
NEPENTHE: ENTROPY-BASED PRUNING AS A NEURAL NETWORK DEPTH'S REDUCER*

Zhu Liao, Victor Quéty, Van-Tam Nguyen, Enzo Tartaglione
 LTCI, Télécom Paris, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, France
 {name.surname}@telecom-paris.fr

ABSTRACT

While deep neural networks are highly effective at solving complex tasks, their computational demands can hinder their usefulness in real-time applications and with limited-resources systems. Besides, for many tasks it is known that these models are over-parametrized: neoteric works have broadly focused on reducing the width of these networks, rather than their depth. In this paper, we aim to reduce the depth of over-parametrized deep neural networks: we propose an eNtropy-basEd Pruning as a nEural Network depTH's rEducer (NEPENTHE) to alleviate deep neural networks' computational burden. Based on our theoretical finding, NEPENTHE focuses on un-structurally pruning connections in layers with low entropy to remove them entirely. We validate our approach on popular architectures such as MobileNet and Swin-T, showing that when encountering an over-parametrization regime, it can effectively linearize some layers (hence reducing the model's depth) with little to no performance loss. The code will be publicly available upon acceptance of the article.

1 Introduction

The landscape of computer vision has undergone a transformative evolution propelled by the advent of Deep Neural Networks (DNNs), which have emerged as instrumental in achieving state-of-the-art outcomes across pivotal computer vision domains, including semantic segmentation [1], classification [2], and object detection [3]. Notably, the pervasive impact of DNNs extends beyond conventional computer vision tasks, showcasing absolute potential in realms such as natural language processing [4], and multi-modal tasks [5]. The employment of DNNs is becoming massive in our lives and looks unstoppable.

While DNN performance has exhibited scalability concerning model and dataset size [6], the inherent computational burden is one major downside. Notably, contemporary state-of-the-art models are characterized by millions (or even billions) of parameters, demanding billions (or trillions) of floating-point operations (FLOPs) for a single input prediction [7]. Consequently, the substantial resources requisite for training and deploying large neural networks, both in terms of pure hardware capability and energy consumption, pose challenges for real-time applications and edge devices.

Over the past decade, the research landscape has witnessed the emergence of compression techniques as a crucial avenue to address the resource-intensive nature of DNNs. The intrinsic link between the generalization capability of DNNs and the model's complexity has been well-established [6]. Notably, off-the-shelf architectures utilized in downstream tasks tend to be over-parameterized, presenting an opportunity for compression with marginal or no performance loss [8]. A spectrum of approaches has been proposed to craft more efficient architectures, spanning from parameter removal [9] to the lowering of numerical precision [10]; however, most of the approaches are unable to reduce the number of layers in a DNN.

The impact of removing individual parameters or whole filters on recent computing resources, such as GPUs, is relatively marginal. Due to the parallelization of computations, the size of layers, whether larger or smaller, is primarily constrained by memory caching and core availability. The critical bottleneck in computation lies in the *critical path*

* *Preprint*




Figure 1: In this work we show that the average neuron’s entropy calculated at the layer scale reduces as we induce some sparsity in the model. The main challenge is to make the average neuron’s entropy go to zero for some layers, as it will be possible to remove it.

that computations must traverse [11], a challenge that can be addressed by strategically removing layers. While some existing works implicitly address this concern [12], they fail to a-priori guarantee no performance loss (given that they impose a target shallow model) or avoid substantial perturbations. This motivates the exploration of designing an iterative pruning strategy, aimed at reducing the model’s depth while preserving optimal performance.

In this work, we present NEPENTHE, an approach that iteratively attempts to remove layers from a DNN. More specifically, given the large use of *rectifier* activation functions such as ReLU, GELU, and Leaky-ReLU, we can identify the average *state* of a given neuron for the trained task, and from that, we can maximize the utilization of one of the two regions identifiable in these activations by minimizing an entropy. We find out that vanilla unstructured pruning is implicitly already minimizing such entropy, but is hardly able to completely force a whole layer to utilize one of these two regions. Through the design of our entropy-weighted pruned parameter budget at the layer’s scale, we can favor solutions where the layer’s entropy drops to zero, hence becoming linearizable (Fig. 1). We summarize, here below, our key messages and contributions:

- we propose a measure of entropy at the single neuron’s scale, which indicates how much such neuron uses its linear part(s): through its minimization, it is in principle possible to linearize it, and by making the average entropy drop to zero it is possible to linearize the whole layer (Sec. 3.1);
- we suggest from a theoretical perspective that unstructured pruning, in rectifier-activated layers, naturally reduces the layer’s entropy (Sec. 3.2), and we validate such result empirically (Sec. 4.2);
- we propose NEPENTHE, a new method aiming to decrease a neural network’s depth (Sec. 3.4) through a proper entropy-guided reweighting of the pruning budget at the layer’s scale (Sec. 3.3);
- we test NEPENTHE in a variety of setups and with some popular architectures (Sec. 4.3), showcasing that it can achieve layer removal with little or no performance loss when over-parametrized networks are employed.

2 Related Works

Neural Network Pruning Neural network pruning has gained considerable attention in recent years due to its potential to enhance model performance and reduce over-fitting. Its goal is to reduce a cumbersome network to a smaller one while maintaining accuracy by removing irrelevant weights, filters, or other structures, from neural networks. While *structured* pruning removes entire neurons, filters, or channels [13, 14], *unstructured* pruning algorithms remove weights without explicitly considering the neural network’s structure [9]. Magnitude-based pruning, where the importance score to prune parameters is based on their magnitude [9, 15, 16], and gradient-based pruning, where the ranking or the penalty term is a function of the gradient magnitude (or to higher order derivatives) [17, 8], are the main types of unstructured pruning approaches. [18] compared the effectiveness of these approaches and concluded that, in general, gradient-based methods are less accurate than magnitude-based methods. Moreover, [19] showed that simple magnitude pruning approaches achieve comparable or better results than complex methods, making them a good trade-off between complexity and competitiveness. Computationally-wise, it is broadly known that, in general-purpose hardware setup,




Figure 2: Distribution of a layer’s parameters with magnitude pruning at threshold t (a), pre-activation distribution at varying t under the assumption of independence and centering of the Gaussian distributed input and layer’s parameters (b), and entropy of the rectifier-activated neuron’s output as a function of t (c), all in the large N limit.

structured pruning is able to provide larger benefits, in terms of both memory and computation, than unstructured approaches, despite the achieved sparsity rate can be substantially lower [20].

Entropy-Guided Pruning Some works have already tried to propose entropy-based approaches to guide pruning. For convolutional neural networks, [21] put forward an iterative filter pruning strategy in which the importance of each filter is calculated by their entropy-based channel selection metric. To recover performance, the pruned model is then fine-tuned. Also for CNNs, [22] suggested an entropy-based method that determines dynamically during training the threshold by considering the average amount of information from the weights to output. Moreover, [23] proposed a two-stage filter pruning framework, first intra-layer and then extra-layer. Given that the entropy is a measure of disorder, evidently, it identifies filters that mutually have low entropy: these can be considered *redundant* and for instance, can be removed from the model. These approaches, despite reducing the layer’s width, are not designed to explicitly remove entire layers.

Neural Network Depth Reduction Towards neural network depth reduction, [24] inspect the possibility of having a layer-wise pruning method based on feature representation, a-posteriori employing a retraining strategy that utilizes knowledge distillation. This work reinforces the possibility of designing a layer-pruning algorithm. Endorsing this, [25] proposed a method that learns whether non-linear activations can be removed, allowing to folding of consecutive linear layers into one. More specifically, ReLU-activated layers are replaced with PReLU activations, showcasing a regularized slope. Post-training, the PReLUs almost linear are removed, and the layer can be folded with its subsequent one. [11] proposes a similar channel-wise approach that enables to significant reduction of more non-linear units in the network while maintaining similar performance. While these works sought to shrink the neural network’s depth by working at the activation level and forcing it to stay either linear or non-linear, our approach does not directly enforce any of that. In rectifier-activated networks, we perform a targeted unstructured pruning that off-line favors either the neuron’s shutdown or the use of its linear part.

3 NEPENTHE

In this section, we present our method NEPENTHE, which focuses on pruning connections in layers with low entropy to remove them entirely. First, we show that unstructured pruning naturally minimizes the neuron’s entropy (in rectifier-activated layers). This will motivate our entropy-guided pruning approach, which allows a gradual layer removal.

3.1 Entropy for Rectifier Activations

Let us assume ψ is the rectifier of the l -th layer, populated by N_L neurons. We can monitor the output $y_{l,i}^x$ of the i -th neuron from a given input x of the dataset $\mathcal{D}$ and write it as:

$$y_{l,i}^x = \psi(z_{l,i}^x), \quad (1)$$

where $z_{l,i}^x$ is the output of the i -th neuron inside the l -th layer. From (1), we can define three possible “States” for the neuron:

$$s_{l,i}^x = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } y_{l,i}^x > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } y_{l,i}^x < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } y_{l,i}^x = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

More synthetically, for the output of the i -th neuron, we can easily identify in which of these States we are by simply applying the sign function to $z_{l,i}^x$, obtaining $s_{l,i}^x = \text{sign}(z_{l,i}^x)$. Informally, we can say that the neuron is in the *ON State* when $s_{l,i}^x = +1$ (as it is typically the linear region) while it is in the *OFF State* when $s_{l,i}^x = -1$ (given that $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \psi(x) = 0$).² The third State $s_{l,i}^x = 0$ is a special case, as it can be either mapped as an ON or OFF State. From the average over a batch of outputs for the neuron, we can obtain the probability (in the frequentist sense) of the i -th neuron of being in either the ON or the OFF States. For instance, we can obtain the probability of the ON State as:

$$p(s_{l,i} = +1) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\|\mathcal{D}\|_0} s_{l,i}^{x_j} \Theta(s_{l,i}^{x_j} - \frac{1}{2})}{S_{l,i}} & \text{if } S_{l,i} \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where

$$S_{l,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\|\mathcal{D}\|_0} s_{l,i}^{x_j} \text{sign}(s_{l,i}^{x_j}) \quad (4)$$

counts how many times the ON and the OFF States are encountered, $\|\mathcal{D}\|_0$ is the number of the input samples, and Θ is the Heaviside function.³ Evidently, we exclude the third State from this count as it can be associated with being either within ON or OFF. Given that we are either interested in the ON or the OFF States, we can then deduce that, when $S_{l,i} \neq 0$, $p(s_{l,i} = -1) = 1 - p(s_{l,i} = +1)$. Given this, we can calculate the entropy of the i -th neuron in the l -th layer as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}_{l,i} = - \sum_{s_{l,i} = \pm 1} p(s_{l,i}) \log_2 [p(s_{l,i})] \quad (5)$$

With the definition in (5), $\mathcal{H}_{l,i}$ can be zero in two possible cases:

- $s_{l,i} = -1 \forall j$. In this case, $z_{l,i} \leq 0 \forall j$. When employing a ReLU, the output of the i -th neuron is always 0, and in this specific case, the neuron can be simply pruned.
- $s_{l,i} = +1 \forall j$. In this case, $z_{l,i} \geq 0 \forall j$. The output of the i -th neuron is always the same as its input,⁴ this neuron can in principle be absorbed by the following layer as there is no non-linearity between them anymore.

By averaging the entropy values for the total number of neurons N_l inside the l -th layer, we can define the average entropy of the l -th layer as:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_l = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_i \mathcal{H}_{l,i}. \quad (6)$$

Since we aim to minimize the depth of deep neural networks by eliminating zero-entropy layers, we would like to have $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_l = 0$. Unfortunately, directly minimizing (6) in the optimization function is hard as it relies on non-differentiable measures like (3). In the next section, we will see how unstructured pruning can surprisingly be a promising choice for such a goal.

3.2 Unstructured Pruning Naturally Reduces the Entropy

Let us assume the input x for a given neuron is a sequence of random variables $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_X, \sigma_X^2)$. Similarly, we can assume the N parameters populating such neuron, for a large N limit, follow as well a Gaussian distribution, and we

²There are few exceptions to this, like LeakyReLU- in those cases, even though the activation will not converge to zero, we still like to call it OFF State as, given the same magnitude of input, the output’s magnitude is lower.

³Please note that for convolutional layers it is necessary to add another sum and average over the whole feature map generated per input.

⁴or very close as in GeLU

model it as $W \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_W, \sigma_W^2)$. Let us assume we apply a magnitude-based pruning mask to the neuron’s parameters, where we apply some threshold t . As such, we obtain a modified distribution for the layer’s parameters:

$$f_{\widehat{W}}(w, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma_W \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{w - \mu_W}{\sigma_W} \right)^2 \right] & |w| > t \\ \zeta(t) \delta(w) & |w| \leq t, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\zeta(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{t - \mu_W}{\sigma_W \sqrt{2}} \right) - \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{-t - \mu_W}{\sigma_W \sqrt{2}} \right) \right] \quad (8)$$

is the fraction of parameters pruned, or *pruning rate*, δ is the Dirac delta and erf is the error function. Fig. 2a displays an example of distribution when applying magnitude pruning having threshold t against the original distribution. Under the assumption of independent-centered distributions having a unitary variance, we can obtain the distribution for the pre-activation z (resulting from the product of the weights and the input, modeled through the random variable Z), according to the result obtained by [26, 27], follows

$$f_Z(z, t) = \frac{1}{\pi} K_0 \left(\left| \frac{1}{q(t)} \cdot z \right| \right), \quad (9)$$

where

$$q(t) = 1 - \operatorname{erf} \left(\frac{t}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \quad (10)$$

and K_n is the n -th order modified Bessel function of the second kind. We can observe, from Fig. 2b, how f_Z is affected by increasing the thresholding t . Now, let us assume the activation function of such a neuron is a rectifier function, and we are interested in observing what is the probability of the post-activation output being in the linear region: we are interested in measuring

$$\begin{aligned} p[Z > 0] &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\epsilon}^{+\infty} K_0 \left(\left| \frac{1}{q(t)} \cdot z \right| \right) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - I \left(\frac{\epsilon}{q(t)} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$I(x) = x[L_{-1}(x)K_0(x) + L_0(x)K_1(x)], \quad (12)$$

L_n is the n -th order modified Struve function, and ϵ is a positive small value. From this, we can easily obtain the complementary probability $p[f_Z(z, t) \leq 0]$ and for instance calculate the entropy between the two States.

Fig. 2c displays the entropy as a function of the thresholding parameter t : as we observe, the entropy decreases given that the threshold increases: through unstructured pruning, the neuron’s output entropy is naturally minimized when employing rectified activations, even in the oversimplified case here treated. In the following, we will present how we are exploiting such a property of unstructured pruning towards layer entropy minimization.

3.3 A Layer Entropy-Aware Pruning Score

Driven by the promising theoretical results presented in Sec. 3.2, we will design here a relevance metric that will guide the unstructured pruning to lower the whole layer’s entropy $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_l$. As we aim to increase the number of zero-entropy layers, intuitively more pruning should be applied to layers with lower entropy, as they are the best candidates to be removed. Concurrently, to minimize the impact on performance, only low-magnitude weights should be removed, as they are typically those providing the lowest contribution to the neural network’s output [9, 13]. To reach these two objectives, we define first an intra-layer’s pruning irrelevance score $\mathcal{I}_l$:

$$\mathcal{I}_l = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{l,i} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}_{l,i}\|_0} |\mathbf{w}_{l,i}|, \quad (13)$$

where $\|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0$ is the current layer’s parameters cardinality (hence, not accounting for the already pruned weights, if any). This metric accounts for the average parameter’s magnitude and the layer’s entropy at the same time: layers with few parameters but high entropy are less prone to be removed than layers with more parameters but lower entropy (under the same parameter’s norm constraint). Besides, the parameter’s magnitude of neurons with zero entropy is

Algorithm 1 Our proposed method NEPENTHE.

```

1: function NEPENTHE( $\mathbf{w}^{\text{INIT}}, L, \mathcal{D}, \zeta, \theta$ )
2:    $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \text{Train}(\mathbf{w}^{\text{init}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}})$ 
3:   dense_acc  $\leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}})$ 
4:   current_acc  $\leftarrow$  dense_acc
5:   while current_acc  $> \theta \cdot$  dense_acc do
6:      $\hat{\mathcal{H}} \leftarrow \text{Entropy}(\mathbf{w}, L, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}})$ 
7:      $\|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{pruned}} \leftarrow \zeta \cdot \|\mathbf{w}\|_0$ 
8:     Weights_to_prune( $L, \hat{\mathcal{H}}, \|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{pruned}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ )
9:      $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \text{Prune}(\mathbf{w}, L, \|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{pruned}})$ 
10:     $\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \text{Train}(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}})$ 
11:    current_acc  $\leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}})$ 
12:   end while
13:   return  $\mathbf{w}$ 
14: end function
15:
16: function WEIGHTS_TO_PRUNE( $L, \hat{\mathcal{H}}, \|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{PRUNED}}, \mathcal{D}$ )
17:   for  $l \in L$  do
18:      $\mathcal{I}_l \leftarrow \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{l,i} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}_{l,i}\|_0} |\mathbf{w}_{l,i}|$ 
19:      $\mathcal{R}_l \leftarrow \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{j \in L} \mathcal{I}_j}{\mathcal{I}_l} & \text{if } \mathcal{I}_l \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ 
20:      $\|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}} \leftarrow \|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}} \cdot \frac{\exp[\mathcal{R}_l]}{\sum_j \exp[\mathcal{R}(j)]}$ 
21:   end for
22: end function

```

not accounted for in the importance score calculation. Symmetrically, to remove parameters from layers having lower pruning irrelevance, we define the inter-layer’s pruning relevance score $\mathcal{R}_l$ as:

$$\mathcal{R}_l = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mathcal{I}_l} \sum_{j \in L} \mathcal{I}_j & \text{if } \mathcal{I}_l \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

This measure is as large as the l -th layer’s pruning irrelevance score is smaller compared to the other layer’s. Noticeably, $\mathcal{R}_l \in [1; +\infty)$: to exactly establish how many parameters $\|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}}$ should be removed inside each layer l at a given pruning iteration, we have the *entropy-weighted pruned parameter budget*

$$\|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}} = \|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}} \cdot \frac{\exp[\mathcal{R}_l]}{\sum_j \exp[\mathcal{R}(j)]}. \quad (15)$$

Here follows an overview of NEPENTHE.

3.4 Entropy-Based Iterative Pruning

Depicted in Alg. 1, we guide our entropy-based iterative pruning algorithm to remove layers with zero entropy. Indeed, if a layer has an entropy equal to zero, then all of its neurons have an entropy equal to zero: $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_l = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{l,i} = 0, \forall i$. Hence, this layer doesn’t necessarily need to have a rectifier: this layer can be removed entirely without the need for future pruning. Towards this end, we first train the neural network, represented by its weights at initialization $\mathbf{w}^{\text{init}}$, on the training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ (line 2) and evaluate it on the validation set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ (line 3). As defined in (6), we then calculate the entropy $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ on the training set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ for each layer l of the considered list of layers L (line 6). This list is initialized to all the layers of the neural network having a rectifier activation (hence, the output layer is excluded).

Considering that ζ represents the percentage of parameters to remove at each pruning iteration and $\|\mathbf{w}\|_0$ the total weight parameters of the considered L layers in the model, we can define the number of weight parameters to be pruned at each iteration $\|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{pruned}}$ (line 7) as:

$$\|\mathbf{w}\|_0^{\text{pruned}} = \zeta \cdot \|\mathbf{w}\|_0. \quad (16)$$

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1
Dense	0.647	0.680	0.728	0.785	0.791	0.797	91.66
IMP (iter #1)	0.585	0.650	0.699	0.725	0.767	0.778	92.29
IMP (iter #2)	0.506	0.580	0.647	0.654	0.700	0.722	92.25
IMP (iter #3)	0.256	0.623	0.658	0.672	0.682	0.737	92.46
IMP (iter #4)	0.192	0.660	0.667	0.676	0.698	0.763	92.27
IMP (iter #5)	0.136	0.589	0.648	0.727	0.728	0.791	92.44
IMP (iter #6)	0.093	0.447	0.640	0.650	0.764	0.765	91.89
IMP (iter #7)	0.055	0.335	0.487	0.592	0.640	0.775	91.66
NEPENTHE	0	0	0	0.014	0.121	0.942	92.55

Table 1: Trend in the bottom six layer’s entropies for ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10.

To assign the parameters to prune in each layer, we define a function `Weights_to_prune` that calculates, for each layer, the weights to remove, according to what discussed in Sec. 3.3 (line 16). At this point, for each layer l , the neurons having non-zero entropy are first selected and then $\|\mathbf{w}_l\|_0^{\text{pruned}}$ non-zero weights having the lowest absolute magnitude are removed (line 9). The model is then retrained (line 10) and re-evaluated on the validation set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ (line 11). The final model is obtained once the performance on the validation set drops below some relative threshold θ .

4 Experiments

In this section, we empirically evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed approach, NEPENTHE, across multiple architectures and datasets for traditional image classification setups. We compare our results with one baseline method: iterative magnitude pruning (IMP) [9], as well as the existing approach Layer Folding [25].

4.1 Experimental setup

We evaluate our method on three models: ResNet-18, MobileNet-V2 and Swin-T, trained on five datasets: CIFAR-10 [28], Tiny-ImageNet [29] and PACS, VLCS, SVIRO from DomainBed [30]. We follow the same training policies as [31] and [32]. For all the datasets, we set $\zeta = 0.5$ for ResNet-18, $\zeta = 0.25$ for Swin-T, and $\zeta = 0.1$ for MobileNet-V2. Moreover, the results for Layer Folding are obtained using the same aforementioned training policy, with the hyper-parameters declared in [25].

4.2 Trend of Layer’s Entropy

As a preliminary experiment, we will study here the effect of pruning on the layer’s entropy. Table 1 reports the entropy trend of the six layers showing the lowest entropy. The iterative magnitude approach removes progressively, in this setup, the 50% of the parameters from the model, following a vanilla global unstructured magnitude pruning approach. As expected from the derivation as in Sec. 3.2, as the pruning progresses (and implicitly t grows), the entropy is naturally decreased, showcasing very small values after some pruning iterations.

However, we also observe that as the entropy $\hat{H}_1$ decreases, the top-1 accuracy begins to deteriorate. This happens as there is no proper pruning re-allocation, that instead happens with NEPENTHE according to (14): indeed, in such case not only does the performance remain high, but we can successfully remove three layers from the model. Noticeably, $\hat{H}_4$ and $\hat{H}_5$ are also very low, while already starting from $\hat{H}_6$ the entropy is very high. Contrarily to magnitude pruning where the entropy is in general in intermediate-range values, NEPENTHE tries to push all the encoded information toward layers having already high entropy, enabling effective layer removal with little (or in this case no) performance loss. This is also illustrated in Fig. 3, showing the distribution of the neuron states per layer for ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10 trained with NEPENTHE. Our unstructured pruning approach effectively removes three layers by pushing all the neurons inside low-entropy layers to be either in the ON or in the OFF state. Besides, we also notice that in some layers (like the 1, 13, and 17) there are entire units at zero entropy- we also achieve some structured sparsity by an

Dataset	Approach	ResNet-18			MobileNet-V2			Swin-T		
		$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$	top-1	Rem.	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$	top-1	Rem.	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$	top-1	Rem.
CIFAR-10	Dense model	0.647	91.66	0/17	0.386	93.68	0/35	0.028	91.54	0/12
	IMP (low prune)	0.585	92.29	0/17	0.186	94.07	0/35	0.001	91.73	0/12
	IMP (mid prune)	0.192	92.27	0/17	0.063	93.32	0/35	0.001	91.46	0/12
	IMP (high prune)	0.055	91.66	0/17	0.046	93.50	0/35	0.286	90.53	0/12
	Layer folding	-	90.65	1/17	-	89.24	9/35	-	85.73	2/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>0.121</i>	<i>92.55</i>	<i>3/17</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>93.26</i>	<i>7/35</i>	<i>0.362</i>	<i>92.29</i>	<i>2/12</i>
Tiny-ImageNet	Dense model	0.471	41.44	0/17	0.076	45.86	0/35	0.067	75.60	0/12
	IMP (low prune)	0.470	42.24	0/17	0.036	45.84	0/35	0.069	75.86	0/12
	IMP (mid prune)	0.485	41.18	0/17	0.161	46.80	0/35	0.089	75.32	0/12
	IMP (high prune)	0.464	39.14	0/17	0.013	45.24	0/35	0.104	67.56	0/12
	Layer folding	-	37.86	4/17	-	25.88	12/35	-	50.54	1/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>0.129</i>	<i>39.56</i>	<i>5/17</i>	<i>0.002</i>	<i>47.92</i>	<i>12/35</i>	<i>0.126</i>	<i>72.58</i>	<i>1/12</i>
PACS	Dense model	0.332	94.70	0/17	0.207	93.20	0/35	0.057	97.10	0/12
	IMP (low prune)	0.331	95.40	0/17	0.218	95.70	0/35	0.060	96.60	0/12
	IMP (mid prune)	0.319	95.10	0/17	0.222	95.70	0/35	0.095	96.60	0/12
	IMP (high prune)	0.280	90.80	0/17	0.170	95.40	0/35	0.101	93.90	0/12
	Layer folding	-	82.90	3/17	-	79.70	1/35	-	87.70	2/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>0.030</i>	<i>93.00</i>	<i>1/17</i>	<i>0.080</i>	<i>92.20</i>	<i>1/35</i>	<i>0.335</i>	<i>95.10</i>	<i>2/12</i>
VLCS	Dense model	0.382	80.89	0/17	0.258	81.83	0/35	0.070	86.58	0/12
	IMP (low prune)	0.387	82.79	0/17	0.269	80.80	0/35	0.078	84.72	0/12
	IMP (mid prune)	0.391	80.15	0/17	0.258	79.59	0/35	0.122	84.06	0/12
	IMP (high prune)	0.357	74.09	0/17	0.273	80.43	0/35	0.139	80.06	0/12
	Layer folding	-	66.91	5/17	-	68.87	2/35	-	70.92	1/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>0.224</i>	<i>78.38</i>	<i>2/17</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>80.06</i>	<i>2/35</i>	<i>0.411</i>	<i>85.27</i>	<i>1/12</i>
SVIRO	Dense model	0.336	99.93	0/17	0.187	99.95	0/35	0.060	99.95	0/12
	IMP (low prune)	0.327	99.98	0/17	0.165	99.98	0/35	0.046	99.84	0/12
	IMP (mid prune)	0.335	99.95	0/17	0.169	99.96	0/35	0.027	99.68	0/12
	IMP (high prune)	0.308	99.95	0/17	0.146	99.95	0/35	0.260	99.75	0/12
	Layer folding	-	99.46	8/17	-	99.83	2/35	-	99.66	5/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>0.001</i>	<i>99.61</i>	<i>8/17</i>	<i>0.020</i>	<i>99.98</i>	<i>2/35</i>	<i>0.162</i>	<i>99.75</i>	<i>5/12</i>

Table 2: Test performance (top-1), lowest non-zero layers’ entropy ($\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$) and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for all the considered setups. The results achieved by our method are in italic.

unstructured approach, as already reported in some works [9, 13]. Here follows an extensive analysis of more datasets and architectures.

4.3 Results

Table 2 shows the test performance (top-1), the lowest non-zero layer’s entropy ($\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$) as well as the number of removed layers (Rem.) for all the considered setups. Since Layer Folding is changing the architecture by hand, it is inconvenient to calculate $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\min}$.

As expected, the IMP approach does not significantly harm the performance but does not enable the removal of any layer. Nevertheless, Layer Folding removes some layers from the architecture but comes at the cost of lower generalizability. On the contrary, NEPENTHE obtains models with a sizable number of removable layers for a little (or no) performance loss compared to dense models. It is also noticeable that in most cases, compared to Layer Folding, NEPENTHE yields better results, either better top-1 accuracy, more removable layers, or both.

4.4 Ablation study

We will perform, in this section, two different studies: the first is a classical ablation, where we analyze the contribution of each term employed within NEPENTHE, and the second where we will test NEPENTHE with some of the most popular rectifiers. Table 3 provides an ablation study on the three key components identifiable within NEPENTHE: the




Figure 3: Distributions of neuron states per layer for ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10 pruned by NEPENTHE. In blue neurons having non-zero entropy, in orange always OFF, and in red always ON.

Entropy	Don't care state	Neurons Selection	top-1	Rem.
			91.66	0/17
✓			92.18	3/17
✓	✓		92.33	3/17
✓	✓	✓	92.55	3/17

Table 3: Ablation study on ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10.

entropy-based weighted pruned parameter budget (14), the presence of the don't care state in the entropy formulation (2) and the filtering mechanism of non-zero entropy neurons (13). Every component contributes towards the effectiveness of NEPENTHE.

Finally, Table 4 shows the test performance of ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10, for different rectifiers. NEPENTHE is not dependent on any particular rectifier and can be effective with any since our method removes three layers without performance loss for all the tested activations.

4.5 Limitations and Future Work

Our entropy-based method NEPENTHE is a successful approach to alleviate deep neural networks' computational burden by decreasing their depth. However, this method also presents some limits: compressing already parameter-efficient architectures that are not over-fitting is challenging, and this approach evidently is unable to reduce the depth of an already under-fitting architecture (like for instance a ResNet-18 trained on ImageNet, for which we report the experiment in the supplementary material). Nevertheless, our work is the first to use unstructured pruning to successfully reduce neural networks' depth, despite being relatively inefficient at compression time as it relies on an iterative strategy. A possible solution to this issue would be to include the entropy in the minimized objective function; however, this is not directly a viable approach as it is a non-differentiable metric. The exploration of differentiable proxies of the layer's entropy is left as future work.

Activation	Method	top-1	Rem.
ReLU	Dense	91.66	0/17
	NEPENTHE	92.55	3/17
SiLU	Dense	91.66	0/17
	NEPENTHE	92.77	3/17
PReLU	Dense	91.25	0/17
	NEPENTHE	92.27	3/17
LeakyReLU	Dense	91.66	0/17
	NEPENTHE	92.49	3/17
GELU	Dense	91.89	0/17
	NEPENTHE	92.57	3/17

Table 4: Analysis with different activation functions on ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we have presented NEPENTHE, an iterative unstructured approach towards layer removal in rectifier-activated deep neural networks. Leveraging on some theoretical results showing that unstructured pruning has the potential to concretely reduce the neural network’s depth, an entropy-based weighting mechanism has been designed to select parameters to prune from the network toward depth reduction and attempt to preserve high performance in the considered tasks. Experiments were conducted on popular architectures, including the Transformer-based Swin-T, showcasing the potential of NEPENTHE to concretely reduce the number of layers in the model. This work has a practical impact even in computation on parallel architectures such as GPUs or TPUs, as it inherently reduces the critical path forward propagation undergoes.

References

- [1] Hafiza Ayesha Hoor Chaudhry, Riccardo Renzulli, Daniele Perlo, Francesca Santinelli, Stefano Tibaldi, Carmen Cristiano, Marco Grosso, Attilio Fiandrotti, Maurizio Lucenteforte, and Davide Cavagnino. Lung nodules segmentation with deephealth toolkit. In *Image Analysis and Processing. ICIAP 2022 Workshops: ICIAP International Workshops, Lecce, Italy, May 23–27, 2022, Revised Selected Papers, Part I*, pages 487–497. Springer, 2022.
- [2] Carlo Alberto Barbano, Enzo Tartaglione, Claudio Berzovini, Marco Calandri, and Marco Grangetto. A two-step radiologist-like approach for covid-19 computer-aided diagnosis from chest x-ray images. In *Image Analysis and Processing–ICIAP 2022: 21st International Conference, Lecce, Italy, May 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 173–184. Springer, 2022.
- [3] Pier Luigi Mazzeo, Emanuele Frontoni, Stan Sclaroff, and Cosimo Distanto. *Image Analysis and Processing. ICIAP 2022 Workshops: ICIAP International Workshops, Lecce, Italy, May 23–27, 2022, Revised Selected Papers, Part I*, volume 13373. Springer Nature, 2022.
- [4] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [5] Dongdong Sun, Minghui Wang, and Ao Li. A multimodal deep neural network for human breast cancer prognosis prediction by integrating multi-dimensional data. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 16(3):841–850, 2019.
- [6] Joel Hestness, Sharan Narang, Newsha Ardalani, Gregory Diamos, Heewoo Jun, Hassan Kianinejad, Md Mostofa Ali Patwary, Yang Yang, and Yanqi Zhou. Deep learning scaling is predictable, empirically. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00409*, 2017.
- [7] Jianyuan Guo, Kai Han, Han Wu, Yehui Tang, Xinghao Chen, Yunhe Wang, and Chang Xu. Cmt: Convolutional neural networks meet vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12175–12185, 2022.
- [8] Enzo Tartaglione, Andrea Bragagnolo, Attilio Fiandrotti, and Marco Grangetto. Loss-based sensitivity regularization: towards deep sparse neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 2022.

- [9] Song Han, Jeff Pool, John Tran, and William Dally. Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015.
- [10] Mohammad Rastegari, Vicente Ordonez, Joseph Redmon, and Ali Farhadi. Xnor-net: Imagenet classification using binary convolutional neural networks. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 525–542. Springer, 2016.
- [11] Christian H.X. Ali Mehmeti-Göpel and Jan Disselhoff. Nonlinear advantage: Trained networks might not be as complex as you think. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 529–546. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.
- [12] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [13] Enzo Tartaglione, Andrea Bragagnolo, Francesco Odierna, Attilio Fiandrotti, and Marco Grangetto. Serene: Sensitivity-based regularization of neurons for structured sparsity in neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(12):7237–7250, 2021.
- [14] Yang He and Lingao Xiao. Structured pruning for deep convolutional neural networks: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00566*, 2023.
- [15] Christos Louizos, Max Welling, and Diederik P. Kingma. Learning sparse neural networks through l_0 regularization. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [16] Michael H. Zhu and Suyog Gupta. To prune, or not to prune: Exploring the efficacy of pruning for model compression, 2018.
- [17] Namhoon Lee, Thalaiyasingam Ajanthan, and Philip Torr. Snip: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [18] Davis Blalock, Jose Javier Gonzalez Ortiz, Jonathan Frankle, and John Gutttag. What is the state of neural network pruning? *MLSys*, 2020.
- [19] Trevor Gale, Erich Elsen, and Sara Hooker. The state of sparsity in deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09574*, 2019.
- [20] Andrea Bragagnolo, Enzo Tartaglione, Attilio Fiandrotti, and Marco Grangetto. On the role of structured pruning for neural network compression. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3527–3531. IEEE, 2021.
- [21] Jian-Hao Luo and Jianxin Wu. An entropy-based pruning method for cnn compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.05791*, 2017.
- [22] Cheonghwan Hur and Sanggil Kang. Entropy-based pruning method for convolutional neural networks. *The Journal of Supercomputing*, 75:2950–2963, 2019.
- [23] Chuhan Min, Aosen Wang, Yiran Chen, Wen Yao Xu, and Xin Chen. 2pfpc: Two-phase filter pruning based on conditional entropy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02220*, 2018.
- [24] Shi Chen and Qi Zhao. Shallowing deep networks: Layer-wise pruning based on feature representations. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 41(12):3048–3056, 2019.
- [25] Amir Ben Dror, Niv Zehngut, Avraham Raviv, Evgeny Artyomov, Ran Vitek, and Roy Jevnisek. Layer folding: Neural network depth reduction using activation linearization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09309*, 2021.
- [26] Cecil C Craig. On the frequency function of xy . *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 7(1):1–15, 1936.
- [27] Antonio Seijas-Macías and Amílcar Oliveira. An approach to distribution of the product of two normal variables. *Discussiones Mathematicae Probability and Statistics*, 32(1-2):87–99, 2012.
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [29] Ya Le and Xuan Yang. Tiny imagenet visual recognition challenge. *CS 231N*, 7(7):3, 2015.
- [30] Ishaan Gulrajani and David Lopez-Paz. In search of lost domain generalization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [31] Victor Quéru and Enzo Tartaglione. Dsd²: Can we dodge sparse double descent and compress the neural network worry-free? In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 14749–14757, 2024.

- [32] Qinwei Xu, Ruipeng Zhang, Ya Zhang, Yanfeng Wang, and Qi Tian. A fourier-based framework for domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 14383–14392, June 2021.
- [33] Zheng He, Zeke Xie, Quanzhi Zhu, and Zengchang Qin. Sparse double descent: Where network pruning aggravates overfitting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8635–8659. PMLR, 2022.
- [34] Zhu Liao, Victor Quétu, Van-Tam Nguyen, and Enzo Tartaglione. Can unstructured pruning reduce the depth in deep neural networks? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1402–1406, 2023.

6 Details on the learning strategies employed

The implementation details used in this paper are presented here.

Like in [33, 34, 31] setups, for the ResNet-18 network, a modified version of the `torchvision` model is used: the first convolutional layer is set with a filter of size 3×3 and the max-pooling layer that follows has been eliminated to adapt ResNet-18 for CIFAR-10.

CIFAR-10 is augmented with per-channel normalization, random horizontal flipping, and random shifting by up to four pixels in any direction. For the datasets of DomainBed, the images are augmented with per-channel normalization, random horizontal flipping, random cropping, and resizing to 224. The brightness, contrast, saturation, and hue are also randomly affected with a factor fixed to 0.4. Tiny ImageNet is augmented with per-channel normalization and random horizontal flipping. ImageNet is augmented with per-channel normalization, random horizontal flipping, random cropping, and resizing to 224.

All weights from ReLU-activated layers are set as prunable for ResNet-18. For Swin-T, all weights from GELU-activated layers are prunable, while for MobileNetv2 all weights from ReLU6-activated layers are considered in the pruning. Neither biases nor batch normalization parameters are pruned.

The training hyperparameters used in the experiments are presented in Table 5. Our code is attached with this supplementary material and will be publicly available upon acceptance of the article.

Model	Dataset	Epochs	Batch	Opt.	Mom.	LR	Milestones	Drop Factor	Weight Decay
ResNet-18	CIFAR-10	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.1	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
Swin-T	CIFAR-10	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.001	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
MobileNetv2	CIFAR-10	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.1	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
ResNet-18	PACS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
Swin-T	PACS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
MobileNetv2	PACS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
ResNet-18	VLCS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
Swin-T	VLCS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
MobileNetv2	VLCS	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
ResNet-18	SVIRO	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
Swin-T	SVIRO	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
MobileNetv2	SVIRO	30	16	SGD	0.9	0.001	[24]	0.1	5e-4
ResNet-18	Tiny ImageNet	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.1	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
Swin-T	Tiny ImageNet	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.001	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
MobileNetv2	Tiny ImageNet	160	128	SGD	0.9	0.1	[80, 120]	0.1	1e-4
ResNet-18	ImageNet	90	128	SGD	0.9	0.1	[30, 90]	0.1	1e-4

Table 5: Table of the different employed learning strategies.

7 Experiments on more datasets

7.1 Detailed experimental results

Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20) present the entropy trends in the six layers exhibiting the lowest entropy, for all the setups. This illustrates that while unstructured pruning inherently reduces the entropy of certain layers, as detailed in Section 4.2, it lacks the capability to entirely eliminate any specific layer. In contrast, our methodology, NEPENTHE, aims to push all the encoded information from layers with low entropy to those with already high entropy. This strategy enables the removal of zero-entropy layers.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.647	0.680	0.728	0.785	0.791	0.797	91.66	0/17
IMP(iter #1)	0.585	0.650	0.699	0.725	0.767	0.778	92.29	0/17
IMP(iter #2)	0.506	0.580	0.647	0.654	0.700	0.722	92.25	0/17
IMP(iter #3)	0.256	0.623	0.658	0.672	0.682	0.737	92.46	0/17
IMP(iter #4)	0.192	0.660	0.667	0.676	0.698	0.763	92.27	0/17
IMP(iter #5)	0.136	0.589	0.648	0.727	0.728	0.791	92.44	0/17
IMP(iter #6)	0.093	0.447	0.640	0.650	0.764	0.765	91.89	0/17
IMP(iter #7)	0.055	0.335	0.487	0.592	0.640	0.775	91.66	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0	0.168	0.581	0.654	0.681	0.714	92.25	1/17
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.076	0.615	0.619	0.633	0.644	92.60	1/17
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0	0.121	0.139	0.642	92.55	3/17
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0	0.003	0.242	0.320	91.93	3/17
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0	0	0	0.114	89.30	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0.019	89.43	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	83.42	6/17

Table 6: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for ResNet-18 on CIFAR-10.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.03	0.054	0.382	0.394	0.394	0.44	91.54	0/12
IMP(iter #1)	0.03	0.055	0.383	0.397	0.398	0.444	91.73	0/12
IMP(iter #2)	0.031	0.057	0.382	0.392	0.399	0.443	91.80	0/12
IMP(iter #3)	0.034	0.063	0.375	0.383	0.393	0.438	91.43	0/12
IMP(iter #4)	0.036	0.072	0.365	0.379	0.382	0.426	91.46	0/12
IMP(iter #5)	0.041	0.080	0.349	0.361	0.369	0.409	91.27	0/12
IMP(iter #6)	0.048	0.096	0.334	0.343	0.350	0.386	91.05	0/12
IMP(iter #7)	0.055	0.113	0.31	0.325	0.327	0.355	90.53	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.215	0.385	0.397	0.407	0.443	91.77	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.001	0.219	0.387	0.399	0.409	0.445	92.06	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0.001	0.254	0.380	0.395	0.405	0.440	92.08	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0.001	0.001	0.377	0.388	0.404	0.433	92.31	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.363	0.373	0.406	0.423	92.29	2/12
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0.344	0.359	0.407	0.412	92.21	2/12
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0.287	0.317	0.405	0.405	92.11	2/12

Table 7: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Swin-T on CIFAR-10.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.386	0.474	0.486	0.504	0.528	0.544	93.68	0/35
IMP(iter #1)	0.186	0.206	0.233	0.241	0.249	0.260	94.07	0/35
IMP(iter #2)	0.116	0.117	0.153	0.167	0.167	0.168	93.67	0/35
IMP(iter #3)	0.082	0.084	0.111	0.119	0.119	0.125	93.83	0/35
IMP(iter #4)	0.063	0.066	0.090	0.094	0.095	0.101	93.32	0/35
IMP(iter #5)	0.056	0.057	0.074	0.075	0.086	0.088	93.26	0/35
IMP(iter #6)	0.050	0.050	0.065	0.067	0.071	0.076	93.47	0/35
IMP(iter #7)	0.046	0.047	0.059	0.060	0.061	0.064	93.50	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0	0.198	0.229	0.232	0.244	0.248	93.55	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.109	0.127	0.138	0.139	0.149	93.42	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.082	0.085	0.103	0.106	0.107	93.14	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0.063	0.065	0.074	0.076	93.25	2/35
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.064	0.067	0.049	0.051	93.37	4/35
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0.042	93.15	5/35
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	93.26	7/35

Table 8: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for MobileNetv2 on CIFAR-10.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.471	0.500	0.592	0.625	0.627	0.783	41.44	0/17
IMP(iter #1)	0.470	0.540	0.621	0.662	0.666	0.780	42.24	0/17
IMP(iter #2)	0.461	0.621	0.637	0.697	0.726	0.781	42.12	0/17
IMP(iter #3)	0.487	0.643	0.735	0.736	0.776	0.779	42.10	0/17
IMP(iter #4)	0.488	0.643	0.760	0.783	0.831	0.831	41.18	0/17
IMP(iter #5)	0.482	0.605	0.727	0.839	0.845	0.872	39.92	0/17
IMP(iter #6)	0.469	0.585	0.690	0.814	0.834	0.834	37.16	0/17
IMP(iter #7)	0.464	0.544	0.641	0.661	0.725	0.741	39.14	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0	0	0.063	0.559	0.633	0.699	41.42	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0	0	0	0	0.129	39.56	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0	0	0	0.169	40.00	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0	0	0	0.109	39.40	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0	0	0	0.107	38.58	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0.125	37.34	5/17
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0.138	35.80	5/17

Table 9: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for ResNet-18 on Tiny ImageNet.

7.2 Layer Folding

Table 21 shows the test performance (top-1) and the number of removed layers (Rem.) of Layer Folding [25] for all the setups, comparing them with the results of NEPENTHE. NEPENTHE consistently achieves better performance than Layer Folding when removing an equivalent number of layers.

7.3 ImageNet

When tackling less complex problems, models often exhibit redundant parameters, indicating a potential for reducing their depth. NEPENTHE enables depth reduction in models without substantially compromising their performance. Conversely, this redundancy in parameters is not evident when models are employed for complex tasks. In such scenarios, diminishing the depth of the models (i.e., reducing the number of layers) could negatively impact their effectiveness. Table 22 presents the performance for Resnet-18 trained on ImageNet. Indeed, there is a notable decline in performance following the removal of a layer from the model. This evidences a limit of NEPENTHE: compressing

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.067	0.133	0.38	0.388	0.395	0.411	75.60	0/12
IMP(iter #1)	0.069	0.131	0.370	0.373	0.384	0.399	75.86	0/12
IMP(iter #2)	0.073	0.133	0.355	0.356	0.367	0.380	75.26	0/12
IMP(iter #3)	0.080	0.143	0.335	0.336	0.346	0.357	73.60	0/12
IMP(iter #4)	0.089	0.156	0.313	0.314	0.319	0.330	72.32	0/12
IMP(iter #5)	0.096	0.169	0.291	0.291	0.295	0.309	70.90	0/12
IMP(iter #6)	0.102	0.184	0.268	0.269	0.275	0.294	69.80	0/12
IMP(iter #7)	0.104	0.193	0.249	0.255	0.266	0.289	67.56	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0	0.139	0.370	0.377	0.392	0.394	72.58	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.143	0.150	0.183	0.195	0.381	71.02	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.143	0.158	0.183	0.192	0.269	70.76	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0.133	0.137	0.165	0.178	0.187	70.12	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0.128	0.132	0.172	0.173	0.180	69.68	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0.124	0.129	0.164	0.174	0.176	70.06	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0.123	0.128	0.160	0.170	0.180	69.42	1/12

Table 10: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Swin-T on Tiny ImageNet.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.076	0.112	0.131	0.133	0.153	0.154	45.860	0/35
IMP(iter #1)	0.036	0.039	0.039	0.045	0.048	0.054	45.84	0/35
IMP(iter #2)	0.025	0.026	0.031	0.035	0.037	0.037	47.10	0/35
IMP(iter #3)	0.018	0.021	0.030	0.030	0.031	0.031	47.740	0/35
IMP(iter #4)	0.016	0.017	0.028	0.028	0.030	0.030	46.800	0/35
IMP(iter #5)	0.013	0.016	0.025	0.025	0.028	0.029	47.560	0/35
IMP(iter #6)	0.008	0.011	0.022	0.023	0.028	0.028	47.580	0/35
IMP(iter #7)	0.007	0.01	0.022	0.023	0.028	0.029	47.440	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.004	0.095	0.096	0.098	0.110	46.70	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.003	0.058	0.064	0.071	0.073	47.22	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	47.26	6/35
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	47.82	9/35
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	47.92	12/35
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.50	34/35

Table 11: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for MobileNetv2 on Tiny ImageNet.

already parameter-efficient architectures that are not over-fitting is challenging, and our approach is unable to reduce the depth of an already under-fitting architecture.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.332	0.439	0.602	0.667	0.686	0.687	94.70	0/17
IMP(iter #1)	0.331	0.423	0.608	0.669	0.688	0.688	95.40	0/17
IMP(iter #2)	0.319	0.429	0.602	0.668	0.670	0.683	95.30	0/17
IMP(iter #3)	0.324	0.419	0.607	0.631	0.682	0.682	94.60	0/17
IMP(iter #4)	0.318	0.441	0.613	0.613	0.661	0.688	95.10	0/17
IMP(iter #5)	0.300	0.452	0.587	0.621	0.636	0.694	94.00	0/17
IMP(iter #6)	0.285	0.458	0.533	0.643	0.647	0.694	92.30	0/17
IMP(iter #7)	0.280	0.418	0.479	0.584	0.646	0.657	90.80	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.129	0.430	0.482	0.634	0.668	0.669	94.20	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.041	0.091	0.482	0.596	0.596	92.40	1/17
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.030	0.066	0.527	0.559	0.599	93.00	1/17
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0.033	0.067	0.422	0.565	90.40	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.032	0.061	0.084	0.217	89.50	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0.001	0.002	0.028	90.10	3/17
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0.002	0.002	0.040	86.30	3/17

Table 12: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for ResNet-18 on PACS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.057	0.184	0.344	0.362	0.380	0.381	97.10	0/12
IMP(iter #1)	0.060	0.204	0.349	0.362	0.382	0.389	96.60	0/12
IMP(iter #2)	0.067	0.214	0.357	0.370	0.383	0.388	96.20	0/12
IMP(iter #3)	0.081	0.245	0.362	0.366	0.375	0.378	96.00	0/12
IMP(iter #4)	0.095	0.269	0.352	0.353	0.355	0.372	96.60	0/12
IMP(iter #5)	0.110	0.303	0.314	0.335	0.339	0.341	95.00	0/12
IMP(iter #6)	0.113	0.278	0.306	0.318	0.321	0.329	94.60	0/12
IMP(iter #7)	0.101	0.232	0.269	0.284	0.293	0.298	93.90	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.086	0.240	0.344	0.376	0.376	0.403	96.90	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.001	0.369	0.372	0.383	0.398	0.416	96.50	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0.001	0.368	0.383	0.385	0.390	0.406	95.90	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0.001	0.360	0.369	0.369	0.392	0.394	96.30	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.001	0.335	0.359	0.366	95.10	2/12
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0.107	0.298	0.348	0.349	94.60	2/12
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0.001	0.001	0.161	0.232	93.30	2/12

Table 13: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Swin-T on PACS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.207	0.291	0.324	0.372	0.463	0.471	93.20	0/35
IMP(iter #1)	0.218	0.263	0.284	0.390	0.457	0.467	95.70	0/35
IMP(iter #2)	0.216	0.235	0.257	0.373	0.453	0.462	95.50	0/35
IMP(iter #3)	0.224	0.244	0.252	0.403	0.464	0.478	95.40	0/35
IMP(iter #4)	0.222	0.229	0.241	0.386	0.459	0.476	95.70	0/35
IMP(iter #5)	0.212	0.223	0.233	0.397	0.464	0.47	95.60	0/35
IMP(iter #6)	0.196	0.212	0.237	0.405	0.470	0.485	96.20	0/35
IMP(iter #7)	0.170	0.207	0.234	0.412	0.468	0.472	95.40	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.119	0.139	0.151	0.192	0.200	0.225	93.30	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.093	0.128	0.129	0.130	0.135	0.165	93.20	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0.077	0.093	0.112	0.125	0.140	0.141	92.50	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0.076	0.083	0.105	0.106	0.116	92.20	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0.054	0.068	0.096	0.097	0.115	89.70	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0.014	0.016	0.036	0.050	0.051	89.00	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0.004	0.008	0.023	0.027	0.034	88.70	1/35

Table 14: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for MobileNetv2 on PACS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.382	0.457	0.647	0.676	0.681	0.698	80.89	0/17
IMP(iter #1)	0.387	0.471	0.647	0.679	0.681	0.703	82.76	0/17
IMP(iter #2)	0.392	0.476	0.644	0.654	0.69	0.703	82.01	0/17
IMP(iter #3)	0.378	0.474	0.620	0.658	0.707	0.707	82.01	0/17
IMP(iter #4)	0.391	0.491	0.595	0.672	0.711	0.726	80.15	0/17
IMP(iter #5)	0.372	0.479	0.571	0.665	0.716	0.739	79.31	0/17
IMP(iter #6)	0.383	0.519	0.531	0.699	0.721	0.750	78.84	0/17
IMP(iter #7)	0.357	0.409	0.502	0.64	0.707	0.712	74.09	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.453	0.497	0.651	0.676	0.680	78.99	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0	0.001	0.508	0.516	0.619	78.38	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0	0	0.518	0.553	76.98	4/17
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0	0	0.516	0.574	78.66	4/17
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	76.05	6/17
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	74.28	6/17
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	74.37	6/17

Table 15: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for ResNet-18 on VLCS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.070	0.175	0.373	0.385	0.414	0.427	86.58	0/12
IMP(iter #1)	0.078	0.179	0.391	0.402	0.421	0.433	84.72	0/12
IMP(iter #2)	0.093	0.195	0.387	0.403	0.416	0.419	85.65	0/12
IMP(iter #3)	0.102	0.224	0.388	0.411	0.424	0.424	84.34	0/12
IMP(iter #4)	0.122	0.236	0.395	0.402	0.415	0.418	84.06	0/12
IMP(iter #5)	0.140	0.261	0.369	0.394	0.404	0.412	82.01	0/12
IMP(iter #6)	0.141	0.292	0.331	0.387	0.390	0.393	81.36	0/12
IMP(iter #7)	0.139	0.277	0.304	0.370	0.373	0.374	80.06	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.121	0.187	0.400	0.402	0.430	0.437	85.46	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.132	0.225	0.403	0.406	0.428	0.438	85.09	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.411	0.413	0.432	0.437	0.457	85.27	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0.409	0.420	0.441	0.446	0.463	83.88	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0.406	0.409	0.428	0.434	0.469	81.73	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0.318	0.383	0.398	0.413	0.469	81.55	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0.001	0.304	0.369	0.374	0.475	79.22	1/12

Table 16: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Swin-T on VLCS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.257	0.353	0.46	0.513	0.514	0.572	81.83	0/35
IMP(iter #1)	0.270	0.292	0.490	0.503	0.533	0.573	80.80	0/35
IMP(iter #2)	0.261	0.263	0.507	0.524	0.528	0.562	81.64	0/35
IMP(iter #3)	0.269	0.271	0.496	0.501	0.536	0.573	80.43	0/35
IMP(iter #4)	0.258	0.258	0.491	0.521	0.550	0.579	79.59	0/35
IMP(iter #5)	0.264	0.271	0.474	0.540	0.545	0.589	79.96	0/35
IMP(iter #6)	0.268	0.277	0.468	0.547	0.549	0.585	80.80	0/35
IMP(iter #7)	0.273	0.279	0.470	0.524	0.554	0.592	80.43	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.184	0.249	0.342	0.505	0.534	0.581	81.08	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.001	0.077	0.251	0.345	0.417	0.500	80.52	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.002	0.005	0.260	0.354	0.488	78.84	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0.001	0.040	0.261	0.363	0.527	77.91	1/35
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.001	0.274	0.366	0.523	80.06	2/35
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0.001	0.26	0.351	0.485	79.31	2/35

Table 17: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for MobileNetv2 on VLCS.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.009	0.446	0.631	0.685	0.693	0.707	99.93	0/17
IMP(iter #1)	0.009	0.456	0.629	0.679	0.684	0.705	99.98	0/17
IMP(iter #2)	0.008	0.446	0.624	0.646	0.68	0.700	99.98	0/17
IMP(iter #3)	0.009	0.454	0.638	0.655	0.676	0.689	100	0/17
IMP(iter #4)	0.007	0.478	0.641	0.658	0.677	0.687	99.95	0/17
IMP(iter #5)	0.010	0.507	0.658	0.659	0.698	0.702	99.96	0/17
IMP(iter #6)	0.006	0.530	0.577	0.676	0.688	0.691	100	0/17
IMP(iter #7)	0.003	0.488	0.495	0.518	0.629	0.657	99.95	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.512	0.551	0.649	0.686	0.702	99.98	0/17
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0	0.001	0.031	0.453	0.460	99.93	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0.012	0.397	0.440	0.598	99.91	2/17
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0	0.006	0.013	0.371	99.86	3/17
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0	0.001	0.005	0.054	99.84	3/17
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	99.61	8/17
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	98.75	8/17

Table 18: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for ResNet-18 on SVIRO.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.061	0.205	0.280	0.290	0.321	0.325	99.95	0/12
IMP(iter #1)	0.046	0.232	0.284	0.285	0.291	0.303	99.84	0/12
IMP(iter #2)	0.026	0.125	0.273	0.280	0.283	0.289	99.77	0/12
IMP(iter #3)	0.022	0.062	0.216	0.233	0.238	0.275	99.84	0/12
IMP(iter #4)	0.027	0.071	0.163	0.183	0.187	0.187	99.68	0/12
IMP(iter #5)	0.034	0.095	0.101	0.115	0.143	0.149	99.68	0/12
IMP(iter #6)	0.036	0.047	0.090	0.125	0.127	0.129	99.79	0/12
IMP(iter #7)	0.026	0.041	0.074	0.124	0.127	0.137	99.75	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.269	0.321	0.326	0.343	0.348	99.93	0/12
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0	0.338	0.347	0.357	0.362	0.367	99.82	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0.156	0.282	0.309	0.376	0.381	99.79	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0.001	0.092	0.235	0.267	0.356	99.68	1/12
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.339	99.77	2/12
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0	0.162	99.75	5/12
NEPENTHE(iter #7)	0	0	0	0	0	0.001	99.70	5/12

Table 19: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Swin-T on SVIRO.

Approach	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_1$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_3$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_4$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_5$	$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_6$	top-1	Rem.
Dense model	0.187	0.241	0.337	0.341	0.484	0.508	99.98	0/35
IMP(iter #1)	0.165	0.218	0.248	0.366	0.478	0.515	99.98	0/35
IMP(iter #2)	0.152	0.191	0.232	0.402	0.471	0.560	100	0/35
IMP(iter #3)	0.161	0.180	0.290	0.411	0.483	0.521	99.98	0/35
IMP(iter #4)	0.169	0.215	0.296	0.419	0.430	0.483	99.96	0/35
IMP(iter #5)	0.162	0.173	0.306	0.372	0.417	0.435	99.93	0/35
IMP(iter #6)	0.155	0.196	0.333	0.337	0.362	0.417	99.93	0/35
IMP(iter #7)	0.146	0.185	0.291	0.317	0.322	0.381	99.95	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #1)	0.001	0.168	0.220	0.385	0.459	0.508	100	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #2)	0.001	0.001	0.163	0.196	0.321	0.367	99.98	0/35
NEPENTHE(iter #3)	0	0	0.002	0.059	0.218	0.375	99.98	2/35
NEPENTHE(iter #4)	0	0	0.004	0.020	0.268	0.392	99.95	2/35
NEPENTHE(iter #5)	0	0	0.001	0.045	0.262	0.388	99.97	2/35
NEPENTHE(iter #6)	0	0	0	0	0.020	0.147	35.55	4/35

Table 20: Test performance (top-1), bottom six layer’s entropies $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for MobileNetv2 on SVIRO.

Dataset	Approach	ResNet-18		MobileNet-V2		Swin-T	
		top-1	Rem.	top-1	Rem.	top-1	Rem.
CIFAR-10	Layer folding	90.65	1/17	86.88	1/35	87.84	6/12
	Layer folding	89.98	2/17	85.73	2/35	88.93	7/12
	Layer folding	89.09	4/17	85.58	3/35	86.56	8/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>92.55</i>	<i>3/17</i>	<i>93.26</i>	<i>7/35</i>	<i>92.29</i>	<i>2/12</i>
Tiny-ImageNet	Layer folding	38.54	2/17	26.00	10/35	50.54	1/12
	Layer folding	37.86	4/17	25.88	12/35	49.00	2/12
	Layer folding	34.94	6/17	24.86	14/35	49.18	3/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>39.56</i>	<i>5/17</i>	<i>47.92</i>	<i>12/35</i>	<i>72.58</i>	<i>1/12</i>
PACS	Layer folding	82.80	1/17	79.70	1/35	87.60	1/12
	Layer folding	82.90	3/17	80.10	2/35	87.70	2/12
	Layer folding	82.40	4/17	78.30	2/35	88.20	3/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>93.00</i>	<i>1/17</i>	<i>92.20</i>	<i>1/35</i>	<i>95.10</i>	<i>2/12</i>
VLCS	Layer folding	67.70	1/17	66.82	1/35	70.92	1/12
	Layer folding	67.00	3/17	68.87	2/35	70.80	2/12
	Layer folding	66.36	5/17	67.94	3/35	70.36	3/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>78.38</i>	<i>2/17</i>	<i>80.06</i>	<i>2/35</i>	<i>85.27</i>	<i>1/12</i>
SVIRO	Layer folding	99.39	5/17	99.83	2/35	99.66	4/12
	Layer folding	99.32	7/17	99.75	3/35	99.66	5/12
	Layer folding	99.46	8/17	99.77	4/35	99.66	6/12
	<i>NEPENTHE</i>	<i>99.61</i>	<i>8/17</i>	<i>99.98</i>	<i>2/35</i>	<i>99.75</i>	<i>5/12</i>

Table 21: Test performance (top-1) and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for all Layer folding models. The results achieved by our method are in italics.

Dataset	Approach	ResNet-18	
		top-1	Rem.
ImageNet	Dense model	68.20	0/17
	IMP (low prune)	68.38	0/17
	IMP (mid prune)	67.88	0/17
	IMP (high prune)	66.63	0/17
	NEPENTHE (low prune)	66.17	0/17
	NEPENTHE (mid prune)	62.74	1/17
	NEPENTHE (high prune)	62.15	3/17

Table 22: Test performance (top-1) and the number of removed layers (Rem.) for Resnet-18 trained on Imagenet.