

Assessing Routing Algorithms for PCNs: Full Evaluation Results

DAVID LOBMAIER, TU Wien, Austria

RAFAEL KONLECHNER, TU Wien, Austria

STEFAN SCHULTE, Christian Doppler Laboratory for Blockchain Technologies for the Internet of Things, Institute for Data Engineering, Hamburg University of Technology, Germany

INGO WEBER, Technical University of Munich & Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, Germany

Within this Technical Report, we present the full analysis of 61 routing protocols for Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) for the purposes of routing in Payment Channel Networks (PCNs). In addition, we present the full results of the implementation of the three algorithms E-TORA, TERP, and M-DART.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Payment Channel Networks, Distributed Ledger Technologies, Routing

1 CANDIDATE ALGORITHMS

Routing algorithms in WSNs have been a popular topic in recent years. As a result, there are many approaches available in the literature. In this supplementary material to the paper “Assessing Routing Algorithms for Payment Channel Networks”, we classify a collection of WSN algorithms, based on their ability to scale and self-organize, trustlessness, and communication compatibility. Then, we filter them for the most promising candidates in the context of PCN routing.

Our collection of WSN routing algorithms is mainly based on the work of Pantazis et al. [37] that has been extended with more recent approaches. Also, a missing algorithm category that uses DHTs has been added. The complete list can be seen in Table 1, where each algorithm is assessed to fulfill (●), partly fulfill (◐) or fail to meet (×) the abovementioned requirements.

With regard to the utilization of WSN routing algorithms in the field of PCNs, we begin by excluding algorithms that do not meet the requirement for scalability and resource efficiency. By using routing tables for all nodes of the network or flooding WRP [33], TBRPF [36], HPAR [25], MWE [44], DREAM [5] and LMR [21] can be removed from the list of candidates. Gossiping, RR [8], DD [22] and ACQUIRE [42] have a risk to easily degenerate into flooding. Also, the algorithms SWE [44] and MERR [56] that need a central control instance are not suited for PCNs.

The next set of routing algorithms are improper for use in PCNs, because of not satisfying the self-organization and flexibility requirement. VGA [2], SPastry [3] and VCP [4] have a fixed topology after initialization. For cluster forming, the algorithms BCDP [34], SHPER [23], DHAC [29] and COUGAR [50] need a central base station. Furthermore, non-deterministic routes and not guaranteed delivery of messages disqualifies SPEED [18] and its multi-path successor MMSPEED [17]. The absence of a global synchronization possibility makes the Sleep/Wake [49] algorithm unusable.

Another requirement that excludes multiple routing algorithms is the communication compatibility. A prominent member is the LEACH [39] protocol and its successors LEACH-C [19], PEGASIS [26], MIMO [54], ELCH [27] and SEECH [46] that need a shared medium for proper operation. TEEN [31] and APTEEN [32] communicate only if a certain threshold of a sensor value is reached. A traffic pattern with a central sink is used by TTDD [30], GBDD [43], GRAB [51], HMRP [47], DGR [15], DCF [13], RPL [48], SAR [45] and MGR [12]. Finally, SPIN-PP/SPIN-EC/SPIN-BN/SPIN-RL [40] are data-centric algorithms and MIP [11] and IEMF/IEMA [16] use an agent, i.e., a program that can be migrated between nodes to perform tasks, e.g., value aggregation.

Table 1. Classification of WSN Routing Algorithms

	Scalability & Resource Efficiency	Self-organization & Flexibility	Trustlessness	Communication Compatibility
WRP [33]	○	●	○	×
TBRPF [36]	×	●	○	●
TORA [38]	○	○	●	●
Gossiping [37]	○	●	○	●
Flooding [37]	×	●	○	●
RR [8]	●	○	○	●
E-TORA [52]	○	○	●	●
ZRP [6]	○	●	●	●
LEACH [39]	●	×	○	×
LEACH-C [19]	●	×	○	×
PEGASIS [26]	●	×	○	×
TEEN [31]	●	×	○	×
APTEEN [32]	●	×	○	×
VGA [2]	●	×	○	×
TTDD [30]	○	○	○	×
BCDCP [34]	○	×	○	●
MIMO [54]	●	×	○	×
HPAR [25]	×	×	○	●
Sleep/Wake [49]	●	×	○	●
GBDD [43]	○	○	○	×
ELCH [27]	○	○	○	●
SHPER [23]	●	×	○	●
DHAC [29]	●	×	○	●
DD [22]	○	○	○	●
COUGAR [50]	○	×	○	×
ACQUIRE [42]	○	○	○	●
SWE [44]	×	×	×	×
MWE [44]	×	×	×	×
SPIN-PP [40]	●	●	●	×
SPIN-EC [40]	●	●	●	×
SPIN-BN [40]	●	×	●	×
SPIN-RL [40]	●	●	●	×
DREAM [5]	×	●	○	●
GEAR [53]	○	●	○	●
GEM [35]	●	●	○	●
IGF [7]	○	●	○	●
SELAR [28]	○	○	○	●
GDSTR [24]	○	○	○	●
MERR [56]	×	○	×	×
OGF [10]	●	●	○	●
PAGER-M [57]	●	●	○	●
HGR [14]	●	●	○	●
MIP [11]	○	●	○	×
IEMF/IEMA [16]	○	●	○	×
ROAM [41]	○	○	○	●
LMR [21]	×	●	○	●
GRAB [51]	○	●	○	×
HMRP [47]	●	○	○	×
CBMPR [55]	○	○	○	●
DGR [15]	●	●	○	×
DCF [13]	●	●	○	×
RPL [48]	●	●	○	×
SAR [45]	○	×	○	×
SPEED [18]	○	×	○	●
MMSPEED [17]	○	×	○	●
MGR [12]	●	○	○	×
TERP [1]	○	●	●	●
SEECH [46]	○	○	○	×
M-DART [9]	○	●	●	●
SPastry [3]	○	×	●	●
VCP [4]	○	×	●	●

The category of location-based protocols consists of several algorithms that are possibly suitable for use in PCNs. But since payment channels are location-independent, there is not an intuitive way to map nodes on specific geographic positions. Therefore, the algorithms GEAR [53], GEM [35], IGF [7], SELAR [28], GDSTR [24], OGF [10], PAGER-M [57] and HGR [14] are also not further regarded.

The following routing protocols remain:

- E-TORA [52]** The successor protocol of TORA [38] uses a directed acyclic graph (DAG) to find possible routes between a sender and a receiver. During route creation and maintenance, it takes energy parameters into account, in order to not always use the same path and to prolong the network lifetime.
- ZRP [6]** The Zone Routing Protocol (ZRP) is a hybrid approach using proactive and reactive routing. With a radius of ρ hops, the zone of neighboring nodes is defined. These are kept in a routing table. Is a recipient outside of the zone, then the reactive component uses route request and reply messages to discover the node.
- ROAM [41]** ROAM is an on-demand routing algorithm that uses directed acyclic multi-paths. In contrast to other on-demand protocols, ROAM maintains routing tables for destinations and link costs, to prevent sending unnecessary search packets. Destinations that are not present in the table, are located using diffusion search.
- TERP [1]** This protocol is a successor of the AODV routing protocol that uses route request and reply messages to discover a path on-demand. For the selection of the route, it takes the energy level as well as the trust of nodes into account. The trust estimation is done by monitoring the operation of neighbor nodes.
- CBMPR [55]** The cluster-based multi-path routing (CBMPR) protocol uses a hierarchical approach with cluster heads that know all members and some neighbor cluster heads. By choosing multiple paths through different clusters, resilience and scalability of the network are raised.
- M-DART [9]** This proactive protocol uses a DHT-based approach to route packets on multiple possible paths. To react on changes in the network, a dynamic addressing layer is used on top of the existing communication layer.

Finally, we select the protocols E-TORA [38], TERP [1] and M-DART [9] to be implemented and evaluated in our work. The reason for choosing E-TORA is its promising feature to use different paths on subsequent messages to extend the network lifetime. This could be turned into the selection of paths that offer higher balances and lower fees in PCNs. As the only algorithm that takes primarily trust into account, TERP is an interesting approach based on AODV that has already been proven to be suitable for use in a PCN by Hoenisch et al. [20]. To round up the selection, the DHT-based protocol M-DART contributes proactive routing to the former on-demand approaches.

2 FULL EVALUATION RESULTS

In the following, we provide the full evaluation results with regard to memory consumption, success ratio, average hop count, average fee, average channel count, node packet count, node packet size, router packet count, and router packet size for the three implemented algorithms E-TORA, TERP, and M-DART. Results are shown for the basic scenario (Figure 1)¹, faulty scenario (Figure 2), malicious scenario (Figure 3), low-participation scenario (Figure 4), hub scenario (Figure 5), and commercial scenario (Figure 6). Also, different network sizes are taken into account: small (sm) with 30 nodes, medium (md) with 200 nodes, and large (lg) with 1000 nodes.

¹Please note: For the purposes of preliminary evaluation runs, for the basic scenario, we have developed a BASIC routing protocol, which is based on unrealistic assumptions, e.g., a shared data structure to exchange network information and to always have an overview about nodes and channels in all parts of the network. Since the results are unrealistically good, we do not show them for all other scenarios.




Fig. 1. Complete Results of the Basic Scenario




Fig. 2. Complete Results of the Faulty Scenario




Fig. 3. Complete Results of the Malicious Scenario




Fig. 4. Complete Results of the Low-Participation Scenario




Fig. 5. Complete Results of the Hub Scenario




Fig. 6. Complete Results of the Commercial Scenario

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial support by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Digital and Economic Affairs, the National Foundation for Research, Technology and Development as well as the Christian Doppler Research Association for the Christian Doppler Laboratory for Blockchain Technologies for the Internet of Things is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adnan Ahmed, Kamalrulnizam Abu Bakar, Muhammad Ibrahim Channa, Khalid Haseeb, and Abdul Waheed Khan. 2015. TERP: A trust and energy aware routing protocol for wireless sensor network. *IEEE Sensors Journal* 15, 12 (2015), 6962–6972.
- [2] Jamal N. Al-Karaki and Ahmed E. Kamal. 2008. Efficient virtual-backbone routing in mobile ad hoc networks. *Computer Networks* 52, 2 (2008), 327–350.
- [3] Abd Al-Basset Al-Mamou and Houada Labiod. 2007. ScatterPastry: An overlay routing using a DHT over wireless sensor networks. In *International Conference on Intelligent Pervasive Computing (IPC)*. IEEE, 274–279.
- [4] Abdalkarim Awad, Christoph Sommer, Reinhard German, and Falko Dressler. 2008. Virtual cord protocol (VCP): A flexible DHT-like routing service for sensor networks. In *5th IEEE International Conference on Mobile Ad Hoc and Sensor Systems (MASS)*. IEEE, 133–142.
- [5] Stefano Basagni, Imrich Chlamtac, Violet R. Syrotiuk, and Barry A. Woodward. 1998. A distance routing effect algorithm for mobility (DREAM). In *4th Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MobiCom)*. ACM, 76–84.
- [6] Nicklas Beijar. 2002. *Zone routing protocol (ZRP)*. Technical Report. Networking Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology.
- [7] Brian Blum, Tian He, Sang Son, and Jack Stankovic. 2003. *IGF: A state-free robust communication protocol for wireless sensor networks*. Technical Report. University of Virginia, Computer Science Department.
- [8] David Braginsky and Deborah Estrin. 2002. Rumor routing algorithm for sensor networks. In *1st ACM International Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications (WSNA)*. ACM, 22–31.
- [9] Marcello Caleffi and Luigi Paura. 2011. M-DART: multi-path dynamic address routing. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing* 11, 3 (2011), 392–409.
- [10] Dazhi Chen and Pramod K. Varshney. 2007. On-demand geographic forwarding for data delivery in wireless sensor networks. *Computer Communications* 30, 14-15 (2007), 2954–2967.
- [11] Min Chen, Sergio Gonzalez, Yan Zhang, and Victor C. M. Leung. 2009. Multi-agent itinerary planning for wireless sensor networks. In *International Conference on Heterogeneous Networking for Quality, Reliability, Security and Robustness (QShine)*. Springer, 584–597.
- [12] Min Chen, Chin-Feng Lai, and Honggang Wang. 2011. Mobile multimedia sensor networks: architecture and routing. *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking* 2011, 1 (2011), 159.
- [13] Min Chen, Victor C. M. Leung, and Shiwen Mao. 2009. Directional controlled fusion in wireless sensor networks. *Mobile Networks and Applications* 14, 2 (2009), 220–229.
- [14] Min Chen, Victor C. M. Leung, Shiwen Mao, Yang Xiao, and Imrich Chlamtac. 2009. Hybrid Geographic Routing for Flexible Energy-Delay Tradeoff. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 58, 9 (2009), 4976–4988.
- [15] Min Chen, Victor C. M. Leung, Shiwen Mao, and Yong Yuan. 2007. Directional geographical routing for real-time video communications in wireless sensor networks. *Computer Communications* 30, 17 (2007), 3368–3383.
- [16] Min Chen, Laurence T. Yang, Taekyoung Kwon, Liang Zhou, and Minh Jo. 2011. Itinerary planning for energy-efficient agent communications in wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 60, 7 (2011), 3290–3299.
- [17] Emad Felemban, Chang-Gun Lee, and Eylem Ekici. 2006. MMSPEED: multipath Multi-SPEED protocol for QoS guarantee of reliability and. Timeliness in wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 5, 6 (2006), 738–754.
- [18] Tian He, John A. Stankovic, Chenyang Lu, and Tarek Abdelzaher. 2003. SPEED: a stateless protocol for real-time communication in sensor networks. In *23rd International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. IEEE, 46–55.
- [19] Wendi B. Heinzelman, Anantha P. Chandrakasan, and Hari Balakrishnan. 2002. An application-specific protocol architecture for wireless microsensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications* 1, 4 (2002), 660–670.
- [20] Philipp Hoenisch and Ingo Weber. 2018. AODV-based routing for Off-Chain Payment Channel Networks. In *First International Conference on Blockchain (LNCS, Vol. 10974)*. Springer, 107–124.
- [21] Xiaobing Hou, David Tipper, and Joseph Kabara. 2004. Label-based Multipath Routing (LMR) in Wireless Sensor Networks. In *International Symposium on Advanced Radio Technologies (ISART)*. U.S. Department of Commerce, NTIA,

- 113–118.
- [22] Chalemek Intanagonwiwat, Ramesh Govindan, and Deborah Estrin. 2000. Directed diffusion: A scalable and robust communication paradigm for sensor networks. In *6th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MobiCom)*. ACM, 56–67.
 - [23] Dionisis Kandris, Panagiotis Tsioumas, Anthony Tzes, George Nikolakopoulos, and Dimitrios Vergados. 2009. Power conservation through energy efficient routing in wireless sensor networks. *Sensors* 9, 9 (2009), 7320–7342.
 - [24] Ben Leong, Barbara Liskov, and Robert Tappan Morris. 2006. Geographic Routing Without Planarization. In *3rd Conference on Networked Systems Design & Implementation (NSDI)*. USENIX Association, 339–352.
 - [25] Qun Li, Javed Aslam, and Daniela Rus. 2001. Hierarchical power-aware routing in sensor networks. In *DIMACS Workshop on Pervasive Networking*. DIMACS Center, Rutgers University, 47–52.
 - [26] Stephanie Lindsey and Cauligi S. Raghavendra. 2002. PEGASIS: Power-efficient gathering in sensor information systems. In *IEEE Aerospace Conference*, Vol. 3. IEEE, 1125–1130.
 - [27] Jalil Jabari Lotf, Mehdi Nozad Bonab, and Siavash Khorsandi. 2008. A novel cluster-based routing protocol with extending lifetime for wireless sensor networks. In *5th IFIP International Conference on Wireless and Optical Communications Networks (WOCN)*. IEEE, 1–5.
 - [28] George Lukachan and Miguel A Labrador. 2004. SELAR: scalable energy-efficient location aided routing protocol for wireless sensor networks. In *29th Annual IEEE International Conference on Local Computer Networks (LCN)*. IEEE, 694–695.
 - [29] Chung-Hong Lung and Chenjuan Zhou. 2010. Using hierarchical agglomerative clustering in wireless sensor networks: An energy-efficient and flexible approach. *Ad Hoc Networks* 8, 3 (2010), 328–344.
 - [30] Haiyun Luo, Fan Ye, Jerry Cheng, Songwu Lu, and Lixia Zhang. 2005. TTDD: Two-tier data dissemination in large-scale wireless sensor networks. *Wireless Networks* 11, 1-2 (2005), 161–175.
 - [31] Arati Manjeshwar and Dharma P. Agrawal. 2001. TEEN: A routing protocol for enhanced efficiency in wireless sensor networks. In *15th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*. IEEE, 2009–2015.
 - [32] Arati Manjeshwar and Dharma P. Agrawal. 2002. APTEEN: A hybrid protocol for efficient routing and comprehensive information retrieval in wireless. In *16th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*. IEEE, 1530–2075.
 - [33] Shree Murthy and Jose Joaquin Garcia-Luna-Aceves. 1996. An efficient routing protocol for wireless networks. *Mobile Networks and applications* 1, 2 (1996), 183–197.
 - [34] Siva D. Muruganathan, Daniel C. F. Ma, Rolly I. Bhasin, and Abraham O. Fapojuwo. 2005. A centralized energy-efficient routing protocol for wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 43, 3 (2005), 8–13.
 - [35] James Newsome and Dawn Song. 2003. GEM: Graph EMbedding for routing and data-centric storage in sensor networks without geographic information. In *1st International Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems (SenSys)*. ACM, 76–88.
 - [36] Richard Ogier, Fred Templin, and Mark Lewis. 2004. *Topology dissemination based on reverse-path forwarding (TBRPF)*. RFC 3684. RFC Editor. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3684>
 - [37] Nikolaos A. Pantazis, Stefanos A. Nikolidakis, and Dimitrios D. Vergados. 2013. Energy-Efficient Routing Protocols in Wireless Sensor Networks: A Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 15, 2 (2013), 551–591.
 - [38] Vincent D. Park and M. Scott Corson. 1997. A highly adaptive distributed routing algorithm for mobile wireless networks. In *Sixteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies (INFOCOM)*. IEEE, 1405–1413.
 - [39] Wendi Rabiner Heinzelman, Anantha P. Chandrakasan, and Hari Balakrishnan. 2000. Energy-efficient communication protocol for wireless microsensor networks. In *33rd Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*. IEEE, 1–10.
 - [40] Wendi Rabiner Heinzelman, Joanna Kulik, and Hari Balakrishnan. 1999. Adaptive protocols for information dissemination in wireless sensor networks. In *5th Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking (MobiCom)*. ACM, 174–185.
 - [41] Jyoti Raju and Jose Joaquin Garcia-Luna-Aceves. 1999. A new approach to on-demand loop-free multipath routing. In *Eight International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*. IEEE, 522–527.
 - [42] Narayanan Sadagopan, Bhaskar Krishnamachari, and Ahmed Helmy. 2005. Active query forwarding in sensor networks. *Ad Hoc Networks* 3, 1 (2005), 91–113.
 - [43] Teek P. Sharma, Ramesh C. Joshi, and Manoj Misra. 2008. GBDD: grid based data dissemination in wireless sensor networks. In *16th International Conference on Advanced Computing and Communications (ADCOM)*. IEEE, 234–240.
 - [44] Katayoun Sohrabi, Jay Gao, Vishal Ailawadhi, and Gregory J Pottie. 2000. Protocols for self-organization of a wireless sensor network. *IEEE Personal Communications* 7, 5 (2000), 16–27.
 - [45] Katayoun Sohrabi, Jay Gao, Vishal Ailawadhi, and Gregory J Pottie. 2000. Protocols for self-organization of a wireless sensor network. *IEEE Personal Communications* 7, 5 (2000), 16–27.

- [46] Mehdi Tarhani, Yousef S. Kavian, and Saman Siavoshi. 2014. SEECH: Scalable energy efficient clustering hierarchy protocol in wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Sensors Journal* 14, 11 (2014), 3944–3954.
- [47] Ying-Hong Wang, Hung-Jen Mao, Chih-Hsiao Tsai, and Chih-Chieh Chuang. 2005. HMRP: hierarchy-based multipath routing protocol for wireless sensor networks. In *International Conference on Embedded and Ubiquitous Computing (EUC)*. Springer, 452–459.
- [48] Tim Winter, Pascal Thubert, Anders Brandt, Jonathan Hui, Richard Kelsey, Philip Levis, Kris Pister, Rene Struik, Jean-Philippe Vasseur, and Roger Alexander. 2012. *RPL: IPv6 routing protocol for low-power and lossy networks*. RFC 6550. RFC Editor. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6550>
- [49] Yan Wu, Sonia Fahmy, and Ness B. Shroff. 2007. Energy efficient sleep/wake scheduling for multi-hop sensor networks: Non-convexity and approximation algorithm. In *26th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*. IEEE, 1568–1576.
- [50] Yong Yao and Johannes Gehrke. 2002. The cougar approach to in-network query processing in sensor networks. *ACM SIGMOD Record* 31, 3 (2002), 9–18.
- [51] Fan Ye, Gary Zhong, Songwu Lu, and Lixia Zhang. 2005. Gradient broadcast: A robust data delivery protocol for large scale sensor networks. *Wireless Networks* 11, 3 (2005), 285–298.
- [52] Fang Yu, Yun Li, Fei Fang, and Qianbin Chen. 2007. A new TORA-based energy aware routing protocol in mobile ad hoc networks. In *3rd IEEE/IFIP International Conference in Central Asia on Internet*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [53] Yan Yu, Ramesh Govindan, and Deborah Estrin. 2001. *Geographical and energy aware routing: A recursive data dissemination protocol for wireless sensor networks*. Technical Report. UCLA Computer Science Department.
- [54] Yong Yuan, Zhihai He, and Min Chen. 2006. Virtual MIMO-based cross-layer design for wireless sensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 55, 3 (2006), 856–864.
- [55] Jie Zhang, Choong Kyo Jeong, Goo Yeon Lee, and Hwa Jong Kim. 2007. Cluster-based Multi-path Routing Algorithm for Multi-hop Wireless Network. *International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking (IJFGCN)* 1, 1 (2007), 67–74.
- [56] Marco Zimmerling, Waltenegus Dargie, and Johnathan M. Reason. 2007. Energy-efficient routing in linear wireless sensor networks. In *IEEE International Conference on Mobile Adhoc and Sensor Systems (MASS)*. IEEE, 1–3.
- [57] Le Zou, Mi Lu, and Zixiang Xiong. 2004. PAGER-M: A novel location-based routing protocol for mobile sensor networks. In *1st International Workshop on Broadband Wireless Services and Applications (BroadWISE)*.