

Date of publication xxxx 00, 0000, date of current version xxxx 00, 0000.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.DOI

# Time-dependent analysis of the interaction between energy harvesting, leakage and consumption processes in a Green IoT Device

# GODLOVE SUILA KUABAN<sup>1</sup>, TADEUSZ CZACHÓRSKI<sup>1</sup>, (MEMBER, IEEE), AND EROL GELENBE<sup>1</sup>, (LIFE FELLOW, IEEE), PIOTR CZEKALSKI<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Baltycka 5, 44-100, Gliwice, Poland, (e-mail: {gskuaban,tadek,seg}@iitis.pl) <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Automatic Control, Electronics and Computer Science, Silesian University of Technology, Akademicka 16, 44-100, Gliwice, (e-mail: piotr.czekalski@polsl.pl)

Corresponding author: G. S Kuaban (e-mail: gskuaban@iitis.pl).

This paragraph of the first footnote will contain support information, including sponsor and financial support acknowledgment. For example, "This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Commerce under Grant BS123456."

ABSTRACT The Internet of Things (IoT) is transforming industries by enhancing productivity and efficiency; however, energy availability remains a significant challenge due to the limited capacity of batteries and supercapacitors powering IoT devices. The emergence of Green IoT (G-IoT) frameworks, which prioritize energy efficiency and renewable energy integration, offers a promising solution to address this challenge. Despite these advancements, energy storage systems (ESSs) face issues such as capacity degradation, leakage, and charge redistribution, which can lead to energy depletion and service disruptions. Traditional models often assume constant energy harvesting rates, overlooking the time-varying nature of environmental conditions that influence energy availability. In this paper, we propose a novel mathematical framework that incorporates time-dependent fluctuations in the energy harvesting rate to analyze the dynamic interactions between energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption in green IoT systems. Our approach includes an energy packet model to represent transient energy dynamics and a Markov model to capture fluctuations in the energy harvesting rate. Through numerical simulations, we evaluate the impact of key design parameters, such as ESS capacity, mean energy consumption rate, energy leakage, and energy harvesting rate variations, on critical performance metrics including the probability of energy depletion and the transient mean number of stored energy packets. The results highlight the importance of considering time-varying energy harvesting in the design and optimization of IoT systems for long-term operation and sustainability.

INDEX TERMS Time-dependent analysis, energy harvesting, energy leakage, energy-efficiency, green IoT

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The Internet of Things (IoT) is one of the most transformative technologies of the 21st century, with applications spanning various industries, including transportation, energy, construction, agriculture, home automation, smart buildings, smart cities, environmental monitoring, healthcare, defense, manufacturing, and logistics [1], [2]. The deployment of hundreds of billions of IoT devices is anticipated to drive productivity and efficiency across multiple sectors [3], solidifying IoT's role as a key enabler of Industry 4.0, which is reshaping modern industries.

Despite substantial progress in developing reliable and sustainable IoT systems, energy availability remains a fundamental challenge. IoT nodes are typically powered by batteries or supercapacitors, both of which have limited energy storage capacity [3], [4]. This limitation raises concerns about achieving long-term, uninterrupted operation of IoT devices, particularly those expected to function for several years without human intervention [5]. Moreover, energy storage systems (ESSs) are not ideal, and their inherent imperfections further restrict their performance. Key issues include capacity degradation over repeated charge-discharge IEEE Access

cycles, energy leakage, and charge redistribution (notably in supercapacitors). These factors accelerate energy depletion, increasing the likelihood of energy-related service disruptions. A potential mitigation strategy is to incorporate these non-idealities into energy storage models to assess their impact accurately. However, this also adds complexity to the modeling process [6].

In recent years, substantial efforts have been made to enhance the energy reliability and sustainability of IoT systems. One of the key advancements in this domain is the Green IoT (G-IoT) framework [7]-[9], which focuses on optimizing energy efficiency, ensuring energy reliability, and integrating renewable energy sources. As the deployment of IoT devices scales into the tens of billions, adopting green IoT strategies is essential for minimizing carbon emissions, reducing electronic waste, and mitigating the environmental impact of IoT operations and disposal. A widely adopted approach in Green IoT is the implementation of energy-saving techniques to reduce power consumption. Several key strategies outlined in [7]-[9] include duty cycling to reduce active power consumption, packet size reduction and transceiver optimization to minimize communication energy, energy-aware routing and adaptive sensing for efficient data collection, protocol overhead reduction to streamline communication, voltage and frequency scaling to optimize hardware power usage, energyefficient hardware and software design, Green IoT communication technologies such as BLE, RFID, NFC, Zigbee, LoRa, and Sigfox, sustainable IoT architectures including green cloud computing, fog computing, and virtualization, as well as the use of sustainable materials and efficient energy management techniques such as energy thresholds. A comprehensive review of energy-saving methodologies for Green IoT is provided in [10]–[12].

Energy Harvesting for Green IoT is another key strategy in green IoT, and it involves capturing energy from ambient or external renewable sources such as solar (photovoltaic), radio frequency (RF), wind, and mechanical vibrations. However, maintaining consistent energy availability remains a challenge due to the intermittent and unpredictable nature of these renewable sources [13]. Additionally, the energy harvested by IoT devices is often limited, typically in the range of a few hundred milliwatt-hours (mWh) or, in some cases, as low as a few hundred micro-watt-hours ( $\mu$ Wh). This constraint underscores the importance of efficient energy management to maximize operational efficiency. A detailed review of various energy harvesting techniques for green IoT is provided in [1], [12].

Designing energy-efficient IoT nodes requires careful consideration of energy leakage. Properly sizing energy harvesting and storage systems is essential to compensate for energy losses, thereby reducing the likelihood of service outages and prolonging the operational lifespan of the nodes. While many studies on IoT node energy performance [3], [14]–[23] have not accounted for energy leakage in storage systems, some have specifically analyzed its effects on wireless communication nodes [24]–[29]. IoT systems are also often supported by computational and data storage servers, so that recent work has also considered the optimum allocation of tasks to multiple diverse processors as to optimize performance and minimize energy consumption of the system [30].

A common technique for evaluating IoT energy performance—without focusing on the complexities of harvesters, nodes, or storage systems—is to model energy in discrete units called energy packets. Introduced in [14], [15], this approach employs queueing theory to represent the charging and discharging behavior of ESSs. Further exploration of this concept can be found in [16], [31], [32].

Within this framework, energy harvested and stored in the battery is modeled as packet arrivals, whereas energy consumption is treated as packet servicing. Unlike traditional queueing models-where the service rate must exceed arrivals to prevent overload-an ESS must ensure a higher energy arrival rate than consumption to avoid depletioninduced service interruptions [24]. Another method characterizes energy variations within an ESS as a continuous stochastic process, such as fluid flow [17]-[19] or diffusion models [3], [21]-[23]. A major challenge when incorporating inefficiencies like leakage is that it introduces an additional deterministic or stochastic process that interacts with energy arrival and consumption dynamics. Moreover, since leakage is directly influenced by the ESS's current energy level, it cannot be treated as an isolated factor but remains intrinsically linked to the energy storage and usage processes.

### **II. MAIN CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PAPER**

Most existing studies on the interaction between energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption processes, including those cited above, assume that the mean energy harvesting rate or the mean rate of energy packet delivery to the energy storage system remains constant. Consequently, these studies primarily rely on steady-state analysis. However, in realworld scenarios, energy harvesting is influenced by random and unpredictable environmental factors, making it inherently stochastic and time-varying.

A Markov process is commonly used to model fluctuations in the mean energy harvesting rate caused by changes in weather conditions. In [33]–[35], the authors employed a two-state Markov chain to represent the energy harvesting process, where one state corresponds to active energy harvesting, while the other represents periods with no harvested energy. Similarly, the authors in [28], [36] proposed a fourstate Markov model to capture weather state transitions, which, in turn, influence the energy harvesting rate over time.

Given the stochastic nature of energy harvesting, incorporating time-dependent variations in the harvesting rate into energy performance models is crucial for accurately evaluating the behavior of energy storage systems (ESSs). Modeling the interplay between transient energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption processes provides valuable insights into the relationships between key design parameters—such as the energy capacity of the ESS, mean energy consumption rate, energy threshold, energy leakage parameter, and energy

IEEE Access

leakage model—and critical performance metrics, including the mean number of stored energy packets and the probability of complete energy depletion (energy service outage probability).

In this paper, we introduce a mathematical framework to analyze the dynamic interactions between time-dependent energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption processes in green IoT networks. Specifically, we propose:

- An energy packet model for the energy storage system that accounts for transient energy dynamics.
- A Markov model to characterize the time-dependent fluctuations in the mean energy harvesting rate.
- To validate our approach, we conduct numerical simulations to evaluate the impact of key design parameters.

We assess their effects on critical energy performance metrics, such as the transient mean number of stored energy packets and the probability of complete energy depletion.

# **III. DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL**

Consider a green IoT system comprising a sensor device, an energy storage system, and an energy harvesting system, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The system follows a harvest-storeconsume energy configuration, meaning that the harvested energy is first stored and subsequently utilized for operation.

For analytical tractability, we model the energy packet arrival process to the storage system as a Poisson process, while the energy consumption process follows an exponential distribution. Although these assumptions may not always perfectly reflect real-world conditions, they serve as a first-order approximation, providing a tractable analytical framework. This allows for deeper insights into the dynamic interactions between energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption processes, facilitating performance evaluation and optimization of energy-efficient IoT systems.

# A. ENERGY PACKET MODEL FOR THE ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEM

The discretization of energy into packets requires defining a quantization step, which corresponds to the size of an energy packet. An energy packet, measured in mWh or mAh, represents a pulse of power or current over a specific time duration.

Since energy is primarily consumed during active periods—when the node performs sensing, computation, or communication—the energy packet size can be expressed as:

$$E_p = P_{\text{active}} \cdot t_{\text{active}},\tag{1}$$

where  $P_{\text{active}}$  denotes the power consumed during active periods, and  $t_{\text{active}}$  represents the time of activity.

Although the quantization step can be arbitrarily chosen, consistency is required across energy harvesting, consumption, and storage processes.

Let  $C_B$  (in mWh) represent the capacity of the energy storage system (ESS), which could be a battery or supercapacitor.

VOLUME 4, 2016

The total number of energy packets the ESS can store is given by:

$$B = \frac{C_B}{E_p},\tag{2}$$

implying that the ESS can hold up to B discrete energy packets, with possible energy states  $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, B\}$ . We assume the IoT node remains in a dormant state and activates only when triggered by an external event, e.g. a system supervising a piplinne is ewaken by the detection of a fluid leakage. The assume that such events are defined by the Poisson process. The time needed to consume an energy unit has the exponential distribution. These assumptions, while not universally precise, serve as a practical first-order approximation for analytical tractability.

The energy storage system's dynamics is modeled using an M(t)/M(n)/1/B queueing system. In Kendall's notation [37], this corresponds to a system with exponentially distributed interarrival and service times, a single server, and finite storage capacity of B energy packets. The notation M(n) accounts for a state-dependent service rate and M(t)for time-dependent arrival rate.

Energy packet arrivals follow a Poisson process, implying exponentially distributed interarrival times with rate  $\lambda$ . The consumption time of an energy packet is also exponentially distributed, with rate  $\mu(n)$ , where n denotes the number of stored energy packets.

In an extended Markovian framework, phase-type distributions can replace the exponential assumption to better approximate real-world energy dynamics, though this increases the complexity by introducing additional states and imposes purely numerical solution.

The service rate  $\mu(n)$ , representing the inverse of the average service time, is given by:

$$\mu(n) = \mu_i + \theta(n), \tag{3}$$

where  $\mu_i$  is the base energy consumption rate and  $\theta(n)$  accounts for state-dependent energy leakage.

We assume that the consumption rate varies depending on the device's operational mode. When stored energy exceeds a threshold K (n > K), the system operates normally with  $\mu_i = \mu_2$ . If the energy level falls below K ( $n \le K$ ), the device switches to an energy-saving mode with  $\mu_i = \mu_1$ .

Three types of leakage rate functions  $\theta(n)$  are considered:

• **linear leakage rate**, proportional to stored energy [24], [38]:

$$\vartheta(n) = (n-1)\xi\tag{4}$$

• **exponential leakage rate** is exponentially related to the stored energy and is common in supercapacitors [28]:

$$\vartheta(n) = \alpha e^{\xi(n-1)}, \quad n \ge 1.$$
(5)

• **constant leakage rate**, independent of stored energy [26]:

$$\vartheta(n) = \alpha \xi. \tag{6}$$



Author et al.: Preparation of Papers for IEEE TRANSACTIONS and JOURNALS



FIGURE 1: The architecture of a green IoT node with erratic energy sources.

This model provides a structured approach for analyzing energy storage behavior in IoT devices under varying conditions.

The evolution of energy packet levels in the ESS is modeled as an M(t)/M(n)/1/B Markovian queueing process  $\{N(t) \mid t \ge 0\}$ . The probability of having *n* energy packets at time *t* is denoted as  $p(n, t) = \Pr\{N(t) = n\}$ .

The system dynamics are governed by the following firstorder differential equations [39]:

$$\frac{dp(0,t)}{dt} = -\lambda p(0,t) + \mu(1)p(1,t), 
\frac{dp(n,t)}{dt} = -(\lambda + \mu(n))p(n,t) + \lambda p(n-1,t)$$
(7)  

$$+\mu(n+1)p(n+1,t), \quad n = 1, \dots B - 1,$$

$$\frac{dp(B,t)}{dt} = \lambda p(B-1,t) - \mu(B)p(B,t).$$
(8)

In the steady-state condition  $(t \rightarrow \infty)$ , the system transitions to an equilibrium state where these differential equations reduce to algebraic equations [39]:

$$p(n) = p(0) \frac{\lambda^n}{\mu(1) \cdots \mu(n)}, \quad n = 1, \dots, B.$$
 (9)

VOLUME 4, 2016

By enforcing the normalization condition  $\sum_{n=0}^{B} p(n) = 1$ , we obtain:

$$p(0) = \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{n=1}^{B} \left(\frac{\lambda^{n}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mu(i)}\right)}.$$
 (10)

This framework enables performance analysis of IoT energy storage systems under different operational constraints and event-driven consumption patterns.

# B. TIME-DEPENDENT STOCHASTIC PROCESS FOR ENERGY HARVESTING

Since the energy harvested depends on random and unpredictable environmental variables, it exhibits a stochastic nature. The mean energy harvesting rate, denoted as  $\lambda$ , varies over discrete time intervals  $\Delta t$ . The evolution of  $\lambda$  can be modeled as either a random process or a Markov process.

Within each time interval  $\Delta t$ ,  $\lambda$  is drawn from a predefined range  $[\lambda_{\min}, \lambda_{\max}]$ . In some simulations,  $\lambda$  is assumed to follow a uniform distribution, generating a new random value at each time step.

Alternatively, the time-dependent mean arrival rate of energy packets,  $\lambda(t)$ , can be modeled as a Markov process with N states and transition probabilities  $p_{ij}$ . The value of  $\lambda$  is influenced by dynamically changing environmental factors such as wind, sunlight, vibrations, cloud cover, and rainfall.

Consider a two-state Markov model that represents the environmental energy states  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  within each interval  $\Delta t$ . This type of model has been discussed in [33]–[35]. The transition probabilities between the two states are  $p_{00}$ ,  $p_{01}$ ,  $p_{10}$ , and  $p_{11}$ , which can be estimated from empirical data [35]. The state transition matrix is given by:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{00} & p_{01} \\ p_{10} & p_{11} \end{bmatrix}$$

where:

- $p_{00}$  is the probability of remaining in state  $S_0$ ,
- $p_{01}$  is the probability of transitioning from  $S_0$  to  $S_1$ ,
- $p_{10}$  is the probability of transitioning from  $S_1$  to  $S_0$ ,
- $p_{11}$  is the probability of remaining in state  $S_1$ .

A more complex model can be defined using a threestate Markov chain  $(S_0, S_1, S_2)$  to represent different weather conditions such as sunny, cloudy, and rainy, which influence the state of a solar energy harvester. The corresponding values of  $\lambda$  for each state are  $\lambda = \{\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ . A four-state weather model was explored in [28], [36], where the state transition matrix is:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{00} & p_{01} & p_{02} & p_{03} \\ p_{10} & p_{11} & p_{12} & p_{13} \\ p_{20} & p_{21} & p_{22} & p_{23} \\ p_{30} & p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

Once the state transition matrix is defined, the Markov chain can be used to simulate dynamic state changes over time. The state at each time step determines the corresponding value of  $\lambda$ .

# IV. TRANSIENT-STATE ENERGY PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

We analyse the transient-state energy performance of the ESS with and without energy thresholds. While steady-state analysis assumes constant mean rates for energy packet delivery to and consumption from the ESS, the mean number of harvested energy packets can fluctuate over time. We evaluate the impact of parameters such as energy leakage rate, energy harvesting rate, and the energy consumption rate on the energy performance metrics such as the service outage probability at time t, p(0, t) and the mean number of energy packets present in the ESS at time t, E[N(t)].

In the case of a single threshold and linear leakage rate, a simplified version of the differential equations in (8) can be obtained. Therefore, the following system of equations governs the time evolution of the state probabilities p(0,t), p(n,t), and p(B,t), describing the dynamic behavior of the system over time.

For p(0, t) (empty state probability):

$$\frac{dp(0,t)}{dt} = -\lambda p(0,t) + \mu_1 p(1,t)$$
(11)

For intermediate states p(n, t), where  $1 \le n \le K - 1$ :

$$\frac{dp(n,t)}{dt} = -(\lambda + \mu_1 + (n-1)\xi)p(n,t) +\lambda p(n-1,t) + (\mu_1 + n\xi)p(n+1,t)$$
(12)

For intermediate states p(n, t), where  $K \le n \le B - 1$ :

$$\frac{dp(n,t)}{dt} = -(\lambda + \mu_2 + (n-1)\xi)p(n,t) +\lambda p(n-1,t) + (\mu_2 + n\xi)p(n+1,t)$$
(13)

For p(B, t) (full state probability):

$$\frac{dp(B,t)}{dt} = \lambda p(B-1,t) - (\mu_2 + (B-1)\xi)p(B,t)$$
(14)

Initially, the system is assumed to be in state  $P_0(0)$ , meaning all probabilities are zero except for  $P_0(0) = 1$ , ensuring normalization.

The expected value of the number of energy packets in the ESS at time t, denoted as E[N(t)] is the weighted sum of the probabilities of being at each state n, i.e.,

$$E[N(t)] = \sum_{n=0}^{B} np(n,t).$$

The transient solution of (8) is more intricate. It can be obtained using the Laplace transform, which converts the system's differential equations into algebraic equations in the Laplace domain. This transformation allows for an analytical solution, as demonstrated in [40]. However, this solution must be inverted numerically. Alternatively, a direct numerical approach can be used, as demonstrated here with our solver [41]. Many other solvers may be helpful.

The results presented in Figs. 2-12 are obtained by numerically solving the system described in equation 8. This is **IEEE**Access

accomplished using Python libraries such as NumPy, SymPy, and SciPy.

First, we define  $\lambda$  as a time-dependent function,  $\lambda(t)$ , and implement a function to generate its values dynamically. The system of equations governing the time evolution of the number of EPs in the ESS is then formulated. After specifying the initial conditions—e.g., p(0,0) = 1 if the ESS is empty at t = 0 or p(B,0) = 0 if the ESS initially contains *B* energy packets—SciPy is used to solve the system numerically.

To track the evolution of the mean number of energy packets in the ESS, we compute the expected value of the system at each time step. That is, at each time interval  $\Delta t$ , we obtain the value  $\lambda$  using a stochastic process. The computed values computed for each interval are then plotted using another Python library called MatplotLib.

To compute and plot the service outage probability, p(0, t), we solve a system of differential equations that describe the dynamics of the queue of stored energy packets under timevarying arrival rates  $\lambda(t)$ .

Using a Markov chain, we generate a sequence of weather states that influence the evolution of  $\lambda(t)$  over time. Each weather state corresponds to a distinct arrival rate  $\lambda(t)$ . The probability distribution p(n,t) for different system states is governed by a set of coupled differential equations, which are solved using the solve\_ivp function from SciPy.

Once the values of p(0,t) are computed for each time interval  $\Delta t$  across various values of  $\lambda$ , they are visualized to analyze the system's performance.

Once the system is solved, p(0,t) is plotted over time using a logarithmic scale. The results illustrate how p(0,t)evolves under different service rate modification strategies. Additionally, the time-dependent arrival rate  $\lambda(t)$  is overlaid on a secondary axis to highlight the impact of weatherinduced variations in arrival intensity.

## **V. NUMERICAL SIMULATION RESULTS**

In the presented numerical simulation results, we consider a battery with a charge rating of Q = 2100 mAh, a depth of discharge (DoD) of 70%, and a voltage of v = 3.7 V. The corresponding energy capacity of the battery is given by:

$$C_B = 2100 \times 0.7 \times 3.7 = 5439 \text{ mWh}$$

We assume that energy is quantized into discrete packets, with each packet having a size of  $E_p = 54.39$  mWh. Consequently, the battery can store a maximum of:

$$B = \frac{5439}{54.39} = 100 \text{ energy packets}$$

For each numerical example, the relevant parameter values are provided alongside the corresponding figure.

# A. THE IMPACT OF SYSTEM PARAMETERS ON THE MEAN NUMBER OF STORED ENERGY PACKETS

The mean number of stored energy packets is a key performance metric, as a higher number of stored packets allows



FIGURE 2: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$  and randomly changing  $\lambda(t)$ :  $\mu_2 = 5$ ,  $\mu_1 = 3$ , K = 40, B = 100



FIGURE 3: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of K and randomly changing  $\lambda(t)$ :  $\mu_2 = 5$ ,  $\mu_1 = 3$ ,  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100

the device to operate for a longer duration without depleting its energy reserves. If the stored energy is exhausted, the device will shut down.

We analyze the impact of model parameters such as  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\xi$ , and K on the mean number of stored energy packets. In each presented result, the values of  $\lambda(t)$  are generated by a stochastic process that updates  $\lambda$  at regular or random time intervals  $\Delta t$ .

For Figs. 2 and 3, the values of  $\lambda(t)$  are randomly generated using a uniform distribution with  $\lambda_{\min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{\max} = 12$ . The values of  $\lambda$  change every  $\Delta t = 12$  hours. The remaining parameters are specified in the figures and their captions. Fig. 2 illustrates the evolution of E[N(t)] for different values of  $\xi$ . In general, as the leakage parameter  $\xi$  increases, the mean number of energy packets (EPs) in the ESS decreases due to higher energy leakage. Fig. 3 shows the evolution of E[N(t)] for various values of K. Higher values of the energy threshold K generally lead to an increase in the mean number of EPs in the ESS. This occurs because when the threshold is reached early—while sufficient energy remains in the ESS—the node enters energy-saving regimes sooner, slowing the depletion of stored EPs.

The time-dependent function  $\lambda(t)$  can be derived from a



FIGURE 4: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$  and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 5$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\mu_2 = 5$ ,  $\mu_1 = 3$ , K = 40, B = 100



FIGURE 5: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 5$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\mu_2 = 5$ ,  $\mu_1 = 3$ , B = 100

weather Markov chain. We model the weather as a simple two-state Markov chain, where each state represents a different weather condition (e.g., sunny and rainy or sunny and not sunny). The state transitions determine the energy delivery rate  $\lambda(t)$ , which varies based on the current weather state.

When the weather state is  $S_0$ , the mean energy delivery rate is  $\lambda_{\max}$ , with a certain probability of transitioning to the  $S_1$  state. Conversely, when the weather state is  $S_1$ , the mean energy delivery rate is  $\lambda_{\min}$ , with a probability of transitioning back to the  $S_0$  state.

The transition matrix for this two-state Markov chain is given by:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 & 0.2\\ 0.3 & 0.7 \end{bmatrix}$$

Fig. 4 shows the evolution of E[N(t)] for various values of  $\xi$ , where  $\lambda(t)$  is generated using the weather Markov chain with  $\lambda_{\min} = 5$  and  $\lambda_{\max} = 12$ . The observed trend is consistent with that of Fig. 2, as discussed earlier. Also, Fig. 5 shows the evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$ , without considering the energy threshold K, and the values of  $\lambda(t)$  are generated from a weather Markov chain  $(\lambda_{\min} = 5 \text{ and } \lambda_{\max} = 12)$ . The trend is the same as in Figs. 2 and 4.



**IEEE**Access

FIGURE 6: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 5$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 18$ ):  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100



FIGURE 7: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 18$ ):  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100

Since increasing or decreasing the energy harvesting rate can mitigate the impact of energy leakage, we analyse the influence of the mean energy harvesting rate and mean energy consumption rate on the evolution of the mean number of energy packets (EPs) in the ESS. Fig. 6 illustrates the evolution of E[N(t)] for various values of  $\mu$ , without considering the energy threshold K, where  $\lambda(t)$  is generated using a weather Markov chain with  $\lambda_{\min} = 5$  and  $\lambda_{\max} = 12$ . Similarly, Fig. 7 presents the evolution of E[N(t)] under the same conditions, except that  $\lambda(t)$  is generated from a weather Markov chain with  $\lambda_{\min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{\max} = 12$ .

In general, as the mean energy consumption rate  $\mu$  increases, the mean number of EPs in the ESS decreases. This is expected, as higher values of  $\mu$  lead to a faster depletion of stored EPs. The key difference between Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 is that in Fig. 7, the weather model allows for periods where no energy is harvested ( $\lambda_{\min} = 0$ ), which results in more pronounced fluctuations in E[N(t)].

Figure 8 depicts the evolution of E[N(t)] for various values of  $\xi$ , excluding the impact of the energy threshold K. The energy arrival rate,  $\lambda(t)$ , is generated from a weather Markov chain. When  $\xi = 0$ , the energy storage system (ESS) is charged to full capacity, and the mean number of stored energy packets remains above 80% of its maximum capacity.

VOLUME 4, 2016



FIGURE 8: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain:  $\mu = 3, B = 100$ 



FIGURE 9: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100, p(B,0) = 0 (starting with B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

As the energy leakage parameter  $\xi$  increases, the depletion rate of stored energy packets increases, leading to a rapid decline in energy packets in the ESS. For instance, when  $\xi = 0.09$ , the mean number of stored energy packets reaches zero before t = 60 time units. Conversely, lower values of  $\xi$ result in higher values of the mean number of energy packets over time. Since the leakage rate is an inherent characteristic of energy storage systems and beyond the control of an IoT system designer, mitigating its impact on the node's lifetime necessitates either reducing energy consumption or increasing energy harvesting rates.

The results presented in Figs. 2–8 assume that the energy storage system (ESS) initially contains zero energy packets (EPs) at time t = 0, i.e., p(0,0) = 1. However, it is also possible to begin with B energy packets in the ESS at t = 0, represented as p(B,0) = 1. The results shown in Figs. 9–12 are obtained under this assumption, meaning the system starts with B EPs at t = 0.

The observed trends regarding the influence of the mean energy consumption rate  $\mu$  and the energy leakage parameter  $\xi$  remain consistent with those in Figs. 2–8. This consistency indicates that our proposed transient analysis framework is independent of the initial number of energy packets, whether



FIGURE 10: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100, p(B, 0) = 0 (starting with B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 11: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\xi = 0.0, B = 100, p(B,0) = 0$  (starting with B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 12: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  from a weather Markov chain ( $\lambda_{min} = 0$  and  $\lambda_{max} = 12$ ):  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(B,0) = 0 (starting with B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 13: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 0(starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 14: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various values of  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\xi = 0.05$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 0 (starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

it is zero or B at t = 0.

The mean energy delivery rate function, denoted as  $\lambda(t)$ , can be modeled using a Markov chain with any number of states. While previous examples considered a twostate Markov chain, we now extend the analysis to a fourstate Markov chain, where each state corresponds to different weather conditions: Night (low or no energy), Sunny (high energy), Cloudy (medium energy), and Rainy (low to medium energy). Although this model focuses on solar energy, it can be generalized to incorporate multiple renewable energy sources that fluctuate based on weather conditions. In such cases, the number of states could increase to better capture system complexities.

The authors in [42] studied the transient charging and discharging of a supercapacitor under varying transient energy harvesting rates, where the energy harvest rate  $\lambda(t)$  fluctuates over time. Suppose that the values of  $\lambda(t)$  are generated from a four-state Markov chain governed by the transition matrix:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.2 & 0.1 & 0.0 \\ 0.1 & 0.6 & 0.2 & 0.1 \\ 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.3 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}$$



IEEE Access

FIGURE 15: The evolution of E[N(t)], for various energy leakage functions  $\vartheta(n)$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$ generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\xi = 0.01$ ,  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 0 (starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

Figs. 13–15 illustrate the results obtained using the fourstate Markov chain. Specifically, Fig. 13 examines the influence of the energy leakage parameter  $\xi$  on the evolution of the mean number of energy packets (EPs) in the energy storage system (ESS), while Fig. 14 investigates the impact of the energy consumption rate  $\mu$ . The observed trends align with the findings from previous figures that analyzed the effects of  $\xi$  and  $\mu$  on the mean number of EPs in the ESS. A key aspect of these figures is the incorporation of a four-state Markov chain with four distinct values of  $\lambda(t)$  (e.g.,  $\lambda = 0, 12, 5, 2$ corresponding to the states Night, Sunny, Cloudy, and Rainy, respectively).

Another significant result is shown in Fig. 15, which explores the impact of different energy leakage functions  $\theta(n)$  on the evolution of the mean number of EPs in the ESS. Three energy leakage models are considered:

- Linear energy leakage:  $\theta(n) = (n-1)\xi$
- Exponential energy leakage:  $\theta(n) = e^{(n-1)\xi}$
- Constant energy leakage:  $\theta(n) = \xi$

The results indicate that the exponential energy leakage model performs the worst, followed by the linear model. This is because, in the exponential energy leakage model, the energy leakage rate grows exponentially with the number of EPs remaining in the ESS, whereas in the linear model, the leakage rate increases linearly. Experimental studies have demonstrated that energy leakage in supercapacitors often follows an exponential model [43]–[45].

# B. THE IMPACT OF SYSTEM PARAMETERS ON THE SERVICE OUTAGE PROBABILITY

In this section, we compute the transient probability of service outage, which quantifies the likelihood of complete energy depletion in the system. Reducing the service outage probability is essential to ensure continuous operation and prevent disruptions caused by the shutdown of the IoT node due to insufficient stored energy.

Following the approach used in the numerical simulations for the transient mean number of stored energy packets,

VOLUME 4, 2016



FIGURE 16: The evolution of p(0, t), for various energy consumption rate  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\xi = 0.01$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 1 (starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 17: The evolution of p(0, t), for various energy consumption rate  $\mu$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\xi = 0.05$ , B = 100, p(B, 0) = 1 (starting with n = B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

we investigate how key model parameters— $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\xi$ , and *K*—influence system performance.

Figures 16-20 illustrate the evolution of the transient probability of depleting all stored energy packets. These results are obtained using the four-state Markov chain representing weather conditions, which was previously employed in the numerical simulations of the transient mean number of stored energy packets. All other relevant parameters are provided in the figure captions.

In the simulations of p(0,t), we assume B = K, meaning that the mean energy consumption rate,  $\mu$ , remains constant.

The general trend observed is that the transient probability of energy depletion, p(0, t), varies dynamically with changes in the mean energy delivery rate,  $\lambda(t)$ . If the initial number of stored energy packets is n = 0 at t = 0, then p(0,0) = 1, and p(0,t) evolves according to variations in  $\lambda(t)$ . Conversely, if the system starts with n = B energy packets at t = 0, then p(0,0) = 0, and p(0,t) increases dynamically based on the fluctuations in  $\lambda(t)$ .

In the simulations, the mean energy consumption rate is set to  $\mu = \{5, 8, 11\}$ . The values of  $\lambda$  corresponding to the energy states  $S_0, S_1, S_2$ , and  $S_3$  are given by:  $\lambda = \{0, 12, 5, 2\}$ 



FIGURE 18: The evolution of p(0, t), for various leakage parameter  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 1 (starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)



FIGURE 19: The evolution of p(0, t), for various leakage parameter  $\xi$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$  generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(B, 0) = 1 (starting with n = B EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

with the corresponding state transition probability matrix:

P =	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.0
	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.1
	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.1
	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3

It is observed that when the mean energy harvesting rate,  $\lambda$ , decreases from higher to lower values, the probability of energy depletion at time *t* increases, and vice versa.

Figures 16 and 17 show the influence of the mean energy consumption rate,  $\mu$ , on p(0,t). The results indicate that the probability of depleting all stored energy packets increases significantly with higher energy consumption rates. This increase is particularly pronounced during time intervals when the mean harvesting rate,  $\lambda$ , is lower than the mean consumption rate,  $\mu$ . The key difference between Figures 16 and 17 is the initial energy level: in Figure 16, the system starts with n = 0 at t = 0, whereas in Figure 17, it starts with n = B.

Figures 18-20 illustrate the impact of the energy leakage rate on the probability of depleting all stored energy packets. Specifically, Figures 18-19 show the influence of the energy



FIGURE 20: The evolution of p(0,t), for various energy leakage functions  $\vartheta(n)$ , no energy threshold K, and  $\lambda(t)$ generated from a four state weather Markov chain:  $\xi = 0.01$ ,  $\mu = 3$ , B = 100, p(0,0) = 0 (starting with n = 0 EPs in the ESS at t = 0)

leakage parameter  $\xi$  on p(0,t). The general trend indicates that as  $\xi$  increases, the probability of energy depletion also increases.

The key difference between the results in Figures 18 and 19 lies in the initial energy levels. In Figure 18, the system starts with n = 0 at t = 0, meaning there is no energy packet in the energy storage system (ESS) initially. In contrast, Figure 19 assumes n = B at t = 0, meaning the ESS starts with B stored energy packets. Additionally, in Figure 19, the values of p(0, t) are displayed on a logarithmic scale to better observe very small probabilities. This is necessary because starting with n = B energy packets at t = 0 results in extremely low values of p(0, t).

The results in Figures 16-19 are computed using the linear energy leakage model. In Figure 20, we analyze the effect of different energy leakage models on p(0,t). The highest values of p(0,t) are observed with the exponential leakage model, followed by the linear leakage model, and finally, the constant leakage model, which results in the lowest values of p(0,t). This occurs because, in the exponential leakage model, the energy leakage rate increases exponentially with the number of stored energy packets. Consequently, the constant leakage model exhibits the lowest probability of service outage, followed by the linear leakage model, and finally, the exponential leakage model, which results in the highest service outage probability.

#### **VI. CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we introduced a novel mathematical framework to analyze the dynamic interactions between timedependent energy harvesting, leakage, and consumption processes in green IoT networks. By incorporating transient energy dynamics and utilizing a Markov model to capture fluctuations in the energy harvesting rate, we were able to provide a more accurate representation of the challenges faced by IoT devices in real-world environments. Through our numerical simulations, we demonstrated the significant impact of key design parameters, such as energy storage system capacity, mean energy consumption rate, energy leakage, and variations in energy harvesting rates, on critical performance metrics like the probability of energy depletion and the transient mean number of stored energy packets. Our findings emphasize the necessity of accounting for timevarying energy harvesting rates and non-idealities in energy storage systems to enhance the reliability and sustainability of green IoT systems. Future work will focus on refining the proposed models and exploring optimization strategies for improving energy efficiency in IoT deployments, particularly in resource-constrained environments.

### REFERENCES

- T. Sanislav, G. D. Mois, S. Zeadally, and S. C. Folea, "Energy harvesting techniques for internet of things (iot)," IEEE access, vol. 9, pp. 39530– 39549, 2021.
- [2] Y. Santo, A. Abelém, A. Riker, and E. E. Tsiropoulou, "Integrating data privacy and energy management in smart cities with partial sustainable iot networks," IEEE Access, 2025.
- [3] G. S. Kuaban, E. Gelenbe, T. Czachórski, P. Czekalski, and J. K. Tangka, "Modelling of the energy depletion process and battery depletion attacks for battery-powered internet of things (iot) devices," Sensors, vol. 23, no. 13, 2023.
- [4] O. Alamu, T. O. Olwal, and E. M. Migabo, "Machine learning applications in energy harvesting internet of things networks: A review," IEEE Access, 2025.
- [5] G. Moloudian, M. Hosseinifard, S. Kumar, R. B. Simorangkir, J. L. Buckley, C. Song, G. Fantoni, and B. O'Flynn, "Rf energy harvesting techniques for battery-less wireless sensing, industry 4.0, and internet of things: A review," IEEE Sensors Journal, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 5732–5745, 2024.
- [6] G. S. Kuaban, T. Czachórski, E. Gelenbe, P. Pecka, V. Nkemeni, and P. Czekalski, "Impact of energy leakage on the energy performance of green iot nodes," in 2024 32nd International Conference on Modeling, Analysis and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems (MASCOTS). IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–8.
- [7] A. Al-Ansi, A. M. Al-Ansi, A. Muthanna, I. A. Elgendy, and A. Koucheryavy, "Survey on intelligence edge computing in 6g: Characteristics, challenges, potential use cases, and market drivers," Future Internet, vol. 13, no. 5, 2021.
- [8] K. Sadatdiynov, L. Cui, L. Zhang, J. Z. Huang, S. Salloum, and M. S. Mahmud, "A review of optimization methods for computation offloading in edge computing networks," Digital Communications and Networks, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 450–461, 2023.
- [9] M. H. Alsharif, A. Jahid, A. H. Kelechi, and R. Kannadasan, "Green iot: A review and future research directions," Symmetry, vol. 15, no. 3, 2023.
- [10] M. A. Albreem, A. M. Sheikh, M. H. Alsharif, M. Jusoh, and M. N. M. Yasin, "Green internet of things (giot): applications, practices, awareness, and challenges," IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 38 833–38 858, 2021.
- [11] R. Arshad, S. Zahoor, M. A. Shah, A. Wahid, and H. Yu, "Green iot: An investigation on energy saving practices for 2020 and beyond," IEEE Access, vol. 5, pp. 15 667–15 681, 2017.
- [12] V. Nkemeni, F. Mieyeville, G. S. Kuaban, P. Czekalski, K. Tokarz, W. B. Nsanyuy, E. M. Deussom Djomadji, M. L. Katche, P. Tsafack, and B. Zieliński, "Evaluation of green strategies for prolonging the lifespan of linear wireless sensor networks," Sensors, vol. 24, no. 21, p. 7024, 2024.
- [13] A. Kansal, J. Hsu, S. Zahedi, and M. B. Srivastava, "Power management in energy harvesting sensor networks," ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS), vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 32–es, 2007.
- [14] E. Gelenbe, "Energy packet networks: Ict based energy allocation and storage," in International Conference on Green Communications and Networking. Springer, 2011, pp. 186–195.
- [15] —, "Energy packet networks: adaptive energy management for the cloud," in CloudCP'12: Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Cloud Computing Platforms. ACM, https://doi.org/10.1145/2168697.2168698, 2012, pp. 1–5.
- [16] G. S. Kuaban, T. Czachórski, E. Gelenbe, S. Sharma, and P. Czekalski, "A markov model for a self-powered green iot device with state-dependent energy consumption," in 2023 4th International Conference on Communi-

**IEEE**Access

Author et al.: Preparation of Papers for IEEE TRANSACTIONS and JOURNALS

cations, Information, Electronic and Energy Systems (CIEES), 2023, pp. 1-7.

- [17] A. Gautam and S. Dharmaraja, "An analytical model driven by fluid queue for battery life time of a user equipment in LTE-A networks," Physical Communication, vol. 30, pp. 213–219, 2018.
- [18] G. L. Jones, P. G. Harrison, U. Harder, and T. Field, "Fluid queue models of battery life," in Proceeding of the 2011 IEEE 19th Annual International Symposium on Modelling, Analysis, and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems. IEEE, 2011, pp. 278–285.
- [19] C. Tunc and N. Akar, "Markov fluid queue model of an energy harvesting IoT device with adaptive sensing," Performance Evaluation, vol. 111, pp. 1–16, 2017.
- [20] O. H. Abdelrahman and E. Gelenbe, "A diffusion model for energy harvesting sensor nodes," in 2016 IEEE 24th International Symposium on Modeling, Analysis and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems (MASCOTS). IEEE, 2016, pp. 154–158.
- [21] T. Czachórski, E. Gelenbe, and G. S. Kuaban, "Modelling energy changes in the energy harvesting battery of an iot device," in Proceedings of the 2022 30th International Symposium on Modeling, Analysis, and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems (MASCOTS). Nice, France: IEEE, 2022, pp. 81–88.
- [22] T. Czachórski, E. Gelenbe, G. S. Kuaban, and D. Marek, "Energy optimization for an unmanned aerial vehicle (e.g drone) during its mission," in Security in Computer and Information Sciences. EuroCybersec 2021. Communications in Computer and Information Science, vol. 1596. Springer, 2022, pp. 61–75.
- [23] E. Gelenbe and Y. M. Kadioglu, "Battery attacks on sensors: Wireless nodes with battery attacks," in EuroCybersec 2018: International symposium on computer and information sciences, cybersecurity workshop. Springer Cham, 2018.
- [24] M. Raeis, A. Burchard, and J. Liebeherr, "Analysis of a queueing model for energy storage systems with self-discharge," ACM Transactions on Modeling and Performance Evaluation of Computing Systems, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1–26, 2020.
- [25] O. P. Angwech, A. S. Alfa, and B. Maharaj, "Managing the harvested energy in wireless sensor networks: A priority geo/geo/1/k approach with threshold," Energy Reports, vol. 8, pp. 2448–2461, 2022.
- [26] D. Zhai, M. Sheng, X. Wang, and Y. Li, "Leakage-aware dynamic resource allocation in hybrid energy powered cellular networks," IEEE Transactions on Communications, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 4591–4603, 2015.
- [27] N. Su and M. Koca, "Stochastic transmission policies for energy harvesting nodes with random energy leakage," in European Wireless 2014; 20th European Wireless Conference. VDE, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [28] N. Dang, R. Valentini, E. Bozorgzadeh, M. Levorato, and N. Venkatasubramanian, "A unified stochastic model for energy management in solarpowered embedded systems," in 2015 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD). IEEE, 2015, pp. 621–626.
- [29] J. Doncel and J.-M. Fourneau, "Balancing energy consumption and losses with energy packet network models," in 2019 IEEE International Conference on Fog Computing (ICFC). IEEE, 2019, pp. 59–68.
- [30] E. Gelenbe, "Minimizing delay and power consumption at the edge," Sensors, vol. 25, no. 2, p. 502, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.3390/s25020502
- [31] E. Gelenbe and Y. M. Kadioglu, "Energy loss through standby and leakage in energy harvesting wireless sensors," in 2015 IEEE 20th International Workshop on Computer Aided Modelling and Design of Communication Links and Networks (CAMAD). IEEEXplore, 2015, pp. 231–236.
- [32] Y. M. Kadioglu and E. Gelenbe, "Product-form solution for cascade networks with intermittent energy," IEEE Systems Journal, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 918–927, 2019.
- [33] S. Zhang, A. Seyedi, and B. Sikdar, "An analytical approach to the design of energy harvesting wireless sensor nodes," IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 4010–4024, 2013.
- [34] A. Seyedi and B. Sikdar, "Modeling and analysis of energy harvesting nodes in wireless sensor networks," in 2008 46th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing. IEEE, 2008, pp. 67–71.
- [35] P. Lee, Z. A. Eu, M. Han, and H.-P. Tan, "Empirical modeling of a solarpowered energy harvesting wireless sensor node for time-slotted operation," in 2011 IEEE wireless communications and networking conference. IEEE, 2011, pp. 179–184.
- [36] A. Jaitawat and A. K. Singh, "Battery and supercapacitor imperfections modeling and comparison for rf energy harvesting wireless sensor network," Wireless Networks, vol. 26, pp. 843–853, 2020.

- [37] D. G. Kendall, "Stochastic processes occurring in the theory of queues and their analysis by the method of the imbedded markov chain," The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 338–354, 1953.
- [38] S. Samain, J. Doncel, A. Busic, and J.-M. Fourneau, "Multiclass energy packet networks with finite capacity energy queues," Performance Evaluation, vol. 152, p. 102228, 2021.
- [39] L. Kleinrock, Queueing Systems Vol. 1: Theory. John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- [40] G. S. Kuaban, T. Czachórski, E. Gelenbe, S. Sharma, P. Singh, P. Pecka, V. Nkemeni, and P. Czekalski, "Energy performance of self-powered green iot nodes," Frontiers in Energy Research, in print, 2024.
- [41] P. Pecka, M. Nowak, A. Rataj, and S. Nowak, "Solving large markov models described with standard programming language," Communications in Computer and Information Science, vol. 935, pp. 57–67, 2018.
- [42] J. Ahn, D. Kim, R. Ha, and H. Cha, "State-of-charge estimation of supercapacitors in transiently-powered sensor nodes," IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 225–237, 2022.
- [43] G. V. Merrett, A. S. Weddell, A. P. Lewis, N. R. Harris, B. M. Al-Hashimi, and N. M. White, "An empirical energy model for supercapacitor powered wireless sensor nodes," in 2008 Proceedings of 17th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks. IEEE, 2008, pp. 1–6.
- [44] H. Yang and Y. Zhang, "Evaluation of supercapacitor models for wireless sensor network applications," in 2011 5th International Conference on Signal Processing and Communication Systems (ICSPCS), 2011, pp. 1– 6.
- [45] A. S. Weddell, G. V. Merrett, T. J. Kazmierski, and B. M. Al-Hashimi, "Accurate supercapacitor modeling for energy harvesting wireless sensor nodes," IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 911–915, 2011.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper was partially supported by Reactive Too project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research, Innovation and Staff Exchange Programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action (Grant Agreement No871163).



GODLOVE SUILA KUABAN received a B.Eng. degree in Electrical and Electronics Engineering, with a speciality in Telecommunications, from the University of Buea, Cameroon, in 2014 and an MSc. degree in Automatic Control, Robotics, Electronics, Telecommunication, and Computer Science Interdisciplinary Studies and specialized in Computer Science from the Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland in 2017. He obtained a PhD degree in Telecommunications and

Technical Computer Science from the Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland, in 2023. From 2017 to 2023, he was a Research Assistant at the Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics, Polish Academy of Science (IITiS-PAN), Gliwice, Poland. He is currently an Assistant Professor at IITiS-PAN. His research interests are computer systems modelling and performance evaluations. Specifically, modelling and evaluations of SDN and IoT networks and energy performance of green networks (e.g., IoT and cellular mobile networks, linear wireless sensor networks). He has participated in six EU-funded research grants: three in IoT security, one in building IoT laboratory testbed, one in developing online education resources on Assembly Language Programming, and one on Reliable Electronics for Tomorrow's Active Systems. Also, he received the Best Paper Award at the International Symposium on the Modeling, Analysis, and Simulation of Computer and Telecommunication Systems (MASCOTS 2023) in Stony Brook, NY, USA and MASCOTS 2024 in Krakow, Poland (published by IEEE).

Author et al.: Preparation of Papers for IEEE TRANSACTIONS and JOURNALS





TADEUSZ CZACHÓRSKI received M.Sc., Ph.D., D.Sc. degrees in informatics respectively in 1972, 1979, 1988, and professor title in 1999. Since 1972 he is a researcher at the Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics of Polish Academy of Sciences, IITIS PAN, Gliwice. He was for three decades a professor at the Silesian University of Technology Gliwice and also spent more than five years at several French universities and research institutes (IRISA Rennes, University

of Versailles, ISEM Orsay Paris-Sud, Paris-Nord, National Institute of Telecommunications) and still maintains scientific cooperation with some of them. From 1990 to 2007 he was the scientific secretary of the Committee of Informatics of Polish Academy of Sciences, between 2007 - 2011 he served as vice-president of this committee and he currently heads the Committee's Section of Computer Networks and Distributed Systems. He is also the former Chair of IFIP Technical Committee TC5 "Information Technology and Applications" and member of the IFIP General Assembly. His scientific interests comprise mathematical methods and software related to modelling and performance evaluation of wide area computer networks, especially the Internet. The methods include Markov chains, diffusion approximation and fluid flow approximation used to study quality of service, traffic control mechanisms and related problems.



PIOTR CZEKALSKI was born in Zabrze, Poland in 1975. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in computer science in 1999 from the Silesian University of Technology (SUT). He followed with a Ph.D. degree, also in SUT, working in parallel in several IT-related companies in Poland (including Computerland and Sygnity). In 2004, he got his Ph.D. in SUT and continues to work there as an assistant professor.

His research interests include the Internet of Things, low-level programming techniques, and applied AI, particularly in the context of mobile and edge-class devices. He is the author of many educational books and research papers and the coordinator of educational, research, and commercial R&D projects.

...



EROL GELENBE, Life Fellow, received his BS degree in Electrical and Electronic Engineering from the Middle East Technical University (Ankara), the Master's and PhD degrees from the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (Tandon School of Engineering, New York University), the Doctor of Science (Habilitation) degree from Sorbonne University (Paris) in 1966, 1968, 1970, 1973, respectively, and the Polish Habilitation in 2023. Known for his research contributions to computer

system and network performance evaluation, for developing Diffusion Approximations, and inventing G-Networks and the Random Neural Network, he was also awarded Fellowships by ACM and IFIP. He is the co-author or author of four monographs in French and English, two of which were published in Japanese and Korean. He has graduated over 90 PhDs, including 24 women, and was himself also awarded four Honorary Doctorates (Honoris Causa) from the University of Rome II, Bogaziçi University (Istanbul), University of Liège (Belgium) and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. He is a Member of Academia Europaea, an elected Fellow of the French National Academy of Technologies and the Turkish Science Academy, a Foreign Fellow of the Science Academies of Belgium and Poland, and an Honorary Fellow of the Islamic World. He was awarded research prizes by the Parlar Foundation of Turkey, the French Academy of Sciences, ACM, and the Mustafa Foundation.