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Abstract – According to the analysis, several task scheduling methods have been implemented, such as the Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) method, which has enhanced the performance of cloud data centers (DCs) in terms of various scheduling metrics. The scheduling issue in cloud computing (CC) is well-known to be NP-hard, with the main challenge arising from the exponential increase in the no. of possible outcomes or groupings as the problem size grows. Therefore, the key aim is to determine secure and optimal solutions for scheduling consumer tasks. In this study, a proposed method called Optimized-Hybrid Medium Access Control Secure Hash Algorithm 3 (O-HMACSHA3) is introduced for CC. The investigation aims to address the issue of reliable resource scheduling access for different tasks in the cloud environment, with a focus on reducing turnaround time (TAT) and energy consumption (EC). The proposed method utilizes optimization with PSO to achieve soft security in resource scheduling. To evaluate its effectiveness, the research method is compared with other task scheduling methods, including PSO and Fruit Fly-Based Simulated Annealing Optimization (FSAO) method, in terms of EC and time. The findings indicate significant improvements in performance metrics, with energy consumption reduced to 47.7 joules and TAT decreased to 316 milliseconds compared to existing methods. This is in contrast to the proposed method, which resulted in 57.3 joules and 479 milliseconds, respectively, for 20 tasks.

Index Terms – Task Scheduling (TS), O-HMACSHA3 (Optimized-Hybrid Medium Access Control Secure hash Algorithm), PSO (Particle Swarm Optimization), EC (Energy Consumption), TAT (Turnaround Time).

1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, technological advancements have given rise to a new concept called cloud computing. It enables the provision and hosting of facilities and resources to numerous users via the Internet on a pay-as-you-go basis [1]. Through various cloud computing (CC) vendors, consumers can access networking, computer infrastructure, data storage, and other applications as needed to fulfill their requirements. It encompasses dissimilar models, such as Software as a Service (SaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), to offer these cloud-based services. In this context, the classical service provider role can be classified into two leading points.

- Organization companies handle cloud stages and offer resources using a procedure-based assessing scheme.
- Cloud service providers rent resources from any organization provider to meet customer requests.

Managing cloud services is challenging due to their dynamic, diverse, and self-configuring nature. The key concerns of task scheduling (TS) [2] in CC are load balancing (LB) and resource management. On a multiprocessor system, TS becomes an NP-complete issue. For this reason, several investigators have implemented various heuristics and meta-heuristic methods to address this problem. Different categories of these heuristic methods include scheduling and clustering methods. They analyze and select optimization methods for TS in the cloud from a large pool of heuristic and meta-heuristic methods [3].

It is an on-demand platform that provides clients with access to collective resources, software, and other equipment at predetermined times. This term is frequently used in the context of the Internet, where the entire Internet can be seen as a cloud. It can help lower capital and effective costs.
Automatic LB services, which are the foundation of cloud vendors, allow organizations to scale up the number of CPUs or memory in their systems to meet growing demands. Depending on the business needs of the entity, this service is optional. Load balancing fulfills two crucial functions: promoting the availability of cloud services and enhancing performance. Figure 1, defined in network diagrams, illustrates a cloud used to represent the Internet [4].

This rapid development places a focus on Cloud Service Providers (CSPs) to evaluate effective resource management. In addition, it is necessary to distribute client demands among Virtual Machines (VMs) to handle more requests without expanding the physical infrastructure [5]. As a result, LB and TS are central themes in CC and have recently increased important care. For instance, general IaaS cloud provider AMAZON EC2 (elastic compute cloud) utilizes elastic LB to allocate client demands [6]. It is important to note that load balancing (LB) and TS for cloud computing are NP-hard issues.

1.1. Objectives

To design soft security for reliable resource scheduling access for different tasks in the CC environment.

The research paper is arranged as trails: Section 2 defines various TS methods for CC and discusses optimization and encryption techniques. The problem definition is offered in Section 3. Section 4 defines the various classifications of task scheduling techniques in cloud computing. Section 5 explores meta-heuristic and heuristic scheduling techniques. The research proposal is elaborated in Sections 6 and 7, which cover the experimental outcomes, conclusion, and upcoming improvements.

2. RELATED WORK

Numerous recent analysis have been showed in the field of CC, focusing primarily on areas such as task development, virtual machines (VMs), evaluation, load balancing (LB), and energy management. LB, in particular, has been a focal point for analysts due to its significance in CC for stakeholders including cloud service sources and users. Based on the analysis of previous literature surveys, one of the details for this attention is the lack of comprehensive classification between numerous LB methods. In this division, a systematic examination of earlier research works is presented. According to the author [13], in their proposed work, various task scheduling methods such as GA, ACO, and others were implemented, leading to improved performance of cloud data centers (DCs) in terms of several task scheduling metrics. These scheduling issues are known to be NP-hard, as the no. of possible answers increases exponentially with the problem size. Therefore, achieving optimized scheduling of consumer jobs is a challenging task. This research implemented an adaptive LB task scheduling method for CC. This method maps external tasks to obtainable VMs in a load-balanced manner to optimize the make span, increase resource utilization (RU), and adaptively reduce Service Level Agreement (SLA) violation.

Figure 1 General Representation of Cloud Computing [4]
Agreement (SLA) violations. The proposed TS approach's performance was measured and compared with other optimization approaches using metrics such as average RU; make span, and SLA violation. The author [14] described research on optimization algorithms such as resource allocation, load balancing (LB), non-linear objective function (OF) optimization, queuing cost, cloud cost estimation, and task particle optimization methods for scheduling in a cloud environment. The key aims of the research are as follows:

- To implement an effective task-based dynamic load-balanced distributed queue that maps tasks to resources, optimizing cost and execution time while improving fault tolerance and reliability.
- To provide a multi-objective optimization (MOO) based strategy for VM consolidation that considers fault tolerance (FT), load balancing (LB), job priority, and efficient resource allocation.
- To achieve an improved relocation evaluation structure and efficient networking, memory, and TS requirements modeling.

Harvinder Singh et al. (2021) [15] proposed addressing the workflow scheduling issue with the goal of maximizing resource utilization. They implemented QoS-based resource allocation and TS using swarm-based ACO method to achieve more expected outcomes and reduce scheduling optimization issues. The implemented methods were simulated in a simulated cloud environment. In future work, the effects of the implemented method will be compared with other policies and evaluated using QoS metrics. Muhammad et al. (2021) [16] discussed an effective adaptive migration method developed for operational migration and placement of VMs on physical machines (PMs). The research method consists of two components: (i) selecting PM positions with the best access latency for reducing VMs and (ii) optimizing the no. of VM migrations. The research was extensively simulated using the CloudSim toolkit. The outcomes of the research method were compared with proactive simulation-based scheduling, load balancing (LB), and task-aware scheduling heuristic techniques in terms of SLA violation, RU, no. of hosts shut down, and EC. The results show that the effective adaptive migration method expressively decreases the no. of migrations by 16% and 24%, SLA violation by 20% and 34%, and maximizes RU by 8% to 17%. Additionally, it reduces the maximum no. of hosts shut down from 10% to 30% compared to the existing methods. Shabaz et al. (2019) [17] discussed the problem of load imbalance as a multi-variant and constraint issue that negatively affects the efficiency and performance of computational systems. Load balancing (LB) methods offer solutions for addressing load imbalance conditions, focusing on both under loading and overloading scenarios. The article presents a research analysis of LB techniques, highlighting the benefits and challenges of existing methods and identifying critical limitations that need to be addressed to further develop effective load-balancing methods. Additionally, the article proposes novel insights into LB in cloud computing. Mohit et al. (2018) [18] introduced a reliable cloud framework for efficiently managing high consumer demands while meeting deadlines and ensuring resistance to failures using a threshold-based trigger plan. The evaluation outcomes demonstrate that the implemented method significantly decreases the make span time and increases the task acceptance ratio by over 10% compared to the min-min approach and by 20% compared to FCFS (first come, first-served) and SJF (shortest job first) algorithms in all scenarios. Danlami et al. (2022) [19] discussed an implemented method where virtual annealing was incorporated to balance local and global search and reduce premature convergence. They introduced a trade-off parameter that allows users to choose a reliable Quality of Service (QoS) level that minimizes the cost of execution. The FSAO method was designed and executed using the EDGECLoudSIM simulation tool. The experimental results demonstrate that the FSAOS efficiently schedules resources based on task requirements, reducing the make span and cost of execution. It achieves better RU compared to the conventional FFO (fruit-fly optimization) and PSO methods. Table 1 provides a description of existing research methods, problems, tools, and metrics related to LB and TS in cloud computing.

Table 1 Existing Analysis of the Different Methods for Cloud Computing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Problems / Gaps</th>
<th>Tool / Server</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>ALTS</td>
<td>Imbalance mapping of tasks</td>
<td>CloudSim</td>
<td>MakeSpan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLA violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>max-min</td>
<td>Minimum makespan scheduling</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Start time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>min-min</td>
<td>issues, memory storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finish time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The classification in Table 2 is based on TS and various performance metrics derived from current research articles. In the table, the presence or absence of parameters is indicated by 'Yes' or 'No', respectively.

Table 2 Comparison Analysis of Task Scheduling Methods with Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proposed techniques</th>
<th>Research gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021[27]</td>
<td>Improved MultiVerse optimization technique</td>
<td>Issues in resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021[28]</td>
<td>Genetic algorithm-based task handling</td>
<td>Re-transmission data issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021[29]</td>
<td>Load balancing-based technique for cloud computing</td>
<td>Complexity occurs whenever transmitting a large volume of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020[30]</td>
<td>Hybrid technique for task scheduling</td>
<td>Tools for resource management are limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. PROBLEM DEFINATION

Cloud computing revolutionizes a significant portion of the IT (Information Technology) sector, transforming the concept of data processing into a valuable asset. It impacts the development and consumption of equipment, increasing the popularity of SaaS and reshaping the industry. The appeal of CC lies in its ability to lease computational resources on-demand, making it an increasingly attractive option for users. Cloud hosting operates on an on-demand or pay-as-you-go model, granting customers the perception of infinite computational resources in a shared environment. These resources can be scaled up or down to meet the necessities of cloud users, necessitating precise task scheduling for optimal utilization.
Despite the existence of several proposed techniques, cloud computing still faces challenges such as high energy utilization, resource management issues, and limited tools for resource management. In a CC system, two distinct players are involved:

- The cloud user and the cloud delivery network. Each player has different objectives, with cloud service providers striving to maximize resource usage while cloud users aim to reduce costs while fulfilling their requirements.
- However, the lack of information exchange between cloud providers and data consumers hinders resource allocation.

Table 3 presents the previous methods of TS in cloud computing, along with the proposed methods and identified gaps.

4. TAXONOMY OF TASK SCHEDULING METHODS IN CLOUD COMPUTING

In this section, the three primary categories into which they are divided are explained: heuristic, meta-heuristic, and hybrid.

4.1. Heuristic Scheduling (HS) Technique

These methods are issue-based and provide a better presentation for a particular field of issues but minimum performance for others. Generally, it offers a specific solution for a particular area of an issue in a finite quantity of time but cannot resolve complex optimization issues. Several heuristic methods have been developed in a cloud environment that determines the workflow scheduling issue and independent tasks. Now, we have deliberated several heuristic methods by dividing them into dissimilar modules based on the important keyword in the research editorial, like; as HEFT (heterogeneous earliest finish time)[31], max-min[32], FCFS [33], SJF [34], RR [35], dynamic resource scheduling and allocation methods depend on the QoS metrics[36], etc. These methods deployed the tasks at the VM utilizing various scheduling methods and tried to reduce several rates of service metrics. Analysis of several heuristic methods along with their benefits and challenges is defined in table 4.

4.2. Meta-Heuristic Scheduling (MHS) Technique

In the past 20 years, these methods have gained significant popularity for their effectiveness in solving complex computational problems. These methods possess several beneficial characteristics, including:

- They are not specific to a particular problem.
- They are approximate and often non-deterministic.
- They proficiently discover the search space to find optimal solutions (OSs) for NP-complete issues.

Examples of such methods include PSO [37], ACO [38], GA [39], HBB-LB (honey bee behavior Load balancing) [40], BAT [41], CSO (Cuckoo Search Optimization) [42], FFA (Firefly Algorithm) [43], LO (Lion Optimization) [44], ABC (Artificial Bee Colony) [40,52], and others, as shown in Figure 2. An analysis of the PSO method, its variants, techniques, quality of service metrics, and challenges can be found in Table 7.
### Table 4 Instantaneous Heuristic Methods with their Challenges and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Research Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>M-HEFT</td>
<td>Evaluate the rank for all tasks in DAG</td>
<td>Reduce the loaded issue of HEFT and the make-span time</td>
<td>It enables the division of the load uniformly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>enhanced min-min</td>
<td>Task relocation method</td>
<td>Optimize the makespan time and rise the resource utilization</td>
<td>Reschedule the tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Max-min</td>
<td>Assign the maximum task to best reserve initially</td>
<td>It optimizes the time and resource utilization</td>
<td>High possibility of overloaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>SJF</td>
<td>Choose minimum task first for implementation</td>
<td>It optimizes turnaround time and ET in evaluation with FCFS and RR</td>
<td>Load imbalanced in this method.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 QoS-Based HS Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>MT (makespan time)</th>
<th>Executi on time</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>Throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 [46]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 [47]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 [48]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 [49]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 HS Technique-Based on Several Metrics along with Constraint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Static</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Resource analysis</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 [46]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 [47]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 [48]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 [49]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 Analysis of Meta-Heuristic Methods with their Benefits and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Research Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 [37][50]</td>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>Task migration approach</td>
<td>Enhance the cost, time and TRR</td>
<td>The local minima hits Gbest, and no measurements of energy use are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 [38][51]</td>
<td>ACO</td>
<td>2-level cloud scheduler method using ACO</td>
<td>Reduce makespan, response time, and throughput</td>
<td>A secondary communication instrument is utilized to interchange the data among entities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of previous scheduling methods, QoS metrics, constraints, and limitations is presented in Table 5. In this table, "Yes" indicates the presence of a parameter, while "No" indicates its absence. Table 6 provides an analysis of several scheduling methods, including metrics, methods, constraints, and challenges. Several task scheduling (TS) methods for cloud environments using the meta-heuristic approach are described, along with their benefits, challenges, and algorithm performance. The details can be found in Tables 8 and 9. In these tables, the following abbreviations are used: T = True, F = False, Y = Yes, and N = No.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Figure 3 illustrates the proposed model flowchart, which outlines the various steps to obtain the desired outcome. The process begins with the use of multiple listeners to capture user requests. These requests may contain task information of similar or different types. The listeners gather data from the Internet and organize task queues based on different priority levels. These priorities enable cloud networks to understand execution patterns and deliver high-quality services to their users. The proposed flow includes an encryption method that ensures the security of all requests and data elements. It is an enhanced version of the HMAC algorithm, incorporating the secure hash function of the SHA3-512 algorithm. This method helps generate a secure encryption key for the HMAC algorithm, resulting in superior-quality encrypted data elements.
Figure 3 Flowchart of the Secure and Optimized Resource Allocation Process

The queue analyzer is a crucial component of the proposed architecture as it analyzes tasks and their header components. The analyzer verifies function properties and estimates the effort required for execution. If there is a queue that requires resources for execution, the analyzer performs request filters to identify attackers and ensure regular performance [53]. Attackers in this environment employ distributed denial of service (DDOS) attacks to bring down or crash the cloud network. Each request has different properties and a specific timespan to detect potential attackers. The proposed model includes an optimization process for analyzing request parameters and filtering out attacker requests in a cloud environment. The decision-making module of the optimization process eliminates attacker requests and blocks user IDs, while managing standard requests in execution queues processed by the cloud network. This iterative process handles resource allocations, tracks occupied resource status, and ensures resource availability based on execution clocks.

Once all processes are completed following the given flow, the performance analyzer calculates the efficiency of the developed model. Various parameters are used to obtain readings and make comparisons to validate differences. Table 10 defines the resource allocation procedure using the hybrid secure O-HMACSHA3 technique, which requires two parameters: T, representing the list of tasks, and R, representing the list of available resources. This process ensures security and optimized execution patterns for the
given task lists. The first phase of O-HMACSHA3 is related to protection by generating secure keys for transmission between the client and server. This hybrid module enhances authentication for every call made to the server. The tasks with their corresponding information create a queue on the cloud server (T). The PSO optimization process in the proposed architecture provides calculated results for execution patterns and is connected to a resource parameter table to update resource status and allocations. The approved list of resources is associated with the given tasks, initiating their execution. The execution process records various metrics to track the effectiveness of the implemented method, as defined in pseudo code 1.

Input: List of tasks T, resource list R
Output: exe_tasks, unexecuted waiting_score

1. Listen to tasks queue T from the user end
2. Hybrid-HMAC authentication layer initialized
   - Generate secret key for secure transmission
   - Add authentication layer with generated secrets
3. Validate keys at cloud server for authorization
4. Analyze task tᵢ from tasks queue T
5. exe_tasks = 0, unexecuted = 0
6. for each tᵢ ∈ T do
7. if status(tᵢ ∈ {Init, pending}) then
8. h_id= allocate_pso(tᵢ) // h_id is host id from the available list
9. if waiting at resource==approved
10. location_res=where(h_id)
11. if location_res==matched
12. Allocate_task(tᵢ) → get_resource(h_id)
13. if resource reply==false
14. Process.kill(tᵢ)
15. end if
16. end if
17. exe_tasks= exe_tasks+1 // exe_tasks are successfully executed tasks list
18. else if status(tᵢ ∈ {crash, fail})
19. unexecuted= unexecuted+1 //unexecuted are the list of unexecuted tasks due to any reason
20. else
21. waiting_score= waiting_score+(ideal_en*time)
22. end if
23. end for

return exe_tasks, unexecuted, waiting_score

Pseudo Code 1 Secure Resource Allocation Process with O-HMACSHA

6. EXPERIMENT ANALYSIS

This section represents the analysis of investigational results attained from the implemented methods in comparison to existing methods. The implemented system evaluated the performance of the secure and optimized resource allocation approach in task scheduling. Various metrics related to task scheduling turnaround time and energy was considered in this research. The calculations were performed using MATLAB simulation language with a GUIDE interface. The simulations were conducted on machines equipped with an Intel Core i3 processor and 8 GB RAM. The structural details of the simulation analysis are provided in Table 10.

Table 10 Parameters of Simulation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulation tool</td>
<td>MATLAB with GUIDE Version 2018a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing power</td>
<td>Intel i3 processor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory machine</td>
<td>8GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section describes the proposed O-HMACSHA3 and FSAOS methods, comparing their parameters such as EC and turnaround time to the existing method.

![Figure 4 PSO Optimizer to Search for Best Cost Values](image)

The task execution depends on the deployed solutions and their calculated cost, as presented in Figure 4. The main
The motive is to minimize the cost function (CF), which processes the tasks and the resource list to determine allocation patterns and generate the cost of execution. This process helps reduce complexity and achieve a high accuracy rate.

Figure 5 Task Allocations in O-HMACSHA3

The task allocation process assigns resources to the input task queues. The list of tasks can be reallocated when a high-priority task emerges during execution. Figure 5 illustrates the reallocation process for the current queue in execution.

Figure 6 Comparative Analysis with Proposed and Existing Method: Turnaround Time (msec)

Turnaround time, depicted in Figure 6, represents the overall time for processing all the queues in a single execution. It indicates the time required for positive implementation of a procedure in the cloud environment. A shorter turnaround time signifies higher performance of the processing algorithms. The execution structure, along with the parameters and test cases, ensures high performance of the researched architecture for processing the queues.

Table 11 Comparison of turnaround time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of tasks queues</th>
<th>Time O-HMACSHA3(millisecond)</th>
<th>Time FSAOS(millisecond)[19]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>721.6</td>
<td>865.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1215.2</td>
<td>1378.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed approach undergoes a validation process involving the execution of various queues to evaluate performance metrics. Table 11 presents the performance comparison between the recently developed existing model and the planned method. The execution results demonstrate the superiority of the O-HMACSHA3 method in all cases.

Table 12 Comparison of Energy Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of tasks</th>
<th>Energy O-HMACSHA3(Joule)</th>
<th>Energy FSAOS(Joule)[19]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>197.9</td>
<td>219.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>414.2</td>
<td>504.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>689.2</td>
<td>831.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>752.1</td>
<td>924.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 Comparative Analysis with Proposed and Existing Method - Energy Consumption j (joule)

Table 12 and Figure 7 define energy consumption as the cost of executing tasks. Lower consumption is desired for efficient execution. The variation in implementation aims to validate the load and performance under different loads. The energy consumption in the planned environment is comparatively lower, indicating the high performance of the introduced approach. The different cases, ranging from small to heavy loads on the allocation side, demonstrate variations in energy consumption. As the system works more, energy consumption tends to increase. However, compared to the existing approach, the planned approach shows lower consumption in all cases.

7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

The research analysis has developed and introduced a secure and optimized resource allocation method for TS. The method has been compared with O-HMACSHA3 and FSAOS [19] methods and the obtained results confirm improvements in turnaround time and energy consumption. The implemented method utilizes the PSO method for optimization and
enhancement of solutions. The proposed O-HMACSHA3 method is presented as an enhancement for reliable resource scheduling access in the cloud environment. The research aims to address existing issues by developing soft security measures for reliable resource scheduling access using PSO optimization in the cloud environment. The performance of the proposed cloud resource scheduling technique is calculated and compared with other task scheduling methods, namely PSO and FSAOS [19], in terms of time and EC. The research method resolves existing problems and improves performance metrics, with energy consumption at 47.7 joules and TAT (Turnaround Time) at 316 msec, compared to the proposed method, which achieved 57.3 joules and 479 msec for 20 tasks, surpassing other existing methods.

As for future work, the research method will focus on enhancing Quality of Service (QoS). The attained consequences confirm the effectiveness of the implemented O-HMACSHA3 process. Furthermore, a SHA3-512 strategy will be implemented to ensure reliable service delivery to clients in the cloud environment. Energy-conscious plans will also be discussed, which have garnered significant interest from the research community. A work schedule considering energy consumption will be created and presented in an actual cloud environment.
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