

Snake Learning: A Communication- and Computation-Efficient Distributed Learning Framework for 6G

Xiaoxue Yu, Xingfu Yi, Rongpeng Li, Fei Wang, Chenghui Peng, Zhifeng Zhao and Honggang Zhang

Abstract—In the evolution towards 6G, integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) with advanced network infrastructure emerges as a pivotal strategy for enhancing network intelligence and resource utilization. Existing distributed learning frameworks like Federated Learning and Split Learning often struggle with significant challenges in dynamic network environments including high synchronization demands, costly communication overheads, severe computing resource consumption, and data heterogeneity across network nodes. These obstacles hinder the applications of ubiquitous computing capabilities of 6G networks, especially in light of the trend of escalating model parameters and training data volumes. To address these challenges effectively, this paper introduces “Snake Learning”, a cost-effective distributed learning framework. Specifically, Snake Learning respects the heterogeneity of inter-node computing capability and local data distribution in 6G networks, and sequentially trains the designated part of model layers on individual nodes. This layer-by-layer serpentine update mechanism contributes to significantly reducing the requirements for storage, memory and communication during the model training phase, and demonstrates superior adaptability and efficiency for both Computer Vision (CV) training and Large Language Model (LLM) fine-tuning tasks across homogeneous and heterogeneous data distributions.

Index Terms—Communication- and Computation-efficient, 6G, Snake learning, Split learning, Federated learning, Collective learning, Large language model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Envisioned to build an inclusive information society, 6G is expected to serve as a fundamental infrastructure for new service and application trends. One important pillar of 6G is the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-related capabilities into communications [1], thus fully reaping the steady progress and fast spread of technologies in AI and particularly machine learning. Besides, benefiting from the impressive evolution of computing technologies and advancements in chip design, data processing in 6G networks is anticipated to expand to the edge (e.g., Base Stations [BSs]) and devices (e.g., User Equipment [UE]) that are closer to the origin of data and support for the proliferation of ubiquitous intelligence. Notably, such an expansion will encompass the implementation of parallel computing-oriented AI functionalities, considering that the NVIDIA DRIVE Thor SoC for autonomous driving has already delivered 500 FP16 (16-bit Floating Point) Tera-Floating-Point-Operations (TFLOPS). Consequently, future connected AI-empowered nodes (e.g., BSs and UEs) can become fully context-aware for more intuitive and efficient interactions among humans, machines, and the environment. Correspondingly, as shown in Fig. 1, 6G will capably orchestrate the computing power distributed across networks and possess advanced functions of model

inference, training, and deployment, thus contributing to the improvements for emerging applications requiring real-time responses and data transport [1].

Meanwhile, the scaling law [2], which has been validated in the field of Large Language Models (LLMs), implies the necessity of escalating data volumes and model parameters for a more powerful AI model. Training and/or fine-tuning an LLM is never a trivial task from both technical and energy-effective perspectives, as it inevitably adds substantial communication, computational, and memory demands. Consequently, an appropriate training (fine-tuning) method, which incorporates the need for efficient distributed learning techniques [3], becomes a key focus of AI research [4]. Furthermore, the inherent variability of the wireless network environment, along with the heterogeneity of computing nodes and data, introduce considerable extra challenges, destabilizing existing distributed learning frameworks (e.g., Federated Learning [FL] [5] or Split Learning [6]) and exacerbating the communication burden due to frequent, real-time synchronization [7]. Although asynchronous methods can relax synchronization requirements, they give rise to certain complications [8] such as model inconsistency, potentially leading to convergence difficulties and affecting models’ overall quality.

On the other hand, model training (fine-tuning) and inference in a distributed manner exhibit significantly distinctive demands for memory bandwidth and computing resources [9]. Hence, it leaves flexible room to orchestrate computing resources for training (fine-tuning). Meanwhile, considering the traffic “tidal effect” in telecommunication networks, dynamic switching operations have been conventionally adopted to save energy consumption [10]. But, as anticipated for the widely deployed computing resources in 6G with far more capital expenditure, it deserves a re-thinking in harnessing the full potential. Therefore, instead of changing the operational status, it is necessary to establish a qualified training (fine-tuning) framework that efficiently leverages the dynamically available communication and computational resources and ensures model consistency. This framework can not only ameliorate the fluctuating resource utilization but also greatly complement the development of AI-as-a-Service (AIaaS) in 6G [11].

In a nutshell, this article proposes “Snake Learning”, a novel distributed collaborative learning framework tailored for 6G networks that integrate wireless network characteristics from the outset. In resemblance to the classic “Snake” game, where a snake maneuvers through the game space to eat items and grow in size, Snake Learning progressively utilizes distributed network nodes’ computational capability and local

arXiv:2405.03372v1 [cs.NI] 6 May 2024




Fig. 1: The integration of AI and 6G networks spans the cloud, edge and device layers. The lifecycle of AI computing services provided by 6G networks, including data collection, model inference and training (fine-tuning), circulates among the core and edge networks.

data, gradually enhancing model performance from incrementally acquired data. Meanwhile, Snake Learning coincides with the underlying directions for efficient distributed learning design that employs model partial updates and quantization to reduce resource consumption and decrease storage and memory demands, making it ideal for training or fine-tuning on resource-constrained nodes. Specifically, model layers are sequentially updated according to data located across multiple nodes, each of which can independently iterate multiple times based on its computational power and time, without the need for real-time synchronization. Distinct from parallel-oriented FL [5], relay-based Split Learning [6], and many variants [12]–[14], Snake Learning’s progressive characteristic is more suitable for the dynamic resource availability induced by “tidal effect” of traffic demands. Finally, Snake Learning supports both Client-Server (CS) and Peer-to-Peer (P2P) modes to distribute AI tasks across multiple nodes effectively, with proven effectiveness in evaluations of Computer Vision (CV) and language domains.

II. KEY CHALLENGES OF DISTRIBUTED LEARNING WITHIN 6G NETWORKS AND DISCUSSIONS OF EXISTING FRAMEWORKS

In this section, we define some evaluations for the appropriateness of a distributed learning framework in 6G and discuss the corresponding pros and cons of several prevalent frameworks.

A. Key Challenges and Evaluation Dimension

1) *Reliance on Communication Synchronization*: Wireless network bandwidth fluctuates significantly due to factors like user density and mobility. These fluctuations impact the transfer of essential data for distributed learning,

as the incurred unstable communication delays undermine the common assumption that local model training and data transmission across nodes is accomplished within a specific and stable synchronization time window. While asynchronous methods ameliorate real-time synchronization requirements, they introduce complexities like “model staleness” due to delayed updates, which leads to model inconsistency and non-convergence, ultimately destabilizing training processes [8]. Hence, the reliance on synchronous communication heavily hinders the applicability of some distributed learning frameworks.

2) *Heterogeneous, Dynamic and Limited Resource Availability*: Besides the vital importance of minimizing communication loads, the effectiveness of distributed learning is also constrained by the heterogeneously varying computational capabilities of network nodes, due to the limitation of hardware, processing power, storage, and energy consumption. This heterogeneity, in combination with unexpected user disengagement or unstable connectivity, results in significant disparities in the nodes’ ability to perform learning tasks and makes distributed learning frameworks fall short of processing computation-intensive tasks promptly. Additionally, the dynamical availability of computational and communication resources necessitates that distributed learning frameworks flexibly accommodate various resources, aligning with fluctuating traffic demands and changing user mobility patterns.

3) *Heterogeneity in Data Distribution*: Data from diverse network nodes exhibit unique distributions, commonly known as Non-Independent and Identically Distributed (Non-IID), due to differences in user behavior, preferences, and geographic locations, etc. Such heterogeneity introduces biases during model training, affecting the stability of the training process and diminishing the generalization ability of the model [15]. To counteract these issues, simply adopting data-level techniques, such as augmentation or synthesizing under-represented class samples, proves inadequate. Instead, more advanced strategies must be incorporated into the design of distributed learning frameworks.

B. Existing Frameworks

1) *Federated Learning*: FL is a mainstream distributed learning framework that enables clients to independently train complete models on their unique datasets and then share the updated model weights or gradients with a central server for aggregation. As depicted in Fig. 2, this central aggregation usually adopts strategies like FedAvg [5], where the significance of each client’s contribution is weighted by their data size. Implementing FL on resource-constrained 6G nodes poses significant challenges due to the high local computational and communication demands, as well as the necessity for precise communication synchronization. Besides, FL has limited accommodation to computing power heterogeneity and often struggles with the “straggler problem” in compulsory aggregation synchronization, where slower nodes delay the entire training process. Therefore, much of the literature focuses on reducing communication costs to enhance the feasibility of deploying FL in 6G.




Fig. 2: Comparison of distributed learning frameworks.

2) *Split Learning*: Split Learning [6] optimizes for resource-limited scenarios by offloading most Deep Neural Network (DNN) computations to a central server, while clients process only a few early layers (called client-side model) using raw data. Each training iteration involves a client transmitting the “smashed data” (i.e., intermediate activations from the cut layer and data labels) to the server, which then calculates loss and sends back gradients for model updates. Furthermore, Random Walking Snakes (RWS) [12] bypass the reliance on a central server by finely segmenting the model and sequentially activating a set of clients (a “snake”). The “head of snake” client alone holds the training data, and offloads computing tasks (i.e., some model segments) to other clients in a snake, as depicted in Fig. 2. Notably, the “snake” configuration in RWS is periodically re-shuffled with newly selected heads. Albeit the reduction in computing and memory demands, it highly increases communication overheads due to frequent exchanges of inter-layer activations and gradients. This kind of relay-based model training process, heavily relies on continuous, high-reliability, and low-latency communications to finish the forward and backward propagation of each iteration, thus vulnerable to communication disruptions. Moreover, its update mechanism can face severe data distribution heterogeneity issues due to the incremental exploitation of data, as the model may overfit to the data distribution held by the last client, posing a risk of catastrophic forgetting.

3) *Combination of Federated Learning and Split Learning*: Various hybrid approaches that integrate FL and Split Learning are also being explored. With the main server responsible for extensive server-side model computations, SplitFed Learning [13] introduces an additional federal server to synchronize client-side local updates utilizing FedAvg [5]. This dual-server setup enhances parallel processing but exacerbates the communication complexity. On the contrary, Accelerated FL [14] further reduces reliance on communication by adopting

a local-loss-based training method. Notably, it utilizes two different local loss functions (one for the auxiliary network [e.g., Multi-Layer Perceptrons] connected to the cut layer on the client-side model, and the other for the server-side model’s output layer) for separately updating two split models, which are further concatenated to form a final model. Therefore, it avoids receiving gradients from the main server and reduces the need for real-time synchronization. Nevertheless, the communication problem on the federal server remains unchanged.

In summary, as analyzed at the bottom part of Fig. 2, these existing distributed learning frameworks still fail to address all the challenges highlighted in Section II-A.

III. SNAKE LEARNING: A DISTRIBUTED COLLABORATIVE LEARNING FRAMEWORK IN 6G NETWORKS

This section outlines the details of the Snake Learning framework, along with its feasibility study on image classification and LLM fine-tuning tasks.

A. Overview

Snake Learning shifts the paradigm from the real-time exchange of complete model updates in FL or smashed data in Split Learning, by enabling nodes to selectively update and transmit partial model parameters. As depicted in Fig. 3, Snake Learning supports both centralized and self-organizing (i.e., CS or P2P) modes. Specifically, in Snake Learning, each node with distinct local data particularly focuses on training some specific middle layers as well as the first and last layers of a DNN model, since the first layer extracts fundamental features, while the last layer tailors task-specific decision boundaries for new tasks. This layer assignment for distributed training facilitates the adaptation to resource availability and heterogeneity, and greatly reduces computing, storage, and




Fig. 3: Snake Learning’s operation details in both client-server and peer-to-peer communication modes. The KD module, an abbreviation for Knowledge Distillation, activates or deactivates according to the inter-node data heterogeneity.

communication requirements on individual nodes. In case of communication and computation disruptions, the chain of training can seamlessly transit to an alternative idle node, thus ensuring continuity of model training.

As the execution process illustrated in Fig. 3, Snake Learning typically involves initialization, layer assignment, local training, and updated parameter transmission during each communication round.

1) *Initialization*: Snake Learning process begins with a server-side initialization of AI model and training tasks. In CS mode, each node verifies its connectivity and capability during each communication round, with the server assessing and confirming its computational resources. In P2P mode, after acquiring an initial model and tasks from the server, nodes undertake localized node discovery to form a self-organizing network, selecting next-hop nodes with minimal central server dependence. Additionally, to address data heterogeneity and prevent catastrophic forgetting, a Knowledge Distillation (KD) module, which computes a distillation loss, is conditionally activated according to the measured inter-node data distribution discrepancy (e.g., Kullback–Leibler divergence, Jensen–Shannon distance or hyperparameter fitting differences).

2) *Layer Assignment*: For a model with N layers, each node gets informed of the specific “middle layer” (i.e., one of the 2nd to $N - 1$ -th layers) to be learned. Specifically, in CS mode, the server retains the centralized control and takes charge of the layer assignment; while in P2P mode, the server distributes the initial model to one node in the first communication round, and subsequent layer assignments are negotiated among neighboring nodes. Both modes take into account the differences in training complexities of middle layers, and determine the assigned layers proportionate to the computational capability and communication connectivity of nodes. Notably, those non-updated layers’ parameters can be quantized to further reduce storage demands.

3) *Local Training*: Nodes train the assigned layers using their locally stored data. Prior to updating the model, the computed gradients undergo a clipping operation to avoid gradient explosion. If the KD module is triggered in initialization, it conducts an extra distillation operation by calculating the cross-entropy loss. This loss measures the discrepancy between the model previously received by the node (as the “teacher”) and the model currently undergoing local training iterations (as the “student”), thus preventing catastrophic forgetting while maintaining learning stability. Besides, the learning rate for updating the parameters of each middle layer remains constant, while the adjustment (e.g., decaying the learning rate) is performed after updating all layers once (i.e., one cycle), thus leading to uniform inter-layer learning speed and boosting model stability across cycles.

4) *Updated Parameter Transmission*: Upon a node completing the designated training epochs, each consisting of several local training iterations, the updated parameters will be exchanged. In CS mode, nodes upload the updated parameters to the server, which then strategically disseminates the received parameters along with layer identifiers to the selected subsequent node. In P2P mode, nodes autonomously choose a suitable next-hop node from adjacent nodes to minimize communication latency and energy consumption. Meanwhile, only updated parameters need to be transmitted if the next node has the latest model cached.

B. Feasibility Study

1) Training of Image Classification Tasks in CV:

To demonstrate Snake Learning’s effectiveness, we consider a common classification task in CV using the Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) VGG-11 model and CIFAR-10 dataset. In particular, VGG-11 comprises $N = 11$ layers, including 8 Convolutional (Conv) and 3 Fully Connected (FC) layers, with the last FC layer corresponding to the number of classification categories (set to 10 in this case). In Snake




Fig. 4: The illustration of Snake Learning's workflow under VGG-11 model.

Learning, as illustrated in Fig. 4, the 9 middle layers (i.e., VGG-11 excluding the 1st and 11th layers) are assigned to distributed nodes, each with distinct local data. For IID data distribution, 50,000 samples with 32×32 pixels in each image are uniformly spread among 9 nodes. Meanwhile, for Non-IID scenarios, we partition the datasets by using the Dirichlet distribution as the class priors. We allocate data D_k to k -th node based on a sampled $D \sim \text{Dir}(\alpha)$, where α determines the degree of Non-IID, with a default setting of $\alpha = 2.0$ throughout our experiments. Snake Learning is compared with FL, which distributes and updates entire VGG-11 model across 9 nodes. Both methods use a batch size of 32 per node, and for each node, one epoch (i.e., $E = 1$) refers to one entire passing of local dataset by its training iterations. After the designated epochs of training, FL executes FedAvg aggregation [5] during communication phase, while Snake Learning transfers the updated parameters. The results, shown in Fig. 5, demonstrate that Snake Learning swiftly achieves 60% accuracy with a fewer number of training iterations. More importantly, Snake Learning maintains acceptable final performance (more than 95% of FL) but reduces almost half of the communication overhead per communication round as analyzed in the right table of Fig. 4, corroborating that Snake Learning's promise for distributed learning under limited communication and computation resources.

Moreover, we investigate layer update sequence impact on Snake Learning in Fig. 5. It can be observed from Fig. 5 that while sequential and random training yield similar outcomes for IID scenarios, sequential training excels in Non-IID scenarios, highlighting its versatility. Reverse middle layer training (i.e., from deep to early layers) consistently underperforms, aligning with the insight that early layers capture basic features while deep layers learn complex ones. In other words, DNNs exhibit a hierarchical feature learning phenomenon. Therefore, sequential training contributes to a robust feature foundation adaptable to heterogeneous data distribution.

2) Fine-Tuning of LLMs :

As increasingly ongoing industrial efforts try to integrate LLMs with sub-10 billion parameters into consumer devices like smartphones and autonomous vehicles, the criticality of fine-tuning these large models escalates. However, the feasibility of fine-tuning an LLM on an edge node in 6G networks primarily hinges on peak memory usage, which is dominated by model parameters, gradients, optimizer states, data batch size, intermediate activations, and fragmented memory from residual states. Consequently, fine-tuning LLMs requires significantly more memory than model inference, and the frequent exchanges of gradients or parameters, often in millions or billions, exacerbate communication issues in existing distributed learning frameworks.

Thus, such LLMs can gain from Snake Learning by optimizing the fine-tuning process across multiple nodes with lower computing, memory, and communication demands. Our experiments employ Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) on the 1.3 billion parameters' open-source OPT model for causal language tasks. The fine-tuning performance is measured by perplexity (ppl), with lower values indicating greater model certainty and effectiveness. The model architecture features an embedding layer, 24 transformer blocks, and a linear output layer for generating predictions. The intermediate transformer blocks are assigned to 24 distinct network nodes for fine-tuning, with each node updating a specific transformer block and employing strategies like freezing or 8-bit quantization on non-updated parameters to further reduce memory. We use 4 distinct datasets comprising high-quality query-answer pairs, including Dahoas/rm-static, Dahoas/synthetic-instruct-gptj-pairwise, Dahoas/full-hh-rlhf, and yitingxie/rlhf-reward-datasets. They are uniformly distributed across the nodes in IID settings; while in Non-IID settings, each node holds only 2 types of datasets, with a batch size of 6 per node. Besides, rather than simply using the typical cosine learning schedule strategy in LLMs, Snake Learning maintains a constant learn-




Fig. 5: Image classification performance comparison of FL and Snake Learning (SL) across varying training epochs E . Non-IID data are simulated under a Dirichlet Distribution ($\alpha = 2$).




Fig. 6: LLM fine-tuning performance comparison of FL and Snake Learning (SL) across varying training epochs E .

ing rate throughout the cycle updating of all blocks, while using the systematic decay for the next cycle to guarantee consistent training across layers. Experimental results show that such a design contributes to avoiding overfitting and enhancing model stability. To further enhance computing and memory efficiency, we complement Snake Learning with the parameter-efficient Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) technique [11], decomposing weight updates for all linear layers into the product of two low-rank matrices. Each matrix has a rank of 128 and employs a scaling factor of 1, significantly reducing the complexity of the model while maintaining performance. Additionally, given the variability in computing power among distributed nodes, assigning a personalized rank to each node could enable a more efficient balance between model size, computational cost, and performance. This aspect warrants further exploration. Fig. 6 provides the comparison between Snake Learning and FL, showing that compared to FL, Snake Learning achieves a more rapid decline in ppl in both IID and Non-IID cases. Furthermore, this performance improvement becomes increasingly apparent as the number of epochs increases. Thus it indicates that Snake Learning is a promising framework for collaboratively fine-tuning LLMs.

IV. DISCUSSIONS ON ADVANTAGES OF SNAKE LEARNING

Besides the performance improvement shown in Section III-B, Snake Learning also has the following merits.

A. Relaxed Synchronization Requirements

Instead of parallel learning-oriented FL or relay-based Split Learning, Snake Learning adopts a sequential learning methodology and performs complete iterative processes on individual nodes. This eliminates the necessity of synchronization during parameter aggregation, allowing for flexible training schedules such as off-peak time fine-tuning.

B. Computation Savings

During the training of neural network models, each training iteration encompasses both forward and backward propagation. Layers that are not involved in training at specific nodes still require forward propagation to supply input features to subsequent layers. However, as gradients of activations for these layers are also calculated during backward propagation to ensure updates, the computation of gradients for their weights can be saved. For instance, using the VGG-11 model, Fig. 4 verifies substantial computation savings, leading to near-linear acceleration relative to the reduction in FLOPs. Additionally, integrating this approach with techniques like pruning and quantization can further amplify these benefits.

C. Memory Savings

As the peak memory usage discussed in Section III-B2, in the mainstream mixed precision training for LLMs, both model parameters and gradients are stored in FP16 format consuming 2 bytes per parameter, while states of the AdamW optimizer (i.e., backup of high-precision model parameters, momentum, and variance of gradients) are in FP32. Therefore,

the memory cost sums up to 16Φ bytes, with Φ denoting the parameter size. Snake Learning dramatically cuts memory costs by storing only updated parameter gradients and corresponding optimizer states. If each node updates roughly $1/N$ of the full model parameters, it only costs memory of $2\Phi + 14\Phi/N$. For example, a single node's memory occupied for fine-tuning the OPT1.3B model can shrink from about 19.37 GB for conventional FL to only 3.13 GB for Snake Learning. Moreover, the additional consideration of forward activations, batch size, and sentence length can yield more obvious memory savings. Besides, the quantization of non-updated parameters can contribute to further reducing memory requirements.

D. Communication Savings

As demonstrated in Fig. 4, Split Learning's communication costs depend on data size and specific tasks. When the training dataset is large, it incurs large volumes of smashed data proportional to the data size. Meanwhile, during real-time synchronization in FL, significant communication overhead is also required due to frequent and full model transmissions. On the contrary, Snake Learning transfers only locally updated partial parameters, naturally reducing communication costs per communication round. Besides, its elimination of compulsory synchronization for parameter aggregation further leads to significant reduction of total communication overhead, especially with the increasing number of local training iterations.

E. Data Heterogeneity Adaptation and Scalability

As shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, the employment of KD module as well as gradient clipping leads to the superiority of Snake Learning in handling Non-IID data. Meanwhile, Snake Learning does not presume the adequacy of a single node's data for training. Therefore, it better aligns with the real-world scenarios of gradually garnering data and training the model.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have proposed "Snake Learning", an innovative distributed collaborative learning framework. By leveraging the idle computational resources of distributed network nodes and assigning partial layers of model updates across them, Snake Learning decentralizes computational workload and reduces storage, memory, and communication demands on individual nodes during model training or fine-tuning. Its serpentine training mechanism mitigates reliance on continuous aggregation synchronization and heavy data transmission, which are common limitations of traditional frameworks like FL and Split Learning. Besides, knowledge distillation and gradient clipping help prevent catastrophic forgetting caused by data heterogeneity and gradient explosion. Evaluations across different domains validate that Snake Learning not only enhances resource utilization but also maintains robust model performance amid data heterogeneity. Overall, Snake Learning sets a new framework for future distributed learning models in 6G environments, promoting efficient AI model training and harnessing distributed data effectively. As moving forward, its adaptability to various applications suggests a broad potential for a more resource-efficient AI-native 6G infrastructure with fruitful AIaaS.

REFERENCES

- [1] International Telecommunication Union - Radiocommunication Sector (ITU-R), "New Recommendation ITU-R M.2160 on the 'IMT-2030 Framework' - Framework and overall objectives of the future development of IMT for 2030 and beyond," Nov. 2023, accessed on May 5, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-R/study-groups/rsg5/rwp5d/imt-2030/Pages/default.aspx>
- [2] J. Kaplan, *et al.*, "Scaling laws for neural language models," *arXiv: 2001.08361*, 2020, accessed on May 5, 2024.
- [3] S. Jere, *et al.*, "Distributed learning meets 6G: A communication and computing perspective," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 112–117, Feb. 2023.
- [4] A. de Vries, "The growing energy footprint of artificial intelligence," *Joule*, vol. 7, no. 10, pp. 2191–2194, 2023.
- [5] B. McMahan, *et al.*, "Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data," in *Proc. AISTATS*, Fort Lauderdale, FL, United States, Apr. 2017.
- [6] O. Gupta, *et al.*, "Distributed learning of deep neural network over multiple agents," *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 116, pp. 1–8, Aug. 2018.
- [7] H. Woisetschlager, *et al.*, "Federated fine-tuning of LLMs on the very edge: The good, the bad, the ugly," *arXiv:2310.03150*, 2023, accessed on May 5, 2024.
- [8] W. Kuang, *et al.*, "FederatedScope-LLM: A comprehensive package for fine-tuning large language models in federated learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00363*, 2023, accessed on May 5, 2024.
- [9] X. Miao, *et al.*, "FlexLLM: A system for co-serving large language model inference and parameter-efficient finetuning," *arXiv: 2402.18789*, 2024, accessed on May 5, 2024.
- [10] Z. Niu, "TANGO: Traffic-aware network planning and green operation," *IEEE Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 25–29, Oct. 2011.
- [11] Y. Chen, *et al.*, "NetGPT: An AI-native network architecture for provisioning beyond personalized generative services," *IEEE Network*, Mar. 2024.
- [12] A. B. Ardic, *et al.*, "Random walking snakes for decentralized learning at edge networks," in *IEEE Workshop Local Metrop. Area Netw.*, London, United Kingdom, Jul. 2023.
- [13] C. Thapa, *et al.*, "Splitfed: When federated learning meets split learning," in *Proc. AAAI*, Virtual, Online, Jun. 2022.
- [14] D.-J. Han, *et al.*, "Accelerating federated learning with split learning on locally generated losses," in *Proc. ICML*, Virtual, Online, Jul. 2021.
- [15] A. M. Abdelmoniem, *et al.*, "A comprehensive empirical study of heterogeneity in federated learning," *IEEE Internet Things J.*, vol. 10, no. 16, pp. 14 071–14 083, Aug. 2023.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Xiaoxue Yu (sdwhyxx@zju.edu.cn) is a PhD Candidate in Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China. Her research interests currently focus on communications in distributed learning.

Xingfu Yi (yixingfu@zju.edu.cn) was a master student in Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China, and graduated in Mar. 2024.

Rongpeng Li (lirongpeng@zju.edu.cn) is an Associate Professor in Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China. His research interests currently focus on networked intelligence for communications-efficiency enhancement.

Fei Wang (wangfei76@huawei.com) is a Chief Researcher of Huawei Technologies. His research directions include 6G wireless network architecture, wireless distributed learning paradigm, etc.

Chenghui Peng (pengchenghui@huawei.com) is a Principal Researcher of Huawei Technologies. His current research interests focus on 6G native AI architecture design.

Zhifeng Zhao (zhaozf@zhejianglab.com) is the Chief Engineer with Zhejiang Lab, Hangzhou, China. His research area includes collective intelligence and software-defined networks.

Honggang Zhang (honggangzhang@zju.edu.cn) is currently involved in research on cognitive green communications.