Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology
15th August 2016. Vol.90. No.1
© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

SELF STABILIZED FRCA USING CONNECTED DOMINATING SET FOR WIRELESS MOBILE ADHOC SENSOR NETWORKS

[1]T MADHU, [2]S S V N SARMA, [3]J V R MURTHY

[1]Research Scholar, JNTUK, Kakinada &Associate Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering,
SRTIST, Nalgonda.
[2]Professor of CSE, Vagdevi College of Engineering, Warangal.
[3]Professor of CSE JNTUCE, JNTUK, Kakinada.
E-mail: [1]madhuthallapalli@yahoo.com, [2]Ssvn.sarma@gmail.com, [3]mjonnalagadda@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Wireless Mobile Ad hoc Sensor Networks (WMASNs) are infrastructure less, multiple hop, energetic network constructed using a group of moveable nodes. Self-stabilization is a theoretic outline of non-screening fault-tolerant. This scheme endures any sort and any countable amount of transitory errors like information damage, memory exploitation, and topological deviations. This paper suggested a novel self-stabilized methodology to the existing Fuzzy Based Clustering Algorithm as to guarantee that event though in case of a cluster head selection for different clusters, when the network attains any illegitimate state, this novel approach always reaches to a legitimate state. The self-stabilization for the clustering network is achieved by constructing a minimum Connect Dominating Sets (CDS) that is employed with Bread First Search (BFS) Tree construction and the proof for the correctness of the self-stabilized approach is given. The proof of correctness is given by means of five guarded-commands in this algorithm.

Keywords: *Wireless Sensor Networks, Self-Stabilization, Connect Dominating Sets, Clustering Head Selection, Breadth First Search*

1. INTRODUCTION

WMASNs [1-3] are infrastructure less, multiple hop, energetic network developed using a group of moveable nodes. This comprises of moveable sensor nodes that constructs a network deprived of any stable infrastructure or any central supervision. In these systems, every node links with another nodes instantly or through intermediary nodes. This form of structure is tremendously interesting owing to the deficiency of infrastructure, price efficacy and simple connection. The deliberations in the systems are to enhance the network constancy, flexibility, bandwidth consumption, and source distribution & administration effectiveness. Wireless sensor networks (WSNs) posture novel research demands associated to the design of procedures, network prototypes, and software that will permit the progress of applications grounded on sensor appliances. Numerous clustering approaches are being accomplished to attain these goals [4-6]. The clustering approach with Adhoc sensor networks is a group of procedures and a group of communication associations amongst the procedures. This structures are tend to fail by their exact environment.

The region of self-stabilization in an enormous sized networks attained accumulative attention amongst scholars, as self-stabilization offers a groundwork for self-properties, comprising self-soothing, self-establishing and self-adaptive. Self-stabilization is a theoretic outline of an unmasking fault-tolerant Grouping procedures. This sort of approach endures any kind and any countable amount of transitory faults like information damage, memory corruption, and topology variation. Since such transitory errors happen so repeatedly in ad hoc networks, clustering approaches on them must endure the actions. Self-stabilizing procedures can initialize implementation from a random (illegitimate) system formation, and ultimately attain an authentic formation. That is, the approach does not requisite entire initializations of circumstances of every procedure and every association. By this property, they with- stand any form and any countable amount of transitory errors and could alter to energetic alterations of

Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology
15th August 2016. Vol.90. No.1
© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

the structure [7]. Furthermore, a self-stabilizing method does not prerequisite a worldwide and coordinated beginning of every procedure whenever a method is initiated, since it can be contemplated that such an initialization conformation is a formation just next to transitory errors that happens.

Definition 1: Consider Γ to *be a group of entire configurations. System S is* self-stabilizing *pertaining to* Δ *in such a way that* $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ *if it fulfills the subsequent both circumstances:*

- *Convergence: Initiating from a random configuration, the configurations ultimately attains to one in* Δ,
- *Closure: For any configuration* $\lambda \in \Delta$, *configuration* γ *that follows* λ *is similar in* Δ *providing that the method do not fail.*

Every $\gamma \in \Delta$ *is known an authentic configuration.*

The Fuzzy Relevance Based Cluster Head Selection Algorithm (FRCA) [8] changes in the network and makes the system stable. This Clustering algorithm does not has the capability to ultimately recuperate to its legal or legitimate state subsequently to any transitory error deprived of any exterior interference. Thus, in order to overcome this issue, this paper proposed a novel self-stabilized methodology to the existing Fuzzy Based Clustering Algorithm as to guarantee that event though in course of a cluster head selection for different clusters, when the network attains any illegitimate state, this novel approach always reaches to a legitimate state. The efficient formation of self-stabilized algorithm plays a significant role in handling rate, performance enhancement, and network constancy. The self-stabilization for the clustering network is achieved by constructing a minimum Connect Dominating Sets (CDS) employed with Bread First Search (BFS) Tree construction and the proof for the correctness of the self-stabilized approach is given. The proof of correctness is given by employing the five guarded-commands in this algorithm.

1.1 Organization of the Paper

A brief overview of Wireless Adhoc sensor networks and self-stabilization along with the motivation for the proposed approach is given in this section. A brief discussion on the literature survey on the self-stabilization techniques and connected dominating sets are given in section 2. A detailed explanation on the Fuzzy Relevance Based Clustered Head Selection Approach is given in section 3. Proposed Self Stabilized FRCA approach is briefly given in section 4. The section 5 proves the developed Self Stabilized Cluster Head Algorithm using the Guard-Command Statements by defining Self Stabilization followed by conclusion for the approach and the references in the section 6 and section 7.

2. LITERATURE SURVEY

Self-stabilization [12, 13] is an adaptable property, permitting a procedure to survive transitory errors in a distributed structure. A self-stabilizing procedure, subsequent to transitory doings triumph the organism and place it in certain random universal condition, makes the system to regain in countable number deprived of any outdoor (e.g., human) interference. There are numerous asynchronous self-stabilizing disseminated approaches for obtaining a k-dominating group of network [11, 10, 9]. All these approaches are verified pretending with an unfair inspiration. The outcome in [11] stabilizes in O (k) by means of O(k log n) space per procedure. In [10], the approach stabilizes in O (n) circles by means of O(log n) space per procedure. Procedure suggested in [9] stabilizes in O(kn) circles by means of O(k log n) space per procedure. Consider that solitary the approach in [10] constructs a k-dominating group which is negligible. Furthermore, none of these outcomes assurances to provide minor k-dominating group. There are numerous self-stabilizing results that calculate negligible 1-dominating group [14, 15]. Nevertheless, the simplification of 1-dominating group outcomes to k-dominating group outcomes do not upgrade, in specific it does not preserve fascinating boundaries on the dimension of the evaluated dominating group.

In the approach of [16] entire group of nodes of a MIS, having a distance of two or three hops, are linked by choosing intermediary nodes as dominators. In graph theory, CDS is a famous issue, initially presented in [17] in 1979 and chiefly considered from that time. In [18] two integrated approaches are suggested to construct a CDS. In [19], [20] disseminated executions of the two preceding approaches are suggested. In [21], a heuristic-dependent integrated approach for the establishment of minimum CDS introduced. In both versions, they initially employed disseminated leader election approach

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

[22] to develop a rooted spanning tree. Later, a repetitive group approach is employed to categorize the nodes that can be black (dominator) or gray (dominated), depending on its positions. Position of a node is an orderly couple of its deepness in the tree and its ID. In [23], a disseminated approach is suggested for an estimation of MWCDS, depending on a controlling group. This methodology is segregated into two stages: the initial one picks the nodes having minimal weights nearby that exist in the controlling group and later picks linkers amongst the left nodes.

In [24], a self-stabilizing approach is recommended for Minimal CDS whose nodes in the system have diverse broadcasting ranges. This issue is a specific instance of LWCDS considering the weight as the communicating range. The suggested methodology is similar to the methodology in [25], by accumulating a ranking function to elect the node with extreme range in the MIS. In [26], an approach which constructs CDS designed using nodes with extreme dynamism is anticipated. This outcome is nearer to [25] nevertheless building a tree depends on the energy obsessed. Maximum study that specify the development of a CDS attempts to minimize the dimension of the group (Minimal CDS). For this issue, it is further fascinated in minimizing the weight compared to the dimension of the CDS. The issue of LWCDS development has been investigated in the research and disseminated approaches have been suggested along with continuous estimation.

3. FRCA SELECTION ALGROITHM

Clustering is a noteworthy approach that professionally gives data for moveable nodes and progresses the functioning capability of routing, bandwidth distribution, and source administration & allocation. FRCA is a clustering procedure that competently groups and accomplishes sensors by means of the fuzzy data of node position in the system. FRCA employs the Fuzzy Relevance Degree (FRD) using the fuzzy value μ [15] as to accomplish and handle grouping. Thus, in this approach, FRD accomplishes grouping by electing certain nodes which functions like coordinating points for cluster. The fuzzy state observing scheme that implements clustering, contains 5 factors: ID, μ, Level, M-hop, and Balance. The Cluster Head (CH) and Cluster Member (CM) are elected by means of fuzzy value μ in the FSV scheme.

FRD is employed to resolve elasticity and regulate the iteration of multiple hop grouping. FRD regulates the amount of clusters to enhance effectiveness. Grouping depends on FRD that assists in preserving outline of cluster as steady as probable, therefore diminishing the topological variations and related expenditures in the course of Cluster Head deviations. The cluster as probable, and the head in the hierarchical scheme plays a significant part in inter-cluster and intra-cluster interactions. Therefore, cluster head functions like indigenous points for its membership nodes and handles the group individuals. A gateway node is a node which links the channel amongst the inter-cluster and intra-cluster interaction. A gateway functions as a mutual or disseminated access point for two cluster heads. Mutually, disseminated gateways offer route for inter-cluster interactions. The regular nodes of the group are instant adjacent of the cluster heads. These have the competence of working as either head or gateway.

FSV Scheme

FSV (Fuzzy State Viewing) scheme groups flexibly and is effective whenever dimension of networks diverges pertaining to movability of nodes. A node transfers not merely packets whereas the fuzzy value to adjacent nodes in FSV Approach. The specified fuzzy value is employed to avoid interventions and outbreaks from other nodes. Group consists of a CH, CH candidate, gateway, and CMs. Cluster nodes, categorized as Cluster Head, Cluster Member, gateway node, and Cluster Head candidate pertaining to its character, transmitting data.

CH Selection

Effective choosing of CH has an immense effect on the grouping scheme. This approach, nevertheless, employs constraints mutually to pick the cluster head by means of FRD and specified by obtainable signal power, and distance amongst the nodes

Fuzzy Relevance Degree

Fuzzy Relevance Degree (FRD) of a node signifies degree of consistency given using adjacent nodes in the systems. The FRCA approach elects the CH depending on the fuzzy significance, accessible power, movability, and the distance amongst nodes. The accessible power, distance amongst nodes, and movability

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

of nodes are accomplished to sustain stability of energy consumption. The distance amongst nodes and movability is accomplished to preserve stability amongst the groups. The FRCA implements grouping depending on constraints specified before and chooses the cluster head for effective grouping. For n nodes of $N = \{x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots\dots x_n\}$, the fuzzy set, $\mu(x_i)$, is specified with subsequent equation (1):

$$\mu(x_i) = \{\mu(x_1), \mu(x_2), \mu(x_3) \dots\dots \mu(x_n)\}, (1 \leq i \leq 1) \quad (1)$$

Where, x_i is a membership node for grouping in systems, and $\mu(x)$ is an association function. Formerly, the fuzzy relevance degree for node x_i i.e. $FRD\ (x_i)$, is specified with subsequent Equation (2):

$$FRD(x_i) = \frac{E_i(t)}{\sum_{j=i}^{n} E_j(t)} \times \mu(x_i) \quad (2)$$

Here $E_i(t)$ is the energy of node x_i at time t specified using total accessible power of adjacent nodes for node x_i. The CH is measures depending on existing power, signal power, and distance. Bearing these constraints, the combined metric is specified using Equation (3):

$$Cost\ (x_i) = AP(x_i) + RS(x_i) + d(x_i) \quad (3)$$

The $Cost\ (x_i)$ is calculated for whole probable cluster heads, and later the cluster head is preferred using minimal (x_i) . Where $AP(x_i)$ is the available power, $RS(x_i)$ is the Received Signal Strength and $d(x_i)$ is the distance amongst the CH i and Membership node j.

Initially, a node having higher energy strength and stouter signal has additional possibility to be as the head in a group. Consequently, the node with minimal price becomes the CH candidate. Then, a non-CH node having maximum power strength compared to those of adjacent nodes that might be a cluster head candidate. The elected cluster head candidate need to inform its adjacent nodes of CH candidate for election (NOTICE_CH_CANDIDATE). Then, cluster members which are not the CH transmits join request information (REQ_JOIN) to nearby CH. If the node is not a CH candidate (NOT_CH_CANDIDATE), formerly the node moves to adjacent nodes which it is a cluster member. Once elected CH by FRD, every cluster scheme implements grouping for adjacent nodes. If the node necessitates grouping, formally it verifies the condition of its own node initially and then verifies the number of nodes of every group. Clustering is specified by verifying the amount of nodes through transmitting FSV data.

4. SELF STABILIZED FRCA USING CONNECTED DOMINATING SETS

In this paper, a novel methodology is suggested to induce concept of self-stabilization into the Fuzzy Relevance based Cluster Head Selection algorithm which is very essential for the wireless mobile Adhoc sensor networks when any illegitimate transient faults occurs. In this approach the concept of self-stabilization is introduced by construction a minimal Connected Dominating Sets. The Connected Dominating Set is beneficial in the evaluation of information transmit and other issues for ad hoc sensor networks. The Ad hoc networks are group of wireless mobile sensor nodes, and having no physical support arrangement and no integrated management. Thus, a Connected Dominating Set designed with the procedures are employed for virtual strength that has a significant part for transmission and connectivity administration etc. A group of nodes is a CDS if the group is associated and every node in the system is either in group or adjacent to nodes in group. Maximum CDS establishing approaches aim to diminish the backbone dimension deprived of consideration nodes features like energy ingestion or flexibility.

The minimal CDS in this proposed approach is constructed by constructing a Breadth First Search Tree for cluster graph G. In order to construct a BFS, selection of an efficient root node is essential. The root node that is employed for this proposed methodology is the Cluster Head (CH) of the clustering algorithm which is selected using Fuzzy Relevance Degree (FRD). Initially, the proposed novel approach selects the Cluster Head Sensor node ch_v from the Cluster Graph G_c, develops a BFS tree T of G_c embedded in ch_v. For any Cluster Member (CM) sensor node cm_{v_i}, let $L(cm_{v_i})$ represent the distance from ch_v to cm_{v_i}. Let C_k represents the deepness of T with higher distance in G_c, C_{L_d} is the group of nodes that has distance d from the root $(0 \leq d \leq C_k)$. The CDS by empirical is the amalgamation of two subcategories, i.e., $(\cup_{d=0}^{k} IC_d) \cup (\cup_{d=0}^{k} SC_d)$.

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

- Initial subsection $(\bigcup_{d=0}^{k} IC_d)$ is a Maximal Independent Set (MIS) for G_c. The source ch_v absolutely connects a groupIC_0. Let DC_d be a group of nodes $cm_{v_i} \in LC_d$ that is conquered by certain node in IC_{d-1}. For every $1 \le d \le C_k$, IC_d is an MIS in an persuaded subgraph by LC_d/DC_d. That is, the experiment overlays domain controlled by the associates of *IC* in the line of accumulating $L(cm_{v_i})$ from *v*.
- The subsequent subset is $(\bigcup_{d=0}^{k} SC_d)$, where the group SC_d of nodes that are the parents of the members of IC_d for every 1≤*d* ≤ C_k. It is known that $SC_d \subset LC_{d-1}$.

This approach of establishment of an MIS $(\bigcup_{d=0}^{k} IC_d)$ is paving on a BFS tree. For any group $C \subset V$ and any node$ch_v \notin C$, consider the distance amongst ch_v and C to be the minimal amongst cm_{v_i} and any $cm_{v_j} \in C$. On the MIS developed by paving on a BFS tree, set fulfills the subsequent technique.

__Statement 1:__ Let i'_c be the MIS developed by paving on a BFS tree T. For any cm_{v_i} in i'_c, the distance amongst cm_{v_i} and $i'_c\{cm_{v_i}\}$ is precisely two hops.

The proof of the statement is similar to the one in [16]. Due to the constraint of space, proof of the statement is left. By Statement1, the associativity of the CDS is guaranteed. With the proof of Statement 1, in the MIS developed by paving on *T*, every member $cm_{v_i} \in LC_d$ of the MIS have a parent on *T* that is adjacent to minimum single member of MIS in LC_{d-1} or LC_{d-2}. Consequently, amalgamation of the MIS and a group of parents of the members of the MIS are linked. As the MIS is likewise a minimum controlling group, the amalgamation is a CDS. It is vibrant that, if every member $cm_{v_i} \in LC_d$ of any MIS has a parent that is adjacent to minimum of single member of the MIS in LC_{d-1} or LC_{d-2} on *T*, formally it is noted that MIS is developed by paving on *T*.

__BFS Tree Construction for FRCA Algorithm:__

1. Pick the cluster head node $ch_v \in C$.
2. Establish a BFS tree T of G_c entrenched at ch_v.
3. Consider *k* to be the depth of T.
4. For every $0 \le d \le k$, let LC_d represent group of nodes at distance *d* from the root in T.
   a. Set $IC_0 : \{cm\}; S_0 := \theta$
   b. For *d=1* to *k* do initiate
   c. $DC_d := \{u | u \in LC_d \text{ and } u \text{ is dominated by certain sensor nodes}$
   d. Select MIS IC_d in $G(LC_d/D_d)$
   e. $S_d := \{u_f | u_f \text{ is the parent in } T \text{ of some } cm_{v_i} \in IC_d\}$
5. End
6. Output $(\bigcup_{d=0}^{k} IC_d) \cup (\bigcup_{d=0}^{k} SC_d)$ as the CDS.

__Description 1__: Let i'_c be any MIS developed by paving on a BFS tree T for G_c. Consider $S'_c (\neq \phi)$ to be a group of nodes where every parent is the member in i'_c on T. The group of nodes $i'_c \cup S'_c$ is a CDS-tree *of T.*

Now, a self-stabilizing algorithm i.e. SS-FRCA is introduced to find a CDS-tree. It is assumed deprived of loss of generalization that every procedure P_{c_i} has the subsequent variables as outcome of the BFS tree *T*, and as an input of SS-CDS.

- $D(P_{c_i})$ – The system id of the parent of P_{c_i} on *T*.
- $D(P_{c_i})$ -- The distance from the root P_{ch_i} to P_{c_i} on *T*.

The outcome of every system is

- $dominate(P_{c_i})$ – Considers a Boolean, if P_{c_i} is a member of CDS.

Formal explanation of suggested approach SS-FRCA is given. There are five Guarded-Commands (GC_1-GC_5) in approach.

- Using GC_1, root P_{ch_i} of *T* along with $D(P_{ch_i}) = 0$ combines together the MIS and CDS.
- Using GC_2 and GC_3, procedure $P_{c_i}(\neq P_{ch_i})$ chooses if P_{c_i}amalgamates with MIS.
  - If every adjacent $P_{c_i} \in N_{c_i}$ where $D(P_{c_i}) \ge D(P_{c_j})$ present is not a member of the MIS, formally P_{c_i} combines the MIS by GC_2.
  - If there persists an adjacent P_{c_j} in such a way that $D(P_{c_i}) > D(P_{c_j})$ is preserved and P_{c_j} is

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

member of MIS, formally P_{c_j} removes the MIS by GC_3.

- Using GC_4 and GC_5, procedure $P_{c_i}(\neq P_{ch_i})$ chooses if P_{c_i} combines the CDS.
    - If P_{c_i} or it's at minimum single offspring on T is member of MIS, formally P_{c_i} combines the CDS uisng GC_4.
    - Else, P_{c_i} removes the CDS using GC_5.

Using Γ, group of entire configurations of SS-FRCA are represented. Group of legal configurations is given below.

Description 2: A configuration γ is legal *if the subsequent three circumstances are fulfilled.*

- *Circumstance 1: γ is in Γ_I, where $\Gamma_I \subset \Gamma$ is group of configurations in such a way that the group of procedures $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is an MIS of G that fulfills Statement 1 on T,*
- *Circumstance 2: $individual(P_{c_i}) = T$ indicates $dominate(P_{c_i}) = T$ for every P_{c_i}, and*
- *Circumstance 3: a set $\{P_{c_i}|dominate(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is a CDS-tree of G_C.*

Using Δ_C, it is represented as a group of legal configurations of SS-CDS.

5. PROOF OF CORRECTNESS FOR SELF STABILIZATION

Lemma 1: *No procedure is honored in configuration γ if $\gamma \in \Delta_C$.*

Proof: Consider γ to be configuration where no procedure is fortunate. Let $\gamma \in \Delta_C$.

- Assume that Circumstance 1 is incorrect, i.e., $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is not an MIS that fulfills Statement 1 on *T*. That is, the group $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is not a self-determining group, is not maximum, or does not fulfills Statement 1 on *T*.
    - It is considered that group is not a self-determining group, there persists P_{c_i} and P_{c_j} in the group in such a way that they are adjacent to one another. If $D(P_{c_i}) = D(P_{c_j}) \neq 0$, the guard of GC3 is correct at P_{c_i} and P_{c_j} since $individual(P_{c_i}) = individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T$. Likewise, if $0 \leq D(P_{c_i}) < D(P_{c_j})$. Formally the guard of GC_3 is correct at P_{c_j} (respP_{c_i}). This is inconsistent for the hypothesis that no procedure is honored in γ. Consequently, the group $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is a self-regulating group.
    - It is considered that the group is not maximum. That is, there persists a system P_{c_i} with $individual(P_{c_i}) = F$ that has no adjacent P_{c_j} along with$individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T$.
    - If $D(P_{c_i})$, formally the guard of GC_1 is correct at P_{c_i}. If $D(P_{c_i}) \neq 0$, formally $\forall P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}[D\left(P_{c_j}\right) > D(P_{c_i}) \vee individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = F]$ grasps at P_{c_j}, and the guard of GC_2 is correct at P_{c_j}. This is inconsistent for hypothesis that no procedure is honored in consequently, $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is an MIS.
    - It is considered that the group does not fulfills Statement 1 on *T*. By proof of Statement 1, this hypothesis specifies that there persists a procedure $P_{c_i} \neq P_{c_j}$ having $individual(P_{c_i}) = T$ whose parent $P_{c_f}(= P(P_{c_i}) \in N_{c_i}$ on T is not neighbor to other system P_{c_j} using $individual(P_{c_j}) = T$ and $D(P_{c_j}) \leq D(P_{c_f})$. Since $D(P_{c_f}) = D(P_{c_i}) - 1$, this hypothesis indicates that $\forall P_{c_j} \in N_{c_f}[D\left(P_{c_j}\right) > D\left(P_{c_f}\right) \vee individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = F]$. Formerly, the guard of GC_2 is correct at P_{c_f} . This is an inconsistency for hypothesis that no procedure is honored in γ. Consequently, the group $\{P_{c_i}|individual(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ fulfills Statement 1 on *T*. Consequently, Circumstance 1 is true.

- Assume that Circumstance 2 is incorrect, i.e., there is a procedure P_{c_j}

Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology
15th August 2016. Vol.90. No.1
© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

having $individual(P_{c_i}) = T$, whereas $dominate(P_{c_i}) = F$. If $D(P_{c_i}) = 0$, formally the guard of GC_1 is correct at P_{c_i}. If $D(P_{c_i}) \neq 0$, formally the guard of GC_4 is correct at P_{c_i}. This is an inconsistent for hypothesis that no procedure is honored. Consequently, the Circumstance 2 is true.

- Assume that Circumstance 3 is incorrect. That is, the group $\{P_{c_i} | dominate(P_{c_i}) = T\}$ is not a Connected Dominating Set tree of G_c.
  - Consider that group is not Connected Dominating Set. Using the circumstance 2, the group is a dominating group since it is known that an MIS is a dominating group. Consequently, group is not linked. With Description 1, there is a procedure P_{c_i} along with $dominate(P_{c_i}) = F$ that is a parent of P_{c_j} having $individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T$ for the hypothesis. Formally, the guard of GC_4 is correct at P_{c_i}. This is inconsistency for the hypothesis that no procedure is honored. Consequently, the group is a CDS.
  - Consider that the group is a CDS, but not a CDS tree. Formally, by Description 1, there is a procedure P_{c_i} having $dominate(P_{c_i}) = T$, however neither P_{c_i} nor its offspring are the members of the MIS. Formerly, GC_5 is correct at P_{c_i}. This is an inconsistent for hypothesis that no procedure is honored.

Thus, the Circumstance 3 is correct.

Hence, $\gamma \in \Delta_c$ if no procedure is honored.

It is known that no procedure is honored if the configuration is authentic.

Lemma 2: *For any configuration γ_0 and evaluation initiating from γ_0, ultimately no procedure is honored.*

Proof: Initially, the root procedure P_{ch} having $L(P_{ch}) = 0$ implements GC1 at maximum, and selects the $individual(P_{ch}) = T$ and $dominate(P_{ch}) = T$. These values certainly does not alter subsequently, since they are not altered by other guarded-commands. Consequently, It is assumed underneath that the values of them are accurate at P_{ch}.

Using description of SS-FRCA, at $P_{c_i} \neq P_{c_r}$, the value of $individual(P_{c_i})$ is specified with GC_2 or GC_3, and these guarded commands does not denote to $individual\left(P_{c_j}\right)$ of any procedure P_{c_i}. Consequently, the value of $individual(P_{c_i})$ is specified prior to $dominate(P_{c_i})$ is specified at every procedure P_{c_i}.

Assume that there is an infinite (non-congregating) evaluation initiating from γ_0. Formally, there is a procedure P_{c_i} such that $D(P_{c_i}) \neq 0$ which implements extremely regularly.

- Assume that P_{c_i} having $D(P_{c_i}) = 1$ fluctuates the value of $individual(P_{c_i})$ interminably regularly, i.e., Pi implements GC_2 and GC_3 interchangeably substantially frequently. Nevertheless, since $individual(P_{ch}) = T$ preserves at P_{ch} and the value not ever alters, P_{c_j} could not implement GC_2 by the description of procedure. That is, P_{c_j} implements GC_3 at maximum once. Consequently, P_{c_j} having $D(P_{c_i}) = 1$ cannot implement substantially frequent.
- Assume that P_{c_i} having $D(P_{c_i}) = d(d > 1)$ fluctuates the value of $individual(P_{c_j})$ considerably frequent, and presume that P_h having $D(P_h) = 1$ not ever implements. Formally, $P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}$ having $D(P_{c_j}) = d$ need to alter the value of $individual(P_{c_j})$ considerably frequent using the description of GC_2 and GC_3. If there is a procedure $P_h \in N_{c_i}$ with $D(P_h) = d - 1$ and $individual(P_h) = T$, formally P_{c_i} could not implement GC_2. Formally, P_{c_i} cannot implement GC_3 considerably frequent. Consequently, there is no procedure $P_h \in N_{c_i}$ with $D(P_h) = d - 1$ and $individual(P_h) = T$. Nevertheless, P_{c_i} can alter the value of $individual(P_{c_i})$ from incorrect to correct by GC_2 merely whenever entire

Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology
15th August 2016. Vol.90. No.1
© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

it's adjacent P_{c_i} having $D(P_{c_i}) = true$ contains $individula(P_{c_j}) = F$ by the description of 2. After P_{c_i} implements GC_2, the guard of GC_2 cannot be correct for entire of its adjacent P_{c_j} with $D(P_{c_j}) = d$. Consequently, P_{c_j} cannot alter the value of $individual(P_{c_j})$ considerably frequent. This is an inconsistent hypothesis. Consequently, P_{c_i} and P_{c_i} cannot implement GC_2 and GC3 considerably frequent.

There is no procedure that implements GC_2 and GC_3 substantially frequent. It is assume underneath that the value of $ind(P_{c_i})$ of every P_{c_i} is accurate, and not ever varies.

Assume that P_{c_i} varies $dom(P_{c_i})$substantially frequent, i.e., P_{c_i} implements GC_4 and GC_5 interchangeably substantially frequently. Nevertheless, using the description of GC_4 and GC_5, every procedure *Pi* specifies the value of $dominate(P_{c_i})$ depending merely on $individual(P_{c_i})$ and every $individual(P_{c_i})$ where P_{c_j} is an offspring of P_{c_i} on *T*. This is inconsistent for the hypothesis that for $dominate(P_{c_i})$ of every procedure P_{c_i} not ever alters. The value of $dom(P_{c_i})$ alters at maximum once.

Consequently, P_{c_i} cannot implement substantially frequent.

Theorem 2: *The procedure* SS-CDS *is self-stabilizing with regard to* Δ_c.

Proof: Considering from Lemmas 1 and 2.

SS-FRCA: A self-stabilizing estimation procedure for FRCA

Constants—read merely and spontaneously updated

- N_{c_i}: Group of adjacent of *Pi* in original Graph G_c.
- $P(P_{c_i})$: Parent of P_{c_i} in *T*.
- $D(P_{c_i})$: The distance from the root in *T*.

Variables

- $individual(P_{c_i})$: T if P_{c_i} is an associate of an MIS.
- $dominate(P_{c_i})$: T iff P_{c_i} is an associate of a CDS.

Macro

- $Grd_k(k = 2,3)$: The guard of GC_K

A Set of Guarded-Commands:

/*GC_1: *Root links an MIS and a CDS.* */

$$L(P_{c_i}) = 0 \wedge \{individual(P_{c_i}) = F \vee dominate(P_{c_i}) = F\} \rightarrow individual(P_{c_i}) := T; dominate(P_{c_i}) := T;$$

/*GC_2: *Link an MIS.* */

$$L(P_{c_i}) \neq 0 \wedge individual(P_{c_i}) \wedge \forall P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}\left[D\left(P_{c_j}\right) > D(P_{c_i}) \vee ind\left(P_{c_j}\right) = F\right] \rightarrow individual(P_{c_i}) := T;$$

/*GC_3: *Remove an MIS.* */

$$L(P_{c_i}) \neq 0 \wedge individual(P_{c_i}) = T \wedge \exists P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}\left[D(P_{c_i}) \leq D(P_{c_i}) \wedge individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T\right] \rightarrow individual(P_{c_i}) := F;$$

/*GC_4: *Link a CDS.* */

$$L(P_{c_i}) \neq 0 \wedge \neg Grd_2 \wedge \neg Grd_3 \wedge dominate(P_{c_i}) = F \wedge \left\{\exists P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}\left[P\left(P_{c_j}\right) = P_{c_i} \wedge individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T\right] \vee individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = T\right\} \rightarrow dominate(P_{c_i}) := T;$$

/*GC_5: *Remove a CDS.* */

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

$$L(P_{c_i}) \neq 0 \wedge \neg Grd_2 \wedge \neg Grd_3 \wedge dominate(P_{c_i}) = T \wedge \left\{\forall P_{c_j} \in N_{c_i}\left[P\left(P_{c_j}\right) \neq P_{c_i} \vee individual\left(P_{c_j}\right) = F\right] \wedge ind\left(P_{c_j}\right) = F\right\} \rightarrow dominate(P_{c_i}) := F;$$

6. CONCLUSIONS

The Wireless Adhoc Networks are the infrastructure less networks that does not have any wired structure or any standard format while the construction of network. In this paper, the self-stabilization for the clustering algorithm is achieved that is employed for the mobile Adhoc sensor networks. The self-stabilization for the proposed approach is developed using the minimal connected dominating sets which is obtained initially by means of constructing the Breadth First Search (BFS) Tree for the clustered networks and obtaining minimal CDS from that tree construction. This approach also provided the proof for the correctness of the self-stabilizing clustering network.

REFERENCES

[1] V. S. Anitha, M. P. Sebastian, "SCAM: Scenario-based clustering algorithm for mobile ad hoc networks", *In Proceedings of the 2009 13th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Distributed Simulation and Real-Time Applications*, Singapore, pp. 97-104, October 2009.

[2] S. Basagni, M. Mastrogiovanni, A. Panconesi, C. Petrioli, "Localized protocols for ad hoc Clustering and backbone formation: A performance comparison", IEEE Transactions in Parallel Distribution Systems, Vol. 17, pp. 292-306, 2006.

[3] S. K. Dhurandher, G. V. Singh, "Weighted-based adaptive clustering algorithm in mobile ad hoc networks", In Proceedings of ICPWC'2005, New Delhi, India, pp. 96-100, January 2005.

[4] L. Gao, D. Mu, Y. Wang, G. Zhang, L. Zhang, "A novel clustering algorithm for ad hoc network" In Proceedings of ICIEA 2009, The 4th IEEE Conference on Industrial Electronic and Applications, Xi'an, China, pp. 445-448, May 2009.

[5] R. Agarwal, M. Motwani, "Survey of clustering algorithm for MANET". International Journal Computer Science Engineering, Vol. 1, pp. 98-104, 2009.

[6] D. Lacks, M. Chatterjee, T. Kocak, "Design and evaluation of a distributed clustering algorithm for mobile ad hoc networks", Journal of Computing, Vol. 52, pp. 656-670, 2009.

[7] E. W. Dijkstra, "Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control", Communications of the ACM, Vol. 17, No. 11, pp. 643–644, 1974.

[8] Chongdeuk Lee and Taegwon Jeong, "FRCA: A Fuzzy Relevance-Based Cluster Head Selection Algorithm for Wireless Mobile Ad-Hoc Sensor Networks", Sensors 2011, vol. 11, No. 5, pp.5383-5401, 2011.

[9] Eddy Caron, Ajoy K. Datta, Benjamin Depardon, and Lawrence L. Larmore, "A self-stabilizing k-clustering algorithm for weighted graphs", JPDC, Vol. 70, No. 11, pp. 1159–1173, 2010.

[10] Ajoy K. Datta, Stéphane Devismes, and Lawrence L. Larmore. "A self-stabilizing o (n)-round k-clustering algorithm", In SRDS, pages 147–155, 2009.

[11] Ajoy K. Datta, Lawrence L. Larmore, and Priyanka Vemula, "A Self-Stabilizing O (k)-Time k-Clustering Algorithm", the Computer Journal, 2009.

[12] Edsger W. Dijkstra, "Self-stabilizing systems in spite of distributed control", Communications ACM, Vol. 17, pp. 643–644, 1974.

[13] Shlomi Dolev. Self-stabilization. MIT Press, 2000

[14] Michiyo Ikeda, Sayaka Kamei, and Hirotsugu Kakugawa, "A space-optimal self-stabilizing algorithm for the maximal independent set problem", In PDCAT, pages 70–74, 2002.

[15] S. Shukla, D. J. Rosenkrantz, and S. S. Ravi, "Observations on self-stabilizing graph algorithms on anonymous networks", In WSS, pages 7.1–7.15, 1995.

[16] K. M. Alzoubi, P.-J. Wan, and O. Frieder, "Message-Optimal Connected Dominating Sets in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks," in MobiHoc '02: Proc. 3rd ACM International Symposium on Mobile ad hoc networking & computing. New York, USA: ACM, pp. 157–164, 2002.

© 2005 - 2016 JATIT & LLS. All rights reserved·
ISSN: 1992-8645 www.jatit.org E-ISSN: 1817-3195

[17] E Sampathkumar and HB Walikar, "The connected domination number of a graph" Journal of Mathematical Physical Sciences, Vol. 13, pp. 607–613, 1979.
[18] S. Guha and S. Khuller, "Approximation algorithms for connected dominating sets. Algorithmica, Vol. 20, pp. 374–387, April 1998.
[19] Bevan Das, Raghupathy Sivakumar, and Vaduvur Bharghavan, "Routing in ad hoc networks using a spine", In ICCCN, pages 34–41, 1997.
[20] Bevan Das and Vaduvur Bharghavan, "Routing in ad-hoc networks using minimum connected dominating sets", In ICC, Vol. 1, pages 376–380, 1997.
[21] M.V. Marathe, H. Breu, H. B. Hunt Iii, S. S. Ravi, and D. J. Rosenkrantz, "Simple heuristics for unit disk graphs", Networks, 25:59–68, 1995.
[22] Israel Cidon and Osnat Mokryn, "Propagation and leader election in a multihop broadcast environment", In 12th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (DISC98), pages 104–118. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
[23] Yu Wang, Weizhao Wang, and Xiang-Yang Li, "Efficient distributed low cost backbone formation for wireless networks", IEEE Transactions Parallel Distributions Systems, Vol. 17, pp. 681–693, July 2006.
[24] H. Raei, M. Tabibzadeh, B. Ahmadipoor, and S. Saei, "A self-stabilizing distributed algorithm for minimum connected dominating sets in wireless sensor networks with different transmission ranges", In Proceedings of the 11th international conference on Advanced Communication Technology, Vol. 1, pp. 526–530. IEEE Press, 2009.
[25] Sayaka Kamei and Hirotsugu Kakugawa, "A self-stabilizing approximation for the minimum connected dominating set with safe convergence", In OPODIS '08: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Principles of Distributed Systems, pp. 496–511, 2008.
[26] Jalel Ben-Othman, Karim Bessaoud, Alain Bui, and Laurence Pilard, "Self-stabilizing algorithm for energy saving in wireless sensor networks", In *ISCC*, pp. 68–73, 2011.