

Network Structures


October 16-23, 2018

Different CNN structures for image classification

- AlexNet
- Clarifai
- Overfeat
- VGG
- Network-in-network
- GoogLeNet
- ResNet

Model architecture-AlexNet Krizhevsky 2012

- 5 convolutional layers and 2 fully connected layers for learning features.
- Max-pooling layers follow first, second, and fifth convolutional layers
- The number of neurons in each layer is given by 290400, 186624, 64896, 64896, 43264, 4096, 4096, 1000
- 650000 neurons, 60000000 parameters, and 630000000 connections




(Krizhevsky NIPS 2014)

How transferable are features in CNN networks?

- (Yosinski et al. NIPS'14) investigate transferability of features by CNNs
- The transferability of features by CNN is affected by
 - ▶ Higher layer neurons are more specific to original tasks
 - ▶ Layers within a CNN network might be fragilely co-adapted
- Initializing with transferred features can improve generalization after substantial fine-tuning on a new task


Base tasks

- ImageNet are divided into two groups of 500 classes, A and B
- Two 8-layer AlexNets, baseA and baseB, are trained on the two groups, respectively




Transfer and selfer networks

- A *selfer* network BnB: the first n layers are copied from baseB and frozen. The other higher layers are initialized randomly and trained on dataset B. This is the control for transfer network
- A *transfer* network AnB: the first n layers are copied from baseA and frozen. The other higher layers are initialized randomly and trained toward dataset B




Transfer and selfer networks (cont'd)

- A *selfer* network BnB+: just like BnB, but where all layers learn
- A *transfer* network AnB+: just like AnB, but where all layers learn




Results



Dissimilar datasets

- Divide ImageNet into man-made objects A (449 classes) and natural objects B (551 classes)
- The transferability of features decreases as the distance between the base task and target task increases



Investigate components of CNNs

- Kernel size
- Kernel (channel) number
- Stride
- Dimensionality of fully connected layers
- Data augmentation
- Model averaging

Investigate components of CNNs (cont'd)

- (Chatfield et al. BMVC'14) pre-train on ImageNet and fine-tune on PASCAL VOC 2007
- Different architectures
 - ▶ mAP: CNN-S > (marginally) CNN-M > (~%2.5) CNN-F
- Different data augmentation
 - ▶ No augmentation
 - ▶ Flipping (almost no improvement)
 - ▶ Smaller dimension downsized to 256, cropping 224×224 patches from the center and 4 corners, flipping (~ 3% improvement)


Arch.	conv1	conv2	conv3	conv4	conv5	full6	full7	full8	
CNN-F	64x11x11 st. 4, pad 0 LRN, x2 pool	256x5x5 st. 1, pad 2	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max	Fast similar to AlexNet
CNN-M	96x7x7 st. 2, pad 0 LRN, x2 pool	256x5x5 st. 2, pad 1	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max	Medium similar to Clarifai model
CNN-S	96x7x7 st. 2, pad 0 LRN, x3 pool	256x5x5 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x3 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max	Slow similar to OverFeat Accurate model

Investigate components of CNNs (cont'd)

- Gray-scale vs. color ($\sim 3\%$ drop)
- Decrease the number of nodes in FC7
 - ▶ to 2048 (surprisingly, marginally better)
 - ▶ to 1024 (marginally better)
 - ▶ to 128 ($\sim 2\%$ drop but 32x smaller feature)
- Change the softmax regression loss to ranking hinge loss
 - ▶ $w_c \phi(I_{pos}) > w_c \phi(I_{neg}) + 1 - \xi$ (ξ is a slack variable)
 - ▶ $\sim 2.7\%$ improvement
 - ▶ Note, \mathcal{L}_2 normalising features account for $\sim 5\%$ of accuracy for VOC 2007
- On ILSVRC-2012, the CNN-S achieved a top-5 error rate of 13.1%
 - ▶ CNN-F: 16.7%
 - ▶ CNN-M: 13.7%
 - ▶ AlexNet: 17%

Model architecture-Clarifai


- Winner of ILSVRC 2013
- Max-pooling layers follow first, second, and fifth convolutional layers
- 11×11 to 7×7 , stride 4 to 2 in 1st layer (increasing resolution of feature maps)
- Other settings are the same as AlexNet
- reduce the error by 2%.



Error %	Val Top-1	Val Top-5	Test Top-5
(Gunji et al., 2012)	-	-	26.2
(Krizhevsky et al., 2012), 1 convnet	40.7	18.2	---
1 convnet for Clarifai	38.4	16.5	---

Model architecture-Clarifai further investigation


- More maps in the convolutional layers leads to small improvement.
- Model averaging leads to improvement (random initialization).



Error %	Val Top-1	Val Top-5	Test Top-5
(Gunji et al., 2012)	-	-	26.2
(Krizhevsky et al., 2012), 1 AlexNet	40.7	18.2	---
1 convnet for Clarifai	38.4	16.5	---
5 convnets for Clarifai (a)	36.7	15.3	15.3
1 convnet for Clarifai but with layers 3,4,5: 512,1024,512 maps – (b)	37.5	16.0	16.1
6 convnets, (a) & (b) combined	36.0	14.7	14.8

Model architecture-Overfeat

- Less pooling and more filters (384 => 512 for conv3 and 384=>1024 for conv4/5).




Layer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Output 8
Stage	conv + max	conv + max	conv	conv	conv + max	full	full	full
# channels	96	256	512	1024	1024	3072	4096	1000
Filter size	11x11	5x5	3x3	3x3	3x3	-	-	-
Conv. stride	4x4	1x1	1x1	1x1	1x1	-	-	-
Pooling size	2x2	2x2	-	-	2x2	-	-	-
Pooling stride	2x2	2x2	-	-	2x2	-	-	-
Zero-Padding size	-	-	1x1x1x1	1x1x1x1	1x1x1x1	-	-	-
Spatial input size	231x231	24x24	12x12	12x12	12x12	6x6	1x1	1x1

	Overfeat		
	top-5 error (%)		
Clarifai	Overfeat-5	Overfeat-7	
Without data augmentation	16.5	16.97	14.18

Model architecture-Overfeat

- With data augmentation, more complex model has better performance.



Layer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Output 8
Stage	conv + max	conv + max	conv	conv	conv + max	full	full	full
# channels	96	256	512	1024	1024	3072	4096	1000
Filter size	11x11	5x5	3x3	3x3	3x3	-	-	-
Conv. stride	4x4	1x1	1x1	1x1	1x1	-	-	-
Pooling size	2x2	2x2	-	-	2x2	-	-	-
Pooling stride	2x2	2x2	-	-	2x2	-	-	-
Zero-Padding size	-	-	1x1x1x1	1x1x1x1	1x1x1x1	-	-	-
Spatial input size	231x231	24x24	12x12	12x12	12x12	6x6	1x1	1x1

	Overfeat		
	top-5 error (%)		
Clarifai	Overfeat-5	Overfeat-7	
With data augmentation	14.76	13.52	11.97
Without data augmentation	16.5	16.97	14.18

Model architecture-the devil of details

- CNN-F: similar to AlexNet, but less channels in conv3-5.
- CNN-S: the most complex one.
- CNN-M 2048: replace the 4096 features in fc7 by 2048 features. Makes little difference.
- Data augmentation. The input image is downsized so that the smallest dimension is equal to 256 pixels. Then 224×224 crops are extracted from the four corners and the centre of the image.

ILSVRC-2012	(top-5 error)
(a) Clarifai 1 ConvNet	16.0
(b) CNN F	16.7
(c) CNN M	13.7
(d) CNN M 2048	13.5
(e) CNN S	13.1

Arch.	conv1	conv2	conv3	conv4	conv5	full6	full7	full8
CNN-F	64x11x11 st. 4, pad 0 LRN, x2 pool	256x5x5 st. 1, pad 2 LRN, x2 pool	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	256x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max
CNN-M	96x7x7 st. 2, pad 0 LRN, x2 pool	256x5x5 st. 2, pad 1 LRN, x2 pool	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max
CNN-S	96x7x7 st. 2, pad 0 LRN, x3 pool	256x5x5 st. 1, pad 1 x2 pool	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 -	512x3x3 st. 1, pad 1 x3 pool	4096 drop-out	4096 drop-out	1000 soft-max
Clarifai	96x7x7 st. 2, LRN,x2 pool	256x5x5 st. 2, pad1 LRN,x2 pool	384x3x3 st. 1, pad1	384x3x3 st. 1, pad1	256x3x3 st. 1, pad1	4096 drop	4096 drop	4096 drop

Model architecture-very deep CNN

- The deep model
VGG in 2014.
- Apply 3×3 filter for all layers.
- 11 layers (A) to 19 layers (E).

ConvNet Configuration					
A	A-LRN	B	C	D	E
11 weight layers	11 weight layers	13 weight layers	16 weight layers	16 weight layers	19 weight layers
input (224×224 RGB image)					
conv3-64	conv3-64 LRN	conv3-64 conv3-64	conv3-64 conv3-64	conv3-64 conv3-64	conv3-64 conv3-64
maxpool					
conv3-128	conv3-128	conv3-128 conv3-128	conv3-128 conv3-128	conv3-128 conv3-128	conv3-128 conv3-128
maxpool					
conv3-256 conv3-256	conv3-256 conv3-256	conv3-256 conv3-256	conv3-256 conv3-256	conv3-256 conv3-256	conv3-256 conv3-256
maxpool					
conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512
maxpool					
conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512	conv3-512 conv3-512
maxpool					
FC-4096					
FC-4096					
FC-1000					
soft-max					

Model architecture- very deep CNN

- The deep model VGG in 2014.
- Better to have deeper layers. 11 layers (A) => 16 layers (D).
- From 16 layers (D) to 19 layers (E), accuracy does not improve.

ConvNet Configuration					
A	A-LRN	B	C	D	E
11 weight layers	11 weight layers	13 weight layers	16 weight layers	16 weight layers	19 weight layers
ConvNet config. (Table 1)					
A		smallest image side	top-1 val. error (%)		top-5 val. error (%)
		train (S)	test (Q)		
A-LRN		256	256	29.6	10.4
B		256	256	28.7	9.9
C		256	256	28.1	9.4
C		384	384	28.1	9.3
C		[256;512]	384	27.3	8.8
D		256	256	27.0	8.8
		384	384	26.8	8.7
		[256;512]	384	25.6	8.1
E		256	256	27.3	9.0
		384	384	26.9	8.7
		[256;512]	384	25.5	8.0

Model architecture- very deep CNN

- Scale jittering at the training time.
- The crop size is fixed to 224×224 .
- S : the smallest side of an isotropically-rescaled training image.
- Scale jittering at the training time: [256; 512]: randomly select S to be within [256 512].
- LRN: local response normalisation. A-LRN does not improve on A.

ConvNet Configuration

A	A-LRN	B	C	D	E
11 weight layers	11 weight layers	13 weight layers	16 weight layers	16 weight layers	19 weight layers

ConvNet config. (Table 1)	smallest image side train (S)	test (Q)	top-1 val. error (%)	top-5 val. error (%)
A	256	256	29.6	10.4
A-LRN	256	256	29.7	10.5
B	256	256	28.7	9.9
C	256	256	28.1	9.4
	384	384	28.1	9.3
[256;512]	384	384	27.3	8.8
D	256	256	27.0	8.8
	384	384	26.8	8.7
[256;512]	384	384	25.6	8.1
E	256	256	27.3	9.0
	384	384	26.9	8.7
[256;512]	384	384	25.5	8.0

Model architecture- very deep CNN


- Multi-scale averaging at the testing time.
- The crop size is fixed to 224×224 .
- Q: the smallest side of an isotropically-rescaled testing image. 
- Running a model over several rescaled versions of a test image (corresponding to different Q), followed by averaging the resulting class posteriors. Improves accuracy ($25.5 \Rightarrow 24.8$).

It means apply the same scaling factor along width and height, so the image doesn't become distorted along one axis.

ConvNet Configuration					
A	A-LRN	B	C	D	E
11 weight layers	11 weight layers	13 weight layers	16 weight layers	16 weight layers	19 weight layers
ConvNet config. (Table 1)		smallest image side		top-1 val. error (%)	
		train (S)	test (Q)		
B		256	224,256,288	28.2	
		256	224,256,288	27.7	
C		384	352,384,416	27.8	
		[256; 512]	256,384,512	26.3	
		256	224,256,288	26.6	
D		384	352,384,416	26.5	
		[256; 512]	256,384,512	24.8	
		256	224,256,288	26.9	
E		384	352,384,416	26.7	
		[256; 512]	256,384,512	24.8	


Model architecture- Network in Network

- Use 1×1 filters after each convolutional layer.



Model architecture- Network in Network

- Remove the two fully connected layers (fc6, fc7) of the AlexNet but add NIN into the AlexNet.



	Parameter Number	Performance	Time to train (GTX Titan)
AlexNet	60 Million (230 Megabytes)	40.7% (Top 1)	8 days
NIN	7.5 Million (29 Megabytes)	39.2% (Top 1)	4 days

Model architecture- GoogleNet


- Inspired by the good performance of NIN.




Google™

Model architecture- GoogleNet (Inception V1)

- Inception model.
- Variable filter sizes to capture different visual patterns of different sizes. Enforce sparse connection between previous layer and output.
- The 1×1 convolutions are used for reducing the number of maps from the previous layer.



(a) Inception module, naïve version



(b) Inception module with dimension reductions

$$W: 1 \times 1 \times 192 \times 64 + 3 \times 3 \times 192 \times 128 + 5 \times 5 \times 192 \times 32 = 387072$$

$$\text{Output: } 28 \times 28 \times 64 + 28 \times 28 \times 128 + 28 \times 28 \times 3 + 28 \times 28 \times 192 \\ = 28 \times 28 \times 416$$

$$W: 1 \times 1 \times 192 \times 64 + (1 \times 1 \times 192 \times 96 + 3 \times 3 \times 96 \times 128)$$

$$+ (1 \times 1 \times 192 \times 16 + 5 \times 5 \times 16 \times 32) + 1 \times 1 \times 192 \times 32 = 163328$$

$$\text{Output: } 28 \times 28 \times 64 + 28 \times 28 \times 128 + 28 \times 28 \times 32 \\ + 28 \times 28 \times 32 = 28 \times 28 \times 256$$

Model architecture- GoogleNet

- Based on inception model.
- Cascade of inception models.
- Widths of inception modules ranges from 256 filters (in early modules) to 1024 in top inception modules.




Model architecture- GoogleNet

- Parameters.


type	patch size/ stride	output size	depth	#1x1	#3x3 reduce	#3x3	#5x5 reduce	#5x5	pool proj	params	ops
convolution	$7 \times 7 / 2$	112 × 112 × 64	1							2.7K	34M
max pool	$3 \times 3 / 2$	56 × 56 × 64	0								
convolution	$3 \times 3 / 1$	56 × 56 × 192	2		64	192				112K	360M
max pool	$3 \times 3 / 2$	28 × 28 × 192	0								
inception (3a)		28 × 28 × 256	2	64	96	128	16	32	32	159K	128M
inception (3b)		28 × 28 × 480	2	128	128	192	32	96	64	380K	304M
max pool	$3 \times 3 / 2$	14 × 14 × 480	0								
inception (4a)		14 × 14 × 512	2	192	96	208	16	48	64	364K	73M
inception (4b)		14 × 14 × 512	2	160	112	224	24	64	64	437K	88M
inception (4c)		14 × 14 × 512	2	128	128	256	24	64	64	463K	100M
inception (4d)		14 × 14 × 528	2	112	144	288	32	64	64	580K	119M
inception (4e)		14 × 14 × 832	2	256	160	320	32	128	128	840K	170M
max pool	$3 \times 3 / 2$	7 × 7 × 832	0								
inception (5a)		7 × 7 × 832	2	256	160	320	32	128	128	1072K	54M
inception (5b)		7 × 7 × 1024	2	384	192	384	48	128	128	1388K	71M
avg pool	$7 \times 7 / 1$	1 × 1 × 1024	0								
dropout (40%)		1 × 1 × 1024	0								
linear		1 × 1 × 1000	1							1000K	1M
softmax		1 × 1 × 1000	0								

Model architecture- Inception V2



1. Add BN after CNN layers
2. Two 3*3 CNN layers to replace one 5*5 CNN, thus increase depth

Model architecture- Inception V3



1. replace 7×7 conv to $(1 \times 7, 7 \times 1)$ convs
 3×3 conv to $(1 \times 3, 3 \times 1)$ convs
2. Input: 224×224 to 299×299

Model architecture- Inception V4




Figure 3. The schema for stem of the pure Inception-v4 and Inception-ResNet-v2 networks. This is the input part of these networks. Cf. Figures 9 and 15.




Figure 4. The schema for 35×35 grid modules of the pure Inception-v1 network. This is the Inception-A block of Figure 9.




Figure 5. The schema for 17×17 grid modules of the pure Inception-v4 network. This is the Inception-B block of Figure 9.

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

Figure 6. The schema for 8×8 grid modules of the pure Inception-v4 network. This is the Inception-C Block of Figure 9.

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com




Figure 7. The schema for 35×35 to 17×17 reduction module. Different variants of this blocks (with various numbers of filters) are used in Figure 9, and [15] in each of the new Inception-v4, -ResNet-v1, -ResNet-v2 variants presented in this paper. The k, l, m, n numbers represent filter bank sizes which can be looked up in Table II.




Figure 8. The schema for 17×17 to 8×8 grid-reduction module. This is the reduction module used by the pure Inception-v4 network in Figure 9.

1. Combinations of previous Inception-A,B,C blocks
2. Using Reduction-A, B to increase model size

Model architecture- Inception V4

In-v3、v4和In-Re-v1、v2的对比




Figure 26. Top-1 error evolution of all four models (single model, single crop). This paints a similar picture as the top-5 evaluation.

Top1

Top5




Figure 25. Top-5 error evolution of all four models (single model single crop). Showing the improvement due to larger model size Although the residual version converges faster, the final accuracy seems to mainly depend on the model size.


<http://blog.csdn.net/u013961690>

Inception V4 largely better than Inception V3

ResNets @ ILSVRC & COCO 2015 Competitions

- 1st places in all five main tracks
 - ▶ ImageNet Classification: ‘Ultra-deep’ 152-layer nets
 - ▶ ImageNet Detection: 16% better than 2nd
 - ▶ ImageNet Localization: 27% better than 2nd
 - ▶ COCO Detection: 11% better than 2nd
 - ▶ COCO Segmentation: 12% better than 2nd

Roadmap of Network Depth



Going deeper



Bear the following in mind:

- Batch normalization. [Sergey Ioffe, Christian Szegedy. ICML 2015]

Is learning better networks as simple as stacking more layers?

Simply stacking more layers


CIFAR-10



- Plain nets: stacking 3x3 conv layers.
- 56-layer net has **higher training error** and test error than 20-layer net.

Deep Residual Learning

Plain net:




$H(x)$ is any desired mapping.

Let these two conv (weight) layers fit $H(x)$.

Deep Residual Learning

Residual net:




$H(x)$ is any desired mapping.

~~Let these two conv (weight) layers fit $H(x)$.~~

Let these two conv (weight) layers fit $F(x)$, where $F(x) = H(x) - x$.

Deep Residual Learning

Residual net:



$F(x)$ is a **residual** mapping w.r.t. **identity**.

- If identity were optimal, easy to set weights as 0
- If optimal mapping is closer to identity, easier to find small fluctuations

Network Structure

Basic design: VGG style

- all 3×3 conv
- no FC layer, no dropout

Training details:

- Trained from scratch
- Use batch normalization
- Standard hyper-parameters & augmentation





Figure: Basic residual block.


Network Structure

Detailed ResNet structure (rightmost) for ImageNet 2015 entry: (part1)





Network Structure

Detailed ResNet structure (rightmost) for ImageNet 2015 entry: (part2)



The dotted shortcuts increase channel dimensions.

CIFAR-10 experiments




Deep ResNets can be trained without difficulties.

Deeper ResNets have **lower training error**, and also lower test error.


ImageNet experiments

ImageNet plain nets



34-layer
18-layer

ImageNet ResNets



18-layer
34-layer


Deep ResNets can be trained without difficulties.

Deeper ResNets have **lower training error**, and also lower test error.

Extension and Resource

- Residual Networks Behave Like Ensembles of Relatively Shallow Networks, NIPS 2016.
- Comparison among ResNet, Highway Network, DenseNet. A blog post [here](#). [Another one](#).
- ResNet code: [Model available] [Torch implementation]

ResNetXt



1. Another dimensional: Cardinality (split-transfer-merge)
2. Increase cardinality perform better than width and depth
3. Less parameters than ResNet

Inception-ResNetV1

Inception-ResNet-v1









Figure 15. Schema for Inception-ResNet-v1 and Inception-ResNet-v2 networks. This schema applies to both networks but the underlying components differ. Inception-ResNet-v1 uses the blocks as described in Figures [4],[10],[7],[11],[12] and [13]. Inception-ResNet-v2 uses the blocks as described in Figures [3],[16],[7],[17],[18] and [19]. The output sizes in the diagram refer to the activation vector tensor shapes of Inception-ResNet-v1.



**1. Inception-ResNet-V1 similar computation as InceptionV3
2. another small trick (No BN after activation function)**

Inception-ResNetV2





Figure 15. Schema for Inception-ResNet-v1 and Inception-ResNet-v2 networks. This schema applies to both networks but the underlying components differ. Inception-ResNet-v1 uses the blocks as described in Figures 14, 10, 7, 11, 12 and 13. Inception-ResNet-v2 uses the blocks as described in Figures 3, 16, 7, 17, 18 and 19. The output sizes in the diagram refer to the activation vector tensor shapes of Inception-ResNet-v1.




Figure 3. The schema for stem of the pure Inception-v4 and Inception-ResNet-v2 networks. This is the input part of those networks. Cf. Figures 9 and 18.




Figure 16. The schema for 35×35 grid (loop 3) module of the Inception-ResNet-v2 network.




Figure 17. The schema for 17×17 grid (Inception module of the Inception-ResNet-v2 network).






Figure 18. The schema for 17×17 to 8×8 grid-reduction module. Reduction-B module used by the wider Inception-ResNet-v2 network in Figure 13.

Network	Top-1 Error	Top-5 Error
BN-Inception [6]	25.2%	7.8%
Inception-v3 [15]	21.2%	5.6%
Inception-ResNet-v1	21.3%	5.5%
Inception-v4	20.0%	5.0%
Inception-ResNet-v2	19.9%	4.9%

Inception-ResNet-v2 model



Inception-Resnet v2




Zoom-in description of Inception-resnet-B block.


From empirical evidence:

1. Training with residual connections **accelerates** the training of Inception networks significantly;
2. Scaling down residuals before adding them to the subsequent layer's activation **stabilizes** training.

Xception (Depthwise separable conv ops)



Inception V3 module




Xception module

Table 3. Size and training speed comparison.

	Parameter count	Steps/second
Inception V3	23,626,728	31
Xception	22,855,952	28






	Top-1 accuracy	Top-5 accuracy
VGG-16	0.715	0.901
ResNet-152	0.770	0.933
Inception V3	0.782	0.941
Xception	0.790	0.945



Why no Relu?

1. Less params than InceptionV3
2. Spatial and Channel Convs
3. No Relu in Xception, but all with Relu in InceptionV3

MobileNets (Compressed depthwise separable conv ops)



Baseline model: 16M


Features map: $D_f \times D_f \times M$, Kernel: $D_k \times D_k \times N$, padding=1, stride=1

**Standard Conv: $D_k \times D_k \times M \times N \times D_f \times D_f$ ops,
params: $N \times M \times D_k \times D_k$**


**MobileNets: $D_k \times D_k \times M \times D_f \times D_f + M \times N \times D_f \times D_f$ ops
params: $1 \times M \times D_k \times D_k + N \times M \times 1 \times 1$**

Once $N > M$, less ops and less params, compressed model for mobile applications

ShuffleNets




- a. MobileNet, independent of different groups
- b. shuffle feature maps
- c. feature maps after shuffle



- a. MobileNet unit
- b. shuffleunit with channel shuffle
- c. Avg pool concat with channel shuffle

Roadmap of Network Structure



Experiment results

Single model evaluated on ILSVRC CLS 2012 validation set.


Network	Top-1 Error	Top-5 Error
BN-Inception [6]	25.2%	7.8%
Inception-v3 [15]	21.2%	5.6%
Inception-ResNet-v1	21.3%	5.5%
Inception-v4	20.0%	5.0%
Inception-ResNet-v2	19.9%	4.9%

Network	Crops	Top-1 Error	Top-5 Error
ResNet-151 [5]	dense	19.4%	4.5%
Inception-v3 [15]	144	18.9%	4.3%
Inception-ResNet-v1	144	18.8%	4.3%
Inception-v4	144	17.7%	3.8%
Inception-ResNet-v2	144	17.8%	3.7%


https://blog.csdn.net/gg_14845119/article/details/73648100
<https://blog.csdn.net/u014061630/article/details/80511232>

CNN for pixelwise classification

- Forward and backward propagation algorithms were proposed for whole-image classification: predicting a single label for a whole image
- Pixelwise classification: predicting a label at every pixel (e.g. segmentation, detection, and tracking)
- For pixelwise classification problems, it is generally trained and tested in a patch-by-patch manner, i.e. cropping a large patch around every pixel and inputting the patch to CNN for prediction (larger patches leading to better performance)
- It involves much redundant computation and is extremely inefficient



Fully convolutional neural networks with 1×1 kernels



Reading materials

- A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, “ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks,” Proc. NIPS, 2012.
- M. Ranzato, “Neural Networks,” tutorial at CVPR 2013.
- K. Chatfield, K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, “Return of the Devil in the Details: Delving Deep into Convolutional Networks,” BMVC 2014.
- P. Sermanet, D. Eigen, X. Zhang, M. Mathieu, R. Fergus, and Y. LeCun, “Overfeat: Integrated recognition, localization and detection using convolutional networks,” In Proc. Int’l Conf. Learning Representations, 2014.
- K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, “Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition,” arXiv:1409.1556, 2014.
- M. Lin, Q.. Chen, and S. Yan, “Network in network,” arXiv:1312.4400v3, 2013.
- C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, D. Anguelov, D. Erhan, V. Vanhoucke, and A. Rabinovich, “Going deeper with convolutions,” arXiv:1409.4842, 2014.

Reading materials

- Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. K. He, et al. *CVPR 2016*. **Best paper.**
 - ▶ Highway and Residual Networks learn Unrolled Iterative Estimation, ICLR 2017.
 - ▶ Identity Mappings in Deep Residual Networks. K. He, et al. *ECCV 2016*. [Extension discussion of ResNet](#).
 - ▶ Deep Networks with Stochastic Depth. G. Huang, et al. *ECCV 2016*
 - ▶ Unsupervised Domain Adaptation with Residual Transfer Networks. *NIPS 2016*.
 - ▶ Wide Residual Networks. *BMVC 2016*.
 - ▶ Residual LSTM: Design of a Deep Recurrent Architecture for Distant Speech Recognition. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1701.03360>.
 - ▶ ...

Reading materials

- Inception-v4, Inception-ResNet and the Impact of Residual Connections on Learning. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.07261v2>.
 - ▶ Rethinking the Inception Architecture for Computer Vision.
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.00567v3>.
 - ▶ Wide-Residual-Inception Networks for Real-time Object Detection.
<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.01243v1.pdf>
 - ▶ ...