

## BORANG PENGESAHAN STATUS TESIS

JUDUL: **A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF QOS FOR DATA TRANSMISSION OVER WIRELESS NETWORK**

Sesi pengajian: **2010/2011**

Saya **SUZI IRYANTI BINTI FADILAH** mengaku membenarkan tesis sarjana ini disimpan di perpustakaan Fakulti Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi dengan syarat-syarat seperti berikut:

1. Tesis dan projek adalah hakmilik Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka.
2. Perpustakaan Fakulti Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi dibenarkan membuat salinan untuk tujuan pengajian sahaja.
3. Perpustakaan Fakulti Teknologi Maklumat dan Komunikasi dibenarkan membuat salinan tesis ini sebagai bahan pertukaran antara institusi pengajian tinggi.
4. \*\* Sila tandakan (/)

\_\_\_\_\_ SULIT

(mengandungi maklumat yang berdarjah keselamatan atau kepentingan Malaysia seperti yang termaktub di dalam AKTA RAHSIA RASMI 1972)

\_\_\_\_\_ TERHAD

(mengandungi maklumat TERHAD yang telah ditentukan oleh organisasi/badan di mana penyelidikan di jalankan)

\_\_\_\_\_ TIDAK TERHAD

\_\_\_\_\_



(TANDATANGAN PENULIS)

\_\_\_\_\_



(TANDATANGAN PENYELIA)

Alamat Tetap: **SUZI IRYANTI BINTI FADILAH**

**DR. ABDUL SAMAD B. SHIBGHATULLAH**

PETI SURAT 47, BT 32,

KG PT SELANGOR, JLN JOHOR,

82000, PONTIAN

JOHOR DARUL TAKZIM.

Tarikh : 15 NOVEMBER 2010

Tarikh : 15 NOVEMBER 2010

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF QOS FOR DATA TRANSMISSION OVER  
WIRELESS NETWORK**


**SUZI IRYANTI BINTI FADILAH**

**This report is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Master of  
Computer Science (Internetworking Technology)**

**FACULTY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA  
2010**

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this project report entitle **“A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF QOS FOR DATA TRANSMISSION OVER WIRELESS NETWORK”** is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The report has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of other degrees.


Signature: .....

Name: SUZI IRYANTI BINTI FADILAH

Date: 10 November 2010

## APPROVAL

I hereby declare that i have read through this project report and in my opinion this project report is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of master of Computer Science (Internetworking Technology).

Signature:.....

Supervisor: DR. ABDUL SAMAD SHIBGHATULLAH

Date: 15 NOVEMBER 2010

## DEDICATION

*Fadilah Abd Karim & Misraton Ahmad  
Wan Muhammad Mukhlis Wan Sallehuddin*

*For my family and friends  
For their love and support throughout my life*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

By the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, many thanks for His blessing in giving me the opportunity to finish my research successfully. I would like to express my gratitude to Kementerian Pengajian Tinggi (KPT) for the sponsorship throughout the whole master degree's semesters.

I must first and foremost thank my thesis supervisor Dr. Abdul Samad Shibghatullah, who was most responsible for helping me make this work a success. His encouragement and guidance combined with a superior, in-depth knowledge of the wireless field have enabled me to complete this thesis. Dr. Samad's patience and kindness have made him not only an excellent advisor, but also a friend. Thanks also to both evaluators, Dr. Zul Azri Muhamad Noh as well for his contribution by assisting me in the early stages of this project, sharing ideas and insight on the project.

I would also want to show my deepest thanks to beloved my parent whom had given me moral, guidance and financial support throughout the research. I hope that with the knowledge and experienced that I gain from this research will be useful in a future.

From the bottom of my heart, I thank you all for your undying support.

## ABSTRACT

A wireless network is admired because it strikes a good balance between speed, cost and simple installation. There are some other issues that contribute of this comparative analysis, which is confusion surrounding the capabilities and status of the IEEE standard especially the new 802.11n WLAN standard, the performance in real environmental test like in a controlled lab may not be reproducible since its affected by the same or similar environmental factors, the IEEE reaffirmation process involves the review of an existing standard to determine if it is still useful, valid, or requires updating. It involves the creation of a standards committee working group who is tasked to review, advice and either modify or reject the standard and the future guidance for any IEEE or WLAN development integration, step by step in choosing technology in related field and benefits to the power users or users in comparing and choosing the suitable technology based on their requirements. The wireless data communications system depends on a number of variables which are throughput, distance, interference and power consumption. The main result is a comparing wireless standard and analyzing the problem of influence various factors on the rate of data transmission in Wireless networks. Yet the purpose specific work of different equipment from two different IEEE 802.11 standards was experimentally researched by using proper software and standards of a wireless network for providing suitable service was analyzed. The aim of this thesis is to provide detailed investigation and analysis of main performance issues related to wireless networks based on the IEEE 802.11g and IEEE 802.11n. A comparison of these standard wirelesses IEEE 802.11 will lead better understanding among the user in a future.

## ABSTRAK

Sebuah rangkaian tanpa wayar digemari kerana keseimbangan yang baik antara kelajuan, kos dan pemasangan sederhana. Namun, ada beberapa isu lain yang memberikan sumbangan kepada analisis komparatif ini antaranya keraguan kemampuan dan status daripada piawaian *IEEE* terutamanya piawaian terbaru 802.11n, hasil kajian makmal terkawal tidak sama dengan persekitaran sebenar akibat dipengaruhi oleh faktor-faktor persekitaran sebenar, proses naik taraf piawaian *IEEE* melibatkan analisa perbandingan suatu piawaian yang sedia ada untuk menentukan sama ada ia diperlukan atau memerlukan perubahan dan analisa ini relevan pada masa depan untuk pembangunan piawaian *IEEE* yang baru, malah bermanfaat bagi pengguna untuk membandingkan dan memilih teknologi yang sesuai. Analisa komparatif ini melibatkan *throughput*, jarak, gangguan dan pengambilan kuasa. Keputusan utama adalah membandingkan piawaian rangkaian tanpa wayar dan menganalisis masalah pelbagai faktor yang mempengaruhi tahap penghantaran data dalam menggunakan perkakasan dan perisian yang tepat dan standard rangkaian wayarles untuk menyediakan perkhidmatan yang sesuai dianalisis. Sekaligus memberikan penyiasatan terperinci dan analisis antara *IEEE 802.11g* dan *IEEE 802.11n* Suatu perbandingan dari standard *IEEE 802.11* akan membawa pemahaman yang lebih baik di kalangan pengguna di masa depan.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	SUBJECT	PAGE
	DECLARATION	i
	APPROVAL	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	LIST OF TABLES	x
	LIST OF FIGURES	xii
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background of the Study	1
1.2	Background of the research problem	2
1.3	Limitations of Current Research Approaches	6
1.4	Research Objective	7
1.5	Research Methodology	8
1.6	Outline of thesis	9
1.7	Summary	10
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Introduction	12
2.2	Chapter Objectives	13
2.2.1	Comparison of the IEEE 802.11, 802.15.1, 802.15.4 and 802.15.6 wireless standards	15

2.2.2	Performance Enhancement of WLAN Using 802.11n and MIMO Technology	19
2.2.3	Research of “802.11n Demystified	22
2.2.4	Accelerating enterprise network by using 802.11n Network	24
2.2.5	Comparison between all the previous research	28
2.2.5.1	Quality of service (QoS)	29
2.2.5.2	Data Transmission	30
2.2.5.3	Techonology Overview	32
2.2.5.4	IEEE 802.11 Standard	34
2.2.5.5	IEEE 802.11	37
2.2.5.6	IEEE 802.11g (Wireless G)	39
2.2.5.7	IEEE 802.11n (wireless N)	41
2.2.6	Factors Affecting Wireless LAN Performance	44
2.2.6.1	Throughput	44
2.2.6.2	Bandwidth	47
2.2.6.3	The obvious major factors	50
2.2.6.4	The other factor	52
2.2.6.5	The minor factors	54
2.2.7	Network Measurement tool	58
2.2.8	Hardware and software requirement	59
2.3	Summary	60

## **CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY 61**

3.1	Research Methodology	61
3.1	Theoretical framework	62
3.2	Research Design	63
3.2.1	WLAN environments in this research fall into two categories	62
3.2.2	Test setup	66
3.2.3	Test design	67

3.2.4	Test procedure	67
3.2.5	Performance metric	68
3.3	Conclusion	70
<b>CHAPTER 4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION</b>		<b>71</b>
4.1	Introduction	71
4.2	Sample of environmental tests	77
4.2.1	Test: Throughput	78
4.2.2	Test: Interference	85
4.2.3	Test: Mobility (Distance)	91
4.2.4	Test: Power Consumption	97
4.3	Conclusion	102
<b>CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
<b>FOR FUTURE RESEARCH</b>		<b>105</b>
5.1	Summary	105
5.2	Conclusion	107
5.3	Future Enhancement	109
<b>REFERENCES</b>		<b>111</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>		<b>113</b>
Appendix A		113
Appendix B		114
Appendix C		115
Appendix D		116
Appendix E		117

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Modes of operation of WLAN standard	15
2.2	The differences of frequency, data rate, range, and type for each WLAN standard	16
2.3	IEEE standard along with modulation and coding scheme	18
2.4	IEEE standard use some kind of PSK scheme except the new 802.11n which use QAM and Alamouti STBC	18
2.5	Comparison between all the previous researches and the current research	28
2.6	IEEE 802 Standards Working Group	35
2.7	IEEE Standards exist or are in development	36
2.8	Summary of 802.11	38
2.9	Summary of 802.11g	41
2.10	Summary of 802.11n	46
2.11	Summary of 802.11, 802.11g and 802.11n	46
2.12	The details of server	59
2.13	The details of client	59
2.14	The details of wireless router	60
4.1	The details running on every test	75
4.2	graph type of correspondents vs. their knowledge about the difference between wireless N and wireless G	75
4.3	The test location details	79

4.4	The average throughput in Location ‘A’ and ‘B’	80
4.5	Table distance vs. throughput (interference)	88
4.6	Table above shows the details value of throughput result with and without interference for both 802.11n and 802.11g	89
4.7	The summary comparison between 802.11n and 802.11g	93
4.8	Table distance vs. average throughput (distance)	95
4.9	Table distance vs. average data transfer	95
4.10	Table average time for battery life	98

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>FIGURE</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2.1	Summary of literature review flow chart	14
2.2	Average throughput/user	20
2.3	Capacity with respect to Bandwidth	21
2.4	Data rate comparison of 802.11a/b/g and 802.11n	23
2.5	Rate and Range comparison of 802.11a/b/g and 802.11n	24
2.6	Total laptops that have wireless N enabled in September 2009 is 50000 or 60 percent (In the Intel environment)	25
2.7	802.11n wireless network delivered increases in throughput up to 3 times compared wireless a/b/g	26
2.8	802.11n was used in mixed mode, supporting laptop that not in wireless 802.11n compatible	26
2.9	TCP Throughput between 802.11g and 802.11n	27
3.1	Research Framework	62
3.2	Flow of the research	64
4.1	The connection between client and server by using iperf	73
4.2	The hardware setup for testing between clients, server and router	74
4.3	Testing location	74

4.4	Result of questionnaires	75
4.5	Result: IEEE 802.11n	80
4.6	Result: IEEE 802.11g	81
4.7	Graph Distance vs. Throughput (Location A)	82
4.8	Graph Distance vs. Throughput (Location B)	82
4.9	The testing interference with microwave	86
4.10	The interference factors in real world	86
4.11	The theoretical result throughput vs. interference	87
4.12	The real environment result throughput vs. Interference	87
4.13	Graph distance vs. throughput (Interference)	88
4.14	Graph distance vs. data transfer (interference)	89
4.15	Communication between client and access point	92
4.16	Graph distance vs. average throughput	94
4.17	Graph distance vs. average data transfer	95
4.18	Graph power consumption vs. wireless	99

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>AFH</b>	Adaptive Frequency-Hopping Spread Spectrum
<b>AP</b>	Access Point
<b>ARS</b>	Adaptive (or Automatic) Rate Selection
<b>ASCII</b>	American Standard Code for Information Interchange
<b>ASK</b>	Amplitude-Shift Keying
<b>ATM</b>	Asynchronous Transfer Mode
<b>BSD</b>	Berkeley Software Distribution
<b>B</b>	Byte
<b>BPSK</b>	Binary Phase-Shift Keying
<b>CCK</b>	Complementary Code Keying
<b>dBm /dBmW</b>	decibels
<b>DAST</b>	Distributed Applications Support Team
<b>DBPSK</b>	Differential Binary Phase-Shift Keying
<b>DPSK</b>	Differential Phase-Shift Keying
<b>DQPSK</b>	Differential Quadrature Phase-Shift Keying
<b>DSSS</b>	Direct-sequence spread spectrum
<b>DRS</b>	Dynamic Rate Shifting
<b>DPSK</b>	Differential Phase-Shift Keying
<b>EBCDIC</b>	Extended Binary Coded Decimal Interchange Code
<b>FHSS</b>	Frequency Hopping Spread Spectrum
<b>FSK</b>	Frequency-Shift Keying
<b>FTP</b>	File Transfer Protocol



<b>GB</b>	Gigabyte
<b>GFSK</b>	Gaussian Frequency-Shift Keying
<b>GHz</b>	Gigahertz
<b>HTTP</b>	Hypertext Transfer Protocol
<b>HT</b>	High Throughput
<b>IBM</b>	International Business Machines
<b>IEEE</b>	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
<b>ISM</b>	Industrial, scientific and medical
<b>KB</b>	Kilobyte
<b>Kbps</b>	Kilobit per second
<b>Kbyte</b>	Kilobyte
<b>LAN</b>	Local Area Network
<b>MAC</b>	Media Access Control
<b>MAN</b>	Metropolitan Area Network
<b>Mbit/s</b>	Megabit per second
<b>MB</b>	Megabyte/Megabit
<b>Mbyte</b>	Megabyte
<b>Mbps</b>	Megabyte per second
<b>MIMO</b>	Multiple input multiple output
<b>NDM</b>	Network Data Mover
<b>NLANR</b>	National Laboratory for Applied Network Research
<b>OFDM</b>	Orthogonal frequency division multiplexing
<b>OS</b>	Operating System
<b>OQPSK</b>	Offset Quadrature Phase-Shift Keying
<b>PC</b>	Personal Computer
<b>PHY</b>	Physical layer
<b>PSK</b>	Phase-Shift Keying

<b>PSSS</b>	Parallel-Sequence Spread Spectrum
<b>QAM</b>	Quadrature Amplitude Modulation
<b>QoS</b>	Quality of service
<b>QPSK</b>	Quadrature Phase-Shift Keying
<b>RAM</b>	Random access memory
<b>RF</b>	Radio frequency
<b>8DPSK</b>	8 Phase Differential Phase-Shift Keying
<b>SONET</b>	Synchronous Optical Networking
<b>SMTP</b>	Simple Mail Transfer Protocol
<b>SNR</b>	Signal-to-noise ratio
<b>SS</b>	Spread Spectrum
<b>STBC</b>	Alamouti Space-Time Block Coding
<b>TCP</b>	Transmission Control Protocol
<b>UDP</b>	User Datagram Protocol
<b>U-NII</b>	Unique Ingredient Identifier
<b>USB</b>	Universal Serial Bus
<b>VPN</b>	virtual private network
<b>WAN</b>	wide area network
<b>WLAN</b>	wireless local area network
<b>WEP</b>	Wired Equivalent Privacy
<b>WPA</b>	Wi-Fi Protected Access
<b>Wi-Fi</b>	Wireless Fidelity
<b>4-DQPSK</b>	4 Rotated Differential Quadrature Phase-Shift Keying

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Background of the study**

As wireless networking has proliferated homes and offices around the world, and network vendors keep releasing with new devices on a regular basis, thus data transmission over wireless has been increasingly deployed too. Following the success of cellular telephone services in the 1990s, the technical community has turned its attention to data transmission (Richard J. Lavery, 2001) However, data transmission techniques are primarily designed for wired networks and can perform poorly over wireless networks. The research focuses on the impact of a wireless connection on the performance of data transmission over wireless. Supporting data transmission in wireless networks is receiving more attention from the research community. WLAN (wireless local area network) is one of the most popular networking technologies today.

The standard IEEE 802.11 has been developed by the IEEE LAN/MAN Standards Committee (IEEE 802) for WLANs operating in the 2.4 GHz and 5 GHz

ISM bands. IEEE 802.11 has many family members but 802.11 (a/b/g/e) are the most popular ones. Recently a new standard naming 802.11n is being drafted by the IEEE which will increase the throughput to over 100 Mbps (Roger B. Marks, Ian C. Gifford, and Bob O'Hara, 2001). The benefits of WLANs include mobility, productivity, ease of deployment, simplicity, flexibility, less cost and etc. The disadvantages include concerns over security, low delivery rates, high error rates due to media characteristics, and contention between stations to access the medium.

Wireless networks are noisy and unreliable communication environments. Data transmission over wireless network is an exciting and active area of research. It is predicted to be one of the highest revenue generating technologies in near future. Unlike in wired networks where data losses are mainly caused by traffic congestions, losses in wireless networks are due to both traffic congestions and transmission errors. This is due to the fact that wireless links have low bit rate and high error rate compared to wired networks. If traffic congestions are somewhat predictable, transmission errors are subject to the variation of the wireless propagation environment, and therefore much harder to predict and control. As a result, providing Quality of Service (QoS) in wireless networks is more challenging.

## **1.0 Background of the research problem**

Today's enterprises face a choice when selecting a vendor of wireless LAN infrastructure for their organization. While there are many standards to choose from in competency manifests itself in disparities in performance specifically, in throughput, wireless LAN coverage, and capacity. Essentially, IEEE 802.11g is designed to improve 802.11a/b while IEEE 802.11n is designed to enable wireless networks to do more, faster and over a larger area. The use of wireless communications is on the rise. It is often more practical and less expensive than

hard-wired solutions, but is not as reliable. The situation is further complicated by an increasing number of wireless standards such as, 802.11, 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11g, 802.11n and other new standards soon.

There are four main obstacles in data transmission over wireless. First, the consumption of battery power is another issue of wireless standards today. Thus, the purpose of this research is to experimentally evaluate this by determining the major contributions to energy consumption. We investigate the rate of battery power consumption in wireless devices (laptops) under different scenarios such as with and without transmission over WLAN, at different standard.

Second, voice of frequency band, 802.11b and g equipment may occasionally suffer interference from microwave ovens, cordless telephones and Bluetooth devices. 802.11b and 802.11g control their interference and susceptibility to interference by using direct-sequence spread spectrum (DSSS) and orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) signaling methods, respectively. 802.11a uses the 5 GHz U-NII band, which, for much of the world, offers at least 19 non-overlapping channels rather than the 3 offered in the 2.4 GHz ISM frequency band. Better or worse performance with higher or lower frequencies (channels) may be realized, depending on the environment, making it susceptible to the same interference as other 802.11 standards. Also, as this band is narrower than the 2.4 GHz band, signal is more easily absorbed or reflected by environmental obstacles

Third, WLAN throughput falls off more or less rapidly the farther a client device moves from an access point. The drop depends on how much metal, wood, concrete, and other construction material is between the two devices. In addition, in almost every case today, an access point is a shared medium: whatever throughput it can deliver is divided up among however many users connect to that one access point. Unless users are sitting right under the access point, they just don't get the maximum throughput



Fourth, Quality of the transmission depends on distance and other factors. The further a device is from its access point, the weaker the signal it can send and receive and the lower the physical rate that it can reliably achieve because the frame error rate increases as the distance increases. A high frame error rate will negate any speed advantages of a high data rate by causing too many retransmissions, 802.11 devices constantly monitor the quality of the signals received from devices with which they communicate

Wireless communications are affected by environmental variables much more than wired networking. The performance of data transmission depends on the quality of service (QoS) assigned to a particular application. Today, there is still a lot of confusion surrounding the capabilities and status of the IEEE standard especially the new 802.11n WLAN standard which also contribute to this analysis development. The confusion is understandable since the standard is very broad and has been slow to develop, and even slower to finalize. Full ratification for 802.11n was on September, 2009.

There are some other issues that contribute of this comparative analysis. There were many factors affecting actual performance analysis such as structures, latency, network traffic, etc. Wireless signals suffer loss and quality degradation as they move through space, especially inside buildings where walls, furniture, human bodies and other obstacles cause absorptions, reflections and refractions, they are also susceptible to interference from other wireless devices such as electrical equipment, microwave ovens and even other wireless devices on the same network that are competing for the same wireless frequency resources. Delivering data over the wireless is an important issue for many Internet applications. Transmission of data has bandwidth, delay, and loss requirements. Because these factors were out of our control and testing was not done in a controlled lab the exact results may not be reproducible. The tests were designed to be objective by ensuring that each test configuration was affected by the same or similar environmental factors.

Besides that, since IEEE more than 400 standards under development, hope that this comparative analysis could be one of the useful references for further analyzing in the future. This is because, every so often, IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) standards must be reaffirmed. The reaffirmation process involves the review of an existing standard to determine if it is still useful, valid, or requires updating. It involves the creation of a standards committee working group who is tasked to review, advice and either modify or reject the standard. (Howard W. Penrose, PhD, CMRP)

This comparative analysis is also developed because of there's lots of research more to the common issues like wireless speed, coverage and etc. There's some more on research comparison between different IEEE standards like comparison 802.11a/b/g only, or research on IEEE 802.11n only and there's quite less research on comparison between IEEE 802.11g and IEEE 802.11n in detail and specifically on the issues of interference, throughput, power consumption and distance whereas the testing result is based on real environment.

Yet, this analysis development is actually could be one of the future guidance for any IEEE or WLAN development integration, step by step in choosing technology in related field and benefits to the power users or users in comparing and choosing the suitable technology based on their requirements.

### **1.3 Limitations of Current Research Approaches**

Supporting efficient and reliable data transmission over wireless networks has been subject of continuous research over the last decade (Rawat, K.S.; Massiha, G.H.; 2003). Wireless transmission has arrived in providing clear and significant

advantages. Yet the market research reports about wireless analysis are still one of the most interests.

There is lots of wireless analysis nowadays. Thus this thesis purpose is only focuses on to analyze the performance of QoS management for data transmission delivery over WLAN for IEEE 802.11 g and IEEE 802.11n, with the metrics used were throughput, interference, distance and power consumption.

Various experiments were conducted to measure and analyze the performance of transmission of data transmission with a notebook as a mobile host over an infrastructure network. The test-bed network consists of the infrastructure network integrating a wireless net.

There will be four samples of tests that will be run with different variables and different IEEE standard. Then, each test will be repeated at least three times to ensure the accuracy and the average result will be taken for generating graph and elaborating comparison and analysis.

The main comparison regarding this analysis is about comparing the throughput between both IEEE 802.11g and 802.11n. This is because different wireless standard will produce different throughput result in data transmission rate. The other variable that will be tested and compared via this thesis is distance. This is because distance affects the wireless performance in term of the farther the distance, the lower the throughput value and the lower the data transfer rate. The distance between transmitter and receiver is proportional with the data transmission rate. The interference also one of the main variable in this research whereas both IEEE standards 802.11g and 802.11n operate at the same frequencies of microwave, cordless phones and Bluetooth which is 2.4GHz. This contribute to interference that effect both wireless performances. Last but not least, the power consumptions issue whereby having built-in wireless means users got a little chip inside notebook that's