

# Age of Computing: A Metric of Computation Freshness in Communication and Computation Cooperative Networks

Xingran Chen, *Member, IEEE*, Yi Zhuang, and Kun Yang\*, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—In communication and computation cooperative networks (3CNs), timely computation is crucial but not always guaranteed. There is a strong demand for a computational task to be completed within a given deadline. The time taken involves both processing time, communication time, and the impact of the deadline. However, a measure of such timeliness in 3CNs is lacking. In this paper, we introduce the novel concept, Age of Computing (AoC), to capture computation freshness in 3CNs. We analyze AoC in a line topology consisting of a source, a transmitter, a receiver, and a computational node. Tasks generated by the source are immediately available at the transmitter, where they enter a communication queue. These tasks then pass to the receiver and subsequently to a computation queue at the computational node for processing. Each task has a deadline, requiring completion within this timeframe. AoC is evaluated under two types of deadlines: (i) soft deadline, tasks can be fed back to the source if delayed beyond the deadline, but with additional latency; (ii) hard deadline, tasks delayed beyond the deadline are discarded. Under both deadlines, we derive the AoC formula and a general expression for the time-average AoC. For the first-come, first-serve discipline, we obtain a closed-form expression for the average AoC under the soft deadline and an approximation for the hard deadline. In addition to freshness, we define computation throughput, providing a general expression and an approximation. To explore the relationship between freshness and throughput, we construct an optimization problem and prove that the objective pair is a weakly Pareto-optimal point. Numerical results validate all the theoretical findings. Additionally, they reveal that under the hard deadline, the computation throughput serves as a reliable proxy for the average AoC.

*Index Terms* — Age of computing, computation freshness, communication and computing cooperated networks.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the 6G era, emerging applications such as the Internet of Things (IoT), smart cities, and cyber-physical systems have significant demands for communication and computation cooperative networks (3CNs), which provide faster data processing, efficient resource utilization, and enhanced security [1]. 3CNs originated from mobile edge computing (MEC) technology, which aims to complete computation-intensive and latency-critical tasks, with the paradigm deploying distributedly tons of billions of edge devices at the network edges [2]. Besides MEC, 3CNs include fog computing and computing power networks. Fog computing can be regarded as a generalization of MEC, where the definition of edge

devices is broader than that in MEC [3]. Computing power networks refers to a broader concept of distributed computing networks, including edge, fog, and cloud computing [4]. In all 3CNs, there is no established metric for capturing the freshness of computation. Recently, a notable metric called the Age of Information (AoI) has been proposed to describe information freshness in communication networks [5]. The AoI metric has broad applications in various communication and control contexts, including random access protocols [6], multiaccess protocols [7], remote estimation [8], wireless-powered relay-aided communication networks [9], and network coding [10], [11].

However, applying AoI in 3CNs is inappropriate because it only addresses communication latency and does not account for computation latency. In this paper, we propose a novel metric called the *age of computing (AoC)* to capture computation freshness in 3CNs. A primary requirement in 3CNs is that computational tasks are processed as promptly as possible and within a maximum acceptable deadline. The core idea of AoC is to combine communication delay, computation delay, and the impact of the maximum acceptable deadline. Communication and computation delays are caused by the transmission and processing of computational tasks, while the impact of the maximum acceptable deadline accounts for additional delays when task delays exceed the users' acceptable threshold.

### A. Related Work

All related papers can be divided into two broad categories. The first category investigates information freshness in edge and fog computing networks. The second category focuses on freshness-oriented metrics.

1) *Information Freshness in Edge/Fog Computing Networks*: In edge and fog computing networks, tasks or messages typically go through two phases: the transmission phase and the processing phase. The basic mathematical model for these networks is established as two-hop networks and tandem queues.

The first study to focus on AoI for edge computing applications is [12], which primarily calculated the average AoI. As an early work, [13] established an analytical framework for the peak age of information (PAoI), modeling the computing and transmission process as a tandem queue. The authors derived closed-form expressions and proposed a derivative-free algorithm to minimize the maximum PAoI in networks with multiple sensors and a single destination. Subsequently, [14] modeled the communication and computation delays as a generic tandem of two first-come, first-serve queues,

Xingran Chen and Yi Zhuang are with School of Information and Communication Engineering, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Sichuang, 611731, China (E-mail: xingranc@ieee.org, yizhuang265@163.com).

Kun Yang is with School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, Essex, CO4 3SQ, U.K (Email: kunyang@essex.ac.uk).

\*: Corresponding author.

and analytically derived closed-form expressions for PAoI in  $M/M/1-M/D/1$  and  $M/M/1-M/M/1$  tandems. Building on [14], [15] went further by considering both average and peak AoI in general tandems with packet management. The packet management included two forms: no data buffer, and a one-unit data buffer with last-come first-serve discipline. This work illustrated how computation and transmission times could be traded off to optimize AoI, revealing a tradeoff between average AoI and average peak AoI. Expanding on [15], [16] explored the information freshness of Gauss-Markov processes, defined as the process-related timeliness of information. The authors derived closed-form expressions for information timeliness at both the edge and fog tiers. These analytical formulas explicitly characterize the dependency among task generation, transmission, and execution, serving as objective functions for system optimization. In [17], a multi-user MEC network where a base station (BS) transmits packets to user equipment was investigated. The study derived the average AoI for two computing schemes—local computing and edge computing—under a first-come, first-serve discipline.

There are other relevant works such as [18]–[21]. [18] investigated information freshness in MEC networks from a multi-access perspective, where multiple devices use NOMA to offload their computing tasks to an access point integrated with an MEC server. Leveraging tools from queuing theory, the authors proposed an iterative algorithm to obtain the closed-form solution for AoI. In [19], a F-RAN with multiple senders, multiple relay nodes, and multiple receivers was considered. The authors analyzed the AoI performances and proposed optimal oblivious and non-oblivious policies to minimize the time-average AoI. [20] and [21] explored AoI performances in MEC networks using different mathematical tools. [20] considered MEC-enabled IoT networks with multiple source-destination pairs and heterogeneous edge servers. Using game-theoretical analysis, they proposed an age-optimal computation-intensive update scheduling strategy based on Nash equilibrium. Reinforcement learning is also a powerful tool in this context. [21] proposed a computation offloading method based on a directed acyclic graph task model, which models task dependencies. The algorithm combined the advantages of deep Q-network, double deep Q-network, and dueling deep Q-network algorithms to optimize AoI.

2) *Freshness-oriented Metrics*: The AoI metric, introduced in [5], measures the freshness of information at the receiver side. AoI depends on both the frequency of packet transmissions and the delay experienced by packets in the communication network [6]. When the communication rate is low, the receiver’s AoI increases, indicating stale information due to infrequent packet transmissions. However, even with frequent transmissions, if the system design imposes significant delays, the receiver’s information will still be stale. Following the introduction of AoI, several related metrics were proposed to capture network freshness from different perspectives. Peak AoI, introduced in [7], represents the worst-case AoI. It is defined as the maximum time elapsed since the preceding piece of information was generated, offering a simpler and more mathematically tractable formulation.

Nearly simultaneously, the age of synchronization (AoS)

[22] and the effective age [23] were proposed. AoS, as a complementary metric to AoI, drops to zero when the transmitter has no packets to send and grows linearly with time until a new packet is generated [22]. The effective age metrics in [23] include sampling age, tracking the age of samples relative to ideal sampling times, and cumulative marginal error, tracking the total error from the reception of the latest sample to the current time.

Later, the age of incorrect information (AoII) [24] and the urgency of information (UoI) [25] were introduced. AoII addresses the shortcomings of both AoI and conventional error penalty functions by extending the concept of fresh updates to “informative” updates—those that bring new and correct information to the monitor side [24]. UoI, a context-based metric, evaluates the timeliness of status updates by incorporating time-varying context information and dynamic status evolution [25], which enables analysis of context-based adaptive status update schemes and more effective remote monitoring and control.

Despite the variety of freshness-oriented metrics proposed, none are applicable for capturing computation freshness in 3CNs. None of these metrics simultaneously address the impact of both communication and computation delays, as well as the maximum acceptable deadline. Motivated by the need for a metric capturing freshness in 3CNs, we propose the AoC metric in this paper.

## B. Contributions

In this paper, we propose a new metric called age of computing (AoC) to mathematically capture the computation freshness in 3CNs. We investigate this metric in a line topology consisting of a source, a transmitter, a receiver, and a computational node (sink). The source generates or offloads computational tasks at a rate  $\lambda$ . These tasks are immediately available at the transmitter, where they enter a communication queue before reaching the receiver. Afterward, the receiver forwards the tasks to the computational node. Once there, the tasks enter a computation queue and are processed accordingly. We assume that each task has a (maximum acceptable) deadline, meaning the source expects each task to be completed within this timeframe. We consider two types of deadlines: (i) soft deadline, if the delay of a task exceeds the deadline, the outcome can still be fed back to the source, but additional latency is added; (ii) hard deadline, if the delay of a task exceeds the deadline, the outcome cannot be fed back to the source, resulting in the task being discarded. We examine the AoC metric under both types of deadlines, as detailed in Section III and Section IV.

Before defining the AoC concept, we introduce three important terminologies (see Definition 3): (i) the latest task, i.e., the last task completed by the computational node, (ii) the informative task, i.e., the latest completed task that is fed back to the source, and (iii) the processing task, i.e., the task currently being processed at the computational node. Using these concepts, we formally define the AoC as the summation of the freshness of the informative task, the latency from the end of the informative task to the start of the processing

task, and the instantaneous delay of the processing task (see Definition 4).

Based on the concept of AoC, we first derive its formula of under the soft deadline (see Lemma 1). Subsequently, we obtain the corresponding general expression for the time-average AoC, which is applicable to any queuing discipline (see Lemma 2). Focusing on the first-come first-serve discipline, we further derive the closed-form expression for the time-average AoC for a tandem of two M/M/1 queuing systems (see Theorem 1). This theoretical result indicates that the time-average AoC is symmetric with respect to communication and computation power. In practical terms, this means that to improve the computation freshness, one can reduce either communication latency or computation latency, as both have the same impact on the overall freshness. Additionally, to enhance the practicality of AoC concept, we propose an alternative calculation method for the AoC, and demonstrate that it serves as a reliable proxy for the original AoC (see Theorem 2).

Next, we derive the formula for AoC under the hard deadline (see Lemma 3). Similar to the soft deadline case, we obtain a general expression for the time-average AoC applicable to any queuing discipline (see Lemma 4). This expression hides lots of correlations, making it extremely challenging to derive a closed-form solution, even for a tandem of two M/M/1 queuing systems. However, we can approximate the time-average AoC and prove that this approximation is accurate when both communication and computation rates are significantly larger than the task generation rate (see Theorem 3). Furthermore, this approximation serves as a lower bound for the time-average AoC (see Remark 1). In addition to freshness, we define computation throughput as the number of tasks fed back to the source per slot (see Definition 5). We provide a general expression for computation throughput (see Lemma 5) and an approximation (see Proposition 1). This approximation serves as an upper bound for computation throughput (see Remark 2). To describe the relationship between computation freshness and computation throughput, we construct an optimization problem aimed at minimizing the (approximated) average AoC while imposing constraints on the (approximated) computation throughput. (see (31)). We prove that the objective pair is a weakly Pareto-optimal point (see Lemma 6).

Numerical results validate all the theoretical findings. Additionally, they reveal two more interesting phenomena: (i) The approximation for the computation throughput is accurate not only when both communication and computation rates are significantly larger than the task generation rate but also across all regions of the generation rate. (ii) Unlike the relationship between the average AoC and the channel throughput, the (approximated) average AoC consistently decreases with the (approximated) computation throughput. This suggests that computation throughput serves as a reliable proxy for the average AoC. Practically, this means we can minimize the average AoC (under the hard deadline) by maximizing the computation throughput.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. Section II proposes and discusses the novel concept

AoC. Section III and Section IV derive theoretical results for the AoC under the soft and hard deadlines, respectively. We numerically verify our theoretical results in Section V and conclude this work in Section VI.

## II. AGE OF COMPUTING

In this section, we introduce the mathematical formulation of the novel concept, Age of Computing (AoC), which quantifies the freshness of computations within 3CNs. Consider a line topology comprising a source, a transmitter, a receiver, and a computational node (sink), as depicted in Fig. 1. In this topology, both the receiver and the computational node are equipped with caching capabilities. The process begins with the source generating/offloading computational tasks, which are immediately available at the transmitter and enter a communication queue awaiting transmission. Once transmitted, the tasks are received and cached by the receiver, where they await processing. Afterward, tasks are handed off to the computational node (sink), where they are processed and eventually depart from the system.




Fig. 1: A line topology consisting of a source, a transmitter, a receiver, and a computational node (sink).

A task is represented by a 3-tuple array  $(L, w, X)$ , where  $L$  denotes the task's input data size,  $w$  represents the maximum acceptable deadline, and  $X$  indicates the computation workload [1]. The network is characterized by another 3-tuple array  $(\lambda, R, F)$ , where  $\lambda$  is the generation/offloading rate at the source,  $R$  is the data rate of communication channel at the transmitter, and  $F$  is the CPU-cycle frequency at the computational node. Given the inherent randomness in transmission and computation, we assume that the expected transmission delay of a task is  $L/R$  and the expected computation delay is  $X/F$ . We also assume that the transmission and computation delays each follow their respective distributions. We define  $\mu_t = R/L$  and  $\mu_c = F/X$  as the *communication rate* and *computation rate*, respectively.

### A. Definition

In the network, the queuing discipline follows a *first-come first-serve* approach. For any task  $k$ , let  $\tau_k$  denote the generation/offloading time at the source,  $\tau_k''$  the time when the computation starts at the computational node, and  $\tau_k'$  the time when the computation completes. The *delay* of task  $k$  is then defined as  $\tau_k' - \tau_k$ .

**Definition 1.** Any task can be classified according to two criteria:

- *Validity:* A task  $k$  is considered valid if its outcome can be fed back to the source; otherwise, it is deemed invalid.

- *Quality*: A task  $k$  is considered good if  $\tau'_k - \tau_k \leq w$ ; otherwise, it is deemed bad.

**Definition 2.** Deadlines  $w$  can be classified into two types:

- *Soft deadline*: Any bad task is a valid task.
- *Hard deadline*: Any bad task is an invalid task.

Before describing the metric AoC, we introduce the concepts of *informative*, *processing*, and *latest* tasks in 3CNs. An *informative* task is a valid task that brings the latest information. The *processing* is the current task being processed, and the *latest* refers to the last completed task. Formally, we define these terms as follows.

**Definition 3.** (*informative, processing, and latest tasks*). The index of the informative task during  $[0, t]$ , denoted by  $N(t)$ , is given by

$$N(t) = \max\{k | \tau'_k \leq t, \text{ and task } k \text{ is valid}\}. \quad (1)$$

The index of the processing task during  $[0, t]$ , denoted by  $P(t)$ , is given by

$$P(t) = \max\{k | \tau''_k \leq t\}. \quad (2)$$

The index of the latest task during  $[0, t]$ , denoted by  $G(t)$ , is given by

$$G(t) = \max\{k | \tau'_k \leq t\}. \quad (3)$$

Let us delve into insights behind Definition 3:

- At any time  $t$ , the computational node is either idle (no task is being processed) or occupied (a task is being processed). From (2) and (3), we have either  $P(t) = G(t)$  or  $P(t) = G(t) + 1$ . If  $P(t) = G(t)$ , then the processing task and the latest task are the same, indicating that the computation queue, or equivalently the computational node, is idle at time  $t$ . If  $P(t) = G(t) + 1$ , then a task is being processing at time  $t$ .
- From (1) and (2), we have  $G(t) \geq N(t)$ . If  $G(t) = N(t)$ , then the informative task and the latest task are the same, indicating that the latest task is valid.
- Combining (1), (2), and (3), we have  $P(t) \geq G(t) \geq N(t)$ .
- If  $t = \tau'_{N(t)}$  (respectively,  $t = \tau'_{P(t)}$  and  $t = \tau'_{G(t)}$ ), then the informative (respectively, processing and latest) task during  $[0, t]$  is completed at time  $t$ .

When  $P(t) = G(t) + 1$ , we define the *instantaneous delay* of the processing task  $P(t)$  as  $d_P^x(t)$ , where  $x \in \{\text{soft}, \text{hard}\}$ . It is worth noting that the instantaneous delay  $d_P^x(t)$  is associated with the computation freshness, and generally depends on the type of the deadline. We formally define the computation freshness at the computational node side as follows.

**Definition 4.** (*AoC*). The age of computing (*AoC*) is defined as the random process

$$c_x(t) = \begin{cases} t - \tau_{N(t)}, & P(t) = G(t) \\ \tau_{P(t)} - \tau_{N(t)} + d_P^x(t), & P(t) > G(t), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $x \in \{\text{soft}, \text{hard}\}$ .

In Definition 4, when the computational node is idle, i.e.,  $P(t) = G(t)$ , the computation freshness is determined by

the time elapsed since the offloading/generation time of the informative task. Conversely, when the computational node is occupied, i.e.,  $P(t) = G(t) + 1$ , the computation freshness is the sum of the latency from the informative task to the processing task and the instantaneous delay of the processing task.

Recall that the concept of information freshness, known as AoI [5], captures the cumulative delay over a time period. Drawing from this idea, AoC represents the cumulative delay associated with computational tasks over a time period. This measure provides a comprehensive understanding of the time-liness of computations within a system. In the next subsection, we present graphical explanations and insights into the concept of computation freshness, highlighting its importance and applications in ensuring timely and efficient processing within 3CNs.

## B. Graphical Insights

By breaking down any time period  $[0, t]$ , we provide a graphical understanding of computation freshness. This is achieved by examining the delay of the informative task, the cumulative latency between the informative task and the processing task, and the instantaneous delay of the processing task.

The time period  $[0, t]$  can be partitioned into different parts based on the state of the computational queue. If  $P(t) = G(t) + 1$  (see Fig. 2 (a)), meaning a task is being processed at time  $t$ , then the period  $[0, t]$  can be partitioned into 3 parts,  $[0, \tau'_{N(t)}]$ ,  $(\tau'_{N(t)}, \tau_{P(t)})$ , and  $(\tau_{P(t)}, t]$ . In the interval  $[0, \tau'_{N(t)}]$ , the computation freshness is introduced by the informative task, denoted as  $i(t)$ . In the interval  $(\tau'_{N(t)}, \tau_{P(t)})$ , all completed tasks before the processing task are not valid, making the time period from  $\tau'_{N(t)}$  to the start of the processing task useless latency, denoted as  $e(t)$ . In the interval  $(\tau_{P(t)}, t]$ , the computation freshness is brought by the instantaneous delay of the processing task,  $d_P^x(t)$  with  $x \in \{\text{soft}, \text{hard}\}$ . If  $P(t) = G(t)$  (see Fig. 2 down), indicating the computational node is idle, then the period  $[0, t]$  can be partitioned into 2 parts:  $[0, \tau'_{N(t)}]$  and  $(\tau'_{N(t)}, t]$ . The instantaneous delay  $d_P^x(t)$  associated with the interval  $(\tau_{P(t)}, t]$  vanishes since no task is being processed. In total, the computation freshness during  $[0, t]$  can be expressed as the summation of  $i(t)$ ,  $e(t)$ , and  $d_P^x(t)$ .




Fig. 2: Two partitions of  $[0, t]$ .

The freshness introduced by the informative task can be captured by its delay,

$$i(t) = \tau'_{N(t)} - \tau_{N(t)}. \quad (5)$$

Recall that  $e(t)$  represents the latency from the informative task to the current time  $t$  or the start of the processing task, so  $e(t)$  has the following expression,

$$e(t) = 1_{\{P(t)=G(t)\}}(t - \tau'_{N(t)}) + 1_{\{P(t)>G(t)\}}(\tau_{P(t)} - \tau'_{N(t)}). \quad (6)$$

The term  $d_P^x(t)$  will be determined in subsequent sections. Consequently, the computation freshness can be expressed as:

$$c_x(t) = i(t) + e(t) + d_P^x(t), \quad (7)$$

where  $x \in \{\text{soft}, \text{hard}\}$ . With some algebraic manipulation, it is straightforward to verify that (7) is equivalent to (4).

### III. AOC ANALYSIS UNDER THE SOFT DEADLINE

In this section, we first describe the definition and expression of  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t)$  (see (9) in Section III-A), we then provide a clear expression for  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$  (see Lemma 1 in Section III-B). Subsequently, we define the time-average AoC and obtain its closed form (see (12) and Theorem 1 in Section III-C). Finally, we present an alternative of the definition of AoC under the soft deadline to ensure its practicality in real-world situations (see (16) and Theorem 2 in Section III-D).

#### A. The Expression of $d_{\text{soft}}(t)$

From Definition 2, under the soft deadline, any bad task is valid, this implies all tasks are valid. In this subsection, we identify the expression of  $d_{\text{soft}}(t)$ .

For task  $k$ , the probability of exceeding the deadline is given by

$$\Pr(\tau'_k - \tau_k > w) \triangleq \epsilon_{w,k}. \quad (8)$$

Under the stationary discipline of first-come first-serve, the sequence  $\{\epsilon_{w,k}\}_k$  is identical over  $k$ , so we omit the subscription  $k$  in (8) for simplicity. Here,  $\epsilon_w$  represents the level of conflict regarding the deadline. The larger  $\epsilon_w$ , the more tasks conflict with the deadline.

We define the computation freshness of the processing task  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t)$  as

$$d_P^{\text{soft}}(t) = 1_{\{P(t)>G(t)\}}(t - \tau_{P(t)} + \epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+). \quad (9)$$

In (9),  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t)$  has 3 terms:  $1_{\{P(t)>G(t)\}}$ ,  $t - \tau_{P(t)}$ , and  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$ . Each term is discussed as follows:

- (i) First term  $1_{\{P(t)>G(t)\}}$ : This term represents the scenario where the processing task is still ongoing at the current time  $t$ . When  $P(t) = G(t)$ , from (9), we have  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t) = 0$ , signifying that the instantaneous delay  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t)$  vanishes upon the completion of the processing task. This occurs because all tasks are considered valid and thus informative. In other words, upon the completion of the processing task, we have  $P(t) = G(t) = N(t)$ , which implies  $d_P^{\text{soft}}(t)$  becomes 0 until a new processing task appears.

- (ii) Second term  $t - \tau_{P(t)}$ : This term represents the delay (also known as the *system time* in the queuing theory) of processing task  $P(t)$  at time  $t$ .
- (iii) Third term  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$ : This term represents the additional latency incurred by the processing task if it exceeds the deadline  $w$  with the level of conflict  $\epsilon_w$ . The larger the exceeding value, the higher the additional latency. Notably, the additional latency does not have a continuous impact at  $t = \tau'_{P(t)}$ . Since all bad tasks are valid, consistent with the ‘‘soft’’ property, once a bad task is completed, its additional latency vanishes.

#### B. The Expression of $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$

To obtain the expression of  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$ , we first introduce

$$h(t) = t - \tau_{N(t)}, \quad (10)$$

which represents the computation freshness brought by the informative task. According to (4), we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *The expression of  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$  is*

$$c_{\text{soft}}(t) = h(t) + 1_{\{P(t)>G(t)\}} \cdot \epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+. \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix A.  $\square$

From Lemma 1, the AoC under the soft deadline,  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$ , comprises two components: the computation freshness incurred by the informative task  $h(t)$ , and the additional latency incurred by the processing task  $P(t)$ .

The computation freshness incurred by the informative task  $h(t)$  reflects the freshness of informative tasks. If the informative task has a recent offloading start time, i.e.,  $\tau_{N(t)}$  is not far from  $\tau'_{N(t)}$ , then  $h(t)$  experiences a substantial downward jump at time  $\tau'_{N(t)}$ ; otherwise, it exhibits a slight downward jump. It is important to note that, under the soft deadline, although  $h(t)$  and the age of information (AoI, refer to [5]) share the same formula, but they are *fundamentally distinct* in their physical interpretations: (i) Freshness of different tasks:  $h(t)$  measures the freshness of the informative task, while the AoI measures the freshness of the latest task. This implies that  $h(t)$  captures the impact of the deadline, which AoI does not. (ii) Quantification of latency:  $h(t)$  quantifies, at any moment, the time elapsed since the informative completed task began offloading, encompassing both the cumulative transmission latency and the cumulative processing latency. In contrast, AoI only captures the cumulative transmission latency.

The additional latency incurred by the processing task  $P(t)$ , represented as  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$ , reflects the impact of the deadline  $w$ . From (8), we know that  $\epsilon_w$  decreases as  $w$  increases. Similarly,  $(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$  also decreases as  $w$  increases. Consequently, the additional latency  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$  decreases with  $w$ . When  $w = 0$ , all tasks are bad tasks, resulting in  $\epsilon_0 = 1$ . In this case, the additional latency  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$  achieves its maximum value  $(t - \tau_{P(t)})^+$ , while when  $\tau = +\infty$ , meaning there is no deadline, all tasks are good tasks, leading to  $\epsilon_{+\infty} = 0$ . Here, the additional latency  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$  achieves its minimum value 0.




Fig. 3: The curve of AoC under the soft deadline.

The curve of AoC is depicted in Fig. 3, using the curve of AoI (see [5]) as a benchmark. When the delay of a task is less than the deadline  $w$ , the AoC curve associated with this task coincides with the AoI curve. However, if the delay of a task exceeds the deadline  $w$ , the portion of the delay that exceeds the deadline increases at a rate of  $1 + \epsilon_w$ , the remaining portion continues to increase at a rate of 1.

### C. Closed Form Expression for Average AoC

Since the AoC  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$  captures the cumulative computation delay at time  $t$ , we often consider the time-average AoC over a period to measure the computation freshness of a network. As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we define the average AoC of a network as

$$\Theta_{\text{soft}} \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_{\text{soft}}(t) dt. \quad (12)$$

To uncover theoretical insights into the average AoC, we investigate it within queue-theoretic systems. The queuing discipline is characterized by a first-come first-served approach. We analyze the time-average AoC using scenarios outlined in [16], [26]: On the source side, computational tasks are offloaded via a Poisson process characterized by an average rate of  $\lambda$ . The interval between consecutive generations/offloadings, denoted by  $X_{k+1} = \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k$ , has an expectation  $\mathbb{E}[X_{k+1}] = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . At the computational node, the storage of tasks at both the communication and computation queues is considered instantaneous [26]. Upon arrival, the transmission delay of each task at the transmitter follows an exponential distribution with an average rate of  $\mu_t (= R/L)$ , and the computation delay at the computational node follows an exponential distribution with an average rate of  $\mu_c (= F/X)$ . Both the communication and computation queues are modeled as M/M/1 queues. Denote the delay of task  $k$  as  $T_k$ . In queuing systems, this delay is also referred to as the system time, and we will use these terms interchangeably. Utilizing a similar approach to calculating average AoI [5], we use a graphical argument to derive the average AoC (see Fig. 3).

**Lemma 2.** *The average AoC can be calculated as*

$$\Theta_{\text{soft}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k T_k] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[X_k^2] + \frac{\epsilon_w}{2} \mathbb{E}[(T_k - w)^+]}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}. \quad (13)$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix B.  $\square$

In (13), when  $w$  increases, both  $\mathbb{E}[(T_k - w)^+]$  and  $\epsilon_w$  (see (8)) decrease with  $w$ , so  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$  decreases with  $w$ . This implies that the larger deadline  $w$ , the more tasks are good one, resulting in a smaller average AoC. Based on Lemma 2, we obtain the closed form expressions for the average AoC.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mu_t = R/L$  and  $\mu_c = F/X$ . Denote*

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t &= \lambda / \mu_t, & \rho_c &= \lambda / \mu_c, \\ \delta_t &= \mu_t (1 - \rho_t), & \delta_c &= \mu_c (1 - \rho_c), \\ \zeta_t &= e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}, & \zeta_c &= e^{-\mu_c \delta_c w}. \end{aligned}$$

*The closed form expression for  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$  is given by: if  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\text{soft}} &= \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\mu_t} + \frac{1}{\mu_c} + \frac{\rho_t^2}{\delta_t} + \frac{\rho_c^2}{\delta_c} + \frac{\rho_t \rho_c}{\mu_t + \mu_c - \lambda} \\ &+ \lambda \left( \frac{\mu_c \delta_c \mu_t \delta_t}{\mu_c - \mu_t} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\zeta_t}{\mu_t \delta_t} - \frac{\zeta_c}{\mu_c \delta_c} \right) \left( \frac{\zeta_t}{\mu_t^3 \delta_t^3} - \frac{\zeta_c}{\mu_c^3 \delta_c^3} \right); \quad (14) \end{aligned}$$

*if  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{\text{soft}} &= \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{2}{\mu_t} + \frac{2\rho_t^2}{\delta_t} + \frac{\rho_t^2}{\mu_t + \delta_t} \\ &+ \zeta_t^2 (1 + \mu_t \delta_t w) \left( \frac{3}{\mu_t^2 \delta_t^2} + \frac{w}{\mu_t \delta_t} \right). \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix C.  $\square$

By exchanging  $\mu_t$  and  $\mu_c$  in (14) and (15), we observe that  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$  remains unchanged. This indicates that  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$  is symmetric with respect to  $(\mu_t, \mu_c)$ . From a mathematical standpoint, this symmetry implies that both communication latency and computation latency equally affect  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$ . Therefore, in practical terms, to improve the computation freshness  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$ , one can reduce either the communication latency or the computation latency, as both have the same impact on the overall freshness.

### D. Practicality

From (11), obtaining the instantaneous AoC at time  $t$  requires the value of  $\epsilon_w$ . According to (8),  $\epsilon_w = \Pr(T_k > w)$ , meaning that the distribution of  $T_k$  is crucial for determining  $\epsilon_w$ . However, under complex queuing disciplines, analyzing the distribution of  $T_k$  can be challenging. In such cases, calculating AoC in (11) becomes difficult, undermining the practicality of the AoC concept. To address this challenge and enhance the practicality of AoC, we propose an alternative calculation. We will demonstrate that this alternative serves as a reliable proxy for the original AoC given in (11).

In practical scenarios, the AoC in (11) is calculated from the initial time ( $t = 0$ ). To improve accuracy, we can propose a time-varying estimate for  $\epsilon_w$ . Denote this estimate as  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$ , which is expressed as follows,

$$\hat{\epsilon}_w(t) = \frac{N(t)}{G(t)}, \quad (16)$$

where  $N(t)$  is given by (1) and  $G(t)$  is given by (3). The estimate in (16) represents the frequency of valid tasks. Note that both  $G(t)$  and  $N(t)$  can be recorded, making  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$  applicable in practice.

Denote the AoC utilizing the estimate  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$  as  $\hat{c}_{\text{soft}}(t)$ . Similar to (12), as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we define the corresponding average AoC as

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}} \triangleq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \hat{c}_{\text{soft}}(t) dt. \quad (17)$$

**Theorem 2.** *By utilizing the time-varying estimate  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$ , we have*

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}} = \Theta_{\text{soft}}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix D.  $\square$

#### IV. AoC UNDER THE HARD DEADLINE

In this section, we first describe the definition and expression of  $d_P^{\text{hard}}(t)$  (see (18) in Section IV-A), we then provide a clear expression for  $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$  (see Lemma 3 in Section IV-A). Subsequently, we provide a general expression of the time-average AoC (see Lemma 4 in Section IV-B) and derive an approximation (see Theorem 3 in Section IV-B). Finally, we define the computation throughput (see Definition 5 in Section IV-C), and investigate the tradeoff between the computation freshness and the computation throughput (see (26) and Lemma 6 in Section IV-D).

##### A. Expressions of $d_{\text{hard}}(t)$ and $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$

From Definition 2, all bad task are invalid under the hard deadline. In this subsection, we identify the expression of  $d_{\text{hard}}(t)$ .

Since only good tasks provide informative information, we define  $d_P^{\text{hard}}(t)$  as follows:

$$d_P^{\text{hard}}(t) = 1_{\{P(t) > G(t)\}}(t - \tau_{P(t)}). \quad (18)$$

If  $P(t) = G(t)$ , indicating that the computation queue is idle, then according to Definition 4, the instantaneous delay of the processing task,  $d_P^{\text{hard}}(t)$ , vanishes. On the other hand, if  $P(t) > G(t)$ , indicating that the processing task is being processed. Combining with (9) and (18), we see that

$$d_P^{\text{soft}}(t) = d_P^{\text{hard}}(t) + 1_{\{P(t) > G(t)\}} \epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+,$$

implies that  $d_P^{\text{hard}}(t)$  incurs less latency brought by the processing task since  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+ \geq 0$ .

According to (4) and (18), the expression of  $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$  can be calculated as follows.

**Lemma 3.** *The expression of  $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$  is*

$$c_{\text{hard}}(t) = h(t), \quad (19)$$

where  $h(t)$  is given by (10).

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix E.  $\square$

(19) implies that  $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$  is solely determined by informative tasks. This observation aligns with Definition 2, which states that only good (informative) tasks can be fed back to the source. In other words, the AoC decreases only at the

completion time of the processing task *if and only if* it is a good task. When  $w = 0$ , all tasks are considered bad, leading to  $c_{\text{hard}}(t) = t$ , which increases linearly with time  $t$ . Conversely, when  $w = \infty$ , there is no deadline, and all tasks are considered good. In this case  $G(t) = N(t)$  for all  $t$ , so  $c_{\text{hard}}(t) = h(t) = t - G(t)$ , which is only affected by the latest task.

Comparing (11) and (19), we see that although an additional latency  $\epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$  is introduced to the AoC,  $c_{\text{soft}}(t)$  is not necessarily larger than  $c_{\text{hard}}(t)$ . This is because the index of the formative task,  $N(t)$ , under the soft deadline is mostly larger than under the hard deadline since all tasks are valid.




Fig. 4: The curve of AoC under the hard deadline.

The AoC curve is depicted in Fig. 4, with the curve of AoI (see [5]) as a benchmark. In this figure, task  $k - 1$  is a good one, so both AoI and AoC decreases at time  $\tau'_{k-1}$ . Suppose that after task  $k - 1$ , the next good task has the index  $k - 1 + M$ . Here,  $M$  is a random variable with the distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{M = n\} \\ = \Pr\{T_k > \tau, \dots, T_{k+n-1} > \tau, T_{k+n} \leq \tau\}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

From (20),  $M \geq 1$ . Since the network is stationary, the random variable  $M$  associated with every good task has the identical distribution as in (20). The AoC does not decrease at times  $\tau'_k, \tau'_{k+1}, \dots, \tau'_{k+M-1}$ , and decreases at time  $\tau'_{k+M}$ . In the interval  $[\tau'_{k-1}, \tau'_{k+M})$ , the AoC increases linearly with time  $t$ .

##### B. Approximation for Average AoC

Similar to (12), we define the time-average AoC under the hard deadline as

$$\Theta_{\text{hard}} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T c_{\text{hard}}(t) dt. \quad (21)$$

Utilizing a similar idea of calculating average AoI [5], we use a graphical argument to provide a general expression for the average AoC (see Fig. 4).

**Lemma 4.** *The average AoC can be calculated as*

$$\Theta_{\text{hard}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_M \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M X_j] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j=1}^M X_j)^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^M X_j]}. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix F.  $\square$

Although the general expression for the average AoC is given by (22), obtaining a closed-form expression for the average AoC is challenging due to a couple of correlations involved. These correlations are detailed as follows.

- (i) Correlation between delays: In the queuing system, if the delay of task  $k$ ,  $T_k$ , increases, the waiting time for task  $k+1$  also increases, leading to a larger delay for task  $k+1$ ,  $T_{k+1}$ . Hence, the sequence  $\{T_k\}_k$  consists of identical but positively correlated delays.
- (ii) Correlation between delays and index  $M$ : According to (20),  $M$  is the first index  $n$  such that  $T_n \leq w$  while all previous  $T_k > w$ . A higher value of  $T_k$  suggests a higher likelihood of subsequent  $T_j$  values (for  $j > k$ ) also being high, thus making  $M$  larger because it takes longer for a  $T_k$  to be less than or equal to  $w$ . This indicates that  $T_k$  and  $M$  are positively correlated.
- (iii) Correlation between the inter-generation times  $X_k$  and delays  $T_k$ : If  $X_k$  is larger, meaning that the interval between the generation/offloading times of task  $k-1$  and task  $k$  is longer, then  $T_k$  is likely smaller because the waiting time for task  $k$  is reduced. Therefore,  $T_k$  and  $X_k$  are negatively correlated.
- (iv) Correlation between the inter-generation times  $X_k$  and index  $M$ : Since  $X_k$  and  $T_k$  are negatively correlated, and  $T_k$  and  $M$  are positively correlated,  $X_k$  and  $M$  are negatively correlated.

Due to all these correlations, it is extremely challenging to derive the closed-form expression for  $\Theta_{\text{hard}}$  in (22). However, we can approximate it accurately under specific conditions.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\mu_t = R/L$  and  $\mu_c = F/X$ . When  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , the average AoC defined in (22) can be accurately approximated by  $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}}$ ,*

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}} = \mathbb{E}[T_M] + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[X_1]} + \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[M^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[M]} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}[X_1]. \quad (23)$$

Let  $\rho_t, \rho_c, \delta_t, \delta_c, \zeta_t$ , and  $\zeta_c$  be given in Theorem 1, if  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ ,

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}} = \frac{\frac{1-\zeta_t(1+\mu_t\delta_t w)}{\mu_t^2\delta_t^2} - \frac{1-\zeta_c(1+\mu_c\delta_c w)}{\mu_c^2\delta_c^2}}{(1-\zeta_t)/\mu_t\delta_t - (1-\zeta_c)/\mu_c\delta_c} + \frac{\mu_c - \mu_t}{\lambda(\mu_c\delta_c(1-\zeta_t) - \mu_t\delta_t(1-\zeta_c))}; \quad (24)$$

if  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ ,

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}} = \frac{\frac{2}{\mu_t\delta_t} - \left(\frac{2}{\mu_t\delta_t} + 2w + \mu_t\delta_t w^2\right)\zeta_t}{1 - \zeta_t(1 + \mu_t\delta_t w)} + \frac{1}{\lambda(1 - \zeta_t(1 + \mu_t\delta_t w))}. \quad (25)$$

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix G.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** (Lower Bound)  $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}}$  in (23) captures an extreme case where the positive correlations among  $\{T_k\}_k$  are removed. Therefore,  $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{hard}}$  in (23) serves as a lower bound for  $\Theta_{\text{hard}}$ . This lower bound is approximately tight when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ .

Similar to Theorem 1, by exchanging  $\mu_t$  and  $\mu_c$  in (24) and (25), we observe that. Therefore, to improve the computation freshness  $\Theta_{\text{hard}}$ , one can reduce either the communication latency or the computation latency, as both have the same impact on the overall freshness.

### C. Computation Throughput

Unlike the soft deadline, all bad tasks are discarded under the hard deadline, and only good tasks can be fed back to the source. The frequency of informative tasks is influenced by two facts: the generation rate  $\lambda$  and the deadline  $w$ . We define the frequency of informative tasks as *computation throughput*. Formally, we have the following definition.

**Definition 5.** (Computation Throughput) *The computation throughput is defined as*

$$\Xi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(t)}{t}. \quad (26)$$

Under the hard deadline, we can calculate the computation throughput in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.** *The computation throughput is given by,*

$$\Xi = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{k=1}^M X_k]}. \quad (27)$$

*Proof.* The proof of Lemma 5 is given in Appendix H.  $\square$

In (27), the generation rate  $\lambda$  is reflected in  $X_k$ , while the deadline  $w$  is captured by  $M$ . It is worth noting that Definition 5 can apply to the case with a soft deadline. Under the soft deadline, (26) implies that  $\Xi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(t)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(t)}{t} = \lambda$ , which is a trivial case. Therefore, we did not investigate the computation throughput concept in Section III.

**Proposition 1.** *When  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , the computation throughput defined in (27) can be accurately approximated by  $\hat{\Xi}$ ,*

$$\hat{\Xi} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[M]\mathbb{E}[X_1]}. \quad (28)$$

Let  $\rho_t, \rho_c, \delta_t, \delta_c, \zeta_t$ , and  $\zeta_c$  be given in Theorem 1, if  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ ,

$$\hat{\Xi} = \lambda \cdot \frac{\mu_c\delta_c(1-\zeta_t) - \mu_t\delta_t(1-\zeta_c)}{\mu_c - \mu_t}, \quad (29)$$

if  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ ,

$$\hat{\Xi} = \lambda(1 - (1 + \mu_t\delta_t w)\zeta_t). \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* The proof of Proposition 1 is given in Appendix I.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** (Upper Bound) As discussed in Section IV-B, according to (20), a higher value of  $T_k$  suggests a higher likelihood of subsequent  $T_j$  values (for  $j > k$ ) also being high, thus making  $M$  larger. However,  $\hat{\Xi}$  in (23) captures an extreme

case where positive correlations among  $\{T_k\}_k$  are removed, resulting in a smaller expectation for  $M$ . Consequently,  $\hat{\Xi}$  in (28) serves an upper bound for  $\hat{\Xi}$ . Additionally, this upper bound is approximately tight when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ .

#### D. Relationship between Freshness and Throughput

While closed-form expressions for computation freshness in (22) and computation throughput in (27) are not available, the relationship between these two metrics can be approximated using (23) and (28). Given that we only have a lower bound for the average AoC, i.e., (23) and an upper bound for the computation throughput i.e., (28), we focus on the set of weakly Pareto-optimal points rather than Pareto-optimal points [27]: A pair  $(\hat{\Theta}^*, \hat{\Xi}^*)$  is defined as a weakly Pareto-optimal point if for any  $(\hat{\Theta}, \hat{\Xi})$ , both inequalities (i)  $\hat{\Theta} < \hat{\Theta}^*$  and (ii)  $\hat{\Xi} > \hat{\Xi}^*$  cannot hold simultaneously [28]. Consider the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda: \hat{\Xi} > u} \hat{\Theta}. \quad (31)$$

Let the corresponding  $\hat{\Theta}$  and  $\hat{\Xi}$  as  $\hat{\Theta}(u)$  and  $\hat{\Xi}(u)$ , respectively. The tradeoff between computation freshness and the computation throughput is explored in the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *The objective pair  $(\hat{\Theta}(u), \hat{\Xi}(u))$  is a weakly Pareto-optimal point.*


*Proof.* The proof of Lemma 6 is given in Appendix J.  $\square$

## V. NUMERICAL RESULTS


In this section, we verify our findings through simulations. We fix  $w = 0.5$  through all experiments.

In Fig. 5, we investigate the average AoC under the soft deadline. The comparisons between theoretical and simulated average AoC are presented in Fig. 5(a). We observe that the theoretical average AoC values in (14) and (15) align with the simulation results. This alignment implies that the theoretical expressions in Theorem 1 are accurate for both cases where  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$  and  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ . Additionally, in both scenarios, the average AoC initially decreases and then increases. When  $\mu_t = 2 < 3 = \mu_c$ , the computation power is larger than the communication power. If  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , the communication queue is almost empty, meaning that the communication resources (and thus the computation resources) are underutilized, resulting in a high average AoC. Conversely, if  $\lambda \rightarrow \mu_t$ , the communication queue is busy, meaning that the communication power is utilized almost to its total capacity, resulting in many tasks waiting in the communication queue to be transmitted, which also leads to a high average AoC. Since  $\mu_t$  and  $\mu_c$  are symmetric in (14) and (15), this conclusion is valid for the case when  $\mu_t \geq \mu_c$ . Using numerical methods (e.g., gradient methods in as described in [29]), we can find the optimal  $\lambda$  in (14) and (15).

In Fig. 5(b), we analyze the estimated average AoC provided in (16) and (17). The estimated average AoC matches well with the theoretical average AoC values. This consistency implies the accuracy of the theoretical expressions presented in Theorem 1.




(a) Theoretical and simulated AoC under different cases.




(b) Theoretical, simulated, and estimated AoC when  $\mu_t = 2, \mu_c = 3$ .

Fig. 5: Numerical results for the average AoC under the soft deadline



(a) Approximated and simulated AoC under different cases.




(b) Approximated and simulated computation throughput when  $\mu_t = 2, \mu_c = 3$ .


Fig. 6: Numerical results for the average AoC under the hard deadline

In Fig.6, we investigate the average Age of Computation (AoC) under the hard deadline scenario. The comparisons between the approximated and simulated average AoC are presented in Fig.6(a). We observe that when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , the approximations of the average AoC in (24) and (25) closely match the simulation results. This agreement verifies the theoretical expressions in Theorem 3. Furthermore, the curves of the approximated average AoC are below those of the simulated average AoC, implying that the approximations in (24) and (25) serve as lower bounds for the average AoC, confirming the validity of Remark 1. Additionally, in both scenarios, the average AoC initially decreases and then increases, similar to the trend observed under the soft deadline. This suggests that the computation freshness exhibits a convex relationship with respect to  $\lambda$ , indicating the existence of an optimal  $\lambda$  that minimizes the average AoC.

In Fig. 6(b), we analyze the computation throughput as defined in (27). The approximated computation throughput in (28) closely matches the simulated results, indicating the accuracy of the approximation. Although the positive correlations among  $\{T_k\}_k$  are removed in (28), making it a lower bound, the reduction in the expectation of  $M$  is small. Consequently, the reduction in  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^M X_j]$  is negligible. Therefore, (28) serves as a tight lower bound for the computation throughput, not only when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , but also across the entire range of  $\lambda$ .



(a) Relationship between the average AoC and computation throughput.



(b) Relationship between the optimal average AoC and computation throughput.

Fig. 7: Relationships between computation freshness and computation throughput under the hard deadline.

The relationship between the computation freshness and

the computation throughput is examined in Fig. 7. In Fig. 7(a), we plot  $\hat{\Theta}$  from (23) versus  $\hat{\Xi}$  from (28) when  $\lambda \in (0, 1.8)$  and  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3), (3, 2), (2, 5)$ . These curves are observed to be decreasing, indicating that both  $\hat{\Theta}$  and  $\hat{\Xi}$  achieve their optimal values simultaneously. Let us delve into this phenomenon: When the network is stable, i.e.,  $\lambda < \min\{\mu_t, \mu_c\} = \mu_t$ , the channel throughput, defined as the number of completed tasks per slot, is  $\lambda$ . From Fig. 6 (a), we know that the average AoC initially decreases with the channel throughput ( $\lambda$ ) and then increases as channel throughput increases. However, Fig. 7(a) shows that the approximated AoC decreases with the approximated computation throughput consistently. This suggests that computation throughput serves as a reliable proxy for the average AoC. Practically, we can minimize the average AoC by maximizing the computation throughput.

Additionally,  $\hat{\Theta}$  v.s  $\hat{\Xi}$  when  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3)$  (the green solid line) coincides with  $\hat{\Theta}$  v.s  $\hat{\Xi}$  when  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (3, 2)$  (the blue scatter line). This implies that the relationship remains unchanged after exchanging the communication and computation rates, as both abilities equally impact overall freshness, as discussed in Section III-C. Comparing  $\hat{\Theta}$  v.s  $\hat{\Xi}$  when  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3)$  (the green solid line) with  $\hat{\Theta}$  v.s  $\hat{\Xi}$  when  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 5)$  (the red dashed line), we observe that, for any fixed  $\lambda$ , the approximated computation throughput under  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 5)$  is larger than that under  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3)$ . Similarly, the approximated average AoC under  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 5)$  is smaller than that under  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3)$ . This is as expected because larger communication or computation capabilities lead to better computation freshness and higher throughput. Both the optimal approximated average AoC and approximated computation throughput for  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 5)$  outperform those for  $(\mu_t, \mu_c) = (2, 3)$  due to the consistency between AoC and computation throughput.

Finally, we solve the optimization (31) when  $u = 0$ , and plot the optimal  $\hat{\Theta}$  v.s the corresponding  $\hat{\Xi}$  in Fig. 7(b). We set  $\mu_t = 2$ ,  $\lambda \in (0, 2)$ , allowing  $\mu_c$  to vary from 3 to 6. As expected, as the computation rate  $\mu_c$  (representing the computation power of the network) increases, the optimal (approximated) average AoC decreases while the corresponding (approximated) computation throughput increases.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this paper, we propose a new metric, the Age of Computing (AoC), to capture the computation freshness in 3CNs. We investigate this metric in a line topology consisting of a source, a transmitter, a receiver, and a computational node, considering both soft and hard deadlines. For both types of deadlines, we derive the formula for AoC and a general expression for the time-average AoC. Focusing on the first-come, first-serve queuing discipline, we derive the closed-form expression for the time-average AoC under the soft deadline, and we seek an approximation for the time-average AoC under the hard deadline. In addition to freshness, we introduce another new concept, computation throughput. To describe the relationship between computation freshness and computation throughput, we construct an optimization problem aimed at minimizing the average AoC and prove that the objective pair is a weakly Pareto-optimal point.

There are two primary future research directions: (1) Deriving and analyzing the time-average AoC in practical scenarios involving complex graphs, such as sequential dependency graphs, parallel dependency graphs, and general dependency graphs [1]. (2) Identifying optimal AoC-based resource management policies in 3CNs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Mao, C. You, J. Zhang, and et. al, "A Survey on Mobile Edge Computing: The Communication Perspective," *IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 2322–2358, 2017.
- [2] W. Shi, J. Cao, Q. Zhang, and et. al, "Edge Computing: Vision and Challenges," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 637–646, 2016.
- [3] *Fog computing and its role in the internet of things*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2012.
- [4] X. Tang, C. Cao, and Y. Wang, "Computing power network: The architecture of convergence of computing and networking towards 6G requirement," *China Communications*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 175–185, 2021.
- [5] A. Kosta, N. Pappas and V. Angelakis, "Age of Information: A New Concept, Metric, and Tool," *Foundations and Trends in Networking*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 162 – 259, 2017.
- [6] X. Chen, K. Gatsis, H. Hassani and S. Saeedi-Bidokhti, "Age of Information in Random Access Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 6548 – 6568, 2022.
- [7] L. Huang and E. Modiano, "Optimizing age-of-information in a multi-class queueing system," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2015.
- [8] X. Chen, X. Liao, and S. Saeedi-Bidokhti, "Real-time Sampling and Estimation on Random Access Channels: Age of Information and Beyond," in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, 2021.
- [9] Y. Zheng, J. Hu, and K. Yang, "Average Age of Information in Wireless Powered Relay Aided Communication Network," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 13, pp. 11 311 – 11 323, 2022.
- [10] X. Chen, R. Liu, S. Wang, and S. Saeedi-Bidokhti, "Timely Broadcasting in Erasure Networks: Age-Rate Tradeoffs," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2021.
- [11] X. Chen and S. Saeedi Bidokhti, "Benefits of Coding on Age of Information in Broadcast Networks," in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2019.
- [12] Q. Kuang, J. Gong, X. Chen, et. al, "Age-of-information for computation-intensive messages in mobile edge computing," in *The 11th International Conference on Wireless Communications and Signal Processing*, 2019.
- [13] C. Xu, H. H. Yang, X. Wang, et. al, "Optimizing information freshness in computing-enabled IoT networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 2, no. 971 - 985, 2020.
- [14] F. Chiariotti, O. Vikhrova, B. Soret, et. al, "Peak age of information distribution for edge computing with wireless links," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 3176 – 3191, 2021.
- [15] P. Zou, O. Ozel, and S. Subramaniam, "Optimizing information freshness through computation–transmission tradeoff and queue management in edge computing," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 949 – 963, 2021.
- [16] X. Qin, Y. Li, X. Song, et. al, "Timeliness of information for computation-intensive status updates in task-oriented communications," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 623 – 638, 2023.
- [17] Z. Tang, Z. Sun, N. Yang, et. al, "Age of information analysis of multi-user mobile edge computing systems," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2021.
- [18] L. Liu, J. Qiang, Y. Wang, et. al, "Age of information analysis of NOMA-MEC offloading with dynamic task arrivals," in *IEEE the 14th International Conference on Wireless Communications and Signal Processing*, 2022.
- [19] X. Chen, K. Li, and K. Yang, "Timely Requesting for Time-Critical Content Users in Decentralized F-RANs," arXiv: 2407.02930, Jul 2024.
- [20] J. He, D. Zhang, S. Liu, et. al, "Decentralized updates scheduling for data freshness in mobile edge computing," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2022.
- [21] K. Peng, P. Xiao, S. Wang, et. al, "AoI-aware partial computation offloading in IIoT with edge computing: a deep reinforcement learning based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 3766 – 3777, 2023.

- [22] J. Zhong, R. D. Yates, and E. Soljanin, "Two freshness metrics for local cache refresh," in *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2018.
- [23] C. Kam, S. Kompella, G. D. Nguyen, et. al, "Towards an effective age of information: Remote estimation of a Markov source," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops*, 2018.
- [24] A. Maatouk, S. Kriouile, M. Assaad, et. al, "The Age of Incorrect Information: A New Performance Metric for Status Updates," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 2215 – 2228, 2020.
- [25] X. Zheng S. Zhou, and Z. Niu, "Beyond Age: Urgency of Information for Timeliness Guarantee in Status Update Systems," in *2020 2nd 6G Wireless Summit*, 2020.
- [26] S. Kaul, R. Yates, and M. Gruteser, "Real-Time Status: How Often Should One Update?" in *IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications*, 2012.
- [27] M. T. M. Emmerich and A. H. Deutz, "A tutorial on multiobjective optimization: fundamentals and evolutionary methods," *Natural Computing*, vol. 17, pp. 585 – 609, 2018.
- [28] J. Lou, X. Yuan, S. Kompella, et.al, "AoI and throughput tradeoffs in routing-aware multi-hop wireless networks," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2020.
- [29] S. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [30] R. Nelson, *Probability, stochastic processes, and queueing theory: the mathematics of computer performance modeling*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1995.

## APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 1

When  $x = \text{soft}$ , any bad task is valid, implying all tasks are valid. From Definition 3, it follows  $N(t) = G(t)$  for all  $t$ .

**Step 1.** Consider the case when  $P(t) = G(t)$ . Since  $N(t) = G(t)$ , then  $N(t) = G(t) = P(t)$ . From (4),  $c_{\text{soft}}(t) = t - N(t) = h(t)$ , which satisfies (11).

**Step 2.** Consider the case when  $P(t) > G(t)$ . This implies that  $t \neq \tau'_{P(t)}$ ; otherwise, if  $t = \tau'_{P(t)}$ , the processing task would be completed at time  $t$ , so  $G(t) = N(t) = P(t)$ , which contradicts  $P(t) > G(t)$ . Since  $t \neq \tau'_{P(t)}$ , combining (4), (6), and (9), we have  $c_{\text{soft}}(t) = t - \tau_{N(t)} + \epsilon_w(t - \tau_{P(t)} - w)^+$ . This satisfies (11).

## APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 2

To derive the expression the average AoC, we start with the graphical argument from [5]. The average AoI is given by:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{ABCD}}]}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k T_k] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[X_k^2]}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}, \quad (32)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[X_k]$  represents the expected time until the next update, and  $\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}$  characterizes the rate of occurrence of the parallelogram  $\overline{ABCD}$ .

By the similar approach, the average AoC can be calculated by

$$\Theta_{\text{soft}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{ABCD}}] + \mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{DEF}}]}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}. \quad (33)$$

From (32) and (33), to obtain the expression for  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$ , it suffices to find the expression for  $\mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{DEF}}]$ .

Since  $\overline{FG} = (T_k - w)^+$  and the slope of  $\overline{FD} = 1$ , then  $\overline{GD} = (T_k - w)^+$ . Since  $\overline{FG} = (T_k - w)^+$  and the slope of  $\overline{FE} = 1 + \epsilon_w$ , then and  $\overline{EG} = (1 + \epsilon_w)(T_k - w)^+$ . Therefore, the difference between  $\overline{EG}$  and  $\overline{GD}$  is  $\overline{ED}$ , which

equals to  $\epsilon_w(T_k - w)^+$ . The area of the triangle  $\overline{DEF}$  is  $\frac{\epsilon_w}{2}((T_k - w)^+)^2$ , which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{DEF}}] = \frac{\epsilon_w}{2} \mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2]. \quad (34)$$

By integrating these findings from (32), (33), and (34), we can obtain the desired results.

#### APPENDIX C

##### THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

From [16, Proposition 1], the average AoI has the following expression,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k T_k] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[X_k^2]}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]} &= \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\mu_t} + \frac{1}{\mu_c} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu_t^2(\mu_t - \lambda)} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu_c^2(\mu_c - \lambda)} + \frac{\lambda^2}{\mu_t \mu_c (\mu_t + \mu_c - \lambda)}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

To obtain the closed expression for  $\Theta_{\text{soft}}$  in (13), it suffices to obtain the closed expression for  $\frac{\epsilon_w}{2} \mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2]$ .

**Step 1.** We first obtain  $\epsilon_w$ . Note that  $T_k$  is the system time in a tandem M/M/1 queues with parameter  $(\lambda, \mu_t, \mu_c)$ . Then, the density function of  $T_k$  has the density function as follows [30], with support set  $x > 0$ ,

$$f_{T_k}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_t \delta_t \mu_c \delta_c}{\mu_c - \mu_t} (e^{-\mu_t \delta_t x} - e^{-\mu_c \delta_c x}), & \mu_t \neq \mu_c \\ \mu_t^2 \delta_t^2 x e^{-\mu_t \delta_t x}, & \mu_t = \mu_c. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

From (8) and (36),  $\epsilon_w$  can be computed as

$$\epsilon_w = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu_c \delta_c e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w} - \mu_t \delta_t e^{-\mu_c \delta_c w}}{\mu_c - \mu_t}, & \mu_t \neq \mu_c \\ (1 + \mu_t \delta_t w) e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}, & \mu_t = \mu_c. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

**Step 2.** We then compute  $\mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2]$ . We first consider the case when  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ , we then consider the case when  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ .

When  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ , according to (36), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2] &= \frac{\mu_t \delta_t \mu_c \delta_c}{\mu_c - \mu_t} \left( \int_w^\infty (x - w)^2 e^{-\mu_t \delta_t x} dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_w^\infty (x - w)^2 e^{-\mu_c \delta_c x} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

By some algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_w^\infty (x - w)^2 e^{-\mu_t \delta_t x} dx &= \frac{2e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}}{\mu_t^3 \delta_t^3} \\ \int_w^\infty (x - w)^2 e^{-\mu_c \delta_c x} dx &= \frac{2e^{-\mu_c \delta_c w}}{\mu_c^3 \delta_c^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when  $\mu_t \neq \mu_c$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2] = \frac{\mu_t \delta_t \mu_c \delta_c}{\mu_c - \mu_t} \left( \frac{2e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}}{\mu_t^3 \delta_t^3} - \frac{2e^{-\mu_c \delta_c w}}{\mu_c^3 \delta_c^3} \right). \quad (38)$$

Next, when  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ , according to (36), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\left((T_k - w)^+\right)^2] = e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w} \left( \frac{6}{\mu_t^2 \delta_t^2} + \frac{2w}{\mu_t \delta_t} \right). \quad (39)$$

From **Step 1** and **Step 2**, substituting (35), (37), (38), and (39) into (13), we have the desired results.

#### APPENDIX D PROOF OF THEOREM 2

From (16),  $\hat{\epsilon}_w^{(2)}(t)$  represents the frequency of valid tasks. Under any stationary queuing discipline, such as first-come first-serve, the limit of  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$  tends to  $\epsilon_w$  due to the Law of Large Numbers,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\epsilon}_w(t) = \epsilon_w.$$

Additionally,  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$  remains unchanged until a new task is completed.

Consider the  $k$ -th valid (latest) task, where the corresponding inter-generation time is  $X_k$ , the corresponding system time is  $T_k$ . Denote the corresponding  $\hat{\epsilon}_w(t)$  as  $\hat{\epsilon}_k$ . Let the number of valid tasks be  $K$ , and consider the limit as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ . Utilizing a similar graphical argument in Appendix B, the average AoC can be computed by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}} &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \left( X_k T_k + \frac{X_k^2}{2} + \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \right)}{\sum_{k=1}^K X_k} \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( X_k T_k + \frac{X_k^2}{2} + \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \right)}{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K X_k}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Law of Large Numbers,  $\hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}}$  can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k T_k] + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_k^2]}{2}}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]} \\ &+ \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2}{\mathbb{E}[X_k]}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We now focus on the term  $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2$ . Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\epsilon}(t) = \epsilon_w$ , for any small  $\eta > 0$ , there exists a large integer  $H(\eta)$ , such that  $|\hat{\epsilon}_k - \epsilon_w| \leq \eta$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{H(\eta)} + \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \right) \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because  $\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{H(\eta)} \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 = 0$ , as there are only finite number ( $H(\eta)$ ) terms and each term is a finite scalar.

Since  $|\hat{\epsilon}_k - \epsilon_w| \leq \eta$ , then the summation  $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2$  has the following bounds,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_w - \eta}{2K} \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \\ &\leq \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2 \\ &\leq \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon_w + \eta}{2K} \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \left( (T_k - w)^+ \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the Law of Large Numbers, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\epsilon_w - \eta}{2} \mathbb{E}[(T_k - w)^+]^2 \\ & \leq \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=H(\eta)}^K \frac{\hat{\epsilon}_k}{2} ((T_k - w)^+)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\epsilon_w + \eta}{2} \mathbb{E}[(T_k - w)^+]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Substituting (41) into (40), let  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain:

$$\hat{\Theta}_{\text{soft}} = \Theta_{\text{soft}}.$$

#### APPENDIX E PROOF OF LEMMA 3

When  $x = \text{hard}$ , all bad tasks are invalid, so from Definition 3,  $G(t) = N(t)$  only if  $\tau'_{G(t)} - \tau_{G(t)} \leq w$ .

**Step 1.** We consider the case when  $P(t) = G(t)$ . From (4),  $c_{\text{hard}}(t) = t - \tau_{N(t)} = h(t)$ , which satisfies (19).

**Step 2.** We consider the case when  $P(t) > G(t)$ . From (5), (6), and (18),  $c_{\text{hard}}(t) = t - \tau_{N(t)} = h(t)$ , which satisfies (19).

#### APPENDIX F PROOF OF LEMMA 4

Utilizing a similar idea of calculating average AoI [5], the average AoC can be computed as the expected area of the parallelogram  $\overline{ABCD}$ . The rate of the informative task is

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(t)}{t}.$$

Then, the average AoC is given by

$$\Theta_{\text{hard}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(t)}{t} \cdot \mathbb{E}[S_{\overline{ABCD}}]. \quad (42)$$

From the distribution of  $M$  in (20), we know that a good task followed by  $M - 1$  bad tasks, so

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(t)}{t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t/N(t)} = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^M X_j]}. \quad (43)$$

In addition, the area of  $\overline{ABCD}$  can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{ABCD}} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^M X_j + T_M\right)^2 / 2 - T_M^2 / 2\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[T_M \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M X_j] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^M X_j\right)^2\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Substituting (43) and (44) into (42), we obtain (22).

#### APPENDIX G PROOF OF THEOREM 3

As discussed in Section IV-B, there are 4 types of correlations underlying (22): (i) positive correlations among the delays  $\{T_k\}_k$  over  $k$ , (ii) positive correlations between  $T_k$  ( $1 \leq k \leq M$ ) and  $M$ , (iii) negative correlations between  $T_k$  and  $X_k$ , and (iv) negative correlations among  $X_k$  and  $M$ . The correlations in (ii), (iii), and (iv) are incurred by the positive

correlations in (i). We can alleviate these correlations when the positive correlations in (i) are negligible.

In an tandem of two M/M/1 queues with parameters  $(\lambda, \mu_t, \mu_c)$ , when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , the positive correlations among  $\{T_k\}_k$  become negligible [30]. In other words,  $T_k$  and  $T_{k+1}$  are approximately independent over  $k$ . Consequently, due to the approximate independence among  $\{T_k\}_k$ , according to (20),  $M$  approximates a geometric distribution with parameter  $1 - \epsilon_w$ , which is approximately independent of  $T_k$ . Additionally, when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , the delay  $T_k$  is dominated by the services times at the transmitter and the computational node. This implies that  $T_k$  and  $X_k$  are approximately independent. Hence,  $X_k$  and  $M$  are also approximately independent.

**Step 1.** We prove (23). Recall that  $\{X_k\}_k$  are i.i.d over  $k$ . As discussed above, when  $\mu_t \gg \lambda$  and  $\mu_c \gg \lambda$ , we have the following: (i) From the model assumption in Section III-C,  $\{X_k\}_k$  are independent and identical distributions. Since  $M$  is approximately independent of  $X_k$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^M X_j\right] \approx \mathbb{E}[M]\mathbb{E}[X_1], \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^M X_j\right)^2\right] &\approx \mathbb{E}[M]\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] \\ &+ (\mathbb{E}[M^2] - \mathbb{E}[M])\mathbb{E}^2[X_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

(ii) Since  $T_k$  is approximately independent of  $X_k$ , we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[T_M \cdot \sum_{j=1}^M X_j] \approx \mathbb{E}[T_M]\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^M X_j\right]. \quad (47)$$

Substituting (45), (46), and (47) into (22), we get:

$$\Theta_{\text{hard}} \approx \mathbb{E}[T_M] + \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[X_1]} + \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[M^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[M]} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}[X_1],$$

thereby completing the proof of (23).

**Step 2.** We prove (24). According to (20),

$$\mathbb{E}[T_M] = \mathbb{E}[T_1 | T_1 \leq w]. \quad (48)$$

Since the density function of  $T_k$  is given by (36), substituting (36) into (47), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[T_M] = \frac{\frac{1 - \frac{1 + \mu_t \delta_t w}{e^{\mu_t \delta_t w}}}{\mu_t^2 \delta_t^2} - \frac{1 - \frac{1 + \mu_c \delta_c w}{e^{\mu_c \delta_c w}}}{\mu_c^2 \delta_c^2}}{\frac{1 - e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}}{\mu_t \delta_t} - \frac{1 - e^{-\mu_c \delta_c w}}{\mu_c \delta_c}}. \quad (49)$$

Since  $X_1$  has an exponential distribution with parameter  $\lambda$ , we have:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[X_1]} = \frac{1}{\lambda}. \quad (50)$$

Recall that  $M$  approximates a geometric distribution with parameter  $1 - \epsilon_w$ . Therefore,

$$\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[M^2]}{2\mathbb{E}[M]} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_w} - 1\right), \quad (51)$$

where  $\epsilon_w$  is given by (37). Substituting (37), (49), (50), and (51) into (23), we obtain (24).

**Step 3.** We prove (25). When  $\mu_t = \mu_c$ , substituting (36) into (47), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[T_M] = \frac{\frac{2}{\mu_t \delta_t} - (\frac{2}{\mu_t \delta_t} + 2w + \mu_t \delta_t w^2) e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w}}{1 - e^{-\mu_t \delta_t w} (1 + \mu_t \delta_t w)}. \quad (52)$$

Substituting (37), (50), (51), and (52) into (23), we obtain (25).

#### APPENDIX H PROOF OF LEMMA 5

Consider a large time horizon  $T$ , during which there are  $N(T)$  informative packets. For each information task  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N(T)\}$ , denote the number of the associated bad tasks as  $M_j$ .  $\{M_j\}_j$  is identical over  $j$  and follows the distribution given in (20). Since  $\{X_k\}_k$  are i.i.d over  $k$ , the sequence  $\{\sum_{k=1}^{M_j} X_k\}_j$  are identical over  $j$ . The remaining time in the interval  $[0, T]$  is  $T - \tau'_{N(T)}$ . Thus, the time horizon can be re-written as

$$T = \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \sum_{k=1}^{M_j} X_{k+j-1} + T - \tau'_{N(T)}. \quad (53)$$

Substituting (53) into (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(T)}{T} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(T)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \sum_{k=1}^{M_j} X_{k+j-1} + T - \tau'_{N(T)}} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{N(T)} \sum_{j=1}^{N(T)} \sum_{k=1}^{M_j} X_{k+j-1} + \frac{T - \tau'_{N(T)}}{N(T)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the sequence  $\{\sum_{k=1}^{M_j} X_k\}_j$  is identical over  $j$ , by the central limit theory, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{k=1}^M X_k] + \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T - \tau'_{N(T)}}{N(T)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[\sum_{k=1}^M X_k]}. \end{aligned}$$

#### APPENDIX I PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

Recall that  $M$  approximates a geometric distribution with parameter  $1 - \epsilon_w$ , and  $X$  follows an exponential distribution with parameter  $\lambda$ , then

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[M] \mathbb{E}[X_1]} = \lambda(1 - \epsilon_w). \quad (54)$$

Substituting (37) into (54), we obtain (29) and (30).

#### APPENDIX J PROOF OF LEMMA 6

The proof is based on contradiction. Assume that the pair  $(\hat{\Theta}(u), \hat{\Xi}(u))$  is not a weakly Pareto-optimal point. This implies that there exists another solution  $(\hat{\Theta}'(u), \hat{\Xi}'(u))$  such that  $\hat{\Theta}'(u) < \hat{\Theta}(u)$  and  $\hat{\Xi}'(u) > \hat{\Xi}(u)$ . Given that  $\hat{\Xi}'(u) > \hat{\Xi}(u) > u$ , the solution  $(\hat{\Theta}'(u), \hat{\Xi}'(u))$  must be a feasible solution to problem (31). However, since  $\hat{\Theta}(u)$  is the minimum value in the problem (31), it follows that  $\hat{\Theta}(u) \leq \hat{\Theta}'(u)$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\hat{\Theta}'(u) < \hat{\Theta}(u)$ .