

# Adaptively Weighted Averaging Over-the-Air Computation and Its Application to Distributed Gaussian Process Regression

Koya Sato, *Member, IEEE* and Koji Ishibashi, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—This paper introduces a noise-tolerant computing method for over-the-air computation (AirComp) aimed at weighted averaging, which is critical in various Internet of Things (IoT) applications such as environmental monitoring. Traditional AirComp approaches, while efficient, suffer significantly in accuracy due to noise enhancement in the normalization by the sum of weights. Our proposed method allows nodes to adaptively truncate their weights based on the channel conditions, thereby enhancing noise tolerance. Applied to distributed Gaussian process regression, the method facilitates low-latency, low-complexity, and high-accuracy distributed regression across a range of signal-to-noise ratios. We evaluate the performance of the proposed method in a radio map construction problem, which is a task for visualizing the radio environment based on limited sensing information and spatial interpolation. Numerical results demonstrate that our approach not only maintains computational accuracy in high noise scenarios but also achieves performance close to ideal conditions in high SNR environments. This advancement holds significant implications for the deployment of real-time, large-scale IoT systems, providing a scalable solution to enhance reliability and efficiency in data-driven environmental monitoring.

**Index Terms**—Over-the-air computation, weighted averaging, Gaussian process regression, radio map construction

## I. INTRODUCTION

ENVIRONMENTAL monitoring has been attracting attention in various fields, such as agriculture, disaster prevention, and radio map construction in wireless systems [2]–[7]. In such a system, distributed Internet of Things (IoT) devices monitor the environment (e.g., temperature, humidity, and communication quality) and upload the data to a centralized server. The server can then analyze real-time environmental information using statistical tools, including machine learning and spatio-temporal prediction models [8]. However, enhancing monitoring accuracy typically leads to a higher density of sensor deployments, which, in turn, causes several issues concerning communication and computation. For example, collecting large-scale sensing data increases communication

latency and consumes limited spectrum resources; further, processing large-scale data leads to a computational delay at the server. Consequently, the design of efficient monitoring systems becomes critical, particularly for applications that demand both high accuracy and low latency.

Recently, over-the-air computation (AirComp) has gained attention as a promising technique for the low-latency joint computation and communication of IoT systems [9], [10]. AirComp leverages the superposition nature of analog signals. The transmitters modulate the message based on a pre-processing function, and then the base station (BS) decodes the computation result by a corresponding post-processing function. This post-processed sum of pre-processed messages is called *nomographic function*, which enables efficient computation for distributed messages, such as summation or product, using only one slot, regardless of the number of nodes [11].

There are, however, several drawbacks to AirComp-based systems regarding noise tolerance. Consider an environmental monitoring scenario wherein multiple distributed nodes collect environmental data across various locations; e.g., radio map construction in wireless communication systems [7]. A radio map is a tool to visualize the communication quality of interest based on the sensing results and spatial interpolation, which can be optimized using Gaussian process regression (GPR). Interpolation in regions lacking observations is a crucial task for the accurate analysis of environmental conditions over expansive areas. Generally, such interpolation can be realized by weighted averaging of distributed data, focusing on the fact that the spatial correlation between samples depends on distance (e.g., inverse distance weighting (IDW) [12] and Kriging (or GPR) [13]). AirComp can realize the weighted average through two communication slots and division of their communication results: (i) calculate the weighted sum of the sensing values, (ii) calculate the sum of weights, and (iii) normalize the weighted sum by the sum of weights.

However, normalizing by the sum of weights often degrades the calculation accuracy due to the noise enhancement. To illustrate this problem, consider a simple weighted averaging task involving two distributed nodes with positive weights  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ , and real-valued measurement data  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , respectively. The ideal weighted averaging operation can be expressed as  $(w_1s_1 + w_2s_2)/(w_1 + w_2)$ . When using AirComp, the sum of weights ( $w_1 + w_2$ ) and the weighted sum ( $w_1s_1 + w_2s_2$ ) must be computed over two slots based on independent AirComp operations, and the two results then need to be divided. Assuming that the computational error

A part of this work was presented at the IEEE GLOBECOM Workshops [1]. This was supported in part by JST CRONOS Grant Number JPMJCS24N1, JST AdCORP Grant Number JPMJKB2307, and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K14255.

K. Sato is with the Artificial Intelligence eXploration Research Center, The University of Electro-Communications, 182-8585, Tokyo, Japan (e-mail: k\_sato@ieee.org).

K. Ishibashi is with the Advanced Wireless and Communication Research Center (AWCC), The University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo 182-8585, Japan (e-mail: koji@ieee.org)

Corresponding author: *Koya Sato*

in the sum of weights is  $\epsilon_w$  and the error in the weighted sum is  $\epsilon_s$ , the BS can estimate the computation result by  $(w_1s_1 + w_2s_2 + \epsilon_s)/(w_1 + w_2 + \epsilon_w)$ . Clearly, the noise term  $\epsilon_w$  can severely degrade the accuracy of the weighted averaging computation due to the division operation.

This issue can be avoided if the sum of weights is available at the BS before AirComp, as the noiseless sum of weights allows the computation  $(w_1s_1 + w_2s_2 + \epsilon_s)/(w_1 + w_2)$ . However, this approach is not practical in monitoring applications. Let us consider a spatial monitoring application based on sensing by IoT devices and IDW-based spatial interpolation. In this scenario, the IoT devices upload sensing results to the server. The server then interpolates the missing values by weighted averaging. To take spatial correlation into account, the IDW sets each weight factor as the inverse of distance from the interpolated location. Thus, avoiding noise enhancement (i.e., computing the sum of weights at the BS alone) requires the BS to acquire precise information on all locations regarding sensing nodes.

In this paper, we propose a noise-tolerant adaptive weighted averaging based on AirComp for low-latency and accurate monitoring systems. In particular, the proposed method introduces an adaptive weighting function that truncates the maximum and minimum of the weights for the noise tolerance (i.e., reducing  $\epsilon_w$  in the above example). Pure AirComp determines a coefficient for the transmission power control so that the node with the worst channel condition transmits its message vector with the maximum transmission power. When the channel condition is flat among each uplink, this coefficient tends to decrease the transmission power if the variance in norm values of message vectors is significant. It reduces the received SNR in the sum of weight computation i.e., enhancing  $\epsilon_w$  in the above example), resulting in noise enhancement in the weighted averaging computation process. To mitigate this issue, our method introduces an adaptive weighting function that truncates the maximum and minimum of the weights based on the channel condition. By optimizing the truncation parameters in this function via Bayesian optimization (BO) [14], the proposed method adapts the noise tolerance according to the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at the server: it works as an average function approximately in the low SNR region and as a pure weighted averaging function in the high SNR region. To demonstrate how the proposed method improve a practical computation problem, the proposed method is applied to distributed Gaussian process regression (GPR) [15], which is a non-parametric distributed regression method.

The performance is evaluated in a radio map construction scenario, a typical application of GPR in wireless communication systems [7]. An accurate radio map can provide the wireless system operator with precise statistical information about the wireless system, thereby enhancing overall system performance. Although many researchers consider it a promising technology for beyond 5G/6G systems, there is a trade-off between the amount of sensor data and performance improvement. This trade-off motivates us to develop a more efficient radio map construction method. Our proposed AirComp-aided GPR enables the system operator to construct a radio map within limited communication slots, regardless

of the amount of sensing data. Thus, this task represents a potential application of the proposed method. Our results show that the proposed method achieves low latency, low complexity, and accurate distributed regression.

The major contributions of this paper are listed as follows.

- We propose an adaptively weighted averaging method for AirComp-based distributed averaging. A BO-based method is developed to adjust the adaptive weighting function to mitigate the effects of noise on the estimation accuracy.
- The proposed method is applied to distributed GPR [15] for low-latency, low-complexity, and accurate distributed regression.
- Numerical results in the radio map construction task demonstrate the root mean squared error (RMSE) of the proposed method is equivalent to the pure weighted averaging method in the high SNR region and approaches the simple averaging method in the low SNR region.

#### A. Related Works

The central concept of the AirComp is based on the superposition property of electromagnetic field and nomographic function. Nomographic function can be expressed as a post-processed sum of pre-processed sensor readings. By applying a non-linear function to the superimposed (and suitably pre-processed) signals, the receiver can obtain the desired function of the sensor readings with only one communication slot: e.g., arithmetic mean, weighted sum, and approximation of product [9]. The origin of AirComp was introduced by [16]. They discussed which functions are analog-computable at a single fusion center by harnessing the interference property of the wireless channel; further, the work in [17] proposed reliable computation of nomographic function for clustered Gaussian sensor networks. These works established the theoretical foundation of AirComp in the ideal wireless channels.

Influenced by exponential growth in IoT systems, recent studies have discussed the practical implementation of AirComp in a wide range of viewpoints, such as extension to multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) [18], [19], reconfigurable intelligent surface (RIS)-aided design [20], and robustness to imperfect (or statistical) channel state information (CSI) [21], [22]. Most of these studies are concerned with increasing the accuracy of nomographic function computation, designing communication parameters or modulation/demodulation functions with the goal of minimizing the mean squared error (MSE) of the computation results.

From the application perspective, AirComp has been expected to be a promising component for federated learning (FL) systems in wireless channels. FL is a distributed machine learning framework that enables multiple edge devices to collaboratively train a machine learning model without sharing raw data [23], [24]. By synthesizing distributed models on the server side, a large amount of data can be trained while ensuring data privacy. There has been extensive research on applications of FL systems, including indoor positioning [25] and vehicle-to-vehicle communication [26], establishing it as a critical technology in next-generation mobile computing. In

FL, the training model is exchanged multiple times between edge devices and the server. Therefore, communication delays during the training process pose a significant challenge, specifically in wireless channels, which has motivated discussions on communication design. For example, FL can be accelerated by adaptively selecting training clients based on factors such as the communication channel conditions, computational capabilities, and data of each device [27], [28]. Further, studies on integrated hardware and computing design have also been conducted; for instance, the authors in [29] introduce fluid antennas, demonstrating that optimizing antenna positioning and computational conditions jointly can significantly improve computational efficiency.

However, these studies primarily assume digital communication systems. When collecting updated models from multiple clients, the orthogonality of communication channels among clients is crucial, thereby degrading communication delays as the number of mobile devices increases. In this context, model aggregation in FL, as exemplified by Federated Averaging (FedAvg) [23], is typically performed based on the averaging of local models. Thus, it is expected that AirComp can reduce communication latency by jointly performing model aggregation and synthesis. The work in [30] proposed a joint device selection and beamforming design for AirComp-supported FL in wireless multiple-access channels. Applying AirComp for privacy improvement in the FL was discussed in [31] [32]. The result of the model aggregation by AirComp tends to be distorted by receiver noise and multipath fading. While this is not desirable in terms of training accuracy, it can suppress the amount of training data leaked from the model. Data privacy in the FL can be thus guaranteed by adjusting the model's transmission method so that the amount of distortion in the model's synthesis results in achieving differential privacy [33].

Although there has been a wide range of discussions concerning AirComp, to the best of our knowledge, this work is the first attempt to tackle the noise enhancement problem of weighted averaging in AirComp. Weighted averaging is a widely used function, especially in monitoring applications; it will become more important in the IoT era. Through this work, we aim to expand the possible applications of AirComp.

### B. Organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Sect. II describes the system model, including the computation target, channel model, and AirComp model. Sect. III introduces the AirComp-based pure weighted averaging method as a baseline. After Sect. IV presents the proposed adaptively weighted averaging method, the proposed method is applied to distributed GPR in Sect. V. Finally, Section VII concludes this paper.

*Notations:* throughout this paper, the transpose, determinant, and inverse operators are denoted by  $(\cdot)^T$ ,  $\det(\cdot)$  and  $(\cdot)^{-1}$ , while the expectation and the variance are expressed by  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  and  $\text{Var}[\cdot]$ , respectively. Further,  $|\cdot|$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  are defined as operators to obtain the absolute and Euclidean distance, respectively. Finally, we define  $\hat{(\cdot)}$  as the estimated result for the decorated variable.




Fig. 1. Signal transmission model for AirComp in a summation computation.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL

This paper discusses the weighted averaging computation between distributed nodes based on AirComp. This section first presents the computation target. Then, we introduce the signal model for AirComp and describe AirComp for the summation operation as a fundamental block in the weighted averaging.

### A. Computation Target

Suppose that  $M$  nodes are connected to a BS. The  $i$ -th node has the measurement vector  $\mathbf{s}_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$  and the weighted vector  $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$  where  $L$  is the message length. Elements in  $\mathbf{w}_i$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$  follow probability density functions (PDFs)  $f_w(\cdot)$  ( $w \geq 0$ ) and  $f_s(\cdot)$ , respectively.

The task is to obtain a vector  $\phi$  with the length  $L$  where the  $l$ -th element represents the weighted averaging of the  $l$ -th samples. This value is given by

$$\phi_l = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^M w_{il}} \sum_{i=1}^M w_{il} s_{il}. \quad (1)$$

This weighted averaging often appears in sensing and estimation applications, such as IDW in spatial interpolation [12], cooperative sensing in spectrum sharing [34], and distributed regression based on GPR [15].

### B. Signal Transmission Model

Fig. 1 summarizes the signal transmission model, where all nodes simultaneously transmit their messages to a BS over a shared wireless channel. Let us consider a network with  $M$  nodes synchronized in time, where the  $i$ -th node has a message vector  $\mathbf{m}_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$ . The BS tries to obtain the sum of the message vectors,  $\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i$ , by the AirComp. The channel follows additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) or independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Rayleigh fading. Further, the channel gain is constant over one transmission.

The  $i$ -th node first encodes its message  $\mathbf{m}_i$  so that BS can extract the sum of  $\mathbf{m}_i$ ; we denote this operation as  $\mathbf{x}_i = \text{Enc}(\mathbf{m}_i)$ . Then, the received signal at the BS can be given by

$$\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^M \sqrt{\gamma_i} h_i \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{z}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i} \in \mathbb{R}$  is the average channel gain corresponding to large-scale fading such as path loss and shadowing, and  $h_i$  is the instantaneous channel gain, which follows 1 in the AWGN channel or  $CN(0, 1)$  in the Rayleigh fading channel. Further,  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the transmitted vector constrained by the maximum transmission power  $P_{\max}$  as  $\|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \leq P_{\max}$ , and  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^L$  is the AWGN vector following  $CN(0, \sigma_z^2)$ , where  $\sigma_z^2$  is the noise floor. Then, BS extracts the sum of  $\mathbf{m}_i$  using a decoding operation, defined by  $\text{Dec}(\mathbf{y})$ .

Note that, throughout this paper, it is assumed that the BS and the nodes have perfect channel state information (CSI) about  $\{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i}h_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$  and the  $i$ -th node knows  $\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i}h_i$  through the protocol detailed in the next subsection.

### C. AirComp for Summation Operation

We next introduce the detailed design of  $\text{Enc}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{Dec}(\cdot)$  for the summation operation [9], which is a fundamental operation for the weighted averaging<sup>1</sup>. The brief timeline of AirComp for the summation operation is shown in Fig. 2. Initially, each node transmits the quantized norm of its message  $\|\mathbf{m}_i\|$  to the BS using digital modulation such as quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) in a time-division multiple access (TDMA) manner. Since the transmitted frame must include known pilot signals for synchronization, BS can obtain the instantaneous uplink CSI  $\{\bar{\gamma}_i h_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$  while decoding  $\|\mathbf{m}_i\|$ , and then calculate a normalization coefficient  $\rho$  for the power control. This factor is determined to ensure that the node with the smallest ratio of CSI to message norm, namely minimum of  $(\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i}h_i/\|\mathbf{m}_i\|)$ , transmits the message at maximum transmit power, while preserving the relative order of magnitudes among the messages. Thus, the BS calculates  $\rho$  by

$$\sqrt{\rho} = \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i}h_i\sqrt{P_{\max}}}{\|\mathbf{m}_i\|} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M \right\}. \quad (3)$$

BS next broadcasts  $\rho$  to the nodes, and the  $i$ -th node estimates  $\bar{\gamma}_i h_i$  while decoding  $\rho$ .

For the AirComp transmission, the  $i$ -th node then converts its message  $\mathbf{m}_i$  to a complex signal based on *channel inversion principle*, so that

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \text{Enc}(\mathbf{m}_i) \triangleq \frac{\sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}_i}h_i} \mathbf{m}_i. \quad (4)$$

After the nodes transmit their messages simultaneously, BS receives the aggregated signal, which is derived by

$$\mathbf{y} = \sqrt{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i + \mathbf{z}. \quad (5)$$

Next, we define the decoding function  $\text{Dec}(\cdot)$  for the summation operation. Specifically, the BS attempts to extract

<sup>1</sup>Note that one might question the difference between AirComp and physical-layer network coding (PNC). PNC leverages waveform superposition to enable the simultaneous transmission of combined messages to be efficiently relayed over a wireless network, thereby enhancing the network throughput [35]. However, in PNC-aided networks, the receiver must extract its intended information from the overlapped signals, which contrasts with the purpose of AirComp, which aims to estimate a function of the received signals [36].




Fig. 2. Timeline of AirComp for a summation computation.

the sum of message vectors from the received vector  $\mathbf{y}$  by applying

$$\text{Dec}(\mathbf{y}) \triangleq \text{Re} \left( \frac{\mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\text{Re}(\cdot)$  extracts the real part. Applying this function to Eq. (5), the BS can extract the sum of message vectors,  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}$ ; i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \text{Re} \left( \frac{\mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i + \frac{\mathbf{z}_R}{\sqrt{\rho}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}_R \triangleq \text{Re}(\mathbf{z})$ . For  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ , the computation result follows  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i$ .

### III. PURELY WEIGHTED AVERAGING AIRCOMP

Before introducing the proposed method, this section presents the pure weighted averaging operation with AirComp. Then, we show the noise enhancement problem in the weighted averaging operation, which motivates us to design the adaptive weighted averaging.

If the sum of the weights is normalized to 1 in advance of the AirComp, the weighted averaging operation can be realized by the weighted *sum*, which is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^M w_i s_{iL}$ . In contrast, the weighted *averaging* as in Eq. (1) is often required in the case where the sum of the weights is not normalized and not available at the BS. This operation must compute (i) the sum of weighted values and (ii) the sum of weights. To this end, these two messages are transmitted in separate time slots, and each sum is computed based on AirComp.

For the sum of weighted values and the sum of weights, the  $i$ -th node sets the following two messages:

$$\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)} = [w_{i1}s_{i1}, w_{i2}s_{i2}, \dots, w_{iL}s_{iL}]^T, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_i^{(1)} = [w_{i1}, w_{i2}, \dots, w_{iL}]^T, \quad (10)$$




Fig. 3. Behavior of adaptive weighting function ( $\delta_{\max} = 7.0$ ,  $\delta_{\min} = 3.0$ ).

After  $\{\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{m}_i^{(1)} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$  are aggregated with AirComp over two time slots, the BS can obtain the following two vectors,

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(0)} = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i^{(0)} + \frac{\mathbf{z}_R^{(0)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(0)}}}, \quad (11)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i^{(1)} + \frac{\mathbf{z}_R^{(1)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(1)}}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\rho^{(t)}$  is a scalar at  $t$  based on Eq. (3), which is constant among nodes. Then, the weighted averaged value can be computed by

$$\hat{\phi}_l = \frac{1}{r_l^{(1)}} r_l^{(0)} \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^M w_{il} + \frac{z_{Rl}^{(1)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(1)}}}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M w_{il} s_{il} + \frac{z_{Rl}^{(0)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(0)}}} \right), \quad (14)$$

where  $r_l^{(t)}$  is the  $l$ -th element in  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}^{(t)}$  and  $z_{Rl}^{(t)}$  is the  $l$ -th element in  $\mathbf{z}_R^{(t)}$ . This computation result follows  $\hat{\phi}_l \rightarrow \phi_l$  when  $\rho^{(0)} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho^{(1)} \rightarrow \infty$ . However, since it divides the weighted sum by the sum of weights, its computation accuracy is often degraded severely due to the noise term  $z_{Rl}^{(1)}$ , as explained in Sect. I.

#### IV. ADAPTIVELY WEIGHTED AVERAGING AIRCOMP

In this section, we propose a modified weighting method to improve the noise tolerance in the weighted averaging operation.

##### A. Main Idea

As can be seen from Eq. (3), in a pure weighted averaging operation, the power control parameter  $\rho$  is designed so that the node having the minimum value of  $(\sqrt{\gamma_i} |h_i| / \|\mathbf{m}_i\|)$  transmits the signal with the maximum transmission power




Fig. 4. Effect of adaptive weighting on the average transmission power performance under AWGN channel in transmission step of  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)}$  ( $\delta_{\min} = 0.0$ ,  $P_{\max} = 1.0$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}_1 = \bar{\gamma}_2 = \dots = 1$  and  $L = 10$ ). Reducing  $\delta_{\max}$  distorts  $w$ ; however, it increases the average transmission power.

$P_{\max}$ . When the channel coefficient  $\sqrt{\gamma_i} |h_i|$  is constant among the nodes, the average transmission power  $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2$  decreases as the variance of  $\|\mathbf{m}_i\|$  increases. It often degrades the received power performance in the computation of Eq. (12), resulting in severe noise enhancement in computing Eq. (14). However, weighted averaging is crucial in various applications, such as environmental monitoring systems with sensing and spatial interpolation, where computation accuracy is essential.

To mitigate this effect, our method truncates the weight vector  $\mathbf{w}_i$  adaptively, based on the following function,

$$g(w) = \max \{ \min \{ w, \delta_{\max} \}, \delta_{\min} \}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  are the upper and lower bounds of the weight, respectively. Bounding  $w$  with  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  reduces the variance of  $\|\mathbf{m}_i\|$ , resulting in less variation in transmission power. This, in turn, increases  $\rho$ , thereby enhancing computational accuracy.

An example of this equation is illustrated in Fig. 3. Controlling  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  can make the weighted averaging behavior. For example, it can realize the pure weighted averaging as with Eq. (14) when  $\delta_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\delta_{\min} = 0$ . In contrast, it nearly performs the simple averaging computation when  $\delta_{\max} = \delta_{\min}$ , which gains the average transmission power. Fig. 4 demonstrates a numerical simulation result regarding the effects of the adaptive weighting on the average transmission power,  $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2$ , under the AWGN channel. This figure assumes  $f_s(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $f_w(x) = \lambda \exp(-\lambda x) (x \geq 0)$  with  $1/\lambda = 1$  for the demonstration purpose. Reducing  $\delta_{\max}$  to  $\delta_{\min}$  makes the weights constant. The difference in  $\|\mathbf{m}_i\|$  between the nodes is reduced, increasing the average transmit power; it will improve the noise enhancement in Eq. (14).

##### B. Detailed Protocol

Alg.1 summarizes the detailed protocol of the proposed AirComp. Its main protocol follows the pure weighted averaging in Sect. III, except for the transformation of the weight

---

**Algorithm 1** Adaptively weighted averaging AirComp

---

**Require:**  $f_w, f_s, \{\bar{\gamma}_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}, \sigma_z^2$

- 1: BS optimizes  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  via Alg. 2.
- 2: BS broadcasts  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  to the nodes.
- 3: **for**  $t = 0$  and **1 do**
- 4:   **for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$  **do**
- 5:     The  $i$ -th node sets  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(t)}$  by Eqs. (16)(17).
- 6:     The  $i$ -th node sends  $\|\mathbf{m}_i^{(t)}\|$  to the BS by digital transmission.
- 7:     BS estimates  $h_i^{(t)}$  when receiving  $\|\mathbf{m}_i^{(t)}\|$ .
- 8:   **end for**
- 9:   BS controls  $\rho^{(t)}$  and broadcasts it to the nodes.
- 10:   All nodes estimate  $h_i^{(t)}$  when receiving  $\rho^{(t)}$ .
- 11:   All nodes construct  $\mathbf{m}_{\text{AW},i}^{(t)}$  by Eqs. (16)(17).
- 12:   All nodes transmit  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(t)}$  simultaneously.
- 13:   BS obtains  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{AW}}^{(t)}$  by Eqs. (18)(19).
- 14: **end for**
- 15: The BS computes  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},l}$  by Eq. (21).
- 16: **return**  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW}} = [\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},1}, \dots, \hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},L}]^T$

---

coefficients by the function  $g(w)$  and tuning parameters in  $g(w)$ . The BS first adjusts  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  according to the average CSI  $\{\bar{\gamma}_i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, M\}$  so that the expected MSE can be minimized. Since the objective function depends on  $f_w$  and  $f_s$ , this problem cannot be derived in a closed-form expression; thus, we solve this problem based on BO, which will be described in Sect. IV-C. After the BS broadcasts these parameters to the nodes, the nodes convert the weighted sensing values and their weights as follows:

$$\mathbf{m}_{\text{AW},i}^{(0)} = [g(w_{i1})s_{i1}, g(w_{i2})s_{i2}, \dots, g(w_{iL})s_{iL}]^T, \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{\text{AW},i}^{(1)} = [g(w_{i1}), g(w_{i2}), \dots, g(w_{iL})]^T, \quad (17)$$

Then, the BS obtains the following vectors via AirComp:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{AW}}^{(0)} = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_{\text{AW},i}^{(0)} + \frac{\mathbf{z}_{\text{R}}^{(0)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(0)}}}, \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{AW}}^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_{\text{AW},i}^{(1)} + \frac{\mathbf{z}_{\text{R}}^{(1)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(1)}}}. \quad (19)$$

Finally, BS computes the weighted averaging vector  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW}} = [\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},1}, \dots, \hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},L}]^T$ , where its  $l$ -th element is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},l} &= \frac{1}{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{AW}}^{(1)}} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{\text{AW}}^{(0)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^M g(w_{il}) + \frac{z_{\text{R}l}^{(1)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(1)}}}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M g(w_{il})s_{il} + \frac{z_{\text{R}l}^{(0)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(0)}}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that, as with the pure weighted averaging, the computation result follows  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},l} \rightarrow \phi_l$  when  $\delta_{\min} = 0$ ,  $\delta_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\rho^{(0)} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\rho^{(1)} \rightarrow \infty$ .

*C. Optimizer for  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$*

Alg. 1 requires the optimization of  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  before the AirComp. Assuming that  $\theta = \{\delta_{\min}, \delta_{\max}\}$ , this problem can

---

**Algorithm 2** Bayesian optimizer for  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$

---

**Require:**  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(0)} = \{[\theta^{(t)}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta^{(t)})] \mid t = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{init}}\}$

- 1: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
- 2:   Maximize Eq. (26) by a gradient-based method
- 3:   Randomly sample a set of test input  $\Theta_*$
- 4:   Calculate  $\mu(\theta_{*,i})$  by Eq. (31) for  $\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*$
- 5:   Calculate  $\sigma^2(\theta_{*,i})$  by Eq. (32) for  $\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*$
- 6:   Calculate  $\alpha(\theta_{*,i})$  by Eq. (36) for  $\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*$
- 7:   Find  $\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)}$  by Eq. (37)
- 8:   Calculate  $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)})$
- 9:   Update the dataset to  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t+1)}$  by Eq. (38).
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **return**  $\theta_{\text{opt}} = \underset{\theta^{(i)} \in \Theta^{(T)}}{\text{argmax}} (-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}})(\theta^{(i)})$

---

be written as the MSE minimization in the adaptive weighted averaging, i.e.,

$$\theta_{\text{opt}} = \underset{\theta}{\text{argmin}} \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [(\phi_l - \hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},l})^2]}_{\triangleq \epsilon_{\text{AW}}(\theta)}, \quad (22)$$

where  $\phi_l$  and  $\hat{\phi}_{\text{AW},l}$  are calculated by Eqs. (1)(21), respectively. However, deriving the exact expression for  $\epsilon_{\text{AW}}$  requires  $f_s$  and  $f_w$ , although these functions depend on the sensing conditions. For instance, in an environmental monitoring application with IDW-based spatial interpolation,  $f_s$  and  $f_w$  depend on the spatial correlation of the region of interest and the distribution of node locations. This makes  $\epsilon_{\text{AW}}$  a black-box function; thus, we need to treat this problem as an unconstrained black-box optimization, where typical methods such as gradient-based optimization are inefficient due to the absence of a closed-form solution.

To this end, we introduce BO [14], a black-box optimization framework for adaptive experimental design. BO models the set of observation values as a GP and interpolates the values at unobserved regions to identify better inputs. This method can be divided into initialization, function modeling by GPR, and parameter update based on the acquisition function. We utilize BO because it efficiently optimizes the unconstrained black-box optimization problem with fast convergence and sample efficiency, enabling the BS to optimize  $\delta_{\max}$  and  $\delta_{\min}$  through offline simulation prior to AirComp. This algorithm is summarized in Alg. 2. We detail each step below.

1) *Initialization:* In the beginning, this method performs several trials of simulations to construct an initial dataset

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(0)} = \left\{ \left[ \theta^{(t)}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta^{(t)}) \right] \mid t = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{init}} \right\}, \quad (23)$$

where  $N_{\text{init}}$  is the number of initial trials and  $\theta^{(t)} = \{\delta_{\max}^{(t)}, \delta_{\min}^{(t)}\}$  is the  $t$ -th initial input randomly selected from its feasible region. Furthermore,  $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta^{(t)})$  is the estimated value for  $\epsilon_{\text{AW}}(\theta^{(t)})$ , which can be obtained by a Monte-Carlo integration with  $f_s, f_w$ , and  $\theta^{(t)}$ .

2) *Function Modeling by GPR:* This step models the distribution of  $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}$  based on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}$  and GPR. GPR is a kernel-based non-parametric regression method that models the target

function as a GP. It first needs to tune its kernel structure from the training data to perform the function modeling accurately. Let us denote the kernel function as  $k_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(i)}, \theta^{(j)})$ , where  $\theta^{(i)} = \{\delta_{\min}^{(i)}, \delta_{\max}^{(i)}\}$  and  $\theta^{(j)} = \{\delta_{\min}^{(j)}, \delta_{\max}^{(j)}\}$ . For example, if we utilize the radial basis function (RBF) with scaling and noise terms for the kernel, this function can be given by,

$$k_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(i)}, \theta^{(j)}) = \beta_1 \exp\left(\beta_2 d^2(\theta^{(i)}, \theta^{(j)})\right) + \beta_3, \quad (24)$$

$$d(\theta^{(i)}, \theta^{(j)}) \triangleq \sqrt{\left(\delta_{\min}^{(i)} - \delta_{\min}^{(j)}\right)^2 + \left(\delta_{\max}^{(i)} - \delta_{\max}^{(j)}\right)^2}, \quad (25)$$

where  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  are positive-valued hyper-parameters. A set of the hyper-parameters,  $\psi = \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ , can be tuned by maximizing the log-marginal likelihood function for multivariate normal distribution,

$$\begin{aligned} \log p\left(\mathbf{y}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)} \mid \Theta^{(t)}, \psi\right) &= -\frac{1}{2} \log \det(\mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}}) - \frac{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}|}{2} \log 2\pi \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{y}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}\right)^{\text{T}} \mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

$$\mathbf{y}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)} = \left[\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}^{(1)}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}^{(t+N_{\text{init}})}\right]^{\text{T}}, \quad (27)$$

$$\Theta^{(t)} = \left\{\theta^{(i)} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, t + N_{\text{init}}\right\}. \quad (28)$$

Further,  $\mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}| \times |\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}|}$  is the kernel matrix, where its element is  $k_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(i)}, \theta^{(j)})$ . Finally,  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}$  is a vector with  $(t + N_{\text{init}})$  elements. Its  $i$ -th element  $\bar{y}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}(\theta^{(i)})$  represents the prior mean at  $\theta^{(i)}$ . Assuming that the prior mean is constant regardless of  $\theta^{(i)}$ , this mean can be calculated by

$$\bar{y}_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)}|} \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}^{(i)}, \forall i. \quad (29)$$

Maximizing Eq.(26) can be realized by a gradient-based method such as limited-memory Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (L-BFGS) method [38]. After this maximum likelihood estimation (MLE), the GPR predicts the distribution of the output at the unknown inputs

$$\Theta_* = \{\theta_{*,i} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{test}}\}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\theta_{*,i}$  is the  $i$ -th randomly-selected test point, and  $N_{\text{test}}$  is the number of test inputs to be interpolated. For an unknown input  $\theta_{*,i}$ , its output mean and variance can be given by the following equations, respectively:

$$\mu(\theta_{*,i}) = \bar{y}(\theta_{*,i}) + \mathbf{k}_{*,i}^{\text{T}} \mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}^{(t)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(t)}\right) \quad (31)$$

$$\sigma^2(\theta_{*,i}) = k_{\text{BO}}(\theta_{*,i}, \theta_{*,i}) - \mathbf{k}_{*,i}^{\text{T}} \mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_{*,i}, \quad (32)$$

where

$$\mathbf{k}_{*,i} = k_{\text{BO}}\left(\Theta^{(t)}, \theta_{*,i}\right) \quad (33)$$

$$\triangleq \left[k_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(1)}, \theta_{*,i}), \dots, k_{\text{BO}}(\theta^{(t+N_{\text{init}})}, \theta_{*,i})\right]^{\text{T}}. \quad (34)$$

<sup>2</sup>Typically, the kernel matrix is expressed as the sum of a noiseless kernel matrix  $\mathbf{K}'_{\text{BO}}$  and a matrix that accounts for the noise term  $\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 \mathbf{I}$  ( $\mathbf{I}$  is  $\mathcal{D}^{(t)} \times \mathcal{D}^{(t)}$  identity matrix and  $\sigma_{\epsilon}^2$  is the noise variance). Following GPyTorch's implementation [37], this paper integrates these to  $\mathbf{K}_{\text{BO}} \triangleq \mathbf{K}'_{\text{BO}} + \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 \mathbf{I}$ .

Finally, the MSE at unknown input is modeled as

$$\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{*,i}) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu(\theta_{*,i}), \sigma^2(\theta_{*,i})\right). \quad (35)$$

We compute  $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{*,i})$  for all  $\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*$ .

3) *Parameter Update Based on Acquisition Function*: Next, we estimate the acquisition function, a criterion for evaluating the goodness of input parameters. Several acquisition functions have been developed, including expected improvement (EI), upper confidence bound, and probability of improvement. We employed EI, which is a popular acquisition function for BO defined as

$$\alpha(\theta_{*,i}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\max\left((-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{*,i})) - (-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}})^+, 0\right)\right], \quad (36)$$

where  $(-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}})^+$  is the maximum value of  $-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{*,i})$  in  $\mathcal{D}^{(t)}$ . After  $\alpha(\theta_{*,i})$  is calculated for all  $\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*$ , we then determine the optimized input at the step  $t$ , i.e., the next input, as

$$\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)} = \underset{\theta_{*,i} \in \Theta_*}{\operatorname{argmax}} \alpha(\theta_{*,i}). \quad (37)$$

After the MSE for this input  $\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)})$  is evaluated, the dataset for BO is updated as,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{BO}}^{(t)} \cup \left\{\left[\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)}, \hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta_{\text{opt}}^{(t+1)})\right]\right\}. \quad (38)$$

Steps 2 and 3 are iterated  $T$  times; finally, the optimized input  $\theta_{\text{opt}}$  can be determined as the input point resulting in the minimum MSE, i.e.,

$$\theta_{\text{opt}} = \underset{\theta^{(i)} \in \Theta^{(T)}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left(-\hat{\epsilon}_{\text{AW}}(\theta^{(i)})\right). \quad (39)$$

#### D. Communication Delay Performance

Table I summarizes the time slots for the proposed and baseline methods at  $L = 1$ . Pure weighted averaging and adaptive weighted averaging require two time slots for AirComp to compute the weighted sum and the sum of weights, while simple averaging requires only one slot. Further, the digital transmission requires  $O(2M)$  slots since it needs to collect  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(1)}$  at the BS, and then the BS processes the received messages. All AirComp-based methods can efficiently compute the weighted averaging compared to the digital transmission.

#### E. Computational Complexity Performance

BO requires training the kernel function, modeling the black-box function, and computing the acquisition function, resulting in increased computational complexity compared with non-adaptive methods. We discuss the additional complexity of the proposed method as follows.

To tune the kernel function, BO must maximize the log-marginal likelihood function in Eq. (26), which involves inverting an  $(N_{\text{init}} + t) \times (N_{\text{init}} + t)$  matrix. Thus, when maximizing it using a gradient-based method, the computational complexity during the training phase is  $O(N_{\text{train}}(N_{\text{init}} + t)^3)$  at step  $t$ , where  $N_{\text{train}}$  represents the number of training iterations in the gradient-based method.

Subsequently, we need to predict the output mean and variance at the test points (Eqs.(31)(32)) and compute the EI

TABLE I  
EFFECTS OF  $M$  ON REQUIRED TIME SLOTS ( $L = 1$ ).

Method	Required Time Slot
AirComp (pure weighted averaging)	$\mathcal{O}(1+1)$
AirComp (simple averaging)	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
AirComp (adaptive weighted averaging)	$\mathcal{O}(1+1)$
Digital transmission (pure weighted averaging)	$\mathcal{O}(2M)$

(Eq. (36)). Since the inverse matrices in Eqs. (31) and (32) can be derived from the kernel training results, computing these for a single input point requires  $\mathcal{O}((N_{\text{init}} + t)^2)$ . If EI is calculated over  $N_{\text{eval}}$  test points, the computational complexity for prediction and EI calculation becomes  $\mathcal{O}(N_{\text{eval}}(N_{\text{init}} + t)^2)$ .

In summary, the computational complexity at step  $t$ , including both training and EI calculation, is  $\mathcal{O}(N_{\text{train}}(N_{\text{init}} + t)^3 + N_{\text{eval}}(N_{\text{init}} + t)^2)$ . Considering that the number of data points increases proportionally with  $t$ , the computational complexity for performing  $T$  iterations of BO can asymptotically be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{O}\left(N_{\text{train}}T(N_{\text{init}} + T)^3 + N_{\text{eval}}T(N_{\text{init}} + T)^2\right). \quad (40)$$

Note that BO needs to be performed only once before AirComp. Since the optimization results can be reused as long as the statistical CSI between the BS and nodes remains flat, the impact of this computational complexity on communication latency can be negligible in practice.

## V. APPLICATION TO DISTRIBUTED GPR

Weighted averaging is a commonly used operation in various fields. This section demonstrates how the proposed method can improve the actual computation problem; to this end, we apply the proposed method to a regression problem based on distributed GPR. There has been a wide range of applications of GPR, such as wireless sensor networks, adaptive experimental design [39] (as applied to optimization of  $\{\delta_{\text{min}}, \delta_{\text{max}}\}$  in Sect. IV-C), and radio map construction [7], [40]. Improving communication efficiency in the distributed GPR will help such sensing applications.

### A. Task Definition

Based on the definition in Sect. II, we consider a situation where  $M$  sensing nodes are connected to a BS over wireless channels. The  $i$ -th node has a dataset,

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{[\mathbf{x}_{in}, y_{in}] \mid n = 1, 2, \dots, N_i\}, \quad (41)$$

where  $N_i$  is the number of data,  $\mathbf{x}_{in}$  is the input vector (e.g., sensing location), and  $y_{in} = f(\mathbf{x}_{in}) + \epsilon$  is its output value generated from  $\mathcal{N}(f(\mathbf{x}_{in}), \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ . Further,  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$  is the i.i.d. measurement noise; for instance, in a radio map construction task,  $\mathbf{x}_{in}$  corresponds to the sensing location,  $f(\mathbf{x}_{in})$  represents the received signal power from the transmitter of interest, and  $\epsilon$  accounts for noise caused by the sensor's temperature or signal interference from other transmitters.

When local datasets are non-overlapped each other, the full dataset over the network can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^M \mathcal{D}_i, \quad (42)$$

where the number of full data is  $N = \sum_{i=1}^M N_i$ . Further, it is assumed that all data in  $\mathcal{D}$  follows a GP: i.e.,

$$f \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu(\mathbf{x}), k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')), \quad (43)$$

where  $\mathcal{GP}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a PDF of GP,  $\mu(\mathbf{x})$  is the expectation value at  $\mathbf{x}$ , and  $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$  is the kernel between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{x}'$ . The task in this context is to estimate  $f$  for test inputs

$$X_* = \{\mathbf{x}_{*,l} \mid l = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{test}}\} \quad (44)$$

from  $\mathcal{D}_i$  distributedly ( $N_{\text{test}}$  is equivalent to the message length  $L$ ). Note that the relationship between  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(1)}$  is illustrated in Fig. 5.

### B. Preliminary of D-GPR Based on Product-of-Experts

We explain the estimation process on a test input  $\mathbf{x}_{*,l}$  based on the full dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  below; by applying the following process to all test inputs, regression analysis can be performed on  $X_*$ . Consider a situation where BS has the full dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  and performs the exact GPR. From the full dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , we define  $\mathbf{y}$  as a vector with  $N$  elements that contains all  $y_{in} \in \mathcal{D}$ ; i.e.,  $\mathbf{y} = [y_{11}, y_{12}, \dots, y_{MN_M}]^T$ . The full GPR predicts the distribution of the output at the test input  $\mathbf{x}_{*,l}$  as the Gaussian distribution with mean ( $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})] = \mu(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$ ) and variance ( $\text{Var}[f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})] = \sigma^2(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$ ) given by the following equations, respectively:

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}) = \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}) + \mathbf{k}_{*,l}^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \quad (45)$$

$$\sigma^2(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}) = k(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}, \mathbf{x}_{*,l}) - \mathbf{k}_{*,l}^T \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{k}_{*,l}, \quad (46)$$

where  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is the kernel matrix, where its element is  $K_{ij} = k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$  ( $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the  $i$ -th element in  $X$ ). Further,  $\mathbf{k}_* = k(X, \mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$  is a vector with  $N$  elements, where its  $i$ -th element  $\bar{y}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  is the prior mean at  $\mathbf{x}_i$ ; assuming that this mean is constant regardless of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , this vector is given from  $\bar{y}(\mathbf{x}_1) = \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}_2) = \dots = \bar{y}(\mathbf{x}_N) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$ , where  $y_i$  is the  $i$ -th element in  $\mathbf{y}$ .

However, performing the exact GPR at the BS requires the computational complexity following  $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$  to calculate the  $N \times N$  inverse matrix. D-GPR based on product-of-experts (PoEs), proposed in [15], can improve this complexity issue by parallelizing computations of Eqs (45)(46) to computations at distributed nodes. This method assumes that local dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i$  is independent of each other [15]. Under this assumption, D-GPR estimates the statistical performance of  $f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  based on the relationship,

$$p(f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})|\mathcal{D}) \approx \prod_{i=1}^M p(f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})|\mathcal{D}_i). \quad (47)$$

To perform the distributed GPR, each node estimates mean and variance based on the GPR for its local dataset; the  $i$ -th node computes the mean and variance on the  $i$ -th node,  $\mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  and  $\sigma^2(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$ , based on the full GPR (Eqs. (45)(46)) and its






Fig. 5. Relationship between variables in D-GPR with adaptively weighted averaging AirComp (noiseless case).

local dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . Then, mean and variance for  $p(f(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})|\mathcal{D})$  can be calculated by the following equations, respectively.

$$\mu^{\text{poe}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}) = (\sigma^{\text{poe}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^2 \sum_{i=1}^M (\sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2} \mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}), \quad (48)$$

$$(\sigma^{\text{poe}}(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2} = \sum_{i=1}^M (\sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2}. \quad (49)$$

This distributed processing requires each node to compute the inverse of  $(N/M) \times (N/M)$  matrix. Thus, the computational complexity at the  $i$ -th node follows  $O((N/M)^3)$  when  $N_1 = N_2 = \dots = N_M$ . However, with the digital transmission, its communication cost still depends on the number of nodes  $M$  to aggregate the local GPR results,  $\mu(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  and  $(\sigma(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2}$ , at the BS.

### C. D-GPR with Adaptively Weighted Averaging AirComp

As can be seen from Eqs. (48)(49), the distributed GPR can be realized by the weighted averaging operation for  $\mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  and  $\sigma_i^2(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$ . We can thus apply the AirComp-based weighted averaging to the distributed GPR.

To exploit the adaptively weighted averaging, the nodes first prepare the messages  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)}$  and  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(1)}$  in Eqs. (16)(17) in which  $w_{il}$  and  $s_{il}$  can be written by

$$w_{il} = (\sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2}, \quad (50)$$

$$s_{il} = \mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}). \quad (51)$$

Then, the BS can obtain the weighted averaging of  $\mu_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l})$  and  $(\sigma_i(\mathbf{x}_{*,l}))^{-2}$  by Alg. 1.

Note that Alg. 2 in this method requires samples from PDFs regarding  $w_{il}$  and  $s_{il}$ . However, these PDFs depend on the test input  $X$ . To obtain  $f_s$  and  $f_w$ , assuming that the PDF of  $y_{in}$  is available, the BS emulates the D-GPR with offline computation in advance. This process can be implemented in the following way:

- 1) Initialize empirical datasets regarding  $w_{il}$  and  $s_{il}$  as  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{S} = \emptyset$
- 2) Generate pseudo dataset  $\mathcal{D}'_i$  based on Eq. (43).

TABLE II  
SIMULATION PARAMETERS.

Parameter	Detail
Kernel function in GPR	Radial basis function (RBF) with scaling and noise term
$N_{\text{test}} (= L)$	10
$P_{\text{max}}$	10 [dBm]
AWGN $\sigma_z^2$	-90 [dBm]
$d_{\text{cor}}$	100 [m]
$\sigma_{\text{dB}}$	8.0 [dB]
$P_{\text{Tx}}$	10 [dBm]
$\eta$	3.0

- 3) Perform local GPR for  $\mathcal{D}'_i$  based on Eqs. (45)(46).
  - 4) Calculates pseudo data regarding  $w_{il}$  and  $s_{il}$  based on Eqs. (48)(49). Further, define them as  $w'_{il}$  and  $s'_{il}$ , respectively.
  - 5) Append elements  $w'_{il}$  and  $s'_{il}$  into  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ , respectively.
  - 6) Repeat the above steps a sufficient number of times.
- Finally, the BS can realize samples from  $f_s$  and  $f_w$  by randomly sampling elements from  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$ , respectively.

### D. Performance in Radio Map Construction Task

1) *Simulation Model:* We evaluate the performance of the AirComp-based distributed GPR in a radio map construction task. A radio map is a tool for visualizing the average received signal power values at an area of interest, which is essential for the design of wireless communication systems (e.g., resource allocation, location tracking, and spectrum sharing) [7], [40]. Recent works have revealed that an accurate radio map can be constructed by sensing the received signal power values at multiple locations and spatial interpolation [41], [42]. Since typical average received signal power values in outdoor scenarios can be modeled as a GP [43], GPR is a theoretically optimal regressor for the spatial interpolation in the radio map construction task.

Our simulation considers a one-dimensional (1D) radio map construction task where the target transmitter (apart from the BS, which is the server role in AirComp) is located at coordinate  $x_{\text{Tx}} = -1$  [m]; the measurement locations are sampled by  $x_{i,l} \sim \mathcal{U}(1 \text{ [m]}, 500 \text{ [m]})$ , and the BS estimates the




Fig. 6. Examples of distributed GPR in a 1D radio map construction task where  $M = 4$  and  $N = 128$  (AWGN channels).

received signal power values between  $[1 \text{ [m]}, 500 \text{ [m]}]$  based on D-GPR.

At the location  $x$ , the received signal power in the logarithmic form can be modeled as [44]

$$P_{\text{Rx}}(x) = P_{\text{Tx}} - 10\eta \log_{10} \|x_{\text{Tx}} - x\| + \chi(x), \quad (52)$$

where  $P_{\text{Tx}}$  is the transmission power and  $\eta$  is the path loss exponent. Further,  $\chi(x)$  is the shadowing, which follows multivariate normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation  $\sigma_S$  [dB]. For two measurement locations  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ , its spatial correlation can be modeled as an exponential function [43], i.e.,

$$\text{Cor}[\chi(x_i), \chi(x_j)] = \exp\left(-\frac{\|x_i - x_j\|}{d_{\text{cor}}} \ln 2\right), \quad (53)$$

where  $d_{\text{cor}}$  is the correlation distance. The task is to estimate the received signal powers at the unobserved locations by the distributed GPR. Other simulation parameters are summarized in Table II.

2) *Comparison Methods*: We compare the performance of the proposed AirComp with the different averaging methods, which are detailed below.

- **Pure Weighted Averaging**: This method takes the weighted averaging based on Eq. (14) without any adaptation.
- **Simple Averaging**: In this method, the nodes transmit the non-weighted sensing values  $\mathbf{m}_i^{(0)} = [s_{i1}, s_{i2}, \dots, s_{iL}]$ , and the BS aggregates them via AirComp. Then, the aggregated vector is divided by  $M$  to obtain the averaged value. This operation can be given by,

$$\hat{\phi}_l = \frac{1}{M} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M s_{il} + \frac{z_{\text{RI}}^{(0)}}{\sqrt{\rho^{(0)}}} \right). \quad (54)$$

- **Computation-Optimal Policy (COP)**: This method is a theoretically optimal approach for the summation operation, as designed in [45]. For a sum of messages  $\sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i$

and the corresponding decoding result, the BS optimizes the nomographic function to minimize the MSE for the summation operation; i.e.,

$$\underset{\text{Dec}(\mathbf{y}), \{\text{Enc}(\mathbf{m}_i)\}_{i=1}^M}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{m}_i - \text{Dec}(\mathbf{y}) \right)^2 \right] \quad (55a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 \leq P_{\text{max}}, \forall i. \quad (55b)$$

Since this method is designed for the summation operation, we applied it separately to: (a) AirComp for the sum of weights and (b) AirComp for the sum of weighted sensing values. The results are then combined at the BS side.

- **Path Loss Estimation**: This method does not use any AirComp and averaging methods. Instead, it estimates the target as  $\hat{\phi}_l = \mathbb{E}_{f_s} [x]$ ; in the radio map construction, this method estimates  $P_{\text{Rx}}(x)$  as

$$\hat{P}_{\text{Rx}}(x) = P_{\text{Tx}} - 10\eta \log_{10} \|x_{\text{Tx}} - x\|. \quad (56)$$

- **Noiseless D-GPR**: This method performs pure D-GPR without any error/noise in the information aggregation, which expresses a limit of regression accuracy.

3) *Radio Map Construction Examples*: Effects of the averaging methods are exemplified in Fig. 6. This figure demonstrates the radio map construction task in AWGN channels with peak signal-to-noise ratios (PSNRs) of 70 dB and 10 dB.  $M = 4$  nodes distributedly measure the received signal power at  $N = 128$  locations; i.e., each node has  $N/M = 32$  samples. Note that, assuming  $\bar{\gamma}_1 = \bar{\gamma}_2 = \dots = \bar{\gamma}$ , this simulation defined the PSNR as the SNR with the maximum transmission power, i.e.,

$$\text{PSNR} \triangleq 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{P_{\text{max}} \bar{\gamma}}{\sigma_z^2} \right) \text{ [dB]}. \quad (57)$$

In PSNR = 70 [dB], pure weighted averaging and adaptive weighted averaging can accurately predict the ground truth




Fig. 7. Effects of PSNR on the distribution of  $\delta_{\min}/\delta_{\max}$  in Rayleigh fading channels where  $M = 32$  and  $N = 256$ .

as well as the noiseless D-GPR. In contrast, although simple averaging can predict a rough relationship, it overly smooths the curve more than pure and adaptive weighted averaging methods, degrading the regression accuracy. At PSNR = 10 [dB], pure weighted averaging has divergent predictions; in contrast, the results with adaptive weighted averaging and simple averaging are similar to the simple averaging at PSNR 70 dB, which demonstrates the noise tolerant property.

We next show the empirical cumulative distribution of  $\delta_{\min}/\delta_{\max}$  in Fig. 7. We evaluated four PSNRs (70 dB, 50 dB, 30 dB, and 10 dB); each CDF was generated from 1000-times independent simulations. As PSNR increased, the ratios tended to be lower: in terms of 90-percentile values,  $\delta_{\min}/\delta_{\max} \approx 8.36 \times 10^{-5}$  at PSNR = 70,  $2.22 \times 10^{-3}$  at PSNR = 50,  $3.97 \times 10^{-2}$  at PSNR = 30 and  $2.81 \times 10^{-1}$  at PSNR = 10, respectively. This ratio approaches 1 when  $\delta_{\min} \approx \delta_{\max}$ , i.e., the truncation function converts the input to a constant weight, and AirComp result behaves as a pseudo simple averaging computation in a low-SNR situation. In contrast, this value approaches 0 when  $\delta_{\min} \ll \delta_{\max}$ . Thus, this method performs a pure weighted averaging computation in a high-SNR situation.

4) *Effects of  $d_{\text{cor}}$* : We discuss detailed RMSE performance. This simulation assumed the number of test points was set as  $N_{\text{test}} = 10 (= L)$ . For a radio map construction simulation, the RMSE can be defined as

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\text{test}}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} (\phi_l - \hat{\phi}_l)^2}. \quad (58)$$

After 1000-times independent simulations, we obtained its median. Note that, as exemplified in Fig. 6, the regression results with the pure weighted averaging method occasionally diverge due to the noise enhancement problem, leading to the divergence of the average RMSE. To discuss the statistical impact of PSNR, we use the median metric.

Figs. 8(a)-8(c) show effects of  $d_{\text{cor}}$  on the RMSE performance of D-GPR in AWGN where  $N = 256$ . The correlation between a test point and measurement samples increases as  $d_{\text{cor}}$  becomes long, thereby improving the RMSE in the noiseless D-GPR. In the AWGN case at an PSNR of 50 dB (Fig. 8(c)), both pure weighted averaging, computation-optimal

method, and adaptive weighted averaging showed ideal RMSE equivalent to noiseless D-GPR in all correlation distances. In contrast, simple averaging exhibited a degradation of approximately 1.6 dB to 2.7 dB compared to the noiseless D-GPR. In the high PSNR region, RMSE can be improved by assigning a large weight to measurement samples near the test point. Simple averaging always assigns equal weight to all samples, resulting in this gap.

In contrast, at the PSNRs of 20 dB and 30 dB (Figs. 8(a) and 8(b)), simple averaging indicated higher accuracy than pure weighted averaging and COP for all correlation distances (Fig. 8(a)) and  $d_{\text{cor}} \geq 60$  [m] (Fig. 8(b)). As shown in Eq. (54), this method divides the sum of non-weighted sensing values by  $M$ . Since this operation avoids noise amplification, its RMSE was lower than the pure weighted averaging and COP at the PSNRs of 20 dB and 30 dB. The adaptive weighted averaging also avoids noise amplification, as demonstrated in Fig. 6. In the AWGN case, it further improved the RMSE by 0.8 dB to 1.8 dB at PSNR of 20 dB and by 1.2 dB to 2.2 dB at PSNR of 30 dB from the simple averaging method.

Pure weighted averaging did not necessarily improve RMSE with increased correlation distance and showed lower accuracy than path loss estimation at the PSNR of 20 dB (e.g., 12.2 dB at  $d_{\text{cor}} = 200$  [m]). Further, COP demonstrated equivalent performance to the pure weighted averaging method under all simulation conditions. Although this method minimizes the MSE for the sum of messages, it cannot mitigate the noise enhancement problem when computing the inverse of the sum, leading to inferior accuracy in low PSNR scenarios.

Figs. 8(d)-8(f) show effects of  $d_{\text{cor}}$  on the RMSE performance in Rayleigh fading channels where  $N = 256$ . As with the AWGN case, we evaluated the RMSEs at the PSNRs of 20 dB (Fig. 8(d)), 30 dB (Fig. 8(e)), and 50 dB (8(f)). The Rayleigh fading channel exhibited trends similar to those of the AWGN channel. In PSNR = 50 [dB], pure weighted averaging, COP, and adaptive weighted averaging all achieved accuracy comparable to the noiseless case. However, as PSNR decreased, the accuracy of pure weighted averaging and COP degraded; e.g., at PSNR = 20 [dB] and  $d_{\text{cor}} = 200$  [m], the RMSE reached 21.1 dB and 21.6 dB, respectively. On the other hand, both simple averaging and adaptive weighted averaging demonstrated monotonic RMSE reduction with respect to  $d_{\text{cor}}$ , regardless of PSNR. Unlike the AWGN case, at PSNR = 20 [dB], adaptive weighted averaging and simple averaging showed comparable accuracy. Nevertheless, throughout all conditions, adaptive weighted averaging consistently achieved the highest accuracy among AirComp-based methods, irrespective of PSNR or  $d_{\text{cor}}$ .

5) *Effects of PSNR*: Next, Fig. 9 shows effects of PSNR on RMSE where  $N = 256$ ,  $d_{\text{cor}} = 100$  [m]. This figure contains the results assuming  $M = 8, 16, 32$  in both AWGN and Rayleigh fading channels.

In radio map construction task, comparing accuracy with the path loss estimation is essential to discuss how a method could estimate the shadowing fluctuation. Focusing on pure weighted averaging and COP, it shows performance equivalent to noiseless D-GPR in the high PSNR region under any conditions. However, even at around PSNR = 40 [dB],




Fig. 8. Effects of the correlation distance  $d_{\text{cor}}$  on RMSE performance where  $M = 32$ .

a performance degradation of more than 1dB is observed. For example, in Fig.9(a), the results are inferior to path loss estimation at PSNRs below 30 dB. On the other hand, both simple and adaptive weighted averaging methods are sufficiently advantageous compared to path loss estimation up to a PSNR of 20dB, achieving more than a 10 dB improvement in PSNR compared to pure weighted averaging and COP. Note that in the low-SNR region, while adaptive weighted averaging approaches simple averaging, it is slightly inferior in terms of RMSE. This is because simple averaging directly divides the AirComp result by the constant  $M$  at the BS, completely eliminating any noise impact during the division process. In contrast, adaptive weighted averaging divides the result by the sum of adaptive weights gathered through AirComp. Although the sum of adaptive weights approaches  $M$  at the low-SNR region, a slight residual noise impact remains during the division process due to computational errors in estimating  $M$ . Furthermore, adaptive weighted averaging shows excellent accuracy asymptotically approaching noiseless D-GPR in the high PSNR region.

This trend is consistent regardless of whether AWGN or Rayleigh fading and independent of  $M$ . Using the proposed method, the RMSE approaches to the simple averaging at the low-SNR region, although it is almost equivalent to the pure weighted averaging and COP at the high-SNR region.

6) *Effects of Unequal Average Channel Gain:* Figs. 8 and 9 assumed  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = \dots = \gamma$ . However, the average channel gain may not be equal between nodes in practice due to factors such as log-normal shadowing or differing distances from the transmitter. Thus, we discuss the effects of unequal average channel gains on RMSE performance.

This simulation extends the average channel gain of the  $i$ -th node as

$$10 \log_{10} \bar{\gamma}_i = 10 \log_{10} \bar{\gamma} + \omega_i \text{ [dB]}, \quad (59)$$

where  $\omega_i$  [dB] is the random variable following a normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation  $\sigma_\omega$  [dB].

Fig. 10 illustrates the effects of  $\sigma_\omega$  on RMSE, where  $M = 32$  and  $N = 256$  in Rayleigh fading channels. We varied  $\sigma_\omega$  from 0 [dB] to 10 [dB] to cover the typical range of shadowing standard deviation [44]. This evaluation selected  $10 \log_{10} \bar{\gamma}_i = -70$  [dB] as the condition under which adaptive weighted averaging exhibited significant accuracy improvement over pure weighted averaging in an equal average channel gain environment (Fig. 10(a)). In contrast,  $10 \log_{10} \bar{\gamma}_i = -50$  [dB] was chosen as the condition where both methods achieved accuracy comparable to noiseless D-GPR (Fig. 10(b)). It should be noted that the results for  $\sigma_\omega = 0$  in Figs. 10(a) and 10(b) correspond to PSNR = 30 and PSNR = 50 in Fig. 9(f), respectively.

In Figs. 10(a), the RMSE of pure weighted averaging and COP degrades as  $\sigma_\omega$  increases. For instance, at  $\sigma_\omega = 10$  [dB], the RMSE values are 12.6 [dB] and 11.3 [dB], respectively. As shown by the PSNR dependency in Fig. 9(f), these methods experience significant RMSE degradation in PSNR < 50 [dB], even in the equal channel gain case. This degradation is due to an increase in low-SNR nodes as  $\sigma_\omega$  increases. Similarly, adaptive weighted averaging also shows degradation as  $\sigma_\omega$  increases; however, it consistently outperforms pure weighted averaging and COP for all values of  $\sigma_\omega$ . Although it performs slightly worse than simple averaging at  $\sigma_\omega = 10$ , the difference is less than 1 dB, indicating that adaptive weighted averaging still provides sufficiently practical performance.




Fig. 9. RMSE versus PSNR where  $N = 256$ ,  $d_{\text{cor}} = 100$ .




Fig. 10. Effects of unequal average channel gain on RMSE ( $M = 32$ ,  $N = 256$ , Rayleigh fading).

7) *Effects of Distribution Mismatching on RMSE:* Tuning of  $\{\delta_{\min}, \delta_{\max}\}$  with Alg. 2 uses PDFs of measurement values ( $f_s$ ) and their weights ( $f_w$ ), requiring statistical information of  $P_{R_x}(x)$ . We discuss the effects of imperfect knowledge on the AirComp.

Since the statistical performance of  $P_{R_x}(x)$  depends on the shadowing factor  $\chi(x)$  in Eq. (52), we model the imperfect knowledge on  $P_{R_x}(x)$  as the noisy correlation distance and standard deviation; i.e.,

$$d'_{\text{cor}} = d_{\text{cor}} + \epsilon_d, \quad (60)$$

$$\sigma'_{\text{dB}} = \sigma_{\text{dB}} + \epsilon_\sigma, \quad (61)$$

where  $\epsilon_d$  and  $\epsilon_\sigma$  are the estimation error term for  $d_{\text{cor}}$  and

$\sigma_{\text{dB}}$ , respectively. With  $d'_{\text{cor}}$  and  $\sigma'_{\text{dB}}$ , the BS performs BO, and the nodes perform D-GPR based on adaptive weighted averaging.

Effects of  $\epsilon_\sigma$  on RMSE is shown in Fig. 11; PSNR = 30 [dB] (Fig. 11(a)) and PSNR = 50 [dB] (Fig. 11(b)). We evaluated the performance under Rayleigh fading channels with parameters  $M = 32$ ,  $N = 256$ , and  $\epsilon_d = 0$ . The performance at  $\epsilon_\sigma = 0$  corresponds to that at PSNR = 30 and 50 in Fig. 9(f).

At PSNR = 30 [dB], the RMSE of the proposed method degraded as the error factor  $\epsilon_\sigma$  increased. However, the point where this method asymptotically approached the characteristics of noiseless D-GPR was consistent regardless of  $\epsilon_\sigma$ . For instance, even at  $\epsilon_\sigma = -6.0$  (i.e.,  $\sigma'_{\text{dB}} = 2.0$ ), it achieved an accuracy improvement of 0.5 dB compared to simple averaging. A similar trend was observed at PSNR = 50 [dB]. Notably, in many wireless channels,  $\sigma_{\text{dB}}$  is approximately 12 dB [44]. This simulation covers the range of  $\sigma'_{\text{dB}} = 2-14$  [dB], demonstrating that even when sufficient prior information on shadowing is unavailable, the hyperparameters can be empirically set, enabling BO to effectively adapt the weights in D-GPR.

Fig. 12 shows effects of  $\epsilon_d$  on RMSE. As with Fig. 11, we evaluated the performance in Rayleigh fading channels at PSNR = 30 [dB] (Fig. 12(a)) and PSNR = 50 [dB] (Fig. 12(b)); the results of compared GPR-based methods (simple averaging, pure weighted averaging, and noiseless D-GPR) indicate their performances with perfect knowledge on  $d_{\text{cor}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{dB}}$ .

At PSNR = 30 [dB], the RMSE of the adaptive weighted averaging method exhibited a gradual degradation as  $\epsilon_d$  increased. However, similar to the influence of the estima-




Fig. 11. Effects of distribution mismatching in standard deviation on RMSE in Rayleigh fading channels ( $M = 32$ ,  $N = 256$ ,  $\epsilon_d = 0$ ).




Fig. 12. Effects of distribution mismatching in spatial correlation distance on RMSE in Rayleigh fading channels ( $M = 32$ ,  $N = 256$ ,  $\epsilon_\sigma = 0$ ).

tion error in  $\sigma_{dB}$ , the proposed method demonstrated the highest accuracy among AirComp-based approaches. Even at  $\epsilon_d = 100$ , it showed an RMSE 0.8 dB lower than that of simple averaging. Overestimation of the correlation distance (i.e.,  $\epsilon_d > 0$ ) tends to assign higher weights to measurement samples far from the test point than the weights based on the accurate information on the correlation distance. Nevertheless, the effect of noisy correlation distance only affects AirComp in terms of whether the AirComp behavior follows a purely weighted average or simple average. The results show that the adaptive weighted averaging can work without significant accuracy degradation.

These results suggest that the proposed method can realize accurate regression despite imperfect knowledge of  $f_s$  and  $f_w$ .

## VI. CASE STUDY IN FL SYSTEMS

We have discussed the effectiveness of the proposed AirComp-based weighted averaging through its application to D-GPR. On the other hand, weighted averaging is a fundamental computational task that appears in numerous contexts beyond sensing, and the potential applications of our proposed method are diverse. In this section, we consider FL systems as a potential application of the proposed method.

In FL systems, the clients update their local model parameters based on their own datasets and send them to the BS. However, this process tends to increase communication delays, as the BS needs to collect multiple model vectors containing a large number of parameters. Although AirComp can improve the communication delay in the FL systems, AirComp with pure weighted averaging will degrade the training performance. We demonstrate effects of the proposed method on the training performance in AirComp-based FL systems.

### A. Federated Averaging with AirComp

The task of FL is to train a machine learning model parameterized by a real-valued vector  $\mathbf{v}$  based on iteration of training across distributed clients without disclosing their training dataset. FedAvg, a typical algorithm for FL [23], aims to construct a model that minimizes the global loss obtained by the weighted average of local loss values among clients. Let us define  $C = \{1, 2, \dots, K_{FL}\}$  as the set of clients participating in the FL system. When the  $i$ -th client has  $N_{FL,i}$  training data, the objective is to find a model satisfying,

$$\mathbf{v}^* \triangleq \underset{\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{K_{FL}} N_{FL,i}} \sum_{i=1}^{K_{FL}} N_{FL,i} F_i(\mathbf{v}), \quad (62)$$

where  $F_i(\mathbf{v})$  is the local loss at the  $i$ -th client. For more detail, the FedAvg algorithm can be realized by the following process:

- 1) BS selects  $M_{FL} (\leq K_{FL})$  clients as the training clients at round  $t_r$ ; we define the set of selected clients as  $C_S^{(t_r)} \subseteq C$ .
- 2) BS distributes a global model at round  $t_r$ ,  $\mathbf{v}^{(t_r)}$ , to the selected clients.
- 3) The selected clients distributedly update  $\mathbf{v}^{(t_r)}$  to  $\mathbf{v}_i^{(t_r)}$  based on their local datasets and a gradient descent-based optimization algorithm over several epochs.
- 4) The selected clients report their updated models to the server.
- 5) BS aggregates the local models based on the weighted averaging of the local models, i.e.<sup>3</sup>,

$$\mathbf{v}^{(t_r+1)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in C_S^{(t_r)}} N_{FL,i}} \sum_{i \in C_S^{(t_r)}} N_{FL,i} \mathbf{v}_i^{(t_r)} \quad (63)$$

- 6) Server and clients iterate the above steps until the model training is sufficiently converged.

Model aggregation in Eq. (63) forms an averaging operation for the local models weighted by the number of the local training data. Thus, we can simply apply Alg. 1 for FedAvg by setting  $\mathbf{m}_{AW,i}^{(0)}$  (Eq. (16)) and  $\mathbf{m}_{AW,i}^{(0)}$  (Eq. (17)) as,

$$\mathbf{m}_{AW,i}^{(0)} = \left[ g(N_{FL,i}) v_{i1}^{(t_r)}, \dots, g(N_{FL,i}) v_{i|V|}^{(t_r)} \right]^T, \quad (64)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{AW,i}^{(1)} = \left[ g(N_{FL,i}) \right]^T, \quad (65)$$

<sup>3</sup>Depending on the implementation, model aggregation may be performed using a simple average rather than the weighted average described in Eq. (63). In such cases, the improvement effect of the proposed method cannot be expected.




Fig. 13. Test accuracy of AirComp-based FL systems in an image classification task using the MNIST dataset.

where  $v_{ij}^{(tr)}$  is the  $j$ -th element in  $\mathbf{v}_i^{(tr)}$ . AirComp reduces the number of slots required to aggregate local models to one, regardless of  $M_{FL}$ , thereby improving communication efficiency in FedAvg. Note that  $\mathbf{m}_{AW,i}^{(1)}$  has one factor only since the weights in the  $i$ -th client follow  $w_{i1} = w_{i2} = \dots = w_{i|\mathbf{v}|} = N_{FL,i}$ .

### B. Image Classification Performance

Based on a prior work on AirComp-aided FL systems in [46], we conducted experiments on the MNIST dataset, which consists of 60,000 training samples and 10,000 test samples. The images were trained using a single-layer feedforward neural network with ten neurons in the hidden layer, where the total number of model parameters is  $|\mathbf{v}| = 7,960$ . The neurons were activated by the rectified linear unit (ReLU) function, and clients performed local training using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) with one epoch per round. In practice, the number of training samples per client is often imbalanced; for example, only certain clients may have access to large amounts of data. To model such a scenario, this simulation determined  $N_{FL,i}$  based on random numbers generated from an exponential distribution with a mean of  $60,000/K_{FL}$ , processed through the floor function. Allowing for data overlap between clients, each client randomly sampled their data from the total 60,000 samples.

Fig. 13 shows the test accuracy of AirComp-based FL systems in the image classification task under two conditions: a high-SNR environment (Fig. 13(a)) and a noisy environment (Fig. 13(b)) with AWGN channels. The test accuracy was evaluated per training round and averaged over ten independent simulations. Additionally, the figure includes the following baseline strategies: (a) pure weighted averaging, and (b) simple averaging. The pure weighted averaging method and the COP perform AirComp without BO, while the simple averaging method computes the non-weighted sum of local models via AirComp and divides it by  $M_{FL}$ .

In Fig. 13(a), the pure weighted averaging method and the COP outperform the simple averaging method throughout the training process. However, under the noisy condition shown in Fig. 13(b), their accuracy values degrade significantly, and the simple averaging method outperforms it. In contrast, the

proposed adaptive weighting method achieves performance equivalent to the pure weighted averaging method and the COP in the high-SNR case and the simple averaging method in the noisy case. This case study demonstrates that the proposed adaptive weighting strategy behaves as a pseudo pure weighted averaging computation under high-SNR conditions, while acting as a pseudo simple averaging computation under low-SNR conditions, thereby enabling accurate distributed training across varying channel conditions.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This paper presented an adaptive weighting method for noise-tolerant weighted averaging in AirComp. The proposed method truncates the maximum and minimum weights to balance noise tolerance and computation accuracy. We developed an optimizer for the truncation function based on BO, which works in a black-box manner with the channel condition.

The proposed method was applied to D-GPR for low-latency and accurate distributed regression. The performance evaluation in a radio map construction task showed that the proposed method could improve the estimation accuracy of the distributed GPR; its RMSE performance approaches the pure weighted average method in the high SNR region and the noise-tolerant simple average method in the low SNR region.

Further, we presented a case study of the proposed method for FL systems. Similar to the D-GPR, it was demonstrated that the proposed method can adapt the model aggregation strategy based on the channel conditions, thereby improving the training performance. The proposed will enable accurate, low-latency weighted averaging in various applications, such as environmental monitoring systems exploiting IoT sensing devices.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Sato, "Over-the-air Gaussian process regression based on product of experts," in *2022 IEEE GLOBECOM Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, 2022, pp. 1814–1820.
- [2] X. Wang, W. Wu, Y. Du, J. Cao, Q. Chen, and Y. Xia, "Wireless IoT monitoring system in hong kong-zhuhai-macao bridge and edge computing for anomaly detection," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 4763–4774, 2024.
- [3] F. Rezaeiabagha, Y. Mu, K. Huang, and L. Chen, "Secure and efficient data aggregation for IoT monitoring systems," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 8056–8063, 2021.
- [4] R. d. F. Bail, J. L. Kovalski, V. L. da Silva, R. N. Pagani, and D. M. d. G. Chirolí, "Internet of things in disaster management: technologies and uses," *Environ. Hazards*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 493–513, 2021.
- [5] F. Cirillo, D. Gómez, L. Diez, I. EliceGUI Maestro, T. B. J. Gilbert, and R. Akhavan, "Smart city IoT services creation through large-scale collaboration," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 5267–5275, 2020.
- [6] R. Minerva, G. M. Lee, and N. Crespi, "Digital twin in the iot context: A survey on technical features, scenarios, and architectural models," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 108, no. 10, pp. 1785–1824, 2020.
- [7] S. Bi, J. Lyu, Z. Ding, and R. Zhang, "Engineering radio maps for wireless resource management," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 133–141, 2019.
- [8] C. K. Wikle and N. Cressie, *Statistics for spatio-temporal data*, John Wiley and Sons., 2011.
- [9] A. Şahin and R. Yang, "A survey on over-the-air computation," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tuts.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1877–1908, 2023.
- [10] G. Zhu, J. Xu, K. Huang, and S. Cui, "Over-the-air computing for wireless data aggregation in massive IoT," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 57–65, 2021.

- [11] M. Goldenbaum, H. Boche, and S. Stańczak, "Nomographic functions: Efficient computation in clustered Gaussian sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 2093–2105, 2015.
- [12] Donald Shepard, "A two-dimensional interpolation function for irregularly-spaced data," in *Proceedings of the 1968 23rd ACM national conference*. ACM, 1968, pp. 517–524.
- [13] N. Cressie, "The origins of Kriging," *Mathematical Geology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 239–252, 1990.
- [14] B. Shahriari, K. Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P. Adams, and N. de Freitas, "Taking the human out of the loop: A review of Bayesian optimization," *Proc. the IEEE*, vol. 104, no. 1, pp. 148–175, 2016.
- [15] M. Deisenroth and J. W. Ng, "Distributed Gaussian processes," in *Proc. ICML2015*, Lille, France, 07–09 Jul 2015, pp. 1481–1490.
- [16] M. Goldenbaum, H. Boche, and S. Stańczak, "Harnessing interference for analog function computation in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Sig. Process.*, vol. 61, no. 20, pp. 4893–4906, 2013.
- [17] M. Goldenbaum, H. Boche, and S. Stańczak, "Nomographic functions: Efficient computation in clustered Gaussian sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 2093–2105, 2015.
- [18] G. Zhu and K. Huang, "MIMO over-the-air computation for high-mobility multimodal sensing," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 6089–6103, 2019.
- [19] X. Zhai, X. Chen, J. Xu, and Derrick W. Kwan N., "Hybrid beamforming for massive MIMO over-the-air computation," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 2737–2751, 2021.
- [20] W. Fang, Y. Jiang, Y. Shi, Y. Zhou, W. Chen, and K. B. Letaief, "Over-the-air computation via reconfigurable intelligent surface," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 69, no. 12, pp. 8612–8626, 2021.
- [21] W. Zhang, J. Xu, W. Xu, X. You, and W. Fu, "Worst-case design for RIS-aided over-the-air computation with imperfect CSI," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 2136–2140, 2022.
- [22] S. Jing and C. Xiao, "Federated learning via over-the-air computation with statistical channel state information," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 9351–9365, 2022.
- [23] B. McMahan, E. Moore, D. Ramage, S. Hampson, and B. A. y Arcas, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Proc. AISTATS*, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, Apr. 2017.
- [24] D. C. Nguyen, M. Ding, P. N. Pathirana, A. Seneviratne, J. Li, and H. V. Poor, "Federated learning for Internet of things: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tuts.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1622–1658, 2021.
- [25] Y. Zuo, L. Gui, K. Cui, J. Guo, F. Xiao, and S. Jin, "Mobile blockchain-enabled secure and efficient information management for indoor positioning with federated learning," *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 12176–12194, 2024.
- [26] J. Posner, L. Tseng, M. Aloqaily, and Y. Jararweh, "Federated learning in vehicular networks: Opportunities and solutions," *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 152–159, 2021.
- [27] L. Fu, H. Zhang, G. Gao, M. Zhang, and X. Liu, "Client selection in federated learning: Principles, challenges, and opportunities," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 24, pp. 21811–21819, 2023.
- [28] T. Nishio and R. Yonetani, "Client selection for federated learning with heterogeneous resources in mobile edge," in *IEEE ICC2019*, May 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [29] Y. Zuo, J. Guo, B. Sheng, C. Dai, F. Xiao, and S. Jin, "Fluid antenna for mobile edge computing," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1728–1732, 2024.
- [30] K. Yang, T. Jiang, Y. Shi, and Z. Ding, "Federated learning via over-the-air computation," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 2022–2035, 2020.
- [31] Y. Koda, K. Yamamoto, T. Nishio, and M. Morikura, "Differentially private Aircomp federated learning with power adaptation harnessing receiver noise," in *IEEE GLOBECOM2020*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [32] S. Park and W. Choi, "On the differential privacy in federated learning based on over-the-air computation," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, pp. 1–1, 2023 (Early Access).
- [33] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 9, no. 3–4, pp. 211–407, 2014.
- [34] I. F. Akyildiz, B. F. Lo, and R. Balakrishnan, "Cooperative spectrum sensing in cognitive radio networks: A survey," *Phys. Commun.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 40–62, 2011.
- [35] P. Chen, Z. Xie, Y. Fang, Z. Chen, S. Mumtaz, and J. J. P. C. Rodrigues, "Physical-layer network coding: An efficient technique for wireless communications," *IEEE Network*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 270–276, 2020.
- [36] Z. Wang, Y. Zhao, Y. Zhou, Y. Shi, C. Jiang, and K. B. Letaief, "Over-the-air computation for 6g: Foundations, technologies, and applications," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 14, pp. 24634–24658, 2024.
- [37] J. R. Gardner, G. Pleiss, D. Bindel, K. Q. Weinberger, and A. G. Wilson, "GPYtorch: Blackbox matrix-matrix Gaussian process inference with GPU acceleration," in *Proc. NeurIPS2018*, 2018.
- [38] Dong C. Liu and Jorge Nocedal, "On the limited memory BFGS method for large scale optimization.," *Math. Program.*, vol. 45, no. 1-3, pp. 503–528, 1989.
- [39] N. Srinivas et al., "Gaussian process bandits without regret: An experimental design approach," in *Proc. ICML2010*, June 2010, pp. 1015–1022.
- [40] Y. Zeng, J. Chen, J. Xu, D. Wu, X. Xu, S. Jin, X. Gao, D. Gesbert, S. Cui, and R. Zhang, "A tutorial on environment-aware communications via channel knowledge map for 6G," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tuts.*, pp. 1–1, 2024 (Early Access).
- [41] X. Wang, X. Wang, S. Mao, J. Zhang, S. C. G. Periaswamy, and J. Patton, "Indoor radio map construction and localization with deep Gaussian processes," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 11, pp. 11238–11249, 2020.
- [42] K. Sato, K. Suto, K. Inage, K. Adachi, and T. Fujii, "Space-frequency-interpolated radio map," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 714–725, 2021.
- [43] M. Gudmundson, "Correlation model for shadow fading in mobile radio systems," *Electron. Lett.*, vol. 27, pp. 2145–2146, Nov. 1991.
- [44] A. J. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [45] W. Liu, X. Zang, Y. Li, and B. Vucetic, "Over-the-air computation systems: Optimization, analysis and scaling laws," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 5488–5502, 2020.
- [46] M. Amiri and D. Gündüz, "Federated learning over wireless fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 3546–3557, 2020.

**Koya Sato** was born in Miyagi, Japan, in 1991. He received the B.E. degree in electrical engineering from Yamagata University, in 2013, and the M.E. and Ph.D. degrees from The University of Electro-Communications, in 2015 and 2018, respectively. From 2018 to 2021, he was an Assistant Professor with the Tokyo University of Science. He is currently an Assistant Professor with the Artificial Intelligence eXploration Research Center, The University of Electro-Communications. His current research interests include wireless communication, distributed machine learning, and spatial statistics.

**Koji Ishibashi** received the B.E. and M.E. degrees in engineering from The University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo, Japan, in 2002 and 2004, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in engineering from Yokohama National University, Yokohama, Japan, in 2007. From 2007 to 2012, he was an Assistant Professor with the Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Shizuoka University, Hamamatsu, Japan. Since April 2012, he has been with the Advanced Wireless and Communication Research Center (AWCC), The University of Electro-Communications, where he is currently a Professor. From 2010 to 2012, he was a Visiting Scholar with the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA. His current research interests include beamforming, grant-free access, energy harvesting, compressed sensing, cell-free networks, and MIMO technologies. He is a Senior Member of IEICE. He was a recipient of the Takayanagi Research Encouragement Award, in 2009, and the KDDI Foundation Award, in 2023. He was certified as an Exemplary Reviewer of IEEE Communications Wireless Letters, in 2015, and awarded by the Telecommunication Technology Committee (TTC) for his devotion to standardization activities, in 2020. He served as an Associate Editor for IEICE Transactions on Communications and IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications and a Guest Editor for IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society.