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Abstract—Proactive tile-based video streaming can avoid motion-to-photon latency of wireless virtual reality (VR) by computing and delivering the predicted tiles in a segment to be requested before playback. However, all existing works either focus on the tile prediction or focus on tile delivering and computing, overlooking the important fact that prediction, communication, and computing have to share the same duration. Moreover, the quality of experience (QoE) of proactive tile-based streaming depends on the worst performance of prediction, communication, and computing, thus it is vital to match the prediction performance to the communication and computing capability. In this paper, utilizing optimizing duration allocation for prediction, communication, and computing, we match the prediction performance to the communication and computing capability to maximize the QoE of watching a VR video. We find the global optimal solution with closed-form expression by decomposing the original problem equivalently into two matching subproblems. From the optimal solution, we find two regions where tile prediction and communication and computing capability respectively play the dominant role, and reveal the tradeoff between the prediction performance and the communication and computing and computing capability. Simulation results using two existing tile prediction methods with a real dataset demonstrate the gain of the optimized duration over the non-optimized duration in prediction, communication, and computing.

Index Terms—Wireless virtual reality, proactive tiled-based VR video streaming, duration optimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Wireless virtual reality (VR) can provide an immersive experience to wireless users. As the main type of VR services [1], VR video usually has 360° × 180° panoramic view with ultra high resolution (e.g. 16 K [2]). Evidently, delivering such video is cost-prohibitive for wireless networks. Nonetheless, it has been found that the range of angles that humans can see at the same time is only a limited area of the full panoramic view (about 110° × 90° [3]), which is referred to as the field of view (FoV). This inspires the design to divide the full panoramic view segment into small tiles in spatial domain, and only compute (i.e., project and render the tiles to generate visible pictures [4], [5]) and deliver the tiles that overlap with FoVs, which is the so-called tile-based streaming [5], [6].

To avoid dizziness in watching VR video, the motion-to-photon (MTP) latency should be low (usually less than 20 ms [7]). When using reactive tile-based streaming, the tiles overlapped with the FoVs (on the magnitude of hundreds of Mbits [7]) should be computed and delivered within the MTP latency after the request of a user, which requires very high data rate. This calls for the proactive tile-based streaming [7]–[9], which computes and delivers the tiles in a segment that are most likely requested before the segment playback. By this means, the MTP latency can be avoided [7]. Therefore, proactive tile-based streaming is anticipated to be the mainstream manner in the ultimate stage of VR streaming [5], [7].

B. Motivation and Our Contributions

Proactive tile-based streaming contains three types of operations: prediction, communication, and computing. To illustrate the problem at hand, we introduce the simplified pipeline of proactive tile-based streaming as in Fig. 1. Before the playback of the segment, using historical information in the observation window, the tiles that are most likely requested is predicted, then are computed and delivered to the user before the segment is playback. Existing works [8]–[19] ignore an important fact: tile prediction and communication and computing have to share the same duration.

With the same shared duration, there is a tradeoff between the performance of prediction and the capability of communication and computing. The performance of prediction indicates how many tiles to be requested can be predicted accurately [9], [10], and the capability of communication and computing here indicates that how many predicted tiles can be proactively computed and delivered before playback. Let us emphasize the tradeoff with the following cases. (i) If the ending of the observation window is close to the predicted segment, that is to say, more time is allocated to the observation and less time for communication and computing, then the prediction performance will be better, however the capability of communication and computing decreases. Conversely, (ii) if the ending of the

Fig. 1: Duration Allocation in Proactive Tile-based VR Streaming
observation window is far from the predicted segment, the capability of communication and computing increases while the prediction performance is degraded.

Furthermore, the quality of experience (QoE) of proactive tile-based streaming depends on the worst performance of prediction, communication, and computing. Both of the above two cases result in the degradation of QoE. In case (i), the tiles to be requested can be predicted accurately, but there may be no enough time remained to compute and deliver all the predicted tiles before playback, thus the final received tiles are not enough to cover the whole FoVs. In case (ii), more tiles can be computed and delivered, but many computed and delivered tiles are not requested due to the poor prediction, thus the useful tiles in final received tiles are not enough. Both cases will cause black holes or playout stalls during the VR video playback [5], which observably degrades the QoE.

This suggests the necessity to carefully design the duration for prediction, communication, and computing. By optimizing the duration allocation, the performance of tile prediction and the capability of communication and computing can be matched, so that tiles to be requested can be predicted accurately and the predicted tiles can be computed and delivered. By this means, QoE can be improved.

Thus, in this paper, we focus on the proactive tile-base VR streaming system, aim to investigate the matching problem and find out how to make best use of prediction, communication, and computing by duration allocation to maximize the QoE of proactive tile-based VR streaming. The main contributions of the paper are summarized as follows.

- **A novel duration optimization framework in proactive tile-based VR streaming system**: Aimed at maximizing the QoE of proactive tile-based VR streaming, where the prediction performance and the capability of communication and computing in delivering and computing tiles are taken into account in the QoE, and the limited communication and computing resources, and arbitrarily given method of tile prediction are considered, we optimize the duration assigned for the three operations in proactive tile-based video streaming. As far as we know, this is the first work that jointly optimizes the duration for observation window, communication, and computing in proactive tile-based VR streaming. For an arbitrary prediction method, we consider its performance metric as a function of the duration of the observation window, and express it as the power series expansion for a more general formulation.

- **Closed-form optimal duration allocation policy**: We formulate the duration optimization problem and find the global optimal duration for prediction, communication, and computing with closed-form expression. With a reasonable assumption on the prediction method, we show that the original matching problem can be transformed into two matching subproblems and solved successively by a serial of transformations and Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions.

- **Two limited regions and the tradeoff between prediction performance and the CC capability**: We find the optimal solution yield in Resource-limited and Prediction-limited region, and validated by the simulation, these two regions also exist in terms of QoE. This provides important insights in system design. When the VR streaming system is in the Resource-limited region, the bottleneck is the resources, the optimal duration should allocate more time for communication and computing. When in the Prediction-limited region, the bottleneck is the prediction performance, the optimal duration should allocate more time for the observation window in prediction. Moreover, increasing resources in the Resource-limited region can efficiently improve the QoE, and increasing resources in the Prediction-limited region only provides the marginal gain, the more efficient means in this region is to improve the prediction performance. Besides, we find that the capability of communication and computing can be traded off by the prediction performance to achieve a target QoE, or vice versa. These two regions and the tradeoff have also not been studied before.

### C. Related Works

As far as we know, there is no related work on the joint duration optimization on prediction, communication, and computing for proactive VR streaming. Our previous work [8] only considers the duration optimization on communication and computing, and only takes the prediction performance into account in the QoE, and the solution can only be applied on a specific prediction method. Besides, the authors in [11], [12] consider offloading the projection in computing operation from the MEC server to the HMD, and reveal the tradeoff between caching and computing. However, without the consideration of prediction and matching the communication to computing.

In addition to the above joint optimization works, existing works mainly focus on each of the three operations individually. For tile prediction, a linear regression (LR) method was proposed in [9] to predict the central point of FoV, and transform it into corresponding tiles [8]. A deep reinforcement learning method was proposed in [13] to predict the FoV of the next frame, and a deep learning method was proposed in [10] that jointly uses head mounted display (HMD) orientations, image saliency maps, and motion maps to predict the tiles to be requested. A context bandits (CB) learning method was proposed in [9] and [14] to predict the tile requests, and longitude and latitude of the user orientation, respectively. With the future FoV locations of other users, a Sequence-to-Sequence prediction method was proposed in [15] to predicting the future FoV in more than seconds ahead. For communication and computing resource allocation, the rendering task in computing is offloaded in [16] from HMD to mobile edge computing (MEC) server to reduce the bandwidth usage and computational workload on HMD. The computing and caching resources were leveraged in [17] to reduce communication resource usage. The multicast opportunity was exploited for multiple users watching the same video in [18] to minimize the transmission energy. The authors in [19] consider the uplink and downlink communication resource allocation to
maximize a utility function that takes prediction accuracy, communication delay, and computing delay into consideration.

However, as mentioned above, all the existing works, including individual study of prediction, computing, and communication [8]–[10], [13]–[19], and some jointly optimization works [8], [11], [12], ignore the fact that all of the three operations are coupled in time domain, and endeavoring improving the performance of one operation that is not the bottleneck is useless for the QoE of VR video. Therefore, the fundamental impacts of matching the performance of the three operations still have not been unleashed.

D. Outline

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the system model. Section III formulates the problem, shows how to obtain the closed-form optimal solution. Section IV provides the numerical results to illustrate the two regions in terms of solution as well as the tradeoff between the prediction performance and the CC capability. Simulation results are provided in Section V to validate the assumption used in obtaining the solution, the two regions in terms of QoE, and evaluated the performance of the proposed optimal solution. Section VI concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Consider a proactive tile-based VR video streaming system, where an MEC server with communication and computing resources serves multiple users. Each VR video is divided into $L$ segments in temporal domain, and each segment is divided into $M$ tiles in spatial domain. A segment has the same playback duration as a tile, denoted as $T_{\text{seg}}$ [5], [7]. The MEC server assigns orthogonal communication and computing resources to users, hence we can only consider one user. The user is equipped with an HMD to watch VR videos. The HMD can track the historical information of the user, send the recorded information to the MEC server, and pre-buffer one segment. While both the MEC server and the HMD can be used for projecting and rendering a video segment before playback, we consider that the MEC server processes the segment before delivering to the HMD. The basic idea can be extended to the case where the HMD accomplishes the computing tasks.

As shown in Fig. 2, proactive tile-based VR streaming contains three coherent operations: prediction, communication, and computing. As the VR video playback, segments are predicted, computed, and delivered one after another. We take operations for $(l+1)$-th segment for example, to explain how the tile-based proactive VR streaming works. The allowed proactive VR streaming time for a segment is $T_{\text{ps}}$, which contains the duration from the beginning of the observation window to the deadline for the segment. The beginning of the observation window depends on how far the historical information is useful for prediction. To avoid the MTP latency, the deadline for the segment should be no more than the begining of the segment playback. The duration of the observation window is $t_{\text{obw}}$, and the total time for communication and computing can be defined as $t_{\text{CC}} = t_{\text{com}} + t_{\text{cpt}}$. The total proactive VR streaming time should satisfy

$$t_{\text{obw}} + t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{ps}}$$

(1)

By using the recorded historical information of a user in an observation window with duration $t_{\text{obw}}$, the MEC server can predict the tiles in a segment to be most likely watched by the user for deciding which tiles in the segment should be proactively computed and delivered [8]. Then, at the end of the observation window, the MEC begins to projects and renders the tiles within duration $t_{\text{cpt}}$, and delivers the processed tiles within duration $t_{\text{com}}$ to the user. Again, to avoid the MTP latency, the delivering for the $(l)$-th and $(l+1)$-th segment should be finished before the playback begining of the $(l)$-th and $(l+1)$-th segment, respectively. Therefore, the delivering for $(l+1)$-th segment can begin at the playback begining of $(l)$-th segment, and must be finished before the playback begining of $(l+1)$-th segment. That is to say:

$$t_{\text{com}} \leq T_{\text{seg}}$$

(2)

A. Performance Metric of Tile Prediction

Degree of overlap (DoO) has been used to measure the overlap between the predicted and requested frames of a panoramic video [13], [24]. A larger value of DoO indicates a better prediction. To reflect the prediction performance for

1The verified useful information for prediction includes sensor-related information [10]. The sensor-related information contains head movement orientation tracking (i.e., yaw, pitch, and roll) and eye tracking [13], [20] data from the HMD sensors. The content-related information contains the content of historical FoVs [13], [21] and temporal and spatial saliency [10], [22]. The audio information of the VR video is also under discussion [22]. Our framework is suitable for prediction using above one or multiple types of information.

2Pre-buffering more segments is possible but does not improve user experience, because the state-of-the-art prediction methods can only predict one segment accurately [9], [23], [24].

3When the duration of $T_{\text{ps}}$ is about 1s, current prediction methods can achieve high prediction performance [9], [13], [23], [24]. With the fixed deadline of $T_{\text{ps}}$, that is to say, historical information with duration about 1s is enough for prediction.
proactive tile-based streaming, we consider segment DoO, which measures the overlap of the predicted tiles and the requested tiles in a segment. From this perspective, DoO mentioned before can be considered as a special case of segment DoO, when a segment contains only one frame and the duration of the segment equals the duration of a frame. The segment DoO of the l-th segment is defined as

$$\text{DoO}_{l}^{seg}(t_{\text{obw}}) = \frac{q_{l}^T \cdot p_{l}^{\text{obw}}}{\|q_{l}\|_1}$$

where $q_{l} \triangleq [q_{l,1}, \ldots, q_{l,M}]$ denotes the ground-truth of the tile requests for the segment with $q_{l,m} \in \{0, 1\}$, $(\cdot)^T$ denotes transpose of a vector, and $p_{l}^{\text{obw}} \triangleq [p_{l,1}^{\text{obw}}, \ldots, p_{l,M}^{\text{obw}}]$ denotes the predicted tile requests for the segment using the information in $t_{\text{obw}}$, with $p_{l,m}^{\text{obw}} \in \{0, 1\}$. When the $m$-th tile in the l-th segment is truly requested or predicted to be requested, $q_{l,m} = 1$ or $p_{l,m}^{\text{obw}} = 1$, otherwise they are zero. Here the number of predicted tiles should less than a threshold, i.e., $\|p_{l}^{\text{obw}}\|_1 \leq N_{\text{max}}$, where $N_{\text{max}}$ is the number of maximal predicted tiles in a segment.

We use average DoO to measure the prediction performance for all segments of a VR video, which is

$$\text{DoO}^{avg}(t_{\text{obw}}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \text{DoO}_{l}^{seg}(t_{\text{obw}}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n}(t_{\text{obw}}) n$$

where the second equality is the power series expansion.

It can be observed from Fig. 2 that the prediction can be more accurate with a longer observation window. This is because given the beginning of the observation window, the predicted segment is closer to the observed historical information with a larger value of $t_{\text{obw}}$. This gives rise to a reasonable assumption as follows.

**Assumption 1:** $\text{DoO}^{avg}(t_{\text{obw}})$ is a monotonous increasing function of $t_{\text{obw}}$.

**B. Capability of Communication and Computing**

To reflect the capability of the system for delivering and computing the predicted tiles in a segment, we introduce a notion called communication and computing (CC) capability, which is defined as,

$$S_{\text{CC}}(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}) \triangleq \min \left\{ \frac{S(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}})}{N_{\text{max}}}, \left[ \frac{C_{\text{com}}}{s_{\text{com}}} \right], \left[ \frac{C_{\text{cpt}}}{s_{\text{cpt}}} \right] \right\}$$

where $s_{\text{com}}$ (in bit) is the consumed communication resource in delivering one tile (usually no less than the number of bits of a tile), and $s_{\text{cpt}}$ (in cycle or thread) is the consumed computing resource in computing one tile. $x$ is the floor operation of $x$, which denotes the maximal integer value that is no more than $x$. Here the reason we use $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ is that the decoding unit of a segment is tile, thus receiving only part of tile it is useless for decoding.

By substituting (5) into (4), we have:

$$S_{\text{CC}}(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}) = \frac{\min \left\{ \left[ \frac{C_{\text{com}}}{s_{\text{com}}} \right], \left[ \frac{C_{\text{cpt}}}{s_{\text{cpt}}} \right], N_{\text{max}} \right\}}{N_{\text{max}}}$$

**C. Quality of Experience (QoE)**

For proactive tile-based streaming, there will be no MTP latency if (1) can be satisfied, thus MTP latency is out of consideration as a QoE metric. Nevertheless, as we mentioned before, black holes or playout stalls will appear if not all requested tiles can be computed and delivered before playback. Hence, we consider another QoE metric, which measures the ratio of requested tiles that can be computed and delivered before playback to the whole requested tiles. This QoE metric will be improved if either the prediction performance can be improved or more predicted tiles can be computed and delivered. Therefore, we can use the following metric to reflect the QoE.

$$\text{DoO}^{avg}(t_{\text{obw}}) \cdot S_{\text{CC}}(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}) \in [0, 100\%]$$

When its value is 100%, all the requested tiles in a VR video are proactively computed and delivered before playback, thus black holes or playout stalls can be totally avoided.

**III. DURATION OPTIMIZATION FOR COMMUNICATION, COMPUTING, AND OBSERVATION WINDOW**

In this section, we formulate a problem to jointly optimize the duration for communication, computing, and the observation window that maximizes the QoE of watching a VR video. We first decouple the problem into two subproblems, then obtain the global optimal solution with closed-form.

**A. Problem Formulation and Approximation**

To maximize the QoE for proactive VR video streaming under communication and computing resource constraints, the problem that optimizes the duration of observation window $t_{\text{obw}}$, the duration for transmission $t_{\text{com}}$ and the duration for computing $t_{\text{cpt}}$ can be formulated as

$$\max_{t_{\text{obw}}, t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}, t_{\text{CC}}, S_{\text{CC}}} \text{DoO}^{avg}(t_{\text{obw}}) \cdot S_{\text{CC}}(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}})$$

s.t.

$$\text{DoO}^{avg}(t_{\text{obw}}) \cdot S_{\text{CC}}(t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}) \in [0, 100\%]$$

$$t_{\text{obw}} + t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{ps}}$$

$$t_{\text{CC}} = t_{\text{com}} + t_{\text{cpt}}$$

$$t_{\text{com}} \leq T_{\text{seg}}$$

$$t_{\text{obw}} \geq \tau$$

$$t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}} \geq 0$$
where $\tau$ is the minimal duration of the observation window, which depends on the specific prediction method [3] [24].

Consider the relation in constraints (7c)-(7f), we obtain the following proposition:

**Proposition 1:** When $T_{ps} \leq T_{seg} + \tau$, constraint (7e) can be omitted without loss of optimality.

*Proof:* See Appendix A

As we mentioned before, the duration of $T_{ps}$ for about 1s is enough for current prediction, and the duration for a segment $T_{seg}$ in VR streaming can be 1s [9]. Moreover, for some prediction methods, $\tau$ can be 1s [24]. That is to say, it is reasonable to consider the condition that $T_{ps} \leq T_{seg} + \tau$ can be satisfied. Thus in the following, we consider the problem under this condition, and we will consider the condition that $T_{ps} > T_{seg} + \tau$ in future work.

Without constraint (7e), problem $P0$ is still a nonconvex discontinuous problem due to the floor operations in $S_{CC}$. To deal with this, we remove the floor operations in $S_{CC}$, and obtain its upper bound as:

$$S_{CC}(t_{com}, t_{cpt}) \geq S_{CC}(t_{com}, t_{cpt})$$

We replace $S_{CC}$ with $S_{CC}^{ub}$ and obtain the corresponding approximate problem as:

**P1:**

$$\max \quad t_{obw}, t_{com}, t_{cpt} : S_{CC}^{ub}(t_{com}, t_{cpt})$$

s.t. $S_{CC}(t_{com}, t_{cpt}) = \frac{\min \{ C_{com}, C_{cpt}, N_{max} \}}{N_{max}}$

$$t_{obw} + t_{CC} \leq T_{ps}$$

$$t_{CC} = t_{com} + t_{cpt}$$

$$t_{obw} \geq \tau, \quad t_{com}, t_{cpt} \geq 0$$

By this means, we can first optimize these three variables with the following problem

**P2:**

$$\max \quad t_{com}(t_{obw}, t_{CC}), t_{cpt}, S_{CC}(t_{CC})$$

s.t. $S_{CC}(t_{CC}) = \frac{\min \{ C_{com}, C_{cpt}, N_{max} \}}{N_{max}}$

$$t_{CC} = t_{com}(t_{obw}) + t_{CC}(t_{obw})$$

and then optimize $t_{obw}$ and $t_{CC}$ with the following problem

**P3:**

$$\max \quad t_{obw}, t_{CC} : S_{CC}(t_{CC})$$

s.t. $t_{obw} + t_{CC} \leq T_{ps}$

$$t_{obw} \geq \tau$$

where $S_{CC}(t_{CC}) = \frac{\min \{ C_{com}, C_{cpt}, N_{max} \}}{N_{max}}$ and $S_{CC}^{ub}(t_{com}(t_{obw}), t_{CC})$, and $S_{CC}^{ub}(t_{com}(t_{obw}), t_{CC})$ is the maximized value of the objective function of $P0$ after optimizing the problem.

After optimizing problem $P3$, the expression of $t_{CC}$ can be obtained. By substituting the expression of $t_{CC}$ into the solution of problem $P2$, the expression of $t_{com}, t_{cpt}$, and $S_{CC}^{ub}$ can be obtained.

C. Matching Communication and Computing under Arbitrary $t_{CC}$

By substituting $t_{com}(t_{obw}) = t_{CC} - t_{cpt}(t_{CC})$ from (10c), problem $P2$ can be equivalently transformed into the following problem

**P2:**

$$\max \quad t_{com}(t_{obw}), t_{CC}, S_{CC}(t_{CC})$$

s.t. $S_{CC}(t_{CC}) \leq \frac{C_{com}(t_{CC} - t_{cpt})}{N_{com}N_{max}}$

$$S_{CC}(t_{CC}) \leq \frac{C_{cpt}N_{max}}{N_{cpt}N_{max}}$$

$$S_{CC}(t_{CC}) \leq 1$$

The solution of problem (12) is,

$$t_{opt}^{*}(t_{CC}) = \begin{cases} \frac{t_{CC}}{C_{com}N_{max}}, & t_{CC} \leq T_{max}^{MC} \\ \frac{t_{CC}}{C_{opt}} + \frac{\alpha}{C_{opt}}, & t_{CC} \geq T_{max}^{MC} \end{cases}$$

where $T_{max}^{MC}$ is the duration to deliver and compute maximal predicted tiles in a segment, i.e.,

$$T_{max}^{MC} = \frac{N_{max}}{C_{com}N_{max} + \frac{N_{max}}{C_{opt}}}$$

*Proof:* See Appendix D

Further consider the solution, when $t_{CC} = T_{max}^{MC}$, we can find from the case of $t_{CC} \leq T_{max}^{MC}$ in (13b) that $S_{CC}(t_{CC}) = 1$, which is exactly the same value as the case of $t_{CC} \geq T_{max}^{MC}$. That is to say, the two cases can achieve the same maximized value of objective function. However, from (11b) we can find
\[ t_{\text{obw}} \leq T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{CC}}, \text{a smaller} t_{\text{CC}} \text{may increase} t_{\text{obw}}, \text{from Assumption 1, the increase of} t_{\text{obw}} \text{may improve the QoE in problem P3. Thus we have the following remark:}
\]

**Remark 1:** The case of \( t_{\text{CC}} \geq T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max} \) in (17) can be omitted, and the constraint of \( t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max} \) can be added into problem P3, without loss of optimality.

By substituting \( t_{\text{com}}(t_{\text{CC}}) = t_{\text{CC}} - t_{\text{cpt}}(t_{\text{CC}}) \) into (13a), the solution of \( t_{\text{com}} \) can be obtained as:

\[
t^*_\text{com}(t_{\text{CC}}) = \frac{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}}{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}} + C_{\text{cpt}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}}t_{\text{CC}}
\]

(15)

### D. Matching prediction to CC capability

By substituting the constraint \( t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max} \) and the solution of \( SP^\text{P2}_\text{CC}(t_{\text{CC}}) \) under \( t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max} \) case in (13b), problem P3 can be re-written as:

\[
\max_{t_{\text{obw}}, t_{\text{CC}}} \frac{\text{DoO}^\text{seg}(t_{\text{obw}})}{t_{\text{CC}}} \cdot \frac{t_{\text{CC}}}{T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max}}
\]

s.t.

\[
t_{\text{obw}} + t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{ps}}
\]

\[
t_{\text{CC}} \leq T_{\text{ps}}^\text{max}
\]

(16a)

\[
t_{\text{obw}} \geq \tau, t_{\text{CC}} \geq 0
\]

(16b)

Since \( \frac{1}{t_{\text{CC}}^\text{seg}} > 0 \), the objective function in (16a) is a monotonous non-decreasing function of \( t_{\text{obw}} \) and \( t_{\text{CC}} \) under Assumption 1. Therefore, the optimal solution is achieved when \( t_{\text{obw}} + t_{\text{CC}} = T_{\text{ps}} \). Upon substituting \( t_{\text{CC}} = T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{obw}} \), problem (16) is degenerated as:

\[
\max_{t_{\text{obw}}} \frac{\text{DoO}^\text{seg}(t_{\text{obw}})}{T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{obw}}}
\]

s.t.

\[
T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{obw}} \leq T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max}
\]

\[
t_{\text{obw}} \leq -\tau
\]

(17a)

The solution of the problem in (17) is,

\[
t^*_\text{obw} = \begin{cases} H, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) < H \\ \phi^{-1}(0), & \phi(H) \leq 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ X, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \text{no feasible solution}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(18)

Upon substituting into \( t_{\text{CC}} = T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{obw}} \), \( t^*_\text{obw} \) can be obtained as:

\[
t^*_\text{CC} = \begin{cases} W, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) < H \\ T_{\text{ps}} - \phi^{-1}(0), & \phi(H) \leq 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ Y, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \text{no feasible solution}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(19)

where

\[
H \triangleq \max\{T_{\text{ps}} - T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max}, \tau\}
\]

(20a)

\[
W \triangleq \min\{T_{\text{CC}}^\text{max}, T_{\text{ps}} - \tau\}
\]

(20b)

\[
\phi(t_{\text{obw}}) \triangleq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(t_{\text{obw}})^n - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n a_n(t_{\text{obw}})^{n-1}(T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{obw}})
\]

(20c)

and \( \phi^{-1}(\cdot) \) is the inverse function of \( \phi(\cdot) \). The value of \( X \) and \( Y \) can be obtained as:

\[
X = H, Y = W, \quad \text{if } f(H) \geq f(\phi^{-1}(0))
\]

(21a)

\[
X = \phi^{-1}(0), Y = T_{\text{ps}} - \phi^{-1}(0), \quad \text{if } f(H) < f(\phi^{-1}(0))
\]

(21b)

where

\[
f(x) \triangleq \frac{\text{DoO}^\text{seg}(x)}{T_{\text{ps}} - x}
\]

(22)

**Proof:** See Appendix D

### E. Solution of \( t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}, \text{and } SP^\text{P2}_\text{CC} \text{ in Problem P1} \)

By substituting (19) into (15), (13a) and (13b), we obtain the optimal duration for communication and computing, and the CC capability as

\[
t^*_\text{com} = \begin{cases} A \cdot W, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) < H \\ A \cdot (T_{\text{ps}} - \phi^{-1}(0)), & \phi(H) \leq 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ A \cdot Y, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \text{no feasible solution}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(23a)

\[
t^*_\text{cpt} = \begin{cases} B \cdot W, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) < H \\ B \cdot (T_{\text{ps}} - \phi^{-1}(0)), & \phi(H) \leq 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ B \cdot Y, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \text{no feasible solution}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(23b)

\[
SP^\text{P2}_\text{CC} = \begin{cases} \frac{W}{T_{\text{CC}}}, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) < H \\ \frac{T_{\text{CC}} - \phi^{-1}(0)}{Y}, & \phi(H) \leq 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \frac{Y}{T_{\text{CC}}}, & \phi(H) > 0 \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \\ \text{no feasible solution}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

(23c)

where \( A \triangleq \frac{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}}{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}} + C_{\text{cpt}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}} \), \( B \triangleq \frac{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}} + C_{\text{cpt}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}}{C_{\text{com}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}} + C_{\text{cpt}}s_{\text{com}}N_{\text{max}}} \).

### IV. TWO-LIMITED REGIONS AND THE TRADEOFF BETWEEN PREDICTION PERFORMANCE AND CC CAPABILITY

In this section, we show the impact of the allocated resources on the optimal duration, demonstrate the Resource-limited and the Prediction-limited region in terms of solution, and illustrate the relation between the prediction performance and the CC capability via numerical results. In the following, we use the value of \( \frac{1}{T_{\text{CC}}^\text{seg}} \) to reflect the allocated resources. This is because from (14) we can see that increasing of \( \frac{1}{T_{\text{CC}}^\text{seg}} \) can reflect increasing of either communication or computing resource. The numerical results of the solution in (18)-(19)-(23) in this section are all obtained under the case that \( \phi(H) > 0 \) and \( \phi^{-1}(0) < H \). As verified with three prediction methods and a real dataset to be introduced in section IV, this case is the only feasible one.

In Fig. [3], we show the impact of the allocated resources on the optimal duration for the observation window and for
communication and computing, respectively. We provide the values of \( t_{obw}^* \) and \( t_{CC}^* \) versus \( \frac{1}{T_{CC}} \), where \( \tau = 0.1 \text{ s}, T_{seg} = 1 \text{ s}, \) and \( T_{ps} = T_{seg} + \tau = 1.1 \text{ s.} \) The optimal duration are obtained from (18) and (19).

We call this region as “the Resource-limited region”, where the bottleneck in this region is the resources. That is to say, the bottleneck in this region is the resources. To increase the number of bits able to be computed or delivering after satisfying the minimal duration required by the observation window, i.e., \( t_{obw}^* = T_{ps} - \tau \). We call this region as “the Resource-limited region”, where \( T_{CC}^{max} > 0.1 \text{ s.} \) When \( T_{CC}^{max} = 0.1 \text{ s.} \), the time allocated to communication or computing tasks is exactly equal to the required time for delivering and computing all the predicted tiles.

As the value of \( \frac{1}{T_{obw}} \) further increases, all the predicted tiles can be delivered and computed, then the prediction performance becomes the bottleneck of proactive streaming. According to Assumption 1, \( \text{DoO}^\text{seg}(t_{obw}) \) can be improved by increasing \( t_{obw} \). Hence, the optimal solution should allocate longer duration for the observation window, i.e., \( t_{CC}^* = T_{CC}^{max} \) and \( t_{obw}^* = T_{ps} - T_{CC}^{max} \). The value of \( t_{CC}^* \) decreases and the value of \( t_{obw}^* \) increases with \( \frac{1}{T_{obw}} \). We call this region with \( T_{CC}^{max} < T_{ps} - \tau \) as “the Prediction-limited region”.

In Fig. 5, we show how the optimized prediction performance and CC capability is matched as increasing of allocated resources. The CC capability is approximately represented as \( \bar{S}_{CC}^\text{seg} \), which is obtained from (23c). The optimized prediction performance is implicitly reflected by \( t_{obw}^* \) obtained from (18), and the reasons are as follows. First and foremost, the numerical results of optimized prediction performance, i.e., \( \text{DoO}^\text{seg}(t_{obw}) \), can not be obtained. This is because from (18) we can see the order and coefficients in the expression of \( \text{DoO}^\text{seg}(t_{obw}) \) is unknown. Besides, different prediction
methods have different order and coefficients in the expression (the details can be found in subsection V-A), thus we can not assume a general value of order and coefficients in the expression. Nevertheless, from Assumption 1, we can see \( \text{DoO}^{\text{opt}}(t_{\text{obw}}) \) is a monotonous increasing function of \( t_{\text{obw}} \), thus we can use \( t^*_\text{obw} \) to implicitly reflect \( \text{DoO}^{\text{opt}}(t_{\text{obw}}) \). In Fig. 5, we can observe that the Prediction-limited and the Resource-limited Region still exist not only in the relation of \( t^*_\text{obw} = \frac{1}{T^\text{max}_{\text{CC}}} \) that has been verified, but also in the relation of \( S^2_{\text{CC}} = \frac{1}{T^\text{max}_{\text{CC}}} \). The process of matching prediction performance and CC capability are as follows:

In the Resource-limited region, the bottleneck is the resources, that is to say, the CC capability is limited. Thus as the allocated resources increases, the CC capability increases and prediction performance remains constant. At the boundary line, the increased CC capability matches the prediction performance. Then as the allocated resource continues increases, the prediction performance and CC capability enter into the Prediction-limited region. In this region, the bottleneck is the prediction performance. Thus as the allocated resource increases, the CC capability remains constant and prediction performance increases. It can be inferred that the real relation of prediction performance and allocated resources, i.e., \( \text{DoO}^{\text{opt}}(t_{\text{obw}}) = \frac{1}{T^\text{max}_{\text{CC}}} \), has the identical tendency. We will verify this inference in subsection V-B.

Fig. 5: \( t^*_\text{obw} \) and \( S^2_{\text{CC}} \) v.s. allocated resources, \( T_{\text{ps}} = T_{\text{seg}} + \tau \).

In Fig. 6 we show the tradeoff between the prediction performance and the CC capability to achieve a given QoE. With each value of \( T_{\text{ps}} \), we compute the values of \( t^*_\text{obw} \), \( t^*_\text{CC} \), and \( S^2_{\text{CC}} \) with (18), (19) and (23b), respectively. Then, for each value of \( S^2_{\text{CC}} \), we obtain the required prediction performance to achieve the given QoE from (11a) by dividing \( S^2_{\text{CC}} \). To help understand the tradeoff between the prediction performance and the CC capability, we take the average QoE of 90% as an example, where the corresponding values of \( t^*_\text{obw} \) and \( t^*_\text{CC} \) are provided in the figure. To achieve the same QoE, increasing the CC capability from 90% to 100% can reduce the required prediction performance from 100% to 90%.

![Fig. 6: Prediction performance v.s. CC capability, \( T_{\text{ps}} = 1s \)](image)

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we use simulations to verify Assumption 1 with three prediction methods, LR, CB, and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) neural network. Then we verify the Resource-limited region and the Prediction-limited region in terms of QoE with LR and CB methods, and verify the matching progress of prediction performance and CC capability with CB method. Finally, we evaluate the performance of the optimal solution. It is worthy to note that our framework and solution can be applied not only with the above three prediction methods, but also with any prediction method with Assumption 1 holds.

Again, in this section, the numerical results of the solution \([18, 19, 23]\) are all obtained under the case that \( \phi(H) > 0 \) and \( \phi^{-1}(0) < H \).

A. DoO\textsuperscript{opt} Functions of LR, CB and GRU Methods

The method proposed in [9] employs a sequence of traces for the central points of FoVs to train a LR model for predicting the central point of the FoV. Then, the predicted tiles can be obtained from the predicted central point of FoV via projecting [8]. This LR method performs similarly to the update-to-date deep learning methods [24] [13] for tile prediction. The CB method proposed in [8] predicts the tiles to be requested implicitly, by using the tile requests in an observation window as contexts and setting the tile requests in the next segment as arms. The details and comparison of these two methods can be found in [8], which is out of the scope of this paper. The GRU method used in [24] employs a sequence of tile requests in a sliding window to predict the future tile requests in FoV. In their work, a segment contains only one frame, in this case, as we discussed in subsection II-A DoO
equal segment DoO. Thus we use DoO to represent segment DoO to measure the performance of GRU method.

For LR and CB method, \( \tau = 0.1 \) s [8], and we set \( T_{ps} = 1 \) s. We consider a real dataset [21], which contains 500 traces of tile requests from 50 users watching 10 VR videos. For each video, \( K = 50 \) traces can be used to compute the ground-truth of \( \text{DoO}^{seg}(t_{obw}) \). By running each prediction method on the \( k \)-th trace, \( \text{DoO}^{seg,k}(t_{obw}) \) can be obtained under different duration of observation window. Then, for each video, the ground-truth of \( \text{DoO}^{seg}(t_{obw}) \) can be obtained as \( \text{DoO}^{seg}(t_{obw}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \text{DoO}^{seg,k}(t_{obw}) \) for fitting. For LR method, the fitted function is

\[
\text{DoO}_{LR}^{seg}(t_{obw}) = \sum_{n=0}^{3} a_n (t_{obw})^n
\]  

(25)

For CB method, the fitted function is

\[
\text{DoO}_{CB}^{seg}(t_{obw}) = a_1 t_{obw} + a_0
\]  

(26)

For GRU method, \( \tau = 1 \) s [24], and we set \( T_{ps} = 2 \) s. The DoO on the dataset [21] can also be found in [24], the fitted function is

\[
\text{DoO}_{GRU}^{seg}(t_{obw}) = \sum_{n=0}^{2} a_n (t_{obw})^n
\]  

(27)

To evaluate the fitting performance, we use mean square error (MSE) as the metric that is widely used in regression analysis, which is

\[
\text{MSE} \triangleq \sum_{d=1}^{D} (\text{DoO}^{seg}(t_{obw})^d - \hat{\text{DoO}}^{seg}(t_{obw})^d)^2
\]  

(28)

where \( D \) is the number of values of \( t_{obw} \), \( (t_{obw})^d \) is the \( d \)-th value of \( t_{obw} \), and \( \hat{\text{DoO}}^{seg}(t_{obw})^d \) is the fitted value of \( \text{DoO}^{seg}(t_{obw})^d \). For LR and CB method, we set \( D = 28 \), for GRU method, \( D = 4 \) [24].

The corresponding fitting parameters for each video and the fitting performance are provided in Table I and II respectively.

**TABLE I: LR method, fitting parameters and fitting performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video</th>
<th>( a_0 )</th>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_3 )</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7101</td>
<td>0.1594</td>
<td>-0.1648</td>
<td>0.0717</td>
<td>9.6782 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7274</td>
<td>0.1686</td>
<td>-0.2354</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
<td>7.7358 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5773</td>
<td>0.1462</td>
<td>-0.1955</td>
<td>0.1013</td>
<td>7.2133 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7305</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>-0.0879</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>2.3901 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7276</td>
<td>0.2081</td>
<td>-0.2722</td>
<td>0.1392</td>
<td>9.6005 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7155</td>
<td>0.05881</td>
<td>-0.0090</td>
<td>-0.0100</td>
<td>7.0082 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7813</td>
<td>0.10309</td>
<td>-0.1231</td>
<td>0.0627</td>
<td>1.1473 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6883</td>
<td>0.04294</td>
<td>-0.0484</td>
<td>0.0178</td>
<td>9.9769 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7404</td>
<td>0.1499</td>
<td>-0.1802</td>
<td>0.0837</td>
<td>7.3371 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7509</td>
<td>0.1060</td>
<td>-0.0816</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>1.4887 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the space limitation, in this table we use numbers to represent videos. The video names of 1 to 10 are Roller Coaster, Mega Coaster, Shark Shipwreck, Driving with, Hog Rider, Kangaroo Island, Pac-Man, Perils Panel, Chariot Race and SFR Sport, respectively.*
In Fig. 7 we compare the fitting function and the ground-truth of DoO\(_{\text{seg}}\)(t\(_{\text{obs}}\)). For each method, we choose two curves, where one has the best and the other has the worst fitting performance, which are highlighted in Tables I, II, and III, respectively. We can see that both the best and worst fitting functions fit well.

Conclude the three prediction methods running on a real dataset, we can see that although the order and coefficients of t\(_{\text{obs}}\) in their DoO\(_{\text{seg}}\)(t\(_{\text{obs}}\)) are different, they all fit the power series function well. Furthermore, the fitted DoO\(_{\text{seg}}\)(t\(_{\text{obs}}\)) function for each method on each video are all the increase function of t\(_{\text{obs}}\), which verifies Assumption 1.

Besides, since the fitting functions fit the prediction performance very well, thus for convenience, we use the fitting function as the prediction performance in the following.

### B. Verify Two Limited Regions and The Matching Process

In subsection IV we verify the two regions and the boundary line exist in term of duration from the derivations and numerical results, and verify the matching process implicitly. In this subsection, we verify the two regions and boundary line still exist in terms of QoE with LR and CB methods, and verify the matching process directly with CB method.

For verifying two limited region, we use the average QoE taken over the 10 videos as the metric, which is obtained by substituting (18) and (19) into (16a). The results using CB and LR as the prediction method are provided in Fig. 8. Again, as in Fig. 3 we set \(\tau = 0.1\) s, \(T_{\text{seg}} = 1\) s, and \(T_{\text{ps}} = T_{\text{seg}} + \tau = 1.1\) s.

As expected, we can observe the Resource-limited region, the Prediction-limited region and the boundary line similar to Fig. 3 where the curves in the two regions have different slopes. The curve in the Resource-limited region has a larger slope, since the resources are the bottleneck and hence increasing resources can directly improve the QoE. The curve in the Prediction-limited region has a smaller slope, since the prediction performance is the bottleneck, and the increase of resources only plays a role of increasing \(t_{\text{obs}}^* = T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{CC}}^*\) by reducing the duration for communication and computing \(t_{\text{CC}}^*\). When the observation window becomes longer, the prediction performs better, i.e., the value of DoO\(_{\text{seg}}\)\(_{\text{CB}}\) and DoO\(_{\text{LR}}\) increases, and hence the QoE is improved but slowly with the increased resources. Besides, we can see in this region, the QoE using CB method outperforms the QoE using LR method. This is because from Fig. 7(a) and Fig. 7(b), we can see that the prediction performance of CB method outperforms the LR method. Thus it is reasonable to infer if the prediction performance of other method is better than the CB method, the QoE using that method will outperform the QoE using CB method.

Furthermore, in the Prediction-limited region, take the LR method as the baseline, compare increasing resources with improving the prediction performance (which can be achieved by replacing the prediction method as CB method), we can observe that improving the prediction performance provides more remarkably gain in the Prediction-limited region.
Fig. 9: Average QoE over 10 videos vs allocated resources and $T_{ps}$.

$\text{DoO}^{\text{seg}}(t^*_\text{obw})$ taken over the 10 videos as the perdition performance, which is obtained by substituting (18) into (26). We set $T_{ps} = 1$ s, and other settings are the same as settings in Fig. 5. As expected, we can see the matching process of $\text{DoO}^{\text{seg}}(t^*_\text{obw}) - 1$ has the same tendency with $t^*_\text{obw} - 1$ in Fig. 5, which validate our inference.

C. Performance of Matching Prediction to CC capability

We use the average QoE taken over the 10 videos as the metric to evaluate the performance of matching prediction to CC capability, which is obtained by substituting (18) and (19), and with legend "Opt duration".

Since there are no related works of tile-based streaming on jointly optimizing the duration of observation window and for communication and computing, we employ three schemes without duration optimization for comparison. In the first scheme, $T_{CC} = T_{obw} = \frac{T_{ps}}{2}$, which is with legend "1:2 duration". In the second scheme, $T_{obw} = \frac{2T_{ps}}{3}$, $T_{CC} = \frac{T_{ps}}{3}$, i.e., more time is allocated for communication and computing, which is with legend "1:1 duration". In the third scheme, $T_{obw} = \frac{3T_{ps}}{4}$, $T_{CC} = T_{ps}$, i.e., more time is allocated for prediction, which is with legend "2:1 duration". All of the four schemes employ $t^*_\text{com}$ and $t^*_\text{cpt}$ for the given value of $t_{CC}$, which are obtained from (23a) and (23b).

The results using CB and LR as prediction method are provided in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12, respectively. For each method, we set $T_{ps} = 1$ s and $T_{ps} = 0.5$ s, respectively. As expected, the optimal solution always yields the best performance, and the slopes of the optimal solution before and after the boundary line in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 match the slopes in the Resource-limited and the Prediction-limited region in Fig. 9(a) and Fig. 9(b), respectively. Specifically, we have the following extra four findings.

i) As the allocated resources, i.e., $\frac{1}{T_{CC}}$ increase, the gain of optimal solution over the three the baselines for comparison becomes larger, and the performance in descending order is always: "Opt duration" > "1:2 duration" > "1:1 duration" > "2:1 duration". Then on the boundary line, the gain becomes largest, for instance, in Fig. 11(a), the gain over "1:2 duration", "1:1 duration" and "2:1 duration" achieve 16%, 29%, and 43%, respectively. As the allocated resources continues increase, the gain becomes smaller.

ii) For the three non-optimized schemes, as the allocated resources increases, the QoE first increases then remains constant, while the QoE for the optimal solution still increases. This finding is more significant in Fig. 11(a).

iii) For optimal solution, the case with the smaller $T_{ps}$ as in Fig. 11(a) and Fig. 12(a) needs more resources to achieve the boundary line, compared to the case with larger $T_{ps}$, as in Fig. 11(b) and Fig. 12(b).

iv) For the average QoE with two prediction methods, after the boundary line, the gain of CB method outperforms the gain of LR method.

These four findings can be explained as follows:

i) Before the boundary line, all of the four schemes are in...
the Resource-limited region. In this region, the scheme that allocates more time for communication and computing yields better performance, this explains the reason for performance ranking among the four schemes. The optimal solution allocates most time for communication and computing, thus it can compute and deliver the maximal predicted tiles among the four schemes. When the allocated resources achieve to the boundary line, for the optimal solution, it can compute and deliver all predicted tiles, and begins to enter into the Prediction-limited region, while the other three non-optimized schemes are still in the Resource-limited region. The reason that the gain of optimal solution becomes smaller after the boundary line is two-fold. On the one hand, for optimal solution, in the Prediction-limited region, due to the limitation of prediction performance, the QoE increases slowly. On the other hand, the other three schemes are still in the Resource-limited region, increasing the allocated resources can increase the QoE rapidly. Conclude both sides, the gain of optimal solution becomes smaller after the boundary line.

From the above discussion, we obtain two extra findings: a) the Resource-limited and the Prediction-limited region still exist in the non-optimized duration allocation schemes. b) The optimal solution can enter into the Prediction-limited region ahead of other non-optimized schemes.

ii) The reason that the QoE keeps constant for three non-optimized schemes is that they are in the Prediction-limited region. In this region, all the predicted tiles can be computed and delivered, and increasing allocated resources will not directly improve the QoE, the only means to improve the QoE is to allocate more time for prediction. The three schemes still remain fixed duration for prediction, thus the QoE keeps constant. On the contrary, the optimal solution transforms the

---

Fig. 11: Performance comparison on average QoE over 10 videos, CB method.

Fig. 12: Performance comparison on average QoE over 10 videos, LR method.
increased allocated resources into increasing for prediction by $t_{\text{low}} = T_{\text{ps}} - t_{\text{CC}}$, thus the QoE can be continues improved.

iii) The smaller $T_{\text{ps}}$ decreases the time for computing and delivering $t_{\text{CC}}$, and thus more allocated resources are required to achieve the boundary line. We can obtain this conclusion by the expression of boundary line: $T_{\text{CC}} = T_{\text{ps}} - \tau$. When $T_{\text{ps}}$ is smaller, $T_{\text{CC}}$ is smaller, and $\frac{t_{\text{CC}}}{t_{\text{seg}}} = \frac{t_{\text{CC}}}{t_{\text{seg}}} = \frac{T_{\text{ps}}}{T_{\text{seg}}} - \frac{\tau}{T_{\text{seg}}}$ is larger, which means more allocated resources are required.

iv) This reason can be found in the discussion of Fig. 8.

Besides, to show how much communication and computing resources are required for matching the prediction performance and CC capability, we consider the following example in Fig. 11(a). Each segment of the videos in the dataset is divided into $M = 200$ tiles in 10 rows and 20 columns [21], each tile has the resolution of $640 \times 540$ pixels and is with bit rate $r = 3$ Mbps and duration $T_{\text{seg}} = 1$ s [28]. Hence, the number of bits in each tile is $s = r \times T_{\text{seg}}$. The maximal number of predicted tiles in a segment is $N_{\text{max}} = 112$. Assume the consumed communication resource in delivering one tile is equal to the number of bits in each tile, i.e., $s_{\text{com}} = s = 3$ Mbits, and the consumed computing resource in computing one tile $s_{\text{cpt}} = 0.06 \text{ GHz}$. The value of $T_{\text{CC}}$ in the boundary line is $T_{\text{ps}} - \tau = 0.9$ s. Assume that $t_{\text{com}} = t_{\text{cpt}}$. By substituting the values of $T_{\text{CC}}$, $s_{\text{com}}$, $s_{\text{cpt}}$, and $N_{\text{max}}$ into (4), we obtain that $C_{\text{com}} = 746.7$ Mbps and $C_{\text{cpt}} = 12.4$ GHz required in the boundary. If $\frac{t_{\text{ps}}}{t_{\text{seg}}} = 5$, we can obtain that $C_{\text{com}} = 3.4$ Gbps and $C_{\text{cpt}} = 56$ GHz. Further considering Fig. 11(a) we can see that significantly more resources are required in order to provide the marginal gain in terms of improving the QoE in the Prediction-limited region. As we mentioned before, this calls for other new predicting method provides more remarkably gain.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied how to match the prediction, communication, and computing in proactive tile-based VR streaming to maximize the QoE. We employ duration allocation as a tool and both the prediction performance and the capability of communication and computing were taken into account as two influence factors. To solve this problem at hand, we approximated and transformed the original problem into two matching subproblems: matching communication and computing and matching prediction to CC capability. With a reasonable assumption, we solved these two subproblems successively, and the solution with closed-form expression is obtained. Further considered the solution with expression and numerical results, we found the Resource-limited and the Prediction-limited region, as well as the boundary line of these two regions. We revealed the bottleneck of these two regions and explained the practical significance of solution in these two regions. Besides, we revealed the tradeoff between the performance of tile prediction and the capability for computing and delivering the predicted tiles. Simulations with three existing tile prediction methods and a real dataset validated the assumption. With two prediction methods, we validated that the Resource-limited and prediction limited-region still exist in terms of QoE, even with the non-optimized solution. Besides, we evaluated the performance of the proposed optimal solution. Our results demonstrated the benefit of matching the capability of tile prediction to the capability of communication and computing. In the Resource-limited region, the QoE can be rapidly improved by increasing the resources. In the Prediction-limited region, the QoE can be further improved but at the cost of increasing the resources considerably, which calls for improving the prediction performance.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

By substituting the condition $T_{\text{ps}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} + \tau$ and the constraint (7d) into (7c), we obtain:

$$t_{\text{low}} + t_{\text{com}} + t_{\text{cpt}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} + \tau$$

(29)

Then put $t_{\text{low}}$ and $t_{\text{cpt}}$ in the right side, we obtain:

$$t_{\text{com}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} + \tau - t_{\text{low}} - t_{\text{cpt}}$$

(30)

Further consider $t_{\text{low}} \geq \tau$ and $t_{\text{cpt}} \geq 0$ in (7f), we obtain:

$$t_{\text{com}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} + \tau - t_{\text{low}} - t_{\text{cpt}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} - t_{\text{cpt}} \leq T_{\text{seg}}$$

(31)

That is to say, with the constraints (7c), (7d) and (7f), the condition $T_{\text{ps}} \leq T_{\text{seg}} + \tau$ is a sufficient condition for the constraint $t_{\text{com}} \leq T_{\text{seg}}$. This completes the proof.

APPENDIX B

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

From (2a) and (2b), we can find the gap between maximized objective function in problem P1 and P0 can be considered as the gap between $S_{\text{sub}}$ and $S_{\text{CC}}$, with the same $\overline{\text{DoO}}_s (t_{\text{seg}})$. Let $g$ denote the gap between $S_{\text{sub}}$ and $S_{\text{CC}}$, i.e., $g \triangleq S_{\text{sub}} - S_{\text{CC}}$.

Before we start the proof, we first introduce the following property:

Property 1: Assume $x \leq y$, then $\lfloor x \rfloor \leq \lfloor y \rfloor$.

Property 1 can be obtained by the definition of $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$. According to the definition of $S_{\text{CC}} (t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}})$, there are three cases:

When $S_{\text{sub}} (t_{\text{com}}, t_{\text{cpt}}) = 1$, according to (8), we have:

$$\frac{C_{\text{com}} t_{\text{com}}}{s_{\text{com}}} \geq N_{\text{max}}$$

(32a)

$$\frac{C_{\text{cpt}} t_{\text{cpt}}}{s_{\text{cpt}}} \geq N_{\text{max}}$$

(32b)

Upon substituting into Property 1, we have:

$$\left[ \frac{C_{\text{com}} t_{\text{com}}}{s_{\text{com}}} \right] \geq \lfloor N_{\text{max}} \rfloor = N_{\text{max}}$$

(33a)

$$\left[ \frac{C_{\text{cpt}} t_{\text{cpt}}}{s_{\text{cpt}}} \right] \geq N_{\text{max}}$$

(33b)
Upon substituting into Eq. 37, we have:

\[ S_{CC}(t_{cc}) = \frac{C_{com}C_{cpt}}{C_{com}s_{cpt}N_{max} + C_{cpt}s_{com}N_{max}} t_{cc} \]  (39)

Upon substituting into Eqs. 12b and 12d, we have:

\[ t_{cc} \geq \frac{s_{com}N_{max}}{C_{com}} + t_{cpt} \]  (40)

and

\[ t_{cc} \geq \frac{s_{com}N_{max}}{C_{com}} + t_{cpt} \]  (41)

By substituting Eq. 40 into Eq. 41, we obtain

\[ t_{cc} \geq \frac{s_{com}N_{max}}{C_{com}} + t_{cpt} \]  (42)

Conclude the above two cases, the solution of problem 12 can be obtained.

APPENDIX D

PROOF OF THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM IN 17

The KKT conditions [29] of problem 17 can be derived as

\[ \nabla D(t_{obw}) (T_{ps} - t_{obw}) - D(t_{obw}) + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0 \]  (42a)

\[ \lambda_1 (T_{ps} - t_{obw} - T_{cc}) = 0 \]  (42b)

\[ \lambda_2 (T_{ps} - t_{obw}) = 0 \]  (42c)

\[ \lambda_3 (T_{cc}) = 0 \]  (42d)

\[ 0 \leq t_{obw} \leq T_{ps} - T_{cc} \]  (42e)

\[ 0 \leq t_{obw} \leq T_{ps} - T_{cc} \]  (42f)

where \( D \) is a nonnegative function, the constant \( \frac{1}{t_{cc}} \) in objective function.

There are four cases in the KKT conditions:

When \( \lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 = 0 \), from Eq. 42a, we obtain \( t_{obw} = T_{ps} - T_{cc} \), from Eq. 42c, we obtain \( T_{ps} - T_{cc} \geq \tau \). From Eq. 42c, we obtain \( \phi(t_{obw}) = 0 \).

When \( \lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 > 0 \), from Eq. 42a, we obtain \( t_{obw} = \tau \), from Eq. 17b, we obtain \( \tau \geq T_{ps} - T_{cc} \). From Eq. 42c, we obtain \( \phi(t_{obw}) = 0 \).

When \( \lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 > 0 \), from Eq. 42a, we obtain \( t_{obw} = T_{ps} - T_{cc} \), from Eq. 17c, we obtain \( T_{ps} - T_{cc} = \tau \). From Eq. 42c, we obtain \( \phi(t_{obw}) = 0 \).

When \( \lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = 0 \), from Eq. 42a, we obtain \( t_{obw} = 0 \), \( t_{obw} = \phi^{-1}(0) \), where \( \phi^{-1}(0) \) is the inverse function of \( \phi(\cdot) \), from Eq. 17b and Eq. 17c, we obtain \( t_{obw} \geq \max \{ T_{ps} - T_{cc} \} \).

The first three cases can be concluded as:

\[ t_{obw} = \frac{T_{ps} - T_{cc}}{\tau}, \text{ if } \phi(H) > 0 \]  (43)

The fourth case can be concluded as:

\[ t_{obw} = \phi^{-1}(0), \text{ if } \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \]  (44)

When only one of the two cases holds, i.e., \( \phi(H) > 0 \) and \( \phi^{-1}(0) < H \), or \( \phi(H) \leq 0 \) and \( \phi^{-1}(0) \geq H \) holds, the solution are [43] and [44], respectively.
When two cases both holds, i.e., $\phi(H) > 0$ and $\phi^{-1}(0) \geq H$, we compare the objective function in the two cases, and find the solution. As in [22], let $f^{(\text{low})}$ denote the objective functions in problem (17), the corresponding objective function in above two cases are $f^{(H)}$ and $f^{(\phi^{-1}(0))}$. If $f^{(H)} \geq f^{(\phi^{-1}(0))}$, then the solution is $t^{\text{low}} = H$, if $f^{(H)} < f^{(\phi^{-1}(0))}$, then the solution is $t^{\text{low}} = \phi^{-1}(0)$.

Conclude the above all cases, the solution can be obtained.
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