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Abstract

We study a heterogeneous Rayleigh fading wireless sensor network (WSN) in which densely deployed sensor nodes monitor an environment and transmit their sensed information to base stations (BSs) using access points (APs) as relays to facilitate the data transfer. We consider both large-scale and small-scale propagation effects in our system model and formulate the node deployment problem as an optimization problem aimed at minimizing the wireless communication network’s power consumption. By imposing a desired outage probability constraint on all communication channels, we derive the necessary conditions for the optimal deployment that not only minimize the power consumption, but also guarantee all wireless links to have an outage probability below the given threshold. In addition, we study the necessary conditions for an optimal deployment given ergodic capacity constraints. We compare our node deployment algorithms with similar algorithms in the literature and demonstrate their efficacy and superiority.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With recent technological advances in communication, sensing, computing, and battery capacity, wireless sensor networks (WSNs) have attracted widespread attention and have been used in numerous applications such as military applications [1], precision agriculture [2], healthcare monitoring [3], and industrial monitoring [4]. The primary utilization of WSN is to monitor physical phenomena such as environmental conditions, target positions, etc. inside a field of
interest. Equipped with sensing and communication units, sensor nodes provide an interface with the physical environment and transmit the sensed information to dedicated base stations (BSs) through wireless radios [5], [6]. Sensor nodes are susceptible to failure due to factors such as adverse environmental condition and breakdown in the onboard electronics; however, battery power depletion is the most pivotal factor since sensors are driven by battery that are infeasible to replenish, especially in hostile environments [7]. Therefore, energy efficiency is considered the most crucial quality-of-service (QoS) metric for functionality of WSNs and longevity of their life span [8]. The network’s energy consumption consists of different parts including the communication, computation, and sensing energy components [9]–[11]; however, empirical measurements have demonstrated that the dominating element is the communication energy [12]. Thus, once sensor nodes are placed in their predetermined positions for monitoring purposes, access points (APs) are deployed to facilitate the communication and connect sensor nodes to their corresponding base stations using various routing schemes [13].

Improving the energy-efficiency of WSNs is an active area of research and various methods have been proposed for this purpose. Some methods, like flat routing, hierarchical routing, and location-based routing, aim at finding the optimal path to reach a base station for sensory data [14]–[18]. Another strategy to improve the energy-efficiency and lifetime of WSNs is scheduling active and sleep modes for sensors [19]–[21]. One line of research that has attracted significant attention in the literature is energy-efficient node deployment due to its critical role in resource utilization and network lifetime. This is because electromagnetic wave propagation diminishes as a power law function of the distance between the transmitter and receiver; thus, the required transmission energy to guarantee a certain signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) at the receiver node highly depends on the distance and placement of network nodes.

Node deployment algorithms can be categorized in many different ways. Some techniques are developed offline and executed in a centralized manner [22] while others are distributed and are based on the assumption that each node has only local information about the state of other nodes [23], [24]. Based on nodes’ mobility, WSNs can also be categorized as either static or mobile where a rich set of node deployment algorithms is developed for each category. Static node deployment methods aim to calculate optimal node positions a priori and assume that nodes will be placed at their predetermined locations [25]–[28]; however, mobile node deployment techniques assume that starting from an initial location, each node moves toward its optimal position [22], [28], [29]. Node deployment algorithms can also be viewed based
on whether they are stochastic or deterministic. Random deployment is preferable in hostile and inaccessible environments or when the network’s size is very large [30] while deterministic methods are favorable for smaller networks, especially when manual placement is feasible since deterministic deployment algorithms often outperform their stochastic counterparts [30]. [31].

The optimal node deployment in WSNs highly depends on the hardware setup. WSNs can be identified as either homogeneous WSNs [15], [32]–[34], where network nodes share the same hardware properties such as the antenna gain, storage, sensitivity, etc., or heterogeneous WSNs [25]–[28], [35], [36] for which nodes, in general, have different characteristics. The optimal deployment in homogeneous WSNs is studied in [33], [34]; however, homogeneous WSNs do not represent inherent challenges that exist in their heterogeneous counterparts, namely, unlike Voronoi regions in homogeneous settings, the optimal regions in heterogeneous WSNs may not be convex, star-shaped, or connected. Node deployment in heterogeneous WSNs is studied in [25]–[27]; however, these studies along with the majority of the work in the literature consider a very simplistic radio energy model that does not reflect the real-world characteristics of the environment in which these networks are deployed. In addition, the randomness of the communication channel due to the fading process is usually ignored. Consequently, the resulting node deployment underestimates the actual energy consumption of the network which can significantly diminish the sustainability and durability of these networks.

With energy-efficiency being a major design concern in most WSNs, finding the optimal node deployment is an active area of research. In this work, we study heterogeneous Rayleigh fading sensor networks in details and aim to provide state-of-the-art algorithms to deploy nodes. The main motivation of this work is to take into account the small-scale fading and the exponential dependence of the required transmission energy on the rate in heterogeneous WSNs. The main contributions of the paper are summarized below:

- We consider a communication energy model that incorporates both large-scale path-loss signal attenuation and small-scale signal variation due to Rayleigh fading, and takes the heterogeneous characteristics of network nodes into account;
- Having an outage probability constraint on all communication channels, we provide theoretical necessary conditions for an optimal deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing protocol, and design an iterative algorithm to deploy nodes such that not only is the communication power consumption minimized in the resulting WSN, but also all communication channels are guaranteed to have an outage probability below the given threshold;
• By marginalizing the stochasticity of the channel capacity due to the Rayleigh fading process and considering the ergodic capacity for all wireless links, we derive the necessary conditions of optimal deployment and design an energy-efficient algorithm to deploy nodes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The system model and problem formulation are discussed in Section II. In Section III, the optimal deployment in heterogeneous Rayleigh fading WSNs under outage probability constraints on communication channels is studied and an iterative algorithm based on the obtained necessary conditions is provided. The optimal deployment in heterogeneous WSNs given ergodic capacity constraints on all wireless links and the corresponding deployment algorithm are studied in Section IV. Simulation results and concluding remarks are provided in Sections V and VI, respectively.

II. System Model

We consider a heterogeneous WSN that consists of homogeneous sensors, $N$ heterogeneous APs, and $M$ heterogeneous BSs. The target region $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex polygon including its interior. In particular, each sensor transmits its data to an AP which acts as a relay node and forwards the collected information to BSs. We denote the set of node indices for APs and BSs by $\mathcal{I}_{AP} = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{BS} = \{1, \cdots, M\}$, respectively. While access points and base stations are characterized as a set of $(N + M)$ discrete points within the target region, the distribution of densely deployed sensors are described via a continuous and differentiable function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\int_W f(\omega) d\omega$ is the total number of sensors within the region $W \subseteq \Omega$. Thus, the total amount of data gathered by sensors within the region $W$ in one time unit is equal to $R_b \int_W f(\omega) d\omega$ in which the bit-rate $R_b$ is a constant due to the homogeneity of sensors [33]. Throughout this paper, we assume that each sensor only transmits its data to one AP. Consequently, the target region $\Omega$ is partitioned into $N$ disjoint regions $W = (W_1, \cdots, W_N) \subseteq \Omega^N$ such that for each $n \in \mathcal{I}_{AP}$, AP $n$ collects data from sensors within the region $W_n \subseteq \Omega$. For any $n \in \mathcal{I}_{AP}$ and $m \in \mathcal{I}_{BS}$, let $p_n \in \Omega$ and $q_m \in \Omega$ denote the location of AP $n$ and BS $m$, respectively. In addition, let $P = (p_1, \cdots, p_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2}$ and $Q = (q_1, \cdots, q_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times 2}$ denote the collective deployment of APs and BSs, respectively.

In addition to AP deployment $P$, BS deployment $Q$, and cell partitioning $W$, the performance of a WSN heavily depends on the routing protocol by which data is transferred from sensors to base stations. Our network in this paper can be regarded as a directed bipartite graph where the vertex set can be partitioned into two disjoint subsets containing access points and base stations,
respectively, and each edge from AP \( n \) to BS \( m \) is associated with a non-negative value \( F_{n,m} \) (bits/s) denoting the flow of data from AP \( n \) to BS \( m \). An example of one such graph is depicted in Fig. 1. Thus, the routing protocol can be characterized by a flow matrix \( \mathbf{F} = [F_{n,m}]_{N \times M} \) where \( F_{n,m} \) denotes the amount of data transmitted from AP \( n \) to BS \( m \) in one time unit. Since each AP, say \( n \), transmits all the received data, the in-flow value should be equal to the out-flow value, i.e.,

\[
R_b \int_{W_n} f(\omega) d\omega = \sum_{m=1}^{M} F_{n,m}.
\]

Note that instead of directly specifying the flow \( F_{n,m} \) from AP \( n \) to BS \( m \), we can specify the ratio of out-flow from AP \( n \) that goes to BS \( m \), i.e.,

\[
r_{n,m} = \frac{F_{n,m}}{\sum_{j=1}^{M} F_{n,j}}.
\]

By definition, it readily follows that \( r_{n,m} \in [0, 1] \) and \( \sum_{m=1}^{M} r_{n,m} = 1 \) since the in-flow to each AP is equal to its out-flow. In particular, the flow matrix \( \mathbf{F} \) can be uniquely determined by the cell partitioning \( \mathbf{W} \) and the normalized flow matrix \( \mathbf{R} = [r_{n,m}]_{N \times M} \).

Fig. 1: The system model and network architecture.

In this paper, we consider a slow fading channel in which the channel gain is stochastic but remains constant in each frame. We also assume that the receiver can track the fading process, i.e., coherent reception and the transmitter has no knowledge of the channel realization except for its statistical properties. For a channel realization \( h \), the maximum communication rate with arbitrarily small error probability is given by \( \log (1 + |h|^2 \gamma) \) bits/s/Hz, where \( \gamma \) represents the received signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) due to large-scale propagation effects. For a Rayleigh fading channel, the fading gain is a standard complex normal random variable, i.e., \( h \sim \mathcal{CN}(0, 1) \); therefore, \( |h|^2 \) has an exponential distribution with parameter 1. Due to stochasticity of the channel realization, the decoding error probability cannot become arbitrarily small regardless of the code used by the transmitter \cite{37}. Hence, the primary objective in this paper is to find an
optimal deployment that minimizes the wireless transmission power consumption of the WSN subject to a given outage probability threshold. For a given data flow $F_{n,m}$, the outage probability is given by [37]:

$$p_{\text{out}_{n,m}}(F_{n,m}) = \mathbb{P}\left\{ B \log \left( 1 + |h|^2 \gamma_{n,m} \right) < F_{n,m} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Similarly, the outage probability for the link between a sensor located at $\omega \in \Omega$ and AP $n$ is:

$$p_{\text{out}_{\omega,n}}(R_b) = \mathbb{P}\left\{ B \log \left( 1 + |h|^2 \gamma_{\omega,n} \right) < R_b \right\}. \quad (2)$$

The received SNR is proportional to the transmit power, i.e., $\gamma \propto P_t \times d^{-\alpha}$ where $d$ is the distance between the transmitter and receiver, and $2 \leq \alpha \leq 5$ is the large-scale path loss exponent [38]. We consider the Friis free space loss equation, i.e., $\alpha = 2$. More precisely, if AP $n$ sends a signal with transmission power $P^{(n,m)}_{\text{transmit}}$, the received signal power at BS $m$, i.e., $P^{(n,m)}_{\text{receive}}$, is

$$P^{(n,m)}_{\text{receive}} = P^{(n,m)}_{\text{transmit}} \times \frac{G_t \cdot G_r \cdot \lambda^2_c}{(4\pi)^2 \|p_n - q_m\|^2 L_n}, \quad (3)$$

where $G_t$ is the transmitter antenna gain of AP $n$, $G_r$ is the receiver antenna gain of BS $m$, $\lambda_c$ is the wavelength of the carrier signal, and $L_n$ denotes all other losses that are not related to the propagation loss such as loss at the antennas, filters, transmission line attenuation, etc. Therefore, for the spectral noise density of $\sigma$ Watts/Hz, the received SNR $\gamma_{n,m}$ is given by:

$$\gamma_{n,m} = \frac{P^{(n,m)}_{\text{receive}}}{\sigma B} = P^{(n,m)}_{\text{transmit}} \times \frac{G_t \cdot G_r \cdot \lambda^2_c}{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 \|p_n - q_m\|^2 L_n}. \quad (4)$$

Similarly, for a sensor located at $\omega \in \Omega$, sending a signal with transmission signal power $P^{(\omega,n)}_{\text{transmit}}$, the received SNR $\gamma_{\omega,n}$ at AP $n$ is given by:

$$\gamma_{\omega,n} = \frac{P^{(\omega,n)}_{\text{receive}}}{\sigma B} = P^{(\omega,n)}_{\text{transmit}} \times \frac{G_{\text{sensor}} \cdot G_r \cdot \lambda^2_c}{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 \|p_n - \omega\|^2 L_{\text{sensor}}}, \quad (5)$$

where $G_{\text{sensor}}$ and $L_{\text{sensor}}$ are the common transmitter antenna gain and system loss of the homogeneous sensors, respectively. For a given outage probability threshold of $\epsilon$, our goal is to find the optimal WSN deployment that minimizes the total wireless transmission power consumption of the network subject to all channels having an outage probability of less than or equal to $\epsilon$. Hence, our primary objective function can be written as:

$$D_1(P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} P^{(\omega,n)}_{\text{transmit}} f(\omega) d\omega + \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} P^{(n,m)}_{\text{transmit}} \quad (6)$$
where the Lagrangian multiplier $\lambda \geq 0$ provides a trade-off between the sensor transmission power $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} P_{n,m}^{(w,n)}$ and AP transmission power $\sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} P_{n,m}^{(n,m)}$. Our primary goal is to minimize the constrained objective function in Eqs. (6) and (7) over node deployments $P$ and $Q$, cell partitioning $W$, and normalized flow matrix $R$.

An alternative way to address the stochasticity of the channel is to think of the channel as allowing $B \log (1 + |h|^2\gamma)$ bits/s flow of data to pass when the fading gain is $h$ and solve for the ergodic capacity of all wireless links in the network. More precisely, our secondary goal is to find the optimal transmission power values for each sensor and AP node such that the transmission power in each wireless link can, on average, allow the flow of data in that link to pass through.

For a Rayleigh flat-fading wireless link from AP $n$ to BS $m$ with an average received SNR $\gamma_{n,m}$, the ergodic capacity admits the following closed-form formula [39]:

$$C_{\text{erg}} = B \log_2(e) \times e^{1/\gamma_{n,m}} \times E_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_{n,m}}\right),$$

(8)

where $E_1(.)$ is the exponential integral of order 1 defined as:

$$E_1(z) = \int_1^{\infty} e^{-zx} \frac{dx}{x},$$

(9)

for $\text{Re}\{z\} > 0$. Therefore, using Eq. (8), the transmission power that, on average, allows the flow $F_{n,m}$ bits/s to pass through this wireless link can be calculated as

$$F_{n,m} = B \log_2(e) \times e^{1/\gamma_{n,m}} \times E_1\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_{n,m}}\right),$$

(10)

$$\gamma_{n,m} = \frac{1}{U^{-1}\left(\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)}\right)},$$

(11)

where $U(x) = e^x \times E_1(x)$. Hence, the AP transmission power is given by:

$$P_{\text{erg. trans.}}^{(n,m)} = \frac{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 \|p_n - q_m\|^2 L_n}{G_{t_n} G_{r_m} \chi_c^2 \times U^{-1}\left(\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)}\right)},$$

(12)

Similarly, the sensor transmission power that can, on average, allow the flow $R_b$ bits/s to pass through the wireless link from sensor $\omega$ to AP $n$ is given by:
Thus, the total wireless power consumption under the ergodic capacity assumption is

\[ D_2(P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} P_{\text{erg. trans.}}^{(\omega, n)} f(\omega) d\omega + \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} P_{\text{erg. trans.}}^{(n, m)}, \]  

where \( \lambda \geq 0 \) is the Lagrangian multiplier. Our secondary goal is to minimize the objective function in Eq. (14) over node deployments \( P, Q \), cell partitioning \( W \), and normalized flow matrix \( R \). In the next section, we focus on our primary objective function and study the optimal node deployment under outage probability constraint on wireless links. In Section IV, we consider our secondary objective function and study the optimal node deployment that minimizes the average network transmission power consumption under ergodic capacity assumption.

### III. Optimal Deployment under Outage Probability Constraint

In this section, we focus on our primary objective function and aim to minimize the wireless power consumption \( D_1 \) in Eq. (6) subject to outage probability constraints given in Eq. (7). Our goal is to find the optimal deployment \( P^* = (p_1^*, \ldots, p_N^*) \) and \( Q^* = (q_1^*, \ldots, q_M^*) \), cell partitioning \( W^* = (W_1^*, \ldots, W_N^*) \), and the normalized flow matrix \( R^* = [r_{n,m}^*]_{N \times M} \) that minimize the wireless transmission power consumption of the network. Note that the optimal value for each of the four variables \( P, Q, W, \) and \( R \) depends on the value of the other three and this optimization problem is NP-hard. Our aim is to derive the necessary conditions of optimality and devise an algorithm that iteratively optimizes the value of each variable while the other variables are held fixed. We accomplish this goal in the following three steps:

**Step 1 [optimizing \( P \) and \( Q \) while \( W \) and \( R \) are fixed]:** First, we rewrite the objective function \( D_1 \) according to the constraints given in Eq. (7). For a wireless link with flow \( F_{n,m} \) from AP \( n \) to BS \( m \), we have:

\[ \mathbb{P}\left\{ |h|^2 < \frac{2 F_{n,m}}{\gamma_{n,m}} - 1 \right\} \leq \epsilon. \]  

(15)

Since \( |h|^2 \) has an exponential distribution with parameter 1, Eq. (15) can be simplified to:

\[ \gamma_{n,m} \geq \frac{2 F_{n,m}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)}. \]  

(16)
Using Eq. (4), we can rewrite Eq. (16) as follows:

\[
P_{\text{transmit}}^{(n,m)} \geq \frac{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 L_n \times \|p_n - q_m\|^2 \times \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right)}{G_{t_n} G_{r_m} \lambda_c^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} = \frac{b_{n,m}}{\ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|p_n - q_m\|^2 \times \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right),
\]

where \( b_{n,m} = \frac{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 L_n}{G_{t_n} G_{r_m} \lambda_c^2} \). Hence, Eq. (17) yields a lower bound on the required transmission power at AP \( n \) that guarantees an outage probability no greater than \( \epsilon \) at the corresponding base station. Note that the minimum transmission power occurs when \( P_{\text{transmit}}^{(n,m)} \) is equal to its lower bound in Eq. (17) which corresponds to having an outage probability of \( p_{\text{out}_{n,m}} (F_{n,m}) = \epsilon \).

Similarly, for a sensor located at \( \omega \) that transmits its data to AP \( n \), we have:

\[
P_{\text{transmit}}^{(\omega,n)} \geq \frac{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 L_{\text{sensor}} \times \|p_n - \omega\|^2 \times \left(2^{\frac{R_b}{\lambda}} - 1\right)}{G_{t_{\text{sensor}}} G_{r_{\text{sensor}}} \lambda_c^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} = \frac{a_n}{\ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|p_n - \omega\|^2 \left(2^{\frac{R_b}{\lambda}} - 1\right),
\]

where \( a_n = \frac{\sigma B (4\pi)^2 L_{\text{sensor}}}{G_{t_{\text{sensor}}} G_{r_{\text{sensor}}} \lambda_c^2} \). Using Eqs. (17) and (18), we can rewrite the objective function \( D_1 \) in Eq. (6) as follows:

\[
D_1 (P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} a_n \frac{\ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)}{\|p_n - \omega\|^2 \left(2^{\frac{R_b}{\lambda}} - 1\right)} f(\omega) d\omega \nonumber
\]

\[
+ \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{b_{n,m}}{\ln \left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|p_n - q_m\|^2 \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right).
\]

Now, for a fixed \( W \) and \( R \), the optimal deployment is given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 1**: The necessary conditions for the optimal AP and BS deployment \( P^* \) and \( Q^* \) in a heterogeneous WSN with wireless transmission power consumption defined in Eq. (6) and outage probability constraint \( \epsilon \) on all wireless links are given by:

\[
p_n^* = \frac{a_n \left(2^{\frac{R_b}{\lambda}} - 1\right) v_n c_n + \lambda \sum_{m=1}^{M} b_{n,m} \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right) q_n^*}{a_n \left(2^{\frac{R_b}{\lambda}} - 1\right) v_n + \lambda \sum_{m=1}^{M} b_{n,m} \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right)}, \quad \forall n \in I_{AP},
\]

\[
q_m^* = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} b_{n,m} \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right) p_n^*}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} b_{n,m} \left(2^{\frac{F_{n,m}}{B}} - 1\right)}, \quad \forall m \in I_{BS},
\]

where \( v_n = \int_{W_n} f(\omega) d\omega \) and \( c_n = \frac{\int_{W_n} \omega f(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{W_n} f(\omega) d\omega} \) are the volume and centroid of the region \( W_n \), respectively. The proof of Proposition 1 is provided in Appendix A.

**Step 2 [optimizing W while P, Q, and R are fixed]**: First, we study the properties of region
boundaries in an optimal cell partitioning $W^*$. Note that while $F$ can be uniquely determined by $W$ and $R$, it only depends on the volumes of regions and not their actual geometric shape. More precisely, if we let $V = (v_1, \ldots, v_N)$ where $v_n$ is the volume of region $W_n^*$, then $F$ can be uniquely calculated by $V$ and $R$ as well. Therefore, Eq. (19) indicates that APs’ transmission power only depends on the volume of regions and not their geometrical shape. In other words, we can manipulate region boundaries in order to reduce the sensors’ power consumption in Eq. (19) and by extension the total power consumption $D_1$ since by keeping the region volumes fixed, APs’ power consumption remains unchanged. Using this intuition, we have:

**Lemma 1**: Let $W^* = (W_1^*, \ldots, W_N^*)$ be an optimal cell partitioning that minimizes the constrained objective function $D_1$ in Eqs. (6) and (7) for a given node deployment and data routing. Let $\delta_{i,j}^* = W_i^* \cap W_j^*$ be the boundary between neighboring regions $W_i^*$ and $W_j^*$. Then, $\delta_{i,j}^*$ is either a segment perpendicular to the line $p_ip_j$ if $a_i = a_j$ or an arc with its center placed at $c = \frac{a_ip_i - a_jp_j}{a_i - a_j}$ if $a_i \neq a_j$.

The proof of Lemma 1 is provided in Appendix B.

Let $h_{i,j}^*$ be the intersection point between the optimal boundary $\delta_{i,j}^*$ and the segment $p_ip_j$ in Lemma 1. The following proposition provides the necessary condition on the location of $h_{i,j}^*$.

**Proposition 2**: Let $W^* = (W_1^*, \ldots, W_N^*)$ be an optimal cell partitioning that minimizes the constrained objective function $D_1$ in Eqs. (6) and (7) for a given node deployment $P$, $Q$, and data routing $R$. Let $\delta_{i,j}^* = W_i^* \cap W_j^*$ be the boundary between neighboring regions $W_i^*$ and $W_j^*$ which intersects the line $p_ip_j$ at point $h_{i,j}^*$. Then we have:

$$a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 \left(2\frac{R_b^2}{\pi} - 1\right) + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} \ln\left(\frac{2}{B}\right) \times R_b \times r_{i,t} \times b_{i,t} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2\frac{r_{i,t}R_bv_i^*}{B}$$

$$= a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 \left(2\frac{R_b^2}{\pi} - 1\right) + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} \ln\left(\frac{2}{B}\right) \times R_b \times r_{j,t} \times b_{j,t} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2\frac{r_{j,t}R_bv_j^*}{B}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

The proof of Proposition 2 is provided in Appendix C.

**Step 3 [optimizing $R$ while $P$, $Q$, and $W$ are fixed]**: Note that for a given deployment $P$, $Q$, and cell partitioning $W$, the sensor power consumption is fixed and $R$ only affects the AP power consumption in Eq. (19). Since the cell partitioning $W$ is fixed and each AP directly transmits its data to base stations, the optimization problem can be split into $N$ objective functions, one for each AP, and they can be optimized separately. More specifically, for AP $n$, we need to
Algorithm 1: Optimal routing in heterogeneous WSNs with outage probability constraint

Optimize the following objective function:

\[
\arg \min_{F_{n,1}, \ldots, F_{n,M}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{b_{n,m}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \| p_n - q_m \|^2 \times \left( 2 \frac{F_{n,m}}{B} - 1 \right),
\]
\[
\sum_{m=1}^{M} F_{n,m} = \int_{W_n} R_b f(\omega) d\omega = R_b v_n, \quad (24)
\]
\[
F_{n,m} \geq 0 \text{ for all } m \in I_{BS}. \quad (25)
\]

Note that when the sum of exponents is fixed, the minimum of the sum of exponentials with the same base occurs when all exponents are equal. For instance, if for three variables \(x, y,\) and \(z\) we have \(x + y + z = c,\) then the minimum of \(2^x + 2^y + 2^z\) occurs when \(x = y = z = \frac{c}{3}.\) Using this intuition and the fact that all elements of the flow matrix are non-negative, we propose the following algorithm that yields the optimal solution to the constrained optimization problem in Eqs. (23)-(25) for each AP \(n.\) Note that once the optimal flow matrix \(F^*\) is obtained, the corresponding normalized flow matrix \(R^*\) can be calculated from the definition.

**Proposition 3:** For a given node deployment \(P, Q,\) and cell partitioning \(W,\) Algorithm 1 yields the optimal normalized flow matrix \(R^* = \arg \min_R D_1(P, Q, W, R)\) for the heterogeneous WSN under the outage probability constraints in Eq. (7).

The proof of Proposition 3 is provided in Appendix D.

Now, inspired by the Lloyd Algorithm [40], we propose Algorithm 2 named Power-Optimized Outage-aware Lloyd (POOL) Algorithm, to optimize node deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing in our heterogeneous WSN and minimize the wireless communication power consumption in Eq. (6) under outage probability constraints given in Eq. (7).

**Proposition 4:** The POOL algorithm is an iterative improvement algorithm, i.e., the objective function \(D_1\) is non-increasing and the algorithm converges.

The proof of Proposition 4 is provided in Appendix E.

**IV. OPTIMAL DEPLOYMENT UNDER ERGODIC CAPACITY ASSUMPTION**

In this section, we consider our secondary objective function and aim to minimize the wireless communication power consumption \(D_2\) in Eq. (14) over node deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing. We fulfill this aim by deriving the necessary conditions for an optimal deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing that minimize the network’s power consumption under ergodic capacity assumption. Then, based on these necessary conditions, we design an iterative algorithm to find such an optimal deployment. This goal is realized in the following three steps.
Algorithm 2: Power-Optimized Outage-aware Lloyd Algorithm

**Step 1 [optimizing \( P \) and \( Q \) while \( W \) and \( R \) are fixed]:** We begin by rewriting the objective function in Eq. (14) as

\[
D_2(P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} \frac{a_n}{U^{-1} \left( \frac{R_0}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \|p_n - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega
\]
is the boundary between neighboring regions $W_{i,j} = W^*_i \cap W^*_j$. Now, for a fixed cell partitioning and data routing, the necessary condition for an optimal deployment is given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 5:** For a fixed $W$ and $R$, the necessary conditions for the optimal AP and BS deployment $P^*$ and $Q^*$ in a heterogeneous WSN with wireless transmission power consumption defined in Eq. (14) and ergodic capacity assumption on all wireless links are given by:

$$
p^*_n = \frac{\frac{a_n v_n}{U - 1} (\frac{B}{\log_2(e)}) + \lambda \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{b_{n,m}}{U - 1} (\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)})}{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{b_{n,m}}{U - 1} (\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)})}, \quad \forall n \in I_{AP},
$$

$$
a^*_m = \frac{\frac{\lambda}{U - 1} (\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)}) \times p^*_n}{\sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{b_{n,m}}{U - 1} (\frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)})}, \quad \forall m \in I_{BS},
$$

where $v_n$ and $c_n$ are the volumes and centroid of $W_n$, respectively. The proof of Proposition 5 is provided in Appendix F.

**Step 2 [optimizing $W$ while $P$, $Q$, and $R$ are fixed]:** The cell partitioning $W$ affects the sensor power consumption in Eq. (26) through integrating over cells $W_n$ for $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$; thus, both volume and shape of each cell influence the sensor power consumption. In contrast, the cell partitioning affects the AP power consumption through the flow matrix $F$ which only depends on the volume of regions and not their shape. Hence, by keeping the volumes constant, one can adjust the region boundaries to reduce the sensor power consumption while the AP power consumption is held fixed. This leads to the following property of optimal region boundaries.

**Lemma 2:** For a given node deployment and data routing, let $W^* = (W^*_1, \ldots, W^*_N)$ be an optimal cell partitioning that minimizes the objective function $D_2$ in Eq. (14). If $\delta^*_{i,j} = W^*_i \cap W^*_j$ is the boundary between neighboring regions $W^*_i$ and $W^*_j$, then $\delta^*_{i,j}$ is either a segment if $a_i = a_j$ or an arc with its center placed at $c = \frac{a_i p_i - a_j p_j}{a_i - a_j}$ if $a_i \neq a_j$.

The proof of Lemma 2 is provided in Appendix G.

Using Lemma 2, the necessary condition for an optimal deployment is derived as follows.

**Proposition 6:** Let $W^* = (W^*_1, \ldots, W^*_N)$ be the optimal cell partitioning that minimizes the objective function $D_2$ in Eq. (14) for a given node deployment $P$, $Q$, and data routing $R$. Let $\delta^*_{i,j} = W^*_i \cap W^*_j$ be the boundary between neighboring regions $W^*_i$ and $W^*_j$ and let $h^*_{i,j}$ be the
Algorithm 3: Optimal data routing in two-tier WSNs under ergodic capacity assumption

Input: Node deployment P, Q; Cell partitioning W;
Set n = 1;

Set $S_0 = \frac{1}{M} \left[ \frac{2R_b v_n}{B \log_2(e)} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left[ \ln(b_{n,m}) + 2 \ln(\|p_n - q_m\|) \right] \right]$;
Set $J_L^{(0)} = \emptyset$ and $J_U^{(0)} = \{1, \ldots, M\}$;
Set iteration counter $k = 0$;

Increase $k$ by 1;

Let $J_L^{(k)} = \{m \mid S_{k-1} < \ln(b_{n,m}) + 2 \ln(\|p_n - q_m\|) \; , \; 1 \leq m \leq M\}$;
Let $J_U^{(k)} = \{1, \ldots, M\} \setminus J_L^{(k)}$;

Calculate $S_k = \frac{M \times S_0 - \sum_{m \in J_L^{(k)}} \ln(b_{n,m}) + 2 \ln(\|p_n - q_m\|)}{|J_U^{(k)}|}$;

is $J_L^{(k)} = J_L^{(k-1)}$?

Yes

Set $F_{n,m} = 0$ for all $m \in J_L^{(k)}$;
Set $F_{n,m} = \frac{B \log_2(e)}{2} \times (S_k - \left[ \ln(b_{n,m}) + 2 \ln(\|p_n - q_m\|) \right])$ for all $m \in J_U^{(k)}$;

Increase $n$ by 1;

No

is $n > N$?

Yes

Obtain the normalized flow matrix $R$ from the flow matrix $F$.

Intersection point of the line $\overline{p_i p_j}$ with $\delta_{i,j}^*$. Then, we have:

$$\frac{a_i}{U^{-1} \left( \frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t} \|q_t\|^2 \times \frac{r_{i,t} R_b}{B \log_2(e)}}{U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} v_n^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v_n^*}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v_n^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right]}$$
\[ \frac{a_j}{U-1} \left( \frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \| p_j - h_{i,j}^* \|^2 + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^M \frac{b_{j,t} \| p_j - q_t \|^2 \times \frac{r_{j,t} R_b}{B \log_2(e)} }{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v^*_j}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v^*_j}{B \log_2(e)} \right] \times U-1 \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v^*_j}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \}. \]  

(29)

The proof is provided in Appendix H.

**Step 3 [optimizing R while P, Q, and W are fixed]:** Note that the data routing R only affects the AP power consumption in Eq. (26) and it does not change the sensor power consumption. Since the cell partitioning, and thus the total volume of data that each AP transmits is fixed, optimizing R translates into each AP adjusting its data transmission independent of other AP nodes. For each AP, say \( n \), we have the following objective function:

\[
\arg \min_{F_{n,1}, \ldots, F_{n,M}} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{b_{n,m}}{U-1 \left( \frac{F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \| p_n - q_m \|^2, \tag{30}
\]

s.t. \( \sum_{m=1}^M F_{n,m} = \int_{W_n} R_b f(\omega) d\omega = R_b v_n, \tag{31} \]

\( F_{n,m} \geq 0 \) for all \( m \in I_{BS}. \tag{32} \)

To make the above optimization problem tractable, we resort to a common optimization strategy that seeks to minimize the upper bound on the objective function instead of directly optimizing the objective function itself. For this purpose, first, we aim to provide an upper bound on the AP \( n \)'s power consumption in Eq. (30).

**Lemma 3:** Let \( U(x) = e^x \times E_1(x) \) where \( E_1(x) \) is the exponential integral of order 1 defined in Eq. (9). Then, we have:

\[ e^x - 1 < \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} < \frac{e^{2x} - 1}{2}. \tag{33} \]

The proof is provided in Appendix I.

Using Lemma 3 we have the following upper bound on the objective function in Eq. (30).

\[
\arg \min_{F_{n,1}, \ldots, F_{n,M}} \sum_{m=1}^M b_{n,m} \| p_n - q_m \|^2 \times \frac{\frac{2F_{n,m}}{B \log_2(e)} - 1}{2}, \tag{34}
\]

s.t. \( \sum_{m=1}^M F_{n,m} = \int_{W_n} R_b f(\omega) d\omega = R_b v_n, \tag{35} \]

\( F_{n,m} \geq 0 \) for all \( m \in I_{BS}. \tag{36} \)

The following algorithm provides a systematic approach to yield the optimal solution to the
constrained optimization problem in Eqs. (34)-(36).

**Proposition 7:** For a given node deployment $P$, $Q$, and cell partitioning $W$, Algorithm 3 yields the optimal normalized flow matrix that minimizes the upper bound in Eq. (34) on the AP $n$’s power consumption under ergodic capacity assumption. The proof is provided in Appendix J.

Using properties we obtained in this section, a Power-Efficient Ergodic-based Lloyd (PEEL) Algorithm, as outlined in Algorithm 4, is proposed to minimize the wireless communication power consumption in Eq. (14) over node deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing.

**Proposition 8:** The PEEL algorithm is an iterative improvement algorithm and converges. The proof is provided in Appendix K.

V. EXPERIMENTS

Simulations are performed for a heterogeneous Rayleigh fading sensor network consisting of 15 APs, 3 BSs, and 1000 sensors. The sensors are uniformly distributed over the target region $\Omega$ which is a square area of size $10\text{km} \times 10\text{km}$. The bit-rate and the carrier wavelength are set to $R_b = 30\text{Kbps}$ and $\lambda_c = 3\text{m}$, respectively. We consider no system loss, i.e., $L_{\text{sensor}} = L_n = 1$ for all $n \in \mathcal{I}_{AP}$, and a transmitter antenna gain of $G_{t_{\text{sensor}}} = 1$ for all homogeneous sensors. We denote the transmitter and receiver antenna gains of AP $n$ by $G_{t_n}^{(AP)}$ and $G_{r_n}^{(AP)}$, respectively, and the receiver antenna gain of BS $m$ by $G_{r_m}^{(BS)}$. Let us denote $S_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10\}$, $S_2 = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13\}$, and $S_3 = \{1, 2\}$. Then, we set:

$$
G_{t_n}^{(AP)} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n \in S_1 \\ 4 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad G_{r_n}^{(AP)} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n \in S_2 \\ 4 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad G_{r_m}^{(BS)} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } m \in S_3 \\ 4 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
$$

We assume that all communication channels have a spectral width of $B = 500\text{KHz}$ and a spectral noise density of $\sigma = 2 \times 10^{-17}$ Watts/Hz. Note that the parameters $a_n$ and $b_{n,m}$ can be calculated from the experimental setup that is outlined above. For instance, we have $b_{6,2} = \frac{\sigma B \times (4\pi)^2 \times L_6}{G_{t_6}^{(AP)} \times G_{r_2}^{(BS)} \times \lambda_c^2} \approx 2.19 \times 10^{-11}$ Watts/m$^2$. The Lagrangian multiplier is set to $\lambda = 0.25$.

In Section V-A, we carry out the simulations for our primary objective function $D_1$ in Eqs. (6) and (7) where we have imposed an outage probability constraint of $\epsilon = 1\%$ on all wireless links. Subsequently, in Section V-B we perform the simulations for our secondary objective function $D_2$ in Eq. (14) and compare our proposed algorithms with state-of-the-art methods in the literature.
A. Heterogeneous WSNs with Outage Probability Constraints

In this section, we compare our proposed POOL Algorithm with cluster formation (CF) Algorithm [41], heterogeneous two-tier Lloyd (HTTL) Algorithm [25], particle swarm optimization (PSO) Algorithm [42], and virtual force (VFA) Algorithm [43]. The main motivation behind choosing these methods for comparison purposes is that they represent state-of-the-art methods...
in different strategy categories used by researchers for node deployment problems. The CF algorithm falls within the category of methods that take a graph-theoretic approach for load balancing and energy efficiency. The HTTL algorithm belongs to the family of geometric-based methods in which the target region is partitioned into several regions, one for each network node, based on a predefined measure of closeness. The PSO algorithm represents the class of meta-heuristic node deployment techniques in which optimization tools are used to find optimal node positions. Finally, the VFA algorithm is a prominent example of force-based techniques and has inspired numerous methods that achieve optimal deployment by applying virtual forces to relocate nodes. Table I summarizes the weighted transmission power consumption of the heterogeneous WSN outlined above for the CF, HTTL, POOL, PSO, and VFA algorithms. The POOL algorithm leads to a 590mW weighted power consumption value and outperforms all other methods. Notably, the POOL algorithm achieves a power consumption value that is less than half of the second best algorithm, i.e., the HTTL algorithm. This in turn prolongs the network lifetime by more than a factor of 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>HTTL</th>
<th>POOL</th>
<th>PSO</th>
<th>VFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Power Consumption (W)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3 shows the final node deployment results where APs and BSs are denoted by red squares and black circles, respectively. Next, we study the trade-off between sensors’ and APs’ power consumption that is parameterized by $\lambda$ in Eq. (6). For small values of $\lambda$, sensor power consumption is the dominant component of $D_1$; thus, it is more paramount to reduce the sensors’ power consumption rather than APs’ power consumption to minimize $D_1$. However, increasing $\lambda$ puts more weight on the APs’ power consumption. This effect is demonstrated in Fig. 2b where for the same initial node deployment, we increase the value of $\lambda$ from 0 to 1. As expected, increasing $\lambda$ reduces the APs’ power consumption but increases the sensors’ power consumption. Eq. (20) provides an alternative intuitive explanation for this observation because as $\lambda$ increases, APs tend to be closer to BSs and farther away from centroids and sensors.

B. Heterogeneous WSNs under Ergodic Capacity Assumption

Here, we compare our proposed PEEL algorithm with the CF, HTTL, PSO, and VFA algorithms introduced in Section V-A. However, instead of restricting all wireless links to have
an outage probability below $\epsilon = 1\%$, we consider the ergodic capacity for all communication channels. The result for each method can then be interpreted as the amount of power that can, on average, allow the flow of data in each link to pass through.

The weighted power consumption of these methods for the heterogeneous WSN under consideration is provided in Table II. The PEEL algorithm outperforms other methods and achieves a total weighted power consumption of 8.61mW. In particular, the PEEL algorithm improves the performance of the second best algorithm by more than a factor of 2 and yields a more sustainable WSN architecture. The AP-sensor power trade-off for the PEEL algorithm is depicted in Fig. 2b where for a fixed initial node deployment, $\lambda$ is increased from 0 to 1. Similar to what we observed for the POOL algorithm in Fig. 2a, increasing $\lambda$ puts more weight on the APs’ power consumption and makes it more important to optimize. This can also be inferred from Eq. (27) where APs become closer to BSs and farther from centroids as $\lambda$ increases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>HTTL</th>
<th>PEEL</th>
<th>PSO</th>
<th>VFA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Power Consumption (mW)</td>
<td>177.56</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>96.37</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some key factors contributing to the superior performance of both POOL and PEEL algorithms are worth noting: While according to the Shannon’s capacity formula, the required SNR for an error-free information transmission grows exponentially with the required bit-rate, most methods in the literature consider a linear approximation to this exponential behavior. Such a linear approximation results in an underestimation of the actual power consumption. In contrast, our approach in this work takes the exponential relationship between SNR and bit-rate into account. Another contributing factor is that this exponential relationship between the required transmission power and the flow of data is exploited in finding the optimal routing for data transfer in Algorithms 1 and 3 using Lemma 5.

VI. Conclusion

A heterogeneous Rayleigh fading sensor network is presented and discussed in which a set of access points act as relay nodes to facilitate the transfer of sensory data from sensors to base stations by the means of wireless communication. By considering both large-scale and small-scale propagation effects on the communication channels, our goal is to minimize the wireless transmission power consumption of the network for two different perspectives on the stochasticity of the channel: First, we impose a threshold on the outage probability of all wireless links and aim to minimize the network’s power consumption under such outage probability constraints. Second, we consider the ergodic capacity for all channels and aim to determine the optimal required transmission power for each sensor or access point such that the allocated transmission power to each channel can, on average, allow the flow of data in that channel to pass through. For each perspective, we derive the theoretical necessary conditions for the optimal deployment, cell partitioning, and data routing that minimizes the network’s power consumption and devise an iterative algorithm accordingly to deploy nodes. Simulation results show that our proposed node deployment algorithms significantly reduce the communication power consumption in such networks and achieve superior performance compared to other techniques in the literature.
**APPENDIX A**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION [1]**

For a fixed cell partitioning $W$ and data routing $R$, we can rewrite the objective function $D_1$ in Eq. (19) using the parallel axis theorem [44] as follows:

$$D_1(P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} \frac{a_n}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|c_n - \omega\|^2 \left(2 \frac{R_b}{\eta} - 1\right) f(\omega) d\omega$$

$$+ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{a_n}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|p_n - c_n\|^2 \left(2 \frac{R_b}{\eta} - 1\right) v_n$$

$$+ \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{b_{n,m}}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} \|p_n - q_m\|^2 \left(2 \frac{F_{n,m}}{B} - 1\right),$$

(38)

where $v_n$ and $c_n$ are the volume and centroid of region $W_n$, respectively. Since the optimal deployment satisfies the zero gradient condition, we take the partial derivatives of Eq. (38) with respect to AP and BS locations as follows. For each $n \in \mathcal{I}_{AP}$, we have:

$$\frac{\partial D_1}{\partial p_n^*} = \frac{2a_n}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} (p_n^* - c_n) \left(2 \frac{R_b}{\eta} - 1\right) v_n + \lambda \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{2b_{n,m}}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} (p_n^* - q_m^*) \left(2 \frac{F_{n,m}}{B} - 1\right) = 0.$$  

(39)

By solving Eq. (39), we directly obtain Eq. (20). Now, for each $m \in \mathcal{I}_{BS}$, we have:

$$\frac{\partial D_1}{\partial q_m^*} = \lambda \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{2b_{n,m}}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\right)} (q_m^* - p_n^*) \left(2 \frac{F_{n,m}}{B} - 1\right) = 0.$$  

(40)

By solving Eq. (40), we obtain Eq. (21) and the proof is complete. ■

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF OF LEMMA [1]**

First, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4:** For a constant $d \in \mathbb{R}$, the geometric locus of points $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$ that satisfy the equation

$$a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 = d,$$

(41)

is a line perpendicular to $\overline{p_i p_j}$ in case $a_i = a_j$, and either a circle centered at $c = \frac{a_i p_i - a_j p_j}{a_i - a_j}$ or an empty set in case $a_i \neq a_j$. 
Proof: First, we consider the case where $a_i = a_j = a$. Let $h$ be the projection of the point $\omega$ on the line $\overline{p_i p_j}$. Using Pythagoras’ theorem, we can rewrite Eq. (41) as follows:

$$\left(\|p_i - h\|^2 + \|h - \omega\|^2\right) - \left(\|p_j - h\|^2 + \|h - \omega\|^2\right) = \left(\|p_i - h\|^2 - \|p_j - h\|^2\right) = \frac{d}{a},$$

(42)

thus, any point $\omega$ whose projection on the line $\overline{p_i p_j}$ is $h$ satisfies Eq. (41). Therefore, the geometric locus of the point $\omega$ is a line perpendicular to the line $\overline{p_i p_j}$. Now, we consider the case where $a_i \neq a_j$. Let $p = (p_x, p_y)$ and $\omega = (\omega_x, \omega_y)$. We can rewrite Eq. (41) as:

$$(a_i - a_j)\left(\omega_x^2 + \omega_y^2\right) - 2(a_i p_{ix} - a_j p_{jx})\omega_x - 2(a_i p_{iy} - a_j p_{jy})\omega_y = d - (a_i\|p_i\|^2 - a_j\|p_j\|^2)$$

(43)

or equivalently:

$$\left[\omega_x - \frac{a_i p_{ix} - a_j p_{jx}}{a_i - a_j}\right]^2 + \left[\omega_y - \frac{a_i p_{iy} - a_j p_{jy}}{a_i - a_j}\right]^2 = d'$$

(44)

where $d' = \frac{d - (a_i\|p_i\|^2 - a_j\|p_j\|^2)}{a_i - a_j} + (a_i p_{ix} - a_j p_{jx})^2 + (a_i p_{iy} - a_j p_{jy})^2$. Hence, the geometric locus of the point $\omega$ is either an empty set if $d' < 0$ or a circle centered at $c = \frac{a_i p_{ix} - a_j p_{jx}}{a_i - a_j}$ with radius $\kappa = \sqrt{d'}$ and Lemma 4 is proved.

Now, we use proof by contradiction to establish Lemma 1. Let $V_i^*$ and $V_j^*$ be the volume of the neighboring regions $W_i^*$ and $W_j^*$, respectively, and assume that the optimal boundary $\delta_{i,j}^*$ is neither a segment if $a_i = a_j$, nor an arc in case $a_i \neq a_j$. Let $m_{i,j}(\alpha) = a p_i + (1 - \alpha)p_j$ and let $l_{i,j}(\alpha)$ be either a line perpendicular to $\overline{p_i p_j}$ at $m_{i,j}(\alpha)$ in case $a_i = a_j$, or a circle centered at $c_{i,j} = \frac{a p_i - a p_j}{a_i - a_j}$ and radius $\kappa_{i,j}(\alpha) = \|c_{i,j} - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|$ in case $a_i \neq a_j$. Now, we define:

$$W_i' = \{\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega_{i,j}^*, a_i\|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - \omega\|^2 \leq a_i\|p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2\}$$

(45)

$$W_j' = \{\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega_{i,j}^*, a_i\|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - \omega\|^2 \geq a_i\|p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2\}$$

(46)

where $\Omega_{i,j}^* = W_i^* \cup W_j^*$, and let $v_i'(\alpha)$ and $v_j'(\alpha)$ be the volume of regions $W_i'$ and $W_j'$, respectively. Note that since the sensor density function $f(\omega)$ is a continuous and differentiable function, both $v_i'(\alpha)$ and $v_j'(\alpha)$ are continuous functions of $\alpha$. As an intuition, note that the geometric locus of points $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^2$, such that $a_i\|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - \omega\|^2 = a_i\|p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2 - a_j\|p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha)\|^2$ holds, is $l_{i,j}(\alpha)$ according to Lemma 4. It readily follows from simple geometric reasoning that for $a_i \leq a_j$, we have $v_i'(\alpha)$ for large enough values of $\alpha$, and $v_j'(\alpha)$ for $\alpha = \frac{a_i}{a_i - a_j}$ that leads to $\kappa_{i,j}(\alpha) = 0$. Similarly, for $a_i > a_j$, we have $v_i'(\alpha)$ for $\alpha = \frac{a_i}{a_i - a_j}$ that leads to $\kappa_{i,j}(\alpha) = 0$. 


and \( v'_{j} = 0 \) for large enough values of \( \alpha \).

Using the above argument and the fact that \( v'_i(\alpha) + v'_j(\alpha) = v'_i + v'_j \), it readily follows that there exists an \( \alpha^* \) for which we have \( v'_i(\alpha^*) = v'_i \) and \( v'_j(\alpha^*) = v'_j \). Now, we define a new cell partitioning \( W'' = (W''_1, \ldots, W''_N) \) where \( W''_t = W'_t \) for \( t \notin \{i, j\} \), \( W''_i = W''_i(\alpha^*) \), and \( W''_j = W''_j(\alpha^*) \). Then, substituting \( W^* \) with \( W'' \) will increase the objective function by:

\[
\Delta = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W''_n} \frac{a_n}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \left\| p_n - \omega \right\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega \\
+ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} b_{i,j} \left\| p_i - q_j \right\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) \right]
\]

Note that \( W''_t = W'_t \) for \( t \notin \{i, j\} \) and \( v''_t = v'_t \) for all \( t \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \). Hence, we have:

\[
\frac{\Delta \times \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)}{\left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right)} = \left[ \int_{W''_1} a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W''_j} a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right]
- \left[ \int_{W''_1} a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W''_j} a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right].
\]

Let \( \mathcal{V}_1 = W''_1 \cap W^*_1 \) and \( \mathcal{V}_2 = W''_j \cap W^*_j \). Note that both \( \mathcal{V}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{V}_2 \) are non-empty; otherwise, we have \( W''_1 = W^*_1 \) and \( W''_j = W^*_j \) which contradicts the assumption that the optimal boundary \( \delta^*_{i,j} \) is not a segment or an arc. Now, we can rewrite Eq. (48) as follows:

\[
\frac{\Delta \times \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)}{\left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right)} = \left[ \int_{\mathcal{V}_1} a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{\mathcal{V}_2} a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right]
- \left[ \int_{\mathcal{V}_2} a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{\mathcal{V}_1} a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right]
= \int_{\mathcal{V}_1} \left( a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 - a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
+ \int_{\mathcal{V}_2} \left( a_j \left\| p_j - \omega \right\|^2 - a_i \left\| p_i - \omega \right\|^2 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
< \int_{\mathcal{V}_1} \left( a_i \left\| p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \right\|^2 - a_j \left\| p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \right\|^2 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
\]
where the inequality in (51) follows from Lemma 4 and the fact that both $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$ are non-empty. Also, Eq. (53) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$ have the same volume because $v_i'' = v_i'$ and $v_j'' = v_j'$. Since $0 < \epsilon < 1$ and $R_0 > 0$, it follows from Eqs. (49)–(53) that
\[
\frac{\Delta \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)}{(2^{\frac{R_0}{\pi}} - 1)} < 0 \quad \implies \quad \Delta < 0,
\]
that is, the increase in the objective function is negative. Thus, $W''$ yields a lower objective function than that of $W^*$ which contradicts the optimality of $W^*$ and the proof is complete. \qed

**APPENDIX C**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION**

According to Lemma 1, the optimal boundary $\delta_{i,j}^*$, which intersects the line $p_ip_j$ at $h_{i,j}^*$, is either a segment if $a_i = a_j$, or an arc with its center placed at $c = \frac{a_ip_i-a_jp_j}{a_i-a_j}$ if $a_i \neq a_j$. Let $\alpha^*$ be the scalar that satisfies the equation $\alpha^* p_i + (1 - \alpha^*) p_j = h_{i,j}^*$. For an infinitesimal $\gamma > 0$, let $\alpha' = \alpha^* - \gamma$. Then, we define a new cell partitioning $W' = (W_1', \ldots, W_N')$ as follows:
\[
W_i' = \{ \omega \mid \omega \in \Omega_{i,j}^*, a_i \parallel p_i - \omega \parallel^2 - a_j \parallel p_j - \omega \parallel^2 \leq a_i \parallel p_i - h_{i,j}' \parallel^2 - a_j \parallel p_j - h_{i,j}' \parallel^2 \},
\]
\[
W_j' = \{ \omega \mid \omega \in \Omega_{i,j}^*, a_i \parallel p_i - \omega \parallel^2 - a_j \parallel p_j - \omega \parallel^2 \geq a_i \parallel p_i - h_{i,j}' \parallel^2 - a_j \parallel p_j - h_{i,j}' \parallel^2 \},
\]
and $W_t' = W_t^*$ for $t \notin \{i,j\}$, where $\Omega_{i,j}^* = W_i^* \cup W_j^*$ and $h_{i,j}' = \alpha' p_i + (1 - \alpha') p_j$. Note that the infinitesimal difference between $\alpha^*$ and $\alpha'$ leads to an infinitesimal difference between volumes of these new regions, i.e., $v_i' = v_i^* + dv$ and $v_j' = v_j^* - dv$, where $v_i'$ and $v_j'$ are the volume of $W_i'$ and $W_j'$, respectively, and $dv$ is the volume of the region $dW = W_i' - W_i^* = W_j^* - W_j'$. By substituting $W^*$ with $W'$, the increase in sensor power consumption can be written as:
\[
\Delta_1 = \int_{W_i'} \frac{a_i}{(1-\epsilon)} \parallel p_i - \omega \parallel^2 \left( 2^{\frac{R_0}{\pi}} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W_j'} \frac{a_j}{(1-\epsilon)} \parallel p_j - \omega \parallel^2 \left( 2^{\frac{R_0}{\pi}} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
\]
\[
- \int_{W_i^*} \frac{a_i}{(1-\epsilon)} \parallel p_i - \omega \parallel^2 \left( 2^{\frac{R_0}{\pi}} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega - \int_{W_j^*} \frac{a_j}{(1-\epsilon)} \parallel p_j - \omega \parallel^2 \left( 2^{\frac{R_0}{\pi}} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
\]
\[
+ \int_{W_i}' \left( a_j \parallel p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \parallel^2 - a_i \parallel p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \parallel^2 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
\]
\[
= \left( a_i \parallel p_i - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \parallel^2 - a_j \parallel p_j - m_{i,j}(\alpha^*) \parallel^2 \right) \times \left( \int_{W_i} f(\omega) d\omega - \int_{W_i'} f(\omega) d\omega \right)
\]
\[
= 0,
\]
where Eq. (63) follows from the relations

\[
\Delta_1 = \int_{dW} \frac{a_i}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_i - \omega\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega - \int_{dW} \frac{a_j}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_j - \omega\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega
\]

(58)

\[
= \int_{dW} \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right) \left[ a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega.
\]

(59)

It follows from Lemma 4 and the definition of \( W'_i \) and \( W'_j \) in Eqs. (55) and (56) that for an infinitesimal region \( dW \), we have:

\[
\Delta_1 = \int_{dW} \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right) \left[ a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) f(\omega) d\omega + O(dv^2)
\]

(60)

\[
= \frac{1}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \left[ a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) dv + O(dv^2).
\]

(61)

Now, substituting \( W^* \) with \( W' \) results in the following increase in AP power consumption:

\[
\Delta_2 = \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v'_i}{B} - 1 \right) + \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v'_j}{B} - 1 \right)
\]

\[
- \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v'_i}{B} - 1 \right) - \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \left( 2 \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v'_j}{B} - 1 \right)
\]

(62)

\[
= \sum_{t=1}^{M} \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right) \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v'_i}{B} \times \left( 2 \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v'_i}{B} - 1 \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{t=1}^{M} \ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right) \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v'_j}{B} \times \left( 2 \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v'_j}{B} - 1 \right),
\]

(63)

where Eq. (63) follows from the relations \( v'_i = v_i^* + dv \) and \( v'_j = v_j^* - dv \). Using the Taylor series expansion, we can write Eq. (63) as follows:

\[
\Delta_2 = \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v'_i}{B} \times \ln \left( 2 \right) \times \frac{r_{i,t} R_b dv}{B}
\]

\[
- \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v'_j}{B} \times \ln \left( 2 \right) \times \frac{r_{j,t} R_b dv}{B} + O(dv^2),
\]

(64)

where \( O(dv^2) \) contains terms of second and higher order in Taylor series approximation. By combining Eqs. (61) and (64), the total increase in objective function due to substituting \( W^* \) with \( W' \) is given by \( \Delta = \Delta_1 + \lambda \Delta_2 \), that is:

\[
\Delta = \frac{1}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \left[ a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) dv
\]
+ \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{i,t}R_b^{*v_i}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{i,t}R_bdv}{B} \\
- \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{j,t}}{\ln \left( \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \right)} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{j,t}R_b^{*v_j}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{j,t}R_bdv}{B} + \mathcal{O}(dv^2) \geq 0, \quad (65)

where the last inequality follows from the optimality of \( W^* \). By dividing \( \Delta \) by \( dv \) and taking the limit \( dv \to 0 \), the term \( \mathcal{O}(dv^2) \) vanishes and we have:

\[
\left[ a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^{*}\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^{*}\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) \\
+ \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} b_{i,t} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{i,t}R_b^{*v_i}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{i,t}R_bdv}{B} \\
- \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} b_{j,t} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{j,t}R_b^{*v_j}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{j,t}R_bdv}{B} \geq 0. \quad (66)
\]

By defining \( \alpha'' = \alpha^* + \gamma \) for an infinitesimal \( \gamma > 0 \) and repeating the same procedure, we obtain:

\[
\left[ a_i \|p_i - h_{i,j}^{*}\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - h_{i,j}^{*}\|^2 \right] \left( 2 \frac{R_b}{\pi} - 1 \right) \\
+ \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} b_{i,t} \|p_i - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{i,t}R_b^{*v_i}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{i,t}R_bdv}{B} \\
- \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} b_{j,t} \|p_j - q_t\|^2 \times 2 \frac{r_{j,t}R_b^{*v_j}}{B} \times \ln (2) \times \frac{r_{j,t}R_bdv}{B} \leq 0. \quad (67)
\]

By combining Eqs. (66) and (67), we obtain Eq. (22) and the proof is complete. \( \blacksquare \)

**APPENDIX D**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3**

First, we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 5:** Let \( g(x) = ax^x + aC^{-x} \) where \( x \in [0, C] \) for \( a, C \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) and \( a > 1 \). Then, \( g(.) \) is symmetric around the point \( x = \frac{C}{2} \) and strictly decreasing in the interval \( [0, \frac{C}{2}] \).

**Proof:** The function \( g(.) \) is symmetric because \( g(x) = g(C-x) \). Now, by taking the derivative w.r.t. \( x \), we have \( \frac{d}{dx} g(x) = \ln(a) \times (a^x - aC^{-x}) \). Since \( a > 1 \), we have \( \frac{d}{dx} g(x) < 0 \) for \( x \in [0, \frac{C}{2}] \) and the proof is complete. \( \blacksquare \)

Lemma 5 readily leads to the following conclusion.

**Corollary 1:** Let \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) be two non-negative real numbers such that \( x_1 + x_2 = C \) is a constant. Then, for \( a > 1 \), decreasing \( |x_1 - x_2| \) results in smaller \( ax_1 + ax_2 \) values.
Now, we proceed to establish Proposition 3. Note that the constrained objective function formulation in Eqs. (23)–(25) is equivalent to

\[
\arg\min_{F_{n,1}, \ldots, F_{n,M}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} 2 \left[ \frac{F_{n,i}}{B} + \log_2 \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \right],
\]

subject to \[
\sum_{i=1}^{M} F_{n,i} = \int W_n R_b f(\omega) d\omega = R_b v_n, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{n,i} \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in I_{BS},
\]

which is equivalent to the following constrained objective function formulation:

\[
\arg\min_{x_{n,1}, \ldots, x_{n,M}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} 2^{x_{n,i}},
\]

subject to \[
\sum_{i=1}^{M} x_{n,i} = \frac{R_b v_n}{B} + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \log_2 \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) = C,
\]

\[
x_{n,i} \geq \log_2 \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, M\},
\]

where \( x_{n,i} = \frac{F_{n,i}}{B} + \log_2 \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \). Corollary 1 indicates that for any two indices \( i \) and \( j \), we can decrease the objective function in Eq. (70) by decreasing \( |x_{n,i} - x_{n,j}| \) while keeping their summation constant. Thus, the minimum occurs when we have \( x_{n,1} = \cdots = x_{n,M} = \frac{C}{M} \).

However, this may contradict the constraint in Eq. (72) for some indices \( i \in \{1, \ldots, M\} \). Therefore, we can always improve the objective function in Eq. (70) and achieve a lower value by decreasing the distance between any pair of \( x_{n,i} \) and \( x_{n,j} \) while keeping their summation constant as long as the constraints in Eq. (72) is not contradicted. This observation results in

**Corollary 2:** Let \( X^*_n = (x^*_{n,1}, \ldots, x^*_{n,M}) \) be the optimal solution to the constrained objective function in Eqs. (70)–(72). Then, there exist unique sets \( I^*_L \) and \( I^*_U \) such that

\[
x^*_{n,i} = x^*_{n,j} = x^* \quad \text{for } \forall i, j \in I^*_U, \quad \text{and} \quad x^*_{n,i} = \log_2 \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \quad \text{for } \forall i \in I^*_L,
\]

and \( x^*_{n,i} > x^* \) for all \( i \in I^*_L \).

To see why the last property holds, first, let us assume that we have \( x^*_{n,j} = \log_2 \left( b_{n,j} \| p_n - q_j \|^2 \right) \) for all \( j \in I^*_U \). Since \( v_n > 0 \), it follows that

\[
\sum_{t=1}^{M} x^*_{n,t} \geq \sum_{t \in I^*_U} x^*_{n,t} + \sum_{t \in I^*_L} x^*_{n,t} = \sum_{t=1}^{M} \log_2 \left( b_{n,t} \| p_n - q_t \|^2 \right) < C,
\]

which is in contradiction with Eq. (71). Hence, there exists an index \( j' \in I^*_U \) for which \( x^*_{n,j'} >
log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right). Now, assume that there exists an index \( i \) such that \( x^*_n,i = \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) < \bar{x}^* = x^*_{n,j}. \) Then, according to Corollary 1, we can achieve a lower objective function by replacing \( x^*_n,i \) and \( x^*_{n,j} \) with \( x^*_n,i + \eta \) and \( x^*_n,j - \eta \) for any \( 0 < \eta < x^*_n,j - \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_j \|^2 \right) \), which contradicts the optimality of \( X^* \). Thus, we have \( x^*_n,i > \bar{x}^* \) for all \( i \in I_L^* \).

Corollary 2 indicates that in an optimal solution, all \( x^*_n,t \) values should be equal to some value \( x^* \) except for those that cannot get close enough to \( x^* \) without contradicting Eq. (72). Hence, the optimal solution can be found using a water filling algorithm as follows. By initializing \( I_L \) to an empty set and starting from the case in which all \( x^*_n,t \) values are equal to the mean value \( x = \frac{C}{M} \), we can identify those indices such as \( i \in I \) for which \( x^*_n,i < \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right). \) Thus, \( I \) provides the first series of indices for which the value of \( x^*_n,i \) cannot be reduced enough to the mean value \( x \) without contradicting the constraint in Eq. (72). Therefore, the optimal value for each \( i \in I \) is \( x^*_n,i = \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \) and we update the set \( I_L \) by taking its union with the set \( I \). Now, we can update the mean value \( \bar{x} \) such that \( \sum_{i \in I_L \setminus I_L^*} \bar{x} + \sum_{i \in I_L} x^*_n,i \) or equivalently \( (M - |I_L|) \times \bar{x} + \sum_{i \in I_L} \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \) still sums to \( C \). By using the new mean value \( \bar{x} \), we can determine the next series of indices that would belong to \( I_L \) and the same procedure can be repeated. Note that in each iteration, the mean value \( \bar{x} \) either decreases or stays the same and the set \( I_L \) either increases in size or stays the same. If \( I_L \) stays the same, meaning that there has been no other index that would contradict Eq. (72), then we have found the optimal solution and the algorithm terminates. Since \( |I_L| \leq M \), the process of \( I_L \) increasing in size can continue for at most \( M \) iterations and the algorithm will finally converge to the optimal value \( X^*_n \) that satisfies Eq. (73) in Corollary 2. The above procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that the optimal values \( F^*_n,1, \ldots, F^*_n,M \) in Eqs. (68) and (69) can then be found as \( F^*_n,i = B \times \left[ x^*_n,i - \log₂ \left( \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \right] \) and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX E**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4**

First, we aim to prove the convergence of the initialization step that is outlined in Algorithm 2. Note that the generalized Voronoi diagram \( \mathcal{V} \) in Algorithm 2 provides the optimal cell partitioning for the following cost function:

\[
\mathcal{D}'(P, W) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} a_n \| p_n - \omega \|^2 f(\omega) d\omega.
\]
Thus, for a fixed AP deployment $P$, updating $W$ according to $V$ does not increase the cost function $D'$. Now, using the parallel axis theorem, we can rewrite Eq. (75) as follows:

$$D'(P, W) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} a_n \|p_n - c_n\|^2 f(\omega)d\omega + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} a_n \|c_n - \omega\|^2 f(\omega)d\omega. \quad (76)$$

Hence, for a fixed cell partitioning $W$, updating $P$ according to the rule $p_n = c_n = \frac{\int_{W_n} \omega f(\omega)d\omega}{\int_{W_n} f(\omega)d\omega}$ does not increase the cost function $D'$ in Eq. (76) as well. Therefore, by iterating this process, a sequence of non-increasing $D'$ values are generated and since $D' \geq 0$, it will converge.

Note that base stations are initialized by applying the Lloyd algorithm to the set of AP points, which is known to converge. Finally, the normalized flow matrix $R$ is updated by applying Algorithm 1, which we showed to converge in Appendix D. Thus, the initialization step which is outlined in Algorithm 2 will eventually converge.

Now, to establish the convergence of the POOL algorithm, we show that none of the three steps corresponding to updating the node deployment, cell partitioning, and normalized flow matrix will increase the objective function $D_1$. Note that when $W$, $R$, $Q$, and $\{p_j\}_{j \neq i}$ are fixed, the objective function $D_1$ is a convex function of $p_i$; thus, updating $p_i$ according to Eq. (20), which is the solution to the zero-gradient equation, does not increase the objective function. Similarly, once $W$, $R$, $P$, and $\{q_j\}_{j \neq i}$ are fixed, $D_1$ is a convex function of $q_i$. Therefore, updating $q_i$ according to Eq. (21), which is the solution to the zero-gradient equation, does not increase $D_1$. Hence, the node deployment step of the POOL algorithm does not increase the objective function. Note that the cell partitioning is updated through an iterative process where at each step, two neighboring regions such as $W_i$ and $W_j$ are selected and their boundary is adjusted. More precisely, in each iteration, all $W_t$ regions for $t \notin \{i, j\}$ are held fixed and only the boundary $\delta_{i,j}$ between regions $W_i$ and $W_j$ is adjusted to provide another partitioning of the region $\Omega_{i,j} = W_i \cup W_j$. According to Proposition 2, this new partitioning is optimal; hence, the objective function $D_1$ will not increase as a result of updating $\delta_{i,j}$. Finally, Proposition 3 indicates that updating the normalized flow matrix according to Algorithm 1 yields the optimal value of $R$ and as such, $D_1$ will either remain the same or decrease. Therefore, Algorithm 2 generates a non-increasing sequence of $D_1$ values in each iteration, i.e., the POOL algorithm is an iterative improvement algorithm and since $D_1 \geq 0$, it will converge.
**APPENDIX F**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION**

Using the parallel axis theorem, we can rewrite the objective function $D_2$ in Eq. (26) as

$$D_2(P, Q, W, R) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n} \frac{a_n}{U-1\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|c_n - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega$$

$$+ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{a_n}{U-1\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_n - c_n\|^2 v_n$$

$$+ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,j}}{U-1\left(\frac{F_{i,j}}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_i - q_j\|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (77)

Since the optimal deployment satisfies the zero-gradient equation, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_{AP}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i^*} D_2 = 2a_i \frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)} \left(p_i^* - c_i\right) v_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{2b_{i,j}}{U-1\left(\frac{F_{i,j}}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \left(p_i^* - q_j^*\right) = 0. \hspace{1cm} (78)$$

Similarly, by taking the derivative with respect to the location of BS $i \in \mathcal{I}_{BS}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i^*} D_2 = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{2b_{j,i}}{U-1\left(\frac{F_{j,i}}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \left(q_i^* - p_j^*\right) = 0. \hspace{1cm} (79)$$

By solving these two equations, we obtain Eqs. (27) and (28) and the proof is complete. 

**APPENDIX G**

**PROOF OF LEMMA**

The proof closely follows that of Lemma 1, thus, we borrow the notations and definitions outlined in Appendix B. More precisely, by using the proof by contradiction, we consider $W'_i$ and $W'_j$ as defined in Eqs. (45) and (46), respectively, and define the cell partitioning $W''$ similarly. Now, we can rewrite Eq. (47) to calculate the increase in objective function $D_2$ due to substituting $W^*$ with $W''$ as follows:

$$\Delta = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n''} \frac{a_n}{U-1\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_n - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,j}}{U-1\left(\frac{r_{i,j}R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_i - q_j\|^2 \right]$$

$$- \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{W_n'} \frac{a_n}{U-1\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_n - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,j}}{U-1\left(\frac{r_{i,j}R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_i - q_j\|^2 \right]. \hspace{1cm} (80)$$
Since $W''_t = W'_t$ for $t \notin \{i, j\}$ and $v''_t = v'_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we have:

$$U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \times \Delta = \left[ \int_{W''_i} a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W''_j} a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right]$$

$$- \left[ \int_{W'_i} a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W'_j} a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega \right]. \quad (81)$$

Note that the right-hand-side of Eq. (81) is the same as the right-hand-side of Eq. (48) which is shown to be less than zero in Eqs. (49)–(53). Thus, since $U^{-1}(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$, we have

$$U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \times \Delta < 0 \quad \implies \quad \Delta < 0,$$

which contradicts the optimality of $W^*$ and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX H**

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6**

As shown in Lemma 2, the optimal boundary $\delta^*_i$ is a segment if $a_i = a_j$, or an arc with its center located at $c = \frac{a_i p_i - a_j p_j}{a_i - a_j}$ if $a_i \neq a_j$. Let $h^*_{i,j}$ be the intersection point of $\delta^*_{i,j}$ and the line $p_i p_j$ which corresponds to the scalar $\alpha^*$ that satisfies the equation $\alpha^* p_i + (1 - \alpha^*) p_j = h^*_{i,j}$. For a small and positive $\gamma > 0$, let $\alpha' = \alpha^* - \gamma$ and define the new cell partitioning $W' = (W'_1, \ldots, W'_N)$ as $W'_t = W'_t$ for $t \notin \{i, j\}$ and

$$W'_i = \{ \omega \mid \omega \in \Omega^*_i, a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 \leq a_i \| p_i - h^*_{i,j} \|^2 - a_j \| p_j - h^*_{i,j} \|^2 \}, \quad (83)$$

$$W'_j = \{ \omega \mid \omega \in \Omega^*_j, a_i \|p_i - \omega\|^2 - a_j \|p_j - \omega\|^2 \geq a_i \| p_i - h^*_{i,j} \|^2 - a_j \| p_j - h^*_{i,j} \|^2 \}, \quad (84)$$

where $\Omega^*_{i,j} = W^*_i \cup W^*_j$ and $h^*_{i,j} = \alpha' p_i + (1 - \alpha') p_j$. The infinitesimal difference between $\alpha^*$ and $\alpha'$ causes infinitesimal difference between volumes of regions $W'_i$ and $W'_j$, i.e., $v'_i$ and $v'_j$, and volumes of regions $W^*_i$ and $W^*_j$. In other words, if $dV$ is the volume of the region

$$dV = W'_i - W^*_i = W'_j - W^*_j,$$

we have $v'_i = v^*_i + dv$ and $v'_j = v^*_j - dv$. The increase in the sensor power consumption due to replacing $W^*$ by $W'$ is then given by

$$\Delta_1 = \int_{W'_i} U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \frac{a_i}{\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_i - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega + \int_{W'_j} U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \frac{a_j}{\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_j - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega$$

$$- \int_{W^*_i} U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \frac{a_i}{\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_i - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega - \int_{W^*_j} U^{-1}\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right) \frac{a_j}{\left(\frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)}\right)} \|p_j - \omega\|^2 f(\omega) d\omega, \quad (85)$$
which can be simplified to
\[
\Delta_1 = \int dW \frac{1}{U-1 \left( \frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \left[ a_i \| p_i - \omega \|^2 - a_j \| p_j - \omega \|^2 \right] f(\omega) d\omega.
\] (86)

Using Lemma 4 and the definition of \( W'_i \) and \( W'_j \) in Eqs. (83) and (84), it readily follows that
\[
\Delta_1 = \frac{1}{U-1 \left( \frac{R_b}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \left[ a_i \| p_i - h_{i,j}^* \|^2 - a_j \| p_j - h_{i,j}^* \|^2 \right] dv + \mathcal{O}(dv^2),
\] (87)

where \( \mathcal{O}(dv^2) \) includes terms of second and higher order. The increase in AP power consumption due to substituting \( W^* \) with \( W' \) can be written as
\[
\Delta_2 = \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t} \| p_i - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} dv + \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{j,t} \| p_j - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} dv
\]
\[= \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t} \| p_i - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} dv \right] + \mathcal{O}(dv^2),
\] (88)

For the function \( U(x) = e^x E_1(x) \), we have
\[
\frac{d}{dx} U(x) = e^x E_1(x) + e^x \times \frac{e^x}{x} = U(x) - \frac{1}{x}
\]
and
\[
\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} \right) = \frac{-(U^{-1})'(x)}{[U^{-1}(x)]^2} = \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} \times U'(U^{-1}(x)) = \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)[1 - x U^{-1}(x)]}.
\] (89)

Now, using Taylor series expansion, we can rewrite \( \Delta_2 \) in Eq. (88) as follows:
\[
\Delta_2 = \sum_{t=1}^{M} \left[ \frac{b_{i,t} \| p_i - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \times \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right] \right] dv
\]
\[= \sum_{t=1}^{M} \left[ \frac{b_{j,t} \| p_j - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \times \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{j,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right] \right] dv + \mathcal{O}(dv^2),
\] (90)

where \( \mathcal{O}(dv^2) \) contains terms of second and higher order in Taylor series expansion. Thus, the total increase in the objective function is given by \( \Delta = \Delta_1 + \lambda \Delta_2 \). Since the cell partitioning \( W^* \) is optimal, the increase in the objective function due to replacing \( W^* \) by \( W' \) cannot be negative; thus, we have \( \Delta \geq 0 \). Therefore, by dividing \( \Delta \) by \( dv > 0 \) and taking the limit \( dv \to 0 \), the term \( \mathcal{O}(dv^2) \) vanishes and we have
\[
\sum_{t=1}^{M} \frac{b_{i,t} \| p_i - q_t \|^2}{U-1 \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right)} \times \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_0 v}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right]
\]
From Eq. (95) it readily follows that
\[
U \geq U^{-1} \left( \frac{a_j}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \|p_j - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v_j^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v_j^*}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{j,t} R_b v_j^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right].
\] (91)

Now, by defining \( \alpha'' = \alpha^* + \gamma \) for an infinitesimal \( \gamma > 0 \) and repeating the same argument, we obtain \( \Delta \leq 0 \) and the inequality sign in Eq. (91) will be reversed, i.e., we have
\[
\leq U^{-1} \left( \frac{a_i}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \|p_i - h_{i,j}^*\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{M} U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v_i^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \left[ 1 - \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v_i^*}{B \log_2(e)} \times U^{-1} \left( \frac{r_{i,t} R_b v_i^*}{B \log_2(e)} \right) \right].
\] (92)

The two inequalities in Eqs. (91) and (92) yield Eq. (29) and the proof is complete.

**APPENDIX I**

**PROOF OF LEMMA 3**

First, we show that the function \( U(x) \) is strictly decreasing. For this purpose, we have:
\[
\frac{d}{dx} U(x) = e^x E_1(x) + e^x \times \left( - \frac{e^{-x}}{x} \right) = e^x E_1(x) - \frac{1}{x} < 0,
\] (93)
where the last inequality follows from the inequality \( xe^x E_1(x) < 1 \) in [45]. Note that for \( y > 0 \), the function \( U(y) = e^y E_1(y) \) satisfies the following inequalities [45], [46]:
\[
\frac{1}{2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2}{y} \right) < U(y) < \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{y} \right).
\] (94)

It readily follows from Eq. (94) that both domain and range of the function \( U(y) \) is \((0, \infty)\). Since \( U(y) \) is strictly decreasing, it is invertible and we define \( y = U^{-1}(x) \). Substituting \( y = U^{-1}(x) \) and \( x = U(y) \) in Eq. (94), we obtain:
\[
\frac{1}{2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2}{U^{-1}(x)} \right) < x < \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} \right).
\] (95)

From Eq. (95) it readily follows that
\[
\frac{1}{2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2}{U^{-1}(x)} \right) < x \quad \implies \quad \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} < \frac{e^{2x} - 1}{2},
\] (96)
\[
x < \ln \left( 1 + \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)} \right) \quad \implies \quad e^x - 1 < \frac{1}{U^{-1}(x)},
\] (97)
which concludes the proof.
APPENDIX J

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 7

The proof closely follows that of Proposition 3, thus, we borrow the notations and definitions outlined in Appendix D. We can rewrite the constrained objective function formulation in Eqs. (34)-(36) as

\[ \arg \min_{F_{n,1},\ldots,F_{n,M}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{2F_{n,i}} + \ln \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \],

(98)

s.t. \[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} F_{n,i} = \int_{W_n} R_b f(\omega) d\omega = R_b v_n, \quad \text{and} \quad F_{n,i} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{I}_{BS}. \] (99)

The above constrained objective function formulation can be rewritten as

\[ \arg \min_{x_{n,1},\ldots,x_{n,M}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} e^{x_{n,i}} \]

(100)

s.t. \[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} x_{n,i} = \frac{2R_b v_n}{B \log_2(e)} + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \ln \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) = S, \] (101)

\[ x_{n,i} \geq \ln \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}, \] (102)

where \( x_{n,i} = \frac{2F_{n,i}}{B \log_2(e)} + \ln \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \). According to Corollary 1, the objective function in Eq. (100) can be decreased by reducing \( |x_{n,i} - x_{n,j}| \) while keeping their summation unaltered. Hence, the minimum occurs when we have \( x_{n,1} = \cdots = x_{n,M} = \frac{S}{M} \). However, it is crucial to make sure that the constraints in Eqs. (101) and (102) are not contradicted. Hence, using the same argument as in Corollary 2, we have:

**Corollary 3:** Let \( X_{n}^* = (x_{n,1}^*, \ldots, x_{n,M}^*) \) be the optimal solution to the constrained objective function in Eqs. (100)-(102). Then, there exist unique sets \( J_U^* \) and \( J_L^* \) such that

\[ x_{n,i}^* = x_{n,j}^* = \bar{x}^* \quad \text{for } \forall i, j \in J_U^*, \quad \text{and} \quad x_{n,i}^* = \ln \left( b_{n,i} \| p_n - q_i \|^2 \right) \quad \text{for } \forall i \in J_L^*, \]

(103)

and \( x_{n,i}^* > \bar{x}^* \) for all \( i \in J_L^* \).

Corollary 3 indicates that all \( x_{n,i}^* \) values are equal to some value \( \bar{x}^* \) in the optimal solution except the ones that cannot get close enough to \( \bar{x}^* \) without contradicting Eq. (102). Hence, the same arguments and the water filling algorithm explained in Appendix D, with the modification of replacing \( \log_2(.) \) with natural logarithm, can be used to determine the optimal solution. This procedure is exactly what is outlined in Algorithm 3 which concludes the proof. \( \blacksquare \)
APPENDIX K
PROOF OF PROPOSITION 8

The proof of convergence for the initialization step is similar to that of Proposition 1 in Appendix E and is omitted here. In what follows, we demonstrate that none of the three steps in the PEEL algorithm will increase the objective function $D_2$. Note that the term in Eq. (27) is the solution to the zero-gradient equation; thus, for a fixed $W$, $R$, $Q$, and $\{p_j\}_{j \neq i}$, updating $p_i$ according to Eq. (27) does not increase the objective function. Similarly, updating $q_i$ according to Eq. (28) does not increase the objective function. Therefore, updating node deployment according to the PEEL Algorithm will not increase $D_2$. Note that cell partitioning is updated iteratively in the PEEL algorithm as follows: in each iteration, two adjacent regions are selected and their common boundary is adjusted according to the optimal necessary condition; thus, the objective function either remains the same or decreases at each iteration. In the last step, the optimal routing that minimizes the upper bound on AP power consumption is calculated. If the resulting routing leads to a decrease in the original objective function, it will be preserved; otherwise, it will be discarded. Hence, the objective function does not increase as a result of the data routing update rule. Hence, Algorithm [4] generates a non-increasing sequence of $D_2$ values, which proves its convergence since $D_2$ is bounded from below by 0.
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