Coverage and Lifetime Optimization
in Heterogeneous Energy Wireless Sensor Networks

Ali Kadhum Idrees, Karine Deschinkel, Michel Salomon, and Raphaël Couturier

FEMTO-ST Institute, UMR 6174 CNRS

University of Franche-Comté

Belfort, France

Email: ali.idness@edu.univ-fcomte.fr, {karine.deschinkel, michel.salomon, raphael.couturier}@univ-fcomte.fr

Abstract—One of the fundamental challenges in Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) is the coverage preservation and the extension of the network lifetime continuously and effectively when monitoring a certain area (or region) of interest. In this paper, a coverage optimization protocol to improve the lifetime in heterogeneous energy wireless sensor networks is proposed. The area of interest is first divided into subregions using a divide-and-conquer method and then the scheduling of sensor node activity is planned for each subregion. The proposed scheduling considers rounds during which a small number of nodes, remaining active for sensing, is selected to ensure coverage. Each round consists in four phases: (i) Information Exchange, (ii) Leader Election, (iii) Decision, and (iv) Sensing. The decision process is carried out by a leader node, which solves an integer program. Simulation results show that the proposed approach can prolong the network lifetime and improve the coverage performance.

Keywords-Wireless Sensor Networks; Area Coverage; Network Lifetime; Optimization; Scheduling.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent years have witnessed significant advances in wireless communications and embedded micro-sensing Micro-Electro-Mechanical Systems (MEMS) technologies which have led to the emergence of Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) as one of the most promising technologies [1]. In fact, they present huge potential in several domains ranging from health care applications to military applications. A sensor network is composed of a large number of tiny sensing devices deployed in a region of interest. Each device has processing and wireless communication capabilities, which enable it to sense its environment, to compute, to store information and to deliver report messages to a base station [2]. One of the main design issues in WSNs is to prolong the network lifetime, while achieving acceptable quality of service for applications. Indeed, sensors nodes have limited resources in terms of memory, energy and computational power.

Since sensor nodes have limited battery life; since it is impossible to replace batteries, especially in remote and hostile environments, it is desirable that a WSN should be deployed with high density because spatial redundancy can then be exploited to increase the lifetime of the network. In such a high density network, if all sensor nodes were to be activated at the same time, the lifetime would be reduced. To extend the lifetime of the network, the main idea is to take advantage of the overlapping sensing regions of some sensor nodes to save energy by turning off some of them during the sensing phase [3]. Obviously, the deactivation of nodes is only relevant if the coverage of the monitored area is not affected. In this paper, we concentrate on the area coverage problem [4], with the objective of maximizing the network lifetime by using an adaptive scheduling. The area of interest is divided into subregions and an activity scheduling for sensor nodes is planned for each subregion. In fact, the nodes in a subregion can be seen as a cluster where each node sends sensing data to the cluster head or the sink node. Furthermore, the activities in a subregion/cluster can continue even if another cluster stops due to too many node failures. Our scheduling scheme considers rounds, where a round starts with a discovery phase to exchange information between sensors of the subregion, in order to choose in a suitable manner a sensor node to carry out a coverage strategy. This coverage strategy involves the solving of an integer program, which provides the activation of the sensors for the sensing phase of the current round.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews the related work in the field. Section III is devoted to the scheduling strategy for energy-efficient coverage. Section IV gives the coverage model formulation, which is used to schedule the activation of sensors. Section V shows the simulation results obtained using the discrete event simulator OMNeT++ [5]. They fully demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed approach. Finally, we give concluding remarks and some suggestions for future works in Section VI.

II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we only review some recent works dealing with the coverage lifetime maximization problem, where the objective is to optimally schedule sensors' activities in order to extend WSNs lifetime. Vu [6] proposed a novel distributed heuristic, called Distributed Energy-efficient Scheduling for k-coverage (DESK), which ensures that the energy consumption among the sensors is balanced and the lifetime maximized while the coverage requirement is maintained. This heuristic works in rounds, requires only 1-hop neighbor information, and each sensor decides its status (active or sleep) based on the perimeter coverage model proposed by Huang and Tseng [7]. More recently, Shibo et al. [8] expressed the coverage problem as a minimum weight submodular set cover problem and proposed a Distributed Truncated Greedy Algorithm (DTGA) to solve it. They take, in particular, advantage from

both temporal and spatial correlations between data sensed by different sensors.

The works presented in [9], [10], [11] focus on the definition of coverage-aware, distributed energy-efficient and distributed clustering methods respectively. They aim to extend the network lifetime while ensuring the coverage. S. Misra et al. [3] proposed a localized algorithm which conserves energy and coverage by activating the subset of sensors with the minimum overlapping area. It preserves the network connectivity thanks to the formation of the network backbone. J. A. Torkestani [12] designed a Learning Automata-based Energy-Efficient Coverage protocol (LAEEC) to construct a Degree-constrained Connected Dominating Set (DCDS) in WSNs. He showed that the correct choice of the degree-constraint of DCDS balances the network load on the active nodes and leads to enhance the coverage and network lifetime.

The main contribution of our approach addresses three main questions to build a scheduling strategy.

How must the phases for information exchange, decision and sensing be planned over time? Our algorithm divides the timeline into rounds. Each round contains 4 phases: Information Exchange, Leader Election, Decision, and Sensing.

What are the rules to decide which node has to be turned on or off? Our algorithm tends to limit the overcoverage of points of interest to avoid turning on too many sensors covering the same areas at the same time, and tries to prevent undercoverage. The decision is a good compromise between these two conflicting objectives.

Which node should make such a decision? A leader node should make such a decision. Our work does not consider only one leader to compute and to broadcast the scheduling decision to all the sensors. When the network size increases, the network is divided into many subregions and the decision is made by a leader in each subregion.

III. ACTIVITY SCHEDULING

We consider a randomly and uniformly deployed network consisting of static wireless sensors. The wireless sensors are deployed in high density to ensure initially a full coverage of the interested area. We assume that all nodes are homogeneous in terms of communication and processing capabilities and heterogeneous in term of energy provision. The location information is available to the sensor node either through hardware such as embedded GPS or through location discovery algorithms. The area of interest can be divided using the divide-and-conquer strategy into smaller areas called subregions and then our coverage protocol will be implemented in each subregion simultaneously. Our protocol works in rounds fashion, as shown in Figure 1.


Figure 1.   Multi-Round Coverage Protocol.

Each round is divided into 4 phases: Information (INFO) Exchange, Leader Election, Decision, and Sensing. For each round, there is exactly one set cover responsible for the sensing task. This protocol is more reliable against an unexpected node failure because it works in rounds. On the one hand, if a node failure is detected before making the decision, the node will not participate to this phase, and, on the other hand, if the node failure occurs after the decision, the sensing task of the network will be temporarily affected: only during the period of sensing until a new round starts, since a new set cover will take charge of the sensing task in the next round. The energy consumption and some other constraints can easily be taken into account since the sensors can update and then exchange their information (including their residual energy) at the beginning of each round. However, the pre-sensing phases (INFO Exchange, Leader Election, Decision) are energy consuming for some nodes, even when they do not join the network to monitor the area. Below, we describe each phase in more details.

A. Information exchange phase

Each sensor node j sends its position, remaining energy RE_j, and the number of local neighbours NBR_j to all wireless sensor nodes in its subregion by using an INFO packet and then listens to the packets sent from other nodes. After that, each node will have information about all the sensor nodes in the subregion. In our model, the remaining energy corresponds to the time that a sensor can live in the active mode.

B. Leader election phase

This step includes choosing the Wireless Sensor Node Leader (WSNL), which will be responsible for executing the coverage algorithm. Each subregion in the area of interest will select its own WSNL independently for each round. All the sensor nodes cooperate to select WSNL. The nodes in the same subregion will select the leader based on the received information from all other nodes in the same subregion. The selection criteria in order of priority are: larger number of neighbours, larger remaining energy, and then in case of equality, larger index.

C. Decision phase

The WSNL will solve an integer program (see section IV) to select which sensors will be activated in the following sensing phase to cover the subregion. WSNL will send Active-Sleep packet to each sensor in the subregion based on the algorithm's results.

D. Sensing phase

Active sensors in the round will execute their sensing task to preserve maximal coverage in the region of interest. We will assume that the cost of keeping a node awake (or asleep) for sensing task is the same for all wireless sensor nodes in the network. Each sensor will receive an Active-Sleep packet from WSNL informing it to stay awake or to go to sleep for a time equal to the period of sensing until starting a new round.

We consider a boolean disk coverage model which is the most widely used sensor coverage model in the literature. Each sensor has a constant sensing range R_s. All space points within a disk centered at the sensor with the radius of the sensing

range is said to be covered by this sensor. We also assume that the communication range $R_c \geq 2R_s$ [13].

Instead of working with the coverage area, we consider for each sensor a set of points called primary points. We also assume that the sensing disk defined by a sensor is covered if all the primary points of this sensor are covered. By knowing the position (point center: (p_x, p_y)) of a wireless sensor node and its R_s, we calculate the primary points directly based on the proposed model. We use these primary points (that can be increased or decreased if necessary) as references to ensure that the monitored region of interest is covered by the selected set of sensors, instead of using all the points in the area.

We can calculate the positions of the selected primary points in the circle disk of the sensing range of a wireless sensor node (see figure 2) as follows:
(p_x, p_y) = point center of wireless sensor node
$X_1 = (p_x, p_y)$
$X_2 = (p_x + R_s * (1), p_y + R_s * (0))$
$X_3 = (p_x + R_s * (-1), p_y + R_s * (0))$
$X_4 = (p_x + R_s * (0), p_y + R_s * (1))$
$X_5 = (p_x + R_s * (0), p_y + R_s * (-1))$
$X_6 = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (0))$
$X_7 = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (0))$
$X_8 = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}))$
$X_9 = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}))$
$X_{10} = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}))$
$X_{11} = (p_x + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), p_y + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}))$
$X_{12} = (p_x + R_s * (0), p_y + R_s * (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}))$
$X_{13} = (p_x + R_s * (0), p_y + R_s * (\frac{-\sqrt{2}}{2}))$.


Figure 2. Sensor node represented by 13 primary points.

IV. COVERAGE PROBLEM FORMULATION

Our model is based on the model proposed by Pedraza et al. [14], where the objective is to find a maximum number of disjoint cover sets. To accomplish this goal, authors proposed an integer program, which forces undercoverage and overcoverage of targets to become minimal at the same time. They use binary variables x_{jl} to indicate if sensor j belongs to cover set l. In our model, we consider binary variables X_j, which determine the activation of sensor j in the sensing phase of the round. We also consider primary points as targets. The set

of primary points is denoted by P and the set of sensors by J.

For a primary point p, let α_{jp} denote the indicator function of whether the point p is covered, that is:

$$\alpha_{jp} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the primary point } p \text{ is covered} \\ & \text{by sensor node } j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The number of active sensors that cover the primary point p is equal to $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_{jp} * X_j$ where:

$$X_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if sensor } j \text{ is active,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We define the Overcoverage variable Θ_p as:

$$\Theta_p = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if the primary point} \\ & p \text{ is not covered,} \\ \left(\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_{jp} * X_j\right) - 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

More precisely, Θ_p represents the number of active sensor nodes minus one that cover the primary point p.
The Undercoverage variable U_p of the primary point p is defined by:

$$U_p = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the primary point } p \text{ is not covered,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Our coverage optimization problem can then be formulated as follows

$$\begin{cases} \min \sum_{p \in P}(w_\theta \Theta_p + w_U U_p) \\ \text{subject to :} \\ \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_{jp} X_j - \Theta_p + U_p = 1, & \forall p \in P \\ \Theta_p \in \mathbb{N}, & \forall p \in P \\ U_p \in \{0, 1\}, & \forall p \in P \\ X_j \in \{0, 1\}, & \forall j \in J \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

- X_j : indicates whether or not the sensor j is actively sensing in the round (1 if yes and 0 if not);

- Θ_p : *overcoverage*, the number of sensors minus one that are covering the primary point p;

- U_p : *undercoverage*, indicates whether or not the primary point p is being covered (1 if not covered and 0 if covered).

The first group of constraints indicates that some primary point p should be covered by at least one sensor and, if it is not always the case, overcoverage and undercoverage variables help balancing the restriction equations by taking positive values. There are two main objectives. Firstly, we limit the overcoverage of primary points in order to activate a minimum number of sensors. Secondly, we prevent the absence of monitoring on some parts of the subregion by minimizing the undercoverage. The weights w_θ and w_U must be properly chosen so as to guarantee that the maximum number of points are covered during each round.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we conducted a series of simulations to evaluate the efficiency and the relevance of our approach, using the discrete event simulator OMNeT++ [5]. We performed simulations for five different densities varying from 50 to 250 nodes. Experimental results were obtained from randomly generated networks in which nodes are deployed over a (50×25) m^2 sensing field. More precisely, the deployment is controlled at a coarse scale in order to ensure that the deployed nodes can fully cover the sensing field with the given sensing range. 10 simulation runs are performed with different network topologies for each node density. The results presented hereafter are the average of these 10 runs. A simulation ends when all the nodes are dead or the sensor network becomes disconnected (some nodes may not be able to send, to a base station, an event they sense).

Our proposed coverage protocol uses the radio energy dissipation model defined by Heinzelman et al. [15] as energy consumption model for each wireless sensor node when transmitting or receiving packets. The energy of each node in a network is initialized randomly within the range 24-60 joules, and each sensor node will consume 0.2 watts during the sensing period, which will last 60 seconds. Thus, an active node will consume 12 joules during the sensing phase, while a sleeping node will use 0.002 joules. Each sensor node will not participate in the next round if its remaining energy is less than 12 joules. In all experiments, the parameters are set as follows: $R_s = 5$ m, $w_\Theta = 1$, and $w_U = |P^2|$.

We evaluate the efficiency of our approach by using some performance metrics such as: coverage ratio, number of active nodes ratio, energy saving ratio, energy consumption, network lifetime, execution time, and number of stopped simulation runs. Our approach called strategy 2 (with leaders) works with two subregions, each one having a size of (25×25) m^2. Our strategy will be compared with two other approaches. The first one, called strategy 1 (with one leader), works as strategy 2, but considers only one region of (50×25) m^2 with only one leader. The other approach, called Simple Heuristic, consists in uniformly dividing the region into squares of (5×5) m^2. During the decision phase, in each square, a sensor is randomly chosen, it will remain turned on for the coming sensing phase.

A. The impact of the number of rounds on the coverage ratio

In this experiment, the coverage ratio measures how much the area of a sensor field is covered. In our case, the coverage ratio is regarded as the number of primary points covered among the set of all primary points within the field. Figure 3 shows the impact of the number of rounds on the average coverage ratio for 150 deployed nodes for the three approaches. It can be seen that the three approaches give similar coverage ratios during the first rounds. From the 9th round the coverage ratio decreases continuously with the simple heuristic, while the two other strategies provide superior coverage to 90% for five more rounds. Coverage ratio decreases when the number of rounds increases due to dead nodes. Although some nodes are dead, thanks to strategy 1 or 2, other nodes are preserved to ensure the coverage. Moreover, when we have a dense sensor network, it leads to maintain the full coverage

for a larger number of rounds. Strategy 2 is slightly more efficient than strategy 1, because strategy 2 subdivides the region into 2 subregions and if one of the two subregions becomes disconnected, the coverage may be still ensured in the remaining subregion.


Figure 3.   The impact of the number of rounds on the coverage ratio for 150 deployed nodes.

B. The impact of the number of rounds on the active sensors ratio

It is important to have as few active nodes as possible in each round, in order to minimize the communication overhead and maximize the network lifetime. This point is assessed through the Active Sensors Ratio (ASR), which is defined as follows:

$$\text{ASR}(\%) = \frac{\text{Number of active sensors during the current sensing phase}}{\text{Total number of sensors in the network for the region}} \times 100.$$

Figure 4 shows the average active nodes ratio versus rounds for 150 deployed nodes.

Figure 4.   The impact of the number of rounds on the active sensors ratio for 150 deployed nodes.

The results presented in figure 4 show the superiority of both proposed strategies, the strategy with two leaders and the one with a single leader, in comparison with the simple heuristic. The strategy with one leader uses less active nodes than the strategy with two leaders until the last rounds, because it uses central control on the whole sensing field. The advantage of the strategy 2 approach is that even if a network is disconnected in one subregion, the other one usually continues the optimization process, and this extends the lifetime of the network.

C. Impact of the number of rounds on the energy saving ratio

In this experiment, we consider a performance metric linked to energy. This metric, called Energy Saving Ratio (ESR), is defined by:

$$\text{ESR}(\%) = \frac{\text{Number of alive sensors during this round}}{\text{Total number of sensors in the network for the region}} \times 100.$$

The longer the ratio is, the more redundant sensor nodes are switched off, and consequently the longer the network may live. Figure 5 shows the average Energy Saving Ratio versus rounds for all three approaches and for 150 deployed nodes.


Figure 5. The impact of the number of rounds on the energy saving ratio for 150 deployed nodes.

The simulation results show that our strategies allow to efficiently save energy by turning off some sensors during the sensing phase. As expected, the strategy with one leader is usually slightly better than the second strategy, because the global optimization permits to turn off more sensors. Indeed, when there are two subregions more nodes remain awake near the border shared by them. Note that again as the number of rounds increases the two leaders' strategy becomes the most performing one, since it takes longer to have the two subregion networks simultaneously disconnected.

D. The percentage of stopped simulation runs

We will now study the percentage of simulations, which stopped due to network disconnections per round for each of the three approaches. Figure 6 illustrates the percentage of stopped simulation runs per round for 150 deployed nodes. It can be observed that the simple heuristic is the approach, which stops first because the nodes are randomly chosen. Among the two proposed strategies, the centralized one first exhibits network disconnections. Thus, as previously explained, in case of the strategy with several subregions the optimization effectively continues as long as a network in a subregion is still connected. This longer partial coverage optimization participates in extending the network lifetime.

E. The energy consumption

In this experiment, we study the effect of the multi-hop communication protocol on the performance of the strategy with two leaders and compare it with the other two approaches. The average energy consumption resulting from wireless communications is calculated by taking into account the energy spent by all the nodes when transmitting and receiving packets during the network lifetime. This average value, which is obtained for 10 simulation runs, is then divided by the average


Figure 6. The percentage of stopped simulation runs compared to the number of rounds for 150 deployed nodes.

number of rounds to define a metric allowing a fair comparison between networks having different densities.

Figure 7 illustrates the energy consumption for the different network sizes and the three approaches. The results show that the strategy with two leaders is the most competitive from the energy consumption point of view. A centralized method, like the strategy with one leader, has a high energy consumption due to many communications. In fact, a distributed method greatly reduces the number of communications thanks to the partitioning of the initial network in several independent subnetworks. Let us notice that even if a centralized method consumes far more energy than the simple heuristic, since the energy cost of communications during a round is a small part of the energy spent in the sensing phase, the communications have a small impact on the network lifetime.


Figure 7. The energy consumption.

F. The impact of the number of sensors on execution time

A sensor node has limited energy resources and computing power, therefore it is important that the proposed algorithm has the shortest possible execution time. The energy of a sensor node must be mainly used for the sensing phase, not for the pre-sensing ones. Table I gives the average execution times in seconds on a laptop of the decision phase (solving of the optimization problem) during one round. They are given for the different approaches and various numbers of sensors. The lack of any optimization explains why the heuristic has very low execution times. Conversely, the strategy with one leader, which requires to solve an optimization problem considering all the nodes presents redhibitory execution times. Moreover,

increasing the network size by 50 nodes multiplies the time by almost a factor of 10. The strategy with two leaders has more suitable times. We think that in distributed fashion the solving of the optimization problem in a subregion can be tackled by sensor nodes. Overall, to be able to deal with very large networks, a distributed method is clearly required.

TABLE I.   EXECUTION TIME(S) VS. NUMBER OF SENSORS

Sensors number	Strategy 2 (with two leaders)	Strategy 1 (with one leader)	Simple heuristic
50	0.097	0.189	0.001
100	0.419	1.972	0.0032
150	1.295	13.098	0.0032
200	4.54	169.469	0.0046
250	12.252	1581.163	0.0056

G. The network lifetime

Finally, we have defined the network lifetime as the time until all nodes have been drained of their energy or each sensor network monitoring an area has become disconnected. In Figure 8, the network lifetime for different network sizes and for both strategy with two leaders and the simple heuristic is illustrated. We do not consider anymore the centralized strategy with one leader, because, as shown above, this strategy results in execution times that quickly become unsuitable for a sensor network.


Figure 8.   The network lifetime.

As highlighted by Figure 8, the network lifetime obviously increases when the size of the network increases, with our approach that leads to the larger lifetime improvement. By choosing the best suited nodes, for each round, to cover the region of interest and by letting the other ones sleep in order to be used later in next rounds, our strategy efficiently prolonges the network lifetime. Comparison shows that the larger the sensor number is, the more our strategies outperform the simple heuristic. Strategy 2, which uses two leaders, is the best one because it is robust to network disconnection in one subregion. It also means that distributing the algorithm in each node and subdividing the sensing field into many subregions, which are managed independently and simultaneously, is the most relevant way to maximize the lifetime of a network.

VI.   CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have addressed the problem of the coverage and the lifetime optimization in WSNs. To cope with this problem, the field of sensing is divided into smaller sub-regions using the concept of divide-and-conquer method, and

then a multi-rounds coverage protocol will optimize coverage and lifetime performances in each subregion. The proposed protocol combines two efficient techniques: network leader election and sensor activity scheduling, where the challenges include how to select the most efficient leader in each sub-region and the best representative active nodes. Results from simulations show the relevance of the proposed protocol in terms of lifetime, coverage ratio, active sensors ratio, energy saving, energy consumption, execution time, and the number of stopped simulation runs due to network disconnection. Indeed, when dealing with large and dense wireless sensor networks, a distributed approach like the one we propose allows to reduce the difficulty of a single global optimization problem by partitioning it in many smaller problems, one per subregion, that can be solved more easily.

In future work, we plan to study a coverage protocol which computes all active sensor schedules in only one step for many rounds, using optimization methods such as swarms optimization or evolutionary algorithms.

REFERENCES

[1]   I. F. Akyildiz and M. C. Vuran, Wireless Sensor Networks.   John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2010.

[2]   S. Misra, I. Woungang, and S. C. Misra, Guide to Wireless Sensor Networks.   Springer-Verlag London Limited, 2009.

[3]   S. Misra, M. P. Kumar, and M. S. Obaidat, "Connectivity preserving localized coverage algorithm for area monitoring using wireless sensor networks," Computer Communications, vol. 34, no. 12, 2011, pp. 1484–1496.

[4]   A. Nayak and I. Stojmenovic, Wireless Sensor and Actuator Networks: Algorithms and Protocols for Scalable Coordination and Data Communication.   John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 2010.

[5]   A. Varga, "Omnet++ discrete event simulation system," Available: http://www.omnetpp.org, 2003.

[6]   C. T. Vu, "Distributed energy-efficient solutions for area coverage problems in wireless sensor networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Georgia State University, 2009.

[7]   C.-F. Huang and Y.-C. Tseng, "The coverage problem in a wireless sensor network," Mobile Networks and Applications, vol. 10, no. 4, 2005, pp. 519–528.

[8]   S. He, J. Chen, X. Li, X. Shen, and Y. Sun, "Leveraging prediction to improve the coverage of wireless sensor networks," IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, vol. 23, no. 4, 2012, pp. 701–712.

[9]   B. Wang, H. B. Lim, and D. Ma, "A coverage-aware clustering protocol for wireless sensor networks," Computer Networks, vol. 56, no. 5, 2012, pp. 1599–1611.

[10]   Z. Liu, Q. Zheng, L. Xue, and X. Guan, "A distributed energy-efficient clustering algorithm with improved coverage in wireless sensor networks," Future Generation Computer Systems, vol. 28, no. 5, 2012, pp. 780–790.

[11]   L. Zhang, Q. Zhu, and J. Wang, "Adaptive clustering for maximizing network lifetime and maintaining coverage," Journal of Networks, vol. 8, no. 3, 2013, pp. 616–622.

[12]   J. A. Torkestani, "An adaptive energy-efficient area coverage algorithm for wireless sensor networks," Ad Hoc Networks, vol. 11, no. 6, 2013, pp. 1655–1666.

[13]   H. Zhang and J. C. Hou, "Maintaining sensing coverage and connectivity in large sensor networks," Ad Hoc & Sensor Wireless Networks, vol. 1, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 89–124.

[14]   F. Pedraza, A. L. Medaglia, and A. Garcia, "Efficient coverage algorithms for wireless sensor networks," in Proceedings of the 2006 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium, 2006, pp. 78–83.

[15]   W. B. Heinzelman, A. P. Chandrakasan, and H. Balakrishnan, "An application-specific protocol architecture for wireless microsensor networks," IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, vol. 1, no. 4, 2002, pp. 660–670.