



AODV, DSDV Performance Analysis with TCP Reno, TCP Vegas, and TCP-NJplus Agents of Wireless Networks on Ns2

Ankur Lal
S.E, CSVTU University
India

Dr.Sipy Dubey
CSE, CSVTU University
India

Abstract—When there is no infrastructure in the network, then mobile ad hoc network is the best choice which is also less costly and easily deployable as in comparison. In such networks, in order to make them reliable and secure one need to analyze the routing mechanisms which are called as the MANET routing protocols. In the research work, we have to do the investigation of mobile ad hoc network protocols like ad hoc on demand routing protocol (AODV), destination sequence distance vector (DSDV) protocol using the different TCP types like TCP Reno, TCP Vegas and TCP NJ-plus. our Analysis of the variants of TCP is based on three performance metrics: TCP Throughput ,Average End- to -End delay and Packet Delivery Fraction . This analysis will be useful in determining the better variant among TCP Protocols to ensure better data transfer, speed, and reliability and congestion control.

Keywords— Ad-hoc Networks, Congestion and TCP variants, Proactive and Reactive Protocols, AODV,DSDV.

I. INTRODUCTION

The routing protocols in the MANET are nothing but our traditional networks, however routing protocols deals with the various challenges which is only because of the nodes mobility which more prone to the errors as compared to the wired networks. Due to the dynamic mobility and routing between the mobile nodes, routes between the mobile nodes sometimes disappear and again back which resulted into the MANET routing mechanism more complicated as compared to the wired network. To finding the optimal communication route from source to destination is only basic and main goal of routing in MANET. Optimal path considers the other network factors as well such as latency, jitter, network overhead, throughput, communication cost and power in order to communicate between the source and destination without failure. Due to mobility the communication paths are changing very frequently and hence network packets are not at all affected or even not changing the packet optimality and its uniformity. There are mainly three categories of the mobile routing protocols such as proactive, reactive and hybrid routing protocols as shown following figure 1. There are many protocols which we are considering for the investigation and evaluation in the mobile ad hoc networks. But each of these routing protocols is focused on the certain aspects of simulation results. Some of the other issues like, the behavior of selected protocol in MANET environment where there are no mobility constraints on nodes, advantages and disadvantages in collaboration with corresponding MANET routing protocols

and quality of service. TCP is not well suited for wireless networks especially in MANET; the performance of TCP degrades significantly due to the heavy

packet and connection losses. To overcome the problems of reliability, different versions of TCP called TCP variants were developed especially for wireless ad hoc networks to provide reliable communication. There are various routing protocols for route discovery and configurations in MANET but, the problem is the selection of suitable coupling of TCP variant over MANET routing protocol to provide reliable communication




Figure 1: Classification of MANET Routing Protocols

II Problem Definition

In addition to non-congestion losses due to transmission errors, recently, the studies show that packet reordering is not

a rare event in WMNs [2, 3] and it plays an important role in the packet transmission. Packet reordering is the network behavior where the relative order of the packets is altered when these packets are transported in the network. In WMNs, packet reordering may happen due to link-layer retransmissions, route fluttering, inherent parallelism in routers, router forwarding lulls etc. When the sender receives three successive duplicate acknowledgments (dupacks) caused by non-congestion loss and packet reordering, TCP sender assumes that a packet has been lost due to network congestion and reduces the size of congestion window (cwnd) unnecessarily. Furthermore, if the dupacks cause due to packet reordering, the sender not only reduce the congestion window size but also trigger spurious retransmission of packets and hence wasting bandwidth.

Several loss differentiation algorithms [4-8] are proposed to improve the performance of TCP over wireless networks. However, these algorithms have no mechanism to detect and differentiate non-congestion losses from packet reordering. TCPs inability to distinguish non-congestion loss from packet reordering may causes unnecessary retransmissions, slow down the growth of cwnd and reduces the efficiency of the receiving TCP. As a result, it is an important issue of TCP to guide the TCP sender for triggering the congestion control algorithms properly by distinguishing non-congestion losses from packet reordering in addition to network congestion when the sender receives three dupacks.

III. Proposed Work

In this project our main goal is to improve the performance of TCP by distinguishing non-congestion losses from packet reordering over MANET. We designed and investigated a new TCP scheme called TCP NJ-Plus, which is capable of reducing the unnecessary retransmissions and reduction of the size of cwnd by detecting and differentiating noncongestion losses from packet reordering over MANET.

Mainly, our proposed solution has three mechanisms. First, detection of non-congestion losses and packet reordering from network congestion loss. Second, detection of noncongestion losses from packet reordering and third, congestion control algorithms of TCP NJ-plus. We evaluated TCP NJ-Plus with other TCP schemes such as TCP-Reno and TCP-Vegas and compared the end-to-end throughput and fairness performance through extensive simulations using NS2. Simulation results show that TCP NJ-Plus has significant improvement over other TCP variants.

IV. Literature Review

As we know that MANET stands for the Mobile Ad hoc Network which is rapidly growing, deployable, on demand self configuring network.

- This is network with no infrastructure at all.
- Links between the mobile nodes are wireless only.
- Topology is not fixed rather it can be dynamic and also network nodes are mobile.
- Since the communication mobile nodes possibly when out of range; nodes must needed to relay traffic.
- It can be a self network or may be connected to other external networks such as internet.

Following figure 2 shows the usage of MANET in the military applications and figure 3 shows the basic network structure for the MANET.




Fig.2: MANET Example




Fig.3: MANET network structure

(I) AODV: Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector Routing Protocol

This is one more ad hoc routing protocol which is somewhat different from the DSR protocol in working and has the following procedure to follow:

(1) **Route discovery:** in this case, routing cache mechanism not applicable rather source node uses the routing tables. If the source node not gets the route in the routing table towards the destination, then it can start broadcasting the RREQ packets all over the MANET network. Route Request packets usage the search engine technique. Node starts creating the reverse routing entry in routing table such that route path reach to the destination, once that node receive the route request packet. After that, the intermediate node or the destination node acknowledge route request RREQ packet by route reply RREP unicast packet and on the receipt of route reply packet, similar to the route request packet, reverse routing entry towards the source of route reply packet is also created. At the same time

one more list is created which is called as precursor list is created which is associated with the all the routing entries.

(2) **Route maintenance:** All the nodes which are along with active route start broadcasting the HELLO messages periodically to all its neighbors in MANET. During this period, if any node doesn't get any kind of packet of HELLO message, then it is considered as link broken between that node and its neighbor node. Here also the REER packet is used to indicate the source about the link breakage or link failure. Sometimes local route mechanism is also used to repair the link between the source and destination mobile nodes, or else the route error packet for the same.

Finally in this section, following table gives the comparison n between the source node and destination node characteristics such as source route, destination paths, detection of neighbors etc.

(II) Destination-sequenced distance vector

DSDV is one of the most well known table-driven routing algorithms for MANETs. The DSDV routing algorithm is based on the classical Bellman-Ford Routing Algorithm (BFRA) with certain improvement [3]. Every mobile station maintains a routing table with all available destinations along with information like next hop, the number of hops to reach to the destination, sequence number of the destination originated by the destination node, etc. DSDV uses both periodic and triggered routing updates to maintain table consistency. Triggered routing updates are used when network topology changes are detected, so that routing information is propagated as quickly as possible. Routing table updates can be of two types and incremental.

Full dump packets carry all available routing information and may require multiple Network Protocol Data Units (NPDU); incremental packets carry only information changed since the last full dump and should fit in one NPDU in order to decrease the amount of traffic generated. Mobile nodes cause broken links when they move from place to place.

(III) TCP over MANET

As a result of the advancement of wireless technology and the proliferation of handheld wireless terminals, recent years have witnessed an ever-increasing popularity of wireless networks, ranging from wireless Local Area Networks (WLANs) and wireless wide-area networks (WWANs) to mobile ad hoc networks (MANETs). In WLANs (e.g., the Wi-Fi technology) or in WWANs (e.g. 2.5G/3G/4G cellular networks), mobile hosts communicate with an access point or a base station that is connected to the wired networks. Obviously, only one hop wireless link is needed for communications between a mobile host and a stationary host in wired networks. In contrast, there is no fixed infrastructure such as base stations or access points in a MANET. Each node in a MANET is capable of moving independently and functioning as a router that discovers and maintains routes and forwards packets to other nodes. Thus,

MANETs are multi-hop wireless networks by nature.

Note that MANETs may be connected at the edges to the wired Internet. Transmission control protocol (TCP) is a transport layer protocol which provides reliable end to end data delivery between end hosts in traditional wired network environment. In TCP, reliability is achieved by retransmitting lost packets. Thus, each TCP sender maintains a running average of the estimated round trip delay and the average deviation derived from it. Packets will be retransmitted if the sender receives no acknowledgment within a certain timeout interval (e.g., the sum of smoothed round trip delay and four times the average deviation) or receives duplicate acknowledgments. Due to the inherent reliability of wired networks, there is an implicit assumption made by TCP that any packet loss is due to congestion. To reduce congestion, TCP will invoke its congestion control mechanisms whenever any packet loss is detected. Since TCP is well tuned, it has become the de facto transport protocol in the Internet that supports many applications such as web access, file transfer and email. Due to its wide use in the Internet, it is desirable that TCP remains in use to provide reliable data transfer services for communications within wireless networks and for those across wireless networks and the wired Internet. It is thus crucial that TCP performs well over all kinds of wireless networks in order for the wired Internet to extend to the wireless world.

Unfortunately, wired networks and wireless networks are significantly different in terms of bandwidth, propagation delay, and link reliability. The implication of the difference is that packet losses are no longer mainly due to network congestion; they may well be due to some wireless specific reasons. As a matter of fact, in wireless LANs or cellular networks, most packet losses are due to high bit error rate in wireless channels and handoffs between two cells, while in mobile ad hoc networks, most packet losses are due to medium contention and route breakages, as well as radio channel errors. Therefore, although TCP performs well in wired networks, it will suffer from serious performance degradation in wireless a network if it misinterprets such non-congestion related losses as a sign of congestion and consequently invokes congestion control and avoidance procedures, as confirmed through analysis and extensive simulations carried out.

As TCP performance deteriorates more seriously in ad hoc networks compared to WLANs or cellular networks, we divide wireless networks into two large groups: one is called one-hop wireless networks that include WLANs and cellular networks and the other is called multi-hop wireless networks that include MANETs.

To understand TCP behavior and improve TCP performance over wireless networks, given these wireless specific challenges, considerable research has been carried out and many schemes have been proposed. As the research in this area is still active and many problems are still wide open, this chapter serves to pinpoint the primary causes for TCP performance degradation over wireless networks, and cover the state of the art in the solution spectrum, in hopes that

readers can better understand the problems and hence propose better solutions based on the current ones.

V. Implementation Details and Technologies Used

Table : Comparison of the three simulators

Simulator	Free	Open Source	Programming Lang.
NS-2	Yes	Yes	C++, TCL
GloMoSim	Limited	Yes	Parse
Opnet	No	No	C

After studying this network simulator, for the present network simulation of the AODV, DSR, ZRP and DSDV, the tool called NS2 is most feasible for the use along with the Tracegraph tool for the performance measurement calculations and output graphs. NS 2 is selected because of the following advantages of using it:


- 1.Open Source and free software for the simulations.
- 2.Easily available for the download and installation.
- 3.Programming is done in C++.
- 4.More features implemented for the simulation.

VI. Results and Discussion

In this research methodology, we have to simulate the four MANET routing protocols such as ADOV, DSDV with number nodes 20, 40 and 75 for the TCP variants. In the following section first we have to show the NAM results for each protocol and for each scenario one by one:


(1) AODV NAM Simulation Results

Fig.VI.1: AODV 20 nodes NAM simulation Result



(2) DSDV NAM Simulation Results

Fig.VI.2: DSDV 20 nodes NAM simulation Result (here only for 20 nodes)




In the same we got the NAM animation results for various network scenarios considered in this simulation studies. Now below we will present the performance evaluation based on simulated networks along with different TCP variants.

1) THROUGHPUT:

Throughput is the ratio of total amount packets the receiver will receive from the source of the data within the specified time frame. End to end delay for the packet transmission is most important metrics for the throughput performance of the

routing protocols. Along with the routing protocols in the wireless networks for the performance analysis the routing agents are also needs to consider routing agents such as TCP (NJplus), TCPReNo and TCPVegas which are investigated in this research work with two well know routing protocols such as AODV and DSDV. Along with the delay, there some other factors which are also affect the performance of the network throughput such as routing overhead, network size and bandwidth. Thus throughput calculates the fraction of the channel capacity which is used in order to transfer the important information.

In this thesis, AODV and DSDV protocols are simulated with different routing TCP agents such as TCPNJplus, TCPReNo, TCPVegas for the different number of mobile nodes and networks sizes. We measured the throughput of every scenario using the AWK scripts. Following tables and graphs are showing the average throughput performance for AODV and DSDV with TCP-Reno, TCP-Vegas and TCP-Njplus.



Fi

Figure VI.4: DSDV-Throughput Performance vs. Network

Protocol Name	TCP Variant	20-Nodes	40-Nodes	75-Nodes
AODV	RENO	202.80	296.97	205.70
DSDV	RENO	262.80	302.95	245.58
AODV	VEGAS	241.39	316.43	216.18
DSDV	VEGAS	302.03	334.27	275.48
AODV	NJPLUS	279.05	320.95	247.6
DSDV	NJPLUS	321.49	342.72	289.5

Based on these readings we prepared following performance comparison graphs for throughput performance:

Following are the graphs for each scenario with different routing protocols and different routing agents: Here measurement of the throughput is calculated by calculating the throughput of receiving the packets versus total simulation time.





Figure VI.5: AODV-DSDV-20 nodes-Throughput



Performance vs. TCP Variants




Figure VI.6: AODV-DSDV-75 nodes-Throughput Performance vs. TCP Variants

Here the figure VI.3 and VI.4 showing that throughput performance against varying number of mobile nodes for three TCP variants. From the graphs it's showing that for both

Figure VI.3: AODV-Throughput Performance vs. Network

Scenario

AODV and DSDV routing protocols the TCP variant NJ-plus outperforms the existing TCP variants.

On the other side, next figures VI.5 and VI.6 showing that DSDV is outperforming the AODV protocol in all scenarios and for all TCP variants. The investigation of the TCP agents on the routing protocols such as AODV and DSDV does not affect that much but it shows the with which TCP agent, this protocols gives the higher throughput.

2. END TO END DELAY

This one more performance metrics which we calculated here for all the TCP variants with the both routing protocols AODV and DSDV with different network scenarios. Following table shows the average end to end delay for this cases which will explain the performance effects of TCP variants with AODV and DSDV network routing protocols:

We measured the average end to end delay of every scenario using the AWK scripts. Following tables and graphs are showing the average delay performance for AODV and DSDV with TCP-Reno, TCP-Vegas and TCP-Njplus.

Protocol Name	TCP Variant	20-Nodes	40-Nodes	75-Nodes
AODV	RENO	498	281.56	373.41
DSDV	RENO	477.1	202.58	204.8
AODV	VEGAS	98.94	77.6	104.6
DSDV	VEGAS	87.98	42.03	34.44
AODV	NJPLUS	97.50	73.97	102.7
DSDV	NJPLUS	86	41.9	32.45




Figure VI.8: DSDV-Delay Performance vs. Network Scenario




Figure VI.9: AODV-DSDV-20 nodes-Delay Performance vs. TCP Variants




Figure VI.7: AODV-Delay Performance vs. Network Scenario




Figure VI.10: AODV-DSDV-75 nodes-Delay Performance vs. TCP Variants


Thus above graphs indicates that there is not much benefit of using either of one TCP variants except NJplus. Overall performance indicates that TCP NJplus performing well in all the conditions most specially with the network scenarios and

MANET routing protocol such as DSDV. Overall DSDV protocol and TCP variants performing well together.

3.Packet Delivery Ratio

This is also one of the major performance metrics which evaluates the performance of routing protocols and TCP variants. packet delivery ratio is nothing but: PDR: total number of packets generated / total number of packets received. Following table showing the results recorded for PDR.

Protocol Name	TCP Variant	20-Nodes	40-Nodes	75-Nodes
AODV	RENO	98.12	97.5	96.10
DSDV	RENO	98.51	99.4	99.3
AODV	VEGAS	99.24	97.95	98.06
DSDV	VEGAS	99.60	98.73	99.4
AODV	NJPLUS	98.50	98.2	97.80
DSDV	NJPLUS	98.70	99.1	98.00



VI.13: AODV-DSDV-20 nodes-PDR Performance vs. TCP Variants

Based on these readings we prepared following performance comparison graphs for PDR performance: Following are the graphs for each scenario with different routing protocols and different routing agents. PDR is measure in terms of %.




Figure VI.11: AODV-PDR Performance vs. Network Scenario




Figure VI.12: DSDV-PDR Performance vs. Network Scenario




Figure VI.14: AODV-DSDV-75 nodes-PDR Performance vs. TCP Variants

From above graphs regarding packet delivery ratio performance, we can say that from figure VI.11 and VI.12, all variants having mixed performance, here in this case proposed approach NJplus not able to beat the performance of TCP-Vegas and TCP-Reno. From figure VI.11 and VI.12, on an average the performance of TCP-Reno is best.

Coming to the next figures VI.13 and VI.14, the performance of PDR under the DSDV protocol with TCP variants is better as compared to the AODV.

From above metrics we compared, the TCP variant called NJplus outperforming the existing TCP variants in terms of throughput, delay, offcourse jitter but having mixed performance in case of PDR. However the TCP variants Vegas and Reno are having very poor performance for delay and throughput. Overall TCP NJplus is better for high performance.

On the other side of the game, the routing protocols AODV and DSDV, DSDV completely outperforming AODV while working with TCP variants. For all TCP variants the performance of DSDV is better as compared to AODV.

VII .Conclusion and Future Work

This research work was based on the protocol investigation from the three main categories of MANET routing protocols such as proactive routing protocol, reactive routing protocols with different TCP variants. The protocols which we study and analyze are AODV, DSDV from reactive routing protocols and proactive routing protocols respectively with varying the number of nodes, data connections, network size. In this research, we proposed an efficient TCP variant called TCP-NJplus which has the aim to outperform the existing TCP variants such as VEGAS and RENO. According to the results which are obtained in the results and discussion section by considering the throughput, delay, packet delivery metrics calculations and graphs generations, following conclusions are arrived at:

(1) In the MANET different protocols have their own advantages and disadvantages which make them different from each other. Here the AODV and DSDV protocol is having good performance of TCP variant called NJplus, however the performance of DSDV in all scenarios with all TCP variants is better as compared to AODV protocol. In short we conclude that with TCP variants DSDV is the protocol performing best among MANET routing protocols.

(2) The performance of TCP variants varies according to the routing protocols and network scenarios. Among all possibilities, the proposed TCP variant having better performance in case of Throughput, delay and jitter as compared to existing TCP variants.

(3) In case of packet delivery ratio, the performance of TCP-NJplus is little lower as compared to existing TCP variants; however we will keep this for further improvement for future work.

Future work:

So far lots of researches and investigations already carried out in between the different MANET routing protocols by measuring, calculating and comparing the parameters like throughput, delay and jitter for the same. And on the basis of this we have to conclude that which protocol is efficient for use. Our future work is also directed to the same direction in which there will be the introduction of one more performance metric which needs to be considered for deciding the efficiency of the protocols which is called as convergence time. Convergence time is nothing but the time between the detection of an interface being down and availability of new routing information time.

One more thing, as we discussed detailed types of MANET routing protocols, thus the future work also concentrates on investigation of the remaining MANET routing protocols such as geographical based routing protocols, hierarchical based routing protocols, multicast routing protocols and broadcast routing protocols for the future investigation of the MANET routing protocols.

VIII. References

- [1] Sumit, Apoorva, Ki-Young, Konstantinos and Ramesh, "Understanding Congestion Control in Multi-hop Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. of MobiCom'08, California, USA, Sept 2008.
- [2] Chunlei Liu; Fangyang Shen; Min-Te Sun; , "A Unified TCP Enhancement for Wireless Mesh Networks," Parallel Processing Workshops, 2007. ICPPW 2007. International Conference on , vol., no., pp.71, 10-14 Sept. 2007.
- [3] Xiaoyuan Guo; Jiangchuan Liu; , "Path diversified retransmission for TCP over wireless mesh networks," Quality of Service (IWQoS), 2010 18th International Workshop on , vol., no., pp.1-9, 16-18 June 2010.
- [4] Fu, C. P., and Liew, S. C. TCP VenO: TCP enhancement for transmission over wireless access networks. IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, 21(2), 216– 228, 2003.
- [5] Hosam, "TCP CERL: Congestion control enhancement over wireless networks", Journal of Wireless networks, 2008.
- [6] Xu, Tian and Ansari, "Improving TCP performance in Integrated wireless communication networks", Computer Networks, 2005.
- [7] Jaehyung Lee, Jungre, Minu, Jahwan and Hyunseung, "NJ+: An Efficient Congestion Control Mechanisms for Wireless Networks", KSII Transactions on Internet and Information Systems, Dec 2008.
- [8] P. Navaratnam, N. Akhtar and R. Tafazolli, "On the performance of DCCP in Wireless Mesh Networks", in Proc. of MobiWac'06, Spain, Oct 2006.
- [9] Md. Monzur Morshed, Md. Habibur Rahman, Md. Rezaur Rahman Mazumder, and K. A. M. Lutfullah, "Simulation and Analysis of Ad-hoc on demand Distance Vector Routing Protocol," ICIS 2009, vol. II, pp. 610- 614, November 2009.
- [10] Valid Nazari Talooki, and Jonathan Rodriguez, "Quality of Service for Flat Routing Protocols in Mobile Adhoc Network," ICST, 7-9 September 2009.
- [11] V. Ramesh, Dr. P. Subbaiah, N. Koteswar Rao and M. Janardhana Raju, "Performance comparison and analysis of DSDV and AODV for MANET," International Journal on Computer Science and Engineering, vol. 02, pp. 183-188, 2010.
- [12] Charles E. Perkins, Elizabeth M. Belding-Royer, and Samir R. Das, "Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector Routing," IETF MANET Draft, Charles E. Perkins, Ad Hoc Networking, ISBN 0-201-30976-9 February 2003.
- [13] S H Manjula, C N Abhilash, Shaila K, K R Venugopal, and L M Patnaik, "Performance of AODV Routing Protocol using Group and entity Mobility Models in Wireless Sensor Networks," In proceedings of the International Multi Conference of Engineers and Computer Scientists (IMECS 2008), Hong Kong, vol. 2, pp. 1212-1217, 19-21 March 2008
- [14] Alvin C Valera, Winston K G Seah and S V Rao, "Improving protocol robustness in ad hoc networks through cooperative packet caching and shortest multipath routing", IEEE transactions on Mobile computing, vol 4 no 5, september/october 2005.

- [15] J Broch, D Maltz, D Johnson, Y C Hu and J Jetcheva, "A performance comparison of multihop wireless ad hoc network routing protocols", Proc. ACM/IEEE Mobicom Conf. pp. 85-97, 1998.
- [16] S J Lee, C.K Toh and M Gerla, "Performance evaluation of table-driven and on-demand ad hoc routing protocols", proc. IEEE symp. Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Comm., pp. 297-301, 1999.
- [17] S Das, R Castaneda, J T Yan and R Sengupta, "Comparative performance evaluation of routing protocols for mobile ad hoc networks", proc. IEEE Int'l Conf. Computer Comm and Networks, 1998
- [18] Network simulator-ns-2. www.isi.edu/nsnam
- [19] NS Manual/Documentation-The VINT Project Collaboration between researchers at UC Berkeley, LBL, USC/ISI and Xerox. PARC.KevinFall_kfall@ee.lbl.gov, Kennan Varadhan_kannan@catarina.usc.edu
- [20] Comer and Douglas E., "Computer Networks and Internet," Prentice Hall, p.476, ISBN 9780136061274, 2008.