

Graph neural network for in-network placement of real-time metaverse tasks in next-generation network

Sulaiman Muhammad Rashid^a, Ibrahim Aliyu^a, Il-Kwon Jeong^b, Tai-Won Um^{c,*}, Jinsul Kim^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Intelligent Electronics and Computer Engineering, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, 61186, Korea

^bHyper-Reality Metaverse Research Laboratory Content Research Division, Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute(ETRI), Daejeon, Korea

^cSchool of Data Science, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, 61186, Korea

Abstract

This study addresses the challenge of real-time metaverse applications by proposing an in-network placement and task-offloading solution for delay-constrained computing tasks in next-generation networks. The metaverse, envisioned as a parallel virtual world, requires seamless real-time experiences across diverse applications. The study introduces a software-defined networking (SDN)-based architecture and employs graph neural network (GNN) techniques for intelligent and adaptive task allocation in in-network computing (INC). Considering time constraints and computing capabilities, the proposed model optimally decides whether to offload rendering tasks to INC nodes or edge server. Extensive experiments demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed GNN model, achieving 97% accuracy compared to 72% for multilayer perceptron (MLP) and 70% for decision trees (DTs). The study fills the research gap in in-network placement for real-time metaverse applications, offering insights into efficient rendering task handling.

Keywords: Delay-constrained computing, Graph neural network, In-Network computing, Metaverse, Real-time rendering

1. Introduction

The Metaverse represents a hypothetical “parallel virtual world,” embodying lifestyles and work environments within virtual cities as an alternative to future smart cities [1]. It envisions seamless integration into our daily lives, offering users immersive real-time experiences globally [2, 3, 4]. However, realizing this vision presents a substantial challenge in ensuring the metaverse operates seamlessly in real-time, irrespective of geographical distances [5]. To achieve high levels of immersion and realism, metaverse applications must render graphics, animations, and simulations in real time [6] which is crucial for virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) applications aiming to induce a sense of presence and “being there” [7]. In the metaverse, users can generate and modify 3D digital content, where rendering plays a pivotal role in producing

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: stwum@jnu.ac.kr (Tai-Won Um), jsworld@jnu.ac.kr (Jinsul Kim)

Preprint submitted to Internet of Things

March 5, 2024

such content [8], involving the computation of images perceived by users based on computer graphics principles [9]. Therefore, efficient handling of rendering tasks for real-time metaverse applications is crucial and imperative for research and development.

While mobile edge computing (MEC) offers a remedy through remote task offloading (TO), it struggles to meet extensive user concurrent demands [10, 11, 12, 13]. The computing in the network (COIN) paradigm emerges as a promising solution, utilizing untapped network resources to execute tasks, diminishing latency, and fulfilling quality of experience (QoE) requirements [10, 14]. Nonetheless, augmenting computing resources or enabling COIN leads to heightened power consumption. Effectively allocating COIN computing resources in real-time to adapt to continually shifting user demands while ensuring overall system availability poses a critical challenge.

1.1. Motivation and Contributions

Despite substantial advancements in handling time-intensive tasks, challenges persist, including potential bottlenecks arising from resource constraints and network congestion [15]. Previous researchers propose the concept of in-network computing (INC) as a solution for managing delay-constrained tasks [16, 17, 18]. This leverages the computing capability of nodes deployed across the INC paradigm. Deciding which INC node should execute a task or whether to offload it to the edge server due to network load can be achieved by adopting a software-defined networking (SDN) architecture [19]. SDN provides programmability, flexibility, and centralized control, enabling efficient management of network resources [20]. In this context, our primary effort focuses on ensuring users experience seamless and immersive interactions within the metaverse while ensuring rendering tasks meet their deadlines. Rendering high-quality 3D content is computationally intensive, requiring substantial processing power to handle the complex calculations [21]. It involves input processing, environment rendering, spatial mapping and tracking, and composition and display [22, 9]. In this study, we consider the first three steps as one independent task that can be computed by one node while another node executes the last step.

However, achieving optimal decisions requires complex mathematical models, posing a challenge to efficient task allocation. As outlined in [23], machine learning (ML) approaches can be devised to determine how to allocate computing tasks across the network. This methodology holds promise in dynamically adapting to the complexities of task allocation, offering a data-driven framework to enhance real-time decision-making.

Recently, graph neural networks (GNN) have received increasing attention and are widely utilized in various applications [24, 25, 26]. Their ability to model and analyze complex relationships within graph-structured data makes them particularly promising for addressing rendering task placement decisions. Our study will leverage graph convolutional networks (GCNs) and develop a model capable of learning the dynamicity of the network and computing requests to facilitate intelligent and adaptive rendering task allocation strategies.

Early studies mainly focused on optimizing rendering algorithms to address the challenges of real-time rendering in metaverse applications, while other techniques, such as INC, which are drawing more researchers' attention in delay-constrained computing, are yet to be devised for such problems. Previous works on INC focused on offloading tasks independently on SDN-based edge networks; none considered computing tasks on more than one node due to the complexity of being computed by a single node. Finally, different ML techniques have been utilized by various researchers to address dynamic task placement problems in SDN edge environments. However, GNN algorithms have not been applied to this field yet. Therefore, this study establishes a novel

approach for studying placement and offloading decisions for delay-constrained tasks for real-time metaverse applications. This approach promises to employ and compare GNN with other ML techniques to efficiently distribute rendering tasks within an INC environment and impact the real-time rendering performance of metaverse applications.

The extensive literature reviewed in this study indicates that no works on in-network placement of real-time rendering tasks in metaverse applications have been conducted. Specifically, we consider a metaverse concert scenario where concert attendees gather to collectively interact and experience the concert. The audience is dispersed worldwide, yet everyone is immersed in the same live performance. In this context, the efficient distribution of real-time rendering tasks within the metaverse network is crucial for providing concert attendees with a seamless and immersive experience. The challenges of coordinating rendering tasks in a distributed and global environment necessitate a specialized system tailored to the unique requirements of metaverse concerts. This study introduces a groundbreaking approach to address this gap, presenting a novel system designed to enhance the in-network placement of real-time rendering tasks. More specifically, our system provides the following:

- We propose an SDN-based network architecture that includes the control and data planes (comprising INC nodes, edge servers, and ingressors). The control plane receives requests from ingressors and orchestrates communication with the selected INC node/edge server for task execution.
- We formulate the optimal task placement problem through an Integer Linear Programming (ILP) to minimize rendering latency under task time execution constraints, queuing delays, and the limited computing capabilities of the executing nodes.
- We designed and implemented a GCN model to identify the near-optimal placement of metaverse rendering tasks in real-time computing nodes, minimizing resource use while meeting delay requirements.
- We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the performance of the model results against some benchmark solutions. The performance of our proposed model surpasses other schemes in the context of delay-constrained computing in metaverse applications.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 addresses related studies and Section 3 presents the system model. In Section 4, we present optimal task placement using GNN; Section 5 explains how we obtain our dataset; and Section 6 presents the numerical investigation to validate the results of our proposed study. Conclusion and research directions are discussed in Section 7.

2. Related work

The problem of delay-constrained computing has garnered considerable attention in recent years [18, 27, 28]. Related research can be categorized into three main areas: first, there is a focus on the in-network placement of delay-constrained tasks. Subsequently, attention is given to the influence of ML in SDN-based task placement. Finally, contemporary studies concerning real-time rendering in the metaverse are presented.

2.1. In-network placement of delay-constraint tasks

The future of computing is poised at the edge [29, 30], where data-driven decisions necessitate near-instantaneous processing. In this scenario, INC nodes serve as execution units, dynamically selected based on each task's specific needs and deadlines. Extensive research has delved into the task placement problem within INC environments [18, 31, 32, 33, 34]. Some approaches involve offloading tasks to the INC node close to the user [34]. However, the resulting heavy workload often increases waiting times, undermining the core objective of near-instantaneous processing. Researchers are actively exploring potential solutions to mitigate this challenge. For instance, notable work in [18], addresses the optimal task placement problem for delay-constrained tasks by formulating it as a mixed-integer linear programming challenge. This line of inquiry has been extended in [23] where supervised ML techniques are leveraged to enhance task placement decisions. As these research efforts unfold, they pave the way for a more responsive computing paradigm that aligns with the demands of data-driven, edge-centric decision-making. Optimizing task placement in INC at the edge, especially for delay-constrained tasks, is crucial given that heavy workloads can lead to increased waiting times, thereby impacting the goal of achieving near-instantaneous processing for data-driven, edge-centric decision-making.

2.2. Impact of ML in SDN-based task placement

The separation of the control and data planes facilitated by SDN has introduced a dynamic technique that enhances network flexibility [35]. Among researchers, ML approaches for task placement in SDN computing are gaining traction [36, 37, 38]. For instance, in [37] authors proposed a deep learning-based resource allocation within SDN-enabled Fog architecture, where ML techniques are employed to compute resource links alongside other controller-imposed constraints. As SDN evolves, the integration of ML techniques optimizes task placement and enhances the adaptability and responsiveness of networks to dynamic conditions. The work presented in [23] signifies a pivotal shift toward intelligent and data-driven decision-making within network environments. Various supervised learning algorithms, such as decision trees (DTs), bagged trees, multilayer perception (MLP), and support vector machines (SVM), were utilized to facilitate less complex and faster placement decision-making within an SDN infrastructure. Given the frequent fluctuation in network conditions and requirements, AI models must strive to deliver near-optimal task placement decisions.

2.3. Contemporary works in real-time rendering in the metaverse

As the metaverse gains prominence as a shared digital space where users engage with each other and digital entities in real time, the demand for real-time rendering with stringent delay constraints becomes imperative. Researchers are exploring innovative solutions to tackle the challenges posed by rendering complex virtual environments in the metaverse while adhering to strict time constraints [39, 40]. Traditionally, rendering algorithms such as view frustum and occlusion culling have been utilized by researchers to selectively remove objects outside the camera's view, thereby enhancing the performance of metaverse applications [41, 42]. However, the need for innovative approaches becomes paramount as the metaverse evolves, with users freely placing diverse objects. Recent works, as highlighted in [42], delve into object-culling techniques that leverage vertex chunks to render a substantial volume of objects in real time. This method compresses bounding boxes into data units, reducing input data for rendering passes. The metaverse is characterized by dynamic and interactive environments [43]. Therefore, it is crucial to explore new directions and methods that can adapt to changes in the virtual world in real time and effectively handle dynamic scenarios without compromising performance.




Figure 1: Experimental Setup

3. System Model

This section offers an in-depth exploration of the framework that facilitates the utilization of SDN-based in-network architecture to facilitate the placement and offloading of delay-constrained tasks within real-time metaverse applications, focusing on the metaverse concert use case.

3.1. Network Model

Offloading all tasks to a single-edge server or node is suboptimal, as it can result in substantial latency, which is unacceptable for delay-constrained applications and may lead to frequent deadline misses [44, 45, 46]. As illustrated in Figure 1, we consider a metropolitan network system comprising the control plane, data plane, ingressors, and concert area to mitigate this issue.

In our scenario, ingressors (group of players) $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ request a set of rendering tasks. The Control Plane CP is crucial in orchestrating and managing overall network operations. It acts as the system's brain, making decisions based on real-time data and communication with the network elements [47, 48]. The CP initializes resource information for each INC node $i \in E$, which includes computing capability C_i , current network load NL , and features associated with each rendering task $r \in R$. Upon receiving a rendering request, the CP returns the address A_r of selected nodes N_r and establishes a communication link with nodes responsible for task execution. Tasks are divided between two INC nodes, denoted as $node1$ and $node2$, or else sent to the edge server.

3.2. Task Model

All INC nodes, denoted by $i \in E$, possess computing capability C_i measured in CPU cycles per second. The ingressors request a set of rendering tasks R , characterized by (S_r, P_r, M_{del}) , where S_r represents the size of task r in megabytes, P_r denotes the processing power required

Table 1: Symbol Descriptions

Symbol	Description
R	set of rendering tasks
E	Set of INC nodes
C_i	Computing capacity of node i
S_r	Size of rendering task r (mb)
P_r	Required processing power for rendering task r
M_{del}	Maximum delay constraint for rendering task r
T_r	Total time to execute task r
C_{del}	Total computation delay for task r
\bar{C}	Average computation time
h_1^{min}	Minimum distance between ingressors and node1
h_2^{min}	Minimum distance between node1 and node 2
α_r	Arrival rate of task r

in CPU cycles to accomplish the task, and M_{del} signifies the maximum delay constraint of the rendering task.

The total time T_i required by computing nodes to complete the task is given as

$$T_i = \frac{P_r}{C_{i1} + C_{i2}}, \quad i \in E \quad (1)$$

where C_{i1} and C_{i2} represent the computing capabilities of the first and second INC nodes, respectively.

Consistent with previous studies [19, 23], the arrival rate of requests for rendering task r at node i follows a Poisson distribution characterized by α_r . The allocation of computing resources received per task has an average distribution denoted by \bar{C} ; Consequently, all INC nodes can collectively form an M/M/1 queuing model to process rendering tasks [49]. The total computation delay for task r at nodes $i1$ and $i2$ will be:

$$C_{\text{del}} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{C_{i1} + C_{i2}}{\bar{C}} - \sum_{i \in R} \alpha_r\right)}, \quad i_1, i_2 \in E \quad (2)$$

3.3. Computing Model

The total network cost NC for a set of rendering task is determined by the distance of nodes between the ingressors and the *node1* as h_1^{min} , the distance of nodes between *node1* and *node2* as h_2^{min} , and the size S_i of the task, it can be derived as:

$$NC = \alpha_r \sum_{r=1}^R S_i (h_1^{\text{min}} + h_2^{\text{min}}), \quad i \in E; r \in R \quad (3)$$

The number of exchanged nodes substantially impact the network cost, potentially resulting in high traffic within the network. Let X_{1i} and X_{2i} denotes binary decisions where '1' signifies that the rendering task is executed by node 1 and 2, respectively; otherwise, '0'. Consequently, we formulate the problem as follows:




Figure 2: Sequence diagram of rendering request and INC procedures

$$P: \min \sum_{i \in E} \sum_{r \in R} X_{1i} X_{2i} \alpha_r \sum_{r=1}^r S_i (h_1^{\min} + h_2^{\min}) \quad (4)$$

Constraints:

$$\sum_{i \in E} X_{1i} + \sum_{i \in E} X_{2i} \leq 2 \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{i \in E} X_{1i} \leq 1 \quad (6)$$

$$X_{1i} + X_{2i} \geq 1 \quad \forall i \in E \quad (7)$$

$$X_1 X_2 \bar{C} \leq X_1 X_2 M_{\text{del}} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{C_i}{\bar{C}} - \sum_{r \in R} \alpha_r > 0 \quad (9)$$

$$X_1, X_2 \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i \in E, \quad r \in R$$

Constraints (5) and (6) described by nonlinear inequalities, ensure that a maximum of two nodes executes each rendering task and only one node executes at a time. Equation (7) ensures that at least one node is chosen for the task. Equations (8) and (9) confirm that the computing resources allocated to a rendering task are within the limits. Table 2 presents the simulation parameter settings except otherwise stated.

4. Optimal task placement using GNN

The ILP problem in eq. (4) corresponds to the Generalized Assignment Problem (GAP) [50, 23], which is NP-hard problem. Due to the complexity of rendering task placement decisions under the constraint capacity of INC nodes and computation delay deadlines, the offloading and placement problem is challenging, as it is difficult to predict task duration. Therefore, a more dynamic solution is needed to adapt to delay and queuing time changes.

The decision-making process in real-time metaverse applications, especially regarding rendering tasks, involves numerous variables and dependencies. Traditional approaches fall short of capturing the complexity of these interactions and adapting to the dynamic nature of network conditions [1, 51]. Neural networks offer a compelling solution for several reasons: Non-linearity handling [52], graph representation [53], and adaptability to dynamic environments.

Table 2: Parameter settings

Parameter	Setting
Computing capability (C_i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle layer nodes: 5×10^8 CPU cycles / s • Upper layer nodes: 10^9 CPU cycles / s • Edge servers: 10^{10} CPU cycles / s
Size of rendering task (S_r)	10 MB
Average processing power required (P_r)	10^7
Maximum delay constraint (M_{del})	Uniformly distributed [10, 150] ms
Arrival rate of task (α_r)	10 requests/s

We propose GNN approach, specifically GCN to train on labeled data derived from our optimal decisions based on historical scenarios. The inputs to the model include the total network cost for each rendering task on all INC nodes, the maximum computation delay of the task, and the Boolean decision that indicates whether the node satisfied the task constraint.

For each task run, each algorithm returns output with the selected nodes as the executors of the rendering task. Once the executor is selected, the controller returns the address of the selected nodes, and the task is sent to the executors for rendering task execution.

We first utilize a unified formula to define a graph, $G = (V, E, X)$, where V represents the set of n nodes and E the set of edges. In the context of this study, V signifies the tasks and source hosts, while E represents the connections/links between tasks and ingressors. The feature matrix X contains the feature vectors associated with each node. We conducted several fine tuning and hyperparameter tests to determine the best parameters for the model (see Table 4).

$$G = (V, E, X) \quad (10)$$

$$V = \{v_i, \dots, v_n\} \quad (11)$$

$$E = \{(v_i, v_j)\} \quad (12)$$

Here, v_i and v_j represent the k -th element of the task and source vectors of the set of rendering requests R , respectively.




Figure 3: Graph convolutional model

$$X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n], \text{ where } x_i \text{ represents the feature vector of node } i. \quad (13)$$

The model comprises two graph convolution layers: $GV(X, W_1)$ and $GV(H, W_2)$. Here, H is the hidden layer output, and W_1 and W_2 denote the weight matrices associated with the graph convolution layers.

$$H_0 = X \quad (14)$$

$$H_i = \text{ReLU}(GV(H_{i-1}, W_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n-1 \quad (15)$$

$$Y = GV(H_{n-1}, W_n) \quad (16)$$

The parameters of the GNN model are denoted by θ . The objective is to minimize the cross-entropy loss function.

$$\min \theta L(GV(\dots (\text{ReLU}(\text{GraphConv}(X, \theta_1)), \theta_2) \dots, \theta_{n-1}), \theta_n) \quad (17)$$

The model computes logits \hat{Y} , representing the predicted labels, where $\hat{Y} = \text{model}(G, X)$. The loss is then computed as $L(\hat{Y}, Y_{\text{train}})$, where Y_{train} is the ground truth for the training set.

5. Dataset generation

Our experiment utilized a dataset generated by the optimal solution from Section 3 through a standard optimization solver (Gurobi). The dataset comprises 100,000 samples (task requests). To create training and validation sets, we employed the 10-fold cross-validation method, dividing the dataset into 10 folds using random sampling without repetition. This method involved 10 training sessions, each utilizing a different fold as a validation set and the remaining folds as training sets. The prediction error was determined as the mean average of the 10 individual errors from each training session, ensuring an unbiased performance evaluation of the model across different dataset partitions.

6. Numerical Investigation

In this section, we present the numerical result of the proposed model and compare its performance with that of other models from the literature.

Table 3: Hyperparameter settings for training of GNN

Setting	Value
Model type	Graph Convolutional Network (GCN)
Number of features	30
Activation function	ReLU
Layers	2
Optimizer	Adam
Epochs	200
Learning rate	0.01

6.1. Experiment Environment

We utilized an SDN network topology comprising 30 INC nodes, as illustrated in Figure 1. Four nodes transmit tasks to the edge servers. In contrast, upper-layer nodes are interconnected in a fully meshed topology, serving as the root of a binary tree spanning three layers. The lowest layer nodes, i.e., the leaf nodes of the tree, function as the ingressors.

The following settings obtain the Optimal solution: The simulation and model training are being run using Spyder (Integrated Development Environment) IDE for Python programming language, and the solver used is Gurobi 11.0.0 and Pyomo framework.

Table 4: GNN Hyperparameter selection results

Epochs	Optimizer	Activation function	Layers	Accuracy	F1-score
50	Adam	ReLU	2	0.82	0.81
100	Adam	ReLU	2	0.93	0.92
200	Adam	ReLU	2	0.97	0.96
50	Adam	Sigmoid	2	0.68	0.58
100	Adam	Sigmoid	2	0.71	0.60
200	Adam	Sigmoid	2	0.70	0.59
50/300	SGD	ReLU	2	0.21	0.04
50/300	SGD	Sigmoid	2	0.65	0.53
50	RMSprop	ReLU	2	0.43	0.31
200	RMSprop	ReLU	2	0.61	0.50
100	Adamax	ReLU	2	0.89	0.86
200	Adamax	ReLU	2	0.94	0.92
100	Adam	ReLU	3 (64, 128, 256)	0.93	0.91
200	Adam	ReLU	3 (64, 128, 256)	0.86	0.82

6.2. Algorithm Computation time analysis

As depicted in Figure 4, the time complexity of algorithm computation for the ML models compared to the optimal solution demonstrates that the optimal solution computes approximately 100 times faster than the ML models. Moreover, this difference substantially increases as the number of rendering requests escalates. The simulation was executed on a 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-12400F, 2.50 GHz (CPU), 16 GB (RAM), and 500GB HD.




Figure 4: Time complexity analysis of Algorithm computation of the ML models as compared to the optimal solution

6.3. GNN vs other ML models

It can be observed in Figure 5a, that the percentage of data offloaded to the edge server in the investigated GNN model is relatively similar to that of the optimized solution. This observation indicates that tasks whose deadlines cannot be met will be forwarded to the cloud, preventing network congestion and reducing the risk of missing task deadlines. However, compared to previous studies' approaches (DT and MLP), they exhibit a slightly higher percentage of tasks being offloaded to the edge server than GNN, resulting in more data being exchanged within the network.

GNN demonstrates efficiency in managing resource costs when running sets of rendering tasks. As shown in Figure 5b, there is only a nearly 2% increase in the resources used across all requests compared to MLP's 18% and DT's 19% against the optimal solution. This finding also indicates that a set of rendering requests will cover slightly less distance in GNN, resulting in lower latency than the other models.

6.4. Performance relative to Baseline Scheme

The baseline scheme is the cloud-based approach, where all rendering tasks are offloaded to the remote cloud for execution. As the number of rendering tasks increases, the total amount of exchanged data within the domain increases, as shown in Figure 6a. The cloud-based approach




Figure 5: GNN vs the Optimal Solution and other ML models

exhibits substantially more input data passing within the network from ingressors to the candidate executor, resulting in higher resource usage and data exchange. In contrast, GNN demonstrates less data exchange with fewer rendering requests, outperforming other models as the network becomes overwhelmed with rendering requests.

The percentage of tasks being offloaded to the cloud affects the execution time of the tasks, as depicted in Figure 6b. Since the cloud is expected to be a powerful executor with unlimited computing capability, the cloud-based approach exhibits very low execution time compared to other solutions. Nevertheless, GNN, compared to other ML models, requires less time for task execution.




Figure 6: Performance relative to Baseline Scheme

6.5. GNN vs other ML models in terms of delay constrained

We compare the performance of GNN relative to MLP and DT, focusing on the impact of delay constraints. Figure 7a shows that the time required to execute tasks with delay constraints

is lower in every aspect. This is because even if the executor’s capability meets the task’s requirements, the controller also checks the time constraint. If the time constraint cannot be met, the task is forwarded to the edge server to avoid congestion within the network.




Figure 7: Impact of delay constrained

Figure 7b illustrates the average time it takes for a set of tasks to wait before execution. Tasks take longer waiting in the queue when no delay constraint is attached to the task. In Figure 7c, we compute the average computation time, which sums the execution and queuing time, representing the overall time it takes to compute set of rendering task.

6.6. ML related performance

We compared our proposed model with previous supervised ML models used in the literature [17], and the metrics demonstrate that GNN outperforms all the models. . Regarding accuracy, the ratio of correctly predicted observations to the total number of observations, GNN correctly predicted 97% of all instances, surpassing MLP’s 72% and DT’s 70%. The output from the optimized solution results in class imbalance due to the infrequent rendering tasks sent to the cloud. Unlike GNN, this imbalance affects the metrics (precision, recall, F1-score) of DT and MLP, resulting in poor performance, as evident in Table 5.

Table 5: Comparison of Metrics for GNN, MLP, and DT

Metrics	GNN	MLP	DT
Accuracy	0.97	0.72	0.70
Precision	0.96	0.65	0.47
Recall	0.97	0.68	0.52
F1-score	0.96	0.66	0.48

7. Conclusion and Future work

Considering the heavy training demands, there will be limited capabilities for the INC nodes during task computation. Since the task allocation problem is an online problem, it cannot be efficiently solved by standard optimization solvers. Therefore, we employed GNN to solve this work’s formulated task placement problem offline.

In this study, we proposed a GNN model for efficiently placing in-network tasks in the metaverse, addressing rendering tasks’ complexity and time sensitivity against edge limitations. Compared to the baselines, MLP, and DT, the GNN substantially improved accuracy and performance for real-time rendering tasks. Our model substantially impacts real-time metaverse applications by integrating INC with edge computing and SDN architecture for efficient task allocation. Future studies should enhance the model’s scalability and robustness, vital for its effectiveness in extensive, complex metaverse settings.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported in part by the Culture, Sports and Tourism R&D Program through the Korea Creative Content Agency grant funded by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism in 2022 (Project Name: Development of real-time interactive metaverse performance experience platform technology on the scale of a large concert hall Project Number: RS-2022-050002, Contribution Rate: 50%) and in part by Innovative Human Resource Development for Local Intellectualization program through the Institute of Information & Communications Technology Planning & Evaluation(IITP) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (IITP-2024-RS-2022-00156287, 50%)

References

- [1] Z. Allam, A. Sharifi, S. E. Bibri, D. S. Jones, J. Krogstie, The metaverse as a virtual form of smart cities: Opportunities and challenges for environmental, economic, and social sustainability in urban futures, *Smart Cities* 5 (3) (2022) 771–801. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/smartcities5030040>.
- [2] R. Chengoden, N. Victor, T. Huynh-The, G. Yenduri, R. H. Jhaveri, M. Alazab, S. Bhattacharya, P. Hegde, P. K. R. Maddikunta, T. R. Gadekallu, Metaverse for healthcare: A survey on potential applications, challenges and future directions, *IEEE Access* 11 (2023) 12765–12795. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3241628>.
- [3] Z. Ramadan, Marketing in the metaverse era: Toward an integrative channel approach, *Virtual Reality* 27 (2023) 1905–1918. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-023-00783-2>.
- [4] D. Buhalis, D. L. b, M. Lin, Metaverse as a disruptive technology revolutionising tourism management and marketing, *Tourism Management* 97 (2023). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2023.104724>.
- [5] M. Xu, W. C. Ng, W. Y. B. Lim, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, D. Niyato, Q. Yang, X. Shen, C. Miao, A full dive into realizing the edge-enabled metaverse: Visions, enabling technologies, and challenges, *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 25 (1) (2023) 656–700. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2022.3221119>.

- [6] S. Cheng, Metaverse and immersive interaction technology, in: *Metaverse: Concept, Content and Context*, 2023. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24359-2>.
- [7] S. Dhelim, T. Kechadi, L. Chen, N. Aung, H. Ning, L. Atzori, Edge-enabled metaverse: The convergence of metaverse and mobile edge computing, *IEEE IoT Journal Distributed, Parallel, and Cluster Computing (cs.DC)* 14 (8) (2022). doi:<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.02764>.
- [8] D. Liu, L. Wei, Q. Zheng, P. Ding, Y. Shen, Design and implementation of distributed rendering system, in: Haikou, China, 2022. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/SmartWorld-UIC-ATC-ScalCom-DigitalTwin-PriComp-Metaverse56740.2022.00332>.
- [9] A. Tewari, J. Thies, B. Mildenhall, P. Srinivasan, E. Tretschk, W. Yifan, C. Lassner, V. Sitzmann, R. Martin-Brualla, S. Lombardi, T. Simon, C. Theobalt, M. Nießner, J. T. Barron, G. Wetzstein, M. Zollhöfer, V. Golyanik, *Advances in neural rendering*, *Computer Graphics Forum* 41 (2) (2022) 703–735. arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/cgf.14507>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/cgf.14507>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cgf.14507>
- [10] I. Aliyu, S. Oh, N. Ko, T.-W. Um, J. Kim, Dynamic partial computation offloading for the metaverse in in-network computing, *IEEE Access* 12 (2024) 11615–11630. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3344817.
- [11] H. Jiang, X. Dai, Z. Xiao, A. Iyengar, Joint task offloading and resource allocation for energy-constrained mobile edge computing, *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 22 (7) (2023) 4000–4015. doi:10.1109/TMC.2022.3150432.
- [12] A. Islam, A. Debnath, M. Ghose, S. Chakraborty, A survey on task offloading in multi-access edge computing, *Journal of Systems Architecture* 118 (2021) 102225. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysarc.2021.102225>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1383762121001570>
- [13] J. Chen, Y. Leng, J. Huang, An intelligent approach of task offloading for dependent services in mobile edge computing, *Journal of Cloud Computing* 12 (107) (2023). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13677-023-00477-9>.
- [14] H. Wu, Z. Xiang, G. T. Nguyen, Y. Shen, F. H. Fitzek, Computing meets network: Coin-aware offloading for data-intensive blind source separation, *IEEE Network* 35 (5) (2021) 21–27. doi:10.1109/MNET.011.2100060.
- [15] A. Shakarami, A. Shahidinejad, M. Ghobaei-Arani, A review on the computation offloading approaches in mobile edge computing: A game-theoretic perspective, *Software: Practice and Experience* 50 (9) (2020) 1719–1759. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/spe.2839>.
- [16] S. Kianpisheh, T. Taleb, A survey on in-network computing: Programmable data plane and technology specific applications, *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 25 (1) (2023) 701–761. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/COMST.2022.3213237>.
- [17] T. Mai, H. Yao, S. Guo, Y. Liu, In-network computing powered mobile edge: Toward high performance industrial iot, *IEEE Network* 35 (1) (2021) 289–295. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/MNET.021.2000318>.
- [18] G. Lia, M. Amadeo, C. Campolo, G. Ruggeri, A. Molinaro, Optimal placement of delay-constrained in-network computing tasks at the edge with minimum data exchange, in: *2021 IEEE 4th 5G World Forum (5GWF)*, Montreal, QC, Canada, 2021. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/5GWF52925.2021.00091>.
- [19] M. Priyadarsini, P. Bera, Software defined networking architecture, traffic management, security, and placement: A survey, *Computer Networks* 192 (2021). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2021.108047>.
- [20] J. Xie, D. Guo, Z. Hu, T. Qu, P. L. b, Control plane of software defined networks: A survey, *Computer Communications* 67 (2015) 1–10. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comcom.2015.06.004>.
- [21] C.-H. Lin, J. Gao, L. Tang, T. Takikawa, X. Zeng, X. Huang, K. Kreis, S. Fidler, M.-Y. Liu, T.-Y. Lin, Magic3d: High-resolution text-to-3d content creation, in: *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [22] M. Huzaifa, R. Desai, S. Grayson, X. Jiang, Y. Jing, J. Lee, F. Lu, Y. Pang, J. Ravichandran, F. Sinclair, B. Tian, H. Yuan, J. Zhang, S. V. Adve, Illixr: Enabling end-to-end extended reality research, in: *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, Storrs, CT, USA, 2021. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1109/IISWC53511.2021.00014>.
- [23] G. Lia, M. Amadeo, G. Ruggeri, C. Campolo, A. Molinaro, V. Loscri, In-network placement of delay-constrained computing tasks in a softwarized intelligent edge, *Computer Networks* 219 (2022). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2022.109432>.
- [24] J. Zhou, G. Cui, S. Hu, Z. Zhang, C. Yang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, C. Li, M. Sun, Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications, *AI Open* 1 (2020) 57–81. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.01.001>.
- [25] F. Liang, C. Qian, W. Yu, D. Griffith, N. Golmie, Wireless communications and mobile computing *Advances of Intelligent Sensory Data Processing and Protection in IoT* (2022). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9261537>.
- [26] A. Gupta, P. Matta, B. Pant, Graph neural network: Current state of art, challenges and applications, *Materials Today: Proceedings* 46 (20) (2021) 10927–10932. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.01.950>.
- [27] A. Bozorgchenani, F. Mashhadi, D. Tarchi, S. A. Salinas Monroy, Multi-objective computation sharing in energy

- and delay constrained mobile edge computing environments, *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 20 (10) (2021) 2992–3005. doi:10.1109/TMC.2020.2994232.
- [28] R. Fantacci, B. Picano, Performance analysis of a delay constrained data offloading scheme in an integrated cloud-fog-edge computing system, *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 69 (10) (2020) 12004–12014. doi:10.1109/TVT.2020.3008926.
- [29] S. Deng, H. Zhao, W. Fang, J. Yin, S. Dustdar, A. Y. Zomaya, Edge intelligence: The confluence of edge computing and artificial intelligence, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7 (8) (2020) 7457–7469. doi:10.1109/JIOT.2020.2984887.
- [30] K. Cao, Y. Liu, G. Meng, Q. Sun, An overview on edge computing research, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 85714–85728. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2991734.
- [31] A. Munir, T. He, R. Raghavendra, F. Le, A. X. Liu, Network scheduling and compute resource aware task placement in datacenters, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 28 (6) (2020) 2435–2448. doi:10.1109/TNET.2020.3013548.
- [32] J. Gedeon, M. Stein, L. Wang, M. Muehlhaeuser, On scalable in-network operator placement for edge computing, in: 2018 27th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks (ICCCN), 2018, pp. 1–9. doi:10.1109/ICCCN.2018.8487419.
- [33] N. Hu, Z. Tian, X. Du, M. Guizani, An energy-efficient in-network computing paradigm for 6g, *IEEE Transactions on Green Communications and Networking* 5 (4) (2021) 1722–1733. doi:10.1109/TGCN.2021.3099804.
- [34] Y. Jin, H. Lee, On-demand computation offloading architecture in fog networks, *Electronics* 8 (10) (2019). doi:10.3390/electronics8101076.
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/8/10/1076>
- [35] N. M. Kaliyamurthy, S. Taterh, S. Shanmugasundaram, A. Saxena, O. Cheikhrouhou, H. B. Elhadj, Software-defined networking: An evolving network architecture—programmability and security perspective, *Security and Communication Networks* 2021 (2021). doi:https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9971705.
- [36] B. Sarma, R. Kumar, T. Tuithung, Machine learning enabled network and task management in sdn based fog architecture, *Computers and Electrical Engineering* 108 (2023) 108705. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2023.108705.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0045790623001295>
- [37] A. Lakhani, M. A. Mohammed, O. I. Obaid, C. Chakraborty, K. H. Abdulkareem, S. Kadry, Efficient deep-reinforcement learning aware resource allocation in sdn-enabled fog paradigm, *Automated Software Engineering* 29 (20) (2022). doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-021-00318-6.
- [38] R. Amin, E. Rojas, A. Aqdas, S. Ramzan, D. Casillas-Perez, J. M. Arco, A survey on machine learning techniques for routing optimization in sdn, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 104582–104611. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3099092.
- [39] A. Hazarika, M. Rahmati, Towards an evolved immersive experience: Exploring 5g- and beyond-enabled ultra-low-latency communications for augmented and virtual reality, *Sensors* 23 (7) (2023). doi:10.3390/s23073682.
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/23/7/3682>
- [40] M. T. Vega, C. Liaskos, S. Abadal, E. Papapetrou, A. Jain, B. Mouhouche, G. Kalem, S. Ergüt, M. Mach, T. Sabol, A. Cabellos-Aparicio, C. Grimm, F. D. Turck, J. Famaey, Immersive interconnected virtual and augmented reality: A 5g and iot perspective, *Journal of Network and Systems Management* 28 (2020) 796–826. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10922-020-09545-w.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468502X22000158>
- [41] J. Xue, X. Zhai, H. Qu, Efficient rendering of large-scale cad models on a gpu virtualization architecture with model geometry metrics, in: 2019 IEEE International Conference on Service-Oriented System Engineering (SOSE), 2019, pp. 251–2515. doi:10.1109/SOSE.2019.00043.
- [42] E.-S. Lee, B.-S. Shin, Vertex chunk-based object culling method for real-time rendering in metaverse, *Electronics* 12 (12) (2023). doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics12122601.
- [43] Y. Zhao, J. Jiang, Y. Chen, R. Liu, Y. Yang, X. Xue, S. Chen, Metaverse: Perspectives from graphics, interactions and visualization, *Visual Informatics* 6 (1) (2022) 56–67. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visinf.2022.03.002.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468502X22000158>
- [44] A. Naouri, H. Wu, N. A. Nouri, S. Dhelim, H. Ning, A novel framework for mobile-edge computing by optimizing task offloading, *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 8 (16) (2021) 13065–13076. doi:10.1109/JIOT.2021.3064225.
- [45] A. Avan, A. Azim, Q. H. Mahmoud, A state-of-the-art review of task scheduling for edge computing: A delay-sensitive application perspective, *Electronics* 12 (12) (2023). doi:10.3390/electronics12122599.
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/12/12/2599>
- [46] L. Lovén, E. Peltonen, L. Ruha, E. Harjula, S. Pirttikangas, A dark and stormy night: Reallocation storms in edge computing, *J Wireless Com Network* 86 (2022). doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s13638-022-02170-y.
URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9292/12/12/2599>

- [47] M. Paliwal, D. Shrimankar, O. Tembhurne, Controllers in sdn: A review report, *IEEE Access* 6 (2018) 36256–36270. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2846236.
- [48] B. Isong, T. Kgogo, F. Lugayizi, B. Kankuzi, Trust establishment framework between sdn controller and applications, in: 2017 18th IEEE/ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking and Parallel/Distributed Computing (SNPD), 2017, pp. 101–107. doi:10.1109/SNPD.2017.8022707.
- [49] K. V. Vijayashree, B. Janani, Transient analysis of an m/m/1 queueing system subject to differentiated vacations, *Quality Technology & Quantitative Management* 15 (6) (2018) 730–748. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/16843703.2017.1335492.
- [50] D. G. Cattrysse, L. N. Van Wassenhove, A survey of algorithms for the generalized assignment problem, *European Journal of Operational Research* 60 (3) (1992) 260–272. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(92)90077-M.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037722179290077M>
- [51] S.-M. Park, Y.-G. Kim, A metaverse: Taxonomy, components, applications, and open challenges, *IEEE Access* 10 (2022) 4209–4251. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3140175.
- [52] S. Pal, The role of neural networks in predicting supply chain disruptions, *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)* 11 (11) (2023) 134–140.
- [53] J. Zhou, G. Cui, S. Hu, Z. Zhang, C. Yang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, C. Li, M. Sun, Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications, *AI Open* 1 (2020) 57–81. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.01.001.