

	Similar performance for the given network size and traffic scenario. (500 Node Network)		Similar features: Discovery and Maintenance Mechanisms		Sharing distributed forwarding approaches		
	Geo Routing	RPL	AODV	DSR	DADR	HYDRO	HWMP
Scalability	High: > 2Million metering end points	Implementation specific. (Factors such as trickled timer, operating mode, etc.)	Low. Transmission of hello messages in a large network can become flooding. High cost of processing	Low. Maintenance of routing tables in a large network have a high cost	High. 1500 Node network topology. The protocol doesn't need too much overhead when updating routes.	High. As the protocol is defined by both centralized and distributed mechanisms.	Low. When 25 or mode nodes are in the network, congestions occur.
Latency	End-to-end delay: Avg 173ms	End-to-End Delay: Avg 160ms	High. Great amount of overhead generated (hello messages)	Better than that reached by AODV. Less Overhead	High. Data packets need to travel forward to serveral hops in order to reach the destination.	Better than the reached by DADR. The border router helps to forward packets faster.	End to end delay: 300ms for a 300 node network
Reliability	High: PDR>99%	High: PDR>99.9%	High: PDR>91.4%	High: PDR>96%	High: PDR > 97,8%. Protocol shows capability of learning new routes when link failures.	HIGH: PDR> 98,9%. Multiple routes are provided to a destination. Redundancy.	HIGH: PDR> 96% obtained when 9 nodes were deployed, but the protocol outperform when the number of nodes increase to 25 or more.
Adaptability	Highly adaptable to different network topologies	High. routing paths from the nodes to the central points are constructed according to the deployed architecture	High. Expiration time feature helps to clean up table potential broken and out-of-date links information	High. Any change in the network is detected through the Maintenance Mechanism.	High. Routing paths are updated/removed/constructed according to the topology state.	High. As the protocol involves the evaluation of links qualities according to topologies changes.	Highly adaptable to different network topologies
Routing scheme	Mesh-Under	Route-Over	Mesh-Under	Mesh-Under/Route-Over	Mesh-Under	Mesh-Under/Route-Over	Mesh-Under
Availability	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	High	Low
Data Delivery Priority	Application Dependant	Application Dependant	Application Dependant	Application Dependant	Application Dependant	Application Dependant	Application Dependant
Interoperability	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
Ease of Deployment	High	High	High	High	Low	High	Low