

Survey of Comparative Analysis of Different Routing Protocols in MANETs: QoS



Anil Kumar, R. K. Shukla, and R. S. Shukla

Abstract In the Ad Hoc network transmit data through wireless channels. In multiple nodes communicate with each other without an established network. A node sends a packet from source to destination with the help of router. MANET is a pliable and stable network that we can simply put up at any time and in any location, but the primary difficulty with this topology is the ability to swiftly modify the nodes. We will focus on existing routing protocols, their characteristics, and performance in this survey article. Multipath, stability, reserve bandwidth, load balancing, and energy efficiency methodologies are used to classify the protocols. The relative strengths and shortcomings of the methods have also been investigated, allowing us to pinpoint potential study topics. Finally, find a realistic bandwidth approach, energy consumption, end-to-end delay, and performance indicators.

Keywords ZRP · DSR · AODV · DSDV

1 Introduction

MANET [1] is a group of communication networks without provisional network and centralised management. These networks are self-organizing and reconfigure. Multiple hop wireless networks with a dynamic network structure. On recent years, it has been a more research in QoS founded on adjustment node and multipath. Researchers are engrossed on the multipath discovery postponement of on-demand routing protocols to ease alone-root glitches in mobile ad hoc networks which is developing area. AODV is an extension of Multipath. In AODV, these provide those

A. Kumar (✉)

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Invertis University, Bareilly, India
e-mail: frequencyanil@gmail.com

R. K. Shukla

Department of Applied Sciences and Humanities, Invertis University, Bareilly, India

R. S. Shukla

Department of Computer Science, College of Computing and Informatics, Saudi Electronic University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

links that are relatively prime and loop free pathways, the multi root source Routing protocol [2] is a multipath variant “Dynamic Source Routing” that improves delay and throughput by using weighted round robin packet distribution. Split Multipath Routing [3] is a technique for routing many paths in a single path. Is there another DSR modification that picks a hop count limit and disjoints several paths maximally? Node-Disjoint Multipath Routing (NDMR) [3] provides numerous pathways that are node-disjoint. There are two major phase of the dynamic source routing protocol as route detection and route upkeep stage [4]. Source node examines its route cache first before sending a packet. The source node consists of routing message to the data packet before sending it, if the required path is present. Otherwise, the source node starts a route discovery activity by transmitting route request packets. A route request packet comprises the source and destination addresses that identifies the request. A node examines its route cache when it receives a route request packet. If does not have routing information for the requested destination to reduce route request packet communication cost, a node methods route appeal packets that it has never seen earlier and for which the destination address is not mentioned in the route record field. He routes reply packet is generated by the destination and comprises the addresses of nodes visited by the route request packet. Otherwise, based on the Generalized Regression Neural Network and Radial Basis function, Bashandy et al. [4] presented the forecast of packet delay in MANET employing AODV, DSDV, and DSR routing. Here is no accounting for connection rescue, however. Lee and Gerla [1] presented a system that employs an alternate method only when the original route fails to deliver data packets. However, this technique is based on the shortest path algorithm, which was the first algorithm for wireless networks. Artificial neural networks (ANNs) have lately been recognized as a viable alternative method for modelling complicated systems and are now commonly employed for forecasting. The major goal of this project is to look at the application part and capabilities of ANNs for delay prediction of mobile ad hoc networks. Neural network models generally higher to standard undeviating forecasting models, according to more research’s [5]. NNs have a number of characteristics that make them useful and appealing for forecasting. Artificial neural networks have a number of advantages, including (i) the fact that they are non-parametric data-driven self-adaptive approaches with few a priori assumptions. (ii) Despite the fact that the underlying links are indefinite or hard to articulate, neural networks may study after examples and reply to delicate useful relationships within data [6]. (iii) The ability to generalize is the most significant aspect of neural networks. The NNs can usually foretell an incidence, even if the sample data is blaring [6]. (iv) With high accuracy, NNs can be applied to estimate non-linear functions of several variable. (v) NNs can be utilized once first cause-and-effect correlations are ambiguous (Fig. 1).

In this study, delay in MANET networks employing several routing protocols is measured using a generalized regression NNs and radial basis networks, which can be applied on available data of experiments. To anticipate latency, a model based on the grouping of two input data are built.



Fig. 1 Mobile ad hoc network [7]

2 Characteristics of MANETs

2.1 *Dynamic Network Topologies*

Every node free to move independent & randomly anywhere in the entire network. Network topology has change randomly at unpredictable time and primarily consist of bidirectional links.

2.2 *Low Bandwidth*

2.2.1 Unfixed Infrastructure

Networks have a higher capacity and a longer transmission range than these networks. Because of effects of many admission, disappearing, noise, and intrusion, wireless communication has a lower throughput than cable communication.

2.2.2 Limited Battery Power

Small batteries and other non-renewable energy sources power the nodes or hosts. As a result, the most significant design optimization objective is energy conservation.

2.2.3 Scalability

When considering a big network size, scalability is a major issue due to the limited memory and processing one of the key design concerns, with networks of 10,000 or even 100,000 nodes being envisaged.

2.2.4 Limited Resources

The bandwidth and power of the MANET are both constrained. Furthermore, mobile node battery life is a limiting issue in their operation.

2.2.5 Security

The wireless links are vulnerable to threats due to a lack of definition. Denial of service attacks and eavesdropping are both conceivable. MANETs are source constrained, and the topology of the network changes on a regular basis.

3 MANET Routing Protocols

Routing protocol is categorised in proactive routing protocol [4], reactive protocol and hybrid protocol. In which routing techniques keep paths to all nodes and the reactive routing protocol has created route with two nodes [2] while hybrid routing protocols work to comprise in proactive and reactive routing approaches to generate routes between nodes. The DSDV is a node-by-node course routing system that necessitates regular broadcasting of routing updates by each node. In dynamic source routing, the node only builds routes when the source requests them. It keeps track of the route cache, which keeps track of newly discovered routes. The routing overhead is lower because it is an on-demand routing technology [9,10]. A source node S consults its route cache first before sending a packet to destination. Source utilises the accessible path in cache if it detects the route [11]. It starts the route finding procedure if the route isn't located. During this process, 5 fields are required: source ID, destination ID, Request ID, Address list, and Acknowledgement list. The packet is then broadcast by the source node to its neighbour. Dynamic Source Routing can keep track of the path, maintaining information between routes, however it is slow. It is hard for the data packets header to hold all of the route information when a network has a high number of pathways.

4 Comparison of QOS Routing Protocols

Later recognizing all types of protocols in MANET, we can't conclude that one is superior in every situation. In some cases, proactive routing protocol DSDV is better, such as when an end-to-end communication path is always available in table driven or proactive routing. A thorough examination of the literature is necessary to gain a current grasp of the issue and its relevance to practice, as well as to identify the methodologies utilized in prior research on the subject and to make comparisons between research findings. Tables 1, 2 and 3 present a comparison routing protocols.

Table 1 Protocols for proactive routing compariso

Parameter	WRP	OLSR	DSDV
Routing overhead	Low	High	High
Throughput	Medium	Low	Low
Loop free	Yes	Yes	Yes
Route updates	Periodically	Periodically	Periodically

Table 2 Protocols for reactive routing comparison

Parameters	TORA	DSR	AODV
Periodic	No	No	No
Route creation	By source	By source	Locally
Throughput	Low	High	Low
Cashing overhead	High	Low	Medium
Routing overhead	High	High	High

Table 3 Protocols for hybrid routing comparison

Parameters	ZHLS	ZRM
Information of route stored	Inter zone table	Intra zone table
Structure	Flat	Hierarchical
Advantage	Reduced transmission	Unique node Id
Performance metric	Shortest path	Shortest path
Routes	No multiple	Multiple

Table 1 illustrates a comparison of QoS routing systems based on various criteria [8]. Table 2 compares the QoS routing protocols based on specific characteristics and Table 3 QoS based result.

5 Conclusion

We have given a full description of MANET in this study, as well as its classification of routing protocols into proactive, reactive, and hybrid. Protocols are classified using casting methodologies that are entirely reliant cardinality of the destination set. The complexity of procedures is compared. However, DSDV outperforms AODV means delay. DSDV protocol sends message to all nodes entire domain. Because, table in the DSDV routing protocol is constantly updated, the main advantage of DSDV is that nodes may quickly obtain routing information. This does not identify which routing protocol is superior or not because, in the case of a big network, the time it takes to transmit a protocol rises over time. We will improve the performance QoS protocols in the future based on several factors.

References

1. Lee S, Gerla M (2000) AODV-BR: backup routing in ad hoc networks. Wireless Adaptive Mobility Laboratory, Computer Science Department, University of California, pp 1311–1316
2. Singh JP, Dutta P, Pal A (2012) Delay prediction in mobile ad hoc network using artificial neural network. *Proc Technol* 4:201–206
3. Ghadimi E, Khonsari A, Diyanat A, Farmani M, Yazdani N (2011) An analytical model of delay in multi-hop wireless ad hoc networks. *Int J Wireless Netw* 5:1–11
4. Bashandy AR, Chong EK, Ghafoor A (2005) Generalized quality-of-service routing with resource Allocation. *IEEE J Select Areas Commun* 23:450–463
5. Kaaniche H, Kamoun F (2010) Mobility prediction in wireless ad hoc networks using neural networks. *J Telecommun* 2:95–101
6. Wang J, Tang Y, Deng S (2001) QoS routing with mobility prediction in MANET. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Pacific rim conference on computers and signal processing*, Victoria, BC, Canada, pp 357–360
7. Bansal E (2013) Improving performance of AODV using ANT agents
8. Apostolopoulos G, Guerin R (1998) Quality of service based routing. a performance perspective. In: *Association for computing machinery's special interest group on data communication*, vol IV, no 11, pp 17–28
9. Lin CR, Liu J (1999) QoS routing in ad hoc wireless. *IEEE J Select Areas Commun* 17(10):1426–11438
10. Chen S, Nahrstedt K (1999) Distributed quality-of-service routing in ad hoc networks. *IEEE J Select Area Commun* 17(5):1488–1505
11. Lin L (1999) QoS routing in ad hoc wireless networks. *IEEE Select Areas Commun* 17:1426–11438
12. Abdrabou A, Zhuang W (2006) A position based QoS routing scheme for UWB mobile ad hoc networks. *IEEE J Select Areas Commun* 24:850–856