

# Optimal Local Thresholds for Distributed Detection in Energy Harvesting Wireless Sensor Networks

Ghazaleh Ardeshiri, Hassan Yazdani, Azadeh Vosoughi *Senior Member, IEEE*  
University of Central Florida

Email:gh.ardeshiri@knights.ucf.edu, h.yazdani@knights.ucf.edu, azadeh@ucf.edu

**Abstract**—We consider a wireless sensor network, consisting of  $K$  heterogeneous sensors and a fusion center (FC), that is tasked with solving a binary distributed detection problem. Each sensor is capable of harvesting and storing energy for communication with the FC. For energy efficiency, a sensor transmits only if the sensor test statistic exceeds a local threshold  $\theta_k$ , its channel gain exceeds a minimum threshold, and its battery state can afford the transmission. Our proposed transmission model at each sensor is motivated by the channel inversion power control strategy in the wireless communication community. Considering a constraint on the average energy of transmit symbols, we study the optimal  $\theta_k$ 's that optimize two detection performance metrics: (i) the detection probability  $P_D$  at the FC, assuming that the FC utilizes the optimal fusion rule based on Neyman-Pearson optimality criterion, and (ii) Kullback-Leibler distance (KL) between the two distributions of the received signals at the FC conditioned by each hypothesis. Our numerical results indicate that  $\theta_k$ 's obtained from maximizing the KL distance are near-optimal. Finding these thresholds is computationally efficient, as it requires only  $K$  one-dimensional searches, as opposed to a  $K$ -dimensional search required to find the thresholds that maximize  $P_D$ .

## I. INTRODUCTION

The designs of wireless sensor networks to perform the task of distributed detection are often based on the conventional battery-powered sensors, leading into designs with a short lifetime, due to battery depletion [1], [2], [3]. Recently, energy harvesting, which can collect energy from renewable resources in ambient environment (e.g., solar, wind, and geothermal energy) has attracted much attention [4], [5]. Energy harvesting technology in wireless sensor networks promises a self-sustainable system with a lifetime that is not limited by the lifetime of the conventional batteries [2], [6], [7].

In this paper, we consider the distributed detection of a known signal using a wireless network with  $K$  energy harvesting sensors and a fusion center (FC). Each sensor makes a noisy observation, corrupted by both additive and multiplicative observation noises. Each sensor applies an energy detector, to compare its test statistic against a local decision threshold  $\theta_k$  (to be optimized), and transmits only if the test statistic exceeds  $\theta_k$ , its channel gain exceeds a minimum threshold  $\zeta_k$ , and its battery state can afford transmission. Given our transmission and battery state models, our goal is to investigate the optimal  $\theta_k$ 's that optimize the detection performance metric, subject to average transmit symbol energy constraint. The paper organization follows: in Section II we present our system model, including our transmission and battery state models. In Section III we derive the optimal fusion rule and its corresponding detection and false alarm




Fig. 1: Our System model

probabilities  $P_D, P_F$ , we provide two approximate expressions for the total Kullback-Leibler (KL) distance  $KL_{tot}$  at the FC, and we discuss finding  $\zeta_k$ 's based on the average transmit symbol energy constraint. Section IV illustrates our numerical results on optimizing  $\theta_k$ 's based on maximizing  $P_D$  and  $KL_{tot}$ , and our concluding remarks.

## II. OUR SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

We consider a distributed binary hypothesis testing problem where  $K$  sensors and a FC are tasked with solving a binary hypothesis testing problem. The particular detection problem we focus on is determining the presence or absence of a known scalar signal  $\mathcal{A}$  (see Fig.??). Let  $x_k$  denote the local observation at sensor  $k$  during an observation period. We assume the following signal model

$$\mathcal{H}_1 : x_k = \mathcal{A}g_k + w_k, \quad \mathcal{H}_0 : x_k = w_k \quad (1)$$

where  $w_k$  and  $g_k$  are additive and multiplicative observation noises, respectively. We assume  $w_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w_k}^2)$ ,  $g_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma_{g_k})$  and all observation noises are independent over time and among  $K$  sensors. During each observation period, sensor  $k$  takes  $N$  samples of  $x_k$  to measure the received signal energy and applies an energy detector to make a binary decision, i.e., sensor  $k$  decides whether or not signal  $\mathcal{A}$  is present. Let  $d_k$

denote the binary decision of sensor  $k$ , where  $d_k = 0$  and  $d_k = 1$ , respectively, correspond to  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . The test statistic for sensor  $k$  is

$$\Lambda_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N |x_{k,n}|^2 \underset{d_k=0}{\geq} \underset{d_k=1}{\geq} \theta_k \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_k$  is local decision threshold to be optimized. For the signal model in (1), conditioned on each hypothesis  $x_k$  is Gaussian, that is,  $x_k|\mathcal{H}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w_k}^2)$  and  $x_k|\mathcal{H}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A}\gamma_{g_k}, \sigma_{w_k}^2)$ . The test statistic  $\Lambda_k$  in (2) has non-central Chi-square distribution [7] as given below

$$\mathcal{H}_1 : \Lambda_k \sim \chi_N^2(\eta_k), \quad \mathcal{H}_0 : \Lambda_k \sim \chi_N^2 \quad (3)$$

where  $\eta_k = \mathcal{A}^2 \mathbb{E}\{g_{k,n}^2\} = \mathcal{A}^2 \gamma_{g_k}$  is the non-centrality parameter. Using (3), the false-alarm probability  $P_{f_k}$  and detection probability  $P_{d_k}$  can be derived as following

$$P_{f_k} = \Pr(\Lambda_k > \theta_k | \mathcal{H}_0) = \frac{\Gamma(N/2, \frac{N\theta_k}{\sigma_{w_k}^2})}{\Gamma(N/2)} \quad (4)$$

$$P_{d_k} = \Pr(\Lambda_k > \theta_k | \mathcal{H}_1) = Q_{N/2}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\eta_k}}{\sigma_{w_k}}, \frac{\sqrt{N\theta_k}}{\sigma_{w_k}}\right) \quad (5)$$

where  $\Gamma(n)$  is the gamma function,  $\Gamma(n, x) = \int_x^\infty t^{n-1} e^{-t} dt$  is the upper incomplete gamma function,  $Q_n(a, b) = \int_b^\infty x \left(\frac{x}{a}\right)^{n-1} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2+a^2}{2}\right) I_{n-1}(ax) dx$  is the generalized Marcum-Q function, and  $I_{n-1}(\cdot)$  is modified Bessel function of order  $n-1$  [8].

We assume each sensor is able to harvest energy from the environment and stores this harvested energy in a battery that has the capacity of storing at most  $\mathcal{K}$  units of energy. As shown in Fig. ??, the sensors communicate with the FC through orthogonal fading channels with channel gains  $|h_k|$ 's that are independent and have Rayleigh distribution with parameters  $\gamma_{h_k}$ . The sensors employ on-off keying (OOK) signaling for communication, where a  $d_k = 1$  decision at sensor  $k$  is conveyed at the cost of spending one or more energy units and a  $d_k = 0$  decision is conveyed through a no-transmission with no energy cost. We assume that only sending a message costs units of energy, and the energy of making the observation and processing is negligible. The number of energy units spent to convey a  $d_k = 1$  decision depends on the quality of the channel gain  $|h_k|$  and the battery state of sensor  $k$ . Motivated by the channel-inversion power control strategy developed in the wireless communication community [9] we try to compensate for the fading and let the number of energy units spent to convey a  $d_k = 1$  decision be (roughly) inversely proportional to  $|h_k|$  (i.e., a smaller  $|h_k|$  corresponds to a larger number of energy units), albeit if the battery has sufficient number of stored energy units. To avoid the battery depletion when  $|h_k|$  is too small, we impose an extra constraint inspired by the channel truncation technique in the channel-inversion power control strategy [9], to ensure that a  $d_k = 1$  decision is conveyed only if  $|h_k|$  exceeds a minimum threshold  $\zeta_k$  (choice of  $\zeta_k$  will be discussed later). Let  $t$  indicate the index of the observation period and  $b_{k,t}$  denote the battery state of sensor  $k$  in the observation period  $t$ . Let  $u_{k,t}$  represent the sensor

output corresponding to the observation period  $t$ . Based on the above explanations, we define  $u_{k,t}$  as

$$u_{k,t} = \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil & \Lambda_k > \theta_k, b_{k,t} > \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil, |h_k|^2 > \zeta_k \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a power regulation constant (that depends on the battery structure). We use the round function  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  toward  $+\infty$ , to ensure that  $u_{k,t}$  is a discrete symbol and the energy of this symbol is equal to the number of consumed energy units to convey  $d_k = 1$ . The constraint  $\Lambda_k > \theta_k$  in (6) comes directly from (2). We assume the average energy of the transmitted symbol  $u_{k,t}$  is constrained, i.e.,  $P_{avk} = \mathbb{E}\{\lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil^2 | u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil\}$ , where the expectation is taken with respect to  $|h_k|$ . We model  $b_{k,t}$  in (6) as the following

$$b_{k,t} = \min\{b_{k,t-1} - \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil I_{u_{k,t-1}} + \Omega_{k,t}, \mathcal{K}\} \quad (7)$$

where  $b_{k,t-1}$  is the battery state of the previous observation period and  $\Omega_{k,t} \in \{0, 1\}$  is a binary random variable, indicating whether or not sensor  $k$  harvests one unit of energy. We assume  $\Omega_{k,t}$  is a Bernoulli random variable, with  $\Pr(\Omega_{k,t} = 1) = p_e$ , where  $p_e$  depends on the harvesting structure. This assumption is repeatedly used in the literature (see [10] and references therein). The indicator function  $I_{u_{k,t-1}}$  in (7) is defined as

$$I_{u_{k,t-1}} = \begin{cases} 1 & u_{k,t-1} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In the remaining, we focus on one observation period and we drop the subscript  $t$  from the battery state  $b_{k,t}$  and the sensor output  $u_{k,t}$ . Given our system model description above, our goal is to investigate the optimal local decision thresholds  $\theta_k$ 's in (2) that optimizes the detection performance metric.

### III. OPTIMIZING LOCAL DECISION THRESHOLDS

We consider two detection performance metrics to find the optimal  $\theta_k$ 's: (i) the detection probability at the FC, assuming that the FC utilizes the optimal fusion rule based on Neyman-Pearson optimality criterion, and (ii) the KL distance between the two distributions of the received signals at the FC conditioned on hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1$ . In Section III-A we derive the optimal fusion rule and the expressions for the detection and false alarm probabilities  $P_D, P_F$  at the FC. In Section III-B we derive two approximate expressions for the KL distance at the FC. In Section III-C we discuss the choice of the threshold  $\zeta_k$  in (6).

#### A. Optimal LRT Fusion Rule and $P_D, P_F$ Expressions

The received signal at the FC from sensor  $k$  is  $y_k = h_k u_k + n_k$ , where the additive communication channel noise  $n_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{n_k}^2)$ . The likelihood ratio at the FC is [11]

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{LRT}} &= \log \left( \frac{f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_1)}{f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left( \frac{\sum_{u_k} f(y_k | u_k, \mathcal{H}_1) \Pr(u_k | \mathcal{H}_1)}{\sum_{u_k} f(y_k | u_k, \mathcal{H}_0) \Pr(u_k | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

in which we use the fact that, given  $\mathcal{H}_i$  the received signals at the FC are independent, i.e.,  $f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_i) =$




Fig. 2: (a) CDF of  $b_k$  for  $K=20$  and  $p_e = 0.5, 0.75, 0.82$ , (b) pmf of  $b_k$  for  $K=50$  and  $p_e = 0.8$ .

$\prod_{k=1}^K f(y_k|\mathcal{H}_i)$ . Examining (9), we note given  $u_k, y_k$  and  $\mathcal{H}_i$  are independent and hence  $f(y_k|u_k, \mathcal{H}_i) = f(y_k|u_k)$  for  $i = 0, 1$ . Also, given  $u_k, y_k$  is Gaussian, i.e.,  $y_k|u_k=0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{n_k}^2)$  and  $y_k|u_k=\lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil \sim \mathcal{N}(\lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k, \sigma_{n_k}^2)$ . The probabilities  $\Pr(u_k|\mathcal{H}_1), \Pr(u_k|\mathcal{H}_0)$  in (9) are

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil | \mathcal{H}_1) \\ &= \Pr(\Lambda_k > \theta_k, b_k > \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil, |h_k|^2 > \zeta_k | \mathcal{H}_1) \\ &= \Pr(\Lambda_k > \theta_k | \mathcal{H}_1) \Pr(b_k > \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil) \Pr(|h_k|^2 > \zeta_k) \\ &= P_{d_k} \rho_k q_k = \alpha_k \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil | \mathcal{H}_0) \\ &= \Pr(\Lambda_k > \theta_k | \mathcal{H}_0) \Pr(b_k > \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil) \Pr(|h_k|^2 > \zeta_k) \\ &= P_{f_k} \rho_k q_k = \beta_k \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $P_{f_k}, P_{d_k}$  are given in (4), (5),  $\rho_k = \Pr(b_k > \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil)$  and  $q_k = \Pr(|h_k|^2 > \zeta_k) = \exp(-\zeta_k/\gamma_{h_k})$ . Assuming  $b_k$  in (7) is a stationary random process, one can compute the cumulative distribution function (CDF) and the probability mass function (pmf) of  $b_k$  in terms of  $K, p_e, \gamma_{h_k}$ . Fig.2(a) shows CDF of  $b_k$  for  $K=20$  and  $p_e = 0.5, 0.75, 0.82$ , and Fig.2(b) depicts pmf of  $b_k$  for  $K=50$  and  $p_e = 0.8$ . For our numerical results in Section IV we use pmf of  $b_k$  to find  $\rho_k$  in (10) and (11). Combing all, we can rewrite  $\Delta_{\text{LRT}}$  as the following [12]

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{LRT}} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left( \frac{\alpha_k f(y_k|u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil) + (1 - \alpha_k) f(y_k|u_k = 0)}{\beta_k f(y_k|u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil) + (1 - \beta_k) f(y_k|u_k = 0)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \log \frac{\alpha_k \exp(-\frac{(y_k - \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k)^2}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2}) + (1 - \alpha_k) \exp(-\frac{y_k^2}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2})}{\beta_k \exp(-\frac{(y_k - \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k)^2}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2}) + (1 - \beta_k) \exp(-\frac{y_k^2}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2})} \end{aligned}$$

In low SNR regime as  $\sigma_{n_k}^2 \rightarrow \infty$  taking a logarithm from  $\Delta_{\text{LRT}}$  and using the approximations  $e^{-x} \approx 1 - x$  and  $\log(1 + x)$  for small  $x$ , we can simplify  $\Delta_{\text{LRT}}$  to  $\Delta_{\text{LRT}} \approx -T_k + \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k y_k$  where  $T_k = \sum_{k=1}^K \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil^2 h_k^2 (\alpha_k - \beta_k) / 2\sigma_{n_k}^2$  and  $\nu_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k (\alpha_k - \beta_k) / \sigma_{n_k}^2$ . Given a threshold  $\tau$ , the optimal likelihood ratio test (LRT) is  $\Delta_{\text{LRT}} \geq \frac{\tau}{\gamma_{\mathcal{H}_0}}$ . The false




Fig. 3:  $P_D$  vs.  $P_F, K=20, p_e = 0.75, P_{av} = 1\text{dB}$ .

alarm and detection probabilities  $P_F, P_D$  at the FC are

$$\begin{aligned} P_F &= \Pr(\Delta_{\text{LRT}} > \tau | \mathcal{H}_0) = Q\left(\frac{\tau - \mu_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_0}{\sigma_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_0}\right) \quad (12) \\ P_D &= \Pr(\Delta_{\text{LRT}} > \tau | \mathcal{H}_1) \\ &= Q\left(\frac{Q^{-1}(a)\sigma_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_0 + \mu_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_0 - \mu_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_1}{\sigma_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_1}\right) \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_i &= -T_k + \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k \mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_i}, \quad \sigma_{\Delta}^2 | \mathcal{H}_i = \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k^2 \sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_i}^2, \quad i = 0, 1 \\ \mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0} &= \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k \beta_k, \quad \sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}^2 = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil^2 h_k^2 \beta_k (1 - \beta_k) + \sigma_{n_k}^2 \\ \mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1} &= \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k \alpha_k, \quad \sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1}^2 = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil^2 h_k^2 \alpha_k (1 - \alpha_k) + \sigma_{n_k}^2 \end{aligned}$$

The threshold  $\tau$  is determined from the constraint on  $P_F \leq a$  in terms of  $a$ . We note that  $P_D$  expression depends on all our optimization variables  $\theta_k$ 's through  $\alpha_k, \beta_k$ 's in  $\mu_{\Delta} | \mathcal{H}_i$  and  $\sigma_{\Delta}^2 | \mathcal{H}_i$ .

### B. KL Expression

Let  $KL_{\text{tot}}$  denote the KL distance between the two distributions  $f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_1)$  and  $f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_0)$  at the FC. Since  $f(y_1, \dots, y_K | \mathcal{H}_i) = \prod_{k=1}^K f(y_k | \mathcal{H}_i)$ , we have  $KL_{\text{tot}} = \sum_{k=1}^K KL_k$  where  $KL_k$  by definition is [13]

$$KL_k = \int_{y_k} f(y_k | \mathcal{H}_1) \log \left( \frac{f(y_k | \mathcal{H}_1)}{f(y_k | \mathcal{H}_0)} \right) dy_k \quad (14)$$

We note that the distributions  $f(y_k | \mathcal{H}_i), i = 0, 1$  are Gaussian mixtures and thus  $KL_k$  in (14) does not have a general closed-form expression [14] and approximations must be made. One can approximate  $KL_k$  in (14) by the KL distance of two Gaussian distributions with the means  $\mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}, \mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1}$ , and the variances  $\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}^2$  and  $\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1}^2$ , respectively, i.e.,  $KL_k$  can be approximated as [15]

$$KL_k \approx \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}^2}{\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1}^2} \right) + \frac{\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1}^2 - \sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}^2 + (\mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_1} - \mu_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0})^2}{2\sigma_{y_k | \mathcal{H}_0}^2} \quad (15)$$




Fig. 4:  $P_D$  vs.  $P_F$ ,  $\mathcal{K} = 20$ ,  $p_e = 0.75$ ,  $P_{av} = 1$  dB.




Fig. 5:  $P_D$  vs.  $P_{av}$ ,  $\mathcal{K} = 20$ ,  $p_e = 0.75$ ,  $P_F = 0.5$ .

Another approximation for  $KL_k$  in (14) can be found using the low SNR regime approximation in Section III-A, as the following

$$KL_k \approx c_k(\beta_k - \alpha_k) \left\{ c_k \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2}} \left( (1 - \alpha_k) \left( Q\left(\frac{y_k}{\sigma_{n_k}}\right) - 0.5 \right) + \alpha_k Q\left(\frac{y_k - c_k}{\sigma_{n_k}}\right) \right) + \alpha_k \exp\left(\frac{(c_k - y_k)^2}{-2\sigma_{n_k}^2}\right) + (1 - \alpha_k) \exp\left(\frac{-y_k^2}{2\sigma_{n_k}^2}\right) \right\} \quad (16)$$

where  $c_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil h_k$ . Different from  $P_D$  expression that depends on all  $\theta_k$ 's,  $KL_{tot}$  is decoupled such that  $KL_k$  depends on  $\theta_k$  only through  $\alpha_k, \beta_k$ 's in  $\mu_{y_k|\mathcal{H}_i}$  and  $\sigma_{y_k|\mathcal{H}_i}^2$ .

### C. Choosing Threshold $\zeta_k$ in (6)

We find  $\zeta_k$  in (6) via solving the constraint  $P_{av_k} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\left[\frac{\lambda}{|h_k|}\right]^2 | u_k = \lceil \frac{\lambda}{|h_k|} \rceil\right\}$ . Recall  $h_k$  has Rayleigh distribution. After some algebraic manipulations we obtain

$$P_{av_k} = \alpha_k \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i+1) \left( e^{\frac{-1}{\gamma_{h_k}} \max\{\zeta_k, \frac{\lambda^2}{i+1}\}} - e^{\frac{-\lambda^2}{i\gamma_{h_k}}} \right) u\left[\frac{\lambda^2}{i} - \zeta_k\right] \quad (17)$$

where  $u[\cdot]$  is the step function and  $\alpha_k$  is given in (10). Note  $\alpha_k$  depends on  $\zeta_k$  through  $q_k$ . Although there is no explicit expression for  $\zeta_k$ , for our numerical results in Section IV we use (17) to find  $\zeta_k$  given  $P_{av_k}$  via the interpolation technique.

## IV. SIMULATION RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this section, we numerically (i) find  $\theta_k$ 's which maximize  $P_D$  in (13). Finding  $\theta_k$ 's in this case requires  $K$ -dimensional search, as  $K$  grows the computational complexity grows exponentially; (ii)  $\theta_k$ 's which maximize  $KL_{tot} = \sum_{k=1}^K KL_k$ ,




Fig. 6:  $P_D$  vs.  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $p_e = 0.8$ ,  $P_{av} = 1$  dB,  $P_F = 0.5$ .

using the  $KL_k$  approximations in (15), (16). Finding  $\theta_k$  in this case requires only one dimensional search and is computationally very efficient. We then compare  $P_D$  evaluated at the  $\theta_k$ 's obtained from maximizing  $P_D$  (refer to as scheme I in the plots), with  $P_D$  evaluated at the  $\theta_k$ 's obtained from maximizing  $KL_{tot}$  (refer to as scheme II in the plots). Our simulation parameters are  $K = 3$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = 1$ ,  $N = 100$ ,  $\lambda = 1$ ,  $\gamma_h = [1.5, 0.8, 1.4]$ ,  $\gamma_g = [1.3, 2, 0.9]$  and  $\sigma_n^2 = [0.9, 1.2, 0.8]$ . Note that sensors are heterogeneous, in the sense that their statistical information parameters are different. Given  $P_{av_k} = P_{av}$  we first obtain numerically  $\zeta_k$ 's using (17), where  $\zeta_k$ 's are still different since  $\alpha_k$ 's are different.

Fig. 3 plots  $P_D$  versus  $P_F$ , where for each  $P_F$  we evaluate  $P_D$  using  $\theta_k$ 's which maximize  $KL_{tot}$ , based on the  $KL_k$  approximations in (15) and (16). The fixed parameters in Fig. (3) are  $\mathcal{K} = 20$  units,  $p_e = 0.75$ ,  $P_{av} = 1$  dB. This figure shows that, these two approximations have similar  $P_D - P_F$  behavior. Therefore, in the remaining figures, we use the  $KL_k$  approximation in (15).

Fig. 4 depicts  $P_D$  versus  $P_F$  for  $\mathcal{K} = 20$  units,  $p_e = 0.75$ ,  $P_{av} = 1$  dB. To plot Fig. 4, for each  $P_F$  we evaluate  $P_D$  using  $\theta_k$ 's that maximize  $P_D$  (scheme I) and  $KL_{tot}$  (scheme II). Comparing schemes I and II in Fig. 4, we observe that these schemes perform very closely, indicating that using  $\theta_k$ 's that are obtained from maximizing  $KL_{tot}$  are near-optimal. In Fig. 4, we also compare schemes I and II for the special case where we assume all sensors employ the same local threshold  $\theta_k = \theta$ . For this special case, finding  $\theta$  maximizing  $P_D$  or  $KL_{tot}$  only needs one dimensional search. The performance gap between each scheme and its corresponding special case indicates that when sensors are heterogeneous, it is advantageous to use different local thresholds according to sensors' statistics (i.e.,  $\gamma_{h_k}, \gamma_{g_k}, \sigma_{n_k}$ ).

Fig. 5 plots  $P_D$  versus  $P_{av}$  for  $\mathcal{K} = 20$  units,  $p_e = 0.75$ ,  $P_F = 0.5$ . As expected,  $P_D$  increases as  $P_{av}$  increases. The reason is as  $P_{av}$  increases  $\zeta_k$ 's decrease, and sensors can afford to transmit even when their channel gains are weaker.

Fig. 6 illustrates  $P_D$  versus  $\mathcal{K}$  for  $p_e = 0.8$ ,  $P_{av} = 1$  dB,  $P_F = 0.5$ . As expected,  $P_D$  increases as  $\mathcal{K}$  increases and it saturates after certain  $\mathcal{K}$ , since  $P_D$  is not limited by the battery size anymore and instead is limited by the sensors' statistics. Comparing schemes I and II and their corresponding special cases in Figs. 5 and 6, we make similar observations to those

in Fig. 4.

In summary, we studied a distributed detection problem in a wireless network with  $K$  heterogeneous energy harvesting sensors and investigated the optimal local decision thresholds for given transmission and battery state models. Our numerical results indicate that the thresholds obtained from maximizing the KL distance are near-optimal. Finding these thresholds is computationally very efficient, as it requires only  $K$  one-dimensional searches, as opposed to a  $K$ -dimensional search required to find the thresholds that maximize the detection probability.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is supported by NSF under grant 1341966.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] S. Sudevalayam and P. Kulkarni, "Energy harvesting sensor nodes: Survey and implications," *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 443461, Third 2011.
- [2] A. Tarighati, J. Gross, and J. Jaldn, "Decentralized hypothesis testing in energy harvesting wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 65, no. 18, pp. 48624873, Sept 2017.
- [3] K. M. Pouryazdanpanah, M. Anjomshoa, S. A. Salehi, A. Afroozeh and G. M. Moshfegh, "DS-VBF: Dual sink vector-based routing protocol for underwater wireless sensor network," *2014 IEEE 5th Control and System Graduate Research Colloquium*, Shah Alam, 2014, pp. 227-232.
- [4] T. Li, P. Fan, and K. B. Letaief, "Outage probability of energy harvesting relay-aided cooperative networks over rayleigh fading channel," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 972978, Feb 2016.
- [5] S. Ulukus, A. Yener, E. Erkip, O. Simeone, M. Zorzi, P. Grover, and K. Huang, "Energy harvesting wireless communications: A review of recent advances," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 360381, March 2015.
- [6] A. Tarighati, J. Gross, and J. Jaldn, "Decentralized detection in energy harvesting wireless sensor networks," in *2016 24th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, Aug 2016, pp. 567571.
- [7] V. Sharma, U. Mukherji, V. Joseph, and S. Gupta, "Optimal energy management policies for energy harvesting sensor nodes," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 13261336, April 2010.
- [8] I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of integrals, series, and products*, 7th ed., 2007.
- [9] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [10] R. Valentini, M. Levorato and F. Santucci, "Aging Aware Random Channel Access for Battery-Powered Wireless Networks," in *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 176-179, April 2016.
- [11] Y. Lin, B. Chen, and P. K. Varshney, "Decision fusion rules in multi-hop wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 475488, April 2005.
- [12] H. R. Ahmadi and A. Vosoughi, "Channel aware sensor selection in distributed detection systems," in *2009 IEEE 10th Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications*, June 2009, pp. 7175.
- [13] D. Bajoiv, B. Sinopoli, and J. Xavier, "Sensor selection for hypothesis testing in wireless sensor networks: a kullback-leibler based approach," in *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*, Dec 2009, pp. 16591664.
- [14] X. Zhang, H. V. Poor and M. Chiang, "Optimal Power Allocation for Distributed Detection Over MIMO Channels in Wireless Sensor Networks," in *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4124-4140, Sept. 2008.
- [15] B. Chen, R. Jiang, T. Kasetkasem, and P. K. Varshney, "Fusion of decisions transmitted over fading channels in wireless sensor networks," in *Conference Record of the Thirty-Sixth Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, 2002., vol. 2, Nov 2002, pp. 1184 1188 vol.2.