

Decentralized Uncoded Storage Elastic Computing with Heterogeneous Computation Speeds

Wenbo Huang¹, Xudong You¹, Kai Wan¹, Robert Caiming Qiu¹, and Mingyue Ji²

¹Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 430074 Wuhan, China

²University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

Emails: {eric_huang, xudong_you, kai_wan,caiming}@hust.edu.cn, mingyue.ji@utah.edu

Abstract—THIS PAPER IS ELIGIBLE FOR THE STUDENT PAPER AWARD. Elasticity plays an important role in modern cloud computing systems. Elastic computing allows virtual machines (i.e., computing nodes) to be preempted when high-priority jobs arise, and also allows new virtual machines to participate in the computation. In 2018, Yang et al. introduced Coded Storage Elastic Computing (CSEC) to address the elasticity using coding technology, with lower storage and computation load requirements. However, CSEC is limited to certain types of computations (e.g., linear) due to the coded data storage based on linear coding. Then Centralized Uncoded Storage Elastic Computing (CUSEC) with heterogeneous computation speeds was proposed, which directly copies parts of data into the virtual machines. In all existing works in elastic computing, the storage assignment is centralized, meaning that the number and identity of all virtual machines possible used in the whole computation process are known during the storage assignment. In this paper, we consider Decentralized Uncoded Storage Elastic Computing (DUSEC) with heterogeneous computation speeds, where any available virtual machine can join the computation which is not predicted and thus coordination among different virtual machines' storage assignments is not allowed. Under a decentralized storage assignment originally proposed in coded caching by Maddah-Ali and Niesen, we propose a computing scheme with closed-form optimal computation time. We also run experiments over MNIST dataset with Softmax regression model through the Tencent cloud platform, and the experiment results demonstrate that the proposed DUSEC system approaches the state-of-art best storage assignment in the CUSEC system in computation time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cloud computing platforms provide elastic computation service at discount, while the computations are scheduled on the Virtual Machines (VMs) at a low-priority. It means that at each time step of the computation process (i) VMs will be preempted if a high-priority job arrives; (ii) new available VMs are allowed to join the computation at any time [1]–[3]. To efficiently tolerate the failures brought by preempted VMs, Yang et al [3] introduced Coded Storage Elastic Computing (CSEC) to address the elasticity using coding technology, with lower storage and computation load requirements. Following the original CSEC work, various works on the extensions such as elastic computing with heterogeneous storage or/and speed, elastic computing against stragglers, optimization on the transition waste, were proposed in [4]–[8]. Despite the advantages of CSEC such as less storage overhead, it may be challenging to be applied to more involved computations (e.g., non-linear

task, deep learning) due to the coded data storage. So we may prefer to place the data in an uncoded way by just assigning the raw data to the VMs. [9] proposed a framework for heterogeneous Uncoded Storage Elastic Computing (USEC) in Matrix-vector computation and [10] considered a Matrix-Matrix computation task in uncoded storage systems.

To the best of our knowledge, in all existing works on elastic computing, the storage assignment is centralized, meaning that the number and identity of all virtual machines possible used in the whole computation process are known in prior during the storage assignment. In this paper we consider Decentralized Uncoded Storage Elastic Computing (DUSEC), where the identity of the VMs participating into the computing process is not in prior known at the beginning of the whole computation process. In other words, any available virtual machine can join the computation and thus coordination among different virtual machines' storage assignments is not allowed. Unlike the centralized system, there is no limit on the number of available VMs N at time step t in the DUSEC system; as N increases, the computation time decreases. For the computation task, we consider the linearly separable function [11], which is a function of K datasets (D_1, \dots, D_K) on a finite field \mathbb{F}_q . The task function can be seen as $K_c^{(t)}$ linear combinations of K intermediate messages. It was shown in [12] that such function could cover Matrix-matrix multiplication, gradient descent, linear transform, etc., as special cases. In addition, we consider that VMs have heterogeneous computation speeds, and aim to minimize the computation time at time t defined as the largest computation time among all available VMs at time step t .

For this new problem, referred to as DUSEC with heterogeneous computation speeds, we consider the case $K_c^{(t)} = 1$, which covers matrix-vector multiplication and gradient descent tasks, and our main contribution is summarized as follows:

- 1) We use the decentralized storage assignment originally proposed in decentralized coded caching [13], where each VM randomly selects a fraction of datasets to store when it joins in the computation. By assuming the number of datasets is large enough, the storage assignment is symmetric (i.e., the number of datasets stored inclusively stored by a set of VMs only depends on the cardinality of this set). Considering the heterogeneous computation speeds of the VMs, We formulate the computation as-

signment into a convex optimization problem to achieve the minimum computation time at each time step t . We then solve the minimum computation time in closed-form, and propose a new algorithm on assigning the computation assignment while achieving this minimum computation time. Note that the algorithm complexity is $\mathcal{O}(N)$, linear with the number of available VMs at time step t , while the classic algorithm to solve this convex optimality has complexity $\mathcal{O}(2^N)$ and cannot provide a close-form solution.

- 2) We perform experiments through real cloud platform with heterogeneous computation speeds, and run over the MINST dataset with a Softmax model. We demonstrate that in terms of the total processing time, the proposed algorithms on DUSEC approaches the start-of-the-art CUSEC scheme in [9], which requires the knowledge on the identity of the VMs at the beginning of the process.
- 3) We then extend the proposed DUSEC scheme by using the distributed gradient coding scheme in [14], such that the resulting elastic computing scheme can also tolerate potential stragglers in the computation process.¹

Notation Convention: We use $|\cdot|$ to represent the cardinality of a set or the length of a vector and $[n] \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. A bold symbol such as \mathbf{a} indicates a vector and $a[i]$ denotes the i -th element of \mathbf{a} . Calligraphic symbols such as \mathcal{A} presents a set with numbers as its elements. Bold calligraphic symbols such as \mathcal{A} represents a collection of sets.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A server uses VMs in a cloud to perform linearly separable computation tasks over multiple time steps. At each time step t , the computation task is a function of K datasets D_1, \dots, D_K , which should be computed collaboratively by N_t available VMs in \mathcal{N}_t with $N_t := |\mathcal{N}_t|$. As in [12], with the assumption that the function is linearly separable from the datasets, the computation task can be written as $K_c^{(t)} \leq K$ linear combinations of K messages,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(t)}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_K) &= g^{(t)}(f_1^{(t)}(D_1), \dots, f_K^{(t)}(D_K)) \\ &= g^{(t)}(W_1^{(t)}, \dots, W_K^{(t)}) = \mathbf{F}^{(t)}[W_1^{(t)}; \dots; W_K^{(t)}], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the i^{th} message is $W_i^{(t)} = f_i^{(t)}(D_i)$, representing the outcome of the component function $f_i^{(t)}(\cdot)$ applied to dataset D_i , and $\mathbf{F}^{(t)}$ represents the demand information matrix with dimension $K_c^{(t)} \times K$, known by all VMs. Each message $W_i^{(t)}$ contains L uniformly i.i.d. symbols on some finite field \mathbb{F}_q .²

In this paper, we mainly consider the case $K_c^{(t)} = 1$, which covers matrix-vector multiplication and gradient descent tasks (by letting $f_i^{(t)}$ be a gradient of loss function). In this case, we assume without loss of generality that the computation task at time step t is $W_1^{(t)} + \dots + W_K^{(t)}$.

¹The difference between elasticity and straggler is that, for elasticity at the beginning of each step time we know the identity of the computing nodes who has joined in or left; but we do not know which nodes will be stragglers.

²The proposed scheme can also work in the field of real numbers.

A. Decentralized Storage Assignment and Heterogeneous Computation speeds

We consider decentralized system, where any VM may join the computation process unpredictably and thus coordination on storage assignment for different VMs is not allowed. We use the decentralized storage assignment in [15], where each VM stores a subset of the datasets independently at random. Assume that each VM n stores $\{D_i : i \in \mathcal{Z}_n\}$, with a equal storage size $|\mathcal{Z}_n| = M$. So each dataset is stored by each VM with probability $\frac{M}{K}$.

Since there is no coordination among VMs' storage assignment and the computation tasks at different time steps are independent, in the rest of this paper we only focus on one time step t ; and to avoid heavy notations, we do not explicitly point out the time step index t in the notations. For example, we drop the superscript from $W_i^{(t)}$ and the i^{th} message becomes W_i . We further assume that the available VMs at the considered time step is $\mathcal{N} = [N]$.

At the considered time step, according to the storage of the VMs in $[N]$, we can divide the K datasets into 2^N sets, where $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ represents the sets of datasets assigned to all VMs in $\{V_j : j \in \mathcal{V}\}$, for each $\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]$. By assuming that K is large enough and then by the law of large numbers, we have

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| = \left(\frac{M}{K}\right)^{|\mathcal{V}|} \left(1 - \frac{M}{K}\right)^{N-|\mathcal{V}|} K + o(K), \quad (2)$$

with probability approaching one when K is sufficiently large.

Note that by the decentralized storage assignment, there exist some datasets not stored by any VMs in $[N]$; thus we can only compute an approximated version of the original computation task. So we change the computation task to $\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i \in \bigcup_{j \in [N]} \mathcal{Z}_j} W_i$.

We consider the scenario of heterogeneous computation speeds, where each VM V_j where $j \in [N]$ has the computation speed $s[j]$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the computation speeds are in an ascending order as $s[1] \leq s[2] \leq \dots \leq s[N]$. Denote $\mathbf{s} = (s[1], \dots, s[N])$.

Next, we define \mathcal{L}_n as the set of datasets which are only assigned to some of the first n VMs; thus

$$\mathcal{L}_n = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,\dots,n\}}. \quad (3)$$

By (2), we have with high probability that

$$|\mathcal{L}_n| = \left(\frac{K-M}{K}\right)^N \left\{ \left(\frac{K}{K-M}\right)^n - 1 \right\} K + o(K). \quad (4)$$

To simply the notation, define $\alpha := \frac{K}{K-M}$ and $\beta := \left(\frac{K-M}{K}\right)^N$. Then we have

$$|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|/K = \beta(\alpha - 1)^{|\mathcal{V}|}, \quad |\mathcal{L}_n|/K = \beta(\alpha^n - 1). \quad (5)$$

B. USEC under Decentralized Assignment

Each V_n where $n \in [N]$ computes $\sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}}} W_i$, where $\mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ denotes the set of datasets in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ which

should be computed by VM V_n . So the computation assignment for all VMs can be exactly determined by the collection, $\mathbf{M} = \{\mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}}, \forall n \in [N], \forall \mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]\}$.

Then the computed results from VMs are transmitted to the server to recover \mathbf{y} .

Computation Load. We define $\mu[n]$, the computation load by each VM V_n , as the number of computed messages normalized by K ; thus we have

$$\mu[n] = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}}|}{K} = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}], \quad (6)$$

where we define $\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] = |\mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}}|/K$. Then the computation load vector for the VMs in $[N]$ is, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu[1], \dots, \mu[n])$. Note that since the computation load is normalized by K , thus we can neglect the deviation terms and assume that

Computation Time. The computation time of each VM V_n where $n \in [N]$ is $\frac{\mu[n]}{s[n]}$. The overall computation time at the considered time step (or simply called computation time) is defined as largest computation time among all VMs in $[N]$,

$$c(\mathbf{M}) \triangleq \max_{n \in [N]} \frac{\mu[n]}{s[n]} = \max_{n \in [N]} \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{s[n]}. \quad (7)$$

Without considering stragglers, each message only needs to be computed once. For a fixed storage assignment $(\mathcal{Z}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Z}_N)$, we can formulate the following optimization problem for the DUSEC system with heterogeneous computation speeds:

$$\underset{\mathbf{M}}{\text{minimize}} \quad c(\mathbf{M}) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{subject to: } \bigcup_{n \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}, \quad \forall \mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]. \quad (8b)$$

The optimization problem in (8) is equivalent to the following convex optimization problem:

$$\underset{\{\mu[n,\mathcal{V}]: n \in [N], \mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]\}}{\text{minimize}} \quad c(\mathbf{M}) = \max_{n \in [N]} \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{s[n]} \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{subject to: } \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}] = \beta (\alpha - 1)^{|\mathcal{V}|}, \quad \forall \mathcal{V} \subseteq [N], \quad (9b)$$

$$\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] \geq 0, \quad \forall n \in [N], \mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]. \quad (9c)$$

III. MAIN RESULTS

Instead of directly solving the convex optimization problem in (9) by the method of Lagrange multipliers or other standard methods, we solve (9) by first proving a cut-set converse bound on the computation time and then proposing an algorithm which matches the converse bound. Thus we can provide the optimal computation time in closed-form for the optimization problem in (9), which is shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Optimal Computation Time): Under the DUSEC system with heterogeneous computation speeds, the optimal




Fig. 1: Illustration of DUSEC when $\mathbf{s} = [1, 2, 5, 5]$ before rearrangement, $c(\mathbf{M}) = 0.1$

computation time is

$$c^* = \min_{\mathbf{M}} c(\mathbf{M}) = \max_{n^*} \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} s[i]}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{where } \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} s[i]} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{\sum_{i=n^*+1}^n s[i]}, \quad \forall n \in [n^* + 1 : N], \quad (10b)$$

$$\text{and } \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{\sum_{i=1}^{n^*} s[i]} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n|/K}{\sum_{i=1}^n s[i]}, \quad \forall n \in [n^* - 1]. \quad (10c)$$

We first show that there must exist some $n^* \in [N]$ satisfying the constraints in (10b) and (10c).

Lemma 1: There exists a n^* that satisfies the Condition (10c) and Condition (10b) in Theorem 1.

The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A. Then the proof of the converse bound in Theorem 1 is given in Appendix B.

A. Achievability Proof of Theorem 1

We first provide an example to illustrate the main idea of the proposed scheme which achieves the optimal computation time in Theorem 1. Recall that our main objective is to fix the set of messages computed by each worker $n \in [N]$, i.e., the set $\mathcal{S}_n \triangleq \bigcup_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{S}_{n,\mathcal{V}}$.

Example 1: We consider a system with parameters ($K = 16000, N = 4, \alpha = 2, \mathbf{s} = [1, 2, 5, 5]$). There are $K = 16000$ datasets, and each VM can store $M = 8000$ datasets. By the law of the large number, we have $|\mathcal{L}_1|/K = 0.0625, |\mathcal{L}_2|/K = 0.1875, |\mathcal{L}_3|/K = 0.4375, |\mathcal{L}_4|/K = 0.9375$. Note that from Theorem 1, we can get the $n^* = 4$ and $c(\mathbf{M}) = 0.0721$. We present the computation load assignment to achieve $c(\mathbf{M}) = 0.0721$ as follows.

There are 4 iterations in the algorithm to get the computation load assignment $\{\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \mathcal{S}_4\}$ for $N = 4$ VMs. In the n -th iteration, we range the computation load for the first n VMs with datasets in \mathcal{L}_n .

In the 1st iteration, V_1 computes $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1$ in $t_1 = 0.0625$. We update $t_1 = 0.0625$, and $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1$.

In the 2nd iteration, we assign $\mathcal{L}_2 \setminus \mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}}$ to V_2 , we have $t_2 = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_2 \setminus \mathcal{L}_1|/K}{s[2]} = 0.0625$ which is equal to t_1 . We update \mathcal{S} into $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}}$, and $t_1 = t_2 = 0.0625$.




Fig. 2: Illustration of DUSEC when $s = [1, 2, 5, 5]$, $c(M) = 0.075$

In the 3rd iteration, we assign $\mathcal{L}_3 \setminus \mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}$ to V_3 , we have $t_3 = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_3 \setminus \mathcal{L}_2|/K}{s[3]} = 0.05$ while $t_3 < t_2 = t_1$ satisfies Condition 10b in Theorem 1. We update \mathcal{S} into $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{A}_1$, $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}}$, $\mathcal{S}_3 = \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}$, and $t_3 = 0.05 < t_1 = t_2 = 0.0625$.

In the 4th iteration, we assign $\mathcal{L}_4 \setminus \mathcal{L}_3$ to V_4 firstly, then $c(M) = t_4 = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_4 \setminus \mathcal{L}_3|/K}{s[4]} = 0.1 > c^* > t_3$, which contradicts with Condition 10b in Theorem 1.

To reduce $c(M) = t_4$, the datasets which are stored in both V_3 and V_4 should be computed by both of them. With $t_3 = 0.05, t_4 = 0.1$, we compute $t_{\{3,4\}} = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_4 \setminus \mathcal{L}_2|/K}{s[3]+s[4]} = 0.075$, and rearrange the computation load of V_3 . V_3 need to compute datasets from $\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$ with size $\delta = (t_{\{3,4\}} - t_3) s[3] = 0.125$.

The main non-trivial technology is that the original computation load of V_3 are $\mathcal{S}_3 = \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}$, while $\{\mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}\}$ are one-to-one corresponding to $\{\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}\}$. Similarly, the original computation load of V_4 , $\mathcal{L}_4 \setminus \mathcal{L}_3$ are one-to-one corresponding to $\{\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}}, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}\}$. From the size of rearranged computation load $\delta = 0.125$ and $\mu[3] = 0.25, \mu[4] = 0.5$, we can update \mathcal{S}_3 into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_3 &= \mathcal{A}_3 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}} \\ &\cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}, \end{aligned}$$

as well as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_4 &= \mathcal{A}_4 \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,4\}} \\ &\cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}} \cup 0.5\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}. \end{aligned}$$

After the computation load rearrangement, $c(M) = t_3 = t_4 = 0.075 > t_1$ while the maximum time is not achieved by V_1 which contradicts with Condition 10b in Theorem 1 see in Fig. 2.

We further rearrange the computation load between $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_3, V_4\}$. With $t_1 = t_2 = t_{\{1,2\}} = 0.0625, t_3 = t_4 = 0.075, t_{\{1,2,3,4\}} = 0.0721$, the common part of datasets between $\{V_1, V_2\}$ and $\{V_3, V_4\}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}}, \\ &\mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}}, \\ &\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}\}, \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 3: Illustration of DUSEC when $s = [1, 2, 5, 5]$ after rearrangement, $c^* = c(M) = 0.0721$

which can be one-to-one corresponding to $\{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}}\}$ with size $\delta = 0.028875$. In another division

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}, \\ &\mathcal{A}_{\{1,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,4\}}, \\ &\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}} \cup \mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}\} \end{aligned}$$

are one-to-one corresponding to $\{\mathcal{A}_3, \mathcal{A}_4, \mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}}\}$ with size $\delta = 0.028875$.

Depending on the correlation of common storage part and original computation load, the rearranged computation load can be designed as $\mathcal{A}'_{n,\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}, n \in [2], \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [2], \mathcal{Q} \subset [3:4]$, where $|\mathcal{A}'_{n,\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}|$ is corresponding to $\mu[n, \mathcal{V}]$ in the original computation load of $\{V_1, V_2\}$, and $|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|$ in $|\mathcal{L}_2|$. And the summation of $|\mathcal{A}'_{n,\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}|, n \in [2], \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [2], \mathcal{Q} \subset [3:4]$, is equal to δ . The computation load arrangement can be designed as $\mathcal{A}'_{n,\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}} = \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{|\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}, n \in [2]$, and $\mathcal{A}'_{n,\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}} = \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{Q}]}{|\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V}}, n \in [3:4]$.

The computation load rearranged to $\mathcal{S}_n, n \in [2]$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q} &= \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{|\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}\cup\mathcal{Q}}, \\ &\forall \mathcal{V} \subset [2], \mathcal{Q} \subset [3:4], \end{aligned}$$

and the computation load rearranged to $\mathcal{S}[n], n \in [3:4]$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V} &= \mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V}] \setminus \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{Q}]}{|\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{L}_2| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}\cup\mathcal{V}}, \\ &\forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [3:4], \mathcal{V} \subset [2]. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal computation load assignment of $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \mathcal{S}_4$ is presented in the Table I. \square

a) Algorithm 1: The algorithm of the computation load assignment consists of N iterations to calculate $\mathcal{S}_n, \forall n \in [N], \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [N]$ and $\mathcal{S}_n \triangleq \bigcup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{V}$.

With no rearrangement (Line 8, 9) For each iteration $n \in N$, in Line 7 we take $\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$ and V_{n+1} into consideration, and we first let V_{n+1} compute the $\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$ by itself, when $t_{n+1} \leq t_n$, we update $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S}_i, \forall i \in [n], \mathcal{S}_{n+1} = \mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$, and $t_{n+1} = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n|/K}{s[n+1]}$.

With rearrangement (Line 11 ~ 19) When $t_{n+1} > t_n$, we try to update $t_{n+1} = t_n$. Firstly, we identify the VMs

TABLE I: The computation load assignment for $s = [1, 2, 5, 5]$ system

	\mathcal{S}_1	\mathcal{S}_2	\mathcal{S}_3	\mathcal{S}_4
\mathcal{A}_1	1	0	0	0
\mathcal{A}_2	0	1	0	0
\mathcal{A}_3	0	0	1	0
\mathcal{A}_4	0	0	0	1
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2\}}$	0	1	0	0
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3\}}$	0.0616	0	0.9384	0
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,4\}}$	0.0616	0	0	0.9384
$\mathcal{A}_{\{2,3\}}$	0	0.0616	0.9384	0
$\mathcal{A}_{\{2,4\}}$	0	0.0616	0	0.9384
$\mathcal{A}_{\{3,4\}}$	0	0	0.5	0.5
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3\}}$	0	0.0616	0.9384	0
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,4\}}$	0	0.0616	0	0.9384
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,3,4\}}$	0.0308	0	0.4846	0.4846
$\mathcal{A}_{\{2,3,4\}}$	0	0.0308	0.4846	0.4846
$\mathcal{A}_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$	0	0.0308	0.4846	0.4846

Algorithm 1 Computation Load Assignment for Heterogeneous Computation Speed

Input: s, N, α

- 1: **for** $n \in [N]$ **do**
- 2: $t_n \leftarrow \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n-1}|/K}{s[n]}$ set the computation time t_n .
- 3: **if** $t_n \leq t_{n-1}$
- 4: $\mathcal{S}_n \leftarrow \cup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [n]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{A}_{n, \mathcal{V}}$ set the computation load of V_n .
- 5: **else** $t_n > t_{n-1}$
- 6: $n' \leftarrow n$ preliminary setting of n'
- 7: $V_{n'-1}, V_{n'-2}, \dots, V_x$ find the VMs that $t_{n'-1} = \dots = t_x$.
- 8: \star update $\{\mathcal{S}_{n'}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_x\}$ through Algorithm 2.
- 9: **if** $\frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|/K}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]} \leq t_{x-1}$
- 10: $n \leftarrow n + 1$
- 11: **else** $\frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|/K}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]} > t_{x-1}$
- 12: $n' \leftarrow x$ **reset** n' , and **return to** \star .
- 13: **end if**
- 14: **end if**
- 15: **end for**

Output: $\mathcal{S}_n, n \in [N]$

$\{V_{n-1}, V_{n-2}, \dots, V_x\}$ that have the same computation time as V_{n-1} . Next, we update $\{\mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{S}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_x\}$ using Algorithm 2. If $x = 1$, we stop the rearrangement phase, if $x \neq 1$, we repeat the process until $t_{x-1} \geq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|/K}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]}$.

This algorithm iteratively updates the computation load assignment by considering the difference in load between consecutive time steps. It adjusts t_{n+1} based on the comparison with t_n , and if necessary, applies the load balancing scheme in Algorithm 2 to equalize the computation times. After N iterations, the algorithm converges to the final load assignment that minimizes the overall computation time c^* with the algorithm complexity $\mathcal{O}(N)$.

b) *Algorithm 2:* Algorithm 2 provides the detailed rearrangement for the load balancing scheme corresponding to **Line 13** in Algorithm 1. In the situation $V_n, n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ can compute the datasets in $\mathcal{L}_{d+l} \setminus \mathcal{L}_d$ in an average time

$t_l = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+1}|/K}{\sum_{n=d+1}^{d+l} s[n]}$, $V_n, n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]$ can compute $\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+l+1}$ in an average time $t_m = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+l+1}|/K}{\sum_{n=d+l+1}^{d+l+m} s[n]}$, where $t_m > t_l$.

Algorithm 2 Computation Load Rearrangement

Input: $s, d, l, m, \mathcal{S}_n, n \in [d+1 : d+l+m], t_m > t_l, \alpha$

- 1: $\delta \leftarrow (\frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m}|/K}{\sum_{i=1}^{d+l+m} s[i]} - t_l) \sum_{i=1}^l s[i]$ calculate the size of rearranged computation load.
- 2: **for** $n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ **do**
- 3: $\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| \delta}{|\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [l], \mathcal{Q} \subset [m]$
- 4: **end for**
- 5: **for** $n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]$ **do**
- 6: $\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \setminus \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{Q}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| \delta}{|\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [m], \mathcal{V} \subset [l]$
- 7: **end for**

Output: $\mathcal{S}_n, n \in [d+1 : d+l+m]$

Firstly, we calculate the average computation time $t_{l+m} = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+1}|/K}{\sum_{n \in [d+1: d+l+m]} s[n]}$ and then we calculate the size of the exchanged computation load $\delta = (t_{l+m} - t_l) \sum_{n \in [d+1: d+l]} s[n]$.

The key technology is to divide the rearranged load of $\{V_n, n \in [d+1 : d+l]\}$ and $\{V_n, n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}$ into two kinds of divisions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l], \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\} \\ &= \{\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{V}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l]\} \\ &= \{\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the rearranged part of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$, $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset \cup (\cup_{\mathcal{P} \subset [d]} \mathcal{P})$, and $\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{V}}$ is denoted as $\{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}$, $\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is denoted as $\{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l]\}$.

We find that $\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{V}}$ in the rearranged part is one-to-one corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ in \mathcal{L}_l , as well as $\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{Q}}$ in the rearranged part is corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ in \mathcal{L}_m , so we set $|\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{V}}| = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|}{|\mathcal{L}_l|} \delta$, and $|\mathcal{A}''_{\mathcal{Q}}| = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta$. As a result, $|\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}| = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta$.

We design $\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ in the $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V}}, \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}$ in the $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{Q}}, \forall n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]$ in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. To be specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}| &= \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V}}| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| |\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta \\ &= \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta, \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}| &= \frac{|\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{Q}}| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| |\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta \\ &= \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{Q}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|}{|\mathcal{L}_l| |\mathcal{L}_m|} \delta, \forall n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we update $\mathcal{S}_n, \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ in **Line 8** in Algorithm 1 as

$$\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| \delta}{|L_l| |L_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}},$$

$$\forall \mathcal{V} \subset [l], \mathcal{Q} \subset [m], \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l],$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}} \setminus \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{Q}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| \delta}{|L_l| |L_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}},$$

$$\forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [m], \mathcal{V} \subset [l], \forall n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m].$$

IV. EVALUATIONS ON TENCENT CLOUD

We evaluate the proposed algorithm using Softmax Regression on Tencent cloud platform. The goal is to compare the performance difference in terms of accuracy and computation time under DUSEC and CUSEC system.

Softmax Regression: Softmax regression is a model designed for solving multi-class classification problems. In Softmax regression, the model starts with a linear transformation of the input feature vector x using the weight matrix W and bias vector b to compute scores for each class, and we train the model by updating W and b by $W := W - \alpha \nabla_W J(W, b)$, where $J(\cdot)$ is the loss function.

The network has one S5.2XLARGE16 master machine with 8 vCPUs and 16 GiB of memory. The worker VMs consist of 2 S5.LARGE8 instances, each with 4 vCPUs and 8 GiB of memory, and 2 S5.2XLARGE16 instances, each with 8 vCPUs and 16 GiB of memory. Observed that all VMs have very different computation speed, we specified the number of cores that each worker node participates in computation to simulate different speeds, normalized as $\{s[1] = 1, s[2] = 2, s[3] = 5, s[4] = 5\}$.

In our experiment, we conduct a comparison between DUSEC and CUSEC considering the presence of preemption. For the CUSEC system, we opt for repetition, cyclic, MAN [16] assignment. The results demonstrate that the proposed DUSEC system approaches the state-of-art assignment in the CUSEC system in computation time (refer to Fig. 4). The DUSEC performs even better because of the less computation load under the decentralized assignment.

V. EXTENSION TO STRAGGLER MITIGATION

In this section, we encode the transmission by each VM of the proposed scheme in Theorem 1 in order to mitigate up to s unpredictable stragglers in the computation process.

Note that without elasticity, coded distributed computing against stragglers was well studied in the literature [14], [17]–[19] to compute the linearly separable function described in Section II with $K_c = 1$. In the proposed schemes [14], [17]–[19], various coding techniques were used to encode the messages computed by each VM n (i.e., the messages W_j where $j \in \mathcal{Z}_n$), who then sends the coded messages to the server. As a result, after receiving the transmissions by a fix number of VMs, the server can recover the computation task, while the communication cost is reduced compared




Fig. 4: Results using DUSEC and CUSEC designs on Tencent cloud platform. The y-axis represents the normalized mean square error between the true dominant eigenvector and the estimated eigenvector.

to the uncoded transmission. In particular, a unified coding scheme was proposed in [14] which works for any computation assignment \mathcal{M} if each message is computed by at least $s+1$ VMs, in order to tolerate s stragglers.

Next we provide an example to illustrate how to combine the proposed elastic scheme with the scheme in [14], in order to tolerate s straggler, while the general description could be found in Appendix E.

Example 2 ($N = 3, s = 1$): We consider the system, where the system should tolerate up to $s = 1$ straggler. For the simplicity, we assume that the computation speeds of the three VMs are $s[1] \ll s[2] = s[3]$. Note that the identity of the straggler is not known before the transmission. Hence, each dataset which is assigned to only one VM in [3] will not be considered into the transmission. In other words, we only consider the datasets in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$ where $\mathcal{V} \subseteq [3]$ and $|\mathcal{V}| > 1$. Denote $W_{\mathcal{V}}$ as the sum of the messages in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$. For each $\mathcal{V} \subseteq [3]$ and $|\mathcal{V}| = 2$, to tolerate 1 straggler, $W_{\mathcal{V}}$ should be completely computed by the VMs in \mathcal{V} . For $\mathcal{V} \subseteq [3]$ and $|\mathcal{V}| = 3$, i.e., $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, we should determine the computation assignment by solving an optimization problem (see the optimization problem in (20) of Appendix E). Different from the original optimization problem in (9), the main difference of the optimization problem in (20) is that each dataset should be computed totally $s+1$ times, instead of 1. In this example, since $s[1] \ll s[2] = s[3]$, we let $W_{\{1,2,3\}}$ completely computed by the workers in $\{2, 3\}$.

Then based on the computation assignment, we apply the coding technique in [14], to let VMs V_1, V_2, V_3 transmit

$$T_1 = \frac{1}{2} W_{\{1,2\}} + W_{\{1,3\}},$$

$$T_2 = \frac{1}{2} W_{\{1,2\}} + W_{\{2,3\}} + W_{\{1,2,3\}},$$

$$W_{\{1,3\}} - W_{\{2,3\}} - W_{\{1,2,3\}},$$

respectively. It can be seen that, from any 2 coded messages of T_1, T_2, T_3 , the server can recover $W_{\{1,2\}} + W_{\{1,3\}} + W_{\{2,3\}} + W_{\{1,2,3\}}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] X. Meng, J. Bradley, B. Yavuz, E. Sparks, S. Venkataraman, D. Liu, J. Freeman, D. Tsai, M. Amde, S. Owen *et al.*, “Mllib: Machine learning in apache spark,” *The journal of machine learning research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1235–1241, 2016.
- [2] M. Abadi, A. Agarwal, P. Barham, E. Brevdo, Z. Chen, C. Citro, G. S. Corrado, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin *et al.*, “Tensorflow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous distributed systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.04467*, 2016.
- [3] Y. Yang, M. Interlandi, P. Grover, S. Kar, S. Amizadeh, and M. Weimer, “Coded elastic computing,” in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, July 2019, pp. 2654–2658.
- [4] S. Kiani, T. Adikari, and S. C. Draper, “Hierarchical coded elastic computing,” in *ICASSP 2021 - 2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2021, pp. 4045–4049.
- [5] N. Woolsey, R.-R. Chen, and M. Ji, “Coded elastic computing on machines with heterogeneous storage and computation speed,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 2894–2908, 2021.
- [6] N. Woolsey, J. Kliewer, R.-R. Chen, and M. Ji, “A practical algorithm design and evaluation for heterogeneous elastic computing with stragglers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv*, 2021.
- [7] X. Zhong, J. Kliewer, and M. Ji, “Matrix multiplication with straggler tolerance in coded elastic computing via lagrange code,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2023, pp. 136–141.
- [8] H. Dau, R. Gabrys, Y. C. Huang, C. Feng, Q. H. Luu, E. Alzahrani, and Z. Tari, “Optimizing the transition waste in coded elastic computing,” in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 174–178.
- [9] M. Ji, X. Zhang, and K. Wan, “A new design framework for heterogeneous uncoded storage elastic computing,” in *2022 20th International Symposium on Modeling and Optimization in Mobile, Ad hoc, and Wireless Networks (WiOpt)*, 2022, pp. 269–275.
- [10] X. Zhong, J. Kliewer, and M. Ji, “Uncoded storage coded transmission elastic computing with straggler tolerance in heterogeneous systems,” *arXiv:2401.12151*, Jan. 2024.
- [11] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah, “Fast distributed algorithms for computing separable functions,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 2997–3007, 2008.
- [12] K. Wan, H. Sun, M. Ji, and G. Caire, “Distributed linearly separable computation,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1259–1278, 2021.
- [13] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, “Decentralized coded caching attains order-optimal memory-rate tradeoff,” *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1029–1040, Aug 2015.
- [14] T. Jahani-Nezhad and M. A. Maddah-Ali, “Optimal communication-computation trade-off in heterogeneous gradient coding,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 1002–1011, 2021.
- [15] M. A. Maddah-Ali and U. Niesen, “Decentralized coded caching attains order-optimal memory-rate tradeoff,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1029–1040, 2015.
- [16] —, “Fundamental limits of caching,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2856–2867, 2014.
- [17] R. Tandon, Q. Lei, A. G. Dimakis, and N. Karampatziakis, “Gradient coding: Avoiding stragglers in distributed learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 3368–3376.
- [18] M. Ye and E. Abbe, “Communication-computation efficient gradient coding,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5610–5619.
- [19] H. Cao, Q. Yan, and X. Tang, “Adaptive gradient coding,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Networking*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 717–734, Apr. 2022.
- [20] N. Woolsey, R.-R. Chen, and M. Ji, “Uncoded placement with linear sub-messages for private information retrieval from storage constrained databases,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 10, pp. 6039–6053, 2020.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

There always exists n^* which satisfies the Condition (10c), in the worst case, $n^* = 1$. Condition (10b) demonstrates that through the Algorithm 4, the last $N - n^*$ VMs still have less computation time than V_{n^*} . In another word, the computation load of the first n^* VMs does not need to be rearranged since the computation time of the last $N - n^*$ VMs is strictly smaller than the over-all computation time c^* . In the worst case, $n^* = N$.

There are two situations in final computation load assignment, $t_i > \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{i+1}/\mathcal{L}_{i-1}|}{s[i]+s[j]} > t_{i+1}$, and $t_i = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{i+1}/\mathcal{L}_{i-1}|}{s[i]+s[j]} = t_{i+1}$, for $i \in [n^* + 1, N]$. In the second situation, $t_{n^*} > \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{i+1}/\mathcal{L}_{i-1}|}{s[i]+s[j]} = t_{i+1}$ from Condition (10b). In the first situation, $t_{n^*} > \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{i+1}/\mathcal{L}_{i-1}|}{s[i]+s[j]} = t_{i+1}$ from Condition (10b).

APPENDIX B
CONVERSE PROOF FOR THEOREM 1

The converse bound for Theorem 1 is proved as follows. Consider any integer $n^* \in [N]$. Since the datasets in \mathcal{L}_{n^*} can only be computed by the VMs in $[n^*]$, thus by the cut-set strategy, the overall computation time c should be no less than the overall computation time if the system only needs to compute the sum of the messages in \mathcal{L}_{n^*} , which is no less than $\frac{|\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}}|}{s[1]+\dots+s[n^*]}$.³ Thus

$$c \geq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}}|/K}{s[1] + \dots + s[n^*]}, \quad \forall n^* \in [N]. \quad (17)$$

Consider another cut of VMs, $[n^* + 1 : n]$, where $n \in [n^* + 1 : N]$. Since the datasets in $\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n^*}$ can only be computed by the VMs in $[n^* + 1 : n]$, thus by the cut-set strategy, the overall computation time c should be no less than the overall computation time if the system only needs to compute the sum of the messages in $\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n^*}$, which is no less than $\frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{s[n^* + 1] + \dots + s[n]}$. Thus

$$c \geq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n^*}|/K}{s[n^* + 1] + \dots + s[n]}, \quad \forall n \in [n^* + 1 : N]. \quad (18)$$

By (17), (18), and Lemma 1, we can directly obtain the converse bound for Theorem 1.

APPENDIX C
GENERAL ALGORITHM

a) Algorithm 3: The algorithm of the computation load assignment consists of N iterations to calculate $\mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{V}]$, $\forall n \in [N]$, $\forall \mathcal{V} \subset [N]$. We denote $\mathcal{S}[n] = \bigcup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [N]} \mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{V}]$.

With no rearrangement (Line 8, 9) For each iteration $n \in N$, in Line 7 we take $\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$ and V_{n+1} into consideration,

³This is because for any non-negative numbers a_1, \dots, a_n and b_1, \dots, b_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_1 + \dots + a_n}{b_1 + \dots + b_n} &= \frac{a_1}{b_1} \frac{b_1}{b_1 + \dots + b_n} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{b_n} \frac{b_n}{b_1 + \dots + b_n} \\ &\leq \max\left(\frac{a_1}{b_1}, \dots, \frac{a_n}{b_n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 3 Computation Load Assignment for Heterogeneous Computation Speed

Input: s, N, α

- 1: **for** $n \in [N]$ **do**
- 2: $t_n \leftarrow \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{n-1}|}{s[n]}$ set the computation time t_n .
- 3: **if** $t_n \leq t_{n-1}$
- 4: $\mathcal{S}[n] \leftarrow \bigcup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [n]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{A}_{n, \mathcal{V}}$ set the computation load of V_n .
- 5: **else** $t_n > t_{n-1}$
- 6: $n' \leftarrow n$ preliminary setting of n'
- 7: $V_{n'-1}, V_{n'-2}, \dots, V_x$ find the VMs that $t_{n'-1} = \dots = t_x$.
- 8: \star update $\{\mathcal{S}[n], \dots, \mathcal{S}[x]\}$ through Algorithm 4.
- 9: **if** $t_{x-1} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]}$
- 10: $n \leftarrow n + 1$
- 11: **else** $\frac{|\mathcal{L}_n \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]} < t_{x-1}$
- 12: $n' \leftarrow x$ **reset** n' , and **return to** \star .
- 13: **end if**
- 14: **end if**
- 15: **end for**

Output: $\mathcal{S}[n], n \in [N]$

and we first let V_{n+1} compute the $\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$ by itself, when $t_{n+1} \leq t_n$, we update $\mathcal{S}[i] = \mathcal{S}[i], \forall i \in [n], \mathcal{S}[n+1] = \mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n$, and $t_{n+1} = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_n|}{s[n+1]}$.

With rearrangement (Line 11 ~ 19) When $t_{n+1} > t_n$, we try to update $t_{n+1} = t_n$. Firstly, we identify the VMs $\{V_{n-1}, V_{n-2}, \dots, V_x\}$ that have the same computation time as V_{n-1} . Next, we update $\{\mathcal{S}[n], \mathcal{S}[n-1], \dots, \mathcal{S}[x]\}$ using Algorithm 4. If $x = 1$, we stop the rearrangement phase, if $x \neq 1$, we repeat the process until $t_{x-1} \leq \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{n+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{x-1}|}{\sum_{i=x}^n s[i]}$.

This algorithm iteratively updates the computation load assignment by considering the difference in load between consecutive time steps. It adjusts t_{n+1} based on the comparison with t_n , and if necessary, applies the load balancing scheme in Algorithm 4 to equalize the computation times. After N iterations, the algorithm converges to the final load assignment that minimizes the overall computation time c^* with the algorithm complexity $\mathcal{O}(N)$.

b) Algorithm 4: Algorithm 4 provides the detailed rearrangement for the computation load assignment corresponding to **Line 13** in Algorithm 3. Where d, l, m are indices to the VMs machines. $t_m = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+l+1}|}{s[d+l+1] + \dots + s[d+l+m]}$ and $t_l = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+1}|}{s[d+1] + \dots + s[d+l]}$.

Firstly, we calculate the average computation time $t_{l+m} = \frac{|\mathcal{L}_{d+l+m} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{d+1}|}{\sum_{n \in [d+1: d+l+m]} s[n]}$ and then we calculate the size of the exchanged computation load $\delta = (t_{l+m} - t_l) \sum_{n \in [d+1: d+l]} s[n]$.

The key technology is to divide the rearranged load of $\{V_n, n \in [d+1 : d+l]\}$ and $\{V_n, n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}$

Algorithm 4 Computation Load Rearrangement

Input: $s, d, l, m, \mathcal{S}[n], n \in [d+1 : d+l+m], t_m > t_l, \alpha$

- 1: $\delta \leftarrow \left(\frac{|L_{l+m}|}{\sum_{i=1}^{l+m} s[i]} - t_l \right) \sum_{i=1}^l s[i]$ calculate the size of rearranged computation load.
 - 2: **for** $n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ **do**
 - 3: $\mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}] \leftarrow \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{|L_l| |L_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [l], \mathcal{Q} \subset [m]$
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: **for** $n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]$ **do**
 - 6: $\mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}] \leftarrow \mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}] \setminus \frac{\delta |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}| \mu[n, \mathcal{Q}]}{|L_l| |L_m| |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}|} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}, \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [m], \mathcal{V} \subset [l]$
 - 7: **end for**
- Output:** $\mathcal{S}[n], n \in [N]$
-




Fig. 5: Results using different α with DUSEC on Tencent cloud platform.

into two kinds of divisions:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l], \forall \mathcal{Q} \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\} \quad (19a)$$

$$= \{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l]\} \quad (19b)$$

$$= \{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{Q}'}, \forall \mathcal{Q}' \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}, \quad (19c)$$

where $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the rearranged part of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$, $\mathcal{U} = \{\emptyset, \mathcal{P}, \forall \mathcal{P} \subset [d]\}$, $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V}} = \{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{Q}' \subset [d+l+1 : d+l+m]\}$, $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{Q}'}$ = $\{\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [d+1 : d+l]\}$.

From the division (19c), we find that $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V}}$ is one-to-one corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$, as well as $\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{Q}'}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, so we set $|\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{V}}| = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|}{|L_l|} \delta$, and $|\mathcal{A}'_{\mathcal{Q}'}| = \frac{|\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|L_m|} \delta$. We design the rearrangement part $\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{S}[n, \mathcal{V}]$ and one-by-one. and so do to $\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}$. To be specifically, $|\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{Q}}| = \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{V}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{Q}}|}{|L_l| |L_m|} \delta, \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ and $|\mathcal{A}'_{n, \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{V}}| = \frac{\mu[n, \mathcal{Q}] |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|}{|L_l| |L_m|} \delta, \forall n \in [d+l+1 : d+l+m]$. Finally, we update t_{l+m} and $\mathcal{S}[n], \forall n \in [d+1 : d+l]$ in **Line 5 & 8** in Algorithm 4.

APPENDIX D EXPERIMENT RESULTS

We also conduct a comparison among different α in DUSEC in terms of the accuracy and computation time, the experimental results indicate that when there is a large number of

available VMs, the storage constraints have a minimal impact on the convergence accuracy.

APPENDIX E

GENERAL DESCRIPTION ON THE PROPOSED DUSEC SCHEME AGAINST STRAGGLERS

To tolerate up to s stragglers, computation redundancy is required. We choose a redundancy parameter $m \geq 1$, and only focus on the datasets in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$, where $|\mathcal{V}| \geq s+m$, where each dataset should be computed by any $s+m$ VMs in \mathcal{V} . It will be clarified later that m will also play an important role on the number of transmissions by each VM, as shown in [14]. The combinatorial convex optimization problem can be written as,

$$\underset{\mathbf{M}}{\text{minimize}} \quad c(\mathbf{M}) = \max_{n \in N} \frac{\sum_{\mathcal{V} \subseteq [N]: n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}]}{s[n]} \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{subject to:} \quad \sum_{n \in \mathcal{V}} \mu[n, \mathcal{V}] = (s+m) |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|, \forall \mathcal{V} \subset [N], |\mathcal{V}| \geq s+m \quad (20b)$$

$$0 \leq \mu[n, \mathcal{V}] \leq |\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}|, \forall n \in N. \quad (20c)$$

When we solve the above problem, we can use the special polynomial coding in [14] to let each VM transmit a coded message with $\frac{1}{m}$ length of the original message. In the following, we will propose a novel low-complexity algorithm to achieve the optimal solution for this problem. Interestingly, the *filling algorithm* introduced in the CSEC framework with heterogeneous computation speed [5] or the heterogeneous storage-constrained private information retrieval problem [20] can be applied here with small modifications to obtain the proposed optimal solution.

The coding part is based on the polynomial codes [14], which can be written in a Matrix form,

$$AB = [MDS] \times \begin{bmatrix} (Demand) \\ (Variablematrix) \end{bmatrix} = C \quad (21)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} * & * & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & * & * & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where A is a MDS matrix constituted from polynomial codes [14] and Matrix B contains the demand $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ in the first line. Matrix C shows the the gradient sets that each VM can transmit. From m coded messages of any $N-s$ VMs, it is possible to recover the task.

Consider a system with parameters ($K = 16000, N = 4, \alpha = 2, \mathbf{s} = [1, 2, 5, 5], s = 1, m = 2$), and the optimal computation load are $\mu[1] = \cup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: 1 \in \mathcal{V}, |\mathcal{V}| \neq 4} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mu[2] = \cup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: 2 \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mu[3] = \cup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: 3 \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mu[4] = \cup_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: 4 \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$. We divide the gradients into non-overlap and equal length 2 sub-vectors, the notation is simplified as $W_{\mathcal{V}} = \{W_{\mathcal{V}}(1), W_{\mathcal{V}}(2)\}$, where W_r presents the gradients in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}$. We only consider the gradients in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{V}}, |\mathcal{V}| \geq 3$ in the coding phase for simplicity.

Algorithm 5 Adaptive Straggler Tolerant Decentralized Un-coded Storage Elastic Computing

Input: $\hat{s}, \gamma, S, T, \beta^t$

- 1: $\nu \leftarrow \hat{s}$: same for all worker VMs
- 2: **for** $t \in [T]$ **do**
- 3: **At Master Machine:**
- 4: $\hat{s} \leftarrow \gamma\nu + (1 - \gamma)\hat{s}$ (update estimate of speed vector).
- 5: $\mathcal{N}_t \leftarrow$ list of available machines
- 6: $\{F_g, \mathcal{M}_g, \mathcal{P}_g : \forall g \in [G]\} \leftarrow$ Results of computation assignment algorithm for \mathbf{X}_g with straggler tolerance of S for available machines \mathcal{N}_t with speeds of \hat{s}
- 7: Send β_t and $\{F_g, \mathcal{M}_g, \mathcal{P}_g : \forall g \in [G]\}$ to worker VMs
- 8: **At Worker VMs:**
- 9: $n \leftarrow$ index of worker VM
- 10: $\mu[n] \leftarrow$ total computation load of worker VM n
- 11: $c_1^* \leftarrow$ current time
- 12: Perform assigned computations based on $\{F_g, \mathcal{M}_g, \mathcal{P}_g : \forall g \in [G]\}$
- 13: $c_2^* \leftarrow$ current time
- 14: $\nu[n] \leftarrow \mu[n]/(c_2^* - c_1^*)$ (calculate speed based on current time step)
- 15: Send computations and $\nu[n]$ to Master Machine
- 16: **At Master Machine:** after receiving results from at most $N - S$ workers.
- 17: $\beta_{t+1} \leftarrow$ Combine worker results
- 18: **end for**

Output: β^t

As illustrate in Fig. ??, V_1 transmits coded messages with half length $T_1 = -3W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(1)} - 2W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(1)} - W_{\{1,3,4\}}^{(1)} - W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(2)} - 2W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(2)} + W_{\{1,3,4\}}^{(2)}$. As well as $T_2 = -2W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(1)} - W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(1)} + W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(1)} - 2W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(2)} - 3W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(2)} - W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(2)} + W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(1)} - W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(2)}$, $T_3 = -W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(1)} + W_{\{1,3,4\}}^{(1)} + 2W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(1)} + W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(2)} + 3W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(2)} + 2W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(2)} + 2W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(1)} + 2W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(2)}$, and $T_4 = W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(1)} + 2W_{\{1,3,4\}}^{(1)} + 3W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(1)} - W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(2)} + 2W_{\{1,3,4\}}^{(2)} + W_{\{2,3,4\}}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2}W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(2)}$. In matrix form,

$$[T_1; T_2; T_3; T_4; T_5] = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -2 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -2 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0.5 & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & -0.5 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(1)} \\ W_{\{1,2,4\}}^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(1)} \\ W_{\{1,2,3\}}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ W_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

From any 3 coded messages $T_n, n \in [4]$, the master

Algorithm 6 Computation Load Assignment for M_t for Heterogeneous Computation Speed

Input: μ_g^*, q, \mathcal{Z} and $\mathcal{N}_g = \{1, \dots, N_g\}$.

- 1: $m \leftarrow \mu_g^*$
- 2: $f \leftarrow 0$
- 3: **while** m contains a non-zero element **do**
- 4: $f \leftarrow f + 1$
- 5: $L' \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^{N_g} m[i]$
- 6: $N' \leftarrow$ number of non-zero elements in m
- 7: $\ell \leftarrow$ indices that sort the non-zero elements of m from smallest to largest³
- 8: $\mathcal{P}_{g,f} \leftarrow \{\ell[1], \ell[N' - L + 2], \dots, \ell[N']\}$
- 9: **if** $N' \geq L + 1$ **then**
- 10: $\alpha_{g,f} \leftarrow \min\left(\frac{L'}{L} - m[\ell[N' - L + 1]], m[\ell[1]]\right)^4$
- 11: **else**
- 12: $\alpha_{g,f} \leftarrow m[\ell[1]]$
- 13: **end if**
- 14: **for** $n \in \mathcal{P}_{g,f}$ **do**
- 15: $m[n] \leftarrow m[n] - \alpha_{g,f}$
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **end while**
- 18: $F \leftarrow f$
- 19: Partition rows $[\frac{q}{G}]$ of \mathbf{X}_g into F disjoint row sets $\mathcal{M}_{g,1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{g,F}$ of size $\frac{\alpha_{1g}}{G}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_{Fg}}{G}$ rows, respectively

Output: $F, \{\mathcal{M}_{g,1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{g,F}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{P}_{g,1}, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{g,F}\}$

can recover the task through coding. For example, when the master receives T_1, T_2, T_3 , it can code $\frac{1}{4}T_3 - \frac{3}{4}T_1 + \frac{1}{2}T_2 = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: |\mathcal{V}| \geq 3} W_{\mathcal{V}}(1)$, and $\frac{1}{4}T_3 + \frac{1}{4}T_1 - \frac{1}{2}T_2 = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \subset [4]: |\mathcal{V}| \geq 3} W_{\mathcal{V}}(2)$.