

posed image for better classification.

| Methods        | w/o FT | w/ FT |
|----------------|--------|-------|
| top-5 err. (%) | 12.21  | 11.87 |

Table 4: Comparison of the top-5 error rate with and without joint fine tuning (FT) on the ImageNet dataset.

### ImageNet classification with ResNet-50

In this part, we further evaluate the performance of our proposed method on ResNet. Without loss of generalization, we select ResNet-50 from the ResNet family and simply use it to replace the VGG-Net as the baseline network. Then it is trained from scratch using a similar process as described in the Sec. of Learning. Because ResNet is a recently proposed network architecture, few works are proposed to accelerate this network. Thus, we simply compared with the standard ResNet-50, ThiNet in Table 5. ResNet is a more compact model, and accelerating this network is even more difficult. However, our method can still achieve  $1.88\times$  speed-up with merely 0.8% increase in top-5 error rate, surpassing ThiNet on both accuracy and efficiency.

| Methods   | top-5 err. (%) | GPU SR       | CPU SR       |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| ResNet-50 | 8.86           | $1\times$    | $1\times$    |
| ThiNet-30 | 11.70          | $1.30\times$ | -            |
| Ours      | 9.66           | $1.73\times$ | $1.88\times$ |

Table 5: Comparison of the top-5 error rate and speed-up rate (SR) of our model and ThiNet on ResNet-50 on the ImageNet dataset.

### CACD face identification

CACD is a large-scale and challenging dataset for face identification. It contains 163,446 images of 2,000 identities collected from the Internet that vary in age, pose and illumination. A subset of 56,138 images that cover 500 identities are manually annotated (?). We randomly select 44,798 images as the training set and the rest as the test set. All the models are trained on the training set and evaluated on the test set. Table 6 presents the comparison results. Note that the execution times are the same as Table 2. In this dataset, our model outperforms the VGG16-Net (0.22% increase in accuracy) and meanwhile achieves a speed-up rate of  $3.13\times$ . Besides, our method also beats the baseline methods. These comparisons again demonstrate the superiority of our proposed WAE. Remarkably, the images on CACD are far different from those on ImageNet, and our method still achieves superior performance on both accuracy and efficiency. It suggests our model can generalize to diverse datasets for accelerating the deep CNNs.

### Noisy image classification

Generally, the high-frequency part of an image contains more noise. Our model may implicitly remove some high-frequency part by minimize the energy of  $I_H$ , so it may be

| Methods           | acc. (%) |
|-------------------|----------|
| VGG16-Net         | 95.91    |
| Wavelet+CNN       | 94.99    |
| Decomposition+CNN | 95.20    |
| Ours              | 96.13    |

Table 6: Comparison of the accuracy of our model, VGG16-Net and the baseline methods on the CACD dataset.

inherently more robust to the noise. To validate this assumption, we add Gaussian noise of mean zero and different variances  $V$  to the test images, and present the accuracy of our method and the original VGG16-Net on these noisy images in Table 7. Note that both our model and the VGG16-Net is trained with the clean images. Our model performs consistently better than VGG16-Net over different noise levels. Remarkably, the superiority of our model is more evident when adding larger noise. For example, when adding noise with a variance of 0.05, our model outperforms the VGG16-Net by 10.81% in accuracy. These comparisons suggest our method is more robust to noise compared to VGG16-Net.

| Methods | VGG16-Net | Ours  |
|---------|-----------|-------|
| V=0     | 95.91     | 96.13 |
| V=0.01  | 90.22     | 91.16 |
| V=0.02  | 80.00     | 83.85 |
| V=0.05  | 45.10     | 55.91 |
| V=0.1   | 14.31     | 23.88 |

Table 7: Comparison of accuracy (in %) on the image of our model and VGG16-Net with gaussian noise of zero mean and different variances on the CACD dataset.

### Conclusion

In this paper, we learn a Wavelet-like Auto-Encoder, which decomposes an input image into two low-resolution channels and utilizes the decomposed channels as inputs to the CNN to reduce the computational complexity without compromising the accuracy. Specifically, the WAE consists of an encoding layer to decompose the input image into two half-resolution channels and a decoding layer to synthesize the original image from the two decomposed channels. A transform loss, which combines a reconstruction error that constrains the two low-resolution channels to preserve all the information of the input image, and an energy minimization loss that constrain one channel contains minimum energy, are further proposed to optimize the network. In future work, we will conduct experiments to decompose the image into sub-images of lower resolution to explore a better trade-off between accuracy and speed.

Autem quis tempora, porro eligendi quis alias quisquam nisi quod sit provident, aperiam pariatur reiciendis perspiciatis voluptatibus natus, soluta accusamus qui delectus aliquam similique quibusdam velit beatae cupiditate nisi maxime?Dolore tempore consequuntur beatae, voluptates asperiores labore veritatis corporis aut dolores, incidunt provident amet enim inventore magnam?Hic vel at delectus

nostrum a iste labore sequi, rem cumque blanditiis commodi  
ipsum, enim perspiciatis ipsa molestias beatae nisi laborum  
rem veniam nostrum doloribus