpful until if the end users know where the data is gathered. For this reason, location and placement of the sensor nodes has been a major focus for study and a number of methods have been documented in the literature.

The majority of existing WSN discovery research assumes the presence of GPS receivers at some known position nodes or beacons [5-12]. They are then utilised in places to determine the positions of other regular sensor nodes that do not have GPS receivers. It may not be possible to provide a GPS receptor at sensor nodes because of satellite cover limits or barriers in the course of satellite signals or severe climatic conditions. All aforementioned approaches are absolute localizations, since in a particular environment the ground truth position or global coordination is achieved. Another kind of localization estimate is termed relative location in which all devices on the network estimate the range between themselves and their surrounding devices, irrespective of their absolute coordination expertise. An absolute location may be turned into a relative location for a second point of reference, that is. However, there is not always a second absolute location [13].

SELF POSITIONING

Capkun initially suggested the Self Positioning Algorithm (SPA), utilised in dispersed mobile wireless networks without GPS sensors. Each node creates a local coordinate system in [14,15], establishing itself as its source. Two additional nodes are picked by random means that the three nodes are not on a single line to interact with one another. Another node may then be located where it is possible to estimate the distance from each of the three nodes. The other local coordinate systems may be adapted by coordinate transformation after the choice of group of nodes that have the greatest density in the network as the localization reference coordinate system. The downside of SPA is the exponential growth of communications costs and the time for convergence by the number of nodes since each node participates separately in the creation and fusion of the local coordinates system.

In order to address the SPA weaknesses, Cluster-based SPA (CSPA) was suggested in [16]. The nodes are started with distinct responsibilities in this method: a tiny subset of the entire number of nodes. The master nodes picked, then the rest become slave nodes. Each master node constructs a local coordination system using an SPA-like method and two master nodes require two common slave nodes to combine their local co-ordinate systems. Compared to the SPA, the CSPA offers a significant improvement by lowering the overhead and convergence times of communication and was expanded to include other applications in the literature[17-20]. Unfortunately, the approach creates flip ambiguity in combining local coordinate systems since two master nodes cannot be within the range of each other, the two master nodes and two slaves are not resilient [21,22].

The so-called backbone-based SPA has been recently developed, which first selects certain nodes inside the network and then forms them into a backbone network[23]. Since the local co-ordinate system is established exclusively at the backbone nodes and then the backbone is a connected network, the method of adjusting the directions of two overlapping local co-ordinate systems and the merge approach proposed in [14,15 is here directly applicable, and robustness checks can avoid flip ambiguities.

We suggest the reader to Chen's thorough study for more information on the ideas and features of alternative relative localization algorithms[24]. Despite a substantial number of relative methods to the location of WSNs, numerous outstanding problems remain in the domain. First of all, all of these relative techniques are reliant on topological relations between two sensor nodes during the merging phase, which in terms of cost of communication and convergence is excessively sophisticated and costly. Another essential challenge for study is the analysis and design of energy-efficient layouts as battery-restrained devices are sensors. Obviously, this is not an easy problem since it encompasses several unrelated activities, including measurements relating to locations, communications between neighbours, and locations estimation. A more complex research topic, thanks to many researchers, is that relatively few works concentrated on the selection criteria of parameters with a direct influence on algorithm performance and field applications.

CONCLUSION

Localization is one of the most important difficulties in wireless sensor networks, as both network functioning and most application level activities are vital in the locations of sensor nodes. This research provides a GPS-free localization system for wireless sensor networks. First, we design a standardised clustering methodology for the development of local coordinate systems where a multiplication factor is used to govern the master and slave node numbers and the degree of connectedness between master nodes. Second, we develop a transformation matrix across the two Cartesian coordinate systems utilising homogenous coordinates, in order to successfully integrate them into a global coordination system and successfully resolve the issue of flip ambiguity. Without a centralised controller, the Algorithm works asynchronously and does not need a previous knowledge of the sensors' position. Based on a probability model and energy needs are also explored, a set of parameter setting suggestions for the suggested method are generated. The mathematical analytical conclusions are validated by a simulation study on a particular numerical case. The suggested method performance under a different multiplication factor, node density and node communication radius scenario can also be compared. Experiments reveal that our approach exceeds current accuracy and convergence techniques.

REFERENCES

1. Bai, H., & Shi, G. (2007). Gas sensors based on conducting polymers. *Sensors*, *7*(3), 267–307. https://doi.org/10.3390/s7030267
2. Bao, X., & Chen, L. (2012). Recent Progress in Distributed Fiber Optic Sensors. *Sensors (Switzerland)*, *12*(7), 8601–8639. https://doi.org/10.3390/s120708601
3. Braginsky, D., & Estrin, D. (2002). Rumor routing algorithm for sensor networks. In R. C. S. S. K. M. Raghavendra C.S. Sivaligam K.M. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the ACM International Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications* (pp. 22–31). https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-0036986248&partnerID=40&md5=72d4d96712f8a4153081b2e6daba5b11
4. Chen, Z., & Lu, C. (2005). Humidity sensors: A review of materials and mechanisms. *Sensor Letters*, *3*(4), 274–295. https://doi.org/10.1166/sl.2005.045
5. Fine, G. F., Cavanagh, L. M., Afonja, A., & Binions, R. (2010). Metal oxide semi-conductor gas sensors in environmental monitoring. *Sensors*, *10*(6), 5469–5502. https://doi.org/10.3390/s100605469
6. Gnawali, O., Fonseca, R., Jamieson, K., Moss, D., & Levis, P. (2009). Collection tree protocol. *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems, SenSys 2009*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/1644038.1644040
7. Hübert, T., Boon-Brett, L., Black, G., & Banach, U. (2011). Hydrogen sensors - A review. *Sensors and Actuators, B: Chemical*, *157*(2), 329–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2011.04.070
8. Karlof, C., & Wagner, D. (2003). Secure routing in wireless sensor networks: Attacks and countermeasures. In E. E. Znati T. Cayirci E. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International Workshop on Sensor Network Protocols and Applications, SNPA 2003* (pp. 113–127). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. https://doi.org/10.1109/SNPA.2003.1203362
9. Lenz, J., & Edelstein, A. S. (2006). Magnetic sensors and their applications. *IEEE Sensors Journal*, *6*(3), 631–649. https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2006.874493
10. Miller, D. R., Akbar, S. A., & Morris, P. A. (2014). Nanoscale metal oxide-based heterojunctions for gas sensing: A review. *Sensors and Actuators, B: Chemical*, *204*, 250–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2014.07.074
11. Miluzzo, E., Lane, N. D., Fodor, K., Peterson, R., Lu, H., Musolesi, M., Eisenman, S. B., Zheng, X., & Campbell, A. T. (2008). Sensing meets mobile social networks: The design, implementation and evaluation of the CenceMe application. *SenSys'08 - Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, 337–350. https://doi.org/10.1145/1460412.1460445

12. Mohan, P., Padmanabhan, V. N., & Ramjee, R. (2008). Nericell: Rich monitoring of road and traffic conditions using mobile smartphones. *SenSys'08 - Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, 323–336. https://doi.org/10.1145/1460412.1460444

13. Newsome, J., Shi, E., Song, D., & Perrig, A. (2004). The Sybil attack in sensor networks: Analysis & defenses. *Third International Symposium on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, IPSN 2004*, 259–268. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-3042785862&partnerID=40&md5=9d3243fe32165102409068dc3a3a2d6d

14. Nicolas-Alonso, L. F., & Gomez-Gil, J. (2012). Brain computer interfaces, a review. *Sensors*, *12*(2), 1211–1279. https://doi.org/10.3390/s120201211

15. Ordóñez, F. J., & Roggen, D. (2016). Deep convolutional and LSTM recurrent neural networks for multimodal wearable activity recognition. *Sensors (Switzerland)*, *16*(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/s16010115

16. Raghunathan, V., Kansal, A., Hsu, J., Friedman, J., & Srivastava, M. (2005). Design considerations for solar energy harvesting wireless embedded systems. *2005 4th International Symposium on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, IPSN 2005*, *2005*, 457–462. https://doi.org/10.1109/IPSN.2005.1440973

17. Shah, R. C., Roy, S., Jain, S., & Brunette, W. (2003). Data MULEs: Modeling a three-tier architecture for sparse sensor networks. In E. E. Znati T. Cayirci E. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International Workshop on Sensor Network Protocols and Applications, SNPA 2003* (pp. 30–41). Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. https://doi.org/10.1109/SNPA.2003.1203354

18. Shnayder, V., Hempstead, M., Chen, B.-R., Allen, G. W., & Welsh, M. (2004). Simulating the power consumption of large-scale sensor network applications. *SenSys'04 - Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, 188–200. https://doi.org/10.1145/1031495.1031518

19. Tian, D., & Georganas, N. D. (2002). A coverage-preserving node scheduling scheme for large wireless sensor networks. In S. K. M. Raghavendra C.S. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the ACM International Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications* (pp. 32–41). Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). https://doi.org/10.1145/570743.570744

20. Varghese, O. K., Gong, D., Paulose, M., Ong, K. G., & Grimes, C. A. (2003). Hydrogen sensing using titania nanotubes. *Sensors and Actuators, B: Chemical*, *93*(1–3), 338–344. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-4005(03)00222-3

21. Wang, X., Xing, G., Zhang, Y., Lu, C., Pless, R., & Gill, C. (2003). Integrated coverage and connectivity configuration in wireless sensor networks. *SenSys'03: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems*, 28–39.

https://doi.org/10.1145/958495.958496

22. Xiao, L., Boyd, S., & Lall, S. (2005). A Scheme for robust distributed sensor fusion based on average consensus. *2005 4th International Symposium on Information Processing in Sensor Networks, IPSN 2005*, *2005*, 63–70. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-33645935048&partnerID=40&md5=3c59bd9291a6660f924c01475169f000

23. Yamazoe, N. (2005). Toward innovations of gas sensor technology. *Sensors and Actuators, B: Chemical*, *108*(1-2 SPEC. ISS.), 2–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2004.12.075

24. Zhang, H., & Hou, J. C. (2005). Maintaining sensing coverage and connectivity in large sensor networks. *Ad-Hoc and Sensor Wireless Networks*, *1*(1–2), 89–124. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85045636699&partnerID=40&md5=d3dcea97985485a835ac2d98c6f24cd3