

Detection of Gaussian signals via hexagonal sensor networks

Paolo Frasca Paolo Mason Benedetto Piccoli *

February 9, 2019

Abstract

This paper considers a special case of the problem of identifying a static scalar signal, depending on the location, using a planar network of sensors in a distributed fashion. Motivated by the application to monitoring wild-fires spreading and pollutants dispersion, we assume the signal to be Gaussian in space. Using a network of sensors positioned to form a regular hexagonal tessellation, we prove that each node can estimate the parameters of the Gaussian from local measurements. Moreover, we study the effect of additive errors in the measurements on such estimates, as a function of the distance among sensors. Finally, we show how a consensus algorithm can be designed to fuse the local estimates into a shared global estimate, effectively compensating the measurement errors.

1 Introduction

This paper considers a special case of the problem of identifying a static scalar signal, depending on the location, using a planar network of sensors in a distributed fashion. Guided by the application to monitoring wild-fires spreading and pollutants dispersion, we assume the signal to be Gaussian in space: the goal of the sensor network is to identify the four parameters describing the Gaussian function. The objective of this paper is to design a network able to achieve such identification goal, relying on noisy punctual measurements. We are going to design the spacial deployment of the sensors, their communication topology, and the algorithms both to infer the parameters from the measurements, and to aggregate local information into a common estimate.

While the parametric estimation problem undertaken in this paper appears to be novel in the literature, more in general sensor networks and distributed estimation are a vast and growing field: we refer the reader to [6, 9, 7, 10, 2, 5, 4] for recent surveys and research works on the subject.

*This work has been partially supported by the FIRB 2005 CASHMA research project. Paolo Frasca is with the DIIMA, Università di Salerno, and with the IAC-CNR, Roma, Italy. Paolo Mason is with the Ecole supérieure d'électricité, Paris, France. Benedetto Piccoli is with the IAC-CNR, Roma, Italy.

1.1 Problem statement

Let $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Gaussian function

$$F(x_1, x_2) = C_1 e^{-\frac{(x_1 - \bar{x}_1)^2 + (x_2 - \bar{x}_2)^2}{C_2}} \quad (1)$$

where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants and $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ is a point of the plane. Let us discuss the meaning of these parameters, considering the application of observing a diffusion process (fire, pollution).

- (i) The point $\bar{x}$ is the center of the distribution, that is the center of the fire or the location of the pollutant leak.
- (ii) The positive scalar C_1 gives the amplitude of F , that is $C_1 = F(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$.
- (iii) The positive scalar C_2 gives information about the width of the event. If the distribution is the outcome of a diffusion process, C_2 is proportional to the square of the time elapsed from the beginning of the event.

Let there be a network of sensors, referred to as nodes. Each sensor is able to measure the value of F in its own location, and to communicate with its neighbors on the graph with no errors or delays. We want the network to be able to collectively estimate the four parameters describing the Gaussian function. To this goal, we devise a two-phases iterative algorithm.

- (i) The sensors, communicating with their neighbors, construct local estimates of the parameters.
- (ii) The local estimates are fused into common estimates, using a consensus algorithm.

1.2 Statement of contribution and outline

We design the two phases of sensing and fusion separately, in a distributed fashion. In Section 2 we discuss the design of the sensor network, and we choose to work with an hexagonal tessellation. In Section 3 we consider how a single node of such network can build an estimate of the parameters of the Gaussian F , using local measurements, that is measurement taken by itself and its neighbors. Moreover, we study the influence of the distance among sensors, with respect to the sensitivity of the estimates to measurement errors. The latter are modeled as additive random noise. Afterwards, in Section 4, we rather consider the whole network, and we discuss how local estimates can be fused into a common estimate, through a consensus algorithm. We show that fusion can effectively compensate errors in the measurements. Finally, Section 6 contains some concluding remarks.

2 Network design: hexagonal tessellation

In this section we discuss the desirable properties for a network of sensors to solve the problem stated in Section 1.1, and we focus on networks whose nodes and links form (a portion of) a regular *hexagonal tessellation* of the plane. We denote by l the length of the edge of each regular hexagon. Indeed, an hexagonal tessellation enjoys many properties which make it the best candidate for our network.

- (i) *Equispacing.* If the communication among nodes is wireless, which is a very natural choice for a wide area network to be deployed in an environment, a common communication model is the disk graph: each node can communicate with nodes closer than a threshold R . Since in a regular hexagonal tessellation all nodes are l far apart from their neighbors, choosing $l < R$ we satisfy the connectivity constraint.
- (ii) *Modularity.* Neglecting border effects, an hexagonal tessellation is vertex, edge and face transitive. This implies that design can be done once, and be applied to any node.
- (iii) *Coverage properties.* Regular tessellations are optimal from the point of view of covering, since they are the Delaunay graph of a centroidal Voronoi partition [1].

In a distributed framework, every single node is supposed to obtain an estimate the four parameters $C_1, C_2, \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2$. We are going to prove in the sequel that, in order to do this, it needs at least four measurements, which can be its own measurement and three measurements from its neighbors. The graph of the hexagonal tessellation is *3-regular* (every node has three neighbors), and this allows the required information exchange.

The above reasons leave the possibility of using another regular tessellations of the plane (triangles or squares). Compared to them, hexagons require the minimum number of connections, three (instead of six and four, respectively): this is a desirable property in terms of the communication cost. Moreover, hexagonal tessellations cover a larger area with the same number of nodes, and this is a useful feature, considering that the cost of a (wireless) network is proportional to the number of nodes. Indeed elementary formulas imply that, being N the number of nodes, the covered area is $\frac{3\sqrt{3}}{4}l^2N$ for the hexagonal tessellation, while it is $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l^2N$, and l^2N , for the triangular and square tessellations, respectively.

Remark 2.1 The regularity properties of the network are lost at the borders. For this reason, estimation is going to be performed at inner nodes only: such limitation is intuitively going to be less important for large networks.




Figure 1: Local configuration and labeling.

3 Estimation

In this section, we show how an inner node of the hexagonal tessellation graph can estimate the four parameters of the Gaussian, using local information. Since all edges are of length l , up to isometries we can assume the four sensors to be located in

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ l \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l \\ -\frac{l}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l \\ -\frac{l}{2} \end{pmatrix},$$

and labeled as in Figure 1.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4$ be the measurements taken by the four sensors, labeled as in Figure 1. Then the four parameters in (1) are given by the following formulas.*

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= \frac{3l^2}{\log\left(\frac{\mu_1^3}{\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4}\right)}; \\ \bar{x}_1 &= \frac{C_2}{2l\sqrt{3}} \log \frac{\mu_4}{\mu_3}; \\ \bar{x}_2 &= \frac{C_2}{6l} \log \frac{\mu_2^2}{\mu_3\mu_4}; \\ C_1 &= \mu_1 e^{\frac{\bar{x}_1^2 + \bar{x}_2^2}{C_2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Let $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4$ express the four measurements as functions of the parameters.

$$\Phi(C_1, C_2, \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = \left(F(0, 0), F(0, l), F\left(-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l, -\frac{l}{2}\right), F\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l, -\frac{l}{2}\right) \right) \quad (2)$$

Then the problem consists in inverting Φ , that is solving the algebraic system

$$\begin{cases} C_1 e^{-\frac{\bar{x}_1^2 + \bar{x}_2^2}{C_2}} & = \mu_1 \\ C_1 e^{-\frac{\bar{x}_1^2 + (l - \bar{x}_2)^2}{C_2}} & = \mu_2 \\ C_1 e^{-\frac{(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l + \bar{x}_1)^2 + (\frac{l}{2} + \bar{x}_2)^2}{C_2}} & = \mu_3 \\ C_1 e^{-\frac{(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l - \bar{x}_1)^2 + (\frac{l}{2} + \bar{x}_2)^2}{C_2}} & = \mu_4. \end{cases}$$

This implies $\frac{\mu_1^3}{\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4} = e^{\frac{3l^2}{C_2}}$, which require that $\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4 < \mu_1^3$. If this holds, we can deduce $C_2 = \frac{3l^2}{\log(\frac{\mu_1^3}{\mu_2\mu_3\mu_4})}$. Moreover, $\frac{\mu_4}{\mu_3} = e^{\frac{2l\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1}{C_2}}$, $\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3\mu_4} = e^{\frac{4l\bar{x}_2}{C_2}}$, so that

$$\bar{x}_1 = \frac{C_2}{2l\sqrt{3}} \log \frac{\mu_4}{\mu_3}, \quad \bar{x}_2 = \frac{C_2}{6l} \log \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_3\mu_4}.$$

Finally, $C_1 = \mu_1 e^{\frac{\bar{x}_1^2 + \bar{x}_2^2}{C_2}}$. We have shown that, provided $\{(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 : \mu_2\mu_3\mu_4 < \mu_1^3\}$, there is only one compatible Gaussian function, whose parameters are stated in the thesis. $\square$

3.1 Estimation errors

For $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, let Δ_i be the error committed in measurement μ_i and let Δ be the column vector having components Δ_i . This section is devoted to estimate such errors.

To start, we remark that, if we recall the definition of the function Φ , given in (2), then the first order approximation of the error committed on the estimated parameters of F can be computed as $(D\Phi)^{-1}\Delta$. Let us assume that the measurement errors Δ_i be independent Gaussian random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i] = 0$ and common variance $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i^2] = \sigma^2$. Then the first order approximations of the errors on the estimates of the parameters of F are Gaussian random variables: they have zero mean and their variance can be computed, after some algebra, as

$$S(l; C_2) = \sigma^2 \frac{C_2^4 e^{2\frac{|\bar{x}|}{C_2}}}{9C_1^2 l^4} \left(9 + e^{2\frac{l(l-2\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} + e^{2\frac{l(l+\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} + e^{2\frac{l(l-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right);$$

$$\begin{aligned} S(l; |\bar{x}|) = & \sigma^2 \frac{C_2^2 e^{2\frac{|\bar{x}|^2}{C_2}}}{36C_1^2 l^4 |\bar{x}|^2} \left(36|\bar{x}|^4 + (2|\bar{x}|^2 + 2l\bar{x}_2)^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-2\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ & + (2|\bar{x}|^2 + l(-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2))^2 e^{\frac{2l(l+\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \\ & \left. + (2|\bar{x}|^2 + l(\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2))^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\bar{x}| = \sqrt{\bar{x}_1^2 + \bar{x}_2^2}$;

$$S(l; C_1) = \sigma^2 \frac{9e^{2\frac{|\bar{x}|^2}{C_2}}}{l^4} \left(9(|\bar{x}|^2 - l^2)^2 + (|\bar{x}|^2 + 2l\bar{x}_2)^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-2\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ \left. + (|\bar{x}|^2 - l(\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1 + \bar{x}_2))^2 e^{\frac{2l(l+\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ \left. + (|\bar{x}|^2 + l(\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2))^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right);$$

$$S(l; \arctan \frac{\bar{x}_2}{\bar{x}_1}) = \sigma^2 \frac{C_2^2 e^{2\frac{|\bar{x}|^2}{C_2}}}{36C_1^2 l^2 |\bar{x}|^4} \left(4\bar{x}_1^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-2\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ \left. + (\bar{x}_1 - \sqrt{3}\bar{x}_2)^2 e^{\frac{2l(l+\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ \left. + (\bar{x}_1 + \sqrt{3}\bar{x}_2)^2 e^{\frac{2l(l-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right).$$

Remark 3.2 (Center position and errors) Remark that all the above functions grow unbounded as $|\bar{x}|$ goes to infinity. This is consistent with the intuition that the sensors be more effective if close to the center of the Gaussian. Moreover, $S(l; \arctan \frac{\bar{x}_2}{\bar{x}_1})$ and $S(l; |\bar{x}|)$ grow unbounded also when $|\bar{x}| \rightarrow 0$. This suggests the opportunity of having nodes enough far apart from each other.

3.2 Optimal spacing

Since we have restricted ourselves to hexagonal regular networks, the design parameter we are left with for optimization is l . It is clear that the choice of l is constrained by the area to be covered and the number of available sensors.

Being aware of these potential constraints, we consider in this section the problem of finding, for each of the above errors variance functions, the value of l which make them minimal. That is, we address the optimization problem

$$l_{\text{opt}} = \underset{l>0}{\operatorname{argmin}} S(l). \quad (3)$$

Whenever it is useful to specify which function we are referring to, we shall write $l_{\text{opt}}(C_1)$, $l_{\text{opt}}(C_2)$, and so on.

Remark 3.3 (Finding l_{opt}) Some facts on the optimization problem (3) are immediate.

- (i) The errors variances $S(l; \cdot)$ depend continuously on l and grow unbounded as l goes to 0 or to ∞ . Hence there is one optimal l . Finding closed form expressions for these minima seems an intractable problem, but the minima can be evaluated numerically.
- (ii) The parameter C_1 has no effect on any l_{opt} .

- (iii) The parameter C_2 can be set as $C_2 = 1$ without loss of generality, since the mapping $(\bar{x}, C_2) \mapsto (\lambda\bar{x}, \lambda^2 C_2)$ induces a mapping as $l_{\text{opt}} \rightarrow \lambda l_{\text{opt}}$, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Before showing some numerical result, we state a bound about $S(l; C_2)$: its tightness is numerically demonstrated in Figure 4.

Proposition 3.4 *Consider the optimization problem (3). Then*

$$\sqrt{C_2} - |\bar{x}| < l_{\text{opt}}(C_2) < \sqrt{2}\sqrt{C_2} + |\bar{x}|.$$

Namely, if $\bar{x} = 0$, then $l_{\text{opt}} = 1.11691\sqrt{C_2}$.

Proof: Up to a multiplicative constant, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dl} S(l) &= \frac{4}{l^5} \left(-9 + \frac{l^2 - l\bar{x}_2 - C_2}{C_2} e^{2\frac{l(l-\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{l^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l\bar{x}_1 + l\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - C_2}{C_2} e^{2\frac{l(l+\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{l^2 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l\bar{x}_1 + l\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - C_2}{C_2} e^{2\frac{l(l-\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1+\bar{x}_2)}{C_2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then the minimum has to satisfy at least one of the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} l^2 - l\bar{x}_2 - C_2 &> 0 \\ l^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l\bar{x}_1 + l\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - C_2 &> 0 \\ l^2 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}l\bar{x}_1 + l\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - C_2 &> 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

That is,

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\text{opt}} &> \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\bar{x}_2 + \sqrt{4C_2 + \bar{x}_2^2} \right), \right. \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1}{2} + \sqrt{4C_2 + \left(\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1}{2} \right)^2} \right), \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1}{2} + \sqrt{4C_2 + \left(\frac{\bar{x}_2}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{3}\bar{x}_1}{2} \right)^2} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Such a minimum is always positive, and moreover

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\text{opt}} &> \frac{1}{2} \left(-|\bar{x}| + \sqrt{4C_2 + |\bar{x}|^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{4C_2}{|\bar{x}| + \sqrt{4C_2 + |\bar{x}|^2}} \\ &> \frac{C_2}{|\bar{x}| + \sqrt{C_2}} \\ &> \sqrt{C_2} - |\bar{x}|, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the fact that the function $y \mapsto y + \sqrt{4C_2 + y^2}$ is increasing.

Let us now look for an upper bound on l_{opt} . To this goal, let us assume l to satisfy

$$l^2 - l|\bar{x}| - C_2 > 0, \quad (6)$$

so that the inequalities (4) are all satisfied. Then, using $e^y > 1 + y$, we argue that

$$\frac{d}{dl}S(l) > l^4 + l^2(|\bar{x}|^2 - C_2/2) - 2C_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Actually the right-hand-side of (7) is positive when

$$l^2 > \frac{1}{2} \left(C_2/2 - |\bar{x}|^2 + \sqrt{(C_2/2 - |\bar{x}|^2)^2 + 8C_2^2} \right).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(C_2/2 - |\bar{x}|^2 + \sqrt{(C_2/2 - |\bar{x}|^2)^2 + 8C_2^2} \right)} &< \sqrt{|C_2/2 - |\bar{x}|^2| + \sqrt{2}C_2} \\ &< |\bar{x}| + \sqrt{2C_2} \end{aligned}$$

and, for every $l \geq |\bar{x}| + \sqrt{2C_2}$, Equation (6) is satisfied, we obtain the upper bound

$$l_{\text{opt}} < |\bar{x}| + \sqrt{2C_2}.$$

□

In Figures 2 and 3, we show some computational results about the minima. Some remarks are in order.

- (i) The functions $S(l)$ feature several local minima, and this results in discontinuities of the computed global minimum l_{opt} .
- (ii) $\lim_{|\bar{x}| \rightarrow \infty} l_{\text{opt}} = 0$. However, we know from Remark 3.2 that in such limit the estimate loses its significance, and so the optimization.

Overall, the optimal l_{opt} depends on the parameters value. Then the optimization can be useful for design whenever we have some *a priori* information on the parameters.

4 Fusion by consensus

In this section we discuss how the estimates of the parameters, obtained locally by the single nodes, can be fused at the network level into an agreement about the parameters of the Gaussian F . To the goal of fusion, we can take advantage of the wide literature [8] on distributed consensus problems. Such problems can be solved by iterative distributed algorithms as the one we describe.




Figure 2: Numerical computation of $l_{\text{opt}}(C_2)$, depending on $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2$, with $C_2 = 1$.




Figure 3: Numerical computation of $l_{\text{opt}}(|\bar{x}|)$, depending on $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2$, with $C_2 = 1$.




Figure 4: Comparing the actual value of $l_{\text{opt}}(C_2)$ and the lower bound (5), assuming $\bar{x}_2 = -1$ and $C_2 = 1$.

To work with more generality, let us consider a quantity of interest $x \in \mathbb{R}$, which in the case of this paper will be one of the parameters of the Gaussian F . The algorithm evolves through discrete time steps $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The scalar $x_i(t)$ denotes the estimate that, at time t , sensor $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ has of the quantity x . The estimate obtained from the estimation phase, described in Section 3, will be $x_i(0)$: note that, in our application, only the inner nodes of the network do possess initial estimates, and then take part to the fusion process. Thus N is the number of inner nodes in the network. The iteration of the algorithm consists in

$$x(t+1) = P(t)x(t), \quad (8)$$

where $x(t) = [x_1(t), \dots, x_N(t)]^*$ is the estimates vector, and $P(t)$ is a stochastic matrix, depending on the *network topology*, and possibly on time. The algorithm above, under suitable assumptions [3], can be proved to converge to a consensus, in the sense that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) = \bar{x}$. The value $\bar{x}$ is said to be the consensus value, and it is a convex combination of the initial values. In some cases, the weights of this convex combination can be controlled by the designer. For instance, if $P(t)$ is constantly equal to a doubly stochastic matrix P , then $\bar{x}$ is the arithmetic average $x_{\text{ave}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(0)$.

Averaging is the first natural idea for fusion of the estimates obtained by each node. Indeed, elementary probability formulas imply that, given that each estimate $x_i(0)$ be affected by an independent random additive error whose variance is σ_i^2 , the average $x_{\text{ave}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(0)$ is affected by an error of variance $N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$. In facts, if all the errors are equal, this yields reducing the error by a factor N . However, this is not the case of the present paper, when the *quality* of the estimates varies among nodes. Indeed, it can very well happen that, for some node j , the error variance be $\sigma_j^2 < N^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$. We argue that computing the arithmetic average is not always the best choice. To cope with this problem we need to use a better estimator than the average. Given the

noisy observations $x_i(0)$, such that $\mathbb{E}[(x_i(0) - x)^2] = \sigma_i^2$, the optimal estimator of x in a mean squared error sense is

$$\hat{x} = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} x_i(0).$$

If the variances σ_k^2 for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ are known *a priori*, then in principle a matrix P can be designed to have $\bar{x} = \hat{x}$. But these are not *a priori* known in the case of this paper, because variances depend on the value x , as illustrated in Section 3.1.

For this reason, we propose here a suboptimal but *distributed* algorithm. At each time step, every node i updates and communicates both the variable $x_i(t)$, and a variable $s_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, which approximates the variance of the error that i is committing in estimating x with the value $x_i(t)$. The algorithm we propose is as follows.

Let us consider the graph $\mathcal{G}$ of the connections among the inner nodes of the hexagonal network, whose nodes are labeled in $\{1, \dots, N\}$. For all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, let $\mathcal{N}_i \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ denote the set of the neighbors of i in the graph, including i itself. Let $x(0)$ be the vector of the local estimates, and $s(0)$ the vector of the presumed variances of the errors affecting $x(0)$, as computed by each node substituting $x(0)$ into the formulas in Section 3.1.

At each time step $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, each node j communicates its states $x_j(t)$ and $s_j(t)$ to all its neighbors, and the states are updated following

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= P(t)x(t) \\ s(t+1) &= M(t)s(t), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$P_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1/s_j(t)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} 1/s_k(t)}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

and

$$M_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1/(s_j(t))^2}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_i} 1/(s_k(t))^2}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The above update can be done in a distributed way, using information at the node and received from the immediate neighbors. Remark that the update matrices depend on the state of the system, and then on time. The convergence of the proposed algorithm is stated in the following result.

Proposition 4.1 (Convergence) *Provided the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, system (9) converges to consensus in both $x(t)$ and $s(t)$, that is, there exist scalars x^*, s^* such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ s(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x^* \mathbf{1} \\ s^* \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the $N \times 1$ vector whose entries equal 1.

Proof: For time-independent consensus iterations, convergence is proved [3] showing that 1 is the only eigenvalue on the unit circle, that its only eigenvector is $\mathbf{1}$, and that all other eigenvalues have modulus strictly less than 1. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is connected and $P(t)$ and $M(t)$ are symmetric and stochastic, the above conditions are satisfied for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Hence, to show convergence it is sufficient to show that the modulus of every non-one eigenvalue of $P(t)$ and of $M(t)$ does not grow to 1 as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

To prove this fact, first we remark that every $M(t)$ is a stochastic matrix, and then $s_j(t) \in [\min_i s_i(0), \max_i s_i(0)]$, for all $t \geq 0$, and all $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Since these intervals are compact and do not contain zero, we argue that $P(t)$ belongs to a compact subset of stochastic matrices. Now, we recall the fact that the eigenvalues of a matrix depend continuously on its entries. Hence, the non-one eigenvalues of $P(t)$ must lie in a compact set, and this implies that there exists $c < 1$, depending on $s(0)$ and not depending on t , such that if λ is an eigenvalue of $P(t)$ or $M(t)$, then $|\lambda| \leq c$. The same reasoning holds for $M(t)$, and this implies the convergence. $\square$

Note that the object of interest is the consensus about the variable $x(t)$. The consensus value x^* is not in general equal to the optimal estimator $\hat{x}$, but simulations presented in Section 5 show that x^* is much closer to the true value x , than the arithmetic average x_{ave} .

5 Simulations

Simulations are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed estimation and fusion algorithm. To provide an example, we focus on the estimation of the center $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ of the Gaussian signal F . We consider a network of twelve nodes, six of which are inner nodes forming an hexagon, and then are able to compute estimates and participate to the fusion process. We assume that each measurement is corrupted by an additive random Gaussian variable whose variance is 1% of the maximum value of the signal to be estimated. Figure 5 shows the raw estimates obtained by each node, and the fused estimate of the center, compared with its true position.

Simulations show that the estimation of the bi-dimensional parameter is possible with the proposed distributed method, and that the sensitivity to measurement errors is greatly reduced by fusion. Note that the consensus algorithm proposed in (9) is much more accurate, and then preferable to simple averaging. As expected, the sensor network is less effective when the Gaussian is eccentric with respect to the network, but for moderate eccentricity, the fusion algorithm gives an effective compensation of the errors affecting the local estimates.

6 Conclusion and open problems

In this work we have posed and solved the problem of distributely estimating a Gaussian signal from noisy measurement taken by networked sensors. Our




Figure 5: Raw and fused estimates of the center of the Gaussian F , whose position $(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ is equal to $(0,0)$, $(0.5,0.5)$, $(1,1)$, and $(1.5,1.5)$, respectively. The label *Wise consensus* denotes the algorithm (9).

solution consists in a two-phases algorithm designed for a network which forms an hexagonal tessellation. In a first phase, sensors locally compute estimates of the parameters identifying the Gaussian signal, using their own measurement, and the measurements by their immediate neighbors. In the second phase, an heuristic consensus algorithm is run to obtain a common estimate. The consensus phase takes advantage of the (approximate) knowledge of the statistics of the errors affecting the local estimates. This feature allows to obtain encouraging results in terms of accuracy, also in presence of significant perturbations in the local estimates. Besides proving the convergence of the algorithm, we also studied the issue of optimizing the inter-node distance with respect to the local estimates errors, obtaining useful results for the network design.

Further research and extensions of the present work include the following issues.

- (i) Sensitivity analysis with respect to errors in the deployment of sensors.
- (ii) Design of distributed algorithms to achieve the hexagonal network by deployment of self-propelled sensors.
- (iii) Extension to different, possibly non regular, tessellations.

Most important, the problem undertaken in this paper points out the interest of studying, in more generality, the problem of an optimal distributed fusion of estimates having different “quality”.

References

- [1] F. Bullo, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez. *Distributed Control of Robotic Networks*. Applied Mathematics Series. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [2] G. C. Calafiore and F. Abrate. Distributed linear estimation over sensor networks. *International Journal of Control*, 82(5):868–882, 2009.
- [3] R. Carli, F. Fagnani, A. Speranzon, and S. Zampieri. Communication constraints in the average consensus problem. *Automatica*, 44(3):671–684, 2008.
- [4] S. H. Dandach and F. Bullo. Algorithms for regional source localization. In *American Control Conference*, St. Louis, MO, June 2009.
- [5] F. Garin and S. Zampieri. Performance of consensus algorithms in large-scale distributed estimation. In *European Control Conference*, Budapest, Hungary, August 2009.
- [6] A. Ghosh and S. K. Das. Coverage and connectivity issues in wireless sensor networks: A survey. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, 4(3):303–334, 2008.
- [7] A. Giridhar and P. R. Kumar. Towards a theory of in-network computation in wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 44(4):98107, 2006.

- [8] R. Olfati-Saber, J. A. Fax, and R. M. Murray. Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1):215–233, 2007.
- [9] M. Rabbat and R. Nowak. Distributed optimization in sensor networks. In *Symposium on Information Processing of Sensor Networks (IPSN)*, pages 20–27, Berkeley, USA, April 2004.
- [10] A. Speranzon, C. Fischione, K. H. Johansson, and A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli. A distributed minimum variance estimator for sensor networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 26(4):609–621, 2008.