

Two-Stage Architectural Fine-Tuning with Neural Architecture Search using Early-Stopping in Image Classification

Youngkee Kim[†]

Won Joon Yun[†]

Youn Kyu Lee[°]

Joongheon Kim[†]

Abstract—Deep neural networks (NN) perform well in various tasks (e.g., computer vision) because of the convolutional neural networks (CNN). However, the difficulty of gathering quality data in the industry field hinders the practical use of NN. To cope with this issue, the concept of transfer learning (TL) has emerged, which leverages the fine-tuning of NNs trained on large-scale datasets in data-scarce situations. Therefore, this paper suggests a *two-stage architectural fine-tuning* method for image classification, inspired by the concept of neural architecture search (NAS). One of the main ideas of our proposed method is a *mutation* with base architectures, which reduces the search cost by using given architectural information. Moreover, an *early-stopping* is also considered which directly reduces NAS costs. Experimental results verify that our proposed method reduces computational and searching costs by up to 28.2% and 22.3%, compared to existing methods.

Index Terms—Neural architecture search (NAS), transfer learning, deep learning, image classification

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, computer vision shows ground-breaking improvement leveraging deep neural networks (NN). Especially, convolutional neural networks (CNN) enable to extract spatial features of images. As a result, CNN exhibits high performance on various computer vision tasks, e.g., image classification [1], state representation in reinforcement learning (RL) [2], super-resolution [3], and object detection [4]. In general, an NN is trained with vast amounts of data to learn specific knowledge and its performance depends on the quality of the data. The data-driven nature of NNs hinders practical applications for computer vision tasks in various industries due to data scarcity [5], [6]. Furthermore, even if a sufficient amount of data is collected, additional costs are required for manual labeling [7]. Consequently, the lack of labeled real-world data impedes the image processing ability of NNs in the field.

To cope with the problem, the concept of transfer learning (TL) has emerged and applied to various fields [8], [9]. Describing TL in a nutshell, TL leverages pretrained knowledge of NNs on a large (source) dataset for a similar task on another small (target) dataset.

Fine-tuning is a method to adjust the pretrained NN to the target dataset for better performing [10]. A typical fine-tuning method is to fix some parameters of a pretrained NN while others are updated by retraining on the target dataset.

Although the effectiveness of fine-tuning is well known, most methods are limited to the tuning of learnable parameters.

Neural architecture search (NAS) is an emerging research field, which aims to design novel NN architectures with automated pipelines. The concept of search space with an RL-based controller has been introduced by [11], and NASNet [12] has achieved better accuracy of discovered architecture than manually designed architectures. However, despite the remarkable performance of searched architecture through intuitive sampling and evaluating processes, it is difficult to apply NAS to practical tasks due to the enormous computation and search time. To address this issue, ENAS proposes a parameter sharing method, which is focused on reducing the huge computational cost caused by the iterative training and validation process for each candidate architecture [13]. All possible architectures within the search space are combined to make an over-parameterized NN called super-network (supernet). The RL-based controller continuously samples sub-networks (subnets) from the supernet to train and validate the performance. The trained parameters of each subnet are reflected in the supernet for reuse in subsequent training. ENAS successfully reduces total search time with the parameter sharing technique.

Suppose that a driver has a mission to get to an unknown destination, and he/she can determine which way to go at every moment. It is clear that the driver will be able to reach the destination given sufficient time, but otherwise, it is not guaranteed. In this case, the driver is more likely to arrive sooner if he/she knows in advance the destination of another driver with a similar purpose. Motivated by this nature, this paper elaborates on a *two-stage architectural fine-tuning* method, which utilizes prior knowledge from validated reference architectures to define efficient search space for target tasks. Empirical results corroborate the efficacy of our proposed method compared to conventional fine-tuning methods [14], [15].

II. TWO-STAGE ARCHITECTURAL FINE-TUNING

Fig. 1 presents the process of our proposed *two-stage architectural fine-tuning* method. To study the feasibility of our proposed fine-tuning method for the image classification task, we consider a TL scenario that transfers knowledge of NNs trained on ImageNet (i.e., source dataset) to CIFAR10 (i.e., target dataset). The purpose of the first stage is to figure out the optimal architecture for the target dataset from the search space represented as a supernet. The supernet and the subnet sampling controller are trained alternately in this stage. The second stage (i.e., TL) starts after obtaining the

[†] Youngkee Kim, Won Joon Yun and Joongheon Kim are with the School of Electrical Engineering, Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea felixkim@korea.ac.kr, ywjoon95@korea.ac.kr, joongheon@korea.ac.kr

[°] Youn Kyu Lee is with Department of Computer Engineering, Hongik University, Seoul, Republic of Korea younkyul@hongik.ac.kr




Fig. 1. Overview of proposed two-stage architectural fine-tuning process.




Fig. 2. Search space definition.

TABLE I
THE NUMBER OF SUBNETS IN EACH SEARCH SCOPE.

Search scope	ENAS Model	
	ENASResNet18	ENASResNet50
Small	2^4	2^3
Medium	2^8	2^9
Large	2^{12}	2^{13}
Full	2^{16}	2^{16}

optimal architecture to be fine-tuned by retraining on the target dataset. More details of each stage are described in the next.

Architectural fine-tuning stage. This stage consists of two processes; (i) search space definition and (ii) the proposed architectural fine-tuning using the *early-stopping*.

Search space: We define the search space as a set of all possible candidate architectures, N subnets, which is denoted as $\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$. Consider the search space is large enough (e.g., $N \geq 2^{50}$), the possibility of containing an optimal architecture in the search space increases, i.e., $p(s^* \in \mathcal{S}) \simeq 1$, where s^* denotes an optimal architecture. Even

so, a vast search space causes high costs (i.e., computing resources and time) to find the optimal subnet architecture, which is very detrimental to search performance. Therefore, we propose a novel search space definition with *mutation* as shown in Fig. 2. First, a base model architecture is provided to serve as a starting point for the architecture search. We choose ResNet-18 as our base architecture due to its relatively light weight and good performance for the image classification task on ImageNet. Then, a mutable block is designed by a layer-level *mutation rule*. The layer-level approach is applicable to diverse base architectures because layer operations are minimal building units of NNs. We design a *mutation rule* that can replace the kernel size of each 3×3 convolutional layer in unit blocks of ResNet-18 (i.e., basic block) with 5×5 . Considering different sizes of each kernel leads to the variation of receptive fields that affects the performance of CNNs [16]. The remaining decision is to select the level of search scope, which finalizes the search space by setting the range for applying the *mutation rule* to the base architecture. We define the search scope for ResNet-18 into four levels (e.g., small, medium, large and full) inspired by the fact that ResNet consists of four sequential modules [17]. Each level of scope gradually expands at the end of the given architecture, based on the knowledge that shallow layers of NN extract general features which is helpful for TL [15]. The *mutation rule* turns unit blocks within the search scope into mutable blocks, forming a supernet for the sampling controller to explore. In the case of medium scope with ResNet-18, the last four basic blocks are included in the search scope. The remaining blocks are set immutable in both architecture and parameters during the search process. Table I represents the total number of candidates to be explored according to the base architecture and the search scope.

Architectural fine-tuning using early-stopping: To search for the optimal architecture from the search space, we utilize an RL-based subnet sampling controller as depicted in Fig.1. The controller consists of stacked long short-term memory

(LSTM) cells predicting choices for the operation of each mutable layer through softmax classifiers and embedding layers. Note that π_θ denotes the parameterized controller. The controller takes the previous state-action history τ_{t-1} , and then returns action and the current state-action history τ_t , which is written as follows:

$$a_t = \arg \max_{\mathbf{a}} \pi_\theta(a_t | \tau_{t-1}), \forall a_t \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (1)$$

$$\tau_t = \text{LSTM}_\theta(\tau_{t-1}), \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \pi_\theta(a_t | \tau_{t-1}) = \text{Softmax}(\text{FC}(\text{LSTM}(\tau_{t-1}))), \quad (3)$$

where LSTM, *Softmax* and FC stand for the LSTM model, a softmax activation function and a fully connected layer, respectively. The objective of the first stage is to maximize the expected discounted returns, which is written as follows:

$$G_i = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=i}^{\lceil \log_2 N \rceil} \gamma^{t-i} \cdot r(\tau_{t-1}, a_t) \cdot \pi_\theta(a_t | \tau_{t-1}) \right], \quad (4)$$

where γ stands for the discounted factor, and the reward function $r(\tau_{t-1}, a_t)$ is calculated by reflecting the test accuracy of sampled candidate architectures (i.e., subnets). Note that τ_0 is identical to the initial state. To maximize the discounted cumulative reward G_1 , we adopt REINFORCE algorithm [18] as follows:

$$J(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^{\lceil \log_2 N \rceil} [\log \pi_\theta(a_t | \tau_{t-1}) \cdot G_t]. \quad (5)$$

After updating the set of controller parameters θ , the controller samples an action set $\mathbf{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_{\lceil \log_2 N \rceil}\}$. The subnet sampler samples a subnet by selecting each convolutional operation for mutable layers corresponding to \mathbf{A} . Then, the subnet is trained with the dataset via stochastic gradient descent (SGD) of the cross-entropy function. Note that the parameters of the subnet are completely synchronized with the supernet.

The supernet is trained simultaneously while the controller is being trained, which results in the non-stationarity of the reward. To handle this problem, we propose an *early-stopping* method that considers the action distribution as well as the cumulative reward of the controller. The controller randomly samples operations at first, but as it trains, the frequency of choosing a particular operation for each mutable layer increases. Based on this observation, we determine when to quit the architectural fine-tuning stage according to the action distribution tendency and the total reward of the controller. The proposed *early-stopping* approach can save the search cost in the architectural fine-tuning stage.

Transfer learning stage. After obtaining the optimal architecture for image classification on the target dataset, the next step is to adjust the parameters of searched NN to the target dataset. We apply the well-known TL method to verify the transferability of newly discovered NN [15]. The front part of the NN loads and freezes pretrained parameters to leverage the general knowledge from the source dataset. On the other hand, the parameters of the rear part are updated by retraining

TABLE II
DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT.

Specifications	Settings
OS	Linux, Ubuntu 20.04 LTS
RAM	128GB (32GB×4)
CPU	Intel Xeon E5-2683 V3 (×2)
GPU	NVIDIA RTX 2080 TI (×3)
GPGPU	CUDA 11.1
Dev. environment	Python v3.8.10
DL framework	Pytorch v1.8.0
NAS framework	NNI v2.4

on the target dataset to extract data-specific features. At this stage, the range of layers to be fine-tuned is identical to the search scope of the previous stage. Note that only learnable parameters within the retraining scope are fine-tuned, and architectural parameters are never modified.

III. EXPERIMENTS


Experimental Setup. To verify our main ideas, we design the comparison method as vanilla TL. Vanilla TL does not require any NAS method but fine-tunes last k layers [15]. The effectiveness of NAS can be explained by comparing our proposed method with vanilla TL. Furthermore, we investigate the feasibility of the *mutation rule* and *early-stopping*. We also conduct an additional experiment with ResNet-50 as a base model to explain the generalizability. Note that this paper considers the image classification task. The detailed experiment setup and environment are shown in Table II and Table III.

Ablation study on NAS. We corroborate the effectiveness of NAS by comparing the *two-stage architectural fine-tuning* method with vanilla TL. We compare the determined ResNet architecture, ENASResNet, to vanilla ResNet. Note that the ENASResNet is derived from the first stage of our proposed method. Both architectures are fine-tuned to the CIFAR10 (i.e., target dataset) based on identical parameters pretrained on the ImageNet (i.e., source dataset). Fig. 3(a) shows the test accuracy of two NNs. The proposed ENASResNet-18 achieves 90% test accuracy with 2.8×10^4 epochs, where vanilla ResNet-18 reaches the identical performance with 3.9×10^4 . In addition, the ENASResNet-18 achieves the final accuracy of 91% with 5.2×10^4 epochs, whereas vanilla ResNet-18 requires 7.9×10^4 epochs. The final performance of the two architectures is almost the same, where the performance difference is just 0.02%, which is negligible. However, the convergence speed of the proposed ENASResNet-18 requires only 65.9%–71.8% computing cost of Vanilla TL.


Feasibility study on early-stopping. We investigate the feasibility of the *early-stopping* method. To verify the *early-stopping*, we trace the sampled subnet $\mathbf{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_K\}$, and then represent with a probability distribution. In addition, the total reward is an important criterion for determining whether the controller converges to the optimum. Fig. 4(a) shows the action distribution and the relative total reward of the subnet sampling controller. Note that the white heat

TABLE III
DETAILS ON EXPERIMENT SETUP.

Parameters	Values
RL controller learning rate	3.5×10^{-4}
RL controller optimizer	Adam
Supernet learning rate	5×10^{-2}
Supernet optimizer	SGD
Total number of training iterations	10^5
Number of iterations per epoch	391
Batch size	64
Source dataset	ImageNet
Target dataset	CIFAR10




(a) ENASResNet-18.




(b) ENASResNet-50.

Fig. 3. Test accuracy results.

map cell represents $p(a_k = 1) \simeq 0$, and the black heat map cell stand for $p(a_k = 1) \simeq 1$, respectively. In addition, the relative total reward is normalized to $\mathbb{R}[0, 1]$. As shown in Fig. 4(a), the actions of the controller are fixed from 140 subnet sampling times. In other words, the subnet is determined with $s^* \mapsto \mathbf{A}^* \equiv \{1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1\}$. However, the total reward converges at 180 subnet sampling times. Note that the sustained supernet update causes a non-stationary reward function which is modeled with the test accuracy of the sampled subnet. The reward increasing pattern from 140 to 180 subnet sampling times occurs for the aforementioned reason. Thus, it is justifiable that the controller stops searching when the action set \mathbf{A} is fixed. As a result, the *early-stopping* method can reduce searching



(a) ENASResNet-18 with medium search scope.



(b) ENASResNet-50 with medium search scope.

Fig. 4. The heatmap and reward results.

costs by up to 22.3%.

Feasibility study on various models. To benchmark our proposed method, we consider ResNet-50 for generalizability. The *mutation rule* of ResNet-50 is designed to the same as ResNet-18, $\forall a_t \in \{3 \times 3, 5 \times 5\} \mapsto \{0, 1\}$. However, the search space is totally new due to the difference in architectural information (e.g., the number of unit blocks, layers in each block) between ResNet-18 and ResNet-50. Note that the architecture of baseline is ResNet-50 in this study. As shown in Fig. 3(b), the proposed ENASResNet-50 outperforms vanilla ResNet-50 corresponding to the final accuracy up to 2.0% and the convergence speed. Fig. 4(b) shows the experiment results corresponding to the heatmap of action distribution with reward pattern. The optimal subnet s^* is obtained at 120 subnet sampling times as shown in Fig. 4(b). We do not find the reward convergence until given 10^5 local iterations.

IV. CONCLUSION

TL is a key to extending the practical use of NNs for computer vision tasks in data-poor fields. In this study, we elaborate the *two-stage architectural fine-tuning* method to adjust architectural factors as well as weight parameters of NNs for TL in image classification. First, we propose a novel search space definition with base architectures, *mutation rules*, and search scope. Subsequently, we discover an optimal architecture for fine-tuning from the search space with an effective NAS technique using the *early-stopping* method. The extensive simulations show that our proposed method is an energy-efficient solution and superiors to existing TL methods in various NN models.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hankyul Baek, Won Joon Yun, Yunseok Kwak, Soyi Jung, Mingyue Ji, Mehdi Bennis, Jihong Park, and Joongheon Kim, “Joint superposition coding and training for federated learning over multi-width neural networks,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2112.02543, December 2021.
- [2] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin A. Riedmiller, “Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1312.5602, December 2013.
- [3] Minseok Choi, Won Joon Yun, and Joongheon Kim, “Delay-sensitive and power-efficient quality control of dynamic video streaming using adaptive super-resolution,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2110.05783, October 2021.
- [4] Zhong-Qiu Zhao, Peng Zheng, Shou-tao Xu, and Xindong Wu, “Object detection with deep learning: A review,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 3212–3232, November 2019.
- [5] Sjors Van Riel, Fons van der Sommen, Sveta Zinger, Erik J. Schoon, and Peter H. N. de With, “Automatic detection of early esophageal cancer with CNNs using transfer learning,” in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, Athens, Greece, October 2018, pp. 1383–1387.
- [6] Jihong Park, Sumudu Samarakoon, Anis Elgabli, Joongheon Kim, Mehdi Bennis, Seong-Lyun Kim, and M erouane Debbah, “Communication-efficient and distributed learning over wireless networks: Principles and applications,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 5, pp. 796–819, May 2021.
- [7] Adam Novozamsky, D. Vit, Filip Sroubek, J. Franc, M. Krbalek, Zuzana Bilkova, and Barbara Zitova, “Automated object labeling for cnn-based image segmentation,” in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, October 2020, pp. 2036–2040.
- [8] Fuzhen Zhuang, Zhiyuan Qi, Keyu Duan, Dongbo Xi, Yongchun Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, Hui Xiong, and Qing He, “A comprehensive survey on transfer learning,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109, no. 1, pp. 43–76, January 2020.
- [9] Fouzia Altaf, Syed M. S. Islam, Naeem Khalid Janjua, and Naveed Akhtar, “Boosting deep transfer learning for covid-19 classification,” in *Proc. of the IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, AK, USA, September 2021, pp. 210–214.
- [10] Simon Kornblith, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V. Le, “Do better imagenet models transfer better?,” in *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, CA, USA, June 2019, pp. 2661–2671.
- [11] Barret Zoph and Quoc V. Le, “Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning,” in *Proc. of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, Toulon, France, April 2017.
- [12] Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V. Le, “Learning transferable architectures for scalable image recognition,” in *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, UT, USA, June 2018, pp. 8697–8710.
- [13] Hieu Pham, Melody Y. Guan, Barret Zoph, Quoc V. Le, and Jeff Dean, “Efficient neural architecture search via parameter sharing,” in *Proc. of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Stockholm, Sweden, July 2018, pp. 4092–4101.
- [14] Jason Yosinski, Jeff Clune, Yoshua Bengio, and Hod Lipson, “How transferable are features in deep neural networks?,” in *Proc. of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, Quebec, Canada, December 2014, pp. 3320–3328.
- [15] Mingsheng Long, Yue Cao, Jianmin Wang, and Michael I. Jordan, “Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks,” in *Proc. of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, Lille, France, July 2015, pp. 97–105.
- [16] Wenjie Luo, Yujia Li, Raquel Urtasun, and Richard S. Zemel, “Understanding the effective receptive field in deep convolutional neural networks,” in *Proc. of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, Barcelona, Spain, December 2016, pp. 4898–4906.
- [17] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, NV, USA, June 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [18] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour, “Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation,” in *Proc. of the Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, CO, USA, December 1999, pp. 1057–1063.