A SYSTAMATIC REVIEW ON WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORK

Dinesh Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Electronics, Electrical and Communications, Galgotias University

ABSTRACT

In a wireless sensor network, localization is a critical approach. The techniques for estimating the position of a node may be classed as target/source localization or self-localization. We present the energy-based technique for target localisation first. Then, we look at approaches for node self-localization. Due to the extensive deployment of wireless sensor networks, the technologies used for localization vary according to application. Additionally, some unique conditions provide a number of difficulties. We present a comprehensive overview of these challenges in this paper, including non-line-of-sight localization, node selection criteria for localization in energy-constrained networks, sensor node scheduling to optimise the trade-off between localization performance and energy consumption, cooperative node localization, and a localization algorithm for heterogeneous networks. Finally, we discuss assessment criteria for wireless sensor network localisation.

KEYWORDS: Localization, WSN, Challenges

INTRODUCTION

Sensors that use sensors that have cheap energy costs, microprocessors, and radio frequency circuits make it possible for wireless sensor network deployment to quickly and widely proliferate (WSN). Because the thousands of low-cost sensor nodes may be deployed via wireless sensor networks, a wide range of potential applications have been suggested, including health surveillance, battlefield surveillance, and environmental monitoring. Location information is often beneficial for geographic information (covering, deployment, routing, location service, target tracking, and rescue), and hence localization is critical. Because of this, it is difficult for researchers to accurately pinpoint a site. Among other things, WSN uses localisation as one of its primary approaches .

Each vehicle robot or aircraft randomly chooses the number of sensor nodes to instal. GPS is an accessible and popular locating technology, but its high cost and energy use make it different to implement in every node. To save money and energy, beacon nodes, which include GPS modules, are used on a smaller scale than usual. Alternatively, nodes might use a localization mechanism to acquire their current position. Node self-localization is a technique used to estimate the unknown node location inside the network. The nodes of WSN are mostly affordable and located in locations that have specific applications in mind. The overall goal is to find the target's position. When we looked at the results of the aforementioned research, we saw that we placed the localization technique into target/source localization, as well as node self-localization.

Furthermore, single-target localization in WSN, multiple-target localization in WSN, single-target localization in wireless binary sensor network (WBSN), and multiple-target localization in WBSN may be further categorised into four separate target locations. In addition to node range-based localization, we have two other types of node self-localization: range-based localization and range-free localization. The former technique estimates position using the measured distance/angle. And, the second technique estimates location using the connection or pattern matching approach. The assessment criteria for localization will be introduced in a specific demonstration, and we will use this demonstration to showcase localization in WSN.

RANGE FREE LOCALIZATION

Hop-count-based localization DV-Hop is the traditional depiction of a range-free positioning system. Because it doesn't matter whether the distance between the beacon node and the unknown node is accurate, it doesn't have to measure that distance. It estimates the distances using the average hop distance, and consumes less hardware. It's simple to put in place, and works well on huge networks. But, as a result, the inaccuracy in location is amplified as well.

The positioning process of DV-Hop is made up of three stages: the dissemination of information, a computation of distance, and a conclusion on the location. The beacon nodes in the information broadcast stage broadcast a location package which contains the number of hops to their neighbours and is initialised to zero for them. When each beacon node sends out a request, the receiver records the shortest hop to the beacon and does not include the whole path to the beacon when calculating how far it is to the next beacon .

LOCALIZATION IN SPECIAL SCENARIO

In the context of sensor networks, current and future applications are considerably different. The size of the network and the types of applications in which it is used are diverse. In some situations, typical localisation techniques will not be useful. The search for sensor nodes that must be found is not an easy one. The four primary difficulties are as follows: One of the biggest issues with range finding is NLOS (non-line-of-sight) ranging inaccuracy. Some parts of the route in a wireless sensor network from the unknown node to the beacon are obstructed by obstacles, therefore the signal measurements contain a route error because of extra distance travelled, which is referred to as the NLOS error. When there is an NLOS error, the location estimate error is significant. The second hurdle is the accuracy and efficiency of localisation in terms of energy usage. The sensor node may fail owing to the exhaustion of energy since it is powered by batteries. So thus, the energy usage is really essential for solving the localisation issue. Node selection, node trade-off, and node resource management are all included. Because of the often-faulty technology and the challenging communication environment, the information obtained is almost certainly inaccurate. Since this is the case, the final issue is to adopt a corporative structure. The fourth problem is to configure the heterogeneous sensor network in diverse environments.

CONCLUSION

If the concentrated network does not have enough information, or if the node has the detrimental information in the sparse network, then we may not have enough knowledge to go on. This region is made up of two main branches. Get access to the neighbourhood nodes' correctness and dependability. Work together with the passive and active nodes to achieve better accuracy. bIt is critical to examine the information that is received. In the study by the researchers used the closest link as a reference to look for more information. When the network density is very high and placement mostly relies on neighbouring node shape, it is possible that the most proximate neighbours are not the optimal links. Denis et al. suggested an adaptive technique to effectively minimise the number of inefficient connections, however this technique requires knowledge about neighbour nodes, therefore the approach is not effective. Thus, the two co-authors of the paper, presented a distributed criteria, where Cramer-Rao limit was used as identifying parameters to identify the connections. To achieve these effects, the approach might potentially eliminate connections to invalid neighbours and unstable transmission; as a result, it may significantly cut computation time and the amount of packets.

REFERENCES

1. Ampatzidis, Y., Bellis, L. D., & Luvisi, A. (2017). iPathology: Robotic applications and management of plants and plant diseases. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 9*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/su9061010
2. Bayilmiş, C., Çakiroğlu, M., Öztürk, S. S., & Çankaya, I. (2010). Development of web based remote monitoring system for wireless sensor networks using MATLAB WEB server [MATLAB WEB sunucusu kullanilarak kablosuz algilayici ağlar i•çi•n i•nternet tabanli i•zleme si•stemi• tasarimi]. *Journal of the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture of Gazi University*, *25*(2), 371–379. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-78149318682&partnerID=40&md5=22f4c964cd9ba7869208e9056c12d251
3. Bdiri, S., Derbel, F., & Kanoun, O. (2016). An 868 MHz 7.5ĝW wake-up receiver with-60 dBm sensitivity. *Journal of Sensors and Sensor Systems*, *5*(2), 433–446. https://doi.org/10.5194/jsss-5-433-2016
4. Fraga-Lamas, P., Fernández-Caramés, T. M., & Castedo, L. (2017). Towards the internet of smart trains: A review on industrial IoT-connected railways. *Sensors (Switzerland), 17*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/s17061457
5. Fu, S., Zhao, L., Su, Z., & Jian, X. (2018). UAV based relay for wireless sensor networks in 5G systems. *Sensors (Switzerland), 18*(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/s18082413
6. Kumar, N., & Kaur, S. (2016). Distance based Angular Clustering Algorithm (DACA) for heterogeneous wireless sensor networks. *2016 Symposium on Colossal Data Analysis and Networking, CDAN 2016*. https://doi.org/10.1109/CDAN.2016.7570912
7. Mittal, N., Kulwinderpreet, Sohi, B. S., & Singh, U. (2016). Mobility based application specific low power routing protocol for wireless sensor networks. *2015 2nd International Conference on Recent*

Advances in Engineering and Computational Sciences, RAECS 2015. https://doi.org/10.1109/RAECS.2015.7453310

8. Mittal, N., Singh, U., & Sohi, B. S. (2017). A stable energy efficient clustering protocol for wireless sensor networks. *Wireless Networks*, *23*(6), 1809–1821. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11276-016-1255-6
9. Shin, S., & Kwon, T. (2018). Two-factor authenticated key agreement supporting unlinkability in 5G-integrated wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Access*, *6*, 11229–11241. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2796539
10. Usman, M., Gebremariam, A. A., Raza, U., & Granelli, F. (2015). A Software-Defined Device-to-Device Communication Architecture for Public Safety Applications in 5G Networks. *IEEE Access*, *3*, 1649–1654. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2015.2479855
11. Xu, L., O'Hare, G. M. P., & Collier, R. (2017). A smart and balanced energy-efficient multihop clustering algorithm (smart-BEEM) for MIMO IoT systems in future networks. *Sensors (Switzerland)*, *17*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/s17071574