

# DECO: Query-Based End-to-End Object Detection with ConvNets

Xinghao Chen<sup>1†</sup> (✉) Siwei Li<sup>1,2†</sup> Yijing Yang<sup>1</sup> Yunhe Wang<sup>1</sup> (✉)  
<sup>1</sup> Huawei Noah’s Ark Lab. <sup>2</sup> Tsinghua University.  
 {xinghao.chen, yunhe.wang}@huawei.com

## Abstract

Detection Transformer (DETR) and its variants have shown great potential for accurate object detection in recent years. The mechanism of object query enables DETR family to directly obtain a fixed number of object predictions and streamlines the detection pipeline. Meanwhile, recent studies also reveal that with proper architecture design, convolution networks (ConvNets) also achieve competitive performance with transformers, e.g., ConvNeXt. To this end, in this paper we explore whether we could build a query-based end-to-end object detection framework with ConvNets instead of sophisticated transformer architecture. The proposed framework, i.e., Detection ConvNet (DECO), is composed of a backbone and convolutional encoder-decoder architecture. We carefully design the DECO encoder and propose a novel mechanism for our DECO decoder to perform interaction between object queries and image features via convolutional layers. We compare the proposed DECO against prior detectors on the challenging COCO benchmark. Despite its simplicity, our DECO achieves competitive performance in terms of detection accuracy and running speed. Specifically, with the ResNet-50 and ConvNeXt-Tiny backbone, DECO obtains 38.6% and 40.8% AP on COCO val set with 35 and 28 FPS respectively and outperforms the DETR model. Incorporated with advanced multi-scale feature module, our DECO+ achieves 47.8% AP with 34 FPS. We hope the proposed DECO brings another perspective for designing object detection framework.

## 1. Introduction

Object detection is one of the most foundational computer vision task and is essential for many real-world applications [1, 31, 32, 34]. The object detection pipeline has been developed rapidly, especially in the era of deep learning. Faster R-CNN [34] is one of the most typical two-stage object detectors, which utilizes a coarse-to-fine framework for bounding box prediction. Meanwhile, one-stage detec-




Figure 1. Comparisons of our proposed Detection ConvNets (DECO) and recent detectors on COCO val set. The latency is measured on a NVIDIA V100 GPU.

tors like SSD [22], YOLO series [1, 31, 32] or FCOS [38] etc. simplify the detection pipeline by directly predicting the objects of interest from the image features. Most of the above object detectors are built upon convolutional neural networks (CNNs or ConvNets) and typically the Non-maximum Suppression (NMS) strategy is utilized for post-processing to remove duplicated detection results.

The advancement of deep neural architectures have been benefiting the task of object detection. For example, more powerful architectures usually bring considerably significant improvement for the detection performance [11, 12, 18, 23]. Recently the emergence of vision transformer and its variants [7, 24, 39, 41] have shown prominent performances on image classification tasks and have built a solid foundation for the object detection field. Carion *et al.* [3] proposes the Detection Transformer (DETR) that refactors the object detection pipeline as a set prediction problem and directly obtains a fixed set of objects via a transformer encoder-decoder architecture. This design enables DETR to get rid of the complicated NMS post-processing module and results in a query-based end-to-end object detection pipeline. There are quite a lot variants to improve DETR via different aspects, e.g., training convergence [10, 28], multi-scale features and deformable attention [50] or better query strat-

† Equal contributions. ✉ Corresponding authors.

egy [16, 21, 42, 44], etc.

Meanwhile, some recent work rethinks the strong performance and reveal that the pure ConvNets could also achieve competitive performance via proper architecture design [25, 43]. For example, ConvNeXt [25] compete favorably with vision transformers like Swin Transformer [24] in terms of accuracy and computational cost. Besides, it is common for AI chips that certain operations of attention modules are not well supported. These motivate us to explore one important question in this paper: *could we obtain a query-based end-to-end object detector via pure ConvNets but still enjoys the excellent properties similar to DETR?* There are also several recent attempts for obtaining an end-to-end object detection with fully ConvNets [36, 37, 40]. However, these frameworks are either built upon one-stage detector like FCOS [38] or RetinaNet [20] with one-to-one label assignment strategy and additional complex module like 3D Max Filtering [40], or are basically two-stage framework [37] which hinders the running speed and deployment efficiency.

In this paper, we proposed **Detection ConvNet (DECO)**, which is a simple yet effective query-based end-to-end object detection framework. Our DECO model enjoys the similar favorable attributes as DETR. For example, using the mechanism of object query, our DECO directly obtains a fixed set of object predictions and also discards the NMS procedure. Moreover, it is stacked with only standard convolutional layers and does not rely on any sophisticated attention modules. To achieve this goal, we first carefully revisit the design of DETR and propose the DECO encoder and decoder architectures as shown in Fig. 2. The DECO encoder is built upon ConNeXt blocks and no positional encodings are necessary since ConvNets are variant to input permutation. The decoder is the most essential part of DETR variants to enable the interaction of object queries and image features, so that object queries can capture the necessary information to make the final object prediction. We abstract the general architecture of decoder and divide it into two components, *i.e.*, Self-Interaction Module (SIM) and Cross-Interaction Module (CIM). In DETR, the SIM and CIM is implemented with multi-head self-attention and cross-attention mechanism, while in our proposed DECO, the SIM is stacked with simple depthwise and  $1 \times 1$  convolutions. We further propose a novel SIM mechanism for our DECO to perform interaction between object queries and image features via convolutional layers as well as simple upsampling and pooling operations.

We evaluate the proposed DECO on the challenging object detection benchmark, *i.e.*, COCO [19]. Experimental results demonstrate that our DECO achieves competitive performance in terms of detection accuracy and running speed, as shown in Fig. 1. Specifically, with the ResNet-50 and ConvNeXt-Tiny backbone, DECO obtains 38.6% and 40.8% AP on COCO *val* set with 35 and 28 FPS respec-

tively and outperforms the DETR model. Extensive ablation studies are also conducted to provide more discussions and insights about the design choices.

The main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel query-based end-to-end object detection framework built with standard convolutions, *i.e.*, Detection ConvNet (DECO), which is simple yet effective. We hope it brings another perspective for the design of future object detection pipelines.
- We carefully design a novel DECO decoder architecture to enable the object queries to fully interact with image features to obtain better detection performance.
- Our DECO is extensively evaluated on the challenging COCO benchmark and obtains competitive performance with prior detectors like DETR and Faster R-CNN in terms of accuracy and speed.

## 2. Related Work

**Object Detection.** Object detection is one of the most foundational computer vision task and has attracted large amount of research interest from the computer vision community [3, 4, 13, 27, 30, 34, 46]. The object detection pipeline has been developed rapidly, especially in the era of deep learning. Faster R-CNN [34] is one of the most typical two-stage object detectors, which first generates region proposal and extracts regional features for final bounding box prediction. Two-stage detection pipeline has been improve from various aspects [2, 30]. Meanwhile, one-stage detectors like SSD [22], YOLO series [1, 31–33], CenterNet [8, 47] or FCOS [38] simplify the detection pipeline by directly predicting the objects of interest from the image features [14, 15, 17, 26, 45, 48, 49].

**Transformer-based End-to-End Detectors.** The pioneering work DETR [3] utilizes a transformer encoder-decoder architecture and models the object detection as a set prediction problem. It directly predicts a fixed number of objects and get rid of the need for hand-designed non-maximum suppression (NMS) [29]. More follow-up studies [5, 10, 28, 42] have made various optimizations and extensions based on the original DETR and achieve strong detection performance. For example, Deformable DETR [50] only attends to a small set of key sampling points by introducing multi-scale deformable self/cross-attention to improve the detection accuracy as well as the training convergence. DAB-DETR [21] improves DETR by using box coordinates as queries in decoder. DN-DETR and DINO [16, 44] introduce several novel techniques, including query denoising, mixed query selection *etc.*, to achieve strong detection performance. RT-DETR [27] designs the first real-time end-to-end detector, in which an efficient multi-scale hybrid encoder and an IoU-aware query selection are proposed. One of the most important properties for DETR-based detectors is the query-based scheme for pro-




Figure 2. The overall architecture of DETR [3] and our proposed **Detection ConvNet (DECO)**. Our DECO is a simple yet effective query-based end-to-end object detection framework and enjoys the similar favorable attributes as DETR. Moreover, it is stacked with only standard convolutional layers and does not rely on any sophisticated attention modules.

ducing the final predictions, which streamlines the detection pipeline and make it an end-to-end detector.

**ConvNet-based End-to-End Detectors.** Inspired by the success of transformer-based detector like DETR variants, several studies also attempt to remove the post-processing NMS by introducing one-to-one assignment strategy [36, 40] and set prediction loss [37]. OneNet [36] systemically explores the importance of classification cost in one-to-one matching and applies it on typical ConvNet-based detectors like RetinaNet [20] and FCOS [38]. DeFCN [40] introduces a new strategy of label assignment to enhance the matching cost. Sparse R-CNN [37] integrates the fixed number of learnable anchor to a two-stage detection pipeline. However, it interacts query and RoI feature by the dynamic head which is a kind of learnable matrix multiplication.

ConvNets have been demonstrated to have competitive performance on various tasks and are deployment-friendly in most hardware platforms [25, 43]. Therefore, in this paper we would like to design a DETR-like detection pipeline but built with standard convolutions, which could inherit both the advantages of ConvNets and the favorable properties of the DETR framework.

### 3. Approach

In this section, we first revisit the DETR models, and provide an overview of our proposed DECO framework. The architecture design of the DECO encoder and decoder is then elaborated in details.

#### 3.1. Preliminary

Object detection pipeline has been studied for decades. Recently Carion *et al.* [3] proposes the Detection Transformer (DETR) that models object detection as a set prediction problem and directly produces a fixed set of objects. As shown in Fig. 2 (a), DETR first utilizes a back-

bone to extract image features, and feeds them into a transformer encoder and decoder architecture. A fixed small set of learned object queries interact with the global image context to directly output the final set of object predictions. DETR streamlines the end-to-end object detection pipeline and has attracted great research interest due to the good accuracy and run-time performance [5, 6, 44, 50] for object detection. Although transformers have shown great power in computer vision tasks like image classification, object detection, segmentation *etc.*, there are also some recent work that reveal the potential of ConvNet-based architecture as the common backbone, *e.g.*, ConvNext [25] and ConvFormer [43]. In this work we re-examine the DETR design and explore whether a ConvNet-based object detector could inherit the good properties of DETR.

#### 3.2. Overall Framework of DECO

One of the most important properties for DETR-based detectors is the query-based scheme for producing the final predictions. In this way, the object detector could directly obtain a fixed number of objects and gets rid of any hand-designed NMS post-processing. We follow this paradigm to design our Detection ConvNets (DECO), as shown in Fig. 2 (b). DECO also utilizes a CNN backbone to extract features from the input image. Specifically, given a RGB image  $x_{\text{img}} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times H_0 \times W_0}$ , the backbone generates feature map  $f \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H \times W}$  and usually  $H, W = \frac{H_0}{32}, \frac{W_0}{32}$ . The feature map  $f$  are then go through a CNN encoder to obtain the output embeddings  $f_{\text{enc}} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_e \times H \times W}$ . The CNN decoder takes  $f_{\text{enc}}$  as well as a fixed number of learned object queries  $o \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$  as input to make final detection prediction via a feed forward network (FFN), where  $d$  is the size of encoder output embeddings. The detailed architectures of the CNN encoder and decoder will be elaborated in the following sections. We utilize the same prediction loss as




Figure 3. The decoder architecture of of DETR [3] and our proposed DECO. We abstract the general architecture of decoder and divide it into two components, *i.e.*, Self-Interaction Module (SIM) and Cross-Interaction Module (CIM). In DETR the SIM and CIM is implemented with multi-head self-attention and cross-attention mechanism, while in our proposed DECO, the SIM is stacked with simple depthwise and  $1 \times 1$  convolutions. We further propose a novel SIM mechanism for our DECO to perform interaction between object queries and image features via convolutional layers as well as simple upsampling and pooling operations.

in DETR, which uses bipartite matching to find paired predicted and ground truth objects.

### 3.3. DECO Encoder

Similar to DETR, a  $1 \times 1$  convolution is first utilized to reduce the channel dimension of  $f$  from  $C$  to  $d$  and obtain a new feature map  $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times H \times W}$ . In DETR,  $z_0$  is fed into stacked transformer encoder layers, which mainly consists of multi-head self-attention (MHSA) and feed-forward network (FFN) to perform spatial and channel information mixing respectively. Recent work such as ConvNeXt [25] has demonstrated that using stacked depthwise and pointwise convolutions could achieve comparable performance with Transformers. Therefore, we use the ConvNeXt blocks to build our DECO encoder. Specifically, each encoder layer is stacked with a  $7 \times 7$  depthwise convolution, a LayerNorm layer, a  $1 \times 1$  convolution, a GELU activation and another  $1 \times 1$  convolution. To align the FLOPs with DETR, our encoder is made up of three stages with the number of blocks of (2, 6, 2) and the channel dimension of (120, 240, 480), respectively. In DETR, positional encodings are necessary to be added to the input of each transformer encoder layer, since the transformer architecture is permutation-invariant. However, the ConvNet architecture is permutation-variant so that our DECO encoder layers could get rid of any positional encodings.

### 3.4. DECO Decoder

Given a small set of object queries, the decoder in DETR aims to reason the relations of the objects and the global image feature. As shown in Fig. 3 (a), each layer in DETR decoder is mainly composed of a self-interaction module (SIM) and a cross-interaction module (CIM). The self-interaction module (SIM) in original DETR is a multi-head self-attention layer and is responsible for interacting information between the object queries. The cross-interaction module (CIM) is the essential part for DETR decoder, which consists of cross-attention layer to perform interaction between the image embeddings from the output of encoder and the object queries. In this way, the object queries could attend to the global image feature and capture the essential information for each predicted objects. In this section, we aim to explore how to build a decoder with ConvNets while maintaining the capability similar to the DETR decoder.

**Self-interaction module (SIM).** Given  $N$  object queries  $o \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ , we first reshape the queries to  $\mathbb{R}^{w_q \times h_q \times d}$  and feed them into convolutional layers. For example, if we have  $N = 100$  object queries, the query embeddings are reshaped into  $\mathbb{R}^{10 \times 10 \times d}$ . More design choices of reshaping will be discussed in ablation studies. As shown in Fig. 3 (b), the SIM part for DECO decoder is quite similar to the design scheme of DECO encoder, where stacking the depthwise convolution and  $1 \times 1$  convolution could lead to strong

Table 1. Comparisons of our DECO with other detectors on COCO 2017 val set. The FPS we report is the average number for the first 100 images on a NVIDIA V100 GPU.

Model	Backbone	GFLOPs	FPS	AP	AP <sub>50</sub>	AP <sub>75</sub>	AP <sub>S</sub>	AP <sub>M</sub>	AP <sub>L</sub>
Faster R-CNN [34]	R50-FPN	180	26	40.2	61.0	43.8	24.2	43.5	52.0
Faster R-CNN [34]	R101-FPN	246	20	42.0	62.5	45.9	25.2	45.6	54.6
FCOS [38]	R50-FPN	201	23	38.7	57.4	41.8	22.9	42.5	50.1
FCOS [38]	R101-FPN	277	19	39.1	58.3	42.1	22.7	43.3	50.3
RetinaNet [20]	R50-FPN	239	21	37.4	56.7	39.6	20.0	40.7	49.7
RetinaNet [20]	R101-FPN	315	17	38.5	57.6	41.0	21.7	42.8	50.4
Sparse R-CNN [37]	R50-FPN	150	20	37.9	56.0	40.5	20.7	40.0	53.5
OneNet-RetinaNet [36]	R50-FPN	239	21	37.5	55.4	40.7	21.5	40.5	47.4
OneNet-FCOS [36]	R50-FPN	206	26	38.9	57.2	42.2	23.9	41.8	49.4
DeFCN [40]	R50-FPN	–	19	41.4	59.5	45.6	26.1	44.9	52.0
YOLOS-Ti [9]	DeiT-Tiny	21	52	28.7	47.2	28.9	9.7	29.2	46.0
YOLOS-S [9]	DeiT-Small	194	5	36.1	55.7	37.6	15.6	38.3	55.3
YOLOS-B [9]	DeiT-Base	538	2	42.0	62.2	44.4	19.5	45.3	62.1
DETR [3]	R34	88	34	31.6	47.6	33.3	13.3	34.1	49.1
DETR [3]	R50	97	28	39.5	60.3	41.4	17.5	43.0	59.1
DETR [3]	ConvNeXt-T	104	25	42.1	63.6	44.3	18.8	45.5	62.8
<b>DECO (Ours)</b>	R50	103	35	38.6	58.8	41.1	19.5	43.3	55.0
<b>DECO (Ours)</b>	ConvNeXt-T	110	28	40.8	61.5	43.5	20.5	45.7	58.4

capability similar to the self-attention mechanism. We utilize a large kernel convolution up to  $9 \times 9$  to perform long-range perceptual feature extraction.

**Cross-interaction module (CIM).** The CIM mainly takes two features as input, *e.g.*, the image feature embeddings from the output of encoder ( $z_e \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times H \times W}$ ), and the object query embeddings produced from the SIM part ( $o \in \mathbb{R}^{w_q \times h_q \times d}$ ). The cross-attention mechanism in DETR decoder allows each object query to interact with the image features to capture necessary information for object prediction. However, using ConvNets to perform such kind of interaction is not so intuitive. As shown in Fig. 3 (b), we first upsample the object queries  $o$  to obtain  $\hat{o} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times H \times W}$  so that it has the same size with image feature  $z_e$ , *i.e.*,

$$\hat{o} = \text{Upsample}(o). \quad (1)$$

Then the upsampled object queries and the image feature embeddings are fused together using *add* operations, followed by a large kernel depthwise convolution to allow object queries to capture the spatial information from the image feature. The skip connection is all utilized, as shown in the following equation:

$$\hat{o}_f = \hat{o} + \text{dwconv}(\text{Fusion}(\hat{o}, z_e)). \quad (2)$$

The output features further go through another FFN with skip connection. Finally, an adaptive *maxpooling* is utilized to downsample the object queries back to the size of  $\mathbb{R}^{w_q \times h_q \times d}$  and will be further processed by the following decoder layers.

$$\hat{o}_p = \text{Pooling}(\hat{o}_f + \text{FFN}(\hat{o}_f)). \quad (3)$$

Table 2. Comparisons of our DECO+ with other detectors on COCO 2017 val set. The FPS is measured on a V100 GPU. <sup>†</sup>We reported the performance of RT-DETR that does not use deformable attention and denoising training.

Model	Backbone	FPS	AP
Deformable-DETR [50]	R50	16	44.9
Anchor-DETR [42]	R50	19	42.2
DAB-DETR [21]	R50	25	42.2
Conditional-DETR [28]	R50	28	43.0
ViDT [35]	Swin-Nano	31	40.4
RT-DETR <sup>†</sup> [27]	R18	60	41.5
<b>DECO+ (Ours)</b>	R18	66	<b>40.5</b>
<b>DECO+ (Ours)</b>	R50	34	<b>47.8</b>

The final output embeddings of the decoder will be fed into the detection head to obtain the class and bounding box prediction, which is similar to the original DETR.

### 3.5. DECO+

One limitation of original DETR as well as our DECO is the lack of multi-scale feature, which is demonstrated to be important for accurate object detection. Deformable DETR [50] utilizes the multi-scale deformable attention module to aggregate multi-scale features, but this mechanism can not be directly applied to our DECO framework. To equip our DECO with multi-scale feature capability, we utilize the cross-scale feature-fusion module proposed in RT-DETR [27] after obtaining the enhanced global feature from our DECO encoder. More modern techniques for DE-

Table 3. Ablation experiments for different upsampling size of object queries in CIM. Dynamic resizing tends to achieve better performance than resizing into a fixed resolution.

Size	GFLOPs	AP
(20 × 20)	97	34.8
(25 × 38)	103	38.1
(40 × 40)	110	37.2
Dynamic	103	<b>38.6</b>

Table 4. Effect of different number of layers in decoder. Performance starts to saturate with more than 6 decoder layers.

#layers	GFLOPs	FPS	AP
5	101	35	38.3
6	103	35	<b>38.6</b>
7	105	34	38.9

TRs would also be compatible with our DECO, which we leave for future exploration.

## 4. Experiments

In this section, we first evaluate our proposed model on object detection benchmark and compare it against state-of-the-art methods. Extensive ablation studies are also conducted to provide more discussions and insights about the design choices.

### 4.1. Experimental Setting

**Dataset.** All experiments are conducted on the challenging COCO 2017 [19] detection benchmark, which contains about 118K training images and 5K validation samples.

**Training.** Following similar settings as DETR [3], we train the proposed DECO models using AdamW optimizer, with weight decay of  $10^{-4}$  and initial learning rates as  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-5}$  for the encoder-decoder and backbone, respectively. We train our models for 150 epoch and also report the DETR results with 150 epoch using the official code. The learning rate is dropped by a factor of 10 after 100 epochs. We follow the same augmentation scheme as DETR, which includes resizing the input image such that the short side is at least 480 and at most 800 pixels and the long size is at most 1333 pixels, randomly cropping the image such that a training image is cropped with probability 0.5 to a random rectangular patch.

**Evaluation.** We follow the standard COCO evaluation protocol and report the average precision (AP), the AP scores at 0.50, 0.75 and for the small, medium, and large objects, *i.e.*  $AP_{50}$ ,  $AP_{75}$ ,  $AP_S$ ,  $AP_M$  and  $AP_L$ .

### 4.2. Comparisons with State-of-the-arts

We evaluate the proposed DECO on COCO benchmark and compare it with recent competitive object detectors, including DETR [3], YOLOs [9], FCOS [38], Faster R-CNN [34],

Table 5. Ablation studies for different kernel sizes in decoder.

kernel size	5×5	7×7	<b>9×9</b>	11×11	13×13	15×15
AP (%)	37.8	37.9	<b>38.6</b>	38.6	38.4	38.6
GFLOPs	103.35	103.47	103.58	103.70	104.11	104.27

Sparse R-CNN [37], OneNet [36] and DeFCN [40]. Experimental results in terms of detection AP and FLOPs/FPS are shown in Table 1. The FPS we report is the average number of the first 100 images in the COCO 2017 *val* set on a NVIDIA V100 GPU and the FLOPs are computed with the input size of (1280, 800). A more intuitive comparison of the trade-off between AP and FPS is also shown in Fig. 1.

**Comparisons with DETR.** We compare the performance of our DECO and DETR [3] equipped with different backbones, *i.e.*, classical ResNet-50 and more recent and powerful ConvNeXt-Tiny [25]. As shown in Table 1, for both ResNet-50 and ConvNeXt-Tiny backbones, despite higher FLOPs, our DECO obtain faster inference speed (FPS) than DETR. It demonstrates that our pure ConvNet-based architecture is more deployment-friendly than the transformer-based DETR in GPU platform. As also shown in Fig. 1, our DECO has better trade-off between detection accuracy and inference speed. Specifically, our DECO obtains 38.6% AP at 35 FPS and is 7.0% AP better than DETR with ResNet-34 backbone for similar running speed. With ConvNeXt-Tiny [25] backbone, our DECO achieves 40.8% AP at 28 FPS, which is competitive with DETR model.

**Comparisons with Typical Detectors.** We also compare our DECO with several typical object detectors, *e.g.*, Faster R-CNN [34], RetinaNet [20] and FCOS [38]. Note that these detectors are equipped with a feature pyramid network (FPN) to fuse multi-scale features, while our DECO only utilizes single scale feature from the last layer of backbone. Nevertheless, the proposed DECO still outperforms these typical detectors, with a better AP vs. FPS trade-off on COCO *val* set.

**Comparisons with Other End-to-End Detectors.** YOLOs is an encoder-only Transformer architecture for object detection based on the vanilla pre-trained vision transformers. Our DECO models show clear advantage over YOLOs and have similar detection performance while running much faster. We also compare our DECO with recent end-to-end detectors with ConvNets, *e.g.*, Sparse R-CNN [37], OneNet [36] and DeFCN. [40]. As shown in Table 1, our DECO achieves similar AP with Sparse R-CNN [37] and OneNet-RetinaNet [36] but has  $1.75\times$  and  $1.35\times$  FPS. Similarly, our DECO obtains 40.8% AP and 28 FPS while DeFCN [40] only has 19 FPS with similar detection accuracy.

**Comparisons for DECO+.** We compare our DECO+ with recent variants of DETR, *e.g.*, Anchor-DETR [37], Conditional-DETR [36] and ViDT. [40] *etc.* As shown in Table 2, our DECO+ with ResNet-50 Backbone achieves 43.8% AP with 34 FPS on V100 GPU, which is better than




Figure 4. Visualizations of query slots for DETR and our DECO. We can find that both DECO and DETR tend to make different object queries to focus on different patterns in terms of spatial areas and box sizes. Interestingly, we could also observe that the slots of DETR for small objects are spatially unordered while the distributions of each slot for our DECO are spatially ordered for small boxes.

Table 6. Effect of different fusion methods.

Fusion Method	GFLOPS	AP
Element-wise Mult.	103	37.8
Concat-Conv	106	<b>38.6</b>
<b>Element-wise Add</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>38.6</b>

most previous DETR variants. Moreover, ResNet-18 based DECO+ obtains 40.5% AP with 66 FPS, achieving quite similar performance with a variant of RT-DETR [27] that we modified to not use deformable attention and denoising training for fair comparison. Note that deformable attention and denoising training is specifically designed for attention-based architecture, and similar improved strategies for DECO still remains for future exploration.

### 4.3. Ablation Studies

We conduct extensive ablation studies to provide more discussions and insights about different design choices and justify the effectiveness of our proposed method.

**Upsampling Size in CIM.** In CIM, the object queries are first upsampled and then fused with the encoder embeddings to deal with different dimensions. Here we have different design choices, *i.e.*, resizing both the object queries and encoder embeddings to a fixed size before fusion, or directly upsampling the object queries to dynamic size of encoder embeddings, which is related to the resolution of input image. As shown in Table 7, utilizing dynamic size achieves the best performance, since it is more flexible for different input resolution and has no information discarding. Noted that  $(25 \times 38)$  is the average size of COCO training set and it lead to 0.5 AP drop than dynamic way.

**Number of Decoder Layers.** As shown in Table 4, more number of layers in decoder tends to have better performance. However, utilizing 6 decoder layers is a good choice

Table 7. Ablation experiments for different shape of queries.

#queries	Query Shape ( $w_q \times h_q$ )	Ratio	AP
100	<b><math>10 \times 10</math></b>	1:1	<b>38.6</b>
100	$20 \times 5$	4:1	38.3
100	$5 \times 20$	1:4	36.9
300	<b><math>30 \times 10</math></b>	3:1	<b>38.9</b>
300	$20 \times 15$	4:3	38.8

to balance performance and computational cost and we keep this choice following DETR [3].

**Kernel size in decoder.** The motivation for using  $9 \times 9$  dwconv is to enable sufficient receptive field. We conduct ablation experiments to explore the effect of different kernel sizes. As shown in Table 5, using  $3 \times 3$  has unsatisfied performance due to limited receptive field, and enlarging kernel size to  $11 \times 11$  or even  $15 \times 15$  brings negligible improvement.

**Different design choices of fusion method in CIM.** As discussed in Section 3, the upsampled object queries and the image feature embeddings are fused together using *add* operations. Here we conduct ablation studies for other design choices of the fusion method, *e.g.*, using concatenation and convolution, or simple conducting element-wise multiplication for fusion. As shown in Table 6, utilizing element-wise multiplication to fuse the object queries and the image feature embeddings does not obtain better performance. Moreover, using *add* operations achieves similar detection performance with using concatenation and convolution, but has slightly smaller FLOPs.

**Different shapes of object queries.** In our proposed method, the object queries should be in 2D shape of  $w_q \times h_q$  and there are several choices of query shape for  $N$  object queries. For example,  $w_q \times h_q$  could be  $10 \times 10$ ,  $20 \times 5$  or  $5 \times 20$  for  $N = 100$  queries. As shown in Table 7, us-




Figure 5. Qualitative results on COCO *val* set for our DECO with ResNet-50 backbone. DECO performs well on a wide range of objects in different situations, such as crowded, occluded and overlapped scenarios.




Figure 6. Generalization ability to unseen numbers of instances. Our DECO successfully detect all 24 giraffes on the synthetic image where the image of giraffe is repeated for 24 times.

ing  $10 \times 10$  obtains better detection performance. When  $N = 300$ , using query shape of  $30 \times 10$  achieves slightly better performance than  $20 \times 15$ . A typical ratio of image size for COCO could be considered as  $1333 : 800 \approx 1.67$  and we could conclude from Table 7 that better performance is obtained when the query shape is approximately the ratio of input image.

#### 4.4. Analysis and Visualization

**Visualization of Query Slots.** Following the same method in DETR, we visualize the boxes predicted by 20 out of total 100 query slots of our DECO. Each point represents one bounding box prediction and the coordinates are normalized by each image size. Different colors indicate objects with different scales, *e.g.*, green, red and blue refer to small boxes, large horizontal boxes and large vertical boxes, respectively. As shown in Fig. 4, we can find that both DECO and DETR tend to make different object queries to focus on different patterns in terms of spatial areas and box sizes. Interestingly, we could also observe that the slots of DETR for small objects are spatially unordered, which indicates that the prediction of each slot is random in spatial dimension. However, things are a bit different for our DECO,

whose distributions of each slot are spatially ordered for small boxes. This observation is most likely to be related to the cross-interaction mechanism of object queries and image features, where cross-attention module tends to capture global information and our proposed module tends to focus on local interaction through large kernel convolutions.

#### Generalization Ability to Unseen Numbers of Instances.

We also take giraffe category as an example to demonstrate the generalization ability of our DECO to unseen number of instances, since no image in the COCO training set has more than 13 giraffes. As shown in Fig. 6, our DECO successfully detect all 24 giraffes on the synthetic image where the image of giraffe is repeated for 24 times.

**Qualitative Results** Qualitative results on COCO *val* set are shown in Fig. 5. We can observe that our DECO performs well on a wide range of objects in different situations, such as crowded, occluded and overlapped scenarios.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this paper, we aim to explore whether we could build a query-based end-to-end object detection framework with ConvNets instead of sophisticated transformer architecture. We propose a novel detection framework, *i.e.*, Detection ConvNet (DECO), which is composed of a backbone and convolutional encoder-decoder architecture. We carefully design the DECO encoder and propose a novel mechanism for our DECO decoder to perform interaction between object queries and image features via convolutional layers. We compare the proposed DECO against prior detectors on the challenging COCO benchmark. Despite its simplicity, our DECO achieves competitive performance in terms of detection accuracy and running speed. Specifically, with the ResNet-50 and ConvNeXt-Tiny backbone, DECO outperforms the DETR model and obtains 38.6% and 40.8% AP on COCO *val* set with 35 and 28 FPS respectively. We hope the proposed DECO brings another perspective for designing object detection framework.



## References

- [1] Alexey Bochkovskiy, Chien-Yao Wang, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *CoRR*, abs/2004.10934, 2020. [1](#), [2](#)
- [2] Zhaowei Cai and Nuno Vasconcelos. Cascade r-cnn: Delving into high quality object detection. In *CVPR*, pages 6154–6162, 2018. [2](#)
- [3] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *ECCV*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2020. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [4] Xinghao Chen, Chang Xu, Mingjing Dong, Chunjing Xu, and Yunhe Wang. An empirical study of adder neural networks for object detection. *NeurIPS*, 34:6894–6905, 2021. [2](#)
- [5] Xiyang Dai, Yinpeng Chen, Jianwei Yang, Pengchuan Zhang, Lu Yuan, and Lei Zhang. Dynamic detr: End-to-end object detection with dynamic attention. In *ICCV*, pages 2988–2997, 2021. [2](#), [3](#)
- [6] Zhigang Dai, Bolun Cai, Yugeng Lin, and Junying Chen. Up-detr: Unsupervised pre-training for object detection with transformers. In *CVPR*, pages 1601–1610, 2021. [3](#)
- [7] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *ICLR*, 2021. [1](#)
- [8] Kaiwen Duan, Song Bai, Lingxi Xie, Honggang Qi, Qingming Huang, and Qi Tian. Centernet: Keypoint triplets for object detection. In *ICCV*, 2019. [2](#)
- [9] Yuxin Fang, Bencheng Liao, Xinggang Wang, Jiemin Fang, Jiyang Qi, Rui Wu, Jianwei Niu, and Wenyu Liu. You only look at one sequence: Rethinking transformer in vision through object detection. *NeurIPS*, 34:26183–26197, 2021. [5](#), [6](#)
- [10] Peng Gao, Minghang Zheng, Xiaogang Wang, Jifeng Dai, and Hongsheng Li. Fast convergence of detr with spatially modulated co-attention. In *ICCV*, pages 3621–3630, 2021. [1](#), [2](#)
- [11] Shang-Hua Gao, Ming-Ming Cheng, Kai Zhao, Xin-Yu Zhang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Philip Torr. Res2net: A new multi-scale backbone architecture. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 43(2):652–662, 2019. [1](#)
- [12] Jianyuan Guo, Kai Han, Yunhe Wang, Chao Zhang, Zhaohui Yang, Han Wu, Xinghao Chen, and Chang Xu. Hit-detector: Hierarchical trinity architecture search for object detection. In *CVPR*, pages 11405–11414, 2020. [1](#)
- [13] Jianyuan Guo, Kai Han, Yunhe Wang, Han Wu, Xinghao Chen, Chunjing Xu, and Chang Xu. Distilling object detectors via decoupled features. In *CVPR*, pages 2154–2164, 2021. [2](#)
- [14] Tao Kong, Fuchun Sun, Huaping Liu, Yuning Jiang, and Jianbo Shi. Foveabox: Beyond anchor-based object detector. *CoRR*, abs/1904.03797, 2019. [2](#)
- [15] Hei Law, Yun Teng, Olga Russakovsky, and Jia Deng. Cornernet-lite: Efficient keypoint based object detection. In *BMVC*. BMVA Press, 2020. [2](#)
- [16] Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Shilong Liu, Jian Guo, Lionel M Ni, and Lei Zhang. Dn-detr: Accelerate detr training by introducing query denoising. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01305*, 2022. [2](#)
- [17] Yanghao Li, Yuntao Chen, Naiyan Wang, and Zhaoxiang Zhang. Scale-aware trident networks for object detection. In *ICCV*, pages 6054–6063, 2019. [2](#)
- [18] Zeming Li, Chao Peng, Gang Yu, Xiangyu Zhang, Yangdong Deng, and Jian Sun. Detnet: Design backbone for object detection. In *ECCV*, pages 334–350, 2018. [1](#)
- [19] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. [2](#), [6](#)
- [20] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *ICCV*, pages 2980–2988, 2017. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [21] Shilong Liu, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Xiao Yang, Xianbiao Qi, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, and Lei Zhang. Dab-detr: Dynamic anchor boxes are better queries for detr. In *ICLR*, 2022. [2](#), [5](#)
- [22] Wei Liu, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Christian Szegedy, Scott E. Reed, Cheng-Yang Fu, and Alexander C. Berg. SSD: single shot multibox detector. In *ECCV*, 2016. [1](#), [2](#)
- [23] Yudong Liu, Yongtao Wang, Siwei Wang, TingTing Liang, Qijie Zhao, Zhi Tang, and Haibin Ling. Cbnet: A novel composite backbone network architecture for object detection. In *AAAI*, pages 11653–11660, 2020. [1](#)
- [24] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *ICCV*, pages 10012–10022, 2021. [1](#), [2](#)
- [25] Zhuang Liu, Hanzi Mao, Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Trevor Darrell, and Saining Xie. A convnet for the 2020s. In *CVPR*, pages 11976–11986, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [26] Xin Lu, Buyu Li, Yuxin Yue, Quanquan Li, and Junjie Yan. Grid R-CNN. In *CVPR*, 2019. [2](#)
- [27] Wenyu Lv, Shangliang Xu, Yian Zhao, Guanzhong Wang, Jinman Wei, Cheng Cui, Yuning Du, Qingqing Dang, and Yi Liu. Dets beat yolos on real-time object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08069*, 2023. [2](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [28] Depu Meng, Xiaokang Chen, Zejia Fan, Gang Zeng, Houqiang Li, Yuhui Yuan, Lei Sun, and Jingdong Wang. Conditional detr for fast training convergence. In *ICCV*, 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [5](#)
- [29] Alexander Neubeck and Luc Van Gool. Efficient non-maximum suppression. In *ICPR*, pages 850–855, 2006. [2](#)
- [30] Jiangmiao Pang, Kai Chen, Jianping Shi, Huajun Feng, Wanli Ouyang, and Dahua Lin. Libra R-CNN: towards balanced learning for object detection. In *CVPR*, 2019. [2](#)
- [31] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. YOLO9000: better, faster, stronger. In *CVPR*, 2017. [1](#), [2](#)
- [32] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *CoRR*, abs/1804.02767, 2018. [1](#)
- [33] Joseph Redmon, Santosh Kumar Divvala, Ross B. Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. In *CVPR*, 2016. [2](#)

- [34] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster R-CNN: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *NeurIPS*, 28, 2015. 1, 2, 5, 6
- [35] Hwanjun Song, Deqing Sun, Sanghyuk Chun, Varun Jampani, Dongyoon Han, Byeongho Heo, Wonjae Kim, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Vidt: An efficient and effective fully transformer-based object detector. In *ICLR*, 2021. 5
- [36] Peize Sun, Yi Jiang, Enze Xie, Wenqi Shao, Zehuan Yuan, Changhu Wang, and Ping Luo. What makes for end-to-end object detection? In *ICML*, pages 9934–9944. PMLR, 2021. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [37] Peize Sun, Rufeng Zhang, Yi Jiang, Tao Kong, Chenfeng Xu, Wei Zhan, Masayoshi Tomizuka, Lei Li, Zehuan Yuan, Changhu Wang, et al. Sparse r-cnn: End-to-end object detection with learnable proposals. In *CVPR*, pages 14454–14463, 2021. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [38] Zhi Tian, Chunhua Shen, Hao Chen, and Tong He. Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection. In *ICCV*, pages 9627–9636, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6
- [39] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *ICML*, pages 10347–10357. PMLR, 2021. 1
- [40] Jianfeng Wang, Lin Song, Zeming Li, Hongbin Sun, Jian Sun, and Nanning Zheng. End-to-end object detection with fully convolutional network. In *CVPR*, pages 15849–15858, 2021. 2, 3, 5, 6
- [41] Wenhai Wang, Enze Xie, Xiang Li, Deng-Ping Fan, Kaitao Song, Ding Liang, Tong Lu, Ping Luo, and Ling Shao. Pyramid vision transformer: A versatile backbone for dense prediction without convolutions. In *ICCV*, pages 568–578, 2021. 1
- [42] Yingming Wang, Xiangyu Zhang, Tong Yang, and Jian Sun. Anchor detr: Query design for transformer-based detector. In *AAAI*, pages 2567–2575, 2022. 2, 5
- [43] Weihao Yu, Chenyang Si, Pan Zhou, Mi Luo, Yichen Zhou, Jiashi Feng, Shuicheng Yan, and Xinchao Wang. Metaformer baselines for vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13452*, 2022. 2, 3
- [44] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, Lionel Ni, and Harry Shum. Dino: Detr with improved denoising anchor boxes for end-to-end object detection. In *ICLR*, 2022. 2, 3
- [45] Shifeng Zhang, Cheng Chi, Yongqiang Yao, Zhen Lei, and Stan Z. Li. Bridging the gap between anchor-based and anchor-free detection via adaptive training sample selection. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2
- [46] Dehua Zheng, Wenhui Dong, Hailin Hu, Xinghao Chen, and Yunhe Wang. Less is more: Focus attention for efficient detr. In *ICCV*, pages 6674–6683, 2023. 2
- [47] Xingyi Zhou, Dequan Wang, and Philipp Krähenbühl. Objects as points. *CoRR*, abs/1904.07850, 2019. 2
- [48] Chenchen Zhu, Yihui He, and Marios Savvides. Feature selective anchor-free module for single-shot object detection. In *CVPR*, 2019. 2
- [49] Chenchen Zhu, Fangyi Chen, Zhiqiang Shen, and Marios Savvides. Soft anchor-point object detection. In *ECCV*, 2020. 2
- [50] Xizhou Zhu, Weijie Su, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Xiaogang Wang, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable detr: Deformable transformers for end-to-end object detection. In *ICLR*. 1, 2, 3, 5