

This is a repository copy of *An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image recognition.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/198422/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Li, Chunlei, Li, Huanyu, Gao, Guangshuai et al. (2 more authors) (2023) An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image recognition. APPLIED SOFT COMPUTING. 110326. ISSN 1568-4946

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2023.110326>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# Applied Soft Computing Journal

## An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image recognition

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	ASOC-D-22-04168R1
<b>Article Type:</b>	Full Length Article
<b>Keywords:</b>	CNN acceleration; Image Recognition; Filter search; 2D information entropy
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	chunlei li Zhongyuan University of Technology CHINA
<b>First Author:</b>	Chunlei li
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Chunlei li Huanyu Li Guangshuai Gao Zhoufeng Liu Pengcheng Liu
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>The success of CNNs for various vision tasks has been accompanied by a significant increase in required FLOPs and parameter quantities, which has impeded the deployment of CNNs on devices with limited computing resources and power budgets. Network pruning, which compresses and accelerates CNN models, is an effective solution to this issue. Some studies have considered pruning as a special case of neural network search (NAS) in recent years. However, existing techniques are often computationally complex or prone to sub-optimal pruning results. As such, this paper proposes a novel acceleration method via a 2D Entropy based-Adaptive Filter Search (2EAFS). The importance of corresponding filters, measured by utilizing the amount of information contained in feature maps, is employed as a theoretical guide to simplify the complex exhaustive search process. Information entropy is then normalized layer by layer and the resulting value is used to calculate a layer-wise importance score in a single step. Additionally, a sparse constraint equation is constructed based on the negative correlation between filter pruning rates and the importance of convolutional layers. The Nelder-Mead search algorithm is then adopted to quickly and adaptively determine the optimal pruning architecture. Finally, importance weights are inherited using the pruning rate and 2D entropy and model performance are restored through fine-tuning. Extensive experiments conducted with the CIFAR-10/100, ILSVRC-2012, NWPU-RESISC45 and CUB-200-2011 datasets showed this approach achieved considerable accuracy increases, with significant reductions in FLOPs and required parameters that surpassed current state-of-the-art methods by a wide margin. For example, 2EAFS achieved a 44.1% reduction in FLOPs over ResNet-50, with only a 0.53% Top-5 accuracy decrease for ILSVRC-2012.</p>

1 An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D  
 2 entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image  
 3 recognition

4 Chunlei Li<sup>a</sup>, Huanyu Li<sup>b</sup>, Guangshuai Gao<sup>c</sup>, Zhoufeng Liu<sup>a</sup>, Pengcheng Liu<sup>d</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Zhongyuan University of  
 Technology, Zhengzhou, 450007, Henan, China*

*<sup>b</sup>College of Oceanography and Space Informatics, China University of Petroleum (East  
 China), Qingdao, 266580, Shandong, China*

*<sup>c</sup>State Key Laboratory of Virtual Reality Technology and Systems, Beihang  
 University, Beijing, 100191, China*

*<sup>d</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of York, York, YO10, U.K*

---

5 **Abstract**

The success of CNNs for various vision tasks has been accompanied by a significant increase in required FLOPs and parameter quantities, which has impeded the deployment of CNNs on devices with limited computing resources and power budgets. Network pruning, which compresses and accelerates CNN models, is an effective solution to this issue. Some studies have considered pruning as a special case of neural network search (NAS) in recent years. However, existing techniques are often computationally complex or prone to sub-optimal pruning results. As such, this paper proposes a novel acceleration method via a **2D Entropy based-Adaptive Filter Search (2EAFS)**. The importance of corresponding filters, measured by utilizing the amount of information contained in feature maps, is employed as a theoretical guide to simplify the complex exhaustive search process. Information entropy is then normalized layer by layer and the resulting value is used to calculate a layer-wise importance score in a single step. Additionally, a sparse constraint equation is constructed based on the negative correlation between filter pruning rates and the importance of convolutional layers. The Nelder-Mead search algorithm is then adopted to quickly and adaptively determine the optimal pruning architecture. Finally, importance weights are inherited using the pruning rate and 2D entropy and model performance are restored through fine-tuning. Extensive experiments conducted

with the CIFAR-10/100, ILSVRC-2012, NWPU-RESISC45 and CUB-200-2011 datasets showed this approach achieved considerable accuracy increases, with significant reductions in FLOPs and required parameters that surpassed current state-of-the-art methods by a wide margin. For example, 2EAFS achieved a 44.1% reduction in FLOPs over ResNet-50, with only a 0.53% Top-5 accuracy decrease for ILSVRC-2012.

1 *Keywords:* CNN acceleration, Image recognition, Filter search, 2D  
2 information entropy

---

### 3 **1. Introduction**

4 In recent years, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have achieved un-  
5 precedented results that have been widely applied in various computer vision  
6 tasks, such as autonomous driving [1, 2], industrial defect detection [3, 4],  
7 and intelligent security [5, 6]. However, as identification and detection per-  
8 formance continue to increase, so does network model capacity (i.e., width  
9 and depth). This in turn places higher requirements on the storage space,  
10 computing efficiency, and power consumption of computing devices. For in-  
11 stance, ResNet-50 [7] requires 25.26M parameters and 4.11B floating point  
12 operations (FLOPs) for forward inference with an image of size  $224 \times 224$ .  
13 Considering the cost and practical environment of industrial applications,  
14 we generally cannot provide devices with sufficient storage and computing  
15 power to meet the needs of developing CNNs, especially on mobile platforms  
16 such as phones, micro-robots, and drones.

17 Various studies have been developed in recent years to address the prob-  
18 lem of reducing parameters and FLOPs, such as compact network design  
19 [8, 9], low-bit knowledge distillation (KD) [10, 11], and quantization [12, 13].  
20 For instance, ShuffleNetV1 [8] employs group convolutions and channel shuf-  
21 fling to enhance the performance of compact models. Hinton et al. [10]  
22 introduced knowledge distillation, which primarily transfers feature informa-  
23 tion from a complex teacher model to a lightweight student model. Rastegari  
24 et al. [12] quantized weights and activations to 1-bit, enabling the model to  
25 achieve real-time detection speed and a low resource footprint. However,  
26 these methods require specific acceleration frameworks (e.g., quantization)  
27 or specialized knowledge for manual design (i.e., compact network design  
28 and KD).




Figure 1: Feature maps generated by the first residual group in ResNet-50. The blue/red boxes indicate high/low information.

1 Network pruning has achieved considerable success due to its simplic-  
 2 ity of operation, implementation efficiency, reduced network complexity, and  
 3 high resolution for over-fitting problems [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Differences in  
 4 sparse structures can be used to divide pruning methods into unstructured  
 5 and structured types. Unstructured pruning reduces the computational cost  
 6 of CNNs by removing individual neurons in filters or connections that con-  
 7 tribute less to fully-connected layers. This type of approach requires specific  
 8 designs for hardware accelerators; otherwise, it is difficult to achieve signif-  
 9 icant speed-ups. Structured pruning can also directly remove unimportant  
 10 channels (filters) without changing the network structure, thus allowing ef-  
 11 fective compression and acceleration using basic linear algebra subprograms  
 12 (BLAS). The resulting pruned network can be further accelerated by quan-  
 13 tization and knowledge distillation. In this paper, we focus on filter pruning,  
 14 enabling the model to achieve compression and acceleration while preserving  
 15 performance, providing an effective solution for devices with limited comput-  
 16 ing power.

17 Previous studies on structured pruning primarily rely on designed filters  
 18 and channel importance criteria, without considering the influence of infor-  
 19 mation entropy (contained in feature maps) on model accuracy, which limits

1 pruning effectiveness. However, rich feature information extracted from well-  
2 trained CNNs can provide a comprehensive understanding of an input image.  
3 For example, Fig. 1 shows a series of feature maps generated from an image  
4 by ResNet-50 during forward inference, in which there are obvious differ-  
5 ences in the resulting visualizations of each feature map. For example, some  
6 maps (blue boxes) contain more useful feature information (e.g., edges and  
7 contours), while others (red boxes) include less feature information. Infor-  
8 mation entropy can effectively provide quantitative measurements that can  
9 be used to represent the richness of information in an image. In this study,  
10 information entropy was applied to identify useful feature information and  
11 remove redundant features, producing a more efficient neural network com-  
12 pression model.

13 This paper proposes a simple yet effective **2D Entropy based-Adaptive**  
14 **Filter Search (2EAFS)** method for fast CNN acceleration, which is illustrated  
15 in Fig. 2. The importance of corresponding filters is first measured using the  
16 2D entropy of feature maps, which simplifies the complexity of model pruning  
17 without imposing additional sparsity constraints or retraining requirements.  
18 FLOPs constraints are then established based on the negative correlation  
19 between filter pruning rates and the importance of convolutional layers. The  
20 Nelder-Mead search algorithm [19] was used to rapidly and adaptively deter-  
21 mine a pruning architecture for each layer, producing a compact sub-network  
22 that meets budget constraints. Critical weights are then inherited based on  
23 the pruning rate and 2D entropy, while model performance is restored by  
24 fine-tuning. This approach can automatically obtain better pruning rates  
25 than empirical settings, dramatically simplifying the original structure. This  
26 filter weight inheritance based on 2D entropy correspondence was able to sig-  
27 nificantly outperform random weight inheritance. The contributions of this  
28 study can be summarized as follows:

- 29 1. A novel network pruning method (i.e., 2EAFS) is proposed, adopting  
30 2D entropy feature evaluation and fast adaptive filter search. This end-  
31 to-end pruning framework simplifies complexity without retraining or  
32 hyperparameter tuning of the model.
- 33 2. An efficient filter importance evaluation criterion is proposed. Specif-  
34 ically, only mini-batches of data are passed to the CNN model to ac-  
35 curately estimate the importance of filters based on the 2D entropy of  
36 the feature maps.
- 37 3. A negative correlation between filter pruning rate and convolutional




Figure 2: The proposed 2EAFS framework. The importance of corresponding filters was first evaluated using the two-dimensional entropy of the feature map. Constraint equations were then constructed using the importance of convolutional layers, while the sub-network structure was adaptively determined by the Nelder-Mead search algorithm. Finally, important weights were inherited based on the pruning rate and 2D entropy and model performance was restored by fine-tuning.

- 1 layer importance is utilized to construct sparse constraint equations.
- 2 An optimal pruning architecture for each layer is then quickly deter-
- 3 mined using the Nelder-Mead search algorithm without human involve-
- 4 ment.
- 5 4. Extensive experiments were conducted with CNNs (e.g., VGG and
- 6 ResNet) applied to datasets such as CIFAR-10/100, ILSVRC-2012,
- 7 NWPU-RESISC45 and CUB-200-2011. Results demonstrated the ef-
- 8 fectiveness and efficiency of 2EAFS in reducing FLOPs and parameter
- 9 requirements.

1 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Related works on  
2 model pruning are discussed in Section II and our proposed 2EAFS frame-  
3 work is then introduced in Section III. Experimental results and correspond-  
4 ing analysis are provided in Section IV. Finally, the paper is concluded in  
5 Section V.

## 6 **2. Related Work**

7 Pruning is highly effective for model compression and can be divided into  
8 three categories: unstructured pruning, fine-grained structured sparse, and  
9 structured pruning techniques.

### 10 *2.1. Unstructured pruning*

11 Unstructured pruning reduces the computational costs of a CNN by re-  
12 moving individual neurons in a filter or connections that contribute less to the  
13 fully connected layer. The optimal brain damage (OBD) algorithm proposed  
14 by LeCun et al. [20], a seminal study in unstructured pruning, uses second-  
15 order derivatives to balance training loss and model complexity. A few years  
16 later, Srinivas and Babu [21] proposed a data-free technique for pruning fully  
17 connected layers to obtain a compact sub-network offering comparable per-  
18 formance. Liu et al. [22] used a 2D discrete cosine transform (DCT) to  
19 increase wight sparseness and remove spatial redundancy. Dong et al. [23]  
20 proposed a pruning algorithm called L-OBS, which pruned parameters using  
21 second-order derivative information from a hierarchical error function, allow-  
22 ing the model to prune large parameter quantities with little degradation  
23 in performance. Chen et al. [24] extended the model compression problem  
24 from the perspective of constrained Bayesian optimization and introduced  
25 a cooling (annealing) solution. However, unstructured pruning produces ir-  
26 regular sparse filters. In addition, a specific hardware acceleration library  
27 must be designed according to the required characteristics. Otherwise, it can  
28 be difficult to achieve theoretical acceleration effects. 2EFAS can retain the  
29 overall structure of the original model and facilitate integration with existing  
30 hardware and software structures.

### 31 *2.2. Fine-grained structured sparse*

32 Fine-grained Structured Sparse usually group weight elements into small  
33 dense regions and prune them at the granularity of groups. To achieve bet-  
34 ter acceleration performance and higher sparsity, researchers have proposed



1 various grouping methods. Ji et al. [25] proposed a method to rearrange ir-  
2 regular fine-grained sparsity into structured coarse-grained sparsity to bridge  
3 the gap between large sparse models and poorer actual acceleration. Lin et  
4 al. [26] proposed a novel pattern of  $1 \times N$  for network pruning that achieves  
5 significant CPU acceleration while maintaining high-performance accuracy.  
6 Supported by the NVIDIA Ampere Core, N: M sparsity leads to attractive  
7 storage and computation efficiency and thus has been extensively studied re-  
8 cently. Zhou et al. [27] proposed the sparse-refined straight-through estimator  
9 (SR-STE) and sparse architecture divergence (SAD) to train N: M structured  
10 sparse networks, achieving significant acceleration. Zhang et al. [28] proved  
11 that N: M learning can be naturally formulated as a combinatorial optimiza-  
12 tion problem of finding the best combination candidates in a finite collection.  
13 Despite the fact that the aforementioned methods can achieve good speed  
14 and recognition accuracy on GPUs with Ampere architecture support, the  
15 inference speed on CPUs and ARM is still limited by hardware constraints.

### 16 *2.3. Structured pruning*

17 In contrast, structured pruning directly removes channels and correspond-  
18 ing filters, which is advantageous for forward inferences and can thus be  
19 readily deployed in embedded devices. Structured pruning can be roughly  
20 divided into three categories (based on the included compact CNN learning  
21 process): pretraining-dependency, regularization-retraining, and automatic  
22 subnet search pruning.

#### 23 *2.3.1. Pretraining-dependency pruning*

24 This approach prunes a filter based on the intrinsic characteristics of  
25 a CNN. The performance of the pruned model can then be enhanced by  
26 fine-tuning. For example, Li et al. [14] used an L1-norm to prune filters  
27 with low feature information and inherit critical weights. NISP [29] applies  
28 feature ranking to measure the importance of each neuron in a final response  
29 layer (FRL), which considers the network pruning problem to be a binary  
30 integer optimization task. He et al. [30] analyzed the limitations of paradigm-  
31 based network pruning and proposed a geometric median-based filter pruning  
32 strategy. Lin et al. [31] preserved filter weights with high-rank feature map  
33 outputs. Other studies have also considered the effects of parameter pruning  
34 on the corresponding loss. For instance, Molchanov et al. [15] proposed  
35 evaluating filter importance by considering first-order gradients. Lee et al.  
36 [16] directly performed unstructured pruning of randomly initialized weights

1 using derivatives. Filter pruning has also been implemented using feature  
2 reconstruction. He et al. [32] proposed an iterative two-step algorithm to  
3 efficiently prune convolutional layers using LASSO regression and linear least-  
4 squares. However, the model evaluation functions used in these methods  
5 must be specially designed. As a result, they offer low time complexity  
6 but exhibit limitations in performance and compression rates. Conversely,  
7 2EFAS utilizes image information entropy to represent the richness of feature  
8 maps, thereby solving the problem of insufficient representation of critical  
9 information.

### 10 *2.3.2. Regularization-retraining pruning*

11 Unlike pruning techniques based on the intrinsic properties of neural  
12 networks, regularization retraining models introduce sparse constraints and  
13 masking strategies to reduce model complexity during the training process.  
14 For example, Wen et al. [33] proposed a structured sparsity learning (SSL)  
15 method to regularize DNN structures (i.e., filters, channels, filter shapes, and  
16 layer depths), thereby achieving hardware-friendly structural sparsity. Liu  
17 et al. [34], and Zhao et al. [35] applied regularization to scale factors in  
18 batch normalization layers as part of a loss function and culled channels cor-  
19 responding to lower factors (based on the pruning rate). Huang and Wang  
20 [36], and Lin et al. [37] introduced a mask to learn sparse model struc-  
21 tures and remove filters corresponding to zero-scale factors. Similarly, SWP  
22 [38] is a filter pruning method that uses a pruning skeleton to learn optimal  
23 filter shapes effectively. Although these strategies are straightforward and  
24 eliminate reliance on pre-training models, the additional constraints require  
25 training from scratch, which reduces the generalizability and flexibility of  
26 training loss, 2EFAS does not necessitate any modification of the loss func-  
27 tion or retraining, but rather only entails fine-tuning, resulting in substantial  
28 savings in resources and computation time, making it more conducive for  
29 industrial application.

### 30 *2.3.3. Automatic subnet search*

31 Some recent studies have focused on searching for an optimal structure  
32 (i.e., the filter or channel number for each layer) rather than evaluating filter  
33 importance. MetaPruning [39] randomly samples each layer’s output channel  
34 number as input and train a PruningNet to generate high-quality weights for  
35 sub-networks of different architectures. An evolution algorithm is then used  
36 to search for optimal sub-networks that satisfy these constraints. AMC [40]

1 accepts the compression rate and accuracy as feedback and uses reinforce-  
 2 ment learning to develop an intelligent agent yielding the pruning rate for  
 3 each layer. However, reinforcement learning typically exhibits unstable con-  
 4 vergence, which requires significant effort for parameter tuning. ABCPruner  
 5 [41] uses an artificial bee colony algorithm to automatically search for ef-  
 6 ficient network architectures and fine-tune the result to identify the most  
 7 efficient sub-networks. However, it also requires retraining the subnetwork  
 8 used for performance evaluations at high computational costs. DMCP [42]  
 9 models channel pruning as a differentiable Markov process, thus, eliminating  
 10 the burden of searching multiple architectures. Although this approach can  
 11 reduce human intervention, it requires training the network from scratch with  
 12 different parameter settings, which is time-consuming and requires excessive  
 13 energy consumption, 2EFAS can directly obtain the optimal pruned network  
 14 under sparse constraints. This also avoids the difficulty of restructuring the  
 15 search when the constraint targets or datasets change, and the process is  
 16 simple and intuitive.

### 17 3. Proposed Method

18 This section details the proposed approach illustrated in Fig. 2. The filter  
 19 pruning problem is first revisited, and the proposed filter importance evalu-  
 20 ation criteria are then introduced. This metric is based on 2D information  
 21 entropy in feature maps and allows for fast determination of the optimal filter  
 22 pruning rate. The pruning framework and implementation details are also  
 23 introduced. Pruning strategies based on multi-branch networks (i.e., ResNet  
 24 [7]) are then discussed.

#### 25 3.1. Preliminary

26 The primary notations used in this paper are summarized in Table 1, and  
 27 the associated neural network pruning problem can be described as follows.  
 28 Given a training set  $\mathcal{X}_{\text{train}}$  and testing set  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{test}}$ , we attempt to determine the  
 29 optimal pruning rate  $p_k$  and weights  $\mathbf{w}'_k$  for each layer, achieving the highest  
 30 accuracy while satisfying a set of sparse constraints. To this end, the pruning  
 31 problem can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (F')^* &= \arg \max_{F'} \text{Acc}(\mathcal{M}_p(F', \mathbf{W}'; \mathcal{X}_{\text{train}}); \mathcal{X}_{\text{test}}) \\
 \text{s.t. } &\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{N}_p(C', \mathbf{W}'; \mathcal{X}_{\text{train}})) < \mathcal{C}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

Table 1: NOTATIONS AND THEIR ASSOCIATED MEANINGS.

Notation	Meaning
$\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{M}_p(\cdot)$	Pretrained and pruned network model
$\mathcal{X}_{\text{train}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\text{test}}$	Training set and testing set
$\mathbf{W} = \{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{f_k \times f_{k-1} \times h_k \times w_k}$	$\mathbf{w}_k$ are the filters in the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer
$\mathbf{W}' = \{\mathbf{w}'_k\}_{k=1}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{f'_k \times f'_{k-1} \times h_k \times w_k}$	$\mathbf{w}'_k$ are the filters of the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer after pruning
$p_k$	The pruning rate for the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer
$f_k$ and $f'_k$	The number of filters in the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer before and after pruning
$h_k$ and $w_k$	The height and width of filters in the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer
$F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_K\}$ and $F' = \{f'_1, f'_2, \dots, f'_K\}$	CNN network structure before and after pruning
$\mathbf{O} = \{\mathbf{o}_k\}_{k=1}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{f_k \times m_k \times n_k}$	The feature map generated after convolution operations: batch normalization, and activation.
$m_k$ and $n_k$	The height and width of the output feature map in the $k^{\text{th}}$ layer.

1 where  $\text{Acc}(\cdot)$  denotes the accuracy of  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{test}}$  applied to  $\mathcal{M}_p(\cdot)$  with a structure  
2  $F'$ . It should be noted the parameters of the pruned network can provide a  
3 weight inheritance for the original network or random initialization paramete-  
4 rs.  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$  is the set of sparse constraint limits, such as FLOPs, parameters,  
5 power, and latency, which require identifying an optimal trade-off between  
6 accuracy and constraints.

### 7 3.2. Information measurement based on 2D entropy

8 Previous studies [43] have used feature map sparsity to remove filters.  
9 However, this data-driven approach depends heavily on the distribution of  
10 input images. It also requires large sample quantities to make reasonable  
11 predictions, which involves a complex and time-consuming training process.  
12 Image entropy can be used for quantitative information measurements and  
13 can also represent the richness of feature maps. The distribution of entropy is  
14 also robust across the entire data set, which has been demonstrated through  
15 extensive empirical validation. Among the requirements discussed above,

1 quantization of the output feature map  $\mathbf{o}_k^i$  in the  $i^{th}$  filter of the  $k^{th}$  layer can  
 2 be defined as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{o}}_k^i = \text{round}(\sigma(\mathbf{o}_k^i) \cdot 255) \quad (2)$$

3 where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid activation function used to normalize a feature map  
 4 and  $\text{round}(\cdot)$  is a rounding function used to generate 8-bit grayscale feature  
 5 maps.

6 Calculations based on Shannon’s entropy theory can only represent entropy  
 7 values for a whole image. As such, they cannot represent the spatial  
 8 characteristics of image pixel distributions, which affect the accuracy of in-  
 9 formation evaluation [44]. 2D information entropy is introduced to represent  
 10 spatial distribution characteristics in the feature maps to address this issue.  
 11 Specifically, we selected grey values adjacent to the image mean to describe  
 12 spatial feature quantities for grey distributions and form a feature binary  
 13 with image pixels. These grey values can be denoted as  $(i, j)$ , where  $i$  repre-  
 14 sents a grey pixel value ( $0 \leq i \leq 255$ ), and  $j$  is the neighborhood grey mean.  
 15 The term  $q_{ij} = f(i, j)/S^2$  denotes the comprehensive characteristics of grey  
 16 values at individual pixel positions and grey distributions for surrounding  
 17 pixels. The term  $f(i, j)$  is the occurrence frequency for the feature binary  
 18  $(i, j)$  and  $S$  is the image scale. The discrete 2D image entropy can then be  
 19 expressed as:

$$H = - \sum_{i,j=0}^{255} q_{ij} \log_2 q_{ij} \quad (3)$$

20 Experiments have shown the average 2D entropy distribution for feature  
 21 maps generated from a few samples in the same filter remains mostly un-  
 22 changed compared to those of larger data quantities. As such, only small  
 23 sub-batches of data must be passed to the CNN model to accurately esti-  
 24 mate the importance of filters based on the 2D entropy of feature maps, thus  
 25 saving significant forward inference overhead. Based on this approach, the  
 26 expected 2D image entropy in each feature map can be defined as:

$$\bar{H}_k^i = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G H_k^i(g)}{G} \quad (4)$$

27 where  $G$  is the number of image samples and  $H_k^i(g)$  is the 2D feature map  
 28 entropy for the  $i^{th}$  filter at the  $k^{th}$  layer in the forward inference. However,

1 since the range of entropy values is closely related to the size of feature maps,  
 2 entropy values in different convolutional layers vary significantly. To this end,  
 3 we propose a max-min normalization to normalize the 2D entropy of each  
 4 layer to  $[0, 1]$  as follows:

$$\bar{H}_k^a \leq \tilde{H}_k^i = \frac{\bar{H}_k^i - \bar{H}_k^a}{\bar{H}_k^b - \bar{H}_k^a} \leq \bar{H}_k^b, \quad a, b \in [1, f_k] \text{ and } a \neq b \quad (5)$$

5 where  $\bar{H}_k^a$  and  $\bar{H}_k^b$  are the maximum and minimum values of the feature map  
 6 entropy in the  $k^{\text{th}}$  layer, respectively, and  $a$  and  $b$  are the corresponding filter  
 7 indices. Thus, we can establish filter importance evaluation criteria based  
 8 on the 2D information entropy in a feature map, pruning the model at the  
 9 given pruning rate as follows:

$$\text{Ind}_k = \text{sort}_{p_k} \left( \text{imp} \left( \tilde{H}_k^i \right) \right) \quad (6)$$

10 where  $\text{imp}(\cdot)$ , used to measure the importance of corresponding filters in a  
 11 feature map, is positively related to the magnitude of the entropy values.  
 12 The term  $\text{sort}_{p_k}(\cdot)$  is a descending order function that returns the index  $\text{Ind}_k$   
 13 of a filter to be retained, based on the pruning rate  $p_k$ . However, it can be  
 14 difficult to quickly determine the optimal rate for each layer while satisfying  
 15 the given constraints, as discussed in the following section.

### 16 3.3. Adaptive Filter Search

17 Several recent studies [39, 41, 42] have modeled neural network pruning  
 18 as an optimal structure search problem, used to determine the pruning rate  
 19 in each layer with various intelligent algorithms. However, these techniques  
 20 exhibit several problems, including the following. (1) The introduction of the  
 21 pruning rate step size vector reduces the search space, which often results in  
 22 sub-optimal performance. (2) The structured search must be repeated when  
 23 budget requirements and datasets are modified, which requires significant  
 24 computational resources and runtime. (3) The minimum pruning rate in  
 25 each layer is set based on subjective experience and is not universal. (4)  
 26 The use of hyper-parameters often leads to issues with tuning optimization,  
 27 which further increases the complexity of the problem.

28 The last layer of a CNN tends to provide the best discrimination informa-  
 29 tion and is commonly used for various application tasks. However, interme-  
 30 diate convolutional layers contain far more critical information in practice.

1 Thus, by analyzing the correlation between layers, a more appropriate prun-  
 2 ing method can be developed to achieve higher recognition accuracy while  
 3 reducing the number of required computations. In this study, we automati-  
 4 cally determined the pruning rate for each layer using the importance  $I_k$  of  
 5 individual convolutional layers [45]:

$$I_k = \frac{M_k}{\sum_{k=1}^K M_k} \quad (7)$$

6 where  $M_k = \frac{1}{f_k} \sum_{i=1}^{f_k} \tilde{H}_k^i$ . After obtaining the importance assessment metrics  
 7 for each block, we must determine how to map this importance to the actual  
 8 pruning rates in each convolutional layer. As in previous studies [46], we  
 9 assumed the filter pruning rate in each layer is negatively correlated with  
 10 the importance. A pruning rate evaluation function can then be constructed  
 11 from this assumption:

$$p_k = 1 - (\alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2) \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, K \quad (8)$$

12 where  $\alpha$  is used to describe the slope of the first-order linearity and  $\beta$  is  
 13 the bias correction term introduced to identify the optimal filter distribution  
 14 while satisfying sparse constraints (FLOPs) used to analyze speedup perfor-  
 15 mance. Eq. (1) converts the generic pruning problem into an attempt to  
 16 solve for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{N}_p((\alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2) * F, \mathbf{W}'; \mathcal{X}_{\text{train}})) - \mathcal{C}| < \mathcal{T} \\ \text{s.t. } 0 < \alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2 \leq 1 \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, K \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

17 where  $0 < \alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2 \leq 1$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are the tolerance and target computa-  
 18 tion, respectively. Since  $p_k \in (0, 1]$ , a range constraint is also involved. The  
 19 linearity of this relationship allows the problem to be transformed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{N}_p((\alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2) * F, \mathbf{W}'; \mathcal{X}_{\text{train}})) - \mathcal{C}| < \mathcal{T} \\ \text{s.t. } \max(\alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2) \leq 1 \\ \min(\alpha I_k + \beta I_k^2) > 0 \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, K \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

20 Since the FLOPs constraint is closely related to the number of filters in the  
 21 front-end and back-end layers, it can be difficult to solve for the values of  $\alpha$   
 22 and  $\beta$  directly. The Nelder-Mead search algorithm [19] can be used to search  
 23 the minimum of a multivariate function and does not require a derivable

1 expression. It also converges to a minimum relatively quickly, saving signif-  
 2 icant runtime compared to pruning algorithms such as ABCPruner [41]. As  
 3 such, this paper applied the encapsulated Nelder-Mead search algorithm in  
 4 scikit-learn under a fixed search domain. Fast determination of the optimal  
 5 pruning rate for each model layer was achieved as a result. It is worth noting  
 6 that, although previous studies have demonstrated pruned sub-networks can  
 7 achieve comparable performance without inheriting original network weights  
 8 (random initialization), a recent study [47] proved the inheritance of impor-  
 9 tant weights in a pruned network could help a sub-network converge to higher  
 10 accuracy without investing more training resources.

### 11 3.4. Pruning Implementation and Multi-Branch Network Processing

12 The proposed pruning process (2EAFS), based on the above analysis, is  
 13 shown in Algorithm 1. The 2D entropy of the output feature map for the  
 14 layer to be pruned was first calculated using Eq. (3). The corresponding  
 15 entropy value was then restricted to  $[0,1]$  using max-min normalization. The  
 16 importance of each convolutional layer was then determined using Eq. (7)  
 17 and a function based on the FLOPs constraint was constructed to adaptively  
 18 and rapidly determine the ideal pruning rate for each layer. Critical weights  
 19 were then inherited based on high or low 2D information entropy. Finally,  
 20 the pruned model was fine-tuned to maintain comparable performance with  
 21 the pre-trained model.

22 Common CNN models include efficient plain networks, multi-branch net-  
 23 work structures offering higher recognition accuracy, and associated varia-  
 24 tions. For example, VGG is a typical front-end representation of this struc-  
 25 ture type [43]. Other network structures have also been developed recently,  
 26 including ResNet[7]. Due to the singular structure of the VGG network, crit-  
 27 ical weights can be directly obtained from a 2D entropy evaluation and the  
 28 Nelder-Mead search algorithm, as shown in Fig. 3(a). In the case of ResNet,  
 29 this approach involves some limitations due to the introduction of residual  
 30 connections. For instance, suppose a residual block must be used to complete  
 31 a sum operation. In this case, it is necessary to ensure the number of input  
 32 and output channels are consistent, making it difficult to directly prune the  
 33 last convolutional layer in each residual block. For example, ResNet-56/110  
 34 (shown in Fig. 3(b)) includes two  $1 \times 1$  convolutional layers per residual block.  
 35 However, the parameters and convolution computations are primarily con-  
 36 centrated in the first layer. In contrast, each residual block in ResNet-50  
 37 (shown in Fig. 3(c)) includes two  $1 \times 1$  and one  $3 \times 3$  convolutional layer. As



1 such, most of the calculations are performed in the first two layers and only  
 2 the last layer is reserved for each residual block of the ResNet, while other  
 3 layers are pruned.

---

**Algorithm 1** The pruning algorithm based on 2EAFS

---

**Input:** The pre-trained model weight is given by  $\{\mathbf{w}_k\}_{k=1}^K$ , the number of fine-tuned iterations is  $N$ , and the target FLOPs quantity is  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Output:** The pruned model  $\mathcal{M}_p(\cdot)$  and the weight parameters  $\{\mathbf{w}'_k\}_{k=1}^K$  after fine-tuning.

1: **for** all  $1 \rightarrow K$  **do**  
 2:     2D entropy  $H \leftarrow \text{Eq.}(3)$   
 3:      $\tilde{H}_k^i \leftarrow \text{Eq.}(4)$  and  $\text{Eq.}(5)$   
 4: **end for**  
 5:  $I_k \leftarrow \text{Eq.}(7)$   
 6: Construct a  $\mathcal{C}$  constrained  $\text{Eq.}(8)$  and  $\text{Eq.}(9)$   
 7:  $p_k \leftarrow \text{Eq.}(10)$  by the Nelder-Mead algorithm  
 8:  $\{\text{Ind}_k\}_{k=1}^K \leftarrow \text{Eq.}(6)$   
 9: Inherit important weights  $\{\mathbf{w}'_k\}_{k=1}^K$  by  $\{\text{Ind}_k\}_{k=1}^K$   
 10: **while**  $1 \rightarrow N$  **do**  
 11:     Fine-tune the pruned model  $\mathcal{M}_p(\cdot)$   
 12: **end while**

---

## 4. Experiments

5 In this section, we demonstrate the compression performance of the pro-  
 6 posed method applied to the CIFAR10/100 and ILSVRC2012 datasets using  
 7 different network architectures. Implementation details for these experiments  
 8 are first explained and comparisons are then provided with some popular  
 9 techniques. Finally, the causes of this improved performance displayed by  
 10 the pruned model are discussed.

### 4.1. Experimental Details

#### 4.1.1. Benchmark Datasets and Models

13 Five benchmark datasets, CIFAR-10 [48], CIFAR-100 [48], ILSVRC-2012  
 14 [49], NWPU-RESISC45[50] and CUB-200-2011[51] were used to conduct a  
 15 series of validation experiments. To facilitate a comparison with other meth-  
 16 ods, the performance of the proposed pruning technique was investigated  
 17 using mainstream CNN models, including plain networks (i.e., VGG-16 [52])




Figure 3: Pruning strategies for the (a) regular structure, (b) residual block1, and (c) residual block2 in the proposed 2EAFS. The online model represents the unpruned structure, while offline denotes the pruned structure.

1 and multi-branch networks (i.e., ResNet). CIFIR-10 and CIFIR-100 are im-  
2 age datasets with sample sizes of 32x32, for which 50k images were used for  
3 training and 10k were used for testing. The primary difference is the former  
4 includes only 10 categories while the latter spans 100. ILSVRC-2012 is a  
5 large-scale dataset containing 1.28 million training images and 50k valida-  
6 tion images from 1,000 categories. NWPU-RESISC45 dataset is a publicly  
7 available benchmark for remote sensing image scene classification which con-  
8 tains 31,500 images, covering 45 scene classes with 700 images in each class,  
9 we are divided into training sets and test sets according to the 7: 3 ratio.  
10 The CUB-200–2011 is the most widely used benchmark for fine-grained im-  
11 age classification. The dataset covers 200 species of birds, including 5,994

1 training images and 5,794 test images. Specifically, VGG-16, ResNet-56, and  
2 ResNet-110, were pruned using CIFAR-10/100, ResNet-50 was pruned on  
3 ILSVRC-2012 and NWPU-RESISC45, while VGG-16 (input image size is  
4  $224 \times 224$ ) was pruned on CUB-200-2011.

#### 5 *4.1.2. Training Settings*

6 All experiments were optimized using a stochastic gradient descent algo-  
7 rithm (SGD) with a momentum of 0.9. To alleviate overfitting and speed  
8 up convergence, CIFAR-10 used a weight decay of 0.005, CIFAR-100 used  
9 weight decay values of 0.005 and 0.0005 for VGG-16 and ResNet-56/110,  
10 respectively, and ResNet-50 with ILSVRC-2012 and NWPU-RESISC45 used  
11 a weight decay of 0.0001. VGG-16, ResNet-56/110, and ResNet-50 included  
12 batch sizes of 256, training epochs of 150, 300, and 90 (NWPU-RESISC45  
13 is 30), and initial learning rates of 0.01, 0.01, and 0.1 (NWPU-RESISC45 is  
14 0.01), respectively. The learning rates for all CIFAR-10/100 networks were  
15 divided by 10 at the 150th and 225th epochs, excluding VGG-16, which di-  
16 vided the learning rate by 10 at the 50th and 100th epochs. In the case  
17 of ILSVRC-2012, the learning rate was divided by 10 in the 30th and 60th  
18 epochs, and the learning rate for the first 5 epochs was gradually increased  
19 to speed up convergence. The training parameters utilized for VGG-16 on  
20 CUB-200-2011 were identical to those for CIFAR-10/100. A total of 2,000  
21 images were randomly sampled from each of the benchmarks and architec-  
22 tures to estimate the average 2D entropy of each feature map.

23 All models were implemented and trained on an NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPU  
24 using Pytorch. Random cropping and horizontal flipping were applied in all  
25 experiments to augment input images. No other processing steps (e.g., label  
26 smoothing, image augmentation, architecture modification, or cosine/linear  
27 decay learning rates) were included, since these experiments are specifically  
28 intended to demonstrate the performance of the pruning algorithm.

#### 29 *4.1.3. Performance Metrics*

30 Parameter quantities and FLOPs were used to evaluate pruning model  
31 memory footprints and acceleration effects, which are mainstream evaluation  
32 criteria used in model compression. Corresponding pruning rates (PR) are  
33 reported below. Specifically, the Top-1 accuracy is reported for CIFAR-  
34 10/100 and both Top-1 and Top-5 accuracies are reported for ILSVRC-2012.  
35 Accuracy correction is another vital evaluation metric for fair comparisons,  
36 as discussed below.

1 *4.2. Experiments on CIFAR-10*

2 **VGG-16.** The performance of our proposed filter pruning method was  
3 compared with several conventional algorithms, including those based on  
4 the intrinsic properties of neural networks, such as L1-Normal [14], Hrank  
5 [30], CPMC [53], SSIM-QSFM [54], several regularization-retraining pruning  
6 methods such as SSS [36], Hinge [55], VCNNP [35], SWP [38] and GAL [37],  
7 and weight sharing method (i.e, SCWC[56]), as shown in Table 2. Compared  
8 with state-of-the-art methods (i.e., Hrank [30], CPMC [53], and QSFM-SSIM  
9 [54]), the proposed model exhibited lower performance degradation (0.38%  
10 vs 1.62% by Hrank [30], 0.28% by CPMC [53], and 1.79% by QSFM-SSIM  
11 [54]), larger parameter reductions (74.9% vs. 65.3% by Hrank, 66.0% by  
12 CPMC, and 75.0% by QSFM-SSIM), and larger FLOPs reductions (86.1%  
13 vs. 82.1% by Hrank, 92.9% by CPMC, and 75.0% by QSFM-SSIM), all  
14 representing significant decreases. Both Hrank and 2EAFS failed to achieve  
15 better experimental results in highly compressed cases, which we attribute  
16 to manually set pruning rates. 2EAFS also produced better experimental  
17 results at different pruning rates in the case of regularization-retraining. For  
18 example, SSS [37], Hinge [55], VCNNP [35], and GAL-0.05 [37] produced  
19 varying degrees of performance degradation (0.69%/0.94% by SSS [37], 0.43%  
20 by Hinge [55], 0.07% by VCNNP [35], and 0.19% by GAL-0.05 [37]) when the  
21 number of FLOPs was reduced by less than 50% and the parameters were  
22 reduced by no more than 80%. In contrast, the proposed method achieved a  
23 65.0% reduction in FLOPs and an 80.3% reduction in parameters, with only  
24 a 0.07% performance decrease. Finally, compared with the weight sharing  
25 method SCWC, 2EAFS has better performance with similar FLOPs. These  
26 results suggest our proposed pruning method offers excellent performance  
27 with a simple model structure.

28 **ResNet-56.** Pruning results for ResNet-56 applied to CIFAR-10 are  
29 shown in Table 3, where it is evident that 2EAFS offers superior perfor-  
30 mance (-0.54%/1.59% vs. -0.26%/2.54% by Hrank [30] and -0.39%/2.06%  
31 by FilterSketch [57] in Top-1 accuracy reduction), with similar FLOP quan-  
32 tities (30.4%/74.7% vs. 29.3%/74.4% by Hrank and 30.4%/74.4% by Fil-  
33 terSketch). 2EAFS was also compared with two property importance-based  
34 methods: L1\_Normal [14] and NISP [29]. Notable performance improvements  
35 (-0.13% vs. -0.02% by L1\_Normal and 0.03% by NISP) were also achieved  
36 in the case of more significant reductions in FLOPs and parameters. This  
37 demonstrates that 2EAFS is adequate for tasks with high compression rates,  
38 enabling deployment on resource-constrained devices. Similar observations

Table 2: Performance comparisons for VGG-16 applied to CIFAR-10.

Method	FLOPs↓	Parameters↓	Top-1%	±Acc(%)
L1-Normal[14]	34.3%	64.0%	93.25→93.40	+0.15
SSS[36]	36.3%	66.7%	93.96→93.27	-0.69
Hinge[55]	39.1%	80.1%	94.20→93.59	-0.43
VCNNP[35]	39.1%	73.3%	93.25→93.18	-0.07
GAL-0.05[37]	39.6%	77.6%	93.96→93.77	-0.19
SSS[36]	41.6%	64.0%	93.96→93.02	-0.94
SCWC[56]	41.9%	39.5%	N/A	+0.07
<b>2EAFS</b>	50.0%	71.4%	93.55→93.92	+0.37
Hrank[30]	53.5%	82.9%	93.96→93.43	-0.53
<b>2EAFS</b>	65.0%	80.3%	93.55→93.62	+0.07
Hrank[30]	65.3%	82.1%	93.96→92.34	-1.62
CPMC[53]	66.0%	92.9%	93.68→93.40	-0.28
SCWC[56]	70.3%	69.4%	N/A	-0.67
SWP[38]	71.2%	92.7%	93.25→92.85	-0.40
QSFM-SSIM[54]	75.0%	75.0%	93.39→91.60	-1.79
<b>2EAFS</b>	74.9%	86.1%	93.55→93.17	-0.38

1 of the adaptive importance-based methods (GAL-0.6 [37] and SCP [58]) sug-  
2 gested that 2EAFS achieved better parameter compression (53.7% vs. 11.8%  
3 for GAL-0.6 and 48.4% for SCP) without performance degradation (-0.13%  
4 vs. 0.28% by GAL-0.6 and 0.46% by SCP).

5 **ResNet-110.** The performance of ResNet-110 applied to CIFAR-10 was  
6 also analyzed, as shown in Table 4. Similar to the results produced by  
7 ResNet-56, 2EAFS achieved better accuracy (94.40% vs. 93.61%) compared  
8 to the baseline model, with a 43.1% reduction in FLOPs and a 43.0%  
9 reduction in parameters. Compared with FilterSketch [57] and Hrank [30],  
10 2EAFS again achieved lower performance degradation (0.02% vs. 0.06% and  
11 0.85%, respectively), with a slight reduction in complexity. This model also  
12 outperformed NISP [29] and GAL-0.5 [37], achieving better recognition per-  
13 formance (93.59% vs. 93.38% and 92.55%, respectively). 2EAFS further  
14 accelerated the required calculations (70.6% vs. 43.8% and 48.5%) and re-  
15 duced the overload (71.1% vs. 43.3% and 44.8%), indicating the proposed  
16 technique to be highly simple and efficient for multi-branch networks, espe-  
17 cially residual networks. Fig. 4 shows the resulting performance degradation  
18 of the proposed pruning method applied to ResNet-56 and ResNet-110 under

Table 3: Performance comparisons for Resnet-56 applied to CIFAR-10.

Method	FLOPs↓	Parameters↓	Top-1%	±Acc(%)
DeepPruningES[59]	21.3%	N/A	93.37→91.89	-1.48
L1-Normal[14]	27.6%	14.1%	93.06→93.04	-0.02
Hrank[30]	29.3%	16.8%	93.26→93.52	+0.26
FilterSketch[57]	30.4%	20.6%	93.26→93.65	+0.39
<b>2EAFS</b>	30.4%	34.1%	93.26→93.80	+0.54
SCWC[56]	32.6%	33.2%	N/A	+0.10
GAL-0.6[37]	37.6%	11.8%	92.98→93.26	-0.28
FilterSketch[57]	41.5%	41.2%	93.26→93.19	-0.07
SCWC[56]	41.8%	43.0%	N/A	-0.04
NIPS[29]	43.6%	43.6%	93.06→93.01	-0.03
CP[32]	50.0%	N/A	92.80→91.80	-1.00
AMC[40]	50.0%	N/A	91.80→91.90	-0.90
DCP[60]	50.0%	N/A	93.80→93.59	-0.21
DMC[61]	50.0%	N/A	93.62→93.69	+0.07
<b>2EAFS</b>	50.7%	53.7%	93.26→93.39	+0.13
SCP[58]	51.5%	48.4%	93.69→93.23	-0.46
SFP[62]	52.6%	N/A	93.59→93.35	-0.24
LFPC[63]	52.9%	N/A	93.59→93.34	-0.25
Aakash et al.[64]	53.9%	51.3%	94.11→93.37	-0.74
Hrank[30]	74.4%	68.1%	93.26→90.72	-2.54
FilterSketch[57]	74.4%	71.8%	93.26→91.20	-2.06
<b>2EAFS</b>	74.7%	76.7%	93.26→91.67	-1.59

1 different FLOPs conditions. Several state-of-the-art methods were compared  
2 to demonstrate the advantages of 2EAFS. It is evident from the figure that  
3 model recognition effects decreased at varying rates as the pruning rate in-  
4 creased. However, 2EAFS consistently achieved better Top-1 accuracy com-  
5 pared to other pruning models with similar computational effort, indicating  
6 the proposed method can achieve maximum compression and acceleration  
7 while maintaining accuracy.

#### 8 4.3. Experiments on CIFAR-100

9 Experiments were also conducted using three networks applied to the  
10 more complex CIFAR-100 dataset. Seven model compression methods were  
11 compared, including VCNNP [35], CPGMI [58], CPMC [53], G-pruning [68],




Figure 4: Comparisons of performance degradation for existing methods and 2EAFS under varying FLOPs quantities. Experiments were performed using the CIFAR-10 dataset.

1 MIL [69], BNP [70], and SFP [62], as shown in Table 5. Specifically, in the  
 2 case of the simple VGG-16 model structure, the proposed method achieved  
 3 better time and spatial complexity than VCNNP [35] and CPGMI [58] with  
 4 comparable performance (73.64% vs. 73.33% and 73.53%). In addition,  
 5 2EAFS achieved outstanding performance in terms of accuracy degradation

Table 4: Performance comparisons for ResNet-110 applied to CIFAR-10.

Method	FLOPs↓	Parameters↓	Top-1%	±Acc(%)
SFP[62]	14.6%	N/A	93.68→93.83	+0.15
L1-Normal[14]	15.9%	2.3	93.53→93.55	+0.02
Liu et al.[65]	15.9%	2.3	93.14→93.22	+0.08
L1-Normal[14]	38.6%	32.4%	93.53→93.30	-0.23
SFP[62]	40.8%	N/A	93.68→93.86	+0.18
CNN-FCF[66]	43.1%	43.2%	93.58→93.67	+0.09
Hrank[30]	41.2%	44.8%	93.50→94.23	+0.73
<b>2EAFS</b>	43.1%	43.0%	93.61→94.40	+0.79
NISP[29]	43.8%	43.3%	93.53→93.38	-0.15
GAL-0.5[37]	48.5%	44.8%	93.50→92.55	-0.95
Hrank[30]	58.2%	59.2%	93.50→93.36	-0.14
<b>2EAFS</b>	58.8%	58.6%	93.61→93.90	+0.29
FilterSketch[57]	63.3%	59.9%	93.50→93.44	-0.06
Hrank[30]	68.6%	68.7%	93.50→92.65	-0.85
DeepPruningES[59]	64.8%	N/A	93.80→91.34	-2.46
<b>2EAFS</b>	70.6%	71.1%	93.61→93.59	-0.02
CNN-FCF[66]	70.8%	69.5%	93.58→92.96	-0.62
Nima et.al[67]	N/A	78.0%	94.27→93.00	-1.27

1 when compressing ResNet-56. For example, our approach produced lower  
 2 performance degradation under the condition of halving model computations  
 3 (1.87% vs. 2.86% for BNP and 2.61% for SFP). To further demonstrate the  
 4 effectiveness of our algorithm, acceleration effects (37.3%, 45.1%, and 53.0%)  
 5 and the performance (72.85%, 72.30%, and 71.89%) of ResNet-110 under dif-  
 6 ferent parameter compression ratios (44.1%, 51.2%, and 58.2%) are reported  
 7 in Table 5. The results of these experiments demonstrate the proposed data-  
 8 driven methodology, 2EAFS, can achieve better acceleration effects in high  
 9 compression states.

#### 10 4.4. Experiments on ILSVRC-2012

11 To further demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach for more com-  
 12 plex datasets, we compared 2EAFS with several advanced algorithms, in-  
 13 cluding those based on the intrinsic properties of neural networks i.e., CP [32],  
 14 Hrank [30], [71] and [74], automatic subnet search such as ABCpruner [41]  
 15 and PSO[73], and some regularization-retraining pruning methods (i.e., SSS



Table 5: Performance comparisons for VGG-16 and ResNet-56/110 applied to CIFAR-100. PR is used to express the reduction rate for parameters or FLOPs.

Model	Method	FLOPs	PR	Parameters	PR	Top-1%	$\pm$ Acc(%)
VGG-16	VCNNP[35]	256.00M	18.1%	9.14M	37.9%	73.26→73.33	+0.07
	CPGMI[58]	198.20M	37.1%	4.99M	37.1%	73.26→73.53	+0.27
	<b>2EAFS</b>	173.16M	44.9%	4.35M	70.6%	73.83→73.64	-0.19
	CPMC[53]	162.00M	48.4%	4.80M	67.5%	73.80→73.01	-0.49
	<b>2EAFS</b>	152.65M	51.4%	3.73M	74.8%	73.83→73.15	-0.68
ResNet-56	G-pruning[68]	87.10M	32.9%	N/A	30%	71.48→70.81	-0.67
	<b>2EAFS</b>	80.00M	36.8%	0.47M	45.4%	71.52→70.60	-0.92
	MIL[69]	76.30M	39.3%	N/A	N/A	71.33→68.37	-2.96
	BNP[70]	67.20M	51.1%	N/A	N/A	72.93→70.07	-2.86
	SFP[62]	59.40M	52.6%	N/A	N/A	71.40→68.79	-2.61
	<b>2EAFS</b>	61.00M	51.8%	0.36M	58.5%	71.52→69.65	-1.87
ResNet-110	<b>2EAFS</b>	159.98M	37.3%	0.97M	44.1%	73.62→72.85	-0.77
	<b>2EAFS</b>	140.02M	45.1%	0.85M	51.2%	73.62→72.30	-0.78
	<b>2EAFS</b>	119.86M	53.0%	0.73M	58.2%	73.62→71.89	-1.73

Table 6: Pruning results of ResNet-50 on ILSVRC-2012. PR is used to express the reduction rate of FLOPs.

Model	FLOPs	PR	Top-1%	$\pm$ Acc%	Top-5%	$\pm$ Acc(%)
SSS-26	2.82B	31.9%	76.15→74.18	-1.97	92.96→91.91	-1.05
CP[32]	2.73B	34.1%	76.15→72.30	-3.85	92.96→90.80	-2.16
SFP[62]	2.39B	41.8%	76.15→74.61	-1.54	92.87→92.06	-0.81
SSS-32[36]	2.33B	43.9%	76.12→71.82	-4.30	92.86→90.79	-2.07
<b>2EAFS</b>	2.30B	44.1%	76.15→74.75	-1.40	92.87→92.34	-0.53
White Box [71]	2.22B	45.6%	76.15→75.32	-0.83	92.96→92.43	-0.53
RRBP[72]	1.86B	54.5%	76.15→73.00	-3.15	92.96→91.00	-1.96
GAL[37]	1.84B	55.6%	76.15→71.80	-4.35	92.96→90.82	-2.14
ABCPruner[41]	1.79B	56.6%	76.01→73.52	-2.49	92.96→91.51	-1.45
PSO[73]	1.71B	58.1%	76.15→71.93	-4.22	92.87→91.26	-1.61
<b>2EAFS</b>	1.60B	61.1%	76.15→73.46	-2.98	92.87→91.51	-1.30
Hrank[22]	1.55B	62.6%	76.15→71.98	-4.17	92.96→91.01	-1.95
CLR-RNF-0.44[74]	1.23B	70.1%	76.01→72.67	-3.34	92.96→91.09	-1.87
Hrank[22]	0.98B	76.0%	76.15→69.10	-7.05	92.96→89.58	-3.38
<b>2EAFS</b>	1.00B	75.7%	76.15→70.53	-6.05	92.87→89.85	-3.28

1 [37], SFP [62], GAL [37], and RRBP [72]). These comparative experiments  
 2 were conducted using ResNet-50 applied to ILSVRC-2012. Unlike in previ-  
 3 ous experiments, we report the Top-1 and Top-5 accuracy and performance  
 4 degradation for 2EAFS under different acceleration conditions, as shown  
 5 in Table 6. Compared with other advanced methods, 2EAFS consistently  
 6 achieved better recognition results. Specifically, it reduced model FLOPs to  
 7 2.30B while achieving 74.75% Top-1 accuracy and 92.34% Top-5 accuracy.  
 8 Compared to Hrank [30], a recent state-of-the-art method, 2EAFS achieved  
 9 better performance (73.46% vs. 71.98% and 70.10% vs. 69.10%) under simi-  
 10 lar acceleration conditions (62.4% vs. 62.6% and 75.7% vs. 76.0%). Under  
 11 larger acceleration conditions, performance (2.69% vs. 3.15% by RRBP [72]  
 12 and 4.35% by [37] in Top-1 accuracy) comparable to RRBP and GAL was  
 13 still achieved. Compared with the automatic search method, in the case of  
 14 reducing more FLOPs, 2EAFS can achieve lower accuracy drop on Top-5.  
 15 The above experimental results demonstrate that our proposed method offers  
 16 significant advantages in pruning ResNet-50 applied to large-scale datasets.

17 Fig. 5 shows the number of filters in the first two convolutional layers for  
 18 each residual block of Resnet-50 under different FLOPs constraints. Each  
 19 time there is a down-sampling operation, the first two residual blocks in the  
 20 same stage retain more filters. We suggest that when down-sampling is per-  
 21 formed with a convolution of stride 2, more filters must be used to compensate  
 22 for a loss of information caused by the reduced resolution of feature maps. In  
 23 addition, it is evident this adaptive pruning algorithm is relatively balanced,  
 24 avoiding poor information transmission caused by excessive pruning of some  
 25 layers.

26 Grad-CAM (Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping) is a visual-  
 27 ization technique that can help evaluate the network’s performance [75]. The  
 28 Grad-CAM for ResNet-50 with 2EAFS is shown in Fig. 6, in which the red  
 29 regions correspond to a high score for a class and the blue regions repre-  
 30 sent that the feature is suppressed. All Grad-CAMs support the white crane  
 31 category, in which the head and belly of the white crane are hot and other  
 32 objects (e.g., vegetation) are cool. According to the Grad-CAM results, the  
 33 ResNet-50 model optimized by 2EAFS can more effectively suppress vegeta-  
 34 tion than the original ResNet-50 while still retaining high scores for the  
 35 white crane class.




Figure 5: The number of filters in the first two convolutional layers for each residual block of Resnet-50 under different FLOPs constraints.




Figure 6: Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping for Resnet50 with 2EAFS: (a) Original image; (b) Pre-training model; (c) 2EAFS(44.1% reduction in FLOPs); (d) 61.1% reduction in FLOPs.

1 4.5. Experiments on NWPU-RESISC45 and CUB-200-2011

2 In order to demonstrate that 2EAFS is also effective in specific scenarios  
 3 or types of data, we chose typical remote sensing scene and image fine-grained  
 4 classification tasks for verification, with ResNet-50 and VGG-16 as bench-  
 5 mark networks, respectively. The experimental results are shown Table 7,

Table 7: The performance of 2EAFS for remote sensing scene recognition and fine-grained image classification

Dataset	Model	Parameters↓	FLOPs↓	Acc(%)	±Acc(%)
NWPU-RESISC45	ResNet-50	0.00%	0.00%	91.53	0.00
		32.19%	30.05%	92.61	+1.08
		51.85%	50.04%	92.06	+0.53
		61.54%	60.02%	91.33	-0.20
CUB-200-2011	VGG-16	0.00%	0.00%	72.32	0.00
		39.92%	32.58%	70.75	-1.57
		43.98%	40.82%	70.06	-2.26

1 such as: on the remote sensing scene recognition dataset NWPU-RESISC45,  
 2 with a 50% reduction in FLOPs, a performance improvement of 0.53% is still  
 3 achieved; for the fine-grained classification dataset CUB-200-2011, with a re-  
 4 duction of about 40% in FLOPs, a loss of 1.57% in accuracy occurs. This is  
 5 because fine-grained classification tasks require more detailed features than  
 6 coarse image classification, and compressing the original network model will  
 7 to some extent lose some of the ability to extract fine-grained features, lead-  
 8 ing to a certain degree of reduction in the accuracy of fine-grained image  
 9 classification. However, the accuracy loss is still tolerable.

#### 10 4.6. Inference speed

11 To further explore the model performance obtained by 2EAFS pruning,  
 12 we evaluated the inference speed for four models under different FLOPs.  
 13 PyTorch implements these tests in CPU(Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4214R CPU  
 14 @ 2.40GHz) and GPU(GeForce RTX 2080 Ti). In Table 8, we can observe  
 15 that the pruning procedure can significantly increase the inference speed of  
 16 the model.

#### 17 4.7. Discussion

18 The above comparative experiments demonstrate that 2EAFS can main-  
 19 tain better recognition accuracy while reducing the number of required cal-  
 20 culations. We suggest its performance efficacy is primarily derived from  
 21 adaptive filter search and the inheritance of weight importance.

22 **Adaptive Filter Search.** Conventional neural network pruning meth-  
 23 ods based on pretraining-dependency [14, 15, 16] and regularization-retraining  
 24 [40, 39, 41, 42] require a fixed pruning structure or a series of hyper-parameter

Table 8: FPS of models with different pruning rates on GPU and CPU.

Image size	Model	FLOPs↓	FPS(CPU)	FPS(GPU)
32×32	VGG-16	0.00%	395.39	203.08
		50.0%	411.00	289.34
		74.9%	477.67	364.52
32×32	ResNet-56	0.00%	110.83	119.13
		30.4%	125.77	125.57
		74.7%	131.13	135.42
32×32	ResNet-110	0.00%	56.87	59.18
		43.1%	65.89	66.52
		70.6%	67.85	69.67
224×224	ResNet-50	0.00%	130.05	23.73
		43.1%	135.04	28.46
		58.8%	137.28	33.25

1 tuning processes, which often produces sub-optimal results. Although auto-  
2 matic subnet searches [40, 39, 41, 42] based on a self-heuristic can provide a  
3 better network structure model, higher computational costs are involved that  
4 often produce suboptimal search results. The hierarchical pruning structures  
5 of VGG-16 with imposed FLOPs constraints are shown in Fig. 7 for different  
6 datasets (CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100). It is evident the pruning rate varies  
7 between layers and the parameter pruning ratio is positively correlated with  
8 the depth of the convolutional layer. In other words, as the depth increases,  
9 more filters tend to be culled. 2EAFS self-adapts to derive a deterministic  
10 optimal pruned architecture without human involvement by introducing a  
11 measure of convolutional layer importance.

12 **Importance Weight Inheritance.** Recent work [65] has demonstrated  
13 the essence of filter pruning lies in identifying an optimal pruned architecture  
14 rather than selecting the most important filter weights, as done in previous  
15 studies [30, 14]. In this subsection, we demonstrate that weights inherited  
16 by 2EAFS are sufficiently important using the results of an ablation study.  
17 High 2D entropy, low 2D entropy, and random weight inheritance based on  
18 pruned networks were extracted using VGG-16 and ResNet-56/110 applied to  
19 CIFAR-10. To provide a fair comparison, the other parameters were set to the  
20 same values as in previous experiments. It is apparent from the experimental  
21 results shown in Table 9 that better performance can be achieved when fil-  
22 ters corresponding to high information entropy feature maps undergo weight





Figure 7: The pruning rate of each layer for VGG-16 applied to (a) CIFAR-10 and (b) CIFAR-100.

- 1 inheritance. Random inheritance also produces a certain degree of performance
- 2 improvement relative to low information entropy. This indicates the
- 3 pre-trained network model has "distilled" some critical information through

Table 9: The effects of different weight inheritance methods on the accuracy of pruned networks.

Method	FLOPs	High 2D entropy	Random	Low 2D entropy
VGG-16-P	78.90M	93.17	92.93	92.71
ResNet-56-P	62.45M	93.39	93.11	92.96
ResNet-110-P	74.88M	93.59	93.22	92.83

1 high 2D entropy, reaffirming the importance of inheriting weight information  
 2 for recognition accuracy.

### 3 **5. Conclusion**

4 Existing deep neural networks offer good performance but at high infer-  
 5 ence and storage costs. As such, this paper proposed an efficient acceleration  
 6 method of CNNs, 2EAFS, in which information entropy in the feature map  
 7 (measured by 2D entropy) was used as a theoretical guide to evaluate cor-  
 8 responding filters and compress more compact CNN models. A constraint  
 9 equation was then constructed based on the negative correlation between  
 10 filter pruning rates and the importance of convolutional layers. The Nelder-  
 11 Mead search algorithm was applied to quickly determine the optimal pruning  
 12 rate in each layer. Finally, the weights of filters were inherited based on the  
 13 pruning rate and information entropy, and model performance was restored  
 14 by -tuning. Extensive experiments demonstrated the superiority of 2EAFS  
 15 compared to other structural pruning algorithms.

### 16 **6. Declarations**

#### 17 *6.1. Conflict of Interest.*

18 All authors disclosed no relevant relationships.

#### 19 *6.2. Data supporting*

20 The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study  
 21 are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

#### 22 *6.3. Acknowledgments*

23 We thank LetPub ([www.letpub.com](http://www.letpub.com)) for linguistic assistance and pre-  
 24 submission expert review.

1 *6.4. Funding Information*

2 This work was supported by NSFC (No.62072489), Henan Science and  
3 Technology Innovation Team (CXTD2017091), IRTSTHN (21IRTSTHN013),  
4 Zhongyuan Science and Technology Innovation Leading Talent Program (214200510013), Qian-  
5 jiang laboratory open fund project of Hangzhou Research Institute of Bei-  
6 hang (2020-Y3-A-026).

7 **References**

- 8 [1] M. Aladem, S. A. Rawashdeh, A single-stream segmentation and depth  
9 prediction cnn for autonomous driving, *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 36  
10 (2020) 79–85.
- 11 [2] W. Farag, Z. Saleh, Behavior cloning for autonomous driving using  
12 convolutional neural networks (2018) 1–7.
- 13 [3] T. Wang, Y. Chen, M. Qiao, H. Snoussi, A fast and robust convolutional  
14 neural network-based defect detection model in product quality control,  
15 *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* 94  
16 (2018) 3465–3471.
- 17 [4] L. Jiang, Y. Wang, Z. Tang, Y. Miao, S. Chen, Casting defect detec-  
18 tion in x-ray images using convolutional neural networks and attention-  
19 guided data augmentation, *Measurement* 170 (2021) 108736.
- 20 [5] Z. S. Sabri, Z. Li, Low-cost intelligent surveillance system based on fast  
21 cnn, *PeerJ Computer Science* 7 (2021) e402.
- 22 [6] L. Xu, X. Zhou, Y. Tao, L. Liu, X. Yu, N. Kumar, Intelligent secu-  
23 rity performance prediction for iot-enabled healthcare networks using an  
24 improved cnn, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 18 (2021)  
25 2063–2074.
- 26 [7] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, J. Sun, Deep residual learning for image  
27 recognition, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision*  
28 *and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- 29 [8] X. Zhang, X. Zhou, M. Lin, J. Sun, Shufflenet: An extremely efficient  
30 convolutional neural network for mobile devices, in: *Proceedings of the*  
31 *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp.  
32 6848–6856.



- 1 [9] K. Han, Y. Wang, Q. Tian, J. Guo, C. Xu, C. Xu, Ghostnet: More  
2 features from cheap operations, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Con-  
3 ference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2020, pp. 1580–  
4 1589.
- 5 [10] G. Hinton, O. Vinyals, J. Dean, et al., Distilling the knowledge in a  
6 neural network, arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531 2 (2015).
- 7 [11] C. Li, X. Ma, Z. An, Y. Xu, A deep neural network compression algo-  
8 rithm based on knowledge transfer for edge device, in: 2018 IEEE/ACM  
9 Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC), IEEE, 2018, pp. 334–335.
- 10 [12] M. Rastegari, V. Ordonez, J. Redmon, A. Farhadi, Xnor-net: Imagenet  
11 classification using binary convolutional neural networks, in: European  
12 conference on computer vision, Springer, 2016, pp. 525–542.
- 13 [13] J. Fang, A. Shafiee, H. Abdel-Aziz, D. Thorsley, G. Georgiadis, J. H.  
14 Hassoun, Post-training piecewise linear quantization for deep neural  
15 networks, in: European Conference on Computer Vision, Springer, 2020,  
16 pp. 69–86.
- 17 [14] H. Li, A. Kadav, I. Durdanovic, H. Samet, H. P. Graf, Pruning filters  
18 for efficient convnets, arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08710 (2016).
- 19 [15] P. Molchanov, S. Tyree, T. Karras, T. Aila, J. Kautz, Pruning convo-  
20 lutional neural networks for resource efficient inference, arXiv preprint  
21 arXiv:1611.06440 (2016).
- 22 [16] N. Lee, T. Ajanthan, P. H. Torr, Snip: Single-shot network pruning  
23 based on connection sensitivity, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02340 (2018).
- 24 [17] C. G. Pachón, D. M. Ballesteros, D. Renza, Senpis: Sequential network  
25 pruning by class-wise importance score, Applied Soft Computing 129  
26 (2022) 109558. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2022.109558>.
- 27 [18] Z. Wang, X. Xie, G. Shi, Rfpruning: A retraining-free pruning method  
28 for accelerating convolutional neural networks, Applied Soft Computing  
29 113 (2021) 107860. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107860>.
- 30 [19] S. Singer, J. Nelder, Nelder-mead algorithm, Scholarpedia 4 (2009)  
31 2928.

- 1 [20] Y. LeCun, J. Denker, S. Solla, Optimal brain damage, *Advances in*  
2 *neural information processing systems* 2 (1989).
- 3 [21] S. Srinivas, R. V. Babu, Data-free parameter pruning for deep neural  
4 networks, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.06149* (2015).
- 5 [22] Z. Liu, J. Xu, X. Peng, R. Xiong, Frequency-domain dynamic prun-  
6 ing for convolutional neural networks, *Advances in neural information*  
7 *processing systems* 31 (2018).
- 8 [23] X. Dong, S. Chen, S. Pan, Learning to prune deep neural networks  
9 via layer-wise optimal brain surgeon, *Advances in Neural Information*  
10 *Processing Systems* 30 (2017).
- 11 [24] C. Chen, F. Tung, N. Vedula, G. Mori, Constraint-aware deep neural  
12 network compression, in: *Proceedings of the European Conference on*  
13 *Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 400–415.
- 14 [25] M. Lin, Y. Zhang, Y. Li, B. Chen, F. Chao, M. Wang, S. Li, Y. Tian,  
15 R. Ji, 1xn pattern for pruning convolutional neural networks, *IEEE*  
16 *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45 (2023)  
17 3999–4008. doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2022.3195774.
- 18 [26] Y. Ji, L. Liang, L. Deng, Y. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Xie, Tetris: Tile-  
19 matching the tremendous irregular sparsity 31 (2018).
- 20 [27] A. Zhou, Y. Ma, J. Zhu, J. Liu, Z. Zhang, K. Yuan, W. Sun, H. Li, Learn-  
21 ing n: M fine-grained structured sparse neural networks from scratch,  
22 *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04010* (2021).
- 23 [28] Y. Zhang, M. Lin, Z. Lin, Y. Luo, K. Li, F. Chao, Y. Wu, R. Ji,  
24 Learning best combination for efficient n: M sparsity, *arXiv preprint*  
25 *arXiv:2206.06662* (2022).
- 26 [29] R. Yu, A. Li, C.-F. Chen, J.-H. Lai, V. I. Morariu, X. Han, M. Gao, C.-  
27 Y. Lin, L. S. Davis, Nisp: Pruning networks using neuron importance  
28 score propagation, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer*  
29 *Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 9194–9203.
- 30 [30] M. Lin, R. Ji, Y. Wang, Y. Zhang, B. Zhang, Y. Tian, L. Shao,  
31 Hrank: Filter pruning using high-rank feature map, in: *Proceedings*

- 1 of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recogni-  
2 tion, 2020, pp. 1529–1538.
- 3 [31] Y. He, P. Liu, Z. Wang, Z. Hu, Y. Yang, Filter pruning via geometric  
4 median for deep convolutional neural networks acceleration, in: Pro-  
5 ceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern  
6 Recognition, 2019, pp. 4340–4349.
- 7 [32] Y. He, X. Zhang, J. Sun, Channel pruning for accelerating very deep  
8 neural networks, in: Proceedings of the IEEE international conference  
9 on computer vision, 2017, pp. 1389–1397.
- 10 [33] W. Wen, C. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Chen, H. Li, Learning structured sparsity  
11 in deep neural networks, *Advances in neural information processing*  
12 *systems* 29 (2016).
- 13 [34] Z. Liu, J. Li, Z. Shen, G. Huang, S. Yan, C. Zhang, Learning efficient  
14 convolutional networks through network slimming, in: Proceedings of  
15 the IEEE international conference on computer vision, 2017, pp. 2736–  
16 2744.
- 17 [35] C. Zhao, B. Ni, J. Zhang, Q. Zhao, W. Zhang, Q. Tian, Variational con-  
18 volutional neural network pruning, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF  
19 Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp.  
20 2780–2789.
- 21 [36] Z. Huang, N. Wang, Data-driven sparse structure selection for deep neu-  
22 ral networks, in: Proceedings of the European conference on computer  
23 vision (ECCV), 2018, pp. 304–320.
- 24 [37] S. Lin, R. Ji, C. Yan, B. Zhang, L. Cao, Q. Ye, F. Huang, D. Do-  
25 ermann, Towards optimal structured cnn pruning via generative ad-  
26 versarial learning, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on  
27 Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.
- 28 [38] F. Meng, H. Cheng, K. Li, H. Luo, X. Guo, G. Lu, X. Sun, Pruning  
29 filter in filter, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33  
30 (2020) 17629–17640.

- 1 [39] Z. Liu, H. Mu, X. Zhang, Z. Guo, X. Yang, K.-T. Cheng, J. Sun,  
2 Metapruning: Meta learning for automatic neural network channel prun-  
3 ing, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on com-  
4 puter vision, 2019, pp. 3296–3305.
- 5 [40] Y. He, J. Lin, Z. Liu, H. Wang, L.-J. Li, S. Han, Amc: Automl for model  
6 compression and acceleration on mobile devices, in: Proceedings of the  
7 European conference on computer vision (ECCV), 2018, pp. 784–800.
- 8 [41] M. Lin, R. Ji, Y. Zhang, B. Zhang, Y. Wu, Y. Tian, Channel pruning  
9 via automatic structure search, arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08565 (2020).
- 10 [42] S. Guo, Y. Wang, Q. Li, J. Yan, Dmcp: Differentiable markov channel  
11 pruning for neural networks, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF confer-  
12 ence on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2020, pp. 1539–1547.
- 13 [43] H. Hu, R. Peng, Y.-W. Tai, C.-K. Tang, Network trimming: A data-  
14 driven neuron pruning approach towards efficient deep architectures,  
15 arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.03250 (2016).
- 16 [44] G. Liu, X. Zheng, Fabric defect detection based on information entropy  
17 and frequency domain saliency, *The Visual Computer* 37 (2021) 515–  
18 528.
- 19 [45] S. Elkerdawy, M. Elhoushi, A. Singh, H. Zhang, N. Ray, To filter prune,  
20 or to layer prune, that is the question (2020).
- 21 [46] X. Liu, J. Cao, H. Yao, W. Sun, Y. Zhang, Adapruner: Adap-  
22 tive channel pruning and effective weights inheritance, arXiv preprint  
23 arXiv:2109.06397 (2021).
- 24 [47] M. Lin, R. Ji, S. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Wu, F. Huang, Q. Ye, Network pruning  
25 using adaptive exemplar filters, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks  
26 and Learning Systems* (2021).
- 27 [48] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton, et al., Learning multiple layers of features  
28 from tiny images (2009).
- 29 [49] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma,  
30 Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, et al., Imagenet large  
31 scale visual recognition challenge, *International journal of computer  
32 vision* 115 (2015) 211–252.

- 1 [50] G. Cheng, J. Han, X. Lu, Remote sensing image scene classifica-  
2 tion: Benchmark and state of the art, CoRR abs/1703.00121 (2017).  
3 arXiv:1703.00121.
- 4 [51] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, S. Belongie, The Caltech-  
5 UCSD Birds-200-2011 Dataset, Technical Report CNS-TR-2011-001,  
6 Computation & Neural Systems, California Institute of Technology,  
7 2011.
- 8 [52] C. Szegedy, W. Liu, Y. Jia, P. Sermanet, S. Reed, D. Anguelov, D. Er-  
9 han, V. Vanhoucke, A. Rabinovich, Going deeper with convolutions,  
10 in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern  
11 recognition, 2015, pp. 1–9.
- 12 [53] Y. Yan, R. Guo, C. Li, K. Yang, Y. Xu, Channel pruning via multi-  
13 criteria based on weight dependency, in: 2021 International Joint Con-  
14 ference on Neural Networks (IJCNN), IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–8.
- 15 [54] Z. Wang, X. Liu, L. Huang, Y. Chen, Y. Zhang, Z. Lin, R. Wang, Model  
16 pruning based on quantified similarity of feature maps, arXiv preprint  
17 arXiv:2105.06052 (2021).
- 18 [55] Y. Li, S. Gu, C. Mayer, L. V. Gool, R. Timofte, Group sparsity: The  
19 hinge between filter pruning and decomposition for network compres-  
20 sion, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision  
21 and pattern recognition, 2020, pp. 8018–8027.
- 22 [56] G. Li, M. Zhang, J. Wang, D. Weng, H. Corporaal, Scwc: Structured  
23 channel weight sharing to compress convolutional neural networks, In-  
24 formation Sciences 587 (2022) 82–96.
- 25 [57] M. Lin, L. Cao, S. Li, Q. Ye, Y. Tian, J. Liu, Q. Tian, R. Ji, Filter  
26 sketch for network pruning, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and  
27 Learning Systems (2021).
- 28 [58] M. K. Lee, S. Lee, S. H. Lee, B. C. Song, Channel pruning via gradient  
29 of mutual information for light-weight convolutional neural networks,  
30 in: 2020 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP),  
31 IEEE, 2020, pp. 1751–1755.

- 1 [59] F. E. Fernandes Jr., G. G. Yen, Pruning deep convolutional neural  
2 networks architectures with evolution strategy, *Information Sciences*  
3 552 (2021) 29–47. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2020.11.009>.
- 4 [60] Z. Zhuang, M. Tan, B. Zhuang, J. Liu, Y. Guo, Q. Wu, J. Huang, J. Zhu,  
5 Discrimination-aware channel pruning for deep neural networks (2018)  
6 883–894.
- 7 [61] S. Gao, F. Huang, J. Pei, H. Huang, Discrete model compression with  
8 resource constraint for deep neural networks (2020).
- 9 [62] Y. He, G. Kang, X. Dong, Y. Fu, Y. Yang, Soft filter pruning  
10 for accelerating deep convolutional neural networks, *arXiv preprint*  
11 *arXiv:1808.06866* (2018).
- 12 [63] Y. He, Y. Ding, P. Liu, L. Zhu, H. Zhang, Y. Yang, Learning filter prun-  
13 ing criteria for deep convolutional neural networks acceleration (2020)  
14 2006–2015. doi:[10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00208](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00208).
- 15 [64] H. Bilal, A. Kumar, B. Yin, Pruning filters with l1-norm and capped  
16 l1-norm for cnn compression, *Applied Intelligence* 51 (2021).
- 17 [65] Z. Liu, M. Sun, T. Zhou, G. Huang, T. Darrell, Rethinking the value of  
18 network pruning, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05270* (2018).
- 19 [66] T. Li, B. Wu, Y. Yang, Y. Fan, Y. Zhang, W. Liu, Compressing convo-  
20 lutional neural networks via factorized convolutional filters (2019) 3972–  
21 3981. doi:[10.1109/CVPR.2019.00410](https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.00410).
- 22 [67] N. Aghli, E. Ribeiro, Combining weight pruning and knowledge distilla-  
23 tion for cnn compression, in: *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*,  
24 2021.
- 25 [68] S. A. Aketi, S. Roy, A. Raghunathan, K. Roy, Gradual channel pruning  
26 while training using feature relevance scores for convolutional neural  
27 networks, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 171924–171932.
- 28 [69] X. Dong, J. Huang, Y. Yang, S. Yan, More is less: A more complicated  
29 network with less inference complexity, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE*  
30 *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp.  
31 5840–5848.

- 1 [70] X. Lu, H. Huang, W. Dong, X. Li, G. Shi, Beyond network pruning:  
2 a joint search-and-training approach, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-  
3 Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on  
4 Artificial Intelligence, 2021, pp. 2583–2590.
- 5 [71] Y. Zhang, M. Lin, C.-W. Lin, J. Chen, Y. Wu, Y. Tian, R. Ji,  
6 Carrying out cnn channel pruning in a white box, IEEE Trans-  
7 actions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems (2022) 1–10.  
8 doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3147269.
- 9 [72] Y. Zhou, Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, Q. Tian, Accelerate cnn via recursive  
10 bayesian pruning (2019) 3306–3315.
- 11 [73] S. Niu, K. Gao, P. Ma, X. Gao, H. Zhao, J. Dong, Y. Chen, D. Shen,  
12 Exploiting sparse self-representation and particle swarm optimization for  
13 cnn compression, IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning  
14 Systems (2022) 1–13. doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3165530.
- 15 [74] M. Lin, L. Cao, Y. Zhang, L. Shao, C.-W. Lin, R. Ji, Pruning net-  
16 works with cross-layer ranking & k-reciprocal nearest filters, IEEE  
17 Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems (2022) 1–10.  
18 doi:10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3156047.
- 19 [75] R. R. Selvaraju, M. Cogswell, A. Das, R. Vedantam, D. Parikh, D. Batra,  
20 Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based  
21 localization, arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02391 (2017).

# Response to Review Comments

Manuscript ID	ASOC-D-22-04168
Title	An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image recognition

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

We would like to thank you and anonymous reviewers for their time spent in evaluating our manuscript and for their constructive comments. We have carefully revised our manuscript according to the comments, which we sincerely appreciate because they helped us to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have thoroughly considered all the comments of the reviewers and revised our manuscript accordingly, and have tried our best to provide the appropriate answer to every question that the reviewers have raised. In addition, we also carefully proofread the experimental results and the grammar of the paper.

The detailed responses to all the comments are given in the following. The original comments are listed as numbered questions whilst their corresponding responses are also listed.

Look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Huanyu Li



## **To Reviewer 1:**

Q1.1. What is the theoretical foundation behind the 2D Entropy based-Adaptive Filter Search (2EAFS) method? How does it differ from other methods that have been proposed for CNN pruning?

*A1.1: 2EAFS is a novel pruning method for convolutional neural networks (CNNs). Compared to traditional pruning methods, 2EAFS employs the concept of 2D image entropy to measure the importance of feature maps corresponding to convolution kernels. Additionally, adaptive filters are utilized to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of pruning. Next, we will provide a detailed explanation of the theoretical foundation of the 2EAFS method and its differences from other CNN pruning methods.*

### **A: Theoretical foundation**

*(1) **2D entropy of feature map.** Traditional CNN pruning methods usually use L1 or L2 regularization. However, this method can only explain the importance of filters based on the weight values and cannot measure their contribution to image information. The concept of image entropy addresses the quantification of information and can be used to measure the richness of information in feature maps. But the premise is that the image entropy distribution is robust on the entire data set. Fortunately, through many experiments and observations, it is found that the image entropy distribution meets the above requirements. Calculations based on Shannon's entropy theory can only represent entropy values for a whole image. As such, they cannot represent the spatial characteristics of image pixel distributions, which affects the accuracy of information evaluation[1]. To address this issue, 2D information entropy is introduced to represent spatial distribution characteristics in the feature maps, thus more accurately assessing the contribution of each filter to image information.*

*(2) **Global pruning.** Our inspiration comes from network slimming[2], where the authors use the scaling factor of the batch normalization layer to achieve model compression. However, the original method has a problem in that during global pruning, inconsistent data distributions may result in some layers having zero channels, which leads to the failure of the pruning method. Therefore, in subsequent studies, researchers often normalize the data. Similarly, since the range of entropy values is closely related to the size of feature maps, entropy values in different convolutional layers vary significantly. To this end, we propose a max-min normalization to normalize the 2D entropy of each layer to [0, 1].*

*(3) **Adaptive Filter Search.** The last layer of a CNN tends to provide the best discrimination information and is commonly used for various application tasks. However, intermediate convolutional layers contain far more critical information in practice. Thus, by analyzing the correlation between layers, a more appropriate*

pruning method can be developed to achieve higher recognition accuracy while reducing the required computations [3]. Therefore, 2EAFS automatically determines the pruning rate of each layer from the perspective of the importance of the convolution layer. After obtaining the importance evaluation index of each convolution layer, we construct the evaluation function through the negative correlation between the pruning rate and the importance and determine the final pruning rate through Nelder-Mead.

### **B:Differences with other CNN pruning methods.**

(1) **Pruning strategy.** 2EAFS uses an adaptive filter search based on 2D information entropy to determine the importance of each filter. In contrast, traditional CNN pruning methods usually use L1 or L2 regularization or measure importance using filter weight statistics such as mean and standard deviation.

(2) **Determination of pruning rate.** Several recent studies [4,5] have modeled neural network pruning as an optimal structure search problem, using various intelligent algorithms to determine the pruning rate in each layer. However, the structured search must be repeated when budget requirements and datasets are modified, which requires significant computational resources and runtime. 2EAFS constructs a sparsity constraint equation based on the negative correlation between the filter pruning rate and the importance of the convolutional layer. The Nelder-Mead search algorithm is then adopted to quickly and adaptively determine the optimal pruning architect.

(3) **Pruning effect.** Compared to traditional CNN pruning methods, 2EAFS can significantly reduce the number of model parameters and computational complexity while maintaining model accuracy. The 2EAFS method achieved better results in experiments than other mainstream pruning methods. Meantime, we also chose typical remote sensing scenarios and image fine-grained type recognition tasks to verify that 2EAFS is still effective in specific scenarios or types of data

[1] Liu, G., & Zheng, X. (2021). Fabric defect detection based on information entropy and frequency domain saliency. *The Visual Computer*, 37(3), 515-528. Springer.

[2] Liu, Z., Li, J., Shen, Z., Huang, G., Yan, S., & Zhang, C. (2017). Learning efficient convolutional networks through network slimming. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision* (pp. 2736-2744).

[3] Chen, S., & Zhao, Q. (2018). Shallowing deep networks: Layer-wise pruning based on feature representations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 41(12), 3048-3056. IEEE.

[4] Liu, Z., Mu, H., Zhang, X., Guo, Z., Yang, X., Cheng, K. -T., & Sun, J. (2019). Metapruning: Meta learning for automatic neural network channel pruning. In

*Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision (pp. 3296-3305).*

[5] Lin, M., Ji, R., Zhang, Y., Zhang, B., Wu, Y., & Tian, Y. (2020). Channel pruning via automatic structure search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08565*.

Q1.2: How exactly is the importance of a filter measured using the amount of information contained in feature maps?

A1.2: Thank you very much for the questions raised by the reviewer. In structured pruning, when a filter is removed, the output feature map of that filter is also removed, which indicates the correlation between the filters and feature maps in neural networks. Previous studies[1] have used feature map sparsity to remove filters. However, this data-driven approach depends heavily on the distribution of input images. It also requires large sample quantities to make reasonable predictions, which involves a complex and time-consuming training process. Image entropy can be used for quantitative information measurements and represent the richness of feature maps. Entropy distribution is also robust across the entire data set, which has been demonstrated through extensive empirical validation. Therefore, this paper uses the expected value of the 2D entropy of each feature map to determine the importance of the corresponding filter.

In addition, we also carried out some ablation experiments to prove the importance of the filter weight obtained by two-dimensional entropy. High 2D entropy, low 2D entropy, and random weight inheritance based on pruned networks were extracted using VGG-16 and ResNet-56/110 applied to CIFAR-10. To provide a fair comparison, the other parameters were set to the same values as in previous experiments. It is apparent from the experimental results shown in Table 1 that better performance can be achieved when filters corresponding to high information entropy feature maps undergo weight inheritance. Random inheritance also produces a certain degree of performance improvement relative to low information entropy. This indicates the pre-trained network model has "distilled" some critical information through high 2D entropy, reaffirming the importance of inheriting weight information for recognition accuracy.

**Table 1: The effects of different weight inheritance methods on the accuracy of pruned networks**

Method	FLOPs	High 2D entropy	Random	Low 2D entropy
VGG-16	78.90	93.17	92.93	92.71
Resnet-56-P	62.45	93.39	93.11	92.96
Resnet-110-P	74.88	93.59	93.22	92.83

[1] Hu H, Peng R, Tai Y W, et al. Network trimming: A data-driven neuron pruning approach towards efficient deep architectures[J]. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.03250*, 2016.

**Q1.3: Can the proposed 2EAFS method be applied to other types of neural networks beyond CNNs? If so, how would the method need to be adapted?**

*A1.3: Thank you very much for the question raised by the reviewer. Currently, as one of the most important algorithms in deep learning, CNNs (CNNs) have achieved great success in computer vision, classification, and other fields. However, there are still major problems that need to be solved, such as high complexity, a large number of parameters, and difficult deployment. Therefore, this paper focuses on proposing an efficient, intuitive, and advanced model compression algorithm specifically for CNNs.*

*Since other types of neural networks, such as recurrent neural networks and fully connected neural networks, have significant differences in structure and parameter composition compared to CNNs, it is difficult to apply the 2EAFS method to other neural networks directly. However, its ideas can provide inspiration and reference for optimizing other neural networks. For example, one can try to design pruning algorithms specific to the particular structure of different neural networks or achieve better model optimization effects by combining pruning with other model compression methods.*

**Q1.4: Are there any limitations to the 2EAFS method that the authors did not address? Are there any specific scenarios or types of data for which the method might not be effective?**

*Q1.4: Thank you very much for the valuable suggestions provided by the author. The 2EAFS method can be effectively applied to model compression tasks of any CNN. In the experimental comparison of this paper, we chose the ILSVRC-2012 dataset, which is the most typical, complex, and has the most categories, to demonstrate that the proposed method still has good compression performance on large-scale datasets. In order to demonstrate that 2EAFS is also effective in specific scenarios or types of data, we chose typical remote sensing scene and image fine-grained classification tasks for verification, with ResNet-50 and VGG-16 as benchmark networks, respectively. The experimental results are shown Table 2, such as: on the remote sensing scene recognition dataset NWPU-RESISC45, with a 50% reduction in FLOPs, a performance improvement of 0.53% is still achieved; for the fine-grained classification dataset CUB-200-2011, with a reduction of about 40% in FLOPs, a loss of 1.57% in accuracy occurs. This is because fine-grained classification tasks require more detailed features than coarse image classification, and compressing the original network model will to some extent lose some of the ability to extract fine-grained features, leading to a certain degree of reduction in the accuracy of fine-grained image classification. However, the accuracy loss is still tolerable.*

*Revision location: Abstract, page 5, lines 5 to 7; Lines 16 to 11 on page; Page 17, lines 1 to 4; Page 25, lines 2 to 5; Page 26, lines 2-9; Table 7.*

**Table 2: The performance of 2EAFS for remote sensing scene recognition and fine-grained image classification**

Dataset	Model	Parameters ↓	FLOPs ↓	Acc(%)	±Acc(%)
NWPU-RESISC45	ResNet-50	0.00%	0.00%	91.53	0.00
		32.19%	30.05%	92.61	+1.08
		51.85%	50.04%	92.06	+0.53
		61.54%	60.02%	91.33	-0.20
CUB-200-2011	VGG-16	0.00%	0.00%	72.32	0.00
		39.92%	32.58%	70.75	-1.57
		43.98%	40.82%	70.06	-2.26

Q1.5: How does the performance of the 2EAFS-pruned models compare to other methods of model compression, such as quantization or low-rank decomposition?

A1.5: Thank you for the valuable feedback. The performance of 2EAFS pruned models depends on specific tasks, training epochs, and deployment complexity, making it difficult to directly compare with model compression methods such as quantization or low-rank decomposition. We will analyze the unique characteristics of these three methods to highlight the advantages of 2EAFS.

The 2EAFS pruning algorithm has advantages such as simple operation, significant performance improvement, and easy deployment, and it is suitable for all types of CNNs (including  $1 \times 1$  convolutional kernels). In addition, the pruned models can be further optimized through parameter quantization or low-rank approximation to improve numerical accuracy and reduce computational complexity while maintaining the required accuracy and computational constraints. This approach is versatile and can be combined with other model compression algorithms.

Quantization cannot eliminate the redundant filters inherent in the network structure, and reducing the bit-width of parameters can lead to precision loss. In addition, when quantizing specific bit widths, many existing training methods and hardware platforms are no longer applicable, and dedicated system architectures need to be designed, resulting in limited flexibility.

Low-rank decomposition has problems such as the high cost of matrix decomposition operations, layer-by-layer decomposition not conducive to global parameter compression, and requiring a large amount of retraining to achieve convergence. In addition, recent years have seen more and more new networks using  $1 \times 1$  convolutions, which are unsuitable for using low-rank decomposition methods and make it challenging to achieve network compression and acceleration.

Q1.6: What are the specific advantages and disadvantages of the proposed 2EAFS method in comparison to other approaches of network pruning?

*A1.6: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. We summarize the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed method as follows:*

*(1) Compared with the unstructured pruning method, 2EFAS has the advantages of good portability, high applicability, simple operation and easy deployment while obtaining better accuracy and compression ratio. Besides that, 2EFAS can retain the overall structure of the original model and facilitate integration with existing hardware and software structures.*

*(2) Compared with the classical pruning methods that use L1 or L2 regularization to measure filter importance, 2EFAS utilizes image information entropy to represent the richness of feature maps, thereby solving the problem of insufficient representation of critical information.*

*(3) Compared to sparsity-constrained pruning methods, 2EFAS does not necessitate any modification of the loss function or retraining but only entails fine-tuning, resulting in substantial savings in resources and computation time, making it more conducive for industrial application.*

*(4) Compared to model compression algorithms that utilize intelligent optimization algorithms to determine pruning rates for each layer, 2EFAS can directly obtain the optimal pruned network under sparse constraints. This also avoids the difficulty of restructuring the search when the constraint targets or datasets change, and the process is simple and intuitive.*

*Similarly, there is significant room for improvement in this method, such as how to combine it with other pruning methods to propose a hybrid pruning model and how to further compress the model by pruning fully connected layers.*


*Revision location: Page 6, lines 28 to 30; Page 8, lines 5 to 9; Page 8, lines 26 to 29; Page 9, lines 13 to 16.*

**Q1.7: What is the impact of the proposed 2EAFS method on the interpretability of the model?**

*A1.7: Thank you very much for your question. We will use Grad-CAM and ablation experiments to demonstrate the interpretability of 2EAFS.*

*(1) Grad-CAM (Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping) is a visualization technique that can help evaluate the network's performance[1]. The Grad-CAM for ResNet-50 with 2EAFS is shown in Fig.1, in which the red regions correspond to a high score for a class and the blue regions represent that the feature is suppressed. All Grad-CAMs support the white crane category, in which the head and belly of the white crane are hot and other objects (e.g., vegetation) are cool. According to the Grad-CAM results, the ResNet-50 model optimized by 2EAFS can more effectively suppress vegetation than the original ResNet-50 while still retaining high scores for*

the white crane class.



**Fig. 1: Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping for Resnet50 with 2EAFS: (a) Original image; (b) Pre-training model; (c) 2EAFS(44.1% reduction in FLOPs); (d) 61.1% reduction in FLOPs.**

(2) We interpret that weights inherited by 2EAFS are sufficiently important using the results of an ablation study. High 2D entropy, low 2D entropy, and random weight inheritance based on pruned networks were extracted using VGG-16, and ResNet-56/110 applied to CIFAR-10. The other parameters were set to the same values as in previous experiments to provide a fair comparison. It is apparent from the experimental results shown in Table 3 that better performance can be achieved when filters corresponding to high information entropy feature maps undergo weight inheritance. Unexpected inheritance also produces a certain degree of performance improvement relative to low information entropy. This indicates the pre-trained network model has "distilled" some critical information through high 2D entropy, reaffirming the importance of inheriting weight information for recognition accuracy.

Revision location: lines 3 to 12 on page 25; Figure 6

**Table 3: The effects of different weight inheritance methods on the accuracy of pruned networks**

Method	FLOPs	High 2D entropy	Random	Low 2D entropy
VGG-16	78.90	93.17	92.93	92.71
Resnet-56-P	62.45	93.39	93.11	92.96
Resnet-110-P	74.88	93.59	93.22	92.83

[1] Selvaraju, R. R., Cogswell, M., Das, A., Vedantam, R., Parikh, D., & Batra, D. (2017). Grad-cam: Visual explanations from deep networks via gradient-based localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision* (pp. 618-626).

**Q1.8: Can the proposed 2EAFS method be used in real-time systems?**

*A1.8: Thank you very much for your questions. Whether it can be applied to real-time systems depends on the model capacity and the specific application scenarios and requirements. Based on normal video playback standard 24FPS, we measured the FPS of the model with the different FLOPs on two chips: CPU (Intel (R) Xeon (R)*

*Silver 4214CPU @ 2.40 GHz) and GPU (GeForce RTX 2080 Ti). The results are presented in Table 4. As shown, with the increase in pruning rate, the inference speed of the model is significantly improved on both GPU and CPU, surpassing 24FPS and meeting the real-time requirements.*

*Revision location: Page 26, lines 11 to 16; Table 8.*

**Table 4. FPS of models with different pruning rates on GPU and CPU.**

Image size	Model	FLOPs ↓	FPS(GPU)	FPS(CPU)
32×32	VggNet16	0.00%	395.39	203.08
		50.0%	411.00	289.34
		65.0%	442.56	329.76
		74.9%	477.67	364.52
	ResNet56	0.00%	110.83	119.13
		30.4%	125.77	125.57
		50.7%	127.49	128.57
		74.7%	131.13	135.42
	VggNet110	0.00%	56.87	59.18
		43.1%	65.89	66.52
		58.85	66.46	67.66
		70.6%	67.85	69.67
224×224	ResNet50	0.00%	130.05	23.73
		43.1%	135.04	28.46
		58.8%	137.28	33.25

**Q1.9:** How does the proposed 2EAFS method compare to other methods that use pruning in combination with other techniques such as distillation, quantization and weight sharing?

*Q1.9: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions. In the experimental part, we added some empirical comparisons of pruning methods combined with distillation [1,2] or weight sharing [3]. It can be seen from the Table 5 that on the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, 2EAFS can achieve a better recognition effect under the condition of similar compression. Quantization is to reduce parameter storage and memory occupation by reducing numerical bit width from the point of view of hardware deployment. However, pruning, distillation, and parameter sharing are used to eliminate redundant filters in the network structure from the perspective of software.*



Considering the difference in principle, this paper does not compare with the quantization method. After that, we will try to quantify the network after 2EAFS pruning and finally realize the deployment of FPGA devices. Thank you again for your valuable suggestions.

Revision location: Table 2, Table 3, and Table 4.

**Table 5: Performance comparison of 2EAFS and pruning methods combined with distillation or weight Sharing**

Dataset	Model	Method	Parameters ↓	Flops↓	±Acc(%)
Cifar-10	VggNet16	Scwc(s=0.5)[1]	39.5%	41.9%	+0.07
		2EAFS	50.0%	71.4%	+0.37
		Scwc(s=0.2)[1]	69.4%	70.3%	-0.67
		2EAFS	86.1%	74.9%	-0.38
	Resnet56	Scwc(s=0.1)[1]	33.2%	32.6%	+0.10
		2EAFS	34.1%	30.4%	+0.54
		Scwc-0.05[1]	43.0%	41.8%	-0.04
		2EAFS	50.7%	53.7%	+0.13
	Resnet110	Nima et.al[2]	78%	N/A	-1.27
		2EAFS	71%	70.6%	-0.02
Cifar-10 0	VggNet16	Hu et.al[3]	N/A	40%	-0.61
		2EAFS	74.8%	51.4%	-0.23

[1] Li, G., Zhang, M., Wang, J., Weng, D., & Corporaal, H. (2022). SCWC: Structured channel weight sharing to compress convolutional neural networks. *Information Sciences*, 587, 82-96. Elsevier.

[2] Aghli, N., & Ribeiro, E. (2021). Combining weight pruning and knowledge distillation for CNN compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 3191-3198).

[3] Hu, Y., Sun, S., Li, J., Wang, X., & Gu, Q. (2018). A novel channel pruning method for deep neural network compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11394*.

## To Reviewer 2:

Q2.1: The discussion part of related work could be improved. Sec. 2 misses discussion with middle-level pruning granularity like the Nvidia N:M sparsity [1, 2], block sparsity [3,4], which are also an important branch in network pruning.

A2.1: Thank you very much for the valuable suggestions of the reviewer. Indeed, middle-level pruning is an important research direction, and we have added a discussion about this in the related work section. As follows:

Fine-grained Structured Sparse usually group weight elements into small dense regions and prune them at the granularity of groups. Researchers have proposed various grouping methods to achieve better acceleration performance and higher sparsity. Ji et al. [1] proposed a method to rearrange irregular fine-grained sparsity into structured coarse-grained sparsity to bridge the gap between large sparse models and poorer actual acceleration. Lin et al. [2] proposed a novel pattern of  $1 \times N$  for network pruning that achieves significant CPU acceleration while maintaining high-performance accuracy. Supported by the NVIDIA Ampere Core,  $N: M$  sparsity leads to attractive storage and computation efficiency and thus has been extensively studied recently. Zhou et al. [3] proposed the sparse-refined straight-through estimator (SR-STE) and sparse architecture divergence (SAD) to train  $N: M$  structured sparse networks, achieving significant acceleration. Zhang et al. [4] proved that  $N: M$  learning can be naturally formulated as a combinatorial optimization problem of finding the best combination candidates in a finite collection. Even though the aforementioned methods can achieve good speed and recognition accuracy on GPUs with Ampere architecture support, the inference speed on CPUs and ARM is still limited by hardware constraints.

Revision location: lines 2 to 9 on page 6; Page 6, lines 32 to 34; Page 7, lines 1 to 15.

- [1] Ji, Y., Liang, L., Deng, L., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., & Xie, Y. (2018). TETRIS: Tile-matching the TRemendous Irregular Sparsity. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, & R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (Vol. 31)*. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [2] Lin, M., Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Chen, B., Chao, F., Wang, M., Li, S., Tian, Y., & Ji, R. (2023).  $1 \times N$  Pattern for Pruning Convolutional Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(4), 3999-4008. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2022.3195774.
- [3] Zhou, A., Ma, Y., Zhu, J., Liu, J., Zhang, Z., Yuan, K., Sun, W., & Li, H. (2021). Learning  $N: M$  fine-grained structured sparse neural networks from scratch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04010*.
- [4] Zhang, Y., Lin, M., Lin, Z., Luo, Y., Li, K., Chao, F., Wu, Y., & Ji, R. (2022). Learning Best Combination for Efficient  $N: M$  Sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06662*.

Q2.2: The authors stated that their method does not require retraining. However, there is actually a following fine-tuning phase after pruning (Lines 11, Algorit

hm1). This is self-contradicted and I recommend the authors organize a different claim.

*A2.2: Thank you very much for raising this issue. We apologize for not providing a clear description, which may have caused some confusion for the reviewer. In the Introduction, page 4, lines 25-26, we intended to convey that 2EAFS does not need to be retrained from scratch and only requires fine-tuning the model after inheriting the weights. We have made the necessary revisions on page 4, lines 25-26, and deleted this statement, and thank the reviewers for reminding us to pay attention to this point.*

Q2.3: The compared methods for ImageNet are outdated. I recommend the authors show comparisons with more advanced methods to make their claim more convincing. Please refer to:

*A2.3: Thank you very much for raising this issue. Following your suggestion, we have added more state-of-the-art methods for comparison on ImageNet to evaluate the effectiveness of 2EFAS.*

*Revision location: lines 11 to 15 on page 23; 24 pages, lines 13 to 14; Table 6*

Q2.4: There are some typos in the current manuscript. Please fix them. I list some examples here.

1) In sec 3.3, there are some bugs in the format of references ("Several recent studies [35, 37, 38] have ...").

2) In page 13, "figure" is missing in "shown in 3(b)".

*A2.4: Thank you for pointing out the errors. We have made the necessary revisions in the new version.*

*Revision location: Page 12, lines 17 to 18; Page 14, lines 33 to 34*

## Cover letter

Dear Editor,

We want to submit the manuscript entitled "An accelerating convolutional neural networks via a 2D entropy based-adaptive filter search method for image recognition", which we wish to be considered for publication on Applied Soft Computer.

The success of CNNs for various vision tasks has been accompanied by a significant increase in required FLOPs and parameter quantities, which has impeded the deployment of CNNs on devices with limited computing resources and power budgets. Therefore, it is necessary to compress the CNN model. Applied soft computer is committed to publishing papers on CNN model research [1, 2]. However, previous studies on structured pruning primarily rely on designed filters and channel importance criteria, without considering the influence of information entropy (contained in feature maps) on model accuracy, which limits pruning effectiveness.

As such, This paper proposes a simple yet effective 2D Entropy based-Adaptive Filter Search (2EAFS) method for fast CNN acceleration. Specifically, the importance of corresponding filters, measured by utilizing the amount of information contained in feature maps, is employed as a theoretical guide to simplify the complex exhaustive search process. Information entropy is then normalized layer by layer and the resulting value is used to calculate a layer-wise importance score in a single step. Additionally, a sparse constraint equation is constructed based on the negative correlation between filter pruning rates and the importance of convolutional layers. The Nelder-Mead search algorithm is then adopted to quickly and adaptively determine the optimal pruning architecture. Finally, importance weights are inherited using the pruning rate and 2D entropy and model performance are restored through fine-tuning. We selected several datasets and carried out extensive experiments to prove the effectiveness of the proposed method. We would be very happy if the submitted manuscript could be reviewed and considered for publication on Applied Soft Computer.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours

Chunlei Li, Ph.D., Prof.

School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Zhongyuan University of Technology,

Zhengzhou, 450007, Henan, China

E-mail:lichunlei1979@zut.edu.cn;

- [1] C. G. Pach'on, D. M. Ballesteros, D. Renza, Senpis: Sequential network pruning by class-wise importance score, Applied Soft Computing 129 (2022) 109558. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2022.109558>.
- [2] Z. Wang, X. Xie, G. Shi, Rfpruning: A retraining-free pruning method for accelerating convolutional neural networks, Applied Soft Computing 113 (2021) 107860. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2021.107860>.

## Highlights

1. This paper proposes a simple yet effective **2D Entropy based-Adaptive Filter Search (2EAFS)** method for fast CNN acceleration, which is illustrated in Fig.1.
2. A novel network pruning method (i.e., 2EAFS) is proposed, adopting 2-D entropy feature evaluation and fast adaptive filter search. This end-to-end pruning framework simplifies complexity without retraining or hyperparameter tuning of the model.
3. An efficient filter importance evaluation criterion is proposed. Specifically, only mini-batches of data are passed to the CNN model to accurately estimate the importance of filters based on the 2-D entropy of the feature maps.
4. A negative correlation between filter pruning rate and convolutional layer importance is utilized to construct sparse constraint equations. An optimal pruning architecture for each layer is then quickly determined using the Nelder-Mead search algorithm without human involvement.
5. Extensive experiments were conducted with CNNs (e.g., VGG and ResNet) applied to datasets such as CIFAR-10/100, ILSVRC-2012, NWPU-RESISC45 and CUB-200-2011. Results demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of 2EAFS in reducing FLOPs and parameter requirements..




Fig1: The proposed 2EAFS framework. The importance of corresponding filters was first evaluated using the two-dimensional entropy of the feature map. Constraint equations were then constructed using the importance of convolutional layers, while the sub-network structure was adaptively determined by the Nelder-Mead search algorithm. Finally, important weights were inherited based on the pruning rate and 2D entropy and model performance was restored by fine-tuning.

## **Credit author statement**

Chunlei,Li: Conceptualization; Funding acquisition; Resources; Writing—review & editing.

Huanyu,LI: Conceptualization; Methodology; Project administration; Software; Validation; Visualization; Writing—original draft; Writing—review & editing.

Guangshuai Gao: Writing—review & editing.

Zhoufeng Liu: Funding acquisition; Resources.

Pengcheng Liu: Writing—review & editing.

## **Credit author statement**

Chunlei,Li: Conceptualization; Funding acquisition; Resources; Writing—review & editing.

Huanyu,LI: Conceptualization; Methodology; Project administration; Software; Validation; Visualization; Writing—original draft; Writing—review & editing.

Guangshuai Gao: Writing—review & editing.

Zhoufeng Liu: Funding acquisition; Resources.

Pengcheng Liu: Writing—review & editing.



Click here to access/download  
**Source Files (word or latex)**  
Source Files (latex).zip

