

Reliable Model Compression via Label-Preservation-Aware Loss Functions

Vinu Joseph^{1*} Shoaib Ahmed Siddiqui^{2,3*} Aditya Bhaskara¹ Ganesh Gopalakrishnan¹
 Saurav Muralidharan⁴ Michael Garland⁴ Sheraz Ahmed³ Andreas Dengel^{2,3}

¹University of Utah ²TU Kaiserslautern

³German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI) ⁴NVIDIA

Abstract

Model compression is a ubiquitous tool that brings the power of modern deep learning to edge devices with power and latency constraints. The goal of model compression is to take a large reference neural network and output a smaller and less expensive compressed network that is functionally equivalent to the reference. Compression typically involves pruning and/or quantization, followed by re-training to maintain the reference accuracy. However, it has been observed that compression can lead to a considerable mismatch in the labels produced by the reference and the compressed models, resulting in bias and unreliability. To combat this, we present a framework that uses a teacher-student learning paradigm to better preserve labels. We investigate the role of additional terms to the loss function and show how to automatically tune the associated parameters. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach both quantitatively and qualitatively on multiple compression schemes and accuracy recovery algorithms using a set of 8 different real-world network architectures. We obtain a significant reduction of up to $4.1\times$ in the number of mismatches between the compressed and reference models, and up to $5.7\times$ in cases where the reference model makes the correct prediction.

1. Introduction

Modern deep learning owes much of its success to the ability to train large models by leveraging data sets of ever increasing size [36]. The best performing models for computer vision [65] and natural language processing applications [16] tend to have tens to hundreds of layers and hundreds of millions of parameters. However, an increasing




Figure 1: Comparing the number of Compression Impacted Pixels (CIPs) for different loss functions on a brain MRI FLAIR segmentation task [7]. CIPs are pixels classified differently in the original and compressed models. Red contour represents the prediction while the green contour represents the ground-truth.

number of applications, including autonomous driving [53], surveillance [68], and voice assistance systems [2], demand ML models that can be deployed on low-power and low-resource devices, and typically have strong latency requirements [14, 44]. In such applications, the notion of *model compression* has gained popularity; at a high level, model compression involves taking a *reference model* and producing a *compressed model* that is lightweight in terms of computational requirements, while being functionally equivalent to the reference model (i.e., produces the same classification outputs on all inputs). Model compression has been studied extensively in computer vision as well as other domains [12], leveraging techniques such as structured weight pruning [61, 51, 18, 25, 50, 22, 17, 23, 56, 32, 3, 52], quantization [72, 20] and low-rank factorization [42, 45, 67, 15,

*Joint first authors. Supported in part by NSF Awards 1704715 and 1817073. This work was in part also supported by the BMBF project DeFuseNN (Grant 01IW17002) and the NVIDIA AI Lab (NVAIL) program. Vinu Joseph is supported in part by an NVIDIA Graduate Research Fellowship. The third author acknowledges the support from NSF CCF-2008688. Correspondence to Vinu Joseph: vinu@cs.utah.edu

19]. Many of these methods rely on making structural modifications to the network and then fine-tuning to potentially regain some of the accuracy loss.

However, in spite of its power and potential, model compression techniques are known to have drawbacks [38]. For example, certain classes may be unfairly affected in terms of classification accuracy compared to others; this may lead to unfair outcomes, e.g., ethnicity-based discrimination in facial [10] or speech recognition [8]. Mitigating this impact of compression is particularly urgent, given the widespread use of compressed deep neural networks in resource-constrained and sensitive domains such as health care diagnostics [64, 21, 5, 54], self-driving cars [53], facial recognition software [8], and human-resource management [13, 26]. For these tasks, the trade-offs incurred by compression will be intolerable given the huge impact on human welfare.

Another class of drawbacks come from complex inputs [41, 63], e.g., in an image with different components, the reference model may ‘focus’ on certain aspects/features while the compressed one may focus on others. These drawbacks may be attributed to the fact that network compression is usually performed with the goal of simply matching the overall accuracy of the reference model. This leads us to the following question: *can compression schemes ensure that the compressed and reference networks are close at a semantic or feature level?* This question is challenging because networks can have different number of layers, features per layer and different connectivity structures. Moreover, the answer generally depends on the architecture of the reference network and the task at hand. The goal of our paper is to use ideas from knowledge distillation (such as logit pairing [4, 30]) to introduce new terms into the objective function of a compression scheme and help answer the above question. With new loss terms, the challenge now is to understand the relative importance of the terms and measure the impact they have on the overall objective.

Compression Impacted Exemplars (CIEs) To measure the impact of compression, we use a metric proposed in a series of work by Hooker et al. [31]: counting the number of classification mismatches between the reference and the compressed model.¹ This number can be *more informative than purely the accuracy* of the compressed model. For example, a lot of research has focused on making models more unbiased, more fair and more robust. If we have a reference model obtained using such methods, we would wish to have compression methods to preserve these properties. In fact, we consider a subset of CIEs (which we call *CIE-Us*, see Section 3) and report both CIE and *CIE-U* numbers.

¹Note that [31] used the slightly different name of *Compression Identified Exemplars*; our modification is done to ensure compatibility with a similar notation for segmentation that we will define later.

Our key contributions in this work are as follows:

- Employing additional loss terms in the compression objective based on the teacher-student paradigm so as to align the predictions of the reference and the compressed models. We show for the first time that such a pairing can be extended to other tasks, by considering semantic segmentation. Figure 1 shows an example of the effect of the different loss terms on the number of model mismatches.
- Analyzing automated strategies for tuning the hyperparameters associated with our multi-part loss functions. We demonstrate that our framework is robust to the choice of tuning strategies, and uniform weighting works as well as more intricate strategies across different datasets and reference network architectures.
- Through extensive experiments, we validate the effectiveness of our framework and show that it not only improves metrics such as the number of CIEs, but also yields better compression accuracy compared to previous approaches.

While the teacher-student paradigm is a coarse way to capture “semantic similarity” between the reference and compressed models, our results show that it can nonetheless be highly effective in reducing the number of CIEs. We also remark that our methodology can work with any compression scheme that allows us to specify a custom objective that can be optimized to produce a compressed model.

2. Background and Related Work

In this section, we provide a brief overview of recent model compression approaches, followed by a more detailed background on group sparsity-based model compression and CIE reduction.

2.1. Model Compression

Deep neural networks are heavy on computation and memory by design, creating an impediment to operating these networks on resource-constrained platforms. To alleviate this constraint, several branches of work have been proposed to reduce the size of an existing neural network. The most commonly employed approach is to reduce the number of weights, neurons, or layers in a network while maintaining approximately the same performance [39]. This approach was first explored on DNNs in early work such as [46, 27]. Studies conducted by [25, 24] showed that simple unstructured pruning can reduce the size of the network by pruning unimportant connections within the network. However, such unstructured pruning strategies produce large sparse weight matrices that are computationally inefficient unless equipped with a specialized hardware [35]. To resolve this issue, structured pruning methods

were proposed where entire channels are pruned simultaneously to ensure that the pruned network can be naturally accelerated on commodity hardware [47, 32, 62]. More recently, Renda et al. [57] proposed the *rewind* algorithm which is similar to simple fine-tuning of the network to regain the loss in accuracy incurred during the pruning step. The sparsity level of the model is updated in small steps where each step enhances the sparsity of the model followed by fine-tuning. The two major schemes for structured pruning are either based on filter pruning [40] or low-rank tensor factorization [49]. Both these approaches enable direct acceleration of the networks in contrast to unstructured pruning. Li et al. [49] explored the relationship between tensor factorization and general pruning methods, and proposed a unified approach based on sparsity-inducing norm which can be interpreted as both tensor factorization or direct filter pruning. By simply changing the way the sparsity regularization is enforced, filter pruning and low-rank decomposition can be derived accordingly. This is particularly important for the compression of popular network architectures with shortcut connections (e.g. ResNet), where filter pruning cannot deal with the last convolutional layer in a ResBlock while the low-rank decomposition methods can.

Accuracy Recovery Algorithms General accuracy recovery algorithms capable of handling a wide variety of compression techniques provide the foundation for modern compression systems. Prior work in this domain includes the LC algorithm [9], ADAM-ADMM [71] and DCP [73]. More recently, the *Rewind* [57] and Group-Sparsity [49] algorithms have been demonstrated to be state-of-the-art compression algorithms. Due to their compression scheme-agnostic nature, we build upon these two methods in our paper to evaluate the proposed *label-preservation-aware loss functions* as described in Section 3.1.

Network Distillation Another branch of network compression initially proposed by [30], attempts to distill knowledge from a large teacher network to a small student network. With the assumption that the knowledge captured by a network is reflected in the output probability distribution, this line of work trains the student network to mimic the probability distribution produced by the teacher network. Since the networks are trained to output one-hot distribution, a temperature T is used to diffuse the probability mass. Advanced methods of distillation have succeeded in achieving much more effective transfer by not only transferring the output logits but the information of the intermediate activations as in [70, 58, 37, 1]. Although network distillation was presented as a general form of logit pairing, it is quite difficult to obtain improvements during distillation without spending considerable effort in manually tuning the temperature T for the softmax layer. In contrast, using pure

logit pairing comes without any additional cost of manual hyperparameter tuning. Therefore, we employ pure logit pairing instead of knowledge distillation in our approach.

Group-Sparsity based Model Compression We now briefly describe the key insight of the compression recovery algorithm that was used in our evaluation. The main idea in the Group-Sparsity recovery algorithm [49] is that the filter pruning and filter decomposition seek a compact approximation of the parameter tensors despite their different operational forms to cope with different application scenarios. Consider a vectorized image patch $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$ and a group of n filters $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. The pruning methods remove output channels and approximate the original output $\mathbf{x}^T \mathcal{W}$ as $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{C}$, where $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ only has k output channels. Filter decomposition methods approximate $\mathcal{W}$ as two filters $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ and $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, making $\mathbf{AB}$ a rank k approximation of $\mathcal{W}$. Thus, both pruning and decomposition-based methods seek a compact approximation to the original network parameters, but adopt different strategies for the approximation. The weight parameters $\mathcal{W}$ are usually trained with some regularization such as weight decay to constrain the hypothesis class. To get structured pruning of the filter, structured sparsity regularization is used to constrain the filter:

$$\min_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{L}(y, \Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{W})) + \mu \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{W}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{W}) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\cdot)$ represents the weight decay and sparsity regularization term respectively, while μ and λ are the regularization factors. Instead of directly regularizing the matrix $\mathcal{W}$ [69, 48], we enforced group sparsity constraints by incorporating a sparsity-inducing matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, which can be converted to the filter of a 1×1 convolution layer after the original layer. Then the original convolution of $Z = X \times \mathcal{W}$ becomes $Z = X \times (\mathcal{W} \times \mathbf{A})$. To obtain a structured sparse matrix, group sparsity regularization is enforced on $\mathbf{A}$. Thus, the loss Eqn. 1 function becomes

$$\min_{\mathcal{W}, \mathbf{A}} \mathcal{L}(y, \Phi(\mathbf{x}; \mathcal{W}, \mathbf{A})) + \mu \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{W}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{A}) \quad (2)$$

Solving the problem in Eqn. 2 results in structured group sparsity in matrix $\mathbf{A}$. By considering matrix $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ together, the actual effect is that the original convolutional filter is compressed.

2.2. Compression Impacted Exemplars (CIEs)

Top-1 accuracy is just one among many possible ways of characterizing the quality of a compressed model. An alternative approach involves counting all the inputs for which the compressed model disagrees with the original, uncompressed model. Each such input is termed a *Compression Impacted Exemplar (CIE)*, following the definition by Hooker et al. [31] (see also footnote 1). While CIE




Figure 2: Overview of our CIE reduction framework using label preservation-aware loss functions.

reduction is critical in domains which require compressed models to match the original model as closely as possible, we observe that reducing label mismatches is all the more important *when the reference model makes a correct prediction*. We term such CIEs *CIE-U*. In Section 3.1, we explore novel loss formulations that target both CIE and CIE-U reduction during compression.

CIE reduction has received relatively little attention from the research community, with recent work by Hooker et al. [31] being the only one that we are aware of that tries to identify and reduce CIEs. Their primary approach involves re-weighting CIEs, where they consider a mitigation strategy of fine-tuning the compressed model for a certain number (chosen to be 3000) of iterations while up-weighting the CIEs relative to the rest of the dataset. Their approach is sensitive to hyperparameters such as: (1) choice of number of fine-tuning iterations, (2) a threshold (90th percentile) to upweight all exemplars above that threshold, and (3) an up-weighting value of $\lambda > 1$ for CIE which they choose to be 2. We believe that our approach is more principled for a number of reasons. First, we pose CIE mitigation as a general *label-preservation* problem and extensively explore several loss functions to mitigate this without introducing any new hyperparameters than were initially used during model compression or changing any of the values of the original compression hyperparameters. Lastly, we are agnostic to the compression scheme and compression algorithm.

2.3. Multi-Part Loss Functions

Networks that perform challenging tasks or multiple tasks often require a combination of losses to work. Considerable effort has been made towards understanding the role of different loss terms [33, 6, 11], and how best to combine them. While most of the prior work combines these losses either using ad-hoc or equal weights, researchers have recently tried to develop systematic methods to adjust the weights on the linear combination of loss components. These methods often require defining new loss functions [6] or changing the optimization procedure [11]. As we describe in Section 3.2, we compare three different hyperparameter tuning strategies to optimize our multi-part loss function.

3. Methodology

Figure 2 provides a high-level overview of the proposed system. Given a reference model $\mathcal{W}$, we wish to obtain a compressed model $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ that: (i) obtains the same or better accuracy as $\mathcal{W}$, and (ii) minimizes the number of CIEs and CIE-U. Recall that as defined in Section 2.2, a CIE is any input x on which the reference and compressed models disagree (i.e., $y_{\bar{\mathcal{W}}} \neq y_{\mathcal{W}}$), and a CIE-U is a CIE for which the reference model’s output matches the ground truth label while the compressed model’s does not (i.e., $y_{\mathcal{W}} = y \wedge y_{\bar{\mathcal{W}}} \neq y$). The middle part of the figure (box labeled $\mathcal{L}$) depicts the proposed learner that uses a label-preservation-aware loss function. $\mathcal{L}$ automatically optimizes the cross-

entropy, distillation and logit pairing losses to realize CIE and CIE-U reductions in the compressed model $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$. Further, as depicted in boxes $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{L}$, our approach is agnostic to the compression scheme and accuracy recovery algorithm used for compressing the reference model $\mathcal{W}$. We now describe the loss functions and the learning schemes used for selecting the associated hyperparameters.

3.1. Label-Preservation-Aware Loss Functions

Most of the known model compression approaches optimize the cross-entropy loss with respect to the target labels i.e. they minimize

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{CE}(\sigma(\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \bar{\mathcal{W}})), y_i), \quad (3)$$

where $\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \bar{\mathcal{W}})$ represents the output of the network (before softmax), parameterized by the compressed weights $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$, σ represents softmax function applied to the network's output, and N denotes the number of examples in a mini-batch. Notice that this loss function does not explicitly encourage any alignment between the compressed and the uncompressed networks, and only requires the compressed network to produce the correct output labels.

To explicitly encourage an alignment between the compressed and uncompressed models, one approach is to introduce a logit pairing objective (as in teacher-student frameworks [4, 30]) which encourages the logits of the two models to be well-aligned with each other:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \bar{\mathcal{W}}) - \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathcal{W})\|^2. \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ represents the weights of the uncompressed model. The overall loss function can now be taken to be a combination:

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + \beta \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}}, \quad (5)$$

where α and β are the corresponding weighting factors for the two losses. Here, the logit pairing term attempts to minimize the difference in the functional form of the two models, while the cross-entropy term can be viewed as placing an additional weight on terms corresponding to CIE-U's, where the uncompressed model makes the right prediction.

The MSE logit pairing objective is one way to ensure that the models have similar behavior. We also considered the following term, which could apply to settings where the reference model is "unsure" of the class, i.e., logits corresponding to two different classes are close in magnitude, making them difficult to disambiguate. To help in such cases, we consider an additional term that effectively maximizes the cross-entropy between the predictions of the two models. In other words,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}_{\text{pred}}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{CE}(\sigma(\Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \bar{\mathcal{W}})), \arg \max_j \Phi(\mathbf{x}_i; \mathcal{W})_j), \quad (6)$$

where the second term is simply the prediction of the uncompressed model on the input x_i . When the logits for two classes are close, this term ensures that the compressed model better respects the ordering between the logit values. The final loss function that we optimize thus has the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \alpha \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + \beta \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}} + \gamma \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}_{\text{pred}}}. \quad (7)$$

It is non-trivial to come up with the right weights for these multi-part loss functions. In the next section, we describe how we automatically tune the hyper-parameters α , β and γ .

3.2. Multi-Part Loss Function Optimization

We experiment with three different ways of setting the hyper-parameters α , β , and γ : UNIFORM, LEARNABLE, and SOFTADAPT. To better understand the contributions of the individual loss terms to the final model, we also evaluate the 7 possible subsets obtained using the three loss terms in Eq. 7. These subsets correspond to setting some of the loss weights to zero, while optimizing the rest of the weights using the three methods we describe.

UNIFORM. Here, we assign a uniform weight to each of the selected loss terms. The weight is equally divided among the number of loss terms present. i.e., for subsets containing 1, 2, and 3 loss terms, the weights are 1.0, 0.5 and 0.33 respectively.

LEARNABLE. In the learnable variant, we treat the weights α, β, γ as parameters of the model, and then optimize them as standard parameters using gradient descent. Since the gradient points in the steepest direction, using gradient descent will naturally choose loss terms which are lowest in magnitude. Therefore, for the learnable weights to be fair, the relative magnitude of the different loss terms should be about the same. We combat this by introducing a weight decay term on the loss term (similar to standard optimization) and then projecting the weights to sum to 1. This avoids the collapse for the terms other than the minimum loss to 0.

$$\alpha = \frac{e^{\alpha'}}{e^{\alpha'} + \beta' + \gamma'}$$

where α' is a parameter of the model. Once the final loss value is computed based on these weights, the parameters of the model (including α' , β' and γ') are updated using SGD.

$$\alpha' = \alpha' - \nabla_{\alpha'}(\mathcal{L} + \eta \|\alpha'\|^2)$$

DATASET	ARCHITECTURE	LOSS FUNCTION	UNCOMPRESSED ACC.	COMPRESSED ACC.	#CIEs	#CIE-Us
CIFAR-100	RESNET-164	CE (DISTILLATION)	76.78%	74.95%	1925	717
		UNIFORM (MSE)	76.78%	76.58%	1092(1.8×)	335(2.1×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	76.78%	76.62%	1237(1.6×)	386(1.9×)
	RESNET-20	CE (DISTILLATION)	68.83%	66.96%	1903	639
		UNIFORM (MSE)	68.83%	68.87%	465(4.1×)	113(5.7×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	68.83%	69.13%	717(2.7×)	184(3.5×)
	RESNEXT-164	CE (DISTILLATION)	76.87%	74.40%	2092	788
		UNIFORM (MSE)	76.87%	76.15%	1327(1.6×)	439(1.8×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	76.87%	75.95%	1523(1.4×)	526(1.5×)
	RESNEXT-20	CE (DISTILLATION)	71.95%	70.98%	1609	535
		UNIFORM (MSE)	71.95%	72.13%	601(2.7×)	161(3.3×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	71.95%	72.16%	792(2×)	202(2.6×)
CIFAR-10	DENSENET	CE (DISTILLATION)	94.62%	92.90%	550	317
		UNIFORM (MSE)	94.62%	93.37%	496(1.1×)	274(1.2×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	94.62%	94.40%	301(1.8×)	135(2.3×)
	RESNET-164	CE (DISTILLATION)	95.03%	93.71%	466	266
		UNIFORM (MSE)	95.03%	94.19%	381(1.2×)	208(1.3×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	95.03%	94.33%	354(1.3×)	189(1.4×)
	RESNET-20	CE (DISTILLATION)	92.54%	90.54%	657	381
		UNIFORM (MSE)	92.54%	92.28%	396(1.7×)	176(2.2×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	92.54%	92.46%	223(2.9×)	101(3.8×)
	RESNET-56	CE (DISTILLATION)	93.09%	91.73%	589	323
		UNIFORM (MSE)	93.09%	91.73%	572(1.0×)	311(1.0×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	93.09%	92.08%	530(1.1×)	278(1.2×)
	RESNEXT-164	CE (DISTILLATION)	95.18%	93.74%	472	276
		UNIFORM (MSE)	95.18%	92.87%	576(0.8×)	373(0.7×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	95.18%	93.83%	462(1.0×)	269(1.0×)
	RESNEXT-20	CE (DISTILLATION)	92.54%	90.92%	783	422
		UNIFORM (MSE)	92.54%	91.37%	674(1.2×)	345(1.2×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	92.54%	92.42%	464(1.7×)	197(2.1×)
IMAGENET	RESNET-50	CE (DISTILLATION)	76.01%	76.35%	4491	1185
		UNIFORM (MSE)	76.01%	76.13%	1890(2.4×)	500(2.4×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	76.01%	76.48%	2911(1.5×)	704(1.7×)
MRI	UNET	UNIFORM (CE)	0.8454	0.8224	38373	15856
		UNIFORM (MSE)	0.8454	0.8576	22988(1.7×)	13468(1.2×)
		UNIFORM (CE, MSE)	0.8454	0.8581	23183(1.7×)	13556(1.2×)

Table 1: Summary of our main results. We compare the performance of our two best-performing losses and one baseline on 12 networks across the CIFAR-10/100, ImageNet and Brain MRI datasets. The full set of results for all 17 loss combinations is available in the supplementary material. The entries in bold correspond to losses that perform best for that architecture+dataset combination.

where η represents the weight decay. We use a strong weight-decay of 1.0 in our experiments to ensure that a particular loss strictly does not dominate others.

SOFTADAPT. Proposed by Heyderi et al. [29], SOFTADAPT is a method to automatically tune the weights of a multi-part loss function. It can be tuned to assign the maximum weight to either the best-performing or the worst-performing loss based on the value of a parameter η . Let $s_\alpha = \mathcal{L}_{CE}(t) - \mathcal{L}_{CE}(t-1)$ be the corresponding change in the loss value between two consecutive steps (define s_β and s_γ using the corresponding losses). They use the normalized version of SoftAdapt which can be written as:

$$s_\alpha = \frac{s_\alpha}{(s_\alpha + s_\beta + s_\gamma) + \epsilon},$$

where ϵ is introduced for numerical stability. The final weight based on these normalized scores is:

$$\alpha = \frac{e^{\eta s_\alpha}}{e^{\eta s_\alpha} + e^{\eta s_\beta} + e^{\eta s_\gamma}},$$

where η selects whether to optimize the worst or the best loss based on whether the value of η is greater than or less than zero respectively. We use $\eta = 1.0$ in our experiments which equates to optimizing the worst performing loss at every weight update step. Note that these weights are not optimized at every step of the optimization process, but updated after every 10 optimization steps and the corresponding average change is taken into account.

4. Evaluation

We evaluate the efficacy of the proposed label-preservation-aware loss functions on a wide range of real-world tasks, network architectures, and datasets. Specifically, we report results for image classification on the CIFAR-10/100 [43] and ImageNet [60] datasets, and semantic segmentation on the Brain MRI Segmentation dataset [7]. To demonstrate that our approach is not restricted to a particular type of architecture, we experiment




Figure 3: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet50 (ImageNet)

with a range of different network architectures, including ResNet-20, ResNet-50 [28], ResNeXt [66], ResNet-56, DenseNet 12-40 [34] and U-Net [59]. As described in Section 3.1, we consider the CE , MSE , and CE_{PRED} losses and use three distinct algorithms to obtain optimal weights for each of these losses: UNIFORM, LEARNABLE, and SOFTADAPT. We evaluate each of these combinations and also include three additional baseline comparisons: (1) CE with distillation, which is used by Li et al. [49], (2) ROUND-ROBIN-COMBO, which picks a loss to minimize in round-robin fashion, and (3) RANDOM-COMBO, which simply picks one loss at random for optimization.

Hyper-Parameter Settings For ResNet20 and ResNet56 on the CIFAR datasets, the residual block is the basic Res-Block with two 3×3 convolutional layers. For ResNet164 on CIFAR and ResNet50 on ImageNet, the residual block is a bottleneck block. ResNeXt20 and ResNeXt164 have cardinality 32, and bottleneck width 1. For CIFAR, we train the reference network for 300 epochs with SGD using a momentum of 0.9, weight decay of 10^{-4} , and batch size of 64; the learning rate starts with 0.1 and decays by 10 at epochs 150 and 225. The ResNet50 model for ImageNet is obtained from the PyTorch pretrained model repository [55]. We use NVIDIA V100 GPUs to train all models. For com-

pression, we follow the settings described in Li et al. [49]; in particular, we use ℓ_1 regularization with a regularization factor of $2e^{-4}$, and use different learning rates for $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{A}$. The ratio between η_s and η is 0.01.

4.1. Results

Table 1 summarizes our main results. Here, we compare our best-performing loss+optimizer combination with the three baselines described above for each task, network architecture, and dataset. As shown in the Table, we demonstrate significant reductions in the number of CIEs (up to $4.1\times$) and CIE-U (up to $5.7\times$) using label-preservation-aware loss functions while largely retaining reference top-1 accuracy. *Further, we notice that one of the simplest loss+optimizer combinations, namely CE and MSE with uniform weights works best in practice.* We now dive deeper into how our proposed loss functions perform for each individual task and dataset. The full set of results spanning different tasks, network architectures, and datasets is included in the supplementary material.

Image Classification on ImageNet To identify the individual contribution of each of the terms in the loss function, as well as their different combinations, we performed detailed experiments over all our loss combinations on the




Figure 4: CIPs for Brain MRI FLAIR Segmentation

networks and datasets shown in Table 1. Due to space restrictions, we only show results for ResNet50 (ImageNet) in this paper in Figure 3; we include results for the other networks and datasets in the supplementary material. As shown in the figure, both UNIFORM-(MSE) and LEARNABLE-(CEpred, MSE) achieve CIE and CIE-U reductions of $2.4\times$ while improving upon baseline top-1 accuracy.

Image Classification on CIFAR-10/100 On CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, we achieve CIE reductions of up to $2.94\times$ and $4.09\times$, respectively, with a negligible drop in accuracy (less than 0.1%) as shown in Table 1. Compared to ImageNet, uniform weights with CE and MSE losses performs best on CIFAR.

Semantic Segmentation on Brain MRI Semantic segmentation is a per-pixel classification task which aims to assign the correct class to every pixel in the input. The notion of CIEs can be naturally extended to segmentation; in this case, each *input pixel* for which the reference and compressed models disagree constitutes a *Compression Impacted Pixel (CIP)*. We extend our proposed formulation to attempt to reduce CIPs, and evaluate our approach on the task of semantic segmentation of brain MRI images. The dataset comprises of brain MRI images along with manual FLAIR abnormality segmentation masks [7]. We use a generic U-Net architecture with two output channels, and train the complete model using conventional cross-entropy loss. We prune the model using unstructured pruning at a sparsity of 81% and the rewind algorithm [57] (see Section 2 for a more detailed description of rewinding).

Figure 4 shows the results for the segmentation task. Similar to classification, we notice a drastic reduction in the number of CIPs when using logit pairing (MSE). We also see a positive impact of including CE along with MSE




Figure 5: Box-plot capturing the variation among CIEs over 10 random runs of ResNet20 on CIFAR100.

on the dice coefficient, as the model only focuses on reducing CIP-U. This indicates that using the proposed label-preservation-aware loss functions can naturally mitigate the impact of compression on the functional form of the classifier even for tasks beyond image classification. We also include some specific qualitative examples of CIP reduction on brain MRI images in Figure 1.

4.2. Ablation Study: CIE Variance across Runs

To better understand how CIEs vary with different loss term weight initializations, we evaluated 10 random runs of our loss+optimizer combinations on ResNet20 (CIFAR-100). Figure 5 shows the results of this experiment in the form of a box-plot. We notice that the number of CIEs across the 10 random runs are fairly consistent for the majority of losses. We observe similar trends on other networks and datasets and include these results in the supplementary material.

5. Conclusions

This paper has presented a novel method for identifying and reducing label mismatches during model compression. We introduce a label-preservation-aware loss formulation and corresponding optimization algorithms that systematically reduce compression impacted exemplars (CIEs). Our formulation carefully balances accuracy recovery with trying to match the functional form of the reference model, yielding dramatic reductions in label mismatches, especially in cases when the reference model makes a correct prediction (CIE-U). We evaluate our approach on a wide range of tasks, network architectures, datasets, accuracy recovery algorithms and compression schemes to obtain up to a $4.1\times$ reduction in CIEs and $5.7\times$ reduction in CIE-U.

References

- [1] S. Ahn, S. X. Hu, A. Damianou, N. D. Lawrence, and Z. Dai. Variational information distillation for knowledge transfer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9163–9171, 2019. [3](#)
- [2] M. Alam, M. D. Samad, L. Vidyaratne, A. Glandon, and K. M. Iftikharuddin. Survey on deep neural networks in speech and vision systems. *Neurocomputing*, 417:302–321, 2020. [1](#)
- [3] S. Anwar and W. Sung. Compact deep convolutional neural networks with coarse pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.09639*, 2016. [1](#)
- [4] J. Ba and R. Caruana. Do deep nets really need to be deep? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, pages 2654–2662. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014. [2, 5](#)
- [5] M. A. Badgeley, J. R. Zech, L. Oakden-Rayner, B. S. Glicksberg, M. Liu, W. Gale, M. V. McConnell, B. Percha, T. M. Snyder, and J. T. Dudley. Deep learning predicts hip fracture using confounding patient and healthcare variables. *NPJ digital medicine*, 2(1):1–10, 2019. [2](#)
- [6] J. T. Barron. A general and adaptive robust loss function. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4331–4339, 2019. [4](#)
- [7] M. Buda, A. Saha, and M. A. Mazurowski. Association of genomic subtypes of lower-grade gliomas with shape features automatically extracted by a deep learning algorithm. *Computers in biology and medicine*, 109:218–225, 2019. [1, 6, 8](#)
- [8] J. Buolamwini and T. Gebru. Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency*, pages 77–91, 2018. [2](#)
- [9] M. A. Carreira-Perpinán. Model compression as constrained optimization, with application to neural nets. part I: General framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01209*, 2017. [3](#)
- [10] K. Chekanov, P. Mamoshina, R. V. Yampolskiy, R. Timofte, M. Scheibye-Knudsen, and A. Zhavoronkov. Evaluating race and sex diversity in the world’s largest companies using deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02353*, 2017. [2](#)
- [11] Z. Chen, V. Badrinarayanan, C.-Y. Lee, and A. Rabinovich. Gradnorm: Gradient normalization for adaptive loss balancing in deep multitask networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 794–803. PMLR, 2018. [4](#)
- [12] Y. Cheng, D. Wang, P. Zhou, and T. Zhang. A survey of model compression and acceleration for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09282*, 2017. [1](#)
- [13] J. Dastin. Amazon scraps secret ai recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*, 2018. [2](#)
- [14] D. K. Dennis, S. Gopinath, C. Gupta, A. Kumar, A. Kusupati, S. Patil, and H. Simhadri. Edgectl machine learning for resource-constrained edge devices. *URL https://github.com/Microsoft/EdgeML*. Retrieved January, 2020. [1](#)
- [15] E. L. Denton, W. Zaremba, J. Bruna, Y. LeCun, and R. Fergus. Exploiting linear structure within convolutional networks for efficient evaluation. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1269–1277, 2014. [2](#)
- [16] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. [1](#)
- [17] X. Dong, J. Huang, Y. Yang, and S. Yan. More is less: A more complicated network with less inference complexity. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5840–5848, 2017. [1](#)
- [18] J. Frankle and M. Carbin. The lottery ticket hypothesis: Training pruned neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03635*, 2018. [1](#)
- [19] R. Girshick. Fast r-cnn. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1440–1448, 2015. [2](#)
- [20] Y. Gong, L. Liu, M. Yang, and L. Bourdev. Compressing deep convolutional networks using vector quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6115*, 2014. [1](#)
- [21] R. Gruetzmacher, A. Gupta, and D. Paradice. 3d deep learning for detecting pulmonary nodules in ct scans. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 25(10):1301–1310, 2018. [2](#)
- [22] S. Han, J. Kang, H. Mao, Y. Hu, X. Li, Y. Li, D. Xie, H. Luo, S. Yao, Y. Wang, et al. Ese: Efficient speech recognition engine with sparse LSTM on FPGA. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, pages 75–84. ACM, 2017. [1](#)
- [23] S. Han, X. Liu, H. Mao, J. Pu, A. Pedram, M. A. Horowitz, and W. J. Dally. Eie: efficient inference engine on compressed deep neural network. In *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 243–254. IEEE, 2016. [1](#)
- [24] S. Han, H. Mao, and W. J. Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*, 2015. [2](#)
- [25] S. Han, J. Pool, J. Tran, and W. Dally. Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1135–1143, 2015. [1, 2](#)
- [26] D. Harwell. A face-scanning algorithm increasingly decides whether you deserve the job. *The Washington Post*, *URL https://wapo.st/2X3bupO*, 2019. [2](#)
- [27] B. Hassibi, D. G. Stork, and G. Wolff. Optimal brain surgeon: Extensions and performance comparisons. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 263–270, 1994. [2](#)
- [28] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. [7](#)
- [29] A. A. Heydari, C. A. Thompson, and A. Mehmood. Softadapt: Techniques for adaptive loss weighting of neural networks with multi-part loss functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.12355*, 2019. [6](#)
- [30] G. Hinton, O. Vinyals, and J. Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015. [2, 3, 5](#)

- [31] S. Hooker, N. Moorosi, G. Clark, S. Bengio, and E. Denton. Characterising bias in compressed models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03058*, 2020. 2, 3, 4
- [32] H. Hu, R. Peng, Y.-W. Tai, and C.-K. Tang. Network trimming: A data-driven neuron pruning approach towards efficient deep architectures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.03250*, 2016. 1, 3
- [33] C. Huang, S. Zhai, W. Talbott, M. A. Bautista, S.-Y. Sun, C. Guestrin, and J. Susskind. Addressing the loss-metric mismatch with adaptive loss alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.05895*, 2019. 4
- [34] G. Huang, Z. Liu, L. Van Der Maaten, and K. Q. Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017. 7
- [35] N. Inc. *Sparsity Enables 50x Performance Acceleration in Deep Learning Networks*, 2020 (accessed Nov 16, 2020). 2
- [36] W. Inc. *Waymo Releases A Large Dataset For Autonomous Driving*, 25 June 2019. 1
- [37] Y. Jang, H. Lee, S. J. Hwang, and J. Shin. Learning what and where to transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.05901*, 2019. 3
- [38] N. K. Jha, S. Mittal, and G. Mattela. The ramifications of making deep neural networks compact. In *2019 32nd International Conference on VLSI Design and 2019 18th International Conference on Embedded Systems (VLSID)*, pages 215–220, 2019. 2
- [39] V. Joseph, G. L. Gopalakrishnan, S. Muralidharan, M. Garland, and A. Garg. A programmable approach to neural network compression. *IEEE Micro*, 40(5):17–25, 2020. 2
- [40] V. Joseph, S. Muralidharan, and M. Garland. Condensa: Programmable model compression. <https://nvlabs.github.io/condensa/>, 2019. [Online; accessed 1-July-2019]. 3
- [41] A. Kendall and Y. Gal. What uncertainties do we need in bayesian deep learning for computer vision? In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5574–5584, 2017. 2
- [42] J. Kossaifi, A. Toisoul, A. Bulat, Y. Panagakis, T. Hospedales, and M. Pantic. Factorized higher-order cnns with an application to spatio-temporal emotion estimation, 2020. 2
- [43] A. Krizhevsky, V. Nair, and G. Hinton. The cifar-10 dataset. online: <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/kriz/cifar.html>, 55, 2014. 6
- [44] A. Kusupati, M. Singh, K. Bhatia, A. Kumar, P. Jain, and M. Varma. Fastgrnn: A fast, accurate, stable and tiny kilo-byte sized gated recurrent neural network. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9017–9028, 2018. 1
- [45] V. Lebedev, Y. Ganin, M. Rakhuba, I. Oseledets, and V. Lempitsky. Speeding-up convolutional neural networks using fine-tuned cp-decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6553*, 2014. 2
- [46] Y. LeCun, J. S. Denker, and S. A. Solla. Optimal brain damage. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 598–605, 1990. 2
- [47] H. Li, A. Kadav, I. Durdanovic, H. Samet, and H. P. Graf. Pruning filters for efficient convnets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08710*, 2016. 3
- [48] J. Li, Q. Qi, J. Wang, C. Ge, Y. Li, Z. Yue, and H. Sun. Oicrs: Out-in-channel sparsity regularization for compact deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7046–7055, 2019. 3
- [49] Y. Li, S. Gu, C. Mayer, L. V. Gool, and R. Timofte. Group sparsity: The hinge between filter pruning and de-composition for network compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8018–8027, 2020. 3, 7
- [50] J.-H. Luo, J. Wu, and W. Lin. Thinet: A filter level pruning method for deep neural network compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06342*, 2017. 1
- [51] J. S. McCarley, R. Chakravarti, and A. Sil. Structured pruning of a bert-based question answering model, 2020. 1
- [52] P. Molchanov, S. Tyree, T. Karras, T. Aila, and J. Kautz. Pruning convolutional neural networks for resource efficient inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.06440*, 2016. 1
- [53] NHTSA. Technical report, u.s. department of transportation, national highway traffic, tesla crash preliminary evaluation report safety administration. *PE 16-007*, Jan 2017. 1, 2
- [54] L. Oakden-Rayner, J. Dunnmon, G. Carneiro, and C. Ré. Hidden stratification causes clinically meaningful failures in machine learning for medical imaging. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*, pages 151–159, 2020. 2
- [55] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Kopf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. 7
- [56] A. Polyak and L. Wolf. Channel-level acceleration of deep face representations. *IEEE Access*, 3:2163–2175, 2015. 1
- [57] A. Renda, J. Frankle, and M. Carbin. Comparing rewinding and fine-tuning in neural network pruning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02389*, 2020. 3, 8
- [58] A. Romero, N. Ballas, S. E. Kahou, A. Chassang, C. Gatta, and Y. Bengio. Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550*, 2014. 3
- [59] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015. 7
- [60] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, et al. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International journal of computer vision*, 115(3):211–252, 2015. 6
- [61] Z. Wang, J. Wohlwend, and T. Lei. Structured pruning of large language models, 2019. 1

- [62] W. Wen, C. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Chen, and H. Li. Learning structured sparsity in deep neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2074–2082, 2016. 3
- [63] M. Wilmanski, C. Kreucher, and A. Hero. Complex input convolutional neural networks for wide angle sar atr. In *2016 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*, pages 1037–1041. IEEE, 2016. 2
- [64] H. Xie, D. Yang, N. Sun, Z. Chen, and Y. Zhang. Automated pulmonary nodule detection in ct images using deep convolutional neural networks. *Pattern Recognition*, 85:109–119, 2019. 2
- [65] Q. Xie, M.-T. Luong, E. Hovy, and Q. V. Le. Self-training with noisy student improves imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10687–10698, 2020. 1
- [66] S. Xie, R. Girshick, P. Dollár, Z. Tu, and K. He. Aggregated residual transformations for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1492–1500, 2017. 7
- [67] J. Xue, J. Li, and Y. Gong. Restructuring of deep neural network acoustic models with singular value decomposition. In *Interspeech*, pages 2365–2369, 2013. 2
- [68] L. W. Yang and C. Y. Su. Low-cost cnn design for intelligent surveillance system. In *2018 International Conference on System Science and Engineering (ICSSE)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2018. 1
- [69] J. Yoon and S. J. Hwang. Combined group and exclusive sparsity for deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3958–3966, 2017. 3
- [70] S. Zagoruyko and N. Komodakis. Paying more attention to attention: Improving the performance of convolutional neural networks via attention transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03928*, 2016. 3
- [71] T. Zhang, K. Zhang, S. Ye, J. Li, J. Tang, W. Wen, X. Lin, M. Fardad, and Y. Wang. Adam-ADMM: A unified, systematic framework of structured weight pruning for DNNs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.11091*, 2018. 3
- [72] C. Zhu, S. Han, H. Mao, and W. J. Dally. Trained ternary quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.01064*, 2016. 1
- [73] Z. Zhuang, M. Tan, B. Zhuang, J. Liu, Y. Guo, Q. Wu, J. Huang, and J. Zhu. Discrimination-aware channel pruning for deep neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 883–894, 2018. 3

A. Additional Experimental Results

A.1. Results on CIFAR-10

A.1.1 DenseNet




Figure 6: DenseNet results on CIFAR-10

A.1.2 ResNet-20




Figure 7: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet-20 (CIFAR-10)

A.1.3 ResNeXt-20




Figure 8: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNeXt-20 (CIFAR-10)

A.1.4 ResNet-56




Figure 9: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet-56 (CIFAR-10)

A.1.5 ResNet-164




Figure 10: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet-164 (CIFAR-10)

A.1.6 ResNeXt-164




Figure 11: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNeXt-164 (CIFAR-10)

A.2. Results on CIFAR-100

A.2.1 ResNet-20




Figure 12: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet-20 (CIFAR-100)

A.2.2 ResNeXt-20




Figure 13: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNeXt-20 (CIFAR-100)

A.2.3 ResNet-164




Figure 14: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNet-164 (CIFAR-100)

A.2.4 ResNeXt-164




Figure 15: Performance of each loss+optimizer combination on ResNeXt-164 (CIFAR-100)

A.3. Results on Brain MRI FLAIR Segmentation




Figure 16: CIP reduction on a small slice of Brain MRI images. First row represents the uncompressed model, second row represents the model compressed using Uniform (CE), third row represents the model compressed using Uniform (MSE), while the fourth row represents the model compressed using Uniform (CE, MSE). Red contour represents the prediction while the green contour represents the ground-truth.