

Benchmarking Deep Learning Models for Object Detection on Edge Computing Devices

Daghash K. Alqahtani¹[0009-0001-5309-6996], Aamir Cheema²[0000-0003-2139-9121], and Adel N. Toosi^{1,2}[0000-0001-5655-5337]

¹ The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
{daghash.alqahtani@student, adel.toosi}@unimelb.edu.au

² Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
Aamir.Cheema@monash.edu

Abstract. Modern applications, such as autonomous vehicles, require deploying deep learning algorithms on resource-constrained edge devices for real-time image and video processing. However, there is limited understanding of the efficiency and performance of various object detection models on these devices. In this paper, we evaluate state-of-the-art object detection models, including YOLOv8 (Nano, Small, Medium), EfficientDet Lite (Lite0, Lite1, Lite2), and SSD (SSD MobileNet V1, SSDLite MobileDet). We deployed these models on popular edge devices like the Raspberry Pi 3, 4, and 5 with/without TPU accelerators, and Jetson Orin Nano, collecting key performance metrics such as energy consumption, inference time, and Mean Average Precision (mAP). Our findings highlight that lower mAP models such as SSD MobileNet V1 are more energy-efficient and faster in inference, whereas higher mAP models like YOLOv8 Medium generally consume more energy and have slower inference, though with exceptions when accelerators like TPUs are used. Among the edge devices, Jetson Orin Nano stands out as the fastest and most energy-efficient option for request handling, despite having the highest idle energy consumption. These results emphasize the need to balance accuracy, speed, and energy efficiency when deploying deep learning models on edge devices, offering valuable guidance for practitioners and researchers selecting models and devices for their applications.

Keywords: Deep Learning · Object Detection Models · Performance evaluation · Inference Time · Energy Efficiency · Accuracy · Edge.

1 Introduction

Object detection is crucial in computer vision for identifying and locating objects in images or videos. It helps organizations optimize and automate processes and has diverse applications in fields like autonomous vehicles, surveillance, retail, healthcare, agriculture, manufacturing, sports analytics, environmental monitoring, and smart cities. Object detection is fundamental to autonomous transportation, enabling precise recognition of pedestrians, obstacles, and other vehicles to ensure safe operation. In autonomous vehicles, for example, object

detectors identify the vehicle’s position, track other objects, and facilitate route planning. Onboard computing units and Internet of Things (IoT) sensors enable local, real-time data processing, allowing for rapid responses to avoid collisions. These capabilities highlight the significant value of object detection in enhancing the performance and safety of automated systems [1].

The field of object detection is marked by continuous technological progress, with ongoing refinement of detection algorithms to improve accuracy and speed in complex environments. The emergence of *edge computing* enables real-time object detection on devices like smartphones, drones, and IoT devices, reducing latency and cloud dependence. However, significant challenges remain in developing robust object detection systems for edge computing due to constrained resources and varying energy requirements. Researchers and industries must select appropriate models and edge devices to balance accuracy, processing speed, and energy consumption.

In this paper, we aim to evaluate the performance of most popular deep learning models for object detection across prominent edge devices, collecting key metrics such as energy consumption, inference time, and accuracy. Additionally, we provide insights for deploying these models on the investigated edge devices. Our **key contributions** can be summarized as follows:

- We developed object detection applications for processing images as a web service using Flask-API.
- We utilized different frameworks, including *PyTorch*, *TensorFlow Lite*, and *TensorRT*, to deploy our deep learning web service models on the edge devices including *Raspberry Pi* series, *Edge TPU*, and *Jetson Orin Nano*.
- We employed the FiftyOne tool to evaluate the *accuracy* of the object detection models and collected the mean Average Precision using COCO datasets for each model on each device.
- We conducted automated comprehensive performance measurement tests using the Locust tool and reported the *energy consumption* and *inference time* of various models including *YOLOv8*, *SSD*, and *EfficientDet Lite* models with different versions on the edge devices.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the edge computing and object detection deep learning architectures. Section 3 outlines the performance evaluation, including the evaluation metrics, experimental setup, and the results of our experiments. Section 4 presents the related work. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper and suggests future research directions.

2 Edge Devices, Frameworks and Model Formats

2.1 Edge Devices

Raspberry Pi: The Raspberry Pi is a line of single-board computers produced by the Raspberry Pi Foundation [8]. When connected to accessories like

a keyboard, mouse, and monitor, the Raspberry Pi becomes a low-cost personal computer. It is widely used for robotics, Internet of Things applications, and real-time image and video processing. The latest Raspberry Pi models include the Raspberry Pi 3 Model B+, Raspberry Pi 4, and Raspberry Pi 5. The Raspberry Pi 4 maintains compatibility with the previous Raspberry Pi 3 Model B+ while offering improvements in processor speed, multimedia capabilities, memory capacity, and connectivity. The Raspberry Pi 5 is the newest model, featuring significant enhancements in CPU and GPU performance as well as increased memory capacity and I/O bandwidth compared to the Raspberry Pi 4.

TPU Accelerator: The Coral USB Accelerator [6] is a USB device that functions as an Edge TPU co-processor for computational devices. It features a USB-C port, allowing it to connect to a host computer and accelerate machine learning inference tasks. The Edge TPU, an Application-Specific Integrated Circuit developed by Google, is designed to execute machine learning models on edge computing devices like the Raspberry Pi.

NVIDIA Jetson: The NVIDIA Jetson Orin Series represents the latest in developer boards for energy-efficient autonomous machinery. With up to 275 trillion operations per second (TOPS) and an 8X performance improvement over the previous generation, the Jetson Orin modules enable numerous concurrent AI inference pipelines. Their support for high-speed interfaces and multiple sensors makes them ideal for advanced robotics. The Orin Nano, the entry-level module in this series, focuses on low power consumption and cost efficiency while maintaining AI processing capabilities. It is suitable for edge AI devices, IoT devices, and embedded systems where space, power, and cost efficiency are critical [16].

2.2 Deep Learning Architectures for Object Detection

Deep learning-based object detection uses convolutional neural networks (CNNs), which replicate neural structures of the human brain with an input layer, multiple hidden layers, and an output layer. These networks, trained using supervised, semi-supervised, or unsupervised methods, achieve high speed and accuracy in detecting single or multiple objects due to their automated learning capabilities with minimal manual feature engineering. Early deep learning-based object detection models are categorized into one-stage and two-stage detectors. One-stage detectors predict both the bounding box and the object's category in a single network pass, enabling faster and more efficient real-time detection. Examples of one-stage object detection models include YOLO, SSD, and EfficientDet.

You Only Look Once (YOLO): Introduced in 2015 by Redmon et al. [17], the YOLO algorithm represents a significant advancement in real-time object detection. Unlike conventional methods that apply a classifier to multiple regions within an image, YOLO models treat detection as a single regression problem,

predicting bounding boxes and class probabilities from entire images in a single evaluation. This approach significantly improves detection speed, making YOLO ideal for real-time applications. The algorithm has evolved through several iterations, including YOLOv2, YOLOv3, YOLOv4, and the latest YOLOv8 developed by Ultralytics [19], each enhancing accuracy, speed, and the ability to detect a wider range of object sizes.

Single shot multibox detector (SSD): The SSD algorithm predicts multiple bounding boxes and their corresponding class scores in a single pass. It uses multiple feature maps from different network layers to perform detections at various scales. SSD’s key innovation is using feature maps from various network layers to predict detections at multiple scales, addressing the challenge of detecting objects of different sizes. Smaller feature maps detect larger objects, while larger feature maps detect smaller objects [14].

EfficientDet: Developed by Google’s Brain Team, EfficientDet is renowned for its efficiency and scalability. Built on the EfficientNet architecture, it scales the network’s depth, width, and resolution through a compound scaling method, enhancing performance while reducing computational cost. The model features a novel weighted bi-directional feature pyramid network for improved feature fusion and cross-scale connections. EfficientDet achieves superior results with fewer parameters and FLOPs. It includes seven variants, EfficientDet0 through EfficientDet6, and EfficientDet Lite models for embedded devices as detailed in [18].

2.3 Deep learning Frameworks

Deep learning frameworks play a crucial role in developing and deploying object detection models by providing comprehensive tools and functionalities. These frameworks facilitate building, training, and implementing object detection systems with pre-built models, data augmentation techniques, and utilities for various development stages. Examples include TensorFlow Lite, PyTorch, and TensorRT. They enable researchers and developers to efficiently manage the complexities of object detection tasks, from data preprocessing and model training to evaluation and deployment.

3 Performance Evaluation

In this study, we evaluate the performance of three prominent object detection models *YOLOv8*, *EfficientDet Lite*, and *SSD* on multiple edge devices, including Raspberry Pi 3, 4, 5, Pi 3 with TPU, Pi 4 with TPU, Pi 5 with TPU, and Jetson Orin Nano. The evaluation focuses on three key performance metrics: *inference time*, *energy consumption*, and *mean Average Precision (mAP)*. Next, we will introduce these metrics.

3.1 Metrics

Inference Time: This metric measures the time taken by each model from receiving the input image to producing detection results, excluding pre-processing or post-processing steps. The inference time is crucial for real-time object detection. We report the inference time in milliseconds for each model on each device, averaging over a series of test images for consistent and reliable measurements.

Energy Consumption: This metric evaluates the energy efficiency of each model on different edge devices. First, we measure the base energy consumption (BE) of the devices in an idle state for five minutes without running any computations. Next, we measure the total energy consumption (TE) for five minutes while running an object detection model. Reported in milliwatt-hours (mWh), the energy consumption per request excluding the base energy usage (EexcR) is determined by subtracting the base energy consumption from the total energy consumption and dividing this difference by the number of requests (NR) processed, as follows: $E_{excR} = \frac{TE - BE}{NR}$. This metric is calculated per request, as the energy consumption depends on the number of processed requests. Evaluating on a per-request basis is crucial for a fair comparison across the different platforms. This is particularly important for battery-powered devices.

Model Evaluation Using COCO Dataset: To determine the capabilities and accuracy of the YOLOv8, EfficientDet Lite, and SSD models, we use the COCO validation dataset of 5,000 images. The open-source FiftyOne [20] tool facilitates visualization, access to COCO data resources [13], and model evaluation. It calculates model accuracy by comparing detected objects to ground reference data. Accuracy is evaluated using four metrics: *Precision*, *Recall*, *F1 score*, and *COCO mean Average Precision (mAP)*.

3.2 Experimental Setup

Hardware and Device Setup: Our experimental setup includes various edge devices to evaluate the performance of object detection models as Table 1 shows. The devices tested are Raspberry Pi 3 Model B+ (1 GB LPDDR2 RAM), Raspberry Pi 4 Model B (4 GB LPDDR4-3200 SDRAM) and Raspberry Pi 5 (4 GB LPDDR4x RAM). These devices are selected for their popularity and affordability. To enhance computational power for deep learning tasks, we equip these Raspberry Pi models with Google Coral USB Accelerators (TPUs). For high-performance comparison, we include the NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano (4 GB RAM, integrated GPU). This allow us to compare devices with CPUs, TPUs, and GPUs. Additionally, We use a UM25C USB power meter with Bluetooth connectivity to measure the energy consumption of the edge devices.

Software and Frameworks: In our experimental setup, we utilize various software frameworks and tools to deploy and run object detection models on different

edge devices as Table 1 displays that. The choice of software and frameworks is influenced by the need to optimize performance for each specific device, including those with CPUs, TPUs, and GPUs. We use PyTorch to deploy and run YOLOv8 models on the Raspberry Pi 3, Raspberry Pi 4, and Raspberry Pi 5. To leverage the capabilities of TPUs, the YOLOv8 models are converted from PyTorch to TensorFlow Lite (TFLite) format and compiled to run on Raspberry Pis with TPUs. Please note that to run YOLOv8 on a TPU, we have compressed the model size to ensure it is executable on the TPU. This means the image size is reduced from 640x640 to 320x320. For deployment on the NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano, the YOLOv8 models are converted to TensorRT format to optimize for the GPU.

EfficientDet Lite and SSD models are initially in TFLite format from Coral [7] to be deployed on the Raspberry Pi devices. These models are compiled to run on TPUs in the respective Raspberry Pi devices. For the NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano, EfficientDet Lite and SSD models are converted from TFLite to TensorRT format for optimized performance on the GPU.

The operating systems used are Raspberry Pi OS (Bookwork - 64 bit) for the Raspberry Pi devices and Jetson Linux (Ubuntu-based) for the NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano. Additional libraries and tools, such as OpenCV for image processing and FiftyOne for model evaluation, are utilized to facilitate the experiments. To detect objects in an image, we write Python code and utilize the Flask-RESTful library to run this code as a service with an API URL. This approach allow us to deploy the object detection functionality as a web service, enabling easy integration and testing across different edge devices.

Table 1: Edge Devices, Models and Frameworks.

Edge Device	RAM	YOLOv8 Framework	EfficientDet Framework	SSD Framework
Raspberry Pi 3 Model B+	1 GB	PyTorch	TFLite	TFLite
Raspberry Pi 4 Model B	4 GB	PyTorch	TFLite	TFLite
Raspberry Pi 5	4 GB	PyTorch	TFLite	TFLite
Pi 3 Model B+ with TPU	1 GB	TFLite	TFLite	TFLite
Pi 4 Model B with TPU	4 GB	TFLite	TFLite	TFLite
Pi 5 with TPU	4 GB	TFLite	TFLite	TFLite
Jetson Orin Nano	4 GB	TensorRT	TensorRT	TensorRT

Experimental Procedure: The procedure for evaluating the object detection models involved several steps as Fig. 1 presents. First, the base energy consumption for each device was measured by running an energy reader Python script on a separate device for five minutes without any computational load. Second, the Locust file was used to send requests sequentially, with each new request sent immediately after the previous response, for five minutes, during which the total energy consumption was measured using the energy reader script, and the average inference time was calculated from the responses along with the number of requests. All this data was automatically written to a CSV file by the Locust

file. Next, to automate the testing, a bash script on the agent device ran the object detection service on the edge device, followed by the Locust file. Upon completion, the script terminated the service and proceeded to the next model, ensuring consistent testing across all devices. Experiments were repeated three times for each model on each device, with the average values used for the final analysis. Finally, the accuracy measurement involved separate Python scripts using the FiftyOne tool to download the COCO validation dataset, and the object detection models were run on this dataset to calculate accuracy metrics, including Precision, Recall, F1 score, and mean Average Precision, which were recorded in a CSV file.




Fig. 1: Experimental Software and Hardware Setup.

3.3 Experimental Results

Energy Consumption: This section discusses the base energy consumption, total energy consumption per request, and energy consumption per request excluding the base energy for various devices.

To start with Fig. 2(a) shows the baseline energy consumption of selected edge devices in mWh. Comparing the different Raspberry Pi models, Pi3 consumes more energy (270 mWh) than both Pi4 (199 mWh) and Pi5 (217 mWh). This indicates an improvement in energy efficiency in newer models. However, when considering the TPU variants, the energy consumption is similar, with both Pi3 with TPU and Pi4 with TPU consuming roughly 300 mWh, while Pi5 with TPU shows reduced consumption at 261 mWh. Notably, the Orin Nano device demonstrates the highest baseline energy consumption at 362 mWh.

In addition, measuring the energy consumption per request, excluding the base energy, for the investigated object detection models on the evaluated edge devices yields interesting results. Firstly, as Fig. 2(b) presents the outcomes on Pi3, the Det_lite models exhibit energy consumption ranging from 0.41 mWh to 0.98 mWh, while SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consume 0.31 mWh and 0.41

mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models demonstrate higher energy demands, spanning from 1.22 mWh to 5.87 mWh. When the TPU is integrated with Pi3, as Fig. 2(c) displays, the Det_lite models consume between 0.32 mWh and 0.61 mWh, and the SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models show reduced consumption of 0.11 mWh and 0.13 mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models also show decreased energy consumption, ranging from 0.23 mWh to 0.43 mWh.

Secondly, Pi4 introduces improved energy efficiency compared to Pi3, with Det_lite models consuming between 0.14 mWh and 0.33 mWh, and SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consuming 0.11 mWh and 0.14 mWh, respectively, as Fig. 2(d) shows. The YOLO8 models on Pi4 range from 0.77 mWh to 2.92 mWh. With the addition of the TPU, Pi4’s energy consumption decreases further; Det_lite models consume between 0.13 mWh and 0.19 mWh, and SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consume 0.10 mWh and 0.11 mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models range from 0.26 mWh to 0.32 mWh on Pi4 with TPU, as Fig. 2(e) presents.

Furthermore, Pi5 displays similar energy usage patterns with P4 as Fig. 2(f) shows. Det_lite models consuming between 0.24 mWh and 0.47 mWh, and SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consuming 0.22 mWh and 0.24 mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models on Pi5 range from 1.02 mWh to 3.58 mWh. Fig. 2(g) presents the integration of TPU with Pi5, with Det_lite models consuming between 0.18 mWh and 0.30 mWh, and SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consuming 0.13 mWh and 0.14 mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models range from 0.47 mWh to 0.62 mWh on Pi5 with TPU.

Finally, the Jetson Orin Nano as Fig. 2(h) demonstrates the lowest energy consumption per request across all models, with Det_lite models consuming between 0.09 mWh and 0.14 mWh, and SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models consuming 0.01 mWh and 0.06 mWh, respectively. The YOLO8 models on Jetson Orin Nano range from 0.13 mWh to 0.22 mWh.

Key insights: Pi3 devices generally exhibit higher energy consumption compared to Pi4 and Pi5 models, indicating an improvement in energy efficiency in the newer models. The addition of TPUs consistently reduces the energy consumption for object detection tasks across all Pi models, particularly in Pi4 and Pi5. However, it is important to note that the addition of TPU has increased the base energy consumption of these devices by 9%, 46%, and 20% for Pi 3, 4, and 5, respectively. Among all the models tested, YOLO8_m has the highest energy consumption per request, while SSD_v1 consumes the lowest energy per request.

Inference Time: This section analyzes the inference times of object detection models. The measurements, reported in milliseconds, reveal distinct performance patterns across these platforms. Beginning with Pi3, the SSD_v1 model exhibits the lowest inference time at 427 ms among all evaluated models. While the Det_lite models require longer inference times compared to SSD_v1 and SSD_lite, they still outperform all variants of the YOLO8 model. Notably, the YOLO8 models demonstrate the highest inference times, with the maximum recorded at 12,960 ms. When the Coral USB Accelerator is integrated with the




Fig. 2: Base Energy Energy Consumption per request excluding the base energy / Total Energy consumption per request for different edge devices.

Raspberry Pi3, as shown in Fig. 3, the inference times for SSD and YOLO8 models improve significantly, with SSD_v1 remaining the fastest at 61 ms. In contrast, Det_lite2 exhibits the highest inference time, taking 1,576 ms.

The results reveal that on Pi4, the SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models achieve the fastest inference times at 209 ms and 292 ms, respectively. Conversely, the YOLOv8 models across all versions are slower than the Det_lite0 and Lite1 models, with YOLO8_m representing the slowest at 3671 ms, as shown in Fig. 3. The addition of the Edge TPU to Pi4 significantly reduces the inference times of the SSD and YOLO8 models, with the SSD_v1 model achieving the lowest inference time of 12 ms, while the Det_lite2 model has the highest at 188 ms.

Similarly, on Pi5, the SSD_v1 and SSD_lite models are the fastest, with inference times of 93 ms and 127 ms, respectively. Although the Det_lite models are slower than the SSD models, they are still faster than the YOLO8 models, with YOLO8_m exhibiting the highest inference time of 1348 ms. The integration of the Edge TPU to Pi5 further improves the performance of the SSD and




Fig. 3: Inference Time per request for different edge devices.

YOLO8 models, with SSD_v1 achieving the lowest inference time of 10 ms and Det_lite2 having the highest at 139 ms.

Finally, on Jetson Orin Nano, the YOLO8_n model demonstrates the minimum inference time of 16 ms, while the Det_lite and SSD models have similar inference times within the range of 20 ms. The YOLO8_m model remains the slowest at 50 ms, as presented in Fig. 3.

Key insights: SSD_v1 exhibits the most rapid inference times when deployed across various edge devices. The incorporation of TPU, substantially enhances the performance of the evaluated models. Conversely, YOLO8_m generally demonstrates the slowest inference times among the tested configurations.

Accuracy: This subsection presents the accuracy measurements. The mean Average Precision (mAP) on the Raspberry Pi devices varied across model sizes, as shown in Fig. 4. While the SSD_v1 model has the lowest mAP at 19, the YOLO8_m model achieves the highest mAP of 44 among all evaluated models. The Det_lite0, lite1, and lite2 models exhibit medium mAPs ranging from 26 to 33. Both SSD_lite and YOLO8_n have similar mAPs around 30, while

YOLO8_s has a higher mAP of approximately 40. When deploying these models on the Pi devices equipped with TPU accelerators, the Det_lite and SSD models, including all their versions, demonstrate comparable mAPs to those observed on the standalone Pi devices, as illustrated in Fig. 4. However, running the YOLO8 models on Pis with TPU accelerators resulted in a reduction in accuracy, with YOLO8_n having the lowest mAP of 16. Furthermore, the mAP of YOLO8 object detection models on Jetson Orin Nano follow a similar accuracy pattern as on the Raspberry Pi, ranging from 31 to 44, as presented in Fig. 4. In contrast, the SSD_v1, SSD_lite, Det_lite0, Det_lite1, and Det_lite2 models exhibit a slight decrease in mAP compared to the Raspberry Pi and Edge TPU results. The SSD_v1 model has the lowest mAP at 16, while the SSD_lite model achieves 27. The Det_lite0 model has an accuracy of 23, while the Det_lite1 and Det_lite2 models perform better, with mAPs of 28 and 32, respectively.

Key insights: YOLO8_m demonstrates consistently superior accuracy compared to other evaluated models across various device platforms. Conversely, the SSD_v1 model often exhibits the lowest mean Average Precision (mAP) among the tested models. The use of TPU accelerators on the Pi devices yields similar accuracy levels for the Det_lite and SSD model families, but results in a reduction in accuracy for the YOLO8 models. Jetson Orin Nano exhibits comparable accuracy patterns for the YOLO8 models to the other setups, but shows a slightly lower mAP for the remaining models in comparison to the Raspberry Pi and TPU-equipped configurations.




Fig. 4: Accuracy (mAP) for different edge devices.

Energy Consumption vs Inference Time: This section highlights the relationship between energy consumption and inference time for object detection models on edge devices, essential for optimizing performance, extending battery life, meeting real-time application needs, and reducing costs. Deploying SSD models on devices shows that energy consumption and inference time are largely linearly correlated for various models. As shown in the Fig. 5(a-b), while Pi3 performs the worst in both metrics, Pi5 with TPU, Pi4 with TPU, and Jetson Orin Nano perform equally well, forming a Pareto front. While Pi5 with TPU




Fig. 5: Energy consumption per request (excluding base energy) versus inference time for various object detection models (A fitted linear regression line is shown, which appears curved due to the logarithmic scale of the inference time).

has better inference times, Jetson Orin Nano demonstrates better energy efficiency. Pi3 with TPU comes next, and Pi4 and Pi5 are comparable, before the worst performance by Pi3. When running the Det_Lite and YOLO8 models, the edge devices exhibit a linear correlation between the two metrics. Jetson Orin Nano outperforms the other devices, while Pi3 demonstrates the poorest performance in terms of both inference time and energy consumption. However, Pi5 shows outlier results with YOLO8, deviating from the overall regression trend as Fig. 5(c-h) presents.

Energy Consumption vs Accuracy: This section briefly presents the results of energy consumption versus accuracy for the evaluated object detection models on edge devices. When deploying SSD and Det_Lite models on edge devices, the accuracy remains consistent across all devices, with a minor reduction on the Jetson Orin Nano. Jetson Orin Nano is the most energy-efficient device, while Pi3 is the least efficient. For YOLO8, accuracy remains stable across all




Fig. 6: Energy consumption per request (excluding base energy) versus accuracy for various object detection models

devices, except for Pis with TPUs, which show a significant reduction due to the compression process required for execution on TPUs. Overall, Jetson Orin Nano achieves the best results in terms of accuracy and energy consumption, whereas Pi3 performs the worst as Fig. 6 displays.

Inference Time vs Accuracy: This section summarizes the results of the evaluation of inference time and accuracy for the investigated object detection models on different edge devices. When deploying SSD models, the accuracy remains consistent across all evaluated devices, with a slight decrease observed on Jetson Orin Nano. Pi5 with TPU exhibits the fastest inference time, while Pi3 is the slowest. A similar trend is observed for the Det_Lite models, with Jetson Orin Nano demonstrating the fastest inference time. For the YOLO8 models, the accuracy remains stable across most devices, except for the Pis with TPUs, which show a significant reduction in accuracy due to the compression process required for execution on these platforms. Overall, Jetson Orin Nano achieves




Fig. 7: Inference time versus accuracy for various object detection models

the best performance in terms of accuracy and inference time for the YOLOv8 models, while Pi3 exhibits the poorest results as shown in Fig. 7.

Energy Consumption vs Inference Time vs Accuracy This section provides a concise summary of the performance evaluation results for the investigated object detection models across various edge computing platforms. The 3D plots in the Fig. 8 depict that with the SSD models, Pi5 with TPU, Pi4 with TPU, and Jetson Orin Nano demonstrate comparable capabilities. However, Pi5 with TPU and Pi4 with TPU are preferred options as they do not compromise accuracy, unlike the Jetson Orin Nano. Regarding the Det_Lite models, Jetson Orin Nano emerges as the optimal choice, exhibiting superior energy efficiency and inference speed, with only a minor impact on accuracy. For the YOLO8 models, Jetson Orin Nano is the most suitable choice among the evaluated devices, delivering the best overall performance in terms of energy consumption, inference time, and accuracy.




Fig. 8: Energy consumption per request (excluding base energy) versus inference time versus accuracy for various object detection models

4 Related Work

This section provides an overview of the most relevant research on object detection models for edge computing devices and compares our work with existing related work as shown in Table 2. To the best of our knowledge, our work is a unique study due to its comprehensive evaluation of various object detection models and edge devices.

Cantero et al. [4] examine quantization levels and model architectures (SSD, CenterNet, EfficientDet, Faster R-CNN) on the NXP i-MX8M-PLUS and Google Coral Dev Board with EdgeTPU, using metrics like warm-up time, inference time, and accuracy. In contrast, our study measures energy consumption and evaluates YOLOv8 on Raspberry Pi 3, Pi 4, Pi 5, and Jetson Orin Nano. Also, Kamath and Renuka [10] examine EfficientDet models with integer quantization on Raspberry Pi, recommending EfficientDet0 and EfficientDet1 for resource-constrained devices. Our study includes a broader range of models and also measures energy consumption.

5 Conclusions and Future Direction

In this paper, we evaluated the performance of deep learning object detection models, including YOLOv8 (Nano, Small, Medium), EfficientDet Lite (Lite0, Lite1, Lite2), and SSD (SSD MobileNet V1, SSDLite MobileDet), on edge devices like Raspberry Pi 3, 4, and 5 (with/without TPU accelerators) and Jetson Orin Nano. We developed an object detection application and deployed models across these devices using frameworks like TensorFlow Lite, Edge TPU, PyTorch, and TensorRT. We collected the mean Average Precision (mAP) metric and assessed the models' performance in terms of inference time and energy consumption.

Our evaluation reveals a trade-off between accuracy, energy consumption, and inference time. The SSD_v1 model had the lowest energy consumption and fastest inference time but was the least accurate. Jetson Orin Nano was the fastest and most energy-efficient device for YOLOv8 models without compromising accuracy. However, converting SSD and EfficientDet_Lite models to TensorRT framework reduced their accuracy. Edge TPU accelerator improved the performance of SSD and EfficientDet Lite models without affecting accuracy but significantly decreased the accuracy of YOLOv8 models.

For future work, we will examine different quantized models, such as int8 and float16, when deploying them on Raspberry Pi devices and Jetson Orin Nano, as these optimizations might significantly impact the results.

References

1. Balasubramaniam, A., Pasricha, S.: Object detection in autonomous vehicles: Status and open challenges. arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07706 (2022)
2. Baller, S.P., Jindal, A., Chadha, M., Gerndt, M.: Deepedgebench: Benchmarking deep neural networks on edge devices. In: 2021 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E). pp. 20–30. IEEE (2021)
3. Bulut, A., Ozdemir, F., Bostanci, Y.S., Soyturk, M.: Performance evaluation of recent object detection models for traffic safety applications on edge. In: Proceedings of the 2023 5th International Conference on Image Processing and Machine Vision. pp. 1–6 (2023)
4. Cantero, D., Esnaola-Gonzalez, I., Miguel-Alonso, J., Jauregi, E.: Benchmarking object detection deep learning models in embedded devices. *Sensors* **22**(11), 4205 (2022)
5. Chen, C.W., Ruan, S.J., Lin, C.H., Hung, C.C.: Performance evaluation of edge computing-based deep learning object detection. In: Proceedings of the 2018 VII International Conference on Network, Communication and Computing. pp. 40–43 (2018)
6. Coral: Usb accelerator datasheet. Tech. rep., Google LLC, <https://coral.ai/docs/accelerator/datasheet/> (2019)
7. Coral: Object detection (May 2024), <https://coral.ai/models/object-detection/>
8. Foundation, R.P.: About us (May 2024), <https://www.raspberrypi.org/about/>
9. Galliera, R., Suri, N.: Object detection at the edge: Off-the-shelf deep learning capable devices and accelerators. *Procedia Computer Science* **205**, 239–248 (2022)

10. Kamath, V., Renuka, A.: Performance analysis of the pretrained efficientdet for real-time object detection on raspberry pi. In: 2021 International Conference on Circuits, Controls and Communications (CCUBE). pp. 1–6. IEEE (2021)
11. Kang, P., Somtham, A.: An evaluation of modern accelerator-based edge devices for object detection applications. *Mathematics* **10**(22), 4299 (2022)
12. Lema, D.G., Usamentiaga, R., García, D.F.: Quantitative comparison and performance evaluation of deep learning-based object detection models on edge computing devices. *Integration* **95**, 102127 (2024)
13. Lin, T.Y., Maire, M., Belongie, S., Hays, J., Perona, P., Ramanan, D., Dollár, P., Zitnick, C.L.: Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*. pp. 740–755. Springer (2014)
14. Liu, W., Anguelov, D., Erhan, D., Szegedy, C., Reed, S., Fu, C.Y., Berg, A.C.: Ssd: Single shot multibox detector. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*. pp. 21–37. Springer (2016)
15. Magalhães, S.C., dos Santos, F.N., Machado, P., Moreira, A.P., Dias, J.: Benchmarking edge computing devices for grape bunches and trunks detection using accelerated object detection single shot multibox deep learning models. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* **117**, 105604 (2023)
16. Nvidia: Nvidia jetson orin (May 2024), <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/autonomous-machines/embedded-systems/jetson-orin/>
17. Redmon, J., Divvala, S., Girshick, R., Farhadi, A.: You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 779–788 (2016)
18. Tan, M., Pang, R., Le, Q.V.: Efficientdet: Scalable and efficient object detection. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 10781–10790 (2020)
19. Ultralytics: Home (2024), <https://docs.ultralytics.com/>
20. Voxel51: Fiftyone (May 2024), <https://voxel51.com/fiftyone/>
21. Zagitov, A., Chebotareva, E., Toshev, A., Magid, E.: Comparative analysis of neural network models performance on low-power devices for a real-time object detection task. *Computer* **48**(2) (2024)