Table 1: The five best runs according to accuracy.

	Run Number	Accuracy (in %)	GPU (in kWh)	Number of Parameters	Energy Quotient
1	*run#*	*0*	*112.03*	*acc*	*gpu*
2.	*run#*	*0*	*107.10*	*acc*	*gpu*
3.	*run#*	*0*	*112.11*	*acc*	*gpu*
4.	*run#*	*0*	*114.55*	*acc*	*gpu*
5.	*run#*	*0*	*110.12*	*acc*	*gpu*

Table 2: The five best runs according to GPU.

	Run Number	GPU (in kWh)	Accuracy (in %)	Number of Parameters	Energy Quotient
1	*run#*	*106.14*	*0*	*acc*	*gpu*
2.	*run#*	*103.95*	*0*	*acc*	*gpu*
3.	*run#*	*105.05*	*0*	*acc*	*gpu*
4.	*run#*	*105.67*	*0*	*acc*	*gpu*
5.	*run#*	*105.82*	*0*	*acc*	*gpu*

Table 3: Parameter values for the winning run in accuracy.

Parameter	Value
model	resnet50
preprocessing	standardization
augmentation	None
precision	float16
batch_size	64
partitioning	80-10-10
lr	0.0008
lr_schedule	exponential
optimizer_momentum	0.5
optimizer	RMSProp
internal	jit_compilation
seed	22
n_parameters	23792612

Table 3: Parameter values for the winning run in GPU.

Parameter	Value
model	resnet50
preprocessing	None
augmentation	cutmix
precision	global_policy_float16
batch_size	64
partitioning	90-5-5
lr	0.01
lr_schedule	exponential
optimizer_momentum	0.5
optimizer	Adam
internal	post_quantization
seed	22
n_parameters	23792612