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Abstract

Evolutionary algorithms (EA) based neural architecture search (NAS) involves evaluating each architecture by training it from scratch, which is extremely time-consuming. This can be reduced by using a supernet for estimating the fitness of an architecture due to weight sharing among all architectures in the search space. However, the estimated fitness is very noisy due to the co-adaptation of the operations in the supernet which results in NAS methods getting trapped in local optimum. In this paper, we propose a method called NEvoNAS wherein the NAS problem is posed as a multi-objective problem with 2 objectives: (i) maximize architecture novelty, (ii) maximize architecture fitness/accuracy. The novelty search is used for maintaining a diverse set of solutions at each generation which helps avoiding local optimum traps while the architecture fitness is calculated using supernet. NSGA-II is used for finding the pareto optimal front for the NAS problem and the best architecture in the pareto front is returned as the searched architecture. Experimentally, NEvoNAS gives better results on 2 different search spaces while using significantly less computational resources as compared to previous EA-based methods. The code for our paper can be found here.

1. Introduction

In the recent years, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have been very instrumental in solving various computer vision problems. However, the CNN architectures (such as ResNet [14], DenseNet [15] AlexNet [17], VGGNet [33]) have been designed mainly by humans, relying on their intuition and understanding of the specific problem. Searching the neural architecture automatically by using an algorithm, i.e. Neural architecture search (NAS), is an alternative to the architectures designed by humans, and in the recent years, these NAS methods have attracted increasing interest because of its promise of an automatic and efficient search of architectures specific to a task. Vanilla NAS methods [13] [44] [45] have shown promising results in the field of computer vision but most of these methods consume a huge amount of computational power as it involves training each architecture from scratch for its evaluation. Vanilla evolutionary algorithm (EA)-based NAS methods also suffers from the same huge computational requirement problem. For example, the method proposed in [30] required 3150 GPU days of evolution.

Recently proposed gradient-based methods such as [24] [11] [40] [10] [4] have reduced the search time by sharing weights among the architectures through the use of supernet. A supernet represents all possible architectures in the search space while sharing the weights among all the architectures. However, the supernet suffers from inaccurate performance estimation which was first reported in [2] and they showed that the co-adaptation among the operations in the compound edge leads to low correlation between the predicted performance via supernet and the true architecture performance from training-from-scratch. This results in premature convergence to the local optimum as shown in [4] and [41]. In order to mitigate this problem, NAS methods using supernet run the algorithm multiple times and select the best architecture out of the multiple runs. This can be thought of as running the algorithm multiple times in order to get a set of good quality neural architectures. This is illustrated in Table 1, which shows the quality of the searched architecture in terms of test accuracy on CIFAR-10 dataset for gradient based method DARTS [24], EA-based method EvNAS [34] and random search [21] in 4 trials. These multiple trials end up increasing the computational costs.

In this paper, we propose a method called NEvoNAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAS Methods</th>
<th>Trial 1</th>
<th>Trial 2</th>
<th>Trial 3</th>
<th>Trial 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DARTS† [24]</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>97.23</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>96.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvNAS‡ [34]</td>
<td>97.19</td>
<td>97.39</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>97.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Search† [21]</td>
<td>97.04</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>97.17</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Quality of the architectures found in 4 trials for different NAS methods using supernet. † represents results report in [21] while ‡ represents re-run.
(Novelty Driven Evolutionary Neural Architecture Search), in which the algorithm is run only once to get a set of good quality neural architecture solutions. This is achieved by posing the NAS problem as a multi-objective problem with 2 objectives: (i) maximize architecture novelty, and (ii) maximize architecture fitness/accuracy. Maximizing architecture novelty (i.e. novelty search) is used for maintaining a diverse set of solutions at each generation which helps avoiding local optimum traps while maximizing the architecture fitness using supernet guides the search towards potential solutions. We used NSGA-II for finding the pareto optimal front of the multi-objective NAS problem and the best architecture in the discovered pareto optimal front is returned as the searched architecture.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

• We propose a novelty metric called architecture novelty metric which determines how novel a neural architecture is from the already discovered neural architectures.

• We pose the NAS problem as a multi-objective problem with the objective of maximizing both the architecture novelty metric and architecture fitness.

• We also created a visualization of the search performed by NEvoNAS to get insights into the search process.

2. Background

2.1. Neural Architecture Search

Neural architecture search (NAS) methods can be classified into two categories: gradient-based methods and non-gradient based methods.

2.1.1 Gradient-Based Methods:

In general, these methods, [24] [11] [40] [10], relax the discrete architecture search space to a continuous search space by using a supernet. The performance of the supernet on the validation data is used for updating the architecture using gradients. As the supernet shares weights among all architectures in the search space, these methods take lesser time in the evaluation process and thus shorter search time. However, these methods suffer from the overfitting problem wherein the resultant architecture shows good performance on the validation data but exhibits poor performance on the test data. This can be attributed to its preference for parameter-less operations in the search space, as it leads to rapid gradient descent, [4]. In contrast to these gradient-based methods, our method does not suffer from the overfitting problem because of its stochastic nature.

2.1.2 Non-Gradient Based Methods:

These methods include reinforcement learning (RL) methods and evolutionary algorithm (EA) methods. In the RL methods [44] [45], an agent is used for the generating neural architecture and the agent is then trained to generate architectures in order to maximize its expected accuracy on the validation data. These accuracies were calculated by training the architectures from scratch to convergence which resulted in long search time. This was improved in [29] by using a single directed acyclic graph (DAG) for sharing the weights among all the sampled architectures, thus resulting in reduced computational resources. The EA based NAS methods begin with a population of architectures and each architecture in the population is evaluated on the basis of its performance on the validation data. The population is then evolved on the basis of the performance of the population. Methods such as those proposed in [30] and [39] used gradient descent for optimizing the weights of each architecture in the population from scratch in order to determine their accuracies on the validation data as their fitness, resulting in huge computational requirements. In order to speed up the training process, in [31], the authors introduced weight inheritance wherein the architectures in the new generation population inherit the weights of the previous generation population, resulting in bypassing the training from scratch. However, the speed up gained is less as it still needs to optimize the weights of the architecture. Methods such as that proposed in [36] used a random forest for predicting the performance of the architecture during the evaluation process, resulting in a high speed up as compared to previous EA methods. However, its performance was far from the state-of-the-art results. In contrast, our method achieved better results than previous EA methods while using significantly less computational resources.

2.2. Novelty Search

Novelty search [20] is an exploratory algorithm which is driven by the novelty of a behavior in the search space. This results in the search process exploring notably different areas of the search space which effectively helps in avoiding the local optimum. In [19], the authors used novelty search for maintaining a diverse set of solutions in evolving virtual creatures. Early work on novelty search based EA [18] has shown promising results in searching for smaller networks. In [42], novelty search was used as a controller to sample architectures for supernet training and the final result reported for the CIFAR-10 dataset was out of 10 independent runs/trials. In contrast, our method runs once in order to get a set of possible solutions and uses novelty search for both supernet training and maintaining diverse set of solutions during the architecture search.
3. Proposed Method

3.1. Search Space and Architecture Representation

We follow [29] [30] [45] [24] [11] [10] [27] [22] to create the architecture by staking together 2 types of cells: normal cells which preserve the dimensionality of the input with a stride of one and reduction cells which reduce the spatial dimension with a stride of two, shown in Figure 1(a). As illustrated in Figure 1(b), a cell in the architecture is represented by an architecture parameter, $\alpha$. Each $\alpha$ for a normal cell and a reduction cell is represented by a matrix with columns representing the weights of different operations $O_p$ from the operation space $O$ (i.e. the search space of NAS) and rows representing the edge between two nodes. For example, in Figure 1(b), $\alpha(1, 2)$ represents the edge between node 1 and node 2 and the entries in the row represent the weights given to the three different operations.

3.2. Performance Estimation

We used a supernet [24] to estimate the performance of an architecture in the search space. It shares the weights among all architectures in the search space by treating all the architectures as the subgraphs of a supergraph. As illustrated in Figure 1(b), the supernet uses the architecture parameter, $\alpha$, wherein the directed edge from node $i$ to node $j$ is the weighted sum of all $O_p$ in the operation space $O$ (i.e. search space of NAS) where the $O_p$ are weighted by the normalized $\alpha^{(i,j)}$ (normalized using softmax). This can be written as:

$$f^{(i,j)}(x^{(i)}) = \sum_{O_p \in O} \frac{\exp(\alpha^{(i,j)}_{O_p})}{\sum_{O_p' \in O} \exp(\alpha^{(i,j)}_{O_p'})} O_p(x^{(i)})$$

where $\alpha^{(i,j)}_{O_p}$ represents the weight of the operation $O_p(.)$ in the operation space $O$ between node $i$ and node $j$. This design choice allows us to skip the individual architecture training from scratch for its evaluation because of the weight-sharing nature of the supernet, thus resulting in a significant reduction of search time.

The performance of an architecture is calculated using the supernet on the validation data, also known as the fitness of the architecture. As illustrated in Figure 2, in order to select an architecture, $A$, in the supernet, a new architecture parameter called discrete architecture parameter, $\bar{\alpha}$, is created with the following entries:

$$\bar{\alpha}^{(i,j)}_{O_p} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } O_p(x^{(i)}) \text{ present in } A \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Using $\bar{\alpha}$, the architecture, $A$, is selected in the supernet and the accuracy of the supernet on the validation data is used as the estimated fitness of $A$.

3.3. Architecture Novelty Metric

In order to create an EA algorithm that rewards novel architecture, we need a novelty metric that measures how
different an architecture is from another architecture. This provides a constant pressure to generate new architecture. In the neural architecture space, we first define a similarity metric, \( Sim(A_1, A_2) \), which measures how similar an architecture \( A_1 \) to another architecture \( A_2 \) and is given as follows:

\[
Sim(A_1, A_2) = \frac{\cap(A_1, A_2)}{n(A_1) + n(A_2) - \cap(A_1, A_2)} \quad (3)
\]

Where \( \cap(A_1, A_2) \) refers to the number of common operations between 2 nodes present in the given architectures, \( A_1, A_2, n(A_1) \) and \( n(A_2) \) refer to total number of operation edges present between nodes in the \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) respectively. Note that \( Sim(A_1, A_2) \) equals to 1 if \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are the same architecture (i.e. \( A_1 = A_2 \)) and \( Sim(A_1, A_2) \) equals to 0 if \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) do not share any operations between 2 nodes (i.e. completely different architectures). Thus, \( 0 \leq Sim(A_1, A_2) \leq 1 \). Now, we define an dissimilarity metric, \( Dis(A_1, A_2) \), which is used for measuring how different an architecture \( A_1 \) is from another architecture \( A_2 \) and is given as follows:

\[
Dis(A_1, A_2) = 1 - Sim(A_1, A_2) \quad (4)
\]

Note that \( Dis(A_1, A_2) \) equals to 0 if \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are the same architecture (i.e. \( A_1 = A_2 \)) and \( Dis(A_1, A_2) \) equals to 1 if \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) do not share any operations between 2 nodes (i.e. completely different architectures). Thus, \( 0 \leq Dis(A_1, A_2) \leq 1 \). For illustration, in Figure 3, the architectures \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) have two common edges between nodes \((0, 3)\) and \((1, 3)\), thus \( \cap(A_1, A_2) = 2 \), while both \( n(A_1) \) and \( n(A_2) \) are equal to 6. So, the dissimilarity metric comes out to be 0.8.

The novelty of a newly generated neural architecture is computed with respect to an archive of past generated neural architectures and current population of neural architecture. To get the novelty of neural architecture, we need a novelty metric [19] which characterizes how far the neural architecture is from its predecessors and the rest of the population in the neural architectural space. We define architecture novelty metric as the mean dissimilarity metric of the k-nearest neighbors, which is given as follows:

\[
F_{nov}(A) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} Dis(A, A_i) \quad (5)
\]

Where \( A_i \) is the \( i \)-th nearest neighbor of the neural architecture \( A \) in terms of the dissimilarity metric. The nearest neighbors are calculated from the archive of past neural architectures and the current population.

**Algorithm 1: NEvoNAS**

**Input:** Population size \( N_{pop} \), training data \( D_{tr} \), total number of training batches \( B \), validation data \( D_{va} \), number of generations \( G \).  

**Output:** Pareto optimal front, \( P_{optimal} \).

1. \( P \leftarrow \) Initialize population for NSGA-II algorithm;  
2. \( S \leftarrow \) Initialize the supernet;  
3. \( archive \leftarrow \) Initialize to empty set;  
4. for \( g = 1, 2, ..., G \) do  
   /* Training supernet using current population */  
   for \( i = 1, 2, ..., B \) do  
      Copy \( \alpha[i \ mod \ N_{pop}] \) to \( S \);  
      Train \( S \) on training batch \( i \);  
   end  
   /* Evaluate architecture using the supernet */  
   \( F_{acc} \leftarrow \) EvaluatePopulation(\( S, P, D_{va} \));  
   /* Evaluate novelty of architectures in population */  
   \( F_{nov} \leftarrow \) CalculateNovelty(\( P, archive \));  
   UpdateArchive(\( P, archive \));  
   /* Apply NSGA-II to get new generation population */  
   end  
12. \( P \leftarrow \) NSGA-II(\( F_{acc}, F_{nov} \));  

**3.4. NEvoNAS**

Multi-objective optimization is a popular branch of evolutionary computation (EC), which involves optimizing problems with more than one objective function simultaneously. NEvoNAS poses the NAS problem as a multi-objective problem with two objectives: (i) maximize archi-
tecture novelty, (ii) maximize architecture fitness. The architecture novelty is calculated using the architecture novelty metric (discussed in Section 3.3) and the fitness of the architecture is calculated using the supernet (discussed in Section 3.2). In order to solve the multi-objective problem, we used NSGA-II [6], a well-known Pareto-based Multi-objective Evolutionary Algorithm (MOEA).

The entire process is summarized in Algorithm 1. NEvoNAS starts with initializing the population randomly, the supernet with random weights and an empty archive. In each generation, the supernet is trained on the training data. During training, $\alpha$ of each individual architecture in the population is copied to the supernet in a round-robin fashion for each training batch. Then, the fitness of each individual architecture in the population, $F_{\text{acc}}$, is calculated using the supernet. Next, the novelty of each individual architecture in the population, $F_{\text{nov}}$, is calculated with respect to the archive of past neural architectures and the current population of neural architectures. The archive is then updated to include the new individual architectures from the current population. NSGA-II is then used to generate the next generation population. The entire process runs for $G$ generations. NEvoNAS returns a pareto optimal front, $P_{\text{optimal}}$, (i.e. set of possible neural architecture solution) and the best neural architecture in the front is returned as the searched architecture. Note that NEvoNAS runs for only once to get a set of possible solutions unlike other NAS methods using supernet [24] [34] [21].

4. Experiments

4.1. Search Spaces

In this section, we report the performance of NEvoNAS in terms of a neural architecture search on two different search spaces: 1) Search space 1 (S1) [24] and 2) Search space 2 (S2) [12]. In S1, we search for both normal and reduction cells where each node $x^{(j)}$ maps two inputs to one output. Here, each cell has seven nodes with first two nodes being the output from previous cells and last node as output node, resulting in 14 edges among them. There are 8 operation in S1, so each architecture is represented by two 14x8 matrices, one each for normal cell and reduction cell. So, an architecture, $\alpha$, is represented by a vector of size $2 \times 14 \times 8 = 224$ for S1. In S2, we search for only normal cells, where each node $x^{(j)}$ is connected to the previous node $x^{(i)}$ (i.e. $i < j$). It is a smaller search space where we only search for the normal cell in Figure 1(a). It provides a unified benchmark for almost any up-to-date NAS algorithm by providing results of each architecture in the search space on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet-16-12. Here, each cell has four nodes with first node as input node and last node as output node, resulting in 6 edges among them. There are 5 operations in S2, so each architecture is represented by one 6x5 matrix for the normal cell. So, an architecture, $\alpha$, is represented by a vector of size $6 \times 5 = 30$ for S2.

4.2. Dataset

CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 [16] has 50K training images and 10K testing images with images classified into 10 classes and 100 classes respectively. ImageNet [8] is well known benchmark for image classification containing 1K classes with 1.28 million training images and 50K images test images. ImageNet-16-120 [5] is a down-sampled variant of ImageNet where the original ImageNet is down-sampled to 16x16 pixels with labels $\in [0, 120]$ to construct ImageNet-16-120 dataset. The settings used for the datasets in S1 are as follows:

- **CIFAR-10:** We split 50K training images into two sets of size 25K each, with one set acting as the training set and the other set as the validation set.
- **CIFAR-100:** We split 50K training images into two sets. One set of size 40K images becomes the training set and the other set of size 10K images becomes the validation set.

The settings used for the datasets in S2 are as follows:

- **CIFAR-10:** The same settings as those used for S1 is used here as well.
- **CIFAR-100:** The 50K training images remains as the training set and the 10K testing images are split into two sets of size 5K each, with one set acting as the validation set and the other set as the test set.
- **ImageNet-16-120:** It has 151.7K training images, 3K validation images and 3K test images.

4.3. Implementation Details

4.3.1 Evolutionary Algorithm Settings:

In general, the supernet suffers from high memory requirements which makes it difficult to fit it in a single GPU. For S1, we follow [24] and use a smaller supernet, called proxy model which is created with 8 stacked cells and 16 initial channels. All the other settings are also same for both datasets i.e. batch size of 64, weight decay $\lambda = 3 \times 10^{-4}$, cutout [9], initial learning rate $\eta_{\text{max}} = 0.025$ (annealed down to 0 by using a cosine schedule without restart [25]) and momentum $\rho = 0.9$. For S2, we do not use a proxy model as the size of the supernet is sufficiently small to be fitted in a single GPU. For training, we follow the same settings as those used in S1 for CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet16-120 except batch size of 256.
Following [36] [37], the evolutionary algorithm (EA), for both S1 and S2, uses a population size of 20 in each generation. For our NSGA-II implementation, we used simulated binary crossover [7] with $\eta = 15$ and probability $= 0.7$ for crossover, polynomial mutation [7] with $\eta = 20$ and probability $= 0.1$ for mutation and the binary tournament selection method. The nearest-neighbors size for the novelty search is 5. Following [24] [34], NEvoNAS runs for 50 generations (i.e. $G$) to get the pareto optimal front, $P_{\text{optimal}}$. We used pymoo [3] (a python library) for the NSGA-II algorithm and pytorch [28] for the supernet training and architecture evaluation on GPUs. All the above training and architecture search were performed on a single Nvidia RTX 3090 GPU.

### 4.3.2 Architecture evaluation:

The discovered architectures (i.e. discovered cells in the pareto optimal front, $P_{\text{optimal}}$) at the end of the architecture search for the selection method. The nearest-neighbors size for the novelty search is 5. Following [24] [34], NEvoNAS runs for 50 generations (i.e. $G$) to get the pareto optimal front, $P_{\text{optimal}}$. We used pymoo [3] (a python library) for the NSGA-II algorithm and pytorch [28] for the supernet training and architecture evaluation on GPUs. All the above training and architecture search were performed on a single Nvidia RTX 3090 GPU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Top-1 Acc. (%)</th>
<th>Params (M)</th>
<th>GPU Days</th>
<th>Search Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ResNet [14]</td>
<td>95.39</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DenseNet-BCC [15]</td>
<td>96.54</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShuffleNet [43]</td>
<td>90.87</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNAS [22]</td>
<td>96.59</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>SMBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPS [21]</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASNet-A [45]</td>
<td>97.35</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENAS [29]</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS [24]</td>
<td>97.24</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS [11]</td>
<td>97.07</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAS [40]</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETN [10]</td>
<td>97.31</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-scale Evo. [31]</td>
<td>94.60</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Evo. [23]</td>
<td>96.25</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN-GA [38]</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP-CNN [35]</td>
<td>94.02</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-CNN [37]</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGANetV1-A2 [27]</td>
<td>97.35</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-CNN+E2EPP [36]</td>
<td>94.70</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGA-NET [26]</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN2AS [42]</td>
<td>97.29</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS-C10A</td>
<td>97.46</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS-C10B</td>
<td>97.37</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS-C10C</td>
<td>97.29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Comparison of NEvoNAS with other NAS methods in S1 in terms of test accuracy (higher is better) on CIFAR-100.
search are trained on the dataset to evaluate its performance. The best performing architecture within the pareto optimal front is returned as the searched architecture of NEvoNAS and is used for comparing with other NAS methods. For S1, we follow the training settings used in DARTS [24]. Here, a larger network, called proxyless network [21], is created using the discovered cells from the pareto optimal front with 20 stacked cells and 36 initial channels for both CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. It is then trained for 600 epochs on both the datasets with the same settings as the ones used in the supernet training above. Following recent works [29] [30] [45] [24] [22], we use an auxiliary tower with 0.4 as its weights, path dropout probability of 0.2 and cutout [9] for additional enhancements. For ImageNet, the neural architecture is created with 14 cells and 48 initial channels in the mobile setting, wherein the input image size is 224 x 224 and the number of multiply-add operations in the model is restricted to less than 600M. It is trained on 8 NVIDIA V100 GPUs by following the training settings used in [4].

4.4. Results

4.4.1 Search Space 1 (S1):

We performed 3 architecture searches on both CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with different random number seeds; their results are provided in Table 2 and Table 3. The results show that the cells discovered by NEvoNAS on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 achieve better results than those by human designed, RL based, gradient-based and EA-based methods while using significantly less computational resources.

Table 4. Comparison of NEvoNAS with other NAS methods in S1 in terms of test accuracy (higher is better) on ImageNet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Test-Accuracy (%)</th>
<th>Params (M)</th>
<th>(\gamma) (M)</th>
<th>GPU Days</th>
<th>Search Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MobileNet V2, (S2)</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASNet-A, (45)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>SMBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASNet-B, (45)</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASNet-C, (45)</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS, (45)</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNAS, (11)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETN, (10)</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmoebaNet-A, (30)</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmoebaNet-B, (30)</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmoebaNet-C, (30)</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGAnetV1-A2, (27)</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS-C10A</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS-C100A</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Search Space 2 (S2):

Following [12], we performed 3 architecture searches with different random number seeds each on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet-16-120 and compared the performance of NEvoNAS with other NAS methods in Table 5. The results show that NEvoNAS outperforms all of the NAS methods on all 3 datasets. We also performed the architecture search using NEvoNAS with only novelty as a single objective (i.e. novelty search, reported as NEvoNAS (only Novelty) in Table 5) and found that novelty search alone gives sub-optimal results with high variance as it is not searching for good quality architecture. Lastly, we performed the architecture search using NEvoNAS with only architecture accuracy/fitness using supernet as a single objective (reported as NEvoNAS (only Accuracy) in Table 5) and found that it also gives sub-optimal results with high variance. Note that the high variance of NEvoNAS (only Accuracy) shows the need for running those NAS methods which use supernet, multiple times in order to select the best architecture out of the multiple runs. In contrast, our method provides a set of neural architecture solutions in a single run.

5. Further Analysis

We first check the diversity of the population during the architecture search by plotting the number of unique individual architectures present in the population for each generation of 3 independent runs in Figure 5. From the Figure 5(b), we find that when NEvoNAS is applied with only accuracy using supernet as an objective, the diversity reduces with generation which indicates the convergence to an optimum. As reported in [2], supernet suffers from inaccurate performance estimation which results in the con-
Table 5. Comparison of NEvoNAS with other NAS methods on NAS-Bench-201 (i.e. S2) [12] with mean ± std. accuracies on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet16-120 (higher is better). NEvoNAS (only Novelty) and NEvoNAS (only Accuracy) refer to applying NEvoNAS with single objective of novelty and architecture accuracy respectively. Optimal refers to the best architecture accuracy for each dataset. Search times are given for a CIFAR-10 search on a single GPU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Search (seconds)</th>
<th>CIFAR-10 validation</th>
<th>CIFAR-10 test</th>
<th>CIFAR-100 validation</th>
<th>CIFAR-100 test</th>
<th>ImageNet-16-120 validation</th>
<th>ImageNet-16-120 test</th>
<th>Search Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSPS [21]</td>
<td>7557</td>
<td>84.16 ± 1.69</td>
<td>87.66 ± 1.69</td>
<td>59.00 ± 4.60</td>
<td>58.33 ± 4.64</td>
<td>31.56 ± 3.28</td>
<td>31.14 ± 3.88</td>
<td>random</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS-V1 [24]</td>
<td>10890</td>
<td>39.77 ± 0.00</td>
<td>54.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.03 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.61 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.43 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.32 ± 0.00</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS-V2 [24]</td>
<td>29902</td>
<td>39.77 ± 0.00</td>
<td>54.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.03 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.61 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.43 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.32 ± 0.00</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS [11]</td>
<td>28926</td>
<td>90.00 ± 0.21</td>
<td>93.51 ± 0.13</td>
<td>71.14 ± 0.27</td>
<td>70.61 ± 0.26</td>
<td>41.70 ± 1.26</td>
<td>41.84 ± 0.90</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETN [10]</td>
<td>31010</td>
<td>82.25 ± 5.17</td>
<td>86.19 ± 4.63</td>
<td>56.86 ± 7.59</td>
<td>56.87 ± 7.77</td>
<td>32.54 ± 3.63</td>
<td>31.90 ± 4.07</td>
<td>gradient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENAS [29]</td>
<td>13314</td>
<td>39.77 ± 0.00</td>
<td>54.30 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.03 ± 0.00</td>
<td>15.61 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.43 ± 0.00</td>
<td>16.32 ± 0.00</td>
<td>RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EvoNAS [34]</td>
<td>22445</td>
<td>88.98 ± 1.40</td>
<td>92.18 ± 1.11</td>
<td>66.55 ± 2.59</td>
<td>66.74 ± 3.08</td>
<td>39.61 ± 0.72</td>
<td>39.00 ± 0.44</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS</td>
<td>9434</td>
<td>90.58 ± 0.62</td>
<td>93.50 ± 0.30</td>
<td>71.33 ± 0.88</td>
<td>71.51 ± 0.52</td>
<td>44.85 ± 0.46</td>
<td>45.30 ± 0.82</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS (only Novelty)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.41 ± 0.34</td>
<td>90.75 ± 0.69</td>
<td>65.78 ± 6.88</td>
<td>65.68 ± 6.82</td>
<td>37.30 ± 5.55</td>
<td>36.90 ± 5.96</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEvoNAS (only Accuracy)</td>
<td>9706</td>
<td>87.43 ± 1.79</td>
<td>90.64 ± 1.62</td>
<td>62.15 ± 9.77</td>
<td>62.14 ± 9.63</td>
<td>39.24 ± 5.08</td>
<td>39.05 ± 5.75</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.85</td>
<td>93.97</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>70.80</td>
<td>44.53</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>91.61</td>
<td>94.37</td>
<td>73.49</td>
<td>73.51</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Illustration of diversity in the population in each generation for the 3 independent runs of (a) NEvoNAS, (b) NEvoNAS using only accuracy as single objective, (c) NEvoNAS using only novelty as single objective.

For analyzing the architecture search, we use the search space S2 [12] to visualize the search process as it provides the true test accuracies of all the architectures in the search space. As illustrated in Figure 6, the search process is visualized by plotting all the architectures discovered during the single run of the proposed algorithm. From the Figure 6(a), we find that when NEvoNAS is applied with only architecture accuracy as objective, the search space explored is far less than when NEvoNAS is applied with multi-objective. In Figure 6(b), we plot all the architectures discovered when NEvoNAS is applied with only architecture novelty as objective and found that novelty search forces the architecture search to explore the architectural search space. But using only novelty as an objective does not give good results as it does not have a metric to calculate the quality of the architecture. This shows that using novelty search forces NEvoNAS to explore the search space which helps in avoiding the local optimum while simultaneously using supernet for architecture fitness helps NEvoNAS to explore good quality architectures.

6. Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to mitigate the noisy fitness estimation nature of the supernet which forces NAS methods using supernet to run multiple times to get a set of neural architecture solutions. We resolve this by posing the NAS problem as a multi-objective problem with two objectives of maximizing the architecture novelty (i.e. novelty and accuracy).
Figure 6. Visualizing the architecture search space exploration by plotting the ground truth accuracies of all the discovered architectures. The x-axis represents all 15,625 architectures in the search space S2 [12], the y-axis represents the true test accuracies of the architectures and the dots represents all the architectures discovered in a single run of (a) NEvoNAS and NEvoNAS using only accuracy, (b) NEvoNAS using only novelty.

(ELTY search) and maximizing the architecture fitness. This results in a pareto optimal front which provides a set of good quality neural architecture solutions in a single run, thus, reducing the computational requirements. We applied NEvoNAS to two different search spaces to show its effectiveness in generalizing to any cell-based search space. Experimentally, NEvoNAS reduced the search time of EA-based search methods significantly while achieving better results in S1 search space and state-of-the-art results in S2 search space. We also show that using novelty as an objective forces the algorithm to explore the search space by maintaining diverse set of individuals in the population in each generation which ultimately helps in avoiding the local optimum trap.

An interesting future research direction is to use the novelty search to get a list of promising smaller search space areas within the full architectural search space.
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Supplementary

1. Discovered Cells in S1

Figure 1. Cells discovered by NEvoNAS-C10B (a) Normal cell (b) Reduction cell; by NEvoNAS-C10C (c) Normal cell (d) Reduction cell.

Figure 2. Cells discovered by NEvoNAS-C100B (a) Normal cell (b) Reduction cell; by NEvoNAS-C100C (c) Normal cell (d) Reduction cell.