

Progressive Weight Loading: Accelerating Initial Inference and Gradually Boosting Performance on Resource-Constrained Environments

Hyunwoo Kim¹, Junha Lee², Mincheol Choi², Jeonghwan Lee², and Jaeshin Cho²

¹ Intel, Seoul, South Korea
onion.kim@intel.com

² Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea
{junha4304, charmfe, hwan1997, cjs823}@yonsei.ac.kr

Abstract. Deep learning models have become increasingly large and complex, resulting in higher memory consumption and computational demands. Consequently, model loading times and initial inference latency have increased, posing significant challenges in mobile and latency-sensitive environments where frequent model loading and unloading are required, which directly impacts user experience. While Knowledge Distillation (KD) offers a solution by compressing large teacher models into smaller student ones, it often comes at the cost of reduced performance. To address this trade-off, we propose Progressive Weight Loading (PWL), a novel technique that enables fast initial inference by first deploying a lightweight student model, then incrementally replacing its layers with those of a pre-trained teacher model. To support seamless layer substitution, we introduce a training method that not only aligns intermediate feature representations between student and teacher layers, but also improves the overall output performance of the student model. Our experiments on VGG, ResNet, and ViT architectures demonstrate that models trained with PWL maintain competitive distillation performance and gradually improve accuracy as teacher layers are loaded—matching the final accuracy of the full teacher model without compromising initial inference speed. This makes PWL particularly suited for dynamic, resource-constrained deployments where both responsiveness and performance are critical.

Keywords: Progressive Weight Loading · Knowledge Distillation · Fast Initial Inference · Resource-Constrained Environments

1 Introduction

With the rapid advancement of deep learning, modern AI models have grown substantially in both size and complexity[1], leading to increased computational and memory demands[2,3]. While larger models often deliver improved performance, their size also results in longer loading times, which can become a critical bottleneck during deployment[4,5]. In memory-constrained environments like

edge devices, these loading delays can be especially severe. A recent study reported that for multi-billion-parameter models, the time spent loading the model into GPU memory can account for over 90% of the total inference latency[6]. Fast and efficient model loading is especially important in latency sensitive applications such as autonomous driving, robotics, and interactive AI services, where delays in model initialization may adversely affect user experience or even compromise safety.

One of the simplest approaches to reducing model loading time is to make the model smaller. Knowledge distillation is a widely used technique that compresses large models into smaller ones while attempting to retain their performance[7,8]. In this process, student models are trained under the guidance of larger teacher models by mimicking the teacher’s output logits[7] and intermediate features[9]. However, the performance of student models often falls short of that of their teacher models[10] and is generally constrained by the student model’s size. This means that although smaller student models can achieve faster loading times, they may struggle to match the accuracy of their larger counterparts.

In this paper, we propose a novel approach called Progressive Weight Loading (PWL) to tackle the challenge of balancing model loading time and performance. As illustrated in Figure 1, PWL achieves fast loading by initially loading a smaller student model, then progressively loading the teacher model’s weights layer by layer while enhancing the student’s performance. This strategy allows us to strike a balance between rapid loading and high accuracy, making it particularly suitable for resource-constrained mobile and latency-sensitive environments. Additionally, we introduce a distillation training method and a student model architecture designed to enable seamless performance improvement as layers of the student model are incrementally replaced by those of the teacher model.




Fig. 1. Illustration of the Progressive Weight Loading (PWL) timeline. Initial inference is performed using the lightweight student model, enabling a fast response. As layers are progressively replaced with those of the teacher model, the overall performance improves gradually toward that of the full teacher.

2 Background

Deploying deep neural networks on resource-constrained edge devices—such as smartphones, IoT systems, and AR/VR headsets—poses significant challenges due to limited compute, memory, and power resources compared to cloud environments[11,12]. These constraints often necessitate model loading and unloading at runtime, making techniques that accelerate model loading and enable fast initial inference highly valuable.

To address these challenges, various model compression techniques have been developed. Among them, pruning[4,13,14] and quantization[15,16] reduce model size and computational cost by removing redundant parameters or lowering numerical precision. Another widely studied method is Knowledge Distillation (KD)[7], where a compact student model is trained to mimic the behavior of a larger, high-performing teacher model. By learning from the teacher’s outputs, the student can achieve competitive accuracy while maintaining a smaller footprint.

KD has proven effective in real world applications, with models like MobileNet[5,17,18], TinyBERT[19], EfficientNet[20], and MobileBERT[21] demonstrating its impact in enabling efficient deep learning on edge devices. Initially, KD focused on matching the final outputs (logits) of the teacher and student networks[7]. However, recent research has extended this concept to hinted loss[9], which includes an intermediate feature alignment step. In this step, the student is guided to match the teacher’s internal representations, leading to more robust and informative knowledge transfer. Methods such as layer-wise distillation[21,22] and attention transfer[23,24] exemplify this progression. Attention transfer proposes re-weighting feature maps with attention maps for loss construction[23]. ReviewKD[25] addresses the challenge of arbitrarily selecting specific layers for distillation by aggregating information across all teacher layers using trainable attention blocks. Neuron Selectivity Transfer[26] and Similarity Preserving KD[22] involve the construction of relational matrices based on batches and features; these matrices then serve as input for their distillation loss functions.

Despite these advancements, the primary objective of existing intermediate feature alignment techniques is to improve the standalone performance of the student model[10]. In contrast, our work introduces a novel perspective: training a student model whose layers can be seamlessly replaced by corresponding layers from the teacher model at inference time, without degrading performance. This approach enables Progressive Weight Loading (PWL)—a mechanism that supports fast initial inference and gradually upgrades the model toward full teacher level performance in a resource aware manner.

3 Design Proposal

3.1 Progressive Weight Loading Overview

PWL starts inference with a smaller, efficient student model and incrementally replaces its layers with those from a larger, more powerful teacher model. The




Fig. 2. Conceptual overview of Progressive Weight Loading (PWL). The student model is initially loaded, and its layers are progressively replaced by those of the teacher model, starting from the input layer. This approach enables a dynamic trade-off between model size and performance, making it well-suited to resource-constrained environments such as mobile and edge computing.

objective of PWL is to progressively enhance performance from the baseline level of the student to the superior level of the teacher. Key benefits of PWL include:

1. **Fast Initial Inference:** By initially deploying the smaller student model, PWL enables rapid model loading and inference, critical for latency-sensitive applications such as autonomous driving or interactive AI services.
2. **Memory Aware Performance Scaling:** PWL provides dynamic control over the memory performance trade-off, making it particularly suitable for mobile and resource-constrained environments. Unlike conventional deployments—which rely entirely on either a small student or a large teacher model, PWL supports partial loading of teacher layers according to the available system memory.

The primary goal of PWL is to achieve gradual and seamless performance improvement as student model’s layers are incrementally replaced with corresponding layers from the teacher model. However, this approach poses several challenges:

- **Feature Alignment:** Differences in architecture between student and teacher models complicate the alignment of their internal feature representations. Therefore, a dedicated feature converter is required to map the student’s features to the teacher’s feature space and vice versa.
- **Training Strategy:** An effective training strategy must be developed to prevent performance degradation during progressive layer replacement. This strategy should facilitate the seamless alignment of student and teacher features, ensuring the student model effectively mimics both the logits and the intermediate representations of the teacher.

To address these challenges, we introduce two key components: the **Invertible Feature Converter** and the **Training Strategy for PWL**.

3.2 Invertible Feature Converter

One of the critical challenges we address is aligning different feature representations between student and teacher model layers. The goal is to ensure compatibility between features extracted from corresponding layers, enabling the progressive loading of teacher model layers into a student model.

We define the features from the student and teacher models as follows 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{feat}_{S_i} &= S_{L_i} \circ S_{L_{i-1}} \circ \dots \circ S_{L_1}(x), \\ \text{feat}_{T_i} &= T_{L_i} \circ T_{L_{i-1}} \circ \dots \circ T_{L_1}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $f_{S_{1:i}}$ represents the output feature from layers 1 to i of the student model, and $f_{T_{1:i}}$ represents the corresponding feature from the teacher model.

For conventional CNN based architectures (e.g., VGG, ResNet), these features typically differ in the number of channels, given by 2:




Fig. 3. Architecture of the feature converter. Since features from the teacher and student models often differ in dimensionality or channel size, they must be transformed to a common space for effective comparison. Our proposed solution employs a lightweight autoencoder-style converter, consisting of simple linear layers for both the encoder and decoder.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{feat}_{S_i} &\in \mathbb{R}^{C_s \times W \times H}, \\ \text{feat}_{T_i} &\in \mathbb{R}^{C_t \times W \times H}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where usually $C_s < C_t$.

In transformer-based models such as Vision Transformer (ViT), the features differ primarily in embedding dimensionality 3:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{feat}_{S_i} &\in \mathbb{R}^{\text{num_blocks} \times d_S}, \\ \text{feat}_{T_i} &\in \mathbb{R}^{\text{num_blocks} \times d_T}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where typically $d_s < d_t$.

To convert teacher features to student features, we propose using a lightweight linear mapping. Specifically, we employ encoder decoder pairs for each layer 4, designed to map high dimensional teacher features to low dimensional student features and vice versa. For CNN based models, these mappings are implemented as 1×1 convolutional layers, whereas for transformer-based models, simple linear layers are used.

Crucially, this feature mapping must be invertible to enable flexible layer replacement. Suppose we replace a student layer S_{L2} with its teacher counterpart T_{L2} . First, the student feature feat_{S1} must be mapped to feat_{T1} before being processed by T_{L2} . Subsequently, the resulting teacher feature feat_{T2} needs to be mapped back to feat_{S2} to continue processing by the student layer S_{L3} . Thus, bidirectional mappings are essential:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Encoder}_i(\text{feat}_{T_i}) &= \text{feat}_{S_i}, \\ \text{Decoder}_i(\text{feat}_{S_i}) &= \text{feat}_{T_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We propose an autoencoder-style[27] architecture for these encoder decoder feature converters, parameterized by learnable weights. These encoders and decoders are jointly optimized with the student model during the distillation training process, ensuring accurate and efficient feature alignment for Progressive Weight Loading.

3.3 Training Strategy for PWL




Fig. 4. Training strategy for PWL. The student model is optimized using a combination of five losses to support progressive layer replacement. Hard loss and soft loss supervise the student using ground-truth labels and teacher logits, respectively. Feature loss and reconstruction loss encourage alignment of intermediate representations between the student and teacher. Random cross loss mitigates performance degradation when individual student layers are replaced with corresponding teacher layers.

The training strategy for PWL involves jointly optimizing the student model and the encoder decoder[27] feature converters through a distillation framework. The Teacher model guides the student model to learn from its logits and intermediate representations. During this process, the encoder decoder converters

are simultaneously trained to minimize the discrepancy between corresponding student and teacher features.

Our training objective comprises 4 primary components:

Distillation Loss 5: The distillation loss L_{distill} consists of two components a hard target loss that enforces correct predictions against ground truth labels, and a soft target loss that encourages the student model to mimic the teacher’s output distribution[7].

$$L_{\text{distill}} = \alpha L_{\text{hard}} + (1 - \alpha) L_{\text{soft}} \quad (5)$$

where

$$L_{\text{hard}} = \text{CE}(p_s, y), \quad (6)$$

$$L_{\text{soft}} = T^2 \text{KL}\left(\sigma\left(\frac{z_t}{T}\right) \parallel \sigma\left(\frac{z_s}{T}\right)\right). \quad (7)$$

with z_t and z_s being the teacher and student logits respectively, σ denoting the softmax function, y the ground truth label, $T > 1$ the temperature parameter[28] used for softening logits, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ balancing the hard and soft losses.

Feature Loss 8: This loss ensures feature compatibility across corresponding layers by minimizing the L2 distance between converted features:

$$L_{\text{feature}} = \sum_i \left(\|\text{Encoder}_i(\text{feat}_{T_i}) - \text{feat}_{S_i}\|^2 + \|\text{Decoder}_i(\text{feat}_{S_i}) - \text{feat}_{T_i}\|^2 \right) \quad (8)$$

Reconstruction Loss 9: We also introduce a reconstruction loss to encourage the encoder-decoder pairs to be near-invertible. This loss minimizes the discrepancy between the original teacher feature and its reconstruction after passing through the encoder and decoder:

$$L_{\text{recon}} = \sum_i \left(\|\text{feat}_{T_i} - \text{Decoder}_i(\text{Encoder}_i(\text{feat}_{T_i}))\|^2 + \|\text{feat}_{S_i} - \text{Encoder}_i(\text{Decoder}_i(\text{feat}_{S_i}))\|^2 \right) \quad (9)$$

Including this term helps the feature converters preserve essential information in the teacher features during mapping, ensuring smooth transitions when progressively replacing student layers with teacher layers. It acts as a regularizer[29] preventing the mappings from collapsing to trivial or lossy transformations and stabilizing training.

Random Cross Loss 12: To ensure consistent accuracy regardless of which student layers are replaced by corresponding teacher layers during progressive loading, we introduce a Random Cross Loss. In each training iteration, a random subset of student layers is replaced by the corresponding teacher layers, with encoder and decoder feature converters applied as needed.

Formally, let the full model consist of L layers, and let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ denote the random subset of layers replaced by teacher layers in a given iteration. The mixed model’s output logits, denoted by z_{mix} 10, are defined as

$$z_{\text{mix}} = f(x; \{\tilde{L}_i\}_{i=1}^L) \quad (10)$$

where

$$\tilde{L}_i = \begin{cases} T_{L_i}(\cdot) & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{R} \text{ (teacher layer with encoder/decoder conversion),} \\ S_{L_i}(\cdot) & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{R} \text{ (student layer).} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Here, S_{L_i} and T_{L_i} represent the student and teacher implementations of the i th layer, respectively, with feature conversion applied to teacher layers to ensure compatibility.

The Random Cross Loss is then computed as the cross entropy between the mixed model’s output and the ground truth label y :

$$L_{\text{random-cross}} = \text{CE}(\sigma(z_{\text{mix}}), y) \quad (12)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the softmax function.

This loss encourages the model to maintain stable and high performance across arbitrary combinations of student and teacher layers during progressive weight loading.

Total Loss 13: Combining these losses, the final training objective is:

$$L_{\text{total}} = L_{\text{distill}} + \lambda_1 L_{\text{feature}} + \lambda_2 L_{\text{recon}} + \lambda_3 L_{\text{random-cross}} \quad (13)$$

where λ_1, λ_2 , and λ_3 are hyperparameters that balance the contributions of feature alignment loss, reconstruction loss, and Random Cross Loss respectively.

4 Implementation Details

All source code, including model definitions, training scripts, and evaluation utilities, is publicly available at: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/ProgressiveWeightLoading-3C6C>

4.1 Framework and Environment

All models and training routines are implemented in **PyTorch 2.7** using **Python 3.12**. Experiments are conducted on a system equipped with an **NVIDIA A100 GPU** and **CUDA 12.6**.

Model statistics, such as parameter counts and memory usage, are obtained using the `torchinfo` library.

4.2 Dataset and Preprocessing

We evaluate our method on two benchmark datasets: **CIFAR-10** and **CIFAR-100**[30]. For training, we apply standard data augmentation techniques commonly used for these datasets[31,32], including:

- `RandomCrop(32, padding=4)`
- `RandomHorizontalFlip(p=0.5)`
- `RandomRotation(15°)`

All images are normalized[31] using dataset-specific mean and standard deviation values prior to input into the model.

4.3 Model Architecture

We designed distinct architectures for teacher and student models across three standard architectures VGG[33], ResNet[34], and Vision Transformer (ViT)[35]—to rigorously evaluate Progressive Weight Loading (PWL). Each architecture is divided into four main blocks, allowing clear comparisons of intermediate representations and facilitating layer-wise progressive loading.

VGG Architecture For the VGG model, the teacher follows the classical VGG16 style architecture[33] comprising four convolutional blocks followed by three fully connected (FC) layers. The student architecture significantly reduces complexity, adopting a VGG6 style model featuring only five convolutional layers distributed across four blocks and a single FC layer. Additionally, each convolutional block’s channel size is halved compared to the teacher, except for the initial block.

ResNet Architecture The ResNet teacher model adopts the widely recognized ResNet-50 architecture[34]. It consists of four convolutional blocks containing 3, 4, 6, and 3 residual layers, respectively. Each residual layer includes two 1×1 convolutional layers and one 3×3 convolutional layer, with channel dimensions selected as 64, 128, 256, and 512. Conversely, the student architecture simplifies to a ResNet-18 style model, featuring only a single residual layer per block with channel dimensions reduced by half, except for the first block.

ViT Architecture For the Vision Transformer (ViT), the teacher model uses a ViT-tiny configuration[35] with 12 transformer layers evenly divided into four blocks (three layers per block), each with an embedding dimension of 192. The student variant simplifies this by allocating just one transformer layer per block, maintaining the same embedding dimension to facilitate feature mapping between corresponding layers.

Table 1 summarizes the specific architectural differences between teacher and student models, highlighting parameter reductions and resulting memory efficiencies for each architecture.

Table 1. Comparison of teacher and student architectures for VGG, ResNet, and ViT. Each model is divided into four corresponding blocks of layers for structural alignment and progressive replacement.

Block	Teacher (VGG16 style)	Student (VGG6 style)
	2 Conv 3×3 (64)	1 Conv 3×3 (64)
Block 1	→ 2 Conv 3×3 (128)	→ 1 Conv 3×3 (128)
Block 2	3 Conv 3×3 (256)	1 Conv 3×3 (128)
Block 3	3 Conv 3×3 (512)	1 Conv 3×3 (256)
Block 4	3 Conv 3×3 (512)	1 Conv 3×3 (256)
Post blocks	3 FC	1 FC
#Params	14.7M	0.9M
Memory (MB)	64.1	5.1 (8.3%)

Block	Teacher (ResNet-50 style)	Student (ResNet-18 style)
Block 1	3 ResNet layers (64)	1 ResNet layer (32)
Block 2	4 ResNet layers (128)	1 ResNet layer (64)
Block 3	6 ResNet layers (256)	1 ResNet layer (128)
Block 4	3 ResNet layers (512)	1 ResNet layer (256)
Post blocks	Global Pooling + FC	Global Pooling + FC
#Params	10.6M	1.2M
Memory (MB)	61.2	8.9 (14.5%)

Block	Teacher (ViT-tiny, 12 layers)	Student (ViT-tiny, 4 layers)
Block 1	3 ViT layers (192 dim)	1 ViT layer (192 dim)
Block 2	3 ViT layers (192 dim)	1 ViT layer (192 dim)
Block 3	3 ViT layers (192 dim)	1 ViT layer (192 dim)
Block 4	3 ViT layers (192 dim)	1 ViT layer (192 dim)
Post blocks	FC	FC
#Params	5.5M	2.1M
Memory (MB)	62.8	22.7 (36.1%)

4.4 Experiment Setup

We adopt distinct training strategies for CNN based model(VGG and ResNet) and for transformer-based models(ViT), to reflect their architectural differences.

For CNN based distillation, we train the student models from scratch using standard supervised learning with an extended training schedule. Models are trained for 160 epochs on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 using a cosine annealing learning rate schedule starting from $5e-2$ and decaying to $1e-5$. We use the SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.9 and weight decay of $5e-4$. This prolonged training stabilizes convergence and facilitates effective feature alignment with the teacher model.

For transformer-based architectures, we adopt a two stage training process. First, the student model is pretrained using intermediate representation (IR) matching and feature loss 8. Then, the student is finetuned on CIFAR-10 or CIFAR-100 for 5 epochs using the AdamW optimizer with a fixed learning rate of $5e-5$.

To enhance stability, we assign a smaller learning rate 1/10th of the base rate to the encoder and decoder layers used for feature conversion. This prevents overfitting of the converters and ensures consistent performance when student layers are progressively replaced by teacher layers.

For the loss formulation, we set the balancing coefficient α in distill loss (L_{distill}) 5 to 0.6, assigning a weight of 0.6 to the hard target loss (L_{hard}) 6 and 0.4 to the soft target loss (L_{soft}) 7. For the total loss 13, we configure the loss weights as follows: $\lambda_1 = 1.0$ and $\lambda_2 = 1.0$ for the feature loss (L_{feature}) 8 and reconstruction loss (L_{recon}) 9, respectively. The weight for the Random Cross Loss ($L_{\text{random-cross}}$) 12 is set to $\lambda_3 = 1.8$, reflecting its greater influence in stabilizing performance during progressive layer replacement.

5 Result and Analysis

Table 2. Comparison of distillation performance with and without PWL training. The student model trained with PWL shows no degradation in performance compared to standard distillation.

Model	CIFAR10			CIFAR100		
	VGG	ResNet	ViT	VGG	ResNet	ViT
Teacher	93.8	94.8	97.4	74.2	75.7	82.3
Student (w/o PWL training)	91.3	92.0	94.3	70.8	72.4	75.2
Student (w/ PWL training)	91.7	92.9	94.1	71.1	72.1	74.6

We evaluate the classification accuracy of student models trained with and without the proposed PWL loss. As shown in Table 2, the inclusion of PWL loss

leads to negligible or minor performance changes across architectures. Specifically, VGG and ResNet show marginal improvements, while ViT experiences a slight decrease in accuracy. These results confirm that incorporating PWL training does not negatively impact the overall effectiveness of knowledge distillation. Importantly, it enables the capability of progressively loading teacher weights into the student model without degrading performance.

Table 3. Gradual performance improvements as teacher weights are progressively loaded from input to output layers in VGG, ResNet, and ViT models.

Layers Loaded	CIFAR10 (%)	CIFAR100 (%)	Memory Loaded(MB)
VGGNet			
Student ($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	91.7	71.1	5.1
$T_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	92.1	70.7	8.3
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	93.1	72.5	16.3
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	92.7	73.9	39.3
Teacher ($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	93.8	74.2	64.1
ResNet			
Student ($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	92.3	71.2	8.9
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	91.9	71.3	12.9
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	92.9	73.0	26.6
$S_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	94.4	72.5	42.1
Teacher ($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	94.8	73.4	61.2
ViT			
Student ($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	94.3	74.6	22.7
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	95.5	76.2	32.2
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	96.4	79.8	43.3
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	97.1	81.4	52.5
Teacher ($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	97.8	82.3	62.8

Table 3 presents the classification performance and memory usage as teacher layers are progressively loaded into the student model, block by block, from input to output. For all three architectures—VGG, ResNet, and ViT—we observe a clear upward trend in accuracy on both CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets as more teacher layers are introduced. This confirms the effectiveness of Progressive Weight Loading (PWL) in bridging the performance gap between the student and teacher models.

Specifically, for VGG and ResNet, accuracy improves steadily while memory usage increases in proportion to the number of loaded teacher blocks. ViT exhibits a more pronounced performance gain, particularly on CIFAR-100, indi-

cating that transformer-based architectures may benefit more from incremental upgrades. Notably, this progressive transition does not result in abrupt changes in performance, demonstrating the stability and smooth integration of teacher layers at each stage.

These results highlight that PWL enables flexible trade-offs between accuracy and resource usage, allowing systems to scale performance in response to available memory or computational constraints.




Fig. 5. Loading time vs. CIFAR-10 accuracy for student, PWL stages, and teacher models across VGG, ResNet, and ViT architectures. PWL delivers inference speed on par with the student model while steadily increasing accuracy as layers are replaced with teacher weights.

We evaluate the loading time of the model for VGG, ResNet and ViT. As shown in figure 5, because PWL first loads the entire student model, the time to first inference is identical to the total time required to load the student model itself. We then incrementally replaced each student layer with its teacher counterpart, while still allowing the unreplaced student layers to perform inference, and measured the time for each step. The total loading time of teacher layers with PWL exceeds the total loading time of the student model, but it has a benefit in that it can still inference with gradually improving performance during the loading time.

Figure 5 presents a comparison of loading times for the student model, the full teacher model, and the progressive layer by layer loading process using PWL across VGG, ResNet, and ViT architectures. The "Student Total" row reflects the initial loading time required to load the entire student model, while the "Teacher Total" row shows the time needed to load the complete teacher model from scratch.

In the "Student \rightarrow Teacher Replace" row, we measure the cumulative time taken as teacher layers are incrementally loaded on top of the already initialized student model. Although the total time for progressive loading exceeds the teacher model’s loading time, PWL offers a critical advantage: inference can begin immediately with the student model and continue throughout the loading process with gradually improving performance. This incremental and non blocking behavior is especially valuable for latency sensitive scenarios, where maintaining continuous availability is more important than waiting for a full teacher model to load.

Table 4. System requirements for ResNet on CIFAR-10. PWL achieves fast initial inference comparable to the student model, while progressively reaching the maximum accuracy of the teacher model.

	Initial Inference Time	Maximum Accuracy	Memory Requirement
Student	24.12 ms	92.9%	8.9 MB
Teacher	65.36 ms	94.8%	61.2 MB
PWL	24.3 ms	94.8%	8 – 62MB (flexible)

Table 4 summarizes the practical benefits of the proposed PWL method. For ResNet with CIFAR-10 dataset, PWL achieves the same maximum accuracy (94.8%) but with a significantly reduced initial inference time—comparable to that of the lightweight student model, compared to teacher model. Moreover, while the teacher model demands a fixed memory footprint of 61.2 MB, PWL offers a flexible memory range (8-62 MB), allowing it to adapt to system constraints by progressively loading teacher layers. This adaptability enables efficient resource utilization and fast initial responses, making PWL particularly suitable for deployment in latency sensitive or memory constrained environments.

6 Ablation Study

Table 5 presents an ablation study evaluating the impact of different teacher layer loading orders on classification accuracy for VGG, ResNet, and ViT across CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. We tested three strategies: **prefix loading** (replacing layers from input to output), **suffix loading** (from output to input), and **contiguous block loading** (replacing a block of intermediate layers).

For VGG and ResNet, the accuracy was relatively stable regardless of loading order, though prefix loading consistently yielded slightly better results. In

contrast, ViT exhibited a significant sensitivity to the loading strategy. Prefix loading led to smooth and progressive accuracy gains, whereas suffix and contiguous loading resulted in performance degradation.

These results highlight that for PWL to be effective especially in attention based architectures like ViT—progressive loading from early layers (prefix loading) is the most robust and optimal strategy.

Table 5. Ablation study on the effectiveness of layer replacement order, conducted on VGG, ResNet, and ViT using CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. Results show that replacing layers in prefix loading—from input to output—yields the most stable and consistent performance improvement.

Loading Order	CIFAR10			CIFAR100		
	VGG	ResNet	ViT	VGG	ResNet	ViT
Prefix Loading						
Student($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	91.7	92.3	94.3	71.1	72.1	74.6
$T_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	92.1	91.9	95.5	70.6	71.4	76.2
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	93.1	92.9	96.4	72.5	72.8	79.8
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	92.7	94.4	97.1	73.8	73.6	81.4
Teacher($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	93.8	94.8	97.4	74.2	75.7	82.3
Suffix Loading						
Student($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	91.7	92.3	94.3	71.1	72.1	74.6
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	91.0	88.8	82.1	65.6	69.2	61.3
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	90.3	93.4	84.2	67.6	73.7	64.7
$S_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow T_{L4}$	91.4	94.3	87.5	69.1	74.5	68.8
Teacher($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	93.8	94.8	97.4	74.2	75.7	82.3
Contiguous Block Loading						
Student($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	91.7	91.8	94.3	53.1	72.1	74.6
$S_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	86.1	88.1	84.5	59.4	65.2	62.1
$S_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	88.4	90.2	81.2	64.1	68.8	59.7
$S_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	89.8	89.1	78.2	65.8	71.0	58.3
Teacher($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	93.8	94.2	97.4	56.1	75.7	82.3

Also, we assessed the individual effectiveness of each component in the proposed PWL training. Table 6 and figure 6 presents an ablation study evaluating the contribution of each component in the proposed loss function (Equation 13) on the ResNet model trained with CIFAR-10. Two evaluation metrics are used: the classification accuracy of the final distilled student model, and the **Cross Accuracy**, which is defined as the mean accuracy across intermediate hybrid models where teacher layers progressively replace student layers. For example,

with three blocks, Cross Accuracy includes the average of models like $T_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}$ and $T_{L1}T_{L2}S_{L3}$.

The results demonstrate that $L_{feature}$ plays a critical role in both student accuracy and cross accuracy. This indicates that aligning internal feature representations not only improves final performance but also enhances model stability during layer-wise replacement. On the other hand, L_{recon} and $L_{random-cross}$ do not significantly affect the distilled student’s final accuracy but greatly improve cross accuracy. Notably, removing $L_{random-cross}$ leads to a dramatic drop in cross accuracy (from 93.1% to 44.2%), confirming its essential role in ensuring seamless replacement between student and teacher layers during progressive loading. These findings support that each component of the proposed loss function contributes to different but complementary aspects of PWL effectiveness.

Table 6. Ablation study on the effectiveness of each loss component for ResNet on CIFAR-10. We evaluate the impact of feature loss, reconstruction loss, and random cross loss, each of which contributes to improving either the final student accuracy or the cross-layer accuracy during progressive weight replacement.

Configuration	Student Acc (%)	Cross Acc (mean, %)
Normal	92.8	93.1
w/o L_{recon}	92.4	88.9 (↓)
w/o $L_{feature}$	88.4 (↓)	82.0 (↓)
w/o $L_{random-cross}$	92.3	44.2 (↓)




Fig. 6. Training metrics—student accuracy, cross accuracy, and validation loss—for ResNet on CIFAR-10, illustrating the impact of ablating feature loss, reconstruction loss, and random-cross loss.

7 Discussion and Future Work

7.1 Invertibility of the Feature Converter

An important point of discussion is whether the feature converter needs to be invertible. We conclude that invertibility is essential when enabling arbitrary layer replacement between the student and teacher models, rather than following a fixed, sequential order. Our ablation study table 5 shows extensive examples of arbitrary layer replacement order sequence. Also, as shown in Table 6, the invertibility from reconstruction loss contributes to cross accuracy, indicating that preserving information through the converter is beneficial for seamless layer-wise replacement.

We also examined the possibility of enforcing strict invertibility using QR decomposition[36] or normalizing flow-based architectures[37,38,39]. However, to maintain simplicity and computational efficiency, we opted for an autoencoder-style feature converter.

7.2 Combining with Other Model Compression Methods

Model compression techniques such as quantization[15,40,16] and pruning[4,13,14] are essential for deploying deep learning models in resource-constrained environments like mobile devices. Progressive Weight Loading (PWL) is compatible with these techniques and can further enhance efficiency by enabling faster model loading and earlier inference.

Although integrating PWL with compression methods is beyond the scope of this study, it presents a promising direction for future research. Such a combination could lead to highly optimized deployments of deep learning models, particularly in latency-sensitive or memory-constrained applications.

7.3 Application to Other Domains

The need for deploying large-scale models extends beyond vision tasks to domains such as text-to-speech (TTS), natural language processing (NLP), and audio processing. In this work, we validate the PWL approach on image classification tasks as a proof of concept.

Given the effectiveness of PWL on transformer-based models like ViT, we anticipate its potential applicability to other domains, particularly in NLP and audio, where large transformer models are prevalent. Exploring these applications remains an important direction for future work.

8 Conclusion

We propose Progressive Weight Loading (PWL), a novel approach that enables fast initial inference and efficient performance-memory trade-offs by progressively replacing the student model’s layers with those of a pre-trained teacher

model. To support this, we introduced a training method that aligns intermediate feature representations between student and teacher layers, ensuring smooth and consistent performance gains as layers are incrementally upgraded.

Through extensive experiments across VGG, ResNet, and ViT architectures, we demonstrated that PWL not only maintains distillation performance but also allows for dynamic and flexible deployment, making it particularly suitable for latency-sensitive and memory-constrained environments. This study demonstrates that the PWL technique can be applied to domains where large scale Transformer models are pervasive such as natural language processing and speech and future work will focus on validating PWL in these settings and rigorously quantifying its benefits for model scalability and responsiveness.

References

1. Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T.B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., Amodei, D.: Scaling laws for neural language models. CoRR **abs/2001.08361** (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361>
2. Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., McCallum, A.: Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in NLP. CoRR **abs/1906.02243** (2019), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02243>
3. Patterson, D.A., Gonzalez, J., Le, Q.V., Liang, C., Munguia, L., Rothchild, D., So, D.R., Texier, M., Dean, J.: Carbon emissions and large neural network training. CoRR **abs/2104.10350** (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.10350>
4. Han, S., Mao, H., Dally, W.J.: Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and Huffman coding. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2016), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.00149>, arXiv:1510.00149
5. Howard, A.G., Zhu, M., Chen, B., Kalenichenko, D., Wang, W., Weyand, T., Andreetto, M., Adam, H.: Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. CoRR **abs/1704.04861** (2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04861>
6. Han, X., Cai, Z., Zhang, Y., Fan, C., Liu, J., Ma, R., Buyya, R.: Hermes: Memory-Efficient Pipeline Inference for Large Models on Edge Devices. In: Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD). pp. 454–461. IEEE (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCD63220.2024.00076>
7. Hinton, G., Vinyals, O., Dean, J.: Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. CoRR **abs/1503.02531** (2015), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02531>
8. Bucilua, C., Caruana, R., Niculescu-Mizil, A.: Model compression. In: Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. pp. 535–541 (2006)
9. Romero, A., Ballas, N., Kahou, S.E., Chassang, A., Gatta, C., Bengio, Y.: Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2015), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6550>, arXiv:1412.6550
10. Gou, J., Yu, B., Maybank, S.J., Tao, D.: Knowledge distillation: A survey. International Journal of Computer Vision **129**(6), 1789–1819 (2021)
11. Chen, J., Ran, X.: Deep learning with edge computing: A review. Proceedings of the IEEE **107**(8), 1655–1674 (2019)

12. Shuvo, M.M.H., Islam, S.K., Cheng, J., Morshed, B.I.: Efficient acceleration of deep learning inference on resource-constrained edge devices: A review. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **111**(1), 42–91 (2022)
13. Molchanov, P., Tyree, S., Karras, T., Aila, T., Kautz, J.: Pruning convolutional neural networks for resource efficient inference. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2017), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.06440>, arXiv:1611.06440
14. Molchanov, D., Ashukha, A., Vetrov, D.: Variational dropout sparsifies deep neural networks. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. pp. 2498–2507. PMLR (2017)
15. Hubara, I., Courbariaux, M., Soudry, D., El-Yaniv, R., Bengio, Y.: Quantized neural networks: Training neural networks with low precision weights and activations. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **18**(187), 1–30 (2018)
16. Frantar, E., Ashkboos, S., Hoefler, T., Alistarh, D.: Gptq: Accurate post-training quantization for generative pre-trained transformers. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.17323>, arXiv:2210.17323
17. Sandler, M., Howard, A., Zhu, M., Zhmoginov, A., Chen, L.C.: Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 4510–4520 (2018)
18. Howard, A., Sandler, M., Chu, G., Chen, L.C., Chen, B., Tan, M., Wang, W., Zhu, Y., Pang, R., Vasudevan, V., et al.: Searching for mobilenetv3. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. pp. 1314–1324 (2019)
19. Jiao, X., Yin, Y., Shang, L., Jiang, X., Chen, X., Li, L., Wang, F., Liu, Q.: Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. pp. 4163–4174 (2020), <https://aclanthology.org/2020.findings-emnlp.372>
20. Tan, M., Le, Q.: Efficientnet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. pp. 6105–6114. PMLR (2019)
21. Sun, Z., Yu, H., Song, X., Liu, R., Yang, Y., Zhou, D.: Mobilebert: A compact task-agnostic bert for resource-limited devices. In: *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. pp. 2158–2170 (2020), <https://aclanthology.org/2020.acl-main.195>
22. Tung, F., Mori, G.: Similarity-preserving knowledge distillation. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. pp. 1365–1374 (2019)
23. Zagoruyko, S., Komodakis, N.: Paying more attention to attention: Improving the performance of convolutional neural networks via attention transfer. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2017), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.03928>, arXiv:1612.03928
24. Ji, M., Heo, B., Park, S.: Show, attend and distill: Knowledge distillation via attention-based feature matching. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. vol. 35, pp. 7945–7952 (2021)
25. Chen, P., Liu, S., Zhao, H., Jia, J.: Distilling knowledge via knowledge review. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 5008–5017 (2021)
26. Huang, Z., Wang, N.: Like what you like: Knowledge distill via neuron selectivity transfer. *CoRR* **abs/1707.01219** (2017), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01219>

27. Hinton, G.E., Salakhutdinov, R.R.: Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *Science* **313**, 504–507 (2006)
28. Guo, C., Pleiss, G., Sun, Y., Weinberger, K.Q.: On calibration of modern neural networks. In: *International conference on machine learning*. pp. 1321–1330. PMLR (2017)
29. Vincent, P., Larochelle, H., Bengio, Y., Manzagol, P.A.: Extracting and composing robust features with denoising autoencoders. In: *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*. pp. 1096–1103 (2008)
30. Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G.E.: Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Tech. rep., Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto (2009), technical Report
31. Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., Hinton, G.E.: Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 25. pp. 1106–1114 (2012)
32. Szegedy, C., Liu, W., Jia, Y., Sermanet, P., Reed, S., Anguelov, D., Erhan, D., Vanhoucke, V., Rabinovich, A.: Going deeper with convolutions. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 1–9 (2015)
33. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2015), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.1556>, arXiv:1409.1556
34. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. pp. 770–778 (2016)
35. Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., et al.: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.11929>, arXiv:2010.11929
36. Francis, J.G.F.: The qr transformation—part 2. *The Computer Journal* **4**(4), 332–345 (1962)
37. Papamakarios, G., Nalisnick, E., Rezende, D.J., Mohamed, S., Lakshminarayanan, B.: Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **22**(57), 1–64 (2021)
38. Dinh, L., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Bengio, S.: Density estimation using real nvp. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1605.08803>, arXiv:1605.08803
39. Kingma, D.P., Dhariwal, P.: Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 31. pp. 10236–10245 (2018)
40. Esser, S.K., McKinstry, J.L., Bablani, D., Appuswamy, R., Modha, D.S.: Learned step size quantization. In: *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.08153>, arXiv:1902.08153
41. LeCun, Y., Bottou, L., Bengio, Y., Haffner, P.: Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **86**(11), 2278–2324 (2002)

Appendix

A Feature Converter Capacity Study

Table 7. Different size of feature converters.

	Tiny	Medium	Heavy
Architecture	Single Linear	Two-layer MLP with bottleneck	Three-layer MLP with non-linearities
#params	98k	163k	310k




Fig. 7. Effect of feature converter capacity on ResNet accuracy for CIFAR-10.

We evaluate three feature converter architectures—Tiny, Medium, and Heavy—to understand how converter capacity affects both inference accuracy and memory footprint during progressive weight loading.

- **Tiny:** a single linear layer (equivalent to a 1x1 convolution).
- **Medium:** a two-layer MLP with a bottleneck.
- **Heavy:** a three-layer MLP with nonlinear activations.

We integrate each converter into a ResNet backbone trained on CIFAR-10 and measure (1) the student accuracy after each layer replacement (cross accuracy), and (2) the converter’s parameter count. Table 7 and Figure 7 summarize these results.

Despite a more than threefold increase in parameters—from 98 k (Tiny) to 310 k (Heavy)—all three converters achieve nearly identical final accuracy (within 0.3 %). This negligible performance gain, combined with the stricter memory constraints of mobile applications, motivates our choice of the Tiny converter for all subsequent experiments.

B Applying PWL to Extremely Small Student Model

Table 8. Applying PWL to a highly compact student network. LeNet-5 student model is replaced to VGG16 teacher model

Layers Loaded	CIFAR10 (%)	CIFAR100 (%)	Memory Loaded(MiB)
LeNet5 -> VGGNet			
Student ($S_{L1}S_{L2}S_{L3}S_{L4}$)	68.4	54.9	<1MiB
$T_{L1} \rightarrow S_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	76.1	58.7	6.3
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow S_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	78.0	62.1	12.1
$T_{L1} \rightarrow T_{L2} \rightarrow T_{L3} \rightarrow S_{L4}$	82.1	65.7	31.8
Teacher ($T_{L1}T_{L2}T_{L3}T_{L4}$)	93.8	74.2	64.1

We investigated whether Progressive Weight Loading (PWL) can be effectively applied to extremely compact student models, particularly for scenarios where ultra-fast initial inference is prioritized over model accuracy—such as in real-time operating systems (RTOS) or resource-constrained embedded environments.

To this end, we adopted LeNet-5[41] as the student model due to its minimal size (less than 1MiB) and experimented with distilling knowledge from a VGG16 teacher model. Our goal was to evaluate whether PWL could progressively enhance the student model’s performance by incrementally replacing its layers with those of the teacher.

As shown in Table 8, we observe a clear performance improvement on both CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 as more layers are replaced. Starting from a baseline LeNet-5, performance improves steadily with each layer swapped, culminating in the full teacher model. This result highlights the potential of PWL even for extremely lightweight models, making it a promising strategy for systems where memory is scarce and rapid model activation is critical.

C Attention Map for ViT

Figure 8 presents the class-token attention overlaid on a CIFAR-10 image for both the student (with PWL) and teacher ViT models. For each transformer block, we extract the attention weights from the block’s final layer and upsample them to the input resolution. The heat-maps reveal that, at every block boundary, the student model attends to essentially the similar image regions as the teacher. This strong correspondence in spatial focus demonstrates that PWL not only maintains predictive accuracy but also preserves the teacher’s interpretability and feature-localization behavior throughout progressive weight replacement.




Fig. 8. Comparison of attention maps from the final layer of each block for both student and teacher models.