

# Towards Smart Microfarming in an Urban Computing Continuum

Marla Grunewald, Mounir Bensalem, Jasenka Dizdarević and Admela Jukan  
Technical University of Braunschweig, Germany  
{marla.grunewald, mounir.bensalem, j.dizdarevic, a.jukan}@tu-bs.de

**Abstract**—Microfarming and urban computing have evolved as two distinct sustainability pillars of urban living today. In this paper, we combine these two concepts, while majorly extending them jointly towards novel concepts of smart microfarming and urban computing continuum. Smart microfarming is proposed with applications of artificial intelligence in microfarming, while an urban computing continuum is proposed as a major extension of the concept towards an efficient IoT-edge-cloud continuum. We propose and build a system architecture for a plant recommendation system that uses machine learning at the edge to find, from a pool of given plants, the most suitable ones for a given microfarm using monitored soil values obtained from IoT sensor devices. Moreover, we propose to integrate long-distance LoRa communication solution for sending the data from IoT to the edge system, due to its unlicensed nature and potential for open source implementations. Finally, we propose to integrate open source and less constrained application protocol solutions, such as AMQP and HTTP protocols, for storing the data in the cloud. An experimental setup is used to evaluate and analyze the performance and reliability of the data collection procedure and the quality of the recommendation solution. Furthermore, collaborative filtering is used for the completion of an incomplete information about soils and plants. Finally, various ML algorithms are applied to identify and recommend the optimal plan for a specific microfarm in an urban area.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The development of the Internet of Things (IoT) has revolutionized the many industrial sectors, and especially in the context of urban living. An urban *pendant* to farming is microfarming, a sustainable farming concept at a smaller scale implemented in urban gardens, typically at less than 5 acres of garden size [1]. Another urban living concept that has hugely benefited from the IoT revolution is urban computing, a pillar of urban sustainability that uses cross-domain data fusion in various context (e.g., airpolution, water quality, traffic, weather) and processes their various modalities (e.g., spatio-temporal and visual) [2]. The voluminous amounts of data that can be collected enable the adaptation of machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI) tools for different functionalities of use in microfarming. In combination with novel communication and computing technology, including the seamless integration of IoT systems with edge and cloud computing, as well as the availability of free and open source solutions, the sustainable urban development is with no doubt the next innovation frontier.

The idea to integrate and combine urban microfarming with urban computing, along with AI and ML applications in a computing continuum, presents an obvious, - but not yet ad-

ressed grand challenge. With IoT emerging as a crucial smart agriculture trend, the challenge arises as to how to leverage proprietary system architectures from large scale farming, to seamlessly facilitate an open data exchange between open-source cloud and edge computing systems, and various on-ground devices in urban areas [3]. Especially in the context of the novel and promising computing paradigms, known as computing continuum or IoT/edge/cloud continuum, and their open source implementations, the expected benefits are large in tackling some of the key challenges of urban microfarming [4]. Put in the context of urban computing, the envisioned *urban computing continuum*, - a novel system architecture that efficiently and seamlessly integrates data, computing and communication in one open system, presents a grand challenge with potential for broader societal impact. We envision a plant recommendation tool to empower urban gardeners decide the most suitable plants for their gardens and climate conditions.

In this paper, we propose an urban computing continuum architecture and a data processing workflow that enables ML-based plant recommendations in microfarming. The IoT devices include sensors that collect and send data to the edge devices, for data processing, prediction and interface. High computational workloads, such as ML training, are on the other hand executed in the cloud. We study the problem of plant recommendation for microfarming using various ML algorithms, using collected sensor data of soils, as well as its surroundings. We propose that a low-power unlicensed Long Range (LoRa) based communication approach is used for data collection. The urban computing concept is implemented as a collaborative filtering approach. Assuming a complete knowledge about the performance of plants in different soils, we evaluate the performance of eight different ML techniques and benchmark their performance. The results validate the system performance. We also show the performance of cosine similarity to predict plant performance in different soils with different data sparsity values. We show that the results carry potential for broader applications also in farming, as experts traditionally depend on time-consuming and labor-intensive process to obtain conclusions about suitable crops [5].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents related work. Section III introduces the reference system architecture, including workflow engineering. Section IV presents the proposed ML pipeline for plant recommendation system. Section V presents the experimental and simulation results. Section VI concludes the paper.

## II. RELATED WORK

Previous work on microfarming [1] introduces IoT as pivotal technology, which we further put in the new context of IoT/edge/cloud continuum. In a continuum, IoT devices collect sensor data from fields and send them to an edge device or gateway. For further processing the data is usually forwarded to the cloud. While there are myriad options to use proprietary smart farming software, which carries challenges [6], IoT/edge/cloud computing concepts today carry potential to offering many open source solutions [7].

In terms of communications, LoRa is a long distance protocol, which makes it suitable for smart farming. Paper [8] deployed a LoRa based network that uses temperature and humidity sensors to monitor and control both the water supply of crops in the field. We adopt a similar approach considering the choice of sensors and information to be obtained from the fields, however the information retrieval does not require using the LoRaWAN infrastructure. Instead, we rely solely physical layer LoRa and offload the computational tasks to the edge based on an open source solution [9].

Urban computing is a concept proposed for smart cities to collect and process sensor data to providing residents with intelligent services [2]. As collected data are prone to incompleteness, collaborative filtering approaches are proposed to predict missing information from collected sensor data [10], [11]. Sparsity has a high impact of the quality of recommendation system, thus in [10] a collaborative filtering recommendation algorithm is based on multi-information source fusion for IoT sensors data. Similar to previous work, we will use cosine similarity to our plant recommendation problem in order to predict missing sensor data about the soils. This approach is similar to [12], which explores different algorithms and expert systems to recommend crops with all data complete and available, whereas our approach is more generic and tolerate data incompleteness. In [13] a single machine learning algorithm, AdaBoost, was used to predict the yield of crops based on geographic parameters, such as state, district, area, seasons, rainfall, and temperature. In our paper, we will consider more soil specific features while testing multiple ML algorithms on their efficiency.

## III. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

### A. Reference Architecture

The IoT/edge/cloud continuum architecture adopted for a smart monitoring and plant recommendation system in urban microfarming, is illustrated in Figure 1. Similar to the concept of urban computing it is designed to enable an easy deployment of ML/AI-based applications, thus facilitating the rapid creation and deployment of models that are efficient to solving problems for urban gardeners. The continuum system architecture consists of three types of devices with a range of capabilities that can jointly process, store and communicate data: IoT, edge, and cloud. Each type of devices has a specific computing capability and constraints as well as different delay, jitter and packet loss along the connections. IoT devices are




Fig. 1: Urban Computing Continuum for Smart Microfarming.

constrained devices that collect data and send them to the more powerful type of devices, be in the edge or the cloud, such as for storage and processing. We assume that IoT devices are spread in  $N$  urban areas, where each urban area can have one or more microfarms, or gardens, in which the soil characteristics can be monitored by heterogeneous set of devices, each equipped with a sensor and microcontroller unit. These units are collecting and sending data on a periodic basis to an edge server. This latter can be located in close proximity to the center of an urban area, such as in communal buildings. Each urban area has its own server, resulting in a total of  $S$  servers for  $N$  urban areas. Communication between the edge and the IoT devices is assumed using unlicensed long-distance protocols, such as LoRa. The idea behind this choice is on the one hand not to rely on the wireless cellular network, perhaps for monetary reasons, while on the other hand to be able to adopt as many open source solutions as possible [9]. In the edge computing part of the continuum, machine learning inference is conducted to preprocess data and retrieve insight in the decision making process. While the data collected about soils and plants is stored by the edge servers, a predefined dataset about plants and soils of different microfarms is stored in the cloud and used to train ML models. The trained models are then sent to the edge server to perform the actual recommendation tasks.

### B. Workflow engineering

Figure 2 illustrates the engineered microfarming *data collection workflow* for the proposed system architecture. In the front-end application, the urban gardener initiates the entire process as a user (system activation). This is accomplished through the user interface, which can be built with various degrees of sophistication (e.g., video, text, social media links). The activation of the system initiates the collection of data from sensors located in the garden's soil, in the IoT context of the continuum. The sensors measure the concentration of the essential macro nutrients *nitrogen (N)*, *phosphorus (P)*,




Fig. 2: Engineering the microfarming data collection workflow

and *potassium* ( $K$ ) as well as the *temperature* and *pH* value; additional parameters can be collected from diverse sources (e.g., air quality, water quality, environmental data). As each sensor is interfacing a microcontroller, this information is then written internally to a file and stored for further processing in the edge computing context. These files with sensor measured parameters are then forwarded to the edge server, via a communication protocol that is suitable for the required distance between the field and the edge server, which includes a database that stores the soil parameters of the microfarm's soil. The urban gardener is assumed to manually provide ratings to be stored in the cloud to create a dataset of plants and their ratings under *Sparse Ratings*. On the other hand, the gardener could also send plants pictures for automated rating through ML models, which is out of scope here.

Figure 3 illustrates the engineered microfarming *recommendation workflow*, where the urban gardener initiates the recommendation process as a user by providing the soil information either manually or through sensors to the user interface. In order to recommend plants, we first process the ratings dataset in the cloud. The sparse nature of these data is due to the fact that not all plants are grown by one gardener in the same garden, or some gardeners do not enter all the data, thus resulting in a significant number of missing values of ratings within the database. In order to complete the existing database, we apply collaborative filtering algorithms to address the gaps in the ratings, thereby creating a complete ratings file for the urban microfarm ecosystems. This file is then utilized for training of the ML models, also in the cloud context, with the input for the ML models consisting of the soil parameters, while the output determines the ratings. The model gets retrained periodically, with the time period  $T$  being chosen by the administrator of the entire system, based on its scale. The trained model is then moved to the so-called *Plant Recommender* of the edge context where it is run using the current soil parameters from the database collected from the farms and as a result provides a recommendation to the urban gardener. Additionally the recommendation is added to the file of the full ratings to enlarge the dataset.

#### IV. ML PIPELINE FOR PLANT RECOMMENDATION

##### A. Data collection

The proposed system employs a heterogeneous set of IoT devices, deployed by using low power resource constrained

hardware devices (e.g., microcontrollers) each interfacing a different sensor. The microcontrollers that each of the sensors is interfaced with are typically resources constrained devices and are expected to be located in remote areas which are connected over LoRa based communication, operating over a license-free spectrum and is low power, which makes it another sustainable solution. To achieve this, each microcontroller is equipped with a LoRa transmitter module, which allows it to send sensor data as LoRa packets. For these messages to reach the edge device (e.g., Raspberry Pi), it also has to be connected with a LoRa receiver module. Here, several communication parameters should be taken into account and configured on both receiver and transmitter side, such as the spreading factor, coding rate, transmission frequency and bandwidth. Once the LoRa packets with sensor data reach the edge device, they are extracted for data cleaning and preprocessing. In addition, the extracted data is also encapsulated into messages of less constrained communication protocols, such as HTTP or AMQP, which are then used to store the data from the edge device to the cloud. The individual soil values sensors gather directly from the soil are as follows:  $N$ ,  $P$ ,  $K$ , *temperature* and *pH* value, while further parameters can be measured from the environment.

##### B. Pre-processing

The pre-processing of the data is transforms the sparse matrices to be complete, to be made suitable for training ML models. This is achieved by calculating the missing ratings from the sparse matrix using cosine similarity, thus generating a complete ratings matrix for all existing plant and soil combinations. In the context of recommendation systems, the cosine similarity metric is calculated using the ratings of two items, designated as  $x$  and  $y$ , which represent two rows in the sparse matrix [14]. Our input data is representing the rating of plants on each soil, and the cosine similarity is given by:

$$\cos(x, y) = \frac{x \cdot y}{\|x\| \|y\|} \quad (1)$$

The sparse matrix  $S \in \mathbb{N}^{m \times n}$  is composed of natural numbers  $\in \llbracket 1..5 \rrbracket$ , with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, as well as missing ratings in between. The parameters  $m$  and  $n$  describe the amount of soil samples and the number of plants that can be rated, respectively. Using cosine similarity on the dataset to compare all  $m$  rows with each other, and the full matrix  $F \in \mathbb{N}^{m \times n}$  is build. Any missing values are filled in the sparse matrix by identifying similar soils based on the similarity matrix and calculated the weighted average of their ratings based on the similarity. These ratings are then added to the sparse matrix to create a complete data set of ratings.

##### C. Recommendation approaches

After collection of soil data, and after pre-processing data into ratings between 1 and 5, we apply cosine similarity to obtain full information about the rating of each plant in each existing soil. Afterwards, the actual recommendation can




Fig. 3: Engineering the microfarming recommendation workflow.

be accomplished through the application of machine learning models using the full ratings 2-dimensional matrix as input. We adopt several widely available ML algorithms to be used for plant selection, which will be benchmarked and compared in terms of accuracy, error rate, training time and inference time. The adopted ML algorithms are: K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), Neural Networks (NN), Linear Regression, Decision Tree, Random Forest, Support Vector Machine (SVM), Gradient Boost (GB), and Extreme Gradient Boost (XGB). Those algorithms are applied to recommend the  $N$  best plants suitable for a given microfarm soil.

## V. EXPERIMENTAL AND SIMULATION RESULTS

This section evaluates various aspects of the proposed system, including the efficiency of low-power communication solution (LoRa) for sending sensor data from the IoT devices to the edge, the use of collaborative filtering for the completion of incomplete sensor information and crop recommendation system based on various ML algorithms. The experiment and simulation parameters are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: Simulation Parameters

Experiment/Simulation	Parameters	Values
LoRa (Experiment)	Distance	35 m
	Frequency	870 Mhz
	Bandwidth	125 kHz
	Coding Rate	4/5
	Spreading Factor	7
Collaborative filtering (Simulation)	library	scikit-learn → cosine_similarity
	Number of plants	15
	Number of soils	10626
ML recommendation (Simulation)	Model library	scikit-learn
	Number of soils	10626
	Number of plants	15
	test size data	20 %

### A. LoRa performance

Table II presents the data obtained from sending data from an IoT sensor device to the edge device, using LoRa transmission, with the experiments conducted in the laboratory. The experiments were conducted by transmitting 100 LoRa packets with a 5-second interval between each transmission. The measured values include the percentage of received packets,

TABLE II: Mean RSSI and SNR values for tested scenarios

Sc.	CAD	Packets received	Payload	Mean RSSI	Mean SNR
1	-	100 %	3 B	-75 dBm	11 dB
2	Yes	100 %, 100 %	3 B	-96 dBm, -90 dBm	5 dB, 9 dB
3	No	54 %, 88 %	3 B	-96 dBm, -72 dBm	5 dB, 11 dB
1	-	100 %	50 B	- 88 dBm	10 dB
2	Yes	100 %, 100 %	50 B	-61 dBm, -78 dBm	11 dB, 11 dB
3	No	10 %, 46 %	50 B	-77dBm, -61 dBm	12 dB , 10 dB
1	-	100 %	250 B	- 76 dBm	11 dB
2	Yes	100 %, 100 %	250 B	-68 dBm, -79 dBm	12 dB, 11 dB
3	No	0 %, 17 %	250 B	/, -65 dBm	/, 10 dB

the Received Signal Strength Indicator (RSSI) as well as the Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR). Three scenarios were observed, in order to evaluate the influence of interference when there is more than IoT device sending the data, one (scenario 1) with a LoRa transmission of a single IoT device, while the other two with two devices transmitting simultaneously (scenario 2 and 3), resulting in packet collisions measured in the edge device. To prevent collisions, a Collision Avoidance Detection (CAD) mechanism is implemented and activated for scenario 2. This mechanism waits for a randomly generated time interval that is shorter than two seconds before checking if the channel is currently occupied. If the channel is still occupied, it waits again before rechecking and eventually transmits the data if the channel is free. For scenario 3, this mechanism is deactivated to demonstrate the impact of collisions. For the experiments, the payload lengths were set to 3 and 250 bytes, respectively, to illustrate a low and high payload value.

The results of the first scenario demonstrate that, in absence of an interfering second LoRa transmission, irrespective of the payload length, all transmitted packets were successfully received. Furthermore, the RSSI and SNR values exhibit comparable ranges in this scenario. The results of the second scenario demonstrate that with an activated CAD, 100% of the packets are received for all three payload lengths from both sending devices. The RSSI and SNR values deviate from those observed with a single transmitting device, exhibiting a range of variation both above and below the mean. The third scenario demonstrated the influence of the CAD. In this

case, it is shown that in the three byte scenario, 54% of the packets were received from one of the devices, while 88% were received from the other, showing a significant loss.

The RSSI and SNR values are observed to be higher for transmitting devices with a greater number of received packets. This phenomenon can be described in terms of the capture effect, whereby a receiver is still able to demodulate the packet with the higher RSSI in the event of a packet collision [15]. With the larger payload sizes of the sensor data, the amount of packets received in the edge device decreases significantly in the third scenario, without the activated CAD (0% and 17% of the packets were received for 250B payload, compared to 54% and 88% for 50sB payload). This phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that the transmission time is also lengthening due to the necessity of transmitting a greater number of symbols, thereby increasing the probability of two signals colliding and one being extinguished by the other. The results of the experiment indicate that, in the context of a single transmitting device, the payload length has a negligible impact on the performance of LoRa transmissions. However, once more than one active LoRa device is attempting to send to a common receiver, packet collision might appear causing messages to be lost. To prevent this, a CAD mechanism should be implemented to ensure the reliability of the system.

### B. Collaborative filtering performance

The performance of the collaborative filtering method, i.e., cosine similarity, is shown in Figure 4. The input data is represented as a 2D matrix of ratings of plants in different soils. To compute the performance of the cosine similarity the two datasets get compared using a confusion matrix to show how accurate the prediction of the rating has been done. In order to demonstrate the impact of sparsity on the performance, this experiment has been conducted with varying levels of sparsity. Sparsity is defined as the ratio of abstinent ratings to the total number of ratings. Three distinct sparsity levels were tested: 70% , 40 % and 10 %. The results are presented in Figures 4a to 4c. We can observe that as sparsity decreases, the performance improves, resulting in more precise predictions. A sparsity of 70 % based on a dataset comprising 10626 soils and 15 plants in insufficient for the reliable prediction of ratings. The performance improves with an increase in sparsity to 40 %. In this experiment, the performance for the outlier ratings( 1,4,5) was satisfactory. However, confusion was evident for the ratings 2 and 3. This could be explained by referring to Figure 4d. The distribution of total ratings is not uniform. The majority of ratings are in the range of ratings 2 and 3, which presents a challenge for the algorithm in distinguishing between them. This issue is mitigated when the sparsity is reduced to 10 %. In this case, the data set is sufficient to reliably calculate the correct ratings, although the performance for ratings 2 and 3 remains slightly poorer than for the other three ratings.

### C. Plant recommendation

The results of the plant recommendation are presented in Table III and Figure 5 with evaluated metrics of accuracy, mean square error (MSE), the model training and inference time. For each algorithm, the model was tested with data sets of varying sizes, ranging from 100 to 10100 soils and their corresponding ratings, in increments of 1000. Figure 5 illustrates the change in accuracy of the eight algorithms utilized as the number of soils in the data set increases. Gradient Boost (GB) and Extreme Gradient Boost (XGB) approach 100 % quickly. In contrast, the linear algorithm exhibits a relatively constant performance, maintaining an accuracy level of approximately 78% over all tested sample sizes. The remaining five algorithms demonstrate a similar trend, with an increasing accuracy as the soil number increases. Table III presents the precise values for the four tracked metrics at the highest tested soil count  $\sim 10^4$ . The highlighted numbers indicate the highest values for the respective metric. Overall, with the exception of the linear algorithm, the accuracy reaches 90 % or higher, with the highest value of 99.99 % measured for GB. The best value for the MSE was observed for the XGB, with a value of 0.0003. The sole exception is the linear algorithm, which exhibits an exceedingly poor MSE of 0.65. The third metric describes the time required for model training in the cloud. These results demonstrate that the high accuracy values are accompanied by extended training periods. The only algorithm that requires a longer inference time than training time is KNN. This is due to the fact that no actual learning occurs during the training phase of KNN, this only occurs during the inference phase, which explains the discrepancy in time requirements. Based on these results, an algorithm can be selected that is appropriate for this use case. In the absence of time constraints, the decision can be made exclusively on the basis of accuracy and MSE. Consequently, the two algorithms GB and EGB are the preferred options.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we presented a comprehensive IoT-edge-cloud architecture and an integrated data workflow tailored for ML-based applications in smart farming and plant recommendation. The architecture comprises an IoT layer with sensors for data collection, an edge layer with dedicated servers for data processing, prediction, and user interaction, and a cloud layer for handling high computational workloads such as ML training. We addressed the plant recommendation problem by employing various ML algorithms on sensor data, including soil composition and climate data. Our proposed communication approach leverages LoRa for efficient data collection, and we introduced a collaborative filtering method using cosine similarity to handle missing data. Our findings indicate that the payload length of LoRa messages does not impact connection reliability, though a collision avoidance mechanism is essential when multiple LoRa devices are employed to prevent packet loss. The evaluation demonstrated that cosine similarity effectively predicts plant performance in varying soil conditions, achieving an accuracy of 93% with 10% data sparsity and




Fig. 4: Confusion matrix with different data sparsity and rating distribution.

Metrics	NN	KNN	Linear	Decision Tree	Random Forest	SVM	Gradient Boost	Extreme Gradient Boost
Accuracy [%]	92.0	90.8	78.3	90.9	94.0	90.1	<b>99.99</b>	99.9
MSE	0.15	0.19	0.65	0.26	0.12	0.19	0.002	<b>0.0003</b>
Training time [ms]	6960.1	3.0	<b>1.1</b>	22.2	1455.0	15646.3	4288.4	314.4
Inference time [ms]	0.9	9.6	<b>0.1</b>	0.4	30.2	2997.4	34.6	14.1

TABLE III: Algorithms performance.




Fig. 5: Prediction performance vs number of soils

70% with 40% data sparsity. Assuming complete knowledge of plant performance in diverse soil conditions, we evaluated eight ML techniques for crop recommendation. Among the ML techniques, Gradient Boost (GB) achieved superior performance with 99.99% accuracy and 0.0002 MSE, requiring 34.6 ms for inference and 4.3 seconds for training. In contrast, the Decision Tree method attained 90.9% accuracy and 0.26 MSE, with significantly faster times of 0.4 ms for inference and 28.7 ms for training. One key limitation is the reliance on a single communication protocol, LoRa, which, despite its efficiency, may face scalability and interference challenges in densely populated sensor environments. Future research will focus on optimizing ML algorithms for deployment on edge devices, through techniques such as model compression and hardware acceleration, will be a priority to achieve faster inference times without compromising accuracy.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. Jorda Jr and et. al., "Automated smart wick system-based microfarm using internet of things," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01279*, 2019.
- [2] I. A. T. Hashem and et. al., "Urban computing for sustainable smart cities: Recent advances, taxonomy, and open research challenges," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 5, 2023.
- [3] D. Glaroudis, A. Iossifides, and P. Chatzimisios, "Survey, comparison and research challenges of iot application protocols for smart farming," *Computer Networks*, vol. 168, p. 107037, 2020.
- [4] P. Gkonis and et. al., "A survey on iot-edge-cloud continuum systems: status, challenges, use cases, and open issues," *Future Internet*, vol. 15, no. 12, p. 383, 2023.
- [5] D. Dahiphale and et. al., "Smart farming: Crop recommendation using machine learning with challenges and future ideas," *Authorea Preprints*, 2023.
- [6] A. K. Ng and R. Maheswaran, "Emerging and disruptive technologies for urban farming: A review and assessment," in *Journal of physics: Conference series*, vol. 2003, no. 1. IOP Publishing, 2021, p. 012008.
- [7] A. Jukan, X. Masip-Bruin, J. Dizdarević, and F. Carpio, *Network of Things Engineering (NoTE) Lab*. Springer, 2023.
- [8] M. Saban, O. Aghzout, and A. Rosado-Muñoz, "Deployment of a lora-based network and web monitoring application for a smart farm," in *2022 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Industry 4.0 & IoT (MetroInd4.0&IoT)*, 2022, pp. 424–427.
- [9] J. Dizdarević and et. al., "An edge/cloud continuum with wearable kinetic energy harvesting iot devices in remote area," in *ICC 2023-IEEE International Conference on Communications*. IEEE, 2024.
- [10] Y. Gao and L. Ran, "Collaborative filtering recommendation algorithm for heterogeneous data mining in the internet of things," *IEEE access*, vol. 7, pp. 123 583–123 591, 2019.
- [11] F. Ortega and et. al., "Collaborative filtering to predict sensor array values in large iot networks," *Sensors*, vol. 20, no. 16, p. 4628, 2020.
- [12] A. Agarwal, S. Ahmad, and A. Pandey, "Crop recommendation based on soil properties: A comprehensive analysis," in *2023 14th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies (ICCCNT)*, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [13] J. R. H. D, and P. B., "A machine learning-based approach for crop yield prediction and fertilizer recommendation," in *2022 6th International Conference on Trends in Electronics and Informatics (ICOEI)*, 2022, pp. 1330–1334.
- [14] D. Soyusiawaty and et.al., "Book data content similarity detector with cosine similarity (case study on digilib.uad.ac.id)," in *2018 12th International Conference on Telecommunication Systems, Services, and Applications (TSSA)*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [15] L. Chasserat, N. Accettura, and P. Berthou, "Experimental throughput models for lora networks with capture effect," in *2022 18th International Conference on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications (WiMob)*, 2022, pp. 36–41.