
Integrating Circle Kernels into Convolutional Neural Networks

Kun He* **Chao Li[†]** **Yixiao Yang[‡]**

School of Computer Science and Technology,
Huazhong University of Science and Technology
Wuhan 430074

{brooklet60, d201880880, m201973180}@hust.edu.cn

Gao Huang

Department of Automation,
Tsinghua University
Beijing 100084

gaohuang@tsinghua.edu.cn

John E. Hopcroft

Computer Science Department,
Cornell University, Ithaca, USA
jeh@cs.cornell.edu

Abstract

The square kernel is a standard unit for contemporary Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), as it fits well on the tensor computation for the convolution operation. However, the receptive field in the human visual system is actually isotropic like a circle. Motivated by this observation, we propose using circle kernels with isotropic receptive fields for the convolution, and our training takes approximately equivalent amount of calculation when compared with the corresponding CNN with square kernels. Our preliminary experiments demonstrate the rationality of circle kernels. We then propose a kernel boosting strategy that integrates the circle kernels with square kernels for the training and inference, and we further let the kernel size/radius be learnable during the training. Note that we reparameterize the circle kernels or integrated kernels before the inference, thus taking no extra computation as well as the number of parameter overhead for the testing. Extensive experiments on several standard datasets, ImageNet, CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, using the circle kernels or integrated kernels on typical existing CNNs, show that our approach exhibits highly competitive performance. Specifically, on ImageNet with standard data augmentation, our approach dramatically boosts the performance of MobileNetV3-Small by 5.20% top-1 accuracy and 3.39% top-5 accuracy, and boosts the performance of MobileNetV3-Large by 2.16% top-1 accuracy and 1.18% top-5 accuracy.

*The first three authors contribute equally.

[†]Corresponding author.

[‡]Corresponding author.

1 Introduction

The square kernel has been taken into granted as the core unit of contemporary Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) since the first recognized CNN of *LeNet* [17] was proposed in 1989, and especially *AlexNet* [15] won the ILSVRC (ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Competition) in 2012. Though there exist some researches in recent years proposing that the kernel or receptive field can be deformable [13, 3, 30, 6], these models take considerable extra parameters or computation overhead. Square kernels have always been the standard configuration for popular CNN architectures and are widely used in various computer vision and natural language processing tasks.

On the other hand, CNNs have spawned an enormous application demand in wearable devices, security systems, mobile phones, automobiles, *etc.*. It remains a longstanding challenge for CNNs to deliver higher accuracy with the constraints of limited computational resources and the demand for real-time inference. These demands drive us to design new network components to promote performance without additional parameters, computation overhead or energy overhead.

Motivated by the fact that the receptive field in the human visual system is isotropic like a circle, we propose the concept of circle kernel for the convolution operation. There are several advantages of circle kernels over square kernels. First, the receptive field and stacked receptive field of circle kernels are more round and similar to the biological receptive field. Second, the receptive field of a kernel is traditionally expected to be isotropic to fit thousands of uncertainly symmetric orientations of the input feature maps, globally or locally. The circle kernel is perfectly isotropic and homogeneous, while a square kernel is symmetric only in a few orientations. Third, Luo *et al.* [20] indicate that the effective receptive field of a square kernel has a Gaussian distribution which is in a near-circle shape. So a circular receptive field may be a compelling version over the square one.

When building a circle kernel, as some points on the circle receptive field are not on grids, we adopt bilinear interpolation for the approximation and extract the corresponding transformation matrix, thus our training takes approximately equivalent amount of time as compared with that of the square kernels. Experiments show that circle kernels exhibit advantages over square kernels, especially on larger kernels in which the receptive field of circle kernels is more like a circle and the differences between circle kernels and square kernels are more distinct. The 3×3 kernels have become the mainstream of the CNN units since VGG [24] proposed that larger kernels can be replaced by several 3×3 kernels using fewer parameters. However, in recent years, the functions of larger kernels are considered underestimated because most models generated by neural architecture search [31, 19, 27, 23] contain large kernels, and ProxylessNAS [1] argues that larger kernels are beneficial for CNNs to preserve more information for downsampling.

We then propose a kernel boosting strategy that integrates circle kernels with square kernels for the convolution, and we allow the kernel size/radius to be learnable during the training. Specifically, each integrated kernel unit has a pair of square kernel and circle kernel. The two kernels share the weight matrix but have distinct transformation matrices. During the training, the shared weight matrix is updated at each epoch, but the transformation matrices of either circle or square receptive field are randomly picked to update, thus the training takes a similar amount of computation overhead. For the inference, we design a re-parameterization method that enables the model with circle kernels or integrated kernels to take no extra computation overhead as well as no extra amount of parameters.

We conducted extensive experiments on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets using VGG-16 [24], ResNet-56 [7], WRNCifar [28], and DenseNetCifar [10] models, and on ImageNet dataset using MobileNetV3-Small, MobileNetV3-Large [9], and ResNet-18 [7] models. Empirical results demonstrate the effectiveness of circle kernels and integrated kernels for the image classification task. Our approach exhibits highly competitive performance, and especially it dramatically boosts the performance of MobileNetV3-Small and MobileNetV3-Large on ImageNet with standard data augmentation.

Note that in this work, we only adopt existing CNN architectures but change the standard square kernels to circle kernels or integrated kernels to facilitate the comparison. In future work, it is possible to design new CNN architectures that are more favorable to the proposed circle kernels or integrated kernel boosting strategy. Also, it is possible to find some other data argumentation methods that are more favorable to circle kernel convolution.

2 Related Works

Understanding and exploring the convolution units has always been an essential topic in the field of deep learning. In this section, we discuss prior works that study basic convolutional units and involve *mixture of experts*, and describe how our work differs.

Convolution Adaptation. To better learn the spatial transformation from the input data, researchers have proposed many adaptive or deformable convolution units to achieve dynamic receptive fields or to reshape the convolutional kernels. *Active convolution* [13] augments the sampling locations in the receptive fields with offsets and learns the offsets end-to-end. Its dynamic receptive field can reach any place of the feature maps but only learns one deformation at each layer, which increases limited spatial transformations but with large computation consumption. *Deformable ConvNet* [3] and *deformable ConvNets v2* [30] use similar deformation methods and sample on feature maps locally and densely to adapt to the geometric variations of objects. They achieve superior performance for semantic segmentation and object detection tasks but with higher computation overhead. In addition, their offsets change with the input and are pixel-wise in the inference stage, which dramatically prolongs the inference time. In contrast, we reshape the receptive field by operating on the original kernel space and randomly pick one of the multiple sets of parameters related to shapes to update to perform the deformations during the training, and our method takes no visible extra time consumption for the testing.

Effective Receptive Field. Luo *et al.* [21] proposed the effective receptive field to the partial derivative of the output concerning the input data to quantify the exact contribution of each raw pixel to the convolution. The effective receptive field measures the impact of each input pixel, and is more effective than the original receptive field. Luo *et al.* find that the effective receptive field of square kernels only occupies a small fraction of the entire original receptive field and has a Gaussian distribution closing to a circle. As illustrated in Figure 1, the receptive field of a circle kernel is naturally round, indicating that the circle kernels may be more effective than square kernels. The effective receptive field involves the receptive field and the weights of kernels. Correspondingly, our re-parameterization method transforms the offsets of the receptive field to the multiplication of a transformation matrix and a weight matrix. When we let the kernel size/radius be learnable, it probably tunes the receptive field to fit the effective receptive field.

Mixture of Experts. *Mixture of experts* [2, 5, 12, 22] means that multiple square kernels are built as experts in parallel, and their outputs are mixed in inference-time using the data-dependent weights. There are several fundamental differences to our kernel integration method. First, they learn multiple square kernels in parallel, while our model randomly picks and updates the size/radius of one of the multiple kernels during the training. Second, they mix the outputs of the kernels while we directly integrate the kernels for inference so that we can use the final wrapped weights for inference without extra calculation overhead. Last but not least, we do not learn different kernels in distinct convolution units but randomly pick and update the transformation matrix of one of the candidate kernels, meanwhile we share the weight matrix in one convolution unit that is trained at every iteration. In this way, we gain similar performance with the same amount of training epochs at the same time avoid falling into local optimums.

3 Integrating Circle Kernels into CNNs

This section proposes circle kernels to have an isotropic receptive field in convolutional neural networks (CNNs). We adopt bilinear interpolation for the approximation and extract the corresponding transformation matrix. Thus the training takes an approximately equivalent amount of calculation when compared with the counterpart CNN with the standard square kernels. We further propose integrating circle kernels with square kernels for the convolution and test our approach on typical CNNs. Such strategy could boost the classification performance of existing CNNs, especially under the scenario of no data augmentation. Moreover, we conjecture that the kernel size could be learned and integrate various learnable kernels to boost the classification performance further. Finally, we design a re-parameterization method for the inference, which enables our model with either circle kernels or integrated kernels to take no extra calculation overhead as well as the number of parameters for testing.




Figure 1: Approximation of a 3×3 circle kernel on a 3×3 square kernel.

3.1 Circle Kernel versus Square Kernel

The receptive field \mathbf{S} of a 3×3 standard square kernel with dilation 1, as shown in Figure 1 (a), can be presented as:

$$\mathbf{S} = \{(-1, 1), (0, 1), (1, 1), (-1, 0), (0, 0), (1, 0), (-1, -1), (0, -1), (1, -1)\}. \quad (1)$$

By convolving an input feature map $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$ with a kernel $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ of stride 1, we have an output feature map $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$ whose value at each coordinate j is:

$$\mathbf{O}_j = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{I}_{j+s}. \quad (2)$$

In contrast, the receptive field of a circle kernel can be presented as:

$$\mathbf{R} = \{(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), (0, 1), (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), (-1, 0), (0, 0), (1, 0), (-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}), (0, -1), (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})\}. \quad (3)$$

Then, the corresponding convolution becomes:

$$\mathbf{O}_j = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}, r \in \mathbf{R}} \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{I}_{j+r}. \quad (4)$$

As the receptive field of a circle kernel contains fractional positions, we employ bilinear interpolation to approximate the corresponding sampling values inside the square receptive field:

$$\mathbf{I}_t = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{B}(s, t) \mathbf{I}_s, \quad (5)$$

where t denotes an arbitrary (fractional) location in the square receptive field, and $\mathbf{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the transformation matrix of the bilinear interpolation. So Eq. (4) becomes:

$$\mathbf{O}_j = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}, r \in \mathbf{R}} \mathbf{W}_s \left(\sum_{t \in \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{B}(s, j+r) \mathbf{I}_t \right). \quad (6)$$

As the transformation matrix \mathbf{B} is a fixed coefficient matrix, Eq. (6) satisfies the associative law of multiplication. Thus, operating on the original kernel \mathbf{W} can replace the offsets in the receptive field, making the training take an equivalent amount of time compared with the counterpart CNN with standard square kernels.

3.2 Integrating Circle Kernel with Square Kernel

We further propose to integrate circle kernels with square kernels for the convolution. Each integrated kernel has two types of receptive field, and all the kernels of a layer is trained with either circle or square receptive field picked randomly. Formally, the receptive field of an integrated kernel is a *bernoulli* random variable, denoted $\mathbf{E} \sim \text{Ber}(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{R}; 0.5)$. Then, the output feature map of the corresponding convolution is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{O}_j = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}, e \in \mathbf{E}} \mathbf{W}_s \left(\sum_{t \in \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{B}(s, j+e) \mathbf{I}_t \right). \quad (7)$$

For a neural network with L layers, the overall model can be regarded as an ensemble of 2^L sub-networks during the training phase.




Figure 2: A square/circle kernel with learnable size/radius. (a) A square kernel with learnable size. (b) A circle kernel with learnable radius.

3.3 Integrating Learnable Kernels and Re-parameterization for the Inference

We continue to let the size/radius of a square/circle kernel be learnable along the lines from the kernel’s origin to the boundary, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Specifically, we initialize a pair of square kernel and circle kernel, whose receptive fields are $\mathbf{D}_s = a\mathbf{S}$ and $\mathbf{D}_c = a\mathbf{R}$ respectively. Here a is a learnable parameter. If $a \in [0, 1]$ then the scaling is inside the 3 receptive field but we relax the constraint and let $a \in \mathbb{R}$ to simplify the calculation.

Let $\mathbf{D} \sim \text{Ber}(\mathbf{D}_s, \mathbf{D}_c; 0.5)$, the value of the integrated convolution at coordinate j of the output feature map can be calculate by:

$$\mathbf{O}_j = \sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}, d \in \mathbf{D}} \mathbf{W}_s \left(\sum_{s \in \mathbf{S}} \mathbf{B}(s, j + d) \mathbf{I}_s \right). \quad (8)$$

Because the scope of the receptive field \mathbf{S} is much smaller than the feature map \mathbf{I} , the increased calculation cost in Eq. (8) can be ignored. Moreover, in the integrated kernels, each transformation matrix is shared by all the input channels but is exclusive for each output channel. As the size/radius of each kernel \mathbf{W} is determined by one learnable variable a and shared by the input channels, the additional parameters are only a few thousandths of the weights of the kernels.

To accelerate the inference, we propose a re-parameterization method. As $\mathbf{B}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a deterministic transformation matrix after the training, Eq. (8) satisfies the associative law of multiplication. Thus, operating on the original kernel \mathbf{W} can replace the offsets in the receptive field. We can save the new weights wrapped by the transformation matrix before the inference, making the model no longer need to distort the feature maps point by point according to the offset for testing. Unfortunately, this operation may increase parameters. For example, the new size of a traditional deformable kernel wrapped by the transformation matrix is $H \times W$ instead of the original $K \times K$. However, because we don’t consider the pixel values outside the original receptive field in the bilinear interpolation, the new size of a learnable kernel wrapped by the transformation matrix is still $K \times K$. That is, the network takes no extra calculation overhead as well as the number of parameters for inference.

3.4 Training a Model with Integrated Kernels

For an input sample \mathbf{x} , the output of a conventional neural network with static parameters can be written as:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}, \Theta). \quad (9)$$

Then, the output of a model with adaptive parameters can be written as $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}, \Theta, \hat{\Theta})$, where Θ represents the basic parameters like weights, and $\hat{\Theta}$ represents adaptive parameters.

During the training, as illustrated in Figure 3, the output of a model with integrated kernels is:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}, \Theta, \text{Mul}(\hat{\Theta}; L, p)), \quad (10)$$

where $\text{Mul}(\cdot; \cdot, p)$ represents a *multinoulli* distribution, L is the number of layers of the CNN model, and $\hat{\Theta}^l$ denotes the parameters related to the kernel shape (square or circle) or size/radius (a) in each layer l . If we integrate N sets of receptive fields for each kernel, then we have N sets




Figure 3: Training the integrated kernels in the overall model. The adaptive parameters $\hat{\Theta} = \{\hat{\Theta}_1, \hat{\Theta}_2, \dots, \hat{\Theta}_N\}$ are picked randomly to train together with the essential weights Θ during the iterations.

of adaptive sub-parameters in each layer. $\hat{\Theta} = \{\hat{\Theta}^1, \dots, \hat{\Theta}^L, \dots, \hat{\Theta}^L\}$, $\hat{\Theta}^l = \{\hat{\Theta}_1^l, \hat{\Theta}_2^l, \dots, \hat{\Theta}_N^l\}$, and $p = \{p_1, \dots, p_n, \dots, p_N\}$ for the *multinoulli* distribution, and we let each $p_n = \frac{1}{N}$. Therefore, the overall model can be regarded as an ensemble of N^L sub-networks during the training phase. In our experiments, N is usually set to 2 and a larger N is discussed in the ablation study of Section 4.5.

3.5 Model Re-parameterization for the Inference

After the training phase, we integrate $\hat{\Theta}^l$ into weights Θ^l for each layer. Let $\hat{\Theta}^l = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \hat{\Theta}_n^l$, we have

$$\tilde{\Theta}^l = \Theta^l \cdot \hat{\Theta}^l, \quad (11)$$

where \cdot represents the matrix multiplication. Thus, the wrapped Θ of the network is $\tilde{\Theta} = \{\tilde{\Theta}^1, \tilde{\Theta}^2, \dots, \tilde{\Theta}^L\}$, and the prediction for each input x during the inference is:

$$y = \mathcal{F}(x, \tilde{\Theta}), \quad (12)$$

which is in the same format of Eq. (9). Because the integration operation is performed before the inference, the network takes no extra calculation in the testing phase.

4 Experiments and Discussions

4.1 Experimental Setup

We empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach on the image classification task using three standard datasets, CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet.

The two CIFAR datasets [14] consist of colored natural images in 32×32 pixels. The training and test sets contain 50,000 and 10,000 images respectively. We train the model for 200 epochs with batch size 128 using standard data augmentation [7, 10, 16, 18] (padding to 40×40 , random cropping, left-right flipping) and report the test accuracy at the final epoch. We evaluate the test accuracy five times for each dataset & model setting to reduce the variance.

The ILSVRC 2012 classification dataset [4], ImageNet, consists 1.2 million images for training, and 50,000 for validation with 1,000 classes. Following the common practice [7, 11, 10, 8], we adopt the standard data augmentations with batch size 256. We train the model for 90 epochs and 180 epochs, and report both the top-1 and top-5 accuracy of several typical CNN models and our corresponding circle or integrated versions on the validation set at the final epoch.

For the training of all the datasets, we utilize the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer with the momentum of 0.9 on Tesla V100. The learning rate initiates from 0.1 and gradually approaches zero following a half-cosine-function shaped schedule with a warm-up at the first five epochs. Unmentioned hyperparameters are the same as the original settings. The best result for each setting is highlighted in **bold**.

For each dataset, we evaluate our method on several representative CNN architectures: 1) VGG-16 [24], ResNet-56 [7], WRNCifar [28] and DenseNetCifar [10] for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100; 2) MobileNetV3-Small, MobileNetV3-Large [9] and ResNet-18 [7] for ImageNet.




Figure 4: The receptive fields of circle kernels in size $k \in \{3, 5, 7\}$. A larger circle kernel exhibits a more round receptive field.

Table 1: Accuracy (%) of the baselines with square kernels and the corresponding circle kernel versions in kernel size $k \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ on the CIFAR datasets using standard data augmentation (denoted as CIFAR-10+ and CIFAR-100+). With the increment of kernel size, the advantage of circle kernel over square kernel becomes more clear.

Model	CIFAR-10+			CIFAR-100+		
	Square	Circle	Top-1↑	Square	Circle	Top-1↑
WRNCifar (3×3)	95.79	95.79	0.00	79.30	78.94	-0.36
WRNCifar (5×5)	95.29	95.65	0.36	78.66	79.05	0.39
WRNCifar (7×7)	94.16	94.59	0.43	77.50	78.15	0.65
DenseNetCifar (3×3)	94.88	94.73	-0.15	77.03	77.11	0.09
DenseNetCifar (5×5)	94.56	95.03	0.47	76.73	76.92	0.19
DenseNetCifar (7×7)	94.20	94.73	0.53	76.33	76.83	0.50

4.2 Circle Kernels versus Square Kernels

One of the cornerstones of the rationality of using circle kernels is the isotropic property of the circle. However, a 3×3 circle kernel is not an actual circle as it only contains nine points. If we build the circle kernels in larger kernel size, as illustrated in Figure 4, we see that a larger circle kernel has a more round receptive field. We conjecture that if the circle kernels are helpful for deep learning tasks, then the larger circle kernels should exhibit a more significant advantage than the corresponding square kernels. As shown in Table 1, we augment WRNCifar [28], DenseNetCifar [10] and their circle kernel versions with larger kernel sizes. With the increment of kernel size, the performance of both the baselines and the corresponding circle kernel versions basically decreases, as the original neural network architecture is designed and hence optimized on 3×3 square kernel. However, the advantage of the circle kernels over square kernels becomes more significant, indicating the superiority of circle kernels.

4.3 Comparison on CIFAR Datasets

We then use the existing kernel size settings in various typical CNNs, and compare the performance of these CNNs with the counterpart versions of our integrated kernels on the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets: *XXX-Int-SC-F* for the integration of square and circle kernels with fixed size/radius, and *XXX-Int-SC-L* for the integration of square and circle kernels with learnable size/radius.

The results are presented in Table 2. We observe that under the setting without data augmentation, the performance of all the models using integrated kernels is consistently promoted on both datasets, on either the fixed size/radius integration or the learnable size/radius integration. The learnable integration version yields the best performance, outperforming the square version baselines by a clear margin: 1.76%, 1.23%, 1.31%, 0.71% on CIFAR-10, and 1.63%, 3.40%, 1.34%, 1.39% on CIFAR-100.

We conjecture that the performance improvements stem from the following three aspects. First, the integrated kernels in each layer enable the network to behave like an ensemble model of multiple sub-networks, improving the generalization by avoiding overfitting. Next, the model with integrated kernels randomly picks and updates the transformation matrix of one of the kernels but keeps the

Table 2: Accuracy (%) of typical CNNs with standard square kernels, and the corresponding versions with circle kernels or integrated kernels on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, without data augmentation (CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100) and with standard data augmentation (CIFAR-10+, CIFAR-100+). Here *XXX-Int-SC-F* indicates the integration of square and circle kernels with fixed size/radius, and *XXX-Int-SC-L* indicates the integration of square and circle kernels with learnable size/radius.

Model	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-10+	CIFAR-100	CIFAR-100+
VGG-16	88.35	94.07	64.15	74.61
VGG-16-Int-SC-F	89.71	94.07	65.68	74.56
VGG-16-Int-SC-L	90.11	94.13	65.78	74.78
ResNet-56	87.93	93.81	58.18	72.19
ResNet-56-Int-SC-F	88.51	93.00	61.36	71.91
ResNet-56-Int-SC-L	89.16	93.95	61.58	72.37
WRNCifar	87.99	95.79	66.65	79.30
WRNCifar-Int-SC-F	88.95	95.61	67.64	78.88
WRNCifar-Int-SC-L	89.30	95.81	67.99	79.47
DenseNetCifar	91.10	94.88	69.54	77.03
DenseNetCifar-Int-SC-F	91.45	94.59	70.52	77.01
DenseNetCifar-Int-SC-L	91.81	95.01	70.93	76.89

shared weight matrices trained at every iteration. During the training, the intensified optimization on the shared weights guarantees the essential performance of the model, and the switch between different transformation matrices helps the model jump out of local optimum to facilitate the diversification. Another understanding is that the multiple transformation matrices interacting with the input feature maps of each layer actually generate multiple sets of wrapped feature maps, which is equivalent to performing some kind of data augmentation on each layer. This explanation can also help us understand the degradation of improvement under the setting with standard data augmentation.

4.4 Comparison on ImageNet

As many real-world applications are under the constraint of limited computational resources and the demand for real-time inference, we choose two streamlined CNNs, ResNet-18 [7] and MobileNetV3 [9] as our baseline models. ResNet is one of the most representative CNNs. MobileNetV3 is the latest version of the famous MobileNet series and it is tuned to mobile phones through a combination of hardware-aware network architecture search and then subsequently improved through novel architecture advances. It is designed for limited computational resources and the demand for real-time inference. MobileNetV3 has two MobileNet models: MobileNetV3-Small and MobileNetV3-Large, targeted for relatively low and high resource use cases. The results are presented in Table 3⁴.

- On the MobileNetV3-Small (Mobile-S) model, we observe that either the circle kernel version or the integrated kernel versions could significantly boost the performance with standard data augmentation. Take the integrated kernels (*Int-SC-F*) as an example, we have the improvements of **5.07%** top-1 accuracy and **3.28%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 90 epochs, and **5.20%** top-1 accuracy and **3.39%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 180 epochs.
- On the MobileNetV3-Large (Mobile-L) model, the performance is also significantly improved by either the circle kernel version or the integrated kernel versions. Take the integrated kernels (*Int-SC-L*) as an example, we have the improvements of **2.18%** top-1 accuracy and **1.17%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 90 epochs, and **2.16%** top-1 accuracy and **1.18%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 180 epochs.
- On the ResNet-18 model, the circle kernel version and the integrated kernel versions also exhibit competitive performance. Take the integrated kernels (*Int-SC-L*) as an example, we have the improvements of **0.50%** top-1 accuracy and **0.34%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 90 epochs, and **0.19%** top-1 accuracy and **0.10%** top-5 accuracy after trained for 180 epochs.

⁴A few results are better than the results in the original submission under review, because the corresponding models are not fully converged at the submission deadline. The pre-trained models are available at: <https://github.com/JHL-HUST/CircleConvNet/>.

Table 3: Accuracy (%) of typical CNNs, MobileNetV3-Small (Mobile-S), MobileNetV3-Large (Mobile-L) and ResNet-18, with standard square kernels and the corresponding versions with circle kernels or integrated kernels on ImageNet dataset. *Square* and *Circle* indicate the existing CNNs with square kernels and the counterpart CNNs with circle kernels, respectively. *Int-SC-F* and *Int-SC-L* indicate the integration of square and circle kernels with fixed or learnable size, respectively. To simplify the calculation, we fix the shape of 5×5 kernels to circles but only change the 3×3 kernel shape in the circle or integrated kernel versions.

Kernel	Epochs	Mobile-S		Mobile-L		ResNet-18	
		Top-1	Top-5	Top-1	Top-5	Top-1	Top-5
<i>Square</i>	90	65.44	86.24	72.77	91.10	70.23	89.63
<i>Circle</i>	90	70.50	89.54	74.48	91.98	70.23	89.54
<i>Int_SC_F</i>	90	70.51	89.52	74.50	92.00	70.54	89.85
<i>Int_SC_L</i>	90	70.06	89.34	74.95	92.27	70.73	89.97
<i>Square</i>	180	66.19	86.73	73.25	91.21	71.12	90.13
<i>Circle</i>	180	71.32	90.13	75.40	92.41	71.00	90.10
<i>Int_SC_F</i>	180	71.39	90.12	75.59	92.35	71.04	90.04
<i>Int_SC_L</i>	180	71.41	90.01	75.41	92.39	71.31	90.23

The performance improvements are closely related to the structure of the baseline models. Most of the convolutional layers in MobileNetV3-Small are composed of kernels in size 5×5 , part of the convolutional layers in MobileNetV3-Large consists of kernels in size 5×5 , and all the kernels in ResNet-18 are in size 3×3 . As discussed in Section 4.2, our approach is in favor of larger kernels, whose receptive field is more isotropic, meanwhile the differences to the corresponding square kernels are more distinct. The 3×3 kernels have become the mainstream of the CNN units since VGG [24] proposed that larger kernels can be replaced by several 3×3 kernels using fewer parameters. However, in recent years, the functions of larger kernels are considered underestimated because most models generated by neural architecture search [31, 19, 27, 23] contain large kernels, and ProxylessNAS [1] argues that larger kernels are beneficial for CNNs to preserve more information when we do downsampling.

From the results, we also observe that the main improvement originates from replacing square kernels with circle kernels, achieving 5.13% top-1 accuracy and 3.40% top-5 accuracy on MobileNetV3-Small and 2.15% top-1 accuracy and 1.20% top-5 accuracy on MobileNetV3-Large after trained for 180 epochs. It indicates that even the models with purely circle kernels are very powerful. Note that MobileNetV3 is built by network architecture search on square kernels. Therefore, it is possible to achieve more remarkable improvement if the network architecture search is applied to CNNs with circle kernels.

4.5 Ablation Studies

We take WRNcifar on CIFAR datasets as an example, and carry out several ablation studies to understand the contribution of each component in our approach.

In Table 4, the integrated kernels enable the model to learn N sets of square and circle kernels with various radii. As the kernels are fixed in two shapes and only the size/radius is learnable, we set $N \in \{2, 4, 6\}$. The results on *Int_SC_2L* and *Int_SC_F* show that for a pair of square and circle kernels, the learnable size/radius could considerably boost the performance. With the increment in the number of integrated kernels, the model performance exhibits an increasing trend for the training without data argumentation. Though the standard data argumentation also helps our approach significantly, it boosts the standard kernel version more and makes almost no difference in the performance on CIFAR-10+ and CIFAR-100+. Maybe there exists some other possible data argumentation methods that fit nicely on the circle kernels, for which we will explore in future work.

4.6 Visualizing the Saliency Maps

We would like to investigate the features that the models actually learn for circle kernels and square kernels. Taking the MobileNetV3-Small model as an example, and following the work of [29, 26],

Table 4: Accuracy (%) of standard WRNCifar and the corresponding versions with circle kernels or integrated kernels on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with or without data augmentation.

Model	Kernel	CIFAR-10	CIFAR-10+	CIFAR-100	CIFAR-100+
WRNCifar	<i>Square</i>	87.99	95.79	66.65	79.30
	<i>Circle</i>	87.31	95.79	67.22	78.94
	<i>Int_SC_F</i>	88.95	95.61	67.64	78.88
	<i>Int_SC_2L</i>	89.30	95.81	67.99	79.47
	<i>Int_SC_4L</i>	88.87	95.90	68.00	79.29
	<i>Int_SC_6L</i>	91.49	95.63	68.16	79.35




Figure 5: Saliency maps of the network models using square and circle kernels on the sampled images of ImageNet, which are correctly classified by both models. For each group of images, we show the original image, and the saliency maps of model with square kernels and the counterpart model with circle kernels sequentially.

we generate saliency maps using *SmoothGrad* [25] to characterize the importance of each pixel on the samples of ImageNet. As illustrated in Figure 5, both square and circle kernels basically capture the features of global structure of the target objects on the images. However, circle kernels can capture more precise contours of the objects (Figure 5 (a)), separate multiple objects of the same class more clearly (Figure 5 (b)) and pay less attention to irrelevant feature information of other object unrelated to the label (Figure 5 (c)).

5 Conclusion

In this work, we propose new types of kernels for the convolution operation in convolutional neural networks (CNNs). Inspired by the fact that the receptive field in the human visual system is isotropic like circles, we propose circle kernels for the convolution operation, and extract the corresponding transformation matrix from the weight matrix. In this way, our training takes similar amount of calculation time when compared with the counterpart CNN with square kernels.

We then propose a kernel boosting strategy that integrates circle kernels with square kernels, which keeps the fixed transformation matrix separably but share the weight matrix to be trained in the training stage. We further allow the kernel size/radius to be learnable and thus the transformation matrix is randomly picked and trained while the shared matrix is trained at each iteration. Experiments using existing typical CNNs on three standard datasets show that our strategy could significantly promote the classification performance. Note that for circle kernels or integrated kernels, we combine various learned kernels before the inference using the re-parameterization method, thus taking no extra computation as well as the number of parameters in the testing stage.

In future work, it is possible to design new CNN architectures and find some other data argumentation strategies that are more favorable to the proposed circle kernels and the integrated kernel boosting strategy. We hope our work inspire more researches in this direction.

References

- [1] Han Cai, Ligeng Zhu, and Song Han. ProxylessNAS: Direct neural architecture search on target task and hardware. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [2] Shaofeng Cai, Yao Shu, and Wei Wang. Dynamic routing networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 3588–3597, 2021.
- [3] Jifeng Dai, Haozhi Qi, Yuwen Xiong, Yi Li, Guodong Zhang, Han Hu, and Yichen Wei. Deformable convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 764–773, 2017.
- [4] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009.
- [5] David Eigen, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning factored representations in a deep mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4314*, 2013.
- [6] Hang Gao, Xizhou Zhu, Stephen Lin, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable kernels: Adapting effective receptive fields for object deformation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [7] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [8] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 630–645, 2016.
- [9] Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Grace Chu, Liang-Chieh Chen, Bo Chen, Mingxing Tan, Weijun Wang, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Vijay Vasudevan, et al. Searching for mobilenetv3. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1314–1324, 2019.
- [10] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- [11] Gao Huang, Yu Sun, Zhuang Liu, Daniel Sedra, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Deep networks with stochastic depth. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 646–661, 2016.
- [12] Robert A Jacobs, Michael I Jordan, Steven J Nowlan, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural Computation*, 3(1):79–87, 1991.
- [13] Yunho Jeon and Junmo Kim. Active convolution: Learning the shape of convolution for image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4201–4209, 2017.
- [14] Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Tech Report*, 2009.
- [15] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25:1097–1105, 2012.
- [16] Gustav Larsson, Michael Maire, and Gregory Shakhnarovich. Fractalnet: Ultra-deep neural networks without residuals. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [17] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [18] Chen-Yu Lee, Saining Xie, Patrick Gallagher, Zhengyou Zhang, and Zhuowen Tu. Deeply-supervised nets. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 562–570, 2015.
- [19] Chenxi Liu, Barret Zoph, Maxim Neumann, Jonathon Shlens, Wei Hua, Li-Jia Li, Li Fei-Fei, Alan Yuille, Jonathan Huang, and Kevin Murphy. Progressive neural architecture search. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 19–34, 2018.
- [20] Wenjie Luo, Yujia Li, Raquel Urtasun, and Richard Zemel. Understanding the effective receptive field in deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29, pages 4898–4906, 2016.
- [21] Wenjie Luo, Yujia Li, Raquel Urtasun, and Richard Zemel. Understanding the effective receptive field in deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4898–4906, 2016.
- [22] Ravi Teja Mullapudi, William R Mark, Noam Shazeer, and Kayvon Fatahalian. Hydranets: Specialized dynamic architectures for efficient inference. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8080–8089, 2018.

- [23] Niv Nayman, Asaf Noy, Tal Ridnik, Itamar Friedman, Rong Jin, and Lihi Zelnik-Manor. XNAS: neural architecture search with expert advice. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d'Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019*, pages 1975–1985, 2019.
- [24] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [25] Daniel Smilkov, Nikhil Thorat, Been Kim, Fernanda Viégas, and Martin Wattenberg. Smoothgrad: removing noise by adding noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03825*, 2017.
- [26] Chuanbiao Song, Kun He, Jiadong Lin, Liwei Wang, and John E. Hopcroft. Robust local features for improving the generalization of adversarial training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [27] Yuhui Xu, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Xin Chen, Guo-Jun Qi, Qi Tian, and Hongkai Xiong. PC-DARTS: partial channel connections for memory-efficient architecture search. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [28] Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. Wide residual networks. In *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)*, pages 87.1–87.12, September 2016.
- [29] Tianyuan Zhang and Zhanxing Zhu. Interpreting adversarially trained convolutional neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7502–7511, 2019.
- [30] Xizhou Zhu, Han Hu, Stephen Lin, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable convnets v2: More deformable, better results. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9308–9316, 2019.
- [31] Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8697–8710, 2018.

A Theoretical Analysis on the Transformation Matrix

In Section 3.3, we use the transformation matrix of bilinear interpolation with values inside the standard square receptive field to simplify the calculation. In this section we provide theoretical analysis on the actual effect of the transformation matrix.

For simplicity, we omit both subscripts related to positions and let \odot represent the convolution operation throughout this section. Let $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$, $\mathbf{O} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$ and \mathbf{A} represent an input feature map, an output feature map and the transformation matrix of bilinear interpolation, respectively. Then, the squared value of a change on the output $\Delta \mathbf{O} = \mathbf{O}^{t+1} - \mathbf{O}^t$ can be calculated as:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{O}\|^2 = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{I})^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W} (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{I}), \quad (13)$$

where $\Delta \mathbf{W}$ is defined as $\mathbf{W}^{t+1} - \mathbf{W}^t$. Here the magnitude of $\Delta \mathbf{O}$ is determined by the interaction between $\Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{I}$, while $\Delta \hat{\mathbf{O}}$ of the traditional convolutional layers is determined by $\Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}$ and \mathbf{I} . So the transformation matrix \mathbf{A} actually warps the receptive field, and Eq. (13) can be transferred to:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{O}\|^2 = \mathbf{I}^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{I}. \quad (14)$$

Here the magnitude of $\Delta \mathbf{O}$ is determined by $\mathbf{A}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$, while $\Delta \hat{\mathbf{O}}$ of traditional convolutional layers is determined by $\Delta \mathbf{W}^\top \Delta \mathbf{W}$. So the transformation matrix \mathbf{A} can also be regarded as warping the kernel space. From Eq. (13) and Eq. (14), we can conclude that the transformation matrix \mathbf{A} affects the gradient descents and establishes a connection between the receptive field and the corresponding weights of the kernel.

B Visualization on the Size/Radius of the Learned Kernels

As shown in the experiments, the integrated kernels with learnable size/radius show favorable performance. As mentioned in Section 3.3, in the integrated kernels with learnable size/radius, the size/radius of each kernel is shared by all the input channels but exclusive for each output channel, and it is determined by the learnable variable a . Here we visualize the mean value for the learned size/radius of all the kernels on each convolutional layer of ResNet-18, which consists of 16 3×3 convolutional layers. As illustrated in Figure 6, the mean value is similar between square kernels and circle kernels for each convolutional layer, and they are all around the original value of $a = 1$.




Figure 6: Statistics on the average size/radius of the learned kernels of ResNet-18 on ImageNet.