

# Energy-Efficient Computation with DVFS using Deep Reinforcement Learning for Multi-Task Systems in Edge Computing

Xinyi Li<sup>†\*</sup>, Ti Zhou<sup>‡\*</sup>, Haoyu Wang<sup>§</sup> and Man Lin<sup>¶</sup>

**Abstract**—Finding an optimal energy-efficient policy that is adaptable to underlying edge devices while meeting deadlines for tasks has always been challenging. This research studies generalized systems with multi-task, multi-deadline scenarios with reinforcement learning-based DVFS for energy saving for periodic soft real-time applications on edge devices. This work addresses the limitation of previous work that models a periodic system as a single task and single-deadline scenario, which is too simplified to cope with complex situations. The method encodes time series data in the Linux kernel into information that is easy to interpret for reinforcement learning, allowing the system to generate DVFS policies to adapt system patterns based on the general workload. For encoding, we present two different methods for comparison. Both methods use only one performance counter: system utilization, and the kernel only needs minimal information from the userspace. Our method is implemented on Jetson Nano Board (2GB) and is tested with three fixed multitask workloads, which are three, five, and eight tasks in the workload, respectively. For randomness and generalization, we also designed a random workload generator to build different multitask workloads to test. Based on the test results, our method could save 3%-10% power compared to Linux built-in governors.

**Index Terms**—Soft real-time system, Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling, Reinforcement Learning

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. System Model Context

Soft real-time systems are often used for processing periodic tasks that are time-constrained but not strictly, and they have many applications. Here are some examples: optimized control software for automobiles [1] involving periodical sensing, computing, and driving tasks that have real-time requirements; a smart-farm system where most communication is periodic [2]; and a system that periodically monitors of soil health [3].

Department of Computer Science, St. Francis Xavier University, Canada. Email: <sup>†</sup>x2021gim@stfx.ca, <sup>‡</sup>tizhou1@cs.stonybrook.edu, <sup>§</sup>x2020fcw@stfx.ca, <sup>¶</sup>mclin@stfx.ca.

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

The research is supported by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

A preprint appears at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.19434>

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

For these systems, performance and energy are two indicators that interest researchers. A previous work [4] modelled them as a single task with a single deadline system and proposed a model-free method to save energy for the system while ensuring performance. However, this modelling method has its limitations because of oversimplification. In real-world applications, there is usually more than one task in one period. Some of these tasks could contain dependencies that need to be executed sequentially, such as getting and processing data [5] [6] [7]. Some tasks can be executed in parallel, such as the system using multiple sensors which can acquire data simultaneously [8] [9] [10].

The previous work [4] could not adequately model the complex situation with only a single task and a single deadline. In this work, we study systems that have multiple tasks in one period, and each of these tasks has its deadlines.

### B. Problem Statement and Proposed Method

We consider multi-tasks in a task set that runs periodically. Each task  $task_i$  has its timestamp of start  $start_i$ , execution time  $exet_i$ , timestamp of finish  $finish_i$  and deadline  $ddl_i$ . For simplicity, we assume each task is independent of the other and their startup depends only on the predefined setting time. During each period, the task set is executed once for a total deadline time of  $T$ , which is the deadline for the last task. Others' deadlines cannot exceed  $T$ .

Fig. 1 gives a detailed example of the type of systems studied in this paper. In this example, a real-time task set consists of five tasks that run on a device with four cores. This series of tasks runs periodically on the system. Our aim is to find a adaptable policy that can save as much system energy as possible without causing tasks to miss their deadlines on the multi-core system. The only reason a deadline is missing on a single-tasking system is that the system dose not run with a high enough frequency. However, various situations may cause a timeout during a run on multicore systems, as shown in Fig. 1. On a multi-core system, a task may miss the deadline because appropriate frequencies are not used, the same as on single-tasking systems. A previous task on the same core or tasks on other cores that have migrated to this core may also cause the deadline to be missed. Thus, in a multi-task system,




Fig. 1. Deadline Missing Example: A Multi-Task set with Multi-Deadline on Multi-Core

the causes for task timeouts become much more complex. How can the frequencies be managed without causing tasks to miss their deadlines and save as much energy as possible? Possible solutions are constructing offline mathematical models [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] or solving the problem automatically with machine learning-based methods [16] [17] [18] [19] [20]. [21] [22] [4]

To solve this problem, we propose to combine Reinforcement Learning (RL) and Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS) with an encoding of system state to capture the deadline of multi-tasks and multi-core system status and make predictions. DVFS is an energy-saving method which adapts voltage and frequency dynamically to satisfy the system's needs. Linux has some built-in DVFS governors [23], such as *Ondemand* and *Conservative*. They make predictions based on the utilization in the previous period, that is, they assume the next period is the same as the previous one. Also, they adjust the frequency based on the max load of the system. Our method uses Double Deep Q Learning (DDQN) [24] to train a DVFS policy since every execution of the task set which reaches  $T$  time could be seen as an episode. This task set will be executed each period which indicates that the events that happened in each period are almost the same. The governor could predict the events and system states once a good policy is driven.

### C. Method Overview

An overview of our method is shown in Fig. 2. In the Linux kernel, we insert an encoder and neural network. The encoder is responsible for encoding the system information from the last period and the observations from this period. The encoded data will be sent to networks with frequency as action to calculate the corresponding Q value. Based on the max Q value, the governor chooses the corresponding frequency for

the next period. If training is required, all the data will be recorded and sent to userspace to update the networks. The new network will be sent to the kernel for testing. After around 400 trainings, the governor could get a good policy.




Fig. 2. An overview of our proposed method.

Our proposed method is more accurate than traditional Linux built-in governors based on the following reasons. Our method uses the temporal series information in the kernel including average and max utilization. While the Linux built-in governors only use max load from the last period which means they have little information and do not have an overall judgement of the workload and system status.

Compared with the previous method for a single task and single deadline situation [4], our new method is not a pure model-free strategy as the task number needs to be passed to the kernel. Besides this information, the method could encode the system parameters to useful information which be learnt by RL. We are the first to propose a method that is applied to multitasking with multiple deadlines in a soft real-time system which can save 3% - 10% power compared with Linux built-in governor.

## II. PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, each part of our proposed method will be demonstrated in detail. Same as [4], the structure of the

method includes modules in both kernel and user space. The Linux kernel consists of two parts for the driven policy to make decisions, one is the temporal encoder for building the environment state, and the other is the neural network for calculating the corresponding Q value. The training module is in userspace, using the reinforcement learning method, Double Deep Q Network. Fig. 3 shows the information that is delivered between userspace and kernel.




Fig. 3. Interaction between userspace and kernel.

#### A. Temporal Encoder

Each time the governor makes the decision, it could get information from the system and userspace. Based on these parameters, the governor could make a decision to adjust the frequency. The parameters observed from the system are CPU utilization, the runtime of the CPU so far, and the total time of it so far. The CPU total time consists of CPU runtime and CPU idle time. The parameters get from userspace is the label for each task, which marks each task's three possible execution statuses: has not started (0), is in progress (1) or has completed (2). This information consists of the time series that the governor observed. We have two encoding methods for the time series. The first encoder is for networks which have one layer Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) and a two-layer Multilayer Perceptron (MLP). The output of GRU will be sent to MLP for processing. This is the final encoder in our proposed method and we use PRO. for abbreviation. For comparison, we have another encoder just for the network, which consists of only a two-layer MLP. We use PROM. as an abbreviation for the method using this encoder.

1) *Temporal Encoder (TEGM) for Network using GRU and MLP*: The time series observed at time  $t$  is encoded as five components,  $s_t = (p1_t, p2_t, i_t, u_t, c_t)$ .  $p1_t$  captures in what frequency and load-interval that the system is currently active and the corresponding time spent. It is represented as an array based on the period from the last governor's decision-making time. For each frequency and each max-load-interval, the corresponding array element represents the active time in

this combination. For example, if we have two frequencies to select, high frequency and low frequency, and the max load is divided into two intervals, one is between  $[0, 60]$  and the other is  $[60, 100]$ , then the array will have four elements. The element is the period time if the current system runs with the corresponding frequency and load, otherwise it will be 0. This element avoids the drawbacks of the traditional governor, which selects the frequency based only on the load. It segments the load and is related to the frequency so that, at the end of the task, even with low system load, the frequency needs to be increased to avoid timeouts, thus avoiding situation (a) in Fig. 1.

$p2_t$  is a multi-dimensional array denoting the start and finish time stamp for each task. One sub-array consists of these two pieces of information for one task. The time stamps are all timed from the start of the first task. The aim of designing this element is to let the system better capture the task pattern in each period since the predefined start time of each task is hidden for the kernel. Suppose there is a period in which one of the tasks starts at a different time. In that case, the system can potentially surmise that the task could be affected by other tasks and thus have the possibility of a timeout, as shown in situations (b) and (c) in Fig. 1.

These two  $p_t$ 's comprise the information about multitasking.  $p1_t$  is designed to obtain the influence on system frequency and load of all tasks currently being performed. Thus, the system could implicitly infer from  $p1_t$  about the number of tasks currently being executed.  $p2_t$  is to give the system an overall control over the execution phase of the task set. Based on the start time and end time of each task, the system can get the tasks that have been completed, those that are in the process of execution, and those that have not yet started.

$i_t$  is an instance observation, which is a two-element array representing the maximum load and average load during the current period. This information can help the system understand the load status of multitasks currently being executed on the multi-core system.

$u_t$  is the average utilized run time of the entire system accumulated so far. It is obtained by multiplying the time of each time period by the average load over that time period.  $u_t$  represents the overall average utilization compared to the total time consumed,  $c_t$ , described below.

$c_t$  is the consumed time from the beginning of the entire task set. Combining this information with  $p2_t$  and  $u_t$ , the system could get control of the execution status of the whole task set.

Overall, the difficulty of multitasking compared to the single task situation is the handling of the information of multiple tasks. Here we use  $p_t$  to solve this problem, which is separated into two parts.  $p1_t$  is used to get information about the current system, and  $p2_t$  is used to get information about the execution of each task so far.  $u_t$  is to get the current load of the system. Both  $i_t$  and  $c_t$  are designed to get the execution status of the whole task set. The general calculating method is shown in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Temporal Encoder (TEGM) for network with GRU and MLP
 

---

- 1: **INPUT:** The label  $label_i$  sent from userspace for each task, the system observation of the last period ( $freq, util_{max}, util_{avg}$ ) and time consumption of last period  $t$
  - 2:  $s_{t-1} = (p1_{t-1}, p2_{t-1}, i_{t-1}, u_{t-1}, c_{t-1})$
  - 3: **OUTPUT:**  $s_t$
  - 4:  $p1_t[freq][load] = t$
  - 5: **for** each label  $label_i$  **do**
  - 6:   **if**  $label_i$  is 1 **then**
  - 7:      $p2_t[i][start] = c_{t-1}$
  - 8:   **else if**  $label_i$  is 2 **then**
  - 9:      $p2_t[i][end] = c_{t-1}$
  - 10:   **end if**
  - 11: **end for**
  - 12:  $i_t = (util_{max}, util_{avg})$
  - 13:  $u_t = u_{t-1} + t \times util_{avg}$
  - 14:  $c_t = c_{t-1} + t$
  - 15:  $s_t = (p1_t, p2_t, i_t, u_t, c_t)$
- 

Fig. 4 shows an example of using this encoder with real system data. The figure shows the runtime situation of a three-task task set. The three tasks are the same and start at 0, 0.3, 0.7 second, the corresponding deadlines are 0.3, 0.4, 0.5 seconds. The vertical dash lines in the figure show the deadlines. The orange broken line is the frequency and the point on the line is the time that the governor makes the decision. The lateral distance between points is a period of time. The blue block is the max utilization while the slash is the average utilization for that period of time. This figure is the data that the governor makes the 17th decision.

2) *Temporal Encoder (TEM) for Network only using MLP:* The encoding method is shown in Algorithm 2. Only the  $p_t$  is different in this encoder, all other parts are the same as TEGM Encoding.  $p_t$  in this encoding only has one part which is the accumulated execution time for each task, and dividing the time into multiple parts based on different frequencies and different loads.  $p_t$  in TEM encoding is the same as  $p1_t$  in TEGM encoding, but has more details for each task.

Fig. 5 shows how the governor made the 17th decision using this encoder.

This coding method is more intuitive and simpler compared to the other method, but less information is obtained. This encoding is suitable for small task sets.

### B. Inference Module in Kernel

The policy is derived through the reinforcement learning method, specifically the double deep Q learning. Like the previous work, the kernel only contains the inference part, which involves using the neural network to calculate the Q value for each candidate frequency. The governor will select




Fig. 4. TEGM example.

---

**Algorithm 2** Temporal Encoder (TEM) For MLP
 

---

- 1: **INPUT:** The label  $label_i$  sent from userspace for each task, the system observation of the current period ( $freq, util_{max}, util_{avg}$ ) and time consumption for this period  $t$
  - 2:  $s_{t-1} = (p_{t-1}, i_{t-1}, u_{t-1}, c_{t-1})$
  - 3: **OUTPUT:**  $s_t$
  - 4: **for** each label  $label_i$  **do**
  - 5:   **if**  $label_i$  is 1 **then**
  - 6:      $p_t[i][freq][load] = p_{t-1}[i][freq][load] + t$
  - 7:   **end if**
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9:  $i_t = (util_{max}, util_{avg})$
  - 10:  $u_t = u_{t-1} + t \times util_{avg}$
  - 11:  $c_t = c_{t-1} + t$
  - 12:  $s_t = (p_t, i_t, u_t, c_t)$
- 

the the frequency with maximum Q value for the next period of time.

The system running status is encoded as the state. As describe in Seciton II-A,  $s_t$  is consisted of  $p_t, i_t, u_t, c_t$ . The way to map the encoding to the frequency selected is to use neural networks. The two different encoding methods use different networks. Each time the governor makes the decision,  $(s_t, freq_{next})$  is saved in the sequence  $\phi$ . If this sequence is used for training purposes, it will be sent to userspace for training.

For the first encoding method, a layer GRU is used to process  $p1_t$ .  $p1_t$  is the data obtained at each system moment. Processing this time series data with GRU allows for the capture of temporal features well. The length of  $p1_t$  is independent






Fig. 5. TEM example.

of the number of tasks in the task set, so the input to the GRU can have a fixed size.

The data obtained through GRU processing,  $pt\_fused$ , is processed along with other data by a two-layer MLP. The candidate frequency is also fed into the MLP as an action to calculate the Q value. Then the governor selected based on the maximum Q value.

For the second method, the state and candidate actions are all processed through MLP. The problem is that the length sequence generated by this kind of encoding method is highly dependent on the number of tasks. The number of input nodes of MLP is proportional to the length of the tasks. Thus, it will be hard for the MLP to process a large scale of task sets. When the number of tasks increases, the network will become larger.

The general inference way is similar to the previous work, shown in Fig 6. The difference between the two encoders is the network described before. When training is required, there is a certain probability that the frequency will be set to a random frequency for exploration. At the same time, the sequence will be recorded and sent to userspace for training.

Note that in this work, all the calculations use floating-point numbers. While there are security issues with using this within the kernel, the range is too wide for the data in this work to be normalized and quantified. Forcing the use of integers would instead create more of a burden. The codebase of building networks in kernel can be found at: <https://github.com/coladog/tinyagent>.




Fig. 6. Kernel Inference Module.

### C. Training Module in Userspace

The module gets the sequence  $\phi$  from the kernel state. Based on the sequence, the module could calculate the reward following Algorithm 3. The general calculation way is the same as the previous work, as shown in Algorithm 3. It contains three components, the time under low frequency and the average utilization. These two are for low energy consumption and high utilization.

The difference is the penalty component. In previous work, once the task times out, the reward is set to 0, and the transitions after the timeout will be discarded. This work adds a threshold which denotes the acceptable exceed rate. Only when the actual exceed rate is larger than the setting threshold, the reward will be 0. The penalty is set this way for the following reason.

- In the case of multitasking, it may happen that the previous task times out while the following task does not. Therefore, directly discarding the part after the timeout may result in the discarding of useful training information. Therefore, only the timeout is detected in the reward calculation here.
- For one execution that there are tasks exceeding the deadline, a threshold is set to give a penalty to those that are still within acceptable range. This is feasible for soft real-time systems. This penalty setting also ensures that the timeout reaward is not higher than the no-timeout case.

The reward is sparse. Only the last transition in the episode is non-zero. The reason for doing so is that it is hard to judge whether the inter-state transition deserves a high reward or not. It is also hard to add a non-zero reward at every deadline because this information is not passed in this design. Therefore, at the end of the episode, the overall value of the episode is judged to be appropriate based on the overall timeout rate, energy consumption at low frequencies, and average utilization.

---

**Algorithm 3** Reward Calculation
 

---

```

1: Let  $T$  denote the total time of one execution of task set
2: Let  $exet_i$  denote the execution time of  $task_i$ 
3: Let  $ddl_i$  denote the deadline of  $task_i$ 
4: Let  $n_e$  denote the number of tasks which exceed the
   deadline
5:  $x = \frac{\text{time spend in } f \text{ during } T}{T}$ 
6:  $r_{freq} = \sum_{f \in F} (1 - \frac{f^3 - f_{min}^3}{f_{max}^3 - f_{min}^3}) \times x$ 
7:  $r_{util} = \text{average utilization during } T$ 
8:  $r_t = \frac{r_{freq}}{2} + \frac{r_{util}}{2}$ 
9: if there are tasks exceed deadline then
10:    $e_r = \sum \frac{ddl_i}{exet_i}$ 
11:    $e_r = \frac{e_r}{n}$ 
12:   if  $e_r$  is larger than threshold then
13:      $r_t = 0$ 
14:   else
15:      $r_t = \frac{r_t}{2} \times e_r \times 10$ 
16:   end if
17: else
18:    $r_t = r_t$ 
19: end if

```

---

Training Module is shown in Fig. 7. It updates the parameters of the network based on DDQN. The updated data is sent to the kernel for the next round of training information gather. Based on this interaction, the kernel running generates the training data; the userspace performs training and updates the neural network. After a certain amount of training, the governor could get a good policy.




Fig. 7. Userspace Training Module.

The experience replay pool follows the previous design. It is divided into 10 buckets. The range of reward belongs to  $[0, 1]$ , which is divided into 10 levels and put into the bucket. Transitions with higher rewards have high priority.

### III. EXPERIMENT

The general architecture of the system in this work includes the kernel inference module and training module. These modules have been altered and optimized for multitasking scenarios.

#### A. Experiment Setup

The detailed experiment setup is shown in Table I. The device used is the Nvidia Jetson Nano Board. We only allow two candidate frequencies which correspond to two-level voltages. The network has two different settings. One network consists of a one-layer GRU and a two-layer MLP. The input and output of GRU are 2 and 6 respectively. The input of MLP depends on the task number. The number of two hidden layers is 30, and the number of outputs is 1. Another network only contains the MLP, the structure of the network is the same as the other. As mentioned in Section II-A, we will use PRO. and PROM. for the abbreviation. In addition, we later expanded the first network to accommodate the increased number of tasks. We use PROL. as an abbreviation.

TABLE I  
EXPERIMENT SETUP

Hardware	Nvidia Jetson Nano 2GB Board
OS	Linux 4.9
Energy measurement	Ruideng UM25C USB power meter
NN structure	2-6 GRU and 2-layer MLP, the number of inputs depending on task number, or pure 2-layer MLP

We pre-defined three workloads for testing our method. The detail information of these three workloads are shown in Table II.

TABLE II  
WORKLOADS USED

Three-task task set	Self-constructed, no parallel tasks (if no timeout)
Five-task task set	From Mibench, consisting of four benchmarks, <i>jpeg</i> , <i>qsort</i> , <i>fft</i> , <i>typeset</i> , has parallel tasks
Eight-task task set	From Mibench, consisting of four benchmarks, <i>jpeg</i> , <i>qsort</i> , <i>fft</i> , <i>typeset</i> , has parallel tasks

The *three-task task set* is a simple self-constructed workload consisting of the same CPU-intensive benchmark. This benchmark is constantly doing multiplication operations which are executed sequentially. The start time of the three tasks are 0, 0.3, 0.7, and the deadlines are 0.3, 0.4, 0.5 seconds respectively. If no task times out, then the entire task set has no parallel running tasks and the total runtime is 1.2 seconds. This workload is constructed to test whether the algorithm can recognize different deadlines for the same task for the purpose of dynamic tuning.

The *five-task task set* is used to test parallel tasks. The start time of five tasks are 0, 0, 0, 0, 1.0 and the deadlines are 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, 1.0, 0.3. The total execution time will be 1.3 seconds. These benchmarks are selected from Mibench [25] and its implementation detail is hidden.

The *eight-task task set* is similar to the *five-task task set*. The start time of five tasks are 0, 0, 0, 0, 1.0, 1.0, 1.0, 1.0 and the deadlines are 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, 1.0, 0.3, 0.5, 0.8, 1.0. The total execution time is 2.0 seconds. This task set is used to test whether the small-scale network could handle a task set with a slightly larger number of tasks. For the above tasks, both coding methods were tested and compared with the Linux built-in governor. Our governor only has two candidate frequencies. For Linux built-in governor governors, the choice of frequencies is all the frequencies that are supported on the Jetson Nano Board.

### B. Reward Curve




Fig. 8. Reward curve with five training on *three-task task set* with PRO. (left) and PROM. (right).




Fig. 9. Reward curve with five training on *Five-task taskset* with PRO. (left) and PROM. (right).

After each training, we tested the updated network five times and recorded the average reward and its standard error. Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 show the reward curves for small-scale task sets (three and five) using two different encoders and networks. The overall reward curve shows an upward trend, showing that the reinforcement learning method acquires more rewards to generate better strategies. Especially for the *three-task task set*, PRO. shows a steady upward trend which is better than PROM. While for the *five-task task set*, these two show a similar trend. The PROM. is slightly better.

However, due to our penalty mechanism and the feature of the soft real-time system, a low reward does not necessarily

mean that the generated strategy is bad. It could be that the governor is trying to exceed the deadline a little bit.

We only used the PRO. and PROL. to test *eight-task Taskset* since pure MLP networks are not suitable for large task sets. Fig. 10 shows the reward curves, the left is a network with only 30 nodes in the middle layer, while the right is a network with 60 nodes. Looking only at the reward curve, increasing the number of nodes in the network does not lead to a better effect.




Fig. 10. Reward curve with five training on *eight-task task set* with PRO. (left) and PROL. (right).

### C. Deadline Awareness




Fig. 11. Execution time curve with five training on *three-task task set* with PRO. (top) and PROM. (bottom).




Fig. 12. Execution time curve with five training on *five-task task set* with PRO. (top) and PROM. (bottom).

We also visualize the average execution time of each task after five tests. Fig. 11, Fig. 12 and Fig. 13 show the execution curve of three workloads respectively. The two parts divided by the orange horizontal line represent two encoders. In each part, one subfigure shows the execution time and deadline for one




Fig. 13. Execution time curve with five training on *eight-task task set* with PRO. (first and second row) and PROM. (third and fourth row).

of the tasks in *eight-task task set*. For these three figures, each line represents a different network setting and each column represents the execution time of one task in the task set. The orange dashed line is the deadline for each task.

It can be seen from the figure that execution time is always near the deadline. Our proposed method could realize the different deadlines of different tasks or the same tasks very well, which is shown in Fig. 11. PRO. is better than PROM. since in the last task, the late execution time of PROM. is over the deadline.

For *five-task task set*, PRO. performed better than PROM. since the execution time curve is closer to the deadline. Thus, comparing the two encoding methods, PRO. and PROM., PROM. is not as good as the RPO. with the increase of task number. For the *eight-task task set* test, the larger network has a better result since the execution time curve is closer to the deadline in the latter four tasks.

#### D. Learned Policy

We visualized the generated policy. As shown in Fig. 14, our proposed method could make different decisions for a similar load. In *three-task task set*, the three tasks are the same but have different deadlines, both our methods could set the system to a low frequency at begin of the task to save energy and increase the frequency to meet the deadline. It could also control time at a low frequency to adapt to different deadlines. The two coding methods produce similar strategies with close results.

The same effect can be found on the policy for *five-task task set*, as shown in Fig. 15. In the 200-400 ms phase, even though the average utilization of the system is almost 100%, the governor still chose a low frequency to reduce the energy consumption. While in the phase of 600-800 ms, the average utilization decreases and the governor chose a high frequency. For a task set of 5 tasks, the GRU already performs better than the MLP. For the last task, the GRU chose a low frequency at the beginning, while the MLP chose a high frequency at the end. This is the last task that was not learned well.




Fig. 14. Frequency policy developed by PRO. (top) and PROM. (bottom) on *three-task task set*.




Fig. 15. Frequency policy developed by PRO. (top) and PROM. (bottom) on *five-task task set*.

For *eight-task Taskset*, PROM. method did not get good results, PRO. can be applicable but needs to expand the number of middle layer nodes. The policy is shown in Fig. 16. Before expanding the number of nodes, the PRO. cannot learn a good policy as can be seen from the figure. The last task deadline exceeds the deadline.

#### E. Energy Saving

Fig. 17 shows the normalized runtime power of three task sets. *Per., Con., Ond., Sch.* represents four Linux built-in governors, *Performance, Conservative, Ondemand* and *Schedutil*. Table III shows the average execution time under different policies.






Fig. 16. Frequency policy developed by PRO. (top) and large GRU (bottom) on *Eight-task Taskset*.




Fig. 17. Power consumption on three tested task sets.

We can see from the figure that PRO. and PROM. have similar results, both saving 7% energy compared with *Ondemand* for *three-task task set*. For *Five-task task set*, both of our methods could learn a policy without exceeding the deadline. However, PROM. cannot save energy compared with *Ondemand*. The PRO. method could save more energy (3%). However, the original PRO. method could not learn a good policy for *eight-task task set* since some of the tasks in the task

TABLE III  
EXECUTION TIME

Taskset	Task	Per.	Con.	Ond.	Sch.	PRO.	PROM.
<i>Three-task Taskset</i>	task 1	0.138	0.200	0.150	0.171	0.266	0.262
	task 2	0.139	0.187	0.159	0.185	0.344	0.331
	task 3	0.139	0.184	0.158	0.189	0.345	0.447
<i>Five-task Taskset</i>	task 1	0.100	0.444	0.100	0.132	0.172	0.257
	task 2	0.167	0.662	0.171	0.180	0.436	0.401
	task 3	0.307	1.046	0.316	0.311	0.735	0.738
	task 4	0.372	1.160	0.384	0.377	0.836	0.867
	task 5	0.086	0.204	0.340	0.158	0.196	0.093
<i>Eight-task Taskset</i>	task 1	0.100	0.436*	0.102	0.130	0.223	0.093
	task 2	0.167	0.663	0.171	0.181	0.307	0.163
	task 3	0.304	1.072	0.312	0.316	0.745	0.759
	task 4	0.371	1.208	0.384	0.379	0.938	0.841
	task 5	0.095	0.276	0.284	0.131	0.131	0.092
	task 6	0.167	0.431	0.362	0.182	0.267	0.377
	task 7	0.303	0.702	0.485	0.318	0.817*	0.521
	task 8	0.371	0.797	0.510	0.375	1.135*	0.789

set exceed the corresponding deadline too much, which can be seen in the table. After expanding the number of nodes, the governor could learn a good policy, which saves 4% compared with *Ondemand*.

#### F. Inference Time Overhead

When the kernel uses the encoder and then infers through the network, there must be overhead compared with built-in governors. we tested the time required for these two parts with 8 tasks. The average overhead of the original PRO. is 0.09 ms. After expanding the nodes, the average overhead is 0.16 ms. The case of fewer tasks will have fewer overheads because the kernel does fewer floating-point calculations.

#### G. Deadline missing

To validate the efficacy of the model, an experiment was conducted to determine whether tasks could be completed within the desired runtime for varying numbers and types of benchmark cases. The percentages in Table IV represent the time spent on the scheduled DDL as a percentage of the total scheduled time. As illustrated in Table IV, the majority of tasks do not result in timeouts, with an average untimeout rate of over 85%. This suggests that the model trained by this method is capable of running these tasks.

TABLE IV  
AVERAGE DDL MISS PERFORMANCE FOR EACH TASK SET

Task Set	0-2.5%	2.5-5%	5%	Not Exceed Deadline
<i>Eight-task</i>	6.06%	4.25%	2.58%	87.18%
<i>Five-task</i>	6.20%	4.10%	3.96%	85.74%
<i>Three-task</i>	3.67%	4.33%	4.83%	87.17%

Table V employs a kind of benchmark test set comprising a fixed number of tasks, but with randomized task types and permutations. The results demonstrate that, even when task types are randomly assigned, the models trained by our method remain well adapted to the task requirements in the majority of cases.

TABLE V  
AVERAGE DDL MISS PERFORMANCE FOR RANDOM TASK SET

Task Set	0-2.5%	2.5-5%	5%	Not Exceed Deadline
<i>Eight-task-R</i>	3.88%	2.30%	4.59%	87.09%
<i>Five-task-R</i>	4.20%	2.60%	4.06%	89.14%
<i>Three-task-R</i>	2.33%	1.50%	10.67%	85.50%

#### H. Random Experimental Design and Results

To validate the effectiveness of our proposed method, we designed a series of experiments. Initially, we compiled a list of benchmark tests. Each benchmark was evaluated under a performance-maximizing policy to determine its minimum execution time, referred to as the baseline time.

We then developed a random task generator that produces sequences of tasks based on specified instructions. For example, if the task generation is set to 3, the generator randomly selects three benchmarks from the list (allowing duplicates) and generates corresponding parameters for each benchmark, such as start time and deadline (DDL). The DDL for each task is determined by extending the task’s start time by a duration ranging between one to two times its baseline time. Specifically, if the start time is  $x$  and the baseline time is  $y$ , the DDL is an open interval on the time axis from  $x + y$  to  $x + 2y$ . This process results in a test sequence.

Using these sequences, we trained and tested our method, comparing its energy performance against the performance obtained using the ondemand strategy. For each task count, three random sequences were generated. The results are as follows: for three tasks, our strategy achieved an average energy saving of approximately 15.25% compared to the ondemand strategy; for four tasks, the average saving was approximately 7.14%; for five tasks, the average saving was approximately 8.12%; and for eight tasks, the average saving was approximately 7.26%.

### I. Algorithm and Results Visualization

---

#### Algorithm 4 Random Task Generator

---

```

1: Input: List of benchmarks  $B$ , number of tasks  $n$ 
2: Output: Sequence of tasks  $T$ 
3:  $T \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
4: for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
5:   Randomly select a benchmark  $b \in B$ 
6:   Generate start time  $start_i$ 
7:   Calculate DDL as the interval  $(start_i +$ 
   baseline time( $b$ ),  $start_i + 2 \times$  baseline time( $b$ ))
8:    $T \leftarrow T \cup \{(b, start_i, DDL)\}$ 
9: end for
10: return  $T$ 

```

---

TABLE VI  
POWER CONSUMPTION COMPARISON BETWEEN ONDEMAND STRATEGY  
AND GRU METHOD

Task number	Power (Ondemand)	Power (GRU)	Saving (%)
3	2.17700	1.84490	15.25
4	2.25465	2.09370	7.14
5	2.03960	1.87377	8.12
8	1.97544	1.83226	7.26

### IV. RELATED WORK

Zheng and Louri [26] combined RL, DVFS, and power-gating (PG) to save energy for Network-on-Chips (NoCs). They take three voltage/frequency (V/F) levels as actions, use cache related metrics, network related metrics for 12 parameters as states, and use an artificial neural network

(ANN) to replace the frequently used stare-action table. The problem is this method only uses simulation to experiment instead of using real devices. Yeganeh-Khaksar et al. [27] saved energy for multicore real-time embedded systems using RL and DVFS. Compared with our method, this work is for sporadic tasks instead of periodic tasks. They use six V/S levels as actions. The state consists of per-task power consumption and transient faults. The core type ARM Cortex-A7 but this is a simulation and assumes it supports per-core DVFS which is quite hard to implement in the real environment. Wang et al. [28] considered both core and uncore frequency by using RL to let uncore frequency at a low level to save energy while the core frequency at a high level to perform tasks. It also assisted with power capping technique. The RL states only uses instruction per cycle (IPC) and the misses per operation (MPO). Asghar et al. [29] used deep Q-network with coral reefs optimization and DVFS for cloud data centers. Coral reefs optimization is used for generating various solutions for task scheduling and deep Q-network is used for judging these solutions. This method still uses simulation. Lin et al. [30] proposed an improved DVFS method for mobile devices. They use a model-free RL method and its innovation is using a new representation state called meta-state which uses an encoder and decoder to process the raw data (a set of utilization, frequency and temperature).

### V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a DVFS method based on deep reinforcement learning to solve the problems that may occur in real-time systems with multiple tasks and multiple deadlines. Inserting a neural network within the governor in the kernel allows the system to adapt frequency control according to the current system and workload. This ensures both performance, that is no task exceeds its deadline, and energy savings. Two different encoders, TEM and TEGM, were tested for neural network state inputs. TEM achieves the same results as the TEGM for a small set of tasks, but after increasing the number of tasks, the TEGM is more effective and can train a better policy, testing with fixed sets of 3, 5 and 8 tasks, respectively. For generalization, a generator that can generate random sets of tasks is used to generate multiple task sets. The test results for these task sets achieved similar results as the fixed task sets.

### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Minaeva, D. Roy, B. Akesson, Z. Hanzálek, and S. Chakraborty, "Control performance optimization for application integration on automotive architectures," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 70, no. 7, pp. 1059–1073, 2020.
- [2] L. Nóbrega, P. Gonçalves, P. Pedreiras, and J. Pereira, "An iot-based solution for intelligent farming," *Sensors*, vol. 19, no. 3, p. 603, 2019.
- [3] S. J. Ramson, W. D. León-Salas, Z. Brecheisen, E. J. Foster, C. T. Johnston, D. G. Schulze, T. Filley, R. Rahimi, M. J. C. V. Soto, J. A. L. Bolivar et al., "A self-powered, real-time, lorawan iot-based soil health monitoring system," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 9278–9293, 2021.

- [4] T. Zhou and M. Lin, "Cpu frequency scheduling of real-time applications on embedded devices with temporal encoding-based deep reinforcement learning," *Journal of Systems Architecture*, vol. 142, p. 102955, 2023.
- [5] H. Lee, Y. Choi, T. Han, and K. Kim, "Probabilistically guaranteeing end-to-end latencies in autonomous vehicle computing systems," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 71, no. 12, pp. 3361–3374, 2022.
- [6] V. Teslyuk, A. Kazarian, N. Kryvinska, and I. Tsmots, "Optimal artificial neural network type selection method for usage in smart house systems," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 47, 2020.
- [7] G. Manogaran, C.-H. Hsu, B. S. Rawal, B. Muthu, C. X. Mavromoustakis, and G. Mastorakis, "Isof: information scheduling and optimization framework for improving the performance of agriculture systems aided by industry 4.0," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 3120–3129, 2020.
- [8] S. M. Salman, A. V. Papadopoulos, S. Mubeen, and T. Nolte, "A systematic methodology to migrate complex real-time software systems to multi-core platforms," *Journal of Systems Architecture*, vol. 117, p. 102087, 2021.
- [9] M. Liu, X. Ding, and W. Du, "Continuous, real-time object detection on mobile devices without offloading," in *2020 IEEE 40th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 976–986.
- [10] J. Yuan, S. Y. Samson, G. Zhang, C. P. Lim, H. Trinh, and Y. Zhang, "Design and hil realization of an online adaptive dynamic programming approach for real-time economic operations of household energy systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 330–341, 2021.
- [11] S. Chang, X. Zhao, Z. Liu, and Q. Deng, "Real-time scheduling and analysis of parallel tasks on heterogeneous multi-cores," *Journal of Systems Architecture*, vol. 105, p. 101704, 2020.
- [12] H. Xu, B. Zhang, C. Pan, and K. Li, "Energy-efficient triple modular redundancy scheduling on heterogeneous multi-core real-time systems," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 191, p. 104915, 2024.
- [13] Z. Wu, L. Han, J. Liu, Y. Robert, and F. Vivien, "Energy-aware mapping and scheduling strategies for real-time workflows under reliability constraints," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 176, pp. 1–16, 2023.
- [14] Z. Houssam-Eddine, N. Capodiecì, R. Cavicchioli, G. Lipari, and M. Bertogna, "The hpc-dag task model for heterogeneous real-time systems," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 70, no. 10, pp. 1747–1761, 2020.
- [15] J.-J. Chen, J. Shi, G. von der Brüggen, and N. Ueter, "Scheduling of real-time tasks with multiple critical sections in multiprocessor systems," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 146–160, 2020.
- [16] J. L. C. Hoffmann and A. A. Fröhlich, "Online machine learning for energy-aware multicore real-time embedded systems," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 493–505, 2021.
- [17] X. Zhan, J. Chen, E. Sánchez-Sinencio, and P. Li, "Power management for multicore processors via heterogeneous voltage regulation and machine learning enabled adaptation," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 2641–2654, 2019.
- [18] X. Li, L. Chen, S. Chen, F. Jiang, C. Li, W. Zhang, and J. Xu, "Deep reinforcement learning-based power management for chiplet-based multicore systems," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, 2024.
- [19] X. Chen, J. Zhang, B. Lin, Z. Chen, K. Wolter, and G. Min, "Energy-efficient offloading for dnn-based smart iot systems in cloud-edge environments," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 683–697, 2021.
- [20] Q. Fettes, M. Clark, R. Bunescu, A. Karanth, and A. Louri, "Dynamic voltage and frequency scaling in nocs with supervised and reinforcement learning techniques," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 375–389, 2018.
- [21] S. K. Panda, M. Lin, and T. Zhou, "Energy-efficient computation offloading with dvfs using deep reinforcement learning for time-critical iot applications in edge computing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 6611–6621, 2022.
- [22] T. Zhou and M. Lin, "Deadline-aware deep-recurrent-q-network governor for smart energy saving," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 3886–3895, 2021.
- [23] T. Zhou, H. Wang, X. Li, and M. Lin, "Profiling and understanding cpu power management in linux," in *2023 IEEE Smart World Congress (SWC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [24] H. Van Hasselt, A. Guez, and D. Silver, "Deep reinforcement learning with double q-learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2016.
- [25] M. R. Guthaus, J. S. Ringenberg, D. Ernst, T. M. Austin, T. Mudge, and R. B. Brown, "Mibench: A free, commercially representative embedded benchmark suite," in *Proceedings of the fourth annual IEEE international workshop on workload characterization. WWC-4 (Cat. No. 01EX538)*. IEEE, 2001, pp. 3–14.
- [26] H. Zheng and A. Louri, "An energy-efficient network-on-chip design using reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [27] A. Yeganeh-Khaksar, M. Ansari, S. Safari, S. Yari-Karin, and A. Ejlali, "Ring-dvfs: Reliability-aware reinforcement learning-based dvfs for real-time embedded systems," *IEEE Embedded Systems Letters*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 146–149, 2020.
- [28] Y. Wang, W. Zhang, M. Hao, and Z. Wang, "Online power management for multi-cores: A reinforcement learning based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 751–764, 2021.
- [29] A. Asghari and M. K. Sohrabi, "Combined use of coral reefs optimization and multi-agent deep q-network for energy-aware resource provisioning in cloud data centers using dvfs technique," *Cluster Computing*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 119–140, 2022.
- [30] C. Lin, K. Wang, Z. Li, and Y. Pu, "A workload-aware dvfs robust to concurrent tasks for mobile devices," in *Proceedings of the 29th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, 2023, pp. 1–16.