

Next Generation LoRaWAN: Integrating Multi-Hop Communications at 2.4 GHz

Riccardo Marini, Giampaolo Cuzzo

CNIT, National Laboratory of Wireless Communications (WiLab), Bologna, Italy
{riccardo.marini, giampaolo.cuzzo}@wilab.cnit.it

Abstract—The Internet of Things (IoT) revolution demands scalable, energy-efficient communication protocols supporting widespread device deployments. The LoRa technology, coupled with the LoRaWAN protocol, has emerged as a leading Low Power Wide Area Network (LPWAN) solution, traditionally leveraging sub-GHz frequency bands for reliable long-range communication. However, these bands face constraints such as limited data rates and strict duty cycle regulations. Recent advancements have introduced the 2.4 GHz spectrum, offering superior data rates and unrestricted transmission opportunities at the cost of reduced coverage and severe interference. To solve this trade-off, this paper proposes a novel hybrid approach integrating multi-band (i.e., sub-GHz and 2.4 GHz) and multi-hop communication into LoRaWAN, while preserving compatibility with the existing standard. The proposed network architecture retains Gateways (GWs) and End Devices (EDs) operating within the sub-GHz frequency while introducing multi-band Relays (RLs) that act as forwarding nodes for 2.4 GHz EDs. Utilizing our previously developed open-source and standards-compliant simulation framework, we evaluate the network performance of our solution under realistic deployment scenarios. The results demonstrate substantial improvements compared to standard single-band and single-hop LoRaWAN networks, demonstrating the potential of this approach to redefine LPWAN capabilities and bridge the gap between current solutions and next-generation IoT applications.

Keywords—LoRa; LoRaWAN; Internet of Things (IoT); Low Power Wide Area Networks (LPWANs); 2.4 GHz.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Internet of Thing (IoT) has revolutionized various sectors, from smart cities to industrial automation, by enabling interconnected devices to communicate seamlessly. At the heart of this transformation lies the need for communication protocols that can achieve wide-area coverage, low power consumption, and scalability to support the ever-increasing number of IoT devices. LoRa technology, together with the LoRaWAN protocol, has emerged as a leading solution in this context, offering an efficient and cost-effective approach to Low Power Wide Area Networks (LPWANs) [1], [2].

Traditionally, LoRaWAN has operated primarily in the sub-GHz frequency spectra, such as EU868 MHz, which provide excellent coverage and energy efficiency but are constrained by strict duty cycle regulations and limited data rates. In 2017, the introduction of LoRa chipsets operating at 2.4 GHz aimed to address these limitations. Indeed, the 2.4 GHz spectrum enables higher data rates and no duty cycle restrictions, whereas it also poses challenges related to increased path loss and

severe interference. However, the recent incorporation of multi-hop communication has opened new avenues for extending network coverage and improving performance, particularly in challenging environments.

In this paper, we aim to further enhance the performance and capabilities of LoRaWAN by investigating a novel approach that combines the benefits of the sub-GHz and 2.4 GHz spectra, along with the recent introduction of Relays (RLs), while maintaining adherence to the LoRaWAN standard. Specifically, we propose a multi-band and multi-hop LoRaWAN network retaining Gateways (GWs) and End Devices (EDs) operating within the sub-GHz frequency, while introducing multi-band RLs capable of receiving data from 2.4 GHz EDs and forwarding it to sub-GHz GWs. This enables the integration of 2.4 GHz into a fully functional LoRaWAN network with minimal modifications to the core architecture. Leveraging the findings of our previous papers [1], [3] and building upon our open-source and standard-compliant simulator [2], we evaluate the network performance of the proposed solution under realistic deployment scenarios. The comprehensive numerical results demonstrate substantial improvements compared to standard single-band and single-hop LoRaWAN networks, including a benchmark LoRaWAN network fully operating at 2.4 GHz, which is motivated by our proposed roadmap [1] even if not yet standardized. Through this study, we provide valuable insights into the trade-offs associated with this hybrid architecture, demonstrating its significant potential to revolutionize LPWANs and address the evolving demands of IoT applications.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II, we provide an overview of LoRa and LoRaWAN, including their technological foundations and a literature review. Sec. III introduces the system model, detailing the deployment, channel, and traffic assumptions used in our study. Sec. IV describes the proposed multi-band, multi-hop approach, outlining all the different features and mechanisms. In Sec. V, we define the simulation parameters, performance metrics and present the numerical results, highlighting key trends and trade-offs. Finally, Sec. VI concludes the paper, summarizing our findings and discussing potential directions for future research.

II. TECHNOLOGY BACKGROUND AND STATE OF THE ART

A. LoRa

LoRa is a proprietary spread-spectrum modulation technique patented by Semtech [4]. It utilizes M distinct chirp




Fig. 1: Pictorial representation of a LoRaWAN network architecture.

signals that span a specific frequency interval, hereafter referred to as Bandwidth (BW) in line with LoRa’s terminology. Specifically, $M = 2^{\text{SF}}$, where the Spreading Factor (SF) is an integer that determines the temporal evolution of each chirp. Increasing the SF results in a longer transmission time (also known as Time On Air (ToA)) but reduces the receiver’s sensitivity. The ToA, without loss of generality, can be expressed as $\text{ToA} = \frac{2^{\text{SF}}}{\text{BW}} N_S$, where SF is the spreading factor, BW is the bandwidth, and N_S represents the number of symbols per symbol time. This value depends on the SF and the specific frequency spectrum under consideration. For clarity, throughout this paper, the term *spectrum* refers to the entire frequency range allocated for LoRa transmissions (e.g., the Industrial, Scientific and Medical (ISM) band), while *channel* denotes a subset of that range. Meanwhile, BW, as previously defined, represents the interval over which chirps sweep. LoRa also incorporates Forward Error Correction (FEC) mechanisms to balance transmission reliability and time efficiency. Specifically, Hamming codes are employed, with the Coding Rate (CR) determining the number of additional Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) bits included in a LoRa frame [5]. A LoRa frame consists of a preamble (for detection and synchronization), an optional header, and the payload containing the actual data.

B. LoRaWAN

The LoRaWAN protocol, introduced by the LoRa Alliance, builds upon the LoRa physical layer to implement higher-layer functionalities. In particular, Fig. 1 represents a block scheme of a LoRaWAN network. EDs communicate with GWs via LoRa, while the GWs act as forwarding entity to the Network Server (NS) using backhaul connections like Wi-Fi, 4G/5G, or Ethernet. To maintain clarity and simplicity throughout the text, we will avoid delving into the specific components of the NS, such as the home, serving, and forwarding NS. However, we remark that the NS may also interface with the Join Server (JS) and Application Server (AS) to handle critical functions like security, authentication, and other relevant operational aspects. Unlike conventional network architectures, EDs are not directly associated with specific GWs but rather with the NS. Consequently, all GWs that receive frames from a given ED forward it to the NS, which is responsible for generating the corresponding Acknowledgments (ACKs) in case of confirmed mode.

Recently, LoRa Alliance introduced the concept of RL [6], which is a feature designed to extend the network’s coverage by enabling certain EDs to act as intermediate nodes between other EDs and the GW. In this mode, a RL-enabled ED receives uplink messages from nearby EDs that are out of

direct reach of a GW and forwards them towards the GW using its own uplink capabilities. This functionality is beneficial in scenarios with sparse gateway deployments or challenging propagation environments, such as remote or indoor locations. RL devices must adhere to strict timing and power constraints to ensure compatibility with the LoRaWAN protocol, and their use typically requires careful network planning to avoid interference or excessive energy consumption. This feature enhances the flexibility and scalability of LoRaWAN deployments, especially in hard-to-reach areas.

LoRaWAN relies on the ALOHA protocol for medium access. In uplink communications, EDs and RLs randomly select an available frequency channel and transmit a LoRa frame whenever a new payload is ready. The transmitted frame is received by all reachable GWs, and the NS handles duplicate elimination (i.e., removing identical frames forwarded by multiple GWs). On the other hand, LoRaWAN defines three operational classes for downlink communication. In class A, after an uplink transmission, EDs open two short receive windows for downlink communication (Receive Window 1 (RX1) and Receive Window 2 (RX2)) at fixed intervals of 1 second and 2 seconds, respectively. The NS selects the GW for the downlink based on the quality of received uplink frames. In class B, devices can open additional receive slots at scheduled times, synchronized through periodic beacons broadcast by GWs. Finally, in class C, devices maintain nearly continuous receive windows, except during uplink transmissions, at the expense of increased power consumption. LoRaWAN also supports two different transmission modes, which are called *confirmed* mode (the ED requires an ACK from the NS through the GW after an uplink transmission) and *unconfirmed* mode (the ED transmits data without expecting an ACK from the NS, leaving the ED unaware of whether the packet was successfully received).

C. Frequency spectrum

LoRaWAN can operate across different frequency spectra, each presenting unique trade-offs. Traditionally, the protocol is used in sub-GHz bands (e.g., EU868 and US915 for Europe and the US, respectively [7]). In these spectra, EDs must support default channels (e.g., three in EU868) and comply with duty cycle limitations (e.g., 1% on default channels) to minimize interference. In 2017, Semtech introduced LoRa chipsets capable of operating in the 2.4 GHz spectrum [3]. This higher frequency spectrum enables wider channels and higher data rates, but at the cost of increased path loss and lower maximum transmit power. Unlike sub-GHz bands, the 2.4 GHz spectrum does not impose duty cycle limitations or predefined channels, offering flexibility for potential future standardization by the LoRa Alliance.

D. State of the Art

While LoRaWAN in the sub-GHz band has been extensively studied [2], research on LoRa at 2.4 GHz has primarily focused on interference [8] and ranging applications [9], with limited attention given to network-level considerations. Among the few works addressing this gap, [10] analyzes a custom on-demand Medium Access Control (MAC) protocol for industrial machines leveraging energy harvesting on LoRa at 2.4 GHz,

[11] explores a railway LoRa network that integrates point-to-point communications at 2.4 GHz with LoRaWAN transmissions at EU868 MHz, while [12] demonstrates the benefits of opportunistic routing in a 2.4 GHz LoRa mesh network through system-level simulations.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, research on LoRaWAN at 2.4 GHz narrows further to [13], which proposes a hybrid approach combining LoRaWAN and IEEE 802.15.4, and [14], which evaluates the success rate of LoRaWAN across EU868, US915, and 2.4 GHz spectra using network simulations. However, these works are highly specific to a few parameters and scenarios.

To address these shortcomings, our earlier work [3] utilized the previously developed network simulator in [2] to perform a comprehensive comparison of LoRaWAN in the EU868 and 2.4 GHz spectra. Building on these promising results, in [1] we proposed a roadmap outlining the integration of the 2.4 GHz band into the current LoRaWAN standard, dividing the process into three main stages based on implementation complexity. In this paper, we take the next step by presenting numerical results evaluating the performance of multi-hopping in a multi-band LoRaWAN network (i.e., working at both EU868 and 2.4 GHz), corresponding to the final stage of our proposed roadmap. We compare the proposed approach with two benchmarks: a LoRaWAN network operating at EU868 MHz, representing the state-of-the-art solution (stage 0 of our roadmap), and LoRaWAN at 2.4 GHz (stage 1, option 1.1 of our roadmap).

III. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Deployment model

We consider a scenario where N EDs and R RLs are randomly and uniformly distributed within a square area of size A_L . A single GW is positioned at the center of the square area. We assume an urban context, meaning that both EDs and RLs may be located either inside or outside buildings. Buildings are modeled as squares with side length A_S , and their centers are distributed across the area in a grid pattern with a pitch $A_P \geq A_S$.

B. Channel model

The channel model utilized in this work aligns with the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) TR 38.901 [15] specifications, which apply to frequencies between 0.5 and 100 GHz. Specifically, we adopt the 3GPP Urban Macro (UMa) propagation model. Consequently, the received power is calculated as follows:

$$P_R[dBm] = P_T[dBm] + G_T^A[dB] + G_R^A[dB] - PL[dB], \quad (1)$$

where P_T represents the transmission power, G_T^A and G_R^A denote the transmit and receive antenna gains, respectively, and PL is the path loss, computed in accordance with [15], which varies based on the Line-of-Sight (LOS)/Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) condition and geometric parameters (see Tables 7.4.1-1 and 7.4.2-1 in [15]). Using eq. (1), a link (e.g., GW-RL or RL-ED) is considered to have coverage if the received power P_R exceeds the receiver sensitivity R_S . The sensitivity

TABLE I: The maximum allowed payload size as a function of the SF [bytes].

SF	7	8	9	10	11	12
B_{\max}	222	222	115	51	51	51

R_S depends on the SF and frequency band being used, with specific values provided in [16], [17].

In addition to coverage requirements, successful decoding of a LoRa frame during a collision necessitates that the Signal to Interference Ratio (SIR) meets or exceeds a defined capture threshold γ :

$$SIR = \frac{P_R}{\sum_i P_{R_i}} \geq \gamma, \quad (2)$$

where P_R is the desired received power, P_{R_i} denotes the power from the i -th interfering LoRa device, and γ is specified in Table 6 of [2]. Notably, inter-SF interference is disregarded, considering only devices transmitting with the same SF as potential interferers.

For LoRaWAN operating in the 2.4 GHz band, additional SFs (SF5 and SF6) are available, which are not covered in Table 6 of [2]. To address this, we conservatively assign them the same γ values as the diagonal elements of the table, ensuring consistency without compromising generality.

C. Traffic model

In this paper, we focus exclusively on uplink communications. EDs periodically generate uplink traffic with a fixed interval of T_U , where each transmission carries a payload of B_U bytes. Instead, RLs transmit a frame of size B , accumulating data received from EDs until the maximum payload size B_{\max} , allowed by their respective SF, is reached. Only then do they initiate transmission to the GW. The values of B_{\max} as a function of the SF are detailed in Table I. Notably, we consider only Class A devices operating in unconfirmed mode (see Sec. II).

IV. PROPOSED APPROACH

As already stated, this paper aims to evaluate the network performance of a multi-band and multi-hop LoRaWAN network. In this section, we provide details on multi-band support and on the implementation of multi-hopping.

A. Network architecture

An example of the proposed network architecture is depicted in Fig. 2¹. Each ED is equipped with a single 2.4 GHz LoRa transceiver, while RLs utilize two LoRa radios, one operating at 2.4 GHz and the other in the EU868 MHz spectrum². In this setup, EDs communicate with RLs via LoRaWAN in the 2.4 GHz spectrum [3], while the RLs-to-GW links employ LoRaWAN in the EU868 MHz band. RLs transmits LoRa frames containing MAC payloads from both the RLs themselves and the EDs.

¹Notice that hereafter we will neglect the NS, JS, AS as our focus is on the radio part.

²It is worth mentioning that the choice of the EU868 MHz spectrum does not undermine the generality of our approach, as the results are also valid for the other available LoRaWAN frequency portions (e.g., US915 MHz).




Fig. 2: Exemplary representation of the proposed network architecture. EDs (green circles) communicate with RLs (yellow stars) using LoRaWAN at 2.4 GHz, forming clusters where each of them operates on a dedicated radio channel within this spectrum. RLs transmit both their own data and that of their associated EDs to a central GW (blue triangle) via LoRaWAN at EU868 MHz. Links can be in either LOS or NLOS, depending on obstructions caused by buildings (gray squares).

B. Cluster definition

Each ED communicates with a single RL, selected based on the highest received power level P_R in the uplink (see eq. (1)). This can be accomplished in practical implementations by suitably extending the relay management procedures recently introduced by the LoRa Alliance [6]³. The sub-network formed by one RL and the associated EDs will be referred to as a *cluster* (see Fig. 2). Inter-cluster interference is eliminated by assigning a unique channel to each cluster within the 2.4 GHz spectrum. According to recent guidelines from Semtech [18], LoRa 2.4 GHz EDs must operate within the 2400 to 2480 MHz frequency band and support a minimum of 16 channels. Consequently, we will adhere to this limit for the number of RLs.

C. Communication model

The data rate for RLs is determined using the well-known Adaptive Data Rate (ADR) algorithm proposed by Semtech [19]. However, in our analysis, the data rate is computed only once and remains fixed throughout the entire simulation run, aligning with the stationarity of the scenario under consideration. Furthermore, we tweaked the algorithm to ensure that RLs are assigned with different SFs when possible, thereby leveraging their quasi-orthogonality property [4]. By checking

³Specifically, we believe that a four-way handshaking process is required, wherein the Wake on Radio Acknowledge (WOR-ACK) frame includes the received power level of the Wake on Radio (WOR) frame. This frame is transmitted on a default channel used by all RLs for channel sounding. Following this, two additional messages would be exchanged: one from the ED to the RL, specifying the selected RL, and the other from the RL to the ED, indicating the channel to be utilized.

TABLE II: Simulation parameters.

Parameter	Value
G_{ED}^A	0 dB
P_{ED}^T	12.5 dBm
P_{RL}^T	16 dBm
G_{RL}^A	0 dB
G_{GW}^A	0 dB
BW	125 (@EU868 MHz) kHz 203 (@2.4 GHz) kHz
CR	4/5
B_U	10 B
T_U	1 s
T	300 s

which SF have already been assigned to other RLs, if a conflict occurs, the SF of one or more RLs is adjusted to a higher value, ensuring unique assignments while maintaining connectivity with the GW. As detailed in Sec. III-C, once the data rate is selected, the RLs transmit LoRa frames with MAC payloads adhering to the B_{max} values specified in Table I. Notably, this approach implies that the uplink transmission periodicity is governed by the 1% duty cycle restriction of the EU868 MHz spectrum. On the other hand, within each cluster, 2.4 GHz EDs exploit the ADR algorithm to select the SF to be used according to the performance of the ED-RL link.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Simulation Setup

Configuration

Numerical results have been obtained starting from our open-source and standard-compliant simulator published in [2], properly modified to consider the context of this paper. All results have been obtained by averaging over 1000 simulation runs of T seconds. As for EDs configuration, they have fixed positions and they remain in such locations for the entire duration of the simulation T . We consider two radio modules, namely the Semtech SX1272 [17] for the EU868 MHz spectrum and the Semtech SX1280 [16] for the 2.4 GHz one, and the corresponding parameters for simulations are taken from their data sheets. The list of simulation parameters is shown in Table II.

Benchmarking the proposal

Numerical results consider the following three network architectures:

- **sub-GHz only**, a LoRaWAN network where EDs are working in the EU868 MHz band. It constitutes the first benchmark (i.e., stage 0 of the roadmap proposed in [1]);
- **2.4 GHz only**, a LoRaWAN network where EDs are working in the 2.4 GHz band and exploit the full LoRaWAN protocol stack to communicate towards a 2.4 GHz GW. While this configuration is not currently defined within the official LoRaWAN standard, it serves as a valuable benchmark for comparison (i.e.,




Fig. 3: Network throughput as a function of the number of EDs, the number of RLs, and for the two benchmark cases. We set $A_L = 1$ km.

stage 1, option 1.1, of the roadmap proposed in [1], and the object of the analysis of [3]);

- **Proposal**, a LoRaWAN network with the introduction of RLs to connect 2.4 GHz EDs (see Sec. IV).

Performance metrics

In the following, results are presented in terms of network throughput S , defined as the number of LoRa frames correctly received by the NS (via GWs):

$$S = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^R 8 M_i B_i}{T} \quad [\text{bits/s}], \quad (3)$$

where R is the number of RLs in the network, M_i denotes the number of uplink LoRa frames of size B_i correctly received by the GW from RL i .

In this context, two main factors can lead to a missed reception at the GW: noise and interference. Regarding noise, the interplay between the selected SF, BW, CR and P_R may prevent successful decoding, even when users are within the coverage of at least one GW. As for interference, the GW's ability to decode a signal depends on the power levels of both the desired and interfering signals, as well as the number of interfering transmissions using the same SF. These factors determine whether the SIR at the GW exceeds the capture threshold γ (see Sec. III).

Additionally, we analyze energy consumption suffered by EDs during the entire simulation duration. Energy consumption is computed following the model as in [2] and previously used and described in [3].

B. Numerical Results

Fig. 3 and 4 show the network throughput S as a function of the number of EDs, N , the number of RLs, R , and for




Fig. 4: Network throughput as a function of the number of EDs, the number of RLs, and for the two benchmark cases. We set $A_L = 5$ km.

two area dimensions ($A_L = 1$ and $A_L = 5$, respectively). We compare our proposal with the two benchmark cases, as described before. As a general trend, the network throughput increases with the number of EDs. Nonetheless, as N increases heavily, the likelihood of collisions rises, potentially limiting further gains in overall network throughput (as can be seen for $N = 50$ in the sub-GHz case). This is due to the usual behavior of the ALOHA protocol, upon which LoRaWAN is based. As can be seen, after introducing a sufficient number of RLs, the proposal is able to overcome both benchmarks (up to 97%). This improvement is attributed to the creation of a corresponding number of clusters in the network, with each cluster operating on a dedicated channel. This design choice allows to reduce the number of collisions between 2.4 GHz EDs, leading to enhanced overall performance.

In essence, the addition of RLs not only alleviates congestion but also optimizes resource allocation, allowing for a more efficient communication environment, especially as the number of EDs increases. As expected, the performance gains achieved by our multi-band and multi-hop LoRaWAN network are influenced by the area dimension. In Fig. 3, where the area is relatively small, the 2.4 GHz LoRaWAN version demonstrates good overall coverage. Consequently, our proposed approach offers a noticeable performance improvement only with a higher number of RLs ($R = 5$). However, the significance of RLs becomes more pronounced as the area dimension increases (see Fig. 4). In this larger scenario, employing just two RLs when $N > 100$ is sufficient to achieve an enhancement in network throughput.

The impact of the number of RLs is also analyzed in Fig. 5, where S is presented as a function of R and for different values of N . The curves show a common trend with an optimum reached for $R = 5$. This happens because, for a higher number of RLs, the SF distribution is no longer orthogonal (i.e., some




Fig. 5: Network Throughput as a function of the number of RLs, and the number of EDs, with $A_L = 5$ km.

TABLE III: Average energy consumption of EDs as a function of the number of EDs and the three network configurations [mJ].

Configuration	N = 50	N = 500
EDs @Sub-GHz	3382.6	3395.01
EDs @2.4 GHz	1420.02	1487.9
EDs @Proposal	1117.62	1139.17

RLs are forced to use the same SF), leading to inter-cluster interference.

In Table III, we analyze the average energy consumption suffered by EDs, where we set $R = 5$ (i.e., the optimum number of RLs) and $A_L = 5$ km (i.e., the largest area dimension). As can be seen, our proposal outperforms the two benchmarks (up to 67%) for both the extreme values of N . In fact, EDs consume less energy due to the possibility of exploiting lower SFs for their communication, hence reducing the overall time spent in transmission (i.e., the ToA).

In general, the introduction of RLs shows benefits in terms of network performance, even though it should be highlighted that it requires an implementation cost (i.e., the introduction of RLs which should provide radio modules for both spectra).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes a novel hybrid architecture for LoRaWAN networks that leverages the complementary features of the EU868 MHz and 2.4 GHz bands, along with the recent introduction of RL functionality in the standard, to enhance network performance while preserving standard compliance. In particular, the network operates in the EU868 MHz band, but it introduces RLs that are capable of receiving LoRa frames from 2.4 GHz EDs and forwarding them to sub-GHz GWs. By leveraging our open-source and standard-compliant network

simulator, the numerical results demonstrate an average improvement in network throughput of up to 97% and energy efficiency of up to 67% compared to single-band (i.e., EU868 MHz or 2.4 GHz) and single-hop deployments. Additionally, our solution exhibits better scalability with increasing numbers of EDs and larger deployment areas. The findings highlight the significant potential of this hybrid approach to revolutionize LPWANs and address the evolving demands of next-generation IoT applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Cuzzo, R. Marini, C. Buratti, and K. Mikhaylov, "On the Support of the 2.4 GHz Band in the LoRaWAN Standard," *IEEE Internet of Things Magazine*, 2024.
- [2] R. Marini, K. Mikhaylov, G. Pasolini, and C. Buratti, "LoRaWANSim: A flexible simulator for LoRaWAN networks," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 3, p. 695, 2021.
- [3] R. Marini and G. Cuzzo, "A comparative performance analysis of LoRaWAN in two frequency spectra: EU868 MHz and 2.4 GHz," in *Proc. EuCNC/6G Summit*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [4] G. Pasolini, "On the LoRa Chirp Spread Spectrum Modulation: Signal Properties and Their Impact on Transmitter and Receiver Architectures," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 357–369, 2021.
- [5] S. Corporation, "AN1200.22 LoRa Modulation Basics," 2015.
- [6] LoRa Alliance, *LoRaWAN® Relay Specification TS011-1.0.0*, 2022.
- [7] —, *LoRaWAN 1.1 Regional Parameters*, 2017.
- [8] L. Polak and J. Milos, "Performance analysis of LoRa in the 2.4 GHz ISM band: coexistence issues with Wi-Fi," *Telecommunication Systems*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 299–309, 2020.
- [9] G. H. Derévianckine *et al.*, "Opportunities and challenges of LoRa 2.4 GHz," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 164–170, 2023.
- [10] G. Cuzzo, C. Buratti, and R. Verdone, "A 2.4-GHz LoRa-Based Protocol for Communication and Energy Harvesting on Industry Machines," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 7853–7865, 2021.
- [11] D. Ferretti *et al.*, "Lora-based railway signalling system for secondary lines," in *Proc. FITCE*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [12] S. Rösler, A. Zubow, and F. Dressler, "Opportunistic Routing in LoRa-based Wireless Mesh Networks," in *Proc. WoWMoM*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 364–369.
- [13] M. Schappacher, A. Dant, and A. Sikora, "Implementation and Validation of LoRa-Based Systems in the 2.4 GHz Band," in *Proc. AICT*. IEEE, 2021.
- [14] P. Masek *et al.*, "Performance Analysis of Different LoRaWAN Frequency Bands for mMTC Scenarios," in *Proc. TSP*. IEEE, 2022.
- [15] 3GPP, "Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz (Release 16)," *TS 38.901*, 2019.
- [16] S. Corporation, "SX1280/1281 Data Sheet DS.SX1280-1.W.APP," 2018.
- [17] —, "SX1272/73 - 860 - 1020 MHz Low Power Long Range Transceiver," 2019.
- [18] —, "TN1300.03, Physical Layer Proposal 2.4GHz," 2023.
- [19] R. Marini, W. Cerroni, and C. Buratti, "A Novel Collision-Aware Adaptive Data Rate Algorithm for LoRaWAN Networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 2670–2680, 2021.