

## Research Letter

# Modeling Distance and Bandwidth Dependency of TOA-Based UWB Ranging Error for Positioning

Giovanni Bellusci,<sup>1</sup> Gerard J. M. Janssen,<sup>1</sup> Junlin Yan,<sup>2</sup> and Christian C. J. M. Tiberius<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wireless and Mobile Communications Group (WMC), Delft University of Technology, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Mathematical Geodesy and Positioning Group (MGP), Delft University of Technology, 2629 HS Delft, The Netherlands

Correspondence should be addressed to Giovanni Bellusci, g.bellusci@tudelft.nl

Received 18 November 2008; Accepted 19 January 2009

Recommended by Luca De Nardis

A statistical model for the range error provided by TOA estimation using UWB signals is given, based on UWB channel measurements between 3.1 and 10.6 GHz. The range error has been modeled as a Gaussian random variable for LOS and as a combination of a Gaussian and an exponential random variable for NLOS. The distance and bandwidth dependency of both the mean and the standard deviation of the range error has been analyzed, and insight is given in the different phenomena which affect the estimation accuracy. A possible application of the model to weighted least squares positioning is finally investigated. Noticeable improvements compared to the traditional least squares method have been obtained.

Copyright © 2009 Giovanni Bellusci et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

## 1. Introduction

Time of arrival (TOA) estimation using ultra-wideband (UWB) signals appears the most suitable ranging technique for indoor positioning applications which require centimeter- to decimeter-level accuracy [1]. For this reason, it is fundamental to provide an in depth investigation and modeling of the accuracy which can be achieved using this approach and its dependency on various system parameters. Some papers investigated and sometimes modeled the ranging performance achieved using UWB [2–6]; however, to the best of our knowledge, the related work reported in literature still lacks a complete and coherent understanding of the various factors which affect the range estimation accuracy, and of good statistical error models.

The contribution of this letter is to provide a better understanding of the types of range error usually experienced in indoor environments and to propose a novel statistical model for the error obtained by TOA-based UWB range estimation. Unlike in the available literature, the distance and the bandwidth dependency of both the bias of the range error, and its random variations have been investigated and statistically modeled. Finally, a possible application of the model to weighted least squares positioning is analyzed and

the improvements compared to the classical least squares approach are evaluated.

## 2. Measurement Setup, Signal Processing, and Range Estimation

The channel impulse response (CIR) measurements used in this paper were collected using a time domain technique and cover the bandwidth between 3.1 and 10.6 GHz allowed by the FCC for UWB radio transmissions. Details of the system setup can be found in [7]. The transmitter-receiver separation varied between 2 and 15 m for LOS, and between 3 and 12 m for NLOS. In NLOS, there is a physical obstruction, represented by walls, between the transmitter and the receiver. To allow distance dependency modeling, a total of about 600 measurements, each corresponding to different transmitter and receiver positions, were collected.

The CIR  $h(t)$  is estimated by deconvolving the received signal in the frequency domain using the inverse filtering technique: the spectrum of the received signal is divided by the one of the reference signal, measured at a distance of one meter, in the absence of reflections. To model the bandwidth dependency of the range error, the spectra of the received

signal and of the reference one are filtered with a rectangular window centered at  $f_c = (3.1 + 10.6)/2$  GHz = 6.85 GHz, and with a bandwidth  $B$  which varies from 0.5 GHz to 7.5 GHz, increased in steps of 0.5 GHz. The first path of the CIR is defined as the first local maximum of the envelope of the estimated channel, with amplitude within 20 dB from the strongest peak. The range error is defined as  $\epsilon = \hat{d} - d$ , where  $\hat{d}$  is the distance estimated by multiplying the TOA of the first path by the speed of light in air, and  $d$  is the true distance between the transmitter and receiver.

### 3. Range Error Results, and Modeling

The range error is expressed as the sum of a bias  $m$ , plus a zero-mean random variable  $S$  which accounts for the random variations around  $m$ . The proposed model explicitly considers the distance and bandwidth dependency of these two quantities:

$$\epsilon(B, d) = m(B, d) + S(B, d). \quad (1)$$

In LOS, the bias  $m(B, d)$  is due to multipath and reflects the fact that nonresolvable paths due to reflections always arrive later than the direct one. In NLOS,  $m(B, d)$  is due to both multipath, as for LOS, and to the additional delay introduced by the propagation through dielectric materials. By analyzing the data,  $m(B, d)$  has been modeled as a linearly increasing function of  $d$ ; the slope of the linear fit increases with decreasing  $B$ :

$$m(B, d) = m_B(B)d + m_0, \quad (2)$$

where  $m_B(B)$  accounts for its bandwidth dependency and it has been modeled as  $m_B(B) = m_1 \exp(-B/m_2) + m_3$ . The coefficients  $m_0$ ,  $m_1$ ,  $m_2$ , and  $m_3$  have been obtained by least squares fitting of the data corresponding to different bandwidths, and are reported in Table 1.  $m(B, d)$  becomes larger for smaller  $B$ , since in this case, the number of nonresolvable multipath components that follow the direct path increases, resulting in more bias. At the same time, the bandwidth dependency becomes more evident with larger  $d$ . In fact in LOS, for increasing  $d$ , the direct path tends to have less weight with respect to the total signal, since the path loss exponent corresponding to the first path power is close to 2 [8], while that corresponding to the total power is usually between 1 and 2 [8], thus smaller; this means that multipath is more deteriorating for the resolvability of the direct path for larger  $d$ . Moreover, by increasing  $d$ , the distance difference between the direct path and the reflected ones tends to decrease, making the nonresolvable multipath more dense. For NLOS, the distance and bandwidth dependency of  $m(B, d)$  can be explained with similar arguments; its significantly larger values compared to LOS, even for larger  $B$ , are due to the additional delay introduced by the propagation through dielectric materials.

The deviation from the mean,  $S(B, d)$ , has been modeled as a random variable with standard deviation  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  which depends on both  $B$  and  $d$ . As for  $m(B, d)$ , also  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  becomes larger by decreasing  $B$ ; in addition, to reflect the

TABLE 1: Parameters for the characterization of  $m(B, d)$  and of  $S(B, d)$ .

$m(B, d)$ :	$m_0$ (m)	$m_1$	$m_2$ (GHz)	$m_3$
LOS	0	0.0148	0.48	0
NLOS	0.019	0.027	0.47	0.013
$S(B, d)$ :	$\sigma_{S_0}$ (m)	$\alpha$	$g_1$ ( $m^{-\alpha}$ )	$g_2$ (GHz)
LOS	0.016	1.5	0.64	0.60
NLOS	0.049	1.5	0.21	0.73




FIGURE 1: Range error versus  $d$  for (a) LOS and for (b) NLOS, for  $B = 7.5$  GHz and  $B = 0.5$  GHz.

fact that for the full bandwidth no distance dependency of  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  has been observed, while for smaller bandwidths,  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  significantly increases with  $d$ , the following model for  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  is proposed:

$$\sigma_S(B, d) = \sigma_{S_0} (g_B(B)g_d(d) + 1), \quad (3)$$

with  $g_B(B) = g_1 \exp(-B/g_2)$  and  $g_d(d) = d^\alpha$ . This behavior for  $\sigma_S(B, d)$  can be justified observing that due to multipath, the resolvability of the direct path becomes worse for smaller bandwidths or larger distances, as previously motivated in the analysis of  $m(B, d)$ . The parameters  $\sigma_{S_0}$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $g_1$ , and  $g_2$  have been obtained by least squares fitting of the data; their values are also reported in Table 1. Figure 1 presents the scatter plot of the range error versus distance both for (a) LOS and for (b) NLOS, for  $B = 7.5$  and  $B = 0.5$  GHz for comparison.

For the statistical characterization of  $S(B, d)$ , a difference between the two propagation conditions arises. Therefore, we introduce the new random variable

$$S_0 = \frac{S(B, d)}{g_B(B)g_d(d) + 1}, \quad (4)$$

which represents  $S(B, d)$  normalized to the terms which model its bandwidth and distance dependency. By analyzing the histogram of  $S_0$ , for LOS, it has been modeled as a zero mean Gaussian random variable with standard deviation  $\sigma_{S_0}$ . For NLOS, we noticed an asymmetric distribution around the zero mean, for all bandwidths. In fact, the tail corresponding to the positive values of the histogram of  $S_0$  is longer than that corresponding to the negative ones. The physical explanation of this aspect is the following: in NLOS, with strong multipath conditions, there are situations in which several reflected and nonresolvable paths may arrive closely after the direct one; this can move the detected first path of the CIR to a delay which is significantly larger than  $1/B$ . On the contrary, the negative errors due to multipath are always limited to approximately  $1/B$ . Figure 2 explains this point. This phenomenon was not experienced in LOS due to the less dense multipath. To account for this aspect, in NLOS,  $S_0$  has been modeled as the sum of two independent random variables

$$S_0 = s_N R_N + s_E R_E + s_0, \quad (5)$$

where  $R_N$  is a standard Gaussian random variable and  $R_E$  is a standard exponential random variable. The coefficients  $s_N = w\sigma_{S_0}$ ,  $s_E = \sqrt{1 - w^2}\sigma_{S_0}$ , and  $s_0 = -s_E = -\sqrt{1 - w^2}\sigma_{S_0}$  can be expressed as functions of only one variable  $w$  ( $0 \leq w \leq 1$ ), and are necessary to weight the two distributions with the constraints for the mean and the standard deviation of  $S_0$ . By fitting the data, we obtained  $w = 0.6$ .

From the described model, it is possible to derive the mean and standard deviation of the range error obtained from the total set of measurements, as a function of  $B$ . From (1) and (2), the global mean range error results in

$$\text{mean}\{\epsilon(B, d)\} = m_B(B)E[d] + m_0, \quad (6)$$

where  $E[\cdot]$  represents the expectation operation.  $E[d] = 6.95$  m for LOS and  $E[d] = 7.74$  m for NLOS has been evaluated from the measured data. For the standard deviation of the range error, using (1)–(4),  $\epsilon(B, d)$  can be expressed as

$$\epsilon(B, d) = m_B(B)d + m_0 + S_0(g_B(B)d^\alpha + 1), \quad (7)$$

which is a nonlinear function of two independent random variables,  $d$  and  $S_0$ . Using the variance propagation law applied to (7), linearized around the means of  $d$  and  $S_0$ , and approximated up to its second order, we find

$$\text{std}\{\epsilon(B, d)\} \cong \sqrt{(m_B(B)\sigma_d)^2 + (\sigma_{S_0}(g_B(B)(E[d])^\alpha + 1))^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\sigma_d = 3.41$  m for LOS, and  $\sigma_d = 2.05$  m for NLOS is the standard deviation of the distribution of the distances, which has been evaluated from the measured data.




FIGURE 2: NLOS range error behavior.




FIGURE 3: Mean and standard deviation of the global range error versus  $B$ .

Figure 3 shows the mean and the standard deviation of the range error directly obtained using the total set of data, and the model proposed in (6)–(8) for comparison.

#### 4. Weighted Least Squares Positioning

In this section, a possible application of the proposed model to improve the classical least squares positioning is investigated. From the total set of measurements, a subset of  $n$  of them is randomly chosen. A pair  $(\theta, \phi)$  is associated to each of the  $n$  selected ranges. In this way, a reference point with spherical coordinates  $(d, \theta, \phi)$  in the three-dimensional space is associated to each measurement, and a simulated positioning system is obtained from the  $n$  selected ranges.  $\theta$  is the angle between the  $z$ -axis and the reference point,  $\phi$  is the angle between the  $x$ -axis and the projection of the reference point on the  $x$ - $y$  plane. The axis origin represents the unknown position to be estimated using the set of the  $n$  corresponding range estimations  $\hat{d}$ . The general system model can be written as  $\underline{d} = A(\underline{x}_u) + \underline{\epsilon}$ , where the underline indicates vector quantities.  $A(\cdot)$  is a mapping from  $R^3$  to  $R^n$ ,  $\underline{d}$  and  $\underline{\epsilon} \in R^n$ , and  $\underline{x}_u = (0, 0, 0)$ . From the vector of the estimated distances, an estimate  $\hat{\underline{x}}_u$  of  $\underline{x}_u$  can be obtained.

TABLE 2: Final position estimation accuracy for different scenarios.

	LOS $n = 4$	LOS $n = 8$	NLOS $n = 4$	NLOS $n = 8$	LOS/NLOS $n = 4$	LOS/NLOS $n = 8$
$B = 7.5$ GHz						
LS	0.025 (m)	0.017 (m)	0.143 (m)	0.093 (m)	0.167 (m)	0.064 (m)
WLS	0.025 (m)	0.017 (m)	0.091 (m)	0.068 (m)	0.054 (m)	0.024 (m)
$B = 0.5$ GHz						
LS	0.211 (m)	0.147 (m)	0.322 (m)	0.210 (m)	0.308 (m)	0.180 (m)
WLS	0.180 (m)	0.102 (m)	0.235 (m)	0.160 (m)	0.207 (m)	0.121 (m)

The performance of the positioning algorithms is evaluated by calculating  $\epsilon_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}_u} = E[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}_u\|]$ , which represents the root mean square error in the position estimation.

In traditional least squares, the problem is solved by searching the minimum of the objective function

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_u^{\text{LS}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_u} \|\underline{d} - A(\mathbf{x}_u)\|^2. \quad (9)$$

If the error model is known, a weighted and unbiased estimation of the position can be obtained

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_u^{\text{WLS}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_u} \|\underline{d} - \underline{m}(B, d) - A(\mathbf{x}_u)\|_{Q_{dd}^{-1}}^2, \quad (10)$$

where  $Q_{dd}$  is the variance matrix (a diagonal matrix containing as the  $[j, j]$  element the variance of the  $j$ th measured distance). Since both  $\underline{m}(B, d)$  and  $Q_{dd}$  depend on the real distance which is unknown, the estimated distance, instead of the unknown real distance, has been used for their evaluation in (10). Six different scenarios have been simulated: LOS and  $n = 4$ , LOS and  $n = 8$ , NLOS and  $n = 4$ , NLOS and  $n = 8$ ,  $n = 4$  with 2 measurements in LOS and 2 in NLOS, and  $n = 8$  with 4 measurements in LOS, and 4 in NLOS. Table 2 shows the obtained results, averaged over 10 000 repetitions, for the two methods proposed in (9), (10), and for  $B = 0.5$  GHz and  $B = 7.5$  GHz, for comparison. Only for the case of LOS and  $B = 7.5$  GHz, there is no improvement using the range error model knowledge, since the range error in this case is unbiased and it does not depend on the distance. For all the other scenarios, the range error model knowledge always allows to improve the final position estimation accuracy up to about 300% when combining together LOS and NLOS measurements for  $B = 7.5$  GHz.

## 5. Conclusions

In this letter, a statistical model for the range error obtained by TOA estimation using UWB signals has been proposed. It is shown that both a decrease of the bandwidth and an increase of the distance cause an increase in the mean and standard deviation of the range error due to the more dense multipath which results in these situations. The range error is modeled as a Gaussian random variable for LOS, and as the combination of a Gaussian and an exponential random variable for NLOS. The more complex characterization in NLOS describes the effects on the range error of the dense

multipath in this propagation condition, and represents a generalization which includes also the LOS scenario. A possible application of the model to weighted least squares positioning is finally investigated. Improvements compared to traditional least squares are especially evident when there is a significant redundancy or a combination of LOS and NLOS measurements.

## References

- [1] S. Gezici, Z. Tian, G. B. Giannakis, et al., "Localization via ultra-wideband radios: a look at positioning aspects of future sensor networks," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 70–84, 2005.
- [2] Z. Irahauten, G. Bellusci, G. J. M. Janssen, H. Nikookar, and C. C. J. M. Tiberius, "Investigation of UWB ranging in dense indoor multipath environments," in *Proceedings of the 10th IEEE Singapore International Conference on Communication Systems (ICCS '06)*, pp. 1–5, Singapore, October 2006.
- [3] C.-C. Chong, F. Watanabe, and M. Z. Win, "Effect of bandwidth on UWB ranging error," in *Proceedings of IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC '07)*, pp. 1559–1564, Kowloon, China, March 2007.
- [4] C. Gentile and A. Kik, "WLC28-4: an evaluation of ultra wideband technology for indoor ranging," in *Proceedings of IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference (GLOBECOM '06)*, pp. 1–6, San Francisco, Calif, USA, November-December 2006.
- [5] B. Alavi and K. Pahlavan, "Modeling of the distance error for indoor geolocation," in *Proceedings of IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking (WCNC '03)*, vol. 1, pp. 668–672, New Orleans, La, USA, March 2003.
- [6] B. Alavi and K. Pahlavan, "Modeling of the TOA-based distance measurement error using UWB indoor radio measurements," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 275–277, 2006.
- [7] Z. Irahauten, A. Yarovoy, H. Nikookar, G. J. M. Janssen, and L. Ligthart, "Measurement setup for ultra wide band indoor radio channel characterization," in *Proceedings 11th Symposium on Communications and Vehicular Technology in the Benelux (SCVT '04)*, Gent, Belgium, November 2004.
- [8] G. Bellusci, G. J. M. Janssen, J. Yan, and C. C. J. M. Tiberius, "Low complexity ultrawideband ranging in indoor multipath environments," in *Proceedings of IEEE/ION Position, Location and Navigation Symposium (PLANS '08)*, pp. 394–401, Monterey, Calif, USA, May 2008.

## Special Issue on Radar and Sonar Sensor Networks

### Call for Papers

Although radar and sonar rely on two fundamentally different types of wave transmission, Radio Detection and Ranging (RADAR) and Sound Navigation and Ranging (SONAR), both are remote sensing systems with important military, scientific, and commercial applications. RADAR sends out electromagnetic waves, while active SONAR transmits acoustic (i.e., sound) waves. In both systems, these waves return echoes from certain features or targets that allow the determination of important properties and attributes of the target (i.e., shape, size, speed, distance, etc.). Because electromagnetic waves are strongly attenuated (diminished) in water, RADAR signals are mostly used for ground or atmospheric observations. Because SONAR signals easily penetrate water, they are ideal for navigation and measurement under water. The networking of radars or sonars is two emerging research areas, known as radar sensor networks and underwater sensor networks. The goal of the Special Issue is to publish the most recent results in the development of radar sensor networks and underwater sensor networks. Researchers and practitioners working in this area are expected to take this opportunity to discuss and express their views on the current trends, challenges, and state-of-the-art solutions addressing various issues in radar and sonar sensor networks. Review papers on radar sensor networks and/or underwater sensor networks are also welcome. Topics to be covered in this Special Issue include, but are not limited to:

- Waveform design and diversity
- UWB radar sensor networks
- Interferences analysis
- Coexistence with other sensor networks
- Network capacity
- MIMO radar
- MIMO radar
- Medium Access Control (MAC)
- Routing
- Underwater channel modeling
- Underwater communications
- Network coverage
- Energy efficiency
- Security and privacy

- Navigation and positioning (localization)
- Sensor fusion
- In-network information processing
- Target detection and tracking
- Other applications

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/wcn/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/> according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	December 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	March 1, 2010
Publication Date	June 1, 2010

#### Lead Guest Editor

**Qilian Liang**, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX 76019-0016, USA; [liang@uta.edu](mailto:liang@uta.edu)

#### Guest Editors

**Xiuzhen (Susan) Cheng**, Department of Computer Science, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, USA; [cheng@gwu.edu](mailto:cheng@gwu.edu)

**Scott C.-H. Huang**, Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong, 83 Tat Chee Ave, Kowloon, Hong Kong; [shuang@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:shuang@cityu.edu.hk)

**Sherwood W. Samn**, Air Force Research Laboratory/RHX, Brooks City Base, San Antonio, TX 78235, USA; [Sherwood.samn@brooks.af.mil](mailto:Sherwood.samn@brooks.af.mil)

**Lingming Wang**, iBiquity Digital Corporation, 150 Allen Road, Suite 201, Basking Ridge, NJ 07920, USA; [lwang@ibiquity.com](mailto:lwang@ibiquity.com)

**Zheng Zhou**, School of Information and Telecommunications, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China; [zzhou@bupt.edu.cn](mailto:zzhou@bupt.edu.cn)



## Special Issue on Advances in Quality and Performance Assessment for Future Wireless Communication Services

### Call for Papers

Wireless communication services are evolving rapidly in tandem with developments and vast growth of heterogeneous wireless access and network infrastructures and their potential. Many new, next-generation, and advanced future services are being conceived. New ideas and innovation in performance and QoS, and their assessment, are vital to the success of these developments. These should be open and transparent, with not only network-provider-driven but also service-provider-driven and especially user-driven, options on management and control to facilitate always best connected and served (ABC&S), in whatever way this is perceived by the different stake holders. To wireless communication services suppliers and users, alike the complexity and integrability of the immense, diverse, heterogeneous wireless networks' infrastructure should add real benefits and always appear as an attractive user-friendly wireless services enabler, as a wireless services performance enhancer and as a stimulant to wireless services innovation. Effecting the integration of services over a converged IP platform supported by this diverse and heterogeneous wireless infrastructure presents immense QoS and traffic engineering challenges. Within this context, a special issue is planned to address questions, advances, and innovations in quality and performance assessment in heterogeneous wireless service delivery.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Performance evaluation and traffic modelling
- Performance assessments and techniques at system/flow level, packet level, and link level
- Multimedia and heterogeneous service integration-performance issues, tradeoffs, user-perceived QoS, and quality of experience
- Network planning; capacity; scaling; and dimensioning
- Performance assessment, management, control, and solutions: user-driven; service-provider-driven; network-provider-driven; subscriber-centric and consumer-centric business model dependency issues
- Wireless services in support of performance assessment, management, and control of multimedia service delivery
- Performance management and assessment in user-driven live-access network change and network-driven internetwork call handovers
- Subscriber-centric and consumer-centric business model dependency issues for performance management, control, and solutions
- Simulations and testbeds

Before submission, authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/wcn/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	August 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	November 1, 2009
Publication Date	February 1, 2010

#### Lead Guest Editor

**Máirtín O'Droma**, Telecommunications Research Centre, University of Limerick, Ireland; [mairtin.odroma@ul.ie](mailto:mairtin.odroma@ul.ie)

#### Guest Editors

**Markus Rupp**, Institute of Communications and Radio-Frequency Engineering, Vienna University of Technology, Gusshausstrasse 25/389, 1040 Vienna, Austria; [mrupp@nt.tuwien.ac.at](mailto:mrupp@nt.tuwien.ac.at)

**Yevgeni Koucheryavy**, Department of Communication Engineering, Tampere University of Technology, Korkeakoulunkatu 10, 33720 Tampere, Finland; [yk@cs.tut.fi](mailto:yk@cs.tut.fi)

**Andreas Kasser**, Computer Science Department, University of Karlstad, Universitetsgatan, 65188 Karlstad, Sweden; [kasser@ieee.org](mailto:kasser@ieee.org)

## Special Issue on Femtocell Networks

### Call for Papers

Recently, there has been a growing interest in femtocell networks both in academia and industry. They offer significant advantages for next-generation broadband wireless communication systems. For example, they eliminate the dead-spots in a macrocellular network. Moreover, due to short communication distances (on the order of tens of meters), they offer significantly better signal qualities compared to the current cellular networks. This makes high-quality voice communications and high data rate multimedia type of applications possible in indoor environments.

However, this new type of technology also comes with its own challenges, and there are significant technical problems that need to be addressed for successful deployment and operation of these networks. Standardization efforts related to femtocell networks in 3GPP (e.g., under TSG-RAN Working Group 4 and LTE-Advanced) and IEEE (e.g., under IEEE 802.16m) are already underway.

The goal of this special issue is to solicit high-quality unpublished research papers on design, evaluation, and performance analysis of femtocell networks. Suitable topics include but are not limited to the following:

- Downlink and uplink PHY/MAC design for femtocells in 3G systems, WiMAX systems, and LTE systems
- Interference analysis, avoidance, and mitigation
- Coexistence between a macrocellular network and femtocell network
- Resource allocation techniques
- Closed subscriber group (CSG) versus open-access femtocells
- Power control and power saving mechanisms (e.g., sleep/idle mode etc.)
- Mobility support and handover
- Time synchronization
- Multiple antenna techniques
- Tradeoffs between femtocells, picocells, relay networks, and antenna arrays
- Comparison with other fixed-mobile convergence (FMC) approaches such as UMA/GAN and dual-mode terminals

- Self-organizing networks and issues in self maintenance and self install
- Issues related to enterprise femtocells

Before submission, authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/wcn/guidelines.html>. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at <http://mts.hindawi.com/>, according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	September 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	December 1, 2009
Publication Date	March 1, 2010

### Lead Guest Editor

**Ismail Guvenc**, Wireless Access Laboratory, DOCOMO Communications Laboratories USA, Inc., Palo Alto, CA 94304, USA; [iguvenc@docomolabs-usa.com](mailto:iguvenc@docomolabs-usa.com)

### Guest Editors

**Simon Saunders**, Femto Forum, UK; [simon@femtoforum.org](mailto:simon@femtoforum.org)

**Ozgur Oyman**, Corporate Technology Group, Intel Corporation, USA; [ozgur.oyman@intel.com](mailto:ozgur.oyman@intel.com)

**Holger Claussen**, Alcatel-Lucent Bell Labs, UK; [claussen@lucent.com](mailto:claussen@lucent.com)

**Alan Gatherer**, Communications Infrastructure and Voice Business Unit, Texas Instruments, USA; [gatherer@ti.com](mailto:gatherer@ti.com)