© 2017 IJSRSET | Volume 3 | Issue 5 | Print ISSN: 2395-1990 | Online ISSN : 2394-4099
Themed Section: Engineering and Technology

A Review - Throughput and Load Balancing using Routing Protocol in MANET

Prof. L. N. Pandey, Deepali Samaiya
Gyan Ganga College of Technology, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

MANET is a self-dealt with and self-configurable framework where the versatile center points move subjectively. Coordinating is an essential issue in MANET and hence the grouping of this paper nearby the execution examination of guiding traditions and creating excitement for compact off the cuff framework strategy has realized many coordinating tradition recommendation. The objective of this paper is to make logical order of the versatile uniquely selected guiding traditions, and to survey and consider operator cases for each class of traditions. We took a gander at three sorts of directing traditions i.e. proactive, responsive and creamer. The execution of all these coordinating traditions is poor around Q0S parameters. All the MANET controlling traditions are cleared up significantly with QoS estimations.

Keywords: MANET, Q0S, Routing, Routing protocols, Time Complexity etc.

I. INTRODUCTION

A MANET is a self-dealing with and self-masterminding multi hop remote framework, where the framework structure changes quickly due to part transportability. Off the cuff remote framework are self-making and self-dealing with and self-administrating. The hubs are permitted to move heedlessly and organize themselves self-confidently; along these lines, the framework's remote topology may change rapidly and unpredictably. Such a framework may work in an independent style, or might be related with the greater Internet [1]. Adaptable hubs that are within each other's radio reach give direct through remote associations, while those far isolated rely on upon various hubs to hand-off messages as switches. In exceptionally delegated framework each center shows both as a host and a switch which progresses the data proposed for some other center point.

An uncommonly named framework may contain a couple of home-figuring devices, including versatile workstations, PDAs, and so forth. Each center point will have the ability to talk direct with whatever other center that lives within its transmission extend [2]. For comparing with hubs that live past this range, the center point needs to use transitional hubs to exchange the messages skip by bounce.

Directing methodologies in Mobile Ad Hoc Network

1. In MANET, courses are chiefly multi bounce in view of the constrained radio proliferation reach and topology changes much of the time and eccentrically since every system host moves arbitrarily. In this way, directing is a necessary piece of specially appointed interchanges.
2. Routing is to discover and keep up courses between nodes in a dynamic topology with potentially uni-directional connections.

II. Routing Protocols in MANET

1. Table-determined or Proactive Protocols:

Proactive guiding traditions attempt to care for dependable, best in class directing information between each combine of hubs in the framework by multiplying, proactively, course updates at settled intervals. Specialist proactive traditions include: Destination-Sequenced Distance-Vector (DSDV) coordinating, Clustered Gateway Switch Routing

(CGSR), Wireless Routing Protocol (WRP), Optimized Link State Routing (OLSR)and The Fisheye State Routing (FSR).

2. On-interest or Reactive Protocols

An interchange system from table-driven coordinating is responsive or on-enthusiasm controlling. Responsive traditions, not at all like table-driven ones, set up a course to a goal when there is an enthusiasm for it, regularly begun by the source center point through revelation change within the framework. Responsive traditions, not in any way like table-driven ones, set up a course to a goal when there is an enthusiasm for it, regularly begun by the source center point through exposure change within the framework. Specialist open controlling traditions include: Dynamic Source Routing (DSR), Ad hoc On Demand Distance Vector (AODV) coordinating, Temporally Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA) and Associativity Based Routing (ABR).

3. Hybrid Routing Protocols

Purely proactive or completely responsive traditions perform well in a limited area of framework setting. Of course, the distinctive uses of exceptionally named frameworks over a broad assortment of operational conditions and framework configuration speak to a test for a singular tradition to work profitably. Researcher's benefactor that the issue of powerful operation more than a broad assortment of conditions can be tended to best match these operational conditions [5]. Delegate cream controlling traditions include: Zone Routing Protocol (ZRP) and Zone-based Hierarchal Link state coordinating tradition (ZHLS).

4. Table-determined or proactive routing protocol:-

A. Destination-Sequenced Distance-Vector (DSDV) steering

Destination - Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV) is a table-driven directing arrangement for exceptionally delegated compact frameworks in perspective of the Bellman-Ford estimation. The rule duty of the figuring was to handle the Routing Loop issue. DSDV meets desires in the going with way. Each guiding table entry passes on bob partition and next bounce for each and every available goal (as in B-F). Likewise, every segment is named with a gathering number which starts from the goal station. The guiding information is announced by TV incidentally and incrementally. In the wake of tolerating the controlling information, courses with later gathering numbers are supported as the commence for settling on sending decisions of the routes with a similar game plan number; those with the briefest bob partition will be used. That information (i.e. next ricochet and hop detachment) is entered in the guiding table, close by the related progression number tag. Right when the association with the accompanying skip has failed, any course through that next bounce is quickly doled out a 1 endless hop division and its plan number is updated. Exactly when a center point gets a telecast with a boundless 1 metric, and it has a later arrangement number to that destination, it triggers a course overhaul show to spread the essential news about that destination.

The point of preference is it is truly suitable for making specially appointed systems with little number of nodes. The DSDV convention is demonstrated to ensure circle free ways to every destination at all moments. DSDV obliges a consistent overhaul of its directing tables, which uses up battery force and a little measure of transmission capacity notwithstanding when the system is unmoving. DSDV is not suitable for very dynamic systems. There is no business usage of this calculation.

B. Cluster-head Gateway Switch Routing (CGSR)

Bunch head Gateway Switch Routing (CGSR) Protocol is a dynamic tradition in light of the DSDV Routing count using a group make a beeline for manage a get-together of action hubs. The count meets desires in an uncommonly direct way. By then which along these lines transmits it to the entryway of the goal gathering. The goal amass head transmits it to the goal center. There are different streamlined gathering head race frameworks. On getting a package, a center point finds the nearest bundle head along the course to the goal as demonstrated by the gathering part table and the directing table. By then the center point advises its guiding table to find the accompanying ricochet remembering the ultimate objective to accomplish the group head picked in step one and transmits the bundle to that center point. The center

point directs its controlling table to find the accompanying bounce remembering the true objective to accomplish the cluster head picked in step one and transmits the package to that center point.

C. Wireless Routing Protocol (WRP)

The Wireless Directing Protocol (WRP) [7] is a proactive unicast guiding tradition for flexible uniquely selected frameworks. WRP utilizes upgraded Bellman-Ford Distance Vector directing figuring. Using WRP, each adaptable center point keeps up a partition table, a coordinating table, an association cost table and a Message Retransmission List (MRL). An entry in the guiding table contains the division to a goal center, the forerunner and the successor along the approaches to the goal, and a tag to recognize its state, i.e., is it a clear way, a circle or invalid. Securing progenitor and successor in the guiding table serves to recognize directing circles and decline checking to endlessness issue, which is the essential shortcoming of the primary partition vector controlling computation. A flexible center point makes a section for each neighbor in its association cost table. In WRP, flexible hubs exchange coordinating tables with their neighbors using upgrade messages.

The upgrade messages can be sent either once in a while or at whatever point association state changes happen. The MRL contains information about which neighbor has not perceived an upgrade message. Moreover, if there is no alteration in its controlling table since last overhaul, a center point is obliged to send a Hello message to ensure organize. On getting an overhaul message, the center adjusts its detachment table and scans for better coordinating routes according to the updated information. In WRP, a center point checks the consistency of its neighbors in the wake of recognizing any association change.
WRP has the same point of interest as that of DSDV. What's more, it has speedier joining and includes less table upgrades. Calculation is straightforward in usefulness. The many-sided quality of support of various tables requests a bigger memory and all through the whole system, this builds the conventions data transfer capacity utilization.

D. Optimized Link State Routing (OLSR) Protocol

The tradition is a headway of the set up association state estimation uniquely designed to the requirements of an adaptable remote LAN. The key thought used as a piece of the tradition is that of multipoint exchanges (MPRs). MPRs are picked hubs which forward broadcast messages in the midst of the flooding methodology. This framework significantly diminishes the message overhead when appeared differently in relation to a customary flooding segment, where every center point retransmits each message when it gets the primary copy of the message. In OLSR, association state information is delivered just by hubs picked as MPRs. Thusly, a moment upgrade is refined by limiting the amount of control messages overpowered in the framework. As a third streamlining, a MPR center point may choose to report only associations amidst itself and its MPR selectors. Therefore, rather than the amazing association state figuring, fragmentary association state information is scattered in the framework. This information is then used for course estimation. OLSR gives perfect courses (similar to number of hops). The tradition is particularly reasonable for tremendous and thick frameworks as the system of MPRs works splendidly in this association.

Favorable circumstances of OLSR is it is a level directing convention, it needn't bother with focal managerial framework to deal with its steering procedure Due to the OLSR directing convention effortlessness in utilizing interfaces, it is anything but difficult to coordinate the directing convention in the current working frameworks, without changing the organization of the header of the IP messages. The one extraordinary preferred standpoint of the OLSR convention is that it instantly knows the status of the connection and it is perhaps to develop the nature of service(QoS) data to such convention so that the hosts know in advantage the nature of the course. The proposed convention is best reasonable for huge and thick specially appointed systems. OLSR convention needs that each host occasional sends the refreshed topology data more prominent preparing power from hubs in the specially appointed remote system.

E. The Fisheye State Routing (FSR)

The Fisheye State Routing (FSR) is a proactive unicast routing protocol based on Link State routing algorithm with effectively reduced overhead to maintain network topology information. As indicated in its name, FSR utilizes a function similar to a fish eye.

The eyes of fishes catch the pixels near the focal with high detail, and the detail decreases as the distance from the focal point increases.

Similar to fish eyes, FSR maintains the accurate distance and way quality data about the quick neighboring hubs, and continuously lessens detail as the separation increments. In Link State directing calculation utilized for wired systems, connect state refreshes are created and overflowed through the system at whatever point a hub distinguishes a topology change. In FSR, be that as it may, hubs trade interface state data just with the neighboring hubs to keep up and coming topology data. Connection state refreshes are traded intermittently in FSR, and every hub keeps a full topology guide of the system. To diminish the measure of connection state refresh messages, the key change in FSR is to utilize distinctive refresh periods for various passages in the directing table. Connection state refreshes relating to the hubs inside a littler extension are engendered with higher recurrence.

5. On-demand or Reactive Protocols:

A. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)

Dynamic Source Routing (DSR) is a steering convention for remote work systems. It is like AODV in that it shapes a course on-request when a transmitting PC asks for one. There are 2 noteworthy stages: - Route revelation utilizes course demand and course answer parcels. Course maintenance–uses course blunder bundles and acknowledgments. The convention enables different courses to any goal and enables every sender to choose and control the courses utilized as a part of directing its parcels, for instance for use in stack adjusting or for expanded heartiness. Different preferences of the DSR convention incorporate effortlessly ensured circle free steering, bolster for use in systems containing unidirectional connections, utilization of just "delicate state" in directing, and exceptionally two hundred hubs, and is intended to function admirably with even high rates of versatility.

B. Ad hoc On Demand Distance Vector (AODV) routing

The AODV is a reactive [3, 4] protocol derived from Dynamic Source Routing and DSDV and DSR it combines the advantages of both protocols. Its route discovery procedure is similar to DSR. When a node has a packet to send to a particular destination, if it does not know a valid route, it broadcasts a route request packet, by specifying the destination address. The neighbors without a valid route to the destination establish a reverse route and rebroadcast route request packet. The route maintenance is done by exchanging beacon packets at regular intervals. This protocol adapts to highly dynamic topology and provide single route for communication.

C. Temporally Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA)

Temporally Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA) is a uniform, destination-based, reactive protocol. A destination- oriented directed acyclic graph is built for each destination. If connectivity changes result in a node losing its entire outbound links, the node “reverses" the direction of some or its entire inbound links. TORA assumes that each node is informed of link-status changes for any of its immediate neighbors. When a source has no route to a destination, it broadcasts a route request for the destination. The request is rebroadcast until it reaches the destination, which is de need to have zero height with respect to itself. The destination broadcasts an update message, indicating its height. Each node that receives the update message updates its height to be one higher than the height in the update message and broadcasts an update message, indicating its new height. The updates must be broadcast reliably and ordered by a synchronized clock or logical timestamp in order to prevent long-lived loops. This process creates a DAG from the source to the destination, which is used for hop-by-hop routing. A route failure is propagated only when a node loses its last downstream link. TORA distinguishes nodes whose height already reflects a link reversal (“reflected"). Again reliable, ordered broadcast is required in order to prevent long- lived routing loops. The destination is the only node with no outgoing link. The maintenance of DAG provides loop free communication to the destination.

6. Hybrid Routing Protocols

A. Zone routing protocol (ZRP)

The Zone Routing Protocol (ZRP) is a half breed steering convention, where the system is separated into directing zones as indicated by the separations amongst hubs and the steering zone characterizes a range (in jumps) that every hub is required to keep up organize availability proactively. The proactive piece of the convention is limited to a little neighborhood of a hub and the responsive part is utilized for directing over the system. This decreases idleness in course revelation and steering zone is k, every hub in the zone can be come to inside k bounces from S. The base separation of a fringe hub from S is k (the span). All hubs aside from L are in the directing zone of S with span 2 In this proactive steering approach-Intra Zone Routing Protocol (IARP) is utilized inside directing zones and receptive directing methodology Inter Zone Routing Protocol (IERP) is utilized between steering zones. Accordingly, for hubs inside the directing zone, routes are quickly accessible. For hubs that lie outside the steering zone, courses are resolved on-request (i.e. responsively), and it can utilize any on-request steering convention to decide a course to the required goal. Course creation is finished utilizing an inquiry answer component. The goal thus sends back an answer message through the switch way and makes the course.

B. Zone-based Hierarchical Link State (ZHLS) Routing Protocol

State routing (ZHLS) is a hybrid routing protocol. In ZHLS, mobile nodes are assumed to know their physical locations with assistance from a locating system like GPS. The network is divided into non-overlapping zones based on geographical information. ZHLS uses a hierarchical addressing scheme that contains zone ID and node ID. A node determines its zone ID according to its location and the pre-defined zone map is well known to all nodes in the network. It is assumed that a virtual link connects two zones if there exists at least one physical link between the zones. A two-level network topology structure is defined in ZHLS, the node level topology and the zone level topology. Respectively, there are two kinds of link state updates, the node level LSP (Link State Packet) and the zone level LSP. A hub intermittently communicate its hub level LSP to every single other hub in a similar zone. In ZHLS, door hubs communicate the zone LSP all through the system at whatever point a virtual connection is broken or made. Thusly, every hub knows the present zone level topology of the system. Before sending parcels, a source initially checks its intra-zone directing table. On the off chance that the goal is in an indistinguishable zone from the source, the steering data is as of now there. Something else, the source sends an area demand to every other zone through door hubs. After a door hub of the zone, in which the goal hub dwells, gets the area ask for, it answers with an area reaction containing the zone ID of the goal [10]. The zone ID and the hub ID of the goal hub will be determined in the header of the information parcels started from the source. Amid the bundle sending system, middle of the road hubs with the exception of hubs in the goal zone will utilize entomb - zone directing table, and when the parcel arrives the goal zone, an intra-zone steering table will be utilized.

The favorable position is no covering zones are here. The zone-level topology data is dispersed to all hubs. Lessens the movement and maintains a strategic distance from single purpose of disappointment. Be that as it may, extra activity delivered by the creation and keeping up of the zone-level topology is troublesome.

Comparison of ZRP and ZHLS

As zone based mobile ad hoc network routing protocols, ZRP and ZHLS use different zone construction methods, which have critical effect on their performance. In ZRP, the network is divided into overlapping zones according to the topology knowledge for neighboring nodes of each node. ZHLS assumes that each node has a location system such as GPS and the geographical information is well known, and the network is geographically divided into non-overlapping zones. The performance of a zone based routing protocol is tightly related to the dynamics and size of the network and parameters for zone construction. However, because zones heavily overlap, ZRP in general will incur more overhead than ZHLS.

Quality of Service (QoS)

QoS is ordinarily described as a game plan of organization necessities that ought to be met by the framework while transporting a package stream from a source to its objective. The framework is depended upon to guarantee a course of action of quantifiable

pre-decided organization credits to the customers to the extent end-to-end execution, for instance, time, exchange speed need, probability of package mishap, the assortment in idleness (jitter), Route acquisition Delay, Communication Overhead, Scalability et cetera. Nature of organizations for a framework is measured in regards to guaranteed measure of data which a framework trades beginning with one place then onto the following in a given calendar opportunity. The measure of the off the cuff framework is particularly related to the idea of organization (QoS) of the framework. If the degree of the flexible uniquely named framework is tremendous, it might make the issue of framework control to an extraordinary degree troublesome. Nature of administration (QoS) is the execution level of an administration offered by the system to the client [8]. The objective of QoS provisioning is to accomplish a more deterministic system conduct, with the goal that data conveyed by the system can be better conveyed and system assets can be better used.

III. QoS parameters in mobile ad hoc networks

As diverse applications have distinctive prerequisites, the administrations required by them and the related QoS parameters vary from application to application. For instance, if there should be an occurrence of media applications time, data transfer capacity necessity, control prerequisite, likelihood of bundle misfortune, the variety in dormancy (jitter), Route obtaining Delay, Communication Overhead, Scalability are the key QoS parameters, while military applications have stringent security prerequisites. For applications, for example, crisis pursuit and safeguard operations, accessibility of system is the key QoS parameter. In WNs the QoS necessities are more affected by the asset imperatives of the hubs. A portion of the asset imperatives are battery charge, handling force, and support space.

Time complexity is defined as the largest time that can elapse between the moment T when the last topology change occurs and the moment at which all the routers have final shortest path and distance to all other routers.

Delay is the time elapsed from the departure of a data packet from the source node to the arrival at the destination node, including queuing delay, switching delay, propagation delay, etc.

Jitter is generally referred to as variations in delay, despite many other definitions. It is often caused by the difference in queuing delays experienced by consecutive packets.

Scalability: It is the ability of a computer application or product (hardware or software) to continue to function well when it (or its context) is changed in size or volume in order to meet a user need.

Packet loss rate is the percentage of data packets that are lost during the process of transmission.

IV. Comparison of routing protocols in mobile ad hoc networks

Now we will show the comparison between Table Driven, Demand Driven and Hybrid protocol. Table 1 shows the protocols and comparison between their QoS parameters, Demand Driven (On-Demand) with four types of protocols such as TORA, DSR, AODV and ABR and comparison between them shows in table 2.Table. Table 3 shows the Table Driven for four kind of protocols such as WRP, CGSR, DSDV, OLSR and comparison between them, 4 shows Time complexity of MANET Routing protocol.

Table-1

Protocol	Type	Time Complexity
DSDV	Table Driven	O (d)
CGSR	Table Driven	O (d)
WRP	Table Driven	O (d)
OLSR	Table Driven	O (d)
DSR	Demand Driven	O (2d)
AODV	Demand Driven	O (2d)
TORA	Demand Driven	O (2d)
ABR	Demand Driven	O(d+z)
ZRP	Hybrid	O (2d)

Table-2

Parameter	Table Driven(Proactive)	Demand Driven(Reactive)	Hybrid
Routing	Flat and	Mostly Flat	Hierarchical
Bandwidth	High	Low	Medium
Power	High	Low	Medium
Route acquisition delay	Lower	Higher	Lower for Intra-zone; Higher for Inter-zone
Control	High	Low	Medium
Communication	High	Low	Medium
Scalability	Up to hundred	Up to few hundred	Designed for up to 1000 or
Topology dissemination	Periodical	On-Demand	Both

Table-3

On-Demand	TORA	DSR	AODV	ABR
Routing Structure	Flat	Flat	Flat	Flat
Overall complexity	High	Medium	Medium	High
Frequency of update transmissions	Event driven	Event driven	Event driven	Periodically
Updates transmitted	Neighbors	Source	Source	Source
Overhead	Medium	Medium	Low	High
Loop Free	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Utilize hello messages	No	No	Yes	Yes
Multiple route	Yes	Yes	No	No
Routing metric	Shortest path	Shortest path	Freshest & Shortest path	Associatively & shortest path & others

Table-4

Table Driven	**CGSR**	**WRP**	**DSDV**	**OLSR**
Routing Structure	Hierarchical	Flat	Flat	Flat
Overall complexity	High	Low	High	Low
Frequency of update transmissions	Periodically	Periodically and as	Periodically and as needed	Periodically
Updates transmitted to	Neighbors and cluster Head	Neighbors	Neighbors	Neighbors
Scalable	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Loop Free	Yes	Yes but non instantaneously	Yes	Yes
Utilize hello messages	NO	YES	YES	YES
Critical nodes	Cluster head	NO	NO	MPRs
Multiple route support	NO	NO	NO	NO
Routing metric	Shortest path	Shortest path	Shortest path	Shortest path

V. CONCLUSION

MANETS are depended upon to accept an indispensable part in the association of future remote correspondence systems. Guiding is a key section of correspondence traditions in flexible uncommonly designated frameworks. The framework of the traditions are driven by specific goals and essentials in perspective of individual assumptions about the framework properties or application zone. Accordingly, it is important that these frameworks should have the ability to give gainful nature of organization (QoS) that can meet the vender requirements. To give capable nature of organization in adaptable uncommonly named frameworks, there is a solid need to develop new models and organizations for routine framework controls. The time deferral is the essential sensitivity toward QoS of coordinating traditions asking for that consistent data be transmitted within a positive time break. QoS backing is key for supporting time essential development sessions. In this segment we have examination of proactive and responsive and cross breed controlling traditions in light of gigantic QoS parameter like throughput, information exchange limit, time versatile quality, Power essential, Route getting deferment, Control overhead, Routing Structure, Communication Overhead, Scalability et cetera. The investigation tries to overview normal coordinating traditions and reveal the qualities and trade offs.

VI. REFERENCES

[1]. "Routing protocols in ad hoc networks: A survey" by Azzedine Boukerch,Begumhan Turgut,Nevin Aydin,Mohammad Z. Ahmad,Ladislau Bölöni ,Damla Turgut -Science Direct Volume 55 issue 13. 15 September 2015, Pages 3032-3080.

[2]. "Ad Hoc Wireless Networks, Architecture and Protocols",by C. Siva Ram Murthy and B.S Manoj Prentice Hall PTR, 2014.

[3]. "Mobile Ad Hoc Networks",by Stefano Basagni, Macro Conti, Silvia Giordano and Ivan Stojmenovic, IEEE press, A john Wily & Sons, INC. publication, 2013.

[4]. A Position-Based QoS Routing Scheme for UWB Mobile Ad Hoc Networks", by A. Abdrabou and W. Zhuang, IEEE JSAC, vol.24, Apr. 2014, pp. 850-56.

[5]. "A Taxonomy for Routing Protocols in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks"by L.M. Feeney, SICS Technical Report T14/07, October 2014.http://www.sics.se/~lmfeeney/research.html

[6]. "An overview of mobile ad-hoc network for the existing protocol and application" By Saleh Ali K.Al-Omari, Putra Sumari.International journal on application of graph theory in wireless ad hoc network and SN.Vol2,No.1,March 2013.

[7]. "Performance Evaluation of AODV, DSDV & DSR Routing Protocol in Grid Environment" By Nor Surayati Mohamad Usop, Azizol Abdullah, Ahmad Faisal Amri Abidin. paper.ijcsns.org.

[8]. "QoS Parameters Analysis to Improve QoS in MANETs Routing Protocol" by I.Panda, International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Electronics Engineering (IJARCSEE) Volume 1, Issue 7, September 2015.page 43-49.

[9]. "An Application-Aware QoS Routing Scheme with Improved Stability for Multimedia Applications in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks", by M. Wang and G.-S. Kuo,Proc. IEEE Vehic. Tech. Conf., Sept. 2015, pp. 1901-15.

[10]. "Study of Zone Based Multicast Routing Protocols in MANETs" by Indumathi.G1, Sindhuja. International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering Vol. 1, Issue 6, August 2014.

[11]. "An Efficient Routing Protocol for Wireless Networks" by S. Murphy, J.J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves, ACM Mobile Networks and Applications Journal, pages 183-197, Nov.2014.http://citeseer.nj.nec.com/10238.html

[12]. "QoS for Mobile Ad Hoc Networks" Diploma Thesis of Patrick Stüdi,Assistant: Jianbo Xue, ETH. March 2013.

[13]. "A Review of Current Routing Protocols for Ad Hoc Mobile Wireless Networks" by Elizabeth M. Royer,University of California, Santa Barbara Chai-Keong Toh, Georgia Institute of Technology.

[14]. "Routing Protocols for Ad-Hoc Mobile Wireless Networks", IEEE Personal Communications Magazine, April 2014, pp. 46-55.

[15]. "A novel routing protocol considering QoS parameter in MANET" by abbehdari, S.; Shamaei, M.; Darehshoorzadeh, A. IEEE Conference Publications 2010. QoS-ODMRP.