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Abstract—Open reconfigurable network (ORN) is proposed to meet users’ diversified and dynamic requirements. Path deployment is a typical service in the ORN, and can be executed in the way of open nested transaction for high efficiency. In this transaction, each operation on network nodes (NNs) is a sub-transaction, which costs CPU resources. In this paper, first we build the cost model of the path deployment of three kinds of sub-transactions execution—prepare in advance, implement concurrently and prepare dynamically. Secondly, we analyze two main approaches of path deployment in the ORN—unicast and multicast, and we concluded that multicast costs more than unicast when we ignore the time. Finally, based on the comprehensive consideration of cost and time, we propose the optimal way to execute nested transaction in the ORN.

Index Terms—Open reconfigurable network, Nested transaction, Transaction costs

I. INTRODUCTION

Open reconfigurable network (ORN) defines mutual interfaces among network equipments, standardizes communication protocols and reconstructs the underlying resources of the network equipments on the same platform; it makes network equipments from different manufactures interoperable, compatible and flexibly to be functional reorganized. ORN is composed of integrated network management nodes (MNs) and a number of open reconfigurable routing and switching network nodes (NNs) [1]. Network nodes are managed by the management node, illustrated by the case of the path deployment, the management node controls resource reservation on network nodes in the ORN. So the execution of path deployment is a typical distributed transaction in the ORN.

A transaction is a set of predefined logical sequence of operations, and its implementation will complete a predefined function for the system. The characteristics of the ACID (Atomicity, Consistency, Isolation, and Durability) are proposed to ensure the correctness of the implementation [5]. In a distributed computing system, a transaction can access a number of different independent resources in different processes, or even on different computers. And we call this transaction a distributed transaction [2]. The traditional atomic transaction is composed of a flat sequence of operations; it has no internal structure and no strict compliance with the ACID characteristics. In the distributed network, two-phase commit protocol [3] is applied by the traditional atomic transaction model to ensure all distributed transactions be committed or rolled back together, so that the database stays in a consistent state. As long as one participant’s transaction fails, the entire transaction must be rolled back [6].

In the ORN, network nodes are controlled by one management node at least. A resource conflict occurs when a network node is ordered by different management nodes to run resource reservation at the same time. The conflict will greatly reduce the success rate of the transaction, and may happen repeatedly. Compared to the traditional atomic transaction model, the nested transaction model is proposed to improve the efficiency of transactions’ execution. The nested transaction model extends the traditional transaction model. In the nested transaction model, a transaction can be divided into several sub-transactions; implementations of the sub-transactions are equivalent to atomic operations of the parent transaction. The parent transaction forms a new initial state for subsequent operations when the implementation of a sub-transaction succeeds; and if the implementation of the sub-transaction fails, it will be canceled and has no influence on its parent transaction or brother transactions. Also, when the implementation of a sub-transaction fails, committed nodes and uncommitted nodes may both exist in the system at the same time; in order to ensure consistency of the system, committed nodes need to execute compensating transactions [16] [17] to come back to the state before the transaction starts [4].

In the nested transaction model, a parent transaction may contain multiple sub-transactions [8] [10], and some sub-transactions may have the same function. The sub-
transaction set composed of transactions with the same function is called a functional alternative set [11]. When to prepare a functional alternative set is depends, so in this paper, we divide the nested transaction model into the following three categories:

- Prepare in advance
  Sub-transactions have the same function are selected as a functional alternative set before the deployment. But only one of them is executed one time. Only if it fails, another transaction from the functional alternative set is selected to be executed.

- Concurrent implementation
  All sub-transactions from the functional alternative set are executed at the same time. But only one of them can be committed. This method increases the system overhead, but when the sub-transaction failure rate is fairly high, it saves re-deployment time.

- Prepare dynamically
  When the transaction is executed, all sub-transactions in the two-phase commit protocol return their first phase results (succeed or failure) after the first step. Then we dynamically generate the failure handling strategy by these results. Choose the optimal path for the deployment dynamically, rather than looking for a functional alternative sub-transaction set in advance. When a sub-transaction fails, look for another sub-transaction has the same function for a new execution.

In this paper, we provide the comparison on the costs of transactions executed in three ways: prepare in advance, implement concurrently and prepare dynamically. Then we calculate the costs of two different ways (unicast and multicast) for the path deployment in the ORN and make a comparison between them. Furthermore, based on the comprehensive consideration of cost and time, we propose the optimal way to execute nested transaction in the ORN.

II. TRANSACTION MODEL

A. The Process of Path Deployment

The executed of path deployment is a typical open nested transaction in the ORN. The paper is focused on the costs of nested transaction in the ORN by studying path deployment.

To facilitate the expression, we allocate a separate determinate number (called ID) from {1, 2, ..., n} for each NN. $NN_i$ denotes the network node (NN) with $ID = i$. When the path deployment is executed, there are two kinds of NNs in the network. Some return successful messages showed in figure 1 and others return failure messages showed in figure 2.
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**Figure 1. Return successful message node.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>The total number of NN involved in the path deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_i$</td>
<td>The moment $NN_i$ starts path deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_s(i)$</td>
<td>Time MN waits for $NN_i$’s response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_c(i)$</td>
<td>Compensation time for the committed node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_w(i)$</td>
<td>Time from $NN_i$ receives the request to $NN_i$ returns its result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_p(i)$</td>
<td>Time from $t_i$ to MN decides to rollback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the nested transaction model, the MN sends a path deployment request to $NN_i$ at time $t_i$. If the MN receives a failure message from $NN_i$ or doesn’t receive any response until $t_i + t_s(i)$, it will try to find the alternative node of $NN_i$. If it exists, it will replace $NN_i$ to go on path deployment. If not, the transaction on $NN_i$ will be rolled back. Before $\max_{1\leq i \leq n}(t_i + t_s(i))$, the MN will make the final decision for the entire transaction. If it decides to abort, it will send abort messages to all NNs, and committed nodes need to
execute compensation transactions to come back to the initial starting state.

To be fair, all NNs we mentioned in the paper have the same \( t_i(t) \), \( t_j(t) \) and \( t_k(t) \).

**B. Definitions of Costs**

The TC (transaction-cost) in the ORN can be divided into two types by different considerations.

If we only consider deployment costs

(1) For irreplaceable nodes, the T-C value is its own cost of the CPU resources during the deployment, denoted by \( c_i \);

(2) For the alternative node, the T-C value

\[
c_s(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{executed unsuccessfully} \\ c_s(t) & \text{executed and uncommitted} \\ c_s(t) + c_e(t) & \text{committed} \end{cases}
\]

When the deployment on a node fails, the value is the sum cost of itself and its alternative node.

If we consider both the deployment costs and compensation costs

When the deployment on a node fails, committed nodes need compensation and others don’t. So the T-C value of a single network node \( NN_j \) can be expressed as:

\[
c_j(t) = \begin{cases} c_j & t_i(t) < t_j(t) \\ c_j + c_e(t) & t_r(t) < t_i(t) \end{cases}
\]

If \( NN_j \) need no compensation, the T-C value of the individual node \( NN_j \) is the cost of deployment; if it needs compensation, the value is the sum of deployment costs and compensation costs.

In the ORN, the deployment on each node is relatively independent. And the successful probability of each node is also relatively independent. We use \( \rho_j(0 < \rho_j < 1 \mid 1 \leq j \leq n) \) to express the success rate on nodes \( NN_j \), so \( 1 - \rho_j \) is the failure probability. In the process of path deployment, when the MN sends a message to \( NN_j \) during the time \([t_i, t_j + t_s(j)]\), its success rate can be expressed as

\[
\rho_{MN,j}(t_i, t_j + t_s(j)) = \rho_{MN,s}(t_i, t_j + t_s(j)) \cdot \rho_k
\]

Among them, \( \rho_{MN,s}(t_i, t_j + t_s(j)) \) is the success rate of messages transmission between MN and \( NN_j \). Because the failure rate of message transmission between MN and NN in the ORN is fairly small and can be ignored, in this paper, we let \( \rho_{MN,j}(t_i, t_j + t_s(j)) = \rho_j \).

In the reconfigurable network, some nodes have alternative nodes, so the success rate of deployment can be divided into two categories:

(1) When \( NN_j \) has no alternative node: \( \rho_j = \rho_j \).

(2) When \( NN_j \) has an alternative node \( NN_k \), then \( \rho_j = \rho_j + (1 - \rho_j) \cdot \rho_k \).

We use \( ETC(s) \) to indicate the ETC of scheduling order \( S = \{t_1, k_1; t_2, k_2; \ldots; t_n, k_n \} \) and it is defined as \( ETC(s) = \{k_j \mid j \in \psi_n \} \), in other words, the sum ETC of all nodes.

**III. CALCULATION AND COMPARISON**

**A. Costs of Sub-transactions Execution**

When the path deployment begins, if all the nodes are deployed at the same time, time spent the least; but it may increase extra CPU costs and compensation costs. In this paper, we analyze the costs of sub-transaction execution by three different ways: prepare in advance, concurrent implementation and prepare dynamically.

For the deployment sequence \( \{t_1, k_1; t_2, k_2; \ldots; t_n, k_n \} \), we assume nodes with an even number have alternative nodes, and nodes with odd numbers have no alternative node.

If alternative nodes are executed, then we obtain:

(1) Prepare in advance

\[
ETC_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{k-1} \rho_k(1 - \rho_k) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_j(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{1}
\]

(2) Concurrent implementation

\[
ETC_2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{k-1} \rho_k(1 - \rho_k) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_j(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{2}
\]

(3) Prepare dynamically

\[
ETC_3 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{k-1} \rho_k(1 - \rho_k) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_j(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{3}
\]

Therefore, \( ETC_1 = ETC_2 = ETC_3 \).

If alternative nodes aren’t executed or don’t exist, then we obtain:

(1) Prepare in advance

\[
ETC_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{v=1}^{k-1} \rho_k(1 - \rho_k) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_j(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{4}
\]

(2) Concurrent implementation

When \( i = 2k - 1 \),

\[
ETC_2(i) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i(1 - \rho_i) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{5}
\]

When \( i = 2k \),

\[
ETC_3(i) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i(1 - \rho_i) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i(t_i + t_s(k)) \tag{6}
\]
nodes from \((1, 2, 2)\), and this moment is the deployment

\[\text{ETC}_2(i) = \prod_{k=1}^{k-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i + c_{v(i)}\right)\]  

When the number of failed node is even, we obtain:

\[\text{ETC}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \prod_{k=1}^{k-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i + c_{v(i)}\right)\]  

When the number of failed node is odd, we obtain:

\[\text{ETC}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \prod_{k=1}^{k-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i + c_{v(i)}\right)\]  

B. Costs of Two Main Path Deployment Approaches

1) Unicast deployment

Definition 1: Let \(S = \{t_1, k_1; t_2, k_2; \ldots; t_n, k_n\}\) and it is a unicast deployment sequence. And if \(t_2 \geq t_1 + p(k_1), \ldots, t_n \geq t_{n-1} + p(k_{n-1})\), particularly, when \((\forall j \in \psi_{n-1})\) \(t_{j+1} = t_j + p(k_j)\), then \(S\) is called the optimal unicast deployment sequence. Here, \(t_{j+1} = t_j + p(k_j)\) indicates that MN sends commit request to \(NN_{j+1}\) immediately after sending to \(NN_j\). For the sake of simplicity, we use \(t_{p(j)}\) instead of \(t_{p(k)}\). In the process of unicast deployment, there are limitless possible sequences. The deployment sequence we talked about is arranged by the deployment speed on each node.

(1) ETC when only consider deployment costs

When the deployment on node \(k\) fails, it indicates that \(k-1\) nodes in front are deployed successfully. The probability of this is \(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right)\). Meanwhile, it occurs at \(t_k + p(k)\), and this moment is the deployment starting time of \(NN_k\)’s alternative node on condition that the transmission time is ignored. Thus, the ETC value of unicast deployment is:

\[C_{\text{Unicast}} = \sum_{n=1}^{n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(t)\right)\]  

(2) ETC when consider both deployment costs and compensation costs

When the deployment on node \(k\) fails, the \(k-1\) nodes in front are deployed successfully deployed and committed. So we need to consider the sum of deployment costs and compensation costs.

\[\text{ETC}_{\text{Unicast}} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(t) + c_v(t)\]  

2) Multicast deployment

Definition 2: Let \(S = \{t_1, k_1; t_2, k_2; \ldots; t_n, k_n\}\) and it is a multicast deployment sequence. Let \(t_1 = t_2 = \cdots = t_n = t_0\), so that MN concurrently deploy all NN nodes at the same time. So in the multicast deployment: \((\forall k)\) \(t_k = t_0\), and we use \(S_v = \{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_n\}\) \(t_{p(i_1)} < t_{p(i_2)} < \cdots < t_{p(i_n)}\) to indicate the multicast deployment set.

(1) ETC when only consider deployment costs

If the deployment on node \(k\) fails, it indicates that the deployments on the \(k-1\) nodes in front are successful. All nodes in the multicast deployment are deployed at the same time, so the \(n-k\) nodes from \((k+1, \ldots, n)\) have been deployed successfully, but not yet successfully committed. So we obtain:

\[\text{ETC}(k) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \rho_v \left(1 - \rho_v \right) \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(t)\]  

\[\text{ETC}_{\text{Multicast}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \text{ETC}(k)\]  

The above formula can become more intuitive. In this paper, we assume that \(\forall i \in (C1(i) \lor C2(i))\).

C1(i): Node with its alternative node executed;  
C2(i): Node without alternative node or don’t execute its alternative node;
In the process of the multicast deployment, 
\((\forall j \neq i) c_i(i_0 + t_i(j)) = c_i, \quad c_i = c_i | c_i + c_u\).

Assume A = "node NN_i has been submitted", B = "In addition to NN_i, at least one node are committed unsuccessfully", then we obtain:

\[
P(A) = \rho_i, \quad P(B / A) = 1 - \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v \quad (14)
\]

\[
P(A \cap B) = P(A) \cdot P(B / A) = \rho_i \cdot (1 - \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v) \quad (15)
\]

Thus, the ETC value of NN_i can be expressed as:

\[
ETC(i) | Multicast = \rho_i \cdot (1 - \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v) \quad (16)
\]

Then we obtain the ETC value of the entire multicast deployment.

\[
ETC_{Multicast} = \sum_{i = 1}^{n} ETC(i) | Multicast
\]

\[
= \sum_{i = 1}^{n} \rho_i \cdot (1 - \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v) \quad (17)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i = 1}^{n} \rho_i - \sum_{i = 1}^{n} \rho_i \cdot \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v
\]

(2) ETC when consider both deployment costs and compensation costs

Assume A_i = " NN_i triggers compensation", B(i,k) = " NN_k is deployed unsuccessfully, therefore successfully deployed node NN_i need compensation", so we get the following probability:

\[
P(A) = \sum_{k = 1, k \neq i}^{n} P(B(i,k)) \quad (18)
\]

\[
P(B(i,k)) = \left( \sum_{v = 1, v \neq i}^{k-1} \rho_v \right) \cdot (1 - \rho_k) \cdot \rho_i \quad (19)
\]

The ETC of nodes NN_i can be expressed as:

\[
ETC(i)|Multicast = \sum_{k = 1, k \neq i}^{n} P(B(i,k)) \cdot (c_i(t) + c_c(t))
\]

\[
= \sum_{k = 1, k \neq i}^{n} \left( \sum_{v = 1, v \neq i}^{k-1} \rho_v \right) \cdot (1 - \rho_k) \cdot \rho_i \cdot (c_i(t) + c_c(t))
\]

Thus we can get the ETC of the entire multicast deployment.

\[
ETC_{Multicast} = \sum_{i = 1}^{n} ETC(i) | Multicast
\]

\[
= \sum_{i = 1}^{n} \sum_{k = 1, k \neq i}^{n} \left( \sum_{v = 1, v \neq i}^{k-1} \rho_v \right) \cdot (1 - \rho_k) \cdot \rho_i \cdot (c_i(t) + c_c(t))
\]

Similarly, we can simplify the expression.

\[
ETC_{Multicast} = \sum_{i = 1}^{n} ETC(i) | Multicast
\]

\[
= \sum_{i = 1}^{n} (c_i(t) + c_c(t)) \cdot \rho_i \cdot (1 - \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i = 1}^{n} (c_i(t) + c_c(t)) \cdot \rho_i - \sum_{i = 1}^{n} (c_i(t) + c_c(t)) \cdot \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v
\]

(22)

C. Comparison between Two Path Deployment Methods

We have proposed the unicast and multicast deployment, calculated their costs based on two aspects: consider deployment costs and consider both deployment costs and compensation costs. We compare them and obtain some results.

In the ORN, if only consider deployment costs, we can conclude that ETC_{Unicast} < ETC_{Multicast}.

Proof:

(1) When \( \forall i \in C(2)(i) \), all nodes have no alternative node or don’t implement their alternative nodes. When all nodes fulfill these conditions and the node k fails: in unicast mode, the k - 1 nodes in front are successfully deployed; in multicast mode, at least k - 1 nodes have been deployed successfully, and \( c_{i1}(t) = c_{i1} \), all n nodes start their deployment. So we obtain:

\[
C_{Unicast} = \sum_{k = 1}^{n} \prod_{v = 1}^{k-1} \rho_v \cdot (1 - \rho_k) \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{k = 1}^{n} \prod_{v = 1}^{k-1} \rho_v \cdot \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i - \prod_{v = 1}^{k-1} \rho_v \cdot \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i
\]

\[
= \sum_{k = 1}^{n} \prod_{v = 1}^{k-1} \rho_v \cdot \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i - \prod_{v = 1}^{k} \rho_v \cdot \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i + \prod_{v = 1}^{k} \rho_v \cdot \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i
\]

\[
= \prod_{v = 1}^{k} \rho_v \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i - \prod_{v = 1}^{k} \rho_v \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i
\]

(23)

We let \( c_k = c_{i1} \) and then we obtain:

\[
C_{Unicast} = \sum_{k = 1}^{n} \prod_{v = 1}^{k} \rho_v \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i - \sum_{v = 1}^{n} \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i
\]

(24)

\[
C_{Multicast} = \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i \cdot \rho_i - \sum_{i = 1}^{n} c_i \cdot \prod_{v = 1}^{n} \rho_v
\]

(25)

Therefore,
\[ C_{\text{Unicast}} - C_{\text{Multicast}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i \right) c_s - \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i \right) \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_s \]
\[
- \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \cdot \rho_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i \right) \]
\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i \right) c_s - \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \cdot \rho_i \]
\[
= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k} \rho_i - \rho_i \right) \cdot c_s \]
\[
< 0 \quad (26) \]

(2) When \( \forall i \in C1(i) \), all alternative nodes needed are executed. When all nodes fulfill the condition, and the deployment of the node \( k \) fails: In unicast mode, the \( k-1 \) node in front are deployed successfully and \( c_i(t) = c_i + c_\kappa \); in multicast mode, not all the \( k-1 \) nodes in front are deployed successfully, but they must have implement their alternative nodes, and all \( n \) nodes start their deployment. So we obtain:
\[
C_{\text{Unicast}} = \sum_{k=2}^{n} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \rho_i \right) \left( 1 - \rho_k \right) \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (c_i + c_\kappa) \quad (27) \]
\[
C_{\text{Multicast}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (c_i + c_\kappa) \cdot \rho_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n} (c_i + c_\kappa) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i \]
\[
< 0 \quad (28) \]

Therefore, \( C_{\text{Unicast}} - C_{\text{Multicast}} < 0 \).

From (1) and (2), we can conclude that when only consider deployment costs, the cost of unicast deployment is less than multicast deployment.

When we consider both deployment costs and compensation costs in the ORN, we can conclude that \( ETC^{\text{Unicast}} < ETC^{\text{Multicast}} \).

Proof:

In the ORN, when the deployment on a node fails, the number of successful nodes in unicast mode is larger than in multicast mode. And more nodes need to execute compensation. If every node has the same compensation costs, compensation costs in multicast mode is much more than in unicast mode. We have proven that deployment costs in multicast mode is large than in unicast mode, so it is proved.

D. Discussion About the Optimal Deployment Method in the ORN

From the research above, we find that the transaction cost in the multicast mode is more than in the unicast mode. But in the ORN, the deployment process is also limited by a deadline. In addition to the above-mentioned CPU costs, we should also consider the time it costs.
$T_{\text{Left}}(j) | \text{Unicast} - T_{\text{Left}}(j) | \text{Multicast}$

$= t_j(j) + t_j - t_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i) - (t_j(j) - \max t_p(i))$

$= t_j - t_0 + \max t_p(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i)$

$= t_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i) - t_0 + \max t_p(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i)$

$= \max t_p(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i)$

Typically, there is little differences among $t_p(i)$ of all NNs, and $(\forall i) t_a(i) \geq \max_{i=1}^{n} t_p(i) / n$ is always valid, so $T_{\text{Left}}(j) | \text{Unicast} - T_{\text{Left}}(j) | \text{Multicast} < 0$. It means that multicast deployment has a longer $T_{\text{Left}}$ than unicast, and deploy alternative network nodes in multicast mode is better when consider the deadline. In the ORN, there are two types of nodes, alternative nodes and non-alternative nodes, so we can combine the two deployment approaches to complete path deployment.

Assume: $\exists C_1 \subseteq \Psi$ and $C_0 \cap C_1 = \Psi$.

$C_0$ : Nodes with alternative nodes

$C_1$ : Nodes without alternative node

Under the above assumptions, the following deployment approach is the optimal by considering both deployment costs and compensation costs:

a) First, all nodes belong to $C_1$ execute multicast deployments;

b) When a) finished, complete all nodes belong to $C_0$ by executing unicast deployments.

We have obtained the conclusion that concurrent execution during the multicast deployment costs more CPU costs, so we choose unicast deployments. In order to improve the efficiency of the deployment, in other words, shorten the deployment time, we choose multicast deployments on the nodes with no alternative nodes.

IV. CONCLUSION

The path deployment we study in the paper belongs to the nested transaction model. A single sub-transaction may be committed when it is completed. Compensation operations may have to be executed if it fails. In this paper, we study total costs of deployment and compensation, and prove merits of the two main deployment approaches—unicast deployment and multicast deployment. Based on these, we discuss the optimal deployment approach. In future studies, we may study the optimal depth of the nested transactions in the ORN and give a rigorous proof.
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