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Abstract

Previous works utilized “smaller-norm-less-important” criterion to prune filters with smaller norm values in a convolutional neural network. In this paper, we analyze this norm-based criterion and point out that its effectiveness depends on two requirements that not always met: (1) the norm deviation of the filters should be large; (2) the minimum norm of the filters should be small. To solve this problem, we propose a novel filter pruning method, namely Filter Pruning via Geometric Median (FPGM), to compress the model regardless of those two requirements. Unlike previous methods, PFGM compresses CNN models by determining and pruning those filters with redundant information via Geometric Median (GM), rather than those with “relatively less” importance. When applied to two image classification benchmarks, our method validates its usefulness and strengths. Notably, on Cifar-10, PFGM reduces more than 52% FLOPs on ResNet-110 with even 2.69% relative accuracy improvement. Besides, on ILSVRC-2012, PFGM reduces more than 42% FLOPs on ResNet-101 without top-5 accuracy drop, which has advanced the state-of-the-art.

1. Introduction

The deeper and wider architectures of deep CNNs bring about the superior performance of computer vision task. However, they also cause the prohibitively expensive computational cost and make the model deployment on mobile devices hard if not impossible. Even the latest architecture with high efficiencies, such as residual connection \cite{he2016deep} or inception module \cite{szegedy2017inception}, has millions of parameters requiring billions of float point operations (FLOPs) \cite{lecun1998gradient}. Therefore, it is necessary to attain the deep CNN models which have relatively low computational cost but high accuracy.

Recent developments on pruning can be divided into two categories, \textit{i.e.}, weight pruning \cite{turian2010structured, he2016sparsely} and filter pruning \cite{han2015learning, he2017channel}. Weight pruning directly deletes weight values...
of a filter and may cause unstructured sparsities. This irregular structure makes it difficult to leverage the existing high-efficiency Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms (BLAS) libraries [17]. In contrast, filter pruning discards selected filters and leaves a model with structured sparsity, which making it possible to take full advantage of BLAS libraries to achieve a better acceleration. Therefore, filter pruning, rather than weight pruning, is more preferred for accelerating the networks and decreasing the model size.

Current practice [15, 28, 12] performs filter pruning by following the “smaller-norm-less-important” criterion. This criterion believes that filters with smaller norms are less important, and therefore, it selects the smaller norm filters to prune. As shown in the top right of Figure 1(a), after calculating norms of filters in a model, a pre-specified threshold \( T \) is utilized to select filters whose norms are smaller than it. Those selected filters, which are considered less important, are pruned to accelerate the network.

However, based on our analysis, a successful utilization of “smaller-norm-less-important” criterion needs two requirements to meet, which is illustrated in Figure 1(b). First, the deviation of filter norms should be large. This requirement makes the threshold \( T \) searching space wide enough, so that distinguishing those filters needed to be pruned from the others would be an easy task. Second, the norms of those filters which can be pruned should be arbitrarily small, i.e., close to zero; in other words, the filters with smaller norms are expected to make absolutely small contributions, rather than relatively less but positively large contributions, to the network. The ideal norm distribution when satisfactorily meeting those two requirements is illustrated as the blue curve in Figure 1. Only when those requirements are met, the pruning operation based on “smaller-norm-less-important” criterion has the least negative influence on the network. However, based on our analysis and experimental observations, it is not always true.

To address the above mentioned problems, we propose a novel filter pruning approach, named Pruning Filter via Geometric Median (PFGM). Different from the previous methods which prune filters with relatively less contribution, our PFGM chooses the filters with the most replaceable contribution, the role of which can be represented by that of the remaining filters. In particular, we calculate Geometric Median (GM) [6] of the filters within the same layer. According to the characteristics of GM, the filter(s) \( \mathcal{F} \) near it can be represented by the remaining filters. And therefore, pruning those filters will not have large influence on the model performance. It is noted that PFGM does not utilize norm based criterion to select filters to prune, which means its performance will not deteriorate even when the two requirements for norm-based criterion are not met.

**Contributions.** In summary, we have three contributions:

(1) We analyze the norm-based criterion, which prunes the relatively less important filters in previous work. We elaborate its two underlying requirements which lead to limitations of the norm-based criterion;

(2) We propose PFGM to prune the most replaceable filters containing redundant information in CNNs, which can still achieve good performances when norm-based criterion cannot;

(3) The extensive experiment on two benchmark datasets demonstrates the effectiveness and efficiency of our PFGM in terms of accelerating the inference time. Particularly, it accelerates ResNet-110 by two times with even 2.69% relative accuracy improvement on CIFAR-10, and also achieves state-of-the-art results on ILSVRC-2012.

2. Related Works

Most previous works on accelerating CNNs can be roughly divided into three categories, namely, matrix decomposition [32, 25], low-precision weights [34, 33], and pruning. Pruning-based approaches aim to remove the unnecessary connections of the neural network [9, 15]. Essentially, weight pruning always results in unstructured models, which makes it hard to deploy the existing efficient BLAS library, while filter pruning not only reduces the storage usage on devices but also decreases computation cost to accelerate the inference. We could roughly divide the filter pruning methods into two categories by whether the training data is utilized to determine the pruned filters, that is, data dependent and data independent filter pruning. Data independent method is more efficient than data dependent method as the ultimateing of training data is computation consuming.

**Weight Pruning.** Many recent works [9, 8, 7, 26, 1, 12, 31] focus on pruning fine-grained weight of filters. For example, [9] proposes an iterative method to discard the small weights whose values are below the predefined threshold. [1] formulates pruning as an optimization problem of finding the weights that minimize the loss while satisfying a pruning cost condition.

**Data Dependent Filter Pruning.** Some filter pruning approaches [16, 17, 13, 18, 5, 23, 29, 27] are data dependent, which means the training data is utilized to determine the pruned filters. [17] adopts the statistics information from the next layer to guide the filter selections. [5] aims to obtain a decomposition by minimizing the reconstruction error of training set sample activations. [23] proposes an inherently data driven method which use Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to specify the proportion of the energy that should be preserved. [27] applies subspace clustering to feature maps to eliminate the redundancy in convolutional filters.

**Data Independent Filter Pruning.** Concurrently with our work, some data independent filter pruning strate-
gies [15, 12, 28, 35] have been explored. [15] utilizes an \( \ell_1 \)-norm criterion to prune unimportant filters. [12] proposes to select filters with an \( \ell_2 \)-norm criterion and prune those selected filters in a soft manner. [28] proposes to prune models by enforcing sparsity on the scaling parameter of batch normalization layers. [35] uses spectral clustering on filters to select unimportant ones.

**Discussion.** To the best of our knowledge, only one previous work reconsiders the smaller-norm-less-important criterion [28]. We would like to highlight our advantages compared to this approach as below: (1) [28] pays more attention to enforce sparsity on the scaling parameter in the batch normalization operator, which is not friendly to the structure without batch normalization. On the contrary, our approach is not limited by this constraint. (2) After pruning channels selected, [28] need fine-tuning to reduce the performance degradation. However, our method combines the pruning operation with normal training procedure, thus extra fine-tuning is not necessary. (3) Calculation of the gradient of scaling factor is needed for [28], thus lots of computation cost are inevitable, whereas our approach could accelerate the neural network without calculating of the gradient of scaling factor.

**3. Methodology**

**3.1. Preliminaries**

We formally introduce symbols and annotations in this subsection. We assume that a neural network has \( L \) layers. We use \( N_i \) and \( N_{i+1} \) to represent the number of input channels and the output channels for the \( i \)-th convolution layer, respectively. \( F_{i,j} \) represents the \( j \)-th filter of the \( i \)-th layer, then the dimension of filter \( F_{i,j} \) is \( \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times K \times K} \), where \( K \) is the kernel size of the network\(^1\). The \( i \)-th layer of the network \( W^{(i)} \) could be represented by \( \{ F_{i,j}, 1 \leq j \leq N_{i+1} \} \). The tensor of connection of the deep CNN network could be parameterized by \( \{ W^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{i+1} \times N_i \times K \times K}, 1 \leq i \leq L \} \).

**3.2. Analysis of Norm-based Criterion**

As pointed in Figure 1, two requirements are necessary for a successful utilization of the norm-based criterion. However, these requirements may not always hold and it might lead to unexpected results. The detailed problems are illustrated in Figure 2, in which the blue dashed curve and the green solid curve indicate the norm distribution in ideal and in real cases, respectively.

(1) **Small Norm Deviation.** In real cases, the deviation of filter norm distributions might be too small, which means the norm values are concentrated to a small interval, as shown in Figure 2(a). In this case, a small norm deviation leads to a small search space for threshold, which will make it difficult to select appropriate filters to prune.

(2) **Large Minimum Norm in Network.** The filters with the minimum norm may not be arbitrarily small, as shown in the Figure 2(b), \( v''_1 >> v_1 \rightarrow 0 \). Under this condition, those filters considered as the least important still contribute significantly to the network, which makes every filter highly informative. Therefore, pruning those filters with minimum norm values will cast a negative effect on the network.

**3.3. Norm Statistics in Real Scenarios**

In Figure 3, statistical information collected from pre-trained ResNet-110 on CIFAR-10 and pre-trained ResNet-18 on ImageNet demonstrates previous analysis. The small green vertical lines show each observation in this norm distribution, and the blue curves denote the Kernel Distribution Estimate (KDE) [21], which is a non-parametric way to estimate the probability density function of a random variable. The norm distribution of first layer and last layer in both structures are drawn. In addition, to clearly illustrate the relation between norm points, two different x-scale, i.e., linear x-scale and log x-scale, are presented.

(1) **Small Norm Deviation in Network.** For the first convolutional layer of ResNet-110, as shown in Figure 3(b), there is a large quantity of filters whose norms are concentrated around the magnitude of \( 10^{-6} \). For the last convolutional layer of ResNet-110, as shown in Figure 3(c), the interval span of the value of norm is roughly \( 0.3 \), which is much smaller than the interval span of the norm of the first layer (1.7). For the last convolutional layer of ResNet-18, as shown in Figure 3(g), most filter norms are between the interval \([0.8, 1.0]\). In all these cases, filters are distributed too densely, which makes it difficult to select a proper threshold to distinguish the important filters from the others.

(2) **Large Minimum Norm in Network.** For the last convolutional layer of ResNet-18, as shown in Figure 3(g), the minimum norm of these filters is around \( 0.8 \), which is large comparing to a large number of filter in the first convolutional layer (Figure 3(e)). For the last convolutional layer of ResNet-110, as shown in Figure 3(c), only one filter is arbitrarily small, while the others are not. Under those circumstances, the filters with minimum norms, although they are relatively less important according to the norm-based

---

\(^1\)Fully-connected layers equal to convolutional layers with \( k = 1 \)
criterion, still make significant contributions in the network.

3.4. Pruning Filter via Geometric Median

To break the strong dependency on the requirements for the norm-based criterion, we propose a new filter pruning method borrowed ideas from geometric median. The central idea of geometric median [6] is as follows: given a set of \( n \) points \( a^{(1)}, \ldots, a^{(n)} \) with each \( a^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^d \), find a point \( x^* \in \mathbb{R}^d \) that minimizes the sum of Euclidean distances to them:

\[
x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \quad \text{where} \quad f(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|x - a^{(i)}\|_2 \tag{1}
\]

For the geometric median is a classic robust estimator of centrality for data in Euclidean spaces [6], we use the geometric median \( F_{i}^{GM} \) to get the common information of all the filters within the single \( i \)-th layer:

\[
F_i^{GM} \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times K \times K}} g(x), \tag{2}
\]

where

\[
g(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}]} \|x - F_{i,j'}\|_2. \tag{3}
\]

In the \( i \)-th layer, if some filters have the same, or similar values as the geometric median in that layer, that is:

\[
F_{i,j^*} \in \arg \min_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}]} \|F_{i,j'} - F_{i}^{GM}\|_2, \tag{4}
\]

then those filters, \( F_{i,j^*} \), can be represented by the other filters in the same layer, and they can be pruned without sacrificing the network performance.

As geometric median is a non-trivial problem in computational geometry, the previous fastest running times for computing a \((1 + \epsilon)\)-approximate geometric median were \( O(d n^{1/3} \cdot \epsilon^{-8/3}) \) by [2], \( O(nd \log^3(n/\epsilon)) \) by [3]. In our case, as the final result \( F_{i,j^*} \) are a list of know points, that is, the candidate filters in the layer, we could relax the above problem.

We assume that

\[
\|F_{i,j^*} - F_{i}^{GM}\|_2 = 0, \tag{5}
\]

so the equation 4 is achieved. Then the above equation 2 becomes to

\[
F_{i,j^*} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \arg \min_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}]} \sum_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}]} \|x - F_{i,j'}\|_2 \\
= \arg \min_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}]} g(x) \tag{6}
\]

Note that even if the to be pruned filter \( F_{i,j^*} \) is not included in the calculation of the geometric median in equation 6, we could also achieve the same result. In this setting, we want to find the filter

\[
F_{i,j^*} \in \arg \min_{j^* \in [1, N_{i+1}]} g'(x), \tag{7}
\]

where

\[
g'(x) = \sum_{j' \in [1, N_{i+1}], j' \neq j^*} \|x - F_{i,j'}\|_2. \tag{8}
\]

With the above equation 6 and equation 8, we could get that:

\[
g'(x) = g(x) - \sum_{j' = j^*} \|x - F_{i,j'}\|_2 \tag{9}
\]

then we could get

\[
\min g'(x) = \min \{g(x) - \|x - F_{i,j^*}\|_2\} = \min g(x) - \min \|x - F_{i,j^*}\|_2 = g(F_{i,j^*}) - \min \|x - F_{i,j^*}\|_2. \tag{10}
\]

For the second component of the right side for equation 10, when \( x = F_{i,j^*} \), we can get:

\[
F_{i,j^*} = F_{i,j^*} \tag{11}
\]

Algorithm 1 Algorithm Description of PFGM

Input: training data: \( X \).

1. Given: pruning rate \( P_i \)
2. Initialize: model parameter \( W = \{W^{(i)}; 0 \leq i \leq L\} \)
3. for epoch = 1; epoch \leq epoch_{max}; epoch += + do
4. Update the model parameter \( W \) based on \( X \)
5. for \( i = 1; i \leq L; i += + do \)
6. Find \( N_{i+1} P_i \) filters that satisfy Equation 6
7. Zeroize selected filters
8. end for
9. end for

Output: The compact model and its parameters \( W^* \)
3.5. Theoretical and Realistic Acceleration

3.5.1 Theoretical Acceleration

Suppose the shapes of input tensor \( I \in N_i \times H_i \times W_i \) and output tensor \( O \in N_{i+1} \times H_{i+1} \times W_{i+1} \). Set the filter pruning rate of the \( i \)th layer to \( P_i \), then \( N_{i+1} \times P_i \) filters should be pruned. After filter pruning, the dimension of input and output feature map of the \( i \)th layer change to \( I' \in [N_i \times (1 - P_i)] \times H_i \times W_i \) and \( O' \in [N_{i+1} \times (1 - P_i)] \times H_{i+1} \times W_{i+1} \), respectively.

Further consider pruning rate \( P_{i+1} \) for the \((i+1)\)th layer, then only \( (1 - P_{i+1}) \times (1 - P_i) \) of the original computation is needed. Finally, a compact model \( \{ W^{(i)} \} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{i+1}(1-P_i) \times N_i(1-P_{i+1}) \times K \times K} \) is obtained.

3.5.2 Realistic Acceleration

In the above analysis, only the FLOPs of convolution operations for computation complexity comparison is considered. This is commonly used in previous work [15, 12], because other operations such as batch normalization (BN) and pooling are insignificant comparing to convolution operations.

However, non-tensor layers (e.g., BN and pooling layers) also need the inference time on GPU [17], and influence the realistic acceleration. Besides, the wide gap between the theoretical and realistic acceleration could also be restricted by the IO delay, buffer switch and efficiency of BLAS libraries. We compare the theoretical and practical acceleration in Table 3.

4. Evaluation and Results

4.1. Benchmark Datasets and Experimental Setting

4.1.1 Dataset setting

In this section, we conduct experiments on two benchmark datasets to validate the effectiveness of our acceleration method. The CIFAR-10 [14] dataset contains 60,000 32×32 color images in 10 different classes, in which 50,000 training images and 10,000 testing images are included. ILSVRC-2012 [20] is a large-scale dataset containing 1.28 million training images and 50k validation images of 1,000 classes. As discussed in [17, 13, 4], ResNet has less redundancy than VGGNet [22], so accelerating ResNet is more difficult. Therefore, we focus on pruning the challenging ResNet model.

4.1.2 Training setting

On CIFAR-10, the parameter setting is the same as [11] and the training schedule is the same as [30]. In the ILSVRC-2012 experiments, we use the default parameter settings which is same as [10, 11]. Data argumentation strategies for ILSVRC-2012 is the same as PyTorch [19] official examples. We analyze the difference between starting from the pre-trained model and from scratch. We merely use the normal training schedule, so the extra fine-tuning time is not necessary.
In the filter pruning step, we simply prune all the weighted layers with the same pruning rate at the same time, which is same as [12]. Therefore, only one hyper-parameter $P_i = P$ is needed to balance the acceleration and accuracy. Note that choosing different rates for different layers could improve the performance [15], but it also introduces extra hyper-parameters. The pruning operation is conducted at the end of every training epoch.

Apart from PFGM only criterion, we also use a mixture of PFGM and previous norm-based method [12] to show that PFGM could serve as a supplement to previous methods. PFGM only criterion is denoted as “PFGM-only”, the criterion combining the PFGM and norm-based criterion is indicated as “PFGM-mix”. “PFGM-only 40%” means 40% filters of the layer are selected with PFGM only, while “PFGM-mix 40%” means 30% filters of the layer are selected with PFGM, and the remaining 10% filters are selected with norm-based criterion [12]. We compare PFGM with previous acceleration algorithms, e.g., MIL [4], PFEC [15], CP [13], ThiNet [17], SFP [12], NISP [29], Rethinking [28]. Not surprisingly, our PFGM method achieves the state-of-the-art result.

### 4.1.3 Pruning setting

In the filter pruning step, we simply prune all the weighted layers with the same pruning rate at the same time, which is same as [12]. Therefore, only one hyper-parameter $P_i = P$ is needed to balance the acceleration and accuracy. Note that choosing different rates for different layers could improve the performance [15], but it also introduces extra hyper-parameters. The pruning operation is conducted at the end of every training epoch.

Apart from PFGM only criterion, we also use a mixture of PFGM and previous norm-based method [12] to show that PFGM could serve as a supplement to previous methods. PFGM only criterion is denoted as “PFGM-only”, the criterion combining the PFGM and norm-based criterion is indicated as “PFGM-mix”. “PFGM-only 40%” means 40% filters of the layer are selected with PFGM only, while “PFGM-mix 40%” means 30% filters of the layer are selected with PFGM, and the remaining 10% filters are selected with norm-based criterion [12]. We compare PFGM with previous acceleration algorithms, e.g., MIL [4], PFEC [15], CP [13], ThiNet [17], SFP [12], NISP [29], Rethinking [28]. Not surprisingly, our PFGM method achieves the state-of-the-art result.

### 4.2. ResNet on CIFAR-10

For the CIFAR-10 dataset, we test our PFGM on ResNet-20, 32, 56 and 110. We use two different pruning rates 30% and 40%.

As shown in Table 1, our PFGM achieves the state-of-the-art performance. For example, MIL [4] without fine-tuning accelerates ResNet-32 by 31.2% speedup ratio with 1.59% accuracy drop, but our PFGM without fine-tuning achieves 53.2% speedup ratio with even 0.19% accuracy improvement. Comparing to SFP [12], when pruning 52.6% FLOPs of ResNet-56, our PFGM has only 0.66% accuracy improvement. Comparing to SFP [12], when pruning 52.6% FLOPs of ResNet-56, our PFGM has only 0.66% accuracy drop, which is much less than SFP [12] (1.33%). For pruning the pre-trained ResNet-110, our method achieves a much higher (52.3% v.s. 38.6%) acceleration ratio with 0.16% performance increase, while PFEC [15] harms the performance with lower acceleration ratio. These results validate the effectiveness of PFGM, which can produce a more compressed model with comparable performance to the original model.

### 4.3. ResNet on ILSVRC-2012

For the ILSVRC-2012 dataset, we test our PFGM on ResNet-18, 34, 50 and 101; and we use pruning rate 30%
Table 2. Comparison of pruned ResNet on ImageNet. “Fine-tune?” and “acc. ↓” have the same meaning with Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Fine-tune?</th>
<th>Baseline top-1 acc.(%)</th>
<th>Accelerated top-1 acc.(%)</th>
<th>Baseline top-5 acc.(%)</th>
<th>Accelerated top-5 acc.(%)</th>
<th>Top-1 acc. ↓(%)</th>
<th>Top-5 acc. ↓(%)</th>
<th>Pruned FLOPs(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MIL [4]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>69.98</td>
<td>66.33</td>
<td>89.24</td>
<td>86.94</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFP [12]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>67.10</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>87.78</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>67.78</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>88.01</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>88.11</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>88.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>88.48</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SFP [12]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>73.92</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>73.92</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>90.70</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>73.92</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>90.69</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PrEC [15]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>75.23</td>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>73.92</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>73.92</td>
<td>72.63</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>91.08</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>SFP [12]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.06</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>75.03</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>74.94</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 40%)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>74.13</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>91.94</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP [13]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ThiNet [17]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>72.04</td>
<td>91.14</td>
<td>90.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFP [12]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>84.60</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NISP [29]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>75.59</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.63</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-mix 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 40%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>76.15</td>
<td>74.83</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>92.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Rethinking [28]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td>75.27</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours (PFGM-only 30%)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td>77.32</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Comparison on the theoretical and realistic acceleration. Only the time consumption of the forward procedure is considered.

and 40% for these models. Same with [12], we do not prune the projection shortcuts for simplification.

Table 2 shows that PFGM outperforms previous methods on ILSVRC-2012 dataset, again. For ResNet-18, pure PFGM without fine-tuning achieves the same inference speedup with [12], but its accuracy exceeds by 0.68%. PFGM-only with fine-tuning could even gain 0.60% improvement over PFGM-only without fine-tuning, thus exceeds [12] by 1.28%. For ResNet-50, PFGM with fine-tuning achieves more inference speedup than CP [13], but our pruned model exceeds their model by 0.85% on the accuracy. Moreover, for pruning a pre-trained ResNet-101, PFGM reduces more than 40% FLOPs of the model without top-5 accuracy loss and only negligible (0.05%) top-1 accuracy loss. In contrast, the performance degradation is 2.10% for Rethinking [28]. Compared to the norm-based criterion, Geometric Median (GM) explicitly utilizes the relationship between filters, which is the main cause to its superior performance.

To compare the theoretical and realistic acceleration, we measure the forward time of the pruned models on one GTX1080 GPU with a batch size of 64. The result is shown in Table 3. As discussed in the above section, the gap between theoretical and realistic model may come from the limitation of IO delay, buffer switch and efficiency of BLAS libraries.

4.4. Ablation Study

4.4.1 Influence of Pruning Interval

In our experiment setting, the interval of pruning equals to one, i.e., we conduct our pruning operation at the end of every training epoch. To explore the influence of pruning interval, we change the pruning interval from one epoch to ten epochs. We use the ResNet-110 under pruning rate 40% as the baseline, as shown in Fig. 4(a). The accuracy fluctuation along with the different pruning intervals is less than 0.3%, which means the performance of pruning is not sen-
Different pruning rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pruning rate (%)</th>
<th>Accuracy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>93.73 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>93.87 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>93.56 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using $\ell_1$-norm and cosine distance, the accuracy is 93.73 ± 0.23 % and 93.87 ± 0.22 %, respectively. Using $\ell_1$-norm as the distance of filter would bring a slightly better result, but cosine distance as distance would slightly harm the performance of the network.

4.3 Influence of Distance Type

We use $\ell_1$-norm and cosine distance to replace the distance function in Equation 3. We use the ResNet-110 under pruning rate 40% as the baseline, the accuracy of the pruned model is 93.73 ± 0.23 %. The accuracy based on $\ell_1$-norm and cosine distance is 93.87 ± 0.22 % and 93.56 ± 0.13, respectively. Using $\ell_1$-norm as the distance of filter would bring a slightly better result, but cosine distance as distance would slightly harm the performance of the network.

4.4 Combining PFGM with Norm-based Criterion

We analyze the effect of combining PFGM and previous norm-based criterion. For ResNet-110 on CIFAR-10, PFGM-mix is slightly better than PFGM-only. For ResNet-18 on ILSVRC-2012, the performances of PFGM-only and PFGM-mix are almost the same. It seems that the norm-based criterion and PFGM together can boost the performance on CIFAR-10, but not on ILSVRC-2012. We believe that this is because the two requirements for the norm-based criterion are met on some layers of CIFAR-10 pre-trained network, but not on that of ILSVRC-2012 pre-trained network, which is shown in Figure 3.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we elaborate the underlying requirements for norm-based filter pruning criterion, and point out their limitations. To solve this, we propose a new filter pruning strategy based on geometric median, named PFGM, to accelerate the deep CNNs. Unlike the previous norm-based criterion, PFGM explicitly considers the mutual relations between filters. Thanks to this, PFGM achieves the state-of-the-art performance in several benchmarks. In Future, we will work on how to combine PFGM with other acceleration algorithms, e.g., matrix decomposition and low-precision weights, to improve the performance to a higher stage.
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