Distributed Indexing Schemes for k-Dominant Skyline Analytics on Uncertain Edge-IoT Data

Chuan-Chi Lai, Member, IEEE, Hsuan-Yu Lin, and Chuan-Ming Liu, Member, IEEE

Abstract—Skyline queries typically search a Pareto-optimal set from a given data set to solve the corresponding multiobjective optimization problem. As the number of criteria increases, the skyline presumes excessive data items, which yield a meaningless result. To address this curse of dimensionality, we proposed a *k*-dominant skyline in which the number of skyline members was reduced by relaxing the restriction on the number of dimensions, considering the uncertainty of data. Specifically, each data item was associated with a probability of appearance, which represented the probability of becoming a member of the *k*-dominant skyline. As data items appear continuously in data streams, the corresponding *k*-dominant skyline may vary with time. Therefore, an effective and rapid mechanism of updating the *k*-dominant skyline becomes crucial. Herein, we proposed two time-efficient schemes, Middle Indexing (MI) and All Indexing (AI), for *k*-dominant skyline in distributed edge-computing environments, where irrelevant data items can be effectively excluded from the compute to reduce the processing duration. Furthermore, the proposed schemes were validated with extensive experimental simulations. The experimental results demonstrated that the proposed MI and Al schemes reduced the computation time by approximately 13% and 56%, respectively, compared with the existing method.

Index Terms—Pareto-optimal, k-dominant skyline, skyline, uncertain data, data streams

1 INTRODUCTION

SKYLINE is an efficient analysis tool [2], [3], [4] for solving multiobjective optimization and multi-criteria decisionmaking problems in the big data of the Internet of Things (IoT). It also has been widely studied and applied in numerous applications, such as location-based services [5], [6], transportation [7], [8], mobile computing [9], [10], Internet of Mobile Things [11], [12], [13], and social networks [14], [15]. As no singularly best answer exists for multi-criteria decision-making applications, the skyline (or Pareto-optimal front) has become a popular approach. Skyline query can assist users to determine the results that fulfills their multicriteria needs, and thus numerous efficient skyline query methods [16], [17], [18], [19] have been developed.

Several well-known location-based services such as Agoda, Hotel.comTM, and trivagoTM, have widely applied skyline queries. To reserve a hotel near a given venue, attendees generally consider the following two factors: distance and price.The attendee may obtain a set of candidate hotels, which is the skyline (or Pareto-optimal front) recommended by these location-based services. As depicted in Fig. 1, the attendee can decide by selecting one of the four hotels from a recommended skyline set of {*A*, *B*, *C*, *D*}.

- The preliminary result of this work was presented in WOCC 2021 [1].
- This research was supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan under the Grant Nos. MOST 109-2221-E-027-095-MY3 and MOST 110-2222-E-035-004-MY2. (Corresponding author: Chuan-Ming Liu.)
- Chuan-Chi Lai is affiliated to the Department of Information Engineering and Computer Science, Feng Chia University, Taichung 40724, Taiwan. (Email: chuanclai@fcu.edu.tw)
- Hsuan-Yu Lin is affiliated to the Tool Productivity Optimization Department, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (TSMC), Hsinchu 30078, Taiwan. (Email: danny30lin@gmail.com)
- Chuan-Ming Liu is affiliated to the Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei 10618, Taiwan. (Email: cmliu@ntut.edu.tw)



Fig. 1. Example of two-dimensional skyline for selecting a hotel

However, as the volume and dimensionality of data increase, the size of the recommended skyline set tends to explode [20], [21], known as the curse of dimensionality. The expected size of the skyline of *n* random vectors/data, with a randomly selected criterion, is $O((\log n)^{d-1})$ in dimensions d [20]. The exponential dependence of skyline on drenders it theoretically useless for IoT analytic applications, except in extremely low dimensions. The quotation information of computer components are listed in Table 1. shows the quotation information of computer components. The values in this table are normalized to [1, 9] space, wherein a lower value represents a better ranking of the corresponding computer components. Suppose a customer intends to purchase a computer, but owing to budget constraints, the best equipment cannot be readily determined. In this case, we can use a skyline query to search options that match the customer's criteria. However, if d = 7 in this example, the skyline result will be $\{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\}$, which is not meaningful for the customer.

To overcome this curse of dimensionality, we propose a variant of skyline–the k-dominant skyline. By relaxing the d-dominance to k-dominance, the k-dominant skyline can

TABLE 1 Quotation information of computer components

Computer	CPU	Memory	HDD	VGA	Motherboard	Power Supply	Blu-ray
u_1	4	8	2	2	8	6	4
u_2	9	8	7	2	1	5	8
u_3	3	2	4	5	6	1	7
u_4	6	3	4	8	1	2	3
u_5	5	7	9	5	7	3	1

obtain a smaller and more manageable set of maxima (or minima), because if k < d, more data items can be eliminated from the skyline. Several methods [21], [22], [23], [24], [25] have discussed *k*-dominant skyline processing based on the certain/deterministic data model, but not all data are certain/deterministic in practical IoT applications. Owing to the aging of the sensor, the data transmitted by the sensor is uncertain. For instance, the location information from the global positioning system (GPS) sensor often contains errors.

Unlike traditional methods for processing the *k*-dominant skyline on deterministic data, the method of calculating the *k*-dominant skyline on uncertain data [26], [27], [28], [29] is much more complicated [30]. Although certain recent studies [31], [32] considered spatial query processing with edge computing, the *k*-dominant skyline processing method based on edge computing environment with uncertain data has been seldom discussed.

This research gap inspired us to propose a method for rapidly evaluating and updating the probability of a *k*dominant skyline in an uncertain edge-IoT data stream environment. In such an environment, each data item bears a specific probability of becoming a *k*-dominant skyline. Owing to the continuous inflow and outflow of data in the system, the *k*-dominant probability of each item varies with time time, i.e., the *k*-dominance probability of each data item must be updated at each instant. Therefore, calculating and updating the probability of the *k*-dominant skyline in an environment of uncertain data flow requires an enormous amount of computation.

In this study, we propose two distributed indexing schemes and apply them to the edge-computing environment to improve the performance of *k*-dominant skyline query processing. Through the proposed distributed indexing scheme, the system can effectively filter out irrelevant information, reduce unnecessary calculations, and thus, accelerate the computation speed. The contributions of the present study are described as follows.

- This study explored k-dominant skyline query processing over uncertain IoT data streams in edgecomputing environments.
- We proposed and deployed two new distributed indexing schemes, *Middle Indexing* (MI) and *All Indexing* (AI), on multiple edge computing nodes to prune irrelevant information in a distributed manner, and thus, effectively improve the performance of the *k*-dominant skyline derivation on uncertain IoT data streams.
- The simulation results indicated that the proposed MI and AI significantly improved the performance of computing *k*-dominant skyline in terms of com-

putation time by approximately 13% and 56%, respectively.

• Compared with the existing method [30], the proposed AI scheme is more suitable for processing high-dimensional uncertain data.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The current state-of-the-art skyline models are reviewed in Section 2. The preliminaries and the problem statements of the current research are expressed in Section 3. Thereafter, the proposed approaches with algorithms and examples are presented in Section 4. The simulation results are discussed in in Section 5. Finally, the conclusions of this study are summarized in Section 6.

2 RELATED WORK

The tools suitable for solving multiobjective optimization problems vary across domains. For example, to solve the considered multiobjective optimization problems in the fields of radio resource management and wireless communications, game theoretic techniques [33], [34], [35] and genetic algorithm-based methods [36], [37] are widely applied. However, the majority of literature in wireless networks focus on realizing optimal performance, and therefore, generate only one Pareto candidate. Conversely, in the fields of database management, location-based services, and recommendation system, k-nearest neighbor [38], skyline [39], [40], and top-k [31], [41] are more popular because most applications in these domains aim at recommending sets of Pareto candidates to the decision-makers. Based on these recommendations of the Pareto candidate sets, the decisionmaker derives the final decision. As the present study is closely related to location-based services and recommendation systems, we did not review the literature on wireless communication and networking issues.

Based on the perspective of data engineering, [2] proposed the idea of skyline queries to extract multicriteria decisions. Tan et al. [16] proposed two indexing schemes, Bitmap and B⁺-tree, for improving the performance of skyline processing. Thereafter, certain studies [18] [19] proposed parallel processing solutions for skyline processing. Zhang et al. [18] used the MapReduce framework for parallel processing of the skyline, and proposed three algorithms: aggressive partition-aware filtering (APF), professional partitionaware filtering (PPF) and partial-presort grid-based partition skyline (PGPS). APF and PPF could filter numerous items in a distributed manner, and PGPS utilized the shuffle processing stage of MapReduce to effectively calculate the skyline from a large amount of data. Huang et al. [19] proposed a cost-based algorithm (CA) according to skyline views to improve the efficiency of the skyline query. The CA algorithm used MapReduce to accelerate the generation of the skyline view (view set).

To support uncetain data, research related to the skyline has been discussed [42], [43], [44]. Ding and Jin [42] evaluated the skyline of uncertain data on a distributed architecture and reduced the computational burden of each distributed node using *probabilistic R-tree* (PR-tree). Liu and Tang [43] proposed an effective probabilistic skyline update (EPSU) method with an augment R-tree structure: SW-tree. With EPSU, uncertain data from the input data stream can be effectively managed, and the time and space required to calculate the probabilistic skyline can be reduced. Park et al. [44] used MapReduce and proposed the probabilistic skyline algorithm by quadtree partitioning with MapReduce (PS-QP-MR) algorithm based on quadtree to process discrete and continuous uncertain data. The authors added a filtering stage to the PS-QP-MR, denoted as the PS-QPF-MR algorithm, to effectively distribute the instances of data items for improving the efficiency of probabilistic skyline queries.

As the number of criteria (or dimensions) increases, it is less likely that one data item dominates another data item, which causes the inclusion of excessive members of the skyline set, and not all criteria of the skyline Set are required by the user. To this end, [21] proposed the concept of k-dominant skyline, which reduced the number of skyline members by relaxing the number of criteria considered from d to k in d-dimensional data, where k < d. Siddique and Morimoto [22] proposed the sort-filtering method, which is suitable for large-scale high-dimensional data and can reduce the time required to calculate the k-dominant skyline query. In particular, they proposed the domination power method [23], which effectively reduced the number of comparisons required to calculate the k-dominant skyline by sorting each item in the sliding window in a specific manner. Under the framework of MapReduce, Tian et al. [24] proposed to the use of a point-based bound tree (PB-tree) to partition the data space and perform parallel calculations. Using the PB-tree method, the workload of the *k*-dominant skyline can be simply distributed and efficiently calculated. As such, four lemmas are proposed to reduce the time required to select candidates and trim false positives in the calculation process of k-dominant skyline [25]. However, the above methods did not considered uncertain data.

Under the environment of uncertain data streams, Li *et al.* [30] proposed the *parallel k-dominant skyline with capability index* (PKDS-CI) approach to rapidly compare the *k*-dominant relationship between two data items. This method initially normalizes each dimension of data and sorts the data according to their normalized values in all dimensions in ascending order. Thereafter, the product of the first *k* small values were sorted, the product of the first *k* large values of each incoming item was determined as the key value, and the sorted results were stored in a table. Based on this normalized and sorted index table, the author proposed the CI theorem to establish that the index effectively filtered out unnecessary calculations, thereby accelerating the update of the *k*-dominant skyline.

In this study, we propose two schemes, MI and AI, based on a distributed edge environment, to process *k*-dominant skyline queries over uncertain edge-IoT data streams. To emphasize the novelty of this work, the proposed schemes and the aforementioned methods are comparatively summarized in Table 2. Furthermore, the proposed MI and AI schemes have been compared with the PKDS-CI in the simulation section.

3 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

In this section, we sequentially introduce the preliminary assumptions, system architecture, and problem statement. The notations used in this research are listed in Table 3.

3.1 Preliminary Assumptions

In this subsection, we define the essential considerations and parameters of this work. Data with uncertainty are called uncertain data [26] [27], which exists in several applications. For instance, multiple temperature sensors may be installed at the same location, and the temperature measured by each sensor may vary, thereby causing uncertainty in the data [28]. This type of data uncertainty is common in environments such as environmental testing and location services. The mathematical definition of uncertain data is expressed as follows:

Definition 1 (Uncertain Data). Given a *d*-dimensional space $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_d\}$, a set of uncertain data $U = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n\} \in S$, and $u_i \cdot s_j$ representing the *j*-th dimensional value of u_i , where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, the occurrence probability of uncertain data item u_i can be denoted as $\mathbb{P}(u_i)$.

An example of an uncertain dataset containing five data items is presented in Table 4, wherein each data item contains four attributes and a probability value. In this example, the attribute values of the data item u_1 in four dimensions are 10,3,4, and 6, respectively; the occurrence probability of u_1 is $\mathbb{P}(u_1) = 0.2$.

Owing to the continuous flow of data stream into the system, copious amounts of data are accumulated. Generally, each datapoint is time-stamped and becomes outdated after a period of time. As these outdated data may provide unimportant information, they must be filtered out to ensure that they do not affect the correctness of the calculation. Because of the infiniteness of the data stream, all data cannot be calculated. As such, the sliding window model can identify the data of interest by filtering out the data that may affect the accuracy of the calculation, which considerably reduces the computation time. Thus, this study adopted the count-based sliding window, defined as follows:

Definition 2 (Count-Based Sliding Window). A sliding window at time *t* is denoted as SW(t). The maximum size of a sliding window is denoted as $|SW|_{\text{max}}$. The size of the sliding window at time *t* is denoted as |SW(t)|. At any instant, |SW(t)| does not exceed the maximum size *n*, i.e., $|SW(t)| \leq |SW|_{\text{max}}, \forall t$. In addition, the sliding window handles the data items in a first-in-first-out manner.

Herein, we assumed that $|SW|_{\text{max}} = 3$ and one new data item flows into the system at each instant, e.g., u_1 at t = 1, u_2 at t = 2, and so forth. In such a scenario, the sliding window will be satiated if $t \ge 3$ and the oldest data item is removed before inserting the new data item.

TABLE 2 Comparisons Of Existing Works

Methods	Query Type	Data Type	Edge Computing
[16] [18] [19]	Skyline	Deterministic	×
[42] [43] [44]	Skyline	Uncertain	×
[21] [22] [23] [24] [25]	k-Ďominant Skyline	Deterministic	x
[30]	k-Dominant Skyline	Uncertain	x
Present study	k-Dominant Skyline	Uncertain	\checkmark

TABLE 3 Notations Used Throughout This Paper

Symbol	Description
d	Total number of data dimensions
k	The target number of dominant dimensions
U	A set of uncertain data items
u	An uncertain data item
S	The attribute space of <i>d</i> -dimensional uncer-
	tain data
$u \cdot s_j$	The j -th attribute value of u
m	The number of edge computing nodes
N_H	The cloud/header server
N_e	The <i>e</i> -th edge computing node, where $e =$
	$1, 2, \ldots, m$
SW	Sliding window
SW(t)	The instance of SW at time t
SW(t)	The size of SW at time t
$ SW _{\rm max}$	The predefined maximum size of SW
$\mathbb{P}(u)$	The occurrence probability of u
$\mathbb{P}_{k-\mathrm{skv}}(u)$	The probability of u being the k -dominance
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	skyline
$u_{ m new}$	A new data item coming into SW
$u_{ m old}$	An old data item leaving SW
$u_{\rm sw}$	A remaining data item in SW
SORTED(U)	The normalized and sorted dataset of U
SORTED(u)	The normalized and sorted tuple of u
$SORTED(u)[\alpha]$	The value stored in the m -th position of
	$SORTED(u)$, where $\alpha = 0, 1,, d-1$
$u_{\min}(k)$	The first selected index position
$u_{\max}(k)$	The second selected index position
$MI_{\min}(u,k)$	The value of $SORTED(u)[u_{\min}(k)]$
$MI_{\max}(u,k)$	The value of $SORTED(u) [u_{max}(k)]$
$MIT_{\min}(k)$	A sorted index table recording the remain-
	ing data items in SW in ascending order of
	$MI_{\min}(u,k)$
$MIT_{\max}(k)$	A sorted index table recording the remaining
	data items in SW in descending order of
	$MI_{\max}(u,k)$
AIT_{\min}	The remaining set of data items after updat-
	ing $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{sw})$ by using the proposed all-
	indexing scheme
AIT_{max}	The remaining set of data items after updat-
	ing $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{new})$ by using the proposed all-
	indexing scheme

A corresponding example is presented in Table 5 to exhibit the variations in the sliding window from t = 1 to t = 5.

To search the *k*-dominant skyline, the system should evaluate the dominant relationship between multiple uncertain items. The dominate is defined as follows:

Definition 3 (Dominate). Given two different data items, $u_a, u_b \in U$. Item u_a dominates item u_b , denoted as $u_a \prec u_b$, iff $u_a \cdot s_j \leq u_b \cdot s_j, \forall j = 1, 2, ..., d$, and $u_a \cdot s_{j'} < u_b \cdot s_{j'}, \exists j' \in \{1, 2, ..., d\}$.

Considering the example in Table 4, if u_4 is not worse than u_2 in all attributes (or dimensions) and u_4 outperforms u_2 in at least one attribute, so we can say u_4 dominates u_2 , denoted as $u_4 \prec u_2$.

TABLE 4 Example Of An Uncertain Data Set

Item	Attr1	Attr2	Attr3	Attr4	Probability
u_1	10	3	4	6	0.2
u_2	9	8	5	9	0.4
u_3	2	10	4	4	0.5
u_4	5	2	3	8	0.1
u_5	7	6	4	6	0.8

TABLE 5 Example Of A Sliding Window

Time Slot	Sliding Window	Size
1	$SW_1 = \{u_1\}$	$ SW_1 = 1$
2	$SW_2 = \{u_1, u_2\}$	$ SW_2 = 2$
3	$SW_3 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$	$ SW_3 = 3$
4	$SW_4 = \{u_2, u_3, u_4\}$	$ SW_4 = 3$
5	$SW_5 = \{u_3, u_4, u_5\}$	$ SW_5 = 3$

In general, the dominant relations between different data items have a transitivity property. This phenomenon is called the *transitivity of domination* and is defined as follows:

Definition 4 (Transitivity of Domination). Given three different data items, $u_a, u_b, u_c \in U$. If $u_a \prec u_b$ and $u_b \prec u_c$, such that $u_a \prec u_c$.

Based on Definitions 3 and 4, *k*-dominant can be defined as

Definition 5 (*k*-Dominate). Given two different data items, $u_a, u_b \in U$, u_a *k*-dominates u_b , denoted as $u_a \prec_k u_b$, iff the following two conditions hold simultaneously:

1) $u_a \cdot s_j \leq u_b \cdot s_j, \forall s_j \in S'$, where $\exists S' \subseteq S, |S'| \geq k$; 2) $u_a \cdot s_{j'} < u_b \cdot s_{j'}, \exists s_{j'} \in S$.

Referring to the exemplary case in Table 4, the data item u_1 was not worse than u_2 in Attr2, Attr3 and Attr4 attributes and outperforms u_2 in at least one attribute such as attribute Attr2, such that u_1 3-dominates u_2 , denoted as $u_1 \prec_3 u_2$.

According to Definitions 3 and 5, *k*-dominance is a relaxing variant of dominance (also called *d*-dominance) and k < d. However, such a relaxation influences *k*-dominance to violate the transitivity of domination. Considering the example in Table 4, if k = 2, $u_1 \prec_2 u_3$ and $u_3 \prec_2 u_1$, this phenomenon is called the *cyclic dominance* (CD) relationship. As most existing skyline query methods follow the transitivity of dominance, they cannot be directly applied to the *k*-dominant skyline query.

Therefore, based on these assumptions and definitions, the k-dominant skyline can be defined as follows:

Definition 6 (*k***-Dominant Skyline).** Given a *d* dimensional space *S*, for data item $u \in S$, none of data items $u' \in S$



Fig. 2. Procedure flowshart of updating $u_{\rm sw},$ where $u_{\rm sw}=\{u|\forall u\in SW\setminus\{u_{\rm new}\}\}$

can k-dominates u, such that u is the k-dominant skyline, expressed as

$$U_{k\text{-skv}} = \{ u | \nexists u' \prec_k u, u' \neq u, u \in S, u' \in S \}.$$

In Table 4, none of data items can *k*-dominate u_3 and u_4 , such that $\{u_3, u_4\}$ represents the *k*-dominant skyline.

In an environment with uncertain data, each data item manifests a probability of composing the k-dominant skyline. Therefore, the probability of data item u representing the k-dominant skyline is defined as

Definition 7 (Probability of Being k**-Dominant Skyline).** According to the aforementioned assumptions and definitions, the probability of data item u being the k-dominant skyline can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u) = \mathbb{P}(u) \times \prod_{u' \in S, u' \prec_k u} \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(u')\right), \qquad (1)$$

where $u, u' \in SW$.

If a new data item u flows into the system, denoted as u_{new} , the system will derive the probability of u_{new} as the k-dominant skyline, $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}})$, using (1). Moreover, the probability of each data item remaining in the sliding window must be updated. If a data item u becomes outdated, denoted as u_{old} , the system will ignore u_{old} and eliminate it from SW. If certain data items are still valid after adding u_{new} into SW, these data items are denoted as a set $U_{\text{sw}} = \{u | \forall u \in SW \setminus \{u_{\text{new}}\}\}$. For simplicity, a data item $u \in U_{\text{sw}}$ is denoted as u_{sw} . The procedure of updating $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}})$ is illustrated in Fig. 2. The process of updating the probability of a data item u_{sw} as the k-dominant skyline follows the definition stated below:

Definition 8 (*k*-Dominant Skyline Probability Update). When a new data item u_{new} flows into the system, if the sliding window SW is already full, the system should remove an old data item u_{old} from SW in advance. After eliminating u_{old} from SW, the system updated each data item remaining in U_{sw} , denoted as u_{sw} , according to

$$\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}}) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}}) / (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{old}})),$$

if $u_{\text{old}} \prec_k u_{\text{sw}} \wedge |SW| = |SW|_{\text{max}},$ (2)

where $U_{sw} = \{u | \forall u \in SW \setminus \{u_{new}\}\}$. If *SW* contains free space/slot or the aforementioned procedure of elimination and update have been executed, the system adds u_{new} into



Fig. 3. Distributed edge-IoT system architecture of considered herein

SW and derives $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}})$ using (1). Thereafter, the system updates each data item u_{sw} (each data item u remaining in U_{sw}) using

$$\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}}) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}}) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{new}})),$$

if $u_{\text{new}} \prec_k u_{\text{sw}} \wedge |SW| < |SW|_{\text{max}}.$ (3)

3.2 System Architecture

Herein, we considered a distributed edge computing environment with uncertain IoT sensing data sources, as displayed in Fig. 3. We utilized this architecture to devise a parallel and distributed computing framework for efficiently processing k-dominant skyline queries over multiple uncertain IoT data streams. There are m edge computing nodes, N_1, N_2, \ldots, N_m , with adequate computing resources and one main cloud server, N_H . All the data coming into edge nodes are uncertain IoT sensing data streams. Each edge node, N_{e} , uses a sliding window, SW_{e} , to handle the received uncertain IoT sensing data. Note that $|SW_e| \leq$ $|SW|_{\max}, \forall e$, where $|SW|_{\max}$ represents the predefined size constraint of all sliding windows. Each edge node, N_e , can directly communicate with the cloud server, N_H , where $e = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Each N_e will continuously submit local collected IoT sensing data to N_H . For the cloud server, N_H , all reported information from every N_e is treated as an input uncertain IoT data stream. N_H continuously places the information received from the edge nodes into its sliding window SW_H and $|SW_H| \leq |SW|_{\text{max}}$. As stated in Definition 2, both the cloud server and edge nodes employ count-based sliding windows.

3.3 Problem Statement

The objective of this study is to develop a timeefficient method to calculate and update the *k*-dominant skyline probability of all uncertain data items in the distributed edge-IoT environment. Although a low latency/computation time is regarded as a key performance indicator for future applications of multicriteria analysis on IoT data, the computation speed of the considered analytical application, *k*-dominant skyline, strongly relies on the dimensionality and volume of the input data. Based on the above assumptions, this study proposes methods to solve the following two problems to improve the computation time for *k*-dominant skylines on uncertain IoT data:

- 1) How to efficiently update dominant probabilities of data items by using the dimensionality of data?
- 2) How to effectively reduce the volume of input data?

4 PROPOSED DISTRIBUTED INDEXING SCHEMES

In this section, we introduce two proposed indexing schemes, MI and AI. Using these schemes, the proposed new theorem can determine an appropriate threshold to build sorted index tables to prune irrelevant data items. This design effectively reduced the amount of reference data required for dominant probability updates of the data items in response to the first problem statement. Furthermore, we applied the proposed indexing scheme to multiple edgecomputing nodes and used this distributed edge framework to efficiently prune irrelevant data items. This approach effectively eliminated the irrelevant data and avoided unnecessary comparisons, thereby significantly improving the overall computation time. In summary, the combination of the indexing scheme and distributed edge framework was applied to address the second problem statement.

4.1 Preprocessing

4.1.1 Data Normalization and Sorting

The proposed MI method was designed to surpass the limitation of cross-dimensional comparisons. To achieve this goal, the first stage of MI, *data normalization and dorting*, normalizes the values of each dimension to the same range and sorts the normalized items in ascending order. An example of a normalized and sorted dataset containing three data items is presented in Table 6.

4.1.2 Selection of Threshold Index Position

After the stage of data normalization and sorting, we obtained a normalized and sorted dataset, SORTED(U), and each data item, $u \in SORTED(U)$, will be sorted in ascending order, denoted as SORTED(u). Thereafter, we employed a pointer $u_{\min}(k)$ to select an index position and used the value stored in this index position as a threshold $MI_{\min}(u,k)$. $u_{\min}(k)$ and $MI_{\min}(u,k)$ can be respectively expressed as

$$u_{\min}(k) \in \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\},\tag{4}$$

$$MI_{\min}(u,k) = SORTED(u) \left[u_{\min}(k) \right].$$
(5)

Using (4) and (5), we defined another pointer $u_{\max}(k)$ and one additional threshold $MI_{\max}(u, k)$ as

$$u_{\max}(k) = u_{\min}(k) + (d-k),$$
 (6)

$$MI_{\max}(u,k) = SORTED(u) \left[u_{\max}(k) \right].$$
(7)

Based on these two pointers and two thresholds, we proposed the following theorem:

Theorem 1. Given a *d*-dimensional space *S*, two data items $p, q \in S$, if $q_{\min}(k) = p_{\min}(k)$ and $MI_{\max}(p,k) < MI_{\min}(q,k)$, such that *q* cannot *k*-dominate *p*.

TABLE 6 Example Of A Normalized and Sorted Dataset

Item	Index 0	Index 1	Index 2
u_1	0	1	1
u_2	0	0.5	1
u_3	0	0.33	0.55

Proof: Assuming that $q_{\min}(k) = p_{\min}(k)$, $MI_{\max}(p,k) < MI_{\min}(q,k)$ and q k-dominates p, q is not worse than p in at least k dimensions and q outperforms p in at least one dimension. However, as $MI_{\max}(p,k) < MI_{\min}(q,k)$, q has opportunities to outperform p in the dimensions from index 0 to index $(q_{\min}(k) - 1)$ and from index $p_{\max}(k)$ to index (d - 1). In summary, q contains at most $1 + (q_{\min}(k) - 1) + (d - 1) - p_{\max}(k) = k - 1$ opportunities to be not inferior or superior than p, indicating that q may (k - 1)-dominate p at most. This contradicts the given assumption and the proof is established.

4.2 Scheme I: Middle Indexing (MI)

4.2.1 Construction of Sorted Middle Index Tables

The proposed MI method sorts each item according to $MI_{\max}(u,k)$ and $MI_{\min}(u,k)$ to filter out the redundant items not required for comparison, reduce unnecessary calculations, and increase the speed of updates. A crucial consideration of this method is that the index position $u_{\min}(k)$ of each data item u remain constant, i.e., all data items require the same baseline to be sorted.

MI includes two sorting strategies–according to the value of $MI_{\max}(u,k)$ and according to the value of $MI_{\min}(u,k)$. The purpose of constructing such an index table is to avoid recalculating and sorting the $MI_{\max}(u,k)$ and $MI_{\min}(u,k)$ of u_{sw} every instant, which can accelerate the procedure of updating the probabilities of the *k*-dominant skyline items.

For each item flowing into a new stream, the proposed MI will use $MI_{\max}(u, k)$ as the key and insert it into the middle index table, $MIT_{\max}(k)$, in descending order. Similar to the index table, $MIT_{\max}(k)$, each new data item can be inserted into the index table $MIT_{\min}(k)$ in ascending order.

4.2.2 The Procedure of Updating *k*-Dominant Skyline Probability using Middle Indexing Scheme

The procedural flowchart for updating $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{sw})$ is illustrated in Fig. 1. The corresponding algorithm is described as a function MI_Update() in Algorithm 1. The operations from Lines 1–9 implement the update of $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{sw})$ in (2) if the sliding window SW is full. The update of $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{sw})$ in (3) is implemented from Lines 10–16. Moreover, lines 3 and 11 of Algorithm 1 use the proposed thresholds in (5) and (7) to review the conditions $MI_{\min}(u_{old}, k) > MI_{\max}(u_{sw}, k)$ and $MI_{\min}(u_{new}, k) > MI_{\max}(u_{sw}, k)$, respectively. If $MI_{\min}(u_{old}, k) > MI_{\max}(u_{sw}, k)$ holds at Line 3, u_{old} cannot k-dominates any other items stored in following slots of sorted middle index table, $MIT_{\max}(k)$. Thus, the system does not execute any action because the following items in the sorted middle index table, $MIT_{\min}(k)$,

PREPRINT SUBMITTED TO IEEE JOURNAL FOR PUBLICATION

Algorithm 1: MI_Update()	
Input: SW, u_{new} , u_{old} , $MIT_{max}(k)$	
Output: Updated SW	
1 if $ SW == SW _{\max}$ then	
2 foreach e in $MIT_{max}(k)$ do	
/* e is $u_{\scriptscriptstyle{\mathrm{SW}}}$ */	
3 if $MI_{\min}(u_{old},k) > MI_{\max}(e,k)$ then	
4 break;	
5 else if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then	
6 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e)/(1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{old}}));$	
7 end	
8 end	
9 end	
10 foreach e in $MIT_{\max}(k)$ do	
11 if $MI_{\min}(u_{new}, k) > MI_{\max}(e, k)$ then	
12 break;	
13 else if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then	
14 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{new}}));$	
15 end	
16 end	
17 return SW;	

fails to k-dominates u_{new} . Similarly, if $MI_{\min}(u_{\text{old}}, k) > MI_{\max}(u_{\text{sw}}, k)$ holds at Line 11, u_{new} cannot k-dominate any items in SW and the system does not execute any action. Otherwise, the system will review whether u_{new} kdominates u_{sw} . If yes, the system will update $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}})$ using (3) at Line 14. The design of thresholds beneficially reduces numerous unnecessary comparisons. This benefit has been established in Theorem 1.

After updating $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}})$ of each remaining item u_{sw} , in the sliding window SW, the system calculated the $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}})$ of the new item u_{new} . The detailed operations were described as the function Ml_Calculate() in Algorithm 2. Line 2 of Algorithm 2 uses the proposed thresholds in (5) and (7) to review the condition $MI_{\max}(u_{\text{new}}, k) < MI_{\min}(u_{\text{sw}}, k)$. If $MI_{\max}(u_{\text{new}}, k) < MI_{\min}(u_{\text{sw}}, k)$ holds, u_{sw} cannot k-dominate u_{new} . Thus, the system does nothing because the following items in the sorted middle index table $MIT_{\min}(k)$ cannot k-dominate u_{new} . If $MI_{\max}(u_{\text{new}}, k) < MI_{\min}(u_{\text{sw}}, k)$ does not hold, the system will review whether u_{sw} k-dominates u_{new} . If yes, the system will calculate/update $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}})$ using (1) at Line 5.

Finally, the system will add the indexing information of u_{new} to the proposed sorted middle index tables $MIT_{\text{max}}(k)$ and $MIT_{\min}(k)$, which will assist in the future processing of *k*-dominant skylines. Such operations are described as function MI_Sort() in Algorithm 3.

4.2.3 Running Example of MI

Consider a scenario of a running example in Fig. 4 and the corresponding dataset in Table 7. If $|SW|_{\text{max}} = 4$, k = 3, and the data items u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_5 enter the sliding window sequentially, then $SW_4 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$. If t = 5, $SW_4 = \{u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5\}$, u_5 represents the new data and u_1 becomes outdated. If we select index 2 and index 3 as the thresholds $u_{\min}(3)$ and $u_{\max}(3)$, respectively, the sorted middle index tables $MIT_{\max}(3)$ and $MIT_{\min}(3)$ will be constructed as Tables 8 and 9, respectively, for t = 5.

Algorithm 2: MI_Calculate()		
Input: SW , u_{new} , $MIT_{\min}(k)$		
Output: $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{new})$		
1 foreach e in $MIT_{\min}(k)$ do		
2 if $MI_{\max}(u_{new},k) < MI_{\min}(e,k)$ then		
3 break;		
4 else if $e \prec_k u_{new}$ then		
5 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}}) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}}) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(e));$		
6 end		
7 end		
s return $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{new});$		

Algorithm 3: MI_Sort()	
Input: <i>u</i> _{new}	
Output: $MIT_{max}(k)$, $MIT_{min}(k)$	
1 insert u_{new} to $MIT_{\text{max}}(k)$;	
2 insert u_{new} to $MIT_{\min}(k)$;	
3 return $MIT_{\max}(k)$, $MIT_{\min}(k)$;	



Fig. 4. Scenario of a running example, where $|SW|_{\max} = 4$, u_1 is going to leave the sliding window, and u_5 is the new data item u_{new} to the sliding window at t = 5

Since u_5 becomes outdated at t = 5 and will be remove from the sliding window SW, the 3-dominant probabilities of the items u_{sw} remaining in SW may vary. The system will use $MI_{min}(u_1,3) = 70$ in Table 7 to compare with $MI_{max}(u,3)$ in $MIT_{max}(3)$ (Table 8). If $MI_{max}(u,3) < MI_{min}(u_1,3)$, the system will not continue to compare with the items stored after u_1 . As u_1 cannot dominate the items stored after u_1 , the system does not need to update the 3-dominant probabilities of these items. In this running example, $MI_{max}(u_4,3) = 60 < MI_{min}(u_1,3) = 70$, such that the 3-dominant probabilities of the items stored after u_4 do not require to be inspected and updated. Conversely, during the influx of a new item $u_{new} = u_5$, the system will review and update the three dominant probabilities of the items remaining in the SW similarly.

Furthermore, the system will determine the objects remaining in the SW that can 3-dominate the new item $u_{\text{new}} = u_5$ by comparing $MI_{\text{max}}(u_5,3) = 80$ (in Table 7) with $MIT_{\min}(3)$ in $MI_{\min}(u,3)$. If $MI_{\max}(u_5,3) < MI_{\min}(u,3)$, the items stored after u cannot 3-dominate u_5 . For the considered running example, we observed that $MI_{max}(u_5,3) = 80 < MI_{\min}(u_2,3) = 90$ and the system does not need to review and update the 3-dominant probabilities of the items stored after u_2 .

Finally, the system will insert u_5 to $MIT_{\min}(3)$, $MIT_{\max}(3)$, and SW. At this instant, the entry and departure operations of certain items within a certain period have all been completed.

TABLE 7 Corresponding Dataset of The Running Example

Item	Index 0	Index 1	Index 2	Index 3
u_1	30	40	70	70
u_2	50	80	90	90
u_3	20	40	40	90
u_4	20	30	50	60
u_5	40	60	80	80

TABLE 8 Example of $MIT_{max}(3)$

Item	$MI_{\max}(u,3)$
u_2	90
u_3	90
u_4	60

TABLE 9 Example of $MIT_{min}(3)$

Item	$MI_{\min}(u,3)$
u_3	40
u_4	50
u_2	90

4.3 Scheme II: All Indexing (AI)

In the MI scheme, the system utilized precomputed threshold index positions u_{\min} and u_{\max} to construct the sorted middle index tables $MIT_{max}(k)$ and $MIT_{min}(k)$ for the given k. Using $MIT_{max}(k)$ and $MIT_{min}(k)$, the system can determine two thresholds $MI_{max}(u,k)$ and $MI_{min}(u,k)$ to prune irrelevant data items, and consequently, improve the efficiency of the k-dominant skyline probability update. For reviewing the dominance between varying items under the same baseline, the system needs to sort $MIT_{max}(k)$ and $MIT_{\min}(k)$ with the fixed threshold index positions, u_{\min} and u_{max} . This finding signifies that u_{min} and u_{max} cannot vary dynamically, which undermines the utility of Theorem 1. Consequently, certain irrelevant data items will not be filtered out. For instance, when new data items arrive, they need to be sorted according to the u_{\min} and u_{\max} obtained in the preprocessing stage. Otherwise, all data items cannot be sorted and compared with the same baseline. Therefore, we proposed the AI scheme to more effectively filter based on Theorem 1.

4.3.1 The Procedure of Updating *k*-Dominant Skyline Probability using All Indexing Scheme

Unlike the MI scheme, the AI scheme does not construct and use sorted MI tables to update the k-dominant skyline probabilities of u_{sw} and u_{new} ($\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{sw})$) and $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u_{new})$). When a new data item u_{new} enters the system, the AI scheme will update the k-dominant skyline probabilities of u_{sw} and u_{new} by directly using (4)–(7) and Theorem 1. Thus, the AI needs to compute all possible $u_{max}(k)$ and $u_{min}(k)$ along with the corresponding possible $MI_{max}(u, k)$ and $MI_{min}(u, k)$. Thereafter, the AI scheme uses Theorem 1 to filter out irrelevant data items, which reduces the computation cost of updating the k-dominant skyline probabilities of the remaining items u_{sw} in SW and the new item u_{new} . When an old data item u_{old} exits the sliding window, the AI

Input: SW , u_{new} , u_{old} , AIT_{max} ; Output: Updated SW ; 1 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max()$; 2 if $ SW == SW _{max}$ then 3 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 4 if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then 5 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e)/(1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{old}))$; 6 end 7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max()$; 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}))$; 13 end 14 end 15 return SW ; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	Algorithm 4: Al_Update()				
Output: Updated SW ; 1 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max()$; 2 if $ SW == SW _{max}$ then 3 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 4 $ /* e$ is u_{sw} */ 4 $ I = u_{old} \prec_k e$ then 5 $ I = V_{k-sky}(e) = V_{k-sky}(e)/(1 - V(u_{old}))$; 6 $ I = und$ 7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max()$; 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 $ I = u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $ I = V_{k-sky}(e) = V_{k-sky}(e) \times (1 - V(u_{new}))$; 13 $ end$ 14 end 15 return SW ; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	Input: SW , u_{new} , u_{old} , AIT_{max} ;				
1 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 2 if $ SW == SW _{max}$ then 3 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 4 if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then 5 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e)/(1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{old}));$ 6 end 7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	Output: Updated <i>SW</i> ;				
2 if $ SW == SW _{\text{max}}$ then 3 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 4 if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then 5 if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then 6 if $u_{end} \prec_k e$ then 7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{\text{max}} \leftarrow \text{Cal_AIT_Max}();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	$ 1 AIT_{\max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max(); $				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2 if $ SW == SW _{\max}$ then				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	3 foreach e in AIT_{max} do				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	/* e is $u_{\rm sw}$ */				
5 $P_{k-sky}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e)/(1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{old}));$ 6 end 7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	4 if $u_{old} \prec_k e$ then				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	5 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e)/(1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{old}}));$				
7 end 8 end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	6 end				
s end 9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	7 end				
9 $AIT_{max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$ 10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	8 end				
10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do 11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return $SW;$ Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	9 $AIT_{\max} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Max();$				
11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then 12 $ \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{new}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return SW; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	10 foreach e in AIT_{max} do				
12 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{new}}));$ 13 end 14 end 15 return SW; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	11 if $u_{new} \prec_k e$ then				
13 end 14 end 15 return SW;	12 $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(e) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(u_{\text{new}}));$				
14 end 15 return SW; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	13 end				
15 return SW; Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	14 end				
Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()	15 return SW;				
Algorithm 5: Cal_AIT_Max()					

	Input: u_{new} or $(u_{\text{old}}), u_{\text{sw}}$;
	Output: AIT _{max} ;
1	$u_{\text{temp}} \leftarrow u_{\text{new}} \text{ (or } u_{\text{old}});$
2	initialize AIT_{max} as an empty list;
3	foreach <i>e</i> in SW do
4	if $MI_{\min}(u_{temp}, k) \leq MI_{\max}(e, k)$ then
5	append e to AIT_{max} ;
6	end
7	end
8	return AIT_{\max} ;

scheme uses the same method to compute $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{sw})$ and $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{new})$.

The procedure of updating $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{sw}})$ using the AI scheme is described below. When a new data item u_{new} enters the system, if the sliding window is full $(|SW(t)| = |SW|_{\text{max}})$, the system with the AI scheme firstly uses indexed values $MI_{\text{max}}(u_{\text{sw}}, k)$, $MI_{\min}(u_{\text{old}}, k)$ and Theorem 1 to rapidly filter out the data items that cannot be possibly k-dominated by u_{old} . After precisely inspecting whether the remaining data items can be k-dominated by u_{old} , the system derives a temporary set, expressed as follows:

$$U'_{\rm sw} = \{ u | \forall u \in U_{\rm sw}, u_{\rm old} \prec_k u \}.$$
(8)

If $U'_{sw} \neq \emptyset$, the system with the AI scheme will employ (6) to update $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u), \forall u \in U'_{sw} \subseteq U_{sw}$.

Second, the system requires to update the data items in u_{sw} that are *k*-dominated by u_{new} . In this step, similar to the preceding step, the system uses the indexed values $MI_{max}(u_{sw}, k)$, $MI_{min}(u_{new}, k)$ and Theorem 1 to filter out the data items that cannot be possibly *k*-dominated by u_{new} . After precisely reviewing whether the remaining data items can be *k*-dominated by u_{new} , the system obtains a temporary set:

$$U'_{\rm sw} = \{ u | \forall u \in U_{\rm sw}, u_{\rm new} \prec_k u \}.$$
(9)

If $U'_{sw} \neq \emptyset$, the system uses (7) to update $\mathbb{P}_{k-sky}(u), \forall u \in U'_{sw} \subseteq U_{sw}$. For the procedure conducted in the above two

Algorithm 6: Al_Calculate() Input: u_{new} , AIT_{min} ; Output: $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{new})$; 1 $AIT_{min} \leftarrow Cal_AIT_Min()$; 2 foreach e in AIT_{min} do 3 | if $e \prec_k u_{new}$ then 4 | $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{new}) = \mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{new}) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(e))$; 5 | end 6 end 7 return $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{new})$;

Algorithm 7: Cal_AIT_Min()

Input: u_{new}, u_{sw} ; Output: AIT_{min} ; 1 initialize AIT_{min} as an empty list; 2 foreach e in SW do 3 | if $MI_{min}(e, k) \le MI_{max}(u_{new}, k)$ then 4 | append e to AIT_{min} ; 5 | end 6 end 7 return AIT_{min} ;

steps, please refer to Algorithms 4 and 5.

Thereafter, in the similar manner, the system uses all the indexed values $MI_{\max}(u_{sw}, k)$, $MI_{\min}(u_{new}, k)$, and Theorem 1 to prune those data items that cannot possibly *k*-dominate u_{new} . After the system inspects whether the remaining data items are *k*-dominated by u_{new} , the system derives a temporary set

$$U'_{\rm sw} = \{ u | \forall u \in U_{\rm sw}, u \prec_k u_{\rm new} \}.$$

$$(10)$$

If $U'_{sw} \neq \emptyset$, the system uses (7) with the data items in U'_{sw} to derive $\mathbb{P}_{k\text{-sky}}(u_{\text{new}})$. The procedure for this step is presented in Algorithms 6 and 7.

4.3.2 Running Example of AI

The AI scheme uses all possible index positions to obtain the indexed threshold values for pruning data items. Considering the same example in Fig. 4, AI will use the following three combinations of indexes: 1) $u_{\min}(3) = 0, u_{\max}(3) = 1;$ 2) $u_{\min}(3) = 1$, $u_{\max}(3) = 2$; and 3) $u_{\min}(3) = 2$, $u_{\max}(3) = 2$ 3 as filtering conditions. First, as $u_{old} = u_1$ exists, the system will determine the data items in the sliding windows that are altering their own k-dominant probabilities, i.e., $U'_{sw} = \{u | \forall u \in U_{sw}, u_1 \prec_k u\}, \text{ where } U_{sw} = \{u_2, u_3, u_4\}.$ For each data item u in $U_{\rm sw}$, the system uses all indexed threshold values corresponding to the above three combinations of indices to prune the data items. For each combination if $MI_{\min}(u_1,k) > MI_{\max}(u,k), \forall u \in U_{sw}, u$ will be filtered out. In this running example of k = 3, u_2 and u_3 does not satisfy all the above-mentioned three combinations of filtering conditions such that they are not filtered out at this step. For $u_{\min}(3) = 2, u_{\max}(3) = 3$, $MI_{\min}(u_1,3) = 70 > MI_{\max}(u_4,3) = 60$, so u_4 will be pruned out. Until this step, by leveraging the proposed AI scheme, the system can efficiently obtain a temporary set $U'_{sw} = \{u_2, u_3\}$. This temporary set includes data items that may need to update their 3-dominant probabilities. However, the system still needs to review whether u_1 can

assuredly 3-dominates u_2 and u_3 . If yes, the system will update the 3-dominant probability of each data item that is exactly dominated by $u_{old} = u_1$. For the other two scenarios: 1) the 3-dominant probability of each data item $u \in U_{sw}$ is updated, where $u_1 \prec_3 u$ and 2) the 3-dominant probability of $u_{new} = u_5$ is updated, based on which the system uses the aforementioned three combinations of the indices (filtering conditions) to prune irrelevant data items in the same manner.

4.4 Complexity Discussion

After introducing the proposed MI and AI schemes, we discuss their time complexity in this section. As discussed earlier, *d* denotes the data dimension and $|SW|_{\text{max}}$ represents the size constraint of the sliding window on a server or edge node. In the first step of the preprocessing phase (i.e., data normalization and sorting), a normalized and sorted dataset should be constructed in both MI and AI. Using a linear time sorting algorithm (e.g. bucket sort), the computation cost of this step is $O(|SW|_{\text{max}} \cdot d)$.

In the second step of the preprocessing phase, the threshold index positions and thresholds are selected according to (4)–(7). Therefore, this operation requires a computation time of only O(1). Subsequently, the system enters the second phase of updating the k-dominant skyline probability. In this phase, MI uses two middle index tables, $MIT_{max}(k)$ and $MIT_{min}(k)$, and requires a computation time of $O(|SW|_{\text{max}})$ to update the dominant probabilities of the relevant data items in SW. Conversely, the AI uses all combination of $(u_{\min}(k), u_{\max}(k)) \in \{(0, d-k), (1, d-k)\}$ $(k+1), \ldots, (k-1, d)$ to filter out irrelevant data items and update dominant probabilities of the relevant data items in *SW*, thereby requiring $O(|SW|_{\max} \cdot k)$ for computation. Therefore, the time complexity of the MI and AI schemes in the worst scenario will be $O(|SW|_{\max} \cdot (d+1))$ and $O(|SW|_{\max} \cdot (d+k))$, respectively. In fact, both MI and AI schemes bear the same time complexity, $O(|SW|_{\text{max}} \cdot d)$, because $k \leq d$.

However, the occurrence of the worst case is highly infrequent. Owing to effective data pruning, the number of reference data items for updating the dominant probability in the second phase is typically less than $|SW|_{\text{max}}$. Suppose the average numbers of the data items referenced for each update of dominant probability in the MI and AI schemes are \bar{r}_{MI} and \bar{r}_{AI} , respectively, where $\bar{r}_{\text{MI}} \leq |SW|_{\text{max}}$ and $\bar{r}_{\text{AI}} \leq |SW|_{\text{max}}$. Accordingly, the time complexity of the MI and AI schemes in the median occurrence case will be $O(|SW|_{\text{max}} \cdot d + \bar{r}_{\text{MI}})$ and $O(|SW|_{\text{max}} \cdot d + \bar{r}_{\text{AI}} \cdot k)$, respectively.

5 SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we conducted several simulations to verify the performance of the proposed MI and AI schemes, including their comparison with the existing method PKDS-CI [30] under two distinct scenarios/environments. In Scenario I, only a single computing node is employed to simulate a centralized computing environment, indicating that the master node is a poker node. In Scenario II, five computing/worker nodes are used including a master node

TABLE 10 Parameter Settings for Scenario I

Parameter	Values	Default Value	
Data dimensionality	12	12	
k	7, 8, 9, 10, 11	11	
$ SW _{\rm max}$	100, 200,, 1,000	500	
The number of data items	10,000	10,000	

to simulate a distributed edge-computing environment. The master node is responsible for collecting distributed computing results and deriving the global *k*-dominant skyline.

As the objective of this research is to improve the computation time (or latency) of the *k*-dominant skyline query (problem statement described in Section 3), we analyzed the performance of the proposed MI and AI schemes and compared it with that of the PKDS-CI method in terms of the average computation time. Recall the problem statement described in Section 3, the objective of this work is to improve the computation time (or latency) of the *k*-dominant skyline query. Hence, we will discuss the performance of our proposed MI and AI schemes and the compared PKDS-CI method in terms of average computation time. In particular, we investigated the influence of the two major factors on the average computation time of each method, i.e., *k* value and the sliding window size $|SW|_{\rm max}$ in Scenarios I and II.

5.1 Scenario I: Centralized Computing Environment

In scenario I, we measured the performance of each scheme on a centralized computing node. The simulations were performed on a computer with an Intel Core i5-4460 CPU, 16 GB DDR3 RAM, and Windows 10. In total, six virtual machines (5 worker nodes and 1 master node) were deployed using Ubuntu 16.04. The simulation of Scenario I was implemented in Python 3.7.4 environment. The output data were the average of 30 iterations/results. The settings of the simulation parameters for Scenario I are presented in Table 10.

First, We discuss the impact of k value on the computation time. According to the results illustrated in Fig. 5, we determined that when the k-value was larger and approached the value of the data dimensions d, the computation cost of MI and PKDS-CI was less. This is because for a small k, an item is less likely to be dominated by another item. Regardless of using any indexing scheme for data pruning, the effect of data pruning worsened as *k* decreased. Notably, the proposed MI scheme outperformed PKDS-CI by about 2% to 13% for k varying from 7 to 11. Conversely, the proposed AI scheme outperformed PKDS-C by about 7% to 44.5% for k varying from 9 to 11. If $k \leq 8$, the AI scheme delivered a worse performance than PKDS-C, as AI inspects all the combinations of the index positions, $u_{\max}(k)$ and $u_{\min}(k)$, for pruning data. Furthermore, if k decreases, a data item cannot easily k-dominate another data item. This phenomenon increases the computation time of the AI scheme as it compares the attribute values between the data items but cannot effectively prune the data. Recall that the average time complexity of AI is $O(|SW|_{\text{max}} \cdot d + \bar{r}_{\text{AI}} \cdot k)$ and $\bar{r}_{\rm AI}$ is typically much larger than k. These simulation results verify that the pruning effect is poor for small values of k and \bar{r}_{AI} remains exceedingly large after pruning. If k



Fig. 5. Computation time of various indexing schemes with varying *k* values on a centralized computing node



Fig. 6. Computation time of various indexing schemes using varying size constraints of sliding windows, $|SW|_{\rm max},$ on a centralized computing node

increases, a data item can more easily *k*-dominate another data item. Thus, in such cases, the AI scheme delivered superior performance in terms of computation time, as it utilized a greater number of combinations of index positions ($u_{\max}(k)$ and $u_{\min}(k)$) than MI and PKDS-CI for data pruning, which significantly reduced \bar{r}_{AI} . Therefore, the proposed AI scheme can more effectively prune data. In summary, the AI solution is more suitable for situations with relatively large values of *d* and *k*.

Additionally, we determined the influence of the size constraint of the sliding windows $|SW|_{\text{max}}$ in the simulation of scenario I. As depicted in Fig. 6, the computation cost of all the compared schemes increased with $|SW|_{\text{max}}$ from 100 to 1000, because every update or evaluation of the *k*-dominant skyline probability of u_{new} compared u_{new} with all items in the sliding window for filtering out data that are *k*-dominated. As expected, the computation time increased when *SW* contained a greater number of items. The results indicated that the extent to which MI and AI can outperform PKDS is not affected by the sliding window size. As portrayed in Fig. 6, the proposed MI and AI schemes decreased the required computation time by about 12% and

TABLE 11 Parameter Settings for Scenario II

Parameter	Values	Default Value
Data dimensionality	12	12
k	7, 8, 9, 10, 11	11
$ SW _{\rm max}$	300, 400, 500, 600, 700	300
The number of data items	10,000	10,000

24% compared to PKDS, respectively.

5.2 Scenario II: Distributed Edge Computing Environment

In Scenario II, we measured the performance of each scheme in a simulated distributed edge computing environment. We execute this simulation on a computer with an Intel Core i7-9700 CPU, 64 GB DDR4 RAM, and Windows 10. We deployed six virtual machines (5 worker nodes and 1 master node) using Ubuntu 16.04 with Apache Spark 2.4.4 platform [45]. The simulations were implemented in Python 3.7.4 environment. The average of 10 iterations/results from the simulations was considered the output data. The settings of the simulation parameters for Scenario II are presented in Table 11.

First, we discuss the impact of k value on computation time. The results obtained with various k values from 7 to 11 is depicted in Fig. 7. As k increases, the performance of AI, MI, and PKDS-CI in terms of the computation time decreases. As k increases, the AI and MI outperformed PKDS-CI by about 70% and 8.06%, respectively. Ultimately, we performed simulations to quantify the impact of the sliding window size on the computation time. The results are presented in Fig. 8. As observed from the results, the computation time increased with the sliding window size. If the size of sliding window ranged from 300 to 700, MI was about 8% to 13% faster than PKDS-CI and AI was about 52% to 56% faster than PKDS-CI. This result demonstrates that the lead does not significantly vary with the size of the sliding window.

5.3 Comparison Summary

As listed in Table 12, the comparison of three schemes varied across the six distinct scenarios. The comparison characteristics were classified in three categories: best, medium, and worst.

According to the present simulation results, the MI scheme displayed medium computational performance across various simulation scenarios in a centralized environment. For large values of d, k and |SW|, the AI scheme delivered the best computational performance. Overall, the conventional method PKDS-CI delivered the worst performance. The AI scheme delivered the worst performance only when the difference between d and k becomes exceedingly large. In such scenarios, the AI scheme cannot effectively prune the irrelevant data items, thereby conducting unnecessary dominance inspections and probability updates. Furthermore, the present simulation results revealed that the computation time for all comparison schemes were proportional to the size of the sliding window. Among



Fig. 7. Computation time of various indexing schemes for varying k values on distributed edge computing nodes



Fig. 8. Computation time of various indexing schemes while using varying size constraints of sliding windows, $|SW|_{\rm max}$, on distributed edge computing nodes

TABLE 12 Comparative Summary of Simulation Performance

Model	Scenario		Method	
WIGHEI		MI	AI	PKDS-CI
	Large d and k	Medium	Best	Worst
Centralized	Large d and small k	Medium	Worst	Best
	Large SW	Medium	Best	Worst
	Large d and k	Medium	Best	Worst
Distributed	Large d and small k	Medium	Best	Medium
	Large SW	Medium	Best	Worst

these schemes, the AI scheme exhibited the flattest trend of computation time growth.

In a distributed edge-computing environment, AI consistently outperformed other comparisons in all considered scenarios. In all test scenarios, MI exhibited medium/moderate computational performance and the comparison method, PKDS-CI, was outperformed in all test scenarios. Only in the case of large d and small k, the computational performances of PKDS-CI and MI were at par.

6 CONCLUSION

As evaluating the k-dominant skyline probability of each data item in an uncertain data stream requires an enormous amount of computation, the theorem proposed in this study can effectively and rapidly determine the k-dominant relationship between two items. We applied this theorem for the derivation of the k-dominant skyline. In addition, we proposed two highly efficient indexing schemes, MI and AI, to effectively filter out several items that did not require any comparison, which significantly accelerated the calculation/update speed. Furthermore, we applied the proposed schemes to a simulated distributed edge-computing environment and conducted certain simulations to measure their performance. According to the simulation results, the distributed MI and AI decreased the computation time by about 13% and 56% compared with the existing method. In particular, for processing high-dimensional uncertain data, the AI scheme can outperform the existing method by almost 70% performance.

In future, we will apply the proposed schemes to a mobile edge-computing platform to provide multicriteria decision services to improve the performance of locationbased recommendation applications.

REFERENCES

- C.-C. Lai, H.-Y. Lin, and C.-M. Liu, "Highly efficient indexing scheme for k-dominant skyline processing over uncertain data streams," in 2021 30th Wireless and Optical Communications Conference (WOCC), Taipei, Taiwan, 2021.
- S. Borzsony, D. Kossmann, and K. Stocker, "The skyline operator," in 17th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), Heidelberg, Germany, 2001.
- [3] D. Kossmann, F. Ramsak, and S. Rost, "Shooting stars in the sky: An online algorithm for skyline queries," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, ser. VLDB '02. VLDB Endowment, 2002, p. 275–286.
- [4] J. Chomicki, P. Godfrey, J. Gryz, and D. Liang, "Skyline with presorting," in *Proceedings 19th International Conference on Data Engineering (Cat. No.03CH37405)*, 2003, pp. 717–719.
- [5] I. M. Al Jawarneh, P. Bellavista, A. Corradi, L. Foschini, and R. Montanari, "Big spatial data management for the internet of things: A survey," *Journal of Network and Systems Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 990–1035, Oct. 2020.
- [6] Y. Li, F. Liu, J. Zhang, T. Chen, H. Chen, and W. Liu, "Privacy-aware fuzzy skyline parking recommendation using edge traffic facilities," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 10, pp. 9775–9786, 2021.
 [7] J. Chaolong, W. Hanning, and W. Lili, "Study of smart trans-
- [7] J. Chaolong, W. Hanning, and W. Lili, "Study of smart transportation data center virtualization based on vmware vsphere and parallel continuous query algorithm over massive data streams," *Procedia Engineering*, vol. 137, pp. 719–728, 2016.
- [8] Q. Gong, J. Liu, and H. Cao, "Csq system: A system to support constrained skyline queries on transportation networks," in 2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), Dallas, TX, USA, 2020.
- [9] A. Bozorgchenani, F. Mashhadi, D. Tarchi, and S. A. Salinas Monroy, "Multi-objective computation sharing in energy and delay constrained mobile edge computing environments," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 2992–3005, 2021.
- [10] X. Zhang, R. Lu, J. Shao, H. Zhu, and A. A. Ghorbani, "Continuous probabilistic skyline query for secure worker selection in mobile crowdsensing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 14, pp. 11758–11772, Jul. 2021.
- [11] C.-C. Lai, Z. F. Akbar, C.-M. Liu, V.-D. Ta, and L.-C. Wang, "Distributed continuous range-skyline query monitoring over the internet of mobile things," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 6652–6667, Aug. 2019.

- [12] D. Nobayashi, I. Goto, H. Teshiba, K. Tsukamoto, T. Ikenaga, and M. Gerla, "Adaptive data transmission control for spatio-temporal data retention over crowds of vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 3822–3835, 2022.
- [13] X. Xu, L. Yao, M. Bilal, S. Wan, F. Dai, and K.-K. R. Choo, "Service migration across edge devices in 6g-enabled internet of vehicles networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1930– 1937, 2022.
- [14] Q. Li, Y. Zhu, and J. X. Yu, "Skyline cohesive group queries in large road-social networks," in 2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), Dallas, TX, USA, 2020.
- [15] F. Hao, J. Gao, J. Chen, A. Nasridinov, and G. Min, "Skyline (λ, k)cliques identification from fuzzy attributed social networks," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1075– 1086, 2022.
- [16] K.-L. Tan, P.-K. Eng, and B. C. Ooi, "Efficient progressive skyline computation," in 27th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB), Roma, Italy, 2001.
- [17] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: Simplified data processing on large clusters," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, p. 107–113, Jan. 2008.
- [18] J. Zhang, X. Jiang, W.-S. Ku, and X. Qin, "Efficient parallel skyline evaluation using mapreduce," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1996–2009, Jul. 2015.
- [19] Z. Huang, W. Xu, J. Cheng, and J. Ni, "An efficient algorithm for skyline queries in cloud computing environments," *China Communications*, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 182–193, Oct. 2018.
- [20] J. L. Bentley, H. T. Kung, M. Schkolnick, and C. D. Thompson, "On the average number of maxima in a set of vectors and applications," *Journal of ACM*, vol. 25, no. 4, p. 536–543, Oct. 1978.
- [21] C.-Y. Chan, H. Jagadish, K.-L. Tan, A. K. Tung, and Z. Zhang, "Finding k-dominant skylines in high dimensional space," in 2006 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Chicago, IL, USA, 2006.
- [22] M. A. Siddique and Y. Morimoto, "k-dominant skyline computation by using sort-filtering method," in *Pacific-Asia Conference* on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (PAKDD), Bangkok, Thailand, 2009.
- [23] —, "Efficient k-dominant skyline computation for high dimensional space with domination power index," *Journal of Computers*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 608–615, Mar. 2012.
- [24] H. Tian, M. A. Siddique, and Y. Morimoto, "An efficient processing of k-dominant skyline query in mapreduce," in *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Bringing the Value of "Big Data" to Users* (Data4U 2014), 2014, pp. 29–34.
- [25] G. Lee and Y.-H. Lee, "An efficient method of computing the kdominant skyline efficiently by partition value," in 2017 3rd International Conference on Information Management (ICIM), Chengdu, China, 2017.
- [26] A. Sarma, O. Benjelloun, A. Halevy, and J. Widom, "Working models for uncertain data," in 22nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), Atlanta, GA, USA, 2006.
- [27] J. Pei, B. Jiang, X. Lin, and Y. Yuan, "Probabilistic skylines on uncertain data," in 33rd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB), Vienna, Austria, 2007.
- [28] S. Prabhakar and R. Cheng, "Data uncertainty management in sensor networks," in *Encyclopedia of Database Systems*, 1st ed., L. Liu and M. T. Özsu, Eds. Boston, MA: Springer US, 2009, pp. 647–651.
- [29] Y. Wang, X. Li, X. Li, and Y. Wang, "A survey of queries over uncertain data," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 485–530, Dec. 2013.
- [30] X. Li, J. Liu, K. Ren, X. Li, X. Ren, and K. Deng, "Parallel kdominant skyline queries over uncertain data streams with capability index," in 2019 IEEE 21st International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications; IEEE 17th International Conference on Smart City; IEEE 5th International Conference on Data Science and Systems (HPCC/SmartCity/DSS), Zhangjiajie, China, 2019.
- [31] C.-C. Lai, T.-C. Wang, C.-M. Liu, and L.-C. Wang, "Probabilistic top-k dominating query monitoring over multiple uncertain iot data streams in edge computing environments," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 8563–8576, Oct. 2019.
- [32] Y. Wu, "Cloud-edge orchestration for the internet of things: Architecture and ai-powered data processing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 16, pp. 12792–12805, Aug. 2021.
- [33] X. Mi, C. Yang, Y. Song, Z. Han, and M. Guizani, "Matching game for intelligent resource management in integrated satellite-

terrestrial networks," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 88–94, 2022.
[34] Y. Kang, H. Wang, B. Kim, J. Xie, X.-P. Zhang, and Z. Han, "Time

- [34] Y. Kang, H. Wang, B. Kim, J. Xie, X.-P. Zhang, and Z. Han, "Time efficient offloading optimization in automotive multi-access edge computing networks using mean-field games," *IEEE Transactions* on Vehicular Technology, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [35] P. A. Apostolopoulos, E. E. Tsiropoulou, and S. Papavassiliou, "Cognitive data offloading in mobile edge computing for internet of things," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 55736–55749, 2020.
- [36] P. Abeysekara, H. Dong, and A. K. Qin, "Edge intelligence for real-time iot service trust prediction," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 2023, early access.
- [37] X. Li, Z. Zhou, Q. He, Z. Shi, W. Gaaloul, and S. Yangui, "Rescheduling iot services in edge networks," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, 2023, early access.
 [38] Y. Liu, S.-T. Khu, and D. Savic, "A hybrid optimization method of
- [38] Y. Liu, S.-T. Khu, and D. Savic, "A hybrid optimization method of multi-objective genetic algorithm (moga) and k-nearest neighbor (knn) classifier for hydrological model calibration," in *Intelligent Data Engineering and Automated Learning – IDEAL 2004, Z. R. Yang,* H. Yin, and R. M. Everson, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 546–551.
- Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 546–551.
 [39] H. Wijayanto, W. Wang, W.-S. Ku, and A. L. Chen, "Lshape partitioning: Parallel skyline query processing using mapreducemapreduce," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 3363–3376, 2022.
- [40] Z. Wang, X. Ding, J. Lu, L. Zhang, P. Zhou, K.-K. R. Choo, and H. Jin, "Efficient location-based skyline queries with secure r-tree over encrypted data," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, pp. 1–14, 2023, early access.
- [41] S. Nishio, D. Amagata, and T. Hara, "Lamps: Location-aware moving top-k pub/sub," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 352–364, 2022.
 [42] X. Ding and H. Jin, "Efficient and progressive algorithms for
- [42] X. Ding and H. Jin, "Efficient and progressive algorithms for distributed skyline queries over uncertain data," *IEEE Transactions* on Knowledge and Data Engineering, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1448–1462, Aug. 2011.
- [43] C.-M. Liu and S.-W. Tang, "An effective probabilistic skyline query process on uncertain data streams," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 63, pp. 40–47, 2015.
- [44] Y. Park, J.-K. Min, and K. Shim, "Processing of probabilistic skyline queries using mapreduce," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 1406–1417, Aug. 2015.
- [45] M. Zaharia, R. S. Xin, P. Wendell, T. Das, M. Armbrust, A. Dave, X. Meng, J. Rosen, S. Venkataraman, M. J. Franklin, A. Ghodsi, J. Gonzalez, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica, "Apache Spark: A unified engine for big data processing," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 56–65, Nov. 2016.



Hsuan-Yu Lin received his MS degree from the Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taipei University of Technology (Taipei Tech), Taiwan in 2021. He joined the Applied Computing Laboratory in 2019 and was interested in developing data indexing and query processing algorithms for data analytic applications. Currently, he is an engineer with the Tool Productivity Optimization Department, Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (TSMC), Hsinchu, Taiwan.



Chuan-Ming Liu (M'03) completed the Ph.D. in computer science from Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA, in 2002. Dr. Liu serves as a Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Information Engineering, National Taipei University of Technology (Taipei Tech), Taiwan. In 2010 and 2011, he held visiting appointments with Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA and Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, China. In addition to his association with several journals, conferences, and societies, he has

published more than 100 papers in numerous prestigious journals and international conferences. His research interests include big data management and processing, uncertain data management, data science, spatial data processing, data streams, ad hoc and sensor networks, and location-based services.



Chuan-Chi Lai (S'13 – M'18) received his Ph.D. degree in computer science and information engineering from the National Taipei University of Technology, Taipei, Taiwan in 2017.

Currently, Currently, he serves an Assistant Professor in the Department of Information Engineering and Computer Science, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan. His research interests include resource allocation, data management, information dissemination techniques, and distributed query processing over moving objects in

emerging applications such as the Internet of Things, edge computing, aerial and mobile wireless applications.

Dr. Lai has received the Postdoctoral Researcher Academic Research Award of Ministry of Science and Technology, Taiwan, in 2019, the Best Paper Awards in WOCC 2021 and WOCC 2018 conferences, and the Excellent Paper Award in ICUFN 2015 conference.