

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. No.	Figure Title	Page No.
Fig. 1.1	Pictorial Representation of degree of membership	9
Fig. 2.1	Different shapes obtained by varying the value of fuzzification factor m	28
Fig. 2.2	Link Preference Index diagram	32
Fig. 2.3	Network for FSPP	36
Fig. 2.4	Ranking of paths in the network	40
Fig. 2.5	Network for FMST	44
Fig. 2.6	Fuzzy Minimum Spanning Tree for the given network	47
Fig. 2.7	Network for FSTP with Steiner points shown as double circles	48
Fig. 2.8	Fuzzy complete undirected distance graph G_1	50
Fig. 2.9	Fuzzy Minimal Spanning Tree T_1 of G_1	53
Fig. 2.10	Final Fuzzy Steiner Tree(T_{FS})	53
Fig. 2.11(a)	Behavior in terms of cost of shortest path shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	66
Fig. 2.11(b)	Behavior in terms of path discretization error shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	66
Fig. 2.11(c)	Behavior in terms of CPU Execution time shown by different ranking methods by varying the delay requirement on a random graph with 250 nodes generated by gengraph-win	67
Fig. 2.12	The point considered as Circumcenter of Centroid (COC) is shown by X	67
Fig. 2.13	A surface plot with the delay requirement, cost and CPU execution time of WF	68

Fig. 2.14	Box and Whisker plot showing the fuzzy cost as a TFN with four parameters at the delay requirement = 30 units	68
Fig. 2.15	Block diagram of a typical Wireless Sensor node (mote)	71
Fig. 2.16	A Wireless Sensor Network (WSN) represented as a Unit Disc Graph (UDG)	71
Fig. 2.17	Pictorial representation of trapezoidal fuzzy number	72
Fig. 2.18	(a) Behaviour of the CFSPP algorithm when applied on a graph with 200 nodes generated using <i>gengraph-win</i> with source (s) = 45 and target (t) = 68, (b) Comparison of the same behaviour for four different network sizes with source (s) = 4 and target (t) = 45	74
Fig. 2.19	Progress of the CFSPP algorithm in terms of energy consumption with a strict and a relaxed delay constraint when applied on a graph with 200 nodes generated using <i>gengraph-win</i>	76
Fig. 2.20	Progress of the CFSPP algorithm in terms of path delay with delay constraint= 350 when applied on a graph with 50, 100, 150, 200 nodes generated using <i>gengraph-win</i>	76
Fig. 2.21	Membership Function for total collected score of a path	82
Fig. 2.22	Membership Function for total time taken to traverse a path	82
Fig. 2.23	Fuzzy decision set Z and Z^*	83
Fig. 2.24	Input Graph $G(V, E)$ with source vertex = 1 and destination vertex = 5	84
Fig. 2.25	Several steps of the parallel formulation of FOP	92
Fig. 3.1	Trapezoidal intuitionistic fuzzy number (TIFN)	104
Fig. 3.2	The point of reference used for ranking a TIFN	107
Fig. 3.3	Behaviour shown by the cost of the shortest path on varying the input delay constraint for a graph with 200 nodes generated using <i>gengraph-win</i>	113
Fig. 3.4	Quasi-Gaussian Intuitionistic Fuzzy Number	115
Fig. 3.5	Centroid method of ranking for QGIFN	116

Fig. 3.6	Trend observed in the cost of the shortest path on varying the input delay constraint for a graph with 100 nodes generated using gengraph-win	121
Fig. 3.7	The input graph with $N = 5, v_1 = 1, v_N = 5$ and the time and score values associated with each edge and vertex respectively	123
Fig. 3.8	The sequential module executing step 1 of IFOP that computes all the distinct paths in the given graph G	130
Fig. 3.9	The parallel version of IFOP along with its work-depth analysis stating the work and depth value of each step	131
Fig. 3.10	Input graph G with number of nodes (N) = 5 , source (v_1) = 1, target (v_N) = 5 and the co-ordinate values (intuitionistic fuzzy points) and the score values (trapezoidal intuitionistic fuzzy numbers) of each node	139
Fig. 4.1	Comparison of the maximum value of the total collected score obtained by four different selection methods for different T_{max} values (160 cities)	158
Fig. 4.2	Comparison of the maximum value of the total collected score obtained by four different selection methods for different T_{max} values (306 cities)	159
Fig. 4.3	Graph for (a) 160 cities and (b) 306 cities instance	160
Fig. 4.4	The process of selecting a path using roulette wheel selection function where the number in () denotes the probability of node selection	162
Fig. 4.5	Progression of RWS_OP algorithm for a graph with 25 nodes with source (V_1) = 1, destination (V_N) = 25 and $T_{max} = 70$	169
Fig. 4.6	Comparison of (a) maximum score and (b) mean score of each method with respect to time budget (T_{max})	173
Fig. 4.7	Comparison of execution time of each method with respect to time budget (T_{max}) based on 30 runs at $\alpha = 0.6$ for Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	174
Fig. 4.8	Comparison of score with respect to α for (a) $T_{max} = 1500$ and (b) $T_{max} = 2500$ for a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland	175
Fig. 4.9	Plots showing (a) utilization of the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score at $\alpha = 0.6$ and $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland (c) Progression of RWS_OP algorithm	179

Fig. 4.10	Plots showing the observation of three different runs of RWS_OP with $\alpha = 0.2$ and $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland. As the algorithm progresses, it results in (a) decrease in the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score as shown above	180
Fig. 4.11	Plots showing (a) utilization of the time budget and (b) increase in the total collected score for three different α values at $T_{max} = 1500$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland	181
Fig. 4.12	Plots showing (a) the percentage of nodes explored with the increase in T_{max} values at $\alpha = 0.6$ and (b) percentage of nodes explored and unexplored for different values of α at $T_{max} = 7000$ for a Real Road Network database with 160 cities of Poland for 30 runs	182
Fig. 4.13	Plot showing that RWS_OP can achieve higher total collected score for larger T_{max} values as compared to Ostrowski_CG and Ostrowski_IG methods when implemented on a Real Road Network database with 306 cities of Poland at $\alpha = 0.6$	184
Fig. 4.14	Comparison of the total collected score value achieved by GRASP and FPA algorithms for different T_{max} values when applied on a graph with 102 nodes, source=1, destination=102	189
Fig. 4.15	Comparison of the average execution time (s) of the CSPP algorithm suggested by Chen <i>et al.</i> (2008) with the bidirectional search algorithm for different network sizes	197