CS237 Project final report

(Project Report for CS 237 - Distributed Systems Middleware)

Kyle E. Benson and Zhipeng Huang Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences University of California, Irvine Irvine, California 92697

Email: kebenson@uci.edu, zhipengh@uci.edu

I. ALGORITHM

There are six routing heuristic algorithms that have been tested and compared in the simulation: orthogonal distant path heuristic, new region heuristic, new angle path heuristic, distant-dependent path heuristic, furthest first path heuristic and closest first path heuristic.

A. Orthogonal Distant Path Heuristic

The intuition of this heuristic is to avoid the straight path, without diverging from it too much. It strikes a middle ground by choosing a path at an ideal angle of 45° , which makes the angle at the top orthogonal, hence the name.

Algorithm 1:

```
\begin $$ /* Sensor, overlay and server node are a, c, b $$ respectively $$ idealDist = |0.5 \cdot dist(a,b)| $$ perpDist = |\sin(angA) \cdot dist(a,c)| $$ if $angA > \frac{\pi}{2}$ or $angA + angC < \frac{\pi}{2}$ or $perpDist > dist(a,b)$ then $likelihood = 0$ else $likelihood = 0.5 \cdot ((1.0 - (||perpDist| - ||idealDist||/idealDist)^2) + (1.0 - (|\frac{\pi}{2} - angC|/\frac{\pi}{2})^2))$ end $$$ end $$
```

B. New Region Heuristic

The intuition of this heuristic is to avoid regions that have been previously attempted unsuccessfully. We assume that no further attempts to contact such a region will succeed.

Algorithm 2:

```
\begin & \textbf{if } peer.region \in regionsAttempted \ \textbf{then } likelihood = 0 \\ & \textbf{else } likelihood = 1.0 \\ & \textbf{end} \\ \end{tabular}
```

C. New Angle Path Heuristic

This heuristic attempts paths along new angles different from the ones previously attempted.

Algorithm 3:

```
\begin{array}{c|c} \textbf{begin} \\ & angle = Angle(overlay, server) \\ & \textbf{if} \ angle = \pi \ \textbf{or} \ angle = 0 \ \textbf{then} \ initLikelihood = 0 \\ & \textbf{else} \ \textbf{if} \ angle < \pi \ \textbf{then} \ initLikelihood = \cos(angle - \frac{\pi}{4}) \\ & \textbf{else} \ \textbf{if} \ angle > \pi \ \textbf{then} \\ & initLikelihood = \cos(2 \cdot ((2\pi - angle) - \frac{\pi}{4})/3) \\ & \textbf{foreach} \ path \in paths Attempted \ \textbf{do} \\ & thisLikelihood = |\frac{\sin(angle)}{2}| \\ & newLikelihood* = thisLikelihood \\ \textbf{end} \end{array}
```

D. Distance-Dependent Path Heuristic

This heuristic attempts paths that use overlay nodes at an ideal distance from the sensor. This ideal distance is chosen as a radius that reaches half-way to the server.

Algorithm 4:

E. Furthest First Path Heuristic

Thus, this heuristic considers overlay peers located further away to be more likely candidates.

```
\begin & /* \mbox{minDistance} = \mbox{some constant small number} & */ \mbox{if } dist(a,b) < minDistance \mbox{then } likelihood = 0 \\ & \mbox{else } likelihood = (dist(a,b) - minDistance)/dist(a,b) \\ & \mbox{end} \end & \mbox{} \label{eq:constant}
```

F. Closest First Path Heuristic

The intuition of this heuristic is to contact nearby overlay nodes that have found a path out of the local region. We found, however, that this approach does not always work well in practice, likely due to the path similarity inherent with nearby nodes.

Algorithm 5:

II. CONCLUSION

There are certain aspects that need to be improved in the future. First of all, a detailed comparison between the six heuristics should be provided regarding items such as difference on convegence time, latency, and so on. Moreover, the purpose of the simulation of the six algorithms should be more clear.