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ABSTRACT

Transmission control protocol (TCP) provides reliable communication. Traditional TCP implementations are tuned to work well over wired networks. A packet loss is occurred in a wired network mainly due to network congestion. On the other hand in a wireless link packet losses are caused mainly due to bit errors resulted from noise, interference, and various kind of fading. TCP has no idea whether a packet loss is caused by congestion or bit error. In this paper, we have investigated TCP performance over cellular mobile system environments. TCP performances in these environments are analyzed for congestion window vs. time, throughput vs. time & throughput vs. delay in ns2 environment. We have also investigated the effects of combining forward error correction (FEC) with TCP in simulated environment using Java. FEC reduces the number of retransmissions and shows different congestion control behavior which can effectively run the network at a higher load.
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INTRODUCTION

Due to rapid advances in the area of wireless communications and the popularity of the Internet, provision of packet data services for applications like-mail, web browsing and mobile computing over wireless channels is gain in importance. Transport Control Protocol (TCP) is a reliable end-to-end, transport protocol that is widely used to support applications like telnet, ftp, and http.

TCP was designed primarily for wire line networks where the channel error rates are very low and congestion is the primary cause of packet loss. Since its original deployment, several modifications to TCP, including Reno, New Reno, Fack, and Vegas, have been proposed and their performance analyzed in wire-line networks.

Fall and Floyd evaluated the performance of TCP Reno, New Reno and SACK by simulations that focused on comparing the differences of packet loss recovery mechanisms (Fall and Floyd, 1996). In addition, in their simulation, packet loss occurrence was designed specifically to highlight the improved performance of SACK. Lakshman and Madhow, investigated the performance of TCP Tahoe and Reno in the presence of large bandwidth-delay product and random losses (Lakshman and Madhow, 1997). They assumed finite buffer size. Nayma and Sumyea analysis of TCP Tahoe, Reno and New Reno and Sack over cellular mobile system but they do not consider Vegas and Fack, they consider two parameters for performance analysis and do not vary TCP receivers (Nayama and Sumyea, 2005).
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VERSIONS OF TCP AND FORWARD ERROR CORRECTION

This TCP implementation has become known as TCP Tahoe. TCP Reno adds one new mechanism called Fast Recovery to TCP Tahoe. TCP NewReno is the newest standardized TCP variant. It contains changes to both the congestion control and the retransmission mechanism of TCP Reno. The use of Sacks permits the receiver to specify several additional data packets that have been received out-of-order within one dupack, instead of only the last in order packet received. TCP Vegas proposes its own unique retransmission and congestion control strategies.

TCP Fack is Reno TCP with forward acknowledgment (Lang, 2002).

For forward error correction redundant information is proactively sent to the receiver in order to allow it to correct errors. The redundant information is generated by means of channel coding. Well-known examples of channel coding are Hamming codes, Reed-Solomon codes and Bose–Chaudhuri–Hochquenghem (BCH) codes.

Hamming code provides a practical solution. The Hamming code can be applied to data units of any length and uses the relationship between data and redundancy bits that can be added to the end of the data unit or interspersed with the original data bits. For the number of redundant bits \(2^r \geq m+r+1\) inequality must be satisfied. Here \(m\) is the number of data bit and \(r\) is the number of redundant bit. If \(m=7\) to satisfy the inequality \(r=4\).

SIMULATION MODEL

The simulation model (network topology) used in this simulation is shown in figure 1. As shown in the figure there are total five nodes. One sender, one base station and three receivers are used. Here the link between the base station and sender is wired and the link between base station and receiver is wireless. So for one sender six versions of TCP sender (supported by NS2) is used and for three receiver four versions of TCP receiver (supported by NS2) is used. Table 1 show the simulation parameter used in simulation.

![Fig. 1: Simulation Topology](image-url)
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For comparison between various TCP versions total 120 second simulation is performed. At first the throughput for various sender and receiver is represented in graph then the average throughput is also calculated. And found that Agent/TCP/Fack give the highest throughput. Now the congestion window size is compared and the average window size is also summarized in table. And found that Agent/TCP/Fack give the highest window size. And to compare between various versions throughput vs. delay is also considered.

Then to improve the TCP performance forward error correction is also used for that hamming code algorithm is used for loss probability of 10% the improvement of TCP is also shown in figure.

TCP Throughput vs. Time:
TCP Throughput vs. Time for Sender Agent/TCP & Agent/TCP/Reno:

Table 1: Simulation parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Base Station &amp; TCP Receiver</th>
<th>Between Base Station &amp; TCP Sender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media: Wireless</td>
<td>Media: Wired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: Orinoco 802.11b 11Mbps PC card</td>
<td>Standard: Ethernet 802.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency: 2.472 GHz</td>
<td>Delay: 1ms to 100ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 2: For Sender Agent/TCP

Fig 3: For Sender Agent/TCP/Reno
TCP throughput vs. Time for Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno & Agent/TCP/Sack1:

Fig 4: For Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno  
Fig 5: For Sender Agent/TCP/Sack1

TCP throughput vs. Time for Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas & Agent/TCP/Fack:

Fig 6: For Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas  
Fig 7: For Sender Agent/TCP/Fack
Congestion Window vs. time:
Congestion Window vs. time for Sender Agent/TCP & Agent/TCP/Reno:

Fig 8: For Sender Agent/TCP
Fig 9: For Sender Agent/TCP/Reno

Congestion Window vs. time for Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno & Agent/TCP/Sack1:

Fig 10: For Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno
Fig 11: For Sender Agent/TCP/Sack1
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Congestion Window vs. time for Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas & Agent/TCP/Fack:

Fig 12: For Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas
Agent/TCP/Fack

TCP Throughput vs. Delay:
TCP throughput vs. Delay for Sender Agent/TCP & Agent/TCP/Reno:

Fig 14: For Sender Agent/TCP
Fig 15: For Sender
Agent/TCP/Reno

TCP throughput vs. Delay for Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno & Agent/TCP/Sack1:

Fig 16: For Sender Agent/TCP/Newreno
Fig 17: For Sender Agent/TCP/Sack1

TCP throughput vs. Delay for Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas & Agent/TCP/Fack:

Fig 18: For Sender Agent/TCP/Vegas
Fig 19: For Sender Agent/TCP/Fack
Comparison of original TCP and TCP with FEC:

![Graph showing comparison between TCP and TCP with FEC](image)

From the above figures for all the six senders and four receivers are considered for performance analysis. For implementation using NS2 one pair of TCP sender and TCP receiver should considered. For those figures it is found that sender Agent/TCP/Fack produce highest window size for receiver Agent/TCPSink. The others pairs can also found from those tables. For average throughput sender Agent/TCP and receiver Agent/TCPSink/Sack1/DelAck produce the highest throughput than the others. The pair between sender Agent/TCP/Fack and receiver Agent/TCPSink/DelAck produces the second highest. So form the all the figures receiver Agent/TCPSink/DelAck produce the maximum throughput.

For forward error correction here hamming code is implemented. Hamming code can only correct single error so for a high bit error rate the coding is not good enough. As for example this research deals with 10% error probability. i.e from hundred packets ten packets will be received with errors. But from figure it is clear that TCP with FEC produce better results than fresh TCP.

**CONCLUSION**

In this paper we investigate TCP senders and TCP receiver and forward error correction with TCP is also investigated. From our analysis we find that TCP Fack give better throughput than other over cellular mobile system. And we also show that FEC with TCP give good throughput. Further investigation can be carried out by implementing FEC with TCP using NS2. And the
performance analysis can also be carried out by including other workloads. For example Hyper Text Transfer Protocol (HTTP) transaction. And performance analysis can also be carried out by considering other errors.
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