International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology
© 2018 IJSRCSEIT | Volume 3 | Issue 4 | ISSN : 2456-3307

Finding Path Errors in Wireless Sensor Networks

P. Divya
MCA Sri Padmavathi College of Computer Sciences And Technology Tiruchanoor, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Wireless sensor arrange (WSN) alludes to a gathering of spatially scattered and devoted sensors for observing and recording the physical states of the earth and sorting out the gathered information at a focal area. In Existing, VANETs that can distinguish and adapt to noxious assaults and furthermore assess the reliability of the two information and portable hubs in VANETs. Extraordinarily, information trust is assessed in view of the information detected and gathered from numerous vehicles; hub trust is surveyed in two measurements, i.e., utilitarian trust and proposal trust, which show how likely a hub can satisfy its usefulness and how dependable the suggestions from a hub for different hubs will be, separately. We propose a low overhead plan for recognizing a system parcel or cut in a sensor organize. Consider a system S of n sensors, displayed as focuses in a two-dimensional plane. A ε-cut, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, is a straight partition of εn hubs in S from a recognized hub, the base station. We demonstrate that the base station can distinguish at whatever point a ε-cut happens by checking the status of just $O(1/\varepsilon)$ hubs in the system. Our plan is deterministic and it is free of false positives: no revealed cut has estimate littler than $1/2\varepsilon n$. Other than this combinatorial outcome, we likewise propose productive calculations for finding the $O(1/\varepsilon)$ hubs that should go about as sentinels, and investigate our reproduction comes about, contrasting the sentinel calculation and two common plans in view of examining.

Keywords: Wireless sensor network , VANETs, sentinel sets

I. INTRODUCTION

Sensor nodes offer a powerful combination of distributed sensing, computing and communication. The ever-increasing capabilities of these tiny sensor nodes, which include sensing, data processing, and communicating, enable the realization of WSNs based on the collaborative effort of a number of other sensor nodes. The sensor nodes are transceivers usually scattered in a sensor field where each of them has the capability to collect data and route data back to the sink/gateway and the end-users by a multi-hop infrastructureless architecture through the sink. They use their processing capabilities to locally carry out simple computations and transmit only the required and partially processed data. The reliance on wireless networks and communications poses a number of challenges to a sensor network designer. Large and small-scale fading limit the range of radio signals, that is, a radio frequency (RF) signal attenuates while it propagates through a wireless medium. The received power is proportional to the inverse of the square of the distance from the source of the signal. As a consequence, an increasing distance between a sensor node and a base station rapidly increases the required transmission power. Therefore, it is more energy-efficient to split a large distance into several shorter distances, leading to the challenge of supporting multi-hop communications and routing. Multi-hop communication requires that nodes in a network cooperate with each other to identify efficient routes and to serve as relays.

II. ALGORITHM

The network topology and the communication protocol are not directly relevant to our result. We simply assume that the sensor network is connected and that every sensor is able to communicate with a base station through multi-hop routing, as long as a valid communication path exists. We also assume that the location of every sensor is available to the base station. A set S of n sensors scattered in a terrain is modeled as a set of n points in the plane (ignoring the altitude of each sensor). Our problem of monitoring the integrity of the sensor field is best studied in a geometric setting.

Sentinel Sets

We wish to detect if the sensor network has suffered a linear cut of size at least εn. We do so by monitoring a small subset of sensor nodes, called the sentinel set W. An adversary can introduce a linear cut, by disabling all sensors lying on the right side L − of a line L. It is assumed that the base station lies on the safe side, L +. We call a directed line L an ε-cut if its halfplane L − contains at least ε fraction of all the sensors; formally, L is a ε-cut if $|L^-(S)| \geq \varepsilon n$. We would like to point out that the base station has no explicit information about the line L. It only learns the signature vector σ(W) that represents the alive or dead status of the sentinel sensors; that is, σ(W) is a binary vector of length |W|. Our goal is to compute a sentinel set of small size that can detect every ε-cut correctly, but never reports a cut of size less than $c\varepsilon n$, for some constant $c < 1$. For ease of presentation, we choose $c = 1/2$ in this paper, but all our results generalize to any fixed value of c, $0 < c < 1$.

A Duality Transform

We use a point-line duality of the Euclidean plane. The dual of a point p(a, b) is the line $p^* : y = ax - b$ and, conversely, the dual of a (non-vertical) line $L : y = ax - b$ is the point $L^* : (a, b)$. The vertical lines can be handled by using a slightly more involved projective duality. Instead, we use the simpler transform here, and assume that all sensor nodes have distinct x-coordinates. In this way, for every vertical line, there is a slightly perturbed non-vertical line with the same signature σ(S). It can be easily checked that the duality transform inverts the above-below relation: if point p lies above (resp. below) line L, then the dual line p^* is below (resp. above) the dual point L^*. A similar transform is used for tracking a linear shadow over a sensornet. The duality transform maps our set S of n sensors into a set S^* of n lines. Conversely, a linear cut L is transformed into a point L^*. We point out that the orientation of L is lost in the duality. We assume throughout that the line L is oriented so that the right halfplane L − lies above the line L. Thus, in the linear cut induced by L, all the sensors above L are cut off. A similar argument holds when the halfplane L − lies below L.

Line Arrangements and Levels

The set of n lines S^* in the dual plane form a line arrangement, denoted $H(S^*)$. The arrangement is a dissection of the plane into convex polygons, some of which are unbounded. The vertices of the arrangement are the intersection points between pairs of lines; the edges of the arrangement are the line segments between two consecutive vertices on a line. An arrangement of n line has at most $n(n-1)/2$ vertices and at most $n(n+1)$ edges. For technical simplification, we assume that no more than 2 lines pass through a vertex. The set of edges in the arrangement that lie above exactly $k - 1$ other lines form an x-monotone polygonal curve. This curve is called the k-level of the arrangement. (A point (a, b) is above k lines if the ray $\{(a, y) : y < b\}$ crosses exactly k lines of the set S^*.) The 1- level, for instance, is the lower envelope of the arrangement. A k-level bends at every vertex along its way.

Minimum Link Separators in Arrangements

Given two disjoint simple polygonal curves, γ1 and γ2, in the plane, a separator % is a polygonal curve that partitions the plane into two parts such that γ1 and γ2 lie on opposite sides of %. A minimum link separator for γ1 and γ2 is such a separator with the minimum number of vertices (i.e., bends). A minimum link separator % between the εn and the εn/2 levels of the arrangement H(S ∗) can efficiently distinguish ε-cuts from the less than (ε/2)-cuts. Specifically, if L ∗ lies below ρ then L is certainly not an ε-cut; and if L ∗ lies above ρ then L is surely an (ε/2)-cut. A minimum link separator, in general, is free to use any lines. However, in our setting, this separator will be used to form a sentinel set, and therefore we must use only the lines of S ∗ in the minimum link separator.

III. CONCLUSION

We proposed a straight forward, low-overhead plan for identifying cuts in sensor systems. We demonstrate that direct ε-cuts can be identified by observing just O(1/ε) hubs of the system, which is asymptotically the most ideal; a straightforward case of n sensors organized around gives a coordinating lower bound. Practically speaking, be that as it may, we expect even less than 1/ε sentinels, which is borne out by our reproduction comes about. A critical element of our calculation is the absence of false positives or false negatives. Accordingly, every cut of size εn or bigger is recognized, and no cut is accounted for unless it incorporates no less than 1/2 εn hubs.

IV. REFERENCES

[1]. Jason Hill, Robert Szewczyk, Alec Woo, Seth Hollar, David Culler, Kristofer Pister. "System architecture directions for network sensors," in Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS-IX) Cambridge, MA, Nov. 2000.

[2]. Chalermek Intanagonwiwat, Ramesh Govindan, and Deborah Estrin, "Directed Diffusion: A Scalable and Robust Communication Paradigm for Sensor Networks," In Proceedings of the Sixth Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networks (MobiCOM 2000), August 2000, Boston, Massachusetts.

[3]. J. O'Rourke, Computational Geometry in C, 2nd Ed. Cambridge University Press, 1998

[4]. Eynat Rafalin, Diane Souvaine, and Ileana Streinu, "Topological sweep in degenerate cases," in Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX'02), San Francisco, CA, January, 2002. 5 Air delivered sensor network by UC Berkeley at 29 Palms, March 2001. http://robotics.eecs.berkeley.edu/~pister/29Palms0103, 8Workshop on Collaborative Signal and Information Processing, http://www.parc.xerox.com/cosense/csp.html, Xerox Palo Alto Research Center, January 2001. 6 IEEE Signal Processing Magazine special issue on Collaborative Signal and Information Processing for Microsensor Networks, S. Kumar, F. Zhao, D. Shepherd (eds.), vol. 19, no. 2, March 2002.

[5]. S. Madden, M.J. Franklin, J. Hellerstein and W. Hong. TAG: a Tiny AGgregation Service for Ad-Hoc Sensor Networks, In Proc of 5th Annual Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI), 2002

[6]. S. Madden, S. Szewczyk, M.J. Franklin and D. Culler. Supporting Aggregate Queries Over Ad-Hoc Sensor Networks, Workshop on Mobile Computing and Systems Application, 2002

[7]. G. Manku and R. Motwani. Approximate frequency counts over data streams. In Proc. 28th Conf. on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB), 2002

[8]. G. Piatetsky-Shapiro and C. Connell. Accurate Estimation of the Number of Tuples Satisfying a Condition, In Proc. of ACM SIGMOD Intl. Conf. on Management of Data (SIGMOD), 1984.

[9]. B. Przydatek, D. Song, and A. Perrig. Secure Information Aggregation in Sensor Networks,

In Proc. of the First ACM Conf. on Embedded Networked Systems (SenSys), 2003

[10]. Y. Yao and J. Gehrke, The Cougar Approach to In-Network Query Processing, ACM SIGMOD Record, vol. 31, pp 9, 2002

[11]. J. Zhao, R. Govindan and D. Estrin. Computing Aggregates for Monitoring Wireless Sensor Networks, The First IEEE Intl. Workshop on Sensor Network Protocols and Applications (SNPA), 2003

[12]. M. de Berg, M. van Kreveld, M. Overmars and O. Schwarzkopf. Computational Geometry: Algorithms and Applications. Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[13]. H. Bronnimann, B. Chazelle, and J. Matou sek. Product range spaces, ˇ sensitive sampling, and derandomization. SIAM J. Comput. 28, 1552-1575, 1999.

[14]. A. Cerpa and D. Estrin. ASCENT: Adaptive Self-Configuring sEnsor Networks Topologies. IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing, 3, 2004.

[15]. C-Y. Chong and S. P. Kumar. Sensor Networks: Evolution, opportunities and challenges. Proc. of the IEEE, 91, 1247–1256, 2003.

[16]. D. Culler, D. Estrin and M. Srivastava. Overview of Sensor Networks. IEEE Computer, 41–49, 2004.

[17]. T. K. Dey. Improved bounds for planar k-sets and related problems. Discrete & Computational Geometry, 373–382, 1998.

[18]. N. Sadagopan and B. Krishnamachari. Maximizing data extraction in energy-lmited sensor networks. Proc. IEEE INFOCOM, 2004.