

Evaluation of Winning Solutions of 2025 Low Power Computer Vision Challenge

Zihao Ye¹, Yung-Hsiang Lu¹, Xiao Hu², Shuai Zhang²,
Taotao Jing², Xin Li², Zhen Yao³, Bo Lang³,
Zhihao Zheng³, Seungmin Oh⁴, Hankyul Kang⁴,
Seunghun Kang⁴, Jongbin Ryu⁴, Kexin Chen⁵,
Yuan Qi, George K. Thiruvathukal⁶, and Mooi Choo Chuah³

¹Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

²Qualcomm, San Diego, CA, USA

³Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, USA

⁴Ajou University, Suwon, South Korea

⁵University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, USA

⁶Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Abstract

The IEEE Low-Power Computer Vision Challenge (LPCVC) aims to promote the development of efficient vision models for edge devices, balancing accuracy with constraints such as latency, memory capacity, and energy use. The 2025 challenge featured three tracks: (1) Image classification under various lighting conditions and styles, (2) Open-Vocabulary Segmentation with Text Prompt, and (3) Monocular Depth Estimation. This paper presents the design of LPCVC 2025, including its competition structure and evaluation framework, which integrates the Qualcomm AI Hub for consistent and reproducible benchmarking. The paper also introduces the top-performing solutions from each track and outlines key trends and observations. The paper concludes with suggestions for future computer vision competitions.

The IEEE Low Power Computer Vision Challenge (LPCVC) was established in 2015 to foster innovation in efficient, low-power vision algorithms suitable for edge devices [1]. Over the past decade, LPCVC has grown into a unique annual event that prioritizes solutions that balance performance with resource constraints such as runtime latency, memory usage, and energy efficiency. The focus on efficient computer vision enables applications in embedded systems, mobile phones, and real-time systems.

The 2025 LPCVC featured three distinct tracks designed to reflect emerging trends and practical needs in the field of computer vision: (1) Image classification under varying lighting conditions and styles, (2) Open-vocabulary segmentation with text prompts, and (3) Monocular relative depth estimation. This paper provides an analysis of the top winners' solutions across the three tracks. By examining these solutions, the paper uncovers

the successful strategies and identifies promising trends in model designs for resource-constrained mobile systems.

1 Related Work

Computer vision competitions serve as critical testbeds for benchmarking algorithmic progress on complex visual tasks. For example, Russakovsky et al. [2] founded the ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC). ILSVRC played a key role in shaping the field by providing a standardized evaluation framework and encouraging innovations in deep learning that significantly enhanced model performance. Similarly, the Microsoft COCO [3] dataset was instrumental in supporting the development of detection and segmentation models for complex, realistic scenes.

In addition to these popular benchmarks, other competitions have driven advances in specialized areas. The Visual Object Tracking (VOT) challenge [4] has guided progress in real-time tracking; the DAVIS challenge [5] has focused on high-quality video object segmentation. Outside of vision, the Kaggle platform and the NeurIPS competitions track [6] have supported a broad range of machine learning challenges, from tabular data and time series forecasting to reinforcement learning and large-scale language modeling.

Complementing these large-scale, high-compute benchmarks, the IEEE Low Power Computer Vision Challenge (LPCVC) focuses on developing efficient algorithms suitable for edge computing. Started in 2015 under the name Low Power Image Recognition Challenge, LPCVC has evolved over the years to emphasize energy-efficient and resource-aware vision systems [1].




Figure 1: Example images from Track 1: Image Classification, illustrating a variety of objects and lighting conditions




Figure 2: Examples from Track 2 demonstrating open-vocabulary semantic segmentation guided by multi-sentence text prompts.



Figure 3: Qualitative examples for Track 3. Each group of three images shows the RGB input, predicted depth map, and confidence map for a single test case.

The 2017 LPCVC continued to emphasize benchmarking and evaluation protocols for embedded vision applications [7]. In 2018, organizers summarized insights from the first three years at the DATE conference and expanded on them at the AICAS 2019 workshop [8]. A comprehensive overview was later published in the IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems, highlighting key technical directions in low-power computer vision [9].

The 2020 LPCVC, presented in a special session at AICAS 2021, introduced new tasks and focused on evaluating both accuracy and efficiency on real-world embedded platforms [10]. The 2021 challenge, offering two tracks: tracking moving objects in video and FPGA object detection, was later analyzed in IEEE Computer magazine, focusing on the evolution of winning approaches and practical trade-offs [11]. The 2023 LPCVC focused on UAV image segmentation for disaster response [12]; this competition drew 60 teams and 676 submissions.

Together, these efforts demonstrate how LPCVC complements traditional benchmarks by emphasizing holistic performance, including latency, energy, and memory. This trajectory shapes the 2025 LPCVC and supports deeper analysis of strategies for constrained environments.

2 2025 IEEE LOW-POWER COMPUTER VISION CHALLENGE

2.1 Track 1

2.1.1 Introduction

Track 1 of the 2025 IEEE Low-Power Computer Vision Challenge was designed to evaluate the robustness of image classification models in the presence of significant real-world variability. The primary objective was to encourage the development of models that maintain high classification accuracy despite changes in lighting conditions and image styles.

The competition featured a custom dataset of images from 64 object categories, selected as a representative subset of the COCO dataset. Each image in the dataset was annotated with both a lighting condition and a style label. The lighting conditions included normal light, low light, and backlit. Additionally, images were also categorized by style into three categories: indoor, outdoor, and synthetic. The synthetic images were generated using a Stable Diffusion model. Example images are shown

in Figures 1(a)–(f), including scenes like an airplane in backlight, an indoor book, and a synthetic apple, etc.

This track emphasizes on both classification accuracy and cross-domain consistency, encouraging the development of robust vision systems suitable for real-world deployment.

2.1.2 Baseline Solution

For Track 1 of the 2025 Low-Power Computer Vision Challenge (LPCVC), the baseline model was based on MobileNetV2 [13], a lightweight convolutional neural network designed for efficient on-device image classification. To adapt MobileNetV2 for the specific requirements of LPCVC Track 1, several modifications were implemented. The input resolution was adjusted to 224×224 pixels to meet the latency constraints of edge devices. We also integrated the preprocessing normalization step into the model to allow participants to customize their own preprocessing. Additionally, the classification head was modified to output predictions for the 64 challenge-specific classes. The resulting baseline achieves a top-1 accuracy of 0.6919 on the validation set, with an average inference latency of 419 microseconds on the Snapdragon 8 Elite.

2.1.3 Evaluation Metrics

The evaluation of track 1 consisted of two stages. First, models were screened for inference latency on Snapdragon 8 Elite QRD, with a 10ms threshold enforced on competition hardware. This threshold was chosen to ensure that all submissions meet real-time deployment requirements. Valid submissions were then ranked using top-1 accuracy on a diverse test set covering all lighting and style conditions.

Final scores were computed as:

$$\text{Final Score} = \frac{\text{Accuracy}}{\max\left(\frac{\text{Execution Time}}{2}, 1\right)}$$

This formula balances accuracy with efficiency, rewarding fast and accurate models while discouraging excessive optimization for latency alone. A 2ms floor in the denominator ensures fairness and encourages exploration of advanced, potentially higher-latency architectures with better performance.

2.2 Track 2

2.2.1 Introduction

Track 2 of LPCVC 2025 addresses the task of *natural-language-driven segmentation* under the constraints of embedded, low-power devices. Unlike conventional segmentation approaches that rely on fixed class sets, models in this track must parse a *text prompt* at inference time,

such as “a light blue racing bicycle”, and generate the corresponding *binary segmentation mask* without any prior exposure to that category. For visual examples of such segmentation outputs, refer to Figure 2.

This task requires models to:

- Accurately interpret text prompts of varying complexity and match them to the visual content.
- Generate precise spatial masks corresponding to the text prompt.
- Reliably segment objects that were not explicitly included in the model’s training classes.

The task combines the flexibility of language understanding with the spatial rigor of segmentation. It pushes models to balance *comprehensive vision-language reasoning* with the *efficiency and compactness* required for on-device deployment.

2.2.2 Baseline Solution

For Track 2 of the 2025 LPCVC, the baseline model is based on the X-Decoder architecture [14]. This architecture integrates vision and language modalities for open-vocabulary segmentation tasks. The model utilizes a vision backbone, Focal-T, combined with a language model to enable segmentation based on textual prompts. To adapt the model for the competition’s requirements, several modifications were implemented. Input images are preprocessed by resizing the longest edge to 1024 pixels while maintaining aspect ratio, followed by zero-padding to a 1024×1024 square. The image input tensor shape is fixed at $1 \times 3 \times 1024 \times 1024$. Text inputs are tokenized using the OpenAI CLIP [15] tokenizer, producing token embeddings and attention masks with shape $2 \times 1 \times 77$. The resulting baseline achieves an mIoU of 0.4610 on the validation set, with an average inference latency of 863.4ms on Snapdragon X Elite.

2.2.3 Evaluation Metrics

Evaluation is split into two stages to ensure models meet both efficiency and segmentation quality criteria. In stage 1, submissions are profiled on the Qualcomm Snapdragon X Elite CRD; models must complete inference in under 1s to qualify. The second stage evaluates on 427 image-prompt pairs using mean Intersection-over-Union (mIoU):

$$\text{IoU}_i = \frac{|P_i \cap G_i|}{|P_i \cup G_i|}, \quad \text{mIoU} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{IoU}_i$$

Only submissions passing the latency filter are ranked by mIoU. This ensures models deliver competitive segmentation performance while satisfying real-time constraints for on-device applications.

2.3 Track 3

2.3.1 Introduction

Track 3 focuses on the task of *monocular relative depth estimation*. This track challenges participants to design lightweight, efficient architectures capable of producing accurate depth maps under low-power and latency constraints. Figure 3 illustrates qualitative results: each group has three images showing the RGB input, the visualized depth map, and the corresponding confidence map. This problem is essential for enabling depth-aware perception on resource-constrained platforms, such as mobile robots, drones, and AR systems, without the need for multi-view or active sensing.

2.3.2 Baseline Solution

For Track 3 of the 2025 LPCVC, the baseline model is based on Depth-Anything-V2 [16], a transformer-based architecture for monocular relative depth estimation. To meet the competition’s requirements, the model was modified to accept RGB images with a fixed resolution of 640×480 pixels. Unlike the original implementation, input normalization is handled inside the model by participants (e.g., applying mean-std normalization or scaling by $1/255$). The model outputs a single-channel relative depth map normalized to $[0,1]$. The resulting baseline achieved a f-score of 62.37 with an average inference latency of 24.1 ms.

2.3.3 Evaluation Metrics

Track 3, Monocular Relative Depth Estimation, is also evaluated in two stages. In stage 1, submission profiled on Snapdragon 8 Elite QRD, and must meet the 34ms (30fps) constraint. Stage 2 using the following point-cloud-based precision, recall, and F-score on the predicted depth output:

- Precision (P) and Recall (R) are computed by converting both the predicted depth map and the ground-truth depth map into 3D point clouds, projecting each pixel to a 3D point using camera intrinsics. A predicted point is considered true-positive if its Euclidean distance to the nearest ground-truth point is within a threshold τ .
- Precision is defined as $P = \frac{TP}{|\text{predicted points}|}$, and Recall as $R = \frac{TP}{|\text{ground-truth points}|}$.
- The F-score combines Precision and Recall as:

$$F = \frac{2 \cdot P \cdot R}{P + R}$$

The primary ranking metric for Track 3 is the F-score, which captures both the accuracy and completeness of reconstruction. Other auxiliary metrics, such as per-pixel MAE, RMSE, and relative error, are computed for diagnostic reporting but do not affect ranking.

2.4 Qualcomm AI Hub

The Qualcomm AI Hub served as the central platform for model deployment and evaluation for the 2025 LPCVC. Designed to streamline the benchmarking of edge AI models under real-world constraints, the AI Hub provides a cloud-based environment with access to Qualcomm hardware, including Snapdragon chips for machine learning applications.

The AI Hub supports on-cloud inference and runtime profiling on target devices. The Hub enforces resource limitations, allowing teams to test and optimize their solutions. Using the official AIHub Python package, participants can compile models, upload datasets, run inference, and profile performance. Teams submitted their model using the compile job ID and sharing the access to the compiled job with the evaluation team. During the daily evaluation, each submission was evaluated by running inference with the hidden test dataset and profiled on AI Hub. The results were further calculated into a performance score and logged for leaderboard ranking.

2.5 Referee System

The referee system, as shown in Figure 4, for the 2025 IEEE Low-Power Computer Vision Challenge was designed to enable standardized and reproducible evaluation of participant-submitted models. The workflow involved three interconnected components: the Qualcomm AI Hub, the competition website (lpcv.ai), and an evaluation server hosted at Purdue University.




Figure 4: Evaluation workflow for LPCVC 2025. Participants compile models via the Qualcomm AI Hub and submit the resulting Compile Job ID to official website (lpcv.ai) (1). The Purdue server (2) coordinates remote inference on Snapdragon hardware from AI Hub (3), collects results, computes scores, and updates the leaderboard.

Participants began by registering with the Qualcomm AI Hub, where they gained access to compilation and deployment services targeting Qualcomm devices. Using the official AI Hub Python packages, each team compiled their model for on-device execution. This process generated a unique Compile Job ID, which identified the uploaded model and compiled model on the AI Hub platform.

The participants then submitted their Compile Job ID to the lpcv.ai website. These records were logged into the submission database and subsequently forwarded to the Purdue evaluation server, which coordinated the automated scoring process.

Upon receiving the job information, the Job Manager initiated profiling and inference jobs on the Qualcomm AI Hub. The AI Hub performed inference and profiling on actual Snapdragon hardware using pre-defined test datasets. The resulting latency was recorded to determine the latency-validity of the submission, and the model outputs were recorded for further calculation for scoring.

The raw model outputs were downloaded to the Purdue server, where the Evaluator module processed them to compute final scores. This step included the necessary format conversions, validation of output consistency, and calculation of metrics relevant to the competition track. Finally, the computed scores were transmitted back to the lpcv.ai website, where the leaderboard was updated to reflect the most recent performance standings.

3 Winners' Solutions

Submissions across all three tracks of the competition demonstrated substantial improvements over the provided baselines, showcasing innovative approaches and strong performance from teams around the world.

In **Track 1 (Image Classification)**, the team *LabLVM* from **Ajou University** achieved an impressive classification accuracy of **0.974**, setting a high standard for the competition. The second-place team, *SEU AIC LAB* from the **School of Integrated Circuits at Southeast University**, followed closely with an accuracy of **0.959**, while *ETF Amigo* from the **School of Electrical Engineering at the University of Belgrade** secured third place with a strong performance of **0.951**. These results represent a significant leap from the baseline accuracy of **0.692**.

In **Track 2 (Open-Vocabulary Semantic Segmentation)**, the top-performing team was once again from Southeast University. Team *SICer*, representing the **School of Integrated Circuits**, achieved a leading mean Intersection-over-Union (mIoU) score of **0.532**. *Sailor Moon* from the **University of Minnesota** earned second place with a very close score of **0.527**, while *MaXinLab* from the **University of California, Irvine** took third with an mIoU of **0.473**. All three teams outperformed the baseline mIoU of **0.461**.

Track 3 (Monocular Depth Estimation) featured another strong showing from *Sailor Moon* of the **University of Minnesota**, which achieved the top **F-score** of **83.14**, the highest among all submissions. The second-place position was held by *LY (Unnamed)*, a joint team from the **Shenyang Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences** and the **Shanghai Electro-**

Mechanical Engineering Institute, who earned a competitive F-score of **81.65**. The third-place team, *Circle*, delivered a strong performance with an F-score of **78.83**. These results represented substantial gains over the baseline F-score of **62.37**.

Overall, the competition results highlight the creativity, rigor, and diversity of approaches taken by the participating teams. The top-performing solutions not only advanced the state-of-the-art accuracy performance but also emphasized the importance of balancing accuracy with efficiency by constraining their latency within the required threshold, making them suitable for real-world deployment.

To better illustrate how each team's performance evolved throughout the competition, Figure 5 presents the score trends over time for the top team in each track.

Table 1: Track 1: Classification accuracy scores of baseline and top-performing teams

Team	Accuracy	Time (ms)
Baseline	0.692	0.419
LabLVM	0.974	1.612
SEU AIC LAB	0.959	1.837
ETF Amigo	0.951	1.550

Table 2: Track 2: Mean Intersection-over-Union (mIoU) scores for baseline and top-performing teams

Team	mIoU	Time (ms)
Baseline	0.461	863.4
SICer	0.532	515.8
Sailor Moon	0.527	882.1
MaXinLab	0.473	383.6

Table 3: Track 3: F-score results of baseline and top-performing teams for relative depth estimation

Team	F-score	Time (ms)
Baseline	62.37	24.1
Sailor Moon	83.14	30.4
Unnamed	81.65	24.7
Circle	78.83	30.3

3.1 Winner's Solutions for Track 1

Track 1 aims to assess model robustness under varying lighting conditions and synthetic image scenarios. The LabLVM team focuses on enhancing the model's generalization capability, an essential attribute for robust performance, rather than optimizing for specific environmental conditions. To this end, they adopt Vision-Language




Figure 5: Performance score (leaderboard test set) trends over time for the top teams in each track.




Figure 6: Overview of Layer Merging and Imitation from track 1’ winner: team LabLMV. The term h_1 denotes the output of Layer 1, which serves as the input to Layer 2. After merging the layers, the merged layer L_{merged} is trained to imitate the original feature vector h_j , thereby preserving the representational behavior of the naive model.

Models (VLMs), known for their superior generalization ability. Team LabLMV adopts MobileCLIP [17], which delivers strong baseline performance for image-text tasks.

However, MobileCLIP does not satisfy the competition’s sub-2ms inference time constraint. To overcome this limitation, the LabLMV team proposes a novel optimization strategy based on Layer Merging and Imitation, as illustrated in Figure 6. This approach enables the use of a shallower vision encoder while maintaining minimal performance degradation. The text encoder remains unchanged, as it processes each input only once.

3.1.1 Layer Merging

To reduce the depth of the encoder, team LabLMV leverages layer merging. Instead of simply averaging the weights of all selected layers, they employ a weighted summation of selected layers. For selected layer index $k \in \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$, the weight w_k for each layer is defined as:

$$w_k = \frac{|k - c|}{\sum_{l=i}^j |l - c|}, \quad \text{where } c = \frac{i + j}{2}.$$

This scheme emphasizes the outermost layers in the merging range, thereby preserving the original feature magnitude. The merged layer is then computed as:

$$L_{\text{merged}} = \sum_{k=i}^j w_k \cdot L_k.$$

To determine which layers to merge, team LabLVM analyzes output stability using calibration data and selects layer ranges with minimal variation. Layer merging is performed symmetrically around a central anchor point. A subset of the COCO 2014 and COCO 2017 datasets serves as the calibration set.

3.1.2 Layer Imitation

Team LabLVM introduces a lightweight training approach, layer imitation, rather than fine-tuning the entire model with cross-entropy loss. The goal is to ensure the merged layer imitates the output of the original layer it replaces, allowing the original model weights to remain largely unchanged and significantly reducing training overhead. Let h_k denote the output feature vector of layer L_k . The merged layer is trained to approximate the output of layer L_j using the Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{imitate}} = \text{MSE}(h_{\text{merged}}, h_j).$$

This training is conducted using samples from the COCO 2014 and COCO 2017 datasets. Despite their effectiveness, the Layer Merging and Imitation strategies depend heavily on the availability and representativeness of the calibration data used to guide layer selection. Addressing this dependency constitutes an important direction for future research.

3.2 Winner’s Solutions of Track 2




Figure 7: Multimodal segmentation workflow: the image encoder and text encoder extract features independently, which are then fused by a multimodal decoder to produce segmentation masks conditioned on text prompts.

Track 2 focuses on open-vocabulary semantic segmentation from image and text inputs, targeting both high mean Intersection-over-Union (mIoU) and low latency on the Snapdragon X Elite CRD. Team SICER from Southeast University achieves top performance in this track by combining thoughtful dataset augmentation, architectural innovations, and efficient fine-tuning strategies.

3.2.1 Challenge Analysis

Team SICer identifies four key challenges in Track 2: (1) multimodal task complexity, (2) limited training time and memory, (3) high computational cost and inference latency, and (4) generalization to unseen categories. Figure 7 illustrates the multimodal pipeline where an image encoder and a text encoder feed into a transformer decoder.

Multimodal models require effective fusion of visual and textual inputs, placing high demands on training stability and memory. For instance, training the X-Decoder baseline model on a single A100 GPU using COCO data takes over 4 hours per epoch. Moreover, X-Decoder exhibits over 3.6T FLOPs, exceeding the 1000ms latency budget on the Snapdragon device. Lastly, the validation data contains 200 categories, while only 80 are visible in training, which requires strong generalization.

3.2.2 Dataset Construction and Augmentation

To improve coverage of unseen categories, SICER expands beyond the standard COCO and RefCOCO datasets by incorporating Visual Genome (VG) [18] and additional segmentation datasets. In addition, AI-generated text prompts were used to enrich these samples.

For augmentation, team SICer applies contrast/brightness adjustments, occlusion via black square overlays, and horizontal flipping. These techniques improve robustness against lighting variations, occlusion, and object symmetry.

3.2.3 Model Architecture and Optimizations

SICER’s core model is based on the X-Decoder framework. The image encoder employs the Swin Transformer to extract multi-scale features, while BERT encodes the text prompts. A multimodal transformer decoder uses cross-attention to integrate both modalities.

To address the latency bottleneck, team SICer proposes replacing traditional multi-head attention with a multi-scale linear attention (MLA) module. MLA reduces computational overhead by generating tokens via 3×3 depth-wise and 1×1 pointwise convolutions. Attention is then computed over the downsampled tokens, followed by feature fusion.

Lastly, the optimal resolution for inference was determined to be 600 pixels, achieving a favorable balance between accuracy and runtime (515.177ms).

3.2.4 Loss Functions and Fine-Tuning Strategy

To improve segmentation of small or rare categories, team SICer adopts a dual-loss strategy:

- **Optimization loss:** an IoU-based loss applied per image, emphasizing common or large objects.

- **Balance loss:** a global mIoU loss computed across the batch, upweighting infrequent and small-category objects.

Additionally, Online Hard Example Mining (OHEM) is used to prioritize difficult training samples.

The fine-tuning was done in two stages. First, the model undergoes full fine-tuning on COCO. Next, it is further tuned using LoRA [19] and Visual Prompt Tuning (VPT) [20] techniques with the augmented dataset. Training is limited to 40 epochs to prevent overfitting, with each round of fine-tuning taking approximately 7 days on a single A100 GPU.

3.2.5 Results

SICER’s solution achieves strong accuracy while satisfying the latency constraint on the Snapdragon X Elite CRD. During training, the model reached an mIoU of 0.4886 on the validation set. On the public evaluation set containing 427 image-text pairs, the model achieved an mIoU of 0.610 with a latency of 515.2 ms.

For the final evaluation on the hidden test set of 2,714 image-text pairs, Team SICER achieved a top mIoU score of **0.532** with an inference latency of **515.8 ms**, ranking **first** in Track 2.

3.3 Winner’s Solutions of Track 3

The model, EfficientDepth, builds on DepthAnythingV2 with ViT-small pre-trained weights to predict the metric depth, which is latter rescaled to relative depth during evaluation. To meet the inference time constraint, we performed model graph optimizations and input resolution tuning to maximize the F-store under the latency limitation.

3.3.1 Model Graph Optimization

Utilizing two features from Qualcomm AI Hub, model layer visualization and per-layer runtime analysis, we identified that many constant operations consumed significant inference time and could be optimized, as an example shown in Figures 8. In particular, during the input normalization, since the subtraction, multiplication, and convolution layers are all linear operations, these layers could be algebraically fused into one convolution layer. This fusion efficiently eliminates the runtime of subtraction and multiplication layers without changing the output. A similar model graph optimization strategy was applied to attention layer, where the multiplication layer was merged into the fully connected layer as shown in figure. In addition, we identified class embedding token operations in the graph relied only on constant initializers and merged them into corresponding nodes without impacting accuracy.




Figure 8: Computational graph segment illustrating the optimization strategy for constant-dependent operations, as implemented by Track 3 team Sailor Moon. The original flow (left) involves complex constant extraction and conditional re-shaping. The optimized pathway (right) shows the graph after merging operations.

3.3.2 Input Resolution Tuning

Based on the prior mentioned graph optimization, we further tuned the input resolution to identify the highest resolution achievable within the given inference time constraints. Table 4 shows a part of the resolution and corresponding results we explored. The input resolution 434×322 yields highest F-score of 83.8 while satisfying the inference constraint.

Table 4: Track 3: F-score results and inference time for various input resolutions

Input Resolution	F-score	Time (ms)
434×322	83.802	30.2
420×322	82.858	29.6
350×350	82.119	26.5
406×308	81.204	23.2
364×364	79.889	29.8

4 Observation and Suggestion for Future Challenges

Throughout the competition, teams employed a variety of strategies to address the challenge’s constraints. During and after the competition, we observed several important trends in how teams approached the challenges and performed:

Optimization of Existing Models All winning teams built on well-known architectures such as MobileNet, EfficientNet, CLIP, and Depth-Anything-V2. Their improvements centered on techniques like pruning, quantization, lightweight fine-tuning, and resolution adjustments, aimed at meeting strict resource constraints without sacrificing too much performance.

Impact of Sample Solutions Organizers provided comprehensive starter kits covering environment setup, model training, Qualcomm AI Hub integration, and submission workflows. These resources lowered the entry barrier, accelerated onboarding, and led many teams to build their solutions around the provided templates. A strong sample solution also helped ensure that top-performing submissions achieved competitive results.

Effect of Competition Timeline As shown in Figure 5, teams generally improved their scores over the course of the competition; however, the scores did not always increase monotonically. This fluctuation reflects participants experimenting with different approaches, occasionally encountering temporary setbacks. Overall, the extended submission window was crucial, providing teams

the time to refine their methods iteratively and ultimately achieve higher performance.

4.1 Suggestions for Future Competitions

For future competitions, organizers can accelerate innovation and broaden participation by providing a wider variety of baseline solutions across multiple model families, encouraging experimentation beyond the most common architectures. These baselines shouldn’t just be the “fastest” or “most common”, but should represent a spectrum of complexity, including smaller, more energy-efficient models and larger models that achieve state-of-the-art accuracy.

Evaluation must evolve to include measurements beyond inference latency, promoting a more holistic view of edge performance. For example, key metrics can include:

- **Energy Consumption:** Measured per inference or as a total budget, this is a critical constraint for battery-powered or perpetually-deployed edge devices.
- **Memory Usage:** Both peak runtime memory and model parameter size are crucial. A small, fast model is useless if its runtime memory exceeds the on-chip memory capacity of the target device.

Additionally, requiring evaluation on multiple edge devices would promote hardware-agnostic solutions that reflect real-world deployment needs. This can prevent over-optimization for a single platform and encourages generalizable solutions that deliver consistent gains across different hardware.

Beyond technical performance, each track can introduce awards or subtracks for original network designs, which would motivate creativity and reward novel approaches that might not immediately achieve top-tier latency but demonstrate significant architectural innovation. This can emphasize that the competition values the long-term advancement of the field just as much as the optimization of existing solutions.

Overall, this year’s competition covered a wide variety of vision tasks, demonstrating the growing maturity and practical focus of the efficient vision model community. Teams showed strong ability to adapt and optimize existing architectures to meet real-world constraints, leveraging starter kits and iterative development to achieve high performance. The results show the importance of accessible resources and the value of extended development time, while also revealing opportunities for encouraging innovation, multi-task solutions, and hardware-agnostic designs in the future. By building on these insights, future competitions can continue to drive progress in deployable computer vision systems, encouraging participants to experiment, innovate, and push the boundaries of applied AI.

Acknowledgments

The 2025 Low-Power Computer Vision Challenge is supported by Qualcomm, NSF-2107230, NSF-2104709, and the Computer Society. Any opinions, findings, and conclusion or recommendations expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the sponsors.

We would like to sincerely thank Qualcomm for sponsoring this competition and the IEEE Computer Society for organizing and supporting the event.

We thank Ibrahim Abdullah, Nihar Atri, Tru Trong Bui Jr., Quentin David Troemner, Shrienidhi Gopalakrishnan, Basil Khwaja, Le Mao, Sherwin Mehmia, Ian Ou, Trent Seaman, Agrim Sharma, Rushil Sogani, Ojas Chaturvedi, Vincent Zhao who assisted in preparing and coordinating the event, contributing significantly to its success.

References

- [1] Y.-H. Lu et al., “Rebooting computing and low-power image recognition challenge,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design*, ser. ICCAD ’15, Austin, TX, USA: IEEE Press, 2015, pp. 927–932, ISBN: 9781467383899.
- [2] O. Russakovsky et al., *Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge*, 2015. arXiv: [1409.0575 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0575). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0575>
- [3] T.-Y. Lin et al., *Microsoft coco: Common objects in context*, 2015. arXiv: [1405.0312 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0312). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0312>
- [4] M. Kristan et al., “The sixth visual object tracking vot2018 challenge results,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) Workshops*, Sep. 2018.
- [5] J. Pont-Tuset, F. Perazzi, S. Caelles, P. Arbeláez, A. Sorkine-Hornung, and L. V. Gool, *The 2017 davis challenge on video object segmentation*, 2018. arXiv: [1704.00675 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.00675). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.00675>
- [6] *Neurips competition track*, <https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2024/CompetitionTrack>, Accessed: 2025-07-20.
- [7] K. Gauen, R. Rangan, A. Mohan, Y.-H. Lu, W. Liu, and A. C. Berg, “Low-power image recognition challenge,” in *2017 22nd Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, 2017, pp. 99–104. DOI: [10.1109/ASPDAC.2017.7858303](https://doi.org/10.1109/ASPDAC.2017.7858303)
- [8] M. Ardi et al., “Special session: 2018 low-power image recognition challenge and beyond,” in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Circuits and Systems (AICAS)*, 2019, pp. 154–157. DOI: [10.1109/AICAS.2019.8771606](https://doi.org/10.1109/AICAS.2019.8771606)
- [9] S. Alyamkin et al., “Low-power computer vision: Status, challenges, and opportunities,” *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 411–421, 2019. DOI: [10.1109/JETCAS.2019.2911899](https://doi.org/10.1109/JETCAS.2019.2911899)
- [10] X. Hu et al., “The 2020 low-power computer vision challenge,” in *2021 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Circuits and Systems (AICAS)*, 2021, pp. 1–4. DOI: [10.1109/AICAS51828.2021.9458522](https://doi.org/10.1109/AICAS51828.2021.9458522)
- [11] X. Hu et al., “Evolution of winning solutions in the 2021 low-power computer vision challenge,” *Computer*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 28–37, 2023. DOI: [10.1109/MC.2023.3250246](https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2023.3250246)
- [12] L. Chen et al., *2023 low-power computer vision challenge (lpcvc) summary*, 2024. arXiv: [2403.07153 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07153). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07153>
- [13] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, *Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks*, 2019. arXiv: [1801.04381 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.04381). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.04381>
- [14] X. Zou et al., *Generalized decoding for pixel, image, and language*, 2022. arXiv: [2212.11270 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.11270). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.11270>
- [15] A. Radford et al., *Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision*, 2021. arXiv: [2103.00020 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020>
- [16] L. Yang et al., *Depth anything v2*, 2024. arXiv: [2406.09414 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09414). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09414>
- [17] P. K. A. Vasu, H. Pouransari, F. Faghri, R. Vemulapalli, and O. Tuzel, *Mobileclip: Fast image-text models through multi-modal reinforced training*, 2024. arXiv: [2311.17049 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17049). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.17049>
- [18] R. Krishna et al., *Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations*, 2016. arXiv: [1602.07332 \[cs.CV\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.07332). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.07332>
- [19] E. J. Hu et al., *Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models*, 2021. arXiv: [2106.09685 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685). [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.09685>

- [20] M. Jia et al., *Visual prompt tuning*, 2022. arXiv: [2203.12119](https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.12119) [cs.CV]. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.12119>