

Towards AI-Assisted Sustainable Adaptive Video Streaming Systems: Tutorial and Survey

REZA FARAHANI, ZOHA AZIMI, CHRISTIAN TIMMERER, and RADU PRODAN, Institute of Information Technology (ITEC), Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Austria

Improvements in networking technologies and the steadily increasing numbers of users, as well as the shift from traditional broadcasting to streaming content over the Internet, have made video applications (e.g., live and Video-on-Demand (VoD)) predominant sources of traffic. Recent advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its widespread application in various academic and industrial fields have focused on designing and implementing a variety of video compression and content delivery techniques to improve user Quality of Experience (QoE). However, providing high QoE services results in more energy consumption and carbon footprint across the service delivery path, extending from the end user's device through the network and service infrastructure (e.g., cloud providers). Despite the importance of energy efficiency in video streaming, there is a lack of comprehensive surveys covering state-of-the-art AI techniques and their applications throughout the video streaming lifecycle. Existing surveys typically focus on specific parts, such as video encoding, delivery networks, playback, or quality assessment, without providing a holistic view of the entire lifecycle and its impact on energy consumption and QoE. Motivated by this research gap, this survey provides a comprehensive overview of the video streaming lifecycle, content delivery, energy and Video Quality Assessment (VQA) metrics and models, and AI techniques employed in video streaming. In addition, it conducts an in-depth state-of-the-art analysis focused on AI-driven approaches to enhance the energy efficiency of end-to-end aspects of video streaming systems (i.e., encoding, delivery network, playback, and VQA approaches). It finally discusses prospective research directions for developing AI-assisted energy-aware video streaming systems.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Multimedia streaming**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**; • **Social and professional topics** → **Sustainability**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Video Streaming; Energy Efficiency; Artificial Intelligence; Quality of Experience; Content Delivery; Video Networking; HTTP Adaptive Streaming; Machine Learning.

ACM Reference Format:

Reza Farahani, Zoha Azimi, Christian Timmerer, and Radu Prodan. 2024. Towards AI-Assisted Sustainable Adaptive Video Streaming Systems: Tutorial and Survey. *J. ACM* 1, 1, Article 1 (June 2024), 33 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the utilization of the Internet has undergone a significant transformation, with video content now comprising approximately 70 % of total Internet traffic. The Ericsson Mobility Report [53] indicates that over 80 % of all mobile data traffic will comprise video by 2028, exceeding the current figure of 71 %. There has been a notable increase in the demand for video streaming

Authors' address: Reza Farahani; Zoha Azimi; Christian Timmerer; Radu Prodan, Institute of Information Technology (ITEC), Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Klagenfurt, Austria, firstname.surname@aau.at.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

0004-5411/2024/6-ART1 \$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Table 1. Summary of related surveys.

Survey	Year	Scope	Video streaming components				AI	Energy
			Encoding	Delivery	Playback	VQA		
[120]	2019	Video compression for intra- or inter-frame prediction.	✓	×	×	×	✓	×
[220]	2020	Video compression for intra- or inter-frame prediction; video quality assessment.	✓	×	×	×	✓	×
[122, 175]	2021, 2023	Content caching and prefetching policies.	×	✓	×	×	✓	×
[61, 96, 165]	2021, 2022	Video compression and transcoding; caching, offloading, and distribution between MEC and clouds.	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓
[101]	2022	Scheduling and resource allocation techniques for video streaming.	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓
[167]	2017	ABR algorithm components and their interactions for HAS-based applications.	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓
[15]	2019	QoE modeling, measurement, and control in Software-Defined Networking (SDN) using Network Function Virtualization (NFV).	×	✓	×	×	✓	✓
[24]	2024	Heuristic and AI-based methods for accelerating video transcoding process.	✓	×	×	×	✓	×
[2]	2024	Energy consumption and environmental impact, as well as tools and datasets for encoding, decoding, and displaying video streaming.	✓	×	✓	×	×	✓
This survey	2024	Tutorial and survey of AI-based energy-efficient video streaming lifecycle i.e., encoding, decoding, delivery, playback, adaptive algorithms, quality assessment.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

applications among all video traffic. For example, live video streaming accounts for more than 17 % of all traffic in 2023 [166]. This growing demand for streaming applications, particularly after the COVID-19 pandemic, has intensified society's dependence on Internet services and contributed significantly to a 20 % increase in the use of Over-the-Top (OTT) providers (e.g., YouTube, Netflix) in 2020 [34]. The rise in demand, coupled with the support for higher quality and resolution content on modern smart devices across diverse domains such as entertainment, broadcasting, healthcare, and education, has motivated OTTs and Internet Service Providers (ISP) to improve further the user Quality of Experience (QoE) and network Quality of Service (QoS). These efforts can increase the energy consumption in the video streaming lifecycle, encompassing content capturing to rendering, consequently emitting a substantial volume of CO₂ and other Greenhouse Gases (GHG). For this purpose, many initiatives, such as the Dimpact [45] project, involve cooperative efforts of media, entertainment, and technology companies to diminish the environmental footprint and enhance the sustainability of the digital media industry.

Given the dynamic characteristics inherent in video streaming applications, reducing energy consumption and CO₂ emissions while meeting users' QoE and latency expectations poses a considerable challenge. This challenge becomes more complex by quantifying and analyzing the energy consumption of video streaming applications, given the extensive data, diverse sequences, devices, and networks involved. Therefore, recent academic and industrial efforts like [54, 153, 204, 206] employ Artificial Intelligence (AI) to address these challenges and use its capabilities to manage large datasets, process structured and unstructured data, extract complex patterns, and provide predictions and insights. Therefore, accurately identifying the appropriate stage in the video streaming lifecycle for applying AI techniques and a comprehensive understanding of the influential factors is critical.

Recent surveys on AI techniques aimed at improving the energy consumption of video streaming applications predominantly focus on specific stages of the streaming lifecycle, such as encoding, delivery, playback, or video assessment. As summarized in Table 1, works like [120, 220] focused on the video encoding part, discussing AI-based video compression techniques. In contrast, works like [122, 175] studied AI-based in-network techniques such as content caching and popularity prediction. Other works such as [61, 96, 101, 165] surveyed AI-based solutions to investigate resource allocation and scheduling within the delivery network segment. In addition, Sani et al., [167] reviewed the literature on different Adaptive Bitrate Streaming (ABR) algorithms by investigating various techniques for monitoring and measuring resources such as network throughput, scheduling segment requests to servers, and adapting the video quality to match resources.




Fig. 1. Survey structure.

Barakabitze et al., [15] presented a review of state-of-the-art QoE management solutions for multimedia streaming. Their work integrates modeling, monitoring, and optimization within emerging technologies and architectures, including cloud and edge computing, and extends to new domains such as immersive multimedia and video gaming. Borges et al., [24] conducted a survey and categorized heuristic and AI solutions to accelerate the video transcoding process. Afzal et al., [2] investigated the energy consumption and environmental impact of video streaming applications, focusing on the encoding, decoding, and display components, excluding AI-based solutions. They also discussed different tools and datasets commonly used in the literature for measuring and analyzing energy consumption in video streaming applications. However, existing surveys need a thorough literature review and taxonomy in the entire video streaming lifecycle to bridge the gap in exploring AI's contributions to optimizing energy consumption and QoE. The primary contributions of this survey are three-fold:

- (1) *Tutorial* on video streaming lifecycle, including encoding, delivery, and playback and exploring metrics and models relevant to video QoE, energy, and AI techniques employed.
- (2) *Taxonomy and survey* of 59 state-of-the-art AI-based energy-aware video streaming works, covering the entire streaming lifecycle and exploring the influence of predicting video quality assessment (VQA) metrics on minimizing energy consumption.
- (3) *Future directions* in designing AI-enabled energy-efficient video streaming systems based on the specific lifecycle parts identified in the survey.

Fig. 1 shows the organization of this survey. Section 2 describes the systematic methodology of the survey, followed by a background on video streaming, VQA and energy metrics and models, and AI-assisted video streaming systems in Section 3. Sections 4, 5, 6, 7 provide a taxonomy and survey the state-of-the-art works in four categories: encoding, delivery network, playback, and VQA. Section 8 outlines future research directions of AI-driven energy-efficient video streaming systems before concluding the article in Section 9.

2 METHODOLOGY

This section describes the systematic review methodology used in this survey, inspired by [151] comprising five *phases* (P) shown in Fig. 2 (a).

$P1$: *Research question formulation*. We formulated five *research questions* (Q) by delineating primary areas of the video streaming lifecycle.




Fig. 2. (a) Systematic literature review methodology, and (b) distribution of surveyed articles based on video streaming lifecycle segments across different years.

- Q1) *Video encoding*: How can AI actively contribute to developing content-aware provisioning, considering both energy and QoE?
- Q2) *Video delivery*: How can AI techniques optimize content delivery services through decision-making policies, e.g., offloading and scheduling to balance network QoS and user QoE while enhancing energy efficiency and reducing economic costs?
- Q3) *ABR algorithm*: How can AI enhance ABR algorithms by integrating content-aware information to improve bitrate selection and energy efficiency?
- Q4) *Video playback*: How can client-based AI technologies, such as super-resolution and denoising, optimize video playback while balancing quality enhancement with energy efficiency?
- Q5) *VQA*: How can AI-based techniques reduce dependency on reference frames in computational VQA processes to optimize energy consumption?

- P2: *Search and paper collection*. We conducted comprehensive searches in the scholarly databases and venues listed in Table 2 considering the five research questions and collected 850 references.
- P3: *Relevant paper selection*. In many cases, determining the relevant articles based on their titles proved challenging. Consequently, we implemented additional filters by scrutinizing the abstracts and meticulously reviewing papers that met the following criteria: (1) published after 2015, indicative of a significant trend in the research landscape; (2) sourced from journals with high impact factors or conferences ranked B or higher according to the *CORE* ranking pertinent to the field (Table 2); and (3) authored by individuals affiliated with universities ranked in the top 500 of the *QS World University Rankings* or companies listed in the *Fortune 500*.
- P4: *Keyword analysis and taxonomy development*. We used 100 keywords from the video, energy, and AI domains to conduct a detailed analysis and formulate a taxonomy for AI-assisted sustainable systems, classified into four categories: encoding, delivery, playback, and VQA.
- P5: *Information extraction and literature review*. We extracted information from the selected works to address the five research questions outlined in the first phase. We contacted the authors to gain more in-depth information about their proposed methodologies and experimental designs when required. From the initially selected 850 articles, we thoroughly surveyed 210 articles, referencing 59 articles that directly or indirectly use AI-based energy-aware solutions for the video streaming lifecycle (Fig. 2 (b)).

3 BACKGROUND

This section provides basic background knowledge on video streaming, delivery networks, VQA, and energy metrics and models. It also presents an overview of the AI-assisted techniques commonly employed for video streaming applications.

Table 2. Search strategy and sources in the systematic literature review.

Year	2018 to 2024	
Keywords	Video	<p>General: Video, video streaming, VoD, live, HTTP adaptive streaming, MPEG-DASH, Apple HLS, AVC, HEVC, VVC, AV1, VP9.</p> <p>Encoding: Entropy encoding, transform coding, intra-, inter-frame, motion estimation/compensation, CU, PU, CTU, partitioning, block partitioning, per-title encoding, per-scene encoding, transcoding, transrating.</p> <p>Delivery: Video transmission, network-assisted streaming, CDN, edge computing, task scheduling, MEC, CDN, computing continuum, WebRTC cloud computing, content delivery, resource allocation, P2P, D2D, TCP, QUIC, MPTCP, content caching.</p> <p>Playback: video decoding, ABR, quality enhancement techniques, super-resolution, frame interpolation, denoising, display.</p> <p>VQA: VMAF, SSIM, PSNR, QoE, latency, P1203, video quality assessment, stalling events, rebuffering, quality switch.</p>
	Sustainability	Energy consumption, power consumption, battery, battery life, CO ₂ , carbon footprint, green, sustainable, energy efficiency.
	AI	Machine learning, supervised learning, unsupervised learning, decision tree, random forest, SVM, LLM, prediction, classification, deep learning, CNN, LSTM, reinforcement learning, Q-learning, online learning deep reinforcement learning, generative AI, explainable AI.
Venues	Encoding, Playback, and VQA	<p>IEEE: TCSVT, TIP, Broadcasting, TMM, Access, DCC, ICME, MMSP, ICIP, VCIP, QoMEX.</p> <p>ACM: MM, MMM, TOMM.</p>
	Delivery	<p>IEEE: TNSM, TMC, Access, TPDS, ICC, ISM, LCN, GLOBECOM, INFOCOM, JSAC, TVT; USENIX: NSDI, ATC; ACM: SIGCOMM, CoNext, MMSys; Elsevier: Computer Networks, Computer Communications.</p>
	Surveys	IEEE: COMST, Access, TCSVT; ACM: CSUR, TOMM; Elsevier: Computer Networks, SUSCOM.
Scholarly search engines		Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, ScienceDirect, ACM Digital Library, ResearchGate, arXiv.

3.1 Video Streaming

Video streaming requires simultaneously downloading and playing back audio and video content, following the lifecycle in Fig. 3. In contrast to traditional video downloading, which retrieves the entire video sequence before playback, video streaming enables users to start watching almost instantly during video transmission. *HTTP Adaptive Streaming* (HAS), e.g., based on Moving Picture Experts Group (MPEG) *Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP* (DASH) standardization [138] or Apple *HTTP Live Streaming* (HLS) [73], is nowadays the predominant video streaming technique [213, 214]. HAS-based streaming encodes the video content in multiple quality (e.g., bitrate and/or resolution) levels, known as representations, and divides them into short and fixed-duration segments. A collection of these representations, known as the *bitrate ladder*, is stored on the media server, such as the origin server or Content Delivery Network (CDN). A manifest file, such as the HLS playlist or DASH MPD, contains the representation information, including the addresses (i.e., HTTP Uniform Resource Locators (URLs)) of the segments stored on media servers. When the video player issues a streaming request, it loads this manifest file, analyzes it, and selects an appropriate segment representation. Determining proper representations depends on network throughput and player characteristics, such as buffer status and display resolution. Therefore, the client must continuously monitor these metrics and dynamically adjust the video quality by choosing the most appropriate representation for the next segment using an ABR algorithm to provide a smooth streaming session with a high network QoS and user QoE [71, 77].

3.2 Delivery Networks

The delivery network includes an origin server with one or a hybrid combination of three networks, as shown in Fig. 3.

3.2.1 Content Delivery Network (CDN). It is a distributed network of servers that work together to deliver content to users, including three main components [150, 155]:

- (1) *CDN servers*, also known as surrogate, cache, or edge servers, placed in various geographical locations near end-users, cache and deliver content quickly and efficiently. A user request contacts the closest CDN server, and if the CDN server has the content in its cache, it fulfills




Fig. 3. General video streaming life cycle, including video encoding, content delivery, and playback phases.

the request faster than retrieving it from the origin server. Otherwise, the content is fetched from the origin server and served at rates slower than delivery from the CDN servers.

- (2) *Origin server* is responsible for storing and updating the original content. When a CDN server does not cache the requested content, the origin server serves the request and then feeds the CDN servers for future demands based on the content distributor policy.
- (3) *CDN content distributor* manages content distribution across the CDN and defines important policies for improving the network performance. For example, it monitors the CDN network to detect frequently accessed content, which it caches on CDN servers to reduce the load on the origin server and improve the overall content delivery performance.

3.2.2 Multi-access Edge Computing (MEC) network. As a complementary technology to cloud computing, provides storage and compute resources close to end-users at the network's edge with lower data processing latencies, better user experience, and lower cost and bandwidth consumption [183]. MEC can offer several merits in various types of video streaming applications, including:

- (1) *VoD streaming.* Applying techniques such as most popular content caching or content prefetching in advance at the edge enhances the scalability and reliability of VoD services, while reducing the load on cloud servers (e.g., origin server), enabling faster content delivery and boosting user QoE [3].
- (2) *Live streaming.* Caching, transcoding, and processing content closer to the user who generates and consumes the data reduces latency and improves live video streaming quality [39, 60].
- (3) *Immersive video streaming.* Augmented Reality (AR) or Virtual Reality (VR) applications necessitate real-time processing and rendering of content to reduce latency and enhance performance. Thus, they demand advanced processing services and techniques beyond traditional streaming, such as real-time data analytics at the network edge closer to the users.

3.2.3 Peer-to-Peer (P2P) network. It is a decentralized delivery where each peer device communicates and shares content directly with others rather than relying on a centralized server. Each peer in a P2P network acts as both client and server that simultaneously downloads and uploads content [176]. A typical P2P network includes three peer types:

- (1) *Tracker server* records peers' logs and coordinates content exchange for efficient distribution and synchronization. When a peer requests content, it contacts the tracker server to fetch a list of others holding the content for direct download without relying on a central server.
- (2) *Seeders* are peers who completely downloaded and shared the content with others. Once a peer downloads the content from a seeder, it may become a seeder and continue sharing. Holding high resources, e.g., upload/download bandwidth and battery, is another characteristic of seeders, which allows them to remain connected to the P2P network for extended periods; consequently, other peers fetch their desired content from these stable peers.
- (3) *Leechers* are peers still downloading the content and have not yet fetched it completely.

3.3 Video Quality Assessment (VQA)

Efforts to reduce the energy consumption of video streaming applications must primarily preserve the users' QoE. Therefore, several standards and frameworks from the literature evaluate the quality of video sequences received by end users through QoE metrics and models.

3.3.1 *VQA metrics.* They measure and assess the perceived quality of videos, facilitating comparisons between different techniques, and typically fall into two groups.

- (1) *Subjective VQA metrics* relate to human perception. *Mean Opinion Score* (MOS) [84] a popular metric that evaluates video QoE based on user opinions on a scale of 1 to 5 (highest quality).
- (2) *Objective VQA metrics* use different algorithms to predict and quantify human perception based on parameters affecting the quality of a compressed video.
 - *Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio* (PSNR) [76] reports the mean squared error of differences in pixels of an original (signal) and compressed or distorted (noise) video. The PSNR is typically in the range of 30 dB to 50 dB for 8-bit data, and 60 dB to 80 dB for 16-bit data [44], where a higher value indicates a better quality. XPSNR [69] extends naive PSNR for ultra-high-resolution content.
 - *Structural Similarity* (SSIM) [195] rather than using pixel information, computes the correlation of neighboring pixels and the match of the luminance and contrast of the compressed and original videos in the range -1 to 1 (where 1 shows perfect similarity) [107, 118].
 - *Video Multi-Method Assessment Fusion* (VMAF) [145] developed by Netflix extracts spatial, temporal, and human perceptual features from distorted and reference video frames. It uses such features as inputs to a Machine Learning (ML) model to predict the subjective quality that minimizes the difference to human judgments. VMAF ranges from 0 to 100, where a higher score indicates better quality [147].

3.3.2 *VQA models.* VQA metrics do not consider some of the influential factors significantly affecting viewer satisfaction [17] such as:

- *Rebuffering/stalling* interrupts or pauses video playback when the player runs out of buffered data and needs to load more to continue playback.
- *Quality switches* alterations in visual resolution or clarity of a video presentation.
- *Startup delay* represents the time lapse between initiating the playback request and the actual display of the video on the screen.

In recent years, several QoE models have been introduced to consider and incorporate these influential factors. The most well-known models are:

- (1) *ITU-T P.1203* introduced by ITU [83] has three modules for estimating video and audio quality and audiovisual integration. This objective model quantifies QoE on a scale of 1 to 5, where a higher score indicates a higher QoE. The video quality estimation model has four operation modes with incremental access to the input information:
 - *Mode 0* accesses the codec, target bitrate, display resolution, framerate, and segment duration information;
 - *Mode 1* considers frame sizes and frame type information in addition to input from mode 0;
 - *Mode 2* receives up to 2% of bitstream information;
 - *Mode 3* has access to all bitstream information on top of all the inputs of previous modes [164].
- (2) *Yin et al.*, [215] evaluates individual video segments using a weighted sum of video quality, quality switches, and total rebuffering time. Numerous studies, [20, 21] expanded its scope to include additional influential VQA factors, such as playback speed.

3.4 Energy Quantification

Efforts to quantify energy consumption and carbon emissions have gained significant momentum in recent years. Several works from the literature present metrics and models to measure and predict energy use and emissions across the video streaming lifecycle.

3.4.1 Energy Metrics. The most common metrics used for measuring energy consumption are:

- *Power consumption* measures the amount of electrical power consumed during video streaming in kW [217].
- *Energy consumption* measured in kWh or J is the total streaming energy used, usually by multiplying the power consumption with the video duration [22, 109].
- *Energy efficiency* is the ratio between video quality (e.g., resolution, bitrate) to the energy consumed, such as bit/J or Pixel/W.
- *Battery life* assesses the duration for each device (e.g., mobile or tablet) maintaining video streaming functionality, typically in hours, before recharging.
- *Carbon intensity* represents the average grams of CO₂ equivalent emitted per kWh of electricity generated with significant variation between countries and energy sources.
- *Carbon footprint* is the electricity consumption multiplied by the carbon intensity, reported as the total amount of GHG expressed in tonnes or kg of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) [178].

3.4.2 Energy models. Several recent energy consumption and carbon emissions models analyze and predict the impact of video streaming applications. Each model focuses on a specific stage of the video streaming lifecycle rather than adopting a comprehensive end-to-end approach.

- (1) *Encoding models* formulate or predict the energy requirements of compressing video sequences using various codecs and parameters. Sharrab et al., [172] introduced a linear model for encoding that specifically addresses the AVC codec utilized in live streaming systems incorporating encoding parameters, such as the number of reference frames, motion estimation range and algorithm, and Quantization Parameter (QP). Azimi et al., [12] proposed an Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) model to predict the energy consumption of the encoding process by utilizing features such as video complexity, QP, resolution, framerate, and codec type.
- (2) *Delivery models* formulate or predict the energy required for preparing and transmitting video sequences across delivery networks to end users. Huang et al., [78] proposed a linear model for LTE networks based on the uplink and downlink throughput. Mehrabi et al., [126] modeled the energy consumption of an edge server for transcoding tasks in a time-slotted manner based on the data volume processed for all active clients. To this aim, they considered specific bitrate allocation to each client, completed transcoding tasks, a processing weight factor for each edge server, and the energy consumption per bit of data, accounting for interactions with other edge servers and the overall processing load.
- (3) *Playback models* formulate or predict the energy required to process, decompress, and playout content on user devices. Herglotz et al., [72] introduced a linear regression model to predict energy consumption based on decoding processing time, enabling measurements independent of hardware and operating systems. Turkkkan et al., [188] proposed an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model to predict the power consumption of a video sequence during playback based on parameters such as bitrate, resolution, framerate, and file size.

3.5 AI-assisted Video Streaming

The typical pipeline of an AI-based video streaming system includes four stages, which can apply to one or multiple parts of the video streaming lifecycle (Fig. 4):




Fig. 4. General AI-assisted video streaming workflow.

- (1) *Raw input data* encompass details of the video sequence (e.g., video complexity features), network (e.g., throughput, load), CDN statistics (e.g., cache occupancy, request popularity), and end-user devices (e.g., playback state, buffer level, battery status) [57, 59]. To address communication challenges among clients, the origin server, and the CDNs, the *Consumer Technology Association* (CTA) [36] in the *Web Application Video Ecosystem* (WAVE) project has introduced the *Common Media Client Data* (CMCD) [37] and *Common Media Server Data* (CMSD) [38] specifications that standardize the streaming components to convey the information, ensuring consistent data interpretation and analysis.
- (2) *Feature extraction* involves identifying, capturing, and selecting relevant characteristics within the input data, including recognizing motion patterns, identifying recurring themes, and noting variations in the resolution of the video sequence. To facilitate this feature selection process, statistical models [95, 169] or machine learning algorithms [216] are often applied, ensuring that the model prioritizes crucial elements to improve the desired output, e.g., video streaming quality and user satisfaction.
- (3) *Learning* involves training models to discern patterns within existing data and determine an appropriate decision-making action. This could entail *Reinforcement Learning* (RL) [22, 56], classification using methods such as *Support Vector Machines* (SVM) [221, 222], or prediction through techniques like *Long Short-Term Memory* (LSTM) [127, 223] or *Random Forest* (RF) [6, 128]. The initial step divides the dataset into training and testing sets, with subsequent training of models on the designated training set. The model parameters are adjusted based on the features extracted in the previous stage, facilitating the understanding of the underlying patterns. To assess the model's efficacy on the test set, relevant evaluation metrics such as *Mean Absolute Error* (MAE) or *Mean Squared Error* (MSE) are defined [6, 128].
- (4) *Inference* utilizes the learned patterns and information to make decisions, predict, or classify unseen data associated with encoding, content delivery, playback, or VQA.

4 VIDEO ENCODING

The encoding phase in video streaming compresses video sequences, facilitating efficient storage and seamless data transfer across the delivery network. This involves eliminating redundant data from raw input files or high-quality encoded video sequences and retaining only essential information. Various compression-decompression technologies, known as codecs, such as *Advanced Video Coding* (AVC/H.264 [85, 200]), *High Efficiency Video Coding* (HEVC/H.265 [86, 181]), *AOMedia Video 1* (AV1) [66], and *Versatile Video Coding* (VVC/H.266 [27, 87]), incorporate distinct compression modules (refer to Section 4.2 for further information). Optimizing the encoding parameters by modules within these codecs reduces the data to encode, subsequently reducing the encoding time and computation complexity. This, in turn, contributes to energy efficiency in computation.




Fig. 5. AI-based per-title encoding for two video sequences with distinct complexities.

4.1 Encoding Configuration

Encoding configuration involves the choice and optimization of encoding parameters, in some implementations [140, 199] known as “preset”, varies from very slow to ultrafast. Faster presets achieve faster encoding with less compression efficiency, while slower presets obtain higher compression efficiency at the cost of longer encoding time and more energy consumption [102]. In addition, several other parameters influence compression efficiency, including:

- *Bitrate* is the amount of data transmitted per unit of time, expressed in bits per second (bps).
- *Framerate* is the number of individual frames displayed per second in a video, expressed in frames per second (fps).
- *Resolution* is the number of pixels in a video frame, expressed as the width and height.
- *Quantization parameter (QP)* balances video quality and compression efficiency by deciding which details to retain or discard during encoding process.

Conventional methods often rely on predetermined presets, independent of the video content and not tailored to the specific characteristics of video content, proving inefficient for video sequences with unique features [11]. Video content featuring a high level of dynamism, characterized by rapid scene changes and fast-paced actions, differs significantly from static content. There are several works on customizing settings for each video title or scene, referred to as *per-title* and *per-scene* encoding, respectively.

4.1.1 Per-title encoding. introduced by Netflix investigates the characteristics of video sequences for finding the “best” encoding parameters balancing quality and compression efficiency based on their complexity [41], encompassing scene changes, motion, and content variability. For the content of average complexity with a 1080p resolution, per-title encoding allocates 20 % less bitrate compared to the fixed ladder method [146]. Although the impact of this method is significant in bitrate savings, it tends to be slower and more resource-intensive [40]. Therefore, several research works are trying to improve the efficiency of per-title encoding, exploring AI-based approaches that leverage video feature extraction and optimized encoding parameter prediction capabilities. Fig. 5 depicts an example workflow of AI-based per-title encoding that starts with live or VoD video source, including three key stages:

- (1) *Content complexity analysis* considers information like: (a) *spatial information*, referring to the arrangement and distribution of pixels in video frames, including colors, shapes, textures, luminance, chrominance, and patterns; (b) *temporal information*, relating to the variations over time in a video and capturing motion information and dynamics across frames.
- (2) *AI-based predictors* uses ML and ANN-based models (e.g., Gaussian Process (GP) [94], RF [128], and [55]) to estimate the optimized encoding profile based on the complexity analysis.
 - *QP prediction.* Katsenou et al., [94] proposed a content-driven method that extracts temporal and spatial features from the uncompressed content for each video sequence. It then applies a GP model to predict the QPs, leading to an optimized bitrate ladder that saves 89.06 % of

the required encodings compared to the exhaustive search method, leading to less processing time and energy consumption.

- *Bitrate ladder prediction.* Mueller et al., [139] proposed an encoding method using a combination of three ML models (i.e., XGBoost, *Convolutional Neural Networks* (CNN), and fully connected neural networks to extract features from a video sequence based on its characteristics. They proposed a bitrate ladder that saves up to 20 % bitrate and reduces the carbon footprint of video streaming compared to conventional per-title encoding.
 - *Preset prediction.* Amirpour et al., [6] used an RF model to predict the optimized preset based on the brightness and temporal complexity of 500 video sequences for an HEVC encoder, showing 70 % energy savings with a penalty of only 0.15 in the VMAF score.
 - *Resolution prediction.* Menon et al., [128] introduced an RF-based prediction of the video encoding time and XPSNR, allowing dynamic resolution adjustments based on video segments' spatial and temporal characteristics. The approach achieved a bitrate reduction of 12.03 % within a 200 s encoding time constraint with an impressive 84.17 % decrease in encoding energy compared to the reference HLS bitrate ladder. Azimi et al., [12] employed an XGBoost model to predict and balance encoding energy and VMAF scores using spatial and temporal complexity features, resolution, framerate, QP, and codec. They used predictive models to identify optimal encoding parameters (i.e., resolution and QP) for each video sequence, balancing energy consumption and VMAF. The approach achieved an average energy reduction of 46 % with only a four-unit decrease in VMAF.
- (3) *Video encoding* considers the content characteristics of each video by adjusting parameters obtained from the previous stage. After encoding, the *convex hull*, which encapsulates the bitrate-resolution pairs with their corresponding VMAF scores, ensures that the selected combinations lie close to this convex shape. Fig. 5 shows two video sequences with distinct VMAF scores for identical bitrate and resolution values, underscoring the importance of different bitrate ladders for each video content based on its complexity.

4.1.2 Per-scene encoding. It analyzes video sequences scene-by-scene and determines the best encoding parameters on their complexity and characteristics. Similar to per-title encoding, AI could be influential in analyzing the video sequence and extracting the features of each scene. For instance, [168] used the Deepencode model [139] to categorize the scenes in a video sequence based on their complexity and predict the best bitrate accordingly, which reduced the energy consumption of HD and UHD video by 9 % and 30 %, respectively.

4.2 Redundancy Reduction

Redundancy reduction minimizes the data necessary to represent video frames. Each video codec employs a set of modules. Since video sequences encompass both spatial and temporal features requiring compression, recent video coding standards incorporate hybrid video coding techniques covering both spatial and temporal aspects [111], including:

- (1) *Predictive coding* eliminates unnecessary video sequence information by addressing spatial and temporal redundancies utilizing intra- and inter-frame prediction methods. Higher prediction accuracy results in encoding fewer residuals, i.e., differences between actual and predicted frames, leading to enhanced compression efficiency and energy consumption.
- (2) *Transform coding* shifts residuals to a spectral domain. It then quantizes the spectral coefficients to diminish spatial and perceptual redundancies.
- (3) *Entropy coding* addresses statistical redundancies by encoding symbols with higher probabilities using fewer bits and symbols with lower probabilities with more bits.




Fig. 6. AI-based block partitioning example in HEVC codec.

Many state-of-the-art codecs and works leverage advanced predictive compression techniques, including intra-frame and inter-frame coding and motion compensation.

4.2.1 Intra-frame prediction. As part of the predictive coding process, it segments video frames into codec-specific block sizes that play a pivotal role in video compression. For example, in the HEVC standard, these blocks called *Coding Tree Units* (CTU) have dimensions of (16×16) , (32×32) , and (64×64) , further broken down into *Coding Units* (CUs) and in turn subdivided into smaller *Prediction Units* (PU) [29]. The intra-frame prediction uses encoded samples within the same video frame to estimate the pixels within each PU. Fig. 6 illustrates an example of the HEVC CU partitioning process, representing an AI-based classification task that analyzes the input video frame to extract the most relevant features, such as temporal, spatial, and motion information, fed to an AI-based classifier. The classifier determines whether to split a specific CU level based on the similarity of each region's features. Various intra-prediction modes, e.g., horizontal, vertical, and angular [103, 142], can identify the optimized mode with the minimum error [181, 222]. In all studies, decisions, such as whether to split a coding unit [132], determine the size of the block [222], and select the intra-prediction mode [91] constitute integral aspects of intra-frame prediction.

Zhang et al., [222] proposed an ML model for data-driven CU size decisions to address the challenges of encoding complexity and power consumption of HEVC intra-frame prediction. Their model consists of an SVM classifier to determine whether to split the CU or propose an uncertain condition for situations requiring further investigation, aiding in the prevention of false predictions. During instances of uncertainty, a second stage of binary classification is performed, leveraging insights from previously coded frames to enhance decision-making. The results show an average reduction in computation complexity of 52.48% compared to the original HM 16.7 encoder, resulting in significant energy savings.

The authors in [132] proposed an ML method to determine the optimal partitioning of a given CU and to predict whether a CU can be combined with the CU of the previous depth or split into more CUs. The results of their approach demonstrated that the features extracted from the depth and variance information are the most relevant parameters for predicting the CU decomposition using ML to achieve a balance between computational complexity and accuracy. [91] introduced an unsupervised multi-view clustering technique to identify correlations between intra-prediction mode decisions and information extracted from the texture data of adjacent CUs in HEVC. Their approach achieved an average time reduction of around 50.4%, resulting in reduced energy consumption compared to the reference HM 16.8 encoder.

4.2.2 Inter-frame prediction. Inter-frame prediction relies on previously encoded reference frames to estimate the movement of objects between frames using motion vectors and compensation. These vectors indicate the displacement of each block between consecutive frames [181]. In [221], the authors proposed a close method [222] using a joint SVM classifier with three outputs to determine

whether to split a CU. In uncertain cases, full rate-distortion optimization determines the CU depth. This process explores all combinations and selects those that reduce the computational complexity by 51.45 % compared to the original HEVC, consequently reducing the energy consumption.

4.2.3 Motion compensation. Arnaudov et al., [9] proposed an ANN model for motion estimation in HD video sequences, improving video quality and balancing performance and power consumption. A dictionary of previously learned fixed search patterns and a pre-trained ANN model can select the best search pattern according to the motion dynamics within a specific region of the video frame. The method achieves the highest motion estimation quality per unit of consumed power, i.e., 0.5 dB less PSNR than a complete search method while minimizing the search space.

4.3 Video transcoding

Video transcoding involves modifying an encoded video to convert it from one coding standard to another. Another form of transcoding is adapting specific parameters like QP, bitrate, or resolution without changing the codec, often known as transrating. This process encompasses both the encoding and decoding procedures, making it a computationally complex and power-intensive operation. The state-of-the-art AI-enabled energy-aware transcoding algorithms in the literature can be categorized based on the conversion of codec, bitrate, and QP.

4.3.1 Codec. Yang et al., [212] proposed an ML-based fast transcoding method from Distributed Video Coding (DVC) [116] to HEVC. Initial features, such as motion information extracted from the DVC decoding, capture relevant characteristics to predict the CU partition and PU modes in the HEVC encoding using an SVM binary classification task, resulting in a noteworthy 57.64 % reduction in encoding complexity and energy consumption.

4.3.2 Bitrate. Bubolz et al., [28] used a Decision Tree (DT) model with 15 features from the decoding process, such as QP, CU position in X and Y directions, and color information to predict CU depth for the HEVC standard. This method achieved early termination in CU partitioning, leading to a 49.5 % reduction in energy consumption, with only a 0.66 % increase in Bjøntegaard Delta (BD)-rate utilized to compare the compression efficiency of different codecs, where positive values indicate that the new codec or configuration is less efficient in terms of bitrate or quality [18].

4.3.3 QP. Costero et al., [35] employed an RL-based approach to manage the runtime of QoS-sensitive real-time video transcoding using three agents, with the primary agent tasked with adapting the QP of the HEVC encoder. The authors strategically decomposed the design space, encompassing various encoding parameters, system settings, and resource allocation choices affecting QoS, power consumption, throughput, and video compression efficiency during transcoding, enabling RL agents to concentrate on specific parameter subsets or configurations. Compared to equivalent approaches, the method demonstrated a notable 24 % reduction in energy.

4.4 Encoding summary

Table 3 summarizes the AI-based for encoding configuration, redundancy reduction, transcoding improvement, and considering energy consumption. XGBoost and RF are the most frequent models for regression tasks, such as bitrate or encoding time prediction, while SVM models are predominantly used for classification, particularly for CU partitioning. Common implementations for HEVC include x265 [140], HM [74], and Kvazaar [191], while typical implementations for VVC are VTM [193] and VVenC [194].

Table 3. Summary of important works in video encoding (4) (SI: Spatial Information, TI: Temporal Information, CI: Color Information, BI: Brightness Information, MI: Motion Information, BR: Bitrate, FR: Framerate, Res: Resolution, RD: Rate-Distortion).

Section	Work	Year	Scope	AI Approach			Evaluation Method	
				Input	Model	Output	Reference Software	Dataset
4.1.1	[94]	2021	QP selection	SI, TI	GP	QP	HM[74]	[1]
	[139]	2022	Bitrate ladder construction	Video size, BR, FR, Res	CNN, ANN, XGBoost,	Bitrate ladder	[139]	Generated by authors
	[6]	2023	Preset selection	TI, BI	RF	Video preset	x265 [140]	[7]
	[128]	2024	Res selection	SI, TI, BR	RF	Encoding time, XPSNR	VVenc[194]	[179]
	[12]	2024	Res and QP selection	SI, TI, FR, Res, QP, Codec type	XGBoost	Energy and VMAF	x264 [203], x265 [140], VVenc[194], AV1 [66]	[5]
4.1.2	[168]	2022	Bitrate ladder construction	Video frame, Res, CI	CNN, ANN, XGBoost	BR	Elemental [10], [139]	Generated by authors
4.2	[222]	2017	CU partitioning	CU information	SVM	CU size	HM[74]	[25]
	[132]	2018		CU information	ML	CU size	Kvazaar [191]	Generated by authors
	[91]	2020		Texture	ML	Intra-prediction modes	HM[74]	Generated by authors
	[221]	2015		MI, RD and Depth of CU, QP	SVM	CU size		[25]
	[9]	2020	Motion vector	MI	ANN	Searching pattern	[207]	
	4.3	[212]	2022	Transcoding acceleration	MI, Residual variability information	SVM	CU size	HM[74]
[28]		2019	QP, CI, CU position		DT	CU size	[171]	
[35]		2019	BR, PSNR, Throughput, Power consumption		RL	QP	Kvazaar [191]	[25]

5 DELIVERY NETWORK

As mentioned above, the CMCD and CMSD specifications have recently garnered attention for facilitating communication between clients and media servers. CMCD provides a standardized method for the streaming client to communicate metrics and playback data to the servers, such as buffer information, playback rate, and content identification, ensuring that the CDN can consistently interpret and analyze the data from various streaming clients. Hence, numerous AI-based network-assisted video streaming systems leverage these protocols to improve network QoS, user QoE, and energy efficiency. One suitable AI technique for such systems is RL, which can be employed on CDN or MEC servers. For example, RL agents illustrated in Fig. 7 leverage CMCD and CMSD information to incorporate network, video, user, and CDN data in their decision-making process for content cache placement [110, 185] to achieve lower latency, higher QoE, and lower delivery energy, creating a reward function communicated to the CDN or MEC servers through the CMCD system. In the following, we categorize AI-based energy-efficient network-assisted video streaming solutions according to their delivery networks. As several studies have introduced novel techniques for edge instances without distinguishing between MEC and CDN, we employ the *edge network* term in our taxonomy.

5.1 Edge network

Enhancing video streaming workflows on edge networks, whether CDN or MEC, requires pivotal choices regarding content caching, video processing task offloading and scheduling, and resource allocation methods.

5.1.1 Content caching. Tanzil et al., [186] proposed a single hidden-layer feed-forward neural network, named Extreme Learning Machine (ELM), to predict the popularity of video content based on user behavior and network properties (e.g., cache size, bandwidth). They used thumbnails, titles, keywords, and descriptions of YouTube video sequences as inputs to the model and proposed a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) optimization model [64] to determine the cache with the minimum cache deployment cost, i.e., the energy consumption required to read/write files




Fig. 7. RL-based streaming system example.

from hardware units. This method improved the cache hit ratio of 0.9 compared to random cache deployment, consequently improving deployment cost.

Li et al., [109] presented a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) model to predict user behavior based on the titles, categories, and descriptions of video sequences. They used an optimization model [158] to determine the optimal caching strategy for popular video content on edge servers driven by latency and energy consumption considerations, leading to an energy reduction of 1800 J, a latency decrease of 120 s, and an 80 % improvement in cache hit rates compared to baseline approaches.

Zheng et al., [223] proposed an LSTM model. Moreover, the popular content, integrated into a Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient (DDPG) [184] algorithm to learn an optimal caching policy in energy consumption and latency in continuous VR action spaces based on user requests. The results indicated that the method exceeds baseline random selection and a traditional DDPG (without LSTM) to trade off energy and latency.

Xie [205] optimized energy-efficient video caching and delivery in cellular networks using Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) agents leveraging network conditions and user demands to decide caching resources and user associations with base stations. They adjusted the model's rewards, achieving a 40 % improvement in energy consumption, including the energy costs of video transmission, compared to baseline random selection.

5.1.2 Offloading, scheduling, and allocation. Chen and Liu [31] introduced an energy-efficient DRL-based model for video processing task offloading and resource allocation in AR applications. The state of the DRL model encompasses the data size, computing and transmission resources, and network conditions. The reward is the energy consumed when task completion and delay constraints are met. They used two methods for task offloading: binary and partial. In the binary-based method, the decision is made whether to offload a task to the edge server or execute it on the user's device. In contrast, in partial task offloading, each task is segmented into subtasks, with each subtask partially offloaded to edge servers. These subtasks include receiving the raw video frame from the camera, tracking the user's position in the environment, identifying objects, and preparing the processed frame for display. Their solution achieved an energy consumption reduction of 75 % compared to a greedy approach and 30 % compared to a random baseline method.

Lu et al., [117] introduced a QoE-aware video processing offloading method utilizing a DRL model tailored for Internet of Things (IoT) devices. The reward function of their approach incorporates service latency, energy consumption, and task success rate, while the model states encompass data size for each task, Transmission loss, and the computation resources available on edge servers. The results indicated an improvement in energy consumption and service latency by 13.97 % and 11.56 % compared to a DDPG approach. Baker et al., in [14] utilized an LSTM model considering energy consumption, latency, and memory usage across various tasks, particularly on video processing tasks, to identify the most reliable edge node for offloading video processing tasks such as real-time

video analysis. Subsequently, they introduced a DRL model to intelligently allocate video processing tasks to the selected edge devices, aiming to expedite task execution and improve latency and energy consumption. The results demonstrated notable improvements in both energy efficiency and latency compared to baseline methods [79, 211]. Zhu et al., [226] introduced an RL-based model to implement an energy-efficient edge resource allocation for video processing tasks. In this solution, the agent states include edge capacity and video processing task size, while the actions involve assigning edge instances to video processing tasks, specifically for handling AI computations such as training and inference. The reward function is also designed based on power consumption, providing a comprehensive energy efficiency measure within the edge computing environment. The results indicated that the energy consumption of the proposed method is 30 % lower than that of the first-in, first-out baseline allocation strategy.

5.2 Peer-to-Peer (P2P)

AI-based solutions are commonly applied in P2P video delivery, specifically for predicting user locations and content popularity and optimizing content caching and delivery. Li et al., [110] employed two distinct recurrent neural network-based architectures, i.e., Echo State Network (ESN) [88] and LSTM, for predicting user locations and content popularity, respectively. The ESN model used historical location information, while the LSTM incorporated user-related details such as gender, age, occupation, and device type. They also introduced a DRL model to strike a balance between energy consumption and delay and to determine the optimal device for connection based on predicted data from neural networks. The proposed method achieves lower energy consumption and reduced content delivery delay compared to the baselines used in the research.

P2P content delivery providers employ several incentives to motivate peers to share their network or computational resources to benefit the entire network. These incentives can vary according to the policies of each P2P provider. For example, the “tit-for-tat” principle can be offered, where active peers receive faster download speeds when they contribute their upload bandwidth to other peers. Another example is the “reward-based” policy, where active peers receive compensation in terms of monetary rewards or free Internet services for their resource contributions [68]. Therefore, to enhance video delivery and reduce server energy consumption, users can allocate a portion of their available computing resources, in addition to network bandwidth, to have distributed video processing (e.g., transcoding or super-resolution) over the P2P network.

Liu et al., [114] introduced a DRL-based model to select optimal peers for running transcoding functions. The reward function incorporates factors such as other users’ trust, historical records of successful transcoding ratios, the status of the peer battery, and its energy consumption pattern. The results validated that their approach achieved superior transcoding efficiency while meeting QoS requirements and outperformed the baseline greedy method. Farahani et al., [56] employed a Self Organizing Map (SOM) [98] to propose an online learning model for handling live video requests in a hybrid P2P-CDN network. This model effectively determines the serving action, whether from the P2P side through video transcoding or caching or from the CDN side through edge caching or edge transcoding, while taking serving latency into consideration. They extended their approach in [58] by incorporating a video super-resolution running at the client side called “peer super-resolution” and considering delivery cost in their decision-making process. The results revealed a 22 % improvement in users’ QoE, a 34 % reduction in streaming service provider costs, and a 31 % decrease in edge server energy consumption compared to alternative greedy strategies.

5.3 Emerging delivery protocols

In recent years, various networking protocols, such as QUIC [82], Web Real-Time Communication (WebRTC) [197], and Multipath Transmission Control Protocol (MPTCP) [62], have been utilized in

Table 4. Summary of important works in delivery network (5) (RTT: Round Trip Time, Bandwidth: BW).

Section	Work	Year	Scope	AI Approach			Evaluation Method	
				Input	Model	Output	Real Testbed/Simulator	Dataset
5.1.1	[186]	2017	Cache placement	Thumbnails, Title, Keywords, Description	ELM	Popular video	NS-3[125]	Generated by authors
	[109]	2021		Video title, Category, Streaming duration, Description, No. requests	MLP		10 servers, 25 clients	[201, 202]
	[223]	2021		Cache capacity, Video popularity	DRL	Cache location	Numerical simulation	Generated by authors
	[205]	2024		Cache capacity, Network BW and congestion			Numerical simulation (10 clients)	Generated by authors
5.1.2	[31]	2021	Video processing task offloading and resource allocation	Task size, Network BW, Computing capacity	DRL	Offloading location	Numerical simulation (3 servers, 15 clients, 3 base stations)	Generated by authors
	[117]	2020	Video processing task offloading	Task size, Transmission loss, Computational capacity			Numerical simulation	Generated by authors
	[14]	2024	Video processing task offloading	Energy consumption, Execution and communication time, BW availability, Trust scores			Python simulation (5 edge devices, 10 tasks)	[42, 47]
	[226]	2022	Video processing resource allocation	Computational capacity, Task size	RL	Resource scheduling	200 NVIDIA Jeston devices [149]	Generated by authors
5.2	[110]	2019	Cache placement	User's information, Age, Location	ESN, LSTM	Popular video, Device location	Numerical simulation (200 peers)	Generated by authors
				Device location, Popularity	DRL	Cache location		
	[114]	2018	Peer selection for transcoding	Workload, Energy consumption, QoS, peer's trust score	DRL	Transcoder selection	Numerical simulation (10 peers)	Generated by authors
	[56, 58]	2022	Request serving by super-resolution and transcoding	Buffer status, BW, Bitrate, Computation power	SOM	Serving action	5 servers, 350 peers	[105, 227]
5.3	[224]	2022	MPTCP delivery path selection	Packet loss, RTT, Energy consumption,	RL	Transmission path	NS-3[148]	Generated by authors
	[170]	2023	Network selection for device connection	Network throughput, Energy consumption	MLP	Connection device	10 Raspberry Pis	Generated by iperf [52]

the streaming domain [67, 135, 160, 228]. These protocols contribute to reducing latency and QoE. Our search methodology revealed a limited emphasis on leveraging AI models to enhance energy efficiency and QoE within such protocols. For instance, the authors in [224] introduced an RL-based model for MPTCP video delivery. The RL agent determines when and over which path the video packets should be transmitted, optimizing the delivery of high-quality 5G media services. The state of the proposed RL model encompasses the packet loss rate in each path, the energy consumption of data transferring in each path, and the Round-Trip Time (RTT), while the reward function is composed of throughput, packet loss, and energy consumption. This method outperformed the lowest-RTT-first [152] and earliest completion first [112] baseline methods in terms of completion time, transmission rate, and energy consumption. Shams et al., [170] proposed a Deep Learning (DL) model to improve the energy consumption of MPTCP video delivery using two algorithms: a Software-Defined Network (SDN)-based method determining the network for device connection; an algorithm adjusting the decision of the first algorithm based on energy consumption. They also utilized an MLP model pre-trained on different network sizes and MPTCP congestion control algorithms. This method reduced energy consumption by 19% and improved network performance by 8% compared to other baselines, such as MPTCP Cubic [161].

5.4 Delivery summary

Table 4 summarizes works that utilized AI techniques to present energy-aware delivery services provided by single or hybrid edge-P2P networks as well as the features of emerging delivery protocols. Our analysis shows that RL-based methods, particularly DRL, are the most popular models for offloading, scheduling, allocation, and caching problems. Moreover, the most common evaluation approaches are simulating the end-to-end aspects of video streaming by numerical simulations, Python-based frameworks, or NS-3.

6 VIDEO PLAYBACK

In recent years, AI techniques have enhanced ABR algorithms, incorporating energy efficiency alongside traditional factors like QoE and network throughput. In addition, client-side AI-based video quality enhancement techniques, such as video super-resolution and contrast adjustments, are typically used to optimize QoE during video playback.

6.1 ABR algorithms

Turkkan et al., [188] developed an RL-based ABR algorithm called GreenABR, incorporating states of energy consumption, network throughput, video player current buffer size, the bitrate of the most recently downloaded segment, and the VMAF score. They used an ANN model to predict the playback energy consumption with only 7 % error based on input variables such as bitrate, resolution, framerate, file size, and VMAF. The ANN-based energy model, leveraging network throughput and video player measurements, optimizes the selection of video representations, ensuring energy-efficient choices. They designed the RL reward function based on quality, buffering, and energy consumption factors. The results demonstrated a 57 % reduction in power consumption compared to the buffer-based BOLA ABR algorithm [177]. The authors extended their research to GreenABR+ [189], employing the same energy model and using VMAF as the perceived quality metric. GreenABR+ tackles the challenge of retraining models for diverse video representation sets by employing a DRL model encompassing a broader bitrate range. GreenABR+ outperforms both GreenABR [188] and Pensieve [124], demonstrating a 57 % reduction in energy consumption and an 87 % improvement in rebuffering time.

Mondal et al., [136] introduced an energy-efficient DASH video player (EnDASH) designed to balance user QoE and energy consumption for devices in mobility scenarios. The player employed three consecutive prediction models, resulting in a nearly 30 % reduction in energy consumption compared to the state-of-the-art Pensieve [124]: (1) an *RF model* to predict the average throughput of the cellular network using historical information and characteristics such as associated cellular technology (i.e., 2G-4G) and the number of neighboring base stations; (2) an *RL model* to predict and determine whether to increase or decrease the buffer length based on a reward function considering energy savings and QoE score. The RL states include the average cellular network throughputs predicted in the previous step, the current playback buffer capacity, and a set of potential changes in the buffer length; (3) a *DRL model* utilizes states, such as the predicted buffer length, throughput, and the previous segment's bitrate, to select the next segment based on the QoE score.

Given the belief in the necessity for an ABR algorithm to adapt more effectively to specific network conditions rather than performing well on average across all conditions, Huang [80] proposed an ABR algorithm, A^2BR , consisting of online and offline stages. In the offline stage, they trained an RL model with diverse scenarios of network conditions. This trained model is then utilized by the video player in the online stage to select the optimal bitrate based on the current network conditions. The results confirmed a 7 % improvement in VMAF while consuming the same amount of energy compared to the baseline approach [214]. Raman et al., [159] introduced a DRL method for energy-efficient live video streaming on mobile devices called LL-GABR. LL-GABR states encompassed player metrics such as current buffer size, latency, rebuffering time, playback rate, bitrate, VMAF, network predicted bandwidth and player energy consumption. They designed a reward function based on high video quality, minimized rebuffering, reduced bitrate switches, and enhanced energy efficiency. LL-GABR showed performance improvements compared to other adaptive bitrate algorithms, such as [65, 182], achieving a 44 % improvement in QoE and a 73 % enhancement in energy efficiency.

6.2 Video super-resolution

Super-resolution refers to a computational task to upscale and restore high-frequency signals that may be lost in a low-resolution image or video, ultimately generating a high-resolution counterpart. This process aims to minimize visual degradation and enhance image quality as much as possible, resulting in a high-resolution image or video [196]. Many DL-based super-resolution models such as [4, 46, 106, 115, 173] have emerged in recent years that stand out for their innovative architectures and impressive performance.

Given that video super-resolution often runs on end-user devices with limited resources and batteries, significant research efforts have been directed towards leveraging AI to design resource and energy-aware super-resolution techniques. Menon et al., [130] introduced a method to determine the encoding resolution by maximizing the achievable VMAF using FSRCNN [46]. They employed an RF model to predict the VMAF scores of the video after applying a super-resolution model and the encoding time for each determined resolution. Their results showed a 32.70 % reduction in bitrate while maintaining the same VMAF compared to the HLS bitrate ladder, leading to a 68.21 % reduction in encoding energy consumption. The authors in [217] proposed a lightweight CNN model by enhancing the efficiency of a well-performing model, ABPN [49], by pruning residual connections. Residual connections, commonly used in neural networks such as ABPN, facilitate the flow of information by providing shortcut paths for gradients during training. The pruning process indeed reduces computational overhead by selectively removing redundant connections within residual blocks without reducing the model's performance. The optimized model achieved a power consumption of 0.7 W, an inference time of 2.03 ms, and a PSNR of 27.46 dB. The results showcased lower power consumption and 43 % improvement in inference time compared to ABPN while preserving nearly identical PSNR levels.

Gao et al., [63] introduced a re-parameterization technique to enrich the network's feature extraction capabilities with multiple paths during training. Subsequently, they expedited network inference by consolidating multiple paths into a single convolution block. They achieved a PSNR of 27.52 with a power consumption of 0.1 W on the identical dataset used in [217]. Zhang et al., [219] proposed an efficient method for running Deformable Convolutional Networks (DCNs) on Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs) for video super-resolution. In their approach, the authors introduced optimizations at two levels: algorithm and hardware. In algorithm-level optimization, they used a lightweight network to reduce complexity and memory usage, while at the hardware level, they designed a dedicated processing core and storage to handle irregular memory access caused by deformable convolutions. The experiments demonstrated a 1.63 times enhancement in energy efficiency compared to other FPGA-based super-resolution baselines.

The authors in [58] proposed a framework for live video streaming (ALIVE), considering all available computational resources from peers, MEC servers, and CDNs. They leveraged video super-resolution for DASH requests in the P2P layer of their architecture, upscaling low-resolution frames received from adjacent peers. Experimenting with various CNN-based super-resolution techniques, they selected CARN [4] for PC and LiDeR [30] for mobile peers. The framework achieved a 22 % improvement in QoE and a 31 % reduction in edge energy consumption. Inspired by the concept of super-resolution to construct high-resolution videos from low-resolution counterparts, the authors in [134] employed a CNN-based model to mitigate the visual distortions inherent in video encoding, adeptly and effectively reconstructing the video sequence from low-bitrate video sequences, yielding a 40 % improvement in perceived quality, as measured by both PSNR and SSIM metrics Compared to baseline methods.

Table 5. Summary of important works in video playback (6) (BR: Bitrate, BS: Base Station, RTT: Round Trip Time, SR: Super-resolution, TR: Transcoding CA: Contrast Adjustment).

Section	Work	Year	Scope	AI Approach			Evaluation Method	
				Input	Model	Output	Real Device/Simulator	Dataset
6.1	[136]	2020	Developing DASH video players	Cellular technology (2G-4G), No. BSs, Download rate	RF	Throughput	Moto G5, Micromax Canvas Infinity	Generated by authors
				Network throughput, Buffer size, Buffer length	RL	Bitrate		
	[188], [189]	2022	Developing ABR algorithms	Energy consumption, BR, VMAF, Network throughput, Buffer size	RL - DRL	Bitrate	Samsung S4	[51]
	[80]	2022		VMAF, Network throughput, Download time, Buffer occupancy	RL	Bitrate	MacBook Pro	[210],[143], [157]
	[22]	2023		Network throughput, RTT, Playback rate, Packet loss, Buffer occupancy, Resolution	RL	Bitrate	[123]	[50, 144, 163, 190]
[159]	2024	Buffer size, VMAF, Bitrate, Energy consumption, Rebuffering time	DRL	Bitrate, Playback rate	Python simulation	[207]		
6.2	[63]	2022	Developing SR methods	Video frame	CNN	Upscaled frame	Python simulation	[141]
	[217]	2022			CNN		Redmi K50 Pro	[141]
	[219]	2023			DCN		Python simulation	[209]
	[134]	2024			CNN	Python, NVIDIA GPUs	Generated by authors	
	[130]	2024			Spatial, temporal information	RF	Resolution	Python simulation
	[58]	2023	SR and TR on battery-constrained end devices	Video frame	CNN	Upscaled frame	iPhone 11, Xiaomi Mi11, virtual machines[162]	[105, 227]
	[174]	2019	CA methods			Higher contrast	Python simulation	[8]
6.3	[104]	2023	CA methods	Video frame	CNN	Pixel-value modification map	OLED display	[8, 26]

6.3 Video contrast adjustment

The user device's display, whether a smartphone, laptop, TV, or PC, constitutes another component contributing to power consumption in the video streaming lifecycle. The display's power consumption typically depends on its technology, such as LCD, OLED, or AMOLED [97]. Video contrast on displays involves the differentiation in brightness or color between each frame's brightest and darkest element, impacting visibility and detail sharpness. Proper contrast alignment optimizes display technology utilization and minimizes unnecessary power consumption while improving visibility without compromising energy efficiency in the display process.

Shin et al., [174] presented a CNN model tailored for OLED displays, aiming to boost video frame contrast and decrease power consumption. Their methodology selectively reduced brightness by a specified ratio while preserving perceived quality through contrast enhancement using a conditional generative adversarial network. This network generated output frames under the constraint of power consumption, resulting in a significant power saving rate of up to 42.1%. Meur et al., [104] focused on reducing display energy consumption using a pixel-wise content-adaptive method to generate an attenuation map on the encoder side. They used a CNN model, providing information on adjusting pixel values for energy reduction. The results indicated that at an energy reduction rate of 10%, the average VMAF score for different video sequences demonstrated a 6% improvement compared to a linear scaling method.

6.4 Playback Summary

Table 6 summarizes AI-based ABR algorithms that incorporate content-aware information to enhance bitrate selection and energy efficiency, primarily utilizing (D)RL models and evaluated on smartphones. Our investigation also highlights client-based AI technologies, i.e., super-resolution and video contrast adjustment, which aim to balance quality enhancement with energy efficiency. These works mainly used CNN-based models and employed a combination of real devices and simulations for evaluation.

7 VIDEO QUALITY ASSESSMENT (VQA)

Expanding on the taxonomy of VQA metrics introduced in Section 3, these metrics can be further categorized as Full Reference (FR), Reduced Reference (RR), and No Reference (NR) methods, depending on the degree of information available for the reference video [113]. VMAF, PSNR, and SSIM are in the FR-VQA category since they evaluate the quality of compressed video by directly comparing it to the original version. In contrast, NR-VQA methods do not utilize the original video content for quality assessment. Therefore, AI techniques are frequently employed to analyze distorted videos independently without relying on a reference video. Moreover, RR-VQA methods offer the advantage of evaluating video quality using limited information, resulting in lower power consumption compared to FR-VQA methods, making them suitable for energy-efficient video streaming applications [48].

7.1 Reduced Reference (RR) and No Reference (NR) VQA prediction

VMAF is a popular choice for quality evaluation due to its stronger correlation with perceptual quality compared to SSIM and PSNR. However, its computational intensity and high time complexity pose challenges [121]. Menon et al., [129] introduced an LSTM-based RR-VQA approach to predict VMAF scores for reconstructed videos. Their proposed method incorporated features such as Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT)-based texture information and a fusion of SSIM between the original and reconstructed videos. The results demonstrated a 9.14 times acceleration compared to traditional VMAF estimation, resulting in an 89.44% reduction in energy consumption. Barman et al., in [16] used four learning models, GP, MLP, Support Vector Regression (SVR), and RF to propose an NR-VQA method to predict VMAF scores in video gaming applications. The models incorporated input such as encoding parameters, content, and compression artifacts besides Blind Image Quality Index (BIQI) [137] and Natural Image Quality Evaluator (NIQE) [133] as two well-known NR image quality methods adapted for video sequences. The results revealed that the SVR model exhibited the best performance compared to ground-truth VMAF.

7.2 QoE prediction

Many works consider bitrate a primary factor in QoE assessment. However, the use of HTTPS by OTT providers to secure data transmission complicates the packet inspection and information extraction (e.g., bitrate) from encrypted network traffic [50, 108]. Pan and Cheng [154] employed three ML models: RF for handling diverse data patterns, Bayesian Networks for probabilistic reasoning, and AdaBoost for enhancing weak classifiers, to evaluate QoE and energy efficiency in encrypted YouTube streaming. They specifically trained these models to estimate video bitrates from HTTPS traffic, resulting in energy savings of up to 20%.

Iekin et al., [81] introduced a Federated Learning (FL) technique for QoE estimation, specifically focusing on energy efficiency and lightweight training. Their approach involves partitioning the dataset across various local devices, each holding a subset of features and a central model trained by communicating with these distributed datasets. Comparative analysis against a fully centralized model showcased the efficacy of their proposed method, demonstrating comparable performance. The authors delved into hyperparameter tuning, focusing on energy efficiency and light training, resulting in a noteworthy 28% reduction in training time and a subsequent decrease in energy consumption associated with model training. Kougioumtzidis et al., [99] addressed the influence of the wireless transmission channel on user QoE and network QoS parameters, such as bandwidth, jitter, latency, and packet loss. They used a CNN-based model to predict the QoE of video games in wireless networks, promoting efficient utilization of computational resources and reducing network

Table 6. Summary of important works in video quality assessment (7) (BR: Bitrate, SI: Spatial Information, TI: Temporal Information, BI: Brightness Information, FR: Framerate).

Section	Work	Year	Scope	AI Approach			Evaluation Method	
				Input	Model	Output	Device/Reference Software/Simulator	Dataset
7.1	[129]	2024	VMAF prediction	SI, TI, BI	LSTM	VMAF	x264[203]	[7]
	[16]	2019		BR, Res, SI, TI, Blur, Blockiness, BIQI, NIQE	SVR	VMAF	MATLAB simulation	[16, 19]
7.2	[154]	2018	MOS prediction	BR, Segment size, Res, Segment duration	RF, AdaBoost, Bayes Network	Bitrate	iPhone 5, 6, 6s, HTC M7, Samsung S4, Xiaomi MI2	Generated by authors
	[81]	2021		SI, TI, FR, BR, No. stalls, Stall duration, MOS	Vertical FL	MOS	Python simulation	[51]
	[99]	2024		Bandwidth, Jitter, Network latency, Packet loss	CNN	MOS	OpenAirInterface [92]	Generated by authors

energy consumption. This method achieved an MAE value of 0.09, outperforming baselines with MAE metrics ranging from 0.1 to 0.7.

7.3 VQA summary

Table 6 summarizes the work that utilized AI techniques to reduce the dependency on reference frames by the NR and RR-VQA methods. Moreover, it highlights work that predicts QoE information, such as bitrate, within HTTPS traffic, aiming to balance QoE assessment and energy efficiency. The investigation reveals no single dominant ML model or evaluation method for the discussed contributions. The choice of model and evaluation approach varies based on specific sub-problems.

8 FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This section outlines potential future research directions for AI-driven, energy-efficient video streaming systems, focusing on the segments of the video streaming lifecycle and the role of generative AI in enhancing the performance of these segments.

8.1 Video encoding

Beyond integrating AI into conventional codecs like HEVC and VVC, there is growing interest in end-to-end learning-based coding schemes [91, 132, 222]. Unlike traditional methods that optimize encoding and decoding separately, end-to-end approaches use integrated DL models to optimize the entire video compression process as a unified learning task. In this context, extensive datasets, including pairs of original video frames and their compressed representations, are typically used to train networks, enabling them to proficiently map input video frames to their compressed counterparts [90]. In particular, the MPAI-EEV standard, developed by the Moving Picture, Audio, and Data Coding by Artificial Intelligence (MPAI) group, demonstrates superior perceptual evaluation metrics compared to the VVC codec [90]. For example, in [119], a DL-based end-to-end compression scheme achieved a 23% improvement in BD-rate on average compared to HEVC. However, further research is needed to explore the impact of this approach on energy consumption and carbon emissions similar to the studies like [70, 93, 100] conducted on existing codecs.

8.2 Delivery network

The increasing prevalence of edge computing, softwareized and virtualized networks, and technologies like *EdgeAI* is driving the integration of AI into critical network and resource management tasks. These tasks include optimizing resource allocation, scheduling video processing, and enhancing user request servicing through intelligent server and segment selection strategies. Given the resource-intensive nature of AI models, it is imperative to optimize both accuracy and energy consumption [89, 208]. A promising strategy involves decentralizing computations, encompassing

both training and inference, by leveraging edge devices. This approach offers significant advantages, particularly in reducing computation time and energy consumption [218]. Leveraging emerging computing technologies, such as serverless computing [43, 156], with AI to enhance the sustainability, efficiency, and monetary cost of video streaming systems presents new opportunities. In addition, using intelligent in-network components to assist video encoders in reducing bitrates and energy consumption through constructing dynamic bitrate ladders while maintaining high quality and user experience, or enhancing network resource utilization in multi-CDN environments [192], e.g., bandwidth and server capacity, are promising yet underexplored strategies.

8.3 Video playback

Recent research indicates that encouraging streaming users to adopt environmentally conscious preferences, such as accepting certain quality degradations to reduce CO₂ emissions, can significantly impact the energy consumption of video streaming [23, 77]. Therefore, the next improvement for CMCD and CMSD protocols or AI-based ABRs may involve incorporating energy-awareness information, enabling both video players and delivery components to provide green services. In addition, optimizing AI techniques for lower energy consumption on the client side, particularly for computationally intensive tasks such as video super-resolution, remains an open research topic to ensure efficiency and sustainability.

8.4 VQA

AI-based VQA solutions are often perceived as black boxes, posing challenges in understanding the relationship between input factors and model outcomes [198]. However, adopting Explainable AI (XAI) techniques [33, 198] can mitigate this challenge by providing clear explanations of the model's behavior and the rationale behind specific decisions. This is particularly crucial for energy-efficient video streaming, where transparent AI decisions can optimize energy consumption without compromising user experience.

8.5 Generative AI

The emergence of Generative AI and Large Language Models (LLMs) [32, 75, 187] is revolutionizing the video streaming lifecycle, similar to their impact on other applications [225]. Current integrations have reduced the complexity of conventional compression techniques [131], enabled players to adjust data transmission rates through more precise network bandwidth predictions [13], accelerated super-resolution models [131], and developed ABR algorithms customized for diverse network conditions [225]. However, the models behind Generative AIs and LLMs are massive and energy-intensive. Recent research revealed that training a single LLM can emit up to 284 tons of CO₂, equivalent to the lifetime emissions of five cars, while inference processes also demand significant computational resources [23, 180]. Consequently, a significant research gap exists concerning the energy efficiency of these methods for streaming use cases.

9 CONCLUSION

The increase in video consumption across various devices has raised concerns about the CO₂ emissions attributed to video streaming, which require solutions to mitigate the environmental impact. This survey investigated AI-based solutions to reduce energy consumption in primary aspects of the video streaming lifecycle, i.e., video encoding, delivery, and playback. It provided essential background on encoding, delivery networks, and playback as integral components of the video streaming lifecycle. It explored VQA and energy models and metrics. It also presented a taxonomy and a state-of-the-art review of 59 AI-based energy-aware solutions in four sections.

Finally, it outlined potential future research directions, highlighting opportunities to improve energy efficiency in video streaming using AI methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mariana Afonso, Angeliki Katsenou, Fan Zhang, and David R. Bull. 2019. A Collection of 100 4K Video Sequences. <https://ang kats.github.io/Dataset-1004K/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [2] Samira Afzal, Narges Mehran, Zoha Azimi Ourimi, Farzad Tashtarian, Hadi Amirpour, Radu Prodan, and Christian Timmerer. 2024. A Survey on Energy Consumption and Environmental Impact of Video Streaming. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [3] Jesús Aguilar-Armijo, Christian Timmerer, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2023. Space: Segment Prefetching and Caching at the Edge for Adaptive Video Streaming. *IEEE Access* 11 (2023), 21783–21798.
- [4] Namhyuk Ahn, Byungkon Kang, and Kyung-Ah Sohn. 2018. Fast, Accurate, and Lightweight Super-Resolution with Cascading Residual Network. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision*. 252–268.
- [5] Hadi Amirpour, Mohammad Ghasempour, Farzad Tashtarian, Samira Afzal, Wassim Hamidouche, and Christian Timmerer. 2024. MVCD: Multi-Dimensional Video Compression Dataset.
- [6] Hadi Amirpour, Vignesh V Menon, Samira Afzal, Radu Prodan, and Christian Timmerer. 2023. Optimizing Video Streaming for Sustainability and Quality: The Role of Preset Selection in Per-Title Encoding. In *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo*. IEEE, 1679–1684.
- [7] Hadi Amirpour, Vignesh V Menon, and Christian Timmerer. 2022. Video Complexity Dataset. <https://vcd.itec.aau.at/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [8] Pablo Arbelaez, Michael Maire, Charless Fowlkes, and Jitendra Malik. 2010. Contour Detection and Hierarchical Image Segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 33, 5 (2010), 898–916.
- [9] Pavel Arnaudov and Tokunbo Ogunfunmi. 2020. Artificially Intelligent Adaptive Search Fast Motion Estimation Algorithm for HD Video. *Journal of Signal Processing Systems* 92, 4 (2020), 389–408.
- [10] AWS. 2024. AWS Elemental Live. <https://aws.amazon.com/elemental-live/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [11] Zoha Azimi, Amritha Premkumar, Reza Farahani, Vignesh V Menon, Christian Timmerer, and Radu Prodan. 2024. Decoding Complexity-Aware Bitrate-Ladder Estimation for Adaptive VVC Streaming. *Accepted in 32nd European Conference on Signal Processing* (2024).
- [12] Zoha Azimi Ourimi, Reza Farahani, Vignesh V Menon, Christian Timmerer, and Radu Prodan. 2024. Towards ML-Driven Video Encoding Parameter Selection for Quality and Energy Optimization. *Accepted in 16th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)* (2024).
- [13] Tahmina Azmin, Mohamad Ahmadinejad, and Nashid Shahriar. 2022. Bandwidth Prediction in 5G Mobile Networks Using Informer. In *13th International Conference on Network of the Future*. IEEE, 1–9.
- [14] Thar Baker, Zaher Al Aghbari, Ahmed M Khedr, Naveed Ahmed, and Shini Girija. 2024. EDITORS: Energy-aware Dynamic Task Offloading using Deep Reinforcement Transfer Learning in SDN-enabled Edge Nodes. *Internet of Things* (2024).
- [15] Alcardo Alex Barakabitze, Nabajeet Barman, Arslan Ahmad, Saman Zadtootaghaj, Lingfen Sun, Maria G Martini, and Luigi Atzori. 2019. QoE Management of Multimedia Streaming Services in Future Networks: A Tutorial and Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials (COMST)* 22, 1 (2019), 526–565.
- [16] Nabajeet Barman, Emmanuel Jammeh, Seyed Ali Ghorashi, and Maria G Martini. 2019. No-Reference Video Quality Estimation Based on Machine Learning for Passive Gaming Video Streaming Applications. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 74511–74527.
- [17] Nabajeet Barman and Maria G Martini. 2019. QoE Modeling for HTTP Adaptive Video Streaming—A Survey and Open Challenges. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 30831–30859.
- [18] Nabajeet Barman, Maria G. Martini, and Yuriy Reznik. 2024. Bjøntegaard Delta (BD): A Tutorial Overview of the Metric, Evolution, Challenges, and Recommendations.
- [19] Nabajeet Barman, Saman Zadtootaghaj, Steven Schmidt, Maria G Martini, and Sebastian Möller. 2018. GamingVideoSET: A Dataset for Gaming Video Streaming Applications. In *16th Annual Workshop on Network and Systems Support for Games*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [20] Román Belda, Ismael de Fez, Pau Arce, and Juan Carlos Guerri. 2020. Look Ahead to Improve QoE in DASH Streaming. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 79, 33 (2020), 25143–25170.
- [21] Abdelhak Bentaleb, Mehmet N Akcay, May Lim, Ali C Begen, and Roger Zimmermann. 2022. BoB: Bandwidth Prediction for Real-Time Communications Using Heuristic and Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia (TMM)* (2022).
- [22] Abdelhak Bentaleb, May Lim, Mehmet N Akcay, Ali C Begen, and Roger Zimmermann. 2023. Meta Reinforcement Learning for Rate Adaptation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*. IEEE, 1–10.

- [23] Gülnaziye Bingöl, Alessandro Floris, Simone Porcu, Christian Timmerer, and Luigi Atzori. 2023. Are Quality and Sustainability Reconcilable? A Subjective Study on Video QoE, Luminance and Resolution. In *15th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 19–24.
- [24] Alex Borges, Bruno Zatt, Marcelo Porto, and Guilherme Correa. 2024. A Systematic Literature Review on Video Transcoding Acceleration: Challenges, Solutions, and Trends. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* (2024), 1–30.
- [25] Frank Bossen. 2013. Common Test Conditions and Software Reference Configurations. *JCTVC-L1100* 12, 7 (2013), 1.
- [26] Frank Bossen, Jill Boyce, Xiang Li, Vadim Seregin, and Karsten Sühning. 2019. JVET Common Test Conditions and Software Reference Configurations for SDR Video. *Joint Video Experts Team* (2019).
- [27] Benjamin Bross, Ye-Kui Wang, Yan Ye, Shan Liu, Jianle Chen, Gary J Sullivan, and Jens-Rainer Ohm. 2021. Overview of the Versatile Video Coding (VVC) Standard and Its Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)* 31, 10 (2021), 3736–3764.
- [28] Thiago Luiz Alves Bubolz, Ruhan A Conceição, Mateus Grellert, Luciano Agostini, Bruno Zatt, and Guilherme Correa. 2019. Quality and Energy-Aware HEVC Transrating Based on Machine Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* 66, 6 (2019), 2124–2136.
- [29] Ekrem Çetinkaya, Hadi Amirpour, Mohammad Ghanbari, and Christian Timmerer. 2021. CTU Depth Decision Algorithms for HEVC: A Survey. *Signal Processing: Image Communication* 99 (2021), 116442.
- [30] Ekrem Çetinkaya, Minh Nguyen, and Christian Timmerer. 2022. LiDeR: Lightweight Dense Residual Network for Video Super-Resolution on Mobile Devices. In *IEEE 14th Image, Video, and Multidimensional Signal Processing Workshop*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [31] Xing Chen and Guizhong Liu. 2021. Energy-Efficient Task Offloading and Resource Allocation via Deep Reinforcement Learning for Augmented Reality in Mobile Edge Networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 8, 13 (2021), 10843–10856.
- [32] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 240 (2023), 1–113.
- [33] Tobias Clement, Hung Truong Thanh Nguyen, Nils Kemmerzell, Mohamed Abdelaal, and Davor Stjelja. 2024. Beyond Explaining: XAI-based Adaptive Learning with SHAP Clustering for Energy Consumption Prediction. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [34] Conviva. 2020. COVID-19 Social & Streaming Report: Streaming in the Time of Coronavirus. http://pages.conviva.com/rs/138-XJA-134/images/RPT_Streaming_in_the_Time_of_Coronavirus.pdf. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [35] Luis Costero, Arman Iranfar, Marina Zapater, Francisco D Igual, Katalin Olcoz, and David Atienza. 2019. MAMUT: Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning for Efficient Real-Time Multi-User Video Transcoding. In *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition*. IEEE, 558–563.
- [36] CTA. 2024. Consumer Technology Association. <https://www.cta.tech/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [37] CTA. 2024. CTA Specification Web Application Video Ecosystem - Common Media Client Data. <https://cdn.cta.tech/cta/media/media/resources/standards/pdfs/cta-5004-final.pdf>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [38] CTA. 2024. Web Application Video Ecosystem - Common Media Server Data. <https://shop.cta.tech/products/web-application-video-ecosystem-common-media-server-data-cta-5006>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [39] Joao da Mata Liborio Filho, Jhonathan Oliveira, and Cesar AV Melo. 2024. Super-Resolution with Perceptual Quality for Improved Live Streaming Delivery on Edge Computing. *Computer Networks* (2024), 110463.
- [40] Jon Dahl. 2018. Instant Per-Title Encoding and What’s Wrong with Static Bitrate Ladders. <https://www.mux.com/blog/instant-per-title-encoding>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [41] Jan De Cock, Zhi Li, Megha Manohara, and Anne Aaron. 2016. Complexity-based Consistent-Quality Encoding in the Cloud. In *IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 1484–1488.
- [42] Yubin Deng, Ping Luo, Chen Change Loy, and Xiaoou Tang. 2014. Pedestrian Attribute Recognition at Far Distance. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. ACM New York, NY, USA, 789–792.
- [43] Chavit Denninnart and Mohsen Amini Salehi. 2024. SMSE: A Serverless Platform for Multimedia Cloud Systems. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 36, 4 (2024), e7922.
- [44] Renuka G Deshpande, Lata L Ragha, and Satyendra Kumar Sharma. 2018. Video Quality Assessment Through PSNR Estimation for Different Compression Standards. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science* 11, 3 (2018), 918–924.
- [45] Dimpact. 2024. Insight to Action on Digital Carbon Impacts. <https://dimpact.org/about>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [46] Chao Dong, Chen Change Loy, and Xiaoou Tang. 2016. Accelerating the Super-resolution Convolutional Neural Network. In *Computer Vision—ECCV*. Springer, 391–407.
- [47] Julio CS Dos Anjos, João LG Gross, Kassiano J Matteussi, Gabriel V González, Valderi RQ Leithardt, and Claudio FR Geyer. 2021. An Algorithm to Minimize Energy Consumption and Elapsed Time for IoT Workloads in a Hybrid Architecture. *Sensors* 21, 9 (2021), 2914.

- [48] Shahi Dost, Faryal Saud, Maham Shabbir, Muhammad Gufran Khan, Muhammad Shahid, and Benny Lovstrom. 2022. Reduced Reference Image and Video Quality Assessments: Review of Methods. *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing* 2022, 1 (2022), 1.
- [49] Zongcai Du, Jie Liu, Jie Tang, and Gangshan Wu. 2021. Anchor-Based Plain Net for Mobile Image Super-Resolution. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2494–2502.
- [50] Zhengfang Duanmu, Wentao Liu, Zhuoran Li, Diqi Chen, Zhou Wang, Yizhou Wang, and Wen Gao. 2020. Assessing the Quality-of-Experience of Adaptive Bitrate Video Streaming. *arXiv preprint* (2020).
- [51] Zhengfang Duanmu, Abdul Rehman, and Zhou Wang. 2018. A Quality-of-Experience Database for Adaptive Video Streaming. *IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting* 64, 2 (2018), 474–487.
- [52] Jon Dugan, Seth Elliott, Bruce A. Mah, Jeff Poskanzer, and Kaustubh Prabhu. 2009. The Ultimate Speed Test Tool for TCP, UDP and SCTP. <https://iperf.fr/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [53] Ericsson. 2023. Ericsson Mobility Report. <https://www.ericsson.com/en/reports-and-papers/mobility-report/reports/june-2023>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [54] Ericsson. 2024. Intelligent Sustainability: The Role of AI in Energy Consumption, Management and New Revenues. <https://www.ericsson.com/en/blog/2023/6/intelligent-sustainability-ai-energy-consumption>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [55] Ali Falahati, Mohammad Karim Safavi, Ardavan Elahi, Farhad Pakdaman, and Moncef Gabbouj. 2024. Efficient Bitrate Ladder Construction using Transfer Learning and Spatio-Temporal Features. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [56] Reza Farahani, Abdelhak Bentaleb, Ekrem Çetinkaya, Christian Timmerer, Roger Zimmermann, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2022. Hybrid P2P-CDN Architecture for Live Video Streaming: An Online Learning Approach. In *IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*. IEEE, 1911–1917.
- [57] Reza Farahani, Abdelhak Bentaleb, Christian Timmerer, Mohammad Shojafar, Radu Prodan, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2023. SARENA: SFC-Enabled Architecture for Adaptive Video Streaming Applications. In *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 864–870.
- [58] Reza Farahani, Ekrem Çetinkaya, Christian Timmerer, Mohammad Shojafar, Mohammad Ghanbari, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2023. ALIVE: A Latency- and Cost-Aware Hybrid P2P-CDN Framework for Live Video Streaming. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management (TNSM)* (2023).
- [59] Reza Farahani, Mohammad Shojafar, Christian Timmerer, Farzad Tashtarian, Mohammad Ghanbari, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2022. ARARAT: A Collaborative Edge-Assisted Framework for HTTP Adaptive Video Streaming. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management (TNSM)* (2022).
- [60] Reza Farahani, Farzad Tashtarian, Christian Timmerer, Mohammad Ghanbari, and Hermann Hellwagner. 2022. Leader: A Collaborative Edge- and SDN-Assisted Framework for HTTP Adaptive Video Streaming. In *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 745–750.
- [61] Chuan Feng, Pengchao Han, Xu Zhang, Bowen Yang, Yejun Liu, and Lei Guo. 2022. Computation Offloading in Mobile Edge Computing Networks: A Survey. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 202 (2022), 103366.
- [62] Alan Ford, Costin Raiciu, Mark Handley, and Olivier Bonaventure. 2013. *TCP Extensions for Multipath Operation with Multiple Addresses*. Technical Report.
- [63] Si Gao, Chengjian Zheng, Xiaofeng Zhang, Shaoli Liu, Biao Wu, Kaidi Lu, Diankai Zhang, and Ning Wang. 2022. RCBSR: Re-parameterization Convolution Block for Super-Resolution. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 540–548.
- [64] Krasimira Genova and Vassil Guliashki. 2011. Linear Integer Programming Methods and Approaches—A Survey. *Journal of Cybernetics and Information Technologies* 11, 1 (2011).
- [65] Craig Gutterman, Brayn Fridman, Trey Gilliland, Yusheng Hu, and Gil Zussman. 2020. Stallion: Video Adaptation Algorithm for Low-Latency Video Streaming. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 327–332.
- [66] Jingning Han, Bohan Li, Debargha Mukherjee, Ching-Han Chiang, Adrian Grange, Cheng Chen, Hui Su, Sarah Parker, Sai Deng, Urvang Joshi, et al. 2021. A Technical Overview of AV1. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 109, 9 (2021), 1435–1462.
- [67] Xueqiang Han, Biao Han, Jinrong Li, and Congxi Song. 2024. Multi-Agent DRL-based Multipath Scheduling for Video Streaming with QUIC. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications (TOMM)* (2024).
- [68] Songlin He, Yuan Lu, Qiang Tang, Guiling Wang, and Chase Qishi Wu. 2022. Blockchain-based P2P Content Delivery with Monetary Incentivization and Fairness Guarantee. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems (TPDS)* 34, 2 (2022), 746–765.
- [69] Christian R Helmrich, Mischa Siekmann, Sören Becker, Sebastian Bosse, Detlev Marpe, and Thomas Wiegand. 2020. XPSNR: A Low-Complexity Extension of The Perceptually Weighted Peak Signal-To-Noise Ratio For High-Resolution Video Quality Assessment. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*. IEEE, 2727–2731.

- [70] Christian Herglotz, Andréas Heindel, and André Kaup. 2017. Decoding-Energy-Rate-Distortion Optimization for Video Coding. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)* 29, 1 (2017), 171–182.
- [71] Christian Herglotz, Werner Robitzka, Matthias Kränzler, Andre Kaup, and Alexander Raake. 2022. Modeling of Energy Consumption and Streaming Video QoE Using a Crowdsourcing Dataset. In *14th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [72] Christian Herglotz, Elisabeth Walencik, and André Kaup. 2015. Estimating the HEVC Decoding Energy Using the Decoder Processing Time. In *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*. IEEE, 513–516.
- [73] HLS. 2024. HTTP Live Streaming. <https://developer.apple.com/streaming/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [74] HM. 2024. Reference Software for HEVC. <https://vcgit.hhi.fraunhofer.de/jvet/HM>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [75] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Training Compute-optimal Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint (2022)*.
- [76] Alain Hore and Djemel Ziou. 2010. Image Quality Metrics: PSNR vs. SSIM. In *20th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*. IEEE, 2366–2369.
- [77] Tobias Hossfeld, Martin Varela, Lea Skorin-Kapov, and Poul E Heegaard. 2023. A Greener Experience: Trade-Offs between QoE and CO₂ Emissions in Today’s and 6G Networks. *IEEE Communications Magazine* (2023).
- [78] Junxian Huang, Feng Qian, Alexandre Gerber, Z Morley Mao, Subhabrata Sen, and Oliver Spatscheck. 2012. A Close Examination of Performance and Power Characteristics of 4G LTE Networks. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services*. 225–238.
- [79] Liang Huang, Xu Feng, Cheng Zhang, Liping Qian, and Yuan Wu. 2019. Deep reinforcement Learning-Based Joint Task Offloading and Bandwidth Allocation for Multi-User Mobile Edge Computing. *Digital Communications and Networks* 5, 1 (2019), 10–17.
- [80] Tianchi Huang, Chao Zhou, Rui-Xiao Zhang, Chenglei Wu, and Lifeng Sun. 2022. Learning Tailored Adaptive Bitrate Algorithms to Heterogeneous Network Conditions: A Domain-Specific Priors and Meta-Reinforcement Learning Approach. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications (JSAC)* 40, 8 (2022), 2485–2503.
- [81] Selim Ickin, Markus Fiedler, and Konstantinos Vandikas. 2021. QoE Modeling on Split Features with Distributed Deep Learning. *Network* 1, 2 (2021), 165–190.
- [82] IETF. 2012. QUIC. <https://quicwg.org/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [83] ITU-T. 2020. P.1203: Parametric Bitstream-Based Quality Assessment of Progressive Download and Adaptive Audiovisual Streaming Services Over Reliable Transport. <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-P.1203-201710-1/en>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [84] ITU-T. 2020. P.800.1 : Mean Opinion Score (MOS) Terminology. <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-P.800.1>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [85] ITU-T. 2021. H.264: Advanced Video Coding for Generic Audiovisual Services. <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-H.264>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [86] ITU-T. 2023. H.265: High Efficiency Video Coding. <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-H.265>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [87] ITU-T. 2023. H.266: Versatile Video Coding. <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-H.266>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [88] Herbert Jaeger. 2007. Echo State Network. *Scholarpedia* (2007).
- [89] Lei Ji, Jing Qian, and Hao Wang. 2023. E2E-QoE based 6G Sustainability: Challenges and Designing Aspects. In *IEEE 98th Vehicular Technology Conference*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [90] Chuanmin Jia, Feng Ye, Fanke Dong, Kai Lin, Leonardo Chiariglione, Siwei Ma, Huifang Sun, and Wen Gao. 2023. MPAA-E2E: Standardization Efforts of Artificial Intelligence Based End-to-End Video Coding. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)* (2023).
- [91] Rashad Jillani, Syed Fawad Hussain, and Hari Kalva. 2020. Multi-View Clustering for Fast Intra Mode Decision in HEVC. In *IEEE International Conference on Consumer Electronics*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [92] Florian Kaltenberger, Aloizio P Silva, Abhimanyu Gosain, Luhan Wang, and Tien-Think Nguyen. 2020. OpenAirInterface: Democratizing Innovation in the 5G Era. *Computer Networks* 176 (2020), 107284.
- [93] Angeliki Katsenou, Jingwei Mao, and Ioannis Mavromatis. 2022. Energy-Rate-Quality Tradeoffs of State-of-the-Art Video Codecs. In *Picture Coding Symposium*. IEEE, 265–269.
- [94] Angeliki Katsenou, Joel Sole, and David R Bull. 2021. Efficient Bitrate Ladder Construction for Content-Optimized Adaptive Video Streaming. *IEEE Open Journal of Signal Processing* 2 (2021), 496–511.
- [95] Asiya Khan, Lingfen Sun, and Emmanuel Ifeachor. 2009. Content Clustering Based Video Quality Prediction Model for MPEG4 Video Streaming Over Wireless Networks. In *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [96] Muhammad Asif Khan, Emna Baccour, Zina Chkirkbene, Aiman Erbad, Ridha Hamila, Mounir Hamdi, and Moncef Gabbouj. 2022. A Survey on Mobile Edge Computing for Video Streaming: Opportunities and Challenges. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 120514–120550.

- [97] Dongwon Kim, Wonwoo Jung, and Hojung Cha. 2013. Runtime Power Estimation of Mobile AMOLED Displays. In *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition*. IEEE, 61–64.
- [98] Teuvo Kohonen. 2012. Self-Organizing Maps. *Springer Science & Business Media* (2012).
- [99] Georgios Kougioumtzidis, Atanas Vlahov, Vladimir K Poulkov, Pavlos I Lazaridis, and Zaharias D Zaharis. 2024. QoE Prediction for Gaming Video Streaming in ORAN Using Convolutional Neural Networks. *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society* (2024).
- [100] Matthias Kränzler, Christian Herglotz, and André Kaup. 2020. A Comparative Analysis of the Time and Energy Demand of Versatile Video Coding and High Efficiency Video Coding Reference Decoders. In *IEEE 22nd International Workshop on Multimedia Signal Processing (MMSP)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [101] Yogesh Kumar, Surabhi Kaul, and Yu-Chen Hu. 2022. Machine Learning for Energy-Resource Allocation, Workflow Scheduling and Live Migration in Cloud Computing: State-of-the-Art Survey. *Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems (SUSCOM)* 36 (2022), 100780.
- [102] Thorsten Laude, Yeremia Gunawan Adhisantoso, Jan Voges, Marco Munderloh, and Jörn Ostermann. 2019. A Comprehensive Video Codec Comparison. *APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing* 8 (2019), e30.
- [103] Thorsten Laude and Jörn Ostermann. 2016. Deep Learning-based Intra Prediction Mode Decision for HEVC. In *Picture Coding Symposium*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [104] Olivier Le Meur, Claire-Hélène Demarty, Franck Aumont, Laurent Blondé, and Erik Reinhard. 2023. Energy-Aware Images: Quality of Experience vs Energy Reduction. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Mile-High Video Conference*. 46–51.
- [105] Stefan Lederer, Christopher Müller, and Christian Timmerer. 2012. Dynamic Adaptive Streaming Over HTTP Dataset. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 89–94.
- [106] Christian Ledig, Lucas Theis, Ferenc Huszár, Jose Caballero, Andrew Cunningham, Alejandro Acosta, Andrew Aitken, Alykhan Tejani, Johannes Totz, Zehan Wang, et al. 2017. Photo-Realistic Single Image Super-resolution Using a Generative Adversarial Network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 4681–4690.
- [107] Chulhee Lee, Seongyoung Woo, Sangwook Baek, J Han, J Chae, and J Rim. 2017. Comparison of Objective Quality Models for Adaptive Bit-streaming Services. In *8th International Conference on Information, Intelligence, Systems & Applications*. IEEE, 1–4.
- [108] Chunyi Li, May Lim, Abdelhak Bentaleb, and Roger Zimmermann. 2023. A Real-Time Blind Quality-of-Experience Assessment Metric for HTTP Adaptive Streaming. In *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo*. IEEE, 1661–1666.
- [109] Chunlin Li, Yong Zhang, Qinqin Sun, and Youlong Luo. 2021. Collaborative Caching Strategy Based on Optimization of Latency and Energy Consumption in MEC. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 233 (2021), 107523.
- [110] Lixin Li, Yang Xu, Jiaying Yin, Wei Liang, Xu Li, Wei Chen, and Zhu Han. 2019. Deep Reinforcement Learning Approaches for Content Caching in Cache-Enabled D2D Networks. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7, 1 (2019), 544–557.
- [111] Na Li, Yun Zhang, and C-C Jay Kuo. 2020. Explainable Machine Learning Based Transform Coding for High Efficiency Intra Prediction. *arXiv preprint* (2020).
- [112] Yeon-sup Lim, Erich M Nahum, Don Towsley, and Richard J Gibbens. 2017. ECF: An MPTCP Path Scheduler to Manage Heterogeneous Paths. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies (CoNEXT)*. 147–159.
- [113] Weisi Lin and C-C Jay Kuo. 2011. Perceptual Visual Quality Metrics: A Survey. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation* 22, 4 (2011), 297–312.
- [114] Mengting Liu, F Richard Yu, Yinglei Teng, Victor CM Leung, and Mei Song. 2018. Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL)-Based Transcoder Selection for Blockchain-Enabled Video Streaming. In *IEEE Globecom Workshops*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [115] Shaoli Liu, Chengjian Zheng, Kaidi Lu, Si Gao, Ning Wang, Bofei Wang, Diankai Zhang, Xiaofeng Zhang, and Tianyu Xu. 2021. EVSRNet: Efficient Video Super-Resolution with Neural Architecture Search. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2480–2485.
- [116] Guo Lu, Wanli Ouyang, Dong Xu, Xiaoyun Zhang, Chunlei Cai, and Zhiyong Gao. 2019. DVC: An End-to-end Deep Video Compression Framework. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 11006–11015.
- [117] Haodong Lu, Xiaoming He, Miao Du, Xiukai Ruan, Yanfei Sun, and Kun Wang. 2020. Edge QoE: Computation Offloading with Deep Reinforcement Learning for Internet of Things. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7, 10 (2020), 9255–9265.
- [118] Zhengyi Luo, Yan Huang, Xiangwen Wang, Rong Xie, and Li Song. 2019. VMAF Oriented Perceptual Optimization for Video Coding. In *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [119] Haichuan Ma, Dong Liu, Ning Yan, Houqiang Li, and Feng Wu. 2020. End-to-end Optimized Versatile Image Compression with Wavelet-like Transform. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44, 3 (2020),

- 1247–1263.
- [120] Siwei Ma, Xinfeng Zhang, Chuanmin Jia, Zhenghui Zhao, Shiqi Wang, and Shanshe Wang. 2019. Image and Video Compression with Neural Networks: A Review. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)* 30, 6 (2019), 1683–1698.
- [121] Pavan C Madhusudana, Neil Birkbeck, Yilin Wang, Balu Adsumilli, and Alan C Bovik. 2021. High Frame Rate Video Quality Assessment using VMAF and Entropic Differences. In *Picture Coding Symposium*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [122] Bakhtiyor Makhkamov and Nazirjon Khasanov. 2023. Energy Efficient Technique and Algorithm Based on Artificial Intelligence in Content Delivery Networks. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development* 20 (2023), 30–43.
- [123] Hongzi Mao, Parimarjan Negi, Akshay Narayan, Hanrui Wang, Jiacheng Yang, Haonan Wang, Ryan Marcus, Mehrdad Khani Shirkoohi, Songtao He, Vikram Nathan, et al. 2019. Park: An Open Platform for Learning-Augmented Computer Systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [124] Hongzi Mao, Ravi Netravali, and Mohammad Alizadeh. 2017. Neural Adaptive Video Streaming with Pensieve. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*. 197–210.
- [125] Spyridon Mastorakis, Alexander Afanasyev, Ilya Moiseenko, and Lixia Zhang. 2016. ndnSIM 2: An Updated NDN Simulator for NS-3. *Technical Report NDN-0028, Revision 2* (2016).
- [126] Abbas Mehrabi, Matti Siekkinen, and Antti Ylä-Jääski. 2019. Energy-Aware QoE and Backhaul Traffic Optimization in Green Edge Adaptive Mobile Video Streaming. *IEEE Transactions on Green Communications and Networking* 3, 3 (2019), 828–839.
- [127] Vignesh V Menon, Reza Farahani, Prajit T Rajendran, Mohammed Ghanbari, Hermann Hellwagner, and Christian Timmerer. 2023. Transcoding Quality Prediction for Adaptive Video Streaming. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Mile-High Video Conference*. 103–109.
- [128] Vignesh V Menon, Amritha Premkumar, Prajit T Rajendran, Adam Wieckowski, Benjamin Bross, Christian Timmerer, and Detlev Marpe. 2024. Energy-efficient Adaptive Video Streaming with Latency-Aware Dynamic Resolution Encoding. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [129] Vignesh V Menon, Prajit T Rajendran, Reza Farahani, Klaus Schoeffmann, and Christian Timmerer. 2024. Video Quality Assessment with Texture Information Fusion for Streaming Applications. *Proceedings of the 3rd Mile-High Video Conference* (2024), 1–6.
- [130] Vignesh V Menon, Prajit T Rajendran, Amritha Premkumar, Benjamin Bross, and Detlev Marpe. 2024. Video Super-Resolution for Optimized Bitrate and Green Online Streaming. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [131] Fabian Mentzer, George Toderici, David Minnen, Sung-Jin Hwang, Sergi Caelles, Mario Lucic, and Eirikur Agustsson. 2022. VCT: A Video Compression Transformer. *arXiv preprint* (2022).
- [132] Alexandre Mercat, Florian Arrestier, Maxime Pelcat, Wassim Hamidouche, and Daniel Menard. 2018. Machine Learning Based Choice of Characteristics for the One-Shot Determination of the HEVC Intra Coding Tree. In *Picture Coding Symposium*. IEEE, 263–267.
- [133] Anish Mittal, Rajiv Soundararajan, and Alan C Bovik. 2012. Making a Completely Blind Image Quality Analyzer. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 20, 3 (2012), 209–212.
- [134] Parham Zilouchian Moghaddam, Mehdi Modarressi, and MohammadAmin Sadeghi. 2024. NU-Class Net: A Novel Deep Learning-based Approach for Video Quality Enhancement. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [135] Huthaifa L Mohamed and Ahlam Fadhil Mahmood. 2023. A Survey of Streaming Protocols for Video Transmission. *NTU Journal of Engineering and Technology* (2023), 186–191.
- [136] Abhijit Mondal, Basabdatta Palit, Somesh Khandelia, Nibir Pal, Jay Jayatheerthan, Krishna Paul, Niloy Ganguly, and Sandip Chakraborty. 2020. EnDASH-A Mobility Adapted Energy Efficient ABR Video Streaming for Cellular Networks. In *IFIP Networking Conference*. IEEE, 127–135.
- [137] Anush Krishna Moorthy and Alan Conrad Bovik. 2010. A Two-step Framework for Constructing Blind Image Quality Indices. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 17, 5 (2010), 513–516.
- [138] MPEG-DASH. 2017. Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP. <https://www.mpeg.org/standards/MPEG-DASH/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [139] Christoph Mueller, Louay Bassbouss, Stefan Pham, Stephan Steglich, Sven Wischnowsky, Peter Pogrzeba, and Thomas Buchholz. 2022. Context-Aware Video Encoding as a Network-Based Media Processing (NBMP) Workflow. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 293–298.
- [140] MulticoreWare. 2024. x265 HEVC Encoder / H.265 Video Codec. <https://www.x265.org/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [141] Seungjun Nah, Sungyong Baik, Seokil Hong, Gyeongnik Moon, Sanghyun Son, Radu Timofte, and Kyoung Mu Lee. 2019. NTIRE 2019 Challenge on Video Deblurring and Super-Resolution: Dataset and Study. In *CVPR Workshops*.
- [142] Preethi S Nair, KR Rao, and Madhu S Nair. 2019. A Machine Learning Approach for Fast Mode Decision in HEVC Intra Prediction Based on Statistical Features. *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems* 36, 3 (2019), 2095–2106.

- [143] Arvind Narayanan, Eman Ramadan, Rishabh Mehta, Xinyue Hu, Qingxu Liu, Rostand AK Fezeu, Udhaya Kumar Dayalan, Saurabh Verma, Peiqi Ji, Tao Li, et al. 2020. Lumos5G: Mapping and Predicting Commercial mmWave 5G Throughput. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. 176–193.
- [144] Arvind Narayanan, Xumiao Zhang, Ruiyang Zhu, Ahmad Hassan, Shuowei Jin, Xiao Zhu, Xiaoxuan Zhang, Denis Rybkin, Zhengxuan Yang, Zhuoqing Morley Mao, et al. 2021. A Variegated Look at 5G in the Wild: Performance, Power, and QoE Implications. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2021 Conference*. 610–625.
- [145] Netflix. 2016. VMAF - Video Multi-Method Assessment Fusion. <https://github.com/Netflix/vmaf>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [146] Netflix Technology Blog. 2015. Per-Title Encode Optimization. <https://netflixtechblog.com/per-title-encode-optimization-7e99442b62a2>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [147] Netflix Technology Blog. 2016. Toward A Practical Perceptual Video Quality Metric. <https://netflixtechblog.com/toward-a-practical-perceptual-video-quality-metric-653f208b9652>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [148] NS3. 2024. The Network Simulator. <https://github.com/Kashif-Nadeem/ns-3-mptcp>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [149] Nvidia. 2024. Embedded Systems with Jetson. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/autonomous-machines/embedded-systems/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [150] Erik Nygren, Ramesh K Sitaraman, and Jennifer Sun. 2010. The Akamai Network: A Platform for High-Performance Internet Applications. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review* 44, 3 (2010), 2–19.
- [151] Software Engineering Group of Keele University and University of Durham Department of Computer Science. 2007. Guidelines for Performing Systematic Literature Reviews in Software Engineering.
- [152] Christoph Paasch, Simone Ferlin, Ozgu Alay, and Olivier Bonaventure. 2014. Experimental Evaluation of Multipath TCP Schedulers. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Capacity Sharing Workshop*. 27–32.
- [153] Basabdatta Palit, Argha Sen, Abhijit Mondal, Ayan Zunaid, Jay Jayatheerthan, and Sandip Chakraborty. 2023. Improving UE Energy Efficiency through Network-Aware Video Streaming over 5G. *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management (TNSM)* (2023).
- [154] Wubin Pan and Guang Cheng. 2018. QoE Assessment of Encrypted YouTube Adaptive Streaming for Energy Saving in Smart Cities. *IEEE Access* 6 (2018), 25142–25156.
- [155] Al-Mukaddim Khan Pathan, Rajkumar Buyya, et al. 2007. A Taxonomy and Survey of Content Delivery Networks. *Grid Computing and Distributed Systems Laboratory, University of Melbourne, Technical Report 4*, 2007 (2007), 70.
- [156] Panos Patros, Josef Spillner, Alessandro V Papadopoulos, Blesson Varghese, Omer Rana, and Schahram Dustdar. 2021. Toward Sustainable Serverless Computing. *IEEE Internet Computing* 25, 6 (2021), 42–50.
- [157] Pensieve. 2017. Pensieve Dataset. <https://github.com/shinshiner/Pytorch-pensieve/tree/master/data>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [158] Ignacio Quesada and Ignacio E Grossmann. 1992. An LP/NLP Based Branch and Bound Algorithm for Convex MINLP Optimization Problems. *Computers & chemical engineering* 16, 10–11 (1992), 937–947.
- [159] Adithya Raman, Bekir Turkkan, and Tefvik Kosar. 2024. LL-GABR: Energy Efficient Live Video Streaming Using Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [160] Yongyi Ran, Tao Zhang, Wenshu Huang, Shaohua Xia, and Jiangtao Luo. 2023. iSAW: Intelligent Super-Resolution-Assisted Adaptive WebRTC Video Streaming. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*. 1–3.
- [161] Injong Rhee, Lisong Xu, Sangtae Ha, Alexander Zimmermann, Lars Eggert, and Richard Scheffenegger. 2018. *CUBIC for Fast Long-Distance Networks*. Technical Report.
- [162] Robert Ricci, Eric Eide, and CloudLab Team. 2014. Introducing CloudLab: Scientific Infrastructure for Advancing Cloud Architectures and Applications. *The Magazine of USENIX & SAGE* 39, 6 (2014), 36–38.
- [163] Haakon Rüser, Paul Vigmostad, Carsten Griwodz, and Pål Halvorsen. 2013. Commute Path Bandwidth Traces from 3G Networks: Analysis and Applications. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 114–118.
- [164] Werner Robitza, Steve Göring, Alexander Raake, David Lindegren, Gunnar Heikkilä, Jörgen Gustafsson, Peter List, Bernhard Feiten, Ulf Wüstenhagen, Marie-Neige Garcia, et al. 2018. HTTP Adaptive Streaming QoE Estimation with ITU-T rec. P. 1203: Open Databases and Software. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 466–471.
- [165] Firdose Saeik, Marios Avgeris, Dimitrios Spatharakis, Nina Santi, Dimitrios Dechouniotis, John Violos, Aris Leivadeas, Nikolaos Athanasopoulos, Nathalie Mitton, and Symeon Papavassiliou. 2021. Task Offloading in Edge and Cloud Computing: A Survey on Mathematical, Artificial Intelligence and Control Theory Solutions. *Computer Networks* 195 (2021), 108177.
- [166] Sandvine. 2024. The Global Internet Phenomena Report. <https://www.sandvine.com/phenomena>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.

- [167] Yusuf Sani, Andreas Mauthe, and Christopher Edwards. 2017. Adaptive Bitrate Selection: A Survey. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials (COMST)* 19, 4 (2017), 2985–3014.
- [168] Robert Seeliger, Christoph Müller, and Stefan Arbanowski. 2022. Green Streaming Through Utilization of AI-Based Content Aware Encoding. In *IEEE International Conference on Internet of Things and Intelligence Systems*. IEEE, 43–49.
- [169] Michael Seufert, Pedro Casas, Nikolas Wehner, Li Gang, and Kuang Li. 2019. Features That Matter: Feature Selection for On-line Stalling Prediction in Encrypted Video Streaming. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM) Workshops*. IEEE, 688–695.
- [170] Ramiza Shams, Atef Abdrabou, Mohammad Al Bataineh, and Kamarul Ariffin Noordin. 2023. Managing Energy Consumption of Devices with Multiconnectivity by Deep Learning and Software-Defined Networking. *Sensors* 23, 18 (2023), 7699.
- [171] K Sharman and C Rosewarne. 2017. Common Test Conditions and Software Reference Configurations for HEVC. In *Proceedings of the Meeting of Joint Collaborative Team on Video Coding*.
- [172] Yousef O Sharrab and Nabil J Sarhan. 2013. Aggregate Power Consumption Modeling of Live Video Streaming Systems. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 60–71.
- [173] Wenzhe Shi, Jose Caballero, Ferenc Huszár, Johannes Totz, Andrew P Aitken, Rob Bishop, Daniel Rueckert, and Zehan Wang. 2016. Real-time Single Image and Video Super-resolution Using an Efficient Sub-pixel Convolutional Neural Network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 1874–1883.
- [174] Yong-Goo Shin, Seung Park, Yoon-Jae Yeo, Min-Jae Yoo, and Sung-Jea Ko. 2019. Unsupervised Deep Contrast Enhancement with Power Constraint for OLED Displays. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing (TIP)* 29 (2019), 2834–2844.
- [175] Junaid Shuja, Kashif Bilal, Waleed Alasmary, Hassan Sinky, and Eisa Alanazi. 2021. Applying Machine Learning Techniques for Caching in Next-Generation Edge Networks: A Comprehensive Survey. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 181 (2021), 103005.
- [176] Pierluigi Siano, Giuseppe De Marco, Alejandro Rolán, and Vincenzo Loia. 2019. A Survey and Evaluation of the Potentials of Distributed Ledger Technology for Peer-to-Peer Transactive Energy Exchanges in Local Energy Markets. *IEEE Systems Journal* 13, 3 (2019), 3454–3466.
- [177] Kevin Spiteri, Rahul Uргаonkar, and Ramesh K Sitaraman. 2020. BOLA: Near-Optimal Bitrate Adaptation for Online Videos. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 28, 4 (2020), 1698–1711.
- [178] Andie Stephens, Chloe Tremlett-Williams, Liam Fitzpatrick, Luca Acerini, Matt Anderson, and Noor Crabbendam. 2021. Carbon Impact of Video Streaming. (2021).
- [179] Alexandros Stergiou and Ronald Poppe. 2022. Adapool: Exponential Adaptive Pooling for Information-Retaining Downsampling. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing (TIP)* 32 (2022), 251–266.
- [180] Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. 2019. Energy and Policy Considerations for Deep Learning in NLP. *arXiv preprint* (2019).
- [181] Gary J Sullivan, Jens-Rainer Ohm, Woo-Jin Han, and Thomas Wiegand. 2012. Overview of the High Efficiency Video Coding (HEVC) Standard. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (TCSVT)* 22, 12 (2012), 1649–1668.
- [182] Liyang Sun, Tongyu Zong, Siqian Wang, Yong Liu, and Yao Wang. 2021. Tightrope Walking in Low-Latency Live Streaming: Optimal Joint Adaptation of Video Rate and Playback Speed. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 200–213.
- [183] Tarik Taleb, Konstantinos Samdanis, Badr Mada, Hannu Flinck, Sunny Dutta, and Dario Sabella. 2017. On Multi-Access Edge Computing: A Survey of the Emerging 5G Network Edge Cloud Architecture and Orchestration. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials (COMST)* 19, 3 (2017), 1657–1681.
- [184] Haining Tan. 2021. Reinforcement Learning with Deep Deterministic Policy Gradient. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Big Data and Algorithms*. IEEE, 82–85.
- [185] Jie Tang, Hengbin Tang, Xiuyin Zhang, Kanapathippillai Cumanan, Gaojie Chen, Kai-Kit Wong, and Jonathon A Chambers. 2019. Energy Minimization in D2D-Assisted Cache-Enabled Internet of Things: A Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 16, 8 (2019), 5412–5423.
- [186] SM Shahrear Tanzil, William Hoiles, and Vikram Krishnamurthy. 2017. Adaptive Scheme for Caching YouTube Content in a Cellular Network: Machine Learning Approach. *IEEE Access* 5 (2017), 5870–5881.
- [187] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. *arXiv preprint* (2023).
- [188] Bekir Oguzhan Turkkan, Ting Dai, Adithya Raman, Tevfik Kosar, Changyou Chen, Muhammed Fatih Bulut, Jaroslav Zola, and Daby Sow. 2022. GreenABR: Energy-Aware Adaptive Bitrate Streaming with Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Multimedia Systems Conference (MMSys)*. 150–163.

- [189] Bekir Oguzhan Turkkan, Ting Dai, Adithya Raman, Tevfik Kosar, Changyou Chen, Muhammed Fatih Bulut, Jaroslaw Zola, and Daby Sow. 2024. GreenABR+: Generalized Energy-Aware Adaptive Bitrate Streaming. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications (TOMM)* (2024).
- [190] Jeroen Van Der Hooft, Stefano Petrangeli, Tim Wauters, Rafael Huyssegems, Patrice Rondao Alface, Tom Bostoen, and Filip De Turck. 2016. HTTP/2-Based Adaptive Streaming of HEVC Video Over 4G/LTE Networks. *IEEE Communications Letters* 20, 11 (2016), 2177–2180.
- [191] Marko Viitanen, Ari Koivula, Ari Lemmetti, Jarno Vanne, and Timo D Hämäläinen. 2015. Kvazaar HEVC Encoder for Efficient Intra Coding. In *IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*. IEEE, 1662–1665.
- [192] Roberto Viola, Angel Martin, Javier Morgade, Stefano Masneri, Mikel Zorrilla, Pablo Angueira, and Jon Montalbán. 2020. Predictive CDN Selection for Video Delivery based on LSTM Network Performance Forecasts and Cost-Effective Trade-offs. *IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting* 67, 1 (2020), 145–158.
- [193] VTM. 2024. Reference Software for VVC. https://vcgit.hhi.fraunhofer.de/jvet/VVCSsoftware_VTM. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [194] VVenC. 2024. The Fraunhofer Versatile Video Encoder. <https://github.com/fraunhoferhhi/vvenc>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [195] Zhou Wang, Alan C Bovik, Hamid R Sheikh, and Eero P Simoncelli. 2004. Image Quality Assessment: From Error Visibility to Structural Similarity. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing (TIP)* 13, 4 (2004), 600–612.
- [196] Zhihao Wang, Jian Chen, and Steven CH Hoi. 2020. Deep Learning for Image Super-Resolution: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 43, 10 (2020), 3365–3387.
- [197] WebRTC. 2011. Real-Time Communication for the Web. <https://webrtc.org/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [198] Nikolas Wehner, Anika Seufert, Tobias Hößfeld, and Michael Seufert. 2023. Explainable Data-Driven QoE Modelling with XAI. In *15th International Conference on Quality of Multimedia Experience (QoMEX)*. IEEE, 7–12.
- [199] Adam Wieckowski, Jens Brandenburg, Tobias Hinz, Christian Bartnik, Valeri George, Gabriel Hege, Christian Helmrich, Anastasia Henkel, Christian Lehmann, Christian Stoffers, et al. 2021. VVenC: An Open and Optimized VVC Encoder Implementation. In *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia & Expo (ICME)*. IEEE, 1–2.
- [200] Thomas Wiegand, Gary J Sullivan, Gisle Bjontegaard, and Ajay Luthra. 2003. Overview of the H. 264/AVC Video Coding Standard. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 13, 7 (2003), 560–576.
- [201] Lior Wolf, Tal Hassner, and Itay Maoz. 2011. Face Recognition in Unconstrained Videos with Matched Background Similarity. In *CVPR*. IEEE, 529–534.
- [202] Lior Wolf, Tal Hassner, and Itay Maoz. 2011. Face Recognition in Unconstrained Videos With Matched Background Similarity. In *CVPR*. IEEE, 529–534.
- [203] x264. 2024. The Best and Fastest H.264 Encoder. <https://code.videolan.org/videolan/x264>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [204] Junxu Xia, Geyao Cheng, Deke Guo, and Xiaolei Zhou. 2020. A QoE-aware Service-Enhancement Strategy for Edge Artificial Intelligence Applications. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7, 10 (2020), 9494–9506.
- [205] Junfeng Xie. 2024. Deep Q-Learning Aided Energy-Efficient Caching and Transmission for Adaptive Bitrate Video Streaming Over Dynamic Cellular Networks. *IEEE Access* (2024).
- [206] Qin Xin, Mamoun Alazab, Rubén González Crespo, and Carlos Enrique Montenegro-Marin. 2022. AI-based Quality of Service Optimization for Multimedia Transmission on Internet of Vehicles (IoV) Systems. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments* 52 (2022), 102055.
- [207] Xiph.org. 2024. Video Test Media [derf’s collection]. <https://media.xiph.org/video/derf/>. Retrieved: 2024-06-01.
- [208] Minrui Xu, Hongyang Du, Dusit Niyato, Jiawen Kang, Zehui Xiong, Shihwen Mao, Zhu Han, Abbas Jamalipour, Dong In Kim, Xuemin Shen, et al. 2024. Unleashing the Power of Edge-Cloud Generative AI in Mobile Networks: A Survey of AIGC Services. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials (COMST)* (2024).
- [209] Tianfan Xue, Baian Chen, Jiajun Wu, Donglai Wei, and William T Freeman. 2019. Video Enhancement with Task-oriented Flow. *International Journal of Computer Vision* 127 (2019), 1106–1125.
- [210] Francis Y Yan, Hudson Ayers, Chenzhi Zhu, Sadjad Fouladi, James Hong, Keyi Zhang, Philip Levis, and Keith Winstein. 2020. Learning in Situ: A Randomized Experiment in Video Streaming. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*. 495–511.
- [211] Peizhi Yan and Salimur Choudhury. 2021. Deep Q-learning Enabled Joint Optimization of Mobile Edge Computing Multi-level Task Offloading. *Computer Communications* 180 (2021), 271–283.
- [212] Jia Yang, Pi-Yan He, Hong Yang, Ya-Juan Xue, and Yan-Hua Jin. 2022. Machine Learning-Based Fast Transcoding for Low-Power Video Communication in Internet of Things. *Signal, Image and Video Processing* 16, 8 (2022), 2183–2191.
- [213] Abid Yaqoob, Ting Bi, and Gabriel-Miro Muntean. 2020. A Survey on Adaptive 360 Video Streaming: Solutions, Challenges and Opportunities. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials (COMST)* 22, 4 (2020), 2801–2838.
- [214] Xiaoqi Yin, Abhishek Jindal, Vyas Sekar, and Bruno Sinopoli. 2015. A Control-Theoretic Approach for Dynamic Adaptive Video Streaming Over HTTP. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Special Interest Group on Data Communication*. 325–338.

- [215] Xiaoqi Yin, Vyas Sekar, and Bruno Sinopoli. 2014. Toward a Principled Framework to Design Dynamic Adaptive Streaming Algorithms Over HTTP. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks*. 1–7.
- [216] Wenbo Yu, Miao Zhang, Zhi He, and Yi Shen. 2021. Convolutional Two-stream Generative Adversarial Network-based Hyperspectral Feature Extraction. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 60 (2021), 1–10.
- [217] Shijie Yue, Chenghua Li, Zhengyang Zhuge, and Ruixia Song. 2022. EESRNet: A Network for Energy Efficient Super-Resolution. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 602–618.
- [218] Siyue Zhang, Wei Yang Bryan Lim, Wei Chong Ng, Zehui Xiong, Dusit Niyato, Xuemin Sherman Shen, and Chunyan Miao. 2023. Towards Green Metaverse Networking: Technologies, Advancements and Future Directions. *IEEE Network* (2023).
- [219] Siyu Zhang, Wendong Mao, and Zhongfeng Wang. 2023. An Efficient Accelerator Based on Lightweight Deformable 3D-CNN for Video Super-Resolution. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* (2023).
- [220] Yun Zhang, Sam Kwong, and Shiqi Wang. 2020. Machine Learning Based Video Coding Optimizations: A Survey. *Information Sciences* 506 (2020), 395–423.
- [221] Yun Zhang, Sam Kwong, Xu Wang, Hui Yuan, Zhaoqing Pan, and Long Xu. 2015. Machine Learning-Based Coding Unit Depth Decisions for Flexible Complexity Allocation in High Efficiency Video Coding. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing (TIP)* 24, 7 (2015), 2225–2238.
- [222] Yun Zhang, Zhaoqing Pan, Na Li, Xu Wang, Gangyi Jiang, and Sam Kwong. 2017. Effective Data Driven Coding Unit Size Decision Approaches for HEVC Intra Coding. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology(TCSVT)* 28, 11 (2017), 3208–3222.
- [223] Chong Zheng, Shengheng Liu, Yongming Huang, and Luxi Yang. 2021. Hybrid Policy Learning for Energy-Latency Tradeoff in MEC-Assisted VR Video Service. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology (TVT)* 70, 9 (2021), 9006–9021.
- [224] Lujie Zhong, Xiang Ji, Zhaoxue Wang, Jiuren Qin, and Gabriel-Miro Muntean. 2022. A Q-Learning Driven Energy-Aware Multipath Transmission Solution for 5G Media Services. *IEEE Transactions on Broadcasting* 68, 2 (2022), 559–571.
- [225] Pengyuan Zhou, Lin Wang, Zhi Liu, Yanbin Hao, Pan Hui, Sasu Tarkoma, and Jussi Kangasharju. 2024. A Survey on Generative AI and LLM for Video Generation, Understanding, and Streaming. *arXiv preprint* (2024).
- [226] Sha Zhu, Kaoru Ota, and Mianxiong Dong. 2022. Energy-Efficient Artificial Intelligence of Things With Intelligent Edge. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 9, 10 (2022), 7525–7532.
- [227] Zoo. 2024. Topology. <http://www.topology-zoo.org/dataset.html>. Accessed: 2024-12-25.
- [228] Mihail Zverev, Pablo Garrido, Fátima Fernández, Josu Bilbao, Özgü Alay, Simone Ferlin, Anna Brunstrom, and Ramón Agüero. 2021. Robust QUIC: Integrating Practical Coding in a Low Latency Transport Protocol. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 138225–138244.