10-15-2018

Optimal and Objective Placement of Sensors in Water Distribution Systems Using Information Theory

Mohammad S. Khorshidi
Shiraz University

Mohammad Reza Nikoo
Shiraz University

Mojtaba Sadegh
Boise State University

Publication Information

Khorshidi, Mohammad S.; Nikoo, Mohammad Reza; and Sadegh, Mojtaba. (2018). "Optimal and Objective Placement of Sensors in Water Distribution Systems Using Information Theory". *Water Research*, 143, 218-228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.050>

This is an author-produced, peer-reviewed version of this article. © 2018, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives license 4.0. The final, definitive version of this document can be found online at *Water Research*, doi: [10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.050](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.050)

Optimal and Objective Placement of Sensors in Water Distribution Systems	1
Using Information Theory	2
1st Author	3
Mohammad S. Khorshidi	4
Research Associate, School of Engineering, Department of Environmental	5
Engineering, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.	6
Email Address: msadegh.khorshidi.ak@gmail.com	7
Phone: +98-937-387-2226	8
	9
2nd Author (Corresponding Author)	10
Mohammad Reza Nikoo	11
Associate Professor, School of Engineering, Department of Environmental	12
Engineering, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.	13
Email Address: nikoo@shirazu.ac.ir	14
Phone: +98-713-613-3497	15
Fax: +98-713-647-3161	16
	17
3rd Author	18
Mojtaba Sadegh	19

Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Boise State University, Boise, 20
 US. 21
 Email Address: mojtabasadegh@boisestate.edu 22
 Phone: +1-208-426-3774 23

Optimal and Objective Placement of Sensors in Water Distribution Systems 25

Using Information Theory 26

Mohammad S. Khorshidi¹, Mohammad Reza Nikoo², Mojtaba Sadegh³, 27

Abstract 28

Optimization-based deployment of contamination warning system in water 29
 distribution systems has been widely used in the literature, due to their superior 30
 performance compared to rule- and opinion-based approaches. However, 31
 optimization techniques impose an excessive computational burden, which in turn is 32
 compensated for by shrinking the problem's decision space and/or using faster 33
 optimization algorithms with less accuracy. This imposes subjectivity in 34
 interpretation of the system and associated risks, and undermines model's accuracy 35
 by not exploring the entire feasible space. We propose a framework that uses 36
 information theoretic techniques, including value of information and 37
 transinformation entropy, for optimal sensor placement. This can be used either as 38

¹ Research Associate, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

² Corresponding Author, Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran. Email Address: nikoo@shirazu.ac.ir.

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Boise State University, Boise, USA.

pre-selection, i.e. pinpointing best potential locations of sensors to be in turn used in	39
optimization framework, or ultimate selection, i.e. single-handedly selecting sensor	40
locations from the feasible space. The proposed framework is then applied to Lamerd	41
water distribution system, in Fars province, Iran, and the results are compared to the	42
suggested potential locations of sensors in previous studies and results of TEVA-	43
SPOT model. The proposed information theoretic scheme enhances the decision	44
space, provides more accurate results, significantly reduces the computational	45
burden, and warrants objective selection of sensor placement.	46
Keywords	47
Sensor placement; value of information; transinformation entropy; water distribution	48
system; contamination warning system	49
Highlights	50
• Optimal placement of sensors in distribution systems ensures safety of drinking	51
water	52
• Value of Information (VOI) can be used for accurate and robust placement of	53
sensors	54
• VOI enhances the decision space and enables exploring the entire feasible space	55
• Transinformation Entropy (TE) minimizes redundant information from multiple	56
sensors	57
• TE maximizes probability of detecting contamination events	58
	59
1. Introduction	60

Delivering safe drinking water through water distribution systems (WDSs), although 61
seemingly straightforward, is a challenging task. A WDS is a distributed and easy- 62
to-access infrastructure, which could deliver contaminants along with potable water 63
to a large population (Shafiee and Zechman, 2013). Water quality in WDSs can be 64
easily compromised by accidental or intentional incidents (Berry et al. 2008; Hu et 65
al. 2018; Janke et al. 2017), and severely damage public health. Such incidents can 66
claim thousands of civilian lives, create horror in a community, harm public 67
confidence in the water supply system, and potentially impair the economy of an 68
entire nation due to post-incident expenses and long-term impacts. Literature 69
corroborates the WDSs' vulnerability to contaminant intrusion, and its catastrophic 70
impacts (Gavriel et al., 1998; Yokoyama, 2007; Forest et al., 2013). For example in 71
May 2000, contaminated drinking water in Walkerton, Ontario, Canada, severely 72
affected 2,300 people and claimed 7 lives (Hrudey et al. 2003). 73

In the face of preventive actions being near impossible to protect an entire WDS, 74
deploying online and real-time monitoring system of water quality has been regarded 75
as the best alternative to mitigate risks of delivering contaminated water to consumers 76
(Hart and Murray 2010; Rathi and Gupta 2014). This is also referred to as 77
Contamination Warning System (CWS), and is a network of multiple quality sensors 78
placed at different locations of a WDS with a centralized monitoring system that 79
detects the time and location that safe drinking water is compromised. Due to 80
expensive costs of purchase, installation and maintenance, placement of sensors at 81
every node in WDS is not economically justified (Zeng et al., 2016). For example, 82
PSA 10.255 analyzer is an online water quality sensor for measuring various elements 83

such as Mercury, Selenium and Arsenic in potable water with 1 micro-grams/Liter 84

accuracy, which costs between 3000\$ to 5000\$ (P. S. Analytical Co., 2018). 85

Therefore, optimal deployment of CWS has been the focus of several studies (e.g. 86

Berry et al. 2005a; Krause et al. 2006; Shastri and Diwekar, 2006; Berry et al. 2008; 87

Ma et al. 2010; Afshar and Marino, 2012; Berry et al. 2012; Zhao et al., 2016; 88

Mukherjee et al., 2017; Janke et al. 2017); in which, an optimization model is 89

developed to find a layout of sensors with objective functions such as minimizing 90

affected population, time to detection, and volume of contaminated water, and 91

maximizing probability of detection. 92

Although optimization approach is proven to be superior to rule- and opinion-based 93

approaches, one of the obstacles in its application for real-world large utility networks 94

is computational burden. Due to expensive computational nature of optimization 95

algorithms, usually a fixed set of nodes or a fixed number of sensors is selected to 96

reduce the number of decision variables (e.g. Weickgenannt et al., 2010; Bazargan- 97

Lari, 2014; Afshar and Khombi, 2015; Tinelli et al., 2017; Janke et al. 2017). Another 98

approach is to use more computationally efficient optimization algorithms that search 99

for a near optimal solution, at the expense of lower accuracy, objectivity and 100

robustness (Berry et al. 2008; Berry et al. 2012; Janke et al. 2017). While most of the 101

literature have focused on developing different optimization techniques to solve for 102

subjectively selected decision variables, Diao and Rauch (2013) argued a more 103

precise and objective method to pre-determine the potential locations of sensors in 104

WDS should be adopted. In an effort to tackle this issue, they proposed an approach 105

inspired by the concept of control theory for complex system analysis (Liu et al., 106

2011). The goal of the proposed controllability analysis is to reduce the number of
decision variables of the CWS deployment optimization problem by eliminating
nodes with “redundant signals” from the set of potential locations, i.e. decision
variables. Therefore, the retained nodes would provide unique signals. The advantage
of this method lies in being merely dependent on the hydraulic of the WDS. However,
the focus of their study was only to determine a minimum number of nodes by virtue
of which any contamination event could be detected (full coverage). Fast detection
of contamination or minimum health impact cannot be guaranteed by this method
(Diao and Rauch, 2013). To account for these factors, possible contamination events
should be simulated and a complementary optimization model should be used along
with this method.

Due to the stochastic nature of how, when and where a contamination could be
injected in WDS, simulation of possible contamination events seems an inevitable
part of optimization approach to deploying CWS (Hart and Murray 2010). Therefore,
this will lead to obtaining a series of probability distribution functions (pdfs) of time
to detection, and affected population, among others, for any potential node for
placement of sensors. Previous studies have focused on optimization of one or a few
signatures of these pdfs as objective function. These signatures were usually the pdfs’
mean (e.g. Berry et al. 2003, 2005a, 2008 and 2012; Preis and Ostfeld, 2008;
Bazargan-Lari, 2014; Janke et al. 2017), or the pdfs’ tale (e.g. Berry et al. 2008 and
2012; Janke et al. 2017; Naserizade et al. 2018). However, aggregating the pdf into a
few signatures, which are in turn used in the optimization process, loses a lot of
valuable information and might not be good representative of the entire system

functionality. These pdfs can deliver paramount inferable information, and different 130
 nodes of a WDS provide diverse information regarding exposed population to 131
 contaminated water, and time interval between injection and detection of 132
 contaminant, among others. This information describes the behavior of the WDS and 133
 the consequences of a contaminant intrusion, and details a corresponding action by 134
 decision maker. Obviously, equipping every node of a WDS with sensors would 135
 provide maximum information about the WDS. However, the installation and 136
 maintenance costs of such comprehensive CWS is prohibitive. Moreover, 137
 information provided by different nodes may not be unique. Even similar information 138
 obtained from a given pair of nodes may have different value to the decision maker, 139
 which can be defined by a utility as a function of objective pdfs. Such perception 140
 would lead to definition of a WDS as a finite set of probabilistic curves, and hence, 141
 provide the ability to compare the locations for placement of sensors in a more 142
 objective way. Consequently, choosing an optimal subset from the original space not 143
 only warrants objectivity but also would hugely reduce the runtime and memory 144
 requirements of the optimization model. This allows for searching for global 145
 optimum in a complete and comprehensive decision space, as opposed to the 146
 traditional sensor placement studies that either had shrunk the decision space or 147
 employed more-efficient but less-accurate optimization algorithms to tackle the 148
 computational burden (Berry et al. 2008; Berry et al. 2012; Janke et al. 2017). 149

We adopt an information theory-oriented approach to determine potential and/or 150
 optimal locations for CWS in WDS. In doing so, we use the concept of Value of 151
 Information (VOI) to determine a set of nodes which can provide maximum 152

information values, and can be used as closest representatives of other nodes. 153
Grayson (1960) developed the VOI technique to assess the value of received 154
information for decision-making. Ever since, the VOI technique has found a wide 155
range of applications in water science, including groundwater quality assessment 156
(Wagner et al., 1992; Shaqadan, 2008), designing groundwater quality monitoring 157
systems (Reichard and Evans, 1989; Ammar et al., 2009; Khader et al., 2012; 158
Hosseini and Kerachian, 2017), designing CWS in agricultural systems (Roberts et 159
al., 2009), and flood monitoring and impact assessment (Alfonso, 2010; Verkade and 160
Werner, 2011; Alfonso and Price, 2012; and Alfonso et al., 2016). The literature has 161
used VOI for time-series analysis, while in this study we use the technique for event- 162
based analysis. 163

Different sets of selected nodes with similar count (but with different locations) may 164
yield a comparable VOI, but with different level of information redundancy. 165
Following a practical assumption in the literature, this study is based on using sensors 166
which are 100% reliable above a certain concentration (e.g. Janke et al. 2017; 167
Naserizade et al. 2018). This assumption warrants avoiding information redundancy. 168
Therefore, Transinformation Entropy (TE) is used to minimize the mutual 169
information of selected nodes. Also, the level of TE for any given pair of nodes 170
depends on the spatial distance of the nodes. Hence, minimizing TE would also result 171
in obtaining more spatially distributed CWS which yields a higher probability of 172
detecting contamination across the WDS. Shannon (1948) introduced the Entropy 173
theory to quantify the information content of a data set (Harmancioglu., 1981). TE is 174
a special form of entropy that quantifies mutual information of two data sets, and has 175

been applied in many monitoring network design problems, including reservoir
quality monitoring stations (Lee et al., 2014; Nikoo et al., 2017), groundwater quality
monitoring stations (Caselton and Husain, 1980; Mogheir and Singh, 2002; Mogheir
et al., 2004a, 2004b, 2005 and 2009; Masoumi and Kerachian, 2008 and 2010; and
Mondal and Singh 2012), and river quality monitoring stations (Harmancioglu and
Yevjevich, 1987; Ozkul et al., 2000; Karamouz et al., 2006 and 2009; Salark and
Sorman, 2006; Mahjouri and Kerachian, 2011; and Memarzadeh et al., 2013).

In this study, we use the VOI and TE techniques to quantify the value and uniqueness
of information of different nodes in WDS. Then, a multi-objective optimization
model, namely NSGA-II (Deb et al., 2000 and 2002), is formulated with a potential
to be used as a pre-selection or ultimate selection method for design of a CWS in
WDS. The objectives of the proposed model are, 1) maximizing VOI, 2) minimizing
TE, and 3) minimizing number of selected sensors. This method is applied for design
of CWS in Lamerd City's WDS which is a large scale WDS and previously used in
other studies (Bazargan-Lari, 2014; Naserizade et al., 2018). Finally, results are
compared to the potential locations for placement of sensors in previous studies and
optimal CWS designs from TEVA-SPOT model (Janke et al. 2017) to assess the
proposed method's capabilities.

2. Methodology

2.1. Value of Information (VOI)

Grayson (1960) first introduced the concept of VOI, and Hirshleifer and Riley (1979)
presented it for monitoring network design (Alfonso and Price, 2012). A decision
maker can update their perception about the state of a system, which can be quantified

in discrete form as the vector of prior probability, $P(s)$, of having a particular state 199
 s . When new information comes to light, based on Bayes' theorem, the updated belief 200
can be represented as, 201

$$P(s|m) = \frac{P(m|s) P(s)}{P(m)}, \quad (1)$$

where, $P(s|m)$ is the updated belief following the receipt of message m ; $P(m|s)$ is 202
the conditional probability of receiving message m when the state of the system is s ; 203
and $P(m)$ is the probability of receiving message m . 204

If one assumes that the time interval between injection and contaminant detection at 205
a given node is the state, s , of that node (which we call "detection state" hereafter), 206
vector $P(s)$ is the belief of the WDS's utility about the possibility of contamination 207
being detectable at any given node in each detection state, s . This belief may be 208
determined roughly by utility's experience or more precisely by simulation of random 209
scenarios. The message m can be inferred as the received contamination warning 210
after passage of m time units from injection of contamination from a sensor placed 211
at any node. Once $P(s)$ is determined, before calculation of updated belief, $P(s|m)$, 212
one has to calculate evidence probabilities, $P(m)$, and evidence conditional 213
probabilities, $P(m|s)$, by gathering new information independent from prior belief. 214
To calculate $P(m)$ for any given node, we assume a sensor is placed at that node and 215
probabilities of receiving contamination warning in m time unit from injection is 216
calculated by the new information. Then, the selected node should be paired with 217
another node and conditional probabilities of receiving contamination warning from 218
the selected node and detection states of the other node should be calculated to obtain 219

$P(m|s)$. In this study, the results of simulation of random scenarios are used for calculation of both prior and evidence probabilities. Since the scenarios are generated randomly, they are independent from Bayesian viewpoint (Alfonso and Price, 2012 and Alfonso et al. 2016).

Presume a utility manager uses a sensor placed at node i to warn consumers of node j about water contamination. Timely warnings would preclude major consequences, while early or late warnings would result in panic or exposure of consumers, respectively. Hence, an action (warning), a , with various lag times and its associated consequences, $C(a, s)$, when the detection state of node j is s , can be defined. The utility of those actions based on received message, u_m , and without the received message, u_s , can be calculated as,

$$u_m = \sum_s C(a, s) P(s|m), \quad (2.a)$$

$$u_s = \sum_s C(a, s) P(s), \quad (2.b)$$

where, S , is the total number of detection states, s . Therefore, the value of a chosen action a_m based on a received message, m , would be $u_m - u_s$. A rational decision maker will choose the action with maximum utility, therefore, the VOI of node i for determining the detection state of node j , ($VOI_i(j)$) can be calculated by,

$$VOI_i(j) = \sum_M P(m) \left[\max_a \left(\sum_s C(a, s) P(s|m) \right) - \max_a \left(\sum_s C(a, s) P(s) \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

in which, M is number of messages. For a given node i , VOI can be calculated for all j nodes, which will result in a VOI_i curve. The area below the VOI_i curve is equal to

the VOI of node i for detecting the states of the entire system. Obviously, the VOI of
node i is always maximum for determining the detection state of node i . When more
than one node is selected to determine the detection state of node j , $VOI_{i_1,2}(j)$ would
be maximum of $VOI_{i_1}(j)$ and $VOI_{i_2}(j)$; i.e. the VOI of set of nodes which is selected
for placement of sensors would be union of VOI curves of the selected nodes. Hence,
the VOI of all nodes of a WDS is maximum, and can be used as a benchmark to
assess the behavior of any set of selected nodes for placement of sensors. A numerical
example is provided in Supplementary Material which explains the steps involved in
calculation of $VOI_i(j)$.

2.2. Transinformation Entropy (TE)

In discrete form, the mutual information which also called transinformation, $TE(i, j)$,
of two selected nodes (i and j) for placement of sensors can be calculated as (Mogheir
et al., 2004a, 2004b),

$$TE(i, j) = - \sum_s \sum_{ss} P(i_s, j_{ss}) \ln \left[\frac{P(i_s, j_{ss})}{P(i_s)P(j_{ss})} \right], \quad (4)$$

where, $P(i_s, j_{ss})$ is the joint probability of having detection state s at node i , while
the detection state of node j is ss ; and $P(i_s)$ and $P(j_{ss})$ are probabilities of having
detection states s and ss at nodes i and j , respectively. Similar to VOI, TE of a set of
nodes is union of their TE curves. Also, the area below the TE curve of a set of nodes
is dependent on the spatial distribution of those nodes. Hence, minimizing TE of the
selected nodes set for placement of sensors would warrant uniqueness of information

of nodes, and consequently selection of nodes with the highest spatial distribution in
WDS. Higher spatial distribution of CWS warrants greater possibility of detecting
contamination.

2.3. Optimization model

Both VOI and TE can be calculated for all pair of nodes in a WDS. This will result
in two square matrices, where the elements in i^{th} row and j^{th} column are equal to
 $VOI_i(j)$ and $TE(i, j)$, respectively. Therefore, a multi-objective optimization model
with a vector of binary decision variables ($\vec{b}$) can be formulated (as in eqs.5) to find
the minimum number of nodes (Z_3 , eq. 5.c) with maximum VOI (Z_1) and minimum
TE (Z_2). The VOI and TE matrices are normalized by their maximum values,
respectively (eqs. 5.a and 5.b). By including the third objective, it is implicitly
assumed that the costs associated with placement of sensors have a monotonic
relationship with number of placed sensors in WDS.

$$\text{maximize } Z_1 = \frac{1}{\max\{[VOI]\}} \sum_{\forall j} \max_i \{b_i \times VOI_i(j)\}, \quad (5.a)$$

$$\text{minimize } Z_2 = \frac{1}{\max\{[TE]\}} \sum_{\forall j \neq i} \max_i \{b_i \times b_j \times TE(i, j)\}, \quad (5.b)$$

$$\text{minimize } Z_3 = \sum_{\forall i} b_i. \quad (5.c)$$

3. Case Study

The proposed methodology is applied for designing CWS in WDS of Lamerd City (Fig.1), Fars province, Iran. This WDS consists of 185 links (pipes), 122 junctions, 23 hydrants, 2 reservoirs and a tank, and supplies water demands of about 81,000 people. The base demand of Lamerd's population is approximately 260 LCD (liters per capita per day), and the daily demand pattern is depicted in Fig.2.

Fig. 1. Water Distribution System (WDS) of Lamerd City. The locations of potential contamination injection: hydrants, reservoirs and tank are marked with symbols as defined in legend.

Fig. 2. Daily pattern of base demand's hourly multipliers.

Arsenic is used as the contaminant of choice in this study as commonly used in the literature (e.g. Shafiee and Zechman, 2013; Bazargan-Lari, 2014; Naserizade et al. 2018). Arsenic is a cheap, accessible and well-known poisonous substance, which could be deadly at very low dosages. The critical dose, C_d (milligrams), of this substance depends on the weight, W_p (kg), of the exposed person and can be calculated as follows (Shafiee and Zechman, 2013),

$$C_d = 5.0 \times 10^{-8} \times W_p. \quad (6)$$

A person with an average 70 kg weight could be critically affected by ingesting 3.5 mg of Arsenic. Throughout this study, the term “affected population” refers to the population who ingested equal to or greater than 3.5 mg Arsenic due to consuming contaminated water. Furthermore, it is assumed that ingesting contaminant could only occur through drinking, and each person drinks 0.93 L/day (Shafiee and Zechman, 2013).

A contamination event is associated with various uncertainties. Monte Carlo
 Simulation (MCS) is used to incorporate the uncertainties emanating from
 contaminant intrusion. For this purpose, mass and duration of injection are considered
 as stochastic variables; and time of injecting, location of injection and number of
 simultaneous injections are considered as scenario-based inputs in MCS. Then, all
 combinations of these parameters (Table 1) are generated and used as contamination
 injection scenarios. It is worth mentioning that 14 hydrants, of the available 23,
 together with the tank and two reservoirs are selected as the potential locations for
 contaminant intrusion. Due to hydraulic of the WDS, contamination injection from
 the other 9 hydrants has very low impact on the affected population. Therefore, these
 hydrants are not considered in contamination scenarios (Naserizade et al., 2018). The
 injection scenarios are simulated using EPANET (Rossman, 2000) model of Lamerd
 WDS, which was previously calibrated by Bazargan-Lari (2014). The simulation
 period is 48 hours and both hydraulic and quality time-steps are 60 seconds. Since
 Arsenic cannot react with materials on the pipe wall in short time, only bulk flow
 reaction is considered in the quality simulation (-0.05 day^{-1}). The results of the
 simulated scenarios are then used to calculate the time to detection at each node, the
 ingested mass of Arsenic, and consequently the affected population. It is assumed
 that the detection limit of available sensors is 0.01 (mg/L) (Naserizade et al. 2018).
 Assumption is that sensors are 100% reliable in detecting contamination with
 concentration above the detection limit, and will fail for concentrations below this
 threshold. These results are used to derive the VOI matrix for all pairs of nodes.

Table 1. Characteristics of scenarios considered in MCS.

Parameter	Values
Time of injection	0100AM, 0700AM, 0900AM, 1100AM, 1200PM, 0100PM, 0200PM, 0300PM, 0400PM, 0500PM, 0600PM, 0700PM, and 0900PM
Mass of injection	200 mg/sec to 700 mg/sec
Duration of injection	40 min to 80 min
Locations of injection	17 points: 14 hydrants, 2 reservoirs and a tank (Fig.1)
Number of injections	Simultaneously from 1, 2 and 3 points
Total number of scenarios	216436 scenarios

In order to show the method's capability, the obtained solutions are compared to the sets of potential nodes for placement of sensors from Bazargan-Lari (2014) and Naserizade et al. (2018) studies, as well as the results of TEVA-SPOT model (Janke et al. 2017). Similar to this study, the researchers use offline simulation of contamination scenarios. However, deriving the objective functions from a large set of simulation results requires huge amount of logical operations, and consume a large volume of memory, especially in an optimization process. Therefore, Bazargan-Lari (2014) and Naserizade et al. (2018) have determined a set of potential locations for placement of sensors, through sensitivity analysis, to reduce the number of decision variables. On the other hand, TEVA-SPOT model requires the user to specify the number of sensors to be placed in WDS. Also, its Graphical User Interface version, TEVA-SPOT GUI, uses a Greedy Randomized Adaptive Search Procedure (GRASP) optimization algorithm to provide near-optimal solutions with lower memory requirements and in quickest possible way. The offline calculation of VOI and TE, however, summarizes all scenarios in two matrices; hence, the decision space could be significantly enhanced. Moreover, VOI and TE approaches hugely reduce the memory requirements and provide faster runtimes, and hence, more accurate

optimization algorithm (NSGA-II — a multi-objective version of GA) is used in our
framework. Ultimately, we compare our solutions with the same number of nodes to
that of the decision space (potential sensors' locations) of Bazargan-Lari (2014) and
Naserizade et al. (2018) and the results of the TEVA-SPOT model.

4. Results and Discussion

A total of seven detection states are considered to derive VOI for each node (Table
2). These states are considered based on the criterion of fast detection of
contamination, given a comprehensive pre-analysis of simulated scenarios (Fig.3).
When an intrusion occurs, contaminated water could not necessarily reach all nodes
of the WDS due to its hydraulic characteristics. From the set of nodes which
contaminated water can reach, almost none is affected by contaminated water in the
first 5 minutes (average affected population $\cong 0.5\%$). In the next 10 minutes, the
affected population increases smoothly ($\cong 2\%$). During the first 60 minutes from
injection, the contamination reaches majority of the possible nodes, however, with
relatively low concentration which affect only about 6% of the population. In the next
240 minutes the affected population rapidly increases ($\cong 96\%$) due to accumulation
of contamination in the consumers body and relatively high concentration of
contamination.

Table 2. Detection states of each node in contaminant intrusion events.

Detection state	Time interval between injection and detection of contaminant (min)
1	0 to 5
2	5 to 15
3	15 to 30
4	30 to 60
5	60 to 120
6	120 to 300
7	More than 300 min

Fig. 3. Temporal change of affected population from the time of injection at each node in all simulated scenarios. The nodes that remain immune from contaminated water in each event are removed from the calculation.

Calculation of VOI requires determining the cost matrix, $C(a, s)$, whose elements are the cost of releasing “no consuming” warning after receipt of message m from i node, when the detection state at node j is s . For example, assume in an intrusion event, contaminated water reaches nodes i and j in the 4th and 2nd detection state,

respectively, and a sensor is placed at node i while there is no sensor at node j . A utility manager warns the consumers at node j following the receipt of contamination warning from the sensor i , which is late, because consumers were already drinking contaminated water for about 45 minutes. The average affected population of node j in the 45 minutes interval is the cost of action a_4 when the state is s_2 , i.e. $C(a_4, s_2)$. On the other hand, early warning would result in a widespread panic among the population of node j . Although a more specific approach for cost assessment of panic among consumers could be considered, the costs of early warnings are considered equal to those of late warnings in this study. Using these assumptions, Fig.3 is used to determine the mean affected population of nodes in each detection state. The difference between the average fraction (%) of affected population multiplied by mean population of nodes ($\cong 663$ persons) for each pair of time intervals (the average of affected population at the beginning and at the end of the interval) with negative sign (Table 3) is set as $C(a, s)$.

Table 3. The cost of actions, $C(a, s)$, in each detection state for the calculation of VOI.

	Cost of actions, $C(a, s)$						
	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6	a_7
s_1	0	-7	-12	-24	-107	-378	-662
s_2	-7	0	-5	-17	-100	-371	-655
s_3	-12	-5	0	-12	-95	-366	-651
s_4	-24	-17	-12	0	-83	-354	-638
s_5	-107	-100	-95	-83	0	-272	-556
s_6	-378	-371	-366	-354	-272	0	-284
s_7	-662	-656	-651	-638	-556	-284	0

From over 216,000 simulated contamination scenarios, about 80% are used for
calculation of prior probabilities, and the remaining 20% are used for calculation of
evidence probabilities. The VOI and TE are then calculated for every pair of nodes.
The normalized VOI and TE of all 122 nodes are equal to 74.24 and 68.82,
respectively. For example, the normalized VOI and TE for nodes 1 and 45 are shown
in Fig. 4. It is vivid in this figure that both VOI and TE are reliant on spatial distance.
Although, TE quantifies the mutual information of a pair of nodes, their information
content may have different value to a decision maker (the neighbors of node 1 in Figs.
4a and c). As mentioned earlier, these values mainly include time to detection and
affected population in CWS design.

392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402

Figs. 4. The values of normalized, (a) $VOI_1(j)$, (b) $VOI_{45}(j)$, (c) $TE(1, j)$, and (d) $TE(45, j)$, which are shown by blue circles and $\forall j$.

After calculation of the VOI and TE matrices, the optimization model is executed.

The obtained pareto-optimal solutions contain 335 CWS layouts with 5 to 114 nodes

for placement of sensors. Also, the solutions include 4 sets with 113 and 114 nodes
with VOI equal to 74.24, albeit their TE are equal to 65.16 and 65.09, respectively.
This implies that these sets of nodes are capable of almost perfectly representing the
entire WDS nodes with respect to the considered states and costs. A randomly
selected set of pareto-optimal solutions and their performance metrics including
probability of detecting a contamination event (Pd), minimum, maximum and
average time to detection (Td_{min} , Td_{max} and Td_{ave} , respectively), as well as
average affected population (Pa_{ave}) are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. A randomly selected set of pareto-optimal solutions with their respective
values of objective functions, probability of detection (Pd), minimum, maximum
and average time to detection (Td_{min} , Td_{max} , and Td_{ave} , respectively), and
average affected population (Pa_{ave}).

# Pareto point	Number of sensors	VOI	TE	Pd	Td_{ave} (min)	Td_{min} (min)	Td_{max} (min)	Pa_{ave} (persons)
1	113	74.24	65.16	1	6.63	2	137	3.3
2	114	74.24	65.09	1	6.62	2	137	3.3
3	113	74.24	65.16	1	6.63	2	137	3.3
4	114	74.24	65.09	1	6.62	2	137	3.3
5	111	74.23	63.64	1	6.63	2	137	3.3
6	111	74.23	63.51	1	6.63	2	137	3.3
7	109	74.23	62.41	1	6.63	2	137	3.3
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
232	33	70.74	13.82	1	11.25	2	149	15.64
233	32	70.58	13.48	1	10.14	2	149	12.61
234	32	70.57	13.37	1	10.14	2	149	12.61
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
273	20	67.31	7.01	0.9963	15.64	2	201	388.66
274	20	67.27	6.85	1	13.87	2	201	54.29
275	19	66.95	6.23	0.9963	15.64	2	201	388.66
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
333	5	44.33	0.95	0.9360	56.64	8	328	5976.54
334	5	37.31	0.86	0.9581	45.97	2	328	4014.10
335	5	37.00	0.82	0.9744	52.86	8	328	2886.67

The selected sets of potential locations for placement of sensors by Bazargan-Lari (2014) and Naserizade et al. (2018) contain 20 (SN20) and 19 (SN19) nodes, respectively (Fig. 5). As shown in Table 4, three of the pareto-optimal solutions also have the same number of sensors. These solutions are pareto-point number 273 (P120), 274 (P220), and 275 (P119). Although, 19 and 20 sensors seem too many for the case study, these solutions are only presented for comparison purposes. However, the obtained solutions are satisfactory to prove the need to use more efficient approaches compared to the traditional methods to enhance the decision space of a CWS optimization problem. The VOI, TE, probability of detection, minimum, maximum and average time to detection, and average affected population for those sets of nodes are calculated using the simulated scenarios (Table 5).

Table 5. Comparing VOI, TE, probability of detection, minimum, maximum and average time to detection, and average affected population of different sets of nodes.

Set of nodes	Number of sensors	VOI	TE	Pd	Td_{ave} (min)	Td_{min} (min)	Td_{max} (min)	Pa_{ave} (persons)
SN20	20	63.57	8.80	0.9963	28.31	2	288	372.25
SN19	19	63.48	7.01	0.9923	43.32	3	179	770.14
P120	20	67.31	7.01	0.9963	15.64	2	201	388.66
P220	20	67.27	6.85	1	13.87	2	201	54.29
P119	19	66.95	6.23	0.9963	15.64	2	201	388.66

Fig. 5. The decision spaces of Bazargan-Lari (2014) (SN20) and Naserizade et al. (2018) (SN19) with 20 and 19 nodes, respectively. The pareto-points #273 (P120) and, #274 (P220) with 20 nodes, and #275 (P119) with 19 nodes are also shown.

As shown in Fig. 5, 18 nodes are common among the pareto solutions. However, there is only one common node among the all five sets of nodes (one complete circle in this figure). For more clarity, the probability distribution of detecting a contamination event during the first 60 minutes from the injection in 2 minutes intervals are depicted in Fig.6 for these five sets of nodes. While P119, P120 and P220 provide a probability of ~ 0.35 for contamination detection under 2 minutes, this probability is about 0.08 and 0.00 for the SN19 and SN20, respectively. The probability of detecting contamination under 60 minutes are 0.976, 0.971, and 0.982

for SN20, P120, and P220, respectively, while it is 0.949, and 0.971 for SN19, and P119, respectively.

Figs. 6. Comparing the probability distribution of time to detection for, (a) SN20, P120, and P220, and (b) SN19, and P119.

To provide a deeper understanding about the coverage of the sets of nodes, the VOI of all sets of nodes are divided by the VOI of the 122 nodes of the WDS and the relative VOIs are visualized in Fig. 7. The only difference between P120 and P220 is the location of two nodes, and the remaining 18 nodes have similar locations. Only P220 is plotted in this figure.

Figs. 7. The VOI of, (a) SN20, and (b) P220, with 20 nodes; and (c) SN19, and (d) P119, with 19 nodes, relative to VOI of the all nodes.

Obviously, the economic factor (i.e. budget limitation) is the main constraint in deployment of CWS in WDS. Berry et al. (2005b) pointed out this obstacle and argued that even different locations for placement of sensors would have different cost. However, using the third objective function in the proposed model in this study,

we implicitly assumed that placing sensors at any point would have equal costs. Also, 471
the proposed model could be modified by replacing the third objective function with 472
a constraint on the number of selected nodes to find more CWS layouts which are 473
economically justifiable. To evaluate the performance of the proposed model against 474
that of TEVA-SPOT, we have considered CWS designs with fewer number of sensors 475
(i.e. CWS designs with 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 sensors). 476

We will now present a brief comparison between the results of the proposed VT 477
model and TEVA-SPOT for the Lamerd WDS. An extensive report on the 478
performance comparison of the VT model against TEVA-SPOT from computational 479
efficiency and results' accuracy viewpoints is provided in Supplementary Materials. 480
Both models were executed on a desktop PC (CPU: Intel® Core™ i7-4500U; RAM: 481
12GB DDR3). Also, the parameters of both models' hydraulic engine (i.e. EPANET 482
v2) have been set up identically. Simulating the 216,000 scenarios by TEVA-SPOT 483
is, however, not possible on a desktop PC. According to Janke et al. (2017), when the 484
size of WDS (i.e. number of nodes) and/or number of simulation scenarios are very 485
large, execution of TEVA-SPOT would not be possible on a typical PC. Hence, only 486
about 12,000 scenarios (about 5% of the scenarios used earlier) were simulated by 487
both models for CWS design. Single-node injection and simultaneous injection from 488
two and three nodes are considered in contamination injection scenarios. The details 489
of the simulated scenarios are provided in Table S3 of Supplementary Material. Both 490
models were constrained to provide at least 80% probability of detection of 491
contamination events (i.e. $Pd \geq 0.8$). 492

Since TEVA-SPOT uses a single-objective optimization scheme, it should be executed for every objective separately, providing a single solution each time. To evaluate the robustness and accuracy of the solutions of VT model against TEVA-SPOT, two objectives were defined for TEVA-SPOT; i.e. minimization of the Value-at-Risk (VaR) of time to detection (Td_{VaR}) and minimization of average of time to detection (Td_{ave}). VaR is the point on a pdf where cumulative probability of the pdf exceeds a certain level (Sarykalin et al., 2008). Hence, for each number of sensors, there would be two solutions from the TEVA-SPOT, one for Td_{ave} and one for Td_{VaR} which are denoted by TSM and TSV, respectively. On the other hand, the multi-objective optimization module of VT model was executed only once for each number of sensors, which in turn provided a pareto front. Each solution on the pareto front is denoted by VT followed by a number. Only one selected solution from VT model is provided here (Table 6) for each CWS design, and the complete pareto front of VT model is provided in Table S5 in Supplementary Material.

The results show that VT model is overall significantly more efficient than TEVA-SPOT. While, the simulation module of VT is 23% slower than that of TEVA-SPOT, its VOI+TE and optimization modules are 350% and 177% faster than impact assessment and optimization modules of TEVA-SPOT, respectively. Also, TEVA-SPOT occupied 5 Giga Bytes (5120 Mega Bytes) of disk space, while VT only occupied 244 Mega Bytes.

Table 6. The results of the TEVA-SPOT and VT models for design of CWS with 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 sensors in Lamerd WDS. The bold items indicate superiority of the solution among others for each specific number of sensors.

# of sensors	Name	VOI	TE	Td_{min} (min)	Td_{ave} (min)	Td_{max} (min)	Pd_{60}	Pd_2
3	TSM	16.77397	0.116832	9	63.75493	344	0.542712	0
	TSV	11.10297	0.156512	3	83.81239	267	0.306441	0
	VT4	22.56917	0.11754	1	49.8007	159	0.542712	0.212542
4	TSM	18.24201	0.224353	3	49.10105	192	0.607458	0
	TSV	18.24201	0.224353	3	49.10105	192	0.607458	0
	VT2	30.57802	0.711998	2	47.61755	155	0.607458	0.110508
5	TSM	21.98782	0.538974	1	41.30393	192	0.665763	0.110508
	TSV	25.15394	0.481675	3	40.19056	179	0.717966	0
	VT5	29.89716	0.65432	1	39.02978	145	0.764407	0.212542
6	TSM	23.79646	1.604539	1	31.9749	192	0.764407	0.110508
	TSV	27.40366	0.934921	1	32.94888	179	0.805424	0.110508
	VT4	34.18355	1.171758	1	24.79165	128	0.805424	0.392542
7	TSM	30.85925	1.859207	1	25.57259	192	0.841356	0.212542
	TSV	33.46646	2.126152	1	27.40483	191	0.899322	0.212542
	VT1	35.54986	1.6227	1	23.07601	128	0.872542	0.392542
8	TSM	31.18343	2.196131	1	21.59754	192	0.872542	0.212542
	TSV	34.34404	2.798189	1	25.97404	191	0.922034	0.212542
	VT1	36.47583	2.371481	1	22.98052	128	0.922034	0.306441
9	TSM	34.87522	2.793573	1	17.385	192	0.899322	0.306441
	TSV	35.25736	3.605313	1	23.89879	191	0.941017	0.212542
	VT6	37.85354	1.833534	1	18.94578	145	0.941017	0.471186

517

In Table 6, values of VOI, TE, Td_{min} , Td_{max} , Td_{ave} and probabilities of detecting contamination events under 60 and 2 minutes from injection (Pd_{60} and Pd_2 , respectively) are provided for comparison. It is clear from the table that nearly in all cases the CWS designs from VT model are superior to those of TEVA-SPOT. Although the optimization module of TEVA-SPOT uses a single-objective algorithm, the results of VT are more accurate than those of TEVA-SPOT even for the objective that TEVA-SPOT is calibrated for. We attribute this behavior to the inefficacy (low efficacy) of the GRASP algorithm which is used in TEVA-SPOT.

526

5. Conclusion

527

In this paper, an information theoretic approach is used for designing Contamination
Warning System (CWS) in Water Distribution System (WDS), which can either be
used to determine the best possible potential locations for placement of sensors to be
in turn employed in an optimization framework, or to single-handedly devise ultimate
sensor placements. The Value Of Information (VOI) and Transinformation Entropy
(TE) techniques are utilized to determine different sets of nodes. Former warrants
maximum achieved information value and latter examines uniqueness of acquired
information (which in turn manifests itself in minimizing the number of required
sensors and maximizing the probability of detection). The advantage of the proposed
framework lies in its cost-effectiveness and objectivity. It is noted, however, that the
simulation part is similar for all offline-simulation based methods. The proposed
method summarizes results of the simulation scenarios in two square matrices with
the size of the WDS nodes. The optimization run-time in the information theoretic
framework, unlike the traditional approaches, is independent of the number of
simulation scenarios. In this study, a large number of contamination scenarios (over
216,000 scenarios) are simulated, which in turn greatly enhanced the decision space
and warranted more accurate and robust results. Comparisons efforts show that the
proposed information theoretic model is capable of outperforming selected models
from the literature including TEVA-SPOT, both from computational efficiency and
results' accuracy viewpoints.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2018.06.050>.

References	551
Afshar, A., Khombi, S.M., 2015. Multi-objective optimization of sensor placement	552
in water distribution networks; dual use benefit approach. <i>Int. J. Optim. Civil Eng.</i> 5	553
(3), 315–331.	554
Afshar, A., Marino, M. A., 2012. Multi-objective coverage based aco model for	555
quality monitoring in large water networks. <i>Water Resour. Manag.</i> , 26(8), 2159–	556
2176.	557
Alfonso, L., 2010. <i>Optimisation of Monitoring Networks for Water Systems:</i>	558
<i>Information Theory, Value of Information and Public Participation</i> , CRC Press, Delft	559
Univ. of Technology, Delft, Netherlands.	560
Alfonso, L., Mukolwe, M.M., Di Baldassarre, G., 2016. Probabilistic Flood Maps to	561
support decision-making: Mapping the Value of Information. <i>Water Resour. Res.</i> ,	562
52(2), 1026-1043.	563
Alfonso, L., Price, R., 2012. Coupling hydrodynamic models and value of	564
information for designing stage monitoring networks. <i>Water Resour. Res.</i> , 48(8).	565
Ammar, K., McKee, M., Kaluarachchi, J., 2009. Bayesian method for groundwater	566
quality monitoring network analysis, <i>J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.</i> , 137, 51–61.	567
Bazargan-Lari, M.R., 2014. An evidential reasoning approach to optimal monitoring	568
of drinking water distribution systems for detecting deliberate contamination events.	569
<i>J. Clean. Prod.</i> , 78, 1-14.	570

Berry, J. W., Boman, E., Riesen, L. A., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A., Watson, J.P.,	571
2008. User's manual: TEVA-SPOT Toolkit 2.0, Sandia National Laboratories,	572
Albuquerque, N.M.	573
Berry, J. W., Fleischer, L., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A., Watson, J-P. 2005a. Sensor	574
placement in municipal water networks, J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage., 131(3),	575
237–243.	576
Berry, J. W., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A., Uber, J. G., Walski, T. M., 2005b. Water	577
quality sensor placement in water networks with budget constraints. In Impacts of	578
Global Climate Change, 1-11.	579
Berry, J., Boman, E., Riesen, L. A., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A., Watson, J. P. 2012.	580
User's manual: TEVA-SPOT toolkit 2.5.2. United States Environmental Protection	581
Agency, Cincinnati.	582
Berry, J., Fleischer, L., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A. 2003. "Sensor placement in	583
municipal water networks." Proc., World Water and Environmental Resources	584
Congress 2003 and Related Symposia, ASCE, Reston, VA.	585
Caselton, W.F., Husain, T. 1980. Hydrologic networks: Information transmission. J.	586
Water Resour. Plann. Manage., 106(2), 503-520.	587
Deb, K., Agrawal, S., Pratap, A., Meyarivan, T., 2000. A Fast Elitist Non-dominated	588
Sorting Genetic Algorithm for Multi-Objective Optimization: NSGA-II.	589
International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving From Nature, Springer Berlin	590
Heidelberg, 849-858.	591

Deb, K., Agrawal, S., Pratap, A. Meyarivan, T. 2002. A Fast and Elitist Multi-	592
Objective Genetic Algorithm: NSGA-II. IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput., 6(2), 182-197.	593
Diao, K., Rauch, W., 2013. Controllability analysis as a pre-selection method for	594
sensor placement in water distribution systems. Water research, 47(16), 6097-6108.	595
Forest, J.J., Howard, R.D., Sheehan, A.M., 2013. Weapons of Mass Destruction and	596
Terrorism, Second ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, U.S.A.	597
Gavriel, A.A., Landre, J.P., Lamb, A.J., 1998. Incidence of mesophilic aeromonas	598
within a public drinking water supply in north-east Scotland. J. Appl. Microbiol., 84	599
(3), 383e392.	600
Grayson, C. J., 1960. Decisions under uncertainty: Drilling decisions by oil and gas	601
operators. Ayer. (Publisher: Harvard Business School).	602
Harmancioglu, N.B., 1981. Measuring the information content of hydrological	603
processes by the entropy concept, Special Issue for the Centennial of Ataturk's Birth.	604
J. of Civil. Eng. Faculty of Ege University, Izmir, Turkey, 1, 13-40.	605
Harmancioglu, N.B., Yevjevich, V. 1987. Transfer of hydrologic information among	606
river points. J. Hydrol., 91, 103-118.	607
Hart, W.E., Murray, R., 2010. Review of sensor placement strategies for	608
contamination warning systems in drinking water distribution systems. J. Water	609
Resour. Plann. Manage., 136(6), 611-619.	610
Hirshleifer, J., Riley, J. G. 1979. The Analytics of uncertainty and the information-	611
an expository survey, J. Econ. Lit., 17(4), 1375-1421.	612

Hosseini, M., Kerachian, R. 2017. A Data Fusion-based Methodology for Optimal	613
Redesign of Groundwater Monitoring Networks. J. of Hydrol., 552(1), 267-282.	614
Hrudey, S. E., Payment, P., Huck, P. M., Gillham, R. W., 2003. A fatal waterborne	615
disease epidemic in Walkerton, Ontario: Comparison with other waterborne	616
outbreaks in the developed world. Water Sci. Technol., 47(3), 7–14.	617
Hu, C., Li, M., Zeng, D., Guo, S., 2018. A survey on sensor placement for	618
contamination detection in water distribution systems. Wireless Netw, 1-15.	619
Janke, R., Murray, R., Haxton, T.M., Taxon, T., Bahadur, R., Samuels, W., Berry, J.,	620
Boman, E., Hart, W., Riesen, L. and Uber, J., 2017. Threat ensemble vulnerability	621
assessment-sensor placement optimization tool (TEVA-SPOT) graphical user	622
interface user's manual (Vol. 147). EPA/600/R-08.	623
Karamouz, M., Nokhandan, A. K., Kerachian, R. 2006. "Design of river water quality	624
monitoring networks using an entropy based approach: a case study." Proceedings of	625
the 2006 World Water and Environmental Resources Congress, Nebraska, USA.	626
Karamouz, M., Nokhandan, A. K., Kerachian, R., Maksimovic, Č., 2009. Design of	627
on-line river water quality monitoring systems using the entropy theory: a case study.	628
Environ. Monit. Assess., 155(1-4), 63 .	629
Khader, A., Rosenberg, D., McKee, M., 2012. A decision tree model to estimate the	630
value of information provided by a groundwater quality monitoring network, Hydrol.	631
Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9(12), 13,805–13,837.	632

Krause, A., Leskovec, J., Isovitsch, S., Xu, J., Guestrin, C., VanBriesen, J., Small, M., Fischbeck, P., 2006. Optimizing sensor placements in water distribution systems using submodular function maximization. In Proceedings of 8th annual water distribution system analysis symposium.	633 634 635 636
Lee, C., Paik, K., Lee, Y. 2014. Optimal sampling network for monitoring the representative water quality of an entire reservoir on the basis of information theory, J. Water. Clim. Change. 5(2), 151-162.	637 638 639
Liu, Y.Y., Slotine, J.J., Baraba'si, A.L., 2011. Controllability of complex networks. Nature 43, 123e248.	640 641
Ma, X., Song, Y., Huang, J., Wu, J., 2010. Robust sensor placement problem in municipal water networks. In 2010 joint conference on computational science and optimization (CSO), Vol. 1. IEEE, 2010, 291-294.	642 643 644
Mahjouri, N., Kerachian, R. 2011. Revising river water quality monitoring networks using discrete entropy theory: the Jajrood River experience. Environ. Monit. Assess. 175, 291-302.	645 646 647
Masoumi, F., Kerachian, R. 2008. Assessment of the groundwater salinity monitoring network of the Tehran Region: Application of the discrete entropy theory. Water. Sci. Technol. IWA, 58(4), 765-771.	648 649 650
Masoumi, F., Kerachian, R. 2010. Optimal redesign of groundwater quality monitoring networks: A case study. Environ. Monit. Assess., 161(1-4), 247-257.	651 652

Memarzadeh, M., Mahjouri, N., Kerachian, R., 2013. Evaluating sampling locations	653
in river water quality monitoring networks: application of dynamic factor analysis	654
and discrete entropy theory. Environ. Earth. Sci. 70(6), 2577-2585.	655
Mogheir, Y., de Lima, J.L.M.P., Singh, V.P. 2004a. Characterizing the spatial	656
variability of groundwater quality using the entropy theory: I. Synthetic data. J.	657
Hydrol. Process. 18, 2165-2179.	658
Mogheir, Y., de Lima, J.L.M.P., Singh, V.P. 2004b. Characterizing the spatial	659
variability of groundwater quality using the entropy theory: II. Case study from Gaza	660
Strip. J. Hydrol. Process. 18, 2579- 2590.	661
Mogheir, Y., de Lima, J.L.M.P., Singh, V.P. 2005. Assessment of informativeness of	662
groundwater monitoring in developing regions (Gaza Strip Case Study). Water.	663
Resour. Manag. 19, 737-757.	664
Mogheir, Y., de Lima, J.L.M.P., Singh, V.P. 2009. Entropy and multiobjective based	665
approach for groundwater quality monitoring network assessment and redesign.	666
Water. Resour. Manag. 23(8), 1603-1620.	667
Mogheir, Y., Singh, V.P. 2002. Application of information theory to groundwater	668
quality monitoring networks., Water. Resour. Manag. 16, 37-49.	669
Mondal, N.C., Singh, V.P. 2012. Evaluation of groundwater monitoring network of	670
Kodaganar River basin from Southern India using entropy. Environ. Earth. Sci. 66,	671
1183-1193.	672

Mukherjee, R., Diwekar, U.M., Vaseashta, A., 2017. Optimal sensor placement with mitigation strategy for water network systems under uncertainty. <i>Comput. Chem. Eng.</i> , 103, 91-102.	673 674 675
Naserizade, S.S., Nikoo, M.R. and Montaseri, H., 2018. A risk-based multi-objective model for optimal placement of sensors in water distribution system. <i>J. Hydrol.</i> , 557, 147-159.	676 677 678
Nikoo, M.R., Pourshahabi, S., Rezazadeh, N., Shafiee, M.E., 2017. Stakeholder engagement in multi-objective optimization of water quality monitoring network, case study: Karkheh dam reservoir. <i>Water Sci. Technol. Water Supp.</i> , 17(4), 966-974.	679 680 681 682
Ozkul, S., Harmancioglu, N.B., Singh, V.P., 2000. Entropy-based assessment of water quality monitoring networks. <i>J. Hydrol. Eng.</i> 5(1), 90-100.	683 684
P. S. Analytical, 2018. [https://www.psanalytical.com/information/asarsenic.html], webpage accessed 4/18/2018.	685 686
Preis, A. Ostfeld, A., 2008. Multiobjective contaminant sensor network design for water distribution systems. <i>J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.</i> , 134(4), 366-377.	687 688
Rathi, S., Gupta, R., 2014. Sensor placement methods for contamination detection in water distribution networks: A review. <i>Procedia Engineering</i> . 89, 181-188.	689 690
Reichard, E. G., Evans, J. S., 1989. Assessing the value of hydrogeologic information for risk-based remedial action decisions, <i>Water Resour. Res.</i> , 25(7), 1451–1460.	691 692

Roberts, M. J., Schimmelpfennig, D., Livingston, M. J., Ashley, E., 2009. Estimating	693
the value of an early-warning system, <i>Rev. Agric. Econ.</i> , 31(2), 303–329.	694
Rossman, L.A., 2000. EPANET user's manual, U.S. Environmental Protection	695
Agency Risk Reduction Engineering Lab.	696
Salark, N., Sorman, A.U., 2006. Evaluation and selection of streamflow network	697
stations using entropy methods. <i>Turkish J. Eng. Environ. Sci.</i> 30, 91–100.	698
Sarykalin, S., Serraino, G., Uryasev, S., 2008. Value-at-risk vs. conditional value-at-	699
risk in risk management and optimization. <i>Tutorials in Operations Research</i> , pp.270-	700
294.	701
Shafiee, M.E., Zechman, E.M., 2013. An agent-based modeling framework for	702
sociotechnical simulation of water distribution contamination events. <i>J. Hydro Inf.</i>	703
15 (3), 862–880.	704
Shannon, C. E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. <i>Bell. Syst. Tech. J.</i>	705
27, 623–656.	706
Shaqadan, A., 2008. Decision analysis considering welfare impacts in water	707
resources using the benefit transfer approach, PhD dissertation, Utah State Univ.,	708
Logan.	709
Shastri, Y., Diwekar, U., 2006. Sensor placement in water networks: A stochastic	710
programming approach. <i>J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.</i> , 132(3),192-203.	711

Tinelli, S., Creaco, E. and Ciaponi, C., 2017. Sampling Significant Contamination	712
Events for Optimal Sensor Placement in Water Distribution Systems. J. Water	713
Resour. Plann. Manage., 143(9), 04017058.	714
Verkade, J., Werner, M., 2011. Estimating the benefits of single value and probability	715
forecasting for flood warning, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss, 8, 6639–6681.	716
Wagner, J. M., Shamir, U., Nemati, H. R., 1992. Groundwater quality management	717
under uncertainty: Stochastic programming approaches and the value of information,	718
Water Resour. Res, 28(5), 1233–1246.	719
Weickgenannt, M., Kapelan, Z., Blokker, M., Savic, D.A., 2010. Risk-based sensor	720
placement for contaminant detection in water distribution systems. J. Water Resour.	721
Plann. Manage., 136(6), 629-636.	722
Yokoyama, K., 2007. Our recent experience with sarin poisoning in Japan and	723
pesticide users with references to some selected chemicals. Neurotoxicology., 28 (2),	724
364e373.	725
Zeng, D., Gu, L., Lian, L., Guo, S., Yao, H., Hu, J., 2016. On cost-efficient sensor	726
placement for contaminant detection in water distribution systems. IEEE Trans. Ind.	727
Inf., 12(6), 2177-2185.	728
Zhao, Y., Schwartz, R., Salomons, E., Ostfeld, A., Poor, H.V., 2016. New	729
formulation and optimization methods for water sensor placement. Environ. Model.	730
Softw., 76, 128-136.	731
	732