

AutoTailor: Automatic and Efficient Adaptive Model Deployment for Diverse Edge Devices

Mengyang Liu^{1,2} Chenyu Lu¹ Haodong Tian³ Fang Dong^{1,†}
 Ruiting Zhou¹ Wei Wang² Dian Shen¹ Guangtong Li¹ Ye Wan¹ Li Li⁴
¹Southeast University ²Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
³Tsinghua University ⁴University of Macau

Abstract

On-device machine learning (ML) has become a fundamental component of emerging mobile applications. Adaptive model deployment delivers efficient inference for heterogeneous device capabilities and performance requirements through customizing neural architectures. SuperNet-based approaches offer a promising solution by generating a large number of model variants from a pre-trained ML model. However, applying SuperNet in existing frameworks suffers from tedious model-aware development and time-consuming hardware-aware profiling, which limits their practical adoption.

We present AutoTailor, the first framework to enable automated, end-to-end SuperNet-based adaptive model deployment for edge devices. Unlike manual SuperNet construction, AutoTailor employs a computation graph-guided compilation approach to automatically transform user-provided ML models into SuperNets. To support efficient specialization, AutoTailor incorporates learning-free latency and accuracy predictors, enabling low-cost yet accurate performance prediction. Our extended evaluations demonstrate that AutoTailor reduces the lines of code for SuperNet construction by 11–27 \times , decreases hardware-aware profiling costs by at least 11 \times , and achieves up to 15.60% absolute accuracy improvement and 60.03% latency reduction compared to state-of-the-art approaches across diverse models and devices.

1 Introduction

Deep neural networks (DNNs) are increasingly executed on edge devices to provide private intelligence for a wide range of mobile applications, including augmented reality [21], video analytics [20], and robot navigation [24]. Static DNN deployment often fails to meet the diverse requirements of applications (e.g., real-time responsiveness or energy efficiency) on heterogeneous edge devices (e.g., industrial GPU boards or personal mobile phones). To solve this problem, adaptive model deployment [8, 14, 52] has emerged as a widely adopted strategy. It first generates multiple model




Figure 1: Latency-accuracy tradeoff of adaptive ResNet-50 on Exynos 1380 SoC big cores and ImageNet1k dataset across different methods. SuperNet consistently achieves state-of-the-art performance. Static use ResNet-18 and ResNet-34 as smaller model variants.

variants with different latency-accuracy trade-offs from a pre-trained DNN and then deploys the most suitable one according to device capabilities and runtime conditions.

The number and granularity of model variants determine the performance of adaptive model deployment. Early work adopted coarse-grained uniform filter pruning [8] to generate variants with different widths. LegoDNN [14] refined this approach by applying non-uniform pruning, providing more variants with improved overall performance. AdaptiveNet [52] further extended the design space by varying not only width but also depth. These methods generate model variants through block scaling, where each block has multiple weight-independent variants, and complete model variants are constructed by combining them. However, in block-scaling approaches, each block requires fine-tuning to preserve accuracy, which limits scalability in producing a larger number of variants and achieving higher performance.

SuperNets [2, 40, 49] provide a promising solution for efficiently generating a large number of model variants. Their key principle lies in weight sharing, where each model variant (SubNet) shares parameters with others and is trained jointly. As shown in Fig. 1, adopting SuperNet as the model variants generation method in adaptive deployment can achieve up to 34.67% latency reduction with the same accuracy and 7.89% absolute accuracy improvement under

[†] Corresponding to Fang Dong <fdong@seu.edu.cn>.

the same latency over state-of-the-art adaptive deployment methods for ResNet50 DNN [15].

Unfortunately, applying SuperNets in practice incurs substantial development and deployment costs due to their high flexibility. On the development side, users must manually transform a static DNN into a dynamic one that supports multiple architectural modifications, a process that not only bloats the codebase but also demands deep expertise in DNN architecture design. For example, ElasticViT [40] transforms LeViT [13] with $4\times$ more lines of code than its original implementations (1638 vs. 406) to make each module transformable. Retiarai [58] mitigates this burden by introducing the MUTATOR abstraction, which frees users from implementing transformable operators. The framework provides a set of predefined MUTATORS, and users only need to wrap transformable operators with specific MUTATORS and candidate options. At runtime, the framework automatically generates model variants, keeping the SuperNet program cleaner and reducing redundant manual work. However, users still require substantial domain expertise to correctly replace static modules with MUTATORS and must carefully specify candidate choices to avoid shape errors, making the process tedious and less accessible to non-experts.

On the deployment side, optimizing model architectures for specific devices requires profiling candidate variants, which is highly time-consuming. The vast number of variants within a SuperNet makes exhaustive offline profiling infeasible, while online profiling during optimization introduces significant inefficiency. To mitigate this, existing approaches [10, 56] train operator-level latency predictors and aggregate their outputs to estimate model-level latency, thereby simplifying predictor construction. However, as learning-based methods, their accuracy fundamentally depends on the quantity and quality of training data. Consequently, building such predictors commonly demands hours of data collection (e.g., 1 hour profiling to achieve an only 50% accuracy predictor as shown in Fig. 7) for each model-platform pair, yet still suffers from non-negligible prediction errors.

Our goal is to enable automatic and efficient SuperNet deployment, thereby advancing adaptive model deployment in practice. Achieving this goal presents two key challenges. First, automating SuperNet construction requires decoupling users from the DNN programs, leaving the framework unaware of which modules are transformable or what candidate choices to assign. Second, the vast number of possible model variants makes accurate predictor training difficult: the larger the design space, the more profiling data are required to train the predictor effectively, resulting in prohibitive time costs.

We observe two fundamental characteristics of SuperNets that can be leveraged to address these challenges. First, SuperNets exhibit **graph structural consistency**: they generate variants by applying architectural modifications to a

base architecture, which preserves the computation graph of the original DNN. This property enables transformable modules to be automatically identified and replaced directly from the computation graph, eliminating the need for manual annotation. Second, SuperNets exhibit **cross-SubNet architectural similarity**: although they contain many SubNets, most operators are repeated. Our analysis (Section 2.4) shows a high repetition ratio (96–98%), meaning the number of unique operators is significantly small. This property enables learning-free predictors that profile only unique operators, eliminating costly sampling and predictor training.

We present AutoTailor, an end-to-end adaptive model deployment framework for edge devices. AutoTailor automatically compiles any user-provided DNN into TailorIR, a novel abstraction we proposed to represent SuperNets, through a computation graph-guided compilation process. The TailorIR-wrapped SuperNet is then fine-tuned to ensure the accuracy of all model variants. To support efficient latency prediction, AutoTailor extracts unique operators from the SuperNet, pruning redundant subspaces via modification dependency analysis and leveraging execution-free tensor shape inference. Operator-level latency results are composed into model-level predictions, and a similar approach is applied for efficient accuracy prediction. Finally, given user requirements, AutoTailor uses these predictors to search for the optimal model variant and outputs deployable DNNs specialized for the target edge platform.

The key contributions of AutoTailor are as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, AutoTailor is the first framework to provide fully automated, end-to-end adaptive model deployment for edge devices.
- We propose a computation graph-guided compilation method and learning-free predictors building methods to reduce development and deployment overheads in applying SuperNets.
- We extensively evaluate AutoTailor across diverse DNNs and edge devices, demonstrating that it reduces engineering effort by 11–27 \times and profiling cost by at least 11 \times , while achieving up to 15.60% absolute accuracy improvement and 60.03% latency reduction compared to state-of-the-art approaches.

2 Background and Motivation

2.1 Adaptive Model Deployment for Edge Devices

Deploying powerful deep neural networks (DNNs) on edge devices to enable private and personalized intelligence has become a rapidly growing trend in mobile applications [50].




Figure 2: An illustration of adaptive model deployment and different model variants generation methods.

Traditional static model deployment, placing a single fixed-architecture model on the device for inference, proves inadequate for edge platforms due to two key characteristics of edge devices. First, edge devices exhibit wide hardware diversity, ranging from high-performance NVIDIA Orin boards [32] to commodity smartphones [33] and resource-constrained microcontrollers (MCUs) [39]. Second, performance requirements vary across edge applications: some real-time processing tasks demand high-frequency DNN inference [20, 21, 28, 59], while persistent background applications [11, 12] require energy-efficient, low-power DNN inference. To better align model execution with heterogeneous resources (e.g., compute capacity) and application requirements (e.g., accuracy and latency), adaptive model deployment has emerged as a promising approach [8, 14, 52]. This process consists of two steps as shown in Fig. 2(a): (1) generating multiple model variants with different architectures, accuracy, and efficiency; and (2) selecting the most suitable variant for a given device and runtime requirement.

The effectiveness of adaptive deployment depends on the range and granularity of the model variants it can generate. Figure 2(b-d) illustrate representative variants produced by existing adaptive deployment methods using a four-layer DNN as an example, where each color corresponds to a specific layer. Early work such as NestDNN [8] relied on uniform filter pruning [25], applying the same sparsity ratio across all layers. LegoDNN [14] extended this idea by enabling non-uniform, layer-wise pruning, thereby expanding the design space with greater flexibility. Moving beyond width-only modifications, AdaptiveNet [52] further introduced a layer-skipping strategy, which substantially enlarges the search space and refines the granularity of architectural adaptation. An observable trend of prior works is to continuously enlarge the model variants design space for achieving better deployment results.




Figure 3: Comparison between block scaling and SuperNet-based model variants generation.

2.2 SuperNet-based Adaptive Model Deployment

LegoDNN [14] and AdaptiveNet [52] adopt a block scaling approach to generate model variants. As shown in Fig. 3(a), block scaling constructs multiple block variants, and different model variants are formed by selecting different combinations of these block choices. Since each new block must be independently constructed and retrained with additional supervision (e.g., block-wise distillation [52]), the overhead of memory consumption and training grows linearly relating to the number of blocks. Such overhead fundamentally limits scalability, restricting both the number of supported model variants and the granularity of modifications.

To overcome these limitations, we find that the SuperNet [2] is a more scalable and efficient model variant generation mechanism. Unlike block scaling, SuperNet can represent a vast number of SubNets in a weight-sharing manner as shown in Fig. 3(b). Different SubNets activate distinct subsets of layers or weights within the same SuperNet, enabling the reuse of parameters across variants. SuperNet training is performed by randomly sampling multiple SubNets per batch, with the total loss aggregated over their outputs. This weight-sharing design significantly reduces memory and training overhead, while supporting a much larger and finer-grained variant space. Scaling AdaptiveNet to match the architectural design space of the SuperNet (excluding input modifications) requires 27× more independent blocks and incurs 27× more training iterations, which is also 8× more than SuperNets, as shown in Fig. 3(c). Consequently, SuperNet provides a




Figure 4: An illustration of SuperNet workflow.

more practical foundation for adaptive model deployment for resource-constrained and dynamic edge environments.

Therefore, we advance SuperNet as the model variant generation method to push the performance frontier of adaptive model deployment. As shown in Fig. 1, our experimental results demonstrate the advantages of the SuperNet-based approach compared with existing methods. Specifically, the SuperNet-based method achieves up to 60.3% latency reduction with the same accuracy and 15.6% absolute accuracy improvement under the same latency constraint compared with AdaptiveNet [52] benefited from its 1,000,000,000× larger design space.

2.3 Problems in Applying SuperNet

Despite the significant performance improvements demonstrated by SuperNet-based adaptive deployment, its adoption in real-world systems remains costly. Figure 4 illustrates the conventional SuperNet workflow and its inefficiencies. First, experts manually design and develop a SuperNet (Step 1), requiring significant model-aware expertise. The SuperNet is then fine-tuned on a GPU server (Step 2) and used to build an accuracy predictor (Step 3). When a new device arrives, a latency predictor must be built through extensive hardware profiling (Step 4), which incurs high device-specific costs. Finally, the system combines both predictors to optimize the architecture on an edge server (can be CPU-only) (Step 5) and deploy the optimized architecture to the target device. This workflow suffers from two major inefficiencies: heavy reliance on expert manual efforts for SuperNet development and expensive profiling for each new model and device.

On the development side, supporting fine-grained and large-scale variant generation requires complex and manual modifications to the original DNN. Existing implementations typically extend each layer with the dynamic module and implement its exploration method too as shown in Fig. 5(b). This implementation not only inflates the codebase, but also strongly relies on DNN architecture design expertise. Retiarii [58] attempt to mitigate the issue via abstractions like MUTATOR as shown in Fig. 5(c), which not only maintains the SuperNet code clean, but also reduces repetitive engineering

Model	ResNet50	MobileNetv3
Number of variants	2×10^{13}	7×10^{22}
Latency profiling (s/variant)	0.2 ~ 1.75	0.4 ~ 3.85
Accuracy profiling (s/variant)	31 ~ 47	31 ~ 43

Table 1: Profiling costs for deploying SuperNets. Latency profiled on Samsung A54 big cores and accuracy profiled on NVIDIA RTX 3070 GPU with 128 batch size.

efforts in implementing model exploration required by SuperNet training and architecture optimization through system-level mutator management. However, developers must still rely heavily on model-aware manual efforts in specifying MUTATORS.

On the profiling side, searching for optimal variants requires performance evaluation across the vast SuperNet design space. Offline profiling is practical for prior block scaling-based methods with 10,000–20,000 model variants. However, as illustrated in Table 1, offline profiling is impractical for SuperNet with 10^{13} – 10^{22} model variants. The other way is online profiling, which incurs unacceptable online overhead in the optimization process. A common alternative is to build predictors trained from partial profiling data. For example, OFA [2] trains MLP-based predictors that encode subnet architectures and output accuracy or latency estimates as shown in Fig. 6(a). However, model-level prediction remains difficult due to the high dimensionality of the architecture space, necessitating substantial profiling to achieve sufficient accuracy. To reduce cost, operator-level latency predictors have been proposed as shown in Fig. 6(b), such as nn-Meter [56], which predicts operator-level latencies and aggregates them to estimate end-to-end latency. LitePred [10] further improves predictor robustness against out-of-distribution sampling.

Nevertheless, two fundamental issues persist. First, predictor accuracy still depends on extensive profiling, often requiring hours of operator measurements. Second, training predictors introduces their own complexity, demanding careful design choices and hyperparameter tuning. As shown in Fig. 7, existing latency or accuracy predictor building methods commonly require hours of data collection to achieve nearly usable predictors.

2.4 Opportunity

To address the development and deployment bottlenecks of SuperNet-based adaptive model deployment, we aim to automate SuperNet construction by isolating users from DNN programs and to devise an efficient method for building latency predictors. However, two challenges arise: (1) how can the framework automatically identify transformable modules and their candidate choices without user intervention? (2)




Figure 5: Illustration of graph structural consistency property and comparison of SuperNet development methods.




Figure 6: Comparison of predictor building methods.




Figure 7: Existing predictor building methods rely on time-consuming profiling for collecting training data.

how can accurate predictors be trained in the vast SuperNet design space with limited profiling data?

We identify two exploitable characteristics to address these challenges. (1) **Graph Structural Consistency**: a SuperNet is derived from a static DNN, where its largest SubNet matches the original architecture. As a result, the overall computation graph remains consistent with the original DNN (Fig. 5(a)). (2) **Cross-SubNet Architectural Similarity**: analysis of 1,000 randomly sampled SubNets (Fig. 8)

shows that the number of unique operators quickly converges as sampling increases, while many operators appear repeatedly (96–98% redundancy), often at high frequencies (up to 414–3590 times). This indicates strong structural redundancy across SubNets, suggesting that the set of unique operators is small and feasible to enumerate.

These two properties create promising opportunities for overcoming existing bottlenecks:

O#1. Automated SuperNet construction. Leveraging graph structural consistency, static modules can be automatically replaced with dynamic modules during compilation as shown in Fig. 5(d), clearing manual efforts needed in SuperNet construction.

O#2. Enumerating unique operators to build learning-free predictors. Cross-SubNet similarity enables enumerating and profiling of all unique operators, which in turn supports efficient construction of lookup-table (LUT)-based predictors as shown in Fig. 6(c), eliminating the need for costly learning-based models.

3 System Overview

AutoTailor advances adaptive model deployment on edge devices by leveraging SuperNets to generate model variants. It achieves automatic and efficient deployment through two key techniques: (1) a graph compilation method (§4.1) that automatically replaces computation graph components without manual coding, and (2) a learning-free predictor construction method (§4.2) that rapidly builds latency lookup tables (LUTs) without costly sampling or training. Given a DNN model and deployment requirements, AutoTailor automatically outputs optimized architectures that deliver state-of-the-art performance on target edge platforms.

Challenges and Approaches. Despite the opportunities, making automatic and efficient deployment practical requires addressing the following challenges.




Figure 8: Illustration of cross-SubNets architectural similarity in different models.




Figure 9: System architecture.

C#1. Lack of abstraction. Constructing SuperNets from static DNNs raises a key challenge: how to represent them in a scalable, model-agnostic way. Retiarii [58] wraps dynamic modules (MUTATOR) and SuperNets (MODELSPACE) around the original DNN (e.g., PyTorch *nn.Module* [45]). While simple, this approach has two drawbacks: (1) modifications are tightly coupled with the model structure, limiting scalability, and (2) reliance on the original DNN restricts cross-platform support and requires framework-specific versions.

We design TailorIR, a model-agnostic abstraction for automatic SuperNet construction (Section 4.1.1). SuperNets are organized as computation graphs of TailorIR modules, each managing its architecture and generating executable versions. This decouples modifications from structure, supports scaling, ensures traceability. Similar to Retiarii, TailorIR enables automatic model exploration, but with broader applicability and cleaner integration.

C#2. High engineering effort in dynamic module development. Supporting diverse DNNs requires many dynamic modules, but existing systems like Retiarii make building these libraries labor-intensive.

To this end, TailorIR introduces two optimizations (Section 4.1.2): (1) bypassing non-variable modules and auto-generating executables with conversion tools; (2) using templated module designs to maximize reuse across models.

C#3. Inefficiency in enumerating unique operators. Constructing LUTs for learning-free latency prediction requires extracting parameters of unique operators (e.g., kernel size, tensor shapes). Although their number is limited (Fig. 8),

operator architectures are only fixed after model-level modifications, making brute-force sampling infeasible.

To this end, we propose a rapid LUT construction method for our latency predictor (Section 4.2.1) that prunes unnecessary sampling by analyzing independent modifications. Using TailorIR’s architecture traceability, operator parameters are extracted without real inference, greatly speeding up enumeration.

C#4. High accuracy profiling cost. Accuracy predictors usually require full model profiling, which is costly since each candidate must be evaluated on GPUs. Unlike latency, accuracy cannot be decomposed to the operator level.

To this end, we propose a modification-level accuracy predictor (Section 4.2.2) based on SuperNet modification sensitivities. Relative accuracy differences between SubNets can be approximated from these sensitivities, allowing efficient prediction without full profiling.

System architecture and workflow. Fig. 9 shows the system architecture. The workflow starts with an input DNN, either from a model zoo or user implementation, represented as a computation graph. The graph is parsed into a TailorIR-based SuperNet (Section 4.1), where static modules are replaced with TailorIR modules, and then fine-tuned to preserve SubNet accuracy (Section 4.3.1). AutoTailor next builds learning-free predictors (Section 4.2): the latency predictor profiles unique operators to build device-specific LUTs (Section 4.2.1), while the accuracy predictor samples SubNets using modification sensitivity to estimate accuracy (Section 4.2.2). Finally, given deployment requirements, AutoTailor searches for the best architecture (Section 4.3.2) and deploys it to the target device.

4 Detailed Design

4.1 Computation Graph-guided Compilation

4.1.1 TailorIR Abstraction. Fig. 10 shows the design of TailorIR using an FFN block as an example. Unlike Retiarii [58], which mainly wraps PyTorch *nn.Module*, TailorIR is an independent abstraction that directly manages architectures. Specifically: (1) each TailorIR module maintains a *Feature* describing both meta and active architectures; (2) the transform function updates features after modifications; (3) the update function ensures consistency and legality; (4) the




Figure 10: TailorIR overview.

build function generates an executable PyTorch module. In a SuperNet, operators, blocks, and the full model are all encapsulated as TailorIR modules, each managing its own state to ensure consistent modifications across different levels.

Decoupled design. TailorIR separates architecture from modifications. A module’s *Feature* encodes its architecture and is turned into an executable via *build*, while *transform* and *update* handle modifications. This decoupling improves readability and scalability, as new modifications only require changes to transform without touching build.

Architecture traceability. A key advantage of TailorIR is architecture traceability, improving module generality and scalability. Unlike conventional approaches that require manually hardcoding parameters, TailorIR uses a one-time deduction rule in *update*, so any transform automatically keeps dependent features consistent.

4.1.2 Module Development Optimizations. TailorIR enables automatic SuperNet construction without requiring manual modification of the original DNN program. However, implementing dynamic modules remains necessary, creating challenges for non-experts and limiting scalability. To overcome this, we provide a comprehensive TailorIR module library that supports diverse DNNs out-of-the-box, with two key optimizations:

Static module bypassing. As in existing SuperNet methods, not all layers need to be transformed into dynamic modules. In AutoTailor, since the original program is not directly accessible, we design dedicated TailorIR modules




Figure 11: Optimizations in TailorIR module development.

to wrap static layers (Fig. 11(a)). These modules maintain a general *Feature* with a default deduction rule in the *update* function to automatically infer attributes from inputs, which works well for non-parameterized and element-wise operators. During the build stage, model conversion tools (e.g., onnx2torch[6]) generate the corresponding executable PyTorch modules from the computation graph.

Templated module design. TailorIR enables automatic SuperNet construction and reuses dynamic modules across diverse DNNs. Although DNNs differ in structure, many share common architectural patterns [16, 23]. To leverage this, we adopt a templated module design that encourages




Figure 12: The example of space pruning.

generic, reusable TailorIR modules. Using templated modules and the *Path* abstraction (Fig. 11(b)), TailorIR decouples structure from specific operators, allowing a single design to adapt across networks and reducing redundant engineering.

4.1.3 Automatic SuperNet Construction. We design a bottom-up three-step parsing process that incrementally transforms an input DNN into a TailorIR-based SuperNet.

Step 1: Operator parsing. The parser traverses the computation graph, mapping each operator to its TailorIR counterpart. Static operators are bypassed (Section 4.1.2). For multi-output operators, the parser traces output paths until they converge, grouping them into default TailorIR blocks. **Step 2: Block parsing.** The parser then matches subgraphs with templated TailorIR blocks based on topological patterns, replacing default blocks with structured block modules. **Step 3: Stage division.** Finally, the model is partitioned into stages (e.g., by resolution or output width), enabling higher-level modifications such as adjusting stage depth. This three-step process yields a fully TailorIR-wrapped SuperNet automatically, without user intervention.

4.2 Learning-free Predictor Building

We propose a learning-free predictor that avoids the overhead and errors of learning-based methods. For latency, AutoTailor profiles only unique operators to build operator-level LUTs, keeping costs low and eliminating generalization errors. To identify these operators efficiently, we prune the SubNet enumeration space using modification dependencies. We extend this idea to accuracy with *modification sensitivity*, which measures the impact of architectural changes and enables efficient modification-level prediction.

4.2.1 Operator-level LUT-based Latency Predictor. AutoTailor accelerates LUT construction by pruning redundant operator enumerations through analysis of modification dependencies.

Pruning enumerating space. As shown in Fig. 12, depth modifications determine only the number of stacked blocks within a stage. Because these blocks are structurally identical, the corresponding operator features remain unchanged regardless of depth, making such modifications independent. Similarly, modifications confined to a specific stage or block are also independent of other choices. By exploiting

Models	normal (GPU hours)	+ space pruning (GPU hours)	+ TailorIR (CPU minutes)
ResNet50	1.25E+09	10.8	11.8
MobileNetv2	872000	0.0382	2.2
ConvNext	8.08978E+15	0.0259	4.8
LeViT	1.02E+41	57.44	46.5

Table 2: Extraction cost of unique operators. In the normal setting, the cost is estimated by multiplying the number of profiling runs by the average cost of a single profiling.

such independence, AutoTailor prunes redundant operator combinations from the enumerating space, thereby avoiding unnecessary profiling.

Beyond the large enumeration space, the cost of extracting operators from a single SubNet is also non-negligible. Tensor shapes are essential operator features for constructing LUTs, yet obtaining them typically requires inference of the entire SubNet due to the dynamic graph design in existing deep learning frameworks. AutoTailor alleviates this overhead by leveraging TailorIR’s architectural traceability, which automatically infers the tensor shape of each module without full SubNet execution. As shown in Tab. 2, this optimization makes model-aware enumeration both efficient and practical.

Latency predictor building. Once the LUT is built, each device profiles its unique operators. For a given SubNet, AutoTailor extracts each operator’s *Feature*, looks up its latency in the device-specific LUT, and sums them to get the model’s total latency. This design ensures accuracy and easy transfer across devices. Operator fusion [31] merges multiple operators into one kernel, breaking the assumption that total latency equals the sum of individual latencies [56]. To handle this, AutoTailor extends TailorIR to support fusion: multiple operators can be combined into a single TailorIR module based on user-defined fusion rules. During LUT construction, each fused operator is built and profiled as a single module, so predictors capture the true execution cost. Section 6.4 shows that this fusion-aware approach achieves accurate latency prediction.

4.2.2 Modification-level Accuracy Predictor. In a SuperNet, shared weights can be partitioned without losing accuracy, as each portion contributes part of the layer’s learned knowledge. Building on this, AutoTailor extends operator-level decomposition from latency to accuracy prediction, breaking down SubNet accuracy into contributions from individual architectural modifications and reducing predictor costs.

One SubNet can be represented as a set of modifications applied to the SuperNet:

$$\text{SubNet} = \{m_1, m_2, \dots\} \quad (1)$$

We define the *sensitivity* of a modification as the accuracy drop when applying this modification to the SuperNet, compared against the unmodified SuperNet baseline:

$$\Delta_m = \text{Acc}(\text{SuperNet}) - \text{Acc}(\text{SubNet}(\{m\})) \quad (2)$$

Then, the accuracy of a SubNet can be approximated as the sum of the sensitivities of all modifications it contains:

$$\text{Acc}(\text{SubNet}) = \text{Acc}(\text{SuperNet}) - \sum_{m \in \text{SubNet}} \Delta_m \quad (3)$$

Although this prediction may not provide exact accuracy values, maintaining the relative order of SubNets is sufficient for adaptive deployment, where the goal is to select the most accurate SubNet under given constraints.

4.3 Automatic Model Exploration

Model exploration samples SubNets from the search space and is crucial for (1) fine-tuning the SuperNet and (2) architecture optimization, where the best candidates are selected using the fine-tuned SuperNet and predictors. AutoTailor automates this by collecting modification abstractions from each TailorIR module; users only specify modifications and candidate choices in a simple configuration file:

```
title = "Example"
[arch]
blocks = ["FFNBlock"]
[var.global_vars]
resolution = [128, 160, 192, 224]
[var.stage_vars]
reduce_depth = [-3, -2, -1, 0]
[var.block_vars]
FFNBlock.expand_ratio = [2, 3, 4]
```

4.3.1 SuperNet Fine-tuning. Fine-tuning is necessary to ensure that modified SuperNets preserve competitive accuracy. AutoTailor incorporates a *Tuner* component to execute this process, providing seamless integration with existing SuperNet-based model exploration strategies [35, 40]. Given a TailorIR-represented SuperNet, the Tuner samples SubNets by applying modifications and fine-tunes them accordingly.

4.3.2 Architecture Optimization. The *Optimizer* in AutoTailor efficiently searches for the best architecture to deploy fine-tuned SuperNets on edge devices using the constructed predictors. To handle this complex task, AutoTailor uses genetic algorithms [2, 40] and accelerates the search with a beam search-based initialization for large design spaces.

4.4 Discussions

Impact of SuperNet fine-tuning strategy. SuperNet fine-tuning is crucial for adaptive deployment. Previous work has focused on improving either accuracy [18, 40, 47, 48] or training efficiency [1, 35, 55]. Here, we use CompOFA’s

tuning strategy for all SuperNets without extra tricks, though more advanced fine-tuning could further boost performance.

Extending to other metric prediction. Beyond latency, energy and memory are also critical for edge deployment. Our predictor can naturally extend to these metrics: energy is aggregated like latency, while memory is decomposed into parameters and activations. The total memory consumption during inference is then obtained as the sum of parameter memory and peak activation memory.

Limitations. Currently, AutoTailor is limited to image classification. However, SuperNets have proven effective in tasks such as object detection [36], machine translation [49], speech recognition [38], and large language models [4]. Extending AutoTailor to these tasks is an important direction for future work.

5 Implementation

We implement AutoTailor on PyTorch [44] in 12500+ LoC of Python, including 4700+ LoC for the library of TailorIR modules to support all SuperNets mentioned in this paper. We use ONNX [43] and ONNX Graph Surgeon [42] tools for parsing the model. The tuner component is implemented on PyTorch DistributedDataParallel (DDP) for supporting distributed SuperNet tuning. The optimized architecture will be translated into NCNN executable format by the PNNX [57] tool for deploying on mobile phones.

6 Evaluation

6.1 Experimental Setup

Testbed. We evaluate AutoTailor on four edge setups: a Samsung A54 smartphone (Exynos 1380) in Big- and Little-cores, and NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano and AGX Orin GPUs. AutoTailor runs on a local server with NVIDIA 3070 GPUs and Intel Xeon Gold 6230R CPUs, offloading SuperNet tuning to the cloud. NCNN [46] is used for on-device inference (FP16 precision), except for ViT on Jetson devices, where PyTorch [44] performs better.

Models and datasets. Tab. 3 lists the SuperNets and their original models used in our experiments. All SuperNets support width, depth, and input modifications. We use ImageNet1K [34] for both fine-tuning and evaluating adapted models. Following the CompOFA [35], each SuperNet is fine-tuned for 600 iterations (150 epochs) with 4 SubNets sampled per batch.

6.2 Adaptive Deployment Performance

We first evaluate AutoTailor’s adaptive deployment performance by searching for optimal architectures across different models, edge devices, and requirements. For each case, we generate 40–50 latency constraints and report only the Pareto frontier of the resulting latency–accuracy trade-offs.




Figure 13: Performance comparison of hardware-aware adaptive model deployment.




Figure 14: Performance comparison of hardware-agnostic adaptive model deployment.

Our adaptation uses our proposed learning-free predictors for providing both latency and accuracy guidance in the architecture optimization. The hyperparameter settings of the genetic search algorithm used in architecture optimization follow those in OFA [2].

Baselines. We compare against AdaptiveNet [52] and LegoDNN [14] using their official implementations. AdaptiveNet uses its released weights, while LegoDNN trains new blocks on pre-trained DNNs from TIMM [53]. For NestDNN, whose code is unavailable, we approximate its performance using Torch-Pruning [9] and denote it as NestDNN*. Pruned variants are fine-tuned for 60 epochs on ResNet50 and MobileNetV2, and 120 epochs on ConvNeXt and ViT. Since AdaptiveNet and LegoDNN do not support Transformers, we compare them only against NestDNN* for these models. We also report static DNN performance for reference.

Original DNN	# of Modifications	# of Variants
ResNet50 [15]	100	2×10^{13}
MobileNetv2 [37]	85	8×10^{10}
MobileNetv3 [17]	160	7×10^{22}
ProxylessNet [3]	166	6×10^{23}
ConvNext-Tiny [30]	163	2×10^{23}
ViT-Base [7]	103	1×10^{12}
LeViT [13]	324	1×10^{45}

Table 3: Illustration of SuperNets in this paper.

Results. Due to space constraints, we select one representative model per runtime, pairing larger models with stronger devices and smaller models with weaker ones. As shown in Fig. 13, AutoTailor supports a wider range of latency constraints and consistently delivers higher accuracy under 92% latency conditions than existing methods.

On ResNet50, AutoTailor achieves an average accuracy gain of 2.27% and a 10.37% latency reduction over AdaptiveNet. On MobileNetV2, the improvements are larger, with 4.12% higher accuracy and 21.48% lower latency. These gains are most pronounced on mobile phones, which have fewer parallel resources than Jetson GPUs and thus require more compact models. AutoTailor generates such compact variants more effectively than existing methods. In contrast, LegoDNN and NestDNN* perform poorly under tight latency budgets, especially on weaker devices, due to their lack of depth modifications. For larger latency budgets (8%), AutoTailor is slightly less competitive, which we attribute to limited SuperNet training. We expect this gap can be closed with stronger tuning strategies, such as OFA’s progressive training [2] (3× more iterations) or AlphaNet’s self-distillation [47] (1.25× more iterations).

On Transformer-style models, AutoTailor improves accuracy by 5.12% and reduces latency by 29.62% on ConvNeXt, and achieves 3.36% higher accuracy with 15.04% lower latency on Vision Transformer compared with NestDNN*. These results demonstrate AutoTailor’s effectiveness on advanced architectures and its potential for emerging systems such as vision foundation models [21] and vision-language




Figure 15: Overhead analysis of ResNet50 adaptive model on phone big cores.




Figure 16: Comparison of LoC in constructing Super-Nets.

models [29], where ConvNeXt and Vision Transformer serve as common image encoders.

We also report hardware-agnostic results by using FLOPs instead of latency (Fig. 14). Unlike hardware-aware results, the FLOPs-guided ones show different trends, underscoring the need for accurate hardware-specific predictors. Across most FLOPs constraints, AutoTailor still achieves state-of-the-art performance. For Vision Transformer, width pruning performs well, likely due to its higher architectural complexity, which may benefit from more SuperNet fine-tuning.

Overhead analysis. Next, we analyze the overhead of applying SuperNets. Fig. 15 compares the extra cost from AutoTailor’s larger design space with AdaptiveNet and a scaled version (AdaptiveNet-scaled) that matches our search space. The official AdaptiveNet validates accuracy on only a data subset, which reduces reliability. For fairness, we validate all 10,609 variants and include this cost in our analysis.

Our sensitivity-based predictor needs only one hour of profiling. Latency profiling takes 12.5× longer than AdaptiveNet but only 20 minutes in absolute time, which is practical. AdaptiveNet requires 60 training iterations with 3 sampled blocks per batch, while our method incurs 3.3× more iterations to fine-tune SuperNets. The AdaptiveNet-scaled comparison highlights our better scalability, even without input modifications that would further raise its overhead.

6.3 Effectiveness of Computation-graph Guided Compilation

Engineering Efforts Reduction. We measure the engineering effort of building SuperNets by comparing lines of code (LoC) changes to the original DNN using `git diff`. We evaluate four SuperNets—ResNet50, MobileNetV3, ProxylessNet, and LeViT, using their official OFA [2] and ElasticViT [40] implementations as the native baseline. The Retiarii baseline




Figure 17: Analysis on TailorIR Modules.

is implemented by us using their open-source framework, NNI [41]. With AutoTailor, users only need to provide a simple configuration file specifying modifications (Section 4.3). As shown in Fig. 16, AutoTailor reduces LoC by 11–27× compared with Retiarii, thanks to automatic graph compilation. While Retiarii eases model exploration, it still requires manual replacement of static modules with mutable ones, which demands both detailed architecture knowledge and significant engineering. In contrast, AutoTailor eliminates such model-aware coding by letting users define SuperNets through concise, easy-to-write configuration files.

Effectiveness of Development Optimization. Fig. 17 analyzes the LoC distribution of core functions, including build, transform, update, and init functions, across TailorIR modules developed for the SuperNets of Tab. 3. About 51% of the effort goes into 12 templated blocks, with nearly 50% saved through LoC reuse. Operator development takes 632 LoC for 21 operators (10 partially bypassed), out of 28 total operators (7 fully bypassed). Parser development accounts for about 20% of the effort, as it maps sub-graphs to block templates. To simplify and avoid conflicts, users can specify block templates directly in the config file (Sec. 4.3).

6.4 Effectiveness of Learning-free Predictors

Baselines. For latency prediction, we compare AutoTailor with LitePred [10], extending both to support additional operators. Each SuperNet uses 2,000 sampled SubNets to build predictors. For accuracy prediction, we compare with OFA’s MLP-based method [2].

Metrics. For latency prediction, we report error rates at the 10% level on 1,000 randomly sampled SubNets. For accuracy prediction, we use top-5 ranking accuracy: 100 groups of 200 candidates are ranked by predicted accuracy. We adopt ranking accuracy instead of absolute values to better match the optimization process, which selects the best SubNets within each group.

Latency profiling cost reduction. As shown in Fig. 7, existing learning-based predictors struggle with accuracy and efficiency. Our learning-free method profiles all unique operators for precise latency estimation, taking only 20 minutes for ResNet50’s convolutions and 40 minutes for MobileNetV3’s depth-wise convolutions, which are their main




Figure 18: Comparison of latency predictors for LeViT.




Figure 19: Illustration of model-level latency prediction error.




Figure 20: Comparison of accuracy predictors.

latency contributors. As shown in Tab. 3, LeViT has the most model variants, making predictor construction challenging. Fig. 18 compares our method with LitePred [10] on three major operators. Our method profiles all unique operators in 13.6 minutes, while the learning-based approach struggles except on MatMul, which we profile in just 1.6 minutes.

Effectiveness of fusion-aware profiling. We compare predicted and measured latencies of the smallest and largest SubNets, with and without fusion. As shown in Fig. 19, ignoring fusion causes errors up to 1.47 \times , especially in larger SubNets with more fused operators. While perfect accuracy is difficult, our fusion-aware method keeps deviations within an acceptable range.

Accuracy profiling cost reduction. As shown in Fig. 20, our accuracy prediction method accelerates predictors’ building time by 2.2–11.6 \times compared to MLP-based methods to achieve 78–98% prediction accuracy. While MLP-based approaches can achieve higher accuracy given sufficient training data, our method offers an efficient alternative for rapidly constructing predictors.

6.5 Sensitivity Study

We also evaluate adaptation performance under predictors of varying accuracy to study their impact. Specifically, we use




Figure 21: Performance comparison with different predictors on LeViT and phone big cores.

our trained MLP predictor (Fig. 20) with the same profiling time as our method to represent a weak accuracy predictor, and another trained with twice the profiling time to represent a strong accuracy predictor with similar accuracy to ours. For latency, we use LitePred’s predictor we trained with the same profiling cost as ours to represent a weak latency predictor. Instead of reporting the Pareto frontier, we present the actual adaptation results under each constraint to directly assess predictor impact. As shown in Fig. 21, our method achieves the most robust results, while low-accuracy predictors lead to up to an 11.2% absolute accuracy drop.

7 Related Work

SuperNet-based Systems. The most related SuperNet-based system is Retiarri [58], which enables automatic model exploration. Later work focused on speeding up on-cloud SuperNet training [54, 60], and SuperServe [22] applies SuperNets for cloud-based adaptive model serving, dynamically selecting models based on requests.

Efficient On-Device DNN Inference. Efficient on-device DNN inference has also been studied beyond architecture optimization. Heterogeneous processing uses multiple types of processors together to speed up execution [19, 51]. Kernel compilation frameworks optimize operator-level execution through code generation and fusion [5, 27], while memory management techniques reduce overhead via parameter storage, activation reuse, and buffer allocation [26]. These approaches complement architectural optimization to improve edge deployment efficiency.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we present AutoTailor, an end-to-end adaptive model deployment framework that delivers state-of-the-art performance. For users, AutoTailor requires only a short configuration file to automatically construct a high-performance SuperNet from a pre-trained DNN. For deployment on new devices, it requires only minutes of profiling to specialize the SuperNet. Overall, AutoTailor significantly advances practical model deployment for diverse real-world edge scenarios.

References

- [1] Aditya Annavajjala, Alind Khare, Animesh Agrawal, Igor Fedorov, Hugo Latapie, Myungjin Lee, and Alexey Tumanov. 2024. DepS: Delayed ϵ -Shrinking for Faster Once-for-All Training. In *Proceedings of the 18th European Conference on Computer Vision, Milan, Italy, September 29-October 4, 2024 (ECCV '24)*. 315–331.
- [2] Han Cai, Chuang Gan, Tianzhe Wang, Zhekai Zhang, and Song Han. 2020. Once-for-All: Train One Network and Specialize it for Efficient Deployment. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020 (ICLR '20)*.
- [3] Han Cai, Ligeng Zhu, and Song Han. 2019. ProxylessNAS: Direct Neural Architecture Search on Target Task and Hardware. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019 (ICLR '19)*.
- [4] Ruisi Cai, Saurav Muralidharan, Hongxu Yin, Zhangyang Wang, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. 2025. LLaMaFlex: Many-in-one LLMs via Generalized Pruning and Weight Sharing. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025 (ICLR '25)*.
- [5] Tianqi Chen, Thierry Moreau, Ziheng Jiang, Lianmin Zheng, Eddie Yan, Meghan Cowan, Haichen Shen, Leyuan Wang, Yuwei Hu, Luis Ceze, Carlos Guestrin, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2018. TVM: an automated end-to-end optimizing compiler for deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, Carlsbad, CA, USA, October 8-10, 2018 (OSDI '18)*. 579–594.
- [6] ENOT developers, Igor Kalgin, Arseny Yanchenko, Pyoter Ivanov, and Alexander Goncharenko. 2022. onnx2torch: Convert ONNX models to PyTorch. <https://github.com/ENOT-AutoDL/onnx2torch>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [7] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. 2021. An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021 (ICLR '21)*.
- [8] Biyi Fang, Xiao Zeng, and Mi Zhang. 2018. NestDNN: Resource-Aware Multi-Tenant On-Device Deep Learning for Continuous Mobile Vision. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, New Delhi, India, October 29 - November 02, 2018 (MobiCom '18)*. 115–127.
- [9] Gongfan Fang, Xinyin Ma, Mingli Song, Michael Bi Mi, and Xinchao Wang. 2023. DepGraph: Towards Any Structural Pruning. In *Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 17-24, 2023 (CVPR '23)*. 16091–16101.
- [10] Chengquan Feng, Li Lina Zhang, Yuanchi Liu, Jiahang Xu, Chengruidong Zhang, Zhiyuan Wang, Ting Cao, Mao Yang, and Haisheng Tan. 2024. LitePred: Transferable and Scalable Latency Prediction for Hardware-Aware Neural Architecture Search. In *21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, Santa Clara, CA, April 15-17, 2024 (NSDI '24)*. 1463–1477.
- [11] Francesco Fraternali, Bharathan Balaji, Dhiman Sengupta, Dezhi Hong, and Rajesh K. Gupta. 2020. Ember: energy management of batteryless event detection sensors with deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems, Virtual Event, Japan, November 16-19, 2020 (SenSys '20)*. 503–516.
- [12] Graham Gobieski, Brandon Lucia, and Nathan Beckmann. 2019. Intelligence Beyond the Edge: Inference on Intermittent Embedded Systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Providence, RI, USA, April 13-17, 2019 (ASPLOS '19)*. 199–213.
- [13] Benjamin Graham, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Hugo Touvron, Pierre Stock, Armand Joulin, Hervé Jégou, and Matthijs Douze. 2021. LeViT: A Vision Transformer in ConvNet's Clothing for Faster Inference. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 10-17, 2021 (ICCV '21)*. 12259–12269.
- [14] Rui Han, Qinglong Zhang, Chi Harold Liu, Guoren Wang, Jian Tang, and Lydia Y. Chen. 2021. LegoDNN: block-grained scaling of deep neural networks for mobile vision. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, October 25-29, 2021 (MobiCom '21)*. 406–419.
- [15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27-30, 2016 (CVPR '16)*.
- [16] Zicong Hong, Jian Lin, Song Guo, Sifu Luo, Wuhui Chen, Roger Wattenhofer, and Yue Yu. 2024. Optimus: Warming Serverless ML Inference via Inter-Function Model Transformation. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth European Conference on Computer Systems, Athens, Greece, April 22-25, 2024 (EuroSys '24)*. 1039–1053.
- [17] Andrew Howard, Ruoming Pang, Hartwig Adam, Quoc V. Le, Mark Sandler, Bo Chen, Weijun Wang, Liang-Chieh Chen, Mingxing Tan, Grace Chu, Vijay Vasudevan, and Yukun Zhu. 2019. Searching for MobileNetV3. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, Seoul, Korea (South), October 27 - November 2, 2019*. 1314–1324.
- [18] Jeimin Jeon, Youngmin Oh, Junghyup Lee, Donghyeon Baek, Dohyung Kim, Chanho Eom, and Bumsu Ham. 2025. Subnet-Aware Dynamic Supernet Training for Neural Architecture Search. In *Proceedings of the 2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Nashville, TN, USA, June 11-15, 2025 (CVPR '25)*. 30137–30146.
- [19] Fucheng Jia, Deyu Zhang, Ting Cao, Shiqi Jiang, Yunxin Liu, Ju Ren, and Yaoxue Zhang. 2022. CoDL: efficient CPU-GPU co-execution for deep learning inference on mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services, Portland, Oregon, 27 June 2022 - 1 July 2022 (MobiSys '22)*. 209–221.
- [20] Shiqi Jiang, Zhiqi Lin, Yuanchun Li, Yuanchao Shu, and Yunxin Liu. 2021. Flexible high-resolution object detection on edge devices with tunable latency. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, October 25-29, 2021 (MobiCom '21)*. 559–572.
- [21] Chanyoung Jung, Jeho Lee, Gunjoong Kim, Jiwon Kim, Seonghoon Park, and Hojung Cha. 2025. ARIA: Optimizing Vision Foundation Model Inference on Heterogeneous Mobile Processors for Augmented Reality. In *The 23rd ACM International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services, Anaheim, California, USA, June 23 - 27, 2025 (MobiSys '25)*.
- [22] Alind Khare, Dhruv Garg, Sukrit Kalra, Snigdha Grandhi, Ion Stoica, and Alexey Tumanov. 2025. SuperServe: Fine-Grained Inference Serving for Unpredictable Workloads. In *22nd USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, Philadelphia, PA, USA, April 28-30, 2025 (NSDI '25)*. 739–758.
- [23] Fan Lai, Yinwei Dai, Harsha V. Madhyastha, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. 2023. ModelKeeper: Accelerating DNN Training via Automated Training Warmup. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, Boston, MA, April 17-19, 2023 (NSDI '23)*. 769–785.
- [24] Jeho Lee, Chanyoung Jung, Jiwon Kim, and Hojung Cha. 2024. Panopticus: Omnidirectional 3D Object Detection on Resource-constrained

- Edge Devices. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, Washington D.C., DC, USA, November 18-22, 2024 (MobiCom '24)*. 1207–1221.
- [25] Hao Li, Asim Kadav, Igor Durdanovic, Hanan Samet, and Hans Peter Graf. 2017. Pruning Filters for Efficient ConvNets. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017 (ICLR '17)*.
- [26] Xiangyu Li, Yuanchun Li, Yuanzhe Li, Ting Cao, and Yunxin Liu. 2024. FlexNN: Efficient and Adaptive DNN Inference on Memory-Constrained Edge Devices. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, Washington D.C., DC, USA, November 18-22, 2024 (MobiCom '24)*. 709–723.
- [27] Rendong Liang, Ting Cao, Jicheng Wen, Manni Wang, Yang Wang, Jianhua Zou, and Yunxin Liu. 2022. Romou: rapidly generate high-performance tensor kernels for mobile GPUs. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, Sydney, NSW, Australia, October 17 - 21, 2022 (MobiCom '22)*. 487–500.
- [28] Neiwen Ling, Xuan Huang, Zhihe Zhao, Nan Guan, Zhenyu Yan, and Guoliang Xing. 2023. BlastNet: Exploiting Duo-Blocks for Cross-Processor Real-Time DNN Inference. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems, Boston, Massachusetts, November 6-9, 2022 (SenSys '22)*. 91–105.
- [29] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10-16, 2023 (NIPS '23)*. Article 1516, 25 pages.
- [30] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. 2022. A ConvNet for the 2020s. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022 (2022)*, 11966–11976.
- [31] Wei Niu, Jiexiong Guan, Yanzhi Wang, Gagan Agrawal, and Bin Ren. 2021. DNNFusion: accelerating deep neural networks execution with advanced operator fusion. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, Virtual Event, Canada, June 20-25, 2021 (PLDI '21)*. 883–898.
- [32] NVIDIA. 2025. NVIDIA Jetson Orin. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/autonomous-machines/embedded-systems/jetson-orin/>.
- [33] Qualcomm. 2025. Snapdragon Overview. <https://www.qualcomm.com/snapdragon/overview>.
- [34] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael S. Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.* 115, 3 (2015), 211–252.
- [35] Manas Sahni, Shreya Varshini, Alind Khare, and Alexey Tumanov. 2021. CompOFA: Compound Once-For-All Networks for Faster Multi-Platform Deployment. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021 (ICLR '21)*.
- [36] Yuiko Sakuma, Masato Ishii, and Takuya Narihira. 2023. DetOFA: Efficient Training of Once-for-All Networks for Object Detection using Path Filter. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision - Workshops, Paris, France, October 2-6, 2023 (ICCV '23)*. 1325–1334.
- [37] Mark Sandler, Andrew G. Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. 2018. MobileNetV2: Inverted Residuals and Linear Bottlenecks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018 (CVPR '18)*. 4510–4520.
- [38] Yuan Shangguan, Haichuan Yang, Danni Li, Chunyang Wu, Yassir Fathullah, Dilin Wang, Ayushi Dalmia, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Ozlem Kalinli, Junteng Jia, Jay Mahadeokar, Xin Lei, Mike Seltzer, and Vikas Chandra. 2024. TODM: Train Once Deploy Many Efficient Supernet-Based RNN-T Compression For On-Device ASR Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, Seoul, Republic of Korea, April 14-19, 2024 (ICASSP '24)*. 10216–10220.
- [39] STMicroelectronics. 2025. STM32 Microcontrollers (MCUs). <https://www.st.com/en/microcontrollers-microprocessors/stm32-32-bit-arm-cortex-mcus.html>.
- [40] Chen Tang, Li Lina Zhang, Huiqiang Jiang, Jiahang Xu, Ting Cao, Quanlu Zhang, Yuqing Yang, Zhi Wang, and Mao Yang. 2023. ElasticViT: Conflict-aware Supernet Training for Deploying Fast Vision Transformer on Diverse Mobile Devices. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, Paris, France, October 1-6, 2023 (ICCV '23)*. 5829–5840.
- [41] Microsoft NNI Team. 2022. NNI: Neural Network Intelligence. <https://github.com/microsoft/nni>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [42] NVIDIA Team. 2021. NVIDIA ONNX GraphSurgeon. <https://docs.nvidia.com/deeplearning/tensorrt/onnx-graphsurgeon/docs/index.html>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [43] ONNX Team. 2021. Open Neural Network Exchange. <https://onnx.ai/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [44] PyTorch Team. 2016. PyTorch Deep Learning Framework. <https://pytorch.org/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [45] PyTorch Team. 2025. PyTorch nn.Module. <https://docs.pytorch.org/docs/stable/generated/torch.nn.Module.html>.
- [46] Tencent Team. 2019. Tencent NCNN. <https://github.com/Tencent/ncnn/>. Accessed: 2025-09-04.
- [47] Dilin Wang, Chengyue Gong, Meng Li, Qiang Liu, and Vikas Chandra. 2021. AlphaNet: Improved Training of Supernets with Alpha-Divergence. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event (ICML '21)*.
- [48] Dilin Wang, Meng Li, Chengyue Gong, and Vikas Chandra. 2021. AttentiveNAS: Improving Neural Architecture Search via Attentive Sampling. In *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, virtual, June 19-25, 2021 (CVPR '21)*. 6418–6427.
- [49] Hanrui Wang, Zhanghao Wu, Zhijian Liu, Han Cai, Ligeng Zhu, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. 2020. HAT: Hardware-Aware Transformers for Efficient Natural Language Processing. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, July 5-10, 2020 (ACL '20)*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel Tetreault (Eds.). 7675–7688.
- [50] Xubin Wang, Zhiqing Tang, Jianxiong Guo, Tianhui Meng, Chenhao Wang, Tian Wang, and Weijia Jia. 2025. Empowering Edge Intelligence: A Comprehensive Survey on On-Device AI Models. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 57, 9, Article 228 (2025), 39 pages.
- [51] Jianyu Wei, Ting Cao, Shijie Cao, Shiqi Jiang, Shaowei Fu, Mao Yang, Yanyong Zhang, and Yunxin Liu. 2023. NN-Stretch: Automatic Neural Network Branching for Parallel Inference on Heterogeneous Multi-Processors. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services, Helsinki, Finland, June 18-22, 2023 (MobiSys '23)*, Petteri Nurmi, Pan Hui, Ardalani Amiri Sani, and Yunxin Liu (Eds.). 70–83.
- [52] Hao Wen, Yuanchun Li, Zunshuai Zhang, Shiqi Jiang, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Yaqin Zhang, and Yunxin Liu. 2023. AdaptiveNet: Post-deployment Neural Architecture Adaptation for Diverse Edge Environments. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, Madrid, Spain, October 2-6, 2023 (MobiCom '23)*. 28:1–28:17.
- [53] Ross Wightman. 2019. PyTorch Image Models. <https://github.com/rwightman/pytorch-image-models>. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo>.

- [54] Ying Xu, Long Cheng, Xuyi Cai, Xiaohan Ma, Weiwei Chen, Lei Zhang, and Ying Wang. 2023. Efficient Supernet Training Using Path Parallelism. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture, Montreal, QC, Canada, February 25 - March 1, 2023 (HPCA '23)*. 1249–1261.
- [55] Jiahui Yu, Pengchong Jin, Hanxiao Liu, Gabriel Bender, Pieter-Jan Kindermans, Mingxing Tan, Thomas S. Huang, Xiaodan Song, Ruoming Pang, and Quoc Le. 2020. BigNAS: Scaling up Neural Architecture Search with Big Single-Stage Models. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020 (ECCV '20)*. 702–717.
- [56] Li Lyna Zhang, Shihao Han, Jianyu Wei, Ningxin Zheng, Ting Cao, Yuqing Yang, and Yunxin Liu. 2021. nn-Meter: towards accurate latency prediction of deep-learning model inference on diverse edge devices. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services, Virtual Event, Wisconsin, USA, 24 June - 2 July, 2021 (MobiSys '21)*. 81–93.
- [57] Nihui Zuo Zhang. 2023. PNNX: PyTorch Neural Network eXchange. <https://github.com/pnnx/pnnx>. Accessed: 2024-06-17.
- [58] Quanlu Zhang, Zhenhua Han, Fan Yang, Yuge Zhang, Zhe Liu, Mao Yang, and Lidong Zhou. 2020. Retiarii: A Deep Learning Exploratory-Training Framework. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, Virtual Event, November 4-6, 2020 (OSDI '20)*. 919–936.
- [59] Wuyang Zhang, Zhezhi He, Luyang Liu, Zhenhua Jia, Yunxin Liu, Marco Gruteser, Dipankar Raychaudhuri, and Yanyong Zhang. 2021. Elf: accelerate high-resolution mobile deep vision with content-aware parallel offloading. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, October 25-29, 2021 (MobiCom '21)*. 201–214.
- [60] Shixiong Zhao, Fanxin Li, Xusheng Chen, Tianxiang Shen, Li Chen, Sen Wang, Nicholas Zhang, Cheng Li, and Heming Cui. 2022. NASPipe: high performance and reproducible pipeline parallel supernet training via causal synchronous parallelism. In *27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Lausanne, Switzerland, 28 February 2022 - 4 March 2022 (ASPLOS '22)*. 374–387.