Pravin U. Malve et al./ Elixir Comp. Sci. & Engg. 92 (2016) 39227-39229

Available online at www.elixirpublishers.com (Elixir International Journal)

Computer Science and Engineering



Elixir Comp. Sci. & Engg. 92 (2016) 39227-39229

Comparative analysis of resource utilization in peer to peer networks

Pravin U. Malve¹, V.S. Gulhane², A.V. Deorankar³ and R.S.Mawale³ ¹Govt. Polytechnic,Murtizapur, Akola, Maharashtra. ²Sipna, COET, Amravati, Maharashtra. ³Govt.College of Engineering, Amravati, Maharashtra.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received: 28 January 2013; Received in revised form: 21 March 2016; Accepted: 26 March 2016;

ABSTRACT

P2P networks has been used over the years to overcome the problem of node failure & service availability in the client server network but it is found that the some nodes in P2P networks actually process less number of requests as compared to the number of request forwarded to a particular node. But as the number of requests send at a node increases the number of request processed at a particular node increases. This paper presents the comparative analysis of resource utilization in peer to peer networks.

© 2016 Elixir All rights reserved.

Keywords

Network animator, Network simulator, Peer to peer networks (P2P), Resource consumer, Resource provider.

Introduction

In a peer to peer network a machine, acts as a resource consumer or resource provider or both, depending on the needs of a user. Resource providers receive the tasks, compute them, and send the results back to the consumer node. A node wants to provide its services to a network acts as resource provider.

All the nodes serve their resources for servicing requests but still some of the resources remains underutilized.

Given the current context, we intend to deploy a platform where any ordinary user increases the number of requests send at a node so that the number of request processed at a particular node increases.

Literature Review

Resource discovery:

Lamnitchi et al [1] have compared different searching methods. it turned out that a learning -based strategy achieves more performance. It consists of forwarding a request to the node that answered similar requests previously (i.e. Using possibly large cache). Moreover results have shown that searching mechanisms which keep a history of past events than the ones that do not store any information about nodes, such as a random walk.

Rozlina Mohamed [3] presents the Taxonomy for Peer-to-Peer resource discovery. Cheema et al [2] purposed a solution for exploiting the single keyword DHT lookup for CPU cycle sharing systems. This solution consists in encoding resource identifiers based on static and dynamic resource descriptions. The static ones could be, for instance, the OS configuration, RAM, or CPU speed. While dynamic descriptions are related to the availability levels of resources, such as a percentage of idle CPU. With this encoding mechanism, it is possible to create mapping between resource and node identifiers in structured peer-to-Peer networks.

Paredes [4] presents a solution through which these queries are forwarded to the neighbor nodes with the best availability

and reputation. The best availability concerns the idleness level of a node in terms of its resources, and the reputation consists in the capability of a node to forward a query to other nodes with availability. The results have shown that this approach is efficient and scalable and thus mapping to peer-to-Peer requirements.

Cycle sharing systems:

Condor [5] allows the integration and use of remote workstations. It maximizes the utilization of workstations and expands the resources available to users, by functioning well in an environment of distributed ownership.

BOINC [6] is a platform for volunteer distributed cycle sharing based on the client-server model. It relies on an asymmetric relationship where users, acting as clients, may donate their idle CPU cycles to a server, but cannot use spare cycles, from other clients, for themselves.

CCOF [7] is an open peer-to-peer system seeking to harvest idle CPU cycles from its connected users. OurGrid [10] is a peer-to-peer network of sites which tries to facilitate the interdomain access to resources in a equitably manner.

Implementation

System requirements:

Operating System: Fedora core 13

Software: Microsoft Visual C++ 6.0 & above, ns 2.34

Hardware: 70 MB space for precompiled ns2 binary or 145 + 50 (nam) MB of space for full ns2 and nam source

NS-2 Simulator

The ns-2 is a network simulator for networking and the results of simulations can be visualized using the Network Animator nam. The **Fedora core 13** operating system is used for installation and configuration of the ns-2.34. The ns-2.34 is configured on the path /home/project/Desktop/project/.

Running the ns

We can start nam with the command 'nam <nam-file>' where '<nam-file>' is the name of a nam trace file that was

generated by ns, or execute it directly out of the Tcl simulation script for the simulation which we want to visualize. Below we can see a screenshot of a nam window .



Fig. 1. Network animator

We have created **rc** (**resource consumer**) package inside **ns-2.34** which defines various properties of the data in terms of packet which are transferred to and from various node which can be identified as packets which are using implemented **resource consumer** protocol for the network.

Results

We have demonstrated the result of implemented work through various simulations implemented in terms of tcl script like **simgridfinal.tcl and simgridmax.tcl**

For the execution of this tcl script the following command is executed on the terminal.

ns simgridfinal.tcl

After the execution **out.nam** file is created inside the current working directory. We can run the simulation by executing the following command on the terminal.

nam out.nam

After execution the output is generated inside the network animator. The results are shown below.



Fig 2. Initial state of network with three resource consumer and three resource provider

Table I Comparison of the various requests received and serviced by the nodes

| | serviced by the nodes. | | | | |
|-------|------------------------|----------|------------|-------------|--|
| Nodes | Number | Number | Total time | Actual | |
| | of | of | on the | Resource | |
| | Requests | Requests | node | Utilization | |
| | Received | Serviced | (Seconds) | (Seconds) | |
| Node2 | 12 | 6 | 1.580800 | 0.49844 | |
| Node3 | 2 | 2 | 1.087200 | 0.254824 | |
| Node4 | 4 | 4 | 1.580800 | 0.74 | |

As it can be observed from the table the node 4 is utilized more than the remaining two nodes. It also shows the total time for which the resource was in the active state in the network and its actual utilization in the network. So here the total resource usage is estimated in the network. The following graphs shows the resource usage in terms of the request processed as shown in Graph 1 and time required as shown in Fig.3.



Fig. 3. Nodes versus requests received and processed



Fig.4. Nodes versus utilization time

For a simgridmax.tcl following command is executed on the terminal.

ns simgridfinal.tcl

After the execution **out.nam** file is created inside the current working directory. We can run the simulation by executing the following command on the terminal.

nam out.nam

After execution the output is generated inside the network animator. The results are shown below.



Fig.5. Initial state of the network with multiple resource provider and multiple resource consumers

 Table II

 Comparison of the various requests received and serviced by the nodes

| Nodes | Number of | Number of | Total time on | Actual |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| | Requests | Requests | the node | Resource |
| | Received | Serviced | (Seconds) | Utilization |
| | | | | (Seconds) |
| Node2 | 35 | 21 | 4.54 | 2.59 |
| Node3 | 5 | 5 | 3.93 | 0.64 |
| Node4 | 10 | 10 | 4.54 | 1.25 |



Fig. 6 Nodes versus requests received and processed



Fig.7 Nodes versus utilization time

Conclusion

This paper presents comparative analysis of resource utilization in different peer to peer networks and demonstrates that the number of requests processed at node 2 has been increased with multiple resource consumers and providers. **References**

[1] A. Iamnitchi and I. Foster. A peer-to-peer approach to resource location in grid environments. In Grid resource management: state of the art and future trends, pages 413–429, Norwell, MA, USA, 2004. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

[2] A. S. Cheema, M. Muhammad, and I. Gupta. Peer-to-peer discovery of computational resources for grid applications. *In GRID '05: Proceedings of the 6th IEEE/ACM International* Workshop on Grid Computing, pages 179–185, Washington, DC, USA, 2005. IEEE Computer Society.

[3] Rozlina Mohamed, Siti Zanaariah Satari : Resource discovery mechanisms for Peer-to-Peer systems. 2nd International conference Computer and Electrical Engineering, Pages 100-104, 2009

[4] F.R.Paredes. Topologies de overlays peer to peer para descoberta de recursos. Master's thesis, Institute Technio, 2008

[5] M. Litzkow, M. Livny, and M. Mutka. Condor - a hunter of idle workstations. *In Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of Distributed Computing Systems, June 1988.*

[6] D. P. Anderson. Boinc: A system for public-resource computing and storage. In GRID '04: Proceedings of the 5th IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Grid Computing, pages 4–10, Washington, DC, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.

[7] V. Lo, D. Zhou, Y. Liu, and S. Zhao. Cluster computing on the fly: P2p scheduling of idle cycles in the internet. *In the internet, 3rd International Workshop on Peer-to-Peer Systmes (IPTPS 2004), pages 227–236, 2004.*