Optimizing Coverage in Convex Quadrilateral Regions with a Single UAV

Alexander Vavoulas, Nicholas Vaiopoulos, Konstantinos K. Delibasis, and Harilaos G. Sandalidis

Abstract

The integration of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) into next-generation wireless networks is a promising solution for providing flexible, efficient coverage. This paper explores the optimal deployment of a single UAV to cover an arbitrary convex quadrilateral region, utilizing a directional antenna with a tiltable beam that produces an elliptical coverage footprint. We examine two distinct coverage scenarios: (i) the largest inscribed ellipse, which maximizes coverage within the quadrilateral while excluding the boundary, and (ii) the smallest circumscribed ellipse, ensuring complete coverage of the entire area. The study formulates an optimization framework that accounts for path loss, signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), and energy consumption to determine the optimal altitude of the UAV. By employing a simplified path loss model, we derive the altitude that minimizes maximum path loss, while also analyzing the impact of antenna directivity on maximizing the minimum SNR at the coverage boundary. Additionally, the UAV's energy consumption is evaluated, considering the power demands during hovering, forward flight, and vertical takeoff. Numerical simulations are presented to illustrate the trade-offs between coverage effectiveness, communication performance, and energy efficiency across various environmental conditions and antenna configurations.

Index Terms

Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), coverage optimization, convex quadrilateral regions, inscribed and circumscribed ellipses, altitude optimization

The authors are with the Department of Computer Science and Biomedical Informatics, University of Thessaly, Papasiopoulou 2-4, 35 131, Lamia, Greece. e-mails{vavoulas,nvaio,kdelimpasis,sandalidis}@dib.uth.gr.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Preliminaries

Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are poised to play a pivotal role in the evolution of 6G networks, supporting ground base stations (BSs) and addressing the high-demand communication requirements of deployed sensor networks. They have witnessed remarkable significance in diverse sectors, including environmental monitoring, infrastructure inspection, disaster response, wildlife conservation, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions. The integration of UAVs is expected to significantly improve data rates and network capacity by capitalizing on their favorable communication links and adaptive mobility. However, extending the operational lifespan of UAVs and developing energy-efficient communication systems remain critical challenges for system designers and operators [1], [2].

Given their unique operational characteristics, accurate air-to-ground propagation channel models are crucial for designing and evaluating UAV communication links, ensuring reliable transmission of both control/non-payload data and payload data [3]. In this context, trajectory planning plays a vital role in determining optimal flight paths, enhancing the efficiency of task execution, and enabling the avoidance of obstacles [4]. Furthermore, optimizing the placement and altitude of UAVs—ideally using a single UAV—can significantly enhance coverage and overall system performance. Effective coordination with BSs also contributes to developing a flexible, integrated air-ground network [5], [6].

Prior studies have predominantly focused on optimizing deployment in a two-dimensional (2D) space. However, in practical environments, UAVs function in a three-dimensional (3D) space, allowing them to maneuver vertically and navigate obstacles, including structures of varying heights, with greater efficiency. Effective placement procedures directly influence key performance metrics, including the probability of outage, deployment costs, quality of experience, and spectrum efficiency, ultimately improving overall network reliability. In addition, incorporating other critical system parameters is essential to ensure adaptability in dynamic or potentially hostile environments [7].

B. Related work

The optimal altitude and placement of UAVs have been extensively studied in the literature, focusing on coverage, connectivity, and energy efficiency. Several significant tutorial and survey

papers in the technical literature address these topics, including [7]–[11]. A review of these studies reveals that 2D models are commonly incorporated into UAV-based communication research, particularly to plan the route from the origin to the designated service area. This method simplifies the coverage area as a flat plane, ignoring 3D obstacles. For example, Wu *et al.* [12] proposed a 2D trajectory model for UAV communication networks, while Mardani *et al.* [13] focused on improving communication quality and ensuring seamless video transmission through a similar 2D approach.

The aforementioned surveys encompass a wide range of studies dedicated to UAV altitude optimization. For instance, Al-Hourani in [14] investigated the optimal altitude to maximize circular ground coverage. Similarly, the work in [15] examined a fixed-altitude scenario aimed at minimizing the number of coverage disks, whereas [16] proposed an efficient UAV placement strategy to enhance user coverage while minimizing transmit power. The study in [17] analyzed the optimal height and maximum coverage radius under Rician fading conditions, while [18] explored the outage probability and coverage performance of UAV-assisted wireless power transfer (WPT) under Rician fading, considering the effects of an angle-dependent Rician factor and the path loss exponent. Additionally, [19] introduced an algorithm to jointly optimize UAV altitude and 2D positioning to maximize user coverage. The impact of directional antennas on coverage and connectivity in a multi-tier UAV network was examined in [20]. Lastly, [21] addressed UAV position and orientation optimization for minimizing deployment costs while accounting for irregular ground coverage patterns.

C. Motivation

Previous studies predominantly assumed circular coverage areas, where the antenna radiation pattern is perpendicular to the ground. However, tilting the antenna relative to this perpendicular axis results in an elliptical coverage footprint, which more accurately reflects practical deployment scenarios. In this context, [22] proposed an energy-efficient 3D UAV placement algorithm incorporating antenna tilt to generate elliptical coverage on the ground. Moreover, in our previous work, we considered elliptical coverage footprints in scenarios where terminal positions are randomly distributed, further emphasizing the significance of using ellipses [23].

In real-world applications, the target coverage area is often an arbitrary convex quadrilateral rather than an idealized circular or elliptical region. Quadrilateral coverage modeling provides a more realistic representation for elongated or irregularly shaped environments with nonuniform user distributions, such as cultural or sporting events, urban landscapes with obstacles, and precision agriculture [24]. An elliptical footprint matches a generic quadrilateral much better to the commonly utilized circular model [23].

Battery life, which inherently limits UAV operations, makes energy-efficient deployment essential. Prolonged hovering durations and high-altitude flight significantly impact energy consumption, reducing mission endurance and coverage reliability. Consequently, determining the optimal altitude must balance communication performance and power efficiency to maximize UAV operational effectiveness.

D. Contribution

This study explores the optimization of UAV coverage within arbitrary convex quadrilateral regions using elliptical footprints, an area with limited exploration in existing literature. Building on our previous work in deploying multiple UAVs across large convex quadrilateral areas [25], this study narrows the focus to scenarios where a single UAV can efficiently ensure coverage. The central objective is to identify the optimal elliptical coverage region that most accurately approximates a quadrilateral, maximizing UAV resource utilization. To achieve this, we analyze two distinct scenarios:

- Scenario 1: In this case, the goal is to cover the interior of the quadrilateral, excluding its boundary as depicted in Fig. 1(a). The largest inscribed ellipse has been identified as a good fit for this objective.
- Scenario 2: Here, the objective shifts to full coverage of the quadrilateral, including its boundaries as indicated in Fig. 1(b). This requires the smallest circumscribed ellipse that encompasses the entire region.

In addition to coverage optimization, this study addresses the determination of the optimal UAV altitude by considering three key factors:

- **Path loss:** We employ a widely used path loss model that incorporates both line-of-sight (LoS) and non-line-of-sight (NLoS) propagation to numerically evaluate the maximum path loss and its impact on coverage.
- **Signal-to-noise ratio** (**SNR**): Using the established path loss model, we incorporate a directional antenna radiation pattern to compute the minimum SNR at the coverage boundary, providing a more precise understanding of communication performance.

• Total energy consumption: The UAV's energy efficiency is examined by accounting for various flight dynamics—including hovering, forward flight, and vertical takeoff—to determine the altitude that minimizes total energy consumption.

E. Organization

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section II introduces the system model, describing the UAV placement strategy and the convex quadrilateral coverage area. It also formulates the steps to determine the optimal inscribed and circumscribed ellipses. Section III focuses on UAV altitude optimization. It first analyzes path loss to determine the altitude that minimizes maximum path loss. Then, it examines the impact of antenna directivity on SNR to identify the altitude that maximizes the minimum SNR. Finally, it explores energy consumption by deriving the altitude that minimizes total power usage. Section IV presents a case study with numerical results across different environments and antenna configurations, illustrating the trade-offs between coverage, SNR, and energy consumption. Section V concludes the paper by summarizing key findings and discussing future research directions, including dynamic mobility and multi-UAV coordination.

II. ELLIPTICAL CELL GENERATION

A. Setup configuration

In the following, we consider the coverage optimization of a ground area enclosed by an arbitrary convex quadrilateral Q in the $\{x, y\}$ plane, with vertices denoted $P_i = (x_i, y_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. The goal is to provide optimal coverage of the area Q using a single UAV that operates at different altitudes H. The UAV is equipped with a directional antenna that exhibits angle-dependent gain, as discussed in Section III. The antenna angular characteristics are defined by two parameters, the semi-apex angle θ and the tilt angle ψ of the emission axis with respect to the ground normal vector. Let us denote the major and minor axes of the elliptical footprint (ground radiation pattern) as 2a and 2b, respectively. Figure 1 depicts this geometry setting. The UAV's ground projection, represented by the point O, lies on the major axis of the ellipse generated by the antenna's radiation pattern, as seen from the UAV position at altitude H.

The horizontal offset, x_0 , between the UAV position and the center of the ellipse is determined by the relative angles θ and ψ . This offset differs whether the projection of the UAV's position Olies inside or outside the ellipse on the ground. Precisely, when O lies within the ellipse, i.e., for $\psi \leq \theta$, the offset is calculated as $x_0 = a - H \tan(\theta - \psi)$ for $\psi \leq \theta$, $\equiv O$ inside the ellipse, and conversely, if *O* lies outside the ellipse, i.e., for $\psi > \theta$, the offset becomes $x_0 = a + H \tan(\psi - \theta)$ for $\psi > \theta$, $\equiv O$ outside the ellipse. Moreover, for a given value of *H*, the angles ψ and θ are expressed in terms of *a* and *b* as

$$\psi = \arccos\left(\frac{\sqrt{b^2 H^2 + b^4}}{\sqrt{a^2 H^2 + b^4}}\right),\tag{1}$$

$$\theta = \arcsin\left(\frac{b^2}{\sqrt{a^2H^2 + b^4}}\right).$$
(2)

This formulation enables a precise calculation of the UAV coverage area at different altitudes, providing a foundation for optimal coverage strategies for the convex quadrilateral Q.

B. Inscribed ellipse with largest area

To determine the ellipse with the maximal area inscribed in Q, we follow the step-by-step methodology in [26, sec. I]. More precisely, let $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}}$ be the affine transformation that maps Qto the quadrilateral Q' with vertices $P'_1 = (0,0)$, $P'_2 = (0,1)$, $P'_3 = (s,t)$, and $P'_4 = (1,0)$ as depicted in Fig. 2(a). $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}}$ applies to any point (x_i, y_i) according to

$$\begin{bmatrix} x'_{i} \\ y'_{i} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{11} & \rho_{12} & \rho_{13} \\ \rho_{21} & \rho_{22} & \rho_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{i} \\ y_{i} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
(3)

with i = 1, ..., 4. Using the coordinates of the vertices of Q and the points P'_1 , P'_2 , and P'_4 , \mathbf{T}_a yields by solving the two systems of linear equations in (3) for $i = 1, 2, 4^1$. Then, the point P'_3 is computed by applying \mathbf{T}_a on P_3 , thus Q' is fully defined. The general equation representing all inscribed ellipses in the (x', y') coordinate system is given by [26, eq. (1.5)]

$$\mathcal{I}_1 x^{\prime 2} + \mathcal{I}_2(q) x^{\prime} y^{\prime} + \mathcal{I}_3(q) y^{\prime 2} + \mathcal{I}_4(q) x^{\prime} + \mathcal{I}_5(q) y^{\prime} + \mathcal{I}_6(q) = 0,$$
(4)

where $\mathcal{I}_1 = t^2$, $\mathcal{I}_2(q) = 4q^2(s-1)t + 2qt(s-t+2) - 2st$, $\mathcal{I}_3(q) = ((1-q)s+qt)^2$, $\mathcal{I}_4(q) = -2qt^2$, $\mathcal{I}_5(q) = -2qt((1-q)s+qt)$, $\mathcal{I}_6(q) = q^2t^2$, with parameter $q \in [0, 1]$. Among the possible values of q, the one that maximizes the inscribed elliptical region is determined as [26, ch. 7.2]

$$q = \frac{-(st-t+1) + \sqrt{(st-t+1)^2 + t(s-1)(t-s+2)}}{(t-1)(t-s+2)},$$
(5)

¹The first system of three equations computes the unknowns $\rho_{11}, \rho_{12}, \rho_{13}$ and the second one determines $\rho_{21}, \rho_{22}, \rho_{23}$.

The unique ellipse of the maximal area inscribed in Q can be obtained in quadratic form as

$$\mathcal{B}_1 x^2 + \mathcal{B}_2 x y + \mathcal{B}_3 y^2 + \mathcal{B}_4 x + \mathcal{B}_5 y + \mathcal{B}_6 = 0, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_1, ..., \mathcal{B}_6 \in \mathbb{R}$ can be easily determined by substituting (5) into (4) and applying the inverse affine transform, as stated in (3).

C. Circumscribed ellipse with smallest area

In this scenario, a similarity transformation \mathbf{T}_s maps Q to the quadrilateral Q'' in the $\{x'', y''\}$ plane, with vertices $P_1'' = (0,0)$, $P_2'' = (0,1)$, $P_3'' = (s,t)$, and $P_4'' = (v,w)$ as depicted in Fig. 2(b) according to

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i''\\y_i''\\1 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{T}_s \begin{bmatrix} x_i\\y_i\\1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma\cos\phi & -\sin\phi & \delta x\\\sin\phi & \sigma\cos\phi & \delta y\\0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_i\\y_i\\1 \end{bmatrix},$$
(7)

where $(x_1'', y_1'') = (0, 0)$, $(x_2'', y_2'') = (0, d)$, and d is the euclidean distance between P_1 and P_2 . Using the coordinates of the vertices of Q and the points P_1'' and P_2'' , we can determine the required (signed) angle: $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan\left(\frac{y_2-y_1}{x_2-x_1}\right)$ if $x_2 - x_1 \neq 0$, else $\phi = 0$. The required translations in (7) are easily derived as $\delta x = -x_1$ and $\delta_y = -y_1$. Finally, the scale factor σ is set to $\sigma = \frac{1}{d}$. Once \mathbf{T}_s is calculated, we can find P_3'' and P_4'' , which define Q'' [26, sec. II].

The general equation representing all circumscribed ellipses in the $(x^{"}, y^{"})$ coordinate system is given by [26, eq. (8.1)]

$$\mathcal{C}_1(u)x''^2 + \mathcal{C}_2(u)x''y'' + \mathcal{C}_3(u)y''^2 + \mathcal{C}_4(u)x'' + \mathcal{C}_5(u)y'' = 0,$$
(8)

where $C_1(u) = sv(t - w)u$, $C_2(u) = (sw^2 - t^2v + vt - ws - sv(s - v)u)$, $C_3(u) = sv(t - w)$, $C_4(u) = (v(t - 1) + (1 - w)s)tw - (vt - ws)svu$, and $C_5(u) = -sv(t - w)$. Among the possible values of u, the value minimizes the circumscribed elliptical region, given by [26, ch. 11.1]

$$s^{3}(s-1)^{2}u^{3} + s^{2}t(2(s-1)^{2} + st + s + t - 1)u^{2} - st^{2}(2(t-1)^{2} + st + s + t - 1)u - t^{3}(t-1)^{2} = 0,$$
(9)

The unique ellipse of the minimal area circumscribed about Q is obtained as

$$\mathcal{D}_1 x^2 + \mathcal{D}_2 x y + \mathcal{D}_3 y^2 + \mathcal{D}_4 x + \mathcal{D}_5 y + \mathcal{D}_6 = 0, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_1, ..., \mathcal{D}_6 \in \mathbb{R}$ can be easily determined by substituting the root of (9) into (8) and applying the inverse similarity transform \mathbf{T}_s^{-1} .

D. Geometric relationships

The major and minor semi-axes, a and b, of the inscribed and circumscribed ellipses can be expressed through (6) and (10), respectively, as

$$a = \sqrt{\mu \frac{\mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{F}_3 + \sqrt{(\mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{F}_3)^2 + \mathcal{F}_2^2}}{2}},$$
(11)

$$b = \sqrt{\mu \frac{\mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{F}_3 - \sqrt{(\mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{F}_3)^2 + \mathcal{F}_2^2}}{2}},$$
(12)

where $\mu = 4\delta_1\delta_2^{-2}$, $\delta_1 = \mathcal{F}_3\mathcal{F}_4^2 + \mathcal{F}_1\mathcal{F}_5^2 - \mathcal{F}_2\mathcal{F}_4\mathcal{F}_5 - \mathcal{F}_6\delta_2$, $\delta_2 = 4\mathcal{F}_1\mathcal{F}_3 - \mathcal{F}_2^2$, whereas $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{B}_i$ (inscribed) and $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{D}_i$ (circumscribed) for i = 1, ..., 6.

III. UAV PLACEMENT AND ALTITUDE OPTIMIZATION

This section explores the ideal UAV altitude required to cover both the inscribed and circumscribed ellipses determined in the previous section, taking into account path loss, SNR, and energy consumption.

A. Optimal altitude vs. path loss

A simplified path loss model is used to calculate the maximum path loss, where the receiver (Rx) has a certain probability of maintaining a LoS connection with the UAV. This probability is affected by environmental factors and the UAV altitude, as detailed in [14].

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{LoS}) = \frac{1}{1 + \eta \exp(-\kappa(\varphi - \eta))},\tag{13}$$

where η and κ are sigmoid function parameters that depend on the environment, and φ represents the angle in degrees corresponding to the boundary of the coverage area given by

$$\varphi = \begin{cases} \arctan\left(\frac{H}{2a - H \tan(\theta - \psi)}\right), & \psi \le \theta \\ \arctan\left(\frac{H}{2a + H \tan(\psi - \theta)}\right), & \psi > \theta, \end{cases}$$
(14)

The NLoS probability is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(NLoS) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(LoS).$$
(15)

The maximum path loss (in dB) between the UAV and a ground Rx occurs at the boundary of the coverage area, i.e. [14]

$$PL_{\max} = \mathbb{P}(\text{LoS}) \cdot PL_{\text{LoS}} + \mathbb{P}(\text{NLoS}) \cdot PL_{\text{NLoS}},$$
(16)

where

$$PL_{\text{LoS}} = 20 \log d + 20 \log \left(\frac{4\pi f}{c}\right) + \xi_{\text{LoS}}$$

$$PL_{\text{NLoS}} = 20 \log d + 20 \log \left(\frac{4\pi f}{c}\right) + \xi_{\text{NLoS}},$$
(17)

 $d = \sqrt{H^2 + (x_0 + \alpha)^2}$ represents the distance from the UAV to the boundary of the coverage area, f is the operating frequency and ξ_{LoS} , ξ_{NLoS} are the mean values of the excessive losses due to scattering and shadowing.

Multiple sets of values H, θ, ψ can generate inscribed or circumscribed elliptical footprints, as defined by (6) and (10), or equivalently by (11) and (12). However, among these configurations, only one configuration minimizes the maximum path loss, PL_{max} . The goal is to identify the optimal height, H_{OPT} , at which PL_{max} is minimized. To achieve this, we first express the angles ψ and θ in (14) using (1) and (2), and substitute them into (13). Finally, through straightforward algebraic manipulations of (13), (16), and (17), the following unified expression is derived

$$PL_{\max} = \frac{\xi_{\text{LoS}} - \xi_{\text{NLoS}}}{1 + \eta \exp\left(-\kappa \left(\arctan\left(\frac{Hb}{ab + \sqrt{(b^2 + H^2)(a^2 - b^2)}}\right) - \eta\right)\right)} + 10 \log\left(H^2 + \left(\frac{ab + \sqrt{(b^2 + H^2)(a^2 - b^2)}}{b}\right)^2\right) + 20 \log\left(4\pi f/c\right) + \xi_{\text{NLoS}}.$$
(18)

The optimal altitude, H_{OPT} , is determined by identifying the *H* value that sets the first derivative of PL_{max} with respect to *H* equal to 0, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial P L_{\max}}{\partial H} = 0. \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{9C_1\eta\kappa \left(a\sqrt{b^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2} + b^2C_2\right)\exp(\kappa\eta)C_3(H_{\rm OPT})}{\pi\sqrt{b^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2} \left(\left(a + C_2\sqrt{b^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2}\right)^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2\right)\left(C_3(H_{\rm OPT}) + \eta\exp(\eta\kappa)\right)^2} + \frac{H_{\rm OPT} \left(\frac{aC_2}{\sqrt{b^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2}} + C_2^2 + 1\right)}{\ln(10)\left(\left(a + C_2\sqrt{b^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2}\right)^2 + H_{\rm OPT}^2\right)} = 0,$$
(20)

This process results in the nonlinear equation of (20) which has no closed-form solution and is solved using numerical methods². In (20) we denote $C_1 = \xi_{\text{LoS}} - \xi_{\text{NLoS}}$, $C_2 = \sqrt{a^2 - b^2}/b$ and $C_3(H) = \exp\left(\frac{180}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{H}{a+C_2\sqrt{b^2+H^2}}\right)\right)$.

B. Optimal altitude vs. SNR

Analyzing the relationship between altitude and maximum path loss provides an initial approximation for optimizing UAV positioning. However, a more thorough and precise analysis requires the inclusion of the antenna radiation pattern, as it plays a vital role in the link budget calculation and offers a deeper understanding of the optimization process. In this regard, the optimal altitude, $H_{\text{OPT}*}$, at which the minimum SNR, γ_{\min} , is maximized, will be determined.

Roughly speaking, the gain of a directional antenna is a highly nonlinear function of the azimuth and elevation angles, adding considerable complexity to the performance analysis. To simplify the analysis, the following gain is considered as described in [20], [27].

$$G_t(\vartheta) = G_0 \cos^m \vartheta,\tag{21}$$

where G_0 represents the maximum antenna gain, m is the directivity factor, which characterizes the beam shape, and $\vartheta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. Figure 3 illustrates the antenna gain (in dB) versus the incidence angle, ϑ , for various values of the directivity factor, considering $G_0 = 5$ dB.

The minimum SNR, γ_{min} , occurs at the boundary of the coverage area, where the path loss is maximized. Accurately determining this value requires accounting for the combined effects of the UAV and Rx antenna gains. By incorporating these factors, a more comprehensive characterization of the received signal quality can be obtained. This computation (in dB) can be expressed as follows

$$\gamma_{\min}(\mathbf{dB}) = P_t + G_t(\theta) + G_r - PL_{\max} - P_n, \tag{22}$$

where P_t is the transmit power of the UAV in dBm, $G_t(\theta)$, G_r are the antenna gains of the UAV and the Rx, respectively, expressed in dB, θ is defined in (2), PL_{max} is given by (18), and P_n is the noise power in dBm. We further assume that the Rx is equipped with an omnidirectional antenna of unit gain, thereby minimizing its impact on the analysis. This assumption facilitates a more generalized performance evaluation without introducing bias into the results.

²The optimal altitude depends on the environmental conditions, which allows for the computation of the corresponding optimal angles, ψ and θ through (1) and (2).

In this scenario, the optimal altitude, H_{OPT*} , is obtained by determining the root of the derivative of (22) with respect to H

$$\frac{\partial \gamma_{\min}}{\partial H} = 0. \tag{23}$$

The resulting nonlinear equation, similar to (20), does not have a closed-form solution and must also be solved using numerical methods.

C. Optimal altitude vs. energy consumption

The operational efficiency of UAVs is inherently constrained by their limited battery capacity, making energy consumption a pivotal factor in the optimization process. To systematically address this constraint, it is essential to analyze the key parameters influencing UAV power consumption across various flight phases.

In the following, the UAV is initially positioned at the intersection of the ellipse semiaxes. It ascends to the target altitude H via vertical takeoff and subsequently transitions into forward-level flight, maintaining a constant altitude while traveling toward its designated location. Upon reaching its destination, the UAV hovers to initiate downlink data transmission to the Rx. During this hovering phase, a steady-state snapshot is examined, assuming that both the UAV and the Rx remain stationary. The hovering, forward flight, and vertical takeoff power consumption is mathematically expressed as [22], [28].

$$p_{\text{hov}} = \underbrace{\overline{\delta}_{\varrho \varsigma} A_{\text{U}} u_{\text{tip}}^{3}}_{8 \, \varrho \varsigma A_{\text{U}} u_{\text{tip}}^{3}} + \underbrace{(1+\text{k}) \frac{\text{N}_{\text{U}}^{3/2}}{\sqrt{2\varrho A_{\text{U}}}}}_{\sqrt{2\varrho A_{\text{U}}}}, \tag{24}$$

$$p_{\text{for}} = Z_1 \left(1 + \frac{3u^2}{u_{\text{tip}}^2} \right) + Z_2 \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{u^4}{4u_0^4}} - \frac{u^2}{2u_0^2} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathscr{D}_{\ell\varsigma} A_{\text{U}} u^3,$$
(25)

$$p_{\rm vto} = Z_1 + \frac{N_{\rm U} u_{\rm to}}{2} + \frac{N_{\rm U}}{2} \sqrt{u_{\rm to}^2 + \frac{2N_{\rm U}}{\rho A_{\rm U}}},$$
 (26)

where Z_1 and Z_2 represent the blade profile power and induced power during hovering, respectively. The parameters δ , ρ , and ς correspond to the profile drag coefficient, air density, and rotor solidity. Additionally, A_U , u_{tip} , k, and N_U denote the rotor disc area, the tip speed of the rotor blade, the incremental correction factor for induced power, and the UAV weight in Newtons, respectively. Furthermore, u, u_0 , \mathcal{D} , and u_{to} represent the forward level flight speed, the mean rotor induced velocity in hover, the fuselage drag ratio, and the vertical takeoff speed, respectively.

Based on the above, the total energy consumption (E_C) , measured in Joules, required to complete the downlink data transmission at the coverage boundary can be expressed as

$$E_{C} = \frac{p_{\text{vto}}H}{\mathbf{u}_{\text{to}}} + \frac{p_{\text{for}}\sqrt{H^{2}b^{2} + (b^{2} + H^{2})(a^{2} - b^{2})}}{\mathbf{u}b^{2}} + (p_{\text{hov}} + P_{t})\frac{Q}{\mathscr{W}\log_{2}(1 + \gamma_{min})},$$
(27)

where \mathscr{W} represents the channel bandwidth, and \mathcal{Q} denotes the throughput requirement (in bits) that the UAV must deliver to the Rx.

The optimal altitude, $H_{\text{OPT}^{**}}$, corresponding to E_C , is determined by numerically solving the root of

$$\frac{\partial E_C}{\partial H} = 0. \tag{28}$$

This altitude signifies the point where energy consumption is minimized under the given conditions. The solution represents a critical trade-off between coverage and power consumption.

IV. CASE STUDY

To facilitate a clearer understanding of the procedures outlined above, we consider a typical quadrilateral Q defined by the vertices $P_1 = (-200, -100)$, $P_2 = (-150, 300)$, $P_3 = (150, 350)$, and $P_4 = (200, 30)$ in the $\{x, y\}$ -plane (with coordinates in meters). Its area can be found by applying the shoelace formula as $S = 126,000m^2$ [29]. Furthermore, specific values are selected for the parameter set ($\xi_{\text{LOS}}, \xi_{\text{NLOS}}, \eta, \kappa$) based on different environments as follows: suburban (0.1, 21, 4.88, 0.43), urban (1, 20, 9.61, 0.16), dense urban (1.6, 23, 12.08, 0.11), and high-rise urban (2.3, 34, 27.23, 0.08) [14]. In addition, the UAV is assumed to operate at a frequency of f = 2 GHz, and is characterized by the following set of parameters [22]: $\delta = 0.012$, $\rho = 1.225 \text{kg/m}^3$, $\varsigma = 0.05$, $A_{\text{U}} = 0.503 \text{m}^2$, $u_{\text{tip}} = 120 \text{m/sec}$, k = 0.1, $N_{\text{U}} = 20 \text{N}$, $u_0 = 4.03 \text{m/sec}$, $\mathcal{D} = 0.6$, u = 20 m/sec, $u_{\text{to}} = 3 \text{m/sec}$ and $\mathcal{W} = 1 \text{MHz}$. Finally, the Tx and noise power are set to 20 dBm and -120 dBm, respectively.

A. Inscribed ellipse with largest area

After estimating the parameters of affine transformation T_a that maps Q to Q', we get from 3

$$x' = \frac{1}{1,535} \left(4x - 0.5y + 750 \right),$$

$$y' = \frac{1}{1.535} \left(-1.3x - 4y + 140 \right),$$
(29)

The coordinates of the transformed vertex P'_3 are obtained by applying (29) to the coordinates of the vertex P_3 , yielding $(s,t) = \left(\frac{235}{307}, \frac{269}{307}\right)$. The value of q that maximizes the inscribed ellipse is determined from (5) as q = 0.527. Subsequently, the \mathcal{B}_i coefficients of the unique maximal-area ellipse are derived by applying the inverse affine transformation $\mathbf{T_a}^{-1}$ to (4), and are presented in Table I. The values of the major and minor semi-axes are determined from (11) and (12), respectively, as $(\alpha, \beta) = (200.3, 155.2)$. The area is approximately $S = \pi ab = 97, 611.80\text{m}^2$ [30, eq. (3.328a)], resulting in a 77.47% coverage.

B. Circumscribed ellipse with smallest area

The similarity transformation mapping Q to Q'', can be written as

$$x'' = \frac{1}{1,625} \left(4x - 0.5y + 750 \right),$$

$$y'' = \frac{1}{1,625} \left(0.5x + 4y + 500 \right).$$
(30)

By applying (30) to the coordinates of vertices P_3 and P_4 , the transformed coordinates of vertices P''_3 and P''_4 are obtained as $(s,t) = \left(\frac{47}{65}, \frac{79}{65}\right)$ and $(v,w) = \left(\frac{307}{325}, \frac{144}{325}\right)$, respectively. The value of u that minimizes the circumscribed ellipse is determined from (9) as u = 1.610. Subsequently, the \mathcal{D}_i coefficients of the unique minimum-area ellipse are derived by applying the inverse similarity transformation \mathbf{T}_s^{-1} to (8) and are presented in Table I. The major and minor semi-axes are calculated from (11) and (12), as $(\alpha, \beta) = (294.3, 223.5)$. The area is approximately $S = 206, 536.80 \,\mathrm{m}^2$, i.e., 39.99% of the elliptic area falls outside Q.

C. Discussion

Figure 4 illustrates the maximum path loss, PL_{max} , as a function of H for various environments, considering the inscribed (dashed-line) and the circumscribed (solid-line) elliptical regions. In each scenario, the H_{OPT} value is appropriately indicated, and the required angles θ

TABLE I
ELLIPSE COEFFICIENTS.

i	\mathcal{B}_i	\mathcal{D}_i	
1	5.073×10^{-6}	5.058×10^{-6}	
2	-2.291×10^{-6}	-1.573×10^{-6}	
3	4.449×10^{-6}	3.415×10^{-6}	
4	0.00033	0.00027	
5	-0.00129	-0.00075	
6	-0.04999	-0.22675	

and ψ are computed using (1) and (2), respectively. The corresponding values are summarized in Table II. As an example, Fig. 5 visualizes the geometric setup where the UAV covers the inscribed ellipse for an urban environment. As expected, the optimum altitude is higher in the circumscribed scenario because the UAV needs to cover a larger area. The feasibility of the resulting scenarios can be easily assessed. For instance, the impractical value of $\theta = 85.5^{\circ}$ in a high-rise urban environment renders the desired area coverage with a single UAV unfeasible.

	Environment	$H_{\rm OPT}$ (m)	θ (°)	ψ (°)	
Inscribed	Suburban	116.9	45.8	26.1	
	Urban	335.8	19.7	36.5	
	Dense Urban	456.0	14.8	37.7	
	High-rise Urban	9.5	85.5	2.8	
Circumscribed	Suburban	173.7	44.3	27.3	
	Urban	501.3	18.7	38.0	
	Dense Urban	653.3	14.6	39.0	
	High-rise Urban	13.3	85.5	2.9	

TABLE II Optimal Altitude.

Figures 6 and 7 demonstrate the minimum SNR, γ_{\min} , as a function of H for various directivity factor values m, considering the inscribed and circumscribed elliptical regions, respectively. The

results indicate that as m increases, leading to a more directional antenna, the optimal altitude, H_{OPT^*} , shifts higher, but the corresponding minimum SNR decreases. This is attributed to the narrower beamwidth, which reduces received power at the coverage boundary despite improving gain along the main lobe. Additionally, in dense urban settings, the steep decline in SNR at lower altitudes highlights the impact of severe NLoS conditions, necessitating higher UAV positioning to mitigate excessive path loss.

Finally, Fig. 8 illustrates the UAV energy consumption, E_C , as a function of H, for both the inscribed and circumscribed ellipses, considering different throughput requirements. The results demonstrate that energy consumption initially decreases with increasing altitude due to reduced aerodynamic drag in forward flight but shifts beyond a certain threshold as path loss raises transmission power demands. The optimal altitude, $H_{OPT^{**}}$, is lower for higher throughput requirements since maintaining a strong SNR at lower altitudes reduces transmission duration and the total energy expenditure. The comparison between the inscribed and circumscribed cases further highlights the trade-off between full coverage and energy efficiency, with the circumscribed scenario requiring higher energy consumption due to the UAV's need to operate at a higher altitude.

Overall, the results emphasize the importance of selecting an appropriate altitude based on environmental conditions, antenna directivity, and energy constraints. The findings provide valuable insights for designing UAV-assisted communication networks that ensure optimal coverage while minimizing energy consumption.

V. CONLCUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This paper investigated the optimal deployment of a single UAV to provide efficient coverage over an arbitrary convex quadrilateral region using an elliptical footprint. Two coverage scenarios were considered: (i) the largest inscribed ellipse, which ensures coverage within the quadrilateral while excluding its perimeter, and (ii) the smallest circumscribed ellipse, which guarantees full region coverage. A comprehensive optimization framework was developed to determine the optimal UAV altitude, incorporating key performance metrics such as path loss, SNR, and energy consumption.

The study demonstrated that the optimal altitude varies significantly based on environmental conditions, antenna directivity, and communication constraints. It was observed that increasing antenna directivity results in a higher optimal altitude while reducing the corresponding minimum

SNR. Additionally, the analysis of UAV energy consumption highlighted the trade-off between maximizing coverage and minimizing power expenditure, emphasizing the importance of balancing flight dynamics and communication performance. The findings provide valuable insights for designing energy-efficient UAV-assisted communication networks, particularly in urban and high-rise environments where NLoS conditions significantly impact performance.

Future research may focus on enhancing UAV-assisted communication networks by integrating real-time adaptive altitude and trajectory optimization. This approach will involve dynamic UAV repositioning to accommodate user distributions, network traffic conditions, and environmental factors such as obstacles and weather variations. Additionally, exploring the use of multiple UAVs for cooperative coverage, interference management, and load balancing is expected to improve network efficiency and resilience. Machine learning techniques could enable predictive UAV deployment, optimizing energy consumption and coverage quality using historical data and real-time analytics. Moreover, the effects of more complex terrain models and non-stationary propagation conditions should be considered to refine deployment strategies for practical, real-world applications. These advancements will be critical in developing highly flexible, energy-efficient, and adaptive UAV-assisted communication systems.

REFERENCES

- G. Geraci, A. Garcia-Rodriguez, M. M. Azari, A. Lozano, M. Mezzavilla, S. Chatzinotas, Y. Chen, S. Rangan, and M. D. Renzo, "What will the future of UAV cellular communications be? A flight from 5G to 6G," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 1304–1335, 3rd Quart. 2022.
- [2] N. Vaiopoulos, A. Vavoulas, and H. G. Sandalidis, "Exploring the random location problem inside a truncated conic shape: Application in UAV communications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 2882–2890, Apr. 2022.
- [3] W. Khawaja, I. Guvenc, D. W. Matolak, U.-C. Fiebig, and N. Schneckenburger, "A survey of air-to-ground propagation channel modeling for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2361–2391, 3rd Quart. 2019.
- [4] P. Shukla, S. Shukla, and A. K. Singh, "Trajectory-prediction techniques for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs): A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, 2024, to appear.
- [5] M. Mozaffari, W. Saad, M. Bennis, Y.-H. Nam, and M. Debbah, "A tutorial on UAVs for wireless networks: Applications, challenges, and open problems," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2334–2360, 3rd Quart. 2019.
- [6] A. Fotouhi, H. Qiang, M. Ding, M. Hassan, L. G. Giordano, A. Garcia-Rodriguez, and J. Yuan, "Survey on UAV cellular communications: Practical aspects, standardization advancements, regulation, and security challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 3417–3442, 4th Quart. 2019.
- [7] J. Carvajal-Rodríguez, D. S. Guamán, C. Tipantuña, F. Grijalva, and L. F. Urquiza, "3D placement optimization in UAVenabled communications: A systematic mapping study," *IEEE Open J. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 5, pp. 523–559, 2024.

- [8] P. Q. Viet and D. Romero, "Aerial base station placement: A tutorial introduction," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 44–49, May 2022.
- [9] N. Parvaresh, M. Kulhandjian, H. Kulhandjian, C. D'Amours, and B. Kantarci, "A tutorial on AI-powered 3D deployment of drone base stations: State of the art, applications and challenges," *Veh. Commun.*, vol. 36, 2022, Art. no. 100474.
- [10] M. A. Ali and A. Jamalipour, "UAV placement and power allocation in uplink and downlink operations of cellular network," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 7, pp. 4383–4393, Jul. 2020.
- [11] I. A. Elnabty, Y. Fahmy, and M. Kafafy, "A survey on UAV placement optimization for UAV-assisted communication in 5G and beyond networks," *Phys. Commun.*, vol. 51, 2022, Art. no. 101564.
- [12] Q. Wu, Y. Zeng, and R. Zhang, "Joint trajectory and communication design for multi-UAV enabled wireless networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 2109–2121, Mar. 2018.
- [13] A. Mardani, M. Chiaberge, and P. Giaccone, "Communication-aware UAV path planning," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 52 609– 52 621, 2019.
- [14] A. Al-Hourani, S. Kandeepan, and S. Lardner, "Optimal LAP altitude for maximum coverage," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 569–572, Dec. 2014.
- [15] J. Lyu, Y. Zeng, R. Zhang, and T. J. Lim, "Placement optimization of UAV-mounted mobile base stations," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 604–607, Mar. 2016.
- [16] M. Alzenad, A. El-Keyi, F. Lagum, and H. Yanikomeroglu, "3-D placement of an unmanned aerial vehicle base station (UAV-BS) for energy-efficient maximal coverage," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 434–437, Aug. 2017.
- [17] M. M. Azari, F. Rosas, K.-C. Chen, and S. Pollin, "Optimal UAV positioning for terrestrial-aerial communication in presence of fading," in 2016 IEEE Global Commun. Conf. (GLOBECOM), Washington, DC, USA, 04-08 Dec. 2016.
- [18] Y. Liu, K. Xiong, Y. Lu, Q. Ni, P. Fan, and K. B. Letaief, "UAV-aided wireless power transfer and data collection in Rician fading," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 10, pp. 3097–3113, Oct. 2021.
- [19] M. Alzenad, A. El-Keyi, and H. Yanikomeroglu, "3-D placement of an unmanned aerial vehicle base station for maximum coverage of users with different QoS requirements," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 38–41, Feb. 2017.
- [20] J. Zhang, H. Xu, L. Xiang, and J. Yang, "On the application of directional antennas in multi-tier unmanned aerial vehicle networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 132 095–132 110, 2019.
- [21] E. Zhou, Z. Liu, W. Zhou, P. Lan, and Z. Dong, "Position and orientation planning of the UAV with rectangle coverage area," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, 2024.
- [22] J. You, S. Jung, J. Seo, and J. Kang, "Energy-efficient 3-D placement of an unmanned aerial vehicle base station with antenna tilting," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 1323–1327, Jun. 2020.
- [23] A. Vavoulas, N. Vaiopoulos, H. G. Sandalidis, and K. K. Delibasis, "On the terminal location uncertainty in elliptical footprints: Application in air-to-ground links," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07299
- [24] R. I. Mukhamediev, K. Yakunin, M. Aubakirov, I. Assanov, Y. Kuchin, A. Symagulov, V. Levashenko, E. Zaitseva, D. Sokolov, and Y. Amirgaliyev, "Coverage path planning optimization of heterogeneous UAVs group for precision agriculture," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 5789–5803, 2023.
- [25] A. Vavoulas, K. K. Delibasis, H. G. Sandalidis, G. Nousias, and N. Vaiopoulos, "Efficient UAV coverage in large convex quadrilateral areas with elliptical footprints," 2025. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.13032
- [26] A. Horwitz, Ellipses Inscribed in, and Circumscribed about, Quadrilaterals. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2024.
- [27] J. Peng, W. Tang, and H. Zhang, "Directional antennas modeling and coverage analysis of UAV-assisted networks," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 2175–2179, Oct. 2022.
- [28] Y. Zeng, J. Xu, and R. Zhang, "Energy minimization for wireless communication with rotary-wing UAV," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 2329–2345, Apr. 2019.

- [29] E. W. Weisstein, "Shoelace formula," From MathWorld–A Wolfram Web Resource, 2024, accessed: 2024-11-19. [Online]. Available: https://mathworld.wolfram.com/ShoelaceFormula.html
- [30] I. N. Bronshtein, Semendyayev, G. Musiol, and H. Mühlig, *Handbook of Mathematics*, 6th ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 2015.



(b) Circumscribed ellipse



(a)



(b)

Fig. 2. Geometric transformations for determining the inscribed and circumscribed ellipse.



Fig. 3. Antenna gain vs. incidence angle for various values of m.



Fig. 4. Maximum path loss vs. altitude, with H_{OPT} values highlighted for the inscribed (dashed lines) and the circumscribed (solid lines) ellipse.



Fig. 5. Setup for covering the inscribed ellipse in an urban environment.



Fig. 6. Minimum SNR as a function of altitude, with H_{OPT} values indicated for the inscribed ellipse in suburban (dashed lines), urban (dot-dashed lines), and dense urban (solid lines) environments.



Fig. 7. Minimum SNR as a function of altitude, with H_{OPT^*} values indicated for the circumscribed ellipse in suburban (dashed lines), urban (dot-dashed lines), and dense urban (solid lines) environments.



Fig. 8. Total energy consumption vs. altitude, with $H_{OPT^{**}}$ values highlighted for the inscribed (dashed lines) and circumscribed (solid lines) ellipses.