
Sim-is-More: Randomizing HW-NAS with Synthetic Devices

Francesco Capuano¹ Gabriele Tiboni^{3,4} Niccolò Cavagnero² Giuseppe Averta²

¹École Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

²Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

³Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

⁴Technische Universität Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany

Abstract Existing hardware-aware NAS (HW-NAS) methods typically assume access to precise information circa the target device, either via analytical approximations of the post-compilation latency model, or through learned latency predictors. Such approximate approaches risk introducing estimation errors that may prove detrimental in risk-sensitive applications. In this work, we propose a two-stage HW-NAS framework, in which we first learn an architecture controller on a distribution of synthetic devices, and then directly deploy the controller on a target device. At test-time, our network controller deploys directly to the target device without relying on any pre-collected information, and only exploits direct interactions. In particular, the pre-training phase on synthetic devices enables the controller to design an architecture for the target device by interacting with it through a small number of high-fidelity latency measurements. To guarantee accessibility of our method, we only train our controller with training-free accuracy proxies, allowing us to scale the meta-training phase without incurring the overhead of full network training. We benchmark on HW-NATS-Bench, demonstrating that our method generalizes to unseen devices and searches for latency-efficient architectures by in-context adaptation using only a few real-world latency evaluations at test-time.

1 Introduction

Designing Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) for deployment on resource-constrained devices involves the dual challenge of (i) selecting architectures that perform well on a given task while (ii) respecting hardware constraints. Hardware-aware Neural Architecture Search (HW-NAS) addresses this challenge by automating architecture design under hardware supervision, offering an automated alternative to the otherwise-manual design of architectures that are efficient for different deployment scenarios. Still, most HW-NAS methods are tailored to a single target deployment scenario, requiring re-searching an architecture satisfying (i-ii) when the deployment scenario—in this work, the device d used to run DNNs—changes.

In this work, we address this limitation focusing on multi-device HW-NAS. In this, our goal is to discover architectures performing well on (i) task-specific metrics—in this work, *validation accuracy*—(ii) hardware-efficiency metrics—in this work, *post-compilation latency*—across *multiple devices*. Current HW-NAS approaches jointly tackling (i-ii) typically rely on real-world performance measurements collected for a fixed target device, which are very expensive to collect as they require compilation of a large number of networks. Furthermore, current approaches to ensure cross-device performance rely on (a) strong assumptions circa analytical approximations of downstream hardware efficiency or (b) predictors approximating real-world measurements. Clearly, (a-b) do hinder practical applicability in risk-averse scenarios, as (a) makes assumptions that risk being too coarse for practical use cases, and the uncertainty circa (b) predictors is difficult to bound in practice.

In this work, we propose a two-stage approach to HW-NAS mitigating the need to access information pre-deployment. With this, we elaborate a search-strategy focused on learning patterns




Figure 1: Overview our method. HW-NAS across different hardware platforms is hindered by fundamental differences across devices, influencing the performance/efficiency tradeoff differently across different devices (A). Our method consists in a two-stage process where we first learn on a distribution of synthetic devices (B, 1), and then zero-shot transfer our learned policy to multiple devices (B, 2).

for DNN HW-design for simulated versions of the target device, to then transfer to the real-device and collect few real-world measurements for adaptation. Initially, the controller learns to design DNNs under computational constraints on fictional synthetic devices. Then, we deploy the controller on the target device, where the controller is tasked with optimizing the architectures, directly using real-world measurements and thus completely avoiding inaccurate latency estimations. Critically, pre-training on synthetic devices drastically limits the number of networks tried at test-time, making real-world measurements a valid alternative for our method, as we learn to probe *the right* networks at test-time.

By training on simulated devices, the controller acquires a model of how latency/accuracy patterns vary across devices. When deployed on the target device, the search strategy we develop can then transfer its prior knowledge to explore more effectively under the unknown target latency distribution. This allows us to completely abandon amortized estimation of latency values—obtained through coarse approximations or the use of predictors—and directly compile and measure real-world latency values on a handful of candidate networks, properly selected thanks to pre-training.

To transfer solutions across simulated and real-world devices, we leverage recent advancements on Reinforcement Learning (RL), which we complement with the use of accuracy proxies to reduce the computational burden associated with RL-based NAS. Such training-free accuracy proxies are especially suitable in our setting because they are fast to compute and practical data-agnostic.

In summary, our work makes the following key contribution: - [we use training-free metrics for NAS] - we develop a **randomized RL training procedure for HW-NAS**, crafting a controller which generalizes across diverse deployment devices at test time. This allows us to bypass inaccurate and expensive ways to estimate post-compilation latency, and rather **use a very limited number of real-world measurements** at test time.

In summary, our work makes the following key contributions: - We reintroduce **RL-based NAS**, leveraging **training-free metrics** to estimate candidate architectures’ downstream performance. The use of training-free proxies enables rapid and efficient architecture evaluation without the computational overhead of full training. - We develop a **randomized RL training procedure for HW-NAS**, crafting a controller which generalizes across diverse deployment devices at test time. This allows us to bypass inaccurate and expensive ways to estimate post-compilation latency, rather learning to **use a very limited number of real-world measurements (10)** at test time.

2 Background

2.1 Hardware-Aware Neural Architecture Search (HW-NAS)

Neural Architecture Search (NAS). Designing Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) by hand is cumbersome and brittle process, originally carried out by highly-specialized human experts, and later automatized via Neural Architecture Search (NAS). In its seminal work, Zoph and Le (2016) demonstrated the feasibility of designing DNNs automatically via RL, using post-training performance metrics as reward signal. While effective, (Zoph and Le, 2016)’s pioneering work most notably demanded a cluster of 800 GPU for training—a computational demand amply exceeding the capabilities of most institutions. Subsequent research introduced more computationally efficient approaches, including weight-sharing paradigms (Brock et al., 2017) and gradient-based methods (Liu et al., 2018). In practice, it is common to search for architectures within cell-based searchspaces (Zoph et al., 2018), hereby reducing DNN design to identifying an optimal cell within a searchspace of all possible combinations, \mathcal{H} .

To democratize NAS, the research community developed *training-free metrics* (TF metrics) (Mellor et al., 2021; Jacot et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2021, 2023), allowing to drastically reduce the and cost and resources needed to evaluate candidate architectures by scoring them at initialization, without any training (Mellor et al., 2021; Tanaka et al., 2020; Cavagnero et al., 2023). To search spaces of candidate architectures, Cavagnero et al. (2023) propose complementing NASWOT (Mellor et al., 2021)—measuring the number of "linear regions" formed by decision boundaries at initialization—with *LogSynflow* (Cavagnero et al., 2023; Tanaka et al., 2020)—correlating the performance of a candidate design with the gradient flow of a loss function specifically designed to reflect the model’s capacity. Further, Cavagnero et al. (2023) proposes approximating the expensive-to-compute NTK (Jacot et al., 2018) with a *SkipScore*, measuring the prevalence of skip connections within an architecture. Thus, Cavagnero et al. (2023) propose scoring \mathcal{H} using

$$p_{\text{FreeREA}}(h) = \text{NASWOT}(h) + \text{LogSynflow}(h) + \text{SkipScore}(h), h \in \mathcal{H}$$

Searching architectures using TF metrics substantially reduces the average cost of probing each candidate architecture, c . In turn, TF metrics prove particularly useful to guide possibly sample-inefficient algorithms, such as RL (Zoph and Le, 2016), allowing RL to rival more sample-efficient methods like evolutionary algorithms (Real et al., 2017) for cell-based NAS (Ying et al., 2019; Dong et al., 2021).

Hardware-Aware NAS (HW-NAS). While traditional NAS typically focuses on metrics such as validation accuracy or model size, hardware-aware NAS (HW-NAS) seeks to incorporate hardware performance indicators characteristic of the deployment scenario of the model while designing DNNs (Benmezziane, 2023). Work in HW-NAS typically considers optimizing post-compilation latency (Wu et al., 2019), memory footprint (King et al., 2025) or energy consumption (Speckhard et al., 2022). In this work we exclusively focus on *post-compilation latency*—crucial when deploying DNNs to resource-constrained environments where fast inference is paramount, such as robotics. HW-NAS seeks to address precisely this very challenge, complementing NAS’ automated approach to DNN design with considerations for hardware constraints and performance metrics specific to the deployment environment. However, designing a comprehensive HW-NAS strategy concerned with downstream real-world performance of trained DNNs is a challenging endeavour for non-hardware experts (Li et al., 2021). In practice, the same high-level logical operations are compiled differently on different hardware platforms (Li et al., 2021; Benmezziane, 2023; Laube et al., 2022). In turn, this makes it nontrivial to identify good architectures across diverse devices.

Measuring latency for HW-NAS. Measuring inference latency is a crucial task in HW-NAS, yet directly compiling and timing each candidate architecture can be a nontrivial and costly process (Li

et al., 2021). Differences in compiler toolchains or library support exacerbate this burden, resulting in latency measurements that can vary across hardware generations or even across software updates. As an alternative, many HW-NAS approaches rely on *approximations* of post-compilation latency.

A popular choice is using lookup tables (LUT), modelling architectures $a = \{o_1, o_2, \dots\}$ as a finite set of fundamental operations, and aggregating the per-operation runtimes $t_d(o_i)$, $o \in \mathcal{O}$ to obtain the network’s latency $\ell_d(a)$ for a given device d .

Typically, operation-wise runtimes available via LUT are aggregated to the architecture level as $\ell_d(a) \approx \hat{\ell}_d(a) = \sum_{o \in a} t_d(o)$ (Wu et al., 2019; Cai et al., 2018). LUTs are popular (Cai et al., 2018, 2019; Laube et al., 2022) because they are fast to use at query time, and cheap to obtain even for very large search spaces. For instance, while FBNet (Wu et al., 2019) contains $\sim 10^{21}$ architectures, obtaining its LUT only requires deploying 9 fundamental operations on target devices. Unfortunately, LUT deliberately fail to capture interactions among operations within a given network, resulting in poor correlation between approximated and true latency values (Laube et al., 2022).

A more flexible strategy is to learn a *predictor model* for latency, where an architecture is encoded using a feature vector $z = f(h)$, $f : \mathcal{H} \mapsto \mathcal{Z}$, and the associated latency $\ell(h)$ is regressed learning $g : \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ on pairs of $\tau = \{h_i, \ell(h_i)\}_{i=1}^K$ (Laube et al., 2022). Once trained, the predictor can quickly infer latency for unseen architectures, thereby accelerating the NAS loop. Laube et al. (2022) report the Kendall-Tau correlation (KT) between true and approximated latency values of various predictors g , versus LUT, while varying the number K of examples needed to train a regression model. In their experiments, Laube et al. (2022) report that any of the predictors used drastically outperform LUT’s KT correlation (0.6) with as little as $K = 60$ examples, reaching $\text{KT} = 0.8$ for $K = 500$. In turn, Laube et al. (2022) show that (i) LUTs introduce severe misestimations of true latency, with unsatisfactory correlation with real-world latency and (ii) predictors trained on a few hundreds of examples significantly outperform LUTs.

Still, even such predictive methods introduce approximation errors making them unreliable in risk-averse deployments such as autonomous robotics, aerospace, or industrial monitoring. Further, both LUTs and predictors assume substantial upfront data collection—building the table or training the model requires a nontrivial set of measured $\{o_i, \ell(o_i)\}_i^{|\mathcal{O}|}$, $\{h_i, \ell(h_i)\}_i^K$ samples. When the target hardware is scarcely accessible, or each compilation is prohibitively expensive these preliminary steps may already pose a major overhead.

Despite advances in TF-metrics and latency approximation, the overall *cost of search* of NAS remains a key concern, especially when architectures must be verified experimentally for downstream performance. With this, we can express the computational cost of NAS C as the product of (i) the number of candidate architectures probed $|\mathcal{N}|$, and (ii) the average *cost to evaluate one network*, c , yielding $C = \sum_i^{\mathcal{N}} c_i \approx |\mathcal{N}|c$.

The cost of many early methods (Zoph and Le, 2016; Baker et al., 2017; Real et al., 2017) is mainly dominated by c , since they require *training* candidate architectures on the target task so as to measure performance. Training a single hypernetwork, for instance, amortizes C by training a single overparameterized model from which many sub-architectures can be sampled (Brock et al., 2017; Pham et al., 2018; Cai et al., 2019), hereby reducing C via reducing c . However, training such a hypernetwork is still prohibitively expensive in scenarios where computational resources are not abundant—Cai et al. (2019) requires 1.2k GPU hours on NVIDIA V100s.

Our approach circumvents computational demand using TF-metrics. Further, it does not make use of any learned predictor or LUT, by constraining the total number of architectures probed at test-time on the target device to a small but carefully selected set, hereby limiting C via bounding $|\mathcal{N}|$. Because we only need to compile and measure a handful of candidate networks, we can reliably obtain high-fidelity latency evaluations for each one, for small C .

2.2 Reinforcement Learning (RL)

Reinforcement learning (RL) is an area of machine learning concerned with training agents to act optimally in an environment that provides feedback via a reward signal (Sutton et al., 1998). In general, RL agents act on environment’s states $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$, taking an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, and observing the next state s_{t+1} and reward r_t . Over time, RL agents attempt to learn a conditional probability distribution $\pi : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \mapsto [0, 1]$ —*policy*, $\pi(a|s)$ —following the objective of cumulative reward maximization. Over discrete state and action spaces—typical in cell-based NAS where any $s \in \mathcal{S}$ represents a given cell/architecture $h \in \mathcal{H}$, and actions $a \in \mathcal{A}$ discrete modifications of h —popular RL algorithms employ trust-regions, as in Trust Region Policy Optimization (TRPO) (Schulman et al., 2015) and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al., 2017). Unlike REINFORCE (Zoph and Le, 2016), trust-region approaches such as PPO iteratively learn π bounding the relative difference between successive policies. In this, trust-region approaches aim at avoiding too drastic updates during training, from which on-policy RL risks not to recover.

While RL-based NAS set an important precedent, it was quickly recognized that repeatedly training every candidate network rendered the search protocol too costly, particularly considering RL’s sample inefficiency (Zoph and Le, 2016; Real et al., 2017). Thus, researchers moved towards alternative solutions attempting to reduce computational demand by limiting the number of networks probed $|\mathcal{N}|$, such as evolutionary algorithms (EAs) (Real et al., 2017; Cavagnero et al., 2023). While EAs have shown promise for single-device NAS (Real et al., 2017; Cavagnero et al., 2023), we argue they remain ill-suited to tackle scenarios where multiple target devices must be supported, or training and target device differ, due to the challenges of transferring EA search-strategies across different HW-NAS instances.

In contrast, RL proved promising in fields where cross domain adaptability is key, such as robotics (Kober et al., 2013; Akkaya et al., 2019), and we thus argue for RL’s return to HW-NAS, for its *transfer learning*. Crucially, cross-domain adaptability avoids the need for separate controllers for possibly very diverse devices.

2.3 Related Works

Once-for-All (OFA). A pioneering approach in HW-NAS is Once-for-All (OFA) (Cai et al., 2019). OFA amortizes NAS’ costs C by training a single over-parameterized hypernetwork, which is successively pruned using EAs (Real et al., 2017) into child subnetworks. As each subnetwork directly inherits weights from the pretrained hypernetwork, OFA requires no additional training, proving efficient. In principle, this allows cheap evaluation of the candidate architectures at test-time ($c \downarrow \implies C \downarrow$), by amortizing the cost of training the hypernetwork—1.2k GPU hours on NVIDIA V100 GPUs—on multiple searches. OFA also allows for HW-NAS, by using LUT to guide EAs in selecting architectures fitting specific computational constraints. However, OFA’s success relies on the costly hypernetwork pre-training phase, requiring access to thousands of GPU hours—something that is simply unattainable in most scenarios. Further, the child network selection process is also subject to approximation errors in hardware metrics, consequent to using LUT to estimate latency, which can yield sub-optimal child network choices (Laube et al., 2022).

Hardware-adaptive Efficient Latent Predictor (HELP). Hardware-adaptive Efficient Latent Predictor (HELP) (Lee et al., 2021) proposes a similar approach to ours to limiting C , by learning a meta-predictor to estimate post-compilation latency for unseen devices, focusing on $c \downarrow \implies C \downarrow$ too. Rather than measuring the latency of every candidate architecture on new physical devices, HELP learns a device-conditioned meta-predictor $f : \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{D} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$, mapping architecture encodings $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ to hardware costs for different devices $d \in \mathcal{D}$. Then, by assessing as little as 10 architectures on d_{target} , HELP adapts the meta-learned predictor, reaching values of KT-correlation with ground-truth latency of ~ 0.8 , and limiting the *per-probe cost* c of each architecture. Constructing HELP’s predictor entails collecting a set of real-world measured samples $\tau_d = \{h(a_i), \ell(a_i)\}_{i=1}^K$ across many




Figure 2: Performance/Efficiency profiles for four synthetic devices generated during training. Networks are scored using $r(h) = p_{\text{FreeRE}}(h) + \bar{\ell}(h)$.




Figure 3: Correlation between downstream validation accuracy and p_{FreeRE} score. Highlighted points indicate h^* for different devices, further underscoring how the optimal architecture in HW-NAS depends on the device considered.

different devices, which can prove challenging for non-experts in hardware (Li et al., 2021). Lastly, in risk-sensitive deployments even modest misestimation of latency can invalidate guarantees on latency bounds, hindering applicability of predictor-based approaches such as HELP.

Our method. Both OFA and HELP aim to mitigate C by limiting the overhead associated with c . OFA amortizes c by reusing super-network weights and LUT—at the expense of accuracy in latency estimation—while HELP uses a meta-learned latency regressor—at the expense of safety in latency estimation. By contrast, our method explicitly mitigates C by limiting the *number* of ground-truth probes $|\mathcal{N}|$ needed at test-time, sidestepping super-network pre-training or predictive models altogether.

This design choice inherently avoids approximation errors in hardware metrics, as each of the few final architectures is tested with real measurements. Hence, we shift complexity into a meta-trained RL controller (Section 3) that can generalize over device variations learning to design well-performing DNNs across various target platforms.

3 Method

3.1 RL-based NAS

In the single-device HW-NAS problem, the goal of a search strategy is to find the architecture $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$ best balancing downstream task performance with hardware performance, according to some weighting of choice. Formally,

$$\max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \text{Acc}(h) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \text{Latency}_d(h) \leq t_{\max},$$

where $\text{Latency}_d(h)$ is the measured *post-compilation* latency of architecture h on device d , and t_{\max} is an admissible latency threshold for that device. Our method extends this objective across a pool of diverse devices $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots\}$, with possibly different latency thresholds.

We attain this framing HW-NAS as a sequential problem formalized through a Markov Decision Process (MDP). In the MDP, states $s_t = h_t \in \mathcal{H}$ represents a given candidate architecture, and actions a_t indicate to how potentially modifying the architecture.

In this work, we focus on NATS-Bench (Dong et al., 2021). In this context, states equate to candidate architectures’ cells $s \equiv [o_1, o_2, \dots, o_5]$, $o_i \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}$. Actions $a = [i, o_{\text{new}}]$, $i = 1, \dots, 6$, $o \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}$ allow the controller to modify s , selecting an operation $o_i \in s$ to replace with o_{new} . The




Figure 4: Overview of the policy network for our method. At training time, the policy π accesses (1) a candidate network, h and its associated latency $\text{Latency}(h)$. The policy is then trained to propose a modification to h through modifying one of the operations in one of the positions.

environment provides a scalar reward depending on the architecture h , $r(h) = p_{\text{FreeREA}}(h) + \bar{\ell}(h)$, rewarding higher values of p_{FreeREA} while also maximizing the inverse-latency $\bar{\ell}(h) = 1 - \ell(h)$, $\ell(h) \in [0, 1]$. Critically, we give the same weight to downstream performance and hardware efficiency.

In our method, the policy π is typically represented by a neural network itself, taking as input states s_t and outputting actions a_t . As our goal is to develop across-devices policies, $s_t = [h_t || \ell(h_t)]$ also contains information regarding the candidate’s latency. Figure 4 shows our policy network: taking as input (i) a representation of the candidate architecture h_t and (ii) its latency $\ell(h_t)$, the policy network π outputs a probability distribution over the possible modifications to operate on h_t , if any. As we also parametrize the policy with a DNN ($\pi = \pi_\theta$), we use PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) to iteratively optimize θ for cumulative-reward maximization.

3.2 Device Generalization via Domain Randomization

To enable cross-device generalization, the network controller faces multiple synthetic devices during training. In practice, synthetic devices are obtained by fitting multiple probability distributions on the latency values reported for 18 different devices obtained aggregating those presented in Li et al. (2021); Lee et al. (2021).

Indicating with $\mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}} = \{\text{conv}1 \times 1, \text{conv}3 \times 3, \text{avgpool}3 \times 3, \text{skip_connect}, \text{identity}, \}$ all the operations available in Dong et al. (2021), we construct $|\mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}|$ independent Gaussian distributions $\mathcal{N}_o(\hat{\mu}_o^{\mathcal{D}}, (\hat{\sigma}_o^{\mathcal{D}})^2)$ using the empirical mean and empirical standard deviation on a pool of \mathcal{D} devices for each operation $o \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}$ (Figure 1).

At the beginning of each training episode, a new parametrization for the environment $\xi = [t(o)]_{o \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}}$ is sampled, and thereafter used it compute the latency—and thus reward r —until episode termination. In this, we observe different performance-efficiency profiles at training time, forcing the agent to learn to adaptively adjust its behavior to changes in the tradeoff landscape, rather than learning how to solve one deployment scenario only. We refer to this process as *randomizing lookup tables*, as we use LUTs not as a means of accurately modeling any particular hardware, but rather as a convenient way of generating diverse device profiles to use during the course of training.

Crucially, we do not expect LUT-based latency estimates to match actual latency on real hardware at deployment. Instead, much like the concept of Domain Randomization (DR) (Tobin

et al., 2017; Akkaya et al., 2019) in robotics, our goal is to expose the agent to a sufficiently diverse range of synthetic latencies so that it is forced to learn robust adaptation strategies. Furthermore, as we exclusively use training-free metrics we are able to run our experiments in extremely resource constrained scenario—under 1 GPU hour using a standard NVIDIA RTX 4080.

Finally, we allow the deployed agent to collect a small number of real measurements from the target device d_{target} at test time, so to form states s_0, s_1, \dots and iteratively design a final (optimized) architecture for d_{target} .

4 Experiments

In this section, we describe our setup for validating the proposed approach to HW-NAS on the NATS-Bench (Dong et al., 2021) search space. Because our method is designed for low-cost optimization using no training information nor latency predictor, we do not compare against other baselines that rely on (i) training (Cai et al., 2019) or (ii) latency predictors (Lee et al., 2021). Instead, we focus on analyzing the performance of our RL agent and its ability to adapt to synthetic device profiles over training, together with how it generalizes to unseen devices at test time, relying on maximum 10 interactions—corresponding to 10 real-world deployments—to adapt to d_{target} .

Training procedure. In our experiments we exclusively use the NATS-Bench topological search space (Dong et al., 2021), which defines candidate architectures as cells of five operations selected from a fixed pool $\mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}$. Each architecture in NATS-Bench is scored via p_{FreeREA} , computed in ca. 300ms/network on a single NVIDIA RTX 4080 (we refer to (Cavagnero et al., 2023) for details circa the computation of p_{FreeREA}). Hardware performance is evaluated via $\bar{\ell}$. At training time, $\bar{\ell}(h) = \sum_{o \in h} t_d(o; \xi)$, which conditions $\bar{\ell}(h)$ on the blocks’ latencies sampled at the beginning on a given episode, $\xi = [t(o)]_{o \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{NATS}}} \sim \Xi$. At test-time, we assume we can deploy a small number of candidate architectures, by directly measuring their true post-compilation latency $\ell_{d_{\text{target}}}(h)$, and thus steering the agent towards adaptation to the considered edge deployment.

In our experiments, we use PPO (Schulman et al., 2017), and policy π_θ is implemented as a neural network itself, taking as input a buffer of the last 5 states, alongside the actions performed $[s_{t-5} || a_{t-5}]$. Thus, ours is a *history-based policy*, a mechanism which proved effective in guaranteeing greater adaptability in RL (Chen et al., 2023). As per the MDP the agent is faced with, we adopt a finite-horizon setting, limiting interactions over training to $T = 50$, starting from a random network sampled within NATS-Bench. We employ a discount factor $\gamma = 0.6$, and ϵ -clipping ($\epsilon = 0.2$) for PPO. We train for a 500k timesteps, sampling a new device at each reset.

Figure 5 depicts the temporal evolution of key performance metrics throughout the training process. Notably, panels (a) and (b) illustrate the progressive improvement in both p_{FreeREA} scores and hardware performance respectively, demonstrating the agent’s capacity to simultaneously optimize for both objectives. The convergence pattern visible in panel (f) confirms the agent’s ability to effectively maximize cumulative rewards, reflecting successful learning of the desired performance-efficiency trade-off. Panel (c) shows the consistent improvement in latency percentile across devices, indicating that the controller progressively learns to identify architectures occupying favorable positions in the device-specific latency distribution, despite this changes during training. The stability of metrics in the latter stages of training suggests the emergence of a robust policy capable of balancing network quality and hardware efficiency irrespective of the targeted deployment environment.

Discussion. Evidence of the agent’s device-adaptive capabilities is presented in Figure 6, tracing optimization trajectories from an identical starting architecture (denoted by the orange star symbol) toward device-specific configurations (marked by red crosses). The fact different architectures are obtained at test time, shows successful conditioning of the optimization trajectory on the device tackled at test-time. These divergent paths empirically validate our approach’s effectiveness in




Figure 5: Average results collected over 20 test-episodes during training. (a) Average (normalized) $p_{\text{FreeREA}}(h_T)$ (b) Average (normalized) $\bar{\ell}(h_T)$ of the (c) Average latency percentile of h_T (d) Average final validation accuracy of h_T (never accessed during training) (e) Average latency of a fixed reference network h_{ref} . (f) Average evolution of the cumulative reward over training.




Figure 6: Starting from the same network (orange star), our agent reaches different network configurations for different devices (red crosses). The different optimization routes correspond to different devices considered for testing.

conditioning the search process on the target hardware characteristics, all while maintaining sample efficiency by requiring fewer than 10 real-world latency measurements per device.

5 Conclusions

In this work, we presented a multi-device HW-NAS framework that employs training-free metrics to proxy downstream performance and transfer across deployment scenarios—a flexible and accessible approach to HW-NAS that does not rely on prohibitive computational demands. Through a combination of (i) synthetic-latency environments faced at train-time, and (ii) a small set of real hardware probes at test-time, our method circumvents other works’ reliance on computationally-expensive hypernetwork training (Cai et al., 2019) or the adoption of potentially inaccurate latency predictors Lee et al.. Instead, our approach constrains the *number* of final measurements to take on at test time to 10. With this, we maintain a low resource footprint while delivering hardware-adaptive architectures, all without relying on inaccurate latency estimation approaches which hinder applicability in risk-averse applications, such as robotics or aerospace.

Limitations & Future Work. While we validate our approach on the popular NATS-Bench (Dong et al., 2021) search space, larger-scale problems such as FBNet (Wu et al., 2019) remain unexplored at this stage. Consequently, an immediate next step is to test our domain-randomized controller on FBNet. Further, the maximal diversity between training and test distributions our approach can robustly stand has not been explored either at this stage. Rather, we focused on ensuring the test device actual latency values would fall within the distribution considered at training time (Figure 1) to prevent out-of-distribution testing, but some more analysis is needed.

Lastly, we highlight that the choice of the underlying synthetic device distributions Ξ is arbitrary at this stage, and that the design of Ξ has been shown to be critical (Akkaya et al., 2019). Should the diversity of the synthetic devices tackled be excessively high, the agent may incur in over-regularized training, thus failing to adapt to find strong architectures per d_{target} . On the contrary, not challenging-enough distributions may prevent greater generalization, hindering transferability from synthetic devices to target ones. Trading off the conflicting objectives of ensuring diversity while not overregularizing is a non trivial problem, and we aim at investigating approaches to it (Tiboni et al., 2023) in the context of HW-NAS in future works.

To conclude, this work demonstrates a low-cost, practical and lightweight approach to HW NAS via training-free proxies and domain-randomized RL over hardware performance. The resulting method promises to keep real-world measurement costs bounded, avoiding the need to recur to overly simplistic and inaccurate approximation of real world hardware performance, while capturing cross-device adaptability that pure single-device solutions to HW-NAS overlook.

References

- Akkaya, I., Andrychowicz, M., Chociej, M., Litwin, M., McGrew, B., Petron, A., Paino, A., Plappert, M., Powell, G., Ribas, R., et al. (2019). Solving rubik’s cube with a robot hand. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.07113*.
- Baker, B., Gupta, O., Naik, N., and Raskar, R. (2017). Designing neural network architectures using reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Benmeziame, H. (2023). *Efficient hardware-aware neural architecture search for edge computing*. PhD thesis, Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France.
- Brock, A., Lim, T., Ritchie, J. M., and Weston, N. (2017). Smash: one-shot model architecture search through hypernetworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.05344*.
- Cai, H., Gan, C., Wang, T., Zhang, Z., and Han, S. (2019). Once-for-all: Train one network and specialize it for efficient deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09791*.
- Cai, H., Zhu, L., and Han, S. (2018). Proxylessnas: Direct neural architecture search on target task and hardware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00332*.
- Cavagnero, N., Robbiano, L., Caputo, B., and Averta, G. (2023). Freerea: Training-free evolution-based architecture search. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1493–1502.
- Chen, W., Gong, X., and Wang, Z. (2021). Neural architecture search on imagenet in four gpu hours: A theoretically inspired perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11535*.
- Chen, W., Gong, X., Wu, J., Wei, Y., Shi, H., Yan, Z., Yang, Y., and Wang, Z. (2023). Understanding and accelerating neural architecture search with training-free and theory-grounded metrics. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(2):749–763.
- Dong, X., Liu, L., Musial, K., and Gabrys, B. (2021). Nats-bench: Benchmarking nas algorithms for architecture topology and size. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(7):3634–3646.
- Jacot, A., Gabriel, F., and Hongler, C. (2018). Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- King, T., Zhou, Y., Röddiger, T., and Beigl, M. (2025). Micronas for memory and latency constrained hardware aware neural architecture search in time series classification on microcontrollers. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1):7575.
- Kober, J., Bagnell, J. A., and Peters, J. (2013). Reinforcement learning in robotics: A survey. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 32(11):1238–1274.
- Laube, K. A., Mutschler, M., and Zell, A. (2022). What to expect of hardware metric predictors in nas. In *International Conference on Automated Machine Learning*, pages 13–1. PMLR.

- Lee, H., Lee, S., Chong, S., and Hwang, S. J. (2021). Hardware-adaptive efficient latency prediction for nas via meta-learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27016–27028.
- Li, C., Yu, Z., Fu, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhao, Y., You, H., Yu, Q., Wang, Y., and Lin, Y. (2021). Hw-nas-bench: Hardware-aware neural architecture search benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.10584*.
- Liu, H., Simonyan, K., and Yang, Y. (2018). Darts: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09055*.
- Mellor, J., Turner, J., Storkey, A., and Crowley, E. J. (2021). Neural architecture search without training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7588–7598. PMLR.
- Pham, H., Guan, M. Y., Zoph, B., Le, Q. V., and Dean, J. (2018). Efficient neural architecture search via parameter sharing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 4095–4104.
- Real, E., Moore, S., Selle, A., Saxena, S., Suematsu, Y., Tan, J., Le, Q. V., and Kurakin, A. (2017). Large-scale evolution of image classifiers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, pages 2902–2911.
- Schulman, J., Levine, S., Abbeel, P., Jordan, M., and Moritz, P. (2015). Trust region policy optimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1889–1897. PMLR.
- Schulman, J., Wolski, F., Dhariwal, P., Radford, A., and Klimov, O. (2017). Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Speckhard, D. T., Misiunas, K., Perel, S., Zhu, T., Carlile, S., and Slaney, M. (2022). Neural architecture search for energy efficient always-on audio models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05397*.
- Sutton, R. S., Barto, A. G., et al. (1998). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge.
- Tanaka, H., Kunin, D., Yamins, D. L., and Ganguli, S. (2020). Pruning neural networks without any data by iteratively conserving synaptic flow. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6377–6389.
- Tiboni, G., Klink, P., Peters, J., Tommasi, T., D’Eramo, C., and Chalvatzaki, G. (2023). Domain randomization via entropy maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01885*.
- Tobin, J., Fong, R., Ray, A., Schneider, J., Zaremba, W., and Abbeel, P. (2017). Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world. In *2017 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems (IROS)*, pages 23–30. IEEE.
- Wu, B., Dai, X., Zhang, P., Wang, Y., Sun, F., Wu, Y., Tian, Y., Vajda, P., Jia, Y., and Keutzer, K. (2019). Fbnet: Hardware-aware efficient convnet design via differentiable neural architecture search. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10734–10742.
- Ying, C., Klein, A., Christiansen, E., Real, E., Murphy, K., and Hutter, F. (2019). Nas-bench-101: Towards reproducible neural architecture search. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 7105–7114. PMLR.
- Zoph, B. and Le, Q. V. (2016). Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01578*.
- Zoph, B., Vasudevan, V., Shlens, J., and Le, Q. V. (2018). Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8697–8710.