

Communication-Computation Trade-Off in Resource-Constrained Edge Inference

Jiawei Shao, Jun Zhang

Abstract—The recent breakthrough in artificial intelligence (AI), especially deep neural networks (DNNs), has affected every branch of science and technology. Particularly, edge AI has been envisioned as a major application scenario to provide DNN-based services at edge devices. This article presents effective methods for edge inference at resource-constrained devices. It focuses on device-edge co-inference, assisted by an edge computing server, and investigates a critical *trade-off* among the computation cost of the on-device model and the communication cost of forwarding the intermediate feature to the edge server. A three-step framework is proposed for the effective inference: (1) model split point selection to determine the on-device model, (2) *communication-aware* model compression to reduce the on-device computation and the resulting communication overhead simultaneously, and (3) task-oriented encoding of the intermediate feature to further reduce the communication overhead. Experiments demonstrate that our proposed framework achieves a better trade-off and significantly reduces the inference latency than baseline methods.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent advancements in Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) have led to successful applications in a broad spectrum of domains, from computer vision to speech recognition and natural language processing [1]. Driven by the demand for deploying DNN-based services at various edge devices (e.g., smartphones, wearables, IoTs), a new research area called *edge AI* emerges [2], [3]. Edge AI consists of edge training, i.e., to train DNN models based on data distributed at different devices, and edge inference, i.e., to provide DNN-based inference at resource-constrained devices. While communication-efficient methods for edge training have received significant attention [4], the counterpart on edge inference is less well investigated. This article aims to fill this gap and introduce new design problems and methodologies for edge inference by presenting a delicate trade-off between communication overhead and on-device computation cost.

Currently, the status quo of edge inference is either execution on the mobile devices (*on-device inference*) or offloading to the edge server for execution (*server-based inference*). Unfortunately, on-device inference provides limited accuracy due to the constrained resources. Some works applied model compression [5] to alleviate the huge computational complexity, relying on the fact that DNNs are always overparametrized. Nevertheless, it is challenging to achieve high accuracy with compact models, e.g., there is a roughly 10% gap between the state-of-the-art mobile model and the best model [6]. On the other hand, server-based inference induces

excessive communication overhead, making it challenging to support latency-sensitive applications like self-driving cars. Moreover, it also suffers from the data privacy issue. Thus, the limited computation resource and the excessive communication overhead form bottlenecks for on-device inference and server-based inference, respectively.

The device-edge co-inference method effectively removes the computation/communication bottleneck mentioned above. It splits a large DNN into two parts: a computation-friendly model is deployed on the edge device, while the other part, usually with a larger size, is deployed on the edge server. The split point selection is critical, which affects the resulting on-device computation cost and communication overhead. Particularly, selecting the split point deeper leads to more on-device computation while reducing the communication overhead. Fig. 1 illustrates an example of this trade-off.

Motivated by the flexibility of device-edge co-inference, this article provides a thorough investigation of the communication-computation trade-off in such methods, and introduces effective design methodologies to achieve a better trade-off. Built upon a rudimentary trade-off via split point selection, we introduce effective techniques to reduce the on-device computation and communication costs from two different perspectives. The first technique, named *communication-aware model compression*, is motivated by the recent development in DNN model compression. It compresses the on-device model to reduce the computation cost while accounting for the induced communication overhead via controlling the size of the output feature. The second technique, named *task-oriented feature encoding*, leverages recent ideas on the learning-driven source and channel coding, and it reduces the communication overhead by compressing the on-device model's output feature. By reducing the communication overhead, feature coding also makes it possible to split at earlier layers, leading to a reduction of on-device computation, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Overall, we present a general framework, including split point selection, communication-aware model compression, and task-oriented feature encoding, to achieve better communication-computation trade-off in device-edge co-inference.

In what follows, we first illustrate the communication-computation trade-off in device-edge co-inference, and present the proposed framework, as shown in Fig. 2. Then we present communication-aware model compression and task-oriented feature encoding to achieve a better trade-off. Extensive simulation results are provided to verify the effectiveness of the proposed framework. Finally, we conclude the article and provide directions for future works.

Jiawei Shao and Jun Zhang are with the Department of Electronic and Information Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong (e-mail: jiawei.shao@connect.polyu.hk, jun-eie.zhang@polyu.edu.hk).




Fig. 1. Communication-computation plane of edge inference. (1) **Trade-off**: the blue and orange curves correspond to the on-device computation and communication overhead at different split points, where the blue curve corresponds to the original network, and the orange curve corresponds to the network with model compressed and feature encoding. (2) **Data amplification**: As suggested in [7], the data amplification means the communication overhead of the intermediate feature is larger than that of input data. The grey dashed line is the communication overhead of input data. (3) **Special points**: the red and blue stars correspond to on-device inference and server-based inference. The purple star corresponds to the device-edge co-inference. With model compression and feature encoding, the on-device computation and communication overhead is reduced, and the data amplification effect is alleviated.

II. COMMUNICATION-COMPUTATION TRADE-OFF IN EDGE INFERENCE

In this section, we first present communication-computation trade-off as a critical design perspective in device-edge co-inference, and introduce split point selection as a rudimentary approach to achieve a baseline trade-off. Then we present two approaches to improve the trade-off for more effective edge inference. Finally, we propose a general framework that incorporates the three techniques, as shown in Fig. 2.

A. Communication-Computation Trade-Off and Model Splitting

The performance of edge inference is fundamentally constrained by limited on-device resources. Many devices are with limited computing capability due to low-end processing units and small memory space, as well as limited communication capability due to the low transmit power and limited bandwidth. Device-edge co-inference is a promising method to overcome these limitations for effective inference, by leveraging advancements in mobile edge computing and wireless networking. It splits a DNN into two parts, to be deployed at a device and an edge server, respectively. By controlling the size and output dimension of the on-device model, while exploiting the abundant resources at the edge server, low-latency edge inference can be achieved.

To improve the efficiency of device-edge co-inference, while accounting for the on-device resource constraints, the trade-off between on-device computation and communication overhead should be carefully made, as illustrated in Fig. 1. A DNN

is with many layers, easily reaching 100's or even over 1000. Different split points will lead to different on-device computation cost and communication overhead. Due to the data amplification phenomenon in many DNN models, it is not desirable to split at too early layers, as the communication cost will increase, as shown in Fig. 1. When it goes deeper, there is a clear computation-communication trade-off. On-device inference and server-based inference can be viewed as two extreme cases, where the split point is at the end of the DNN and at the beginning of the DNN, respectively.

Split point selection provides a rudimentary way for communication-computation trade-off, and it has been widely investigated recently [7]. It typically assumes a given DNN model, and only picks a split point, without modifying the neural network or the intermediate feature vector. In this way, it resembles a computation offloading problem, and can be solved accordingly. Nevertheless, such solutions fail to exploit unique properties of neural networks and intermediate features, and thus lead to high communication and on-device computation costs. Inspired by the abundant redundancy in neural network parameters and features, we introduce model compression and feature encoding in the following two subsections for more effective on-device computation and communication, with more details provided in Sections III and IV.

B. Communication-Aware Model Compression for Better Trade-Off

Modern DNN models are with millions or even billions of parameters, which makes it impossible to directly deploy state-of-the-art models on resource-constrained devices. Model compression has been a widely applied technique to reduce the model size with little performance loss due to the redundancy in the model parameters. In device-edge co-inference, different from traditional model compression, we focus on compressing part of the model. Meanwhile, considering that the output of the on-device model affects the communication overhead, the compression method should be *communication-aware*, i.e., it should try to reduce the resulting communication overhead while compressing the model.

There have been many model compression methods, which, nevertheless, have not explicitly considered the induced communication overhead. In Section III, we shall introduce different model compression methods, and develop effective approaches for communication-aware model compression.

C. Task-Oriented Feature Encoding for Better Trade-Off

As shown in Fig. 1, there is a data amplification effect [7] in DNN, i.e., the size of the intermediate feature may increase with the layers, even surpassing the size of the input data. Although communication-aware model compression can alleviate this problem to some extent, the excessive communication overhead makes it difficult to split at an early layer to save on-device computation. For deeper layers, it is also desirable to reduce the output size, so that low-latency inference can be achieved over bandwidth-limited communication channels. Intuitively, the feature to be transmitted to the edge server should only contain a *minimal* amount of information that is

sufficient for the inference task. This motivates us to compress the feature vector to reduce the communication overhead. A side effect is that the split point could be moved earlier, so that the on-device computation cost can also be reduced. That is, a better communication-computation trade-off can be achieved.

Different from the traditional source coding techniques that aim to strike a rate-distortion balance, the compression of feature vectors in edge inference should be performed in a *task-oriented* manner, i.e., we care less about accurate data recovery at the edge server, but care more about the inference performance. Moreover, joint source-channel coding can be applied to further improve the efficiency of feature transmission over noisy channel.

D. Framework Overview

Based on the above discussion, we propose a general framework, as shown in Fig. 2, which combines three techniques, namely model splitting, model compression, and feature encoding. Going through the three steps will produce a particular operating point, and repeating the process will produce a trade-off curve, as shown in Fig. 1, which achieves improvements over the baseline curve. Alternatively, this framework can be run iteratively to find an optimal split point, the corresponding compressed model, and the feature encoder. For example, to minimize the inference latency, an optimized splitting policy can be applied, following by model compression and feature encoding, so that the overall latency will decrease through iteration. More details about the model compression and feature encoding are introduced in the next two sections.

III. COMMUNICATION-AWARE MODEL COMPRESSION

This section first introduces common methods for DNN model compression. Then, methods that can be applied for communication-aware model compression are identified. Implementation details about a particular method, incremental network pruning, are presented next.

A. Model Compression for DNNs

There have been lots of interests in DNN model compression [5], which effectively reduces the memory footprint and computational cost of powerful DNNs to deploy them on resource-constrained devices. Rapid progresses have been achieved on this exciting topic, and many methods have been proposed, which can be categorized into four schemes: parameter pruning, low-rank factorization, compact convolutional filters, and knowledge distillation. The *parameter pruning* methods explore the redundancy in the model parameters and remove the redundant and less salient ones. *Low-rank factorization* based techniques use matrix/tensor decomposition to reduce the informative parameters of DNNs. The *compact convolutional filters* method design special structural convolutional filters to reduce the parameter space and computational complexity. The *knowledge distillation* methods learn a compact distilled model based on the output of the original model and maintain the performance.

B. Communication-Aware Model Compression

While traditional model compression methods focus on reducing the number of parameters and computational complexity of the DNN deployed on a single device, model compression for device-edge co-inference ideally should account for both the on-device computation cost and the resulting communication overhead. Thus, it should be designed in a *communication-aware* manner, and directly applying existing compression methods may not be effective. We adopt parameter pruning in our framework, which has been the most widely used model compression method. Many of the pruning methods reduce the parameter size in an *unstructured* way, i.e., they remove individual unimportant weights in a DNN. In this way, a sparse weight matrix is produced, which requires specialized hardware to speedup and could not control the output size. On the other hand, the *structured* channel-wise pruning method [8] has potential to remove the unnecessary channels/kernels in the on-device (convolutional) layers, which helps to reduce the output size. This motivates us to develop a communication-aware model compression method based on structured pruning, as described in the next subsection. Notice that there is a delicate communication-computation trade-off for communication-aware model compression. It essentially needs to compress both the on-device model and the output feature. As too much compression will lead to performance degradation, we have to strike a balance between the compression ratio of the model and that of the output feature, i.e., a trade-off between on-device computation cost and the communication overhead.

C. Incremental Network Pruning

We propose a communication-aware model compression for the on-device model, namely, incremental network pruning, as shown in the yellow region of Fig 2. It follows a typical iterative pruning process, as explained below.

We first set targeted channel-wise sparsity ratios at the beginning of the pruning iteration, including the output layer, corresponding to the dimension of the output feature. There is a binary mask for every layer of the on-device model. A particular element of the mask is set to 0 means that the corresponding output channel is masked (pruned) in this iteration. The pruning process consists of three steps in each iteration. (1) We sort the weights corresponding to each output channel based on their l_2 -norm. The smallest $S_i\%$ of weights will be masked in this iteration, where $S_i\%$ is the corresponding sparsity ratio. (2) In the forward-propagation, the values of masked weights are set to 0, and only the unmasked weights will be updated in the back-propagation. (3) The masked weights are recovered to their original values at the beginning of this iteration, and then our method starts the next iteration. The sparsity ratio in each iteration will incrementally increase until it reaches the desired ratio, and this mechanism makes the pruning process stable.

IV. TASK-ORIENTED FEATURE ENCODING

While communication-aware model compression can partly reduce the communication overhead, its capability in doing




Fig. 2. The proposed framework of device-edge co-inference. (1) **Split the Network**: The input of the framework is the pre-trained DNN. The first step is to select the split point to divide the DNN into two parts. The front part of the neural network is deployed on the edge device, and the other part is offloaded on the edge server. (2) **Compress the on-device model**: The on-device model is compressed by incremental structural pruning. In each iteration, the mask would remove the unimportant weights (set their value to 0) based on their l_2 -norm. Then the unmasked weights would be updated in the training process. After back-propagation, the masked weight would be recovered, and then the next iteration starts. In the training process, the sparsity ratio will incrementally increase until it reaches the desired ratio. (3) **Encode the intermediate feature**: With the compressed on-device model, we use a pair of lightweight encoder-decoder structure to shrink the volume of the intermediate feature. Besides, using learning-driven source coding or joint source-channel coding, we further reduce the communication overhead by learning the optimal codeword mapping.

so is limited. In this section, we propose task-oriented feature encoding to further reduce the communication overhead. In the following, we first elaborate the key difference between the design of compression methods in traditional communication theory and that for feature compression in edge inference. Next, we introduce the implementation details of our task-oriented feature encoding method.

A. Communication-Oriented vs. Task-Oriented Compression

In traditional communication theory, there are many hand-crafted coding methods to compress the data, including source coding (e.g., Huffman coding, PNG, JPEG.) and joint source-channel coding [9]. Besides, many recent works applied learning-driven DNNs for coding, e.g., [10]. These methods train a pair of DNNs as the encoder and decoder, capable of extracting high-level compact features from the raw data with a high compression ratio. The design objective of these methods is to recover the compressed data at the receiver, either perfectly (lossless coding) or with tolerable distortion (lossy coding). However, for edge inference, we care less about data recovery at the receiver and care more about the

inference performance of the specific task. This insight has inspired recent studies (e.g., [11]) to exploit the fault-tolerant property of the DNNs to achieve much reduced communication overhead without losing inference performance. The next subsection shall introduce the task-oriented feature encoding method adopted in our framework.

B. Two-Step Feature Encoding

We propose a two-step encoding method, consisting of (1) data dimension reduction to shrink the volume of the intermediate feature and (2) learning-driven coding to further compress the feature by finding the optimal codeword mapping. Both steps are implemented via neural networks, which are trained in an end-to-end manner. In Fig. 2, the intermediate feature encoding is shown in the green region of the framework.

1) *Dimension Reduction*: Inspired by the recent work using the auto-encoder structure for communication [11], we use a pair of lightweight complementary encoder and decoder (with less than 1% additional computational complexity compared with the original network) to reduce the data dimension.

Generally, the cube-like intermediate data in convolutional layers have three dimensions: channel, width, and height. Many existing works [8] indicated redundant channels in the intermediate feature, especially when the feature is in deeper layers. So, the first layer in the encoder is a convolutional layer to reduce the unnecessary channels. Next, the reshaped output passes a fully connected layer to further reduce its dimension. At the edge server, the decoder reconstructs the data by a complementary encoder structure.

2) *Learning-Driven Coding*: In the second step, the DNN learns the mapping from source symbols to codewords. We provide two alternative coding methods: learning-driven source coding and learning-driven joint source-channel coding (JSCC). To apply, the former method should be accompanied with traditional channel coding against channel noise, while the latter one, without using separate channel coding, considers the channel noise in the training process.

Learning-Driven Source Coding: As the original float-point numbers in the intermediate features induce a significant communication overhead, using (lossy) source coding via quantizing the float-point numbers to fewer bits can considerably reduce the overhead. Inspired by a recent study [12] that learned discrete representations to quantize the output of an auto-encoder, we use a DNN to learn a set of optimal (discrete) codewords for the lossy compression, rather than using traditional methods like rounding or truncation with pre-defined codewords. These learning-driven codewords can fit the original data distribution and minimize the encoded information loss.

Learning-Driven Joint Source-Channel Coding: JSCC assumes a noisy channel and models the channel noise as a non-trainable layer in the DNN, which enables end-to-end training for the encoder/decoder. Learning-driven JSCC can reduce the redundancy from the separate channel coding for two reasons. First, DNN-based encoder and decoder can find better codeword mapping than the hand-crafted channel coding. Besides, due to DNNs' fault-tolerant property, although the channel noise corrupts the transmitted data, it has relatively less effect on the performance of edge inference.

V. EXPERIMENT AND EVALUATION

A. Experimental Setup

1) *Dataset and Neural Network*: We evaluate our proposed framework on an image classification task with the CIFAR-10 dataset [13], which consists of 60,000 32×32 color images in 10 classes. We use the classical ResNet18 [14] as a classifier, which is trained on the 50,000 training images and evaluated on the 10,000 testing images.

2) *Metric*: For this DNN-based application, one important metric is classification accuracy. Our result shows that the original ResNet18 can reach around 95% accuracy, and we set the accuracy threshold to 93% in edge inference. Another important metric is the end-to-end latency, which is mainly influenced by the on-device computation and communication overhead. The on-device computation workload is approximated by the float-point operations (FLOPs), and the communication overhead is evaluated by the transmitted data size (bits) or transmitted latency (seconds).




Fig. 3. The communication-computation trade-off curves in device-edge co-inference.

3) *Baselines*: To the best of our knowledge, there has been no systematic study of the communication-computation trade-off in device-edge co-inference. To fully illustrate this trade-off and verify the effectiveness of our framework, we consider three baselines: (1) the original network with split point selection, but without model/feature compression; (2) the 2-Step Pruning method [15], where the first step prunes the entire DNN to shrink the on-device model and the second step only prunes the layer right before the split point to reduce the communication overhead; (3) BottleNet++ [11], which uses an auto-encoder structure to compress the transmitted feature size while maintaining the inference performance. Because BottleNet++ and our method uses DNNs to encode the feature, to ensure the fairness of the comparison, we use Huffman coding to compress the intermediate feature of the original network and the 2-Step Pruning method. Besides, we use the PNG method for compression when directly transmitting the input image, which is set as a benchmark for the communication overhead. (The simulation code will be made available soon.)

B. Communication-Computation Trade-Off

Fig. 3 plots the communication-computation trade-off curves of our method (with learning-driven coding) and the three baselines.

First, for each point on the curve of our framework, there is no point on other curves with smaller computation cost and communication overhead simultaneously. Compared with the original network, our framework achieves a significant saving in both the on-device computation cost and communication overhead. So, our method can enable effective inference on resource-constrained devices and is applicable in varying combinations of device computation capability and available bandwidth.

Next, we analyze the four curves from the data amplification perspective [7]. The grey dashed line is the communication overhead for transmitting the input data. Nearly all the intermediate features of the original network and the 2-Step




Fig. 4. Latency as a function of communication rate. Our method can maintain the latency around 0.1s when the communication becomes poor (less than 40KB)

Pruning method are larger than the input data. Although 2-Step Pruning considers reducing the communication overhead in the second step pruning, simply removing the redundant channel is not enough to alleviate the data amplification effect. So they have few available split points for device-edge co-inference, and these two settings can hardly reduce the end-to-end latency. For BottleNet++, it has a great potential to compress the intermediate feature size, and all the communication overheads at the split points are smaller than the input data. However, BottleNet++ does not compress the on-device model, so most of the split points suffer excessive on-device computation, which will increase the inference latency and energy consumption. Our method makes a better communication-computation trade-off, which remedies the influence of data amplification and requires less on-device computation.

C. Edge Inference Speedup

This part provides a real-world case study to compare the end-to-end latency of different methods. We select the Raspberry Pi 3 as the edge device (1GB RAM and 24GFLOP/s), and the edge server is with RTX 2080 TI (11GB RAM and 13.45 TFLOP/s). Note that the Raspberry is constrained by its memory resource, because its CPU and GPU share the 1GB RAM, and other modules also occupy the memory. We use Pytorch to build the ResNet18, and the original network needs more than 0.9 GB memory. We can roughly deploy 40% of the uncompressed model and 90% of the compressed model on the Raspberry due to the memory constraint.

With the fixed computation capability and memory constraint, we test the inference latency under different bandwidth scenarios. In Fig. 4, we observe that when the edge device has limited bandwidth (smaller than 40KBps), our method can maintain the inference latency around 0.1s. However, for the three baselines, the end-to-end latency increases dramatically. The reason is that our method, with more available split points, can flexibly adjust the number of on-device offloading layers

and easily strike a balance between the on-device computation and communication overhead. Thus, our method can work effectively in resource-limited scenarios.

D. Performance of Learning-Driven JSCC over Noisy Channels

Previous simulations assumed error-free transmission of the intermediate feature. In this part, we consider noisy channels and verify the effectiveness of the learning-driven JSCC scheme for feature encoding.

In this experiment, we split the neural network behind the *Conv_4x* [14]. Then we compare the communication overhead of learning-driven coding (assuming perfect channel coding) and learning-driven JSCC. Besides, to show the performance gain, we also compare with the communication overhead of (1) the input data and (2) the intermediate feature of the original network. We consider two kinds of noisy channels, namely, an AWGN channel and a Binary Symmetric Channel (BSC), where the noise is characterized by the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), and bit flipping rate p , respectively.

Note that JSCC does not need extra channel coding to protect the signals/bitstream against channel noise, and we assume perfect channel coding for other methods. Specifically, we adopt the Shannon capacity bound as the communication rate for baseline methods, i.e., $C = W \log_2(1 + \text{SNR})$ for the AWGN channel and $C = 1 - H(p)$ for the BSC channel, so we are comparing with the performance upper bounds of these methods.

Fig. 5 shows that the communication overhead of JSCC is slightly lower than (or comparable with) learning-driven source coding with optimal channel coding, as it exploits the fault-tolerant property of the DNN. Besides, JSCC is with much lower encoding/decoding complexity, as it is constructed by the DNN. Moreover, it outperforms the other two baselines by a large margin. This comparison illustrates the great potential of JSCC in edge inference, as it is able to reduce the communication overhead, processing time and energy.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

This paper introduced a device-edge co-inference framework with communication-aware model compression and task-oriented feature encoding. Simulations verified that this framework achieved a better communication-computation trade-off and much lower latency than other baselines. Moreover, it was shown that joint source-channel coding is promising to reduce the transmission latency of edge inference by leveraging DNNs' fault-tolerant property.

This article made a first attempt to investigate the unique communication-computation trade-off in edge inference and there are lots of interesting directions to follow. First, our proposed method requires manually selecting the splitting point, setting the compression ratio, and defining the encoder-decoder structure. More effective design approaches can be developed via leveraging automated machine learning (AutoML), which, for example, has been applied to automatically search for optimal neural network architectures. It is also interesting to extend the proposed methods to other edge AI applications, e.g., natural language processing based applications.




Fig. 5. (a) The communication latency under different SNR's in the AWGN channel with channel bandwidth $W = 1\text{MHz}$ and (b) the communication overhead under different bit flipping rates in the Binary Symmetric Channel.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2012, pp. 1097–1105.
- [2] G. Zhu, D. Liu, Y. Du, C. You, J. Zhang, and K. Huang, "Toward an intelligent edge: wireless communication meets machine learning," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 19–25, 2020.
- [3] Z. Zhou, X. Chen, E. Li, L. Zeng, K. Luo, and J. Zhang, "Edge intelligence: Paving the last mile of artificial intelligence with edge computing," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 8, pp. 1738–1762, 2019.
- [4] Y. Shi, K. Yang, T. Jiang, J. Zhang, and K. B. Letaief, "Communication-efficient edge AI: Algorithms and systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09668*, 2020.
- [5] Y. Cheng, D. Wang, P. Zhou, and T. Zhang, "Model compression and acceleration for deep neural networks: The principles, progress, and challenges," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 126–136, 2018.
- [6] H. Cai, C. Gan, T. Wang, Z. Zhang, and S. Han, "Once for all: Train one network and specialize it for efficient deployment," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [7] H. Li, C. Hu, J. Jiang, Z. Wang, Y. Wen, and W. Zhu, "Jalad: Joint accuracy-and latency-aware deep structure decoupling for edge-cloud execution," in *2018 IEEE 24th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS)*, 2018, pp. 671–678.
- [8] M. Zhu and S. Gupta, "To prune, or not to prune: Exploring the efficacy of pruning for model compression," in *International Conference on Learning Representations, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018*, 2018.
- [9] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [10] K. Choi, K. Tatwawadi, A. Grover, T. Weissman, and S. Ermon, "Neural joint source-channel coding," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 1182–1192.
- [11] J. Shao and J. Zhang, "Bottleneck++: An end-to-end approach for feature compression in device-edge co-inference systems," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun. (ICC) Workshop on Edge Machine Learning for 5G Mobile Networks and Beyond, Dublin, Ireland, 2020*.
- [12] A. van den Oord, O. Vinyals *et al.*, "Neural discrete representation learning," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 6306–6315.
- [13] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," Citeseer, Tech. Rep., 2009.
- [14] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proc. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [15] W. Shi, Y. Hou, S. Zhou, Z. Niu, Y. Zhang, and L. Geng, "Improving device-edge cooperative inference of deep learning via 2-step pruning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.03472*, 2019.

Jiawei Shao [S'20] (jiawei.shao@connect.polyu.hk) received his B.S. degree from Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.

Jun Zhang [S'06-M'10-SM'15] (jun-eie.zhang@polyu.edu.hk) received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Texas at Austin. He is currently an Assistant Professor at The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.