

# Effective Feature Selection for Predicting Spreading Factor with ML in Large LoRaWAN-based Mobile IoT Networks

Aman Prakash\*, Nikumani Choudhury<sup>†</sup>, Anakhi Hazarika<sup>†</sup>, Alekhya Gorrela<sup>†</sup>,

\* National Institute of Advanced Manufacturing Technology, Ranchi, India

<sup>†</sup> Birla Institute of Technology & Science, Pilani, Hyderabad, India

Email: {nikumani, anakhi.hazarika, p20220103}@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in, amanprakash.connect@gmail.com

**Abstract**—LoRaWAN is a low-power long-range protocol that enables reliable and robust communication. This paper addresses the challenge of predicting the spreading factor (SF) in LoRaWAN networks using machine learning (ML) techniques. Optimal SF allocation is crucial for optimizing data transmission in IoT-enabled mobile devices, yet it remains a challenging task due to the fluctuation in environment and network conditions. We evaluated ML model performance across a large publicly available dataset to explore the best feature across key LoRaWAN features such as RSSI, SNR, frequency, distance between end devices and gateways, and antenna height of the end device, further, we also experimented with 31 different combinations possible for 5 features. We trained and evaluated the model using k-nearest neighbors (k-NN), Decision Tree Classifier (DTC), Random Forest (RF), and Multinomial Logistic Regression (MLR) algorithms. The combination of RSSI and SNR was identified as the best feature set. The finding of this paper provides valuable information for reducing the overall cost of dataset collection for ML model training and extending the battery life of LoRaWAN devices. This work contributes to a more reliable LoRaWAN system by understanding the importance of specific feature sets for optimized SF allocation.

**Index Terms**—LoRaWAN, Spreading Factor, Machine Learning, Random Forest, k-nearest neighbors, Multinomial Logistic Regression, Decision Tree Classifier

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet of Things (IoT) is a network of interconnected devices such as sensors, actuators, storage, and processing units with telecommunication interfaces. This allows the integration of any device with the internet, establishing interaction between devices that are commonly referred to as machine-to-machine (M2M) communications [1]. Low Power Wide Area Network (LPWANs) is commonly used for static and mobile IoT devices that provide multi-year battery life and send small amounts of data over long distances with the transmission frequency being a few times per hour with varying environments [2]. LoRa is one of the prime communication standards requiring low power for long-range communications for IoT devices. However, this network faces scalability, low data rate, and other performance issues.

Data rate (DR), Spreading Factor (SF), and bandwidth (BW) are the parameters responsible for efficient data transmission




Fig. 1. LoRaWAN network architecture

in LoRaWAN. The SF is a tunable parameter that controls the speed of data transmission, where, lower SF indicates higher DR. Allocating optimal SF overcomes these issues and helps to improve the performance of the network [3], [4].

### A. LoRaWAN

LoRa developed by Semtech Corporation is a Radio Frequency modulation technology for low-power, long-range networks. Its communication range is up to three miles in urban areas and up to ten miles in rural areas. A key characteristic of LoRa is its very low power consumption which enables battery-powered devices to operate for up to ten years [5]. LoRaWAN is an extension of LoRa, developed by LoRa Alliance. LoRaWAN has several benefits over LoRa, such as end-to-end encryption, bi-directional communication, and open standards. LoRa Alliance is a non-profit organization focused on maintaining and encouraging LoRaWAN's open ecosystem globally [1].

LoRaWAN architecture comprises a Gateway (GW), end devices (EDs), network server, and application server [2] as illustrated in Figure 1. Various non-ML methods are available in the literature for optimal SF selection. For instance, for static EDs (e.g., water meter, gas monitoring), Adaptive Data

Rate (ADR) protocol is used, and for mobile EDs (e.g., pet tracking), algorithms like Blind ADR [6], Enhanced ADR [7], and MADERE [8] are used. These methods for SF selection often rely on heuristic approaches and are insufficient to adapt to dynamic large IoT scenarios.

### B. Spreading Factor (SF)

The number of bits encoded in a symbol by LoRa is an adaptable resource parameter called SF. There are a total of 6 SFs i.e., (SF7-SF12) operated by LoRa. The greater the SF (e.g. SF11, SF12), the farther the network distance coverage, lower battery power usage and data rate, the inverse is true for lower SFs. Hence, SF choice plays a significant role in overall network performance. [5].

With a remarkable amount of data and computing resources available, there is widespread interest in applying ML methods to communication system solutions [9]. In machine learning, a feature is an individual measurable property that serves as an input variable for training of machine learning models, playing a critical role in the model’s ability to make predictions. Despite extensive studies on SF prediction using ML in LoRaWAN networks, a research gap exists in identifying the optimal combination of input features to improve SF prediction accuracy. The major contributions of this work are as follows:

- 1) Develop a feature selection method to identify the best set of LoRaWAN features for predicting optimal SF allocation.
- 2) Design and train different ML algorithms for 31 unique combinations of features present in publicly available LoRaWAN dataset.
- 3) Accuracy and F1 Score metrics are analyzed to evaluate the performance of ML models on different combinations of input features.

The rest of the section of the paper is as follows. Section II details related work in Machine Learning. Section III describes the dataset, feature selection and combination approach, ML algorithms, evaluation metrics, and computing specifications, followed by Section IV, which presents the key findings and their implications. We conclude in Section V with a discussion on future work.

## II. RELATED WORK

The authors in [10] used various ML algorithms to predict RSSI using 13 features. Algorithms such as linear regression, polynomial regression of degree 3 (expanding 13 features into 560 to capture non-linear relationships), k-NN, Random Forest, and Gradient Boost. The Gradient Boost model achieved the lowest prediction error leading to the conclusion that latitude, longitude and altitude are the most significant features in predicting RSSI.

This study [11] used various ML techniques for signal loss prediction in LoRa. Lasso, one of the explored techniques,

automatically selects the most relevant features and discards others, leading to a simplified model, it achieved RMSE(dB) of 9.41 outperforming several classical algorithms.

The authors in [12] experimented with four sets of training features (i.e., RSSI, RSSI + SNR, RSSI + SF, RSSI + SF + SNR) to train ML models using five different algorithms to estimate the distance of a target node from a LoRa gateway. They used their privately collected data and a public dataset to evaluate the results using the mean average error metric. RSSI + SF + SNR training feature outperforms other features.

The authors in [13] propose a deep learning-based novel approach-”AI-ERA” to assign SF to both static and mobile devices proactively. They generated the dataset using ns-3 to train a deep neural network. This approach improved the packet success ratio by 32% and 28% for static and mobile EDs respectively.

Many studies focused on novel approaches for SF prediction using ML, but there remains a critical gap in understanding which input features are most important for model training. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive ranking feature importance and identifying the optimal feature set focused on SF in LoRaWAN networks.

## III. METHODOLOGY

### A. LoRaWAN Dataset

1) *Dataset Description:* This study utilizes a comprehensive LoRaWAN dataset made available through [14], consisting of 930,753 datapoints and 25 features in a comma-separated value (.csv) file recorded from October 2021 to March 2022 with an average sampling duration of 60 seconds. All features of the dataset including SF are listed in Table I.

TABLE I  
SUMMARY OF DATASET FEATURES

Index	Carrier Frequency
Timestamp	Frame Length
Antenna height (of GW)	Temperature
Antenna height (of ED)	Relative Humidity
ED ID	Pressure
Experimental path loss	PM2.5
Distance between the GW and ED	RSSI
ED Transmitter Radiated Power	SNR
ED Transmitter Losses	Time on Air
ED Transmitter Antenna gain	<b>SF</b>
GW Losses	Noise Power
GW Antenna gain	Signal Power
Energy consumed by the transmission	

2) *Data Collection Setup:* The experimental setup for the collection of the dataset consists of four EDs and one GW located in the urban area of Medellín, Colombia. The EDs were strategically placed at varying distances from GW in the city. The GW was connected to the internet using Ethernet. All the collected data was stored in a cloud MySQL database.

### B. Feature Selection and Combination Approach

One of the preliminary steps in ML model training is input feature selection. In ML literature, there exist several traditional statistical methods to rank features based on their ability to enhance the predictive accuracy of the target variable, such as filter methods, wrapper methods, and embedded methods [15]. However, to interpret the results while applying domain knowledge of LoRaWAN, we adopt our straightforward approach.

1) *Picking Features*: From the LoRaWAN dataset, we selected five key features out of 24 and one target variable i.e. SF. These features were chosen based on their theoretical relevance to LoRaWAN performance and their common usage in existing studies exploring different approaches for SF prediction [16] [17] [13] [18]:

- Distance between the GW and EDs
- Antenna height (ED)
- Carrier frequency of the transmission
- RSSI (Received Signal Strength Indicator)
- SNR (Signal-to-Noise Ratio)

Selecting these five features allows us to constrain the feature set.

2) *Feature Combination Approach*: For further exploration of the impact of features on model performance, we incorporated a feature combination approach. We generated all possible combinations of five features. For illustration, examples of some feature combinations include:

- Combination 1: RSSI
- Combination 2: RSSI + SNR
- Combination 3: Frequency + SNR + RSSI

The total number of feature combinations is given by the combinatorics formula:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} = 2^n - 1 \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  is the number of features. For  $n = 5$ , we get 31. Each of these 31 combinations is used to train the model with four different ML algorithms, resulting in 124 models. Details of all feature combinations and their performances are given in section IV.

### C. Machine Learning Models

We utilized four different classification ML algorithms, that is: k-Nearest-Neighbours (k-NN), Decision Tree Classifier, Multinomial Logistic Regression, and Random Forest to evaluate the performance of the selected feature. These algorithms were found to be the most frequently applied in existing studies for improving the performance of LoRa and LoRaWAN [17] [18] [19] [20]. Labelled data was divided into training set (80%) and rest (20%) for testing of ML models. The results for each model were recorded to identify the most important feature

combination and algorithm for predicting the Spreading Factor (SF). The best k value for the k-NN algorithm was chosen based on the highest weighted F1 score. Table II contains the specific hyperparameters for different algorithms used in this research.

TABLE II  
HYPERPARAMETERS FOR FOUR ML ALGORITHMS

Algorithm	Hyperparameter
k-nearest neighbors (k-NN)	k (Number of neighbors): 1 to 20
Decision Tree Classifier	Random State: 42
Multinomial Logistic Regression	Solver: lbfgs Max Iterations: 1000 Random State: 42
Random Forest	Estimators Number: 100 Bootstrap: True Random State: 42

### D. Evaluation Metrics

In this study, we used accuracy and F1 Score metrics to evaluate the performance of machine learning models. Accuracy alone can be sometimes misleading for an imbalanced dataset hence another metric F1 score also taken into consideration which can help to better conclude the results. The F1 Score is the harmonic mean of precision and recall [21]. Precision and recall are just two of many classification measures. Both the metrics provide a different perspective on the model prediction and help us understand the overall performance. These metrics are computed for each feature combination of all four machine learning algorithms used in this study.

### E. Computing Specifications

The training of machine learning models was performed on a desktop computer, with an 11th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-11300H processor and 16.0 GB installed RAM capacity. The ML models were trained using the following software and package versions:

- Python: 3.11.4 (packaged by Anaconda, Inc.)
- Jupyter Notebook: 6.5.7
- Anaconda: 23.7.2
- scikit-learn: 1.3.0

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The analysis of the accuracy and F1 Score of the trained ML models provided several key insights and trends for the prediction of SF. This analysis includes the best and worst-performing ML algorithms, the impact of different features and the general trend of accuracy and F1 score as the number of features in combinations increases. To validate our feature analysis findings, we also employed Pearson's correlation. All the metrics calculated are summarised in Table III- VII. The code employed in this research is available on GitHub [22].

### A. Feature Analysis

The analysis reveals that the combinations, including the RSSI feature, outperform other features. Single RSSI features have higher accuracy and F1 score than other single features as observed from Table III. A similar trend is noticed when RSSI is combined with other features across all algorithms, whether in two, three, or four-feature combinations. This corroborates with the working principle of the ADR technique in LoRaWAN networks. SNR was found to be the second most important feature after RSSI. Together RSSI and SNR combination performed better than either feature alone, also it outperformed every other two feature combinations, as evident from Table IV. The antenna height of end devices and distance between the end devices and gateway feature showed moderate performance as individual performance. However, when combined with RSSI then its performance slightly increased.

The frequency feature was identified as the lowest performer among all individual features. Models that included frequency in combination with other features had lower performance compared to those that included RSSI or SNR. This may be because, in LoRaWAN networks, the carrier frequency is a fixed parameter that varies primarily by region. For instance, in Europe, the frequency bandwidth is set between 863 MHz to 870 MHz [1]. Given its limited variation within a specific deployment, the frequency may be leading to lower performance. However, when the frequency is combined with both RSSI and SNR, a noticeable improvement is observed, as seen in Table V.

The average percentages of accuracy and F1-score, calculated across four machine learning algorithms for all 31 feature combinations are visualized in Figure 2, with feature combination serial numbers (detailed in Table III- VII) on the x-axis and corresponding metrics on the y-axis. Its analysis reveals an upward trend in performance metrics as the number of features in combinations increases. Notably, feature combinations 6 (RSSI + SNR), 16 (RSSI + SNR + Distance), 17 (RSSI + SNR + Height), 18 (RSSI + SNR + Frequency), 26 (RSSI + SNR + Distance + Height), 27 (RSSI + SNR + Distance + Frequency), 28 (RSSI + SNR + Frequency + Height), and 31 (all five features) consistently achieve the highest performance metrics, approaching 65% while the rest fall below 60% as visualized in Figure 2, a common observation is that all of these feature combinations include RSSI and SNR as features which validate these two as top features. The analysis indicates that the difference in average metrics when using RSSI + SNR alone (feature combination 6) is minimal compared to using RSSI + SNR alongside additional features ( three, four, or five features). Notably, this is the smallest feature combination set among the above best-performing options. This suggests that if the ML model is trained on (RSSI + SNR) set, there would be a negligible impact on the quality of SF prediction over the models utilizing all five features, which have the highest average metric, approaching 65.5 %.




Fig. 2. Visualization of metrics: Average Accuracy % and F1 %

### B. Algorithm Performance

DTC and RF consistently outperformed k-NN and MLR in both accuracy and F1 scores across all feature combinations. MLR consisted of the lowest metric among all four algorithms. However, The relative performance of feature combinations is consistent across all algorithms, suggesting feature combinations are not algorithm-dependent.

### C. Verification of result using Filter Method

Pearson’s correlation is a statistical method under the filter method, measures the linear relationship between features and the target variable [15]. The result obtained from this method aligns with the findings we obtained in section IV-A. Specifically, RSSI has demonstrated the highest correlation and frequency the lowest, with the spreading factor (SF) as shown in Figure 3.

### D. Significance of Findings

The results of this study have important implications for optimizing LoRaWAN network deployments and operations. The experimental setup for the collection of the dataset can potentially be simpler in design rather than maintaining complex multi-sensor arrays to skip the less important features such




Fig. 3. Feature Ranking Based on Pearson Correlation

TABLE III  
PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR SINGLE FEATURES

No.	Feature	k-NN		MLR		DTC		RF		Average	
		Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1
1	RSSI	57.81	60.65	52.04	43.02	59.44	58.35	59.44	58.35	57.18	55.07
2	SNR	54.36	57.52	52.83	45.69	56.94	52.14	56.94	52.14	55.27	51.87
3	Frequency	44.60	37.65	52.53	36.19	52.53	36.19	52.53	36.19	50.55	36.55
4	Height	52.54	56.77	52.60	42.47	52.94	49.23	52.94	49.23	52.76	49.43
5	Distance	53.12	53.96	52.34	36.19	52.94	49.23	52.94	49.23	52.88	47.15

TABLE IV  
PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR TWO-FEATURE COMBINATIONS

No.	Features	k-NN		MLR		DTC		RF		Average	
		Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1
6	<b>RSSI+SNR</b>	<b>64.43</b>	<b>65.57</b>	<b>59.69</b>	<b>57.02</b>	<b>66.23</b>	<b>66.71</b>	<b>66.21</b>	<b>66.58</b>	<b>64.14</b>	<b>63.97</b>
7	RSSI+Frequency	58.33	60.63	52.03	43.04	60.05	60.41	60.07	60.55	57.62	56.16
8	RSSI+Height	59.59	61.76	54.66	47.58	61.31	61.02	61.31	61.02	59.22	57.84
9	RSSI+Distance	59.83	62.00	52.73	45.76	61.31	61.02	61.31	61.02	58.79	57.45
10	SNR+Frequency	54.38	57.03	52.86	45.89	57.63	55.57	57.32	55.80	55.63	53.57
11	SNR+Height	55.61	53.12	53.31	48.34	58.16	55.65	58.17	55.33	56.31	53.11
12	SNR+Distance	56.03	57.87	53.25	49.05	58.16	55.65	58.17	55.33	56.40	54.48
13	Frequency+Height	52.87	56.51	52.66	44.06	53.10	53.64	53.10	53.64	52.93	51.96
14	Frequency+Distance	52.87	56.51	52.53	36.19	53.10	53.64	53.10	53.64	52.90	50.00
15	Height+Distance	53.12	53.96	52.60	42.47	52.94	49.23	52.94	49.23	52.90	48.72

TABLE V  
PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR THREE-FEATURE COMBINATIONS

No.	Features	k-NN		MLR		DTC		RF		Average	
		Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1
16	RSSI+SNR+Distance	65.14	65.87	60.05	58.89	66.60	67.14	66.59	67.04	64.59	64.73
17	RSSI+SNR+Height	65.08	65.78	59.51	57.17	66.60	67.14	66.59	67.04	64.45	64.28
18	RSSI+SNR+Frequency	66.25	66.52	59.53	56.78	67.73	67.76	67.75	67.75	65.32	64.70
19	RSSI+Distance+Height	59.83	62.00	54.50	48.28	61.31	61.02	61.31	61.02	59.24	58.08
20	RSSI+Distance+Frequency	59.75	60.90	52.38	44.68	61.77	61.83	61.77	61.71	58.92	57.28
21	RSSI+Height+Frequency	59.59	60.74	54.78	47.71	61.77	61.83	61.77	61.71	59.48	58.00
22	SNR+Distance+Height	56.03	57.87	53.55	49.53	58.16	55.65	58.17	55.33	56.48	54.60
23	SNR+Distance+Frequency	56.71	58.03	53.27	49.53	58.76	57.17	58.76	57.17	56.88	55.47
24	SNR+Frequency+Height	55.39	58.04	53.38	48.62	58.76	57.17	58.76	57.17	56.57	55.25
25	Frequency+Distance+Height	52.87	56.51	52.66	44.06	53.10	53.64	53.10	53.64	52.93	51.96

TABLE VI  
PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR FOUR-FEATURE COMBINATIONS

No.	Features	k-NN		MLR		DTC		RF		Average	
		Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1
26	RSSI+SNR+Distance+Height	65.14	65.87	60.34	59.24	66.60	67.14	66.59	67.03	64.67	64.82
27	RSSI+SNR+Distance+Frequency	66.48	66.76	60.11	59.00	68.04	68.05	68.05	67.99	65.67	65.45
28	RSSI+SNR+Frequency+Height	66.71	66.95	59.38	57.06	68.04	68.05	68.05	67.99	65.55	65.01
29	RSSI+Frequency+Distance+Height	59.75	60.90	54.23	47.76	61.77	61.83	61.77	61.71	59.38	58.05
30	Frequency+SNR+Distance+Height	56.71	58.03	53.56	49.74	58.78	57.17	58.76	57.17	56.95	55.53

TABLE VII  
PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR FIVE-FEATURE COMBINATION

No.	Features	k-NN		MLR		DTC		RF		Average	
		Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1	Acc %	F1
31	RSSI+SNR+Frequency+Distance+Height	66.48	66.76	60.33	59.19	68.04	68.05	68.05	67.99	65.73	65.50

as frequency and focus only on collecting important features like RSSI and SNR thus reducing the cost of data collection for model training.

The reduced feature set (RSSI + SNR) would require lower training time and computational requirements for ML model training. Consequently, a model deployed using the selected feature would require lower memory and limited processing capability for inference, especially important for end devices with limited processing capability [23]. After deployment in a live LoRaWAN environment, only the essential new data needs to be collected for SF prediction, thereby reducing power consumption during data collection and processing, and contributing to extended battery life.

These advantages tackle key challenges in LoRaWAN networks requiring a long-term, battery-powered operation. This finding suggests, that focusing on these two features would provide cost-effective and energy-efficient implementations while maintaining good outcomes in SF prediction.

## V. CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we explored the influence of various feature combinations in Spreading Factor prediction for LoRaWAN networks using machine learning methods. Our results signify the importance of RSSI and SNR as key features, with their combination consistently outperforming other feature sets across four machine-learning algorithms. The result suggests that focusing on critical features can lead to efficient data collection and model training processes, further reducing computational requirements and extending battery life in IoT devices.

As a part of future work, we can further improve SF prediction leading to a reliable LoRaWAN network for the growing IoT ecosystem:

- 1) **Exploring Deep Learning Techniques:** Neural networks can capture more complex relationships among the features and SF, which could potentially lead to higher accuracy and other improved metric scores.
- 2) **Diverse dataset:** Experimenting with different rural or urban datasets could give more insights into this research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work is supported by the Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, Government of India through Startup Research Grant, under Grant SRG/2023/002016.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Montagny, "Lora-lorawan and internet of things for beginners," Available: [www.univ-smb.fr/lorawan](http://www.univ-smb.fr/lorawan), 2021.
- [2] L. Alliance, "A technical overview of lora and lorawan," *White Paper, November*, vol. 20, 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://resources.lora-alliance.org/document/what-is-lorawan>
- [3] P. Maurya, A. Singh, and A. A. Kherani, "A review: spreading factor allocation schemes for lorawan," *Telecommunication Systems*, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 449–468, 2022.
- [4] A. Hazarika and N. Choudhury, "iSFA: Intelligent SF Allocation Approach for LoRa-Based Mobile and Static End Devices," in *2024 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [5] Semtech, "Lora and lorawan: A technical overview," 2020. [Online]. Available: [https://lora-developers.semtech.com/uploads/documents/files/LoRa\\_and\\_LoRaWAN-A\\_Tech\\_Overview-Downloadable.pdf](https://lora-developers.semtech.com/uploads/documents/files/LoRa_and_LoRaWAN-A_Tech_Overview-Downloadable.pdf)
- [6] Semtech Corporation, "Lorawan mobile apps-blind adr downloadable," 2017, accessed: 2024-07-30. [Online]. Available: [https://lora-developers.semtech.com/uploads/documents/files/LoRaWAN\\_Mobile\\_Apps-Blind\\_ADR\\_Downloadable.pdf](https://lora-developers.semtech.com/uploads/documents/files/LoRaWAN_Mobile_Apps-Blind_ADR_Downloadable.pdf)
- [7] N. Benkahla, H. Tounsi, S. Ye-Qiong, and M. Frikha, "Enhanced adr for lorawan networks with mobility," in *2019 15th International Wireless Communications & Mobile Computing Conference (IWCMC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [8] A. Durand, N. El Rachkidy, and A. Guitton, "Madere: Mobile adaptive datarate for lorawan," in *2023 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [9] O. Simeone, "A very brief introduction to machine learning with applications to communication systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 648–664, 2018.
- [10] S. Hosseinzadeh, M. Ashawa, N. Owoh, H. Larjani, and K. Curtis, "Explainable machine learning for lorawan link budget analysis and modeling," *Sensors*, vol. 24, no. 3, p. 860, 2024.
- [11] R. Ballestrin, J. F. Feijó, M. Feldman, and I. Müller, "Exploring machine learning techniques for path loss prediction in lora networks," in *2024 19th International Symposium on Wireless Communication Systems (ISWCS)*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [12] K. Z. Islam, D. Murray, D. Diepeveen, M. G. Jones, and F. Sohel, "Machine learning-based lora localisation using multiple received signal features," *IET Wireless Sensor Systems*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 133–150, 2023.
- [13] A. Farhad and J.-Y. Pyun, "Ai-era: Artificial intelligence-empowered resource allocation for lora-enabled iot applications," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 19, no. 12, pp. 11 640–11 652, 2023.
- [14] M. González-Palacio, D. Tobón-Vallejo, L. M. Sepúlveda-Cano, S. Rúa, G. Pau, and L. B. Le, "Lorawan path loss measurements in an urban scenario including environmental effects," *Data*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 4, 2022.
- [15] C. Chebbi, *Mastering machine learning for penetration testing: develop an extensive skill set to break self-learning systems using Python*. Packt Publishing Ltd, 2018.
- [16] A. Farhad, D.-H. Kim, J.-S. Yoon, and J.-Y. Pyun, "Deep learning-based channel adaptive resource allocation in lorawan," in *2022 International Conference on Electronics, Information, and Communication (ICEIC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–5.
- [17] M. González-Palacio, D. Tobón-Vallejo, L. M. Sepúlveda-Cano, S. Rúa, and L. B. Le, "Machine-learning-based combined path loss and shadowing model in lorawan for energy efficiency enhancement," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 10 725–10 739, 2023.
- [18] T. Yatagan and S. Oktug, "Smart spreading factor assignment for lorawans," in *2019 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–7.
- [19] S. U. Minhaj, A. Mahmood, S. F. Abedin, S. A. Hassan, M. T. Bhatti, S. H. Ali, and M. Gidlund, "Intelligent resource allocation in lorawan using machine learning techniques," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 10 092–10 106, 2023.
- [20] C. A. Gomez, A. Shami, and X. Wang, "Machine learning aided scheme for load balancing in dense iot networks," *Sensors*, vol. 18, no. 11, p. 3779, 2018.
- [21] A. Géron, *Hands-on machine learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras, and TensorFlow*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2022.
- [22] gitgoap, "Lorawan-ml," <https://github.com/gitgoap/LoRaWAN-ML>, 2024, accessed: 2024-08-04.
- [23] A. Farhad, D.-H. Kim, J.-S. Yoon, and J.-Y. Pyun, "Deep learning-based channel adaptive resource allocation in lorawan," in *2022 International Conference on Electronics, Information, and Communication (ICEIC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–5.