

A Survey on Cloud-Edge-Terminal Collaborative Intelligence in AIoT Networks

Jiaqi Wu , Jing Liu , Yang Liu , *Member, IEEE*, Lixu Wang , Zehua Wang , *Member, IEEE*, Wei Chen 
, *Member, IEEE*, Zijian Tian , Richard Yu , *Fellow, IEEE*, Victor C.M. Leung , *Life Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—The proliferation of Internet of things (IoT) devices in smart cities, transportation, healthcare, and industrial applications, coupled with the explosive growth of AI-driven services, has increased demands for efficient distributed computing architectures and communication networks, which has driven cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence (CETCI) into a fundamental paradigm within the artificial intelligence of things (AIoT) community. With advancements in deep learning, large language models (LLMs), and edge computing technologies, CETCI has made significant progress synergized with emerging AIoT applications, moving beyond conventional research scope of isolated layer optimization to deployable collaborative intelligence systems for AIoT (CISAIOT), a practical research focus in AI, distributed computing, and communications fields. In this survey, we describe foundational architectures, enabling technologies, and applicable scenarios of various CETCI paradigms, offering a tutorial-style review for beginners in CISAIOT. We systematically analyze architectural components spanning cloud, edge, and terminal layers, examining core technologies including network virtualization, container orchestration, and software-defined networking, while presenting multi-perspective categorizations of collaboration paradigms that investigate task offloading, resource allocation, and optimization techniques across heterogeneous network infrastructures. Furthermore, the survey explains intelligent collaboration learning frameworks by reviewing recent advances in federated learning, distributed

deep learning, edge-cloud model evolution, and reinforcement learning-based approaches. Finally, we discuss challenges (e.g., scalability, heterogeneity, and interoperability) and future development trends (e.g., 6G+, agents, quantum computing, and digital twin), discussing how distributed computing and communication technologies integration can address existing research challenges and promote open opportunities, serving as a guide for researchers developing robust, efficient, and secure collaborative AIoT systems.

Index Terms—Cloud-Edge-Terminal Collaborative Intelligence, Distributed Computing, Data Management, AIoT, Survey

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

THE evolution of computing paradigms has witnessed a significant shift from traditional cloud computing to more distributed architectures in response to the explosive growth of Internet of things (IoT) devices and the increasing complexity of communication network infrastructures. Traditional cloud computing, characterized by centralized data processing and storage, faces substantial challenges with the increasing number of devices generating massive amounts of heterogeneous data at the network edge, creating unprecedented demands on communication bandwidth and network resource management [1]. To address these limitations, edge computing has emerged as a novel approach that brings computational resources closer to data sources, delivering lower service latency and higher quality of service (QoS) to end devices while optimizing network traffic patterns and reducing communication overhead [2]. The architectural transformation has been further accelerated by the integration of artificial intelligence with IoT, giving rise to artificial intelligence of things (AIoT), a paradigm that combines AI technologies with IoT infrastructure to enable intelligent operations and decision making [3]. The AIoT paradigm empowers IoT systems to perceive complex environments, process collected data intelligently, and make smart decisions in a timely manner, making the overall system faster, smarter, greener, and safer [4].

The recognition that neither cloud computing nor edge computing alone can effectively address all the requirements of modern intelligent systems has led to the emergence of cloud-edge-terminal collaboration architectures. Meanwhile, hybrid paradigms, including edge-cloud computing and fog computing, leverage the complementary strengths of each layer in the computational hierarchy [5]. The cloud layer provides powerful computing capabilities and global insights, the edge layer

Jiaqi Wu is with the School of Artificial Intelligence, China University of Mining and Technology (Beijing), Beijing 100083, China, and with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada (e-mail: wjq11346@student.ubc.ca).

Jing Liu is with the Division of Natural and Applied Sciences, Duke Kunshan University, Kunshan 215316, China, and with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada, and also with the School of Information Science and Technology, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China (e-mail: jing.liu@ieee.org).

Yang Liu is with the Department of Computer Science, The University of Toronto, ON M5S 1A1, Canada (e-mail: yangliu@cs.toronto.edu).

Zehua Wang is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 2332 Main Mall Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4 (e-mail: zwang@ece.ubc.ca).

Zijian Tian is with the School of Artificial Intelligence, China University of Mining and Technology (Beijing), Beijing 100083, China. (e-mail: tianzj0726@126.com).

Wei Chen is with the School of Computer Science and Technology, China University of Mining and Technology, Xuzhou 221116, Jiangsu province, China. (e-mail: chenwdavior@163.com).

F. Richard Yu is with the Department of Systems and Computer Engineering, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6, Canada (e-mail: richard.yu@carleton.ca).

Victor C. M. Leung is with the Artificial Intelligence Research Institute, Shenzhen MSU-BIT University, Shenzhen 518172, China, the College of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 528060, China, and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada (e-mail: vleung@ece.ubc.ca).




Fig. 1: Research trends in computing paradigms and AIoT from 2021-2025, depicted through publications and citations.

offers reduced latency and localized processing, while the terminal layer (IoT devices) handles data collection and preliminary analysis [6]. Consequently, the collaborative approach has demonstrated superior performance in various domains, including industrial applications where the industrial Internet of things (IIoT) is revolutionizing traditional processes [7]. Furthermore, the collaboration facilitates enhanced security and privacy protection by enabling processing and analyzing data at the edge while sharing only privacy-preserving model parameters rather than raw data [8]. As computing capabilities of IoT hardware continue to advance, the vision of an edge-cloud continuum is emerging, where software components can seamlessly move between different levels of the computational hierarchy to optimize system performance [9].

B. Motivation

Despite the significant potential of cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence (CETCI) for revolutionizing AIoT systems, several fundamental challenges must be addressed to realize seamless collaborative operation across distributed environments. CETCI represents a specific paradigm of collaborative intelligence systems for AIoT (CISAIOT), which encompasses the orchestrated integration of cloud computing capabilities with intelligent edge and terminal devices to enable adaptive, context-aware AIoT services. As evidenced in Fig. 1, which tracks the growth in publications and citations from 2021 to 2025, with a marked surge in cloud-edge-terminal collaboration research and its AIoT network applications (statistics collected as of 2025/08/21). Terminal devices, including IoT sensors and actuators, face inherent computational limitations that restrict their capacity for complex AI task processing [6]. Additionally, the resource-constrained nature of these devices, characterized by limited processing power, memory, and energy, creates significant barriers to deploying sophisticated machine learning models locally [10]. Consequently, efficient task offloading and resource allocation strategies become necessary.

Moreover, network bandwidth limitations present a critical bottleneck, as the substantial data volume generated by AIoT devices can overwhelm network infrastructure, especially in real-time data streaming scenarios [2]. Therefore, optimizing communication protocols and data transmission is crucial for effective collaboration. Furthermore, the real-time processing

demands of many AIoT applications, such as autonomous vehicle navigation and real-time health monitoring [11], necessitate distributed intelligence at the edge to mitigate the prohibitive latency of cloud processing. In addition, scalability challenges in communication networks arise as AIoT deployments expand to support millions of interconnected devices, requiring adaptive network architectures that can dynamically scale communication resources, optimize network topology, and maintain consistent performance across varying loads and network conditions [12]. Privacy and security concerns are also paramount in AIoT systems [13], given the sensitive nature of collected data, which includes personal health information or manufacturing process data [1]. Robust security mechanisms are thus essential to prevent unauthorized access and data breaches, while simultaneously preserving user privacy during collaborative learning and data sharing.

C. Related Surveys

As illustrated in Table I, existing surveys have explored various facets of cloud computing, edge computing, and AIoT [15], each contributing valuable insights within their specific research domains. Surveys on edge computing have established strong foundations in resource management and application deployment [14], while cloud computing surveys have provided comprehensive coverage of centralized resource provisioning and service management [25]. Similarly, existing AIoT surveys have made significant contributions by addressing AI integration into IoT systems, encompassing data acquisition, model training, and application development [19]. For example, Tuli et al. [29] investigate AI-augmented edge and fog computing with particular emphasis on resource management challenges, and Zhang and Tao [4] provide a comprehensive AIoT overview, discussing its progress and challenges. Recent works like Duan et al. [20] have advanced the understanding of distributed AI systems, with their primary focus on distributed computing aspects. Moreover, application-specific surveys such as Kumar and Agrawal [21] for industrial IoT and Qu et al. [23] for mobile edge intelligence with large language models (LLMs) offer valuable specialized domain insights within their respective application areas. Additionally, emerging surveys on generative AI in edge-cloud systems highlight the growing interest in advanced AI deployment across distributed architectures [26], with their emphasis on generative AI technologies.

Beyond conventional edge computing surveys, recent advancements in mobile edge intelligence specifically for LLMs have been comprehensively documented by Qu et al. [30], who provide a contemporary analysis of edge LLM caching, training, and inference while emphasizing cost-effectiveness and privacy preservation through on-device deployment. Additionally, Van Huynh et al. [18] present an innovative integrated communication, computing, and storage model for digital twin-enabled metaverse applications by leveraging mobile edge computing (MEC) and ultra-reliable low-latency communications, thereby demonstrating the practical implementation of edge intelligence for demanding real-time interactive services. Furthermore, Wang et al. [24] contribute

TABLE I: Comparison of recent surveys on cloud-edge-terminal collaboration and related AIoT systems, evaluating their coverage across resource management, model evolution, security aspects, computing paradigms, and application domains.

Ref. Year	Domain	Resource Management		Model Evolution		Security Aspects		Computing Paradigms			Applications			
		Task Off.	Res. Alloc.	Model Comp.	Know. Trans.	Security	Privacy	Edge Cloud	ECC	AIoT	Manuf.	Transport.	Health Agri.	
[14] 2019	Edge-Cloud Systems, Application Mgmt.	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[15] 2019	Network Architecture, Resource Allocation	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[16] 2019	IoT, Distributed Systems	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[17] 2020	Resource optimization, AI algorithms	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[18] 2022	Metaverse, Digital Twin	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[19] 2023	Multiple domains, IoT networks	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[20] 2023	Distributed AI Systems	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[21] 2023	Industrial IoT, Data Analysis	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[22] 2024	Mobile Computing, Network Optimization	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[23] 2024	Edge AI, LLMs, Mobile Computing	●	●	●	●	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[24] 2024	DL, AI Systems Architecture	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[25] 2024	Cloud Computing, Edge Computing, IoT	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[26] 2024	Mobile Networks, Generative AI Services	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[27] 2025	Mobile Networks, Edge Comp.	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
[28] 2025	Edge-Cloud Comp., Model Opt.	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○
<i>Ours</i> 2025	AIoT, CETCI, Res. Mgmt., Model Evo.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

Notes: ●: "Fully covered"; ○: "Partially covered"; ○: "Not covered". Column abbreviations: Task Off.: Task Offloading; Res. Alloc.: Resource Allocation; Model Comp.: Model Compression; Know. Trans.: Knowledge Transfer; ECC: Edge-Cloud Collaboration; AIoT: Artificial Intelligence of Things; Manuf.: Manufacturing; Transport.: Transportation; Health: Healthcare; Agri.: Agriculture.

significantly by analyzing collaborative elements within end-edge-cloud systems specifically for deep learning, systematically investigating key enabling technologies including model compression, partition, and knowledge transfer across the computational continuum. Meanwhile, Yang et al. [27] offer an advanced exploration of reinforcement learning methodologies for mobile edge computing networks, detailing how RL strategies enhance offloading, caching, and communication within MEC networks while addressing critical issues related to resource optimization, security, and privacy. More recently, Liu et al. [28] provide a comprehensive examination of edge-cloud collaborative computing with a focus on distributed intelligence and model optimization, systematically analyzing model compression, adaptation, and neural architecture search alongside AI-driven resource management strategies that balance performance, energy efficiency, and latency requirements. While some research has explored edge-cloud collaboration [16], these works have primarily concentrated on specialized applications such as federated learning for QoS enhancement [1] or blockchain for secure decision-making [10], each making valuable contributions within their specific domains. Consequently, as evident from Table I, our survey complements existing literature by providing comprehensive analysis of CETCI in AIoT networks, systematically addressing key dimensions including task offloading, resource allocation, model compression, knowledge transfer, security and privacy concerns, and diverse application domains, thereby extending the current understanding of collaborative intelligence systems.

D. Survey Scope and Contributions

In this survey, we extend the conventional scope of cloud-edge-terminal computing from isolated layer analysis to practical collaborative intelligence research towards real-world AIoT applications, termed CETCI, to engage a broader readership from the distributed computing and AIoT communities. According to research objectives and involved domains, CETCI is delineated into the hierarchical framework shown in Fig. 2, encompassing: 1) *Architectural Paradigms*, consisting of cloud, edge, and terminal layers with their respective computing capabilities, communication interfaces, and resource characteristics, responsible for distributed task execution, data

processing, and intelligent decision-making across the computing continuum; 2) *Enabling Technologies*, targeting network virtualization, container orchestration, software-defined networking, and AI/ML integration platforms for large-scale AIoT deployments, linking the physical infrastructure and intelligent algorithms, supporting configurable deployment of collaborative tasks across heterogeneous environments; 3) *Intelligent Management*, focusing on resource optimization strategies driven by mathematical optimization, machine learning, and distributed algorithms, especially encompassing task offloading, resource allocation, and performance optimization; 4) *Collaborative Learning*, encompassing federated learning, distributed deep learning, edge-cloud model evolution, and reinforcement learning paradigms that enable privacy-preserving knowledge sharing and distributed intelligence across the computing hierarchy. Most existing works [22, 23, 31] concentrate on individual layers or specific technologies, overlooking the synergistic integration and collaborative optimization challenges in real-world AIoT scenarios.

Furthermore, as illustrated in Fig. 3, our survey adopts a topology-driven perspective that systematically organizes the research scope of CETCI and its supporting components. The core architecture demonstrates the intricate integration of cloud, edge, and terminal layers with diverse application domains, enabling technologies, and performance metrics, forming a cohesive collaborative intelligence ecosystem. The supporting components framework details the critical roles of resource management, collaborative learning, security and privacy protection, and data management, highlighting their individual contributions to system functionality while emphasizing their interconnected nature for achieving optimal collaborative performance. Moreover, the topology-centric view reveals how each component contributes to the overall CETCI paradigm, from foundational infrastructure management to advanced intelligent optimization strategies, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of the collaborative ecosystem's complexity and interdependencies [32, 33].

Thanks to the development of distributed AI and edge computing technologies [16, 20, 34], CISAIoT networks have made significant progress in recent years, evolving from traditional centralized cloud computing to sophisticated col-




Fig. 2: Illustrative structure of cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence (CETCI) in AIoT networks, highlighting the key components, methodologies, and challenges addressed in this survey.

laborative paradigms that leverage the unique advantages of each computational layer. Nevertheless, advancements have liberated AIoT applications from the constraints of single-layer processing limitations and addressed critical challenges in latency, bandwidth, privacy, and scalability [5]. Compared to conventional isolated approaches [35–37], collaborative architectures can optimize resource utilization, enhance system

resilience, and enable real-time intelligent processing across diverse AIoT scenarios. Therefore, researchers in this field are currently focusing on the design of collaborative frameworks, optimization strategies, and intelligent coordination mechanisms that can seamlessly integrate multi-layer capabilities while addressing the inherent challenges of distributed heterogeneous environments [15]. The contributions of this survey




Fig. 3: Topology diagram of research scope of CETCI and its supporting components, which illustrates (a) core architecture illustrates the integration of cloud, edge, and terminal layers with application domains, enabling technologies, and performance metrics; and (b) supporting components details the roles of resource management, collaborative learning, security, and data management, highlighting their contributions to system functionality and future directions.

are:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first comprehensive survey that systematically reviews cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence in AIoT networks. It covers the full spectrum of recent research across all three architectural layers and provides a holistic view of CISAIoT development without restricting to specific technologies or applications.
- We present a unified framework to systematically categorize existing works from architectural, technological, and application-oriented perspectives. Our taxonomy encompasses architectural paradigms, enabling technologies, intelligent management strategies, collaborative learning approaches, and security mechanisms, providing a comprehensive organizational structure for understanding CETCI systems.
- We conduct a thorough technical review that covers both the breadth and depth of CETCI research, including detailed analysis of task offloading strategies, resource allocation mechanisms, federated learning paradigms, and optimization techniques, which provides readers with current understanding of state-of-the-art methodologies and their interplay within collaborative frameworks.
- We identify critical open challenges and outline promising future research directions, including emerging trends in 6G integration, quantum computing, digital twins, and large language models, offering valuable insights and guidance for advancing the state-of-the-art in collaborative AIoT systems.

E. Paper Organization

The remainder of this survey is organized as follows. Sec. II introduces cloud-edge-terminal architecture and enabling technologies. Sec. III explores intelligent resource management, including task offloading and optimization. Sec. IV examines collaborative learning paradigms such as federated learning and distributed deep learning. Sec. V addresses security and privacy protection. Sec. VI discusses data management

and communication protocols. Sec. VII showcases practical applications across smart manufacturing, transportation, and healthcare. Finally, Sec. VIII discusses challenges and future directions, and Sec. IX concludes the survey.

II. ARCHITECTURE AND KEY CONCEPTS

A. Cloud-Edge-Terminal Architecture

Distributed computing paradigms have evolved to leverage three-layered architectures comprising cloud, edge, and terminal components. The cloud layer provides centralized computing and storage capabilities, while the edge layer acts as a distributed computing intermediary between the cloud and terminal devices. Lastly, the terminal layer, comprising IoT devices and sensors, handles data acquisition and initial processing. Moreover, the layers interact to enable collaborative intelligence across diverse application domains.

1) *Cloud Layer*: Centralized computing infrastructure defines the cloud layer's primary function, offering scalable resources that form the core of distributed CETCI systems. Consequently, this massive computational capacity supports complex model training, analytics, and data warehousing for interconnected AIoT applications [38]. Typically managed by third-party providers, cloud platforms offer on-demand access to computing power, memory, and storage, thus enabling AIoT applications to scale dynamically [39]. Furthermore, the centralized architecture facilitates efficient resource management and allocation across diverse tasks and applications. The cloud's capacity for large-scale data processing is essential for AIoT applications handling massive datasets generated by numerous interconnected devices. In addition, the cloud readily provides the substantial processing power and memory often required for complex computations, such as training sophisticated machine learning models. Furthermore, its role extends to long-term data storage, archiving historical data from AIoT devices for future analysis, model training, and system optimization [40]. Consequently, the centralized repository ensures data integrity, availability, and accessibility

across the AIoT system, facilitating data-driven insights and predictive models [1].

2) *Edge Layer*: Intermediate processing nodes strategically positioned between cloud and terminals characterize the edge layer's architecture. Rather than relying solely on distant cloud resources, the distributed nodes enable localized computation, significantly reducing data transmission requirements and improving responsiveness [41]. The edge layer's proximity to data sources enables computations closer to where data originates, thereby reducing the volume of data transmitted to the cloud [42]. Additionally, the localization minimizes latency and enhances real-time processing capabilities. Formally, if L_c and L_e denote the latency for processing data in the cloud and at the edge, respectively, and T_t and t_t represent the data transmission times between the terminal device and the cloud and edge, respectively, then the total latencies are $L_{total_c} = L_c + T_t$ and $L_{total_e} = L_e + t_t$. Because edge nodes are closer to terminal devices, t_t is significantly smaller than T_t . In many applications, specialized edge hardware allows L_e to be comparable to, or even smaller than, L_c [43], thus generally making L_{total_e} smaller than L_{total_c} and improving real-time performance. Additionally, by offloading computationally intensive tasks from both terminal devices and the cloud, the edge layer balances the network workload [44], optimizing energy consumption and resource utilization, particularly crucial for applications with stringent real-time requirements, such as autonomous driving and industrial automation [3, 45]. Pre-processing and filtering data at the edge further reduces the transmitted data volume, conserving network bandwidth and reducing communication costs, which is essential for large-scale AIoT deployments [1, 2].

3) *Terminal layer*: Physical world interaction defines the terminal layer's essential role through diverse IoT devices and sensors. Beyond simple data collection, the devices transform environmental phenomena into actionable digital information while enabling bidirectional communication with their surroundings [46]. As a result, the data acquisition transforms physical phenomena into digital signals, encompassing various modalities like temperature, pressure, humidity, location, images, and audio, depending on the application [47]. Subsequent to acquisition, initial data processing within the terminal layer often involves tasks such as data cleaning, filtering, aggregation, and feature extraction to reduce data volume, enhance data quality, and prepare relevant information for later stages [48]. For example, a smart thermostat might collect temperature readings and calculate an average over a specific period, thereby reducing communication overhead and computational burden on the edge and cloud layers [49]. Beyond data collection, the terminal layer enables bidirectional interaction with the physical environment through IoT-controlled actuators that can affect the physical world based on received instructions or processed data, enabling real-time control and automation [50]. For instance, smart irrigation system automatically adjusts the irrigation schedule based on collected soil moisture data, creating a feedback loop for dynamic adaptation and optimization [2].

B. Enabling Technologies

Effective collaboration across distributed architectures relies on four fundamental technologies: network virtualization, container orchestration, software-defined networking (SDN), and artificial intelligence/machine learning (AI/ML). Network virtualization creates flexible and scalable network infrastructures, while container orchestration manages and deploys applications across the distributed environment. In addition, SDN impacts dynamic network management and optimizes data flow, and AI/ML technologies contribute to intelligent decision-making and autonomous operations within collaborative paradigms.

1) *Network Virtualization*: Resource abstraction revolutionizes network management by creating logical networks independent of physical infrastructure. Virtual network components enable flexible resource allocation while supporting multiple isolated network slices simultaneously [34]. Decoupling the virtual resources from the underlying physical infrastructure offers flexibility in resource allocation and management. Specifically, mapping virtual to physical resources introduces a key optimization problem, formally defined as $\min_{\mathbf{M}} f(\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{R}_v, \mathbf{R}_p)$, where \mathbf{M} is the mapping matrix, \mathbf{R}_v represents VN resource requirements, and \mathbf{R}_p denotes available physical resources [51]. The objective function $f(\cdot)$ aims to minimize metrics such as resource utilization or energy consumption. Consequently, network virtualization facilitates efficient resource sharing among multiple VNs, enhancing resource utilization and reducing costs [52]. In AIoT systems, this virtualization enables dynamic resource provisioning and scaling, adapting to fluctuating application demands. Network slicing, a crucial application of network virtualization in AIoT [53], creates dedicated, isolated virtual networks tailored to specific application or service needs, thereby improving resource allocation and enhancing security and privacy. For cloud-edge-terminal collaboration, network virtualization enables seamless integration and interoperability between architectural layers [54], facilitating dynamic resource allocation across the cloud, edge, and terminal devices to optimize performance and reduce latency. By abstracting the complexities of the underlying physical infrastructure, network virtualization simplifies AIoT application deployment and management [55], allowing developers to focus on application logic and accelerating solution development. Additionally, it enhances network reliability and resilience by providing redundancy and fault tolerance [2], enabling dynamic remapping of virtual networks to available resources in case of physical resource failure.

2) *Container Orchestration*: Application lifecycle automation across distributed infrastructure relies on container orchestration platforms. Declarative management approaches simplify deployment complexity while ensuring consistent application behavior across heterogeneous environments [56]. Notably, the declarative model simplifies application management and enhances portability across diverse cloud and edge environments. Central to container orchestration is cluster scheduling, which efficiently places containers onto available nodes within a cluster [57]. Given a set of containers \mathcal{C} and nodes \mathcal{N} , cluster scheduling seeks a mapping function

$f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ that optimizes objectives like minimizing resource utilization or maximizing performance, subject to constraints such as resource capacity, application dependencies, and network latency. Autoscaling dynamically adjusts container instances based on real-time demand by monitoring performance metrics and triggering scaling actions based on predefined thresholds [58]. Networking solutions within container orchestration systems establish virtual networks, assign IP addresses, and manage traffic routing, often leveraging SDN principles for dynamic configuration and optimization [59]. Efficient container image distribution, particularly in bandwidth-constrained edge environments, can be achieved through peer-to-peer (P2P) sharing and optimized image layer structures [35, 60]. Resource allocation algorithms distribute resources like CPU, memory, and storage among containers, considering application requirements, resource availability, and performance goals, with particular attention to shared resources for real-time applications [61]. Integrating container orchestration with lightweight approaches like K3s enhances hybrid deployments across resource-constrained edge nodes and resource-rich cloud environments [62–64].

3) *Software-Defined Networking*: Centralized network control emerges through SDN’s separation of control and data planes. Programmable network management enables dynamic traffic optimization while supporting flexible policy enforcement across distributed systems [65]. An SDN architecture comprises a controller \mathcal{C} , a set of switches \mathcal{S} , the network topology \mathcal{N} , and a set of applications \mathcal{A} . The controller interacts with the switches via a southbound interface, typically OpenFlow [66], using a standardized protocol with a message type and payload for instructions. Consequently, the controller dynamically manages network traffic by installing flow entries, defined by matching traffic characteristics and corresponding actions [67]. In addition to dynamic flow management, SDN facilitates network virtualization [36], creating virtual networks ($\mathcal{S}_v, \mathcal{N}_v$) on the physical infrastructure for efficient resource allocation and isolation [68]. Enhanced security is achieved through centralized security policy enforcement and standardized management of authentication, authorization, and accounting (AAA) infrastructures [69, 70]. Furthermore, traffic engineering and load balancing capabilities optimize data flow across multiple network interfaces, improving network resource utilization and AIoT application performance, especially in multi-homed environments [71].

4) *Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*: Intelligent decision-making capabilities emerge from AI/ML algorithms deployed across computational layers. Adaptive learning systems enable autonomous operations while supporting predictive analytics and real-time optimization across CISAIOT frameworks [4]. A fundamental concept in ML is the model, represented as a function $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$, where \mathbf{x} denotes the input data and θ represents the model’s parameters. Learning aims to find optimal parameters θ^* that minimize a loss function $L(\theta)$, measuring the discrepancy between model predictions and ground truth [72]. Specifically, $\theta^* = \arg \min_\theta L(\theta) = \arg \min_\theta \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N l(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i)$, where N is the number of training samples, \mathbf{x}_i is the i -th input sample, y_i is the corresponding ground truth label, and $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a specific loss




Fig. 4: Overview of performance metrics for evaluation.

function. Importantly, the learning process allows systems to adapt and improve their performance over time. Depending on application requirements and resource constraints, AI/ML models can be deployed at different layers within the cloud-edge-terminal collaborative framework [2]. For example, complex deep learning models, given their computational demands, might be trained in the cloud, while simpler models can be deployed at the edge or terminal layers for real-time inference. Collaborative learning paradigms, such as federated learning, enable distributed model training across multiple devices without sharing raw data, thus preserving privacy and reducing communication overhead [6]. Reinforcement learning (RL) provides a framework for optimizing decision-making in AIoT systems, where agents learn to interact with an environment to maximize cumulative reward [50]. Specifically, the goal is to find the optimal policy $\pi^* = \arg \max_\pi \mathbb{E} [\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r_t | \pi]$, where r_t is the reward at time t and γ is a discount factor.

C. Performance Metrics

Comprehensive performance evaluation of cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence requires systematic assessment across multiple dimensions to ensure effective system operation in AIoT environments. As illustrated in Fig. 4, we present a performance metrics evaluation framework for CETCI systems, categorizing five critical assessment dimensions with their corresponding formulations.

1) *Response Time*: Real-time responsiveness demands stringent latency control across distributed computing layers. Response time optimization becomes critical for time-sensitive applications where millisecond delays can significantly impact system performance [73]. Latency, the delay between request initiation and response commencement, and response time, the duration from request initiation to complete fulfillment, are key performance indicators. In a cloud-edge-terminal collaborative system, total latency (L_{total}) comprises processing latencies on the terminal (L_{term}), edge (L_{edge}), and cloud (L_{cloud}) servers, along with network transmission latency (L_{net}) as: $L_{total} = L_{term} + L_{edge} + L_{cloud} + L_{net}$ [74].

CETCI enables low-latency data processing and real-time responsiveness by distributing computational tasks strategically [2, 75]. Specifically, processing data closer to the source

(at the edge or terminal) reduces transmission delays to the cloud. Response time R_{total} is defined as $R_{total} = L_{total} + P_{proc}$, where P_{proc} is the task processing time. Within a collaborative framework, response time depends on the task allocation strategy; offloading computationally intensive tasks to the cloud while assigning less demanding tasks to the edge or terminal can significantly reduce R_{total} [76]. Consequently, efficient task offloading and resource allocation are essential for optimizing response time and ensuring timely service delivery [1], especially given the dynamic nature of AIoT environments, which necessitates adaptive strategies for varying workloads and resource availability [77].

2) *Energy Consumption*: Power efficiency constraints drive sustainable design practices across resource-limited computing environments. Energy optimization strategies must balance computational performance with battery life and operational costs while maintaining system reliability [78]. The total energy consumption (E_{total}) is the sum of energy consumed by the cloud, edge, and terminal layers, denoted as E_{cloud} , $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{edge}} E_{edge,i}$, and $\sum_{j=1}^{N_{term}} E_{term,j}$, respectively, where N_{edge} and N_{term} represent the number of edge nodes and terminal devices. Each term includes energy used for computation, communication, and storage. The energy consumption of each component is a function of its utilization [79]. For example, the energy consumed by an edge node i is modeled as $E_{edge,i} = P_{idle,i} \cdot T_{idle,i} + P_{active,i} \cdot T_{active,i} + E_{comm,i}$, where $P_{idle,i}$ and $P_{active,i}$ represent power consumption in idle and active states, $T_{idle,i}$ and $T_{active,i}$ denote the corresponding time durations, and $E_{comm,i}$ is the communication energy.

Cloud-edge-terminal collaboration is key to balancing computational load and reducing energy consumption [80]. Offloading computationally intensive tasks from terminals to edge servers or the cloud reduces terminal energy consumption, but introduces communication overhead. Therefore, intelligent task offloading strategies are essential for minimizing overall system energy. Optimizing energy consumption requires considering task characteristics, resource availability, network conditions, and device energy profiles. Dynamic resource allocation, such as putting underutilized edge servers into sleep mode, enhances energy efficiency [81]. In addition, using renewable energy sources at the edge and cloud reduces the carbon footprint of AIoT systems [82]. Federated learning, a distributed learning paradigm, reduces communication overhead and thus energy consumption by training models locally and aggregating updates at the edge or cloud [1].

3) *Resource Utilization*: Optimal resource allocation maximizes computational efficiency while minimizing operational overhead across heterogeneous infrastructure. Strategic workload distribution enables cost-effective utilization of available computing, storage, and network resources [83]. Overall resource utilization U_{total} can be defined as the ratio of the sum of used resources U_r to the sum of total available resources A_r across N_{res} resources, such as CPU, memory, and bandwidth. Maximizing U_{total} requires strategically distributing workloads and data across the cloud, edge, and terminal layers. Specifically, allocating M_{task} tasks to K_{node} computing nodes across this continuum involves minimizing the total execution cost, subject to constraints like deadlines, resource availability,

and energy limits [84]. Consequently, the allocation problem, where $c_{task,node}$ represents the cost of executing task i on node j , can be effectively addressed using optimization techniques like linear programming and deep reinforcement learning. In addition, computation reuse, quantified by the reuse rate (R_{comp}), optimizes resource utilization by avoiding redundant computations and reducing latency [85]. Energy-aware resource allocation and collaborative strategies like federated learning further enhance efficiency by minimizing energy consumption and sharing computational loads [1, 86]. As a result, mechanisms contribute to both cost-effectiveness and high performance in distributed systems, addressing challenges in sustainable edge computing, including energy efficiency and fault tolerance [78]. Ensuring secure and reliable resource sharing across different domains also necessitates trust-based collaboration mechanisms [81].

4) *Quality of Service*: Service reliability guarantees require comprehensive performance monitoring across distributed system components. QoS metrics encompass latency, throughput, availability, and reliability to ensure consistent application behavior under varying operational conditions [29]. Different AIoT applications have distinct QoS requirements. For instance, autonomous driving systems require low latency for real-time decision-making, while environmental monitoring emphasizes high throughput and data integrity. Cloud-edge-terminal collaboration ensures consistent service delivery by dynamically adapting to application requirements and network conditions [87]. The adaptability stemming from the distributed architecture enables flexible resource allocation and task offloading. Specifically, QoS is a function of resource allocation R_{alloc} and task offloading decisions T_{off} , represented as $Q_{total} = f(R_{alloc}, T_{off})$. CETCI optimizes this function by dynamically adjusting R_{alloc} and T_{off} based on real-time conditions and application needs. Service level agreements (SLAs) define specific performance targets, expressed as constraints on the QoS vector: $Q_{total} \in C_{feasible}$, where $C_{feasible}$ represents the feasible QoS region [88]. Consequently, cloud-edge-terminal collaboration strives to maintain Q_{total} within $C_{feasible}$ by continuously monitoring performance and adapting resource allocation and task offloading strategies [1, 2]. Through collaborative approach also enhances reliability and availability through redundancy and fault tolerance, distributing tasks and data across multiple nodes to ensure continuous service even with component failures.

5) *Quality of Experience*: User satisfaction measurement extends beyond technical metrics to encompass subjective interaction quality. QoE evaluation considers usability, accessibility, and contextual factors that collectively determine overall user perception of system performance [4]. QoE can be modeled as a function $Q_{exp} = f(Q_{obj}, U_{pref}, C_{con})$, where Q_{obj} represents objective QoS parameters (e.g., latency, throughput), U_{pref} denotes subjective user preferences, and C_{con} encompasses contextual factors like device capabilities and network conditions [81]. In cloud-edge-terminal collaborative systems, QoE is particularly important due to the system's distributed nature and the diverse application requirements. Specifically, such collaboration enhances QoE by distributing tasks and resources across different layers, where the over-




Fig. 5: Taxonomy of intelligent resource management.

all QoE can be expressed as $Q_{total} = \alpha_{cloud}Q_{ecloud} + \alpha_{edge}Q_{eedge} + \alpha_{term}Q_{eterm}$, with weighting factors α_{cloud} , α_{edge} , and α_{term} reflecting the contribution of each layer [81]. Processing data closer to the source (at the edge or terminal) minimizes transmission delays and improves real-time performance, which is critical for applications like autonomous driving and interactive gaming [2]. Additionally, context-aware adaptation of processing and communication strategies, formulated as $A_{adapt}(t) = g(N_{net}(t), D_{device}(t), A_{req}(t))$ where $N_{net}(t)$, $D_{device}(t)$, and $A_{req}(t)$ represent network conditions, device capabilities, and application requirements at time t , further enhances QoE by ensuring seamless and efficient interactions [1]. Furthermore, this adaptation allows the system to optimize resource utilization while maintaining desired QoE levels, and it also addresses privacy concerns by enabling local data processing, thereby increasing user trust [6, 89].

III. INTELLIGENT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PARADIGMS

Strategic resource management encompasses multiple interconnected paradigms, as summarized in Fig. 5. Furthermore, the paradigms operate synergistically to optimize system performance across distributed computing environments.

A. Task Offloading Strategies

Strategic allocation of computational tasks across distributed resources forms the cornerstone of effective resource management in collaborative intelligence systems. As illustrated in Table II, recent learning-based and optimization-based task offloading strategies achieve significant performance improvements through their distinct approaches. Learning-based methods harness machine learning to dynamically predict optimal offloading decisions using real-time and historical data. Meanwhile, game theory and optimization-based methods model task offloading as mathematical problems to achieve near-optimal solutions. Additionally, context-aware strategies adapt offloading decisions to application-specific requirements, device capabilities, and environmental conditions.

TABLE II: Summary of learning-based and optimization-based task offloading strategies in CETCI AIoT systems.

Method	Year	Venue	Performance Metrics	Performance Results	Edge	Cloud	ECC	CETC	TO
Binh et al. [117]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Tolerance Time	Reduces tolerance time by 8.81% vs. other RL algorithms	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
ADPRL [93]	2024	IEEE TCC	Task Completion Time, Energy Consumption	Outperforms heuristic and learning-based methods	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
ECIVA [90]	2024	AEI	Accuracy, Throughput	87.5% mAP at 0.5 IoU threshold, 39.2% increased throughput	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Sharma et al. [92]	2024	IEEE TMC	Time and Energy Consumption	Reduces time/energy consumption by up to 15%	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
MADDPG [91]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Offloading Delay, Energy Consumption	Superior performance vs. state-of-the-art approaches	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
DARC-DE [95]	2024	ASC	Total Delay, Bandwidth Utilization	15-40% delay reduction vs. PSO, GA, and Bees Algorithm	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
SA-BPSO [96]	2022	IEEE IMCEC	User Overhead	Better reduces total user overhead compared to other schemes	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Duan et al. [94]	2024	JSC	Completion Time, Energy Consumption	Reduces energy consumption and task completion time	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
SRA-E-ABCO [118]	2024	JCC	Task Offloading Delay, System Overhead	Reduces task offloading delay compared to baseline schemes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zhang et al. [37]	2024	IEEE TCC	Cost Mini., Task Completion Delay	Superior performance compared to several approaches	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Bai et al. [99]	2024	IEEE TMC	Completion Delay	Significantly reduces completion delay	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
PRAISE [97]	2024	IEEE TMC	System Benefits, Resource Costs	Higher system benefits and lower resource costs than baselines	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
BRTO [98]	2024	INS	Latency, Energy Efficiency, Security	Outperforms other strategies in scalability and efficiency	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Li et al. [100]	2024	COMNET	Long-term Network Performance	Converges to optimal solution in polynomial time	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓

Notes: TO = Task Offloading.

1) *Learning-Based Offloading Strategies*: Adaptive decision-making algorithms enable autonomous task allocation through machine learning techniques. RL frameworks train intelligent agents to optimize offloading choices by continuously learning from environmental feedback and performance metrics [44]. Specifically, RL algorithms, such as deep Q-networks (DQN) [90], train agents to make offloading decisions by interacting with the environment and receiving rewards based on metrics like latency, energy consumption, and task completion time [117]. Researchers have also explored more sophisticated RL techniques, including deep meta Q-learning [92] for faster adaptation to new scenarios and multi-agent deep deterministic policy gradient (MADDPG) [91] for coordinated decision-making in multi-user environments. In addition, dependency-aware mechanisms have been incorporated into the learning process to handle tasks with dependencies and optimize overall workflow [93].

2) *Game Theory and Optimization-Based Strategies*: Strategic interaction modeling provides mathematically rigorous frameworks for offloading optimization. Game-theoretic approaches enable competitive and cooperative resource allocation while addressing conflicting objectives among multiple participants [37]. Similarly, Duan *et al.* [94] leverage game theory to optimize offloading strategies for cloud robots in a cloud-edge collaboration system, minimizing both system completion time and energy consumption through a Nash equilibrium solution. In addition to game-theoretic approaches, optimization techniques, often integrated with these models, employ algorithms such as evolutionary algorithms and swarm intelligence. Specifically, Bandyopadhyay *et al.* [95]

TABLE III: Summary of resource allocation techniques.

Method	Year	Venue	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Performance Results	Edge	Cloud	ECC	CETC	RA
OTFAC [102]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Cloud-Edge Collaborative IoT	Delay, Energy Consumption	55% reduction in average delay vs. HierFVG	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Fang et al. [101]	2023	IEEE VTC	Cloud-Edge Networks	Latency, Resource Utilization	Superior performance over mainstream DRLs	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Huang et al. [103]	2024	IEEE JSAC	Space-Air-Ground Networks	Energy Consumption, Latency	Outperforms benchmark schemes	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
DRLS-VNE [104]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	CETC Vehicular Network	Security, Resource Utilization	Significantly enhances VNE solution performance	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SA-BPSO [96]	2022	IEEE IMCEC	Cloud-Edge Collaborative System	Total User Overhead	Better reduces total user overhead compared to other schemes	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Hua et al. [86]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Heterogeneous Edge-Cloud Computing	Energy Consumption	Significantly reduces energy consumption of mobile devices	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
ETCRA [81]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Edge-Cloud Workflows	Execution Time, Energy Consum., Reliability	Significantly outperforms baselines on measurements	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Aloplex-DE [79]	2024	INS	Local-Edge-Cloud Computing	Latency, Energy Consumption	Near-optimal performance compared to SOTA algorithms	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nguyen et al. [105]	2024	IEEE TCC	Space-Air-Ground Networks	Energy Consumption, Delay	Superior effectiveness compared to baselines	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
DT-MADDPG [119]	2024	IEEE JSTSP	Digital Twin Enabled 6G Industrial IoT	Success Rate, Latency, Energy Consumption	Significantly improves task success rate while reducing latency	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zhai et al. [82]	2024	CEE	Edge-Cloud Collaboration	Response Delay, Carbon Emiss., Operating Profits	Reduces avg. delay by 33.42 times vs. traditional cloud	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Ali-Eldin et al. [106]	2021	SC	Edge vs. Cloud Computing	End-to-End Latency	Edge queuing delays can offset benefits of lower network latencies	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Li et al. [107]	2024	IEICE-TF	Distribution Grid with IoT Devices	Load Balancing Degree, Queuing Delay	Effectively reduces edge-cloud load balancing degree	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zhou et al. [11]	2024	ADHOC	Edge-Cloud Architecture for AIoT	Quality of Service, Privacy	Higher effectiveness and efficiency in improving QoS	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗

Notes: RA = Resource Allocation.

propose DARC-DE, a Delay-Aware Resource-Constrained Offloading algorithm based on discretized differential evolution, to maximize bandwidth utilization and minimize delay in edge-cloud systems. Chen *et al.* [96] introduce a hybrid simulated annealing-binary particle swarm optimization (SA-BPSO) algorithm to minimize total user overhead, considering latency, energy, and computing costs. Likewise, Jiao *et al.* [118] present E-ABCO, an elite-artificial bee colony offloading method, further demonstrating the application of swarm intelligence for optimizing offloading strategies.

3) *Context-Aware Offloading Strategies*: Situational intelligence drives adaptive offloading through environmental and application-specific awareness. Contextual factors, including device mobility, task dependencies, and security requirements influence optimal placement decisions [97]. Additionally, device mobility necessitates dynamic adaptation of offloading locations for efficient task execution, as highlighted in [98]. Security requirements influence offloading decisions by prioritizing secure environments for sensitive tasks. Similarly, energy constraints, especially for resource-limited devices, drive strategies that balance computational load and minimize energy consumption across the architecture, such as those in [99] and [100].

B. Resource Allocation Mechanisms

Optimal distribution of computing, networking, and storage resources across heterogeneous environments stands as a fundamental requirement for successful collaborative intelligence. Accordingly, Table III summarizes recent learning-based resource allocation techniques, detailing their scenarios, performance metrics, and results, with notable improvements in latency, energy consumption, and QoS. Learning-based strategies utilize machine learning to dynamically adjust resource allocation based on real-time system states and historical patterns. Meanwhile, energy-aware methods focus on minimizing

energy usage while maintaining performance, addressing the constraints of edge nodes and terminal devices. Furthermore, QoS-driven approaches prioritize metrics like latency, reliability, and throughput, ensuring performance guarantees for delay-sensitive applications.

1) *Learning-Based Resource Allocation*: Intelligent resource distribution emerges through machine learning algorithms that adapt to dynamic system conditions. Adaptive allocation frameworks leverage historical patterns and real-time monitoring to optimize resource utilization across heterogeneous computing environments [101]. Combining optimal transport and federated actor-critic learning, Gan *et al.* [102] introduced a dual-driven resource optimization mechanism (OTFAC) to optimize bandwidth and computation resource allocation, achieving significant reductions in delay and energy consumption through offline and online learning. Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) has also become a prominent technique. Specifically, Huang *et al.* [103] developed a decision-assisted hybrid action space DRL algorithm for joint optimization of offloading and resource allocation in space-air-ground integrated networks, effectively managing resources across a complex hybrid cloud and multi-access edge computing scenario. Addressing security, Zhang *et al.* [104] proposed a security-aware DRL-based resource allocation scheme in a cloud-edge-terminal cooperative vehicular network, enhancing security during virtual network embedding with a dynamic trust evaluation mechanism. In addition, hybrid approaches like the simulated annealing-binary particle SA-BPSO proposed by Chen *et al.* [96] offer further optimization avenues in cloud-edge collaborative systems, minimizing total user overhead while considering latency, energy, and computing costs.

2) *Energy-Aware Resource Allocation*: Sustainability considerations drive power-efficient resource distribution across energy-constrained devices. Battery life optimization requires balanced allocation strategies that maintain performance while minimizing power consumption through intelligent workload management [81]. Similarly, an energy-efficient scheme for low-latency multi-type service provisioning in a local-edge-cloud environment is proposed in [79], leveraging the aloplex-based differential evolution (Aloplex-DE) algorithm to optimize resource allocation for minimal latency and energy consumption. In [86], energy efficiency in heterogeneous edge-cloud computing is addressed by jointly optimizing power control, transmission scheduling, and offloading decisions to minimize mobile device energy consumption, specifically considering user mobility. Addressing a different network architecture, [105] tackles energy consumption in a space-air-ground integrated network (SAGIN) through joint optimization of computation offloading, UAV trajectory control, and resource allocation. Finally, [119] introduces a digital twin (DT) assisted end-edge-cloud collaborative computing scheme for 6G Industrial IoT, where the DT monitors the physical environment and informs resource allocation strategies to minimize system cost under latency and energy constraints.

3) *QoS-Driven Resource Allocation*: Performance guarantee enforcement requires resource allocation mechanisms that prioritize service quality metrics. Latency-sensitive ap-




Fig. 6: Different types of collaboration learning paradigms.

lications demand specialized allocation strategies that ensure consistent performance under varying operational conditions [106]. Minimizing latency is paramount in these applications, while maintaining reliable communication and sufficient throughput is essential for applications with continuous data streams, such as remote patient monitoring in smart healthcare. For instance, prioritizing low-latency workloads for edge execution while offloading less time-sensitive tasks to the cloud can significantly improve overall QoS in edge-cloud collaborative systems [82]. Similarly, adaptive strategies that dynamically adjust resource assignments based on real-time QoS demands, coupled with efficient scheduling algorithms [108], can further enhance system responsiveness and efficiency [1].

C. Optimization Techniques

Mathematical and learning-based optimization approaches address the complex challenges of task offloading and resource allocation in distributed computing environments. Linear programming provides tractable solutions for resource allocation problems under linearity assumptions by transforming complex distribution challenges into mathematically solvable frameworks with guaranteed optimal solutions [95]. Convex optimization extends to nonlinear problems with reliable convergence guarantees through gradient-based methods and interior-point algorithms, enabling globally optimal solutions for complex resource distribution challenges [97, 105]. Game theory modeling provides equilibrium-based optimization frameworks through competitive and cooperative interaction modeling, enabling strategic decision-making among rational participants through concepts like Nash equilibrium and Stackelberg leadership [37, 116]. For comprehensive coverage of optimization techniques including detailed algorithm analysis, application scenarios, and performance evaluation results with specific implementations and case studies, readers are referred to Sec. II of the supplementary material.

IV. INTELLIGENT COLLABORATION LEARNING PARADIGMS

As illustrated in Fig. 6, CETCI employs four intelligent collaboration learning paradigms: federated learning with privacy-preserving aggregation and differential privacy mechanisms, distributed deep learning through model/data parallelism, edge-cloud model evolution via knowledge distillation and compression, and reinforcement learning optimization for

resource allocation. The taxonomy details are summarized in Fig. 7.

A. Federated Learning

Distributed machine learning across decentralized datasets presents unique opportunities and challenges in collaborative intelligence systems. FL enables training shared models without direct data exchange, accommodating diverse data distribution scenarios and collaboration patterns. Horizontal federated learning applies when devices share similar feature spaces but hold distinct data samples, while vertical federated learning addresses scenarios with complementary feature sets for overlapping data instances. In addition, federated transfer learning leverages pre-trained models to accelerate learning in data-scarce or heterogeneous environments.

1) *Privacy-Preserving Federated Learning*: Data protection mechanisms ensure secure collaborative learning without compromising individual privacy. Differential privacy and secure aggregation techniques enable model training while safeguarding sensitive information across distributed participants [120]. DP introduces calibrated noise into shared model updates, masking individual contributions while maintaining accuracy, particularly beneficial when the central server's trustworthiness is uncertain [121]. Variants like zero-concentrated DP (zCDP) offer strong privacy guarantees [122], and methods like the multi-stage adjustable private algorithm (MAPA) dynamically adjust the privacy-utility trade-off, improving accuracy and convergence in asynchronous FL [123]. Alternatively, secure aggregation employs cryptographic techniques, such as multi-party computation (MPC) [124] and learning with errors (LWE) [125], to aggregate updates without revealing individual contributions, thereby eliminating the need for a trusted third party and enhancing scalability in large AIoT networks. Differentially private federated tensor completion, combined with secure aggregation techniques like objective perturbation and parallel tensor decomposition, provides a robust solution for protecting sensitive data in collaborative AIoT data prediction [126].

2) *Robustness and Security of Federated Learning*: Adversarial attack resistance becomes critical in decentralized learning environments. Model poisoning threats and communication vulnerabilities require robust defense mechanisms to maintain system integrity and reliability [127]. Additionally, unreliable AIoT communication networks exacerbate these issues. Communication failures, such as dropped packets, disrupt the FL process, leading to incomplete aggregation and reduced accuracy. While asynchronous FL offers flexibility and efficiency [89], it introduces further security risks by allowing attackers to exploit timing discrepancies for injecting poisoned models. Consequently, robust aggregation techniques [128], anomaly detection methods [129], and secure communication protocols [121] are essential defense mechanisms for ensuring secure and reliable FL in these collaborative environments.

B. Distributed Deep Learning

Scaling deep learning models across multiple devices addresses computational limitations and accelerates training processes. Model parallelism, discussed in Sec. IV-B1, partitions




Fig. 7: Taxonomy of intelligent collaboration learning paradigms, including federated learning (FL), distributed deep learning (DDL), edge-cloud model evolution (ECME), and reinforcement learning optimization (RLO).

and distributes large models across multiple computational layers, effectively leveraging their combined resources. Subsequently, Sec. IV-B2 investigates data parallelism, where training data is distributed among available devices to accelerate training while carefully considering communication and synchronization overhead.

1) *Model Parallelism*: Large-scale model partitioning enables distributed deployment across heterogeneous computing resources. Computational load distribution through model segmentation allows efficient utilization of available processing capacity while overcoming individual device limitations [131]. For instance, AlpaServe [131] leverages model parallelism not only for scaling individual large models but also for statistically multiplexing devices serving various models, consequently improving resource utilization and reducing latency. AutoDiCE [132] further exemplifies this approach by automating the process of splitting and distributing CNN models across heterogeneous edge devices for efficient inference [133]. Consequently, this distributed deployment also empowers all-in-edge deep learning, enabling both training and inference on resource-constrained edge servers [133].

2) *Data Parallelism*: Training acceleration emerges through distributed data processing across multiple computing nodes. Parallel gradient computation enables faster model convergence while leveraging the collective computational power of distributed devices [135]. Furthermore, this aggregation process often involves averaging the gradients or employing more sophisticated techniques like secure aggregation [6]. Consequently, the training process is accelerated by leveraging the combined computational power of the distributed devices. Within the CETCI architecture, this paradigm efficiently utilizes resources across different tiers, allowing resource-constrained terminal devices to handle smaller data chunks while edge servers aggregate local updates, thereby reducing the communication burden on the cloud [136]. Meanwhile, the hierarchical approach enhances scalability and reduces latency, which is particularly beneficial for real-time AIoT applications. Techniques like quantization can be combined with data parallelism to further improve communication efficiency, especially crucial in

TABLE IV: Summary of model compression and knowledge distillation techniques for CETCI AIoT systems.

Method	Year	Venue	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Edge	Cloud	ECC	CETC
PECo [151]	2024	IEEE TGRS	Urban Building Modeling	Geometric Accuracy, Structural Compactness	✓	✓	✗	✗
CDC [152]	2020	IJCAI	Edge-Cloud DL	Bandwidth Efficiency	✓	✓	✓	✗
Hawladar et al. [153]	2024	COMCOM	Autonomous Driving	Detection Quality, Latency	✓	✓	✓	✗
BPS [154]	2024	IEEE TCC	Collaborative Edge	Throughput	✓	✓	✓	✓
Joshi et al. [155]	2024	IEEE TII	Intelligence Landslide Monitoring	Energy Consumption, Response Latency, Prediction Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✓
CO-PILOT [139]	2024	FGCS	IoT Edge-Cloud	End-to-end Latency, Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✗
EdgeActNet [156]	2024	IEEE TMC	Human Activity Recognition	Accuracy, Memory, Inference Time	✓	✗	✗	✗
DTS-KD [140]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Industrial IoT	F1 Score, Accuracy, Precision, Recall	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wang et al. [137]	2024	CVPR	Multimodal LLMs	Generalization Capabilities	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wu et al. [157]	2024	IEEE TII	Aviation Manuf.	Edge Detection Accuracy	✓	✗	✗	✗
VLMCE [158]	2023	IEEE IoTJ	Edge-Cloud Services	VNR Cost, Blocking Ratio	✓	✓	✓	✗
Yang et al. [138]	2025	ADHOC	IoT Traffic Identification	Identification Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✗
CEMA [159]	2023	ICLR	Distribution Shifts	Adaptation Performance	✓	✓	✓	✗
MEDIA [142]	2024	IEEE TNSE	Cloud-Edge Collaborative Computing	Offloading Strategy Accuracy, Training Cost	✓	✓	✓	✗
Duan et al. [94]	2024	JSC	Cloud Robots	Completion Time, Energy Consumption	✓	✓	✓	✗
Auto-Updating IDS [160]	2024	IEEE TVT	Vehicular Network	Attack Detection Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✓
CORA [161]	2024	IEEE TWC	Mobile Edge Clouds	User Complaint Rate	✓	✓	✓	✗
FedITA [162]	2024	AEI	Industrial Motors Fault Diagnosis	F1-score	✓	✓	✓	✗
Lu et al. [163]	2024	IEEE TIE	Industrial Process Index Forecasting	Prediction Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✗
DDLO [164]	2024	JGC	Accounting Informatization	Computing Time, Offloading Time, Accuracy, Cost	✓	✓	✓	✗
FlexibleFL [128]	2024	INS	Cloud-Edge Federated Learning	Attack Defense Success Rate	✓	✓	✓	✗
CADCL-DTM [141]	2024	CAC	Rolling Bearings Edge	Forgetting Performance	✓	✓	✗	✓
Li et al. [165]	2024	IEEE TMC	Computing Intelligent Transportation Systems	Model Accuracy	✓	✗	✗	✗
Lian et al. [166]	2024	SDI	Collaborative Continuous Learning	Detection Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✗
EdgeC3 [143]	2024	IEEE TMC	IoT Edge Learning	Model Accuracy, Cost	✓	✓	✓	✗
ADMM-FedMeta [144]	2021	MobiHoc	Mobile Edge Computing	Computational Cost	✓	✗	✗	✗
Cross-FCL [167]	2024	IEEE TMC	Mobile Edge Computing	Accuracy	✓	✗	✓	✗

bandwidth-limited AIoT networks [89].

C. Edge-Cloud Model Evolution

Continuous model adaptation across distributed computing environments represents a fundamental requirement for dynamic systems. Table IV provides a comprehensive overview of model compression and knowledge distillation techniques, highlighting their application scenarios and performance metrics, such as improvements in accuracy and latency across diverse domains like autonomous driving and industrial IoT. Model compression and distillation enable efficient knowledge transfer from resource-rich cloud models to constrained edge devices. Meanwhile, incremental learning and model updates allow edge models to adapt to new data and contexts without full retraining, fostering continuous learning and enhancement.

1) *Model Compression and Distillation*: Knowledge transfer mechanisms enable deployment of sophisticated models on resource-constrained devices. Compression techniques and

teacher-student paradigms facilitate efficient model adaptation while preserving essential intelligence capabilities [137]. Knowledge distillation, in turn, transfers learned information from a larger teacher model in the cloud to a smaller student model at the edge [140]. Specifically, the student model is trained to mimic the teacher model's output distribution, effectively transferring the embedded "dark knowledge" and improving generalization performance [159]. Approaches like growth-adaptive distillation [138] dynamically adjust the student model's architecture during this process, while others utilize methods such as adapter-based knowledge distillation (AKD) for efficient transfer [144].

2) *Incremental Learning and Model Updates*: Continuous model adaptation enables learning from evolving data streams without complete retraining. Edge-based incremental learning addresses resource constraints while preserving existing knowledge during adaptation to new environmental conditions [168]. Model updates can be implemented periodically or triggered by events like data distribution shifts or concept drift [165]. For example, the CADCL-DTM [141] model uses incremental learning to adapt to dynamic changes in smart manufacturing, and the MEDIA algorithm [142] employs it for efficient collaborative cloud-edge computing. In intelligent transportation, cloud-edge frameworks leverage visual prompts and knowledge distillation for continual adaptation [166], while EdgeC3 [143] optimizes model aggregation and offloading for continuous data streams. Similarly, ADMM-FedMeta [144] facilitates continual edge learning through knowledge transfer, and continual learning enhances digital twin synchronization [155].

D. Reinforcement Learning-based Optimization

Advanced decision-making in complex environments increasingly relies on RL paradigms due to their ability to optimize operations without explicit supervision. To this end, Table V offers a detailed summary of RL and MARL approaches, showcasing their application in diverse scenarios like vehicular networks and industrial IoT, with significant improvements in metrics such as latency and energy consumption.

1) *Reinforcement Learning for Resource Management*: Adaptive policy learning enables autonomous resource management through environmental interaction. RL agents continuously optimize allocation strategies by learning from feedback signals and dynamic system conditions [145]. Consequently, RL algorithms can learn to anticipate these changes and adaptively adjust resource allocation to maximize efficiency and minimize latency.

Researchers have explored applying RL to dynamic resource management in related contexts. For example, DRL has been employed to optimize task offloading decisions in edge-cloud systems [92], where DRL agents dynamically offload tasks based on resource availability, network conditions, and task deadlines. Similarly, multi-agent RL has been used for resource scheduling in cloud-edge computing power networks [149], enabling devices to learn optimal offloading strategies while coordinating to avoid congestion [117]. In addition, RL can optimize energy consumption by dynamically

TABLE V: Summary of RL and MARL approaches.

Method	Year	Venue	Learning Paradigms	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Performance Results
Zhu et al. [169]	2022	IEEE IoTJ	Multi-Agent RL	Age Sensitive MEC	Average Age of Information (AoI)	Outperforms baseline methods on average system age
Park et al. [170]	2022	ArXiv	MADRL	UAV Swarms, Mobile Access	Quality of Service (QoS)	Maximizes total QoS in mobile access applications
DRL-CCMCO [171]	2022	IEEE TSIPN	Deep RL	Industrial Networks	Execution Delay, Energy Consumption	Fast convergence, high stability, lowest total cost
Gao et al. [146]	2024	IEEE TPWRS	MADRL	Power Distribution Networks	Optimization Performance, Latency	Verified in IEEE 33-bus system and practical 445-bus system
Li et al. [145]	2024	ICMLSC	MARL	Cloud-Edge-End Collaborative Networks	Task Completion Latency, Energy Consumption	Improved task scheduling efficiency
Coop-MADRL [147]	2023	IEEE TNSM	Cooperative MADRL	Multi-Cloud-Edge Networks	Network Utilization, Task Latency	Minimized network utilization and task latency in 1 millisecond
Xu et al. [172]	2021	IEEE TVT	MARL	Millimeter-wave Cloud-Edge Collaboration	Network Delay, QoS Satisfaction Rate	Superior performance in delay cost and QoS satisfaction
Coop-MADRL [173]	2022	IEEE ICC	Cooperative MADRL	Multi-Cloud Multi-Edge Networks	Average Latency	Drastically reduced average latency vs. greedy approach
Kim et al. [174]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Federated RL	Cloud-Edge-Terminal IoT Networks	Learning Speed, Adaptability	Outperforms approaches without collaborative policy learning
BiAAC [175]	2024	IEEE Access	Policy-Gradient RL	Edge-Cloud Networks	Execution Time, Network Usage, Migration Delay	8% reduction in execution time, 4% desc in network usage
A2C-DRL [176]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Deep RL	Stochastic Edge-Cloud Environments	Reward Value, Task Rejection, Load-balancing	Outperforms seven SOTA algorithms
Nieto et al. [177]	2024	JCC	DRL	IoT Edge-Cloud	Quality-of-Experience (QoE)	Outperforms baselines in QoE values and energy consumption
Binh et al. [117]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	RL	Vehicular Edge-Cloud Computing	Tolerance time	Reduces tolerance time by 8.81% compared to other RL algorithms
LsiA3CS [150]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	DRL	IoT	Task completion time, Energy consumption	Significant reduction in task completion times and energy consumption
Sharma et al. [92]	2024	IEEE TMC	Meta-RL	Edge-Cloud Systems	Time and energy consumption	Reduces time and energy consumption by up to 15%
Zhang et al. [178]	2023	ArXiv	MARL	Geo-Distributed Data Centers	System utility, GPU utilization, Energy cost	Improves system utility by up to 28.6%
MADRLom [149]	2024	COMNET	MADRL	Software-Defined Cloud-Edge Computing	Total system overhead	Significant reduction in total system overhead
Zhang et al. [179]	2024	IEEE TC	Hybrid DRL	Edge-Cloud	Task completion time, Energy consumption	Outperforms existing design approaches
Chen et al. [180]	2023	ArXiv	DRL	Datacenter Resource Management	Overall cost	15% better than MIP solver with reduced computation time
Wang et al. [51]	2025	IEEE TGCN	DRL	Cloud Native Wireless Network	Network efficiency	Significant improvements in network efficiency

adjusting computational load distribution across different layers, as demonstrated in studies on energy-efficient edge-cloud collaborative sensing systems [175] and large-scale industrial IoT environments [150].

2) *Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning*: Coordinated decision-making emerges through distributed agents that learn collaborative strategies. MARL frameworks enable autonomous devices to optimize individual objectives while contributing to system-wide performance improvements [145]. Through interactions with the environment and other agents, MARL enables devices to learn optimal policies, dynamically allocating resources like computing power and bandwidth in resource-constrained scenarios [169]. Consequently, MARL facilitates efficient task offloading, allowing devices to autonomously determine whether to process tasks locally or offload them to edge or cloud servers based on factors such as network conditions and task complexity [173]. Examples of MARL's effectiveness in AIoT include controlling multiple UAVs for maximized QoS in autonomous mobile access applications using a centralized training and distributed execution approach [170]. In addition, studies have explored MARL for distribution network reconfiguration within a cloud-edge collaboration framework, leveraging algorithms like discrete multi-agent soft actor-critic (MASAC) to address




Fig. 8: Taxonomy of security & privacy protection.

non-stationary environments [146]. Similarly, Coop-MADRL has been employed for cooperative computing offloading and route optimization in multi-cloud-edge networks, minimizing network utilization and task latency [147], while other research demonstrates MARL's utility in distributed transmission within collaborative cloud-edge systems for enhanced network delay performance and QoS satisfaction [172].

V. SECURITY AND PRIVACY PROTECTION

Fig. 8 provides a systematic classification of security threats, protection mechanisms, and privacy-preserving techniques essential for securing CETCI systems, where each category encompasses specific approaches and solutions that address the unique security requirements of distributed AIoT environments.

A. Security Threats and Vulnerabilities

Distributed collaborative architectures introduce expanded attack surfaces that must be addressed to ensure robust operation. Sensitive data across multiple layers risks unauthorized access and interception, potentially leading to breaches and eavesdropping. Moreover, denial-of-service attacks can overwhelm resources, disrupting services and disabling critical devices. Consequently, ensuring data integrity and authentication demands robust mechanisms to verify authenticity and prevent tampering within collaborative ecosystems. A comprehensive summary of security threats and vulnerabilities across diverse scenarios including vehicular networks and multimedia IoT, with detailed analysis of privacy, accuracy, and latency considerations, is provided in Table 1 of the supplementary material.

1) *Data Breaches and Eavesdropping*: Information security vulnerabilities expose sensitive data to unauthorized access and interception attacks. Distributed system architectures create multiple attack vectors where malicious actors can exploit weak points to compromise data integrity [32]. For example, eavesdroppers can intercept sensitive data transmitted between terminal devices and the edge or cloud [181]. Resource-constrained terminal devices, often lacking robust security, are susceptible to breaches [10], potentially allowing unauthorized data access and manipulation, consequently disrupting AIoT applications. Similarly, edge nodes, aggregating data from

multiple devices, are also vulnerable. A compromised edge node amplifies the impact of a breach, exposing a larger dataset [198]. In addition, the increasing use of AI models introduces further risks, as attackers can exploit model vulnerabilities to infer sensitive information, even without direct data access [6].

2) *Denial-of-Service Attacks*: Resource exhaustion attacks threaten system availability by overwhelming computational and network capabilities. DoS vulnerabilities become amplified in CETCI systems where interdependent layers create cascading failure risks [182]. Specifically, DoS attacks within AIoT can target any architectural layer, from resource-constrained terminal devices to powerful cloud servers. For example, attacks on the terminal layer might flood IoT sensors, exhausting their processing power and disrupting data acquisition [183]. Similarly, targeting the edge layer can hinder local processing, increasing latency and affecting real-time decision-making [184]. Attacks on the cloud layer, in contrast, can disrupt centralized data storage and analysis, impacting overall system performance [2]. Moreover, the distributed nature of distributed systems introduces unique vulnerabilities, as the interconnected layers create multiple points of failure exploitable by attackers [1]. The heterogeneity of devices and networks further complicates attack detection and mitigation. Consequently, DoS attacks can significantly degrade key AIoT performance metrics, including latency, resource utilization, and QoS, potentially impacting critical infrastructure and services like smart healthcare and manufacturing [10]. Robust security mechanisms are therefore crucial for mitigating these attacks and ensuring reliable system operation [6].

3) *Data Integrity and Authentication*: Trust establishment requires comprehensive verification mechanisms to ensure data authenticity and prevent tampering. Multi-layered authentication protocols safeguard against unauthorized modifications while maintaining system reliability across distributed environments [185]. Similarly, authentication verifies the identities of participating devices and users [187], mitigating risks associated with unauthorized access. Achieving these security goals requires a multi-faceted approach, encompassing cryptographic techniques for data protection and secure authentication protocols [186]. Robust system-wide breach detection and mitigation mechanisms are also essential [6]. For instance, blockchain can enhance data integrity and provenance [10], while federated learning can improve data privacy during collaborative model training [1].

B. Security Mechanisms and Solutions

Protecting collaborative intelligence paradigms against various threats requires robust security mechanisms encompassing encryption and authentication, intrusion detection and prevention, and blockchain technologies [1, 199]. Cryptographic protection mechanisms secure data transmission and storage across distributed computing layers, while lightweight symmetric encryption and attribute-based encryption address varying data sensitivity in AIoT environments [181, 186]. Proactive threat monitoring systems identify and neutralize malicious activities through real-time anomaly detection across distributed infrastructure [10, 188]. Additionally, blockchain-based decentralized trust mechanisms eliminate single points




Fig. 9: Taxonomy of data management and communication techniques, including data acquisition & preprocessing (DAP), data storage & retrieval (DSR), and communication protocols & optimization (CPO).

of failure while ensuring immutable transaction records and secure access control within collaborative ecosystems [32, 192]. For detailed analysis of specific security mechanisms including secure network coding, intrusion detection and prevention systems deployment strategies, and blockchain integration applications, readers are referred to Sec. III.A of the supplementary material.

C. Privacy-Preserving Techniques

Protecting user data within distributed collaborative systems requires comprehensive privacy-preserving techniques including federated learning, differential privacy, homomorphic encryption, and secure multi-party computation [6, 200]. Federated learning facilitates collaborative model training without direct data sharing, where edge devices train local models and share only model updates with central servers [89, 193]. Differential privacy introduces calibrated noise to shared updates, ensuring individual data point privacy while maintaining model utility through controlled privacy budgets [126, 198]. Homomorphic encryption enables secure data aggregation and inference across distributed devices without decryption requirements [8, 124], while secure multi-party computation maintains input confidentiality across participating entities for collaborative analytics [10, 196]. Comprehensive coverage of privacy mechanisms, including hierarchical federated learning frameworks, computational overhead optimization strategies, and integration approaches for enhanced privacy solutions, is provided in Sec. III.B of the supplementary material.

VI. DATA MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Fig. 9 illustrates the framework for handling data acquisition, storage, and communication, where the components work together to ensure efficient data flow and reliable communication across the distributed AIoT architecture.

A. Data Acquisition and Preprocessing

Effective data management in resource-constrained environments requires streamlining data processing to optimize performance across distributed architectures. Filtering and

aggregation techniques at the edge and terminal levels reduce data volume while extracting meaningful insights at the source. Additionally, data compression and encoding methods minimize transmission overhead, preserving essential information to enhance collaboration efficiency. A detailed overview of data preprocessing methods highlighting their application in scenarios like multimedia IoT and vehicular networks, with comprehensive analysis of compression ratios, accuracy, and latency improvements, is provided in Table 2 of the supplementary material.

1) *Data Filtering and Aggregation*: Preprocessing operations at distributed network edges optimize transmission efficiency while preserving essential information [3]. Volume reduction through intelligent filtering minimizes communication overhead and latency [2]. Several filtering techniques include threshold-based filtering, discarding data outside a predefined range, and statistical filtering, employing measures like mean and standard deviation to remove outliers [45]. Additionally, Kalman filtering estimates system state and filters sensor noise. For aggregation, methods such as averaging, summing, and counting over specific time windows or spatial regions apply [89], while more sophisticated techniques like wavelet transforms extract relevant features while reducing dimensionality. In resource-constrained AIoT environments, the processes enable real-time processing and decision-making [10], exemplified by anomaly detection and preventative maintenance in smart manufacturing [6], as well as traffic flow optimization in smart transportation [1].

2) *Data Compression and Encoding*: Lossy and lossless compression techniques are fundamental for minimizing transmission overhead in resource-constrained environments. Lossy methods achieve higher compression ratios at the expense of data fidelity, and studies have explored their effectiveness in machine learning training sets, demonstrating significant compression with minimal quality loss [201]. Deep learning-based super-resolution models can further enhance the quality of lossy compressed images at the receiver side, balancing size reduction and visual degradation in MIoT scenarios [202]. In contrast, lossless compression preserves data integrity but achieves lower compression ratios. For example, edge source coding techniques utilize user preferences to optimize lossless compression performance at the network edge [216]. Preprocessing techniques, particularly for floating-point time-series data, can enhance compression capabilities [217]. Specifically, methods based on data statistics and deviation have shown superior compression ratios compared to deep learning-based methods for certain time series datasets [218]. Similarly, ROOT I/O compression improvements in HEP analysis balance compression efficiency with computational costs [219]. Adaptive techniques, such as selective edge compression, dynamically adjust compression parameters based on data characteristics or network conditions, improving network transfer performance and achieving significant data savings [220]. Alternatively, hybrid approaches combining machine learning with standard compression methods have also been explored for scientific data, aiming to preserve derived quantities with minimal error [221].

B. Data Storage and Retrieval

Efficient data management in distributed collaborative systems encompasses three critical aspects: edge caching for proximity-based storage optimization, distributed data storage across multi-tier infrastructures, and comprehensive data integrity and availability mechanisms. Edge caching strategies enhance access latency through intelligent content placement and predictive caching algorithms, while distributed storage architectures enable efficient data distribution across cloud and edge nodes with strategic placement based on access patterns [2, 208]. Data integrity and availability protection ensures information authenticity and continuous accessibility through robust mechanisms including blockchain applications, authentication protocols, and fault-tolerant storage designs [10, 185]. For detailed coverage of edge caching techniques, distributed storage architectures, and data integrity mechanisms including specific implementation strategies and optimization approaches, readers are referred to Sec. IV.A of the supplementary material.

C. Communication Protocols and Optimization

Efficient data exchange in distributed collaborative systems requires three fundamental components: resource-aware communication protocols, bandwidth optimization techniques, and fault tolerance mechanisms. Lightweight protocols such as MQTT and CoAP enable efficient data transmission in resource-constrained environments, while network coding enhances data integrity and reduces redundancy in AIoT communication [211, 212]. Bandwidth optimization strategies encompass traffic scheduling for critical data flow prioritization, rate adaptation for dynamic network conditions, and link aggregation for enhanced capacity and resilience [33, 107]. Comprehensive fault tolerance mechanisms ensure resilient communication through error detection and recovery, redundancy management, connection management strategies, and quality assurance practices that guarantee reliable service delivery [209, 215]. For detailed analysis of communication protocol implementations, bandwidth optimization algorithms, and fault tolerance mechanisms including specific deployment strategies and performance considerations, readers are referred to Sec. IV.B of the supplementary material.

VII. APPLICATIONS

CETCI has been extensively deployed to address a variety of challenging real-world AIoT scenarios due to its distributed processing capabilities and real-time responsiveness. We have grouped these applications into five different categories based on the domain: smart manufacturing, smart transportation, smart healthcare, smart cities, and smart agriculture. For each category, we provide a brief introduction to the domain, followed by a detailed explanation of how CETCI has been applied to enhance performance and efficiency. Fig. 10 illustrates the overview of these diverse applications that have leveraged collaborative intelligence.



Fig. 10: Overview of applications across different domains.

A. Smart Manufacturing

Distributed collaborative intelligence offers significant potential for optimizing key aspects of manufacturing processes, including real-time defect detection, predictive maintenance, and automated quality control.

1) *Real-Time Defect Detection*: Production line monitoring demands immediate anomaly identification to minimize manufacturing waste [195]. Terminal sensors and IoT devices capture real-time data, including images, videos, and quality-related sensor readings [45]. Edge devices, proximate to the production process, perform initial data processing and filtering to reduce the volume of data transmitted to the cloud [80], enabling faster processing and reduced latency crucial for real-time defect detection [1]. Complex AI models, trained on historical data in the cloud, are deployed on edge devices for real-time inference, such as deep learning models analyzing images and videos for product defects [235]. The cloud layer provides centralized storage for large datasets and facilitates model training and updates, which allows for continuous improvement of defect detection models and adaptation to new defect types [74]. Additionally, the cloud offers insights into overall production quality and identifies trends in defect occurrence [2].

2) *Predictive Maintenance*: Machine learning analytics enable proactive equipment failure prediction and optimized maintenance scheduling [77]. Distributed computational workloads enhance this process through real-time data processing capabilities. Specifically, sensors at the terminal layer collect equipment performance data, which is subsequently pre-processed and analyzed at the edge layer. Complex models and historical data residing in the cloud then contribute to more accurate predictions [76]. Equally important, the hierarchical approach reduces latency, enabling timely interventions and minimizing downtime. For example, [235] presents a quality-related hierarchical fault detection framework using minimal gated units and federated bi-directional knowledge distillation to improve accuracy and reliability. Circuit-level AI solutions integrated within control and calibration blocks during circuit

design, as proposed in [222], can further enhance component predictability and adaptability for predictive maintenance.

3) *Automated Quality Control*: Lightweight AI deployment at production edges enables immediate defect detection through rapid sensor analysis [2]. Real-time processing reduces reliance on centralized systems while minimizing response latency for corrective actions [76]. Moreover, this collaborative paradigm also supports sophisticated quality control mechanisms, such as real-time image analysis for defect identification [6], by distributing computational tasks across the three layers for efficient processing of large visual datasets. The edge layer's role in data preprocessing and filtering optimizes bandwidth usage and enhances data security by reducing cloud transmission and keeping sensitive data closer to the source [10, 214]. Additionally, federated learning enables training quality control models across multiple sites without sharing raw data, improving model accuracy and robustness while preserving confidentiality [1].

B. Smart Transportation

Distributed collaboration is transforming Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) within modern paradigms, particularly in autonomous driving, traffic management, and real-time monitoring. Consequently, this collaborative framework facilitates real-time decision-making for safe and efficient autonomous vehicle navigation and control by leveraging the interplay of cloud, edge, and terminal layers. In addition, it optimizes traffic flow and mitigates urban congestion, enhancing road safety and responsiveness through timely data processing and analysis for incident detection.

1) *Autonomous Vehicle Navigation and Control*: Safe and efficient vehicular automation requires distributed intelligence across heterogeneous computing layers. Onboard sensors and computers collect real-time environmental data, including images, LiDAR point clouds, and GPS coordinates [223]. The cloud layer provides high-level functionalities like map updates, traffic prediction, and fleet management [10]. Specifically, cloud-edge collaboration enables offloading computationally intensive tasks, such as AIGC for trajectory prediction and traffic simulation, to the edge, consequently reducing latency and improving real-time performance [226]. Similarly, edge-terminal collaboration allows rapid responses to critical events, such as obstacle avoidance, by processing sensor data locally [223]. Moreover, this distributed architecture, exemplified by frameworks like Auto-Split and EdgStr [224], enhances the robustness of autonomous driving systems by enabling local decision-making and optimizing resource utilization, even with intermittent cloud connectivity [2].

2) *Traffic Flow Optimization and Congestion Management*: In AIoT-enabled smart cities, cloud-edge-terminal collaboration offers a comprehensive approach to optimizing traffic flow and mitigating congestion. Edge computing's proximity to data sources facilitates real-time responses to changing traffic conditions [5], which is essential for dynamic traffic management. Furthermore, the collaborative architecture enables coordinated control of traffic signals and other infrastructure, leading to smoother flow and reduced congestion [2]. For




Fig. 11: Illustration of CETCI in smart healthcare.

example, real-time data from terminal-layer sensors can be processed at the edge to identify congestion, subsequently used to adjust traffic signals or suggest alternative routes through connected vehicle platforms [225]. Additionally, the cloud layer provides long-term traffic pattern analysis and predictive modeling for proactive congestion management [1].

3) *Real-time Traffic Monitoring and Incident Detection*: Rapid anomaly identification enhances road safety through distributed surveillance and analysis capabilities [226]. Edge processing of traffic camera and GPS data reduces latency while minimizing bandwidth consumption [45, 227]. Consequently, AI algorithms deployed at the edge enable real-time analysis of traffic patterns and identify anomalies, such as sudden braking or stopped vehicles [218]. Moreover, this capability facilitates immediate responses, including dispatching emergency services or adjusting traffic signals [225]. Meanwhile, the cloud provides centralized storage and processing for complex analyses like long-term trend identification and predictive modeling [2]. Machine learning models on edge devices further improve the system's adaptability to dynamic traffic conditions and enhance incident detection accuracy [2].

C. Smart Healthcare

As illustrated in Fig. 11, which shows three core application scenarios: (1) remote patient monitoring, (2) AI-assisted disease diagnosis and prognosis, and (3) personalized treatment. The CETCI paradigm enables three key healthcare services, where each component ensures timely and secure delivery of healthcare interventions.

1) *Remote Patient Health Monitoring and Vital Signs Tracking*: Continuous physiological monitoring transforms healthcare delivery through distributed sensor networks and real-time analytics [228]. Wearable devices and IoT sensors collect vital signs including heart rate, blood pressure, and oxygen saturation [75]. Subsequently, edge devices preprocess and aggregate this data, reducing transmission volume to the cloud [2] and enabling timely interventions through initial analysis and alerts. The cloud layer facilitates long-term data stor-

age, advanced analytics, and AI-assisted diagnosis, supporting personalized treatment and medication management [124]. For example, FL [1, 124] trains models on decentralized patient data at the edge, preserving privacy while improving vital signs prediction and anomaly detection. Cloud-edge collaboration also enables continuous monitoring and real-time feedback to patients and providers, promoting proactive healthcare management [230]. Differentially private federated tensor completion methods [6] and on-device contactless vital sign measurement using MTTs-CAN [236] further enhance privacy and real-time monitoring capabilities.

2) *AI-assisted Disease Diagnosis and Prognosis*: Intelligent diagnostic systems leverage distributed computing to enhance medical decision-making accuracy [229]. Real-time patient data processing at network edges reduces latency for timely clinical interventions [228]. For instance, edge-deployed AI algorithms analyze physiological data like ECGs and blood pressure for preliminary diagnoses, rapidly identifying potential issues and triggering alerts [2]. Meanwhile, the cloud provides access to comprehensive medical databases and sophisticated AI models, enabling more complex analyses and accurate prognoses [6]. FL trains robust AI models while preserving patient privacy by allowing edge devices to collaboratively train a shared model without exchanging raw data [1, 34]. Notably, the collaborative paradigm, combined with AI and FL, improves diagnostic accuracy and speed, leading to more effective and personalized interventions [155, 237].

3) *Personalized Treatment Plans and Medication Management*: Individualized therapeutic approaches emerge through comprehensive patient data integration across distributed healthcare networks [230]. Multi-source monitoring combines wearable sensors, edge analytics, and cloud platforms for holistic patient assessment [2]. For example, wearable devices continuously monitor patient vitals, and edge servers perform real-time AI-driven anomaly detection, triggering timely interventions [1]. Edge computing also facilitates personalized medication reminders and dosage adjustments based on real-time data, improving adherence and minimizing adverse effects. Subsequently, the cloud aggregates data from multiple patients to develop sophisticated predictive models for disease progression and treatment response [6]. Secure data sharing across this continuum empowers healthcare providers with comprehensive patient information for informed decision-making and collaborative care [10]. Distributing computational tasks across different layers addresses privacy concerns and reduces latency, which are crucial for real-time healthcare applications [208].

D. Smart Cities

Distributed collaboration significantly enhances intelligent urban environment development through three primary application areas: smart surveillance and crime prevention, environmental monitoring and pollution control, and smart energy management and grid optimization. Real-time security monitoring leverages distributed processing for enhanced public safety through intelligent video analytics and edge-deployed frameworks that reduce cloud dependency while improving

surveillance efficiency [190, 231]. Environmental monitoring benefits from comprehensive data collection across distributed sensor networks, enabling faster pollution hotspot identification and proactive mitigation through machine learning models trained on historical and real-time data [5, 78]. Smart energy management optimizes grid efficiency through intelligent energy distribution, predictive maintenance capabilities, and renewable energy integration supported by edge devices that manage intermittent energy sources based on real-time conditions [82, 86]. For detailed coverage of smart surveillance systems, environmental monitoring architectures, and energy management optimization strategies including specific implementation examples and performance analysis, readers are referred to Sec. V.A of the supplementary material.

E. Smart Agriculture

Distributed collaboration offers transformative potential for intelligent farming practices through two primary application domains: precision agriculture and crop monitoring with yield prediction. Precision agriculture benefits from real-time sensor analytics and intelligent decision-making systems where edge processing minimizes latency for immediate agricultural condition responses while cloud resources provide computational power for complex tasks like crop yield prediction and disease detection [126, 233]. Advanced crop monitoring leverages multi-source data integration from IoT sensors, drones, and satellites, enabling comprehensive crop management and productivity forecasting through real-time soil condition monitoring, weather pattern analysis, and ML-based yield prediction using historical and real-time data [238, 239]. Federated learning enhances privacy and model robustness by enabling distributed model training across farms without sharing sensitive agricultural data, while cloud-edge collaboration facilitates model deployment and updates adapted to local farming conditions [240]. For comprehensive coverage of precision agriculture techniques, crop monitoring systems, and yield prediction methodologies including specific sensor deployment strategies and optimization approaches, readers are referred to Sec. V.B of the supplementary material.

VIII. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A. Technical Challenges

As illustrated in Fig. 12, realizing effective collaborative intelligence across the CETCI continuum entails addressing multiple challenges, which interact across layers, devices, and applications within AIoT environments, demanding integrated and adaptive solutions.

1) *Scalability*: Exponential growth in IoT device deployment creates unprecedented computational and communication bottlenecks across distributed infrastructure [45]. Managing massive device populations while maintaining system performance requires innovative distributed computing paradigms [42, 78]. For example, relying solely on cloud or edge resources is inadequate for complex systems like urban sound classification, highlighting the need for optimized resource allocation across the entire continuum. Additionally, the dynamic nature of AIoT networks, characterized by fluctuating




Fig. 12: Summary of key challenges in CISAIoT networks.

device participation, necessitates adaptive and resilient architectures [209]. Scaling frameworks like the one proposed in [2] for fleet analytics to handle massive device fleets and diverse data streams remains a critical challenge. Efficiently processing data and training models in these distributed environments often leverages techniques like federated learning [1, 6], which in turn introduce their own scalability concerns regarding communication overhead and model convergence.

2) *Heterogeneity*: Device diversity spanning computational capabilities, communication protocols, and data formats introduces fundamental integration challenges [241]. Network infrastructure variations from high-bandwidth 5G to resource-constrained environments compound complexity [45]. Additionally, diverse AIoT applications introduce varying performance and security requirements [242]. Addressing such heterogeneity necessitates flexible and adaptive frameworks, such as Auto-Split and EdgStr, designed for diverse edge and cloud environments [1]. Crucially, ensuring interoperability through standardized communication protocols and data formats is essential for efficient data exchange and collaborative processing across the cloud-edge-terminal continuum [2, 6].

3) *Interoperability*: Disparate hardware architectures, operating systems, and communication protocols create fundamental barriers to seamless integration [243]. Protocol diversity ranging from lightweight MQTT [209] to robust enterprise solutions complicates unified system design. Additionally, the diverse nature of AI models, from simple rule-based systems on terminals to complex deep learning models in the cloud, further complicates integration [2]. Without standardized interfaces and data exchange mechanisms, integrating these disparate components hinders efficient collaborative AI tasks and real-time insights. Consequently, deploying and managing AI models across the cloud-edge-terminal continuum becomes challenging, limiting system adaptability and scalability, and creating data silos that restrict AI model training and evolution, ultimately impacting overall performance [1]. Addressing this requires developing standardized frameworks and protocols that facilitate seamless communication and data exchange across diverse AIoT components, considering resource constraints and supporting various AI models and data formats.

4) *Security*: Multi-layer attack surfaces expose data, models, and system integrity to sophisticated threats [32]. Sensitive

information transmission across distributed layers faces interception and exploitation risks [197]. Similarly, DoS attacks can disrupt AIoT service availability by overwhelming network resources or computational nodes [189]. Additionally, model poisoning attacks, particularly relevant in federated learning [6], compromise AI model integrity and reliability by injecting corrupted data during training [10]. Ensuring data integrity and authentication across the system is therefore crucial for preventing unauthorized modifications and ensuring trustworthy data sources and processing results.

5) *Privacy*: Distributed data processing across multiple infrastructure layers amplifies privacy vulnerabilities and regulatory compliance challenges [13]. Information traversing terminals, edge servers, and cloud environments faces escalated breach and eavesdropping risks [244]. Additionally, inferring sensitive information from aggregated model parameters, even without direct data access, poses a significant threat [245]. Consequently, techniques like DP and secure aggregation become crucial for protecting user data during collaborative learning [6]. Ensuring secure data storage and retrieval across these diverse layers further complicates privacy preservation, demanding robust techniques like those explored in [10] to foster trust and ethical AIoT deployment.

6) *Resource Management*: Dynamic resource allocation across heterogeneous infrastructure demands sophisticated optimization strategies for computational, storage, and network resources [214]. Balancing diverse application requirements while minimizing energy consumption and operational costs requires adaptive algorithms [81]. For example, algorithms like ETCRA aim to minimize system latency and enforce trust constraints while optimizing resource allocation [81]. Additionally, resource collaboration and expansion schemes, including real-time resource purchasing based on current demand, are vital for enhancing system efficiency and long-term profit maximization [84].

7) *Trust and Reliability*: System dependability requires robust authentication mechanisms and fault tolerance strategies across distributed environments [246]. Identity verification prevents unauthorized access while ensuring authenticity and integrity of devices, data, and processes [10]. Data integrity must also be maintained throughout its lifecycle, from terminal acquisition to edge processing and cloud storage [247]. Additionally, reliable systems require fault tolerance strategies to address device malfunctions, network disruptions, and security breaches, as well as efficient resource management for reliable performance under varying AIoT application demands [81, 209]. For example, trust-based resource allocation can prioritize trustworthy devices for reliable execution of critical tasks.

B. Future Research Directions

As illustrated in Fig. 13, promising research avenues in CETCI span advanced resource management, enhanced security, standardization, emerging technologies, explainable AI, and next-generation networks optimization.

1) *Advanced Resource Management*: Intelligent allocation algorithms must dynamically adapt to fluctuating computational, storage, and network demands across increasingly




Fig. 13: Overview of future research directions.

complex infrastructure [38]. Machine learning approaches, including particle swarm optimization enable real-time decisions based on system state and historical patterns [96]. Integrating trust-based mechanisms into these algorithms can enhance cross-domain collaboration reliability and security [186]. Energy-aware strategies are essential for minimizing power consumption, particularly in resource-constrained edge and terminal layers [81]. Additionally, dynamic allocation, potentially coupled with deep reinforcement learning, optimizes resource utilization for efficient task offloading and execution [76]. Context-aware strategies, adapting to application-specific requirements like task dependencies and device mobility, are also critical given the heterogeneity of AIoT resources and tasks [119]. Integrating Digital Twins with resource management frameworks can further enhance AIoT system efficiency and reliability through real-time monitoring and control optimization [195].

2) *Security and Privacy*: The collaborative nature of CISAIoT necessitates innovative security and privacy mechanisms to address evolving threats. FL, a cornerstone of collaborative intelligence, requires enhanced privacy, achievable through techniques like DP [6] and secure aggregation [1]. Robust and secure FL implementations are crucial to mitigate attacks like model poisoning. Beyond FL, homomorphic encryption and secure MPC [248] offer avenues for secure data processing and collaborative analysis. Integrating blockchain technologies [10] can further enhance trust and transparency in data and model management. Addressing data integrity and authentication is equally vital, particularly in keyword-based private information retrieval [193]. Verifiable mechanisms, including B-OPRF and FGF-mkPIR [244], can ensure data accuracy and prevent unauthorized access, complementing intrusion detection and prevention systems, encryption, and authentication protocols [13] for comprehensive security.

3) *Standardization*: Seamless integration within the cloud-edge-terminal continuum for AIoT necessitates interoperability, a significant challenge stemming from the heterogeneous nature of devices, networks, and software platforms [34]. Consequently, establishing common standards and protocols is crucial for efficient collaboration. Key standardization areas include data formats and communication protocols, such as lightweight options like MQTT and CoAP for resource-constrained environments [249]. Standardized APIs and interfaces are also essential for application deployment and management across the continuum. Equally vital are standardized security and privacy protocols, including technologies like

blockchain, to protect sensitive data and ensure system trust [10]. Standardized benchmarks and metrics are also needed for evaluating the performance of different collaborative frameworks [1].

4) *Explainable AI*: Transparent and interpretable AI (xAI) is essential for CISAIoT due to the increasing complexity of deployed AI models [88]. Moreover, this interpretability is crucial for establishing trust and understanding the decision-making processes, particularly in critical applications like healthcare [229] and autonomous driving [4]. The "black box" nature of current AI models hinders user trust and acceptance [250], thus necessitating XAI methods tailored for the distributed nature of cloud-edge-terminal collaboration. Explaining decisions across the cloud, edge, and terminal layers requires techniques that capture each layer's contribution and its interactions. The heterogeneity of AIoT devices and networks [10] further complicates XAI, demanding adaptability to diverse hardware and software environments, while resource constraints necessitate lightweight and efficient XAI techniques. Promising research directions include model-agnostic XAI techniques like the TRUST XAI model and methods specifically designed for federated learning [1], a key paradigm in AIoT.

5) *6G/Next-Generation Networks*: The transformative advancements promised by 6G networks, including higher bandwidth, lower latency, and improved reliability [251], offer unprecedented opportunities for optimizing cloud-edge-terminal collaboration in AIoT [256]. Specifically, the increased bandwidth of 6G can facilitate seamless data transfer between the cloud, edge, and terminal devices, enabling real-time processing of large AIoT datasets [252], while ultra-low latency empowers time-sensitive applications like autonomous driving and remote surgery by enabling near-instantaneous decision-making [119]. Enhanced reliability in 6G also ensures consistent communication across the cloud-edge-terminal architecture, improving the robustness of AIoT systems [2]. However, realizing this potential requires addressing key challenges, such as developing efficient resource management strategies for 6G's increased network resources and computational power [1], and ensuring data security and privacy across the cloud-edge-terminal continuum, which becomes even more critical with 6G's increased connectivity and data volume [6]. Consequently, future research should prioritize novel security mechanisms and privacy-preserving techniques tailored for 6G networks.

6) *Digital Twin*: Digital twin (DT) technology represents a transformative paradigm for CISAIoT networks, enabling real-time monitoring, prediction, and optimization through virtual replicas [79]. Advanced DT architectures leverage MEC and ultra-reliable low-latency communications while minimizing latency through task offloading and caching [18, 256]. DT-assisted collaborative computing enables intelligent resource management through real-time environment monitoring [119]. However, implementing DT in federated edge learning introduces security challenges, particularly poisoning attacks [127]. Addressing vulnerabilities requires condition-adaptive dynamic evolution methods based on continual learning [141]. Integrating continual learning with DT synchro-

nization enables real-time model updates [165], while DT-empowered attack detection systems enhance 6G network security [188] and enable privacy-preserving healthcare anomaly detection [124].

7) *LLMs and Agents*: LLMs and intelligent agents represent emerging frontiers in CETCI, offering unprecedented capabilities for natural language processing and autonomous decision-making [23]. Efficient LLM inference offloading utilizing active inference approaches significantly improves data utilization efficiency and adaptability to dynamic task loads [253]. Cached model-as-a-resource provisioning enables sustainable LLM agent services in space-air-ground networks [254], while split learning systems facilitate collaborative deployment across mobile devices and edge servers [257]. Multi-agent reinforcement learning enhances task scheduling and load balancing [145]. Generative AI techniques like ECO-LLM dynamically adjust task placement [258], while activation-guided quantization enables faster edge inference [259]. Guidance-based knowledge transfer facilitates efficient collaboration [140], and vector database-assisted frameworks enhance QoS through edge caching [260].

8) *Quantum Computing*: Quantum computing integration into CETCI presents unprecedented opportunities and critical security challenges for AIoT networks [245]. Quantum-edge cloud computing (QECC) paradigms effectively address traditional limitations by combining quantum computational power with low-latency edge processing and scalable cloud resources [12]. However, quantum computing necessitates comprehensive security assessments, as timing-based side-channel vulnerabilities can compromise algorithm confidentiality [255]. Developing quantum-resistant cryptographic solutions becomes paramount for protecting infrastructure against quantum-induced threats [245]. Simulation toolkits like iQuantum enable modeling quantum computing environments for resource management research [261]. Quantum cloud platforms require advanced resource management and enhanced security mechanisms [262]. Quantum-enhanced deep reinforcement learning can improve estimation accuracy and task offloading efficiency, leveraging parallel processing capabilities [263].

IX. CONCLUSION

In this survey, we have comprehensively examined cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence (CETCI) in AIoT networks, exploring its evolution from traditional cloud computing to an integrated paradigm. We have analyzed collaborative architectures, enabling technologies, and key performance metrics that drive this ecosystem. Furthermore, we have investigated intelligent resource management strategies, collaboration learning paradigms, and security mechanisms essential for effective AIoT operation. Additionally, we have examined data management approaches and communication protocols crucial for seamless integration across the cloud-edge-terminal continuum. To conclude, we have showcased transformative real-world applications, while identifying key future directions and open challenges, such as scalability, heterogeneity, and security, for next-generation AIoT systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Zhou, S. Pal, C. Dong, and K. Wang, "Enhancing quality of service through federated learning in edge-cloud architecture," *Ad Hoc Netw.*, vol. 156, p. 103430, 2024.
- [2] E. Raj, M. Westerlund, and L. Espinosa-Leal, "Reliable fleet analytics for edge iot solutions," 2021.
- [3] G. Zhu, Z. Lyu, X. Jiao, P. Liu, M. Chen, J. Xu, S. Cui, and P. Zhang, "Pushing ai to wireless network edge: An overview on integrated sensing, communication, and computation towards 6g," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 66, no. 3, p. 130301, 2023.
- [4] J. Zhang and D. Tao, "Empowering things with intelligence: A survey of the progress, challenges, and opportunities in artificial intelligence of things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 7789–7817, 2021.
- [5] T. Vo, P. Dave, G. Bajpai, and R. Kashef, "Edge, fog, and cloud computing : An overview on challenges and applications," 2022.
- [6] Z. Yang, B. Xiong, K. Chen, L. T. Yang, X. Deng, C. Zhu, and Y. He, "Differentially private federated tensor completion for cloud-edge collaborative aiot data prediction," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 256–267, 2024.
- [7] G. S. S. Chalapathi, V. Chamola, A. Vaish, and R. Buyya, "Industrial internet of things (iiot) applications of edge and fog computing: A review and future directions," in *Fog/Edge Comput. Secur. Priv. Appl.*, 2021, pp. 293–325.
- [8] D. Kim, Y. Lee, S. Cheon, H. Choi, J. Lee, H. Youm, D. Lee, and H. Kim, "Privacy set: Privacy-authority-aware compiler for homomorphic encryption on edge-cloud system," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 21, pp. 35 167–35 184, 2024.
- [9] D. Khalyeyev, T. Bureš, and P. Hnětynka, "Towards characterization of edge-cloud continuum," in *ECSAW*, 2023, pp. 215–230.
- [10] C. Chi, Z. Yin, Y. Liu, and S. Chai, "A trusted cloud-edge decision architecture based on blockchain and mlp for aiot," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 201–216, 2024.
- [11] S. F. Ahmed, S. Shuravi, S. Afrin, S. J. Rafa, M. Hoque, and A. H. Gandomi, "The power of internet of things (iot): Connecting the dots with cloud, edge, and fog computing," 2023.
- [12] M. I. Hossain, S. A. Sumon, H. M. Hasan, F. Akter, M. B. Badhon, and M. N. U. Islam, "Quantum-edge cloud computing: A future paradigm for iot applications," 2024.
- [13] A. Alwarafy, K. A. Al-Thelaya, M. Abdallah, J. Schneider, and M. Hamdi, "A survey on security and privacy issues in edge-computing-assisted internet of things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 4004–4022, 2021.
- [14] T. L. Duc, R. G. Leiva, P. Casari, and P.-O. Östberg, "Machine learning methods for reliable resource pro-

- visioning in edge-cloud computing: A survey,” *ACM Computing Survey*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 94:1–94:39, 2019.
- [15] C.-H. Hong and B. Varghese, “Resource management in fog/edge computing: A survey on architectures, infrastructure, and algorithms,” *ACM Computing Survey*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 97:1–97:37, 2019.
- [16] J. Ren, D. Zhang, S. He, Y. Zhang, and T. Li, “A survey on end-edge-cloud orchestrated network computing paradigms: Transparent computing, mobile edge computing, fog computing, and cloudlet,” *ACM Computing Survey*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 125:1–125:36, 2019.
- [17] M. Asim, Y. Wang, K. Wang, and P.-Q. Huang, “A review on computational intelligence techniques in cloud and edge computing,” *IEEE Trans. Emerg. Topics Comput. Intell.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 742–763, 2020.
- [18] D. Van Huynh, S. R. Khosravirad, A. Masaracchia, O. A. Dobre, and T. Q. Duong, “Edge intelligence-based ultra-reliable and low-latency communications for digital twin-enabled metaverse,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1733–1737, 2022.
- [19] S. Ahmad, I. Shakeel, S. Mehruz, and J. Ahmad, “Deep learning models for cloud, edge, fog, and iot computing paradigms: Survey, recent advances, and future directions,” *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 49, p. 100568, 2023.
- [20] S. Duan, D. Wang, J. Ren, F. Lyu, Y. Zhang, H. Wu, and X. Shen, “Distributed artificial intelligence empowered by end-edge-cloud computing: A survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 591–624, 2023.
- [21] R. Kumar and N. Agrawal, “Analysis of multi-dimensional industrial iot (iiot) data in edge–fog–cloud based architectural frameworks : A survey on current state and research challenges,” *J. Ind. Inf. Integr.*, vol. 35, p. 100504, 2023.
- [22] A. Asghari and M. K. Sohrabi, “Server placement in mobile cloud computing: A comprehensive survey for edge computing, fog computing and cloudlet,” *Comput. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 51, p. 100616, 2024.
- [23] G. Qu, Q. Chen, W. Wei, Z. Lin, X. Chen, and K. Huang, “Mobile edge intelligence for large language models: A contemporary survey,” 2024.
- [24] Y. Wang, C. Yang, S. Lan, L. Zhu, and Y. Zhang, “End-edge-cloud collaborative computing for deep learning: A comprehensive survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [25] P. Souza, T. Ferreto, and R. Calheiros, “Maintenance operations on cloud, edge, and iot environments: Taxonomy, survey, and research challenges,” *ACM Computing Survey*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 256:1–256:38, 2024.
- [26] M. Xu, H. Du, D. Niyato, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, S. Mao, Z. Han, A. Jamalipour, D. I. Kim, X. Shen, V. C. M. Leung, and H. V. Poor, “Unleashing the power of edge-cloud generative ai in mobile networks: A survey of aigc services,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1127–1170, 2024.
- [27] N. Yang, S. Chen, H. Zhang, and R. Berry, “Beyond the edge: An advanced exploration of reinforcement learning for mobile edge computing, its applications, and future research trajectories,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 546–594, 2025.
- [28] J. Liu, Y. Du, K. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Hu, Z. Wang, Y. Liu, P. Sun, A. Boukerche, and V. C. M. Leung, “Edge-cloud collaborative computing on distributed intelligence and model optimization: A survey,” 2025.
- [29] S. Tuli, F. Mirhakimi, S. Pallewatta, S. Zawad, G. Casale, B. Javadi, F. Yan, R. Buyya, and N. R. Jennings, “Ai augmented edge and fog computing: Trends and challenges,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 216, p. 103648, 2023.
- [30] G. Qu, Q. Chen, W. Wei, Z. Lin, X. Chen, and K. Huang, “Mobile edge intelligence for large language models: A contemporary survey,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, pp. 1–1, 2025.
- [31] H. Du, R. Zhang, Y. Liu, J. Wang, Y. Lin, Z. Li, D. Niyato, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, S. Cui, B. Ai, H. Zhou, and D. I. Kim, “Enhancing deep reinforcement learning: A tutorial on generative diffusion models in network optimization,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, no. 4, pp. 2611–2646, 2024.
- [32] Z. Rahman, X. Yi, and I. Khalil, “Blockchain-based ai-enabled industry 4.0 cps protection against advanced persistent threat,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 6769–6778, 2023.
- [33] Z. Nezami, K. Zamanifar, K. Djemame, and E. Pournaras, “Decentralized edge-to-cloud load balancing: Service placement for the internet of things,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 64 983–65 000, 2021.
- [34] A. Maia, A. Boutouchent, Y. Kardjadja, M. Gherari, E. G. Soyak, M. Saqib, K. Boussekar, I. Cilbir, S. Habibi, S. O. Ali, W. Ajib, H. Elbiaze, O. Erçetin, Y. Ghamri-Doudane, and R. Glitho, “A survey on integrated computing, caching, and communication in the cloud-to-edge continuum,” *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 219, pp. 128–152, 2024.
- [35] S. Becker, F. Schmidt, and O. Kao, “Edgepiper: P2p-based container image distribution in edge computing environments,” in *IEEE IPCCC*, 2021, pp. 1–8.
- [36] P. Cardoso, J. Moura, and R. Marinheiro, “Software-defined elastic provisioning of iot edge computing virtual resources,” 2023.
- [37] X. Zhang, Z. Wang, F. Tian, and Z. Yang, “Stackelberg-game-based multi-user multi-task offloading in mobile edge computing,” *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 459–475, 2024.
- [38] A. Levin, S. Garion, E. K. Kolodner, D. H. Lorenz, K. Barabash, M. Kugler, and N. McShane, “Aioptions for a cloud object storage service,” in *IEEE BigDataCongress*, 2019, pp. 165–169.
- [39] B. A. Yusuf, A. A. Alahmadi, T. E. H. El-Gorashi, and J. M. H. Elmoghani, “Cloud fog architectures in 6g networks,” in *6G Mob. Wirel. Netw.*, 2021, pp. 285–326.
- [40] R. Blythman, M. Arshath, J. Smékal, H. Shaji, S. Vivona, and T. Dunmore, “Libraries, integrations and

- hubs for decentralized ai using ipfs,” 2022.
- [41] Q. Liang, P. Shenoy, and D. Irwin, “Ai on the edge: Characterizing ai-based iot applications using specialized edge architectures,” in *IEEE IISWC*, 2020, pp. 145–156.
- [42] M. J. Baucas and P. Spachos, “Using cloud and fog computing for large scale iot-based urban sound classification,” *Simul. Model. Pract. Theory*, vol. 101, p. 102013, 2020.
- [43] J. Kennedy, B. Varghese, and C. Reaño, “Avec: Accelerator virtualization in cloud-edge computing for deep learning libraries,” in *ICFEC*, 2021, pp. 37–44.
- [44] Q. Ren, O. Abbasi, G. K. Kurt, H. Yanikomeroglu, and J. Chen, “Caching and computation offloading in high altitude platform station (haps) assisted intelligent transportation systems,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 9010–9024, 2022.
- [45] S. Becker, F. Schmidt, A. Gulenko, A. Acker, and O. Kao, “Towards aiops in edge computing environments,” in *IEEE BigData*, 2020, pp. 3470–3475.
- [46] Z. Chang, F. Zhang, and D. Zhang, “An exploration on integrated sensing and communication for the future smart internet of things,” 2023.
- [47] S. Qiu, “Improving performance of smart education systems by integrating machine learning on edge devices and cloud in educational institutions,” *J. Grid Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 41, 2024.
- [48] V. Mihai, C. E. Hanganu, G. Stamatescu, and D. Popescu, “Wsn and fog computing integration for intelligent data processing,” in *ECAI*, 2018, pp. 1–4.
- [49] N. K. Nawandar, N. Cheggoju, and V. R. Satpute, “Stand-alone device for iot applications,” 2021.
- [50] L. Lei, Y. Tan, K. Zheng, S. Liu, K. Zhang, and X. Shen, “Deep reinforcement learning for autonomous internet of things: Model, applications and challenges,” *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1722–1760, 2020.
- [51] L. Wang, J. Wu, J. Zhang, and Y. Gao, “Efficient deep reinforcement learning based resource allocation for cloud native wireless network,” *IEEE Trans. Green Commun. Netw.*, pp. 1–1, 2025.
- [52] C. S. M. Babou, Y. Owada, M. Inoue, K. Takizawa, and T. Kuri, “Distributed edge cloud proposal based on vnf/sdn environment,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 124 619–124 635, 2024.
- [53] K. Khalafi and N. Lu, “Network slicing for edge-cloud orchestrated networks via online convex optimization,” in *IEEE INFOCOM*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [54] A. Sabbioni, A. Garbugli, L. Foschini, A. Corradi, and P. Bellavista, “Serverless computing for qos-effective nfv in the cloud edge,” *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 40–46, 2024.
- [55] U. C. Özyar and A. Yurdakul, “A decentralized framework with dynamic and event-driven container orchestration at the edge,” in *IEEE iThings*, 2022, pp. 33–40.
- [56] M. Bogo, J. Soldani, D. Neri, and A. Brogi, “Component-aware orchestration of cloud-based enterprise applications, from toasca to docker and kubernetes,” *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 1793–1821, 2020.
- [57] M. Rodriguez and R. Buyya, “Container orchestration with cost-efficient autoscaling in cloud computing environments,” in *Handbook of Research on Multimedia Cyber Security*, 2020, pp. 190–213.
- [58] Z. Zhong, M. Xu, M. A. Rodriguez, C. Xu, and R. Buyya, “Machine learning-based orchestration of containers: A taxonomy and future directions,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 10s, pp. 217:1–217:35, 2022.
- [59] Y. Liu and A. H. Herranz, “Enabling 5g qos configuration capabilities for iot applications on container orchestration platform,” in *IEEE CloudCom*, 2023, pp. 63–68.
- [60] Y. Feng, S. Shen, X. Wang, Q. Xiang, H. Xu, C. Xu, and W. Wang, “Break: A holistic approach for efficient container deployment among edge clouds,” in *IEEE INFOCOM*, 2024, pp. 1491–1500.
- [61] G. Monaco, G. Gala, and G. Fohler, “Extensions for shared resource orchestration in kubernetes to support rt-cloud containers,” 2023.
- [62] Z. Wang and R. Buyya, “Integration of fogbus2 framework with container orchestration tools in cloud and edge computing environments,” 2021.
- [63] M. A. Rodriguez and R. Buyya, “Container-based cluster orchestration systems: A taxonomy and future directions,” *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 698–719, 2019.
- [64] Z. Wang, M. Goudarzi, J. Aryal, and R. Buyya, “Container orchestration in edge and fog computing environments for real-time iot applications,” in *Comput. Intell. Data Anal.*, 2023, pp. 1–21.
- [65] A. Nunez, J. Ayoka, M. Z. Islam, and P. Ruiz, “A brief overview of software-defined networking,” 2023.
- [66] S. Ali, M. K. Alvi, S. Faizullah, M. A. Khan, A. Alshanjiti, and I. Khan, “Detecting ddos attack on sdn due to vulnerabilities in openflow,” in *AECT*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [67] P. F. Moraes and J. S. B. Martins, “A pub/sub sdn-integrated framework for iot traffic orchestration,” in *ICFNDS*, 2019, pp. 1–9.
- [68] D. Gedia and L. Perigo, “Neto-app: A network orchestration application for centralized network management in small business networks,” 2018.
- [69] I. Ahmad, “Improving software defined cognitive and secure networking,” 2020.
- [70] F. Lopez-Gomez, R. Marin-Lopez, O. Canovas, G. Lopez-Millan, and F. Pereniguez-Garcia, “Sdn-aaa: Towards the standard management of aaa infrastructures,” *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 236, p. 104114, 2025.
- [71] A. Al-Najjar, F. H. Khan, and M. Portmann, “Network traffic control for multi-homed end-hosts via sdn,” *IET Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 19, pp. 3312–3323, 2020.
- [72] W. Toussaint and A. Y. Ding, “Machine learning sys-

- tems for intelligent services in the iot: A survey,” 2020.
- [73] A. Abouaoumar, S. Cherkaoui, Z. Mlika, and A. Kobbane, “Resource provisioning in edge computing for latency-sensitive applications,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 14, pp. 11 088–11 099, 2021.
- [74] Y. Hao, Y. Miao, L. Hu, M. S. Hossain, G. Muhammad, and S. U. Amin, “Smart-edge-cocaco: Ai-enabled smart edge with joint computation, caching, and communication in heterogeneous iot,” *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 58–64, 2019.
- [75] N. Gholipour, M. D. de Assuncao, P. Agarwal, J. Gascon-Samson, and R. Buyya, “Tpto: A transformer-ppo based task offloading solution for edge computing environments,” in *IEEE ICPADS, 2023*, pp. 1115–1122.
- [76] J. Xu, W. Wan, L. Pan, W. Sun, and Y. Liu, “The fusion of deep reinforcement learning and edge computing for real-time monitoring and control optimization in iot environments,” in *EPECE, 2024*, pp. 193–196.
- [77] K. Rao, G. Coviello, W.-P. Hsiung, and S. Chakradhar, “Eco: Edge-cloud optimization of 5g applications,” in *CCGRID, 2021*, pp. 649–659.
- [78] P. Arroba, R. Buyya, R. Cárdenas, J. L. Risco-Martín, and J. M. Moya, “Sustainable edge computing: Challenges and future directions,” *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2272–2296, 2024.
- [79] Y. Chen, S. Ye, J. Wu, B. Wang, H. Wang, and W. Li, “Fast multi-type resource allocation in local-edge-cloud computing for energy-efficient service provision,” *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 668, p. 120502, 2024.
- [80] J. Wu, H. Dai, Y. Wang, S. Shen, and C. Xu, “Pecco: A profit and cost-oriented computation offloading scheme in edge-cloud environment with improved moth-flame optimization,” *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 34, no. 22, p. e7163, 2022.
- [81] J. Li, Z. Qin, W. Liu, and X. Yu, “Energy-aware and trust-collaboration cross-domain resource allocation algorithm for edge-cloud workflows,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 7249–7264, 2024.
- [82] X. Zhai, Y. Peng, and X. Guo, “Edge-cloud collaboration for low-latency, low-carbon, and cost-efficient operations,” *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, vol. 120, p. 109758, 2024.
- [83] K. Toczé and S. Nadjm-Tehrani, “A taxonomy for management and optimization of multiple resources in edge computing,” *Wireless Commun. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 2018, no. 1, p. 7476201, 2018.
- [84] C. Wang, Y. Yang, M. Qi, and H. Ma, “Efficient cloud-edge collaborative inference for object re-identification,” 2024.
- [85] B. Nour and S. Cherkaoui, “A network-based compute reuse architecture for iot applications,” in *IEEE GLOBECOM, 2024*, pp. 157–162.
- [86] W. Hua, P. Liu, and L. Huang, “Energy-efficient resource allocation for heterogeneous edge–cloud computing,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2808–2818, 2024.
- [87] G. Bisicchia, S. Forti, E. Pimentel, and A. Brogi, “Continuous qos-compliant orchestration in the cloud-edge continuum,” *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2191–2213, 2024.
- [88] B. Sedlak, V. C. Pujol, P. K. Donta, and S. Dustdar, “Equilibrium in the computing continuum through active inference,” *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 160, pp. 92–108, 2024.
- [89] Y. Liu, P. Huang, F. Yang, K. Huang, and L. Shu, “Quasyncl: Asynchronous federated learning with quantization for cloud–edge–terminal collaboration enabled aiot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 59–69, 2024.
- [90] X. Ji, F. Gong, N. Wang, C. Du, and X. Yuan, “Task offloading with enhanced deep q-networks for efficient industrial intelligent video analysis in edge–cloud collaboration,” *Adv. Eng. Inform.*, vol. 62, p. 102599, 2024.
- [91] H. She, L. Yan, and Y. Guo, “Efficient end–edge–cloud task offloading in 6g networks based on multiagent deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 20 260–20 270, 2024.
- [92] N. Sharma, A. Ghosh, R. Misra, and S. K. Das, “Deep meta q-learning based multi-task offloading in edge-cloud systems,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2583–2598, 2024.
- [93] X. Chen, J. Cao, Y. Sahni, S. Jiang, and Z. Liang, “Dynamic task offloading in edge computing based on dependency-aware reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 594–608, 2024.
- [94] Y. Duan and C. Jiang, “Binary task offloading strategy for cloud robots using improved game theory in cloud-edge collaboration,” *J. Supercomput.*, vol. 80, no. 10, pp. 14 752–14 772, 2024.
- [95] B. Bandyopadhyay, P. Kuila, M. C. Govil, and M. Bey, “Delay-sensitive task offloading and efficient resource allocation in intelligent edge–cloud environments: A discretized differential evolution-based approach,” *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 159, p. 111637, 2024.
- [96] X. Chen and S. Zheng, “Resource allocation and task offloading strategy base on hybrid simulated annealing-binary particle swarm optimization in cloud-edge collaborative system,” in *IMCEC, vol. 5, 2022*, pp. 379–383.
- [97] C. Feng, P. Han, X. Zhang, Q. Zhang, Y. Liu, and L. Guo, “Dependency-aware task reconfiguration and offloading in multi-access edge cloud networks,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 9271–9288, 2024.
- [98] J. Li, M. Zhu, J. Liu, W. Liu, B. Huang, and R. Liu, “Blockchain-based reliable task offloading framework for edge–cloud cooperative workflows in iomt,” *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 668, p. 120530, 2024.
- [99] Z. Bai, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, and W. Wang, “Delay-aware cooperative task offloading for multi-uav enabled edge-cloud computing,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*,

- vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1034–1049, 2024.
- [100] Y. Li, H. Wang, J. Sun, H. Lv, W. Zheng, and G. Feng, “Two-timescale joint service caching and resource allocation for task offloading with edge–cloud cooperation,” *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 254, p. 110771, 2024.
- [101] J. Fang, Y. He, F. R. Yu, J. Li, and V. C. Leung, “Large language models (llms) inference offloading and resource allocation in cloud-edge networks: An active inference approach,” in *IEEE VTC*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [102] D. Gan, X. Ge, and Q. Li, “An optimal transport-based federated reinforcement learning approach for resource allocation in cloud–edge collaborative iot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2407–2419, 2024.
- [103] C. Huang, G. Chen, P. Xiao, Y. Xiao, Z. Han, and J. A. Chambers, “Joint offloading and resource allocation for hybrid cloud and edge computing in sagins: A decision assisted hybrid action space deep reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1029–1043, 2024.
- [104] Y. Zhang, C. Jiang, and P. Zhang, “Security-aware resource allocation scheme based on drl in cloud–edge–terminal cooperative vehicular network,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 95–104, 2024.
- [105] M. D. Nguyen, L. B. Le, and A. Girard, “Integrated computation offloading, uav trajectory control, edge-cloud and radio resource allocation in sagin,” *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 100–115, 2024.
- [106] A. Ali-Eldin, B. Wang, and P. Shenoy, “The hidden cost of the edge: A performance comparison of edge and cloud latencies,” in *SC*, 2021, pp. 1–12.
- [107] S. Li, X. You, S. Zhang, M. Fang, and P. Zhang, “Cloud-edge-device collaborative high concurrency access management for massive iot devices in distribution grid,” *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. E107.A, no. 7, pp. 946–957, 2024.
- [108] H. Asghar and E.-S. Jung, “A survey on scheduling techniques in the edge cloud: Issues, challenges and future directions,” 2022.
- [109] C. Zeng, X. Wang, R. Zeng, Y. Li, J. Shi, and M. Huang, “Joint optimization of multi-dimensional resource allocation and task offloading for qoe enhancement in cloud-edge-end collaboration,” *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 155, pp. 121–131, 2024.
- [110] X. He, H. Xu, X. Xu, Y. Chen, and Z. Wang, “An efficient algorithm for microservice placement in cloud-edge collaborative computing environment,” *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1983–1997, 2024.
- [111] Y. Lu, P. Zhang, Y. Duan, M. Guizani, J. Wang, and S. Li, “Dynamic scheduling of iov edge cloud service functions under nfv: A multi-agent reinforcement learning approach,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 4, pp. 5730–5741, 2024.
- [112] C. Fang, H. Xu, T. Zhang, Y. Li, W. Ni, Z. Han, and S. Guo, “Joint task offloading and content caching for noma-aided cloud-edge-terminal cooperation networks,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 15 586–15 600, 2024.
- [113] L. Wu, P. Sun, Z. Wang, Y. Li, and Y. Yang, “Computation offloading in multi-cell networks with collaborative edge-cloud computing: A game theoretic approach,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 2093–2106, 2024.
- [114] G. Dragotto, A. Boukhtouta, A. Lodi, and M. Taobane, “The critical node game,” *J. Comb. Optim.*, vol. 47, no. 5, p. 74, 2024.
- [115] F. Shams, V. Lottici, and Z. Tian, “Joint latency-energy minimization for fog-assisted wireless iot networks,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 6, pp. 1–15, 2025.
- [116] K. Yu, S. Wang, and X. Tao, “Game theory for 5g cloud-edge-terminal distributed networks under dos attacks,” in *IEEE WCNC*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [117] T. H. Binh, D. B. Son, H. Vo, B. M. Nguyen, and H. T. T. Binh, “Reinforcement learning for optimizing delay-sensitive task offloading in vehicular edge–cloud computing,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2058–2069, 2024.
- [118] S. Jiao, H. Wang, and J. Luo, “Sra-e-abco: Terminal task offloading for cloud-edge-end environments,” *J. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 58, 2024.
- [119] Y. Wang, J. Fang, Y. Cheng, H. She, Y. Guo, and G. Zheng, “Cooperative end-edge-cloud computing and resource allocation for digital twin enabled 6g industrial iot,” *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 124–137, 2024.
- [120] T. Stevens, C. Skalka, C. Vincent, J. Ring, S. Clark, and J. Near, “Efficient differentially private secure aggregation for federated learning via hardness of learning with errors,” in *USENIX Security*, 2022, pp. 1379–1395.
- [121] Y. Liu, R. Zhao, J. Kang, A. Yassine, D. Niyato, and J. Peng, “Towards communication-efficient and attack-resistant federated edge learning for industrial internet of things,” *ACM Trans. Internet Technol.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 59:1–59:22, 2021.
- [122] R. Hu, Y. Guo, and Y. Gong, “Concentrated differentially private and utility preserving federated learning,” 2020.
- [123] Y. Li, S. Yang, X. Ren, and C. Zhao, “Asynchronous federated learning with differential privacy for edge intelligence,” 2019.
- [124] D. Gupta, O. Kayode, S. Bhatt, M. Gupta, and A. S. Tosun, “Hierarchical federated learning based anomaly detection using digital twins for smart healthcare,” in *IEEE CIC*, 2021, pp. 16–25.
- [125] S. Chatel, C. Knabenhans, A. Pyrgelis, C. Troncoso, and J.-P. Hubaux, “Verifiable encodings for secure homomorphic analytics,” 2024.
- [126] L. Zhang, X. Wang, J. Wang, R. Pung, H. Wang, and K.-Y. Lam, “An efficient fhe-enabled secure cloud–edge computing architecture for iomt data protection with

- its application to pandemic modeling,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 15 272–15 284, 2024.
- [127] M. A. Ferrag, B. Kantarci, L. C. Cordeiro, M. Debbah, and K.-K. R. Choo, “Poisoning attacks in federated edge learning for digital twin 6g-enabled iots: An anticipatory study,” in *NCC*, 2023, pp. 1253–1258.
- [128] Y. Zhao, Y. Cao, J. Zhang, H. Huang, and Y. Liu, “Flexiblleft: Mitigating poisoning attacks with contributions in cloud-edge federated learning systems,” *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 664, p. 120350, 2024.
- [129] S. Ma, J. Nie, J. Kang, L. Lyu, R. W. Liu, R. Zhao, Z. Liu, and D. Niyato, “Privacy-preserving anomaly detection in cloud manufacturing via federated transformer,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 8977–8987, 2022.
- [130] A. Panda, S. Mahloujifar, A. N. Bhagoji, S. Chakraborty, and P. Mittal, “Sparsefed: Mitigating model poisoning attacks in federated learning with sparsification,” in *AISTATS*, 2022, pp. 7587–7624.
- [131] Z. Li, L. Zheng, Y. Zhong, V. Liu, Y. Sheng, X. Jin, Y. Huang, Z. Chen, H. Zhang, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stolica, “Alpaserve: Statistical multiplexing with model parallelism for deep learning serving,” in *OSDI*, 2023, pp. 663–679.
- [132] X. Guo, A. D. Pimentel, and T. Stefanov, “Autodice: Fully automated distributed cnn inference at the edge,” 2022.
- [133] P. Joshi, M. Hasanuzzaman, C. Thapa, H. Affli, and T. Scully, “Enabling all in-edge deep learning: A literature review,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 3431–3460, 2023.
- [134] A. Banitalebi-Dehkordi, N. Vedula, J. Pei, F. Xia, L. Wang, and Y. Zhang, “Auto-split: A general framework of collaborative edge-cloud ai,” in *KDD*, 2021, pp. 2543–2553.
- [135] D. Liu, X. Chen, Z. Zhou, and Q. Ling, “Hiertrain: Fast hierarchical edge ai learning with hybrid parallelism in mobile-edge-cloud computing,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 1, pp. 634–645, 2020.
- [136] T. Qi, Y. Zhan, P. Li, J. Guo, and Y. Xia, “Arena: A learning-based synchronization scheme for hierarchical federated learning—technical report,” 2023.
- [137] G. Wang, J. Liu, C. Li, Y. Zhang, J. Ma, X. Wei, K. Zhang, M. Chong, R. Zhang, Y. Liu, and S. Zhang, “Cloud-device collaborative learning for multimodal large language models,” in *CVPR*, 2024, pp. 12 646–12 655.
- [138] Y. Yang, C. Fan, S. Chen, Z. Gao, and L. Rui, “Growth-adaptive distillation compressed fusion model for network traffic identification based on iot cloud-edge collaboration,” *Ad Hoc Netw.*, vol. 167, p. 103676, 2025.
- [139] H. Kim, J. S. Choi, J. Kim, and J. H. Ko, “A dnn partitioning framework with controlled lossy mechanisms for edge-cloud collaborative intelligence,” *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 154, pp. 426–439, 2024.
- [140] L. Tang, C. Xue, Y. Zhao, and Q. Chen, “Anomaly detection of service function chain based on distributed knowledge distillation framework in cloud-edge industrial internet of things scenarios,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 10 843–10 855, 2024.
- [141] X. Li, X. Ma, H. Zhang, and D. Yuan, “Condition-adaptive dynamic evolution method for digital twin of rolling bearings based on continual learning,” in *CAC*, 2024, pp. 5666–5671.
- [142] L. Zhao, Y. Han, A. Hawbani, S. Wan, Z. Guo, and M. Guizani, “Media: An incremental dnn based computation offloading for collaborative cloud-edge computing,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1986–1998, 2024.
- [143] S. Lin, X. Zhang, Y. Li, C. Joe-Wong, J. Duan, D. Yu, Y. Wu, and X. Chen, “Online management for edge-cloud collaborative continuous learning: A two-timescale approach,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 14 561–14 574, 2024.
- [144] S. Yue, J. Ren, J. Xin, S. Lin, and J. Zhang, “Inexact-admm based federated meta-learning for fast and continual edge learning,” in *MobiHoc*, 2021, pp. 91–100.
- [145] Z. Li, J. Yu, X. Liu, and L. Peng, “Load balancing for task scheduling based on multi-agent reinforcement learning in cloud-edge-end collaborative environments,” in *ICML*, 2024, pp. 94–100.
- [146] H. Gao, R. Wang, S. He, L. Wang, J. Liu, and Z. Chen, “A cloud-edge collaboration solution for distribution network reconfiguration using multi-agent deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 3867–3879, 2024.
- [147] A. Suzuki, M. Kobayashi, and E. Oki, “Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for cooperative computing offloading and route optimization in multi cloud-edge networks,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Service Manag.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 4416–4434, 2023.
- [148] Y. Luo, J. Yang, W. Xu, K. Wang, and M. D. Renzo, “Resource allocation using gradient boosting aided deep q-network for iot in c-rans,” 2019.
- [149] Y. Guo, X. Xu, and F. Xiao, “Madrmlom: A computation offloading mechanism for software-defined cloud-edge computing power network,” *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 245, p. 110352, 2024.
- [150] Z. Zhang, F. Zhang, Z. Xiong, K. Zhang, and D. Chen, “Lsia3cs: Deep-reinforcement-learning-based cloud-edge collaborative task scheduling in large-scale iiot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 13, pp. 23 917–23 930, 2024.
- [151] S. Di, H. Deng, D. Chen, X. Mao, Y. Zou, L. Wu, Y. Guo, Y. Lin, and L. Zhang, “Peco: A point-edge collaborative framework for global-aware urban building contouring from unstructured point clouds,” *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 62, pp. 1–19, 2024.
- [152] Y. Dong, P. Zhao, H. Yu, C. Zhao, and S. Yang, “Cdc: Classification driven compression for bandwidth efficient edge-cloud collaborative deep learning,” in *IJCAI*,

- vol. 4, 2020, pp. 3378–3384.
- [153] F. Hawlader, F. Robinet, and R. Frank, “Leveraging the edge and cloud for v2x-based real-time object detection in autonomous driving,” *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 213, pp. 372–381, 2024.
- [154] X. Hou, Y. Guan, N. Choi, and T. Han, “Bps: Batching, pipelining, surgeon of continuous deep inference on collaborative edge intelligence,” *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 830–843, 2024.
- [155] A. Joshi, S. Agarwal, D. P. Kanungo, and R. K. Panigrahi, “Integration of edge-ai into iot-cloud architecture for landslide monitoring and prediction,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 4246–4258, 2024.
- [156] F. Luo, S. Khan, A. Li, Y. Huang, and K. Wu, “Edge-actnet: Edge intelligence-enabled human activity recognition using radar point cloud,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 5479–5493, 2024.
- [157] Z. Wu, Y. Wang, H. Xie, M. Feng, H. Wu, C. Ding, and A. Mian, “A systematic point cloud edge detection framework for automatic aircraft skin milling,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 560–572, 2024.
- [158] Z. Yang, R. Gu, H. Li, and Y. Ji, “Approximately lossless model compression-based multilayer virtual network embedding for edge-cloud collaborative services,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 14, pp. 13 040–13 055, 2023.
- [159] Y. Chen, S. Niu, S. Xu, H. Song, Y. Wang, and M. Tan, “Towards robust and efficient cloud-edge elastic model adaptation via selective entropy distillation,” in *ICLR*, 2023.
- [160] C. Fan, J. Cui, H. Jin, H. Zhong, I. Bolodurina, and D. He, “Auto-updating intrusion detection system for vehicular network: A deep learning approach based on cloud-edge-vehicle collaboration,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 10, pp. 15 372–15 384, 2024.
- [161] L. Fu, J. Tong, T. Lin, and J. Zhang, “Data-driven online resource allocation for user experience improvement in mobile edge clouds,” *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 13 707–13 721, 2024.
- [162] Y. He and W. Shen, “Fedita: A cloud-edge collaboration framework for domain generalization-based federated fault diagnosis of machine-level industrial motors,” *Adv. Eng. Inform.*, vol. 62, p. 102853, 2024.
- [163] S. Lu, Y. Zhang, and J. Wu, “Online prediction of industrial process index: An edge-cloud collaborated approach,” *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 71, no. 9, pp. 11 419–11 428, 2024.
- [164] X. Yang, “Optimizing accounting informatization through simultaneous multi-tasking across edge and cloud devices using hybrid machine learning models,” *J. Grid Comput.*, vol. 22, no. 1, p. 12, 2024.
- [165] J. Li, S. Guo, W. Liang, J. Wang, Q. Chen, Y. Zeng, B. Ye, and X. Jia, “Digital twin-enabled service provisioning in edge computing via continual learning,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 7335–7350, 2024.
- [166] Z. Lian, M. Lv, X. Xu, Z. Ding, M. Zhu, Y. Wu, and J. Yan, “Cloud-edge collaborative continual adaptation for its object detection,” in *SDI*, 2024, pp. 15–27.
- [167] Z. Zhang, B. Guo, W. Sun, Y. Liu, and Z. Yu, “Cross-fcl: Toward a cross-edge federated continual learning framework in mobile edge computing systems,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 313–326, 2024.
- [168] L. Yang, Z. Luo, S. Zhang, F. Teng, and T. Li, “Continual learning for smart city: A survey,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 7805–7824, 2024.
- [169] Z. Zhu, S. Wan, P. Fan, and K. B. Letaief, “Federated multiagent actor-critic learning for age sensitive mobile-edge computing,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 1053–1067, 2022.
- [170] C. Park, H. Lee, W. J. Yun, S. Jung, and J. Kim, “Coordinated multi-agent reinforcement learning for unmanned aerial vehicle swarms in autonomous mobile access applications,” 2022.
- [171] S. Chen, J. Chen, Y. Miao, Q. Wang, and C. Zhao, “Deep reinforcement learning-based cloud-edge collaborative mobile computation offloading in industrial networks,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. Netw.*, vol. 8, pp. 364–375, 2022.
- [172] C. Xu, S. Liu, C. Zhang, Y. Huang, Z. Lu, and L. Yang, “Multi-agent reinforcement learning based distributed transmission in collaborative cloud-edge systems,” *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 1658–1672, 2021.
- [173] A. Suzuki and M. Kobayashi, “Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for cooperative offloading in cloud-edge computing,” in *NCC*, 2022, pp. 3660–3666.
- [174] D.-Y. Kim, D.-E. Lee, J.-W. Kim, and H.-S. Lee, “Collaborative policy learning for dynamic scheduling tasks in cloud-edge-terminal iot networks using federated reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 10 133–10 149, 2024.
- [175] K. Afachao, A. M. Abu-Mahfouz, and G. P. Hanke, “Efficient microservice deployment in the edge-cloud networks with policy-gradient reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 133 110–133 124, 2024.
- [176] J. Lu, J. Yang, S. Li, Y. Li, W. Jiang, J. Dai, and J. Hu, “A2c-drl: Dynamic scheduling for stochastic edge-cloud environments using a2c and deep reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 16 915–16 927, 2024.
- [177] G. Nieto, I. de la Iglesia, U. Lopez-Novoa, and C. Perfecto, “Deep reinforcement learning techniques for dynamic task offloading in the 5g edge-cloud continuum,” *J. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 94, 2024.
- [178] S. Zhang, M. Xu, W. Y. Bryan Lim, and D. Niyato, “Sustainable aigc workload scheduling of geodistributed data centers: A multi-agent reinforcement learning approach,” in *IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2023, pp. 3500–3505.

- [179] J. Zhang, Z. Ning, M. Waqas, H. Alasmay, S. Tu, and S. Chen, "Hybrid edge-cloud collaborator resource scheduling approach based on deep reinforcement learning and multiobjective optimization," *IEEE Trans. Comput.*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 192–205, 2024.
- [180] C.-L. Chen, H. Zhou, J. Chen, M. Pedramfar, T. Lan, Z. Zhu, C. Zhou, P. Mauri Ruiz, N. Kumar, H. Dong, and V. Aggarwal, "Learning-based two-tiered online optimization of region-wide datacenter resource allocation," 2023.
- [181] W. Fang, C. Zhu, and W. Zhang, "Toward secure and lightweight data transmission for cloud-edge-terminal collaboration in artificial intelligence of things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 105–113, 2024.
- [182] J. Li, L. Lyu, X. Liu, X. Zhang, and X. Lyu, "Fleam: A federated learning empowered architecture to mitigate ddos in industrial iot," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 4059–4068, 2022.
- [183] M. Wang, J. Santillan, and F. Kuipers, "Thingpot: An interactive internet-of-things honeypot," 2018.
- [184] C. Chen, Y. Li, Q. Wang, X. Yang, X. Wang, and L. T. Yang, "An intelligent edge-cloud collaborative framework for communication security in distributed cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 172–179, 2024.
- [185] H. Dui, J. Wang, T. Zhu, and L. Xing, "Maintenance optimization methodology of edge cloud collaborative systems based on a gateway cost index in iiot," *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.*, vol. 251, p. 110370, 2024.
- [186] M. Xiao, Q. Huang, W. Chen, C. Lyu, and W. Susilo, "Domain-specific fine-grained access control for cloud-edge collaborative iot," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, vol. 19, pp. 6499–6513, 2024.
- [187] Y. Yao, J. Chang, and A. Zhang, "Efficient data sharing scheme with fine-grained access control and integrity auditing in terminal-edge-cloud network," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 16, pp. 26 944–26 954, 2024.
- [188] Y. Yigit, C. Chrysoulas, G. Yurdakul, L. Maglaras, and B. Canberk, "Digital twin-empowered smart attack detection system for 6g edge of things networks," in *IEEE GC Wkshps*, 2023, pp. 178–183.
- [189] X. Sáez-de-Cámara, J. L. Flores, C. Arellano, A. Urbietta, and U. Zurutuza, "Clustered federated learning architecture for network anomaly detection in large scale heterogeneous iot networks," *Comput. Secur.*, vol. 131, p. 103299, 2023.
- [190] E. Blasch, R. Xu, Y. Chen, G. Chen, and D. Shen, "Blockchain methods for trusted avionics systems," in *IEEE NAECON*, 2019, pp. 192–199.
- [191] J. Pan, J. Wang, A. Hester, I. Alqerm, Y. Liu, and Y. Zhao, "Edgechain: An edge-iot framework and prototype based on blockchain and smart contracts," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 4719–4732, 2019.
- [192] T. R. Gadekallu, Q.-V. Pham, D. C. Nguyen, P. K. R. Maddikunta, N. Deepa, B. Prabadevi, P. N. Pathirana, J. Zhao, and W.-J. Hwang, "Blockchain for edge of things: Applications, opportunities, and challenges," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 964–988, 2022.
- [193] Z. Li, Q. Li, Y. Zhou, W. Zhong, G. Zhang, and C. Wu, "Edge-cloud collaborative learning with federated and centralized features," in *SIGIR*, 2023, pp. 1949–1953.
- [194] H. Liu, J. Yan, and Y.-J. A. Zhang, "Differentially private over-the-air federated learning over mimo fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 8232–8247, 2024.
- [195] A. Bujari, A. Calvio, A. Garbugli, and P. Bellavista, "A layered architecture enabling metaverse applications in smart manufacturing environments," in *IEEE MetaCom*, 2023, pp. 585–592.
- [196] J. Sengupta, S. Ruj, and S. D. Bit, "Sprite: A scalable privacy-preserving and verifiable collaborative learning for industrial iot," in *CCGRID*, 2022, pp. 249–258.
- [197] L. Duan, J. Sun, Y. Chen, and M. Gorlatova, "Privascissors: Enhance the privacy of collaborative inference through the lens of mutual information," 2023.
- [198] Y. Wang, X. Chen, and Q. Wang, "Privacy-preserving security inference towards cloud-edge collaborative using differential privacy," 2022.
- [199] Q. Wang, D. Zhou, and Y. Li, "Secure outsourced calculations with homomorphic encryption," *Adv. Comput. Int. J.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 01–14, 2018.
- [200] N. Rodríguez-Barroso, G. Stipcich, D. Jiménez-López, J. A. Ruiz-Millán, E. Martínez-Cámara, G. González-Seco, M. V. Luzón, M. A. Veganzones, and F. Herrera, "Federated learning and differential privacy: Software tools analysis, the sherpa.ai fl framework and methodological guidelines for preserving data privacy," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 64, pp. 270–292, 2020.
- [201] R. Underwood, J. C. Calhoun, S. Di, and F. Cappello, "Understanding the effectiveness of lossy compression in machine learning training sets," 2024.
- [202] H. N. Noura, J. Azar, O. Salman, R. Couturier, and K. Mazouzi, "A deep learning scheme for efficient multimedia iot data compression," *Ad Hoc Netw.*, vol. 138, p. 102998, 2023.
- [203] D. Lee, A. Sim, J. Choi, and K. Wu, "Idealem: Statistical similarity based data reduction," 2019.
- [204] C. Li, X. Wang, T. Zong, H. Cao, and Y. Liu, "Predictive edge caching through deep mining of sequential patterns in user content retrievals," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 233, p. 109866, 2023.
- [205] Z. Zhang, M. St-Hilaire, X. Wei, H. Dong, and A. E. Saddik, "How to cache important contents for multi-modal service in dynamic networks: A drl-based caching scheme," *IEEE Trans. Multimedia*, vol. 26, pp. 7372–7385, 2024.
- [206] H. Torabi, H. Khazaei, and M. Litoiu, "A learning-based caching mechanism for edge content delivery," in *ACM/SPEC ICPE*, 2024, pp. 236–246.
- [207] Y. Zheng, Y. Chen, C. Tan, Y. Yang, C. Shu, and L. Chen, "Optimization model for vehicular network

- data queries in edge environments,” *J. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 145, 2024.
- [208] A. Luckow, K. Rattan, and S. Jha, “Pilot-edge: Distributed resource management along the edge-to-cloud continuum,” in *IEEE IPDPS*, 2021, pp. 874–878.
- [209] A. Javed, K. Heljanko, A. Buda, and K. Främling, “Cefiot: A fault-tolerant iot architecture for edge and cloud,” in *IEEE WF-IoT*, 2018, pp. 813–818.
- [210] L. Chen, J. Qi, X. Su, and R. Wang, “Remr: A reliability evaluation method for dynamic edge computing network under time constraint,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 4281–4291, 2023.
- [211] E. D. Paolo, E. Bassetti, and A. Spognardi, “Security assessment of common open source mqtt brokers and clients,” 2023.
- [212] C. Gündoğan, C. Amsüss, T. C. Schmidt, and M. Wählich, “Iot content object security with oscore and ndn: A first experimental comparison,” in *IFIP Networking*, 2020, pp. 19–27.
- [213] C. V. Phung, J. Dizdarevic, and A. Jukan, “Enhancing block-wise transfer with network coding in coap,” in *Euro-ParW*, 2020, pp. 737–741.
- [214] F. Wang, X. Wen, L. Li, Y. Wen, S. Zhang, and Y. Liu, “Cloud-edge-end collaborative multi-service resource management for iot-based distribution grid,” *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. E107.A, no. 9, pp. 1542–1555, 2024.
- [215] J. Nikolić, N. Jubatyrov, and E. Pourmaras, “Self-healing dilemmas in distributed systems: Fault correction vs. fault tolerance,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Service Manag.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 2728–2741, 2021.
- [216] Y. Lu, W. Chen, and H. V. Poor, “User preference aware lossless data compression at the edge,” *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3792–3807, 2020.
- [217] F. Taurone, D. E. Lucani, M. Fehér, and Q. Zhang, “Change a bit to save bytes: Compression for floating point time-series data,” in *NCC*, 2023, pp. 3756–3761.
- [218] V. Agrawal, G. Kuldeep, and D. Dey, “Near lossless time series data compression methods using statistics and deviation,” in *IEEE GC Wkshps*, 2022, pp. 426–431.
- [219] O. Shadura, B. P. Bockelman, P. Canal, D. Piparo, and Z. Zhang, “Root i/o compression improvements for hep analysis,” *EPJ Web Conf.*, vol. 245, p. 02017, 2020.
- [220] T. Melissaris, K. Shaw, and M. Martonosi, “Optimizing iot and web traffic using selective edge compression,” 2020.
- [221] T. Banerjee, J. Choi, J. Lee, Q. Gong, J. Chen, S. Klasky, A. Rangarajan, and S. Ranka, “Scalable hybrid learning techniques for scientific data compression,” 2022.
- [222] T. Dosluoglu and M. MacDonald, “Circuit design for predictive maintenance,” *Adv. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 02, no. 04, pp. 533–539, 2022.
- [223] J. Tang, S. Liu, B. Yu, and W. Shi, “Pi-edge: A low-power edge computing system for real-time autonomous driving services,” 2018.
- [224] J. Zhang, Z. Wei, B. Liu, X. Wang, Y. Yu, and R. Zhang, “Cloud-edge-terminal collaborative aigc for autonomous driving,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 40–47, 2024.
- [225] Z. Ni, H. Chen, Z. Li, X. Wang, N. Yan, W. Liu, and F. Xia, “Mscet: A multi-scenario offloading schedule for biomedical data processing and analysis in cloud-edge-terminal collaborative vehicular networks,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 2376–2386, 2023.
- [226] V. Katariya, F.-E. Jannat, A. D. Pazho, G. A. Noghre, and H. Tabkhi, “Vegaedge: Edge ai confluence anomaly detection for real-time highway iot-applications,” 2023.
- [227] S. Ghosh and S. K. Ghosh, “Mobility driven cloud-fog-edge framework for location-aware services: A comprehensive review,” in *Mobile Edge Comput.*, 2021, pp. 229–249.
- [228] T. Shaik, X. Tao, N. Higgins, L. Li, R. Gururajan, X. Zhou, and U. R. Acharya, “Remote patient monitoring using artificial intelligence: Current state, applications, and challenges,” *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. e1485, 2023.
- [229] V. Hayyolalam, M. Aloqaily, Ö. Özkasap, and M. Guizani, “Edge intelligence for empowering iot-based healthcare systems,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 6–14, 2021.
- [230] R. Buyya, S. N. Srirama, R. Mahmud, M. Goudarzi, L. Ismail, and V. Kostakos, “Quality of service (qos)-driven edge computing and smart hospitals: A vision, architectural elements, and future directions,” in *NICEDT*, 2023, pp. 1–23.
- [231] S. Y. Nikouei, R. Xu, Y. Chen, A. Aved, and E. Blasch, “Decentralized smart surveillance through microservices platform,” in *Sens. Syst. Space Appl.*, vol. 11017, 2019, pp. 160–175.
- [232] X. Zhou, X. Xu, W. Liang, Z. Zeng, and Z. Yan, “Deep-learning-enhanced multitarget detection for end-edge-cloud surveillance in smart iot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 16, pp. 12 588–12 596, 2021.
- [233] P. Kumar, A. Nelson, Z. Kapetanovic, and R. Chandra, *Affordable Artificial Intelligence – Augmenting Farmer Knowledge with AI*, 2021.
- [234] X. Cao, Y. Yao, L. Li, W. Zhang, Z. An, Z. Zhang, L. Xiao, S. Guo, X. Cao, M. Wu, and D. Luo, “igrow: A smart agriculture solution to autonomous greenhouse control,” *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 11 837–11 845, 2022.
- [235] X. Zhang, L. Ma, K. Peng, C. Zhang, and M. A. Shahid, “A cloud-edge collaboration based quality-related hierarchical fault detection framework for large-scale manufacturing processes,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 256, p. 124909, 2024.
- [236] X. Liu, J. Fromm, S. Patel, and D. McDuff, “Multi-task temporal shift attention networks for on-device contactless vitals measurement,” in *NeurIPS*, vol. 33,

- 2020, pp. 19 400–19 411.
- [237] J. Yao, S. Zhang, Y. Yao, F. Wang, J. Ma, J. Zhang, Y. Chu, L. Ji, K. Jia, T. Shen, A. Wu, F. Zhang, Z. Tan, K. Kuang, C. Wu, F. Wu, J. Zhou, and H. Yang, “Edge-cloud polarization and collaboration: A comprehensive survey for ai,” *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 6866–6886, 2023.
- [238] C. Wang and J. Gong, “Intelligent agricultural greenhouse control system based on internet of things and machine learning,” 2025.
- [239] F. Huber, A. Yushchenko, B. Stratmann, and V. Steinhage, “Extreme gradient boosting for yield estimation compared with deep learning approaches,” *Comput. Electron. Agric.*, vol. 202, p. 107346, 2022.
- [240] W. Khuen Cheng, J. Cheng Khor, W. Zheng Liew, K. Thyé Bea, and Y.-L. Chen, “Integration of federated learning and edge-cloud platform for precision aquaculture,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 124 974–124 989, 2024.
- [241] T. Chen, S. Barbarossa, X. Wang, G. B. Giannakis, and Z.-L. Zhang, “Learning and management for internet of things: Accounting for adaptivity and scalability,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 4, pp. 778–796, 2019.
- [242] A. Luckow, K. Rattan, and S. Jha, “Exploring task placement for edge-to-cloud applications using emulation,” in *ICFEC*, 2021, pp. 79–83.
- [243] J. Ménétrey, M. Pasin, P. Felber, and V. Schiavoni, “Webassembly as a common layer for the cloud-edge continuum,” in *FRAME*, 2022, pp. 3–8.
- [244] H. Yang, W. Zheng, T. Zhang, P. Vijayakumar, B. B. Gupta, V. Arya, and M. S. Christo, “A flexible and verifiable keyword pir scheme for cloud–edge–terminal collaboration in aiot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 18 111–18 122, 2024.
- [245] Y. Baseri, V. Chouhan, and A. Ghorbani, “Cybersecurity in the quantum era: Assessing the impact of quantum computing on infrastructure,” 2024.
- [246] V. Venkatraman, S. Pal, Z. Jadidi, and A. Jolfaei, “A conceptual trust management framework under uncertainty for smart vehicular networks,” in *IEEE INFOCOM*, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [247] S. Sagar, A. Mahmood, Q. Z. Sheng, M. Zaib, and F. Sufyan, “Can we quantify trust? towards a trust-based resilient snot network,” *Computing*, vol. 106, no. 2, pp. 557–577, 2024.
- [248] D. Dhinakaran, S. M. U. Sankar, D. Selvaraj, and S. E. Raja, “Privacy-preserving data in iot-based cloud systems: A comprehensive survey with ai integration,” 2024.
- [249] P. Sowiński, I. Lacalle, R. Vaño, and C. E. Palau, “Autonomous choreography of webassembly workloads in the federated cloud-edge-iot continuum,” in *IEEE CloudNet*, 2023, pp. 454–459.
- [250] M. Zolanvari, Z. Yang, K. Khan, R. Jain, and N. Meskin, “Trust xai: Model-agnostic explanations for ai with a case study on iiot security,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 2967–2978, 2023.
- [251] C. Christophorou, I. Ioannou, V. Vassiliou, L. Christofi, J. S. Vardakas, E. E. Seder, C. F. Chiasserini, M. Iordache, C. B. Issaid, I. Markopoulos, G. Franzese, T. Järvet, and C. Verikoukis, “Adroit6g dai-driven open and programmable architecture for 6g networks,” in *IEEE GC Wkshps*, 2023, pp. 744–750.
- [252] Y. Lin, W. Feng, Y. Wang, Y. Chen, Y. Zhu, X. Zhang, N. Ge, and Y. Gao, “Satellite-mec integration for 6g internet of things: Minimal structures, advances, and prospects,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 5, pp. 3886–3903, 2024.
- [253] Y. He, J. Fang, F. R. Yu, and V. C. Leung, “Large language models (llms) inference offloading and resource allocation in cloud-edge computing: An active inference approach,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 11 253–11 264, 2024.
- [254] M. Xu, D. Niyato, H. Zhang, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, S. Mao, and Z. Han, “Cached model-as-a-resource: Provisioning large language model agents for edge intelligence in space-air-ground integrated networks,” 2024.
- [255] C. Lu, E. Telang, A. Aysu, and K. Basu, “Quantum leak: Timing side-channel attacks on cloud-based quantum services,” 2024.
- [256] A. Masaracchia, V.-L. Nguyen, D. B. da Costa, E. Ak, B. Canberk, V. Sharma, and T. Q. Duong, “Toward 6g-enabled urlcs: Digital twin, open ran, and semantic communications,” *IEEE Commun. Stand. Mag.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 13–20, 2025.
- [257] M. Xu, D. Niyato, J. Kang, Z. Xiong, S. Mao, Z. Han, D. I. Kim, and K. B. Letaief, “When large language model agents meet 6g networks: Perception, grounding, and alignment,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 63–71, 2024.
- [258] K. Rao, G. Coviello, P. Benedetti, C. Giuseppe De Vita, G. Mellone, and S. Chakradhar, “Eco-llm: Llm-based edge cloud optimization,” in *Proceedings of the 2024 Workshop on AI For Systems*, 2024, pp. 7–12.
- [259] X. Shen, P. Dong, L. Lu, Z. Kong, Z. Li, M. Lin, C. Wu, and Y. Wang, “Agile-quant: Activation-guided quantization for faster inference of llms on the edge,” *AAAI*, vol. 38, no. 17, pp. 18 944–18 951, 2024.
- [260] Z. Yao, Z. Tang, J. Lou, P. Shen, and W. Jia, “Velo: A vector database-assisted cloud-edge collaborative llm qos optimization framework,” 2024.
- [261] H. T. Nguyen, M. Usman, and R. Buyya, “iquantum: A case for modeling and simulation of quantum computing environments,” in *IEEE QSW*, 2023, pp. 21–30.
- [262] H. T. Nguyen, P. Krishnan, D. Krishnaswamy, M. Usman, and R. Buyya, “Quantum cloud computing: A review, open problems, and future directions,” 2024.
- [263] A. Paul, K. Singh, A. Kaushik, C.-P. Li, O. A. Dobre, M. Di Renzo, and T. Q. Duong, “Quantum-enhanced drl optimization for doa estimation and task offloading in isac systems,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 364–381, 2025.

Supplementary Material

A Survey on Cloud-Edge-Terminal Collaborative Intelligence in AIoT Networks

Jiaqi Wu , Jing Liu , Yang Liu , *Member, IEEE*, Lixu Wang , Zehua Wang , *Member, IEEE*, Wei Chen 
Member, IEEE, Zijian Tian , F. Richard Yu , *Fellow, IEEE*, Victor C.M. Leung , *Life Fellow, IEEE*

I. OVERVIEW

In this supplementary material, we provide more detailed coverage of key cloud-edge-terminal collaborative intelligence (CETCI) components that are not fully addressed in the main paper due to page limitations. We have moved comprehensive explanations of 1) optimization techniques for task offloading and resource allocation, 2) security mechanisms and privacy-preserving techniques, 3) data management and communication protocols, and 4) specific application domains to this supplement. Specifically, [Sec. III](#) covers mathematical and learning-based optimization techniques including linear programming, convex optimization, and game theory approaches. [Sec. IV](#) presents detailed security mechanisms and privacy-preserving techniques for collaborative intelligence systems. [Sec. II](#) provides comprehensive analysis of data management and communication protocols in distributed AIoT environments. [Sec. V](#) showcases specific applications in smart cities and smart agriculture domains, demonstrating the practical implementation of cloud-edge-terminal collaboration.

II. OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUES IN INTELLIGENT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Mathematical and learning-based optimization approaches address the complex challenges of task offloading and resource allocation in distributed computing environments. This section provides detailed coverage of three fundamental optimization paradigms: linear programming, convex optimization, and game theory. Each approach offers unique advantages for solving resource management problems in cloud-edge-terminal collaborative systems. [Table I](#) summarizes representative optimization techniques across different algorithm types and scenarios, demonstrating their performance improvements in metrics such as response time, latency, and energy consumption.

A. Linear Programming

Constrained optimization under linear relationships enables tractable solutions for resource allocation problems. LP formulations transform complex distribution challenges into mathematically solvable frameworks with guaranteed optimal solutions [\[28\]](#). For example, the objective function might minimize total system cost, encompassing energy consumption at terminal and edge layers [\[29\]](#), computation costs at the

TABLE I: Summary of optimization techniques.

Method	Year	Venue	Algorithm Type	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Performance Results
TIGO [1]	2024	IEEE TSC	Two-stage Iterated Greedy Optimization CMDP-based Framework	Cloud-Edge Collaborative Computing Distributed Serverless Edge Clouds	Average Response Time	Better response times in less time compared to existing methods
DSCF [2]	2024	IEEE IoTJ			Inference Latency	Less than half the inference latency compared to local computing
AWSH [3]	2024	IEEE TMC	Hyper-Heuristic Algorithm	5G Mobile Edge Clouds	Latency, Load Balancing	Superior performance compared to SOTA solutions
Lu et al. [4]	2024	IEEE TVT	Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Alternating Optimization	IoV Edge Cloud	Quality of Service	Effective performance in complex network situations
Nguyen et al. [5]	2024	IEEE TCC		Space-Air-Ground Networks	Energy Consumption, Delay	Superior effectiveness compared to baselines
Qiu et al. [6]	2024	IEEE TMC	Online Algorithm	Edge Intelligence Cloud	Security, Reliability, Throughput	Promising performance compared to baseline algorithms
Wei et al. [7]	2024	IEEE TPDS	Two-stage Algorithm	Federated Learning in Edge Clouds	Learning Costs	33.5%-39.6% lower average total costs vs. previous methods
SemCom-SEC [8]	2024	IEEE JSAC	Federated Learning, Game Theory	Satellite-Borne Edge Cloud Network	Delay, Energy Consumption, Privacy	Reduced delay and energy consumption while enhancing privacy
Asgarian et al. [9]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Approximation Algorithm	Edge-Cloud Computing Industrial IoT	Delay, Resource Consumption	Near-optimal solution with polynomial time complexity
Bai et al. [10]	2024	IEEE TMC	Convex Approximation, Lyapunov Optimization	UAV-Enabled Edge-Cloud Computing	Task Completion Delay	Significant reduction in task completion delay
JTOCC [11]	2024	IEEE TWC	DRL, LSTM	NOMA-Aided CETCI	Network Latency	Lower-delay content distribution and fast convergence
PRAISE [12]	2024	IEEE TMC	Task Reconfiguration	Multi-Access Edge Cloud Networks	Total Offloading Benefit	Higher system benefits and lower resource costs than baselines
CORA [13]	2024	IEEE TWC	Data-driven Optimization	Mobile Edge Clouds	Quality of Experience	18% reduction in user complaint rate on YouTube dataset
Co-NOMA [14]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Cooperative NOMA	Reality in Cloud/Edge Computing	Logarithmic Rate, Delay	Outperforms traditional multiple access and NOMA methods
Xiao et al. [15]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Online Learning	Video Caching in IoT Networks	Delay, Resource Utilization	Performance advantages compared to SOTA algorithms
ADMM-FedMeta [16]	2021	MobiHoc	Federated Meta-Learning	Edge Learning in IoT	Learning Performance, Computational Cost	Substantially outperforms existing baselines
RL-ROIS [17]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Reinforcement Learning	RIS-Aided IoT Networks	Capacity, Latency, Energy Consumption	Superior efficiency and robustness
Zhao et al. [18]	2024	IEEE TMC	Online Algorithm	Serverless Cloud Inference	Inference Latency, Cost, Accuracy	Less than half inference latency compared to local computing
MESP [19]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Game Theory	Industry 5.0	End-to-End Execution Delay	20%-30% reduction in computational overhead and delay
COMEC [20]	2024	IEEE TMC	Algorithm	Multi-Cell Networks	Total cost (delay and energy)	Superior system cost compared to baselines
Zhou et al. [21]	2024	ADHOC	Framework	AIoT	Quality of Service	Higher effectiveness and efficiency than centralized approach
Dragotto et al. [22]	2024	JCC	Game-theoretic model	Cloud Networks	Network security posture	Efficacy demonstrated through computational tests
Raj et al. [23]	2021	ArXiv	Framework	Edge IoT	Efficiency, Robustness	Validated through air quality forecasting experiment
PGRA [24]	2020	ArXiv	Algorithm	Satellite Edge Computing	Network payoff, Deployment cost	Effectively addresses VNF placement problem
MADRLom [25]	2024	COMNET	Mechanism	Software-Defined Cloud-Edge Networks	System overhead	Significant reduction in total system overhead
Zhang et al. [26]	2024	IEEE TCC	Game-theoretic	Mobile Edge Computing	Task completion delay, User cost	Superior performance compared to several approaches
Li et al. [27]	2024	ArXiv	Framework	Wireless Powered Edge Computing	Weighted sum computation rate	Comparable to exhaustive search with reduced execution time

cloud and edge [1], and network communication costs [5]. Constraints can represent resource limitations, such as bandwidth [30], processing capacity at each layer [31], and latency [3]. LP also supports various task offloading strategies, including decisions on offloading locations (edge or cloud) and resource allocation [6]. Additionally, incorporating predicted future system states into the LP formulation enables proactive resource management in dynamic AIoT environments [4].

B. Convex Optimization

Nonlinear optimization with convergence guarantees addresses complex resource distribution challenges. Convex programming techniques enable globally optimal solutions through gradient-based methods and interior-point algorithms [5]. As an example, resource allocation might aim to minimize energy consumption under latency and throughput constraints. If these constraints and the objective function are convex, gradient descent can iteratively update resource allocation based on the objective function's gradient, while interior-point methods traverse the feasible region for optimal solutions [12]. Several studies have explored this approach, including [32], which uses online convex optimization for network slicing in edge-cloud orchestrated networks to minimize system costs. Similarly, [33] employs convex optimization for resource and power allocation in cloud-edge collaboration to minimize user overhead. In addition, [11] uses successive convex approximation (SCA) for resource optimization in NOMA-aided cloud-edge-terminal cooperation, and [10] applies convex approximation to a delay minimization problem in multi-UAV enabled edge-cloud cooperation. However, formulating such convex programs often requires simplifications to address the complexity and dynamic nature of cloud-edge-terminal environments.

C. Game Theory

Competitive and cooperative interaction modeling provides equilibrium-based optimization frameworks. Strategic decision-making among rational participants enables stable resource allocation through concepts like Nash equilibrium and Stackelberg leadership [34]. For instance, [20] formulates a non-cooperative game for distributed cost minimization in multi-cell networks, demonstrating game theory's applicability to computation offloading in edge-cloud collaboration. Similarly, [26] uses a Stackelberg game to model user, base station, and cloud interactions in multi-user multi-task offloading for mobile edge computing. Beyond resource allocation, game theory also addresses security, as exemplified by [22], which introduces the critical node game for assessing cybersecurity risks in cloud networks. Additionally, [35] proposes a game-theoretic algorithm for optimizing system completion time and energy consumption in cloud robot task offloading. Cooperative solutions, such as the Nash bargaining solution in [36] for joint latency-energy minimization in fog-assisted networks, offer alternative approaches for various collaboration paradigms. For instance, examples, including task offloading [19], resource allocation [37], and collaborative computation [38], highlight game theory's utility in optimizing resource management for cloud-edge-terminal collaboration.

III. SECURITY MECHANISMS AND PRIVACY-PRESERVING TECHNIQUES

A. Security Mechanisms and Solutions

Protecting collaborative intelligence paradigms against various threats requires robust security mechanisms. We explore three key security solutions: encryption and authentication, intrusion detection and prevention, and blockchain technologies. Encryption and authentication techniques safeguard data transmission and storage across distributed architectures. Additionally, intrusion detection and prevention systems proactively identify and mitigate security breaches. Finally, blockchain technologies offer potential enhancements to security and trust establishment within collaborative environments.

1) *Encryption and Authentication*: Cryptographic protection mechanisms secure data transmission and storage across distributed computing layers. Strong encryption protocols combined with robust authentication systems prevent unauthorized access while maintaining communication efficiency [39]. Lightweight symmetric encryption secures data exchange between resource-constrained devices and edge nodes, while CP-ABE [40] offers fine-grained access control based on specific criteria, addressing the varying data sensitivity in AIoT environments. Authentication verifies the identity of communicating entities, preventing unauthorized access and manipulation. For example, GS-SNC enhances security through scrambling and encoding, offering advantages in computational complexity and space overhead compared to other secure network coding approaches like DP-SNC and SPOC [41]. Integrating blockchain technology strengthens security by providing immutable records of data transactions and access logs [42], and homomorphic signatures enable efficient third-party integrity auditing without accessing raw data [43].

2) *Intrusion Detection and Prevention*: Proactive threat monitoring systems identify and neutralize malicious activities before system compromise. Real-time anomaly detection enables rapid response to security incidents across distributed computing infrastructure [21]. For example, unusual data flows between the edge and cloud, or sudden spikes in data transmission at the terminal layer, can signal intrusions [44]. Deploying IDPS at different architectural layers, such as the edge or cloud, provides comprehensive security coverage [45]. Edge-based IDPS enables faster responses to localized threats by analyzing data near the source, while cloud-based IDPS leverages centralized resources to identify complex attack patterns [42]. In addition to detection, IDPS [23] incorporates prevention mechanisms, including blocking malicious traffic and isolating compromised devices, to actively mitigate threats. Table II provides an overview of methods addressing security threats and vulnerabilities in collaborative intelligence systems, highlighting their deployment scenarios and performance metrics across different architectural configurations.

3) *Blockchain Technologies*: Decentralized trust mechanisms eliminate single points of failure while ensuring immutable transaction records. Distributed consensus protocols enhance system resilience and provide transparent, tamper-proof data management [53]. Cryptographic hashing and consensus mechanisms, integral to blockchain's architecture,

TABLE II: Summary of methods addressing security threats and vulnerabilities in CISAIOT networks.

Method	Year	Venue	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Edge	Cloud	ECC	CETC
Yang et al. [46]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	AIoT Data Prediction	Privacy and Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rahman et al. [47]	2023	IEEE IoTJ	Industry 4.0 CPS	Security, Detection Performance	✓	✓	✓	✗
Fang et al. [41]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	CETC-AIoT	Computational Complexity	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chen et al. [48]	2024	IEEE TNSE	Workflow Scheduling	Execution Cost, Deadline Constraints	✓	✓	✓	✗
Wang et al. [49]	2022	ArXiv	Security Inference	Privacy-Utility Tradeoff	✓	✓	✓	✗
Zhou et al. [21]	2024	ADHOC	AIoT Services	QoS, Effectiveness, Efficiency	✓	✓	✓	✗
Wang et al. [50]	2018	ArXiv	IoT Security	Attack Detection	✗	✗	✗	✗
Li et al. [51]	2022	IEEE TII	Industrial IoT	Attack Cost, Detection Accuracy	✓	✗	✓	✗
Chi et al. [42]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	AIoT Edge Applications	Security, Model Efficiency	✓	✓	✓	✓
Raj et al. [23]	2021	ArXiv	AIoT Applications	Efficiency, Robustness	✓	✓	✓	✗
Dui et al. [52]	2024	RESS	IIoT Systems	Reliability, Gateway Cost	✓	✓	✓	✗
Xiao et al. [40]	2024	IEEE TIFS	Cloud-Edge IoT	Security, Efficiency	✓	✓	✓	✓

ensure data integrity and prevent unauthorized tampering [47], which is crucial for secure data aggregation and processing from numerous AIoT devices. Furthermore, blockchain facilitates secure access control and device authentication within the collaborative ecosystem [42]. Through smart contracts, predefined rules and policies are automatically enforced, streamlining device interactions and ensuring compliance for activities such as sensitive data access and resource allocation across the cloud, edge, and terminal layers [54]. Applications of blockchain integration in AIoT include secure data logging and auditing, decentralized avionics services, and trusted decision architectures [55].

B. Privacy-Preserving Techniques

Protecting user data within distributed collaborative systems is paramount. Four prominent techniques address privacy concerns: federated learning, differential privacy, homomorphic encryption, and secure multi-party computation. Federated learning enables collaborative model training without sharing raw data, while differential privacy adds noise to further protect individual data points. Homomorphic encryption allows computations on encrypted data without decryption, and secure multi-party computation enables joint computation on private inputs, revealing only the output.

1) *Federated Learning and Differential Privacy*: Complementary privacy mechanisms combine to strengthen distributed learning frameworks [56]. FL facilitates collaborative model training without direct data sharing [57], where edge devices or terminals train local models and share only model updates (e.g., gradients) with a central server [58]. However, potential information leakage from the updates necessitates further privacy enhancements through DP [59]. Specifically, DP introduces calibrated noise to these shared updates, ensuring that the presence or absence of a single data point does not significantly affect the final model [49], thereby hindering adversarial attempts to infer individual user data. Techniques like objective perturbation, adding noise to the objective function, achieve DP guarantees in FL [46]. The privacy-utility trade-off is controlled by the privacy budget (ϵ ,

δ), exemplified by differentially private over-the-air FL where transmit power adjustments influence this trade-off [60].

2) *Homomorphic Encryption*: Computational privacy through encrypted data processing eliminates decryption requirements during analysis [39, 60]. Beyond traditional cryptographic approaches, HE enables secure data aggregation, model training, and inference across distributed devices and cloud servers. For example, edge devices can encrypt sensor readings using HE before transmission, ensuring data confidentiality during transit and storage, even if intermediary nodes are compromised [61]. Consequently, cloud servers can perform computations on this encrypted data without decryption, enabling tasks like model training and inference on sensitive data [62]. In collaborative learning, HE facilitates secure model updates by enabling encrypted aggregation of model parameters [63]. Hierarchical federated learning frameworks demonstrate the practical integration of HE with multi-level privacy protection, exemplified by digital twin-based anomaly detection systems in smart healthcare that utilize edge cloudlets for local model training while preserving patient data privacy through encrypted multi-party collaboration [64]. Additionally, verifiable encodings and authenticators built upon HE can ensure the correctness of cloud-based computations on encrypted data [65]. Although the benefits are substantial, practical application of HE faces challenges related to computational overhead. However, ongoing research focuses on optimizing HE schemes, including using GPUs for accelerated computations and developing privacy-authority-aware compilers for efficient ciphertext management [66].

3) *Secure Multi-Party Computation*: Joint computation over private datasets maintains input confidentiality across participating entities [67]. Multiple parties—including cloud servers, edge nodes, and devices—can collaboratively compute functions over their combined data while preserving individual input secrecy, particularly crucial for sensitive information such as patient health records [21] or manufacturing process data [42]. For example, multiple hospitals could leverage MPC to train a shared machine learning model on patient data without directly sharing the raw data due to privacy regulations. Consequently, model updates can be jointly computed based on local datasets without revealing individual patient records. Similarly, MPC enhances security in task offloading and resource allocation within cooperative networks [41], facilitating collaborative decision-making regarding resource utilization without disclosing individual constraints or priorities. Furthermore, integrating MPC with techniques such as federated learning [46] and differential privacy [68] provides a more comprehensive privacy solution. For example, this integration enables secure aggregation of model updates or the addition of noise to computation outputs.

IV. DATA MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

A. Data Storage and Retrieval

Efficient data management is crucial for collaborative intelligence in distributed systems. Edge caching plays a key role in optimizing data access and minimizing network congestion.

TABLE III: Summary of data preprocessing methods for efficient transmission in resource-constrained AIoT environments.

Method	Year	Venue	Type	Scenarios	Performance Metrics	Edge	Cloud	ECC	CETC
Raj et al. [23]	2021	ArXiv	Edge ML/Ops	AIoT Fleet Analytics	Forecasting Accuracy	✓	✓	✓	✗
Becker et al. [69]	2020	IEEE BigData	AI/Ops	Edge Computing	Resource Utilization, Detection Performance	✓	✓	✗	✗
QuAsyncFL [58]	2024	IEEE IoTJ	Federated Learning	Cloud-Edge-Terminal AIoT ML/AI Training	Efficiency, Convergence	✓	✓	✓	✓
Underwood et al. [70]	2024	ArXiv	Data Compression	ML/AI Training	Compression Ratio, Model Quality	✓	✓	✗	✗
Noura et al. [71]	2023	Ad Hoc Netw.	DL-based Compression	Multimedia IoT	Visual Quality, Compression Ratio	✓	✓	✓	✗
Edge Source Coding [72]	2019	ArXiv	Lossless Compression	Edge Networks	Number of Bits Needed	✓	✗	✗	✗
Taurone et al. [73]	2023	ArXiv	Floating-point Compression	IoT Time-Series Data	Compression Ratio, Recovery Error	✓	✗	✗	✗
Shadura et al. [74]	2020	ArXiv	Lossless Compression	HEP Analysis	I/O Bandwidth, Storage Space	✗	✓	✗	✗
Mellisaris et al. [75]	2020	ArXiv	Selective Compression	IoT and Web Traffic	Network Transfer Speed, Data Savings	✓	✗	✗	✗
Banerjee et al. [76]	2022	ArXiv	Hybrid Compression	Scientific Data	Compression Factor, QoI Preservation	✓	✓	✓	✗
LTSDC [77]	2022	ArXiv	Statistical Compression	IoT Time-Series Data	Compression Ratio	✓	✗	✗	✗
Zhou et al. [21]	2024	ADHOC	Federated Learning	Edge-Cloud AIoT Edge Computing	QoS, Latency	✓	✓	✓	✗
Arroba et al. [78]	2023	ArXiv	Sustainable Computing	Infrastructure	Energy Efficiency	✓	✓	✗	✗
QOMVN [79]	2024	JCC	Edge Collaborative Caching	Vehicular Networks	Data Query Latency	✓	✗	✓	✗
Rac et al. [80]	2021	ArXiv	Containerization	Edge Computing	Application Execution Efficiency	✓	✓	✗	✗

Furthermore, distributing data across cloud and edge nodes requires consideration of data consistency, availability, and access efficiency. Maintaining data integrity and ensuring high availability against potential disruptions and security threats also pose significant challenges in distributed environments. Table III presents a comprehensive overview of data management and communication techniques, categorizing methods by their deployment scenarios and key performance metrics such as latency reduction, throughput improvement, and reliability enhancement.

1) *Edge Caching*: Proximity-based storage strategies reduce access latency through intelligent content placement near end-users [81]. Popular data items stored at network edges increase cache hit rates and minimize retrieval delays. Result caching extends this concept by storing computation results, which is particularly advantageous for computationally intensive tasks [82]. Similarly, predictive caching anticipates future requests based on historical patterns and preemptively stores data, further minimizing latency [83, 84]. For example, PEC employs deep learning for content popularity prediction and prefetching [83], while a D3QN-based scheme dynamically evaluates content importance for efficient caching and eviction in dynamic networks [85]. In vehicular networks, edge collaborative caching, aided by tabu search algorithms, prioritizes high-traffic data and ensures backup within the collaborative domain to reduce latency and prevent single-point failures [79].

2) *Distributed Data Storage*: Multi-tier storage architectures enable efficient data distribution across cloud and edge infrastructures [86]. Proximity-based storage reduces latency for real-time applications while enhancing fault tolerance through geographical distribution [23]. Distributing data across multiple nodes enhances fault tolerance, ensuring system reliability even with individual node failures [42]. Strategic data placement, based on access patterns, caches frequently accessed data at the edge for faster retrieval, while less frequently used data resides in the cloud [69]. Data partitioning techniques divide large datasets into smaller chunks distributed across multiple nodes, facilitating parallel processing and improving system performance [46]. Additionally, essential data

synchronization mechanisms maintain consistency and data integrity across distributed locations, preventing conflicts from concurrent updates [21]. Security considerations are addressed through encryption techniques for data confidentiality and access control mechanisms to restrict unauthorized access [27].

3) *Data Integrity and Availability*: Comprehensive protection mechanisms ensure information authenticity and continuous accessibility across distributed networks [52]. Trustworthy decision-making requires robust data integrity, exemplified by blockchain applications for enhanced security [42]. Addressing authentication and preventing model poisoning attacks, as discussed in [87] and [46], respectively, are also critical. Data availability, ensuring data accessibility, can be impacted by fluctuating resources and bandwidth in dynamic edge networks, especially for time-sensitive applications [88]. Efficient data storage and retrieval, including edge caching techniques [23], are thus essential for improving data access latency and enhancing availability. Similarly, distributed data storage across multiple nodes, as highlighted in the CEFIoT architecture [87], improves fault tolerance and resilience.

B. Communication Protocols and Optimization

Efficient data exchange is crucial for distributed collaborative systems. We explore communication protocols and optimization techniques that enable effective data transmission. Established protocols like MQTT and CoAP enable efficient data transmission in complex environments. Furthermore, bandwidth optimization methods, including traffic scheduling, rate adaptation, and link aggregation, maximize data throughput and minimize latency. Additionally, fault tolerance mechanisms, such as error detection and recovery, connection management, and service monitoring, ensure reliable communication, contributing to overall performance and stability.

1) *Communication Protocols*: Resource-aware messaging protocols optimize data exchange efficiency in constrained CISAIoT environments. MQTT [89] and CoAP [90] exemplify lightweight approaches designed for low-overhead communication. MQTT, a publish-subscribe protocol with low overhead and diverse QoS levels, suits resource-constrained environments and various AIoT applications [91]. Open-source MQTT broker implementations, such as Mosquitto and EMQX, are readily available and have been experimentally benchmarked in edge computing [92]. CoAP, specifically designed for resource-constrained devices and networks, offers a RESTful interface for interaction with web services and has been explored with security mechanisms like OSCORE [90]. In addition, network coding enhances data integrity and reduces redundancy in AIoT communication. For instance, integrating network coding into CoAP's block-wise transfer reduces retransmissions in lossy networks [93], while secure network coding schemes like GS-SNC [41] enhance security and efficiency by protecting against attacks.

2) *Bandwidth Optimization Techniques*: Network resource management strategies maximize throughput while minimizing latency across distributed systems [94]. Traffic scheduling prioritizes critical data flows to optimize bandwidth utilization, particularly for real-time applications requiring immediate

response [95]. Rate adaptation, in contrast, dynamically adjusts transmission rates based on network conditions [96]. Specifically, it reduces the rate during congestion and increases it when bandwidth is available. Link aggregation, similarly, combines multiple network links into a single logical link, thereby increasing capacity and resilience against link failures [97]. Notably, this approach enhances efficiency for bandwidth-intensive applications.

3) *Fault Tolerance and Quality Assurance*: Resilient communication infrastructure requires comprehensive error handling and performance monitoring mechanisms [98]. Fault tolerance employs error detection techniques to identify disruptions, data corruption, or device malfunctions, while recovery mechanisms restore functionality through data replication or task rescheduling [87]. Redundancy management, often achieved through redundant hardware or communication paths, ensures data availability and service continuity [52]. Connection management strategies optimize communication performance through link monitoring to identify connectivity issues, failover strategies for seamless transition to backup paths [52], and load balancing to distribute traffic and prevent congestion [95]. In addition, quality assurance practices guarantee reliable service delivery. Specifically, service monitoring tools collect performance data, enabling identification of bottlenecks, while performance optimization techniques, such as bandwidth allocation or data compression, improve efficiency and reduce latency [21, 78]. SLA management ensures that the system meets predefined performance targets. Nonetheless, practices enhance reliability by minimizing errors and reducing latency, the potential trade-off between performance optimization and energy consumption in resource-constrained AIoT environments requires careful consideration [95].

V. APPLICATIONS IN SMART CITIES AND AGRICULTURE

A. Smart Cities

Distributed collaboration significantly enhances the development of intelligent urban environments. Consequently, this collaborative paradigm improves public safety, environmental monitoring, and urban planning within modern networks. For instance, it enhances smart surveillance and crime prevention, leading to improved security and faster response times. In addition, collaborative frameworks contribute to creating more sustainable and livable urban spaces by enabling advanced environmental monitoring and pollution control. They also optimize smart energy management and grid operations, ultimately improving energy efficiency and resource allocation in smart cities.

1) *Smart Surveillance and Crime Prevention*: Real-time security monitoring leverages distributed processing to enhance public safety through intelligent video analytics [53]. Large-scale surveillance data processing benefits from edge deployment of lightweight frameworks such as LISPS, reducing cloud dependency [99]. Additionally, distributing deep learning models, such as A-YONet, which combines YOLO and MTCNN aspects, across the cloud-edge-terminal continuum enhances multi-target detection and activity tracking in complex environments [100]. Furthermore, this collaborative intelligence improves surveillance system efficiency

and accuracy while addressing real-time analysis challenges and limited edge computing resources, ultimately facilitating proactive crime prevention through timely suspicious activity identification and efficient resource allocation.

2) *Environmental Monitoring and Pollution Control*: Sustainable urban management requires comprehensive environmental data collection and analysis across distributed sensor networks [78]. City-wide edge devices monitor air quality, water conditions, and noise levels through real-time sensing [23]. Edge computing's localized data processing reduces latency and bandwidth consumption compared to cloud-only solutions [101], enabling faster identification of pollution hotspots and quicker responses to environmental incidents. For complex tasks like predictive modeling and control strategy development, cloud resources are leveraged [21]. For example, machine learning models trained on historical and real-time data can predict future pollution levels, enabling proactive mitigation [46]. Cloud platforms also facilitate data sharing and collaboration among stakeholders, including government agencies, research institutions, and citizens [21].

3) *Smart Energy Management and Grid Optimization*: Grid efficiency improvements emerge through intelligent energy distribution and consumption optimization [102]. Distributed data collection on energy usage and grid conditions informs real-time decision-making for resource allocation [103]. As a result, the collaborative approach facilitates more efficient energy allocation, reducing waste and improving overall grid efficiency. In addition, by analyzing data from various sources, this collaborative paradigm enables predictive maintenance of grid infrastructure, minimizing downtime and improving grid reliability [95]. Integrating renewable energy sources is also supported through this framework [78, 104]. Specifically, edge devices can manage the intermittent nature of renewable energy by intelligently distributing power based on real-time conditions and predicted demand, thereby enhancing grid stability and reducing reliance on fossil fuels.

B. Smart Agriculture

Distributed collaboration offers transformative potential for intelligent and efficient farming practices. Precision agriculture benefits from real-time data processing and decision-making capabilities provided by collaborative frameworks. Additionally, collaborative systems play a crucial role in crop monitoring and yield prediction by leveraging distributed intelligence to analyze data from diverse sources, including sensors, drones, and satellites. Consequently, this analysis provides insights into crop health, growth patterns, and potential yields, enabling timely interventions and optimized resource allocation for increased agricultural productivity and sustainability.

1) *Precision Agriculture*: Resource optimization in farming benefits from real-time sensor analytics and intelligent decision-making systems [105]. Edge processing of IoT sensor data minimizes latency while enabling immediate responses to changing agricultural conditions [23]. The cloud provides computational power for complex tasks like crop yield prediction and disease detection [60], while federated learning enables distributed model training across farms without sharing

sensitive data, enhancing privacy and model robustness [106]. Consequently, farmers gain actionable insights from real-time data analysis, optimizing resource allocation like water and fertilizer usage, and improving efficiency and sustainability [107]. For example, AI-powered systems analyze sensor data and imagery to detect early signs of crop stress, enabling timely interventions to prevent yield loss [96].

2) *Crop Monitoring and Yield Prediction*: Agricultural intelligence leverages multi-source data integration for enhanced crop management and productivity forecasting. Terminal IoT sensors collect real-time information on soil conditions, weather patterns, and growth stages [108]. Edge devices preprocess and aggregate this data, reducing transmission volume to the cloud and enabling faster localized insights [109]. Accordingly, edge computing facilitates real-time monitoring and control, allowing for prompt responses to changing conditions, such as adjusting irrigation or applying fertilizers based on real-time analysis [110]. The cloud layer, with its extensive computational resources, performs complex analyses, including ML-based yield prediction using historical data, weather forecasts, and real-time sensor data [111, 112]. Furthermore, this information supports farmers' decisions regarding harvesting, resource allocation, and market planning. Cloud-edge collaboration also enables ML model deployment and updates at the edge, adapting models to local conditions and improving accuracy [106]. Moreover, the collaborative approach improves agricultural productivity and promotes sustainable practices by optimizing resource utilization and minimizing environmental impact, such as optimizing harvesting logistics and reducing waste [113, 114].

REFERENCES

- [1] X. He, H. Xu, X. Xu, Y. Chen, and Z. Wang, "An efficient algorithm for microservice placement in cloud-edge collaborative computing environment," *IEEE Trans. Serv. Comput.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1983–1997, 2024.
- [2] H. Ko, H. Jeong, D. Jung, and S. Pack, "Dynamic split computing framework in distributed serverless edge clouds," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 14 523–14 531, 2024.
- [3] N. M. Laboni, S. J. Safa, S. Sharmin, M. A. Razzaque, M. M. Rahman, and M. M. Hassan, "A hyper heuristic algorithm for efficient resource allocation in 5g mobile edge clouds," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 29–41, 2024.
- [4] Y. Lu, P. Zhang, Y. Duan, M. Guizani, J. Wang, and S. Li, "Dynamic scheduling of iov edge cloud service functions under nfv: A multi-agent reinforcement learning approach," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 73, no. 4, pp. 5730–5741, 2024.
- [5] M. D. Nguyen, L. B. Le, and A. Girard, "Integrated computation offloading, uav trajectory control, edge-cloud and radio resource allocation in sagin," *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 100–115, 2024.
- [6] Y. Qiu, J. Liang, V. C. Leung, and M. Chen, "Online security-aware and reliability-guaranteed ai service chains provisioning in edge intelligence cloud," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 5933–5948, 2024.
- [7] X. Wei, K. Ye, X. Shi, C.-Z. Xu, and Y. Wang, "Joint participant and learning topology selection for federated learning in edge clouds," *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 1456–1468, 2024.
- [8] G. Zheng, Q. Ni, K. Navaie, and H. Pervaiz, "Semantic communication in satellite-borne edge cloud network for computation offloading," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 1145–1158, 2024.
- [9] M. Asgarian, K. Jamshidi, and A. Bohlooli, "An efficient approximation algorithm for service function chaining placement in edge–cloud computing industrial internet of things," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 12 815–12 822, 2024.
- [10] Z. Bai, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, and W. Wang, "Delay-aware cooperative task offloading for multi-uav enabled edge-cloud computing," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1034–1049, 2024.
- [11] C. Fang, H. Xu, T. Zhang, Y. Li, W. Ni, Z. Han, and S. Guo, "Joint task offloading and content caching for noma-aided cloud-edge-terminal cooperation networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 15 586–15 600, 2024.
- [12] C. Feng, P. Han, X. Zhang, Q. Zhang, Y. Liu, and L. Guo, "Dependency-aware task reconfiguration and offloading in multi-access edge cloud networks," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 9271–9288, 2024.
- [13] L. Fu, J. Tong, T. Lin, and J. Zhang, "Data-driven online resource allocation for user experience improvement in mobile edge clouds," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 23, no. 10, pp. 13 707–13 721, 2024.
- [14] R.-J. Reifert, H. Dahrouj, and A. Sezgin, "Extended reality via cooperative noma in hybrid cloud/mobile-edge computing networks," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 7, pp. 12 834–12 852, 2024.
- [15] H. Xiao, Y. Zhuang, C. Xu, W. Wang, H. Zhang, R. Ding, T. Cao, L. Zhong, and G.-M. Muntean, "Transcoding-enabled cloud–edge–terminal collaborative video caching in heterogeneous iot networks: An online learning approach with time-varying information," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 296–310, 2024.
- [16] S. Yue, J. Ren, J. Xin, S. Lin, and J. Zhang, "Inexact-admm based federated meta-learning for fast and continual edge learning," in *MobiHoc*, 2021, pp. 91–100.
- [17] T. Zhang, D. Xu, A. Tolba, K. Yu, H. Song, and S. Yu, "Reinforcement-learning-based offloading for ris-aided cloud–edge computing in iot networks: Modeling, analysis, and optimization," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 11, pp. 19 421–19 439, 2024.
- [18] K. Zhao, Z. Zhou, L. Jiao, S. Cai, F. Xu, and X. Chen, "Taming serverless cold start of cloud model inference with edge computing," *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 8111–8128, 2024.
- [19] A. Hazra, A. Kalita, and M. Gurusamy, "Distributed

- service provisioning with collaboration of edge and cloud in industry 5.0,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 12, pp. 21 885–21 894, 2024.
- [20] L. Wu, P. Sun, Z. Wang, Y. Li, and Y. Yang, “Computation offloading in multi-cell networks with collaborative edge-cloud computing: A game theoretic approach,” *IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 2093–2106, 2024.
- [21] J. Zhou, S. Pal, C. Dong, and K. Wang, “Enhancing quality of service through federated learning in edge-cloud architecture,” *Ad Hoc Netw.*, vol. 156, p. 103430, 2024.
- [22] G. Dragotto, A. Boukhtouta, A. Lodi, and M. Taobane, “The critical node game,” *J. Comb. Optim.*, vol. 47, no. 5, p. 74, 2024.
- [23] E. Raj, M. Westerlund, and L. Espinosa-Leal, “Reliable fleet analytics for edge iot solutions,” 2021.
- [24] X. Gao, R. Liu, and A. Kaushik, “Virtual network function placement in satellite edge computing with a potential game approach,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Service Manag.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 1243–1259, 2022.
- [25] Y. Guo, X. Xu, and F. Xiao, “Madrlom: A computation offloading mechanism for software-defined cloud-edge computing power network,” *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 245, p. 110352, 2024.
- [26] X. Zhang, Z. Wang, F. Tian, and Z. Yang, “Stackelberg-game-based multi-user multi-task offloading in mobile edge computing,” *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 459–475, 2024.
- [27] Y. Li, X. Zhang, B. Lei, Q. Zhao, M. Wei, Z. Qu, and W. Wang, “Computation rate maximization for wireless-powered edge computing with multi-user cooperation,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 5, pp. 965–981, 2024.
- [28] B. Bandyopadhyay, P. Kuila, M. C. Govil, and M. Bey, “Delay-sensitive task offloading and efficient resource allocation in intelligent edge–cloud environments: A discretized differential evolution-based approach,” *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 159, p. 111637, 2024.
- [29] C. Zeng, X. Wang, R. Zeng, Y. Li, J. Shi, and M. Huang, “Joint optimization of multi-dimensional resource allocation and task offloading for qoe enhancement in cloud-edge-end collaboration,” *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 155, pp. 121–131, 2024.
- [30] D. Gan, X. Ge, and Q. Li, “An optimal transport-based federated reinforcement learning approach for resource allocation in cloud–edge collaborative iot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2407–2419, 2024.
- [31] V. Choudhary, P. Wang, S. Sourav, and B. Chen, “Enhancing data processing throughput in iot-edge-cloud systems using optimized task placement,” in *IEEE ICDCS*, 2024, pp. 1474–1475.
- [32] K. Khalafi and N. Lu, “Network slicing for edge-cloud orchestrated networks via online convex optimization,” in *IEEE INFOCOM*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [33] X. Chen and S. Zheng, “Resource allocation and task offloading strategy base on hybrid simulated annealing-binary particle swarm optimization in cloud-edge collaborative system,” in *IMCEC*, vol. 5, 2022, pp. 379–383.
- [34] K. Yu, S. Wang, and X. Tao, “Game theory for 5g cloud-edge-terminal distributed networks under dos attacks,” in *IEEE WCNC*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [35] Y. Duan and C. Jiang, “Binary task offloading strategy for cloud robots using improved game theory in cloud-edge collaboration,” *J. Supercomput.*, vol. 80, no. 10, pp. 14 752–14 772, 2024.
- [36] F. Shams, V. Lottici, and Z. Tian, “Joint latency-energy minimization for fog-assisted wireless iot networks,” *IEEE Open J. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 6, pp. 1–15, 2025.
- [37] J. Fang, Y. He, F. R. Yu, J. Li, and V. C. Leung, “Large language models (llms) inference offloading and resource allocation in cloud-edge networks: An active inference approach,” in *IEEE VTC*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [38] A. Zhu, H. Lu, S. Guo, Z. Zeng, M. Ma, and Z. Zhou, “Syroc: Symbiotic robotics for qos-aware heterogeneous applications in iot-edge-cloud computing paradigm,” *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 150, pp. 202–219, 2024.
- [39] Q. Wang, D. Zhou, and Y. Li, “Secure outsourced calculations with homomorphic encryption,” *Adv. Comput. Int. J.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 01–14, 2018.
- [40] M. Xiao, Q. Huang, W. Chen, C. Lyu, and W. Susilo, “Domain-specific fine-grained access control for cloud-edge collaborative iot,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensics Security*, vol. 19, pp. 6499–6513, 2024.
- [41] W. Fang, C. Zhu, and W. Zhang, “Toward secure and lightweight data transmission for cloud–edge–terminal collaboration in artificial intelligence of things,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 105–113, 2024.
- [42] C. Chi, Z. Yin, Y. Liu, and S. Chai, “A trusted cloud–edge decision architecture based on blockchain and mlp for aiot,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 201–216, 2024.
- [43] Y. Yao, J. Chang, and A. Zhang, “Efficient data sharing scheme with fine-grained access control and integrity auditing in terminal–edge–cloud network,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 16, pp. 26 944–26 954, 2024.
- [44] Y. Yigit, C. Chrysoulas, G. Yurdakul, L. Maglaras, and B. Canberk, “Digital twin-empowered smart attack detection system for 6g edge of things networks,” in *IEEE GC Wkshps*, 2023, pp. 178–183.
- [45] X. Sáez-de-Cámara, J. L. Flores, C. Arellano, A. Urbietta, and U. Zurutuza, “Clustered federated learning architecture for network anomaly detection in large scale heterogeneous iot networks,” *Comput. Secur.*, vol. 131, p. 103299, 2023.
- [46] Z. Yang, B. Xiong, K. Chen, L. T. Yang, X. Deng, C. Zhu, and Y. He, “Differentially private federated tensor completion for cloud–edge collaborative aiot data prediction,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 256–267, 2024.
- [47] Z. Rahman, X. Yi, and I. Khalil, “Blockchain-based ai-enabled industry 4.0 cps protection against advanced persistent threat,” *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 6769–6778, 2023.

- [48] C. Chen, Y. Li, Q. Wang, X. Yang, X. Wang, and L. T. Yang, "An intelligent edge-cloud collaborative framework for communication security in distributed cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Netw.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 172–179, 2024.
- [49] Y. Wang, X. Chen, and Q. Wang, "Privacy-preserving security inference towards cloud-edge collaborative using differential privacy," 2022.
- [50] M. Wang, J. Santillan, and F. Kuipers, "Thingpot: An interactive internet-of-things honeypot," 2018.
- [51] J. Li, L. Lyu, X. Liu, X. Zhang, and X. Lyu, "Fleam: A federated learning empowered architecture to mitigate ddos in industrial iot," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 4059–4068, 2022.
- [52] H. Dui, J. Wang, T. Zhu, and L. Xing, "Maintenance optimization methodology of edge cloud collaborative systems based on a gateway cost index in iiot," *Reliab. Eng. Syst. Saf.*, vol. 251, p. 110370, 2024.
- [53] E. Blasch, R. Xu, Y. Chen, G. Chen, and D. Shen, "Blockchain methods for trusted avionics systems," in *IEEE NAECON*, 2019, pp. 192–199.
- [54] T. R. Gadekallu, Q.-V. Pham, D. C. Nguyen, P. K. R. Maddikunta, N. Deepa, B. Prabadevi, P. N. Pathirana, J. Zhao, and W.-J. Hwang, "Blockchain for edge of things: Applications, opportunities, and challenges," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 964–988, 2022.
- [55] J. Pan, J. Wang, A. Hester, I. Alqerm, Y. Liu, and Y. Zhao, "Edgechain: An edge-iot framework and prototype based on blockchain and smart contracts," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 4719–4732, 2019.
- [56] N. Rodríguez-Barroso, G. Stipcich, D. Jiménez-López, J. A. Ruiz-Millán, E. Martínez-Cámara, G. González-Seco, M. V. Luzón, M. A. Veganzones, and F. Herrera, "Federated learning and differential privacy: Software tools analysis, the sherpa.ai fl framework and methodological guidelines for preserving data privacy," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 64, pp. 270–292, 2020.
- [57] Z. Li, Q. Li, Y. Zhou, W. Zhong, G. Zhang, and C. Wu, "Edge-cloud collaborative learning with federated and centralized features," in *SIGIR*, 2023, pp. 1949–1953.
- [58] Y. Liu, P. Huang, F. Yang, K. Huang, and L. Shu, "Quasyncl: Asynchronous federated learning with quantization for cloud–edge–terminal collaboration enabled aiot," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 59–69, 2024.
- [59] Y. Li, S. Yang, X. Ren, and C. Zhao, "Asynchronous federated learning with differential privacy for edge intelligence," 2019.
- [60] L. Zhang, X. Wang, J. Wang, R. Pung, H. Wang, and K.-Y. Lam, "An efficient fhe-enabled secure cloud–edge computing architecture for iomt data protection with its application to pandemic modeling," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 9, pp. 15 272–15 284, 2024.
- [61] D. Kim, Y. Lee, S. Cheon, H. Choi, J. Lee, H. Youm, D. Lee, and H. Kim, "Privacy set: Privacy-authority-aware compiler for homomorphic encryption on edge-cloud system," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 21, pp. 35 167–35 184, 2024.
- [62] Fahina, S. U, Poorna, Supriya, R. M. H, and D. Vasudeva, "Securing the data in cloud using algebra homomorphic encryption scheme based on updated elgamaal(ahee)," 2022.
- [63] A. Aloufi and P. Hu, "Collaborative homomorphic computation on data encrypted under multiple keys," 2019.
- [64] D. Gupta, O. Kayode, S. Bhatt, M. Gupta, and A. S. Tosun, "Hierarchical federated learning based anomaly detection using digital twins for smart healthcare," in *IEEE CIC*, 2021, pp. 16–25.
- [65] S. Chatel, C. Knabenhans, A. Pyrgelis, C. Troncoso, and J.-P. Hubaux, "Verifiable encodings for secure homomorphic analytics," 2024.
- [66] Y. Zhai, M. Ibrahim, Y. Qiu, F. Boemer, Z. Chen, A. Titov, and A. Lyashevsky, "Accelerating encrypted computing on intel gpus," in *IEEE IPDPS*, 2022, pp. 705–716.
- [67] J. Sengupta, S. Ruj, and S. D. Bit, "Sprite: A scalable privacy-preserving and verifiable collaborative learning for industrial iot," in *CCGRID*, 2022, pp. 249–258.
- [68] L. Duan, J. Sun, Y. Chen, and M. Gorlatova, "Privascissors: Enhance the privacy of collaborative inference through the lens of mutual information," 2023.
- [69] S. Becker, F. Schmidt, A. Gulenko, A. Acker, and O. Kao, "Towards aiops in edge computing environments," in *IEEE BigData*, 2020, pp. 3470–3475.
- [70] R. Underwood, J. C. Calhoun, S. Di, and F. Cappello, "Understanding the effectiveness of lossy compression in machine learning training sets," 2024.
- [71] H. N. Noura, J. Azar, O. Salman, R. Couturier, and K. Mazouzi, "A deep learning scheme for efficient multimedia iot data compression," *Ad Hoc Netw.*, vol. 138, p. 102998, 2023.
- [72] Y. Lu, W. Chen, and H. V. Poor, "User preference aware lossless data compression at the edge," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 3792–3807, 2020.
- [73] F. Taurone, D. E. Lucani, M. Fehér, and Q. Zhang, "Change a bit to save bytes: Compression for floating point time-series data," in *NCC*, 2023, pp. 3756–3761.
- [74] O. Shadura, B. P. Bockelman, P. Canal, D. Piparo, and Z. Zhang, "Root i/o compression improvements for hep analysis," *EPJ Web Conf.*, vol. 245, p. 02017, 2020.
- [75] T. Melissaris, K. Shaw, and M. Martonosi, "Optimizing iot and web traffic using selective edge compression," 2020.
- [76] T. Banerjee, J. Choi, J. Lee, Q. Gong, J. Chen, S. Klasky, A. Rangarajan, and S. Ranka, "Scalable hybrid learning techniques for scientific data compression," 2022.
- [77] V. Agrawal, G. Kuldeep, and D. Dey, "Near lossless time series data compression methods using statistics and deviation," in *IEEE GC Wkshps*, 2022, pp. 426–431.
- [78] P. Arroba, R. Buyya, R. Cárdenas, J. L. Risco-Martín, and J. M. Moya, "Sustainable edge computing: Challenges and future directions," *Softw. Pract. Exp.*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2272–2296, 2024.

- [79] Y. Zheng, Y. Chen, C. Tan, Y. Yang, C. Shu, and L. Chen, "Optimization model for vehicular network data queries in edge environments," *J. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 145, 2024.
- [80] S. Rac and M. Brorsson, "At the edge of a seamless cloud experience," 2021.
- [81] D. Antonogiorgakis, A. Britzolakis, P. Chatziadam, A. Dimitriadis, S. Gikas, E. Michalodimitrakis, M. Oikonomakis, N. Siganos, E. Tzagkarakis, Y. Nikoloudakis, S. Panagiotakis, E. Pallis, and E. K. Markakis, "A view on edge caching applications," 2019.
- [82] Y. Wang and V. Friderikos, "A survey of deep learning for data caching in edge network," *Informatics*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 43, 2020.
- [83] C. Li, X. Wang, T. Zong, H. Cao, and Y. Liu, "Predictive edge caching through deep mining of sequential patterns in user content retrievals," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 233, p. 109866, 2023.
- [84] H. Torabi, H. Khazaei, and M. Litoiu, "A learning-based caching mechanism for edge content delivery," in *ACM/SPEC ICPE*, 2024, pp. 236–246.
- [85] Z. Zhang, M. St-Hilaire, X. Wei, H. Dong, and A. E. Saddik, "How to cache important contents for multi-modal service in dynamic networks: A drl-based caching scheme," *IEEE Trans. Multimedia*, vol. 26, pp. 7372–7385, 2024.
- [86] A. Luckow, K. Rattan, and S. Jha, "Pilot-edge: Distributed resource management along the edge-to-cloud continuum," in *IEEE IPDPS*, 2021, pp. 874–878.
- [87] A. Javed, K. Heljanko, A. Buda, and K. Främling, "Cefiot: A fault-tolerant iot architecture for edge and cloud," in *IEEE WF-IoT*, 2018, pp. 813–818.
- [88] L. Chen, J. Qi, X. Su, and R. Wang, "Remr: A reliability evaluation method for dynamic edge computing network under time constraint," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 4281–4291, 2023.
- [89] E. D. Paolo, E. Bassetti, and A. Spognardi, "Security assessment of common open source mqtt brokers and clients," 2023.
- [90] C. Gündoğan, C. Amsüss, T. C. Schmidt, and M. Wählich, "Iot content object security with oscore and ndn: A first experimental comparison," in *IFIP Networking*, 2020, pp. 19–27.
- [91] R. Giambona, A. E. C. Redondi, and M. Cesana, "Mqtt+: Enhanced syntax and broker functionalities for data filtering, processing and aggregation," in *ACM Q2SWinet*, 2018, pp. 77–84.
- [92] J. Dizdarevic, M. Michalke, and A. Jukan, "Engineering and experimentally benchmarking open source mqtt broker implementations," 2023.
- [93] C. V. Phung, J. Dizdarevic, and A. Jukan, "Enhancing block-wise transfer with network coding in coap," in *Euro-ParW*, 2020, pp. 737–741.
- [94] S. Li, X. You, S. Zhang, M. Fang, and P. Zhang, "Cloud-edge-device collaborative high concurrency access management for massive iot devices in distribution grid," *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. E107.A, no. 7, pp. 946–957, 2024.
- [95] F. Wang, X. Wen, L. Li, Y. Wen, S. Zhang, and Y. Liu, "Cloud-edge-end collaborative multi-service resource management for iot-based distribution grid," *IEICE Trans. Fundam. Electron. Commun. Comput. Sci.*, vol. E107.A, no. 9, pp. 1542–1555, 2024.
- [96] J. Xu, W. Wan, L. Pan, W. Sun, and Y. Liu, "The fusion of deep reinforcement learning and edge computing for real-time monitoring and control optimization in iot environments," in *EPECE*, 2024, pp. 193–196.
- [97] Z. Nezami, K. Zamanifar, K. Djemame, and E. Pournaras, "Decentralized edge-to-cloud load balancing: Service placement for the internet of things," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 64 983–65 000, 2021.
- [98] J. Nikolić, N. Jubatyrov, and E. Pournaras, "Self-healing dilemmas in distributed systems: Fault correction vs. fault tolerance," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Service Manag.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 2728–2741, 2021.
- [99] S. Y. Nikouei, R. Xu, Y. Chen, A. Aved, and E. Blasch, "Decentralized smart surveillance through microservices platform," in *Sens. Syst. Space Appl.*, vol. 11017, 2019, pp. 160–175.
- [100] X. Zhou, X. Xu, W. Liang, Z. Zeng, and Z. Yan, "Deep-learning-enhanced multitarget detection for end-edge-cloud surveillance in smart iot," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 8, no. 16, pp. 12 588–12 596, 2021.
- [101] T. Vo, P. Dave, G. Bajpai, and R. Kashef, "Edge, fog, and cloud computing : An overview on challenges and applications," 2022.
- [102] X. Zhai, Y. Peng, and X. Guo, "Edge-cloud collaboration for low-latency, low-carbon, and cost-efficient operations," *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, vol. 120, p. 109758, 2024.
- [103] W. Hua, P. Liu, and L. Huang, "Energy-efficient resource allocation for heterogeneous edge-cloud computing," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 2808–2818, 2024.
- [104] J. Li, Z. Qin, W. Liu, and X. Yu, "Energy-aware and trust-collaboration cross-domain resource allocation algorithm for edge-cloud workflows," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 7249–7264, 2024.
- [105] P. Kumar, A. Nelson, Z. Kapetanovic, and R. Chandra, *Affordable Artificial Intelligence – Augmenting Farmer Knowledge with AI*, 2021.
- [106] W. Khuen Cheng, J. Cheng Khor, W. Zheng Liew, K. Thye Bea, and Y.-L. Chen, "Integration of federated learning and edge-cloud platform for precision aquaculture," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 124 974–124 989, 2024.
- [107] F. Z. Bassine, T. E. Epule, A. Kechchour, and A. Chehbouni, "Recent applications of machine learning, remote sensing, and iot approaches in yield prediction: A critical review," 2023.
- [108] C. Wang and J. Gong, "Intelligent agricultural greenhouse control system based on internet of things and machine learning," 2025.
- [109] Y. Chen, S. Ye, J. Wu, B. Wang, H. Wang, and W. Li, "Fast multi-type resource allocation in local-edge-cloud computing for energy-efficient service provision," *Inf.*

- Sci.*, vol. 668, p. 120502, 2024.
- [110] X. Cao, Y. Yao, L. Li, W. Zhang, Z. An, Z. Zhang, L. Xiao, S. Guo, X. Cao, M. Wu, and D. Luo, "igrow: A smart agriculture solution to autonomous greenhouse control," *AAAI*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 11 837–11 845, 2022.
- [111] F. Huber, A. Yushchenko, B. Stratmann, and V. Steinhage, "Extreme gradient boosting for yield estimation compared with deep learning approaches," *Comput. Electron. Agric.*, vol. 202, p. 107346, 2022.
- [112] Z. Cao, Y. Ma, and Z. Zhang, "Corn yield prediction based on remotely sensed variables using variational autoencoder and multiple instance regression," 2022.
- [113] H. Chowdhury, D. B. P. Argha, and M. A. Ahmed, "Artificial intelligence in sustainable vertical farming," 2023.
- [114] F. Lin, S. Crawford, K. Guillot, Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, X. Yuan, L. Chen, S. Williams, R. Minvielle, X. Xiao, D. Gholson, N. Ashwell, T. Setiyono, B. Tubana, L. Peng, M. Bayoumi, and N.-F. Tzeng, "Mmst-vit: Climate change-aware crop yield prediction via multi-modal spatial-temporal vision transformer," in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 5774–5784.