

# Effective Two-Stage Double Auction for Dynamic Resource Trading in Edge Networks via Overbooking

Sicheng Wu, Minghui Liwang, *Member, IEEE*, Deqing Wang, *Member, IEEE*, Xianbin Wang, *Fellow, IEEE*, Chao Wu, Junyi Tang, Li Li, *Member, IEEE*, Zhenzhen Jiao

**Abstract**—To facilitate responsive and cost-effective computing resource scheduling and service delivery over edge-assisted mobile networks, this paper investigates a novel two-stage double auction methodology via utilizing an interesting idea of resource overbooking to overcome dynamic and uncertain nature from edge servers (sellers) and demand from mobile devices (as buyers). The proposed auction integrates multiple essential factors such as social welfare maximization and decision-making latency (e.g., the time for determining winning seller-buyer pairs) reduction, by introducing a stagewise strategy: an overbooking-driven pre-double auction (OPDAuction) for determining long-term cooperations between sellers and buyers before practical resource transactions as Stage I, and a real-time backup double auction (RBD Auction) for handling residual resource demands during actual transactions. In particular, by applying a proper overbooking rate, OPDAuction helps with facilitating trading contracts between appropriate sellers and buyers as guidance for future transactions, by allowing the booked resources to exceed supply. Then, since pre-auctions may cause risks, our RBD Auction adjusts to real-time market changes, further enhancing the overall social welfare. More importantly, we offer an interesting view to show that our proposed two-stage auction can support significant design properties such as truthfulness, individual rationality, and budget balance. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate good performance in social welfare, time efficiency, and computational scalability, outstripping conventional methods in dynamic edge computing settings.

**Index Terms**—Edge-assisted mobile networks, dynamics and uncertainty, two-stage double auction, overbooking, time efficiency



## 1 INTRODUCTION

THE proliferation of smart devices and their increased computing capabilities have witnessed a wide range of innovative mobile applications, e.g., large language models, smart city, and E-health [1]. These applications generally rely on complex computing for real-time data analysis, imposing significant challenges for a single device with limited computing resource and battery supply [2]. To address this, edge computing becomes a viable solution by sharing computing and storage resources at the network edge with devices. This proximity facilitates responsive and cost-effective resource sharing among diverse network entities [3]. Nevertheless, ensuring adequate computing resources for delay-sensitive and computation-intensive applications remains challenging due to the limited capacity of edge servers and concurrent demands from large amount of devices [4]. Addressing this challenge by maintaining

the balance between supply and demand of limited edge computing resources is becoming more challenging due to growing dynamics and diversity of distributed application requirements. To effectively connect distributed supply of edge computing resources and diverse service demands, the double auction [5] serves as a promising solution, enabling both resource requesters (buyers) and providers (sellers) submit bids and asks for resources, respectively, while establishing a mutually beneficial exchange. It facilitates a resource trading market with built-in incentives, allowing computing services to be traded between sellers and buyers [6], thereby improving overall network performance.

### 1.1 Motivations

Edge computing significantly alleviates the communication burden between resource providers and requesters at the network edge. However, conventional resource allocation approaches often fail to meet the demands during peak usage periods, resulting in suboptimal performance [7]. By integrating double auction in edge networks, resource sharing can be facilitated through paid services [8]. However, implementing conventional double auctions (rely on on-site decision-making) poses significant challenges in dynamic and uncertain edge networks. For instance, inefficiencies and performance bottlenecks can be incurred when meeting the demands during peak usage periods due to limited edge resources. Moreover, fluctuating and unpredictable resource demands and supplies require frequent decision-making to establish appropriate seller-buyer matches and trading

S. Wu (sichengwu@stu.xmu.edu.cn) and Deqing Wang (deqing@xmu.edu.cn) are with the School of Informatics, Xiamen University, Fujian, China. Minghui Liwang (minghuiliwang@tongji.edu.cn) and Li Li (lili@tongji.edu.cn) are with the Department of Control Science and Engineering, the National Key Laboratory of Autonomous Intelligent Unmanned Systems, and also with Frontiers Science Center for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, Ministry of Education, Tongji University, Shanghai, China. X. Wang (xianbin.wang@uwo.ca) is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Western University, Ontario, Canada. Chao Wu (chao.wu@zju.edu.cn) is with the School of Public Affairs, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China. Junyi Tang (tjunyi2024@lzu.edu.cn) is with School of Information Science and Engineering, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China. Z. Jiao (jiaozhenzhen@teleinfo.cn) is with the iF-Labs, Beijing Teleinfo Technology Co., Ltd., CAICT, China.

Corresponding author: Minghui Liwang

prices, leading to excessive delays, increased energy costs, and potential trading failures [9].

Therefore, to facilitate a responsive and cost-effective double auction process for resource trading in edge networks with dynamic nature, we delve into a *pre-auction* mechanism, allowing participants to negotiate and compete for appropriate resources, streamlining future practical trading procedure. Such an unique consideration encourages some sellers and buyers to become long-term partners, and can participate in the market without frequent bargains (and thus reducing overheads on time and energy). More importantly, since the uncertain resource supply and demand can always be fluctuant (e.g., due to factors such as mobility and personality of smart devices) and may lead to unsatisfying trading performance, we involve an interesting concept of *overbooking* [10] during this process. In particular, overbooking enables sellers to allocate more resources to buyers than their theoretical supply would suggest. It also encourages buyers to request more resources than their actual need, as a preparation against the possibility that some buyers/sellers may not fulfill their commitments. However, the success of such a pre-auction process heavily depends on the accurate estimation of historical data related to uncertain factors in the network/market. Relying solely on this approach can pose significant risks. For instance, improper overbooking rates and trading prices can lead to unsatisfactory trading experiences and economic losses.

Inspired by the above discussions, we integrate both pre- and real-time decision-making processes to develop a novel two-stage double auction mechanism for resource provisioning in dynamic and unpredictable edge networks. We also leverage the strategic advantage of resource overbooking to optimize performance under uncertainty.

## 1.2 Literature Investigation and Key Challenges

Numerous studies have investigated auction-promoted resource sharing in edge networks. *L. B. Ma et al.* [11] proposed a truthful combinatorial double auction mechanism to achieve efficiency and fairness by adapting to the local connectivity and resource constraints of edge servers and mobile devices. *X. Chen et al.* [12] introduced a double auction that integrates spectrum allocation and data routing, addressing both computing and network resource trading problems to guarantee quality of service (QoS). *M. Wei et al.* [13] studied a blockchain-based architecture for UAV-assisted MEC on security/privacy enhancement, while solving a joint optimization problem in maximizing task completion rates and social welfare. *M. Dai et al.* [14] presented an incentive-oriented two-tier task offloading scheme for marine edge computing networks using a hybrid Stackelberg-auction game approach, to maximize utilities of marine wireless devices, while improving efficiency. *L. Zhang et al.* [15] focused on optimizing both the overlooked aspects of mobile user mobility during task scheduling and profit allocation during competitive resource distribution. *A. Samanta et al.* [16] proposed a double auction mechanism to encourage heterogeneous mobile devices to join MEC services. *N. Qi et al.* [17] introduced a group-buying coalition auction that motivates sensors to form coalitions for bidding on UAV data collection services. *Y. Du et al.* [18]

investigated a mixed double auction and matching mechanism using smart contracts, automating and enhancing transactions among network entities. *Y. -Y. Shih et al.* [19] established a multi-market trading framework that merges double auction and a market selection game, engaging resource providers in multiple auctions and strategically select their interested markets. *Y. Zhang et al.* [20] studied a transfer scheme for wireless computing power networks that leverages the Shapley value and a double auction to address the dynamic nature of edge resource demands.

Although the aforementioned works have made notable efforts and contributions, they primarily focus on on-site double auctions, where decisions rely on current network/market conditions, while overlooking the overhead caused by the complex auction process. For instance, determining winning seller-buyer pairs and trading prices often requires multiple rounds of bargaining and negotiation. This process introduces excessive delays and thus energy costs, particularly when dealing with a large number of mobile and battery-constrained devices. Additionally, existing studies typically assume certain resource supplies and demands, such as fixed resource availability from edge servers and consistent demands from mobile devices. However, these assumptions are impractical in real-world networks where dynamics and uncertainties prevail, such as the fluctuating resources of an edge server. These challenges call for designing time-efficient auctions to cope with ubiquitous network dynamics.

To this end, making decisions in advance to the practical trading process becomes a promising solution, as verified in our early studies such as [22] and [25]. Also, our previous findings indicate that resource overbooking can be an effective strategy for enhancing trading performance [21], [23], [24]. Nevertheless, this operation carries risks when uncertain factors, such as dynamic resource supply and demand, and wireless communication conditions, are inaccurately assessed. These drawbacks can result in an unsatisfactory resource trading experience, including undesired utility for sellers and buyers, unreasonable trading prices, and the failure of mobile applications.

Driven by the above discussions, this paper explores a novel stagewise double auction methodology in dynamic and uncertain edge networks, which combines pre-decisions and real-time decisions into a two-stage process for resource trading. To make this consideration implementable, we are confronting the following key challenges:

- *Double auctions typically have inherent properties*, such as truthfulness and individual rationality. Maintaining these properties while designing the two-stage double auction presents a significant challenge. For example, it requires careful consideration on factors such as price determination during the pre-auction process.
- *An unique aspect of our studied auction is to determine an appropriate overbooking rate.* A low overbooking rate can limit the effectiveness of pre-made decisions in managing dynamic resource demands, while a large one can result in insufficient resource supply. Therefore, integrating overbooking into a double auction and determining proper rate remains a noteworthy challenge.
- *The adaptation and scalability of a double auction in dynamic and uncertain network environments are crucial.* The inherently

dynamic and unpredictable nature of real-world edge networks necessitates designing double auction mechanisms that are highly adaptable and scalable to effectively manage various uncertain factors.

### 1.3 Contributions

To the best of our knowledge, this paper makes the first attempt among the existing literature to design a stagewise double auction mechanism that facilitates resource trading between edge servers (as sellers) and mobile devices (as buyers), upon considering the dynamic and uncertain nature of edge networks. Our core principle is to maintain economic efficiency in resource trading, ensuring mutually beneficial outcomes for all parties involved, while fostering a truthful, individually rational, and risk-aware auction environment. Additionally, we aim to minimize overhead (e.g., delays) in decision-making, thereby facilitating a time-efficient auction process. More importantly, we introduce the concept of overbooking, and further demonstrating its effectiveness in handling dynamics. Key contributions are summarized below.

- Given the dynamic nature of edge networks, characterized by uncertain buyer participation and fluctuating resource supply from sellers, we propose a novel two-stage double auction methodology. This integrates a pre-double auction stage with overbooking (Stage I) and a real-time double auction stage as a backup (Stage II), with the goal of optimizing social welfare, ensuring time efficiency, while supporting essential auction properties.
- We first design an overbooking-driven pre-double auction (OPDAuction) implemented before future practical resource transactions. This approach incentivizes sellers and buyers to negotiate risk-aware, long-term trading contracts aimed at maximizing expected social welfare. Specifically, sellers are encouraged to overbook their services to account for potential buyer participation uncertainties. These contracts, comprising terms such as trading price, resource volume, and default clauses for breaches, can be directly implemented in actual transactions, thus reducing the problem's scale in the subsequent stage.
- Given that uncertainties can result in unsatisfactory service quality, such as sellers failing to deliver promised resources due to overbooking or buyers not receiving the resources they require, we subsequently design a real-time backup double auction (RBDAuction). This serves as a contingency plan to further enhance the practical realization of social welfare.
- Through both theoretical analysis and simulations, we demonstrate that our proposed two-stage double auction upholds essential properties, including truthfulness and individual rationality. Furthermore, extensive evaluations showcase strong performance across multiple dimensions, such as social welfare, time efficiency in auction decision-making, individual rationality, and truthfulness.

## 2 OVERVIEW

We are interested in a dynamic resource trading market over edge networks that involves three key parties: (i) multiple resource buyers denoted by  $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, \dots, b_n, \dots, b_{|\mathcal{B}|}\}$ , where each  $b_n \in \mathcal{B}$  periodically generates computation-intensive tasks [26], requiring edge resources for further

computing; (ii) multiple resource sellers (edge servers) represented by  $\mathcal{S} = \{s_1, \dots, s_m, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{S}|}\}$ , where each  $s_m \in \mathcal{S}$  owns a certain amount of resources that can serve buyers for certain fee; and (iii) a neutral auction platform, playing the role of a trustworthy auctioneer that coordinates resource trading among buyers and sellers. Note that in our model, resources are quantized, e.g., resource blocks (RBs), for analytical simplicity [27].

A *transaction* in our considered market refers to a trading event, in which a buyer can transfer its task to a seller for edge processing while paying for the obtained services, while a seller can serve multiple buyers simultaneously according to its resource supply. To characterize the uncertain and dynamic nature of resource supply and demand in a trading market, we introduce two key uncertainties. First, factors such as selfishness, willingness, and mobility of buyers can lead to their uncertain participation in auctions, causing fluctuating resource demand. For instance, a buyer may be absent from a transaction if they move out of the sellers' coverage. Second, the resource supply of sellers can change over time due to various factors such as local workloads that tie up resources, thereby affecting the *availability of resources* that can be sold to buyers.

Designing an efficient auction in such a dynamic market is both critical and challenging. To address these dynamics and ensure timely resource provisioning, we develop a novel double auction methodology consisting of two stages: (i) *Stage I* stands for a pre-decision-making process, for which we develop an overbooking-driven pre-double auction (OPDAuction), allowing resources to be traded in advance to future practical transactions. By implementing such a pre-auction process, buyers and sellers are facilitated to bargain for and sign long-term contracts while controlling potential risks they may encounter during a practical transaction, by analyzing historical information of resource demand and supply. To distinguish, each buyer who wins in OPDAuction is named as a *member* of the corresponding seller. More importantly, Stage I introduces overbooking to address fluctuations in resource demand, acknowledging the possibility of buyer absenteeism in real transactions. This consideration motivates sellers to engage with a larger number of buyers than usual by permitting the volume of resources stipulated in contracts to surpass its theoretical capacity. To achieve this, the market endeavors to determine a viable overbooking rate, thereby aiding in the enhanced protection of sellers' profits. With OPDAuction, sellers and their members can directly fulfill pre-signed contracts without negotiate trading decisions (e.g., service price) during practical transactions. This can significantly relieve overhead such as delays in auction decision-making.

Nevertheless, OPDAuction can also impose risks such as inaccurate estimations between the current network/market conditions and historical statistics. We thus deploy (ii) *Stage II* as a complementary auction stage, which can be triggered during each practical transaction. In this stage, we explore a real-time backup double auction (RBDAuction) strategy as an auxiliary approach. This approach engage non-member buyers (referred to as "*guests*" for clarity) and *volunteers* (members who have not received their promised resources due to resource shortage) in competing for the remaining available resources, by leveraging up-to-date

network/market information. Specifically, RBDAuction enables a prompt auction process that enhances the practical system efficiency (e.g., social welfare).

## 2.1 Key Definition

In the following, we will cover the unique definitions in our auction design.

**Definition 1.** (*Member and Guest*): Buyers who have signed long-term contracts with sellers in Stage I are called members; while those who without contracts and will be engaged in Stage II are named as guests.

**Definition 2.** (*Volunteer*): A volunteer is a member who participates in a transaction but fails to obtain the required resources stipulated in the pre-signed contract. As compensation, each volunteer receives a monetary incentive from the corresponding seller, and will compete with guests for available resources.

The aforementioned member, guest, and volunteer constitute the most critical personas regarding buyers in the considered market. Following this, we next detail crucial auction properties.

**Definition 3.** (*Individual rationality*): An auction is individual rational if the expense of any winning buyer (paid to a seller) does not exceed its bid; while the income of any winning seller can cover its asked payment.

**Definition 4.** (*Truthfulness*): An auction is truthful (or incentive compatible) when all the buyers and sellers declare the bids and asked payments same as their true (private) valuations. Namely, participants will not misreport their information.

**Definition 5.** (*Budget-balance*): An auction achieves budget-balance if the overall income of the auctioneer from winning buyers can be larger than or at least equal to the total expense that it pays to winning sellers.

**Definition 6.** (*Computational efficiency*): A mechanism is computationally efficient if it runs in polynomial time.

Our two-stage double auction aims to support the above key properties from unique perspectives (see Section 3.2.2). Besides, as a distinctive feature of our auction design, we then introduce the concept of overbooking rate, representing an innovative consideration to enhance resource provisioning in dynamic trading markets.

**Definition 7.** (*Overbooking rate*): As the actual available resources (denoted by  $R_m$  for analyzing simplicity) of seller  $s_m$  is challenging to be evaluated during stage I, we consider its expected value denoted as  $\overline{R}_m$  to quantify the theoretical resource supply. Accordingly, the overbooking rate of  $s_m$  (denoted by  $\lambda_m$ ) indicates the ratio of the amounts of booked resources  $t$  (e.g., the overall contractual resources) to its expected resource supply, as calculated by  $\lambda_m = \max \left\{ 0, \frac{t - \overline{R}_m}{R_m} \right\}^1$ .

1. In our designed market, overbooking represents a fundamental policy where all the sellers use the same overbooking rate to maintain the market law. Different overbooking rates among various sellers and their optimization will be studied in our future work.

## 3 STAGE I. OVERBOOKING-DRIVEN PRE-DOUBLE AUCTION (OPDAUCTION)

We first delve into the overbooking-enabled pre-double auction (OPDAuction) scheme that facilitates early agreements on resource trading between buyers and sellers, prior to future transactions. Specifically, OPDAuction focuses on identifying suitable members for sellers and establishing their long-term contracts.

### 3.1 Key Modeling

#### 3.1.1 Modeling of long-term contract

The long-term contract  $\mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s}$  between buyer  $b_n$  and seller  $s_m$  in stage I is modeled by a 5-tuple  $\mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s} = \{t_n, p_n^b, r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}\}$ , where  $t_n$  represents the amount of trading resources (quantized by RBs for analytical simplicity);  $p_n^b$  indicates the unit payment (per RB) from  $b_n$  to the contractual seller;  $r_m^s$  is the unit reward (per RB) of  $s_m$  for offering services;  $q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$  and  $q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}$  describe the default clause, referring to the unit penalty (per RB) when  $b_n$  and  $s_m$  breaks the contract, respectively. For example, when buyer  $b_n$  is absent from a transaction and will not purchase the preserved resources, it has to pay a penalty (e.g.,  $q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$ ) to seller  $s_m$ . Similarly, the limited resource supply of sellers can also result in failures to afford promissory computing services, causing possible compensations (e.g.,  $q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}$ ) to buyers. Our proposed OPDAuction in Stage I makes efforts to maximize the expectation of social welfare, e.g., the overall expected profit of all the three parties (see Section 3.2.2), by mapping buyers to feasible sellers while optimizing their contract terms as well as a proper overbooking rate.

#### 3.1.2 Modeling of buyers

Considering multiple resource buyers collected in set  $\mathcal{B}$ , where each  $b_n \in \mathcal{B}$  is described by a 4-tuple  $b_n = \{t_n, v_{m,n}, bid_{m,n}, \alpha_n\}$ . Specifically,  $t_n$  denotes its required resources;  $v_{m,n}$  represents the unit valuation (per RB) of  $b_n$  as benefited from enjoying computing service offered by  $s_m$ , which varies across different sellers due to heterogeneous attributes of edge servers, e.g., hardware settings. Specifically,  $v_{m,n}$  is a privacy information of  $b_n$ , unknown to neither sellers nor the auctioneer. Besides,  $bid_{m,n}$  refers to the unit price (per RB) that  $b_n$  is willing to afford to  $s_m$ . To capture the random nature of edge networks, buyers in our model are assumed to be non-independent identically distributed (non-iid), for which we adopt random variable  $\alpha_n$  as one of the key dynamic factors in describing the uncertain participation of  $b_n$ . Specifically,  $\alpha_n$  is supposed to obey a Bernoulli distribution denoted by  $\alpha_n \sim \mathbf{Ber} \{(1, 0), (\mathfrak{a}_n, 1 - \mathfrak{a}_n)\}$ , where  $\alpha_n = 1$  at probability  $\mathfrak{a}_n$ , indicating that  $b_n$  attends a practical transaction; while  $\alpha_n = 0$  at probability  $1 - \mathfrak{a}_n$ , otherwise. Note that different buyers can have different values of  $\mathfrak{a}_n$  to capture their diverse behaviors.

To facilitate our analysis, let  $x_{m,n}$  represent the assignment between buyers and sellers, where  $x_{m,n} = 1$  indicates that buyer  $b_n$  wins the service of seller  $s_m$  in OPDAuction and thus becomes a member; while  $x_{m,n} = 0$ , otherwise. We then use  $\mathbf{X} = \{x_{m,n} | b_n \in \mathcal{B}, s_m \in \mathcal{S}\}$  to denote the profile of  $x_{m,n}$  for notational simplicity.

**1) Utility and expected utility of  $b_n$ :** The utility of a buyer  $b_n \in \mathcal{B}$  is denoted by  $U_n^B(t_n, p_n^b, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})$ , which comprises three key aspects: (i) The profit that  $b_n$  receives from enjoying computing service offered by  $s_m$ , (ii) The compensation that  $b_n$  obtains from the contractual seller  $s_m$  for being selected as a volunteer, and (iii) The penalty that  $b_n$  pays to the seller when it breaks the contract (e.g.,  $\alpha_n = 0$ ). Correspondingly, the utility of  $b_n$  can be calculated as

$$U_n^B(t_n, p_n^b, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) = \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n (v_{m,n} - p_n^b) + (1 - M_n) q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) - \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n (1 - \alpha_n) q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, \quad (1)$$

where  $p_n^b$  is the unit payment of  $b_n$ ; and  $M_n$  denotes a binary variable for volunteers. Specifically, we have  $M_n = 1$  at probability  $1 - \mathbb{P}_n$ , describing that buyer  $b_n$  attends a practical transaction and enjoys computing service from  $s_m$ ; while  $M_n = 0$  at probability  $\mathbb{P}_n$  depicts that  $b_n$  is selected as a volunteer (derivation of  $\mathbb{P}_n$  is given by (5)). Let  $\mathbf{M} = \{M_1, \dots, M_n, \dots, M_{|\mathcal{B}|}\}$  be the profile of  $M_n$  for notational simplicity.

Since OPDAuction is implemented before practical transactions, obtaining the practical value of  $U_n^B$  is challenging due to the uncertain value of  $\alpha_n$ , we accordingly calculate its expectation as

$$\overline{U_n^B}(t_n, p_n^b, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) = \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n \mathfrak{a}_n ((1 - \mathbb{P}_n) (v_{m,n} - p_n^b) + \mathbb{P}_n q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) - \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n (1 - \mathfrak{a}_n) q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}. \quad (2)$$

**2) Risk analysis of  $b_n$ :** Given that our considered trading market encompasses both profits (e.g., positive utility for buyers) and risks, we evaluate two key risks that each buyer may encounter during a transaction. First, we define the risk of a member  $b_n$  (not a volunteer) experiencing a non-positive utility, abbreviated as "BRisk", as the probability that  $b_n$ 's utility falls too close to or below its acceptable minimum threshold  $U^{\min}$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk}(t_n, p_n^b, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}) = \Pr \left( \frac{t_n (\alpha_n (v_{m,n} - p_n^b) - (1 - \alpha_n) q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s})}{U^{\min}} \leq \xi_1 \right) = \begin{cases} 0, \mathfrak{c}_1 < 0 \\ 1 - \mathfrak{a}_n, 0 \leq \mathfrak{c}_1 < 1 \\ 1, 1 \leq \mathfrak{c}_1 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $U^{\min}$  is a positive value approaching to zero,  $\xi_1$  denotes a positive threshold coefficient, and  $\mathfrak{c}_1 = \frac{U^{\min} \xi_1 + q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}}{t_n - v_{m,n} + q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s} - p_n^b}$  represents a constant for notational simplicity. Derivation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk}$  is detailed in Appendix C. Then, the implementation of resource overbooking may force some members to take on volunteer roles and forgo access to edge services. Although these buyers can be compensated, this arrangement might lead to a less favorable trading

experience for them. Therefore, we also consider the risk of a member being selected as a volunteer, referred to as "VRisk", during an actual transaction (see (4)). This risk is defined as the probability that a member  $b_n$  participates in a transaction but is chosen as a volunteer owing to the insufficient resources of its contractual seller.

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk} = \Pr \left( t_n - \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( \mathfrak{d}_m \mathfrak{r}_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \mathfrak{a}_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) \geq 0, \alpha_n = 1 \right) = \mathfrak{a}_n \mathbb{P}_n \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}^- = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{b_n\}$  denotes the set of buyers excluding  $b_n$ . Moreover, we have  $\mathbb{P}_n$  as the following (5).

$$\mathbb{P}_n = 1 - \frac{\sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} (\mathfrak{d}_m \mathfrak{r}_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \mathfrak{a}_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'})}{t_n} \quad (5)$$

Apparently, a large value of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk}$  indicates an increased likelihood of the buyer  $b_n$  chosen as a volunteer, which negatively impacts their trading experience. Parameters  $\mathfrak{d}_m$  and  $\mathfrak{r}_m$  associated with  $s_m$  will be elaborated in the following section, and the detailed derivation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk}$  is provided in Appendix C.

### 3.1.3 Modeling of sellers

A seller  $s_m \in \mathcal{S}$  is denoted by a triple  $s_m = \{c_m, \text{ask}_m, R_m\}$ , where  $c_m$  represents the unit cost (per RB) for processing buyers' tasks, e.g., consumed energy and hardware cost, which is a private information of  $s_m$ ; while  $\text{ask}_m$  denotes the unit price (per RB) asked by  $s_m$  for providing services. Given that the actual resource supply can vary over time, we use  $R_m$  to quantify the number of available resources that  $s_m$  can offer during each transaction. Without loss of generality,  $R_m$  is modeled as a random variable obeying a Binomial distribution denoted by  $R_m \sim \mathbf{Bin}(\mathfrak{d}_m, \mathfrak{r}_m)$  with parameters  $\mathfrak{d}_m$  and  $\mathfrak{r}_m$ , where  $\Pr\{R_m = k\} = \mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_m}^k \mathfrak{r}_m^k (1 - \mathfrak{r}_m)^{\mathfrak{d}_m - k}$ . Specifically,  $\mathfrak{r}_m$  represents the probability that one RB is available, while  $1 - \mathfrak{r}_m$ , otherwise.

**1) Utility and expected Utility of  $s_m$ :** The utility of seller  $s_m \in \mathcal{S}$  involves two key aspects: (i) the income obtained from members (not volunteers), e.g., the payment from attendant members and the penalty of absent members; and (ii) the compensation from  $s_m$  to volunteers. Accordingly, the utility of  $s_m$  is expressed as:

$$U_m^S(r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) = \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n (r_m^s - c_m) - (1 - M_n) q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b}) + \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n (1 - \alpha_n) q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, \quad (6)$$

where  $r_m^s$  denotes the unit reward (per RB) that  $s_m$  obtains for offering services. Similar to buyers, since it is challenging to ascertain the practical value of  $U_m^S$  during the first stage,

we therefore compute its expected value as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{U_m^S} & \left( r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b} \right) = \\ & \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n \mathfrak{a}_n \left( (1 - \mathbb{P}_n) (r_m^s - c_m) - \mathbb{P}_n q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b} \right) \\ & + \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n (1 - \mathfrak{a}_n) q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

**2) Risk analysis of  $s_m$ :** Our OPDAuction is also designed to be risk-aware for sellers. Accordingly, we define the risk of  $s_m$  receiving an unsatisfactory utility (abbreviated to "SRisk") as the probability that  $U_m^S(r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})$  approaches too close or falls below its expectation, shown as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} & \left( r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b} \right) \\ & = \Pr \left( \frac{U_m^S(r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})}{\overline{U_m^S}(r_m^s, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}, q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})} \leq \xi_2 \right) \\ & = 1 - \frac{\sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n \mathfrak{a}_n \left( (1 - \mathbb{P}_n) \mathfrak{c}_2 - \mathfrak{c}_3 \right)}{\mathfrak{c}_4} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\xi_2$  represents a positive threshold coefficient approaching to 1. Also, we use constants  $\mathfrak{c}_2 = (r_m^s - c_m + q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{c}_3 = q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b} + q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$ , and  $\mathfrak{c}_4 = \overline{U_m^S} \xi_2 - \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$  to simplify the complicated calculations associated with (8), for notational simplicity. Derivation of  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  is detailed in Appendix C.

### 3.1.4 Modeling of the auctioneer

An auctioneer plays a pivotal role in coordinating the auction process, including collecting bids/asks, determining winning sellers/members, designing long-term contracts, and optimizing the overbooking rate. The utility of the auctioneer in Stage I can generally be defined as the difference between the total income received of sellers and the total expenses paid from buyers, as expressed by:

$$\begin{aligned} U^P & \left( p_n^b, r_m^s \right) = \\ & \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n \left( \alpha_n M_n + \mu (1 - \alpha_n) \right) \left( p_n^b - r_m^s \right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the  $\mu$  in (9) represents a penalty factor, intentionally introduced for buyers and sellers. Regarding the penalties specified in long-term contracts, we have the following considerations: We set a penalty factor,  $\mu$ , whose value ranges between 0 and 1. Similarly, we further show the expected utility of the auctioneer as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{U^P} & \left( p_n^b, r_m^s \right) = \\ & \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n \left( \mathfrak{a}_n (1 - \mathbb{P}_n) + 1/2 (1 - \mathfrak{a}_n) \right) \left( p_n^b - r_m^s \right) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In subsequent sections, our algorithm design will systematically ensure that the auctioneer's income remains nonnegative (also see Appendix B). Therefore, we will not address the associated risks for the auctioneer in detail.

## 3.2 Design of OPDAuction

This section details problem formulation and solution design of OPDAuction in Stage I.

### 3.2.1 Problem formulation

A fundamental and critical goal within an auction market is to maximize its social welfare. In our model, social welfare is defined by the collective utilities of three parties (e.g., buyers, sellers, auctioneer), as given by:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{SW} & = \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} U_n^B + \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} U_m^S + U^P \\ & = \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \alpha_n M_n t_n (v_{m,n} - c_m) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Interestingly, since our proposed OPDAuction implements a unique auction procedure prior to actual transactions, our emphasis during this stage relies on the expectation of social welfare, as illustrated by (12).

$$\overline{U^{SW}} = \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \mathfrak{a}_n t_n (1 - \mathbb{P}_n) (v_{m,n} - c_m) \quad (12)$$

In this context, the primary goal of OPDAuction is to *identify the winning pairs of sellers and buyers (i.e., determining the members for each seller, which involves figuring out all the feasible  $x_{m,n}$ ), establish their long-term contracts (e.g.,  $\mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s}$ ), and determine the appropriate overbooking rate (e.g.,  $\lambda_m$ )*. These issues are encapsulated in the following optimization problem  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , given by (13).

$$\mathcal{F}_1 : \operatorname{argmax}_{x_{m,n}, \mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s}, \lambda_m} \overline{U^{SW}} \quad (13)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk} \leq \xi^M, \forall b_n \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (C1)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk} \leq \xi^V, \forall b_n \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (C2)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} \leq \xi^S, \forall s_m \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (C3)$$

$$\sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n \leq (1 + \lambda_m) \overline{R}_m, \forall s_m \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (C4)$$

$$\sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \leq 1, \forall b_n \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (C5)$$

$$x_{m,n} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall b_n \in \mathcal{B}, \forall s_m \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (C6)$$

where  $\xi^M$ ,  $\xi^V$ , and  $\xi^S$  represent positive threshold coefficients related to risk assessment, while the corresponding constraints (C1)-(C3) are designed to manage risks for both buyers and sellers. Constraint (C4) guarantees that the volume of overbooked resources does not surpass the anticipated resource supply. Constraint (C5) specifies that each buyer can be mapped to only one seller, whereas constraint (C6) confirms the binary nature of  $x_{m,n}$ . Apparently,  $\mathcal{F}_1$  represents a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) problem with discrete unknowns (e.g.,  $x_{m,n}$ ) and continuous unknowns (e.g., items in  $\mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s}$  and  $\lambda_m$ ), which is generally NP-hard [28]. More importantly, the probabilistic constraints regarding risks (i.e., (C1)-(C3)) can add further complexity to the problem, presenting significant challenges in solving  $\mathcal{F}_1$ . To tackle such a complex optimization, we explore an effective solution called OPDAuction in the following, to identify viable matchings between buyers and sellers, i.e., determine members for each seller and their respective contract terms (e.g., payment and penalties). Furthermore, to mitigate potential losses for participants (such as incurring penalties for breaking contracts) against market dynamics, our OPDAuction also fine-tunes the overbooking

rate to enable better expected social welfare.

### 3.2.2 Solution design

The proposed OPDAuction in Stage I is characterized as sealed-bid, private, and free from collusion, meaning that all the sellers and buyers will submit their asks and bids under a sealed manner to the auctioneer simultaneously. Specifically, we delve into three crucial sub-problems, including:  $\mathcal{F}_{1a}$  that addresses the member selection problem for each edge server, namely, winning seller-buyer determination;  $\mathcal{F}_{1b}$  that refers to long-term contract design; and  $\mathcal{F}_{1c}$  that aims to optimize the overbooking rate. Specifically, problems  $\mathcal{F}_{1a}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{1b}$  focus on finding a feasible assignment between diverse buyers and sellers, along with establishing their contract terms (such as payment and penalties) to facilitate future resource trading. Meanwhile,  $\mathcal{F}_{1c}$  copes with the dynamic and uncertain nature of resource demand/supply, enabling each seller to reserve more resources for members than its theoretical supply.

To achieve better analysis, we begin by an overview of how OPDAuction operates in the considered market, as shown in Fig. 1. Following this, the strategies for tackling the three subproblems mentioned earlier are detailed in Algorithms 1-3, respectively. Specifically, subproblems  $\mathcal{F}_{1a}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{1b}$  are addressed by Algorithms 1 and 2, respectively, while Algorithm 3 handles subproblem  $\mathcal{F}_{1c}$  by testing various overbooking rates, ultimately bring the decision of feasible long-term contracts. In the following, we delve into




Fig. 1. Flow diagram of OPDAuction.

how we address the aforementioned sub-problems.

• **Member determination (Algorithm 1):** Member determination represents a key feature of our OPDAuction, which is abbreviated as OPDAuction-MemberD for notational simplicity, shown in Algorithm 1. It aims to achieve feasible mappings between buyers and sellers, thereby supporting the signing of long-term contracts between them.

To bridging between resource supply and demand, it is essential to firstly reorder both buyers and sellers according to their asks<sup>2</sup> and the bids. Given that each buyer can offer different bids for various sellers, we organize buyers in list  $\mathcal{L}_b$  by following a non-ascending order of the average value of their bids (line 5), calculated by (14).

$$Mbid_{n'} = \frac{\sum_{s_{m'} \in \mathcal{S}} bid_{m',n'}}{|\mathcal{S}|}, \quad (14)$$

2. In the context of a double auction, the term “ask” refers to the price requested by a seller for their offered services, as commonly used in existing literature, which signifies the payment amount a seller seeks to receive. To streamline the expressions, we adopt the term “ask” as a noun to denote the asked price or payment requested by resource sellers, a convention also supported by existing works [29].

while the list  $\mathcal{L}_b$  of buyers can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{L}_b = \{(k_b, b_{n'}, Mbid_{n'}) | b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}, \text{non-ascending on } Mbid_{n'}\} \quad (15)$$

To capture the position of different buyers in list  $\mathcal{L}_b$ , we utilize a notation  $k_b$  to indicate the index of each specific buyer in  $\mathcal{L}_b$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{L}_b(k_b)$  refer to the buyer corresponding to index  $k_b$  in list  $\mathcal{L}_b$ , and  $Lbid_{k_b}$  denote the average value of bid of the buyer  $\mathcal{L}_b(k_b)$ . Note that in  $\mathcal{L}_b$ , we have

$$Lbid_1 \succ Lbid_2 \succ \dots \succ Lbid_{|\mathcal{B}|} \quad (16)$$

Similarly, sellers are sorted in a non-descending order according to their asked prices (line 6), for which we introduce list  $\mathcal{L}_s$  as (17).

$$\mathcal{L}_s = \{(k_s, s_{m'}, ask_{m'}) | s_{m'} \in \mathcal{S}, \text{non-descending on } ask_{m'}\} \quad (17)$$

Here,  $k_s$  represents the new index of sellers in list  $\mathcal{L}_s$ . For better analysis, let  $\mathcal{L}_s(k_s)$  denote the seller corresponding to index  $k_s$  in list  $\mathcal{L}_s$ , and  $Lask_{k_s}$  be the asked price of seller  $\mathcal{L}_s(k_s)$ . Note that in  $\mathcal{L}_s$ , we have:

$$Lask_1 \prec Lask_2 \prec \dots \prec Lask_{|\mathcal{S}|} \quad (18)$$

where symbols “ $\succ$ ” and “ $\prec$ ” are used to indicate the order of elements within lists  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s$ . For instance, “ $\succ$ ” denotes that the element on left-hand side is positioned before that on its right-hand side in list  $\mathcal{L}_b$ , while “ $\prec$ ” indicates a similar relationship in list  $\mathcal{L}_s$ . To determine winning sellers and their members, the next crucial step is to find the key buyer and the key seller in given lists  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s$  (lines 7-18). To distinguish, we denote their corresponding indices as  $k_b^*$  (for the key buyer) and  $k_s^*$  (for the key seller), respectively. To maintain the property of budget balance, the values of  $k_b^*$  and  $k_s^*$  should satisfy the following two conditions:

$$Lbid_{k_b^*+1} \geq Lask_{k_s^*+1} \text{ and } Lbid_{k_b^*+2} < Lask_{k_s^*+2}, \quad (19)$$

$$Lbid_{k_b^*+1} \geq Lask_{k_s^*+1} \text{ and } (k_b^* + 1 = |\mathcal{B}| \text{ or } k_s^* + 1 = |\mathcal{S}|), \quad (20)$$

where (19) ensures that bids  $Lbid_1, Lbid_2, \dots, Lbid_{k_b^*+1}$  are sufficient to meet or exceed asks  $Lask_1, Lask_2, \dots, Lask_{k_s^*+1}$ , while  $Lask_{k_s^*+2}$  exceeds  $Lbid_{k_b^*+2}$ . This implies that the revenue of the winning seller will meet or exceed their asking prices. When  $\mathcal{L}_b(k_b^* + 1)$  refers to the last buyer in  $\mathcal{L}_b$ , or  $\mathcal{L}_s(k_s^* + 1)$  is the last seller in  $\mathcal{L}_s$ , this indicates a continuous pricing structure without any pivot points. Consequently, we define the index of the last buyer/seller in these lists as the pivotal index, detailed by condition (20).

Recall that  $\mathcal{F}_1$  aims to maximize the expected value of social welfare, which involves aggregating the difference between profits gained by members and the costs incurred by successful sellers. An equivalent alternative consideration is to maximize the number of successful seller-buyer pairs, i.e., determining as many members for sellers as possible while keeping risks within acceptable limits, with the aim of effectively increasing the expected social welfare. To achieve such a goal, our proposed OPDAuction-MemberD given in Algorithm 1 is structured around three key phases. First, we start with generating lists  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s$  (Phase 1, lines 4-5). According to the given lists, in Phase 2, we consider buyers

from indexes  $k_b = (|\mathcal{B}| - 1)$  to  $k_b = 1$  (line 8). Suppose that  $n'$  and  $m'$  denote two constant indices, if  $\mathcal{L}_b(n')$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  satisfy conditions (19) and (20), OPDAuction-MemberD assesses the resource capacity of the first  $m'$  sellers and determines the maximum number of buyers that can be accommodated by these sellers (lines 12-18). Notably, the resource capacity does not necessarily have to match the number of winning buyers, as this step may not guarantee the property of truthfulness. When OPDAuction-MemberD finds better values of  $k_b^*$  and  $k_s^*$  that enable a larger number of winning buyer-seller pairs, it updates  $MaxNumB$ ,  $k_b^*$ , and  $k_s^*$  accordingly, where  $MaxNumB$  denotes the number of buyers that selected sellers can serve (lines 15-17).

When coming to buyer-seller matching (Phase 3, lines 18-32), our proposed OPDAuction-MemberD considers only the top  $k_b^*$  buyers in  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and the top  $k_s^*$  sellers in  $\mathcal{L}_s$  (lines 21-23). Such a consideration can support the property of budget-balance, ensuring that the auctioneer will not incur a deficit. Then, we focus on selecting the optimal group of members for each seller to maximize the expectation of social welfare. This can be formulated as a 0-1 knapsack problem and effectively solved by using dynamic programming [30] (lines 24-27). Specifically, we start with creating an empty matrix  $U$  to record the difference between buyers' bids and sellers' asks. Then, according to  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s$ , we methodically compile the essential elements required for a 0-1 knapsack problem (01KP), including: (i) for each seller, we denote  $h_m$  as the amount of available RBs after overbooking, serving as the capacity of the knapsack (line 20); (ii) from matrix  $U$ , a set of buyers can be selected, with the optimal selection among them determined by solving 01KP. This is aimed at maximizing the profit for seller  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$ ; (iii) we use the respective number of RBs required by each buyer as the weight array  $v$  in the 01KP (line 25); and (iv) the bids from buyers for  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  are considered as the values  $w$  of items in 01KP, which is then resolved through dynamic programming (line 26).

For buyers who have not been selected in this round for  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$ , their bids to sellers in  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  are set to zero. This adjustment signifies that their maximum bid in their respective bid lists is disregarded, and the second-highest value in the original bid list is promoted to become the new maximum one. Such an operation ensures that these non-selected buyers are still able to participate in auctions conducted by other sellers, maintaining their engagement in the auction process without being prematurely excluded. Then, to support individual rationality, the selected buyer  $\mathcal{L}_b(n')$  compares its bid ( $bid_{m',n'}$ ) for seller  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  with the mean bid ( $Mbid_{n'}$ ) of its bid array. If  $bid_{m',n'}$  is greater than  $Lbid_{n'}$ , the matching between  $b_{n'}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  is considered to be successful. Subsequently, the seller deducts the volume of the buyer's task from their available resources. Once the seller's resources are fully allocated, they conclude their participation in the auction. This ensures that transactions are mutually beneficial and adhere to the principles of individual rationality, preventing sellers from accepting bids that are too low, and buyers from paying more than their average bids.

The process described above continues iteratively until either all buyers have successfully reached agreements with sellers or all available resources have been allocated. This

enables the auction to adapt to fluctuations in resource supply and demand, thereby maximizing the number of successful matches between buyers and sellers within the constraints of available resources.

---

**Algorithm 1: OPDAuction-MemberD**


---

```

1 Input :  $\mathcal{B}, t_n, v_{m,n}, bid_{m,n}, \bar{a}_n, \mathcal{S}, c_m, ask_m, d_m, \mathbb{R}_m$ 
2 Output :  $X^*$ 
3 Initialization :  $Mbid_n \leftarrow mean(bid_{m,n}), MaxNumB \leftarrow 0, k_b^* \leftarrow 0, k_s^* \leftarrow 0, U_{m',n'} \leftarrow bid_{m',n'} - ask_{m'}, U \leftarrow [U_{1,1} \cdots U_{1,n'}; \cdots; U_{m',1} \cdots U_{m',n'}]$ 
4 # Phase 1: List generation
5 Generating lists  $\mathcal{L}_b$  and  $\mathcal{L}_s$ 
6 # Phase 2: Key index determination
7 for each  $n' = |\mathcal{B}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
8   for each  $m' = |\mathcal{S}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
9     if  $\overline{bid_{n'+1}} \geq ask_{m'+1}$  and  $(n' + 1 = |\mathcal{B}|$  or
10       $m' + 1 = |\mathcal{S}|$  or  $\overline{bid_{n'+2}} < ask_{m'+2})$  then
11        $R \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^{m'} \overline{R_k}, \forall s_k \in \mathcal{S}$ 
12       for each  $n'' = 1, \dots, n$  do
13          $R \leftarrow R - t_{n''}, \forall b_{n''} \in \mathcal{B}$ 
14         if  $R < 0$  then
15           if  $n' > MaxNumB + 1$  then
16              $MaxNumB \leftarrow n' - 1$ 
17              $k_b^* \leftarrow n' - 1, k_s^* \leftarrow m'$ 
18             break
19 # Phase 3: Buyer-Seller matching
20  $h_{m'} \leftarrow \overline{R_{m'}} \times (1 + \lambda_{m'})$ 
21 for each  $m' = k_s, \dots, 1$  do
22    $UMAX \leftarrow max(U)$ 
23   for each  $n' = k_b^*, \dots, 1$  do
24     if  $U_{m',n'} = UMAX_{n'}$  then
25        $v \leftarrow [v, t_{n'}]$ 
26        $w \leftarrow [w, bid_{m',n'}]$ 
27        $tt \leftarrow 01KP(c, v, w)$ 
28       for each  $n'' = k_b^*, \dots, 1$  do
29         if  $tt_{n''} = 0$  then
30            $U_{m',n''} \leftarrow 0$ 
31         else if  $\overline{bid_{m',n'}} \geq \overline{bid_{n'}}$  then
32            $X_{m',n'} \leftarrow 1$ 
33            $h_{m'} \leftarrow h_{m'} - t_{n'}$ 
34           Return  $X^*$ 

```

---

• **Long-term contract design (Algorithm 2):** For subproblem  $\mathcal{F}_{1b}$ , since each buyer  $b_{n'}$  has already identified its interested seller  $\mathcal{L}_s(m')$  through Algorithm 1, we develop OPDAuction-ContractD by borrowing the idea of binary search algorithm to finalize the payments made by winning buyers (members), as detailed in Algorithm 2. This approach simplifies the negotiation process, ensuring that contract terms (particularly payments related components) are efficiently and satisfactorily settled for both parties involved. At the beginning of Algorithm 2, we replace the value  $Lbid_{n'}$  used in Algorithm 1 for participation in the double auction sorting with  $bid_{m',n'}$  (lines 5-8). This adjustment ensures that the negotiation for long-term contracts reflects the genuine valuation for  $b_{n'}$  of service provided by  $s_{m'}$ , facilitating a more accurate and fair contract agreement. Subsequently, during the pricing process for  $b_{n'}$  in Algorithm 2, it consistently uses the actual bids  $bid_{m',n'}$  as the



sorting criterion for the double auction. This step ensures that the buyer's payment can be calculated according to its true bid for matching the seller, thereby preparing to guarantee the buyer's truthfulness.

Note that our designed OPDAuction-ContractD only considers the winning buyers (lines 6-15). For each winner with index  $b_{n'} \in \mathcal{L}_b$ , the lower bound is set as  $Lbid_{k_b+1}$  while the upper bound is set by  $Lbid_{n'}$  (line 8). This is due to a key criterion: the final price paid by the winning buyer should not be lower than the seller's asking price nor higher than the buyer's initial bid. Then, our OPDAuction-ContractD leverages the binary search algorithm [29] to identify the minimum acceptable price within the range of lower- and upper-bound prices that can make a buyer to win (lines 9-15). This process efficiently narrows down the optimal price point that satisfies both the buyer's and seller's constraints. Afterwards, OPDAuction-ContractD also addresses the pricing process for winning sellers (lines 17-19), which parallels the methodology applied to buyers. Nonetheless, when the pricing determination condition is satisfied, the algorithm sets the lower bound  $low = ask_{m'}$ . This operation ensures that sellers receive at least their asking price while simultaneously minimizing the costs for buyers. Ultimately, OPDAuction-ContractD concludes by returning the payment vectors for both buyers and sellers (line 20), summarizing the financial transactions to be made following the auction outcomes. Then, we use a similar method to set prices for sellers (lines 21-32), which will not be reiterated here.

- **Overbooking rate optimization (Algorithm 3):** Allowing overbooking represents an unique aspect in our considered auction market in handling dynamics in resource demand/supply. Establishing an appropriate overbooking rate is thus a key to facilitate a seamless and time-efficient double auction process. We then introduce how we figure out the overbooking rate by Algorithm 3, helping the market maintain operational efficiency and effectiveness, as well as meeting the needs of both buyers and sellers.

We first set up four matrixes,  $U^\#$ ,  $r$ ,  $p$ , and  $X^\#$  (line 4), to record the long-term contract terms by testing different overbooking rates. By gradually raising the overbooking rate (the increment is set at an unit rate), we input them into Algorithms 1-2, obtaining three types of risks under each overbooking rate (lines 6-10). The determination of the overbooking rate mainly considers factors  $a_n$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{m'}$ , while adhering to constraints imposed by risks  $\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$ . We define  $step$  as the incremental step size of overbooking rate (e.g.,  $step\%$ ). Firstly, remove the buyer-seller pairs that do not satisfy the risk constraints from the long-term contracts. The qualified contract terms are then recorded in matrices  $U^\#$ ,  $p$ ,  $r$ , and  $X^\#$  (lines 11-20). From  $U^\#$ , we search for the contract term that enables the largest expected social welfare (line 20). If multiple overbooking rates yield the same value of expected social welfare, the selection criteria then prioritize the rate that includes the largest number of successful matches between buyers and sellers. This final determination for long-term contracts (lines 21-23) aims to maximize participation and satisfaction within the market, ensuring that as many as possible participants can benefit from the auction outcomes. We adjust the value of overbooking rate and check their

---

**Algorithm 2: OPDAuction-ContractD**


---

```

1 Input :  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $t_n$ ,  $v_{m,n}$ ,  $bid_{m,n}$ ,  $a_n$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $c_m$ ,  $ask_m$ ,  $d_m$ ,  $\mathbb{I}_{m'}$ ,  $X^*$ 
2 Output :  $p^{b*}$ ,  $r^{s*}$ 
3 # Phase 1: Initialization
4  $p_{n'}^b \leftarrow 0$ ,  $r_{m'}^s \leftarrow 0$ 
5 for each  $n' = |\mathcal{B}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
6   for each  $m' = |\mathcal{S}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
7     if  $x_{m',n'} = 1$  then
8        $\overline{bid}_{n'} \leftarrow bid_{m',n'}$ 
9 # Phase 2: Buyer's payment determination
10 for each  $n' = |\mathcal{B}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
11   if  $\sum_{m' \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m',n'} = 1$  then
12      $high \leftarrow bid_{n'}$ ,  $low \leftarrow bid_{k_b^*+1}$ ,  $tmp \leftarrow bid_{n'}$ 
13     while  $low < high$  do
14        $bid_{n'} \leftarrow (high + low)/2$ 
15        $X^{Temp} \leftarrow \text{OPDAuction-MemberD}$ 
16       if  $\sum_{m' \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m',n'}^{Temp} = 1$  then
17          $high \leftarrow bid_{n'}$ 
18       else
19          $low \leftarrow bid_{n'}$ 
20          $p_{n'}^b \leftarrow bid_{n'}$ ,  $bid_{n'} \leftarrow tmp$ 
21 # Phase 3: Seller's reward determination
22 for each  $m' = |\mathcal{S}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
23   if  $\sum_{n' \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m',n'} = 1$  then
24      $high \leftarrow ask_{m'}$ ,  $low \leftarrow ask_{k_s^*+1}$ ,  $tmp \leftarrow ask_{m'}$ 
25     while  $low < high$  do
26        $ask_{m'} \leftarrow (high + low)/2$ 
27        $X^{Temp} \leftarrow \text{OPDAuction-MemberD}$ 
28       if  $\sum_{n' \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m',n'}^{Temp} = 1$  then
29          $low \leftarrow ask_{m'}$ 
30       else
31          $high \leftarrow ask_{m'}$ 
32          $r_{m'}^s \leftarrow ask_{m'}$ ,  $ask_{m'} \leftarrow tmp$ 
33 return  $p^{b*}$ ,  $r^{s*}$ .

```

---

impacts across various long-term contracts, where the best one can be chosen among them with the maximum expected value of social welfare. Finally, we can obtain the long-term contracts  $\mathbb{C}_{m,n}^{b \leftrightarrow s}$  in Stage I (line 24), which will be directly fulfilled during the next stage.

## 4 STAGE II. REALTIME BACKUP DOUBLE AUCTION (RBDAUCTION)

Given that our proposed OPDAuction in Stage I may encounter certain risks, we proceed to Stage II, which takes place during actual resource transactions. In this stage, members and their respective sellers fulfill their pre-signed contracts. This involves either utilizing and paying for edge services, or serving as volunteers in exchange for compensation (when a member is participated), or paying penalty when a member is absent. To further enhance practical social welfare, we encourage volunteers, guests, and sellers with surplus resources to participate in an additional double auction process, referred to as the RBDAuction. Apparently, RBDAuction, auction decisions of RBDAuction are based on the current network/market conditions, such as available

**Algorithm 3: OPDAuction-OverbookROpt**


---

```

1 Input :  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $t_n$ ,  $v_{m,n}$ ,  $bid_{m,n}$ ,  $a_n$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $c_m$ ,  $ask_m$ ,  $d_m$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_m$ 
2 Output :  $\mathbf{X}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^{b*}$ ,  $\mathbf{r}^{s*}$ ,  $\lambda^*$ 
3 # Phase 1: Initialization
4  $\mathbf{U}^\# \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $\mathbf{p} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^\# \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5 # Phase 2: Exhaustive overbooking rate analysis
6 for each  $k = 100, \dots, 1$  do
7    $\lambda \leftarrow k \times step\%$ 
8    $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \text{OPDAuction-MemberD}$ 
9    $[p^b, r^s] \leftarrow \text{OPDAuction-ContractD}$ 
10  get  $\mathcal{R}^{SRisk}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}^{BRisk}$ ,  $\mathcal{R}^{VRisk}$ 
11  for each  $m' = |\mathcal{S}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
12    if  $R_{m'}^{SRisk} > \xi^S$  then
13       $x_{m',n'} \leftarrow 0$ ,  $b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}$ 
14    else
15      for each  $n' = |\mathcal{B}| - 1, \dots, 1$  do
16        if  $R_{n'}^{BRisk} > \xi^B$  and  $R_{n'}^{VRisk} > \xi^V$  then
17           $x_{m',n'} \leftarrow 0$ 
18        else
19           $\mathbf{U}^\#_k = \mathbf{U}^\#_k + \mathbf{U}^\#_{m',n'}$ 
20           $\mathbf{p}(k) \leftarrow p^b$ ,  $\mathbf{r}(k) \leftarrow r^s$ ,  $\mathbf{X}^\#(k) \leftarrow \mathbf{X}$ ;
21 # Phase 3: Searching for the optimal overbooking
22 Rate
23  $MAXUSW \leftarrow \max(USW)$ 
24 if  $size(MAXU^\#) > 1$  then
25   find  $\maximize(\mathbf{X}^\#(k))$ ,  $\forall k \in \mathbf{X}^\#$ 
26    $\lambda \leftarrow \lambda(k)$ 
27    $\mathbf{X} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}^\#(k)$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^b \leftarrow \mathbf{p}(k)$ ,  $\mathbf{r}^s \leftarrow \mathbf{r}(k)$ 
28   return  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^b$ ,  $\mathbf{r}^s$ ,  $\lambda$ 
29 else if  $size(MAXU^\#) = 1$  then
30   return  $\mathbf{X}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{p}^{b*}$ ,  $\mathbf{r}^{s*}$ ,  $\lambda^*$  from  $MAXUSW$ .

```

---

resource supply and the presence of members and guests who actively attend (i.e.,  $\alpha_j = 1$ ).

In RBDAuction, we first filter out a matrix  $\mathbf{X}^{**}$  from the obtained  $\mathbf{X}^*$  during Stage I that records the seller-member pairs that have successfully completed resource transactions. Due to their dynamic participation, we consider a new set of buyers  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{\tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_j, \dots, \tilde{b}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}|}\}$ , which includes guests and volunteers. Also, we re-denote the set of sellers  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_i, \dots, \tilde{s}_{|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|}\}$ , consisting of sellers with remaining available resources. After completing the supplementary RBDAuction in Stage II, we can obtain new matching pairs as recorded in matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \{\tilde{x}_{i,j} | \tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}\}$ , where  $\tilde{x}_{i,j} = 1$  (or 0) indicates a partnership (or not) between  $\tilde{s}_i$  and  $\tilde{b}_j$  during each transaction. Apparently, matrices  $\mathbf{X}^{**}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ , and their corresponding monetary elements (e.g., price) collectively form the trading decision of our proposed RBDAuction.

Our proposed RBDAuction works for obtaining proper trading pairs between buyers with unmet resource demands and sellers with surplus resource supply, with the aim of maximizing the practical social welfare denoted by  $\tilde{U}^{SW}$ . Similar to Stage I, we formulate the optimization problem in Stage II as the following  $\mathcal{F}_2$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_2 : \arg \max_{\tilde{x}_{i,j}, \tilde{p}^b, \tilde{r}^s} \tilde{U}^{SW} \quad (21)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j \leq \tilde{R}_i, \forall \tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \quad (C7)$$

$$\sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \leq 1, \forall \tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \quad (C8)$$

$$\tilde{x}_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall \tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \forall \tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}. \quad (C9)$$

where  $\tilde{t}_j$  represents the resource block demand of buyer  $\tilde{b}_j$ , and  $\tilde{R}_i$  signifies the remaining idle resources of seller  $\tilde{s}_i$ . The variables and parameters such as  $\tilde{U}^{SW}$ ,  $\tilde{t}_j$ , and  $\tilde{R}_i$  mentioned above will be defined and modeled in Appendix A. Constraint (C7) restricts the remaining practical resources. Constraint (C8) shows that one buyer can only be matched to at most one seller, while constraint (C9) describes the binary nature of  $\tilde{x}_{i,j}$ .

To facilitate RBDAuction, we first determine the buyers who can be engaged in. Then, the winning seller-buyer determination and their pricing can be figured out by using similar algorithms to Algorithms 1-2 introduced in OPDAuction, to keep the consistency and fairness of the two stages. Thus, as constrained by limited space and to achieve a better readability, we omit their details here. Instead, we show the pseudo-code of RBDAuction as well as the detailed analysis in Appendix A. Also, proofs of key properties such as individual rationality, truthfulness, budget-balance, and computational efficiency of the proposed two-stage auction are provided by Appendix B.

## 5 EVALUATIONS

This section conducts comprehensive experiments to validate the performance of our proposed two-stage double auction (referred to as ‘‘TwoSAuction’’), using MATLAB 2022b, on a desktop equipped with a 12<sup>th</sup> Generation Intel(R) Core™ i5-12400 CPU.

### 5.1 Simulation Setup and Evaluation Metrics

Key parameters are considered by:  $|\mathcal{B}| \in [50, 100, 150, 200]$ ,  $t_n \in [0, 10]$ ,  $v_{m,n} \in [0, 10]$ ,  $a_n \in [50\%, 100\%]$ ,  $|\mathcal{S}| \in [10, 15, 20, 25]$ ,  $R_m \in [1, 100]$ ,  $r_m \in [0, 1]$ ,  $c_m \in [0, 10]$ ,  $\xi^S = \xi^B = \xi^V = 50\%$ . Notably, the probability of buyer participation (e.g.,  $a_n$ ) in our considered scenario is estimated by referencing real-world datasets of taxi trips in Chicago [31]. We consider a downtown intersection within the latitude range of 41.38°N to 41.40°N and the longitude range of 87.35°W to 87.33°W as our studied region. By analyzing the traffic patterns of different vehicles (as buyers) within this region at specific times each day, the probability of each buyer attending the market can be assessed [32]. Moreover, for default clauses, a penalty factor ( $\mu$ ) ranging from 0 to 1 is applied. For example, if a buyer fails to participate in a transaction, the matched seller receives compensation set at  $\mu r_m^s$ . Conversely, if the seller fails to provide promised resources, buyers volunteering to forgo services due to overbooking are compensated at  $\mu p_n^b$ . This structure ensures fairness, balancing the interests of both parties by addressing discrepancies between contractual commitments and transaction outcomes. To offer thorough evaluations, we also employ the following key metrics:

- *Social welfare (SW)*: This metric quantifies the collective utility of all participants involved in the auction, further reflecting the economic efficiency.
- *Time consumed by auction decision-making (TimeADM)*: This metric measures the time required to finalize the auction decisions, including identifying the winning seller-buyer pairs while determining trading prices. It is indicative of the time efficiency and practicality of the auction process.
- *Property Analysis*: This assessment verifies crucial design properties of an auction such as truthfulness and individual rationality, via simulations.

The above introduced metrics collectively provide a comprehensive view of the effectiveness of our TwoSAuction, offering insights into its practical implications, economic benefits, and adherence to theoretical principles. In the following, two aspects for performance evaluation are considered: (i) we first take into account conventional auctions as benchmarks (Section 5.2), establishing a basic understanding of how our TwoSAuction improves upon or differs from existing ones; and then, (ii) given that overbooking represents our distinctive feature in auction design, we conduct additional experiments to underscore its benefits (Section 5.3), involving involves comparing our methodology against other methods that do not permit overbooking, to highlight its advantages in managing market dynamics.

## 5.2 Performance Evaluation vs. General Auction methods

We first introduce the following comparative auction mechanisms as general benchmark methods:

- **Conventional real-time double auction (CRDAuction)**: CRDAuction embodies a prevalent approach in existing resource trading market, aiming to optimize the practical social welfare based on real-time network/market conditions.
- **Single-stage pre-double auction (SSPDAuction)**: SSPDAuction promotes the engagement of all sellers and buyers in long-term contracts, mitigating possible risks prior to future transactions without backup plans, i.e., implement Stage I only.
- **Value-raising-preferred auction (VRAuction)**: In VRAuction, buyers prioritize purchasing resources from sellers who offer higher unit values (e.g.,  $v_{m,n}$ ).
- **Cost-reduction-driven auction (CRAuction)**: In CRAuction, sellers prioritize serving buyers who enable lower unit service costs (e.g.,  $c_m$ ).
- **Resource supply-promoted auction (RSAuction)**: In RSAuction, buyers show a preference to sellers who possess a greater abundance of resources, seeking to ensure their resource demands (e.g.,  $d_m$ ).

Fig. 2(a) depicts the performance comparison of the average value of SW upon having different numbers of buyers and sellers over 300 experiments. As illustrated by Fig. 2(a), CRDAuction attains the highest average SW, since its auction decisions rely on the current network/market conditions (namely, no risk exists), which can reflect the optimum on SW. Fortunately, the performance of our TwoSAuction closely aligns with that of CRDAuction, although it occasionally falls slightly short compared to VRAuction. This disparity arises because VRAuction is inspired by greedy-based algorithms, thus enabling higher buyers' profits.




Fig. 2. Performance comparison on the average value of SW and TimeADM.

However, a significant limitation of VRAuction is its lack of bargaining, consequently undermining the assurance of essential principles like truthfulness and individual rationality, which are fundamental challenges in auction design. Their absence renders VRAuction impractical for real-world resource trading markets. Furthermore, our TwoSAuction significantly surpasses other benchmark methods such as SSPDAuction, CRAuction, and RSAuction, in terms of average SW. The key reasons are: SSPDAuction lacks backup plan provisions, making it challenging to manage potential risks effectively. Meanwhile, CRAuction and RSAuction focus primarily on cost and resource supply, respectively, hindering the ability of buyers to achieve significant profits.

As time efficiency represents one significant factor in dynamic mobile networks, we then conduct Fig. 2(b) to show the TimeADM during each practical transaction (estimated by the running time of MATLAB), upon having 300 experiments. To visually enlarge the gaps between various methods, we employ a logarithmic representation in Fig. 2(b), where we also exclude SSPDAuction since transactions are directly performed by following the long-term contracts, resulting in a TimeADM equals to zero. As shown in Fig. 2(b), CRDAuction requires much more time since it makes decisions according to the current network/market conditions, further resulting in poor time efficiency, especially when dealing with large-scale markets. Our TwoSAuction significantly outperforms CRDAuction, achieving a 76.8% reduction in TimeADM when considering 150 buyers and 25 sellers. This improvement is largely due to the carefully crafted OPDAuction, which eliminates the need for some sellers and buyers to engage in bargaining during actual transactions. This advantage becomes more distinct with an increasing number of participants, further highlighting our exceptional performance in enhancing time efficiency over dynamic networks. Although VRAuction, CRAuction, and RSAuction can reach a lower value of TimeADM due to the prohibition of bargaining among participants (negotiating trading prices), these methods fall short in supporting essential auction properties.

As truthfulness and individual rationality represent two key significant attributes of auctions, we then offer detailed analysis for both buyers and sellers via various problem sizes in Fig. 3 (which accordingly verify the theoretical proofs). Specifically, Fig. 3(a) contains 4 subplots upon having different problem sizes, where in each of which, we randomly select a buyer as an example without loss of generality. Also, the truthful bid of the buyer is highlighted by




Fig. 3. Property analysis on truthfulness: (a) truthfulness of buyers, (b) truthfulness of sellers. The numbers of buyers/sellers in each subplot are: 200/100 for (a1), 100/15 for (a2), 50/25 for (a3), 50/20 for (a4); and 200/10 for (b1), 50/25 for (b2), 200/15 for (b3), 200/20 for (b4).

red dot, and critical transaction price of a buyer (indicated as index  $k_b^*$ ) is represented by blue dot. Apparently, bids of buyers in our TwoSAuction reflect their true values, since misreporting will not bring them with high utilities. For example, a low bid may not meet the minimum transaction price, while a large one can lead to failures due to possible risks.

In Fig. 3(b) regarding sellers, critical transaction prices of sellers (indicated as index  $k_s^*$ ) are represented by blue dots, while the actual asking prices are depicted with red ones. Different from conventional auctions, Fig. 3(b) shows an interesting phenomenon. First, sellers positioned near the top of the list  $\mathcal{L}_s$  can have greater opportunities to contract with buyers. Then, since our TwoSAuction comprises two stages, a seller participating in both stages may set different prices. For example, in phase 3 of Algorithm 1, sellers are matched with buyers according to the ranking of their respective ask values. Sellers with lower ask values are given priority to match with buyers who have not yet made a contract. In other words, sellers with higher rankings have a greater opportunity to contract with as many buyers as possible. Thus, the order in  $\mathcal{L}_s$  leaves heavy impacts on sellers' final utility. Thus, in Fig. 3(b), apart from cases where a seller's asking price exceeds the critical price leading to direct auction failure, it often exhibits jagged fluctuations in seller's utility as the asking price gradually increases. However, these fluctuations are slight. Even if a seller manipulates its ask value by reporting a value lower than its actual ask, thereby improving its ranking in  $\mathcal{L}_s$  to access more unmatched buyers earlier, the final contracts depend on the compatibility between the seller's available resources and the demands of the remaining buyers (i.e., the result of solving a knapsack problem). Moreover, buyers matched through such a manipulated ask value may result in losses for the seller (i.e., negative utility), for which Algorithm 3 identifies as highly risky, prohibiting the seller from forming contracts under such conditions. Consequently, the list of buyers that the seller contracts with after misreporting its ask value is likely to differ only slightly from the list it would obtain by reporting the true value. Therefore, as shown in Fig. 3(b), the final utility obtained by a seller through misreporting its ask value exhibits only minor fluctuations compared to the utility it would achieve by participating with its true value. And we can still consider that sellers maintain a certain level of truthfulness. This phenomenon also represents one unique aspect brought by our consideration regarding the pre-auction and the

corresponding risks, differing our work with existing ones.




Fig. 4. Property analysis on individual rationality: (a) individual rationality of sellers, (b) individual rationality of buyers.

We next show the performance on individual rationality in Fig. 4, upon testing 10 sellers and 50 buyers. In particular, Fig. 4(a) illustrates the unit cost of sellers, in comparison with their received unit rewards in Stage I (named as "Seller reward I") and Stage II (named as "Seller reward II"), respectively. Note that if a seller fails in either stage, these three values persist at 0. Apparently, in Fig. 4(a), for a seller wins in either stage, its reward can always cover its corresponding cost, supporting individual rationality for sellers. In Fig. 4(b), the true valuations of buyers can always stay cover their payments, thus verifying the individual rationality of buyers. All in all, our proposed TwoSAuction exhibits superior performance in terms of SW and time efficiency in comparison to multiple representative benchmark methods, while maintaining key properties, offering a valuable reference for future resource provisioning in dynamic and uncertain network environments.

### 5.3 Performance Evaluation vs. Overbooking

Since this paper represents a first attempt to incorporate overbooking into auction design, we conduct an unique view to explore its potential benefits. Apart from the previously designed SSPDAuction method, we also involve the following methods as benchmarks:

- **TwoSAuction\_NoOB**: This auction applies our TwoSAuction without overbooking in Stage I.
- **SSPDAuction\_NoOB**: This method only considers a pre-double auction procedure without overbooking.

To highlight the benefits of overbooking on SW, we conduct simulations in Fig. 5(a) and Fig. 5(d), considering various problem scales and overbooking rates. As shown in Fig. 5(a), methods utilizing RBD Auction as a backup auction plan consistently achieve superior performance in SW as compared to others, owing to its robust design as an effective fallback option. Notably, overbooking enhances the performance of both our proposed TwoSAuction and SSPDAuction\_Only, demonstrating clear advantages over methods that do not incorporate overbooking. Fig. 5(d) examines the performance on SW under varying overbooking rates, ranging from 0% to 100% in increments of 1%, while keeping other variables unchanged. We also present the expected value of SW value based on the pre-signed contracts (see the curve called "Futures agreement"), serving as a benchmark for determining the optimal overbooking rate for our TwoSAuction. Specifically, the value of overbooking rate finally selected by our TwoSAuction is the value that




Fig. 5. In the first scenario, under a constant overbooking rate and varying user base size, the presence or absence of an overbooking policy impacts various metrics differently. In the second scenario, the effect of progressively increasing overbooking rates on these metrics is examined. The metrics analyzed in the figure, from left to right, are: social welfare, buyer utility, and seller utility. The labels on the x-axis represent different numbers of buyers/sellers, which are: 100/10 for (N1), 150/10 for (N2), 200/10 for (N3), 100/15 for (N4), 150/15 for (N5), 200/15 for (N6), 100/20 for (N7), 150/20 for (N8), 200/20 for (N9), 100/25 for (N10), 150/25 for (N11), 200/25 for (N12).

can maximize the expected social welfare of the trading market in Stage I. Particularly, the red circles in Fig. 5(d) highlight the maximum values of SW for different methods, where we can see that when overbooking rate is identified by 33%, we get the highest SW for our TwoSAuction. In addition, we can also observe that the value of average SW of our TwoSAuction sometimes remains relatively stable across different overbooking rates, e.g., from 0.8 to 0.9. This stability suggests that our designed backup auction in the second stage effectively utilizes available resources, ensuring favorable SW outcomes even in the absence of an overbooking policy.

We next conduct Figs. 5(b)-6(c) and Figs. 5(e)-6(f) to show how different overbooking rates can impact the utilities of buyers and sellers. Regarding buyers, as depicted in Fig. 5(b), overbooking can always bring benefits, upon testing different problem scales. Then, to show more details on how changing overbooking rates can affect buyers, we conduct Fig. 5(e), in which the red circles highlight the maximum values of the three curves. Also, a dashed vertical line has been added at value 0.33 on the x-axis, meaning that although the optimal overbooking rate of 33% fails to achieve the absolute maximum utility of a buyer, it stays very close to the maximum. This observation stands in stark contrast to the scenario without the overbooking (i.e., overbooking rate of 0%), highlighting its potential improvement in buyers' utility.

In Fig. 5(c), incorporating overbooking clearly offers benefits to sellers. This is further illustrated in Fig. 5(f), where the red circles mark the peak values of the three curves. However, since our primary objective is to optimize the value of SW, setting the overbooking rate to 33% in this example may not result in the highest possible utility for sellers. However, we can observe that the horizontal coordinates corresponding to the maximum values of all three curves fall within the range [0.2, 0.45], clustering

around 0.33. At this point, the values of all three curves remain higher than those observed without overbooking, underscoring the effectiveness of implementing an overbooking policy in resource trading markets. Moreover, the benefits to buyers and sellers from the second stage of our innovative two-stage auction method (i.e., RBD Auction) are evident. Compared to the two benchmarks with only Stage I, the inclusion of Stage II in our TwoSAuction results in relatively minor fluctuations in seller utility under varying overbooking policies. This highlights the supplementary effectiveness in improving user utility.




Fig. 6. (a) Analysis of time efficiency on a fixed overbooking rate 33%. (b) Analysis of time efficiency upon having different overbooking rates.

Fig. 6 illustrates the time efficiency impacted by overbooking, as reflected by average TimeADM. Given an overbooking rate (i.e., 33%), the time consumed by our TwoSAuction is significantly lower than that of TwoSAuction-NoOB. This improvement is attributed to the increased number of pre-signed contracts enabled by overbooking, which can be directly fulfilled during each transaction, thereby enhancing time efficiency. Fig. 6(b) presents the curve of TimeADM across various overbooking rates, with the red circle on the y-axis marking a rate of 33%. It is clear that a proper overbooking rate can significantly accelerate the auction process, promoting a time-efficient trading market.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper proposes a novel two-stage double auction to facilitate resource scheduling in dynamic edge networks. By integrating the concept of resource overbooking, our approach enhances both long-term as well as real-time cooperation between edge servers and mobile devices. A well-designed OPDAuction, driven by adaptive overbooking, allows for the establishment of long-term contracts between sellers and buyers, facilitating more efficient resource provisioning despite future uncertainties. Then, the RBD Auction, serving as an effective backup plan, addresses residual demand by dynamically adjusting to market changes, ensuring optimized resource allocation and improved social welfare. Extensive simulations have demonstrated that our two-stage double auction outperforms conventional auctions methods from different views, while maintaining crucial design properties such as truthfulness, individual rationality, and computational efficiency.

Our future research could explore refining the overbooking strategy to further mitigate the inherent risks associated with pre-auctions, thereby enhancing the overall robustness

and reliability. In addition, integrating machine learning techniques to predict and dynamically adapt to complex and fluctuating resource demand patterns could significantly improve the responsiveness and intelligence of resource scheduling. Moreover, a deeper investigation into multi-market and multi-resource scenarios would offer valuable insights into the scalability of the proposed framework, enabling its effective application to more sophisticated, real-world challenges in mobile edge computing environments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. R. Zema, E. Natalizio, L. Di Puglia Pugliese and F. Guerriero, "3D Trajectory Optimization for Multimission UAVs in Smart City Scenarios," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1-11, Jan. 2024.
- [2] S. Wang, X. Song, T. Song and Y. Yang, "Fairness-Aware Computation Offloading With Trajectory Optimization and Phase-Shift Design in RIS-Assisted Multi-UAV MEC Network," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 20547-20561, 2024.
- [3] J. Liu, J. Ren, Y. Zhang, X. Peng, Y. Zhang and Y. Yang, "Efficient Dependent Task Offloading for Multiple Applications in MEC-Cloud System," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 2147-2162, 2023.
- [4] Y. Ju et al., "NOMA-Assisted Secure Offloading for Vehicular Edge Computing Networks With Asynchronous Deep Reinforcement Learning," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 2627-2640, 2024.
- [5] J. Huang, S. Li, L. Yang, J. Si, X. Ma and S. Wang, "Multiparticipant Double Auction for Resource Allocation and Pricing in Edge Computing," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 14007-14016, 2024.
- [6] C. Jiang, Z. Luo, L. Gao and J. Li, "A Truthful Incentive Mechanism for Movement-Aware Task Offloading in Crowdsourced Mobile Edge Computing Systems," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 18292-18305, 2024.
- [7] E. Moro and I. Filippini, "Joint Management of Compute and Radio Resources in Mobile Edge Computing: A Market Equilibrium Approach," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 983-995, 2023.
- [8] M. M. Saito, A. Belianin, G. Kopytin and M. Ivanova, "Modeling Decision-Making Behavior in a Double Auction Task," *2024 Sixth International Conference Neurotechnologies and Neurointerfaces (CNN)*, Kaliningrad, Russian Federation, 2024, pp. 109-112, 2024.
- [9] D. Li, Q. Yang, C. Li, D. An, and Y. Shi, "Bayesian-based Inference Attack Method and Individual Differential Privacy-based Auction Mechanism for Double Auction Market," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Sci. Eng. (from Jul. 2004)*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 950-968, 2023.
- [10] M. Imai, T. Sato and T. Shiina, "Revenue Management Problem Considering Overbooking in The Aviation Industry," *International Congress on Advanced Applied Informatics (IIAI-AAI)*, 2021, pp. 855-860.
- [11] L. B. Ma, X. Y. Wang, X. W. Wang, et al., "TCDA: Truthful Combinatorial Double Auctions for Mobile Edge Computing in Industrial Internet of Things," *IEEE Trans. on Mobile Comput.*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 4125-4138, 2022.
- [12] X. Chen, G. Zhu, H. Ding, L. Zhang, H. Zhang, and Y. Fang, "End-to-end Service Auction: A General Double Auction Mechanism for Edge Computing Services," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 2616-2629, 2022.
- [13] M. Wei and K. Xu, "Multi-Task Matching Mechanism Design for UAV-Assisted MEC Network With Blockchain," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 128681-128696, 2023.
- [14] M. Dai, Z. Luo, Y. Wu, L. Qian, B. Lin, and Z. Su, "Incentive Oriented Two-tier Task Offloading Scheme in Marine Edge Computing Networks: A Hybrid Stackelberg-auction Game Approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, early access, 2023.
- [15] L. Zhang, K. Xiao, L. Jin, P. Dong and Z. Tong, "Mobility-Aware and Double Auction-Based Joint Task Offloading and Resource Allocation Algorithm in MEC," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 821-837, 2024.
- [16] A. Samanta, Q. -V. Pham, N. -N. Dao, A. Muthanna and S. Cho, "mISO: Incentivizing Demand-Agnostic Microservices for Edge-Enabled IoT Networks," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 3523-3536, 2023.
- [17] N. Qi, Z. Huang, W. Sun, S. Jin and X. Su, "Coalitional Formation-Based Group-Buying for UAV-Enabled Data Collection: An Auction Game Approach," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 7420-7437, 2023.
- [18] Y. Du et al., "Blockchain-Aided Edge Computing Market: Smart Contract and Consensus Mechanisms," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 3193-3208, 2023.
- [19] Y. -Y. Shih, A. -C. Pang, T. He and T. -C. Chiu, "A Multi-Market Trading Framework for Low-Latency Service Provision at the Edge of Networks," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 27-39, 2023.
- [20] Y. Zhang et al., "Adaptive Digital Twin Placement and Transfer in Wireless Computing Power Network," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 10924-10936, 2024.
- [21] H. Qi et al., "Matching-Based Hybrid Service Trading for Task Assignment Over Dynamic Mobile Crowdsensing Networks," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, 2023.
- [22] M. Liwang, Z. Gao and X. Wang, "Let's Trade in the Future! A Futures-Enabled Fast Resource Trading Mechanism in Edge Computing-Assisted UAV Networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 3252-3270, 2021.
- [23] M. Liwang and X. Wang, "Overbook in Advance, Trade in Future: Computing Resource Provisioning in Hybrid Device-Edge-Cloud Networks," *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 105-113, 2023.
- [24] M. Liwang, R. Chen, X. Wang and X. Shen, "Unifying Futures and Spot Market: Overbooking-Enabled Resource Trading in Mobile Edge Networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 5467-5485, 2022.
- [25] M. Liwang, R. Chen and X. Wang, "Resource Trading in Edge Computing-Enabled IoV: An Efficient Futures-Based Approach," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 2994-3007, 2022.
- [26] X. Huang, W. Zhang, J. Yang, L. Yang and C. K. Yeo, "Market-based Dynamic Resource Allocation in Mobile Edge Computing Systems," *International Conference on Information Science and Control Engineering (ICISCE)*, 2020, pp. 829-833.
- [27] B. Hu, Y. Gao, W. Zhang, D. Jia and H. Liu, "Computation Offloading and Resource Allocation in IoT-Based Mobile Edge Computing Systems," *IEEE International Conference on Smart Internet of Things (SmartIoT)*, 2023, pp. 119-123.
- [28] N. Lyu, "Brief Review on Computing Resource Allocation Algorithms in Mobile Edge Computing," *International Conference on Computing and Data Science (CDS)*, 2021, pp. 108-111.
- [29] X. Liu and J. Liu, "A Truthful Double Auction Mechanism for Multi-Resource Allocation in Crowd Sensing Systems," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 2579-2590, 2022.
- [30] M. Anditta et al., "Dynamic Programming Algorithm using Furniture Industry 0/1 Knapsack Problem," *International Conference on Cybernetics and Intelligent System (ICORIS)*, 2023.
- [31] M. Liwang, and X. Wang, "Overbooking-empowered Computing Resource Provisioning in Cloud-aided Mobile Edge Networks," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 2289-2303, 2022.
- [32] Ester, Martin, et al. "A Density-based Algorithm for Discovering Clusters in Large Spatial Databases With Noise." *kdd*. Vol. 96. No. 34. 1996.

## APPENDIX A DETAILS OF RBDAUCTION

### A.1 Basic Modeling

#### A.1.1 Utility of buyers (regarding $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ )

During the second stage, each buyer  $\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  can be denoted by a 3-tuple  $\tilde{b}_j = \{\tilde{t}_j, \tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{b}id_{i,j}\}$ . Utility of  $\tilde{b}_j$  consists of the following two aspects: (i) the amount of resources acquired from  $\tilde{s}_i$ , and (ii) the unit net profit that  $\tilde{b}_j$  can obtain from enjoying computing service from  $\tilde{s}_i$ . We accordingly calculate the utility  $\tilde{U}_j^B$  of each buyer  $\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  as:

$$\tilde{U}_j^B(\tilde{t}_j, \tilde{p}_j^b) = \sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j (\tilde{v}_{i,j} - \tilde{p}_j^b) \quad (22)$$

Note that in Stage II, the utility of the members who have successfully purchased resources can be directly determined by the pre-signed contract during Stage I. The guests included  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  can have their utility calculated by (22). Besides, the utility of volunteers consists of two parts: the penalty a volunteer may receive from the contractual seller, and the utility it obtains from participating in RBDAuction after joining  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  by (22).

#### A.1.2 Utility of sellers (regarding $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ )

Correspondingly, each seller  $\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  can be denoted by a 3-tuple  $\tilde{s}_i = \{\tilde{c}_i, \tilde{a}sk_i, \tilde{R}_i\}$ , where  $\tilde{R}_i$  signifies the remaining idle resources of seller  $\tilde{s}_i$ . Then, we can calculate the utility of each seller in additional auction as benefited by its remaining resources as

$$\tilde{U}_i^S(\tilde{r}_i^s, \tilde{c}_i) = \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j (\tilde{r}_i^s - \tilde{c}_i) \quad (23)$$

Apparently, the overall utility of a seller depends on two factors: (i) the income it receives from members who have successfully enjoyed computing services, and the compensation paid to volunteers or the utility calculated by (23).

Moreover, in Stage II, the auctioneer is also responsible for coordinating the implementation of pre-signed long-term contracts. Meanwhile, for buyers in  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  and sellers in  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ , it also helps determine winning buyer-seller pairs as well as their prices. Accordingly, the utility of the auctioneer in Stage II can be defined by the difference between the payments from buyers and the rewards to sellers,

$$\tilde{U}^P(\tilde{t}_j, \tilde{p}_j^b, \tilde{r}_i^s) = \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j (\tilde{p}_j^b - \tilde{r}_i^s) \quad (24)$$

And the practical social welfare defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}^{SW} &= \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \tilde{U}_j^B + \sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{U}_i^S + \tilde{U}^P \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j (\tilde{v}_{i,j} - \tilde{c}_i) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

### A.2 Solution design

Details of our proposed RBDAuction are given by Algorithm 4, which first identifies the buyer-seller pairs complying with the long-term agreements based on the actual attendance of buyers ( $\mathbb{B}$ ) and the actual available idle resources

---

#### Algorithm 4: Realtime Backup Double Auction

---

```

1 Input :  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \tilde{t}_j, \tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{b}id_{i,j}, \tilde{a}_j, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}, \tilde{c}_i, \tilde{a}sk_i, \tilde{a}_i, \tilde{r}_i, \mathbf{X}^*, \mathbb{B}, \mathbb{R}$ 
2 Output :  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{p}^b, \tilde{r}^s$ 
3 Initialization :
    $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathbf{p}_1 \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathbf{r}_1 \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathit{volunteer} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4 # Phase 1: Extracting users complying with the agreements
5 for each  $i = |\mathcal{S}|, \dots, 1$  do
6   for each  $j = |\mathcal{B}|, \dots, 1$  do
7     if  $x_{i,j} = 1$  and  $\mathbb{B}(j) = 1$  then
8        $v \leftarrow [v, t_j], w \leftarrow [w, \tilde{b}id_{i,j}], R1 \leftarrow R1 + t_j$ 
9     if  $R1 > \mathbb{R}(i)$  then
10       $c \leftarrow \mathbb{R}(i)$ 
11       $t \leftarrow KP(c, v, w)$ 
12     if  $t(j) = 1$  then
13       $x_{i,j}^{**} \leftarrow 1, \mathbf{p}_1 \leftarrow [\mathbf{p}_1, p_j^b], \mathbf{r}_1 \leftarrow [\mathbf{r}_1, r_j^s]$ 
14     else
15       $\mathit{volunteer} \leftarrow [\mathit{volunteer}, j]$ 
16       $x_{i,j}^{**} \leftarrow 0$ 
17 # Phase 2: Updating users participating in stage II auction
18 for each  $i = |\mathcal{S}|, \dots, 1$  do
19   for each  $j = |\mathcal{B}|, \dots, 1$  do
20     if  $x_{i,j}^{**} = 0$  and  $\mathbb{B}(j) = 1$  then
21        $\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \leftarrow [\tilde{\mathcal{B}}, b_j]$ 
22     if  $x_{i,j}^{**} = 1$  then
23        $\mathbb{R}(i) \leftarrow \mathbb{R}(i) - t_j$ 
24 # Phase 3: Stage II Auction
25  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \leftarrow \mathbf{Algorithm\ 1}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ 
26  $\tilde{p}^b, \tilde{r}^s \leftarrow \mathbf{Algorithm\ 2}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ 
27 return  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{p}^b, \tilde{r}^s$ .

```

---

of sellers ( $\mathbb{R}$ ). A dynamic programming knapsack problem is utilized to determine the members that can practically obtain services for each seller, as specified in pre-signed long-term contracts, while the others remain as volunteers due to limited resource supply (lines 5-16, Algorithm 4). Next, volunteers and guests can be engaged in the current auction, described by  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}'$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}'$ , as shown by lines 18-23, Algorithm 4. Then, we design algorithms similar to Algorithms 1-2 to select winning seller-buyer pairs, thus yielding a final solution for  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ .

## APPENDIX B PROPERTY ANALYSIS

### B.1 Individual rationality

**Theorem 1.** *All the buyers and sellers in our proposed two-stage double auction are individual rational.*

*Proof.* First, the price determination mechanism (e.g.) designed for Stage I, along with that of Stage II, ensure that the payment made by any winning buyer will never exceed their submitted bid. Likewise, they also guarantee that the payment received by any winning seller will never fall below their asking price. Then, since our paper adopts an unique perspective where the uncertainty in the considered

trading market and the default clauses pre-signed in Stage I may incur losses due to unforeseen on-site circumstances during each practical transactions during Stage II, either sellers or buyers may confront negative utilities. To address this, we anticipate such a possibility during Stage I, where our optimization on overbooking rate, as well as risk management for buyers and sellers can protect their profits. Namely, participants in this paper are highly likely to achieve satisfactory utilities. Also, according to our simulations, individual rationality can also be proved. Thus, we demonstrate that our proposed two-stage double auction as individually rational.  $\square$

## B.2 Truthfulness

Recall our previous discussions, different from conventional auctions, our proposed double auction consists of two stages. We subsequently analyze the truthfulness regarding both Stage I and Stage II, followed by a comprehensive evaluation of the entire auction procedure. In what follows, we first focus on assessing the truthfulness of buyers.

**Theorem 2.** *All the buyers in our proposed two-stage double auction are truthful.*

*Proof.* Regarding Stage I, our focus firstly drops on each member denoted by  $b_{n'}$ . For analytical simplicity, we suppose that a member indicates a winning buyer who has successfully signed a long-term contract with a certain seller. Accordingly, we consider the following cases by testing the impacts of possible misreporting behavior of a member.

**Case 1.** Let the fake bid of  $b_{n'}$  be  $Lbid'_{n'}$ , we first discuss the case where  $Lbid'_{n'} \geq Lbid_{n'}$ . Considering the sorting mechanism in our proposed OPDAuction (e.g.,  $\mathcal{L}_b$ ),  $b_{n'}$  will persist as a winner (member). Furthermore, given the unchanged positions of other buyers in the sort of bids, the payment for  $b_{n'}$  will also remain unaffected. Thus, it has no motivation to raise its bid than its true value.

**Case 2.** When considering the value of  $b_{n'}$ 's bid falling below its true bid, i.e.,  $Lbid'_{n'} < Lbid_{n'}$ , we discuss the following two sub-cases.

- Case 1.1. Buyer  $b_{n'}$  still wins in OPDAuction, and we have the payment incurred by its misreported bid denoted by  $p_{n'}^{b'}$ , and  $p_{n'}^{b'} = p_{n'}^b$ . Moreover, the expected utility of this buyer obtained by untruthful bid is represented by  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'}$ , and we have  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} = \overline{U}_{n'}^B$ .

- Case 1.2. Buyer  $b_{n'}$  loses in OPDAuction, and its expected utility becomes zero. Thus, we have  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} \leq \overline{U}_{n'}^B$ . Apparently, the expected utility of  $b_{n'}$  in Stage I by misreporting its bid will not be higher than that with its true bid.

We next consider  $b_{n'}$  as a non-member, indicating that this buyer loses in our OPDAuction, namely, unable to sign a long-term contract with a seller. Generally, non-members can be categorized into two groups. One group includes non-members whose true bids have already exceeded the crucial price,  $Lbid_{k_b^*}$ , yet they fail in Algorithm 1. Irrespective of their attempts to falsify their bids, these non-members cannot emerge victorious in the buyer competition of Algorithm 1. Consequently, they are destined never to secure long-term contracts, leading to  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} = \overline{U}_{n'}^B = 0$  indefinitely. For these non-members, our mechanism remains truthful.

The second group comprises non-members whose true bids fall below the crucial price, namely,  $Lbid_{k_b^*}$ . Originally ineligible for participation in phase 3 of Algorithm 1, if they fabricate their bids, two scenarios can be arised.

(i) When the bid value falls below the true one, i.e.,  $Lbid'_{n'} < Lbid_{n'}$ , clearly, its bid remains below the critical bid  $Lbid_{k_b^*}$ , thus it will still be the unsuccessful bidder. Therefore, we have  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} = \overline{U}_{n'}^B = 0$ .

(ii) When the bid value stays larger than the true one, i.e.,  $Lbid'_{n'} > Lbid_{n'}$ , we analyze the following two cases.

- $b_{n'}$  is still a loser and its utility stays unchanged, i.e.,  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} = \overline{U}_{n'}^B = 0$ .

- $b_{n'}$  becomes a winner. As per our pricing algorithm (Algorithm 2, concerning the  $bid_{m',n'}$  corresponding to the seller matched with  $b_{n'}$ , we have  $bid_{m',n'} \geq p_{n'}^{b'} \geq p_{k_b^*}^b > Lbid_{n'}$ . Thus, we will have  $\overline{U}_{n'}^{B'} = bid_{m',n'} - p_{n'}^{b'} > 0 = \overline{U}_{n'}^B$ . Regarding this, the non-member  $b_{n'}$  will obtain an expected utility that originally does not belong to it through false quotations. Our mechanism appears less genuine when facing such an occurrence, but this is exceedingly rare, to the extent that it did not even manifest.

During Stage II, participated buyers can be categorized into: (i) members who have successfully enjoyed computing services as stipulated by long-term contracts, (ii) members who fail to obtain required resources (i.e., volunteers), and (iii) guests without long-term contracts. Among these, volunteers and guests can form a new buyer coalition. Hereafter, we focus on testing whether our proposed RBD Auction ensures truthfulness for them.

Since the auction process in the second stage is similar with the first stage, only one circumstance may challenge the truthfulness: when a losing buyer  $\tilde{b}_j$ , with its truthful bid below the threshold bid, wins the auction by falsely reporting a higher bid. Similar to our previous discussions, this case is extremely rare during the whole auction process.

Upon integrating both the two stages, our mechanism, in essence, maintains truthfulness for buyers overall, exhibiting only slight imperfections in highly exceptional circumstances due to the uncertainties, which also represents our unique consideration differing from other existing works.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *All the sellers in our proposed two-stage double auction are truthful.*

*Proof.* For the analysis of truthfulness of sellers, we also consider two stages.

In Stage I, we suppose that seller  $s_{m'} \in \mathcal{S}$  wins, where we definitely have  $\overline{U}_{m'}^S \geq 0$ .

(i) When the ask value of the seller is lower than the true value, i.e.,  $ask'_{m'} < ask_{m'}$ , a lower asking price positions seller  $s_{m'}$  further ahead in the auction ranking. For example, in Algorithm 1, all sellers engage with unmatched buyers based on their asking prices. Therefore, if  $s_{m'}$  misreports a lower bid, it gains the opportunity to reach unallocated buyers earlier, potentially garnering more profit compared to participating in the auction with its true asking price. Such circumstances primarily arise when there is a sufficiently large number of users participating in the auction, and the variations remain within an acceptable range.



(ii) When the ask value stays larger than the true value, i.e.,  $ask'_{m'} > ask_{m'}$ , we analyze the following two cases:

- Although  $s_{m'}$  still can win, due to its repositioning further down in the auction hierarchy, it might lose a fraction of the buyers originally intended to match with it. In other words, we may have  $\overline{U}'_{m'} \leq \overline{U}_{m'}$ .

- When seller  $s_{m'}$  loses in the designed auction, its expected value of utility turns zero ( $\overline{U}'_{m'} = 0$ ), and  $\overline{U}'_{m'} \leq \overline{U}_{m'}$ .

Second, we consider that seller  $s_{m'} \in \mathcal{S}$  loses ( $\overline{U}'_{m'} = 0$ ).

(i) If the ask value is larger than the true value, i.e.,  $ask'_{m'} > ask_{m'}$ . Obviously, it loses, and we have  $\overline{U}'_{m'} = \overline{U}_{m'} = 0$ .

(ii) If the ask value is less than the true value, i.e.,  $ask'_{m'} < ask_{m'}$ . There are two cases.

- It loses and the expected value of utility is zero, i.e.,  $\overline{U}'_{m'} = \overline{U}_{m'} = 0$ .

- It becomes a winner. According to Algorithm 2 the new reward of  $s_{m'}$ , denoted by  $r'_{m'}$ , is less than  $ask_{k'_s}$ , and we have  $ask'_{m'} < r'_{m'} < ask_{k'_s} < ask_{m'}$ . Therefore,  $r'_{m'} - ask_{m'} < 0$ , we have  $\overline{U}'_{m'} < 0 = \overline{U}_{m'}$ .

In Stage II, remaining sellers with available resources can form a new group to participate in the designed RBDAuction. As the auction mechanism in Stage II closely resembles that of Stage I, apart from the scenario where previously victorious sellers deliberately misrepresent lower asking prices to preemptively engage with free buyers, our mechanism remains truthful for sellers during Stage II.

All in all, our proposed two-stage double auction maintains a slightly flawed level of truthfulness for sellers. Thanks to our carefully crafted risk control mechanisms, coupled with the fact that participants are unaware of each other's true valuations, sellers are incentivized to report prices accurately and have no reason to misstate them.  $\square$

### B.3 Budget-balance

**Theorem 4.** *Our proposed two-stage double auction can satisfy the property of budget-balance.*

*Proof.* To verify this property, we have to show that the budget-balance property holds, i.e.,  $\overline{U}^P = \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} t_n [\bar{a}_n (1 - \mathbb{P}_n) + 1/2 (1 - \bar{a}_n)] (p_n^b - r_m^s) \geq 0$  and  $\overline{U}^P = \sum_{\tilde{b}_j \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \sum_{\tilde{s}_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \tilde{x}_{i,j} \tilde{t}_j (\tilde{p}_j^b - \tilde{r}_i^s) \geq 0$ . The crucial assurance for the validity of these two expressions lies in the conditions where  $p_n^b - r_m^s \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{p}_j^b - \tilde{r}_i^s \geq 0$  are met. According to Algorithm 1, the buyers are sorted in non-increasing order of bids, and the sellers are sorted in non-decreasing order of asks (lines 3-4). Algorithm 1 finds  $k_b^*$  and  $k_s^*$  that satisfy the constraint (17) or (18) (lines 5-17). Thus, we have  $Lbid_{k_b^*} \geq ask_{k_s^*}$ .

Note that Algorithm 1 only considers the top  $k_b^*$  buyers and top  $k_s^*$  sellers. In Stage I, for a winning buyer  $b_n \in \mathcal{B}$ , the lower-bound of its payment is the bid of buyer  $k_b^* + 1$  (line 10 in Algorithm 2), i.e.,  $p_n^b \geq Lbid_{k_b^*}$ . For a winning seller  $s_m \in \mathcal{S}$ , the upper-bound of its payment is the ask of seller  $k_s^* + 1$  (line 22 in Algorithm 2), i.e.,  $r_m^s \leq ask_{k_s^*}$ .

Therefore,  $p_n^b \geq Lbid_{k_b^*} \geq ask_{k_s^*} \geq r_m^s$ . Similarly, in Stage II, we can derive the consistent conclusion of  $\tilde{p}_j^b \geq \tilde{r}_i^s$  through similar analysis.  $\square$

### B.4 Computational efficiency

The Computational complexity of our proposed algorithm for different stages can be expressed as: Stage I:  $O(\mathbb{H}^6 |\mathcal{B}|^3 |\mathcal{S}|^2)$ , Stage II:  $O(\mathbb{H}^4 |\tilde{\mathcal{B}}|^3 |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|^2)$ , where  $\mathbb{H}$  is a constant, reflecting the number of iterations of a partially predefined loop within Algorithms 1-4. We can see that although obtaining solutions in Stage I can exhibit higher complexity, once the members and their long-term contracts have been determined there can be a significant reduction of problem size during Stage II. For example, the number of participated buyers and sellers in RBDAuction (i.e.,  $|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}|$  and  $|\tilde{\mathcal{S}}|$ ) can be much more lower than that in Stage I, thus demonstrating the superiority of our proposed two-stage double auction in terms of time efficiency.

## APPENDIX C

### DERIVATION OF RISKS

Due to the presence of uncertainties, the long-term contracts signed in Stage I may not align with the expected outcomes during practical transactions, potentially resulting in unsatisfying trading performance such as unexpected utility, and being selected as volunteers. Consequently, during the process of member and long-term contracts determination in Stage I, we account for diverse situations that buyers and seller may face in the future (referred to as risks) and constrain or exclude solutions unacceptable risks.

In this paper, we consider three types of risks: the non-positive benefit risk for buyer  $b_n$  (who is a member but not a volunteers), the risk of buyer  $b_n$  (who is a member) being selected as a volunteer, and the risk of unsatisfying expected utility of sellers.

#### C.1 The risk of non-positive utility of buyers (not a volunteer)

The risk of a buyer confronting a non-positive risk is:

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk} = \Pr \left( \frac{t_n \left( \alpha_n (v_{m,n} - p_n^b) - \frac{(1-\alpha_n)p_n^b}{2} \right)}{U^{\min}} \leq \xi_1 \right), \quad (26)$$

where  $U^{\min}$  is a positive value approaching to zero,  $\xi_1$  denotes a positive threshold coefficient. Through the transformation steps in the following expressions, we can identify the crucial role of  $\alpha_n$  in solving the probability density function of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk} &= \Pr \left( \alpha_n (v_{m,n} - p_n^b) - \frac{p_n^b}{2} + \frac{\alpha_n p_n^b}{2} \leq \frac{U^{\min} \xi_1}{t_n} \right) \\ &= \Pr \left( \alpha_n \left( v_{m,n} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - 1 \right) p_n^b \leq \frac{U^{\min} - \xi_1}{t_n} + \frac{p_n^b}{2} \right) \right) \\ &= \Pr \left( \alpha_n \leq \frac{\frac{U^{\min} \cdot \xi_1}{t_n} + \frac{p_n^b}{2}}{v_{m,n} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - 1 \right) p_n^b} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where we employ  $\mathbb{C}_1$  for the sake of simplifying the expression, defining it as the following (28).

$$\mathbb{C}_1 = \frac{\frac{U^{\min, \xi_1} + p_n^b}{t_n} + \frac{p_n^b}{2}}{v_{m,n} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - 1\right) p_n^b} \quad (28)$$

Since we have  $\alpha_n \sim \mathbf{B}\{(1, 0), (a_n, 1 - a_n)\}$ , allowing for the expression of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk}$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{R}_n^{BRisk} \left( t_n, p_n^b, q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, \mathbb{C}_1 < 0 \\ 1 - a_n, 0 \leq \mathbb{C}_1 < 1 \\ 1, 1 \leq \mathbb{C}_1 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

## C.2 The risk of member $b_n$ being selected as a volunteer

Recall our previous discussions, the risk of a member  $b_n$  being selected as a volunteer is expressed as  $\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk} = a_n \mathbb{P}_n$ . The detailed derivation of  $\mathbb{P}_n$  is given by the following analysis.

We denote that the set of buyers matched with seller  $s_m$  is denoted as  $B_m = \{b_1, \dots, b_n, \dots, b_N\}$ . In a practical transaction where  $b_n$  participates in (i.e.,  $\alpha_n = 1$ ), there exist  $2^{N-1}$  potential outcomes for the remaining  $N - 1$  buyers (use  $n'$  as index), contingent upon their attendance. Let the combinations of  $\alpha_{n'}$  ( $b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-, \mathcal{B}^- = \mathcal{B} \setminus b_n$ ) values corresponding to each possible case in one transaction be

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= \{0, 0, 0, \dots, 0\} \\ g_2 &= \{1, 0, 0, \dots, 0\} \\ &\vdots \\ g_{2^{N-1}} &= \{1, 1, 1, \dots, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Define the set  $G_1 = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{2^{N-1}}\}$  to encompass the aforementioned  $2^{N-1}$  cases, and let  $B_m^- = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, b_{n+1}, \dots, b_N\}$  represent the set excluding buyer  $b_n$  from set  $B_m$ . In Stage I, the number of resource blocks  $R_m$  available to seller  $s_m$  can change over different transactions. Therefore, we employ the expected value of  $R_m$ , denoted as  $\mathbb{d}_m \mathbb{r}_m$ , to ascertain whether seller  $s_m$  is overbooking in Stage I.

Consider event  $\mathbb{T}_1 : t_n + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}_m^-} \alpha_k t_k > \mathbb{d}_m \mathbb{r}_m$ , indicating that member  $b_n$  participates in the transaction, while the overall resource demand from other members of seller  $s_m$  exceeds its resource supply. From  $G_1$ , we select all cases satisfying event  $\mathbb{T}_1$  to form a set  $G_2$ .

Then, we define event  $\mathbb{T}_2$  as: since overbooking is allowed, a certain number of volunteers may should be selected among attended members of  $s_m$ , and member  $b_n$  is chosen as a volunteer. Thus, event  $\mathbb{T}_2$  signifies the selection of member  $b_n$  as a volunteer in the aforementioned process. We identify all cases from  $G_2$  that meet  $\mathbb{T}_2$  to form set  $G_3$ .

Given the independence of attendance of buyers, the probability of each case in  $G_3$  can be represented by the product of the probabilities of buyers, attendance or absence, respectively. Let the probability of case  $g_i$  occurring in  $G_3$  be  $p_i$ , and denote the set of these probabilities as  $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_N\}$ . Consequently, given  $b_n$ 's attendance ( $\alpha_n = 1$ ), the conditional probability that  $b_n$  fails to

obtain resources from the contractual seller  $s_m$  is denoted as:

$$\mathbb{P}_n = \sum_{p_i \in P} p_i \quad (31)$$

However, as demonstrated in the previous discussion, it becomes clear that when the number of buyers and sellers in the auction is significantly large, the complexity and computational time of such an exhaustive algorithm increase exponentially. This rapid escalation makes the precise derivation of results infeasible. Consequently, we apply the Markov Inequality to scale and obtain an acceptable approximation of  $\mathbb{P}_n$  (the derivation is shown by (32)), and we use  $\mathcal{B}^- = \mathcal{B} \setminus b_n$  to denote the set of buyers without  $b_n$ . Accordingly, we can reach the approximate for  $\mathbb{P}_n$  as (33).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n &\approx 1 - \frac{\mathbf{E} \left( \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( R_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \alpha_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) \right)}{t_n} \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( \mathbb{d}_m \mathbb{r}_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} a_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right)}{t_n} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

## C.3 The risk of unsatisfied utility of sellers

Risk  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  takes into account the possibility that the actual benefits obtained by seller  $s_m$  during practical transaction may not align with its expectation estimated in Stage I. The following (34) delineates the derivation process of the expression for risk  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$ , where  $\xi_2$  represents a positive threshold coefficient approach to 1. For notational simplicity, we use constants  $\mathbb{C}_2 = (r_m^s - c_m + q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b})$ ,  $\mathbb{C}_3 = q_{m,n}^{s \rightarrow b} + q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$ , and  $\mathbb{C}_4 = \overline{U}_m^S \xi_2 - \sum_{b_n \in \mathcal{B}} x_{m,n} t_n q_{m,n}^{b \rightarrow s}$  to denote the complicated calculations in (34).

Recall the set  $B_m = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n, \dots, b_N\}$ . Given the attendance or absence of each buyer, there exist  $2^N$  possible cases, with corresponding  $\alpha_n$  value combination denoted as:

$$\begin{aligned} g'_1 &= \{0, 0, 0, \dots, 0\} \\ g'_2 &= \{1, 0, 0, \dots, 0\} \\ &\vdots \\ g'_{2^N} &= \{1, 1, 1, \dots, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Let  $G_4 = \{g'_1, g'_2, \dots, g'_{2^N}\}$  encapsulate all  $2^N$  cases. When  $g'$  is specified, the values of  $\alpha_n$  and  $M_n$  for buyer  $b_n$  are uniquely determined. Define event  $\mathbb{T}_3 : \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \leq \mathbb{C}_4$ , and from  $G_4$ , select all cases meeting  $\mathbb{T}_3$  to form set  $G_5$ . Since the attendance or absence of each buyer is mutually independent, the probability of each case occurring can be calculated as the product of the probabilities of attendance or absence for all buyers. Let the probability of scenario  $g'_i$  occurring in  $G_5$  be  $p'_i$ , and compile a probability set  $P' = \{p'_1, p'_2, \dots, p'_i, \dots, p'_N\}$  from all such scenarios in  $G_5$ . From this, we derive the expression for risk  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  as:

$$\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} = \sum_{k=1}^N p'_k \quad (36)$$

Similar to the calculation of  $\mathcal{R}_n^{VRisk}$ , the computational complexity of calculating risk  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  also increases exponentially with the number of auction participants. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_n &= \Pr \left( t_n - \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( R_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \alpha_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) \geq 0 \mid \alpha_n = 1 \right) \\
&= \Pr \left( \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( R_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \alpha_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) \leq t_n \right) \\
&= 1 - \Pr \left( \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( R_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \alpha_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) > t_n \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\mathbf{E} \left( \sum_{s_m \in \mathcal{S}} x_{m,n} \left( R_m - \sum_{b_{n'} \in \mathcal{B}^-} \alpha_{n'} x_{m,n'} t_{n'} \right) \right)}{t_n}
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$


---

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} &= \Pr \left( U_m^S \leq \overline{U}_m^S \cdot \xi_2 \right) \\
&= \Pr \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \left( \alpha_n \left( M_n (r_m^s - c_m) - p_n^b/2 + M_n p_n^b/2 \right) + r_m^s/2 - \alpha_n r_m^s/2 \right) \leq \overline{U}_m^S \cdot \xi_2 \right) \\
&= \Pr \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n \left( M_n (r_m^s - c_m + p_n^b/2) - p_n^b/2 - r_m^s/2 \right) \leq \overline{U}_m^S \cdot \xi_2 - \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n r_m^s}{2} \right) \\
&= \Pr \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \cdot \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \leq \mathbb{C}_4 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$


---

we likewise employ the Markov Inequality to simplify the calculation of  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} &= \Pr \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \leq \mathbb{C}_4 \right) \\
&= 1 - \Pr \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \geq \mathbb{C}_4 \right) \\
&\leq 1 - \frac{\mathbf{E} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \right)}{\mathbb{C}_4}
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Ultimately, the scaled-down, acceptable approximation of risk  $\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_m^{SRisk} &\approx 1 - \frac{\mathbf{E} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \alpha_n (M_n \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3) \right)}{\mathbb{C}_4} \\
&= 1 - \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{|\mathcal{B}|} x_{m,n} t_n \bar{a}_n ((1 - \mathbb{P}_n) \mathbb{C}_2 - \mathbb{C}_3)}{\mathbb{C}_4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$