

# Trust-based Service Composition and Binding with Multiple Objective Optimization in Service-Oriented Mobile Ad Hoc Networks

## APPENDIX A

In this appendix, we provide details of trust propagation and aggregation in the single-trust baseline protocol design. A node receiving a trust update follows the propagation and aggregation protocol described below to update its  $(\alpha, \beta)$  pair toward the SP. Trust propagation is done through recommendations received from 1-hop neighbors whom the trustor encounters dynamically. A node (trustor) will select  $n_{\text{rec}}$  recommenders whom it trusts most to provide trust recommendations of an SP (trustee). A recommender should only pass its direct interaction experience with the trustee node in terms of  $(\alpha, \beta)$  as a recommendation to avoid dependence and looping [25]. Let node  $i$  be the trustor, node  $j$  be the trustee, and node  $k$  be a recommender. Also let  $(\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_{i,j})$  be the trustor's  $(\alpha, \beta)$  toward the trustee,  $(\alpha_{k,j}, \beta_{k,j})$  be the recommender's  $(\alpha, \beta)$  toward the trustee and  $(\alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k})$  be the trustor's  $(\alpha, \beta)$  toward the recommender. Based on belief discounting (see [24] for details), node  $i$  will compute its new  $(\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}}, \beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}})$  as follows:

$$\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = \alpha_{i,j} + \frac{2\alpha_{i,k}\alpha_{k,j}}{[(\beta_{i,k} + 2)(\alpha_{k,j} + \beta_{k,j} + 2)] + 2\alpha_{i,k}} \quad (14)$$

$$\beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}} = \beta_{i,j} + \frac{2\alpha_{i,k}\beta_{k,j}}{[(\beta_{i,k} + 2)(\alpha_{k,j} + \beta_{k,j} + 2)] + 2\alpha_{i,k}} \quad (15)$$

The basic idea is that if node  $i$  does not trust  $k$ , it will discount the recommendation provided by node  $k$ , so  $\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \alpha_{i,j}$  and  $\beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \beta_{i,j}$  as if the recommendation from  $k$  does not have any effect. This can be derived from (14) and (15). First of all, if node  $i$  does not trust node  $k$  then  $\alpha_{i,k} \ll \beta_{i,k}$ . In case node  $k$  is performing a bad-mouthing attack on node  $j$ , then  $\alpha_{k,j} \ll \beta_{k,j}$ . Applying these two conditions to (14) and (15), one can easily verify  $\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \alpha_{i,j}$  and  $\beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \beta_{i,j}$ . In case node  $k$  is performing a ballot-stuffing attack on node  $j$ , then  $\alpha_{k,j} \gg \beta_{k,j}$  and again one can easily verify  $\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \alpha_{i,j}$  and  $\beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}} \sim \beta_{i,j}$ . After trust aggregation, the trustor's (or node  $i$ 's) trust toward the trustee (or node  $j$ ) is then computed as  $T_{i,j} = \frac{\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}}}{\alpha_{i,j}^{\text{new}} + \beta_{i,j}^{\text{new}}}$ .

## APPENDIX B

In this appendix, we provide implementation details of the ILP solution technique for optimally solving the node-to-service assignment problem with MOO in (9) of the

main file for both trust-based and non-trust-based algorithms.

TABLE IV: Variable Definitions for ILP.

Variable	Definition
$ov_{p,q}$	1 if service requests $O_p$ and $O_q$ are overlapping in time; 0 otherwise
$s_{j,k}$	1 if node $j$ can provide abstract service $S_k$ ; 0 otherwise
$tt_{j,k}$	1 if advertised service quality of node $j$ satisfies the abstract service level minimum threshold of $S_k$ ; 0 otherwise
$in_{k,m}$	1 if service request $O_m$ requires abstract service $S_k$ ; 0, otherwise
$to_{j,k,m}$	$s_{j,k} \times tt_{j,k} \times in_{k,m}$
$w_{j,k,m}$	1 if node $j$ is assigned to service $S_k$ in service request $O_m$ ; 0 otherwise

Table IV defines the variables used in the ILP formulation. There is only one decision variable, namely,  $w_{j,k,m}$  to be determined by the ILP, specifying if node  $j$  should be assigned to abstract service  $k$  of service request  $m$ . The ILP will search for an optimal solution of  $w_{j,k,m}$  for all  $j$ 's,  $k$ 's and  $m$ 's to maximize MOO in both trust-based design and non-trust-based design algorithms. The objective function  $\text{MOO} = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} (\omega_{Q,m} \bar{Q}_m + \omega_{D,m} \bar{D}_m + \omega_{C,m} \bar{C}_m)$  as defined by (9) of the main file can be computed as a linear function of  $w_{j,k,m}$  (the only decision variable to be decided by the ILP). The service-to-node assignment MOO problem is formulated as follows:

Given:  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S}_m, \mathcal{N}$

Calculate:  $ov_{p,q}, s_{j,k}, tt_{j,k}, in_{k,m}$

Find:  $w_{j,k,m}$

Maximize:  $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{T}} (\omega_Q \bar{Q}_m + \omega_D \bar{D}_m + \omega_C \bar{C}_m)$

Subject to:  $\forall \{p, q\} ov_{p,q} \times (w_{j,k,p} + w_{j,k,q}) \leq 1;$

$\sum_j w_{j,k,m} = in_{k,m}; w_{j,k,m} \leq to_{j,k,m}$

## REFERENCES

- [24] A. Jøsang and R. Ismail, "The Beta Reputation System," in *15th Bled Electronic Commerce Conf.*, 2002, pp. 1-14.
- [25] A. Jøsang, R. Ismail, and C. Boyd, "A Survey of Trust and Reputation Systems for Online Service Provision," *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 618-644, 2007.