

D-LoRa: a Distributed Parameter Adaptation Scheme for LoRa Network

Ruiqi Wang¹, Tongyu Song^{2*}, Jing Ren^{1*}, Xiong Wang¹, Shizhong Xu¹, Sheng Wang¹

¹University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China

²Zhejiang Lab, Hangzhou, China

202421011308@std.uestc.edu.cn,

tongyusong@ieee.org, {renjing,wangxiong,xsz,wsh_keylab}@uestc.edu.cn

Abstract—The deployment of LoRa networks necessitates joint performance optimization, including packet delivery rate, energy efficiency, and throughput. Additionally, multiple LoRa parameters for packet transmission must be dynamically configured to tailor the performance metrics prioritization across varying channel environments. Because of the coupling relationship between LoRa parameters and metrics, existing works have opted to focus on certain parameters or specific metrics to circumvent the intricate coupling relationship, leading to limited adaptability. Therefore, we propose D-LoRa, a distributed parameter adaptation scheme, based on reinforcement learning towards network performance. We decompose the joint performance optimization problem into multiple independent Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB) problems with different reward functions. We have also built a comprehensive analytical model for the LoRa network that considers path loss, quasi-orthogonality of spreading factor, and packet collision. Experimental results show that our scheme can increase packet delivery rate by up to 28.8% and demonstrates superior adaptability across different performance metrics.

Index Terms—LoRa, MAB, Packet Delivery Rate, Energy Efficiency, Throughput, Distributed Parameter Adaptation

I. INTRODUCTION

Long-Range (LoRa) is one of the Low-Power Wide Area Networks (LPWAN) communication technologies [1], which is widely used in smart cities, farm monitoring, and other fields [2], [3]. The performance of LoRa networks is primarily measured by three metrics, i.e., Packet Delivery Rate (PDR), Network Energy Efficiency (EE), and Throughput (TH).

The performance degradation in LoRa networks primarily stems from packet loss, caused by collisions and propagation effects in time-varying communication channels [4]. These issues are significantly affected by the dynamically configured packet transmission parameters, including Spreading Factor (SF), Bandwidth (BW), Carrier Frequency (CF), and Transmission Power (TP) [2]. Therefore, implementing an effective parameter adaptation strategy becomes imperative to minimize packet loss and enhance network performance.

Recent studies have proposed various parameter adaptation schemes for LoRaWAN (the LoRa MAC layer protocol), as summarized in TABLE I, which only adjust a subset of parameters to optimize a few specific performance metrics. These methods can be categorized into centralized algorithms and distributed algorithms.

Centralized algorithms are deployed on the central entity (gateway or network server), configuring each node's parameters by gathering network-wide data and relaying the configuration to the nodes via downlink messages [2]. Adaptive Data Rate (ADR) [5], a representative centralized algorithm, dynamically adjust three parameters (SF, BW, TP) to increase the throughput while reducing energy consumption. However, these algorithms require significant communication resources for node interactions, potentially causing congestion and latency issues [2], [6].

Distributed algorithms allow the nodes to self-assign parameters without global information. Hong et al. [7] proposed a reinforcement learning (RL) based method, LR-RL, for SF allocation aimed at minimizing packet collision rate. A. Abdelghany et al. [4] considered the channel quality and proposed QoC-A for selecting transmission channels to improve PDR. As these algorithms lack global information, they often converge towards suboptimal solutions. To address this limitation, B. Reynders et al. [8] proposed RS-LoRa, a hybrid algorithm incorporating centralized and distributed elements, to decrease packet error rate while improving throughput. However, the performance gains are still constrained.

Optimizing packet transmission parameters in a LoRa system can be framed as a combinatorial optimization problem, which is NP-hard [9]. To streamline this intricate optimization challenge, existing algorithms confine parameter configuration to specific parameters and limit optimization objectives to individual metrics. Meanwhile, the necessity to reduce communication resources makes distributed decision-making without global information both essential and challenging.

Therefore, this paper proposes D-LoRa, a distributed parameter adaptation algorithm based on RL, aiming to optimize three performance metrics (PDR, EE, TH) by allocating four LoRa parameters (SF, BW, CF, TP). Specifically, an RL agent is deployed at each node for decision-making regarding LoRa parameter adaptation. Configuring each LoRa parameter is formulated as a Multi-Armed Bandit (MAB), requiring each agent to manage four MABs. Furthermore, we devise metric terms to tailor the agent's parameter preferences, optimizing diverse network metrics. The primary contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- **Decomposition scheme for LoRa performance opti-**

* Corresponding Author

TABLE I: Comparison of Different LoRa Parameter Adaptation Schemes

Algorithm	Type of Algorithm	Adapted LoRa Parameters				Target Metrics		
		SF	BW	CF	TP	PDR	EE	TH
ADR	Centralized	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
LR-RL	Distributed	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
QoC-A	Centralized	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
RS-LoRa	Centralized + Distributed	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
D-LoRa	Distributed	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

mization problem. We introduce D-LoRa, which decomposes the combinatorial optimization problem into four distinct MAB subproblems for adapting LoRa packet transmission parameters (i.e., SF, BW, CF, and TP). Unique reward functions have been devised for the MABs to optimize the metrics (i.e., PDR, EE, and TH).

- **A comprehensive analytical model for LoRa networks.** We propose an analytical model for LoRa network considering the path loss, quasi-orthogonality of SF, and packet collision. We also formulate the problem of LoRa parameters adaption for packet transmission as an optimization problem based on this system model.
- **Performance evaluation.** Simulations have been conducted using our simulator [10]. The experimental results show that our scheme can increase the PDR by up to 28.8% compared to the best-performing baseline algorithm. Moreover, the diverse optimization results observed with D-LoRa's variant algorithms demonstrate the flexibility of D-LoRa.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we first introduce the system modeling and then formulate the constrained optimization problem towards network performance improvement.

A. Network Model

In this paper, we consider a star topology network with a central gateway GW and a set $\mathbb{N} = \{n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N\}$ of $N = |\mathbb{N}|$ nodes randomly distributed in the area. The nodes collect data from the surrounding environment and send the encoded packets to GW. The set $\mathbb{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_P\}$ denotes the $P = |\mathbb{P}|$ packets sent by these nodes. The definitions are shown below.

Definition 1 (Gateway): The central gateway is denoted as $\text{GW} \doteq \langle x^g, y^g, \mathbb{P}^{\text{gr}} \rangle$, where (x^g, y^g) is the two-dimensional coordinate of the gateway and \mathbb{P}^{gr} is the set of the packets the gateway received.

Definition 2 (Node): A node i is denoted as $n_i \doteq \langle x_i, y_i, \mathbb{P}_i^{\text{ns}}, \mathbb{P}_i^{\text{nr}}, \mathbb{P}_i^{\text{nl}}, \text{LR} \rangle$, where (x_i, y_i) is the two-dimensional coordinate of the node. \mathbb{P}_i^{ns} is the set of the packets sent by node i , \mathbb{P}_i^{nr} is the set of the packets sent by node i that are successfully received and \mathbb{P}_i^{nl} is the set of the packets sent by node i that are lost. $\text{LR} \doteq \{\text{SF}, \text{BW}, \text{CF}, \text{TP}\}$ is the set of available LoRa parameters for node i .

Definition 3 (Packet): A packet j is denoted as $p_j \doteq \langle \text{PS}_j, \text{id}(j), \mathbb{L}\mathbb{P}, E_j \rangle$, where PS_j is the payload size of the

packet and $\text{id}(j)$ is the identity of the node that sends packet j . $\mathbb{L}\mathbb{P} = \{\text{SF}_j, \text{BW}_j, \text{CF}_j, \text{TP}_j\}$ is the LoRa parameters selected by $n_{\text{id}(j)}$ to configure the packet. E_j is the energy consumption of $n_{\text{id}(j)}$ sending p_j .

B. Packet Collision Model

In a LoRa network, a gateway can receive transmissions from numerous nodes, leading to scenarios where multiple data packets may overlap at the gateway, resulting in packet collision. Authors in [11] proposed the definitions of the four conditions that can give rise to packet collisions: CF, SF, power, and timing. The binary variable C_j indicating whether p_j collides during transmission can be expressed as [11]:

$$C_j = C_j^{\text{time}} \wedge C_j^{\text{SF}} \wedge C_j^{\text{CF}} \wedge C_j^{\text{pwr}}, \quad (1)$$

where C_j^{time} , C_j^{SF} , C_j^{CF} , C_j^{pwr} are binary variables indicating whether p_j has time overlap, SF collision, CF collision, and capture effect with other packets. $C_j = 1$ means that p_j is lost due to collision during transmission.

C. Packet Propagation Model

Given the application scenarios in densely populated areas, we employ a radio transmission model based on the Log-Distance Path Loss Model [12]. The path loss $L_j^{\text{pl}}(d)$ of p_j when transmitted to the gateway can be expressed as:

$$L_j^{\text{pl}} = \overline{L^{\text{pl}}}(d_0) + 10\gamma \log\left(\frac{d}{d_0}\right) + X_\delta, \quad (2)$$

where $\overline{L^{\text{pl}}}(d_0)$ is the average path loss with the reference distance is d_0 , $d = \sqrt{(x_{\text{id}(j)} - x^g)^2 + (y_{\text{id}(j)} - y^g)^2}$ is the Euclidean distance between $n_{\text{id}(j)}$ and GW, γ is the path loss factor, $X_{\delta_1} \sim N(0, \delta_1^2)$ is the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance δ_1^2 considering the shadowing effect. Assuming that the effects of other gains and losses in the propagation process are zero, the Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI) of p_j at GW can be expressed as:

$$\text{RSSI}_j = \text{TP}_j - \overline{L^{\text{pl}}}(d_0) - 10\gamma \log\left(\frac{d}{d_0}\right) - X_\delta. \quad (3)$$

p_j can only be successfully decoded by GW if RSSI_j is not less than its Receiver Sensitivity (RS). RS_j is determined by the SF_j and BW_j of p_j , which can be expressed as:

$$\text{RS}_j = -174 + 10 \log_{10}(\text{BW}_j) + \text{NF} + \text{SNR}_j, \quad (4)$$

where NF is the Noise Figure which is a fixed value depending on the hardware, and SNR_j depends only on the SF_j . The

RSs corresponding to different SF and BW combinations are shown in TABLE II [13]:

TABLE II: RSs in dBm for different SF and BW combinations

BW \ SF	7	8	9	10	11	12
125kHz	-123	-126	-129	-132	-133	-136
250kHz	-120	-123	-125	-128	-130	-133
500kHz	-116	-119	-122	-125	-128	-130

In Section II-B, the co-SF interference between packets is modelled as co-SF collisions. Given the quasi-orthogonality of SF [14], we incorporated the inter-SF interference into the Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratio (SINR) calculations for packets. The SINR_j of p_j can be expressed as:

$$\text{SINR}_j = \frac{\text{RSSI}_j}{\sum_{k \neq j, \text{SF}_k \neq \text{SF}_j, \text{CF}_k = \text{CF}_j} \text{RSSI}_k + N_0 W(u, \delta^2)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\sum_{k \neq j, \text{SF}_k \neq \text{SF}_j, \text{CF}_k = \text{CF}_j} \text{RSSI}_k$ is interference from the packets having reception overlap with p_j with the same CF and different SF and $N_0 W(u, \delta^2)$ is the Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN). p_j can only be successfully decoded by GW when SINR_j is not less than its SINR threshold ($\text{SINR}_j^{\text{req}}$), which is determined by SF_j . The SINR thresholds for different SFs are shown in TABLE III [13]:

TABLE III: SINR thresholds in dB for different SF

SF	7	8	9	10	11	12
SINR^{req}	-7.5	-10	-12.5	-15	-17.5	-20

Based on the analysis presented above, p_j can only be successfully received by GW if both RSSI_j and SINR_j are not less than the thresholds. S_j is a binary variable that denotes whether p_j is lost in the propagation process due to its weak signal strength, which can be expressed as:

$$S_j = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \text{RSSI}_j \geq \text{RS}_j \text{ and } \text{SINR}_j \geq \text{SINR}_j^{\text{req}}, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

D. Energy Consumption Model

The symbol period of p_j is determined by SF_j and BW_j , which is calculated as $T_j^{\text{sym}} = \frac{2^{\text{SF}_j}}{\text{BW}_j}$. The Time on Air (ToA) of p_j can be expressed as:

$$\text{ToA}_j = T_j^{\text{pre}} + T_j^{\text{pay}}, \quad (7)$$

where T_j^{pre} is the preamble duration and T_j^{pay} is the payload duration, which can be expressed respectively as [15]:

$$T_j^{\text{pre}} = (n_j^{\text{pre}} + 4.25) \cdot T_j^{\text{sym}}, \quad T_j^{\text{pay}} = n_j^{\text{pay}} \cdot T_j^{\text{sym}}, \quad (8)$$

where n_j^{pre} is the preamble size of a LoRa packet, which is 8 symbols in default. n_j^{pay} is the number of payload symbols of packet j , which can be calculated as [15]:

$$n_j^{\text{pay}} = (8 + \max(\left\lfloor \frac{8\text{PS}_j - 4\text{SF}_j + 28 + 16\text{CRC} - 20\text{H}}{4(\text{SF}_j - 2\text{DE})} \right\rfloor, 0)) \cdot (\text{CR} + 4), \quad (9)$$

In the default configuration of LoRaWAN, Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) is enabled ($\text{CRC} = 1$), the header is enabled ($\text{H} = 0$), the LowDataRateOptimization is disabled ($\text{DE} = 0$), and the coding rate is set to $4/5$ ($\text{CR} = 1$). The energy consumed by $n_{\text{id}(j)}$ sending p_j can be expressed as:

$$E_j = \text{TP}_j \cdot \text{ToA}_j. \quad (10)$$

E. Optimal Problem Formulation

In our work, we have considered PDR, EE, TH as the network performance metrics. PDR is defined as the ratio of the number of packets successfully received by GW to the total number of packets sent by the nodes in the network, which can be expressed as:

$$\text{PDR} = \frac{|\mathbb{P}^{\text{gr}}|}{\sum_{i=0}^N |\mathbb{P}^{\text{ns}}_i|}. \quad (11)$$

EE is defined as the amount of effective data that can be successfully transmitted per unit of energy consumed by the network in bits/mJ, which can be expressed as:

$$\text{EE} = \frac{\sum_{p_i \in \mathbb{P}^{\text{gr}}} \text{PS}_i}{\sum_{n_j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{p_k \in \mathbb{P}^{\text{ns}}_j} E_k}, \quad (12)$$

where the numerator represents the size of effective data received by GW and the denominator represents the total energy consumption of the nodes during the transmission process. TH is defined as the amount of effective data successfully transmitted by the network per unit time in bps, which can be expressed as:

$$\text{TH} = \frac{\sum_{p_i \in \mathbb{P}^{\text{gr}}} \text{PS}_i}{\sum_{n_j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{p_k \in \mathbb{P}^{\text{ns}}_j} \text{ToA}_j}, \quad (13)$$

where the denominator is the total time it takes for the nodes to send packets during the transmission process.

Our objective is to improve the performance of the LoRa network, which involves optimizing multiple metrics rather than focusing on a single one. Hence, we have devised a utility function, comprising a weighted aggregation of the three metrics, to assess the network's performance quantitatively. The performance optimization problem is formulated as following:

$$(\text{P1}) \quad \max \mathcal{U} = \theta \cdot \text{PDR} + \phi \cdot \text{EE} + \psi \cdot \text{TH} \quad (14)$$

$$\text{s.t. } C_j = 0, S_j = 0, \forall p_j \in \mathbb{P}^{\text{gr}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\text{SF}_j \in \mathbb{SF}, \forall p_j \in \mathbb{P}, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{BW}_j \in \mathbb{BW}, \forall p_j \in \mathbb{P}, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{CF}_j \in \mathbb{CF}, \forall p_j \in \mathbb{P}, \quad (18)$$

$$\text{TP}_j \in \mathbb{TP}, \forall p_j \in \mathbb{P}, \quad (19)$$

where \mathcal{U} is the utility function, θ, ϕ, ψ are the weight factors and $\theta + \phi + \psi = 1$. Constraint (15) means p_j can only be received by GW when both its RSSI_j and SINR_j are not less than the thresholds and there is no collision occurred during its transmission. Constraints (16), (17), (18), and (19) limit the LoRa parameters that are available for nodes to configure for packet transmission.

III. DISTRIBUTED PARAMETER ADAPTATION ALGORITHM

In this section, we first decompose the combinatorial optimization problem into multiple distinct MAB problems. Subsequently, we present the design of rewards and the training process of our distributed adaptation algorithm D-LoRa.

A. Problem Decomposition and D-LoRa Design

As introduced in Section II, there exists a complex coupling relationship among the four LoRa parameters (SF, BW, CF, and TP). The combinatorial optimization problem, formulated as P1, is known to be NP-hard [9], [16], [17]. For a LoRa network with N nodes, there are a total of $(|\mathcal{SF}| \cdot |\mathcal{BW}| \cdot |\mathcal{CF}| \cdot |\mathcal{TP}|)^N$ possible global parameter configurations. Moreover, due to the dynamic communication channel, iterating through all possible parameter configurations is time-consuming and challenging to identify the optimal solution [17]. Therefore, we decompose the optimization problem into several mutually independent subproblems, each corresponding to a distinct adjustable parameter. Given the non-stationary characteristics of wireless channel environments and the need to minimize the overhead associated with system state tracking, we have opted for MAB algorithms to solve each subproblem and propose D-LoRa.

The framework of D-LoRa is shown in Fig. 1. In D-LoRa, an independent agent is deployed on each node, while configuring the four LoRa parameters are conceptualized as four distinct bandits that each agent needs to manage. Therefore, the process of configuring parameters for packet transmission of a node can be regarded as the process of selecting the levers of the four bandits of the agent. The agent will receive four distinct rewards: r_{sf} , r_{bw} , r_{cf} , and r_{tp} after each packet transmission, which correspond to the selections of the four parameters. The objective of the agent is to get the largest possible cumulative reward for each bandit after T action selections, leading it to favor actions with higher expected rewards. The update of expected rewards can be expressed as follows:

$$Q_k(a) = Q_{k-1}(a) + \frac{1}{k}[r_k(a) - Q_{k-1}(a)], \quad (20)$$

where $r_k(a)$ is the reward obtained from the k th selection of action a , $Q_{k-1}(a)$ is the expected reward of a after its $(k-1)$ th selection, and $Q_k(a)$ is the expected reward of a after its k th selection.

Upper Confidence Bound (UCB) algorithm is applied to balance the exploration and exploitation in the MAB algorithm. Each time the agent makes an action selection, it will select the action with the largest UCB, which can be expressed as:

$$a = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} [Q(a) + U(a)], \quad (21)$$

where U_a is the exploration term, which can be expressed as:

$$U(a) = c \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log t}{2N(a)}}, \quad (22)$$

where c is the weight factor, t is the total number of actions, and N_a is the number of action a .




Fig. 1: Framework of the D-LoRa algorithm

B. Rewards design

A packet can be either received or lost in its transmission process, in which packet loss occurs either due to packet collisions or its RSSI or SINR falls below the thresholds. Different LoRa parameters have distinct impacts on packet transmission results. As indicated in Eq. (1), the inappropriate configuration of SF, CF, and BW is the primary cause of packet collisions. Furthermore, as stated in Eq. (3), the RSSI of a packet is largely influenced by its TP. The thresholds for RSSI and SINR are determined by SF and BW, as outlined in TABLE II and TABLE III. Based on the above analysis, we designed the rewards for different transmission results as shown in TABLE IV:

TABLE IV: Rewards for different parameters under different packet transmission results

Packet \ Reward	Reward			
	r_{sf}	r_{bw}	r_{cf}	r_{tp}
Collision loss	-1	-0.5	-0.5	0
Signal strength loss	-0.5	-0.5	0	-1
Successfully received	1	1	1	1

The aforementioned reward design focuses solely on packet reception, with D-LoRa aiming to enhance the PDR without considering EE and TH. SF and BW significantly influence a packet's ToA, which in turn affects the TH. Specifically, smaller SF and BW correlate with higher TH. Furthermore, EE is primarily determined by the TPs of the nodes. Ideally, to minimize unnecessary energy consumption, the TP should be kept as low as possible, provided that the packet is transmitted successfully. CF is excluded from the design of metric terms towards EE and TH because CF predominantly impacts only the PDR. Therefore, the metric terms are designed for r_{sf} , r_{bw} , and r_{tp} , which enable D-LoRa to improve EE and TH:

$$r_{sf_i} = r_{sf_i} + \xi \cdot \frac{\frac{SF_i}{2^{SF_i}}}{\sum_{SF_j \in \mathcal{SF}} \frac{SF_j}{2^{SF_j}}}, \quad (23)$$

$$r_{bw_i} = r_{bw_i} + \zeta \cdot \frac{BW_i}{\sum_{BW_j \in \mathcal{BW}} BW_j}, \quad (24)$$

$$r_{tp_i} = r_{tp_i} + \eta \cdot \frac{TP_i}{\sum_{TP_j \in \mathcal{TP}} TP_j}, \quad (25)$$

where ξ , ζ , and η are metric factors that can be modified to meet different metric objectives.

C. Training for Agents

As shown in Alg. 1, each agent has four Action-Value Estimate Lists and their corresponding Count Lists. We regard a complete transmission process of the LoRa network as an episode. The changes of PDR, EE, and TH in each episode can intuitively show the training effect of D-LoRa. The network is initialized at the beginning of each episode (line 3). When a node needs to transmit a packet, it adapts the LoRa parameters for packet transmission and updates its Lists (lines 8-15). After the training is completed, the Lists of each agent are retained for the test phase, whose results are used as the final performance of D-LoRa.

Algorithm 1 D-LoRa algorithm

Input: The set of nodes \mathbb{N} , Gateway GW, Default LoRa network configuration

Output: PDR, EE, TH

```

1: Initialize the four Action-Value Estimates Lists:  $Q_i^{\text{SF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{TP}}$ , Count Lists:  $T_i^{\text{SF}}$ ,  $T_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $T_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $T_i^{\text{TP}}$  and Total Count  $t_i$  for each  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ 
2: for  $episode = 1$  to  $M$  do
3:   Initialize  $\mathbb{P}^{\text{SF}}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_i^{\text{TP}}$  for each  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ 
4:   Start packet transmission
5:   while Network does not satisfy the stop condition do
6:     for each  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$  do
7:       if  $n_i$  needs to transmit a packet  $P_j$  then
8:         Calculate the UCBs  $U_i^{\text{SF}}$ ,  $U_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $U_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $U_i^{\text{TP}}$  of  $Q_i^{\text{SF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{TP}}$  based on Eq. (22)
9:         Select  $a_{\text{sf}}$ ,  $a_{\text{bw}}$ ,  $a_{\text{cf}}$ ,  $a_{\text{tp}}$  based on Eq. (21)
10:        Send  $p_j$  to GW
11:        Check the transmission state of  $p_j$  and obtain the rewards:  $r_{\text{sf}_i}$ ,  $r_{\text{bw}_i}$ ,  $r_{\text{cf}_i}$ ,  $r_{\text{tp}_i}$  for each parameter referring to TABLE IV
12:        Update  $r_{\text{sf}_i}$  based on Eq. (23)
13:        Update  $r_{\text{bw}_i}$  based on Eq. (24)
14:        Update  $r_{\text{tp}_i}$  based on Eq. (25)
15:        Update  $Q_i^{\text{SF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{BW}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{CF}}$ ,  $Q_i^{\text{TP}}$  based on Eq. (20)
16:       end if
17:     end for
18:   end while
19: end for

```

IV. SCHEME PERFORMANCE

In this section, we analyze the performance of the proposed scheme and four baseline algorithms. At the same time, we derived four variant algorithms from D-LoRa towards different network performance metrics.

A. Experiment Setting

The simulations are carried out on the LoRaWAN simulator LoRaSimPlus [10]. We consider a circular LoRa network with the topological radius varying from 1000 m to 2500 m, in which 50 nodes are randomly distributed in the network area as shown in Fig. 2(a). During the simulation, each node continuously sends packets with the same payload size of 20

bytes to GW. The available LoRa parameters for each node are set as: $\text{SF} = \{7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12\}$, $\text{BW} = \{125, 250, 500\}$ kHz, $\text{CF} = \{470.1, 470.3, 470.5, 470.7, 470.9, 471.1, 471.3, 471.5\}$ MHz, $\text{TP} = \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14\}$ dBm [13], [15]. The packet sending interval of the node follows an exponential distribution with the parameter $\lambda = 0.25$, which means the average packet sending period of the node is 4 s. According to [18], the parameters of the path loss model are set to $\overline{L}^{\text{pl}}(d_0) = 128.95$ dB, $d_0 = 1000$ m, $\gamma = 2.32$, $\delta_1 = 7.8$. AWGN follows the zero-mean normal distribution with the standard deviation $\delta_2 = 1$. The weight factor c is set to 2.

B. Baseline Algorithms

The four baseline algorithms are shown as follows:

- **Random:** Each node configs LoRa parameters randomly for packet transmission.
- **Round-Robin:** Each node assigns SF and CF configurations to its packets based on its identity in a round-robin fashion to ensure unique combinations, reducing the risk of collisions. BW and TP are randomized.
- **ADR** [5]: ADR selects the minimum available SF and BW combination based on the link budget that the node used to send packets. Meanwhile, the smallest possible TP is assigned to reduce energy consumption.
- **RS-LoRa** [8]: In RS-LoRa, each node selects SF locally. Similar to ADR, RS-LoRa also selects the minimum available TP for packet transmission to improve EE.

We derived four variant algorithms of D-LoRa by modifying the metric factors ξ , ζ , and η towards different metrics. The parameter settings of the four variant algorithms are shown in the TABLE V:

TABLE V: Metric factors of the variant algorithms

Variant algorithm	Metric factor		
	ξ	ζ	η
D-LoRa-PDR	0	0	0
D-LoRa-EE	0	0	3.5
D-LoRa-TH	10	10	0
D-LoRa-Balance	0	0	1.8

C. Performance Comparison

Fig. 2 illustrates the simulation results of PDR, EE, and TH for various algorithms under different radius. Fig. 2(b) demonstrates that D-LoRa-PDR significantly improves the PDR, achieving an increase of 18.51% (at 1000 m) to 28.80% (at 2500 m) compared to the best-performing baseline algorithm. Furthermore, as the radius increases, the PDR of D-LoRa does not exhibit a notable decline as observed in other algorithms. This superior performance can be attributed to D-LoRa's parameter adaptation mechanism, which leverages historical channel quality information rather than solely relying on node-gateway distance as in the conventional ADR algorithm.

Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 2(d) indicate that two D-LoRa variants: D-LoRa-EE and D-LoRa-TH have the best performance in EE and TH when the radius is 1000 m. As the topological radius exceeds 1000 m, RS-LoRa and ADR perform best in terms




Fig. 2: Experimental results of the baseline algorithms and D-LoRa variant algorithms

of EE and TH respectively. RS-LoRa attempts to maintain relatively consistent collision probabilities across different SFs [17], causing nodes to prefer smaller SFs without considering their distance from the gateway. Consequently, the ToA of the packets is reduced due to the smaller SFs, resulting in lower energy consumption. However, as the radius increases, PDR decreases sharply because smaller SFs limit the packet transmission distance. The goal of ADR is to ensure that packets reach the gateway while minimizing transmission time by assigning appropriate SF and BW based on the distance between the node and the gateway. However, this method causes nodes at similar distances from the gateway to select the same SF, resulting in severe packet collisions. As a result, ADR exhibits lower PDR performance.

The flexibility of D-LoRa lies in its ability to adapt to different metrics by adjusting the reward functions. For instance, D-LoRa-PDR primarily aims to improve PDR, while D-LoRa-EE focuses on enhancing EE, and D-LoRa-TH prioritizes increasing TH. As illustrated in Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 2(d), in a network with 1000 m radius, D-LoRa-EE achieves a 387.6% increase in EE at the cost of an 11.7% decrease in PDR compared to D-LoRa-PDR. Similarly, D-LoRa-TH improves TH by 43.9% while sacrificing 5.7% of PDR. Moreover, D-LoRa-Balance presents a balanced solution that holistically incorporates all three metrics, achieving a 95.4% PDR in contrast to D-LoRa-PDR, 67.3% EE compared to D-LoRa-EE, and 64.6% TH compared to D-LoRa-TH.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have investigated the network performance optimization problem in a LoRa network. A distributed parameter adaptation algorithm, D-LoRa, has been proposed to solve the complex combinatorial optimization problem. Reward functions tailored for different network performance metrics were designed. Experimental results have validated the superiority of D-LoRa over baseline algorithms. The flexibility and optimization results of D-LoRa suggest promising applications within LoRa systems. Future research directions could involve further extending the D-LoRa algorithm to address more complex LoRa network environments and validating its efficacy in real-world deployments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Augustin A, Yi J, Clausen T, Townsley WM. A Study of LoRa: Long Range & Low Power Networks for the Internet of Things [J]. *Sensors*, 2016, 16(9):1466.
- [2] Gkotsiopoulos P, Zorbas D, Douligeris C. Performance determinants in LoRa networks: A literature review [J]. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2021, 23(3): 1721-1758.
- [3] Sundaram JP, Du W, Zhao Z. A survey on LoRa networking: Research problems, current solutions, and open issues [J]. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2019 Oct 25;22(1):371-88.
- [4] Abdelghany A, Uguen B, Moy C, et al. Decentralized adaptive spectrum learning in wireless iot networks based on channel quality information [J]. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2022, 9(20): 19660-19669.
- [5] Semtech Corporation. Understanding the LoRa® Adaptive Data Rate, Semtech, 2019.
- [6] Zhou Q, Zheng K, Hou L, Xing J, Xu R. Design and implementation of open LoRa for IoT [J]. *IEEE Access*, 2019 Jul 22;7:100649-57.
- [7] Hong S, Yao F, Zhang F, et al. Reinforcement learning approach for SF allocation in LoRa network [J]. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2023, 10(20): 18259-18272
- [8] Reynders B, Wang Q, Tuset-Peiro P, et al. Improving reliability and scalability of LoRaWANs through lightweight scheduling [J]. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2018, 5(3): 1830-1842.
- [9] R. M. Sandoval, A. -J. Garcia-Sanchez and J. Garcia-Haro. Optimizing and Updating LoRa Communication Parameters: A Machine Learning Approach [J]. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 2019, vol. 16(3): 884-895.
- [10] Ruiqi Wang, LoRaSimPlus: LoRaWAN Simulator developed based on Simpy, <https://github.com/Rich-King395/LoRaSimPlus>, 2024.
- [11] Bor MC, Roedig U, Voigt T, et al. Do LoRa low-power wide-area networks scale? [C]. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM international conference on modeling, analysis and simulation of wireless and mobile systems*. ACM, 2016: 59-67.
- [12] Rappaport TS. *Wireless communications: principles and practice* [M]. Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- [13] Semtech Corporation. SX1276/77/78/79 - 137 MHz to 1020 MHz Low Power Long Range transceiver. In *WIRELESS & SENSING PRODUCTS DATASHEET*. Semtech, 2020.
- [14] Mahmood A, Sisinni E, Guntupalli L, Rondón R, Hassan SA, Gidlund M. Scalability analysis of a LoRa network under imperfect orthogonality [J]. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2018, 15(3):1425-36.
- [15] Zhang X, Lin Z, Gong S, Gu B, Niyato D. Multiagent Reinforcement Learning with an Attention Mechanism for Improving Energy Efficiency in LoRa Networks [C]. *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2023: 4152-4157.
- [16] Sandoval RM, Garcia-Sanchez AJ, Garcia-Haro J. Performance optimization of LoRa nodes for the future smart city/industry [J]. *EURASIP journal on wireless communications and networking*, 2019, (2019):1-13.
- [17] Zhao Z, Gao W, Du W, Min G, Mao W, Singhal M. Towards energy-fairness in LoRa networks [J]. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2022 Apr 27;22(9):5597-610.
- [18] Petajarvi J, Mikhaylov K, Roivainen A, Hanninen T, Pettissalo M. On the coverage of LPWANs: range evaluation and channel attenuation model for LoRa technology [C]. *14th International Conference on ITS Telecommunications (ITST)*. Copenhagen, Denmark, 2015, pp. 55-59.