

HD-CNN: HIERARCHICAL DEEP CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK FOR IMAGE CLASSIFICATION

Zhicheng Yan

Department of Computer Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, IL 61820, USA
zyan3@illinois.edu

Vignesh Jagadeesh, Dennis DeCoste, Wei Di & Robinson Piramuthu

eBay Research Labs
San Jose, CA 95125, USA
{vjagadeesh, ddecoste, wedi, rpiramuthu}@ebay.com

ABSTRACT

Existing deep convolutional neural network (CNN) architectures are trained as N-way classifiers to distinguish between N output classes. This paper builds on the intuition that not all classes are equally difficult to distinguish from the true class label. Towards this end, we introduce hierarchical branching CNNs, called Hierarchical Deep CNN (HD-CNN), wherein classes that can be easily distinguished are classified in the higher-layer coarse category CNN, while the most difficult classifications are done on lower-layer fine category CNN. We propose utilizing a multinomial logistic loss and a novel temporal sparsity penalty for HD-CNN training. Together, they ensure each branching component deals with a subset of categories confusing to each other. This new network architecture adopts a coarse-to-fine classification strategy and a module design principle. The proposed model achieves superior performance over standard models. We demonstrate state-of-the-art results on the CIFAR100 benchmark.

1 INTRODUCTION

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) have seen a strong resurgence over the past few years in several areas of computer vision. The primary reasons for this comeback are attributed to increased availability of large-scale datasets and advances in parallel computing resources. For instance, convolutional networks now hold state-of-the-art results in image classification (Lin et al. (2013); Sermanet et al. (2014); Zeiler & Fergus; Ciresan et al. (2012)), object detection (Sermanet et al., 2014; He & Sun; Girshick et al., 2014), pose estimation (Toshev & Szegedy), face recognition (Taigman & Wolf, 2013) and a variety of other tasks. This work builds on the rich literature of CNNs by exploring a very specific problem in classification. The question we address is: *Given a base neural*




Figure 1: A few example images of categories *Apple*, *Orange* and *Bus*. Images from categories *Apple* and *Orange* are visually similar, while images from category *Bus* have distinctive appearance from either *Apple* or *Orange*.




Figure 2: **Hierarchical Deep Convolutional Neural Network architecture.** Both coarse category component and each branching fine category component can be implemented as standard deep CNN models. Branching components share shallow layers while have independent deep layers.

network, is it possible to induce new architectures by arranging the base neural network in a certain sequence to achieve considerable gains in classification accuracy?? The base neural network could be a vanilla CNN (Krizhevsky et al., 2012) or a more sophisticated variant like the Network in Network (Lin et al., 2013). We call our proposed novel architecture for approaching this problem Hierarchical Deep CNN (HD-CNN).

Intuition behind HD-CNN Conventionally, deep neural networks are trained as N -way classifiers to tell one category apart from the remaining $N - 1$ categories. However, it is fairly common that some difficult classes are confused more often with a given true class label than others. In other words, for any given class label, it is possible to define a set of easy classes and a set of confusing classes. The intuition behind the HD-CNN framework is to use an coarse classifier CNN to separate the easily separable classes from one another. Subsequently, the challenging classes are routed downstream to fine CNNs that just focus on confusing classes. Let us take an example shown in Fig 1. In the *CIFAR100* (Krizhevsky & Hinton, 2009b) dataset, it is relatively easy to tell an *Apple* from a *Bus* while telling an *Apple* from an *Orange* is harder. Images from *Apple* and *Orange* can have similar shape, texture and color, and correctly telling one from the other is harder. In contrast, images from *Bus* often have distinctive appearance from those in *Apple* and classification can be expected to be easier. In fact, both categories *Apple* and *Orange* belong to the same coarse category *fruit and vegetables* and category *Bus* belongs to another coarse category *vehicles 1*, as defined within *CIFAR100*. On the one hand, presumably it is easier to train a deep CNN to classify images into coarse categories. On the other hand, it is intuitively satisfying that we can train a separate deep CNN focusing only on the fine/confusing categories within the same coarse category to achieve better classification performance.

Salient Features of HD-CNN Architecture: Inspired by the observations above, we propose a generic architecture of convolutional neural network, which follows the coarse-to-fine classification strategy and module design principle. It provenly improves classification performance over standard deep CNN models. See Figure 2 for a schematic illustration of the architecture. First, a standard deep CNN is chosen to be used as the building block of HD-CNN. Second, a coarse category component is added to the architecture for predicting the probabilities over coarse categories. Third, multiple branching components are independently added. Each of them is good at classifying only a subset of categories. Last, the multiple full predictions from branching components are linearly combined to form the final prediction, weighted by the corresponding coarse category probabilities. This modular design gives us the flexibility to choose the most fitting end-to-end deep CNN as the HD-CNN building block for the task under consideration.

Contribution Statement: Our primary contributions in this work are summarized below. First, we introduce a novel coarse to fine HD-CNN architecture for hierarchical image classification. Second, we develop strategies for training HD-CNN, including the addition of a temporal sparsity term to the traditional multinomial logistic loss and the usage of HD-CNN components pretraining. Last but not least, we empirically illustrate boosting performance of vanilla CNN and NIN building blocks using HD-CNN.

We evaluate our method on *CIFAR100* dataset and report new state-of-the-art. The paper is organized as follows. We review related work in section 2 and elaborate the HD-CNN architecture in section 3. The HD-CNN training is discussed in section 4 and experimental results are shown in section 5.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK

Convolutional neural networks hold state-of-the-art performance in a variety of computer vision tasks, including image classification (Krizhevsky et al., 2012), object detection (Girshick et al., 2014; He & Sun), image parsing (Farabet et al., 2013), face recognition (Taigman & Wolf, 2013) and so on. There has recently been considerable interest in enhancing specific components in CNN architecture, including pooling layers (Zeiler & Fergus, 2013), activation units (I. Goodfellow & Bengio, 2013; Springenberg & Riedmiller, 2013), nonlinear layers (Lin et al., 2013). These changes either facilitate fast and stable network training (Zeiler & Fergus, 2013), or expand the network’s capacity of learning more complicated and highly nonlinear functions (I. Goodfellow & Bengio, 2013; Springenberg & Riedmiller, 2013; Lin et al., 2013).

In this work, we do not redesign a specific part within any existing CNN model. Instead, we design a novel generic CNN architecture that wraps around an existing CNN model as a building block. We assemble multiple building blocks into a larger Hierarchical Deep CNN. In HD-CNN, each building block tackles an easier problem and is promising to give better performance. When each building block in HD-CNN excels at solving its assigned task and together they are well coordinated, the entire HD-CNN is able to deliver better performance.

2.2 IMAGE CLASSIFICATION

The architecture proposed through this work is fairly generic, and can be applied to computer vision tasks where the CNN is applicable. To keep the discussion focussed, we adopt the problem of image classification. Classical image classification systems in vision use handcrafted features like SIFT (Lowe) and SURF (Bay et al.) to capture spatially consistent bag of words (Lazebnik et al.) model. More recently, the breakthrough paper of (Krizhevsky et al., 2012) showed massive improvement gains on the imagenet challenge while using a CNN. Subsequently, there have been multiple efforts to enhance this basic model for the image classification task. Impressive performance on the CIFAR dataset has been achieved using recently proposed Network in Network (Lin et al., 2013), Maxout networks and variants (I. Goodfellow & Bengio, 2013; Springenberg & Riedmiller, 2013), and exploiting tree based priors (Srivastava & Salakhutdinov, 2013) while training CNNs. Further, several authors have investigated the use of CNNs as feature extractors (Razavian et al., 2014) on which discriminative classifiers are trained for predicting class labels. The recent work by (Wei & Yan, 2014) proposes to optimize a multi-label loss function that exploits the structure in output label space.

The strength of HD-CNN comes from explicit use of hierarchy, designed based on classification performance. Use of hierarchy for multi-class problems has been studied before. In (Godbole et al., 2002), the authors used a fast initial naïve bayes training sweep to find the hardest classes from the confusion matrix and then trained SVMs to separate each of the hardest class pairs. However, to our knowledge, we are the first to incorporate hierarchy in the context of Deep CNNs, by solving coarse classification followed by fine classification. This also enables us to exploit deeper networks without increasing the complexity of training.

3 OVERVIEW OF HD-CNN

3.1 NOTATIONS

The following notations are used for the discussion below. A dataset consists of N_t training samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^t, y_i^t\}_{i=1}^{N_t}$ and N_s testing samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^s, y_i^s\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$. \mathbf{x}_i and y_i denote the image data and label, respectively. There are C fine categories in the dataset $\{S_k\}_{k=1}^C$. We will identify C' coarse categories as elaborated in section 4.1.1.

Algorithm 1 HD-CNN training algorithm

-
- 1: **procedure** HD-CNN TRAINING
 - 2: **Step 1:** Pretrain HD-CNN
 - 3: **Step 1.1:** Identify coarse categories using training set only (Section 4.1.1)
 - 4: **Step 1.2:** Pretrain coarse category component (Section 4.1.2)
 - 5: **Step 1.3:** Pretrain fine category components (Section 4.1.3)
 - 6: **Step 2:** Fine-tune HD-CNN (Section 4.2)
-

3.2 HD-CNN ARCHITECTURE

Similar to the standard deep CNN model, Hierarchical Deep Convolutional Neural Network (HD-CNN) achieves end-to-end classification as can be seen in Figure 2. It mainly comprises three parts, namely a single coarse category component B , multiple branching fine category components $\{F^j\}_{j=1}^{C'}$ and a single probabilistic averaging layer. On the left side of Fig 2 is the single coarse category component. It receives raw image pixel as input and outputs a probability distribution over coarse categories. We use coarse category probabilities to assign weights to the full predictions made by branching fine category components.

In the middle of Figure 2 are a set of branching components, each of which makes a prediction over the full set of fine categories. Branching components share parameters in shallow layers but have independent deep layers. The reason for sharing parameters in shallow layers is three-fold. First, shallow layers in CNN usually extract primitive low-level features (eg. blobs, corners) (Zeiler & Fergus) which are typically category-agnostic and hence useful for classifying all fine categories. Second, it greatly reduces the total number of parameters in HD-CNN, which is critical to the success of training a good HD-CNN model. If we build up each branching fine category component completely independent of each other, the number of free parameters in HD-CNN will be linearly proportional to the number of coarse categories. An overly large number of parameters in the model will make the training extremely difficult. Third, both the computational cost and memory consumption of HD-CNN are also reduced, which is of practical significance to deploy HD-CNN in real applications.

On the right side of Figure 2 is the probabilistic averaging layer which receives branching component predictions as well as the coarse component prediction and produces a weighted average as the final prediction (Equation 1).

$$p(\mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{C'} B_{ij} p_j(\mathbf{x}_i) \quad (1)$$

where B_{ij} is the probability of coarse category j for image i predicted by the coarse category component B . $p_j(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the fine category prediction made by the j -th branching component F^j for image i .

We stress that both coarse category component and fine category components can be implemented as any end-to-end deep CNN model which takes image pixels as input and returns probabilistic prediction over categories as output. This flexible modular design allows us to choose the best module CNN as the building block depending on the task we are tackling.

4 TRAINING HD-CNN WITH TEMPORAL SPARSITY PENALTY

The purpose of adding multiple branching CNN components into HD-CNN is to make each one excel in classifying a subset of fine categories. To ensure each branch consistently focuses on a subset of fine categories, we add a *Temporal Sparsity Penalty* term to the multinomial logistic loss function for training. The revised loss function we use to train HD-CNN is shown in Equation 2.

$$E = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n p_{y_i} \log(p_{y_i}) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{C'} (t_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{ij})^2 \quad (2)$$

where n is the size of training mini-batch. y_i is the ground truth label for image i . λ is a regularization constant and is set to $\lambda = 5$. B_{ij} is the probability of coarse category j for image i predicted by the coarse category component B . t_j is the target temporal sparsity of branch j .

We are not the first one using temporal sparsity penalty for regularization. In (Lee et al., 2008), a similar temporal sparsity term was adopted to regularize the learning of sparse restricted Boltzmann machines in an unsupervised setting. The difference is that we use temporal sparsity penalty to regularize the supervised HD-CNN training. In section 5, we show that, with proper initialization, the temporal sparsity term can ensure each branching component focuses on classifying a different subset of fine categories and prevent a small number of branches receiving the majority of coarse category probability mass.

The complete workflow of HD-CNN network training is summarized in Algorithm 1. It mainly consists of a pretraining stage and a fine-tuning stage, both of which are elaborated below.

4.1 PRETRAINING HD-CNN

Compared to training a HD-CNN from scratch, fine-tuning the entire HD-CNN with pretrained components has several benefits.

First, assume that both coarse category and branching components choose a similar implementation of a standard deep CNN. Compared to the standard deep CNN model, we have additional free parameters from shared branching shallow layers as well as C' independent branching deep layers. This will greatly increase the number of free parameters within HD-CNN. With the same amount of training data, overfitting problem is more likely to hurt the training process if HD-CNN is trained from scratch. Pretraining is proven to be effective for overcoming the difficulty of insufficient training data (Girshick et al., 2014).

Second, a good initialization for the coarse category component will be beneficial for branching components to focus on a consistent subset of fine categories that are much harder to classify. For example, the branching component 1 excels in telling *Apple* from *Orange* while the branching component 2 is more capable of telling *Bus* from *Train*. To achieve this goal, we have developed an effective procedure to identify a set of coarse categories which coarse category component is pre-trained to classify (Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2).

Third, a proper pretraining for the branching fine category components can increase the chance that we can learn a better branching component over the standard deep CNN for classifying a subset of fine categories this branch specializes on (Section 4.1.3).

4.1.1 IDENTIFYING COARSE CATEGORIES

For most classification datasets, the given labels $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ represent fine-level labels and we have no prior about the number of coarse categories as well as the membership of each fine category. Therefore, we develop a simple but effective strategy to identify them.

First, we divide the training samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^t, y_i^t\}_{i=1}^{N_t}$ into two parts *train_train* and *train_val*. We train a standard deep CNN model using the *train_train* part and evaluate it on the *train_val* part.

Second, we obtain the confusion matrix \mathbf{F} of size $C \times C$ from *train_val* part. A distance matrix \mathbf{D} is derived as $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{F}$. We change the diagonal entries of \mathbf{D} to zero. To make \mathbf{D} symmetric, we transform it by computing $\mathbf{D} = 0.5 * (\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{D}^T)$. The entry \mathbf{D}_{ij} measures how easy it is to discriminate categories i and j .

Third, Laplacian eigenmap (B. & N., 2003) is used to obtain low-dimensional feature representations $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^C$ for the fine categories. Such representations preserve local neighborhood information on a low-dimensional manifold and are used to cluster fine categories into coarse categories. We choose to use *knn* nearest neighbors to construct the adjacency graph with $knn = 3$. The weights of the adjacency graph are set by using a heat kernel with width parameter $t = 0.95$. The dimensionality of $\{\mathbf{f}_i\}_{i=1}^C$ is chosen to be 3.

Last, Affinity Propagation (Frey & Dueck, 2007) is employed to cluster C fine categories into C' coarse categories. We choose to use Affinity Propagation because it can automatically induce the number of coarse categories and empirically lead to more balanced clusters in size than other clustering methods, such as k -means clustering. Balanced clusters are helpful to ensure each branching component handles a similar number of fine categories and thus has a similar amount of workload. The damping factor λ in Affinity Propagation algorithm can affect the number of resulting clusters

and it is set to 0.98 throughout the paper. The result here is a mapping $P : y \mapsto y'$ from fine to coarse categories.

Target temporal sparsity. The coarse-to-fine category mapping P also provides a natural way to specify the target temporal sparsity $\{t_j\}_{j=1,\dots,C'}$. Specifically, t_j is set to be the fraction of all the training images within the coarse category j (Equation 3) under the assumption that the distribution over coarse categories across the entire training dataset is identical to that within a training mini-batch.

$$t_j = \frac{\sum_{k|P(k)=j} |S_k|}{\sum_{k=1}^C |S_k|} \quad (3)$$

where S_k is the set of images from fine category k .

4.1.2 PRETRAINING THE COARSE CATEGORY COMPONENT

To pretrain the coarse category component, we first replace fine category labels $\{y_i^t\}$ with coarse category labels using the mapping $P : y \mapsto y'$. The full set of training samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^t, y_i^t\}_{i=1}^{N_t}$ are used to train a standard deep CNN model which outputs a probability distribution over the coarse categories. After that, we copy the learned parameters from the standard deep CNN to the coarse category component of HD-CNN.

4.1.3 PRETRAINING THE FINE CATEGORY COMPONENTS

Branching fine category components $\{F^j\}_{j=1}^{C'}$ are also independently pretrained. First, before pre-training each branching component we train a standard deep CNN model F^p from scratch using all the training samples $\{\mathbf{x}_i^t, y_i^t\}_{i=1}^{N_t}$. Second, we initialize each branching component F^j by copying the learnt parameters from F^p into F^j and fine-tune F^j by only using training images with fine labels y_i^t such that $P(y_i^t) = j$. By using the images within the same coarse category j for fine-tuning, each branching component F^j is adapted to achieve better performance for the fine categories within the coarse category j and is allowed to be not discriminative for other fine categories.

4.2 FINE-TUNING HD-CNN

After both coarse category component and branching fine category components are properly pre-trained, we fine-tune the entire HD-CNN using multinomial logistic loss function with temporal sparsity penalty. We prefer to use larger training mini-batch as it gives better estimations of temporal sparsity.

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 OVERVIEW

We evaluate HD-CNN on the benchmark dataset *CIFAR100* (Krizhevsky & Hinton, 2009a). The *CIFAR100* dataset consists of 100 classes of natural images. There are 50,000 training images and 10,000 testing images. For identifying coarse categories, we randomly choose 10,000 images from the training set as the *train_val* part and the rest as the *train_train* part.

To demonstrate that HD-CNN is a generic architecture, We experiment with two different building block networks on *CIFAR100* dataset. In both cases, HD-CNN can achieve superior performance over the building block network alone. We implement HD-CNN on the widely deployed *Caffe* (Jia, 2013) project and plan to release our code. We follow (I. Goodfellow & Bengio, 2013) to pre-process the datasets (e.g. global contrast normalization and ZCA whitening). For *CIFAR100*, we use randomly cropped image patch of size 26×26 and their horizontal reflections for training, For testing, we use multi-view testing (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). Specifically, we extract five 26×26 patches (the 4 corner patches and the center patch) as well as their horizontal reflections and average their predictions.

We follow (Krizhevsky et al., 2012) to update the network parameter by back propagation. We use small mini-batches of size 100 for pretraining components and large mini-batches of size 250 for

Table 1: **Accuracy, memory, speed:** Comparison of Testing accuracies, GPU memory consumption and testing time cost between standard and HD-CNN models on *CIFAR100* dataset. The mini-batch size is 100.

Model	Test Accuracy	Memory (MB)	Time (sec.)
CIFAR100-CNN	55.51%	147	3.37
HD-CNN + CIFAR100-CNN	59.91%	236	12.52
CIFAR100-NIN	64.72%	276	7.91
HD-CNN + CIFAR100-NIN	65.33%	618	27.83

Table 2: **Testing accuracies of different methods on *CIFAR100* dataset.** HD-CNN with CIFAR100-NIN building block and sparsity penalty regularized training establish state-of-the-art results for a single network. Model averaging of five independent models also set new state-of-the-art results of multiple networks.

Method	Test Accuracy
ConvNet + Tree based priors (Srivastava & Salakhutdinov, 2013)	63.15%
Network in network (Lin et al., 2013)	64.32%
HD-CNN + CIFAR100-NIN w/o sparsity penalty	64.12%
Model averaging (two CIFAR100-NIN models)	64.96%
HD-CNN + CIFAR100-NIN w/ sparsity penalty	65.33%

fine-tuning the entire HD-CNN. We start the training with a fixed learning rate and decrease it by a factor of 10 after the training error stops improving. We decrease the learning rate twice.

5.1.1 CNN BUILDING BLOCK

We use a standard CNN network *CIFAR100-CNN* as the building block. The *CIFAR100-CNN* network consists of 3 convolutional layers, 1 fully-connected layer and 1 *SOFTMAX* layer (supplement Table 4). There are 64 filters in each convolutional layer. Rectified linear units (ReLU) are used as the activation units. Pooling layers and response normalization layers are also used between convolutional layers.

We identify five coarse categories (supplement Table3). Accordingly, we build up a HD-CNN with five branching components using *CIFAR100-CNN* building block. Branching components share layers from *conv1* to *norm1* but have independent layers from *conv2* to *prob*.

We compare the test accuracies of a standard *CIFAR100-CNN* network and a HD-CNN with *CIFAR100-CNN* building block in Table 1. The HD-CNN achieves testing accuracy 59.91% which improves the performance of the baseline *CIFAR100-CNN* of 55.51% by more than 4%.

We dissect the HD-CNN by computing the fine-category-wise testing accuracy for each branching component. This can be done by using the single full prediction from a branching component. For a branching component j , we sort the fine categories $\{k\}_{k=1}^C$ in descending order based on the mean coarse probability $\{M_{kj}\}_{k=1}^C$ where $M_{kj} = \frac{1}{|y_i^s=k|} \sum_{y_i^s=k} B_{ij}$. The classwise accuracies for each branching component are shown in Figure 3. Note that if we treat the single prediction from a branching component as the final prediction, the five branching components will have testing accuracies 13.2%, 2.5%, 17.4%, 16.9% and 16.4% on the entire testing set, respectively. But when the branching predictions are linearly combined using the coarse category prediction as the weights, the accuracy increases to 59.91%.




Figure 3: **Class-wise testing accuracies of 5 branching fine category components in HD-CNN with CIFAR100-CNN building block.** From bottom to top in the y axis direction, the fine categories have been sorted based on mean coarse probability in descending order. For clarity, only top 40 fine categories are shown since each branching component specializes on just top few classes.

5.1.2 NIN BUILDING BLOCK

In (Lin et al., 2013), a *NIN* network¹ with three stacked *mpconv* layers achieves state-of-the-art testing accuracy 64.32% (supplement Table 5). We use *CIFAR100-NIN* as the building block and build up a HD-CNN with five branching components. Branching components share layers from *conv1* to *conv2* but have independent layers from *cccp3* to *prob*.

We achieve testing accuracy 65.33% which improves the current best method *NIN* (Lin et al., 2013) by 0.61% and sets new state-of-the-art results of a single network on *CIFAR100*.

Comparisons with model averaging. HD-CNN is fundamentally different from model averaging technique (Krizhevsky et al., 2012). In model averaging, all the models are capable of classifying the full set of the categories and each one is trained independently. The main sources of their prediction differences are different initializations. In HD-CNN, each branching component only excels at classifying a subset of the categories and all the branching components are fine-tuned jointly. We compare HD-CNN performance with model averaging results. As our 5-branch HD-CNN consumes about two times as much GPU memory as building block model, we independently train two *CIFAR100-NIN* networks with random parameter initialization and take their averaged prediction as the final prediction. We obtain testing accuracy 64.96% which is about 0.4% lower than that of HD-CNN (Table 2). Note that HD-CNN is orthogonal to the model averaging technique and an ensemble of HD-CNN networks can further improve the performance.

Effectiveness of temporal sparsity penalty. To verify the effectiveness of temporal sparsity penalty in our loss function (2), we fine-tune a HD-CNN using the traditional multinomial logistic loss function. The testing accuracy is 64.12%, which is more than 1% worse than that of a HD-CNN trained with temporal sparsity penalty. We find that without the temporal sparsity penalty regularization, the coarse category probability concentration issue arises. That is the trained coarse category component consistently assigns nearly 100% probability mass to one of branching fine category components. In this case, the final averaged prediction is dominated by the single prediction of a certain branching

¹https://github.com/mavenlin/cuda-convnet/blob/master/NIN/cifar-100_def

component. This downgrades the HD-CNN back to the standard building block model and thus has similar performance to the standard model.

5.1.3 COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF HD-CNN

Due to the use of shared layers in the branching components, the increase of both computational complexity and memory footprint of HD-CNN is sublinearly proportional to the number of branching components when compared to the building block models. For example, a 5-branch HD-CNN with *CIFAR100-NIN* building block consumes about two times as much GPU memory as the building block model. We compare the computational complexity at testing time between HD-CNN models and standard building block models in terms of GPU memory consumption and time cost for the entire test set (Table 1).

6 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Our proposed HD-CNN is a flexible deep CNN architecture to improve over existing deep CNN models. As part of future work, we would like to evaluate our method on larger datasets, such as ImageNet (Russakovsky et al., 2014) classification dataset which has 1000 classes. We also plan to extend HD-CNN architectures in this work to those with more than 2 hierarchical levels.

REFERENCES

- B., Mikhail and N., Partha. Laplacian eigenmaps for dimensionality reduction and data representation. *Neural computation*, 15(6):1373–1396, 2003.
- Bay, H., Tuytelaars, T., and Van Gool, L. Surf: Speeded up robust features. In *ECCV 2006*.
- Ciresan, D., Meier, U., and Schmidhuber, J. Multi-column deep neural networks for image classification. In *CVPR 2012*, pp. 3642–3649. IEEE, 2012.
- Farabet, Clément, Couprie, Camille, Najman, Laurent, and LeCun, Yann. Learning hierarchical features for scene labeling. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 35(8):1915–1929, 2013.
- Frey, B. J. and Dueck, D. Clustering by passing messages between data points. *Science*, 315:972–976, 2007.
- Girshick, Ross, Donahue, Jeff, Darrell, Trevor, and Malik, Jitendra. Rich feature hierarchies for accurate object detection and semantic segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2014.
- Godbole, Shantanu, Sarawagi, Sunita, and Chakrabarti, Soumen. Scaling multi-class support vector machines using inter-class confusion. *KDD '02*, pp. 513–518, New York, NY, USA, 2002. ACM.
- He, K., Zhang X. Ren S. and Sun, J. Spatial pyramid pooling in deep convolutional networks for visual recognition. In *ECCV 2014*.
- I. Goodfellow, D. Warde-Farley, M. Mirza A. Courville and Bengio, Y. Maxout networks. In *ICML*, 2013.
- Jia, Yangqing. Caffe: An open source convolutional architecture for fast feature embedding, 2013.
- Krizhevsky, A. and Hinton, G. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Computer Science Department, University of Toronto, Tech. Rep*, 2009a.
- Krizhevsky, A., Sutskever, I., and Hinton, G. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1097–1105, 2012.
- Krizhevsky, Alex and Hinton, Geoffrey E. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Masters thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto*, 2009b.
- Lazebnik, S., Schmid, C., and Ponce, J. Beyond bags of features: Spatial pyramid matching for recognizing natural scene categories. In *CVPR 2006*.
- Lee, H., Ekanadham, C., and Ng, A. Sparse deep belief net model for visual area v2. In *NIPS*, 2008.
- Lin, M., Chen, Q., and Yan, S. Network in network. *CoRR*, abs/1312.4400, 2013.
- Lowe, D. Object recognition from local scale-invariant features. In *Computer Vision, 1999*.

- Razavian, Ali Sharif, Azizpour, Hossein, Sullivan, Josephine, and Carlsson, Stefan. Cnn features off-the-shelf: an astounding baseline for recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1403.6382*, 2014.
- Russakovsky, Olga, Deng, Jia, Su, Hao, Krause, Jonathan, Satheesh, Sanjeev, Ma, Sean, Huang, Zhiheng, Karpathy, Andrej, Khosla, Aditya, Bernstein, Michael, Berg, Alexander C., and Fei-Fei, Li. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge, 2014.
- Sermanet, Pierre, Eigen, David, Zhang, Xiang, Mathieu, Michael, Fergus, Rob, and LeCun, Yann. Overfeat: Integrated recognition, localization and detection using convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, April 2014.
- Springenberg, Jost Tobias and Riedmiller, Martin. Improving deep neural networks with probabilistic maxout units. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6116*, 2013.
- Srivastava, Nitish and Salakhutdinov, Ruslan. Discriminative transfer learning with tree-based priors. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2094–2102, 2013.
- Taigman, Y., Yang M. Ranzato M. and Wolf, L. Deepface: Closing the gap to human-level performance in face verification. In *CVPR*, pp. 1701–1708, 2013.
- Toshev, A. and Szegedy, C. Deeppose: Human pose estimation via deep neural networks. In *CVPR 2014*.
- Wei, Y., Xia W. Huang J. Ni B. Dong J. Zhao Y and Yan, S. Cnn: Single-label to multi-label. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5726*, 2014.
- Zeiler, M. and Fergus, R. Visualizing and understanding convolutional networks. In *ECCV 2014*.
- Zeiler, M. D and Fergus, R. Stochastic pooling for regularization of deep convolutional neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2013.

7 SUPPLEMENTARY

- List of fine categories within each coarse category are listed in Table 3
- The complete *CIFAR100-CNN* architecture is defined in Table 4.
- The complete architecture, named as *CIFAR100-NIN*, is shown in Table 5.

Table 3: **The automatically identified five coarse categories on *CIFAR100* dataset.** Fine categories within the same coarse category are more visually similar to each other than those across different coarse categories.

Coarse category	Fine categories
1	bed, bottle, bowl, can, chair, clock, couch, cup, lamp, maple tree, oak tree, pine tree, plate, rocket, skyscraper, telephone, television, wardrobe, willow tree
2	baby, boy, girl, man, woman
3	bear, beaver, camel, cattle, chimpanzee, dolphin, elephant, flatfish, fox, hamster, kangaroo, leopard, lion, mouse, mushroom, otter, porcupine, possum, rabbit, raccoon, ray, seal, shark, shrew, skunk, snail, squirrel, tiger, turtle, whale, wolf
4	apple, aquarium fish, bee, beetle, butterfly, caterpillar, cloud, cockroach, crab, crocodile, dinosaur, lizard, lobster, orange, orchid, pear, poppy, rose, snake, spider, sunflower, sweet pepper, trout, tulip
5	bicycle, bridge, bus, castle, forest, house, keyboard, lawn mower, motorcycle, mountain, palm tree, pickup truck, plain, road, sea, streetcar, table, tank, tractor, train, worm

Table 4: CIFAR100-CNN network architecture.

Layer name	conv1	pool1	norm1	conv2	pool2	norm2	conv3	pool3	ip1	prob
Layer spec	64 5*5 filters	3*3 MAX		64 5*5 filters	3*3 AVG		64 5*5 filters	3*3 AVG	fully-connected	SOFTMAX
Activation		ReLU		ReLU			ReLU			

Table 5: CIFAR100-NIN network architecture.

Layer name	conv1	cccp1	cccp2	pool1	conv2	cccp3	cccp4	pool2	conv3	cccp5	cccp6	pool3	prob
Layer spec	192 5*5 filters	160 1*1 filters	96 1*1 filters	3*3 MAX	192 5*5 filters	192 1*1 filters	192 1*1 filters	3*3 MAX	192 3*3 filters	192 1*1 filters	100 1*1 filters	6*6 AVG	SOFTMAX
Activation		ReLU	ReLU			ReLU	ReLU			ReLU	ReLU		