

Distributed Detection in Wireless Sensor Networks Under Multiplicative Fading via Generalized Score Tests

Domenico Ciuonzo¹, Senior Member, IEEE, Pierluigi Salvo Rossi², Senior Member, IEEE, and Pramod K. Varshney³, Life Fellow, IEEE

Abstract—In this article, we address the problem of distributed detection of a noncooperative (unknown emitted signal) target with a wireless sensor network. When the target is present, sensors observe a (unknown) deterministic signal with attenuation depending on the unknown distance between the sensor and the target, multiplicative fading, and additive Gaussian noise. To model energy-constrained operations within Internet of Things, one-bit sensor measurement quantization is employed and two strategies for quantization are investigated. The fusion center receives sensor bits via noisy binary symmetric channels and provides a more accurate global inference. Such a model leads to a test with nuisances (i.e., the target position x_T) observable only under \mathcal{H}_1 hypothesis. Davies' framework is exploited herein to design the generalized forms of Rao and locally optimum detection (LOD) tests. For our generalized Rao and LOD approaches, a heuristic approach for threshold optimization is also proposed. The simulation results confirm the promising performance of our proposed approaches.

Index Terms—Distributed detection (DD), generalized-likelihood ratio test, Internet of Things (IoT), locally optimum detection (LOD), Rao test, wireless sensor networks (WSNs).

I. INTRODUCTION

THE Internet of Things (IoT) envisages billions of tiny devices with sensing, computation, and communication capabilities to be used in everyday life and currently represents a game-changing technology for the wireless communications and sensing sector [1], [2]. Wireless sensor networks (WSNs) constitute the “sensing arm” of the IoT, with distributed detection (DD) representing a widely investigated task [3], [4] having multifold applications, such as cognitive radio systems [5], [6] or surveillance [7]. Unfortunately, strict bandwidth and energy constraints in WSNs hamper full-precision reporting by the sensors, which usually are limited

to sending one bit to the fusion center (FC) regarding the inferred hypothesis. For the mentioned reason, in the last few years, several works have focused on DD based on one-bit quantized measurements [8]–[10]. In such a case, the optimal decision procedure at the sensors is one-bit quantization of the local-likelihood ratio (LR) [11], [12]. There are two problems with this procedure. First, the design complexity of the quantizer thresholds grows exponentially [13], [14], and second, the sensor LR cannot be evaluated due to unknown target parameters [14]. Hence, the bit reported is either the outcome of a raw-measurement quantization [15]–[17] or represents the inferred binary-valued event (via suboptimal detection statistics [18]).

In both options, the FC gathers the sensor-generated bits and fuses them via a suitably designed fusion rule to improve the single-sensor detection capability. In IoT-based systems, the FC could be hosted in the cloud by implementing a “sensing as a service” paradigm [19]. The optimum fusion rule, under conditional independence, involves the comparison of a weighted sum of the received sensor bits with a threshold, with weights depending on the unknown target parameters [3]. Still, when the model is parametrically specified (with some parameters unknown), the FC faces a composite test of hypotheses and the generalized LRT (GLRT) is the usual design choice [20]. Indeed, GLRT-based fusion of quantized data has been extensively studied in the DD-focused WSN literature [16], [21], [22], including the challenging case of an unknown source located at an unknown position (*uncooperative target*), because it requires the least amount of knowledge. Accordingly, some recent works have dealt with this problem [7], [15], [22]–[24]. In [22], a GLRT was derived for detecting a target with unknown position and emitted power. To obtain computationally simpler solutions (not requiring a grid search over both the target location and the emitted power/signal domains), *generalized forms of score tests* (abbreviated as G-Score tests) have been proposed for noncooperative detection of both *deterministic* [15] and *stochastic* target emissions [7], [23]. Recently, Ciuonzo and Salvo Rossi [24], Zhu *et al.* [25], and Wang *et al.* [26] have addressed the challenging *multiplicative fading* scenario in distributed estimation and detection problems, respectively. The latter scenario is a generalization of both deterministic and stochastic models, and is able to model complicated

Manuscript received July 24, 2020; revised December 31, 2020; accepted January 27, 2021. Date of publication February 2, 2021; date of current version May 21, 2021. (Corresponding author: Domenico Ciuonzo.)

Domenico Ciuonzo is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technologies, University of Naples “Federico II,” 80138 Naples, Italy (e-mail: domenico.ciuonzo@unina.it).

Pierluigi Salvo Rossi is with the Department of Electronic Systems, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 7491 Trondheim, Norway, and also with the Department of Gas Technology, SINTEF Energy Research, 7034 Trondheim, Norway (e-mail: salvorossi@ieee.org).

Pramod K. Varshney is with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244 USA (e-mail: varshney@syr.edu).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/JIOT.2021.3056325




Fig. 1. System model considered.

propagation mechanisms (e.g., a Rician model or estimated small-scale fading).

The *main contributions* of this article are summarized as follows.

- 1) In this article, we focus on DD of a noncooperative target with a spatially dependent emission (signature), that experiences multiplicative fading. Our DD scenario encompasses detection of a noncooperative target with an amplitude attenuation function (AAF) depending on the sensor-target distance, one-bit measurement quantization, and noisy reporting channels [modeled as binary symmetric channels (BSCs)] emulating orthogonal multiple-access channels such as in narrowband IoT (NB-IoT) [27]. Such a scenario encompasses those considered in previous works as special cases [7], [15], [23].
- 2) We consider both raw quantization (RQ) and square-based quantization (SQ) in the design of low-complexity fusion rules that yield good performance. We show that the usual RQ [24], [26] does not always represent a good choice when nonlinear-of-sight terms become relevant in multiplicative fading. Hence, we consider SQ to cope with this issue. This operation transforms the composite test from two sided (on the signal) to one sided (on the power) with nuisance parameters present only under the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_1 [28].
- 3) We *devise* and *optimize*: a) generalized Rao (G-Rao) and b) generalized locally optimum detection (LOD) (G-LOD) approaches, based on RQ and SQ, respectively, for the aforementioned scenario. The derived expression is shown to require significantly lower complexity than their GLR counterparts based on the same

quantization type, thus highlighting their practical applicability. Furthermore, the resulting SQ (for G-Rao) and RQ (for G-LOD) optimization (by means of the corresponding quantization thresholds) are shown to be *sensor-individual* (i.e., each threshold can be optimized independently of the others), considers the sensor-FC channel status, and does not depend upon either the target strength or its position, thus allowing *offline* computation.

- 4) A comprehensive simulation-based analysis is presented to compare the proposed G-Rao and G-LOD tests with: a) their GLR counterparts and b) tests based on full-precision measurements (i.e., no quantization and reporting loss). The above comparison is performed over relevant WSN parameters, such as the sensing signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), the ratio between direct and scattered terms, and the current reporting channel quality.

We note that the present work extends our earlier conference paper [24], which provided only a *preliminary analysis* of fusion rule design and quantizer optimization-based only on the G-Rao test. To the best of our knowledge, only the aforementioned work has tackled DD of an uncooperative target in the *multiplicative fading* case to date.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section II states the considered problem. Section III develops GLR and G-score tests for the setup introduced. Then, Section IV focuses on the quantizer design. Numerical results and concluding discussion are given in Section V.

Notation: Lowercase bold letters are adopted for vectors, with a_n representing the n th component of \mathbf{a} ; $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$, $(\cdot)^T$, and $u(\cdot)$ denote expectation, vector-transpose, and the unit step function, respectively; $p(\cdot)$ and $P(\cdot)$ represent the probability density functions (pdf) and probability mass functions (pmf), respectively; χ_k^2 [resp. $\chi_k'^2(\xi)$] denotes a chi-square (resp. a noncentral chi-square) pdf with k degrees of freedom (resp. and noncentrality parameter ξ); $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ denotes a Gaussian pdf with mean μ and variance σ^2 ; $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot)$ [resp. $p_{\mathcal{N}}(\cdot)$] denotes the complementary cumulative distribution function (resp. the pdf) of a normal random variable in its standard form, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$; the symbol \sim (resp. $\overset{a}{\sim}$) corresponds to “distributed as” (resp. to “asymptotically distributed as”).

II. WSN MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a set of sensors $k \in \mathcal{K} \triangleq \{1, \dots, K\}$ monitoring a given area to test the absence (\mathcal{H}_0) or presence (\mathcal{H}_1) of a noncooperative target, as illustrated in Fig. 1. When the target is present (\mathcal{H}_1), we assume that it radiates an *unknown deterministic* isotropic signal θ , which is affected by path loss, multiplicative fading, and additive noise, before reaching each sensor

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_0: z_k = w_k \\ \mathcal{H}_1: z_k = g(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}_T) h_k \theta + w_k. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In (1), $z_k \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes the k th sensor observation, whereas $w_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w,k}^2)$ and $h_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{h,k}, \sigma_{h,k}^2)$ are the noise

and multiplicative fading terms, respectively.¹ Also, $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the *known* k th sensor position (obtained via self-localization procedures), while $\mathbf{x}_T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the *unknown* target position. Both the terms \mathbf{x}_T and \mathbf{x}_k determine the value of the *generic* AAF $g(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)$. In fact, any functional form of the AAF (accounting for the spatial target signature) may be considered in this article, given the availability of $g(\cdot, \cdot)$ at FC.²

For compactness, in what follows, we use the shorthand notation $g_k \triangleq g(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)$. Hence, based on the above assumptions, $z_k | \mathcal{H}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{w,k}^2)$ and $z_k | \mathcal{H}_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta, \sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta))$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, where $\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta) = (g_k^2 \sigma_{h,k}^2 \theta^2 + \sigma_{w,k}^2)$ denotes the k th *equivalent variance*.

Furthermore, we define: 1) target SNR and 2) the ratio between direct (Line of Sight, LoS) and scattered (Non Line-of-Sight, NLoS) target power terms, respectively, as

$$\text{SNR} \triangleq 10 \log_{10} \left(\theta^2 \left(\mu_h^2 + \sigma_h^2 \right) / \sigma_w^2 \right) \quad (2)$$

$$\kappa \triangleq 10 \log_{10} \left(\mu_h^2 / \sigma_h^2 \right). \quad (3)$$

To address the energy and bandwidth limitations in IoT scenarios, the k th sensor quantizes z_k into a single bit.³ Herein, we investigate *two* quantization strategies. In the first case, we consider the usual RQ [15], namely, $b_k \triangleq u(z_k - \tau_k)$. In the second case, we investigate SQ, namely, $d_k \triangleq u(z_k^2 - \gamma_k)$, which was used for the purely random (*viz.*, stochastic) signal case in [23] and [29]. For RQ, the bit detection probability under \mathcal{H}_1 equals

$$\beta_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq \mathcal{Q} \left([\tau_k - g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta] / \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)} \right) \quad (4)$$

while for \mathcal{H}_0 it is given by $\beta_{0,k} \triangleq \beta_k(\theta = 0, \mathbf{x}_T) = \mathcal{Q}(\tau_k / \sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2})$. Differently, for SQ, the bit detection probability under \mathcal{H}_1 equals

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq & \mathcal{Q} \left([\sqrt{\gamma_k} - g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta] / \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)} \right) \\ & + \mathcal{Q} \left([\sqrt{\gamma_k} + g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta] / \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

while for \mathcal{H}_0 it is $\rho_{0,k} \triangleq \rho_k(\theta = 0, \mathbf{x}_T) = 2 \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{\gamma_k} / \sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2})$.

To model energy-constrained communications within the IoT context, after RQ (resp. SQ) the k th sensor bit b_k (resp. d_k) is sent over a channel modeled as a BSC. Hence, the FC receives a noisy version \hat{b}_k (resp. \hat{d}_k), where $P_{e,k}$ denotes the *known* bit-error probability of the k th link, namely, $\hat{b}_k = (1 - b_k)$ [resp. $\hat{d}_k = (1 - d_k)$] with bit-flip probability $P_{e,k}$. We

note that the considered set of independent BSCs can emulate the modulation-decoding process⁴ usually adopted in WSNs and IoT applications employing the uplink of the NB-IoT standard [27]. Indeed, although WSNs need to provide connectivity to a large number of sensors, the latter have low data rate requirements. Accordingly, low-order modulation schemes (e.g., BPSK) and single-carrier frequency-division multiple access perfectly fit their needs. Such configuration is a common operational mode of the NB-IoT uplink, as detailed in what follows.

More specifically, NB-IoT has a bandwidth of 180 kHz, corresponding to one LTE physical resource block. Additionally, a possible subcarrier spacing equals 3.75 kHz (the other configuration spacing allowed is 15 kHz) in single-tone transmission, for a total of 48 subcarriers, and each subcarrier can be allocated to a different user for a time slot of 32 ms. The latter constitutes the elementary resource unit to be allocated to a single user for sending its data. Therefore, if the sensing duty cycle for each node is 0.1 s, then the system can support the noninterfering transmission/reception of more than 150 sensors performing one-bit quantization of their corresponding measurements in a given cell. In view of these considerations, we can safely hypothesize orthogonal channels between the sensors and the FC, similar to [2].

For the sake of a compact notation, we collect the received bits as $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \triangleq [\hat{b}_1 \dots \hat{b}_K]^T$ and $\hat{\mathbf{d}} \triangleq [\hat{d}_1 \dots \hat{d}_K]^T$ in RQ and SQ cases, respectively.

Given these assumptions, when RQ is applied, the probability that $\hat{b}_k = 1$ under \mathcal{H}_1 is given by $\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq (1 - P_{e,k})\beta_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) + P_{e,k}(1 - \beta_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T))$, whereas under \mathcal{H}_0 $\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} = (1 - P_{e,k})\beta_{0,k} + P_{e,k}(1 - \beta_{0,k})$. Similarly, when SQ is adopted, the probability that $\hat{d}_k = 1$ under \mathcal{H}_1 is given by $\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq (1 - P_{e,k})\rho_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) + P_{e,k}(1 - \rho_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T))$, whereas under \mathcal{H}_0 the expression equals $\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} = (1 - P_{e,k})\rho_{0,k} + P_{e,k}(1 - \rho_{0,k})$.

Definition of Test of Hypotheses: Note that the full-precision testing problem, *i.e.*, which assumes the availability of original measurements z_1, \dots, z_K , depends on the unknown target position \mathbf{x}_T , which can be observed at the FC *only* when the *signal is present* ($\theta \neq \theta_0$, where $\theta_0 = 0$), *i.e.*, $\{\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1\} \rightarrow \{\theta = \theta_0, \theta \neq \theta_0\}$. Hence, the test with full-precision measurements is a two-sided one with a nuisance term (\mathbf{x}_T) identifiable only under \mathcal{H}_1 [28].

However, when considering the two quantization approaches, some *further clarifications* are necessary. In the case of RQ, the unknown target position \mathbf{x}_T can be observed at the FC *only* when the *signal is present* ($\theta \neq \theta_0$, where $\theta_0 = 0$), *i.e.*, $\{\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1\} \rightarrow \{\theta = \theta_0, \theta \neq \theta_0\}$, since $\beta_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ [and, as a consequence, $\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$] depends on θ . Hence, the corresponding test is again a two-sided one with a nuisance term (\mathbf{x}_T) identifiable only under \mathcal{H}_1 [28].

⁴We remark that the explicit inclusion of noisy and fading effects in the model underlying the design of the presented fusion rules (that is, considering a “decode-and-fuse” approach [30]), although promising in terms of achievable performance gains, constitutes a challenging task. This is due to the more involved expression of the pdf of the resulting received signal vector and to the difficulty in the evaluation of the consequent score/FI expressions. For this reason, the design of aforementioned class of fusion rules is left to future studies.

¹We hypothesize that sufficient spatial separation of the sensors implies statistical independence of noise and fading terms $w_{k,s}$ and $h_{k,s}$.

²The latter functional form may be estimated by means of some *training data* obtained by running an initialization phase (consisting of $n = 1, \dots, N$ timeslots) in which a *cooperative* target (with emitted signal $\theta[n]$ and position $\mathbf{x}_T[n]$ *known* at the FC) moves throughout the surveilled area and the (quantized) measurements transmitted by the WSN are collected by the FC. Once a sufficient number of training data have been gathered, the AAF may be estimated via standard learning techniques (e.g., kernel-based regression).

³In this work, we restrict our attention to: 1) deterministic and 2) one-bit quantizers. Still, the proposed fusion methodology (including the quantizer optimization later reported in Section IV) could be in principle applied also in the general case of nondeterministic (e.g., dithered) and multibit quantizers. The above interesting generalization is, however, left to future studies.

Conversely, when considering SQ, the k th probability $\rho_k(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ [and, as a consequence, $\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$] is actually a function of the target emitted power $P_\theta \triangleq \theta^2$. Therefore, we have

$$\rho_k(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq \mathcal{Q}\left(\left[\sqrt{\gamma_k} - |g_k \mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}\right] / \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}\right) + \mathcal{Q}\left(\left[\sqrt{\gamma_k} + |g_k \mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}\right] / \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}\right) \quad (6)$$

where $\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta) = (g_k^2 \sigma_{h,k}^2 P_\theta + \sigma_{w,k}^2)$. Hence, \mathbf{x}_T can be observed *only* when the power is present ($P_\theta > P_{\theta_0}$, where $P_{\theta_0} = 0$), i.e., $\{\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_1\} \rightarrow \{P_\theta = P_{\theta_0}, P_\theta > P_{\theta_0}\}$. Thus, in the SQ case, we test a one-sided parameter with a nuisance term (\mathbf{x}_T) identifiable only under \mathcal{H}_1 [28].

The aim of our study is to design a simple test (from a computational viewpoint) deciding in favor of \mathcal{H}_0 (resp. \mathcal{H}_1) when the statistic $[\Lambda(\hat{\mathbf{b}})$ or $\Lambda(\hat{\mathbf{d}})]$ is below (resp. above) the threshold γ_{fc} , and the design of the quantizer (i.e., optimized τ_k or γ_k , $k \in \mathcal{K}$) for each sensor. The FC performance is evaluated in terms of its false alarm ($P_F \triangleq \Pr\{\Lambda > \gamma_{\text{fc}} | \mathcal{H}_0\}$) and detection ($P_D \triangleq \Pr\{\Lambda > \gamma_{\text{fc}} | \mathcal{H}_1\}$) probabilities, respectively, with Λ denoting the generic decision statistic at the FC.

III. DESIGN OF THE FUSION RULES

First, we observe that the log-likelihood function of the received vector $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ versus (θ, \mathbf{x}_T) , namely, $\log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$, can be expressed in explicit form as [7] and [22]

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \hat{b}_k \log[\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] + (1 - \hat{b}_k) \log[1 - \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] \right\}. \quad (7)$$

We recall that the above expression holds also for SQ, i.e., with the log-likelihood $\log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$, if we replace \hat{b}_k and $\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ with \hat{d}_k and $\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$, respectively. We now introduce the design rationales considered for obtaining the proposed fusion rules.

The GLR is the most common approach for tests with composite hypotheses [22], with its implicit expression for the decision statistic based on RQ given by

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLR}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \triangleq 2 \log \left[\frac{P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)}{P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta_0)} \right]. \quad (8)$$

In the above equation, the pair $(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)$ represents the maximum-likelihood (ML) estimates under \mathcal{H}_1 , i.e.,

$$(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) \triangleq \arg \max_{(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)} P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T). \quad (9)$$

Similarly, the GLR statistic based on SQ is given by

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLR}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) \triangleq 2 \log \left[\frac{P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; \hat{P}_{\theta_1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)}{P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_{\theta_0})} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Analogously, the pair $(\hat{P}_{\theta_1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)$ represents the ML estimates under \mathcal{H}_1 , obtained as

$$(\hat{P}_{\theta_1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T) \triangleq \arg \max_{(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)} P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T). \quad (11)$$

We observe that Λ_{GLR} [see (8) and (10)] requires the solution of an optimization task. Unfortunately, the ML estimate pair $(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)$ [resp. $(\hat{P}_{\theta_1}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_T)$] cannot be obtained in closed form and this hinders its practical implementation. Hence, a (joint) grid approach is usually adopted on (θ, \mathbf{x}_T) [resp. (P_θ, \mathbf{x}_T)] [7], [21], [22]. Accordingly, the GLR statistic is able to provide an estimate for *both* the emitted signal θ (resp. power P_θ) and the target location \mathbf{x}_T .

On the other hand, Davies' work represents an alternative approach for capitalizing on either the two-sided (when RQ is applied) or one-sided (when SQ is applied) nature of the considered hypothesis test [28], allowing to generalize score tests to the more challenging scenario of nuisance parameters observed *only* under \mathcal{H}_1 . In fact, score tests rely on the ML estimates of nuisances under \mathcal{H}_0 [20], which cannot be obtained here since they are *unobservable*.

For instance, referring to our model and considering the design of a Rao test (based on RQ), the numerator of the statistics would be given by $(\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial \theta)^2 |_{\theta=\theta_0, \mathbf{x}_T=\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{T,0}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{T,0}$ represents the ML estimate of the target position under \mathcal{H}_0 . However, when the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 holds, the target is *absent*, and thus, its position \mathbf{x}_T *cannot be estimated*.

Conversely, if \mathbf{x}_T were known, the Rao (LOD) statistic would represent a suitable decision statistic for the corresponding two-sided (resp. one-sided) testing on θ (resp. P_θ) [20]. Unfortunately, since the target location parameter is not known in our case, we rather obtain a functional score statistics *indexed* by \mathbf{x}_T . Thus, to overcome this technical difficulty, Davies proposed the *functional supremum* as the relevant statistic, that is

$$\Lambda_{\text{GRao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \frac{(\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial \theta)^2 |_{\theta=\theta_0}}{I^{\text{rq}}(\theta_0, \mathbf{x}_T)} \quad (12)$$

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLoD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \frac{\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial P_\theta |_{P_\theta=P_{\theta_0}}}{\sqrt{I^{\text{sq}}(P_{\theta_0}, \mathbf{x}_T)}} \quad (13)$$

where $I^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{(\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial \theta)^2\}$ represents the fisher information (FI) of $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ (with respect to θ), assuming \mathbf{x}_T known. Similarly, $I^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \triangleq \mathbb{E}\{(\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial P_\theta)^2\}$ represents the FI of $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ (with respect to P_θ), assuming \mathbf{x}_T known. The underlying idea of Davies' approach is to select a test which accepts the hypothesis \mathcal{H}_1 when the functional statistic evaluated at the most-likely target position [i.e., that corresponding to $\arg \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \Lambda(\cdot; \mathbf{x}_T)$] exceeds a given threshold γ_{fc} . This choice can be also interpreted as a "GLRT-like" philosophy on these particular nuisance parameters. Accordingly, both the generalized score statistics in (12) and (13) implicitly estimate *only* the target location \mathbf{x}_T .

Hereinafter, we will refer to the decision statistics in (12) and (13) as Generalized Rao (G-Rao) and Generalized LOD (G-LoD), *respectively*, to indicate the use of Rao and LOD as the inner statistic within the Davies framework [7].

The closed-form expression of Λ_{GRao} is drawn by means of the explicit forms of the score function (i.e., $\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial \theta$) and the FI [i.e., $I^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$], *both evaluated* at $\theta = \theta_0$. Their derivation is provided in

Appendices A and B, respectively. In the former case, the final expression of the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) score function at $\theta = \theta_0$ is given by

$$\left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} = \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{rq}} g_k \quad (14)$$

where the auxiliary definition

$$\Xi_k^{\text{rq}} \triangleq \frac{(1 - 2P_{e,k})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}]} \frac{\mu_{h,k}}{\sigma_{w,k}} p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\tau_k}{\sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \right) \quad (15)$$

has been employed. We recall that $p_{\mathcal{N}}(\cdot)$ is used to denote the pdf of a normal random variable in its standard form. Also, we highlight that the term Ξ_k^{rq} allows to express the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) score function at $\theta = \theta_0$ in (14) in a compact form by separating deterministic terms not depending on \mathbf{x}_T from: 1) random contributions [i.e., $(\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}})$] and 2) deterministic terms that are instead function of \mathbf{x}_T (i.e., g_k). In the latter case, the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) FI at θ_0 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I^{\text{rq}}(\theta_0, \mathbf{x}_T) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{rq}})^2 g_k^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} g_k^2 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the definition $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} \triangleq \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{rq}})^2$ has been employed in the last line. Accordingly, the explicit form of the G-Rao statistic can be thus rewritten as $\Lambda_{\text{GRao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \Lambda_{\text{Rao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{x}_T)$, where

$$\Lambda_{\text{Rao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{x}_T) = \frac{\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K v_k^{\text{rq}}(\hat{b}_k) g(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k) \right\}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} g^2(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)} \quad (17)$$

denotes the Rao statistic assuming \mathbf{x}_T known, and we have defined $v_k^{\text{rq}}(\hat{b}_k) \triangleq (\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{rq}}$.

In contrast, the explicit expression of Λ_{GLOD} is drawn by means of the explicit forms of the score function ($\log [P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] / \partial P_\theta$) and the FI ($I^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$), both evaluated at $P_\theta = P_{\theta_0}$. Their derivation is provided in the Appendices A and B, respectively. In the former case, the final expression of the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) score function at $P_\theta = P_{\theta_0}$ is given by

$$\left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} \right|_{P_\theta=P_{\theta_0}} = \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{sq}} g_k^2 \quad (18)$$

where the definition

$$\Xi_k^{\text{sq}} \triangleq \frac{(1 - 2P_{e,k}) \sqrt{\gamma_k} (\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}] \sigma_{w,k}^3} p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_k}{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \right) \quad (19)$$

has been employed. We highlight that the term Ξ_k^{sq} allows to express the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) score function at $P_\theta = P_{\theta_0}$ in (18) in a compact form by separating deterministic terms not depending on \mathbf{x}_T from: 1) random contributions [i.e., $(\hat{d}_k -$

$\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}})$] and 2) deterministic terms that are instead function of \mathbf{x}_T (i.e., g_k^2). In the latter case, the (\mathbf{x}_T -conditional) FI at P_{θ_0} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I^{\text{sq}}(P_{\theta_0}, \mathbf{x}_T) &= \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{sq}})^2 g_k^4 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} g_k^4 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the definition $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} \triangleq \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{sq}})^2$ has been employed in the last line. As a result, the explicit form of the G-LOD statistic can be shown to be $\Lambda_{\text{GLOD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \Lambda_{\text{LOD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{x}_T)$ where

$$\Lambda_{\text{LOD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{x}_T) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K v_k^{\text{sq}}(\hat{d}_k) g^2(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} g^4(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)}} \quad (21)$$

denotes the LOD statistic assuming \mathbf{x}_T known, and we have defined $v_k^{\text{sq}}(\hat{d}_k) \triangleq (\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{sq}}$.

The appeal of G-Rao and G-LOD statistics is motivated by their *simpler implementation* (as $\hat{\theta}_1$ and $P_{\hat{\theta}_1}$ are not needed), requiring solely a grid with respect to \mathbf{x}_T , that is

$$\Lambda_{\text{GRao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \approx \max_{i=1, \dots, N_{\mathbf{x}_T}} \Lambda_{\text{Rao}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{x}_T[i]) \quad (22)$$

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLOD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}) \approx \max_{i=1, \dots, N_{\mathbf{x}_T}} \Lambda_{\text{LOD}}(\hat{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{x}_T[i]). \quad (23)$$

Thus, their complexity is $\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T})$, implying a *significant reduction* with respect to the GLR. Indeed, the complexity of the latter equals $\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T} N_\theta)$ and $\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T} N_{P_\theta})$ when RQ and SQ are adopted, respectively. In the above expressions, the terms $N_{\mathbf{x}_T}$ and N_θ (resp. N_{P_θ}) denote the number of position and amplitude (resp. power) bins employed. A comparison of the complexity involved in the implementation of the above fusion rules is summarized in Table I.

It is evident that Λ_{GRao} depends on τ_k 's (collected as $\boldsymbol{\tau} \triangleq [\tau_1 \ \dots \ \tau_K]^T$), via the terms $v_k^{\text{rq}}(\hat{b}_k)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, which can be *optimized* to boost performance, as performed in [24]. The same reasoning applies to Λ_{GLOD} , as it is a function of γ_k 's (collected as $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \triangleq [\gamma_1 \ \dots \ \gamma_K]^T$), through $v_k^{\text{sq}}(\hat{d}_k)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, which can be *optimized* as well. We notice that the same optimization applies also to Λ_{GLR} for RQ and SQ cases. We accomplish this objective in what follows.

IV. OPTIMIZATION OF QUANTIZERS THRESHOLDS

We point out that (asymptotically) optimal deterministic quantizers cannot be obtained, since no closed-form performance expressions exist for the tests based on Davies approach [28]. Hence, the rationale in [16], [29], and [31] cannot be applied to our case. Due to this reason, we use a modified approach (that resorts to a heuristic, yet intuitive, basis) that has been successfully applied to DD problems for the special cases of either purely deterministic or stochastic target emission [15], [23].

In detail, it is well known that the \mathbf{x}_T -clairvoyant Rao statistic Λ_{Rao} is distributed (under an asymptotic, weak-signal,

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF FUSION RULES CONSIDERED IN THIS WORK. FOR EACH OF THESE, THE COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY REQUIRED NEEDED FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION (VIA GRID DISCRETIZATION) IS ALSO REPORTED (LAST COLUMN)

Fusion Rule	Quantization	Expression	Complexity
GLR ^{rq}	RQ	$2 \max_{(\mathbf{x}_T, \theta)} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{b}_k \log \left[\frac{\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}} \right] + (1 - \hat{b}_k) \log \left[\frac{1 - \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}} \right]$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T} N_\theta)$
G-Rao ^{rq}	RQ	$\max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k^{\text{rq}}(\hat{b}_k) g_k \right\}^2 / \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} g_k^2$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T})$
GLR ^{sq}	SQ	$2 \max_{(\mathbf{x}_T, P_\theta)} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{d}_k \log \left[\frac{\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}} \right] + (1 - \hat{d}_k) \log \left[\frac{1 - \alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}} \right]$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T} N_{P_\theta})$
G-LOD ^{sq}	SQ	$\max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \sum_{k=1}^K \nu_k^{\text{sq}}(\hat{d}_k) g_k^2 / \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} g_k^4}$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T})$
GLR ^{fp}	-	$\max_{(\mathbf{x}_T, \theta)} \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left[\sigma_{w,k}^2 / \sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta) \right] + \left[z_k^2 / \sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta) \right] - \left[(z_k - g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta)^2 / \sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta) \right]$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T} N_\theta)$
G-Rao ^{fp}	-	$\max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K g_k \mu_{h,k} z_k / \sigma_{w,k}^2 \right)^2 / \sum_{k=1}^K g_k^2 \mu_{h,k}^2 / \sigma_{w,k}^2$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T})$
G-LOD ^{fp}	-	$\max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{g_k^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} (\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2) \left(\frac{z_k^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} - 1 \right) \right] / \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{g_k^4}{\sigma_{w,k}^4} (\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)^2}$	$\mathcal{O}(K N_{\mathbf{x}_T})$

assumption)⁵ as [20]

$$\Lambda_{\text{Rao}}(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \stackrel{a}{\sim} \begin{cases} \chi_1^2, & \text{under } \mathcal{H}_0 \\ \chi_1^2(\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})), & \text{under } \mathcal{H}_1. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

A similar result applies to the \mathbf{x}_T -clairvoyant LOD statistic Λ_{LOD} , which is asymptotically (under the same conditions as the Rao test) distributed as [20]

$$\Lambda_{\text{LOD}}(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \stackrel{a}{\sim} \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), & \text{under } \mathcal{H}_0 \\ \mathcal{N}(\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}), 1), & \text{under } \mathcal{H}_1. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

The noncentrality $\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \triangleq (\theta_1 - \theta_0)^2 \mathbf{I}(\theta_0, \mathbf{x}_T)$ and the deflection $\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) \triangleq (P_{\theta_1} - P_{\theta_0}) \sqrt{\mathbf{I}(P_{\theta_0}, \mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})}$ measures⁶ in (24) and (25), respectively, are given as

$$\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = \theta_1^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k) g^2(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k) \quad (26)$$

$$\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = P_{\theta_1} \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\gamma_k) g^4(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k)}. \quad (27)$$

Additionally, they are reported as a function of $(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$, respectively, to stress the dependence on the unknown position \mathbf{x}_T and the vector of variables to optimize ($\boldsymbol{\tau}$ or $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$). Finally, the terms θ_1 and P_{θ_1} represent the *true values of the target signal and power*, respectively, under \mathcal{H}_1 .

Clearly, the larger $\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ are, the better the \mathbf{x}_T -clairvoyant Rao and LOD tests, respectively, will perform when the target to be detected is located at \mathbf{x}_T . The same applies to the \mathbf{x}_T -clairvoyant GLR on either quantizer-originated data. For this reason, we aim to design the threshold vectors $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, respectively, as

$$\boldsymbol{\tau}^* \triangleq \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} \lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \quad (28)$$

⁵That is, $|\theta_1 - \theta_0| = c/\sqrt{K}$ for a certain value $c > 0$ [20].

⁶We employ the slightly modified notations $\mathbf{I}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k)$ [resp. $\mathbf{I}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\gamma_k)$], as opposed to $\mathbf{I}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}$ [resp. $\mathbf{I}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}$], to stress the dependence on thresholds τ_k 's. (resp. γ_k 's).

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* \triangleq \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}). \quad (29)$$

However, by doing so, we could potentially obtain (impractical) solutions $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$, which depend on \mathbf{x}_T . Luckily, for this particular problem, the optimization simplifies into K *decoupled* threshold designs (hence, the optimization complexity scales linearly with the number of sensors K), whose solutions are also independent of \mathbf{x}_T [see (26) and (27)].

Indeed, for the G-Rao case, it holds (for each k)

$$\max_{\tau_k} \left\{ \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k) = \frac{\mu_{h,k}^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} \frac{p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\tau_k / \sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2})}{\Delta_k + \beta_{0,k}(\tau_k) [1 - \beta_{0,k}(\tau_k)]} \right\} \quad (30)$$

where $\Delta_k \triangleq [P_{e,k} (1 - P_{e,k})] / (1 - 2P_{e,k})^2$. The aforementioned objective is shown in Fig. 2(a) for different values of $P_{e,k}$ and κ . It is known from the quantized estimation literature [32], [33] that for Gaussian pdf $\tau_k^* \triangleq \arg \max_{\tau_k} \psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k) = 0$ when $\Delta_k = 0$ (corresponding to $P_{e,k} = 0$). However, it is not difficult to show⁷ that this result holds for any value of $\Delta_k \neq 0$, which corresponds to different conditions of the noisy ($P_{e,k} \neq 0$) reporting channels. It is worth noticing that the objective maximizer in (30) coincides with the one obtained for the case of a purely deterministic (LoS) parameter in [15] and is thus *independent* of the specific LoS/NLoS relative weight.

⁷Indeed, the inequality $p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\tau_k^0) / \{\Delta_k + \mathcal{Q}(\tau_k^0) [1 - \mathcal{Q}(\tau_k^0)]\} \leq p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(0) / \{\Delta_k + \mathcal{Q}(0) [1 - \mathcal{Q}(0)]\}$, where $\tau_k^0 \triangleq \tau_k / \sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2}$, can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\tau_k^0) \mathcal{Q}(0) [1 - \mathcal{Q}(0)] - p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(0) \mathcal{Q}(\tau_k^0) [1 - \mathcal{Q}(\tau_k^0)] \right\} \\ & + \Delta_k \left\{ p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\tau_k^0) - p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(0) \right\} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The above condition is always satisfied since the negativity of first term within the curly brackets follows directly from the result for ideal BSCs ($\Delta_k = 0$) [32], [34], while for the second term both (1) $\Delta_k > 0$ and (2) $\{p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\tau_k^0) - p_{\mathcal{N}}^2(0)\} \leq 0$ (because the normal distribution attains its mode at zero) hold.




Fig. 2. Threshold objectives used for optimizing (a) RQ ($\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k)$) and (b) SQ ($\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\rho_{0,k})$) for $P_{e,k} \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2\}$ and $\kappa \in \{-5, 0\}$ dB. (a) Objective function for selection of τ_k^* in G-Rao^{rq} and GLR^{rq}. (b) Objective function for selection of $\rho_{0,k}^*$ (viz., γ_k^*) in G-LOD^{sq} and GLR^{sq}.

Differently, for the G-LOD case, we have (for each k)

$$\max_{\gamma_k} \left\{ \psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\gamma_k) = \frac{(\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)^2}{(\sigma_{w,k}^2)^2} \times \frac{P_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\sqrt{\gamma_k/\sigma_{w,k}^2})(\gamma_k/\sigma_{w,k}^2)}{\Delta_k + \rho_{0,k}(\gamma_k)[1 - \rho_{0,k}(\gamma_k)]} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Such maximization can be reformulated in terms of the sensor false-alarm probability $\rho_{0,k}$ (being in *bijective* correspondence with γ_k) as

$$\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\rho_{0,k}) = \frac{(\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)^2}{(\sigma_{w,k}^2)^2} \times \frac{P_{\mathcal{N}}^2(\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\rho_{0,k}/2)) [\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(\rho_{0,k}/2)]^2}{\Delta_k + \rho_{0,k}(1 - \rho_{0,k})}. \quad (32)$$

The aforementioned objective is shown in Fig. 2(b) for different values of $P_{e,k}$ and κ . The optimized $\rho_{0,k}^*$ can be easily evaluated via a 1-D line search. It is worth noticing that the objective maximizer in (32) coincides with the one obtained for the case of a purely random (NLoS) parameter in [23], and is thus independent on the specific LoS/NLoS relative weight.

Remarks: Although optimization of both raw- and square-quantizer thresholds has been shown to be independent of the specific LoS/NLoS relative weight, we stress that detection performance in both cases is going to depend significantly on the above parameter instead. Indeed, we observe that the (optimized) noncentrality $\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ grows, via the terms $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, with $\mu_{h,k}^2/\sigma_{w,k}^2$ [see (30)]. Conversely, the (optimized) noncentrality $\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$ grows, via the terms $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\rho_{0,k})$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, with $(\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)/\sigma_{w,k}^2$ [see (32)]. Hence, the above observations highlight that: 1) the performance of G-LOD is likely to be weakly dependent over a wide range of LoS/NLoS relative conditions (because of the presence of the sum $\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2$); 2) G-Rao is expected to suffer from severe performance degradation when NLoS terms become dominant (because of the absence of $\sigma_{h,k}^2$); and 3) in highly LoS conditions, we expect a more sensible gain achieved by G-Rao at low SNR as the result of the squaring of $(\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)/\sigma_{w,k}^2$ in (32).

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Simulation Setup: Herein, we compare the numerical performance of the optimized G-Rao, G-LOD, and GLR tests, based on the threshold-optimization design proposed in Section IV. Specifically, our simulation setup considers a 2-D ($\mathbf{x}_T \in \mathbb{R}^2$) square area defined as $\mathcal{A} \triangleq [0, 1]^2$, in which a non-cooperative target is detected by a WSN with $K = 49$ sensors. For simplicity, the nodes are arranged to uniformly cover the whole \mathcal{A} in a grid fashion. Regarding the sensing model, the AAF considered is a power law, namely

$$g(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{x}_k) \triangleq 1 / \sqrt{1 + (\|\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{x}_k\|/\eta)^\alpha} \quad (33)$$

where we have set $\eta = 0.2$ (viz., approximate target extent) and $\alpha = 4$ (viz. decay exponent). Also, for simplicity, $w_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2 = 1)$ and $\mu_h^2 = 1$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$. Initially, we assume error-free BSCs, namely, $P_{e,k} = 0$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$. All the simulations are based on 10^5 Monte Carlo runs.

Based on Section III, the implementation of Λ_{GLR} , Λ_{GRao} , and Λ_{GLOD} leverages grid search. Specifically, the search space of the target signal θ (resp. power P_θ) is assumed to be $S_\theta \triangleq [-\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$ (resp. $S_{P_\theta} \triangleq [0, P_{\bar{\theta}}]$), where $\bar{\theta} > 0$ (resp. $P_{\bar{\theta}} > 0$) is such that the SNR = 20 dB. The vector collecting the points on the grid is then defined as $[-\mathbf{g}_\theta^T \ 0 \ \mathbf{g}_\theta^T]^T$ (resp. $[0 \ \mathbf{g}_{P_\theta}^T]^T$), where \mathbf{g}_θ (resp. \mathbf{g}_{P_θ}) collects target strengths (power values) corresponding to the SNR values $-10:2.5:20$ (dB). As a result, the number of amplitude and power bins equals $N_\theta = 25$ and $N_{P_\theta} = 13$, respectively. Second, the search support of \mathbf{x}_T coincides with the monitored area ($S_{\mathbf{x}_T} = \mathcal{A}$). Accordingly, the 2-D grid is the result of sampling \mathcal{A} uniformly with $N_{\mathbf{x}_T} = N_c^2$ points, where $N_c = 100$. In this setup, the evaluation of G-Rao (G-LOD) requires $N_c^2 = 10^4$ grid points, as opposed to $N_c^2 N_\theta = 2.5 \times 10^5$ (resp. $N_c^2 N_{P_\theta} = 1.3 \times 10^5$) points for GLR. This leads to a > 20 (resp. > 10) times lower complexity of G-Rao (G-LOD) with respect to a GLR based on the same quantization strategy.

Considered Baselines: For the sake of a complete comparison and to assess the loss due to quantization, we consider the following baselines: 1) a GLR having available the full-precision measurements z_k 's; 2) G-Rao; and 3) G-LOD tests based on the same data. Regarding 1), its (implicit) expression is analogous to that in (8) and is implemented via the




Fig. 3. P_D versus κ factor (dB); false-alarm probability at FC is set to $P_F = 0.01$. A WSN with $K = 49$ sensors and target with SNR = 10 dB is considered. The sensor thresholds for RQ and SQ are set according to the design reported in Section IV.

following explicit expression:

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLR}}^{\text{fp}}(\mathbf{z}) = \max_{(\mathbf{x}_T, \theta)} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \log \left[\frac{\sigma_{w,k}^2}{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)} \right] + \left[\frac{z_k^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} \right] - \left[\frac{(z_k - g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta)^2}{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)} \right] \right\}. \quad (34)$$

For 2) and 3), their explicit expressions (the proof is not included for brevity) are, respectively, given as

$$\Lambda_{\text{GRao}}^{\text{fp}}(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \frac{\left(\sum_{k=1}^K g_k \mu_{h,k} z_k / \sigma_{w,k}^2 \right)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^K g_k^2 \mu_{h,k}^2 / \sigma_{w,k}^2} \quad (35)$$

$$\Lambda_{\text{GLOD}}^{\text{fp}}(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \max_{\mathbf{x}_T} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{g_k^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} (\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2) \left(\frac{z_k^2}{\sigma_{w,k}^2} - 1 \right) \right]}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{g_k^4}{\sigma_{w,k}^4} (\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2)^2}}. \quad (36)$$

We remark that in order to apply G-LOD, the derivation is actually performed starting from the square values z_k^2 (leading to an analogous change of the nature of the test from two-sided to one-sided as in the one-bit quantization case).

Discussion of Results: First, Fig. 3 provides a P_D comparison (subject to $P_F = 0.01$) of considered fusion rules versus κ (dB), to assess their detection sensitivity versus the LoS/NLoS relative terms ratio emitted by the noncooperative target. In the present analysis, the target position \mathbf{x}_T is randomly sampled within \mathcal{A} at each run (when \mathcal{H}_1 is drawn). We consider a sensing SNR = 10 dB for the target. The results highlight that G-LOD^{sq} performs as well as a GLR^{sq} and outperforms both G-Rao and GLR based on RQ, over the whole κ range. The observation of the performance for tests based on full-precision highlight: 1) the loss due to quantization and 2) problems related to considering a Rao test for the multiplicative fading case, especially in a low κ condition.

Then, in Fig. 4, we perform a P_D comparison (subject to $P_F = 0.01$) of considered fusion rules versus SNR (dB), to assess their detection rate versus the sensing SNR for two different conditions of “scatteredness,” namely, $\kappa = 0$ dB and




Fig. 4. P_D versus SNR (dB); false-alarm probability at FC is set to $P_F=0.01$. A WSN with $K = 49$ sensors is considered. Sensor thresholds for RQ- and SQ-based rules are set according to Section IV. (a) $\kappa = 10$ dB. (b) $\kappa = 0$ dB.




Fig. 5. P_D versus number of sensors K ; false-alarm probability at FC is set to $P_F = 0.01$. A target with SNR = 10 dB and $\kappa = 10$ dB is considered. Sensor thresholds for RQ- and SQ-based rules are set according to Section IV.

$\kappa = 10$ dB. The results highlight the close match between the GLR and the corresponding generalized score test (G-Rao or G-LOD) based on the same type of data (i.e., FP, RQ, or SQ). By comparing G-Rao^{rq} and G-LOD^{sq}, it is apparent that their relative performance depends on the scatteredness condition. For example, while for high-LoS, G-Rao^{rq} performs better, in the case of low-LoS, the advantage of G-LOD^{sq} becomes apparent. The advantage of the squaring operation is also evident from the performance gap reduction achieved by G-LOD^{fp} with respect to GLR^{sq} and G-Rao^{fp}.

As a complementary analysis, in Fig. 5, we deepen the P_D comparison (subject to $P_F = 0.01$) by analyzing a variable number of sensors K . In detail, we consider the same square surveillance area $\mathcal{A} = [0, 1]^2$, but we assume a linear increase of the number of sensors on the grid length (i.e., a quadratic grow of K) so as to investigate the effect of WSN grid densification on the system detection rate. As expected,




Fig. 6. Comparison of G-LOD^{sq} and G-Rao^{rq} for randomly-generated target. P_D versus (κ, SNR) (dB) for FC false-alarm probability set to $P_F = 0.01$ for (a) G-LOD^{sq} and (b) G-Rao^{rq}, respectively, and (c) their difference $\Delta P_D \triangleq (P_D^{\text{GLoD}^{\text{sq}}} - P_D^{\text{GRao}^{\text{rq}}})$. A WSN with $K = 49$ sensors is considered: their thresholds are optimized as in Section IV; ideal BSCs are assumed, i.e., $P_{e,k} = 0$.




Fig. 7. P_D versus BEP ($P_{e,k} = P_e$); the FC false-alarm probability is set to $P_F = 0.01$. A WSN with $K = 49$ sensors and target with sensing SNR = 10 dB are considered. (a) $\kappa = 0$ dB. (b) $\kappa = 5$ dB.

all the considered fusion rules benefit from a finer grid of sensors monitoring the target to be detected, with the rules based on FP achieving near-ideal performance with a lower number of sensors (i.e., a coarser grid). Differently, concerning fusion rules based on one-bit quantization, those based on SQ achieve slightly improved performance for lower values of K . Differently, as the WSN densification grows, such gain over RQ-based rules reduces. For instance, when targeting $P_D \approx 0.8$, (resp. $P_D \approx 0.9$) a uniform grid with $K = 49$ (resp. $K = 64$) sensors suffices for both RQ-based and SQ-based rules.

A more in-depth comparison of G-LOD^{sq} and G-Rao^{rq} along the κ and SNR dimensions is reported in Fig. 6. Specifically, we present P_D versus (κ, SNR) (dB) for an FC false-alarm probability set to $P_F = 0.01$ for G-LOD^{sq} (left) and G-Rao^{rq} (center), respectively, and their difference ΔP_D (right). From the inspection of results, we can infer how G-Rao^{rq} is highly sensitive to low values of κ (NLoS condition). Differently, G-LOD^{sq} is almost insensitive to the specific LoS/NLoS condition (viz., the value of κ). The performances of both fusion rules degrade with a decreasing SNR. By comparing the performance of both rules [via the difference $\Delta P_D \triangleq (P_D^{\text{GLoD}^{\text{sq}}} - P_D^{\text{GRao}^{\text{rq}}})$] over the whole (κ, SNR) plane, it is apparent how high SNR and high κ represent the region where G-LOD^{sq} “wins,” whereas an opposite outcome is observed in the case of low SNR and low κ (i.e., G-Rao^{rq} wins). Still, in the latter case, the performance gain ensured by G-Rao^{rq} over G-LOD^{sq} (right figure) is not as high as the winning G-LOD^{sq} region. Such results may be explained by looking at the terms $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\rho_{0,k})$ [see (30) and (32), respectively], and their relative trends highlighted at the end of Section IV. Indeed, $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}(\tau_k)$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}(\rho_{0,k})$ directly influence the value of the \mathbf{x}_T -clairvoyant noncentrality parameters $\lambda_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $\delta_Q(\mathbf{x}_T, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$, respectively, which limit (from the above) the achievable performance of G-Rao^{rq} and G-LOD^{sq}.

We then delve into the analysis of the effect of the reporting errors by means of Fig. 7. The latter provides a P_D comparison (subject to $P_F = 0.01$) of the seven fusion rules versus $P_{e,k} = P_e$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$ (i.e., the same BEP for all the sensors). Two different scatteredness cases are considered, namely, $\kappa = 0$ dB [Fig. 7(a)] and $\kappa = 5$ dB [Fig. 7(b)]. The results highlight that BEP (viz., P_e) increase has a detrimental effect on *all* the RQ/SQ-based rules and further enlarges their gap with respect to FP-based counterparts. Remarkably, in the case of $\kappa = 5$ dB, the benefits of SQ (over RQ) are almost nullified when $P_e \approx 0.15$.

Finally, we investigate the detection coverage properties of the considered fusion rules over the entire surveillance area




Fig. 8. P_D heatmaps versus target position \mathbf{x}_T for (a) G-Rao^{rq}, (b) G-LOD^{sq}, (d) GLR^{rq}, and (e) GLR^{sq}. For completeness, also the best two full-precision baselines [(c) and (f), corresponding to GLR^{fp} and G-LOD^{fp}, respectively] are reported. The FC false-alarm probability is set to $P_F = 0.01$. WSN with $K = 49$ sensors and target with sensing SNR = 5 dB and $\kappa = 0$ dB are considered. Corresponding decisions are sent over BSCs with $P_{e,k} = 0.1$. The sensor thresholds for RQ and SQ are set according to the design reported in Section IV.

\mathcal{A} . To this end, in Fig. 8, we report P_D (under $P_F = 0.01$) versus the target location \mathbf{x}_T (for SNR = 5 dB and $\kappa = 0$ dB) for all the rules considered, except of G-Rao^{fp}, due to its poor performance in this peculiar NLoS configuration. It is apparent that $P_D(\mathbf{x}_T)$ surface is similar for all the rules from a qualitative viewpoint. Also, it underlines lower detection performance at the edges of the surveillance area. This outcome arises from the regular WSN placement within \mathcal{A} for the scenario analyzed. From the comparison among the different rules, it is apparent that the G-LOD^{sq} test presents only marginal loss with respect to GLR^{sq}, and significant gain with respect to G-Rao^{rq} and GLR^{rq}. Clearly, the detection coverage is not as good as the FP counterparts considered, due to the degrading effect of parsimonious (one-bit) quantization.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this work, we devised a WSN-based DD scheme in the presence of: 1) multiplicative fading; 2) quantized measurements; and 3) nonideal and nonidentical BSCs. The target to be detected emits an unknown (since it is noncooperative) deterministic signal (θ) from unknown location (\mathbf{x}_T). Since \mathbf{x}_T is a nuisance parameter present only under \mathcal{H}_1 (i.e., when $\theta \neq 0$), we designed generalized versions of the Rao and LOD tests as attractive (low-complexity) alternatives to GLR [the latter requiring a grid search on the whole space (θ, \mathbf{x}_T)] based on the same quantization choice. These generalized forms were obtained from the framework in [28]. The resulting forms of G-Rao and G-LOD require single maximization (with respect to \mathbf{x}_T) of a family of \mathbf{x}_T -conditional decision statistics, obtained by assuming \mathbf{x}_T known, thus avoiding the need for grid search over θ (or P_θ). Furthermore, we developed an effective criterion (drawn from semitheoretical performance)

to optimize sensor thresholds of either quantization type (RQ or SQ). This resulted in a zero-threshold choice for RQ and a simple 1-D search for SQ. Also, these outcomes were shown to be independent of the specific κ value. Numerical results for G-LOD^{sq} underlined: 1) similar P_D values to both G-Rao^{rq} and GLR^{rq} in the LoS case; 2) similar performance of GLR^{sq} in the NLoS case; and 3) high gains with respect to G-Rao^{rq} over a relevant κ range. Accordingly, we believe the adoption of SQ with G-LOD^{sq} represents an appealing design choice for DD in such scenario for a wide range of LoS/NLoS conditions. The sole exception is represented by high-LOS low-SNR scenarios, where the joint use of RQ and G-Rao test at the FC should be preferred.

Future directions of research will investigate DD via sensor fusion in more challenging and close-to-real contexts. These include multibit quantizers [35], robustness to phy-layer attacks [36], time-correlated reporting channels [37], multidimensional measurement models [38], incompletely specified noise and model pdfs (e.g., unknown AAF), models enjoying sparsity [8], and energy-efficient censoring sensors. Additionally, the derivation of (asymptotic) theoretical expressions for the detection (P_D) and false-alarm (P_F) probabilities of generalized score tests is also foreseen as a (challenging) avenue for future research.

APPENDIX A DERIVATION OF THE SCORE FUNCTIONS

In this Appendix, we derive the \mathbf{x}_T -conditional score functions for G-Rao and G-LOD tests, namely, $\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T) / \partial \theta]$ and i.e., $\partial \log [P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) / \partial P_\theta]$, evaluated at θ_0 and P_{θ_0} , respectively.

We first focus on the score function needed for G-Rao evaluation. Precisely, based on the factorization form in (7), the

log-likelihood function $\log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ is given by

$$\log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T) = \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \hat{b}_k \log[\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] + (1 - \hat{b}_k) \times \log[1 - \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)] \right\}. \quad (37)$$

Taking the derivative of $\log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ with respect to θ , we write the corresponding expression as (due to independence)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{P'(\hat{b}_k; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{P(\hat{b}_k; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \frac{(\hat{b}_k - \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T))}{\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) [1 - \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)]}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

According to the bit probability model in (4), the derivative of $\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ with respect to θ is given explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} &= (1 - 2P_{e,k}) p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\tau_k - g_k \mu_{h,k} \theta}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(\theta)}} \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{(\tau_k g_k^2 \sigma_{h,k}^2 \theta + g_k \mu_{h,k} \sigma_{w,k}^2)}{[\sigma_{\text{eq},k}(\theta)]^{3/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Evaluating the derivative of the log-pdf in (38) at $\theta = \theta_0$ (corresponding to the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0), leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left. \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} \frac{(\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}]} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

and, in turn

$$\left. \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} = (1 - 2P_{e,k}) p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\tau_k}{\sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \right) \frac{g_k \mu_{h,k}}{\sigma_{w,k}}. \quad (41)$$

Then, exploiting the appropriate substitutions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \frac{(\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}]} (1 - 2P_{e,k}) p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\tau_k}{\sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \right) \frac{g_k \mu_{h,k}}{\sigma_{w,k}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By defining the auxiliary quantity

$$\Xi_k^{\text{rq}} \triangleq \frac{(1 - 2P_{e,k})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}]} \frac{\mu_{h,k}}{\sigma_{w,k}} p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\tau_k / \sqrt{\sigma_{w,k}^2} \right) \quad (43)$$

we obtain the final expression

$$\left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{b}}; \theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\theta_0} = \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{rq}} g_k. \quad (44)$$

Differently, referring to the \mathbf{x}_T -conditional score function needed for G-LOD evaluation, we observe that $\log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ admits a similar additive form as (37). Accordingly, $\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) / \partial P_\theta$ can be rewritten similarly as the last line of (38) if we replace \hat{b}_k , $\alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ and $\partial \alpha_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) / \partial \theta$ with \hat{d}_k , $\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ and $\partial \alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) / \partial P_\theta$, respectively.

Based on the bit probability model in (6), the derivative of $\alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ with respect to P_θ is more involved and given explicitly as in (45), shown at the bottom of the page.

Evaluating the derivative of the log-pdf in (38) at $P_\theta = P_{\theta_0}$ (corresponding to the null hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0), leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} \right|_{P_\theta=P_{\theta_0}} &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\lim_{P_\theta \rightarrow P_{\theta_0}} \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} \right) \frac{(\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}]}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The above limit is an undetermined form of the type (0/0) and its explicit solution (obtained by leveraging $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} [\exp(x) - 1]/x = 1$) is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \alpha_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} &= (1 - 2P_{e,k}) \times \left\{ \frac{|g_k| |\mu_{h,k}| \sigma_{w,k}^2}{2 \sqrt{P_\theta} [\sigma_{\text{eq},k}(P_\theta)]^3} \left[-p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} + |g_k| |\mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}} \right) + p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} - |g_k| |\mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}} \right) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} g_k^2 \sigma_{h,k}^2}{2 [\sigma_{\text{eq},k}(P_\theta)]^3} \left[p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} + |g_k| |\mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}} \right) + p_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} - |g_k| |\mu_{h,k}| \sqrt{P_\theta}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\text{eq},k}^2(P_\theta)}} \right) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} \right|_{P_\theta=P_{\theta_0}} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \frac{(\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}]} (1 - 2P_{e,k}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times P_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_k}{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} g_k^2 [\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2]}{\sigma_{w,k}^3} \right) \right\}. \quad (47) \end{aligned}$$

By exploiting the definition

$$\Xi_k^{\text{sq}} \triangleq \frac{(1 - 2P_{e,k})}{\alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}]} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_k} [\mu_{h,k}^2 + \sigma_{h,k}^2]}{\sigma_{w,k}^3} P_{\mathcal{N}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_k}{\sigma_{w,k}^2}} \right) \quad (48)$$

we obtain the final expression

$$\left. \frac{\partial \log P(\hat{\mathbf{d}}; P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)}{\partial P_\theta} \right|_{P_\theta=P_{\theta_0}} = \sum_{k=1}^K (\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) \Xi_k^{\text{sq}} g_k^2. \quad (49)$$

This concludes the proof.

APPENDIX B

DERIVATION OF THE FISHER INFORMATION

In this Appendix, we derive the \mathbf{x}_T -conditional FI expressions needed for G-Rao and G-LOD tests, respectively.

In detail, exploiting (conditional) independence of the bits received from different sensors (this applies to both RQ and SQ), we express both these quantities as

$$I^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) = \sum_{k=1}^K I_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \quad (50)$$

$$I^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) = \sum_{k=1}^K I_k(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) \quad (51)$$

where we have denoted with $I_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ [resp. $I_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$] the contribution of k th sensor to the FI, that is, $I_k^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) = \mathbb{E}\{(\partial \ln [P(\hat{b}_k | \mathbf{x}_T, \theta)] / \partial \theta)^2\}$ (resp. $I_k^{\text{sq}}(P_\theta, \mathbf{x}_T) = \mathbb{E}\{(\partial \ln [P(\hat{d}_k | \mathbf{x}_T, P_\theta)] / \partial P_\theta)^2\}$). Then, the substitution $\theta \rightarrow \theta_0$ in $I^{\text{rq}}(\theta, \mathbf{x}_T)$ [and exploiting (44)] provides

$$I^{\text{rq}}(\theta_0, \mathbf{x}_T) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[(\hat{b}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}) \right]^2 \right\} (\Xi_k^{\text{rq}})^2 g_k^2 \quad (52)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{rq}}] (\Xi_k^{\text{rq}})^2 g_k^2 \quad (53)$$

and a similar expression holds for G-LOD case [exploiting (49)], that is

$$I^{\text{sq}}(P_{\theta_0}, \mathbf{x}_T) = \sum_{k=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[(\hat{d}_k - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) \right]^2 \right\} (\Xi_k^{\text{sq}})^2 g_k^4 \quad (54)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} [1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}] (\Xi_k^{\text{sq}})^2 g_k^4. \quad (55)$$

By using the definitions $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{rq}} \triangleq \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{rq}})^2$ and $\psi_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} \triangleq \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}} (1 - \alpha_{0,k}^{\text{sq}}) (\Xi_k^{\text{sq}})^2$, in conjunction with (50), we obtain the (conditional) final FI results in (16) and (20), respectively.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research is a part of BRU21—NTNU Research and Innovation Program on Digital and Automation Solutions for the Oil and Gas Industry (www.ntnu.edu/bru21).

REFERENCES

- [1] "Overview of the Internet of Things (IoT)," ITU, Geneva, Switzerland, ITU-T Recommendation Y.2060, Jun. 2012.
- [2] M. A. Al-Jarrah, M. A. Yaseen, A. Al-Dweik, O. A. Dobre, and E. Alsusa, "Decision fusion for IoT-based wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1313–1326, Feb. 2020.
- [3] P. K. Varshney, *Distributed Detection and Data Fusion*, 1st ed. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [4] D. Ciuonzo and P. Salvo Rossi, Eds., *Data Fusion in Wireless Sensor Networks: A Statistical Signal Processing Perspective* (Control, Robotics, and Sensors). Stevenage, U.K.: Inst. Eng. Technol., 2019.
- [5] Z. Chen and Y. Zhang, "Providing spectrum information service using TV white space via distributed detection system," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 7655–7667, Aug. 2019.
- [6] H. Zayyani, F. Haddadi, and M. Korki, "One-bit spectrum sensing in cognitive radio sensor networks," *Circuits Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 2730–2743, 2020.
- [7] D. Ciuonzo and P. Salvo Rossi, "Distributed detection of a non-cooperative target via generalized locally-optimum approaches," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 36, pp. 261–274, Jul. 2017.
- [8] H. Zayyani, F. Haddadi, and M. M. Korki, "Double detector for sparse signal detection from one-bit compressed sensing measurements," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 1637–1641, Nov. 2016.
- [9] C. Li, Y. He, X. Wang, G. Li, and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection of sparse stochastic signals via fusion of 1-bit local likelihood ratios," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 12, pp. 1738–1742, Dec. 2019.
- [10] C. Li, G. Li, and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection of sparse stochastic signals with 1-bit data in tree-structured sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 68, pp. 2963–2976, 2020.
- [11] I. Y. Hoballah and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed Bayesian signal detection," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 995–1000, Sep. 1989.
- [12] A. R. Reibman and L. W. Nolte, "Optimal detection and performance of distributed sensor systems," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. AES-23, no. 1, pp. 24–30, Jan. 1987.
- [13] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Decentralized detection," *Adv. Stat. Signal Process.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 297–344, 1993.
- [14] R. Viswanathan and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection with multiple sensors—Part I: Fundamentals," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 54–63, Jan. 1997.
- [15] D. Ciuonzo, P. Salvo Rossi, and P. Willett, "Generalized Rao test for decentralized detection of an uncooperative target," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 678–682, May 2017.
- [16] J. Fang, Y. Liu, H. Li, and S. Li, "One-bit quantizer design for multisensor GLRT fusion," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 257–260, Mar. 2013.
- [17] S. Laitrakun, "Decision fusion for composite hypothesis testing in wireless sensor networks over a shared and noisy collision channel," *Int. J. Distrib. Sens. Netw.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [18] D. Ciuonzo and P. Salvo Rossi, "Decision fusion with unknown sensor detection probability," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 208–212, Feb. 2014.
- [19] F. H. Bijarbooneh, W. Du, E. C.-H. Ngai, X. Fu, and J. Liu, "Cloud-assisted data fusion and sensor selection for Internet of Things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 257–268, Jun. 2016.
- [20] S. M. Kay, *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing, Volume 2: Detection Theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, Jan. 1998.
- [21] R. Niu and P. K. Varshney, "Joint detection and localization in sensor networks based on local decisions," in *Proc. 40th Asilomar Conf. Signals Syst. Comput.*, 2006, pp. 525–529.

- [22] A. Shoari and A. Seyedi, "Detection of a non-cooperative transmitter in Rayleigh fading with binary observations," in *Proc. IEEE Mil. Commun. Conf. (MILCOM)*, 2012, pp. 1–5.
- [23] D. Ciunzo and P. Salvo Rossi, "Quantizer design for generalized locally optimum detectors in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 162–165, Apr. 2018.
- [24] D. Ciunzo and P. Salvo Rossi, "Distributed detection of a non-cooperative target with multiplicative fading," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Signal Process. Intell. Recognit. Syst. (SIRS)*, 2019, pp. 263–275.
- [25] J. Zhu, X. Lin, R. S. Blum, and Y. Gu, "Parameter estimation from quantized observations in multiplicative noise environments," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 63, no. 15, pp. 4037–4050, Aug. 2015.
- [26] X. Wang, G. Li, and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection of weak signals from one-bit measurements under observation model uncertainties," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 415–419, Mar. 2019.
- [27] B. Martinez, F. Adelantado, A. Bartoli, and X. Vilajosana, "Exploring the performance boundaries of NB-IoT," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 5702–5712, Jun. 2019.
- [28] R. D. Davies, "Hypothesis testing when a nuisance parameter is present only under the alternative," *Biometrika*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 33–43, 1987.
- [29] F. Gao, L. Guo, H. Li, and J. Fang, "One-bit quantization and distributed detection with an unknown scale parameter," *Algorithms*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 621–631, 2015.
- [30] D. Ciunzo, G. Romano, and P. Salvo Rossi, "Channel-aware decision fusion in distributed MIMO wireless sensor networks: Decode-and-fuse vs. decode-then-fuse," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 2976–2985, Aug. 2012.
- [31] D. Ciunzo, G. Papa, G. Romano, P. Salvo Rossi, and P. Willett, "One-bit decentralized detection with a Rao test for multisensor fusion," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 861–864, Sep. 2013.
- [32] H. C. Papadopoulos, G. W. Wornell, and A. V. Oppenheim, "Sequential signal encoding from noisy measurements using quantizers with dynamic bias control," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 978–1002, Mar. 2001.
- [33] D. Rousseau, G. V. Anand, and F. Chapeau-Blondeau, "Nonlinear estimation from quantized signals: Quantizer optimization and stochastic resonance," in *Proc. 3rd Int. Symp. Phys. Signal Image Process.*, 2003, pp. 89–92.
- [34] A. Ribeiro and G. B. Giannakis, "Bandwidth-constrained distributed estimation for wireless sensor networks—Part I: Gaussian case," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 1131–1143, Mar. 2006.
- [35] X. Cheng, D. Ciunzo, P. Salvo Rossi, X. Wang, and L. Shi, "Multi-bit decentralized detection of a non-cooperative moving target through a generalized Rao test," in *Proc. IEEE 11th Sensor Array Multichannel Signal Process. Workshop (SAM)*, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [36] P.-Y. Chen, S.-M. Cheng, and K.-C. Chen, "Information fusion to defend intentional attack in Internet of Things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 337–348, Aug. 2014.
- [37] N. Biswas, P. Ray, and P. K. Varshney, "Distributed detection over channels with memory," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 2494–2498, Dec. 2015.
- [38] J. Fang, X. Li, H. Li, and L. Huang, "Precoding for decentralized detection of unknown deterministic signals," *IEEE Trans. Aerosp. Electron. Syst.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 2116–2128, Jul. 2014.



Domenico Ciunzo (Senior Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree in electronic engineering from the University of Campania, Caserta, Italy, in 2013.

He is an Assistant Professor with the University of Napoli Federico II, Naples, Italy. Since 2011, he has been holding the several visiting researcher appointments. His research interests include data fusion, wireless sensor networks, the Internet of Things, and machine learning.

Dr. Ciunzo is a recipient of the Best Paper Awards from IEEE International Conference on Computer and Communication Systems in 2019 and Computer Networks in 2020, the Exceptional Service Award from IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Society in 2019, and the Early-Career Technical Achievement Award from IEEE Sensors Council of sensor networks/systems in 2020. Since 2014, he has been an (Area) Editor of several IEEE journals.



Pierluigi Salvo Rossi (Senior Member, IEEE) was born in Naples, Italy, in 1977. He received the Dr.Eng. degree (*summa cum laude*) in telecommunications engineering and the Ph.D. degree in computer engineering from the University of Naples "Federico II", Naples, Italy, in 2002 and 2005, respectively.

He held visiting appointments with Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA; Lund University, Lund, Sweden; Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway; and Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden. From 2005 to 2008, he held postdoctoral positions with the University of Naples "Federico II"; Second University of Naples, Naples; and NTNU. He was an Assistant Professor from 2008 to 2014, tenured in 2011 with the Second University of Naples. He was an Associate Professor from 2014 to 2016 and a Full Professor from 2016 to 2017 with NTNU. From 2017 to 2019, he was a Principal Engineer with Kongsberg Digital AS, Horten, Norway. Since 2019, he has been a Full Professor with the Department of Electronic Systems, NTNU, and the Director of IoT@NTNU. Since 2021, he is a part-time Research Scientist with the Department of Gas Technology, SINTEF Energy Research. His research interests fall within the areas of communication theory, data fusion, machine learning, and signal processing.

Prof. Salvo Rossi was awarded as the Exemplary Senior Editor of the IEEE COMMUNICATIONS LETTERS. He is a Executive Editor of the IEEE COMMUNICATIONS LETTERS; an Area Editor of the IEEE OPEN JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY; and an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON SIGNAL AND INFORMATION PROCESSING OVER NETWORKS. He was an Associate Editor of the IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS; and a Senior Editor and an Associate Editor of the IEEE COMMUNICATIONS LETTERS in 2018.



Pramod K. Varshney (Life Fellow, IEEE) received the B.S. degree (Highest Hons.) in electrical engineering and computer science, the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL, USA, in 1972, 1974, and 1976, respectively, and the Doctor of Engineering degree (*honoris causa*) from Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, USA, in 2014.

Since 1976, he has been with Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA, where he is currently a Distinguished Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and the Director of the Center for Advanced Systems and Engineering. He was the President of the International Society of Information Fusion in 2001. He has published over 530 conference papers and 310 journal papers. During his career, he has supervised 62 doctoral dissertations.

Dr. Varshney received the 1981 ASEE Dow Outstanding Young Faculty Award. In 2000, he received the Third Millennium Medal from the IEEE and Chancellor's Citation for exceptional academic achievement with Syracuse University. He received the IEEE 2012 Judith A. Resnik Award from Drexel University, the ECE Distinguished Alumni Award from the University of Illinois in 2015 and the ISIF's Yaakov Bar-Shalom Award for a Lifetime of Excellence in Information Fusion in 2018. He is on the Editorial Board of the *Journal on Advances in Information Fusion* and has served on the Editorial Boards of IEEE TRANSACTIONS OF SIGNAL PROCESSING as well as *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* among others. He is a Member of Tau Beta Pi. He was elected to the grade of Fellow of the IEEE in 1997 of his contributions in the area of distributed detection and data fusion.