

# **EfficientNet:**

## **Rethinking Model Scaling for Convolutional Neural Networks**

Mingxing Tan, Quoc V. Le

박태우


# Introduction

- 최근 Convolutional Network의 성능을 높이기 위해 width,depth 또는 resolution을 늘렸음.
- 그래서 SOTA 네트워크의 경우 이전보다 더 많은 parameter를 필요로 함.

Year	Network	Accuracy	Parameter
2014	GoogLeNet	74.8%	6.8M
2017	SENet	82.7%	145M
2018	GPipe	84.3%	557M


- 3가지 scaling 중 방법에 대한 정확한 가이드라인이 존재하지 않았음.
- 본 논문에서는 단순히 scaling up하는 것보다 3가지 scaling의 balance에 초점을 맞춤.

# Introduction



본 논문에서 제안하는 balance를 맞추며  
3가지 요소를 모두 scaling한 모델

# Compound Model Scaling



**Figure 3. Scaling Up a Baseline Model with Different Network Width ( $w$ ), Depth ( $d$ ), and Resolution ( $r$ ) Coefficients.** Bigger networks with larger width, depth, or resolution tend to achieve higher accuracy, but the accuracy gain quickly saturate after reaching 80%, demonstrating the limitation of single dimension scaling. Baseline network is described in Table 1.

- Width, Depth, Resolution 각각의 값만을 변화시키며 accuracy를 측정하는 실험을 함.
- 3가지 scaling factor 모두 accuracy의 변화율이 점점 작아지면서 saturation 되는 것을 확인할 수 있음.


# Compound Model Scaling

앞의 실험을 통해 다음과 같은 결론을 얻음.

**Observation 1** – Scaling up any dimension of network width, depth, or resolution improves accuracy, but the accuracy gain diminishes for bigger models.

# Compound Model Scaling

직관적으로 생각했을 때, image의 resolution이 커짐에 따라 fine-grained patterns를 알기 위해 depth 또는 width도 같이 증가해야한다. 그래서 다음과 같은 실험을 함.



**Figure 4. Scaling Network Width for Different Baseline Networks.** Each dot in a line denotes a model with different width coefficient ( $w$ ). All baseline networks are from Table 1. The first baseline network ( $d=1.0, r=1.0$ ) has 18 convolutional layers with resolution 224x224, while the last baseline ( $d=2.0, r=1.3$ ) has 36 layers with resolution 299x299.

- depth 와 resolution의 값을 고정시킨 뒤 width의 값만 증가시켜 accuracy를 측정함.
- 기본 base인 (a)의 성능에서 scaling factor를 함께 증가함에 따라 accuracy가 더 높게 측정되었음.
- 특히 (b)와 (c)의 경우 depth보다 resolution을 width와 함께 올리는 경우 더욱 높은 accuracy를 보임을 확인할 수 있음.

# Compound Model Scaling

앞의 실험을 통해 다음과 같은 결론을 얻음.

**Observation 2** – In order to pursue better accuracy and efficiency, it is critical to balance all dimensions of network width, depth, and resolution during ConvNet scaling.

# Compound Scaling Method

$$\text{depth: } d = \alpha^\phi$$

$$\text{width: } w = \beta^\phi$$

$$\text{resolution: } r = \gamma^\phi$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha \cdot \beta^2 \cdot \gamma^2 \approx 2$$

$$\alpha \geq 1, \beta \geq 1, \gamma \geq 1$$

$\beta$ 와  $\gamma$ 가 제공된 이유는  
width를 늘림에 따라 conv filter는  $(W \times H \times nC \times nC')$ 의 크기를 가지고  
resolution의 경우  $(nW \times nH)$ 의 크기를 가지기 때문.

-  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ 의 값으로 scaling factor들 간의 **balance**를 조정,  $\phi$  값으로 모델의 **size**를 결정.

Step 1.

$\phi$  값을 1로 고정한 뒤 grid search를 통해  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ 의 **best value**를 찾음.  
(EfficientNet-B0 network 기준  $\alpha=1.2$   $\beta=1.1$   $\gamma=1.15$ 의 값을 가짐.)

Step 2.

위에서 구한  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ 의 **best value**를 고정,  $\phi$  값을 늘려 원하는 모델의 size를 늘림.



# EfficientNet Architecture

- 기본 baseline network의 성능에 따라 compound scaling의 결과 또한 달라지기 때문에 좋은 baseline network를 찾는 것이 중요함.
- 본 논문에서는 MnasNet과 거의 유사한 network인 **EfficientNet-B0**를 AutoML을 통해 생성.
- 기존의 MnasNet과 다른점이라면, EfficientNet은 특정 H/W를 타겟으로 하지 않기 때문에, latency보다 FLOPS를 최적화함.

**Table 1. EfficientNet-B0 baseline network** – Each row describes a stage  $i$  with  $\hat{L}_i$  layers, with input resolution  $\langle \hat{H}_i, \hat{W}_i \rangle$  and output channels  $\hat{C}_i$ . Notations are adopted from equation 2.

Stage $i$	Operator $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$	Resolution $\hat{H}_i \times \hat{W}_i$	#Channels $\hat{C}_i$	#Layers $\hat{L}_i$
1	Conv3x3	$224 \times 224$	32	1
2	MBConv1, k3x3	$112 \times 112$	16	1
3	MBConv6, k3x3	$112 \times 112$	24	2
4	MBConv6, k5x5	$56 \times 56$	40	2
5	MBConv6, k3x3	$28 \times 28$	80	3
6	MBConv6, k5x5	$14 \times 14$	112	3
7	MBConv6, k5x5	$14 \times 14$	192	4
8	MBConv6, k3x3	$7 \times 7$	320	1
9	Conv1x1 & Pooling & FC	$7 \times 7$	1280	1

# Result

Table 2. **EfficientNet Performance Results on ImageNet** (Russakovsky et al., 2015). All EfficientNet models are scaled from our baseline EfficientNet-B0 using different compound coefficient  $\phi$  in Equation 3. ConvNets with similar top-1/top-5 accuracy are grouped together for efficiency comparison. Our scaled EfficientNet models consistently reduce parameters and FLOPS by an order of magnitude (up to 8.4x parameter reduction and up to 16x FLOPS reduction) than existing ConvNets.

Model	Top-1 Acc.	Top-5 Acc.	#Params	Ratio-to-EfficientNet	#FLOPS	Ratio-to-EfficientNet
<b>EfficientNet-B0</b>	<b>77.3%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>5.3M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>0.39B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNet-50 (He et al., 2016)	76.0%	93.0%	26M	4.9x	4.1B	11x
DenseNet-169 (Huang et al., 2017)	76.2%	93.2%	14M	2.6x	3.5B	8.9x
<b>EfficientNet-B1</b>	<b>79.2%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>	<b>7.8M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>0.70B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNet-152 (He et al., 2016)	77.8%	93.8%	60M	7.6x	11B	16x
DenseNet-264 (Huang et al., 2017)	77.9%	93.9%	34M	4.3x	6.0B	8.6x
Inception-v3 (Szegedy et al., 2016)	78.8%	94.4%	24M	3.0x	5.7B	8.1x
Xception (Chollet, 2017)	79.0%	94.5%	23M	3.0x	8.4B	12x
<b>EfficientNet-B2</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>9.2M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>1.0B</b>	<b>1x</b>
Inception-v4 (Szegedy et al., 2017)	80.0%	95.0%	48M	5.2x	13B	13x
Inception-resnet-v2 (Szegedy et al., 2017)	80.1%	95.1%	56M	6.1x	13B	13x
<b>EfficientNet-B3</b>	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>12M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>1.8B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNeXt-101 (Xie et al., 2017)	80.9%	95.6%	84M	7.0x	32B	18x
PolyNet (Zhang et al., 2017)	81.3%	95.8%	92M	7.7x	35B	19x
<b>EfficientNet-B4</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>19M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>4.2B</b>	<b>1x</b>
SENet (Hu et al., 2018)	82.7%	96.2%	146M	7.7x	42B	10x
NASNet-A (Zoph et al., 2018)	82.7%	96.2%	89M	4.7x	24B	5.7x
AmoebaNet-A (Real et al., 2019)	82.8%	96.1%	87M	4.6x	23B	5.5x
PNASNet (Liu et al., 2018)	82.9%	96.2%	86M	4.5x	23B	6.0x
<b>EfficientNet-B5</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>30M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>9.9B</b>	<b>1x</b>
AmoebaNet-C (Cubuk et al., 2019)	83.5%	96.5%	155M	5.2x	41B	4.1x
<b>EfficientNet-B6</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>43M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>19B</b>	<b>1x</b>
<b>EfficientNet-B7</b>	<b>84.4%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>66M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>37B</b>	<b>1x</b>
GPipe (Huang et al., 2018)	84.3%	97.0%	557M	8.4x	-	-

We omit ensemble and multi-crop models (Hu et al., 2018), or models pretrained on 3.5B Instagram images (Mahajan et al., 2018).

# Result

Table 2. **EfficientNet Performance Results on ImageNet** (Russakovsky et al., 2015). All EfficientNet models are scaled from our baseline EfficientNet-B0 using different compound coefficient  $\phi$  in Equation 3. ConvNets with similar top-1/top-5 accuracy are grouped together for efficiency comparison. Our scaled EfficientNet models consistently reduce parameters and FLOPS by an order of magnitude (up to 8.4x parameter reduction and up to 16x FLOPS reduction) than existing ConvNets.

Model	Top-1 Acc.	Top-5 Acc.	#Params	Ratio-to-EfficientNet	#FLOPS	Ratio-to-EfficientNet
<b>EfficientNet-B0</b>	<b>77.3%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>5.3M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>0.39B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNet-50 (He et al., 2016)	76.0%	93.0%	26M	4.9x	4.1B	11x
DenseNet-169 (Huang et al., 2017)	76.2%	93.2%	14M	2.6x	3.5B	8.9x
<b>EfficientNet-B1</b>	<b>79.2%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>	<b>7.8M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>0.70B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNet-152 (He et al., 2016)	77.8%	93.8%	60M	7.6x	11B	16x
DenseNet-264 (Huang et al., 2017)	77.9%	93.9%	34M	4.3x	6.0B	8.6x
Inception-v3 (Szegedy et al., 2016)	78.8%	94.4%	24M	3.0x	5.7B	8.1x
Xception (Chollet, 2017)	79.0%	94.5%	23M	3.0x	8.4B	12x
<b>EfficientNet-B2</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	<b>9.2M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>1.0B</b>	<b>1x</b>
Inception-v4 (Szegedy et al., 2017)	80.0%	95.0%	48M	5.2x	13B	13x
Inception-resnet-v2 (Szegedy et al., 2017)	80.1%	95.1%	56M	6.1x	13B	13x
<b>EfficientNet-B3</b>	<b>81.7%</b>	<b>95.6%</b>	<b>12M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>1.8B</b>	<b>1x</b>
ResNeXt-101 (Xie et al., 2017)	80.9%	95.6%	84M	7.0x	32B	18x
PolyNet (Zhang et al., 2017)	81.3%	95.8%	92M	7.7x	35B	19x
<b>EfficientNet-B4</b>	<b>83.0%</b>	<b>96.3%</b>	<b>19M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>4.2B</b>	<b>1x</b>
SENet (Hu et al., 2018)	82.7%	96.2%	146M	7.7x	42B	10x
NASNet-A (Zoph et al., 2018)	82.7%	96.2%	89M	4.7x	24B	5.7x
AmoebaNet-A (Real et al., 2019)	82.8%	96.1%	87M	4.6x	23B	5.5x
PNASNet (Liu et al., 2018)	82.9%	96.2%	86M	4.5x	23B	6.0x
<b>EfficientNet-B5</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>30M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>9.9B</b>	<b>1x</b>
AmoebaNet-C (Cubuk et al., 2019)	83.5%	96.5%	155M	5.2x	41B	4.1x
<b>EfficientNet-B6</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>43M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>19B</b>	<b>1x</b>
<b>EfficientNet-B7</b>	<b>84.4%</b>	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>66M</b>	<b>1x</b>	<b>37B</b>	<b>1x</b>
GPipe (Huang et al., 2018)	84.3%	97.0%	557M	8.4x	-	-

We omit ensemble and multi-crop models (Hu et al., 2018), or models pretrained on 3.5B Instagram images (Mahajan et al., 2018).

# Result

Table 3. Scaling Up MobileNets and ResNet.

Model	FLOPS	Top-1 Acc.
Baseline MobileNetV1 (Howard et al., 2017)	0.6B	70.6%
Scale MobileNetV1 by width ( $w=2$ )	2.2B	74.2%
Scale MobileNetV1 by resolution ( $r=2$ )	2.2B	72.7%
<b>compound scale (<math>d=1.4, w=1.2, r=1.3</math>)</b>	<b>2.3B</b>	<b>75.6%</b>
Baseline MobileNetV2 (Sandler et al., 2018)	0.3B	72.0%
Scale MobileNetV2 by depth ( $d=4$ )	1.2B	76.8%
Scale MobileNetV2 by width ( $w=2$ )	1.1B	76.4%
Scale MobileNetV2 by resolution ( $r=2$ )	1.2B	74.8%
<b>MobileNetV2 compound scale</b>	<b>1.3B</b>	<b>77.4%</b>
Baseline ResNet-50 (He et al., 2016)	4.1B	76.0%
Scale ResNet-50 by depth ( $d=4$ )	16.2B	78.1%
Scale ResNet-50 by width ( $w=2$ )	14.7B	77.7%
Scale ResNet-50 by resolution ( $r=2$ )	16.4B	77.5%
<b>ResNet-50 compound scale</b>	<b>16.7B</b>	<b>78.8%</b>

Table 4. Inference Latency Comparison – Latency is measured with batch size 1 on a single core of Intel Xeon CPU E5-2690.

	Acc. @ Latency		Acc. @ Latency
ResNet-152	77.8% @ 0.554s	GPipe	84.3% @ 19.0s
EfficientNet-B1	78.8% @ 0.098s	EfficientNet-B7	84.4% @ 3.1s
<b>Speedup</b>	<b>5.7x</b>	<b>Speedup</b>	<b>6.1x</b>




Figure 5. FLOPS vs. ImageNet Accuracy – Similar to Figure 1 except it compares FLOPS rather than model size.



# Result

**Table 5. EfficientNet Performance Results on Transfer Learning Datasets.** Our scaled EfficientNet models achieve new state-of-the-art accuracy for 5 out of 8 datasets, with 9.6x fewer parameters on average.


	Comparison to best public-available results						Comparison to best reported results					
	Model	Acc.	#Param	Our Model	Acc.	#Param(ratio)	Model	Acc.	#Param	Our Model	Acc.	#Param(ratio)
CIFAR-10	NASNet-A	98.0%	85M	EfficientNet-B0	98.1%	4M (21x)	<sup>†</sup> Gpipe	<b>99.0%</b>	556M	EfficientNet-B7	98.9%	64M (8.7x)
CIFAR-100	NASNet-A	87.5%	85M	EfficientNet-B0	88.1%	4M (21x)	Gpipe	91.3%	556M	EfficientNet-B7	<b>91.7%</b>	64M (8.7x)
Birdsnap	Inception-v4	81.8%	41M	EfficientNet-B5	82.0%	28M (1.5x)	Gpipe	83.6%	556M	EfficientNet-B7	<b>84.3%</b>	64M (8.7x)
Stanford Cars	Inception-v4	93.4%	41M	EfficientNet-B3	93.6%	10M (4.1x)	<sup>‡</sup> DAT	<b>94.8%</b>	-	EfficientNet-B7	94.7%	-
Flowers	Inception-v4	98.5%	41M	EfficientNet-B5	98.5%	28M (1.5x)	DAT	97.7%	-	EfficientNet-B7	<b>98.8%</b>	-
FGVC Aircraft	Inception-v4	90.9%	41M	EfficientNet-B3	90.7%	10M (4.1x)	DAT	92.9%	-	EfficientNet-B7	<b>92.9%</b>	-
Oxford-IIIT Pets	ResNet-152	94.5%	58M	EfficientNet-B4	94.8%	17M (5.6x)	Gpipe	<b>95.9%</b>	556M	EfficientNet-B6	95.4%	41M (14x)
Food-101	Inception-v4	90.8%	41M	EfficientNet-B4	91.5%	17M (2.4x)	Gpipe	93.0%	556M	EfficientNet-B7	<b>93.0%</b>	64M (8.7x)
Geo-Mean	<b>(4.7x)</b>						<b>(9.6x)</b>					

<sup>†</sup>Gpipe (Huang et al., 2018) trains giant models with specialized pipeline parallelism library.

<sup>‡</sup>DAT denotes domain adaptive transfer learning (Ngiam et al., 2018). Here we only compare ImageNet-based transfer learning results.

Transfer accuracy and #params for NASNet (Zoph et al., 2018), Inception-v4 (Szegedy et al., 2017), ResNet-152 (He et al., 2016) are from (Kornblith et al., 2019).

# Result



**Figure 7. Class Activation Map (CAM) (Zhou et al., 2016) for Models with different scaling methods-** Our compound scaling method allows the scaled model (last column) to focus on more relevant regions with more object details. Model details are in Table 7.

# Reference

<https://hoya012.github.io/blog/EfficientNet-review/>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vhz0quyvR7I&t=2s>