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Abstract

A convergecast is a popular routing in sensor networks. It periodically forwards collected data at every sensor node along a configured routing path to the outside of a sensor network via the base station (BS). To extend the lifetime of energy-limited sensor networks, many previous researches proposed schemes for data compression. However, few researches investigated the relation between packet compression ratio and spanning trees. We propose packet Compression ratio dependent Spanning Tree (CST) which can provide effective routing paths in terms of the tree length for all ranges of compression ratio \( f \). CST is equivalent to the Shortest Path spanning Tree (SPT) which is optimum in the case of no-compression \( (f = 0) \) and is equivalent to the Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) in the case of full-compression \( (f = 1) \). CST outperforms SPT and MST for any range of \( f \) \((0 < f < 1)\). Through simulation we show CST provides shorter paths than MST and SPT in terms of the tree length by 34.1% and 7.8% respectively. We confirm CST is very useful in convergecasts.
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1. Introduction

A sensor network is a distributed wireless network to monitor various conditions of a remote area through an autonomously configured routing path [1-4]. This paper studies packet compression-dependent convergecasts. A convergecast is a type of communication in the reverse direction of a broadcast in which all collected packets are forwarded to a single control node called a base station (BS) [2,5]. To perform convergecast effectively, each node forwards its packets to its neighbor once and only once. If we trace these packet routes, we can build up a spanning tree. A convergecast is very popular in sensor networks [3,4]. It is common in sensor networks that intermediate nodes try to reduce packet size during forwarding. This is called packet compression. Most previous researches focused on no-compression or full-compression cases for simplicity.

The compression ratio \( f \) is represented by the relatively decreased packet lengths over all added packet lengths to a unit length at each sensor node [2,6,7]. At no-compression \( (f = 0) \), a node relays all collected packets without reducing them. At full-compression \( (f = 1) \), a node generates an \( x \)-bit packet after merging many received \( x \)-bit packets and an \( x \)-bit packet generated at the node.

The Shortest Path spanning Trees (SPTs) and the Minimum Spanning Trees (MSTs) are useful for convergecast to save energy because transmission energy typically proportional to the square of distance. SPT minimizes the length of paths from the root to all nodes, and MST minimizes the sum of lengths of a set of links which are used to connect all nodes. In terms of packet compression, SPT and MST are optimum in total transmission energy for a convergecast in no-compression and full-compression cases respectively.

There are only a few previous researches about packet compression-related spanning trees. Upadhyayula et al. [7] tried to find a spanning tree that minimizes energy and ‘time’ for a convergecast. Time indicates the number of time slots required for a convergecast in a wireless TDMA environment. To achieve less time, the paper explains how to configure spanning trees and suggests an algorithm for building them. The proposed algorithm tends to prefer balanced trees.

Luo et al. proposed Minimum Fusion Steiner Tree (MFST) [8] and Binary Fusion Steiner Tree (BFST) [9]. Both assume that sensor nodes must perform complex calculations spending energy for packet compression. They tried to minimize the sum of transmission energy and packet compression energy. In MFST, packet compression occurs at every intermediate node. In reality,
packet compression is not always beneficial to energy saving if a compression ratio is low or the energy for packet compression is large. BFST proposes a feasibility test of packet compression. If a node passes the test, it compresses packets and transmits the reduced packet. If it fails, it sends packets without packet compression. These researches focused on the packet compression side, leaving transmission oversimplified. Spanning trees were not their main interest. They assumed all transmissions spend a unit of energy regardless of transmission distance. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.

We propose three ideas in this paper. The first one is a packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. Second, we propose a one-time compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression. The third idea is a packet Compression model that does not allow infinitely repeated packet compression-related metric in defining the tree lengths. We could not find any packet compression related paper that investigates the interaction between spanning trees and packet compression ratio.
root node $R$ in $T_S$. The notation $\sum_{q \in Q_T} d(q)$ in this paper denotes summation is done for all values of the index variable $q$ in $T_S$.

$$L(T_s) = \sum_{q \in Q_T} d(q).$$ \hfill (5)

Minimizing $L(T_S)$ at no-compression is equivalent to finding SPT, and minimizing $L(T_S)$ at full-compression is equivalent to finding MST.

2.2. Formulation of Our Problem

2.2.1. Assumption of Sensor Network and Convergecast

In a sensor network, all locations of sensor nodes are known. All nodes periodically generate a fixed-length packet which is convergecast to the root node $R$. During convergecast, packet compression occurs, and we have enough statistics about packet compression.

2.2.2. Definition of Problem

Assuming Subsection 2.2.1, we want to find the spanning tree $T_S$ that minimizes total forwarding energy for a convergecast. To numerically define the problem, our goal is to find the $T_S$ that has minimum tree length using definitions in (4) and (5).

2.3. Analysis of Our Metric $d(\cdot)$

The metric metrics $d(\cdot)$ and $\lambda(\cdot)$ are nonlinear. If we use a nonlinear operator, the link cost $C(i,j)$ contributes differently to the tree length. This influences the preferred type of spanning trees. If we apply $d(\cdot)$, nodes close to $R$ prefer short links, and nodes distant from $R$ choose straight paths to $R$. If we use $\lambda(\cdot)$, nodes prefer short links and do not mind choosing very long-hop paths.

The nonlinear operator $d(\cdot)$ is very difficult to handle. We found a strange characteristic about $d(\cdot)$. Under $d(\cdot)$, a node can be more distant from $R$ than its descendant. We also found that there is no greedy solution, and are strongly convinced that there is no polynomial optimum solution. Therefore, we decided to rely on heuristics.

\textbf{Figure 2} can be used to explain why there is no greedy solution. \textbf{Figure 2(a)} describes a given four-node network. There are four usable wireless links in \textbf{Figure 2(a)}, and their link costs are written by them. The node $R$ is the root node of the spanning tree. \textbf{Figures 2(b) and 2(c)} illustrate two spanning trees. \textbf{Figure 2(b)} shows the spanning tree solved by a greedy solution. In \textbf{Figures 2(b) and 2(c)}, node distance is recorded in each node circle.

The greedy solution chooses a link that minimally increases the tree length if the link addition still keeps the sub-tree connected. The sub-tree grows with the addition of selected links. The greedy method firstly chooses $l(R,A)$. The selected links, especially $l(R,A)$, are never removed from the spanning tree. If we add three node distances, the length of the greedy spanning tree $T_S$ becomes 196. In contrast, the length of the minimum tree $T_S$ in \textbf{Figure 2(c)} is 189.4. $L(T_S)$ is shorter by 6.6 than $L(T_S)$. \textbf{Figure 2} shows the optimum tree does not always include greedy selection.

We choose one-time compression $d(\cdot)$ instead of continuous compression $\lambda(\cdot)$ for two reasons. Firstly, $d(\cdot)$ is very simple. Because of simplicity, we can not only calculate the best estimate compression ratio $\hat{f}$ from statistics easily, but also obtain the core operation expressed in (7) with $\theta(l)$ -complexity. Secondly, the $\lambda(\cdot)$ model only covers partial ways of compression. $\lambda(\cdot)$ cannot describe a typical nonzero compression. Compression ratio generally decreases as compression repeats. Nonzero length is common after infinite compression. $\lambda(\cdot)$ cannot cover this type of compression.

3. Packet Compression Ratio Dependent Spanning Tree (CST)

In this section we define CST in two steps and explain its operation. Step A calculates the best estimate $\hat{f}$ of $f$ using statistics. Step B generates a spanning tree with calculated $\hat{f}$. Step B has two sub-steps. Step B.1 generates an initial spanning tree and Step B.2 describes how to transform to a shorter one.

3.1. Step A: Calculation of the Best Estimate $\hat{f}$ of $f$

To deduce the best estimate $\hat{f}$, we need statistical data about the average packet length for every active link in a spanning tree. As our major target is to find out the optimal spanning trees with obtained $\hat{f}$, we leave this part to the Appendix.

\textbf{Figure 2}. Evidence that shows CST solution cannot be greedy. (a) A given network. $f=0.8$ ; (b) A tree $T_S$ by greedy method, $L(T_S)=196$ ; (c) A tree $T_S$ by optimum method, $L(T_S)=189.4$. 
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3.2. Step B: Tree Establishment

This step finds the local shortest spanning tree with \( f \) obtained in Step A. We heuristically generate a CST in two sub-steps. An initial tree is built up in a top-down process (from \( R \) to leaf nodes) in Step B.1, and is reconfigured in a bottom-up process (from leaf nodes to \( R \)) to a shorter one in Step B.2.

3.2.1. Step B.1: Initial Tree Setup

Step B.1 defines how to establish an initial tree. An initial tree is built by a combined algorithm of Dijkstra’s SPT [10] and Prim’s MST [11]. These two famous algorithms are very alike in definition. They are both greedy and satisfy the greedy properties mentioned in Section 2.3. Dijkstra chooses a link that connects a node whose distance to \( R \) is minimum, and Prim picks up the link whose link cost is minimum. Because both protocols always maintain the working sub-tree as connected, merging two algorithms is straightforward.

Our algorithm uses the Dijkstra’s SPT algorithm until it generates an \( n_s \)-node sub-tree including \( R \). Then we use the Prim’s MST algorithm until a complete \( n \)-node spanning tree is made. \( n_s \) is calculated from (6). In (6), \( \lceil x \rceil \) represents the integer closest to \( x \) and not smaller than \( x \). We fix \( W \) in (6) as 8 based on simulation with various \( n \)-node sensor networks and \( f \) values.

\[
n_s = \left(1 - f^w\right) \cdot n, \quad W = 8, \quad 0 \leq f \leq 1.
\]  

We can make two comments on the initial tree. First, \( W \) has a very large value 8. This makes \( n_s \) very close to \( n \) in (6) for most values of \( f \). This means the initial tree is very similar to SPT. Second, we use the SPT algorithm in establishing a spanning tree near \( R \). It is because the node, having many descendants, prefers SPT in selecting its parent node.

We explain the reason as follows. Suppose a node \( m \) is looking for a better parent node. \( m \)'s current parent node is \( p_i(m) \), and there is a candidate \( m_i \) in Figure 3, \( m \) decides its parent node as the one that produces less tree length. Assume \( m \)'s uplink \( l(m, p_i(m)) \) and \( d(m) \) are short, and \( l(m, m_i) \) and \( d(p_i(m)) \) are long. For \( m \), the link cost of its first hop contributes 100\% to the tree length, and the link costs of later hops are added as a ratio of \( (1 - f) \). However, for \( m \)'s descendants, the costs of all up-links above \( m \) are reflected fairly with a ratio of \( f \). The first hop costs more than later hops. If \( m \) has many descendants, \( m \) has to consider them too. For the sake of its descendants, \( m \) chooses \( m_i \) as a parent node sacrificing itself.

3.2.2. Step B.2: Spanning Tree Establishment

Step B.2 reduces tree length from the initial tree established according to Step B.1. We are going to explain the core operation of the algorithm that decides \( m \)'s best up-link as shown in Figure 3. The node \( m \) is called a ‘designate node.’ Throughout the operation, a designate node \( m \) prepares: 1) 10 closest nodes representing \( m_i \) (1 \( \leq i \leq 10 \)), 2) \( d(m) \), and 3) the number of \( m \)'s descendant nodes denoted by \( h(m) \). A list \( Q \) is maintained that sorts all nodes in reverse order of \( d(\cdot) \).

Figure 3(a) is the current spanning tree \( T_o \), and Figure 3(b) is a candidate of a new spanning tree \( T_m \) for one of \( 10 m_i \)'s. \( p_i(m) \) and \( m \)'s descendants are excluded from \( m \). For \( T_o \) and all candidate spanning trees \( T_m \), we calculate \( L(T_o) \) and \( L(T_m) \) and choose a tree with the least tree length. If the chosen parent node is different from \( p_i(m) \), we reconfigure the spanning tree according to Figure 3(b) and update influenced variables.

The Tree improvement \( L_m \) defined by \( (L(T_m) - L(T_o)) \) indicates relatively improved tree length with a new parent node \( m \). Positive \( L_m \) means the new tree is better. If we apply our metric \( d(\cdot) \), \( L_m \) becomes (7). If we replace \( d(\cdot) \) with \( d(\cdot) \), (7) changes to (12). Note (12) has \( \Theta(1) \)-complexity because it only includes known terms including \( d(\cdot)|_{T_o} \).

So far we have explained how to improve the tree for a designate node. We will now give comments on how to assign designate nodes. A designate node \( m \) is chosen from \( Q \) by the reverse order of \( d(m) \). After performing all jobs mentioned above, the algorithm updated the queue \( Q \) to choose the next designate node \( m_n \) as the one whose \( d(m_n) \) is the smallest but larger than \( dm \) which is \( d(m) \) before reconfiguration. We call a cycle every related operation during which \( Q \) is totally scanned once for choosing designate nodes. Cycles repeat until no more improvement is possible. We observed through simulation that calculation usually finishes at the second or the third cycle. In this way, we achieve the locally best CST.

The CST algorithm for a cycle is summarized below.

1) Prepare \( m_n, d(m), h(m) \) for every \( m \) and establish a queue \( Q \) in reverse order of \( d(\cdot) \). Let \( dm = \infty \).
2) Check whether \( m' \) exists whose \( d(m') \) is the largest but less than \( dm \).

Figure 3. Spanning tree before and after reconfiguration. (a) Tree \( T_o \) before reconfiguration; (b) Tree \( T_m \) after reconfiguration.
We investigated the tree lengths of CST, SPT and MST for various fs according to (4) and (5). We have 25-node, 100-node and 400-node sensor networks with nodes located randomly in a unit-length square sensor field. We also select the root node randomly. We prepare 100 kinds of sensor networks for each condition and deduce the average tree length to draw curves. We basically use the link cost C(i, j) as a square of distance from i to j, and we consider the case of the fourth power of distance additionally because the transmission loss model is proportional to \(d^{-2}\) with the wireless transmission distance \(d\).

Figure 4 shows five CSTs with varying \(f\) from 0 to 1 in a 35-node sensor network with a fixed root node \(R\) at the center top position denoted by big dots in the sensor field. CSTs in Figures 4(a) and 4(e) are equivalent to SPT and MST respectively. We can observe that paths along SPT have a tendency to be straight toward \(R\) in Figure 4(a), and SPT links are longer than MST links in Figure 4(e). When \(f\) increases from 0 to 0.75, we notice only a few changes. Most changes occur in the range of 0.75 \(\leq f \leq 1\).

Figures 5 to 8 draw the tree lengths using (5) for the entire range of \(f\) (0 \(\leq f \leq 1\)). Figures 5 to 7 indicate the tree lengths of SPT, MST and CST when the numbers of nodes are 25, 100 and 400 respectively. All curves in these figures decrease monotonously with increasing \(f\) because the tree length is short with a high \(f\) value due to (4). CST is always the shortest for all \(f\)s, and SPT and MST curves cross each other at \(f\) value of a little more than 0.9. The difference in tree lengths between SPT and MST cases are large at a large sensor network and a sparse sensor network.

We additionally examined the case of the fourth power of distance instead of square distance assigned to the link cost \(C(i, j)\) in Figure 8. As tree length in Figure 8 drops sharply as \(f\) increases, we use the log scale in the y-axis. Except when using log or nonlog scales, Figures 5 to 8 are similar in curve pattern.

Table 1 shows tree lengths and their averages for SPT and MST relative to CST for various \(f\)s at 20% intervals. ‘Relative’ means the results are obtained after being divided by CST length for the same condition. A special \(f\)
Figure 4. Changes in CSTs with varying $f$. (a) 0%; (b) 25%; (c) 50%; (d) 75%; (e) 100%.

Figure 5. Tree lengths of MST, SPT and CST with varying $f$ in 25-node sensor networks.

Figure 6. Tree lengths of MST, SPT and CST with varying $f$ in 100-node sensor networks.

Figure 7. Tree lengths of MST, SPT and CST with varying $f$ in 400-node sensor networks.

Figure 8. Tree lengths of MST, SPT and CST with varying $f$ in 100-node sensor networks. ($C(i, j)$ is re-defined as fourth power of normal transmission distance.)

Table 1. Relative tree length of CST, SPT and MST in 100-node sensor networks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$ (%)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CST</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>107.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>134.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSPT*</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MSPT is the tree from SPT and MST which produces the shorter tree length.
value of 93% is added at which the SPT curve and MST curve coincide. Table 1 introduces MSPT in the last row. MSTP is defined as the shorter tree from MST and SPT for each given condition.

The far right column in Table 1 shows averages of the relative tree lengths on a line except for the value at \( f = 93\% \). The average MSPTs include this value specially because MSPT has a peak value at \( f = 93\% \). According to Table 1, CST is 34.1% and 7.8% shorter than MST and SPT respectively in terms of tree length. CST still out-performs MSPT by 2.4%.

5. Conclusions

In convergecast sensor networks, many routing schemes have proposed packet compression to save energy. The Shortest Path spanning Tree (SPT) and the Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) are only popularly used because they are optimal at no-compression and full-compression respectively. We proposed two important concepts. One is a simple one-time compression model. The other is a new routing method called packet Compression ratio dependent Spanning Tree (CST).

CST is superior to SPT and MST for three reasons. Firstly, CST provides us the best estimate \( \hat{f} \) of compression ratio \( f \) using collected statistics. Secondly, we can calculate CST easily using a one-time compression model. Thirdly, CST outperforms CST, MST and SPT at all considered sensor network environments and is optimum at no-compression and full-compression. Simulation shows CST outperforms MST and SPT by 34.1% and 7.8% respectively in averaging over many compression ratio \( f_s \). These observations confirm that CST is very useful in convergecast sensor networks.
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Appendix: Step A—Calculation of the Best Estimate \( \hat{f} \) of Compression Ratio \( f \)

This step demonstrates how to calculate the best estimate \( \hat{f} \) of compression ratio \( f \) with a given spanning tree \( T_S \) from collected statistics. We call the quadratic modeling error \( M_E \) by adding the square of link estimate error \( L_e(l(i,j)) \) of our one-time compression model throughout all links in \( T_S \) shown in (13). We can find the only \( \hat{f} \) that minimizes \( M_E(f) \) in (14).

\[
M_E(f) = \sum_{l(i,j)\in T_S} L_e(l(i,j))^2. \tag{13}
\]

\[
M_E(\hat{f}) = \min \{ M_E(f) \} \leq M_E(f). \tag{14}
\]

The link estimate error \( L_e(l(i,j)) \) is defined in (15). To perform convergecast, every node forwards packets along \( T_S \), compressing the received packets with the compression ratio \( f \). To calculate the best estimate \( \hat{f} \), we use statistics to provide the average message length \( E_{ij} \) on a link \( l(i,j) \) in \( T_S \). If we apply our one-time compression model, we can build up the one-time compression model length \( W_{ij} \) for all active links \( l(i,j) \) according to the procedure mentioned in Subsection 2.1 and Figure 1. Utilizing the property that \( W_{ij} \) is a linear equation of \( f \), we can obtain every \( a_{ij} \) and \( b_{ij} \) for every active link \( l(i,j) \) in (16).

\[
L_e(l(i,j)) = E_{ij} - W_{ij}, \tag{15}
\]

\[
W_{ij} = a_{ij} \cdot f + b_{ij}, \quad a_{ij}, b_{ij} \text{ are constants.} \tag{16}
\]

Combining the four definitions (13) to (16), we get (17). Equation (17) turns to a simple quadratic equation of \( f \) in (18) for the constants \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \).

\[
M_E(f) = \sum_{l(i,j)\in T_S} (a_{ij} \cdot f + (b_{ij} - E_{ij}))^2 \tag{17}
\]

\[
= \alpha \cdot f^2 - \beta \cdot f + \gamma, \quad \alpha(\neq 0), \beta, \gamma \text{ are constants.} \tag{18}
\]

The quadratic equation in (18) has the minimum value at the origin. Because a parabolic and its axis cross at the origin, the axis of the parabolic guarantees the minimum modeling error \( M_E(f) \). The axis corresponds to

\[
\hat{f} = \frac{\beta}{2\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{l(i,j)\in T_S} (E_{ij} - b_{ij})}{\sum_{l(i,j)\in T_S} a_{ij}}. \tag{19}
\]

All \( E_{ij}, a_{ij}, \) and \( b_{ij} \) are available, thus we can get \( \hat{f} \).