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Abstract – Cloud Computing (CC) combines the computer paradigm and a shared environment allowing multiple users to access services and resources. In addition to being accessible internationally via the Internet, this ecosystem may be shared at all levels. Resources, infrastructure, and platforms at all levels may be traded with a wide range of customers. Through the Internet, CC enables remote server access. To create cloud environments, CC uses a wide range of already existing technologies, including internet servers, web browsers, and virtualization. These system vulnerabilities can have a significant impact on the cloud as well. The majority of data breaches occur on the way to their final destination. Because of this, the route that data takes must be protected. In this paper, Hybrid Optimization-based Secure Routing Protocol (HOSRP) is proposed to find the best route to destination and provide security to data that passes on it. HOSRP initially clusters the network into different numbers via modified particle swarm optimization strategy and selects the cluster head. HOSRP detects the shorted routes among clusters via firefly optimization strategy to minimize the delay and maximize the delivery ratio of packets. HOSRP applies security to data transmission using the message digest and cryptographic strategy. The performance of HOSRP is analyzed using greencloud simulator with standard performance metrics. Results indicate that HOSRP has better performance in minimizing the delay to save energy consumption and protecting security to the data.

Index Terms – Hybrid, Optimization, Routing, Cloud, Security, Swarm.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cloud Computing (CC) has great potential to benefit and alter the whole IT sector because of its various features. Considerations including service availability, security, and system performance are important considerations for potential cloud customers. Still, according to an IDC Enterprise Panel poll performed in 2008, security is by far the most pressing issue. While CC’s security challenges are complicated, they may be explained because CC is implemented on top of established techniques and architectures like SaaS, SOA, and distributed computing[1]. CC would inevitably inherit many of the security flaws introduced by these diverse methodologies and architectural approaches when they are all combined. As a result, as cloud users migrate their apps out of the enterprise/organizational barrier into the open cloud, their trust model will also change. If this is the case, cloud customers may be relinquishing physical access to their data and apps. With no physical boundaries between the cloud and its users’ devices, traditional security measures such as firewalls become obsolete in this new context[2], [3].

Users of cloud services must rely significantly on cloud service providers to safeguard them against security breaches. However, CC consumers and cloud service providers are not always from the same trust domain for CC. When cloud service providers and accompanying system, administrators adhere to proper regulations/compliances, they may be denied access to private user data in domains such as healthcare[4].

To fulfill the security needs of individual cloud customers, cloud service providers must deliver security services that match those needs while also complying with legislation. For non-sensitive apps, cloud users’ vital data must be protected, and they must verify the cloud’s security[5]. For this aim, secure auditing procedures are often required. Because of the multitenancy trait, multiple organizations and trust domains share the same computer resources in CC. A consequence of this is that any purposeful or unintentional misbehavior on the part of a single cloud user puts other co-residents in danger and opens the door to additional Internet-based hostile attacks[6], [7].

Essentially, the cloud is a location where information may be exchanged through satellite networks. The hosting company’s responsibility is to manage the enormous data centres that offer security, storage capacity, and processing power required to keep all of the information customers submit to the cloud. Google Drive, Apple iCloud, Amazon Web
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Services, and Microsoft Azure are some of the most well-known cloud hosting providers, but many more are both big and small. As a result, these hosting businesses may hold the rights to utilize their cloud and transfer files on their servers while also providing customers with an infrastructure to connect between devices and applications.

Security in the cloud refers to measures taken to ensure that the data, apps, and infrastructure housed within are safe from intrusion. Software, hardware and storage may all be delivered via the Internet in the form of a cloud-based service. When it comes to CC, it’s almost universally used by enterprises of all sizes because of the advantages of flexibility, quick deployment, scalability and minimal upfront expenses. Routing is transferring a data packet from one location to another in a network.

Routing concepts may be used for a wide range of networks, including circuit-switched and network connectivity. A router is a specialized device that is often used to carry out routing tasks. To go from one point to another, packets of Internet Protocol (IP) pass across the network through the router. Routing tables, which keep track of the routes to multiple network destinations, are often used to guide forwarding by routers. Train passengers check the schedule to choose which train to board while looking at a routing table. Routing tables are similar to railway schedules. However, they are used for network routes instead of trains. They may be defined by an administrator or learnt from network traffic by using routing protocols to build these tables.

1.1. Problem Statement

The ease of data exchange between intelligent devices may wander the Internet. CC networks do not need any external infrastructure. Protocols for discovering routes between nodes that may move and are randomly located are crucial in CCs. Routing protocols are the backbone of CCs, making design research difficult. CCs have far more capacity, mobility, and node power than conventional networks, breaking connections and increasing packet loss ratio. Routine route-finding and maintenance waste electricity and time. CCs have massive control message exchanges between mobile nodes. Several academics have studied alternative topologies to minimize latency, energy consumption, routing overhead, and service quality.

1.2. Objective

The significant objective of HOSRP is to find the best path by performing clustering in the cloud network and finding the shortest route to minimize the delay and energy consumption. For performing clustering and finding the best route, HOSRP utilizes bio-inspired strategies. The data that travels in the best route is protected using message digest cum cryptographic techniques.

1.3. Organization of the Paper

The current section of the article has provided information about CC and issues in CC. Also, it has discussed the statement of problem regarding the research and objective of the research. Section 2 reviews the literatures related to the current research work. Section 3 proposes the protocol for routing the data in CC. Section 4 illustrates the simulator. Section 5 discusses the simulation setting and metrics used to measure the performance. Section 6 provides the discussion about the results obtained from the simulation. Section 7 concludes the research with future work.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

“Efficient and Secure Trusted Routing Mechanism” [8] is proposed for secure and efficient routing from one node to another if the path adopted fails in delivering the message to the node at the destination. The malware activities, namely, botnet size, bot distribution, and membership recruitment for patterns, were handled for defined networks to route its data.

“Securing Data based Multipath Routing” [9] is proposed to enable multipath routing for efficient data transmission in an ad-hoc network. Security for the message is provided by splitting the data, which are encrypted and fused to transmit data in disjoint paths that already exist. The probability is measured for reconstituting the original data. “Spatial and Energy-Aware Trusted Dynamic Distance Source Routing” [10] is proposed for enhancing network lifetime in Wireless Sensor Network. The efficiency, energy level, and spatial data were measured using Quality of Service. Also, performance metrics are innovated to evaluate the data size, energy usage and speed of data communication. Time for the sliding window is also enhanced to detect the attackers, and Network Simulator-2 is used for evaluation. “Ad-hoc Monitoring Routing Protocol” [11] is proposed for constructing MANET using network-based functionalities: security, network monitoring, resource management, routing, and security. The quality of link and connectivity are designed with a routing process for defining the topologies with IPv6 and IPv4 addressing. Integration of the techniques was unified for supporting the mobile nodes. “Enhanced Energy Efficient-Secure Routing protocol” [12] is proposed for accessing the data protected in the network for transmission. Nodes are selected, and the routing path is fetched based on the energy threshold to forward the packets in the ad-hoc network. The neighbor nodes are chosen to enforce the security policy to avoid end-to-end delay and packet loss in the network.

“Intellectual and Secure Edge-Enabled Computing” [13] is proposed for building the strategy for communication by the transmission of data for energy and data management in the network. A chaining strategy with distributed hashing is presented for an efficient computing system. The optimal features are fetched using data routing in deep learning for
training and routes are predicted over servers at the edges. “Secure Load Balanced Routing” [14] is proposed for clustering in WSN. Metric called trust-based security handles the wavering state from good to bad for load balancing. Better packet transmission, energy efficiency and security were achieved and evaluated using Exponential Cat Swarm Optimization. “Moth-Flame Optimization for Secured Communication” [15] is proposed for optimizing the process of routing in Low-power and lossy Networks. The Moth-Flame technique is used for detecting rank attacks for avoiding the malicious nodes in the network. The rank attack detection is enabled, and the petal technique is employed to select the nodes at the next hop and from the source node. “Delay Tolerant Networks” [16] is analyzed for security concerns in the proposed study. Message forwarding is enabled in DTN in which connectivity loss is detected. The integrity of the transmitted message is validated, and appropriate nodes are forwarded. Overhead ratio, delivery ratio and delay of delivering the data were enhanced based on its routing strategies. “Taylor grounded Cat Salp Swarm Algorithm” [17] is proposed for enabling the multi-hop routing in WSN. Low Energy Adaptive Clustering Hierarchy algorithm is used for selecting the cluster heads. The nodes at the sensor are selected for transmitting data through the base station and optimal hop. The trust model is built with integrity, direct, indirect, and data forwarding rate.

“Cost Optimization-based Mathematical Framework” [18] is proposed to minimize the cost and maximize the reliability in Software-Defined Networks. The optimal number of devices are determined using the NSGA–II technique. The cost for technique is minimized, and security issues, namely packet removal and change, analysis of traffic, erroneous routing, and network downtime, were handled. “Secure-Intrusion Detection System” [19] is proposed for MANET in the wireless network. Data is received for consistency, and the framework is built to detect the security issue using the Secure Energy Routing protocol. The attacks are detected, and distorted node in the network is sensed using a simulator. “Sequence Number based Secure Routing” [20] is proposed to detect the structure of the packet. The node availability, resource availability and communication among nodes were identified based on proactive and reactive routing. The packet’s delivery ratio is enhanced, and the network’s lifetime is improved. “Ontological Security Frameworks” [21] is proposed for drawing the method and structure of the placement based on landscape, displacement and migration. The sense of time-space and routine loss was drawn, and the framework built a security and attachment theory model. Spatial routinization was detected with the method of routinization.

“Finite-State Chaotic Compressed Sensing (FSCCS)” [22] proposed for secure data transmission in the cloud. It aims to reduce the amount of data transmitted and improve the security of that data (i.e., routing). By combining global and local information, the detected data similarity got reduced in sensed data. Even though the similarity level reduced but it creates the networking congestion while the data passes in cloud. For DevSecOps inter-cloud adoption, “Conceptual Security Model (CSM)” [23] is proposed. As a result, CSM focuses on integrating security service apps so that open-source software consumers don’t experience long delays when using it. Security, routing, and user operations are integrated into a single system. Major focus of CSM is on security where it minorly focuses on routing to send data. To improve the security of the cloud network, “Lightweight Cryptography (LC)” [24] was developed. The design of LC is based on the amount of time it takes to compute the key used for providing security (i.e., encryption and decryption), (ii) statistics and (iii) entropy. LC too focuses on providing security and not yet focused on routing.

From the above discussed literatures, it was identified the need for common algorithm which focuses on finding the best route and also to provide security while data gets transmitted in the cloud.

3. HYBRID OPTIMIZATION-BASED SECURE ROUTING PROTOCOL

3.1. Node Clustering

Clustering in CC consists of nodes in the range of clusters and selection of the Cluster Head (CH) using a modified PSO technique. The CH will move the data fused by communicating with the cloud server. The selection of CH plays a significant role in the CC network. The model for node energy usage in CC network is illustrated as follows:

Energy usage during transmission of data is mathematically expressed in Eqn.(1).

\[ e_T = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2E^r)N \] (1)

Energy usage while receiving the data is mathematically expressed in Eqn.(2).

\[ e_R = \alpha_3N \] (2)

Energy usage while reaching an idle state is mathematically expressed in Eqn.(3).

\[ e_I = (\alpha_4I_s)Q(N) \] (3)

From Eqns.(1)-(3), E represents the distance for transmission, \( r \) refers to exponent for path loss, \( N \) denotes the size of the message, \( I_s \) refers to idle time, \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) are the parameters that are system dependent, and \( Q(N) \) refers to the cloud processing rate for the message.
Secured clusters are created using different variables for a cloud node using the PSO algorithm. The algorithm is a computational optimization method that is bio-inspired naturally for finding the best optimal solution. At first, the system initializes the random solutions via searching, and the solutions are generated at every iteration, and these solutions are known as a particle. Each particle in the PSO preserves the record for all its subordinates to retrieve the best optimum solution. Also, the value of fitness is measured, which is stored as its best optimum solution and is denoted as $Q_{best}$. The best value called $F_{best}$ is chosen as the solution from the generated population and calculated as a neighbor. The particle’s velocity is measured using random parameters, and it is fetched utilizing the amount of velocity based on $Q_{best}$.

The fitness value of the individual is replaced and updated with its candidate by comparing with the fitness of other cloud nodes using Eqn.(4) and Eqn.(5).

$$v(s+1) = v(s) + C_1 \times r() \times (y_{Q_{best}} - y(s)) + C_2 \times r() \times (y_{F_{best}} - y(s))$$ \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

$$y(s+1) = y(s) + v(s+1)$$ \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

Here, every particle’s velocity and vector position are denoted as $y(s)$ and $v(s)$ for time $s$. The rate of social and self-learning is represented using $B_1$ and $B_2$. The replacement of global fitness is performed using a new fitness value called $y_{F_{best}}$, i.e., when the new fitness value is better than the global fitness value. The formulation of the fitness function is performed using Eqn.(6).

$$G = U_1 \times M_e + U_2 \times M_{RD} + U_3 \times E_{ij} + U_4 \times M_{SV}$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

Here, the node degree is $M_e$, residual-node energy is $M_{RD}$, the distance among node $i$ to $j$ is $E_{ij}$, and the node’s trust value is $M_{SV}$. $U_1$ denotes the weight values, $U_2$, $U_3$ and $U_4$, where $U_1 + U_2 + U_3 + U_4 = 1$. When a cluster is ready to transmit the data to the next cluster after the CH is fixed using PSO, the sink node carries the same procedure. Algorithm 1 provides the pseudocode of performing clustering with modified PSO.

1. Begin
2. Sink node sends "Hello" message.
3. Identify $Q_{best}$ and $F_{best}$ for all particles
4. For all particle
5. Add location and velocity using Eq.(4) and Eq.(5)
6. Calculate the position of nodes with neighbor nodes
7. Compute individual particle fitness
8. Update $Q_{best}$ and $F_{best}$
9. If count of iteration attains maximum value, then
10. Select that specific particle value as best particle
11. Else
12. Increment particle count by 1
13. End If
14. End for
15. End

Algorithm 1 Clustering with Modified PSO

3.2. Safe Routing

Here, the safe routing for selection is performed using three different operations: encryption of data, detection of the shortest path, and data integrity.

3.3. Encryption of Data

Here, the message block is segregated into two different sub-blocks where encryption is performed at the first block using the AES algorithm, and RC-6 is used in the second block for encryption.

The plain text is segregated into two blocks in the encryption procedure, and every block holds 128 bits. Suppose $M$ is non-integer number and a fraction, then it is categorized into two parts $q_i[0: M/2 - 1]$ and $q_i[M/2: M - 1]$ blocks. The first $M/2$ blocks are encrypted with key $L$ generated by AES with 128 bits and length $K$.

Using the encryption procedure, the standard text is segregated into two main blocks in which each block holds 128 bits, namely, $q_i[0: M/2 - 1]$ and $q_i[M/2: M - 1]$. Here, the value of $M$ is a non-integer value and holds a fraction. Encryption of the first $M/2$ blocks is performed using $L$ keys generated with 128-bit size and length $K$ using the AES algorithm.

$$q_i = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} c_j , 0 \leq i \leq m/2 - 1$$ \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

$$B_i = d_{AES}(L, c_j)$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

Here, the input ciphered are denoted using $c_j$ based on the secret keys of AES, and the function of encryption is represented using $d_{AES}$. Also, the encryption of message blocks of $q_i[M/2: M - 1]$ is carried out using the RC6 algorithm. The security level is increased using the RC6 algorithm, and the execution time is stable. It works four times faster for the encryption and decryption process, and it is expressed as Eqn.(9) and Eqn.(10).
Multi-hop-based improved firefly algorithm detects the shortest path for data transmission. Using multi-hop and intra-cluster communication, data were transmitted using CH. Firefly algorithm is generally a bio-inspired technique required to search the problem. The enhanced firefly algorithm coded routing using a novel fitness function using node degree, distance, and residual energy to the sink node from the sensor node. The behavior of firefly is detected using the brightness and intensity value: every firefly, \( G_i y_i \leq 1 \leq M_i \) has the position of \( y_i \). Here, \( i \) denote the intensity of the firefly and its dimension. In detecting the shortest path, every firefly represents the forwarding of data to the sink node from every cluster using relay CH. Every brighter firefly catches the brighter one, which is measured using Eqn.(11).

\[
Y_i = Y_i + \beta g d^{-\gamma r_i^2} (y_j - y_i) + \alpha \left( R - \frac{1}{2} \right)
\]  

(11)

Here, \( \alpha e (0,1) \) and \( \beta \) were the randomized parameters, and the variable \( R \) is random. The \( ith \) position of the firefly is represented using \( y_i \), and \( jth \) position of the firefly is \( y_j \). The main aim of the enhanced firefly algorithm is to fetch the finest route from the CH. Instead of measuring the distance among \( i \) and another key, the radius is computed using Eqn.(12).

\[
r_{best} = \sqrt{(y_i - y_{fbest})^2}
\]  

(12)

Here, \( y_{fbest} \) refers to the restoration for \( y_i \) that provides a better factor for scaling.

For achieving the lesser fitness solution than the traditional firefly algorithm, the appended size is generated in which the step size of first-order \( \Delta k_{1j} \) is smaller than the step size of the second one \( \Delta k_{2j} \). Normal distribution \( (R_m) \) is used instead of random distribution \( (R) \) to diversify the search area, and it is expressed as Eqn.(13).

\[
Y_i = Y_i + \beta g d^{-\gamma r_i^2} (y_j - y_i) + \alpha \left( R_m - \frac{1}{2} \right)
\]  

(13)

In every optimization algorithm based on population, the convergence for pre-mature local minima is a problem. There is no proper exploitation and exploration in a traditional firefly algorithm, and to eradicate the issue, a value called \( A \) is used at the time \( s \).
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5. SIMULATION SETTING AND PERFORMANCE METRICS

Standard computer network performance metrics [25]–[32] is utilized to measure the performance of HOSRP. Cloudsim Simulator [33], [34] is used in this research to evaluate the performance of EACOSR against the current routing protocols. Additionally, this research work uses the Avalanche Effect performance metric to measure security performance. Table 1 lists the simulation parameters utilized in the assessment.

Table 1 Simulation Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth Capacity of Cloudlet</td>
<td>12500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudlet Count</td>
<td>200-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudlet Length</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Energy of Cloudlet</td>
<td>15 Joule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet Size</td>
<td>512 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM Capacity of Cloudlet</td>
<td>8192 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Capacity of Cloudlet</td>
<td>40960 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Simulation Time</td>
<td>100 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Count</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM Bandwidth</td>
<td>2048 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM Count</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM Operating System</td>
<td>Linux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM RAM</td>
<td>1024 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM Size</td>
<td>10240 MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Throughput Analysis

Figure 2 discusses the throughput performance of routing protocols with a different number of cloudlets ranging from 200 to 1000. Figure 3 showcases the average throughput attained by the proposed routing protocol (HOSRP) and existing protocol (FSCCS, CSM and LC). From Figure 2 and Figure 3 it is evident that HOSRP has attained better throughput than existing routing protocols. It is because of finding the optimized cum stable route to the destination that does not face any routing issues. Existing routing protocols...
attempt to seek route without checking its stability and quality, resulting in poor route selection and route failure. PSO plays a significant role in HOSRP in finding the better path. The result values of Figure 3 is given in Table 2 for better understanding.

6.2. Packet Delivery Ratio Analysis

Figure 4 highlights the average packet delivery ratio attained by the proposed routing protocol (HOSRP) and existing protocol (FSCCS, CSM and LC). Figure 5 discusses routing protocols’ packet delivery ratio performance with a different number of cloudlets ranging from 200 to 1000. From Figure 4 and Figure 5, it is clear for an understanding that HOSRP outperforms FSCCS, CSM and LC in terms of delivering packets to the destination. The clustering strategy followed in HOSRP leads to identifying the trusted nodes and stable route to the destination, leading to increased packet delivery ratio than other FSCCS, CSM and LC that focuses on identifying the route in short duration rather than selecting the trusted cum stable route to the destination. It is also to be noted that the performance of HOSRP gets lowered when the count of cloudlets increases, but it comparatively gives better performance than other routing protocols. The result values of Figure 5 are given in Table 3 for better understanding.
6.3. Packet Drop Ratio Analysis

Figure 6 discusses routing protocols’ packet drop ratio performance with a different number of cloudlets ranging from 200 to 1000. Figure 7 demonstrates the average packet drop ratio of the proposed routing protocol (HOSRP) and existing protocol (FSCCS, CSM and LC). From Figure 5, it is possible to understand that the packet drop ratio of all protocols increases with the increase of cloudlets. It is to be noted from Figure 6 and Figure 7 that HOSRP outperforms FSCCS, CSM and LC in terms of meager packet drop ratio. Detection of shortest route cum stable route is the specific reason HOSRP gets a meager packet drop ratio. The existing routing protocols select the route without checking the distance and quality of the route. The result values of Figure 7 are given in Table 4 for better understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routing Protocols</th>
<th>Average Packet Drop Ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSCCS</td>
<td>34.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>27.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>24.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSRP</td>
<td>17.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. Delay Analysis

Figure 8 compares the delay faced by the proposed routing protocol HOSRP against the existing routing protocols (FSCCS, CSM and LC). Figure 9 compares the average delay faced by HOSRP and existing routing protocols. From Figure 9, it is evident that the delay of all routing protocols gets
increased when the count of cloudlets increases, but when comparatively HOSRP faces a minimum delay than the considered existing routing protocols. The main intention of HOSRP is to securely deliver the data packet to the destination, where it focuses on avoiding congestion. The routes identified by existing routing protocols face more congestion due to poor quality routes that lead to more delay. HOSRP selects the best route in an optimized manner focusing on its quality and avoiding congestion and reduced delay. The result values of Figure 9 are given in Table 5 for better understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routing Protocols</th>
<th>Average Delay (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSCCS</td>
<td>6499.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>6169.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>5989.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSRP</td>
<td>5309.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5. Energy Consumption Analysis

Energy Consumption Analysis is demonstrated in Figure 10 and Figure 11. In Figure 9, HOSRP proves that it consumed a low energy level to deliver the data packet to the destination over simulation duration. Consumption of energy to deliver the packet to the destination drastically increases when the count of cloudlets increases. Figure 11 compares the average energy consumption of HOSRP and existing routing protocols (FSCCS, CSM and LC). Finding the minimum distance cum optimized route is the root cause for consuming low energy by HOSRP. The significant reason for consuming more energy to deliver the packet to the destination by existing routing protocols is the selection for the poor-quality route, non-avoidance of congestion and multiple retransmissions of data packets. The result values of Figure 11 are given in Table 6 for better understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routing Protocols</th>
<th>Average Energy Consumption (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSCCS</td>
<td>60.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>57.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>51.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSRP</td>
<td>34.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6. Avalanche Effect Analysis

Figure 12 illustrates the avalanche effect of the proposed routing protocol HOSRP against existing routing protocols (FSCCS, CSM, and LC). From Figure 12, it is likely to understand that HOSRP has a better avalanche effect than the current protocols. HOSRP provides security via message-digest algorithm and cryptographic techniques. Also, it is to be noted that the performance of CSM is lower than LC in all other considered performance metrics, but in the avalanche effect metric, it has better performance than LC in terms of providing security. The result values of Figure 12 are given in Table 7 for better understanding.

![Avalanche Effect](image)

**Figure 12 Avalanche Effect**

**Table 7 Average Avalanche Effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routing Protocols</th>
<th>Average Avalanche Effect (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSCCS</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSRP</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has proposed a Hybrid Optimization-based Secure Routing Protocol (HOSRP) to find the best route in a cloud network to reach data to destination with reduced delay and increased security. HOSRP performs clustering before finding the best route. For clustering, a modified version of particle swarm optimization is used and to find the best cum shortest route, HOSRP utilizes modified reliable firefly optimization. Security for the data is provided using message digest cum cryptographic techniques. Performance of HOSRP is analyzed in Green Cloud simulator with standard performance metrics. HOSRP is faster and uses less energy than any previously used techniques. In HOSRP, the avalanche effect is 71.7%, demonstrating the efficiency of data transport security. In the future, improved bio-inspired based ideas may be applied to improve routing and security.
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