

# YOLOX: Exceeding YOLO Series in 2021

Zheng Ge\* Songtao Liu\*† Feng Wang Zeming Li Jian Sun  
Megvii Technology

{gezhen, liusongtao, wangfeng02, lizeming, sunjian}@megvii.com




Figure 1: Speed-accuracy trade-off of accurate models (top) and Size-accuracy curve of lite models on mobile devices (bottom) for YOLOX and other state-of-the-art object detectors.

## Abstract

In this report, we present some experienced improvements to YOLO series, forming a new high-performance detector—YOLOX. We switch the YOLO detector to an anchor-free manner and conduct other advanced detection techniques, i.e., a decoupled head and the leading label assignment strategy SimOTA to achieve state-of-the-art results across a large scale range of models: For YOLO-Nano with only 0.91M parameters and 1.08G FLOPs, we get 25.3% AP on COCO, surpassing NanoDet by 1.8% AP; for YOLOv3, one of the most widely used detectors in industry, we boost it to 47.3% AP on COCO, outperforming the current best practice by 3.0% AP; for YOLOX-L with roughly the same amount of parameters as YOLOv4-CSP, YOLOv5-L, we achieve 50.0% AP on COCO at a speed of 68.9 FPS on Tesla V100, exceeding YOLOv5-L by 1.8% AP. Further, we won the 1st Place on Streaming Perception Challenge (Workshop on Autonomous Driving at CVPR 2021) using a single YOLOX-L model. We hope this report can provide useful experience for developers and

researchers in practical scenes, and we also provide deploy versions with ONNX, TensorRT, NCNN, and Openvino supported. Source code is at <https://github.com/Megvii-BaseDetection/YOLOX>.

## 1. Introduction

With the development of object detection, YOLO series [23, 24, 25, 1, 7] always pursuit the optimal speed and accuracy trade-off for real-time applications. They extract the most advanced detection technologies available at the time (e.g., anchors [26] for YOLOv2 [24], Residual Net [9] for YOLOv3 [25]) and optimize the implementation for best practice. Currently, YOLOv5 [7] holds the best trade-off performance with 48.2% AP on COCO at 13.7 ms.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, over the past two years, the major advances in object detection academia have focused on anchor-free detectors [29, 40, 14], advanced label assignment strategies [37, 36, 12, 41, 22, 4], and end-to-end (NMS-free) detectors [2, 32, 39]. These have not been integrated into YOLO families yet, as YOLOv4 and YOLOv5

\* Equal contribution.

† Corresponding author.

<sup>1</sup>We choose the YOLOv5-L model at 640 × 640 resolution and test the model with FP16-precision and batch=1 on a V100 to align the settings of YOLOv4 [1] and YOLOv4-CSP [30] for a fair comparison

are still anchor-based detectors with hand-crafted assigning rules for training.

That’s what brings us here, delivering those recent advancements to YOLO series with experienced optimization. Considering YOLOv4 and YOLOv5 may be a little over-optimized for the anchor-based pipeline, we choose YOLOv3 [25] as our start point (we set YOLOv3-SPP as the default YOLOv3). Indeed, YOLOv3 is still one of the most widely used detectors in the industry due to the limited computation resources and the insufficient software support in various practical applications.

As shown in Fig. 1, with the experienced updates of the above techniques, we boost the YOLOv3 to 47.3% AP (YOLOX-DarkNet53) on COCO with  $640 \times 640$  resolution, surpassing the current best practice of YOLOv3 (44.3% AP, ultralytics version<sup>2</sup>) by a large margin. Moreover, when switching to the advanced YOLOv5 architecture that adopts an advanced CSPNet [31] backbone and an additional PAN [19] head, YOLOX-L achieves 50.0% AP on COCO with  $640 \times 640$  resolution, outperforming the counterpart YOLOv5-L by 1.8% AP. We also test our design strategies on models of small size. YOLOX-Tiny and YOLOX-Nano (only 0.91M Parameters and 1.08G FLOPs) outperform the corresponding counterparts YOLOv4-Tiny and NanoDet<sup>3</sup> by 10% AP and 1.8% AP, respectively.

We have released our code at <https://github.com/Megvii-BaseDetection/YOLOX>, with ONNX, TensorRT, NCNN and Openvino supported. One more thing worth mentioning, we won the 1st Place on Streaming Perception Challenge (Workshop on Autonomous Driving at CVPR 2021) using a single YOLOX-L model.

## 2. YOLOX

### 2.1. YOLOX-DarkNet53

We choose YOLOv3 [25] with Darknet53 as our baseline. In the following part, we will walk through the whole system designs in YOLOX step by step.

**Implementation details** Our training settings are mostly consistent from the baseline to our final model. We train the models for a total of 300 epochs with 5 epochs warm-up on COCO *train2017* [17]. We use stochastic gradient descent (SGD) for training. We use a learning rate of  $lr \times \text{BatchSize}/64$  (linear scaling [8]), with a initial  $lr = 0.01$  and the cosine lr schedule. The weight decay is 0.0005 and the SGD momentum is 0.9. The batch size is 128 by default to typical 8-GPU devices. Other batch sizes include single GPU training also work well. The input size is evenly drawn from 448 to 832 with 32 strides. FPS and

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/ultralytics/yolov3>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/RangliLyu/nanodet>

Models	Coupled Head	Decoupled Head <sup>使分离</sup>
Vanilla YOLO	38.5	39.6
End-to-end YOLO	34.3 (-4.2)	38.8 (-0.8)

Table 1: The effect of decoupled head for end-to-end YOLO in terms of AP (%) on COCO.

latency in this report are all measured with FP16-precision and batch=1 on a single Tesla V100.

**YOLOv3 baseline** Our baseline adopts the architecture of DarkNet53 backbone and an SPP layer, referred to YOLOv3-SPP in some papers [1, 7]. We slightly change some training strategies compared to the original implementation [25], adding EMA weights updating, cosine lr schedule, IoU loss and IoU-aware branch. We use BCE Loss for training *cls* and *obj* branch, and IoU Loss for training *reg* branch. These general training tricks are orthogonal to the key improvement of YOLOX, we thus put them on the baseline. Moreover, we only conduct RandomHorizontalFlip, ColorJitter and multi-scale for data augmentation and discard the RandomResizedCrop strategy, because we found the RandomResizedCrop is kind of overlapped with the planned mosaic augmentation. With those enhancements, our baseline achieves 38.5% AP on COCO *val*, as shown in Tab. 2.

**Decoupled head** In object detection, the conflict between classification and regression tasks is a well-known problem [27, 34]. Thus the decoupled head for classification and localization is widely used in the most of one-stage and two-stage detectors [16, 29, 35, 34]. However, as YOLO series’ backbones and feature pyramids (e.g., FPN [13], PAN [20].) continuously evolving, their detection heads remain coupled as shown in Fig. 2.

Our two analytical experiments indicate that the coupled detection head may harm the performance. 1). Replacing YOLO’s head with a decoupled one greatly improves the converging speed as shown in Fig. 3. 2). The decoupled head is essential to the end-to-end version of YOLO (will be described next). One can tell from Tab. 1, the end-to-end property decreases by 4.2% AP with the coupled head, while the decreasing reduces to 0.8% AP for a decoupled head. We thus replace the YOLO detect head with a lite decoupled head as in Fig. 2. Concretely, it contains a  $1 \times 1$  conv layer to reduce the channel dimension, followed by two parallel branches with two  $3 \times 3$  conv layers respectively. We report the inference time with batch=1 on V100 in Tab. 2 and the lite decoupled head brings additional 1.1 ms (11.6 ms v.s. 10.5 ms).




Figure 2: Illustration of the difference between YOLOv3 head and the proposed decoupled head. For each level of FPN feature, we first adopt a  $1 \times 1$  conv layer to reduce the feature channel to 256 and then add two parallel branches with two  $3 \times 3$  conv layers each for classification and regression tasks respectively. IoU branch is added on the regression branch.




Figure 3: Training curves for detectors with YOLOv3 head or decoupled head. We evaluate the AP on COCO *val* every 10 epochs. It is obvious that the decoupled head converges much faster than the YOLOv3 head and achieves better result finally.

**Strong data augmentation** We add Mosaic and MixUp into our augmentation strategies to boost YOLOX’s performance. Mosaic is an efficient augmentation strategy proposed by ultralytics-YOLOv3<sup>2</sup>. It is then widely used in YOLOv4 [1], YOLOv5 [7] and other detectors [3]. MixUp [10] is originally designed for image classification task but then modified in BoF [38] for object detection training. We adopt the MixUp and Mosaic implementation in our model and close it for the last 15 epochs, achieving 42.0% AP in Tab. 2. After using strong data augmentation, we found ImageNet pre-training is no more beneficial, we

thus train all the following models from scratch.

**Anchor-free** Both YOLOv4 [1] and YOLOv5 [7] follow the original anchor-based pipeline of YOLOv3 [25]. However, the anchor mechanism has many known problems. First, to achieve optimal detection performance, one needs to conduct clustering analysis to determine a set of optimal anchors before training. Those clustered anchors are domain-specific and less generalized. Second, anchor mechanism increases the complexity of detection heads, as well as the number of predictions for each image. On some edge AI systems, moving such large amount of predictions between devices (e.g., from NPU to CPU) may become a potential bottleneck in terms of the overall latency.

Anchor-free detectors [29, 40, 14] have developed rapidly in the past two year. These works have shown that the performance of anchor-free detectors can be on par with anchor-based detectors. Anchor-free mechanism significantly reduces the number of design parameters which need heuristic tuning and many tricks involved (e.g., Anchor Clustering [24], Grid Sensitive [11].) for good performance, making the detector, especially its training and decoding phase, considerably simpler [29].

Switching YOLO to an anchor-free manner is quite simple. We reduce the predictions for each location from 3 to 1 and make them directly predict four values, i.e., two offsets in terms of the left-top corner of the grid, and the height and width of the predicted box. We assign the center lo-

Methods	AP (%)	Parameters	GFLOPs	Latency	FPS
YOLOv3-ultralytics <sup>2</sup>	44.3	63.00 M	157.3	10.5 ms	95.2
YOLOv3 baseline	38.5	63.00 M	157.3	10.5 ms	95.2
+decoupled head	39.6 (+1.1)	63.86 M	186.0	11.6 ms	86.2
+strong augmentation	42.0 (+2.4)	63.86 M	186.0	11.6 ms	86.2
+anchor-free	42.9 (+0.9)	63.72 M	185.3	11.1 ms	90.1
+multi positives	45.0 (+2.1)	63.72 M	185.3	11.1 ms	90.1
+SimOTA	47.3 (+2.3)	63.72 M	185.3	11.1 ms	90.1
+NMS free (optional)	46.5 (-0.8)	67.27 M	205.1	13.5 ms	74.1

Table 2: Roadmap of YOLOX-Darknet53 in terms of AP (%) on COCO *val*. All the models are tested at  $640 \times 640$  resolution, with FP16-precision and batch=1 on a Tesla V100. The latency and FPS in this table are measured without post-processing.

cation of each object as the positive sample and pre-define a scale range, as done in [29], to designate the FPN level for each object. Such modification reduces the parameters and GFLOPs of the detector and makes it faster, but obtains better performance – 42.9% AP as shown in Tab. 2.

**Multi positives** To be consistent with the assigning rule of YOLOv3, the above anchor-free version selects only ONE positive sample (the center location) for each object mean-while ignores other high quality predictions. However, optimizing those high quality predictions may also bring beneficial gradients, which may alleviates the extreme imbalance of positive/negative sampling during training. We simply assigns the center  $3 \times 3$  area as positives, also named “center sampling” in FCOS [29]. The performance of the detector improves to 45.0% AP as in Tab. 2, already surpassing the current best practice of ultralytics-YOLOv3 (44.3% AP<sup>2</sup>).

**SimOTA** Advanced label assignment is another important progress of object detection in recent years. Based on our own study OTA [4], we conclude four key insights for an advanced label assignment: 1). loss/quality aware, 2). center prior, 3). dynamic number of positive anchors<sup>4</sup> for each ground-truth (abbreviated as dynamic top-k), 4). global view. OTA meets all four rules above, hence we choose it as a candidate label assigning strategy.

Specifically, OTA [4] analyzes the label assignment from a global perspective and formulate the assigning procedure as an Optimal Transport (OT) problem, producing the SOTA performance among the current assigning strategies [12, 41, 36, 22, 37]. However, in practice we found solving OT problem via Sinkhorn-Knopp algorithm brings 25% extra training time, which is quite expensive for training 300 epochs. We thus simplify it to dynamic top-k strategy, named SimOTA, to get an approximate solution.

<sup>4</sup>The term “anchor” refers to “anchor point” in the context of anchor-free detectors and “grid” in the context of YOLO.

We briefly introduce SimOTA here. SimOTA first calculates pair-wise matching degree, represented by cost [4, 5, 12, 2] or quality [33] for each prediction-*gt* pair. For example, in SimOTA, the cost between *gt*  $g_i$  and prediction  $p_j$  is calculated as:

$$c_{ij} = L_{ij}^{cls} + \lambda L_{ij}^{reg}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a balancing coefficient.  $L_{ij}^{cls}$  and  $L_{ij}^{reg}$  are classification loss and regression loss between *gt*  $g_i$  and prediction  $p_j$ . Then, for *gt*  $g_i$ , we select the top  $k$  predictions with the least cost within a fixed center region as its positive samples. Finally, the corresponding grids of those positive predictions are assigned as positives, while the rest grids are negatives. Noted that the value  $k$  varies for different ground-truth. Please refer to Dynamic  $k$  Estimation strategy in OTA [4] for more details.

SimOTA not only reduces the training time but also avoids additional solver hyperparameters in Sinkhorn-Knopp algorithm. As shown in Tab. 2, SimOTA raises the detector from 45.0% AP to 47.3% AP, higher than the SOTA ultralytics-YOLOv3 by 3.0% AP, showing the power of the advanced assigning strategy.

**End-to-end YOLO** We follow [39] to add two additional conv layers, one-to-one label assignment, and stop gradient. These enable the detector to perform an end-to-end manner, but slightly decreasing the performance and the inference speed, as listed in Tab. 2. We thus leave it as an optional module which is not involved in our final models.

## 2.2. Other Backbones

Besides DarkNet53, we also test YOLOX on other backbones with different sizes, where YOLOX achieves consistent improvements against all the corresponding counterparts.

Models	AP (%)	Parameters	GFLOPs	Latency
YOLOv5-S	36.7	7.3 M	17.1	8.7 ms
YOLOX-S	<b>39.6 (+2.9)</b>	9.0 M	26.8	9.8 ms
YOLOv5-M	44.5	21.4 M	51.4	11.1 ms
YOLOX-M	<b>46.4 (+1.9)</b>	25.3 M	73.8	12.3 ms
YOLOv5-L	48.2	47.1 M	115.6	13.7 ms
YOLOX-L	<b>50.0 (+1.8)</b>	54.2 M	155.6	14.5 ms
YOLOv5-X	50.4	87.8 M	219.0	16.0 ms
YOLOX-X	<b>51.2 (+0.8)</b>	99.1 M	281.9	17.3 ms

Table 3: Comparison of YOLOX and YOLOv5 in terms of AP (%) on COCO. All the models are tested at  $640 \times 640$  resolution, with FP16-precision and batch=1 on a Tesla V100.

Models	AP (%)	Parameters	GFLOPs
YOLOv4-Tiny [30]	21.7	6.06 M	6.96
PPYOLO-Tiny	22.7	4.20 M	-
YOLOX-Tiny	<b>32.8 (+10.1)</b>	5.06 M	6.45
NanoDet <sup>3</sup>	23.5	0.95 M	1.20
YOLOX-Nano	<b>25.3 (+1.8)</b>	0.91 M	1.08

Table 4: Comparison of YOLOX-Tiny and YOLOX-Nano and the counterparts in terms of AP (%) on COCO *val*. All the models are tested at  $416 \times 416$  resolution.

**Modified CSPNet in YOLOv5** To give a fair comparison, we adopt the exact YOLOv5’s backbone including modified CSPNet [31], SiLU activation, and the PAN [19] head. We also follow its scaling rule to product YOLOX-S, YOLOX-M, YOLOX-L, and YOLOX-X models. Compared to YOLOv5 in Tab. 3, our models get consistent improvement by  $\sim 3.0\%$  to  $\sim 1.0\%$  AP, with only marginal time increasing (comes from the decoupled head).

**Tiny and Nano detectors** We further shrink our model as YOLOX-Tiny to compare with YOLOv4-Tiny [30]. For mobile devices, we adopt depth wise convolution to construct a YOLOX-Nano model, which has only 0.91M parameters and 1.08G FLOPs. As shown in Tab. 4, YOLOX performs well with even smaller model size than the counterparts.

**Model size and data augmentation** In our experiments, all the models keep almost the same learning schedule and optimizing parameters as depicted in 2.1. However, we found that the suitable augmentation strategy varies across different size of models. As Tab. 5 shows, while applying MixUp for YOLOX-L can improve AP by 0.9%, it is better to weaken the augmentation for small models like

YOLOX-Nano. Specifically, we remove the mix up augmentation and weaken the mosaic (reduce the scale range from  $[0.1, 2.0]$  to  $[0.5, 1.5]$ ) when training small models, i.e., YOLOX-S, YOLOX-Tiny, and YOLOX-Nano. Such a modification improves YOLOX-Nano’s AP from 24.0% to 25.3%.

For large models, we also found that stronger augmentation is more helpful. Indeed, our MixUp implementation is part of heavier than the original version in [38]. Inspired by Copypaste [6], we jittered both images by a random sampled scale factor before mixing up them. To understand the power of Mixup with scale jittering, we compare it with Copypaste on YOLOX-L. Noted that Copypaste requires extra instance mask annotations while MixUp does not. But as shown in Tab. 5, these two methods achieve competitive performance, indicating that MixUp with scale jittering is a qualified replacement for Copypaste when no instance mask annotation is available.

Models	Scale Jit.	Extra Aug.	AP (%)
YOLOX-Nano	$[0.5, 1.5]$	-	25.3
	$[0.1, 2.0]$	MixUp	24.0 (-1.3)
YOLOX-L	$[0.1, 2.0]$	-	48.6
	$[0.1, 2.0]$	MixUp	49.5 (+0.9)
	$[0.1, 2.0]$	Copypaste [6]	49.4

Table 5: Effects of data augmentation under different model sizes. “Scale Jit.” stands for the range of scale jittering for mosaic image. Instance mask annotations from COCO *trainval* are used when adopting Copypaste.

### 3. Comparison with the SOTA

There is a tradition to show the SOTA comparing table as in Tab. 6. However, keep in mind that the inference speed of the models in this table is often uncontrolled, as speed varies with software and hardware. We thus use the same hardware and code base for all the YOLO series in Fig. 1, plotting the somewhat controlled speed/accuracy curve.

We notice that there are some high performance YOLO series with larger model sizes like Scale-YOLOv4 [30] and YOLOv5-P6 [7]. And the current Transformer based detectors [21] push the accuracy-SOTA to  $\sim 60$  AP. Due to the time and resource limitation, we did not explore those important features in this report. However, they are already in our scope.

### 4. 1st Place on Streaming Perception Challenge (WAD at CVPR 2021)

Streaming Perception Challenge on WAD 2021 is a joint evaluation of accuracy and latency through a recently proposed metric: streaming accuracy [15]. The key insight be-



Method	Backbone	Size	FPS (v100)	AP (%)	AP <sub>50</sub>	AP <sub>75</sub>	AP <sub>S</sub>	AP <sub>M</sub>	AP <sub>L</sub>
YOLOv3 + ASFF* [18]	Darknet-53	608	45.5	42.4	63.0	47.4	25.5	45.7	52.3
YOLOv3 + ASFF* [18]	Darknet-53	800	29.4	43.9	64.1	49.2	27.0	46.6	53.4
EfficientDet-D0 [28]	Efficient-B0	512	98.0	33.8	52.2	35.8	12.0	38.3	51.2
EfficientDet-D1 [28]	Efficient-B1	640	74.1	39.6	58.6	42.3	17.9	44.3	56.0
EfficientDet-D2 [28]	Efficient-B2	768	56.5	43.0	62.3	46.2	22.5	47.0	58.4
EfficientDet-D3 [28]	Efficient-B3	896	34.5	45.8	65.0	49.3	26.6	49.4	59.8
PP-YOLOv2 [11]	ResNet50-vd-dcn	640	68.9	49.5	68.2	54.4	30.7	52.9	61.2
PP-YOLOv2 [11]	ResNet101-vd-dcn	640	50.3	50.3	69.0	55.3	31.6	53.9	62.4
YOLOv4 [1]	CSPDarknet-53	608	62.0	43.5	65.7	47.3	26.7	46.7	53.3
YOLOv4-CSP [30]	Modified CSP	640	73.0	47.5	66.2	51.7	28.2	51.2	59.8
YOLOv3-ultralytics <sup>2</sup>	Darknet-53	640	95.2	44.3	64.6	-	-	-	-
YOLOv5-M [7]	Modified CSP v5	640	90.1	44.5	63.1	-	-	-	-
YOLOv5-L [7]	Modified CSP v5	640	73.0	48.2	66.9	-	-	-	-
YOLOv5-X [7]	Modified CSP v5	640	62.5	50.4	68.8	-	-	-	-
YOLOX-DarkNet53	Darknet-53	640	90.1	47.4	67.3	52.1	27.5	51.5	60.9
YOLOX-M	Modified CSP v5	640	81.3	46.4	65.4	50.6	26.3	51.0	59.9
YOLOX-L	Modified CSP v5	640	69.0	50.0	68.5	54.5	29.8	54.5	64.4
YOLOX-X	Modified CSP v5	640	57.8	<b>51.2</b>	69.6	55.7	31.2	56.1	66.1

Table 6: Comparison of the speed and accuracy of different object detectors on COCO 2017 *test-dev*. We select all the models trained on 300 epochs for fair comparison.

hind this metric is to jointly evaluate the output of the entire perception stack at every time instant, forcing the stack to consider the amount of streaming data that should be ignored while computation is occurring [15]. We found that the best trade-off point for the metric on 30 FPS data stream is a powerful model with the inference time  $\leq 33$ ms. So we adopt a YOLOX-L model with TensorRT to product our final model for the challenge to win the 1st place. Please refer to the challenge website<sup>5</sup> for more details.

## 5. Conclusion

In this report, we present some experienced updates to YOLO series, which forms a high-performance anchor-free detector called YOLOX. Equipped with some recent advanced detection techniques, *i.e.*, decoupled head, anchor-free, and advanced label assigning strategy, YOLOX achieves a better trade-off between speed and accuracy than other counterparts across all model sizes. It is remarkable that we boost the architecture of YOLOv3, which is still one of the most widely used detectors in industry due to its broad compatibility, to 47.3% AP on COCO, surpassing the current best practice by 3.0% AP. We hope this report can help developers and researchers get better experience in practical scenes.

<sup>5</sup><https://eval.ai/web/challenges/challenge-page/800/overview>

## Acknowledge

This research was supported by National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2017YFA0700800). It was also funded by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2021M690375) and Beijing Postdoctoral Research Foundation

## References

- [1] Alexey Bochkovskiy, Chien-Yao Wang, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10934*, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [2] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *ECCV*, 2020. 1, 4
- [3] Qiang Chen, Yingming Wang, Tong Yang, Xiangyu Zhang, Jian Cheng, and Jian Sun. You only look one-level feature. In *CVPR*, 2021. 3
- [4] Zheng Ge, Songtao Liu, Zeming Li, Osamu Yoshie, and Jian Sun. Ota: Optimal transport assignment for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2021. 1, 4
- [5] Zheng Ge, Jianfeng Wang, Xin Huang, Songtao Liu, and Osamu Yoshie. Lla: Loss-aware label assignment for dense pedestrian detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04307*, 2021. 4
- [6] Golnaz Ghiasi, Yin Cui, Aravind Srinivas, Rui Qian, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ekin D Cubuk, Quoc V Le, and Barret Zoph. Simple

- copy-paste is a strong data augmentation method for instance segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2021. 5
- [7] glenn jocher et al. yolov5. <https://github.com/ultralytics/yolov5>, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6
- [8] Priya Goyal, Piotr Dollár, Ross Girshick, Pieter Noordhuis, Lukasz Wesolowski, Aapo Kyrola, Andrew Tulloch, Yangqing Jia, and Kaiming He. Accurate, large mini-batch sgd: Training imagenet in 1 hour. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02677*, 2017. 2
- [9] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1
- [10] Zhang Hongyi, Cisse Moustapha, N. Dauphin Yann, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *ICLR*, 2018. 3
- [11] Xin Huang, Xinxin Wang, Wenyu Lv, Xiaying Bai, Xiang Long, Kaipeng Deng, Qingqing Dang, Shumin Han, Qiwen Liu, Xiaoguang Hu, et al. Pp-yolov2: A practical object detector. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10419*, 2021. 3, 6
- [12] Kang Kim and Hee Seok Lee. Probabilistic anchor assignment with iou prediction for object detection. In *ECCV*, 2020. 1, 4
- [13] Seung-Wook Kim, Hyong-Keun Kook, Jee-Young Sun, Mun-Cheon Kang, and Sung-Jea Ko. Parallel feature pyramid network for object detection. In *ECCV*, 2018. 2
- [14] Hei Law and Jia Deng. Cornernet: Detecting objects as paired keypoints. In *ECCV*, 2018. 1, 3
- [15] Mengtian Li, Yuxiong Wang, and Deva Ramanan. Towards streaming perception. In *ECCV*, 2020. 5, 6
- [16] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *ICCV*, 2017. 2
- [17] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014. 2
- [18] Songtao Liu, Di Huang, and Yunhong Wang. Learning spatial fusion for single-shot object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09516*, 2019. 6
- [19] Shu Liu, Lu Qi, Haifang Qin, Jianping Shi, and Jiaya Jia. Path aggregation network for instance segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2, 5
- [20] Shu Liu, Lu Qi, Haifang Qin, Jianping Shi, and Jiaya Jia. Path aggregation network for instance segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2
- [21] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14030*, 2021. 5
- [22] Yuchen Ma, Songtao Liu, Zeming Li, and Jian Sun. Iqdet: Instance-wise quality distribution sampling for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2021. 1, 4
- [23] Joseph Redmon, Santosh Divvala, Ross Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1
- [24] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolo9000: Better, faster, stronger. In *CVPR*, 2017. 1, 3
- [25] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.02767*, 2018. 1, 2, 3
- [26] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2015. 1
- [27] Guanglu Song, Yu Liu, and Xiaogang Wang. Revisiting the sibling head in object detector. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2
- [28] Mingxing Tan, Ruoming Pang, and Quoc V Le. Efficientdet: Scalable and efficient object detection. In *CVPR*, 2020. 6
- [29] Zhi Tian, Chunhua Shen, Hao Chen, and Tong He. Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection. In *ICCV*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [30] Chien-Yao Wang, Alexey Bochkovskiy, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Scaled-yolov4: Scaling cross stage partial network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.08036*, 2020. 1, 5, 6
- [31] Chien-Yao Wang, Hong-Yuan Mark Liao, Yueh-Hua Wu, Ping-Yang Chen, Jun-Wei Hsieh, and I-Hau Yeh. Cspnet: A new backbone that can enhance learning capability of cnn. In *CVPR workshops*, 2020. 2, 5
- [32] Jianfeng Wang, Lin Song, Zeming Li, Hongbin Sun, Jian Sun, and Nanning Zheng. End-to-end object detection with fully convolutional network. In *CVPR*, 2020. 1
- [33] Jianfeng Wang, Lin Song, Zeming Li, Hongbin Sun, Jian Sun, and Nanning Zheng. End-to-end object detection with fully convolutional network. In *CVPR*, 2021. 4
- [34] Yue Wu, Yinpeng Chen, Lu Yuan, Zicheng Liu, Lijuan Wang, Hongzhi Li, and Yun Fu. Rethinking classification and localization for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2
- [35] Yue Wu, Yinpeng Chen, Lu Yuan, Zicheng Liu, Lijuan Wang, Hongzhi Li, and Yun Fu. Rethinking classification and localization for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2
- [36] Shifeng Zhang, Cheng Chi, Yongqiang Yao, Zhen Lei, and Stan Z Li. Bridging the gap between anchor-based and anchor-free detection via adaptive training sample selection. In *CVPR*, 2020. 1, 4
- [37] Xiaosong Zhang, Fang Wan, Chang Liu, Rongrong Ji, and Qixiang Ye. Freeanchor: Learning to match anchors for visual object detection. In *NeurIPS*, 2019. 1, 4
- [38] Zhi Zhang, Tong He, Hang Zhang, Zhongyuan Zhang, Junyuan Xie, and Mu Li. Bag of freebies for training object detection neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04103*, 2019. 3, 5
- [39] Qiang Zhou, Chaohui Yu, Chunhua Shen, Zhibin Wang, and Hao Li. Object detection made simpler by eliminating heuristic nms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.11782*, 2021. 1, 4
- [40] Xingyi Zhou, Dequan Wang, and Philipp Krähenbühl. Objects as points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.07850*, 2019. 1, 3
- [41] Benjin Zhu, Jianfeng Wang, Zhengkai Jiang, Fuhang Zong, Songtao Liu, Zeming Li, and Jian Sun. Autoassign: Differentiable label assignment for dense object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03496*, 2020. 1, 4