

Collaborative Satellite Computing through Adaptive DNN Task Splitting and Offloading

Shifeng Peng¹, Xuefeng Hou¹, Zhishu Shen^{1†}, Qiushi Zheng², Jiong Jin², Atsushi Tagami³, and Jingling Yuan¹

¹School of Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, Wuhan University of Technology, China

²School of Science, Computing and Engineering Technologies, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia

³KDDI Research, Inc., Japan

E-mail: {psf, martinhou, yjl}@whut.edu.cn, z_shen@ieee.org, {qiushizheng, jiongjin}@swin.edu.au, at-tagami@kddi.com

Abstract—Satellite computing has emerged as a promising technology for next-generation wireless networks. This innovative technology provides data processing capabilities, which facilitates the widespread implementation of artificial intelligence (AI)-based applications, especially for image processing tasks involving deep neural network (DNN). With the limited computing resources of an individual satellite, independently handling DNN tasks generated by diverse user equipments (UEs) becomes a significant challenge. One viable solution is dividing a DNN task into multiple subtasks and subsequently distributing them across multiple satellites for collaborative computing. However, it is challenging to partition DNN appropriately and allocate subtasks into suitable satellites while ensuring load balancing. To this end, we propose a collaborative satellite computing system designed to improve task processing efficiency in satellite networks. Based on this system, a workload-balanced adaptive task splitting scheme is developed to equitably distribute the workload of DNN slices for collaborative inference, consequently enhancing the utilization of satellite computing resources. Additionally, a self-adaptive task offloading scheme based on a genetic algorithm (GA) is introduced to determine optimal offloading decisions within dynamic network environments. The numerical results illustrate that our proposal can outperform comparable methods in terms of task completion rate, delay, and resource utilization.

Index Terms—Satellite computing, task splitting, DNN partitioning, task offloading

I. INTRODUCTION

The beyond 5G or 6G (B5G/6G) networks are expected to meet the ubiquitous demands of the future digital society. However, the traditional base stations (BSs) are unrealistic to be fully deployed in remote rural areas due to geographical and economic restrictions. Furthermore, the proliferation of mobile devices and the escalating demand for smart applications have given rise to a surge in computationally intensive tasks. In the absence of robust ground network infrastructure, processing these tasks generated by users in remote rural areas becomes a pivotal concern. Satellite computing possesses a unique strength in providing global coverage, extending connectivity to areas beyond the reach of conventional terrestrial networks. Furthermore, leveraging on-board computing capabilities in satellites for task processing can notably reduce the service delay caused by the network congestion [1], [2].

Task offloading within a centralized architecture results in substantial communication and computational overhead, particularly within large-scale low Earth orbit (LEO) satellite networks. To solve this issue, a distributed architecture that relies on data sharing among various satellites is anticipated. In this system, each terminal such as a satellite, independently determines offloading decisions based on its local observations [3]. However, the distributed solutions encounter non-convergence issues in the pursuit of global optimization.

Deep learning methods based on deep neural networks (DNN) have been widely adopted for the efficient processing of diverse tasks within satellite networks. However, the challenge arises from the limited computing and storage resources available on satellites when executing computationally intensive tasks using DNN [4]. To address this limitation, large DNN tasks can be initially distributed into different *blocks* according to the task processing units determined by the decision-making satellite. These blocks are divided into multiple *segments* based on network information including network scale and resource usage status. In this paper, the above procedure is referred to *task splitting*. Furthermore, to enhance feature representation, DNN models frequently incorporate a substantial number of layers, thereby intensifying the complexity of *DNN partitioning*. Specifically, DNN partitioning encounters the challenge of balancing the partition granularity and workload (the calculation amount of each task segment) [5]. Finally, multiple satellites collaborate to execute these tasks, ensuring the optimal resource utilization.

Our primary focus is on situations in which data services encompass multiple satellites and user equipments (UEs) distributed across varied geographical regions. Diverse UEs generate a range of tasks and offload split task segments to multiple satellites for collaborative processing. In this paper, we propose adaptive DNN task splitting and offloading schemes within collaborative satellite computing systems, aiming to attain load balancing across different satellites. To this end, a genetic algorithm (GA) is used to explore optimal solutions in a large decision space. The primary contributions of our work include:

- 1) A system model is developed to facilitate collaborative computing among multiple satellites. This model encompasses DNN partitioning and task offloading, focusing on optimizing task completion rate and minimizing process-

[†]The first two authors contributed equally to this work.

[†] Corresponding author.

ing delay.

- 2) A scheme leverages binary monotonicity is introduced for achieving workload balance by task splitting. This scheme employs dichotomy to balance the workload of DNN slices and then distributes them to multiple LEO satellites, enabling collaborative inference and enhancing the utilization of satellite computing resources.
- 3) To facilitate collaborative satellite computing, a GA-based self-adaptive task offloading scheme is introduced. This scheme optimizes offloading decisions by analyzing the task inference process, ensuring the efficient transmission of intermediate results from DNN slices.
- 4) An experimental investigation is carried out on two representative DNN types. The entire process can be executed on Raspberry Pi, a single-board computer installed on the recently launched satellite research platform, which supports in-orbit computing [2]. This investigation highlights the superior performance of our proposed scheme in comparison to other methods, specifically in terms of task completion rate and task delay.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II summarizes the related work, and Section III describes the problem statement. Section IV presents our proposed task splitting and offloading schemes. Section V summarizes the evaluation results that verify the performance of our proposal against that of the comparable methods. Section VI gives the conclusions for our future work.

II. RELATED WORK

A. DNN Partitioning and Task Splitting

The characteristics of DNN models enable them to be easily partitioned and deployed to multiple satellites for collaborative computing. In general, DNN model partitioning can be divided into vertical partitioning [6], horizontal partitioning [7], and combined vertical-horizontal [8] partitioning. In [7], the authors integrated BranchyNet with DNN models and utilized an early exit mechanism to divide the model in order to meet the requirements of inference latency and accuracy. In [9], the authors divided the convolutional layers based on the grid and allocated them to multiple devices with different computing capabilities for task execution. It is essential to consider the equitable distribution of workload for each segment during the DNN partitioning process to optimize resource utilization.

B. Task Offloading in Satellite Networks

The authors in [3] proposed a multi-agent double actors twin delayed deterministic policy gradient (MA-DATD3) algorithm that contains double actors and double critics. MA-DATD3 was designed to solve the computation offloading optimization problem with a centralized training and decentralized execution paradigm. In [10], the author conducted a joint optimization of computation offloading and power control. They introduced a Lyapunov optimization-based algorithm for minimizing the overall delay of tasks while satisfying the energy constraints of satellites. In [11], the authors transformed the offloading decision optimization problem into a linear programming




Fig. 1: System model.

problem by using the binary variables relaxation method. A distributed algorithm based on the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMMs) was proposed to approximate the optimal solution with low computational complexity. The methods introduced in previous research primarily catered to scenarios with a limited number of satellites covering a single area, rendering them unsuitable for offloading extensive DNN tasks that demand substantial computing resources.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

A. System Model

As shown in Fig. 1, we assume an integrated satellite-ground system consisting of LEO satellites and UEs located in multiple remote rural areas. Multiple LEO satellites form a constellation to achieve seamless global coverage. Each satellite orbits the Earth periodically to enable the establishment of satellite-ground connections. Due to the limited computational capabilities of UEs, these UEs have a restricted capacity to handle computationally intensive tasks. As a result, the computing tasks need to be transmitted to satellites via a gateway for processing. The gateway in each area is responsible for collecting tasks generated by the UEs within that specific area and transmitting these tasks to the satellite through wireless links. Each satellite is equipped with pre-trained DNN models to handle computing tasks collected from gateways at the ground. Moreover, satellite-to-satellite communication is facilitated through inter-satellite link (ISL). For example, in Fig. 1, satellite #1 receives tasks to be conducted by DNN model 1 from an area and executes task splitting. The segments of the respective tasks are offloaded to satellite #4 and #5.

The key elements within the proposed system comprise satellites, gateways, and UEs. Here, \mathcal{S} represents a set of satellites where i ($i \in \mathcal{S}$) denotes an individual satellite. Similarly, \mathcal{G} stands for a set of gateways, with each gateway denoted as g . \mathcal{E} represents a set of UEs, E_i represents a set of UEs within the coverage area of satellite i . Without loss of generality, we designate the decision-making satellite

to provide access and computing services to the UEs and gateway g within its covered area. The system operational time is divided into Γ slots, denoted by τ . We assume that the number of computing tasks received by each decision-making satellite in slot τ obeys the Poisson distribution. Subsequently, the decision-making satellite splits the received DNN tasks and offloads the task segments to multiple satellites for collaborative computing.

B. Communication Model

Before the satellite determines task splitting and offloading decisions, the tasks must be transmitted to the satellite through the satellite-ground wireless link. Assuming multiple gateways share bandwidth without interfering with each other, according to Shannon formula, the average transmission rate $v_{g,i}(t)$ between gateway g and satellite i is:

$$v_{g,i}(t) = B_0 \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_g \xi_{g,i}(t)}{M_G} \right), \quad (1)$$

where B_0 is the channel bandwidth, P_g represents the transmit power, $\xi_{g,i}(t)$ denotes the channel gain consists of large-scale fading and shadowed-Rician fading [11], and M_G indicates the additive white Gaussian noise.

The satellite network consists of N_o orbits, on which N_s satellites are evenly distributed. Due to the constraints imposed by communication distances, each satellite can only transmit tasks to its adjacent satellites through ISL. Assuming Gaussian channels, the maximum achievable data rate [12] for the transmission between satellites i and j is:

$$r(i, j) = B \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_t G_i(j) G_j(i) L_i(j) L_j(i)}{kTB} \right), \quad (2)$$

where B is the bandwidth between satellites, P_t is the transmission power, $G_i(j)$ and $G_j(i)$ are the gain of the transmit and received antennas, respectively. $L_i(j)$, $L_j(i)$ represent the beam pointing coefficient ($L_i(j), L_j(i) < 1$), k is the wavenumber, and T is the resultant noise temperature.

C. Computation Model

Each satellite is equipped with a predefined DNN model that enables it to handle specific DNN task segments. Additionally, a satellite has the capability to transmit its output to adjacent satellites for further processing, such as inference and computations like pooling and convolution for the next slice. Considering the constraints of a satellite's resource capacity and the size of the DNN task segments, it is imperative to enhance the utilization of each satellite's computing resources by achieving a balanced workload distribution for each DNN task segment. We aim to optimize the largest workload of all DNN task segments in a min-max fashion. The utility function is defined as:

$$U : \min_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}} \max m_k, \quad (3)$$

where m_k represents the workload of each DNN task segment, L denotes the expected sliced number.

In satellite network operations, a critical scenario may arise in which the satellite's remaining computing resources are

depleted. In this case, the DNN task segment assigned to the respective satellite will not be executed, and thus the original task will be discarded. It is essential to determine whether a task can be processed or not on a satellite based on the current resource usage. After a satellite loads new DNN task segments, the total workload is:

$$W = q + m_k, k \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, \quad (4)$$

where q represents the workload of DNN task segments a satellite has already loaded. The maximum workload that a satellite can accommodate is M_w . If $W < M_w$, load the task segments to the satellite for processing, otherwise, discard the respective task segment.

D. Task Delay and Drop Model

The task delay comprises computational delay and transmission delay. For each pre-split DNN task block, let L be the number of segments and $\{q_{i,j,1}, q_{i,j,2}, \dots, q_{i,j,L}\}$ be the workload of segments of j -th block of satellite i . Suppose the k -th segment of this block is input to satellite $s_{i,j,k}$, the computation capability of satellite x is represented as C_x , then the computation delay t_x^{comp} of satellite x can be deduced by:

$$t_x^{comp} = \frac{1}{C_x} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i^{task}} \sum_{k=1}^L q_{i,j,k} \cdot [s_{i,j,k} = x], \quad (5)$$

where $[\cdot]$ is a self-reference function defined as:

$$[s_{i,j,k} = x] = \begin{cases} 1, & s_{i,j,k} = x, \\ 0, & \text{Otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

For the transmission delay, let $MH(i, j)$ be the Manhattan distance between satellite i and satellite j . The transmission delay t_x^{tran} of satellite x is calculated by:

$$t_x^{tran} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i^{task}} \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} MH(s_{i,j,k}, s_{i,j,k+1}) \cdot q_{i,j,k} \cdot [s_{i,j,k} = x]. \quad (7)$$

The total delay t_x^{sum} of satellite x is defined as:

$$t_x^{sum} = t_x^{comp} + t_x^{tran}. \quad (8)$$

In addition, the task drop could happen when the computing resources of the current satellite are insufficient. Let $D_{i,j}$ be the number of drop of the j -th task block of satellite i , the total drop rate r_D could be calculated as:

$$r_D = \frac{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i^{task}} D_{i,j}}{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} N_i^{task}}. \quad (9)$$

E. Optimization Objective

Based on the aforementioned models, we aim to minimize the task drop rate and delay during the whole process using the non-negative weight parameters α and β . The optimization problem is defined as below:

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\alpha r_D + \beta \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} t_i^{sum} \right), \quad (10)$$

s.t.

$$r_D \leq r^{max}, \quad (11a)$$

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} t_i^{sum} \leq t^{max}, \quad (11b)$$

$$MH(x, s_i) \leq D_M, \forall s_i \in \mathcal{A}_x, \quad (11c)$$

$$dp_{i,j} \in \{1, 2, \dots, L+1\}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{S}, 1 \leq \forall j \leq N_i^{task}, \quad (11d)$$

$$N_{i,j}^l \geq L, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{S}, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, N_i^{task}. \quad (11e)$$

Regarding the constraints, the first two constraints indicate those associated with the minimum drop rate and task delay. It is not preferable to transmit tasks to satellites that are located far away. For an offloading scheme that aims to choose candidate satellites s_i from the decision space \mathcal{A}_x determined by satellite x , the constraint is expressed in Equation 11c. D_M herein is the maximum permissible communication distance.

Besides, the arriving tasks that can be completed according to beforehand scheme (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_L) or be dropped during the progress. The drop point $dp_{i,j}$ could be only selected from $\{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ (See Equation 11d). The whole offloading process is completed if $dp_{i,j} = L+1$. From the aspect of DNN partitioning, the number of DNN layer $N_{i,j}^l$ should be strictly larger than a preset partitioned number L (See Equation 11e).

IV. DNN TASK SPLITTING AND OFFLOADING SCHEMES

The offloading decisions are associated with the coupling relationship among different variables. This results in the single-objective optimization problem being a discrete and non-convex optimization problem, which is regarded as a classical NP-hard problem [11]. To address this computational challenge, we introduce adaptive DNN task splitting and offloading schemes for collaborative satellite computing. Specifically, the satellite distributes tasks into different blocks and splits them into L segments. The cooperative processing sequence between satellites is determined by the task offloading scheme, enabling each satellite to execute task processing based on the computed decision.

A. Workload Balanced Task Splitting Scheme

Achieving workload balance among resource-constrained satellites requires distributing the workload of each task block evenly. This is crucial to avoid overwhelming specific satellites with massive tasks, while others remain underutilized. For this purpose, we propose a workload balanced task splitting scheme as illustrated in Algorithm 1.

Initially, a lower bound (*Lower*) is set as the maximum workload of each layer. This step is essential to ensure that each segment can be accurately processed (Line 13 in Algorithm 1). Assembly, an upper bound (*Upper*) is defined as the total workload of all layers, which indicates that all layers can be partitioned into a single block.

Then, our scheme confirms whether it is appropriate to set the maximum workload of a block as *mid* or not (See *Split()* in Algorithm 1). If the obtained resulting number of slices is less than the partitioned number L , in accordance with monotonicity, the maximum acceptable workload of block

Algorithm 1 Workload Balanced Task Splitting Scheme

Input: The workload of each layer $\{w_1, \dots, w_{N^l}\}$, expected sliced number $L(L \leq N^l)$, and precision ϵ .

Output: The partitioning result with L slices.

```

1: procedure SPLIT(LimitSize)
2:   Initialize Scheme  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ , Blocktemp  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3:   for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N^l$  do
4:     if  $\sum_{w \in \text{Block}_{temp}} w + w_i \leq \text{LimitSize}$  then
5:       Blocktemp  $\leftarrow \text{Block}_{temp} \cup w_i$ 
6:     else
7:       Scheme  $\leftarrow \text{Block}_{temp} \cup \text{Scheme}$ 
8:       Blocktemp  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ 
9:     end if
10:  end for
11:  return Scheme
12: end procedure

13: Initialize Lower  $\leftarrow \max_{k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N^l\}} w_k$ , Upper  $\leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^{N^l} w_k$ 
14: while Upper - Lower >  $\epsilon$  do
15:   Denote mid  $\leftarrow \lfloor \frac{\text{Lower} + \text{Upper}}{2} \rfloor$ 
16:   Obtain Scheme  $\leftarrow \text{Split}(\text{mid})$ 
17:   if  $|\text{Scheme}| > L$  then
18:     Lower  $\leftarrow \text{mid}$ 
19:   else
20:     Upper  $\leftarrow \text{mid}$ 
21:   end if
22: end while
23: Let result  $\leftarrow \text{Split}(\text{Upper})$ 
24: if  $|\text{result}| < L$  then append empty blocks of segments to result
   till  $|\text{result}| = L$ 
25: end if
26: return result

```

needs to be decreased, otherwise, the number of blocks should be increased. After performing a Binary Search, it is possible that the block number is less than L . In this case, empty blocks that signify the absence of any workload are added to the final result (Line 24 in Algorithm 1).

The time complexity of Binary Search is $O(\log_2 V)$, where V is the value field of searching interval. In our proposed scheme, as the algorithm enumerates workloads for all layers during the split procedure, the time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(N^l \cdot \log_2 V)$. Meanwhile, in terms of space complexity, additional memory is only needed when storing the results of the split procedure. Therefore, the space complexity is $O(L)$.

B. GA-based Self-adaptive Task Offloading Scheme

We introduce GA in our scheme due to its ability to continuously explore and adapt task assignments. This capability is particularly valuable for effectively managing real-time changes and uncertainties in dynamic networks. After conducting Algorithm 1, the arriving tasks are split into L segments and distributed into several blocks. Subsequently, there arises a need to determine a satellite processing sequence, i.e., (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_L) denotes the i -th segment of tasks of this block will be processed by satellite c_i , which is defined as the chromosome of individuals. Our scheme first initializes N_{ini} individuals, a process outlined in Line 1 of Algorithm 2. Then, a series of iterative steps are employed, encompassing repro-

Algorithm 2 GA-based Self-adaptive Task Offloading Scheme

Input: The workload of sliced block $B_{i,j} = \{q_{i,j,1}, q_{i,j,2}, \dots, q_{i,j,L}\} \in \mathcal{B}_i$, and the set of indices of available satellites \mathcal{S}_{avail} .

Output: The task offloading result.

- 1: Initialize primitive group gp_0 by randomly summoning N_{ini} chromosomes like $\mathcal{C} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_L)$ of length L , $\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, L, c_i \in$ satellite indices.
- 2: **for** $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N_{iter}$ **do**
- 3: **if** $(i \neq 1) \wedge (|\min_{j \in gp_i} def_j - \min_{j \in gp_{i-1}} def_j| \leq \epsilon)$ **then**
- 4: break
- 5: **end if**
- 6: Reproduce any different chromosomes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} pairwise by heuristic algorithm
- 7: Eliminate those chromosomes (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_L) with highest deficit calculated by Equation 12 till the size of $gp_i \leq N_K$
- 8: Randomly summon N_{summ} new chromosomes
- 9: **end for**
- 10: **return** The chromosome with the lowest deficit

duction, elimination, and augmentation operations, to derive a chromosome sequence that minimizes deficits.

For the reproduction operation (Line 6 in Algorithm 2), we propose a heuristic algorithm to reproduce individuals. Let (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_L) and (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_L) be the parents' chromosomes. For each pair of indices i, j ($1 \leq i \leq j \leq L, c_i = d_j$), summon two new individuals, the chromosomes of which are $(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_j, c_{i+1}, c_{i+2}, \dots, c_{i+L-j-1}, c_{i+L-j})$ and $(d_{j-(L-i)}, d_{j-(L-i)+1}, \dots, d_{j-1}, c_i, c_{i+1}, \dots, c_{L-1}, c_L)$.

For the elimination operation, a novel deficit measurement is introduced to discriminate the quality of each chromosome, the deficit of (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_L) is calculated by:

$$\theta_1 \sum_{k=1}^L \frac{q_{i,j,k}}{C_{d_k}} + \theta_2 \sum_{k=1}^{L-1} q_{i,j,k} \cdot MH(d_k, d_{k+1}) + \theta_3 D_{i,j}, \quad (12)$$

where θ_1, θ_2 and θ_3 are non-negative weight parameters.

The augmentation operation is performed after the operations of reproduction and elimination to maintain diversity among the chromosomes. This operation introduces new individuals to participate in the next iteration. Eventually, the chromosome with the smallest deficit is selected as the processing sequence.

During each iteration, it is necessary to reproduce different pairs of individuals, eliminate individuals to maintain the group size, and then summon several new individuals. The group size at the beginning of iteration is approximately $N_{summ} + N_K$ and the time complexity for conducting these 3 operations is $O((N_{summ} + N_K)^2 \cdot L)$. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 2 is approximate to $O(N_{iter} \cdot (N_{summ} + N_K)^2 \cdot L)$. Meanwhile, the maximum size of the group during the iteration is approximate to the quantity of $(N_K + N_{summ})^2$. Since every individual has a chromosome of length L , the space complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O((N_K + N_{summ})^2 \cdot L)$.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

An experimental environment has been designed for LEO satellite networks of varying sizes, denoted as $N \times N$, where

TABLE I: Main experimental parameters

Parameter	Value
Network topology N (size = $N \times N$)	4 ~ 32, default value = 10
Satellite bandwidth B	20 MHz [12]
Satellite computation capability C_x	3 GHz [4]
Satellite transmission power P_t	30 dBW [4]
Gateway bandwidth B_0	10 MHz [4]
Generated task incidence λ	4 ~ 70
Task splitting number L	3 (VGG19), 4 (ResNet101)
Maximum communication distance D_M	2 (VGG19), 3 (ResNet101)
$\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, N_{ini}, N_{iter}, N_K, N_{summ}, \epsilon$	1, 20, 10^6 , 20, 10, 20, 10, 1

each network consists of N orbits and each orbit contains N satellites. The main parameters are summarized in Table I. Considering the regularity of the constellation topology, we define the neighbors of each satellite as the adjacent four satellites that can directly communicate with each other. The incidence of each UE subjects to Poisson Distribution $\pi(\lambda)$, where λ indicates the number of tasks. We verify the effectiveness of our proposed SCC against the following methods:

- *Random* is a method where the candidate satellite for offloading is independently and randomly selected.
- *Residual-Resource-Priority (RRP)* is a method that selects the available satellites with the most residual computing resources to process the next segment of the tasks.
- *DQN* is a commonly used DRL algorithm. It endeavors to minimize the task drop rate and delay based on current observed network states.

B. Experimental Results

The performance validation of various methods is based on two commonly used DNN models: ResNet101 and VGG19. The performance is evaluated from three aspects: *task completion rate*, *total average delay*, and the *variance* in the total workload assigned to each satellite.

As depicted in Figs. 2(a) and 3(a), SCC exhibits the capability to maintain high performance, even when the task incidence is relatively high. This is attributed to the dynamic and adaptive insertion operation, along with a unique deficit calculation method employed by SCC. These features enable SCC to explore a vast solution space, resulting in an approximately 4% increase in task completion rate against the others.

From the aspect of total average delay, the performance of each method increases proportionally with the growth in task incidence. Among these methods, our proposed SCC maintains a relatively low delay performance by optimizing both transmission and computation delay. In contrast, both RRP and DQN prefer to select the fittest satellites, leading to an imbalanced distribution where a particular satellite is chosen by multiple decision-making satellites. As shown in Figs 2(b) and 3(b), on average, SCC reduces the delay by 620 ms and 140 ms against RRP and DQN respectively.

In terms of the variance in satellite usage, a smaller value signifies a more robust consideration of load balancing across different satellites. With the assistance of balanced task splitting, our proposal effectively harnesses the available resources. SCC can achieve a similar performance compared with *Random*, which can theoretically achieve a perfectly even distribution.




Fig. 2: Performance achieved by different methods using ResNet101.




Fig. 3: Performance achieved by different methods using VGG19.

We verify the task completion rate with different network scales. The generated task incidence is fixed as 25. The results demonstrate that *SCC* can still outperform other methods even if the network scale is more than 1000 ($= 32 \times 32$). This is because *SCC* tends to choose satellites with low deficits, indicating that the selected satellites currently possess more resources available for offloading decisions. This leads to a more balanced task distribution of efficient offloading.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we delve into the challenge of DNN task splitting and offloading within a collaborative satellite computing system with the objective of minimizing both task delay and drop rate. To achieve this, we have developed an adaptive task splitting scheme designed to balance the workload efficiently. This scheme dynamically orchestrates collaborative inference among satellites, significantly enhancing the utilization rate of satellite computing resources. Furthermore, a GA-based self-adaptive task offloading scheme is introduced to determine optimal offloading decisions. The experimental results demonstrate the superiority of our proposal over comparable methods in terms of overall delay and task completion rate. Our primary forthcoming focus revolves around the integration of an early exit technique that balances the trade-off between processing delay and accuracy during the DNN partitioning process.

REFERENCES

[1] Z. Shen *et al.*, “A survey of next-generation computing technologies in space-air-ground integrated networks,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 1, 2023.
 [2] S. Wang and Q. Li, “Satellite computing: Vision and challenges,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 24, pp. 22514–22529, 2023.

[3] Z. Ji, S. Wu, and C. Jiang, “Cooperative multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for computation offloading in digital twin satellite edge networks,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 3414–3429, 2023.
 [4] H. Zhang, R. Liu, A. Kaushik, and X. Gao, “Satellite edge computing with collaborative computation offloading: An intelligent deep deterministic policy gradient approach,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 9092–9107, 2023.
 [5] W. Fan *et al.*, “Joint DNN partition and resource allocation for task offloading in edge–cloud-assisted IoT environments,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 10146–10159, 2023.
 [6] S. Q. Zhang, J. Lin, and Q. Zhang, “Adaptive distributed convolutional neural network inference at the network edge with ADCNN,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Processing (ICPP)*, pp. 1–11, 2020.
 [7] E. Li *et al.*, “Edge AI: On-demand accelerating deep neural network inference via edge computing,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 447–457, 2020.
 [8] S. Zhang *et al.*, “DeepSlicing: Collaborative and adaptive CNN inference with low latency,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 32, no. 9, pp. 2175–2187, 2021.
 [9] Z. Zhao, K. M. Barijough, and A. Gerstlauer, “Deepthings: Distributed adaptive deep learning inference on resource-constrained IoT edge clusters,” *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 2348–2359, 2018.
 [10] L. Cheng *et al.*, “Dynamic computation offloading in satellite edge computing,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pp. 4721–4726, 2022.
 [11] Q. Tang, Z. Fei, B. Li, and Z. Han, “Computation offloading in LEO satellite networks with hybrid cloud and edge computing,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 9164–9176, 2021.
 [12] I. Leyva-Mayorga, B. Soret, and P. Popovski, “Inter-plane inter-satellite connectivity in dense LEO constellations,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 3430–3443, 2021.