

# A Primal-Dual Based Power Control Approach for Capacitated Edge Servers

Qinghui Zhang, *Student Member, IEEE*, Weidong Li, *Member, IEEE*, Qian Su, *Member, IEEE*  
and Xuejie Zhang, *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—The intensity of radio waves decays rapidly with increasing propagation distance, and an edge server’s antenna needs more power to form a larger signal coverage area. Therefore, the power of the edge server should be controlled to reduce energy consumption. In addition, edge servers with capacitated resources provide services for only a limited number of users to ensure the quality of service (QoS). We set the signal transmission power for the antenna of each edge server and formed a signal disk, ensuring that all users were covered by the edge server signal and minimizing the total power of the system. This scenario is a typical geometric set covering problem, and even simple cases without capacity limits are NP-hard problems. In this paper, we propose a primal-dual-based algorithm and obtain an  $m$ -approximation result. We compare our algorithm with two other algorithms through simulation experiments. The results show that our algorithm obtains a result close to the optimal value in polynomial time.

**Index Terms**—Power Control, Primal-Dual, Approximation Method, Edge Computing, Power Cover

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Background

In recent years, edge computing has been proposed as a timely and resource-efficient alternative to address data computation issues [1]. Edge computing brings the service and utilities of cloud computing closer to the user. The response time that users perceive is effectively reduced, and the data processing in the cloud center is alleviated. In addition to reduced service delays, we must consider another issue. From 2010 to 2020, global Internet traffic expanded 15-fold, and the energy consumed in transmitting data has increased at the same rate [2]. Industry and academia have focused on reducing energy consumption in wireless communication processes, in which the power of the antenna is an important consideration. Various power control methods have been proposed for different wireless networks. In terms of controlling the power of cellular networks, [3] interpreted cellular and cell-free massive MIMO networks as max-min utility optimization problems with affine interference mappings and polyhedral constraints. In [4], Dai *et al.* investigated

the joint optimization of base station (BS) clustering and power control for non-orthogonal multiple access (NOMA)-enabled coordinated multipoint (CoMP) transmission in dense cellular networks, maximizing the sum rate of the system. In addition, in terms of wireless sensor networks (WSNs), [5] investigated how machine learning could be used to reduce the possible transmission power level of wireless nodes and, in turn, satisfy the quality requirements of the overall network. Reducing the transmission power has benefits in terms of both energy consumption and interference. In [6], Moltafet *et al.* developed a dynamic control algorithm using the Lyapunov drift-plus-penalty method. They used this approach to jointly optimize the sampling action of each sensor, the transmit power allocation, and the subchannel assignment, minimizing the average total transmit power of all sensors, subject to a maximum average Age of Information (AoI) constraint for each sensor.

The above research on cellular networks and WSNs controlled the antenna’s power by reducing signal interference and improving the user’s quality of service (QoS). However, in edge networks, computing resources, such as CPUs, are often scarcer than channel resources. Therefore, wireless channel allocation and signal interference are not considered in this paper.

In typical wireless networks, the signal coverage area of an antenna, which is determined by the antenna’s power, is a disk centered on the antenna. Because the signal intensity decreases with increasing distance, a larger signal coverage disk needs more power [7]. In an edge computing system composed of edge servers and users, the edge servers communicate with users through wireless signals transmitted by antennas. This article assumes that the edge server has antennas and is abbreviated as *server*. When a server serves a user, its signal should cover the user. In addition, each edge server can provide only limited resources for the users it serves. In summary, the problem studied in this article is how to appropriately assign power in a capacitated edge server to ensure that the server covers all users while minimizing the total power. We define this problem as the *capacitated minimum power cover (CMPC)* problem. In practical situations, a user may be located outside the maximum coverage region of the servers or the number of users may exceed the total capacity of the servers. We assume that a server has no upper power limit and that the overall system has the capacity to cover all users. As a result, we can obtain a scheme that covers all users with the technique developed in this paper, which provides a reference for later decisions, such as whether to cover distant users. We

Qinghui Zhang, Qian Su and Xuejie Zhang are with the School of Information Science and Engineering, Yunnan University, Kunming, Yunnan 650091, P.R. China.

E-mail: zhangqinghui@mail.ynu.edu.cn, suqian@ynu.edu.cn, xjzhang@ynu.edu.cn

Weidong Li is with the Department of Mathematics, Yunnan University, Kunming, Yunnan 650091, P.R. China.

E-mail: weidong@ynu.edu.cn.

(Corresponding author: Xuejie Zhang)

can also address the situation in which the demand exceeds the capacity by repeatedly using the method proposed in this paper. Therefore, the above two assumptions are reasonable. Our detailed contributions in this work can be summarized as follows:

- (*CMPC and Resource Allocation Model*) The CMPC problem is a fundamental *minimum power coverage* (MPC) problem. The MPC problem is NP-hard even in the absence of capacity constraints [8], [9]. Based on the CMPC problem, we establish a minimum power control resource allocation model in a capacitated edge network.
- (*Primal-Dual Algorithms*) To address the above challenges, we propose a primal-dual-based approximation algorithm to solve the CMPC problem. After the theory proof, we obtain an approximation guarantee of  $m$  ( $m$  edge servers considered) in polynomial time.
- (*Performance Evaluation*) Numerical results are presented to validate the effectiveness and efficiency of our proposed algorithms.

## B. Previous Research

The primal-dual-based approximation algorithm is a generalization of the primal-dual method used for linear programming and combinatorial optimization problems [10]. This algorithm provides effective solutions for many optimization problems in mobile edge computing (MEC). In [11], attack-resilient distributed algorithms based on primal-dual optimization were proposed for situations when Byzantine attackers are present in a system. In [12], Wang *et al.* modelled the system in an online manner and formulated the underlying optimization problem, maximizing the total profit according to constraints on the computational resources on the edge clouds and job migration. Furthermore, a  $(1 - 1/e)$ -competitive primal-dual-based online algorithm was proposed. An efficient social welfare approximation algorithm that used a classic primal-dual framework was developed in [13]. In this paper, the cloud market for computing jobs with completion deadlines was studied, and efficient online auctions for cloud resource provisioning were designed.

The CMPC problem is a fundamental *minimum power coverage* (MPC) problem that has been extensively studied in the last two decades. Originally, the problem was introduced for modeling the power control problem in edge computing communication. Broadly, the CMPC problem belongs to the family of *minimum weight set cover* (MWSC) problems. The CMPC problem can be viewed as a special variant of the MWSC problem with the following general formulation: Given a universe  $E$  of elements (points or terminal devices) and a family  $\mathcal{G}$  of ranges (or geometric objects such as disks and polygons) where each range has a weight assignment  $w : \mathcal{G} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ , determine a set  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  of ranges such that every element in  $E$  is covered by at least one range in  $\mathcal{F}$  and the total weight  $\sum_{G \in \mathcal{F}} w(G)$  is minimized. Clearly, the CMPC problem can be formulated as a special MWSC problem in which  $\mathcal{G}$  is the set of all possible disks centered at servers with at least one user on their boundaries. The difference between the CMPC and MWSC problems is that the capacity of server

$s$  is limited to  $k_s$ ; therefore, the capacity of the disk centered at  $s$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  is also constrained.

In general, the MWSC problem is challenging to solve optimally, even for some simple versions. For example, Alt *et al.* and Bilò *et al.* presented a minimum cost covering problem without capacity constraints that is still NP-hard for any  $\alpha > 1$  in [8], [9]. Thus, the development of polynomial-time approximation algorithms is the main objective for CMPC problems.

The MWSC problem is a classic combinatorial problem with an approximation ratio of  $H(\Delta)$  [14], [15], where  $H(\Delta) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{\Delta}$  is the harmonic number and  $\Delta$  denotes the size of the largest set ( $H(\Delta) \leq \ln \Delta + 1$ ). Furthermore, a simple linear programming (LP) rounding algorithm can produce an approximation ratio of  $f$ , where  $f$  is the maximum number of sets containing a common element [16].

For the *geometric minimum weight set cover* problem, considerably better approximation factors can be achieved. Hochbaum used the partition and shifting methods to develop a polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) for a minimum unit disk cover problem in which the disks are uniform and have no prefixed locations [17]. For a minimum disk cover problem in which the disks have different sizes, Mustafa and Ray designed a PTAS using a local search method [18]. This PTAS was generalized by Roy *et al.* [19] to non-piercing regions, including pseudodisks. These results demonstrate the cardinality version of the geometric set cover problem. Varadarajan considered the weight [20] and presented a clever quasi-uniform sampling technique that was improved by Chan *et al.* [21], yielding a constant approximation for the minimum weight disk cover problem. This constant approximation was generalized by Bansal and Pruhs [22] for the minimum weight disk multicover problem in which every point must be covered multiple times. Mustafa *et al.* used a separator framework [23] to develop a quasi-PTAS for the minimum weight disk cover problem.

In previous studies, the capacity constraints of the minimum power cover problem have rarely been considered. In [24], a rounding-based mechanism for capacitated covering problems that minimized the cardinality and obtained a constant approximation was proposed to address this problem. However, the radius of the disk was expanded to reduce the cardinality. Thus, this method is not applicable in this paper due to the exponential relationship between radius and power.

## II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PRELIMINARIES

### A. System Model

We consider that all the facilities in the edge networks are distributed in a fixed dimensional  $\mathbb{R}^d$  space, where the facilities are edge servers and users. Let  $S$  denote the set of  $m$  edge servers and  $U$  denote the set of  $n$  users. For each user  $j \in U$  to connect to an edge server  $i \in S$ ,  $j$  must be contained in the signal disk formed by  $i$  and obtain an IP from this disk. The IP capacity of edge server  $i$  is  $k_i$ . If  $i$  forms a signal disk with radii  $r_i$ , the power we should provide is

$$p_i = c \cdot (r_i)^\alpha. \quad (1)$$

TABLE I  
 SUMMARY OF NOTATIONS

$m$	# of servers	$n$	# of users
$S$	Set of servers	$U$	Set of users
$U'$	Set of uncovered users	$\mathcal{D}'$	Set of unselected disks
$k_i$	Server $i$ 's capacity		
$d(i, j)$	Distance between server $i$ and user $j$		
$D_{ij}$	Disk formed by $i$ and $j$ or the set of users the disk contains		
$r_i (r_{ij})$	Radius of server $i$ 's disk (disk $D_{ij}$ )		
$p_i (p_{ij})$	Power of server $i$ 's disk (disk $D_{ij}$ )		
$\mathcal{D}$	Set of disks formed by $m$ servers and $n$ users		
$\mathcal{D}_i$	Set of disks centered on server $i$ in $\mathcal{D}$		
$x_{ij}$	Disk $D_{ij}$ is selected (1) or not (0)		
$y_{h,ij}$	User $h$ is covered by disk $D_{ij}$ (1) or not (0)		
$\theta_h$	Costs charged due to user $h$		
$\mu_i$	Extra cost of server $i$ selecting multiple disks		
$\beta_{ij}$	Minimum cost that disk $D_{ij}$ charges each user it contains		
$\gamma_{h,ij}$	Cost that user $h$ is willing to pay for disk $D_{ij}$		
$\mathcal{D}'_{ij}$	Set of uncovered users in $D_{ij}$		
$\delta(D_{ij})$	Set of users charged by $D_{ij}$		

where  $c$  and  $\alpha$  are constants ( $\alpha$  is usually called the *attenuation factor*).

Although  $r_i$  can be selected arbitrarily, there will be precisely one terminal device located on the boundary of the disk with radius  $d(i, j)$  in the optimal solution, where  $d(i, j)$  denotes the distance between  $i$  and  $j$ . Therefore, at most  $mn$  disks need to be considered. We denote the set of such disks as  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $i$  and  $j$  can form a disk  $D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}$  with radius  $r_{ij} = d(i, j)$  and center  $i$ . The disk set with  $i$  as the center in  $\mathcal{D}$  is represented by  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . Therefore, we have  $\mathcal{D}_i = n$ . A set of disks  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{D}$  is called a cover for a set of users  $\widehat{U} \in U$  if each user  $j \in \widehat{U}$  is covered by some disk in  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ . The problem is to find a cover  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathcal{D}$  for  $S$  with minimum power  $p(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}) = \sum_{D_{ij} \in \widehat{\mathcal{D}}} p_{ij}$ .

In the following, we denote instance of the CMPC problem as  $(U, \mathcal{D}, k)$  and the optimal power for the instance  $(U, \mathcal{D}, k)$  as  $OPT$ . To simplify the notation, we use  $D_{ij}$  to represent both a disk in  $\mathcal{D}$  and the set of users contained in  $D_{ij}$  and  $p_{ij}$  to denote the power of disk  $D_{ij}$ , where  $p_{ij} = c \cdot (r_{ij})^\alpha$ .

We note that  $D_{ij}$  containing a user  $u$  means that  $u$  is within the range of  $D_{ij}$  ( $u \in D_{ij}$ ); thus,  $D_{ij}$  covering  $u$  means that server  $i$  serves  $u$ , who then obtains resources.

In actual scenarios, there are situations in which multiple users are located at the same distance from a server. Suppose that a server cannot provide services for all users simultaneously. In that case, the server provides the users with services in an orderly manner according to the urgency or bid level of the users. Because this article does not focus on task scheduling, we use Definition 1 to determine the order of the users.

*Definition 1:* Map the positions of all users and servers to a coordinate system and use  $\cos(\vec{s}\vec{u})$  to represent the cosine of the angle between vector  $\vec{s}\vec{u}$  and the  $x$ -axis formed by server  $s$  and user  $u$ . The distances between users  $u$  and  $d$  and server  $s$  are  $r_{su}$  and  $r_{sd}$ , respectively. If  $\cos(\vec{s}\vec{u}) > \cos(\vec{s}\vec{d})$ , then  $r_{su} > r_{sd}$ , and the same is true if  $p_{su} > p_{sd}$ . Because  $r_{su} = r_{sd}$ ,  $D_{su}$  contains  $d$  but  $D_{sd}$  does not contain  $u$ .

### III. A PRIMAL-DUAL APPROACH FOR CAPACITATED SERVERS

In this section, we present a primal-dual algorithm for the CMPC problem on the instance  $(U, \mathcal{D}, k)$ . Then, we show how to use this algorithm to determine the power assignment of each server.

#### A. Capacitated Minimum Power Cover Problem

Under the assumption of sufficient capacity ( $\sum_{i \in S} k_i \geq n$ ), the CMPC problem can be formulated as an integer program. Variable  $x_{ij}$  indicates whether disk  $D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}$  is chosen, that is,  $x_{ij} = 1$  if and only if  $D_{ij}$  is selected. Variable  $y_{h,ij}$  indicates whether user  $h \in U$  is covered by  $D_{ij}$ ; here,  $y_{h,ij} = 1$  if and only if  $h$  is covered by  $D_{ij}$ . The integral linear programming (ILP) problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\min \sum_{D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}} p_{ij} \cdot x_{ij} \quad (2)$$

$$s.t. \sum_{D_{ij}: h \in D_{ij}} y_{h,ij} \geq 1, h \in U \text{ and } D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D} \quad (2a)$$

$$k_i x_{ij} - \sum_{h: h \in D_{ij}} y_{h,ij} \geq 0, D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D} \quad (2b)$$

$$x_{ij} \geq y_{h,ij}, h \in D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D} \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_{D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}_i} x_{ij} \leq 1, \mathcal{D}_i \in \mathcal{D} \quad (2d)$$

$$x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, y_{h,ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall h \in U, \forall D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D} \quad (2e)$$

Note that constraint (2a) ensures that user  $h$  is covered by at least one disk. The capacity limit of each disk is expressed in constraint (2b). Constraint (2c) guarantees that disk  $D_{ij}$  does not cover user  $h$  until the disk is selected. Constraint (2d) implies that each server  $i \in S$  can select only a disk as its power assignment.

The ILP without constraints (2b and 2d) is still an NP-hard combinatorial optimization problem that is equivalent to the classic set cover problem. The challenge escalates when we consider the capacity of the servers and the uniqueness of the power assignments. To address these challenges, we utilize the primal-dual algorithm design technique. We relax the ILP constraints of  $x_{ij}$  and  $y_{h,ij}$  to  $x_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $y_{h,ij} \geq 0$  to formulate the dual problem. Note that we do not need to add the constraints  $x_{ij} \leq 1$  and  $y_{h,ij} \leq 1$  since they are automatically satisfied in an optimal solution of Equation (2). By introducing dual variables  $\theta_h$ ,  $\beta_{ij}$ ,  $\gamma_{h,ij}$  and  $\mu_i$  to constraints (2a), (2b), (2c) and (2d), respectively, the dual LP of the relaxed (2) becomes:

$$\max \sum_{h \in C} \theta_h - \sum_{i \in S} \mu_i, \quad (3)$$

$$s.t. \theta_h - \beta_{ij} - \gamma_{h,ij} \leq 0, h \in D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (3a)$$

$$k_i \beta_{ij} + \sum_{h: h \in D_{ij}} \gamma_{h,ij} \leq p_{ij} + \mu_i, D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}_i \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (3b)$$

$$\theta_h \geq 0, \beta_{ij} \geq 0, h \in U, D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (3c)$$

$$\gamma_{h,ij} \geq 0, h \in D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (3d)$$

These dual variables also have economic benefits. Servers charge a fee of  $\theta_h$  to user  $h \in U$  to provide services. The dual variable  $\mu_i$  represents the additional cost when server  $i \in S$  selects multiple disks. Users are not charged more than they are willing to pay. For a user  $h$  contained in  $D_{ij}$ ,  $h$  is willing to pay  $\beta_{ij}$  when  $D$ 's capacity is insufficient. Otherwise, the fee paid by  $h$  is  $\gamma_{h,ij}$ . Furthermore, all users contained in disk  $D_{ij}$  are willing to pay no more than the sum of  $p_{ij}$  and  $\mu_i$ . Therefore, the objective function (3) maximizes the profit of the servers.

We next design an efficient primal-dual covering scheme that simultaneously increases the dual variables by a polynomial number of times, which we use to solve optimization problems (2) and (3).

### B. Primal-Dual Algorithm Design

The first use of the primal-dual-based approximation algorithm is based on the work of Bar-Yehuda and Even [25]. The procedure *PD* follows the classic primal-dual method: starting from the trivial dual feasible solution of zero, the method increases the dual variables simultaneously until some disk becomes tight. Then, a tight disk is chosen and iterated until a feasible solution is obtained. Next, we introduce how the algorithm works in detail.

Initially, the dual variables  $\{\theta\}$  and  $\{\alpha\}$  are 0, resulting in a dual feasible solution (with all  $\beta_{ij} = 0$  and  $\gamma_{h,ij} = 0$ ). We use  $U'$  to denote the set of uncovered users and  $\mathcal{D}'$  to denote the set of unselected disks. We use  $D'_{ij}$  to denote the uncovered users currently in  $D_{ij}$ . The disks are selected by increasing the dual variables  $\theta_h$  for the uncovered users  $h \in U'$  simultaneously. The dual program has two kinds of constraints: user constraints and server constraints.

To maintain the dual feasibility of the user constraints (3a), as we increase  $\theta_h$ , we must increase  $\beta_{ij}$  or  $\gamma_{h,ij}$ , where  $h \in D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}'$ . If the disk contains a large number of uncovered users, we increase  $\beta_{ij}$ ; otherwise, we increase  $\gamma_{h,ij}$ . Formally, if  $k_i < |D'_{ij}|$ , we increase  $\beta_{ij}$ ; otherwise, we increase  $\gamma_{h,ij}$ .

For each disk constraint,  $k_i \beta_{ij} + \sum_{h:h \in D_{ij}} \gamma_{h,ij} \leq p_{ij} + \mu_i$ ; initially, the left-hand side of this equation is 0, and the right-hand side is equal to the cost of the disk. This algorithm ensures that each server selects at most one disk; thus,  $\mu_i = 0$  for all  $i \in S$ . When the dual variables of the unassigned edges are increased, we stop the procedure as soon as a disk constraint is met with equality. (In Algorithm 1, this is represented by disk  $D_{su}$  in the main loop.) We can confirm only that the users in  $D'_{su}$  are served by  $s$ , not that  $s$  chooses disk  $D_{su}$ . We temporarily select this disk as the current disk for  $s$  and record the value with  $L_s = D_{su}$ . Through  $L_s$ , we can ensure that each edge server selects at most one disk as its power strategy, so  $\mu_i = 0, i \in S$  in the whole algorithm process. In lines 5-6 of Algorithm 1, we update the related variables and sets. First, we delete the users in  $D'_{su}$  from  $U'$  and the concentric disk with a radius less than  $d(s, u)$  from  $\mathcal{D}'$  ( $\mathcal{D}'_{<r_{su}} = \{D_{ij} : D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}' \text{ and } r_{ij} < r_{su}\} \cup D_{su}$ ). Then, we update  $\{\mathcal{D}'\}$  in the disks of the other servers. After these variables and sets are updated, the dual variables corresponding to the removed users and disks stop increasing

---

### Algorithm 1 PD

---

**Input:** A set of users  $U$ , a set of servers  $S$ , a power function  $p : D_{ij} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ , and a capacity constraint  $k$ .

**Output:** A subset of disks  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$  covering all users in  $U$ .

- 1: Initialize  $k'_i \leftarrow k_i, L_i \leftarrow \emptyset, \mu_i \leftarrow 0, \theta_h \leftarrow 0, \beta_{ij} \leftarrow 0, \gamma_{h,ij} = 0, \forall j, h \in U, \forall i \in S$ .
  - 2:  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}, U' \leftarrow U$ .
  - 3: **while**  $U' \neq \emptyset$  **do**
  - 4: Increase  $\{\theta_h\}_{h \in U'}$  and  $\{\beta_{ij} + \gamma_{h,ij}\}_{D'_{ij}:h \in D'_{ij}}$  simultaneously until some disk  $D_{su}$  becomes tight. (If  $|\{h : h \in D'_{ij} \cap U'\}| > k_i$ , we increase  $\beta_{ij}$ ; otherwise, we increase  $\gamma_{h,ij}, h \in D'_{ij}$ )
  - 5:  $L_s \leftarrow D_{su}$ .
  - 6:  $U' \leftarrow U' \setminus D'_{su}, \mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}' \setminus \mathcal{D}'_{<r_{su}}$ .
  - 7:  $D'_{ij} \leftarrow D'_{ij} \setminus \{D'_{ij} \cap D'_{su}\}, D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}' \setminus \mathcal{D}'_s$ .
  - 8: **end while**
  - 9:  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}} \leftarrow \{L\}$ .
  - 10: **return**  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ .
- 

in subsequent iterations. The above steps are iterated until all users are covered by one disk. The disk that covers the user are the last disk selected by each server, that is,  $\{L\}$ .

The above process maintains dual feasibility. According to Lemma 1, the capacity constraint is maintained throughout the algorithm.

### C. A PD Instance

To further understand the PD algorithm, we illustrate an instance of the PD algorithm. In Fig. 1, we present an instance of the CMPC problem  $(U, \mathcal{D}, k)$ , where  $U = \{1, 2, \dots, 20\}$ ,  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and  $k = 5$ . For ease of representation, we use triangles and circles to represent servers and users, respectively, which are distributed in a 2-dimensional coordinate system. In Fig. 1, the disk drawn as a solid line is the final disk obtained by Algorithm 1. The specific power value that each server should provide can be calculated with the equation  $p(a) = c \cdot r(a)^\alpha$  (in this case,  $c = 1$  and  $\alpha = 2$ ). The disk drawn with the dotted line is the disk that is temporarily selected by the PD algorithm during processing (that is, the value assigned to the variable  $l_a$  during the algorithm's execution). There are nine disks in Fig. 1, indicating that the main loop of the PD algorithm produces nine tight disks in total. Next, we introduce how the PD algorithm obtained the results in this instance.

After the instance  $(U, \mathcal{D}, k)$  is input and all dual variables are set to zero, the algorithm enters the while loop. By continuously increasing the dual variables, disks  $D_{3,10}$  become tight first. According to the iteration sequence, the disks selected for each iteration are  $D_{3,10}, D_{4,19}, D_{5,7}, D_{3,8}, D_{1,4}, D_{2,5}, D_{4,20}, D_{2,16}$  and  $D_{1,6}$ . In this process, each user determines which server serves it. For example, although users  $u_8$  and  $u_{12}$  are contained in disk  $D_{3,8}$  and disk  $D_{2,5}$ , respectively, the first selected disk, that is,  $D_{3,8}$ , covers them. Finally, the users served by servers  $s_1$  to  $s_5$  are  $\{u_1, u_4, u_6\}_{s_1}$ ,

$$\{u_2, u_3, u_5, u_{15}, u_{16}\}_{s_2}, \quad \{u_8, u_{10}, u_{12}, u_{14}, u_{18}\}_{s_3},$$

$$\{u_{19}, u_{20}\}_{s_4}, \text{ and } \{u_7, u_9, u_{11}, u_{13}, u_{17}\}_{s_5}.$$




Fig. 1. Total power of the PD algorithm with different numbers of servers and values of  $K$ .

#### D. Theoretical Analysis

*Lemma 1:*  $D_{su}$  must have the capacity to cover all users in  $D'_{su}$  when it is selected. Formally,  $|D'_{su}| \leq k_s$  when  $D_{su}$  is selected.

*Proof:* Assume that the  $D_{su}$  selected in an iteration satisfies  $|D'_{su}| > k_s$ . At this point,  $k_s \beta_{su} = p_{su}$ , with  $\gamma_{h,su} = 0, h \in D_{su}$ . Then, there must be an unselected disk  $D_{sd}, r_{sd} < r_{su}$  with  $|D'_{sd}| = k_s$ . We have that

$$p_{sd} \geq k_s \beta_{sd} + \sum_{h:h \in D_{sd}} \gamma_{h,sd} \quad (4)$$

$$= \sum_{h:h \in D'_{sd}} (\beta_{sd} + \gamma_{h,sd}) \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{h:h \in D'_{sd}} \theta_h \quad (6)$$

$$= k_s \beta_{su} \quad (7)$$

$$= p_{su} \quad (8)$$

$$> p_{sd}. \quad (9)$$

Equation (5) holds because  $\gamma_{h,sd} = 0, h \in D_{sd} \setminus D'_{sd}$ . Based on the former assumption and Definition 1,  $D'_{sd} \subseteq D'_{su}$ . Then,  $\theta_h = \beta_{su} = (\beta_{sd} + \gamma_{h,sd}), h \in D'_{sd}$ . Therefore, Equation (7) holds. In summary, Inequality (9) breaks constraint (3b), and the above assumption is not tenable.  $\square$

*Lemma 2:* We can charge the power of each selected disk  $D_{ij}$  to users in  $D'_{ij}$  such that each user  $h$  obtains a charge of at most  $m \cdot \theta_h$ .

*Proof:* Define a disk to be a *low degree* disk if  $|D_{ij}| \leq k_i$  when it is selected; otherwise, define the disk as a *high degree* disk. We discuss the charging mechanism for both low-degree and high-degree disks. We use  $\delta(D_{ij})$  to denote the set of users charged by  $i$ .

Consider a low degree disk  $D_{ij}$  with  $\beta_{ij} = 0$ . When  $D_{ij}$  is selected, we charge all the users contained in this disk; thus,  $\delta(D_{ij}) = D_{ij}$ . Since the disk constraint is tight, we have  $p_{ij} = \sum_{h:h \in D_{ij}} \gamma_{h,ij} = \sum_{h:h \in \delta(D_{ij})} \theta_h$ . Thus, we charge the cost of disk  $D_{ij}$  to all users contained in this disk by charging  $\theta_h$  to each  $h \in \delta(D_{ij})$ .

Now, consider a high degree disk  $D_{ij}$ ; then, at some point in time we have  $|D'_{ij}| = k_i$ . At this point, we fix the value of  $\beta_{ij}$  and subsequently increase the  $\gamma_{h,ij}$  variables and make  $\delta(D_{ij}) = D'_{ij}$ . When this disk is declared open  $|D'_{ij}| \leq k_i$ , we have that  $p_{ij} = k_i \beta_{ij} + \sum_{h:h \in D_{ij}} \gamma_{h,ij}$ . For the users not in  $\delta(D_{ij})$ , note that  $\gamma_{h,ij} = 0$ . Hence,  $p_{ij} = k_i \beta_{ij} + \sum_{h:h \in \delta(D_{ij})} \gamma_{h,ij}$ . Since there are exactly  $k_i$  users in  $\delta(D_{ij})$ , we have  $p_{ij} = \sum_{h:h \in \delta(D_{ij})} (\beta_{ij} + \gamma_{h,ij}) = \sum_{h:h \in \delta(D_{ij})} \theta_h$ . Thus, the cost of disk  $D_{ij}$  is charged to all users in  $\delta(D_{ij})$ .

Finally, Algorithm 1 selects up to  $m$  disks. Therefore, each user in  $C$  can be charged up to  $m$  times. Formally,  $|\{D_{ij} : h \in \delta(D_{ij}), D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}\}| \leq m, h \in U$   $\square$

*Theorem 1:* The CMPC-PD algorithm returns an  $m$ -approximation for the capacitated minimum power cover problem in polynomial time.

*proof (Approximation ratio):* For the cover  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  constructed by the algorithm, we show that  $\sum_{D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} p_{ij} \leq f \cdot \text{OPT}$ , where OPT is the value of an optimum solution to the CMPC problem. Let  $Z_{LP}^*$  be the optimal value of the linear programming relaxation of (2). It is sufficient to show that  $\sum_{D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} p_{ij} \leq f \cdot (\sum_{h \in U} \theta_h - \sum_{i \in S} \mu_i)$  for the final dual solution  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$  since by weak duality we know that for any dual feasible solution  $\theta$  and  $\alpha$ ,  $\sum_{h \in U} \theta_h - \sum_{i \in S} \mu_i \leq Z_{LP}^*$ . Thus, since the LP is a relaxation,  $Z_{LP}^* \leq \text{OPT}$ .

According to Lemma 2, we can charge the cost of each chosen disk  $D_{ij}$  to the users in  $\delta(D_{ij})$  at most  $m$  times. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} p_{ij} &= \sum_{D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} (k_i \beta_{ij} + \sum_{h:h \in D_{ij}} \gamma_{h,ij} - \mu_i) \\ &= \sum_{D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}} \sum_{h:h \in \delta(D_{ij})} \theta_h \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_{h \in U} \theta_h \cdot |\{D_{ij} : h \in \delta(D_{ij}), D_{ij} \in \hat{\mathcal{D}}\}| \quad (11)$$

$$\leq m \cdot \sum_{h \in U} \theta_h \quad (12)$$

$$\leq m \cdot \text{OPT} \quad (13)$$

where the second equality is derived from Lemmas 2 and  $\mu_i = 0, i \in S$ .

*(Polynomial Running Time):* The **while** loop iterates at most  $n$  times to cover all users. Line 4 takes  $O(mn^2)$  time to increase the dual variables. Lines 5-7 update several sets in  $O(n)$  time. Thus, the CMPC-PD algorithm runs in polynomial time  $O(mn^3)$ .  $\square$

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We use the PD algorithm proposed above and synthetic data to conduct practical experiments to simulate the power control for servers in edge networks. The experiments ignore the vertical distribution of the two facilities, mapping their positions to a 2-dimensional coordinate system. The relevant parameters are shown in Table II. The specific experimental settings are as follows:

- 1) The hardware configuration of the experimental environment is as follows: the CPU is an Intel i7-10700 with 8

TABLE II  
CONFIGURATION OF EXPERIMENTAL PARAMETERS.

Param	Description	Value
$\alpha$	Power parameter in Equation 1	[1, 2]
$c$	Power parameter in Equation 1	1
$m$	# of servers	[1,10]
$n$	# of users	[20,500]
$\bar{k}$	Average capacity of all servers	[0,200]
$k_i$	Capacity of server $i$	[0,200]
$K$	Total capacity of all servers	$m \cdot \bar{k}$
$l$	Side length of facility distribution area	100
$\lambda$	Ratio of the side length of the server distribution area to $l$	[0, 1]
$p_i^X (p_i^Y)$	X (Y) coordinate of server $i$	[0, 100]
$p_j^X (p_j^Y)$	X (Y) coordinate of user $j$	[0, 100]

cores and 16 threads at 2.9 GHz, 16 GB memory, and a hard disk capacity of 1 TB.

- 2) The entire system includes two facilities, namely, servers and users, which are distributed randomly in a 2-dimensional space. The capabilities of each server are limited, and all users must be covered by some server. In this experiment, we randomly set the capacity of each server according to its average capacity  $\bar{k}$ ; thus, the capacity of each server varies around  $\bar{k}$ . To ensure that the total system capacity satisfies the requirement of covering all users, if  $\sum_{i \in S} k_i < n$ , we artificially increase the gap so that  $\sum_{i \in S} k_i = n$ ; if  $\sum_{i \in S} k_i \geq n$ , no operation is performed.
- 3) Each experiment is performed 50 times, and the final results are averaged to reduce the impact of randomness.
- 4) The IP utilization rate of a server is the ratio of the number of users covered by that server to its capacity.
- 5) The variance in the IP utilization is defined by Equation (14):

$$s^2 = \frac{\sum_{i \in S} (|L_i| - n/m)^2}{m}. \quad (14)$$

According to the property of variance, the smaller the value of  $s^2$  is, the more balanced the number of users covered by each server; however, in this case, a few servers cover all users.

- 6) In this section, we compare the PD algorithm with the optimal (OPT) and nearest capable server (NCS) approaches. The OPT approach uses IBM's open source tool CPLEX to obtain the optimal solution to the CMPC problem. If we do not obtain the optimal solution within 10 minutes, we stop the algorithm. The NCS approach is a greedy-based method that can be used to solve the CMPC problem. To determine which server covers which user during each iteration, the algorithm selects the closest server-user point pair for which the server still has capacity.

#### A. Impact of the Number of Users

In this experiment, we analyzed the impact of changes in the number of users on the CMPC problem. The main foci are the total system power, algorithm execution time, and variance in the server's capacity utilization.  $n$  is gradually increased from

20 to 200 in steps of 10. All facilities are distributed in an area with a side length of 100. The average capacity of each server is  $\bar{k} = 50$ . Therefore, the total capacity of all servers is  $K = 500$ . For the two constants in Equation (1),  $c = 1$  and  $\alpha = 2$ . When the number of users is greater than 200, the optimal solution of a single instance cannot be obtained within 10 minutes.

Fig. 2a shows the variation in the total power as the number of users increases for the three approaches. Overall, the total power obtained by the three methods increases as the number of users increases. This is consistent with our intuition. For example, consider several servers installed around a shopping mall. It is certain that the number and capacity of these servers does not change in one day. However, users in the mall change over time. When the number of consumers increases, the probability that the server serves more distant customers increases. The statistics of the total power should then increase. In addition, the DP result is closer to OPT than the NCS result. This finding indicates the superiority of our method. Although our results are not as good as the optimal solution, Fig. 2b shows the considerable time cost required to arrive at the optimal solution.

#### B. Impact of the Number of Servers and $K$

In this section, we study the impact of the number of servers and the total capacity  $K$  on the algorithm. This investigation helps us to determine whether to reduce the total power of the system by increasing the number or capacity of the servers when the number of users is stable. In this experiment, we assume that there are 100 users, and  $m$  and  $K$  increase from 1 to 8 and 100 to 200, respectively. The values of the other variables are the same as those in Section IV-A.

Fig. 3 clearly shows that when the total capacity of the system is sufficient ( $K \geq 150$ ), the total power does not change significantly with increasing  $m$ . This result indicates that sufficient capacity generates less power. When the system capacity is tight, increasing the number of servers causes the PD algorithm to encounter the issue of local optimization. Combined with the results in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, this finding leads to a rapid increase in the total power. However, when considering the cost of the server itself, with the assumption of a stable number of users, we can use fewer servers. In this case, the PD algorithm shows good performance regardless of resource constraints, as shown in Fig. 4. In addition, Fig. 4 shows that as the number of servers increases, the approximate ratio of the PD algorithm increases. This result confirms the conclusion of Theorem 1.

#### C. Impact of the Number of Servers and $\lambda$

Server location problems are also an important research topic. Although this paper does not discuss how to determine the location of the server, we can explore the impact of the server distribution on the PD algorithm by controlling the concentration of the servers. We assume that the two facilities are distributed in a square with a side length of  $l = 100$  and use  $\lambda$  to control the distribution area of the server. The side length of this area is  $\lambda l$ , and the center of this region is located at




Fig. 2. System performance with different numbers of users.




Fig. 3. Total power of the PD algorithm with different numbers of servers and values of  $K$ .




Fig. 4. Approximation ratio of the PD algorithm with different numbers of servers and values of  $K$ .

$(l/2, l/2)$ . The number of servers  $m$  is increased from 1 to 8, with  $K = 150$  and  $n = 100$ . The values of the other variables are the same as those in Section IV-A.

Fig. 5 shows that when the number of servers is less than or equal to 3, the more concentrated the servers are, the lower the total power is. However, as the number of servers gradually increases, different concentrations lead to power changes. When the number of servers is increased to 8, the total power ranking result is opposite to the previous result. Thus, when we need to place servers in an area, to satisfy the needs of the system, we need to place servers only near the center of the area; however, if the QoS of users is considered,

the servers should be evenly placed in this area rather than only close to the center.




Fig. 5. Total power of the PD algorithm with different numbers of servers and values of  $\lambda$ .




Fig. 6. Approximation ratio of the PD algorithm with different numbers of servers and values of  $\lambda$ .

#### D. Impact of Different Values of $\alpha$

In Equation (1),  $\alpha$  is an important parameter that represents the signal attenuation coefficient. Variations in  $\alpha$  inevitably affect the total power. Therefore, in this section, we explore the impact of  $\alpha$  on the total power and the performance of the PD algorithm. In this experiment, the same dataset was used




Fig. 7. System performance with different values of  $\alpha$ .

for different values of  $\alpha$ . This dataset was developed according to the case when  $m = 6$  and  $K = 150$ , as described in Section IV-B.

Fig. 7a shows that the total power of the PD and CPLEX algorithms increases exponentially with increasing  $\alpha$ . The reason for this result is clear. A larger value of  $\alpha$  increases the cost of the PD algorithm choosing a disk that differs from the optimal solution. Therefore, as shown in Fig. B, the approximation ratio of the PD algorithm does not increase with small increases in  $\alpha$ . Although the influence of  $\alpha$  on the approximation ratio is not obvious, the variance in the IP utilization decreases with increasing  $\alpha$ . This result shows that users are increasingly evenly served by the server.

### V. CONCLUSION

Signal coverage consumes considerable energy in wireless networks; thus, in this paper, we studied how to assign the appropriate power to servers to reduce energy consumption. We built a signal coverage model based on the CMPC problem in edge networks and developed an  $m$ -approximation primal-dual-based algorithm. The numerical results show satisfactory performance. In this paper, we considered that the each user needs to be covered by 1 server, and the servers should provide services for all users. However, servers do not serve users with significant costs in practical scenarios. Therefore, partial coverage and users' natural number requirement should be the focus of future work.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China [Nos. 12071417, 61762091, and 62062065] and the 13th Postgraduate Innovation Project of Yunnan University [No. 2021Z079].

### REFERENCES

[1] N. Abbas, Y. Zhang, A. Taherkordi, and T. Skeie, "Mobile edge computing: A survey," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 5, pp. 450–465, 2 2018.  
 [2] IEA, "Data centres and data transmission networks," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iea.org/reports/data-centres-and-data-transmission-networks>  
 [3] L. Miretti, R. L. G. Cavalcante, S. Stanczak, M. Schubert, R. Boehnke, and W. Xu, "Closed-form max-min power control for some cellular and cell-free massive MIMO networks," *CoRR*, vol. abs/2205.00429, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.00429>

[4] Y. Dai, J. Liu, M. Sheng, N. Cheng, and X. Shen, "Joint optimization of bs clustering and power control for noma-enabled comp transmission in dense cellular networks," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, pp. 1924–1937, 2 2021.  
 [5] M. Chincoli and A. Liotta, "Self-learning power control in wireless sensor networks," *Sensors*, vol. 18, p. 375, 1 2018.  
 [6] M. Moltafet, M. Leinonen, M. Codreanu, and N. Pappas, "Power minimization for age of information constrained dynamic control in wireless sensor networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 419–432, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOMM.2021.3124949>  
 [7] D. Ronnow and P. Handel, "Nonlinear distortion noise and linear attenuation in mimo systems—theory and application to multiband transmitters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, pp. 5203–5212, 10 2019.  
 [8] H. Alt, E. M. Arkin, H. Brönnimann, J. Erickson, S. P. Fekete, C. Knauer, J. Lenchner, J. S. B. Mitchell, and K. Whittlesey, "Minimum-cost coverage of point sets by disks," in *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual symposium on Computational geometry - SCG '06*, vol. 2006, no. June. New York, New York, USA: ACM Press, 2006, p. 449. [Online]. Available: <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doi=1137856.1137922>  
 [9] V. Bilò, I. Caragiannis, C. Kaklamanis, and P. Kanellopoulos, "Geometric Clustering to Minimize the Sum of Cluster Sizes," in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2005, vol. 3669, no. October, pp. 460–471. [Online]. Available: [http://link.springer.com/10.1007/11561071\\_42](http://link.springer.com/10.1007/11561071_42)  
 [10] W. David P. and S. David B., *THE DESIGN OF APPROXIMATION ALGORITHMS*. New York, New York, USA: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2011.  
 [11] B. Turan, C. A. Uribe, H.-T. Wai, and M. Alizadeh, "Resilient primal-dual optimization algorithms for distributed resource allocation," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 282–294, 2021.  
 [12] Z. Wang and D. Xu, "Online job scheduling in mobile edge computing based on primal-dual method," in *2021 Computing, Communications and IoT Applications (ComComAp)*, 2021, pp. 47–52.  
 [13] R. Zhou, Z. Li, C. Wu, and Z. Huang, "An efficient cloud market mechanism for computing jobs with soft deadlines," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 793–805, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2016.2609844>  
 [14] "A Greedy Heuristic for the Set-Covering Problem," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 233–235, 1979.  
 [15] D. S. Johnson, "Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems," *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 256–278, 1974.  
 [16] Vazirani, Vijay V., *Approximation Algorithms*. Springer, 2003.  
 [17] D. S. Hochbaum, "Approximation Algorithms for the Set Covering and Vertex Cover Problems," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 555–556, aug 1982. [Online]. Available: <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/0211045>  
 [18] N. H. Mustafa and S. Ray, "Improved Results on Geometric Hitting Set Problems," *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 883–895, dec 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s00454-010-9285-9>  
 [19] A. Basu Roy, S. Govindarajan, R. Raman, and S. Ray, "Packing and Covering with Non-Piercing Regions," *Discrete and Computational*



*Geometry*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 471–492, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-018-9983-2>

- [20] K. Varadarajan, “Weighted geometric set cover via quasi-uniform sampling,” in *Proceedings of the Forty-Second ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC ’10. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2010, p. 641–648. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806777>
- [21] T. M. Chan, E. Grant, J. Könemann, and M. Sharpe, “Weighted Capacitated, Priority, and Geometric Set Cover via Improved Quasi-Uniform Sampling,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, jan 2012, pp. 1576–1585. [Online]. Available: [http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-33090-2\\_14](http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-33090-2_14)<https://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/1.9781611973099.125>
- [22] N. Bansal and K. Pruhs, “Weighted Geometric Set Multi-cover via Quasi-uniform Sampling,” in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 2012, vol. 7501 LNCS, pp. 145–156. [Online]. Available: [http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-33090-2\\_14](http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-642-33090-2_14)
- [23] N. H. Mustafa, R. Raman, and S. Ray, “Quasi-Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme for Weighted Geometric Set Cover on Pseudodisks and Halfspaces,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1650–1669, jan 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://epubs.siam.org/doi/10.1137/14099317X>
- [24] S. Bandyapadhyay, S. Bhowmick, T. Inamdar, and K. Varadarajan, “Capacitated covering problems in geometric spaces,” *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, vol. 63, pp. 768–798, 6 2020.
- [25] R. Bar-Yehuda and S. Even, “A linear-time approximation algorithm for the weighted vertex cover problem,” *Journal of Algorithms*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 198–203, jun 1981.



**Xuejie Zhang** received a master’s degree in computer science and engineering from Harbin Institute of Technology in 1990. He received a Ph.D. degree in computer science and engineering from The Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1998. He is currently a professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering of Yunnan University. His main research interests include high-performance computing, distributed systems, computer networks and cloud computing.



**Qinghui Zhang** received a B.E. degree in software engineering from Yangzhou University in 2020. He is currently working toward an M.S. degree at Yunnan University. His research interests include cloud computing and edge computing.



**Weidong Li** received a Ph.D. degree from the Department of Mathematics of Yunnan University in 2010. He is currently a professor at Yunnan University. His main research interests include combinatorial optimization, approximation algorithms, randomized algorithms and cloud computing.



**Qian Su** received a master’s degree in computer science from Yunnan University in 2009. She is a lecturer and a Ph.D. candidate at the School of Information Science and Engineering, Yunnan University. Her research interests include edge computing and cloud-edge collaboration.