











that exists, the source node starts a DSR routing request to find another route. Due to the nature of MANETs, it is common to find out multiple routes between two nodes.

By adopting an alternative route to the destination node, we circumvent the misbehavior reporter node. When the destination node receives an MRA packet, it searches its local knowledge base and compares if the reported packet was received. If it is already received, then it is safe to conclude that this is a false misbehavior report and whoever generated this report is marked as malicious. Otherwise, the misbehavior report is trusted and accepted. By the adoption of MRA scheme, EAACK is capable of detecting malicious nodes despite the existence of false misbehavior report.

#### D. Digital Signature

As discussed before, EAACK is an acknowledgment-based IDS. All three parts of EAACK, namely, ACK, S-ACK, and MRA, are acknowledgment-based detection schemes. They all rely on acknowledgment packets to detect misbehaviors in the network. Thus, it is extremely important to ensure that all acknowledgment packets in EAACK are authentic and untainted. Otherwise, if the attackers are smart enough to forge acknowledgment packets, all of the three schemes will be vulnerable. With regard to this urgent concern, we incorporated digital signature in our proposed scheme. In order to ensure the integrity of the IDS, EAACK requires all acknowledgment packets to be digitally signed before they are sent out and verified until they are accepted. However, we fully understand the extra resources that are required with the introduction of digital signature in MANETs. To address this concern, we implemented both DSA and RSA-KEM digital signature schemes in our proposed approach. The goal is to find the most optimal solution for using digital signature in MANETs.

### 5. Performance Evaluation

In this section, we concentrate on describing our simulation environment and methodology as well as comparing performances through simulation result comparison with Watchdog, TWOACK, and EAACK schemes.

#### A. Simulation Methodologies

To better investigate the performance of EAACK under different types of attacks, we propose three scenario settings to simulate different types of misbehaviors or attacks.

- **Scenario 1:** In this scenario, we simulated a basic packet dropping attack. Malicious nodes simply drop all the packets that they receive. The purpose of this scenario is to test the performance of IDSs against two weaknesses of Watchdog, namely, receiver collision and limited transmission power.
- **Scenario 2:** This scenario is designed to test IDSs' performances against false misbehavior report. In this case, malicious nodes always drop the packets that they receive and send back a false misbehavior report whenever it is possible.
- **Scenario 3:** This scenario is used to test the IDSs' performances when the attackers are smart enough to forge acknowledgment packets and claiming positive

result while, in fact, it is negative. As Watchdog is not an acknowledgment-based scheme, it is not eligible for this scenario setting.

- Figure 9. S-ACK scheme: Node C is required to send back an acknowledgment packet to node A.

#### B. Simulation Configurations

Our simulation is conducted within the Network Simulator (NS) 2.34 environment on a platform with GCC 4.3 and Ubuntu 9.10. The system is running on a laptop with Core 2 Duo T7250 CPU and 3-GB RAM. In order to better compare our simulation results with other research works, we adopted the default scenario settings in NS 2.34. The intention is to provide more general results and make it easier for us to compare the results. In NS 2.34, the default configuration specifies 50 nodes in a flat space with a size of  $670 \times 670$  m. The maximum hops allowed in this configuration setting are four. Both the physical layer and the 802.11 MAC layer are included in the wireless extension of NS2. The moving speed of mobile node is limited to 20 m/s and a pause time of 1000 s. User Datagram Protocol traffic with constant bit rate is implemented with a packet size of 512 B. For each scheme, we ran every network scenario three times and calculated the average performance. In order to measure and compare the performances of our proposed scheme, we continue to adopt the following two performance metrics

- 1) **Packet delivery ratio (PDR):** PDR defines the ratio of the number of packets received by the destination node to the number of packets sent by the source node.
- 2) **Routing overhead (RO):** RO defines the ratio of the amount of routing-related transmissions [Route REQuest (RREQ), Route REPLY (RREP), Route ERRor (RERR), ACK, S-ACK, and MRA]. During the simulation, the source node broadcasts an RREQ message to all the neighbors within its communication range. Upon receiving this RREQ message, each neighbor appends their addresses to the message and broadcasts this new message to their neighbors. If any node receives the same RREQ message more than once, it ignores it. If a failed node is detected, which generally indicates a broken link in flat routing protocols like DSR, a RERR message is sent to the source node. When the RREQ message arrives to its final destination node, the destination node initiates an RREP message and sends this message back to the source node by reversing the route in the RREQ message. Regarding the digital signature schemes, we adopted an open source library named Botan. This cryptography library is locally compiled with GCC 4.3. To compare performances between DSA and RSA-KEM schemes, we generated a 1024-b DSA key and a 1024-b RSA-KEM key for every node in the network. We assumed that both a public key and a private key are generated for each node and they were all distributed in advance. The typical sizes of public- and private-key files are 654 and 509 B with a 1024-b

**Table 2**

Scenario I: Packet Delivery Ratio					
	Malicious Nodes: 0%	Malicious Nodes: 10%	Malicious Nodes: 20%	Malicious Nodes: 30%	Malicious Nodes: 40%
DSR	1	0.82	0.73	0.68	0.66
Watchdog	1	0.83	0.77	0.7	0.67
TWOACK	1	0.97	0.96	0.92	0.92
AACK	1	0.96	0.96	0.93	0.92
EAACK(DSA)	1	0.96	0.97	0.93	0.91
EAACK(RSA)	1	0.96	0.97	0.92	0.92
Scenario I: Routing Overhead					
	Malicious Nodes: 0%	Malicious Nodes: 10%	Malicious Nodes: 20%	Malicious Nodes: 30%	Malicious Nodes: 40%
DSR	0.02	0.023	0.023	0.022	0.02
Watchdog	0.02	0.025	0.025	0.023	0.023
TWOACK	0.18	0.4	0.43	0.42	0.51
AACK	0.03	0.23	0.32	0.33	0.39
EAACK(DSA)	0.15	0.28	0.35	0.44	0.58
EAACK(RSA)	0.16	0.3	0.37	0.47	0.61

DSA key, respectively. On the other hand, the sizes of public- and private-key files for 1024-b RSA-KEM are 272 and 916 B, respectively. The signature file sizes for DSA and RSA-KEM are 89 and 131 B, respectively.

In terms of computational complexity and memory consumption, we did research on popular mobile sensors. According to our research, one of the most popular sensor nodes in the market is Tmote Sky. This type of sensor is equipped with a TI MSP430F1611 8-MHz CPU and 1070 KB of memory space. We believe that this is enough for handling our simulation settings in terms of both computational power and memory space.

## 6. Conclusion and Future Work

Packet-dropping attack has always been a major threat to the security in MANETs. In this research paper, we have proposed a novel IDS named EAACK protocol specially designed for MANETs and compared it against other popular mechanisms in different scenarios through simulations. The results demonstrated positive performances against Watchdog, TWOACK, and AACK in the cases of receiver collision, limited transmission power, and false misbehavior report. Furthermore, in an effort to prevent the attackers from initiating forged acknowledgment attacks, we extended our research to incorporate digital signature in our proposed scheme. Although it generates more ROs in some cases, as demonstrated in our experiment, it can vastly improve the network's PDR when the attackers are smart enough to forge acknowledgment packets. We think that this tradeoff is worthwhile when network security is the top priority. In order to seek the optimal DSAs in MANETs, we implemented both DSA and RSA-KEM schemes in our simulation. Eventually, we arrived to the conclusion that the DSA scheme is more suitable to be implemented in MANETs. To increase the merits of our research work, we plan to investigate the following issues in our future research: 1) possibilities of adopting hybrid cryptography techniques to further reduce the network overhead caused by digital signature; 2) examine the possibilities of adopting a key exchange mechanism to eliminate the requirement of predistributed keys; 3) testing the performance of EAACK in real network environment instead of software simulation.

## References

- [1] T. Sheltami, A. Al-Roubaiey, E. Shakshuki, and A. Mahmoud, "Video transmission enhancement in presence of misbehaving nodes in MANETs," *Int. J. Multimedia Syst.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 273–282, Oct. 2009.
- [2] K. Al Agha, M.-H. Bertin, T. Dang, A. Guitton, P. Minet, T. Val, and J.-B. Viollet, "Which wireless technology for industrial wireless sensor networks? The development of OCARI technol.," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 4266–4278, Oct. 2009.
- [3] R. Akbani, T. Korkmaz, and G. V. S. Raju, "Mobile Ad hoc Network Security," in *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering*, vol. 127. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2012, pp. 659–666.
- [4] R. H. Akbani, S. Patel, and D. C. Jinwala, "DoS attacks in mobile ad hoc networks: A survey," in *Proc. 2nd Int. Meeting ACCT*, Rohtak, Haryana, India, 2012, pp. 535–541.
- [5] T. Anantvalee and J. Wu, "A Survey on Intrusion Detection in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks," in *Wireless/Mobile Security*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [6] L. Buttyan and J. P. Hubaux, *Security and Cooperation in Wireless Networks*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, Aug. 2007.
- [7] V. C. Gungor and G. P. Hancke, "Industrial wireless sensor networks: Challenges, design principles, and technical approach," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 4258–4265, Oct. 2009.
- [8] Y. Hu, D. Johnson, and A. Perrig, "SEAD: Secure efficient distance vector routing for mobile wireless ad hoc networks," in *Proc. 4th IEEE Workshop Mobile Comput. Syst. Appl.*, 2002, pp. 3–13.
- [9] Y. Hu, A. Perrig, and D. Johnson, "ARIADNE: A secure on-demand routing protocol for ad hoc networks," in *Proc. 8th ACM Int. Conf. MobiCom*, Atlanta, GA, 2002, pp. 12–23.
- [10] G. Jayakumar and G. Gopinath, "Ad hoc mobile wireless networks routing protocol—A review," *J. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 8, pp. 574–582, 2007.
- [11] D. Johnson and D. Maltz, "Dynamic Source Routing in ad hoc wireless networks," in *Mobile Computing*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 1996, ch. 5, pp. 153–181.

- [12] N. Kang, E. Shakshuki, and T. Sheltami, "Detecting misbehaving nodes in MANETs," in *Proc. 12th Int. Conf. iiWAS*, Paris, France, Nov. 8–10, 2010, pp. 216–222.
- [13] N. Kang, E. Shakshuki, and T. Sheltami, "Detecting forged acknowledgements in MANETs," in *Proc. IEEE 25th Int. Conf. AINA*, Biopolis, Singapore, Mar. 22–25, 2011, pp. 488–494.
- [14] [14] K. Kuladinith, A. S. Timm-Giel, and C. Görg, "Mobile ad-hoc communications in AEC industry," *J. Inf. Technol. Const.*, vol. 9, pp. 313–323, 2004.
- [15] J.-S. Lee, "A Petri net design of command filters for semiautonomous mobile sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 1835–1841, Apr. 2008.
- [16] K. Liu, J. Deng, P. K. Varshney, and K. Balakrishnan, "An acknowledgment-based approach for the detection of routing misbehavior in MANETs," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 536–550, May 2007.
- [17] S. Marti, T. J. Giuli, K. Lai, and M. Baker, "Mitigating routing misbehavior in mobile ad hoc networks," in *Proc. 6th Annu. Int. Conf. Mobile Comput. Netw.*, Boston, MA, 2000, pp. 255–265.
- [18] A. Menezes, P. van Oorschot, and S. Vanstone, *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC, 1996, T-37.
- [19] N. Nasser and Y. Chen, "Enhanced intrusion detection systems for discovering malicious nodes in mobile ad hoc network," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, Glasgow, Scotland, Jun. 24–28, 2007, pp. 1154–1159.

### Author Profile

**K. Sree Divya** is currently pursuing master's degree program in Computer Science Engineering in Annamacharya Institute of Technology, Tirupati, A.P. India

**G. Anusha** is Assistant Professor in computer science Engineering in Annamacharya Institute of Technology, Tirupati, A.P. India

**K. Santhi** is Associate Professor, S V College of Engineering, Tirupath. A.P. India