

---

# Early-exit Convolutional Neural Networks

Edanur Demir · Emre Akbas

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** This paper is aimed at developing a method that reduces the computational cost of convolutional neural networks (CNN) during inference. Conventionally, the input data pass through a fixed neural network architecture. However, easy examples can be classified at early stages of processing and conventional networks do not take this into account. In this paper, we introduce 'Early-exit CNNs', *EENets* for short, which adapt their computational cost based on the input by stopping the inference process at certain exit locations. In EENets, there are a number of exit blocks each of which consists of a confidence branch and a softmax branch. The confidence branch computes the confidence score of exiting (i.e. stopping the inference process) at that location; while the softmax branch outputs a classification probability vector. Both branches are learnable and their parameters are separate. During training of EENets, in addition to the classical classification loss, the computational cost of inference is taken into account as well. As a result, the network adapts its many confidence branches to the inputs so that less computation is spent for easy examples. Inference works as in conventional feed-forward networks, however, when the output of a confidence branch is larger than a certain threshold, the inference stops for that specific example. The idea of EENets is applicable to available CNN architectures such as ResNets. Through comprehensive experi-

ments on MNIST, SVHN, CIFAR10 and Tiny-ImageNet datasets, we show that early-exit (EE) ResNets achieve similar accuracy with their non-EE versions while reducing the computational cost to 20% of the original. Code is available at <https://github.com/eksuas/eenets.pytorch>

**Keywords** Deep Learning · Efficient Visual Recognition · Adaptive Computation · Early Termination · Confidence based Recognition

## 1 Introduction


Deep neural networks are power-hungry. They typically need powerful processing units (i.e. GPU cards) in order to run in a reasonable amount of time. Reducing their computational cost with minimal degradation in accuracy is an important goal that has been approached from several different directions. One promising way to this end is to make the network adapt its computational cost to the input during inference. This idea has recently been explored in many ways. Researches have proposed early termination networks (Huang et al., 2017; Teerapittayanon et al., 2016; Berestizshevsky and Even, 2018; Figurnov et al., 2017; Panda et al., 2016), layer skipping networks (Veit and Belongie, 2018; Wang et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018), specialized branches with wide networks (Mullapudi et al., 2018), adaptive neural trees (Tanno et al., 2018), cascaded networks (Bolukbasi et al., 2017) and pruning methods such as channel gating networks (Hua et al., 2018).

Conventionally, the input data pass through a fixed neural network architecture. However, easy examples can be classified at early stages of processing and conventional networks do not take this account. In order to reduce the computational cost, the methods mentioned above aim to adapt the computation graph of

---

E. Demir  
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey  
E-mail: e181920@metu.edu.tr

E. Akbas (corresponding author)  
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey  
Tel.: +90-312-210 5522  
Fax: +90-312-210 5544  
E-mail: emre@ceng.metu.edu.tr  
Web: <http://user.ceng.metu.edu.tr/~emre/>



**Fig. 1** Architectural overview of EENets. An early-exit block (shown with gray color) can be added at any location. If, at a certain early-exit block, say the  $i^{th}$  one, the network is sufficiently confident (i.e.  $h_i > 0.5$ ), then the execution is terminated at that point and the network’s output is set to  $\hat{y}_i$ .  $c_i$  denotes the computational cost (in terms of the total number of floating-point operations) upto the  $i^{th}$  early-exit block. “CNN layers” are classical computation blocks that may be composed of one or more convolutional or fully-connected layers and non-linear activation functions. EENets aim to strike a balance between minimizing the computational cost and maximizing the accuracy.

the network to the characteristics of the input instead of running the fixed model that is agnostic to the input. Our work in this paper can be categorized under the “early termination networks” category.

In this paper, we introduce “Early-exit CNNs”, *EENets* for short, which adapt their computational cost based on the input itself by stopping the inference process at certain exit locations. Therefore, an input does not have to flow through all the layers of the fixed network; on the contrary, the computational cost can be significantly decreased based on the characteristics of inputs. Figure 1 shows the architectural overview of the Early-exit Convolutional Neural Networks (EENets).

In EENets, there are a number of exit blocks each of which consists of a confidence branch and a softmax classification branch. The confidence branch computes the confidence score of exiting (i.e. stopping the inference process) at that location; while the softmax branch outputs a classification probability vector. Both branches are trainable and they are independent of each other. These exit blocks constitute a very small part of the

overall network (e.g. a single exit blocks constitutes  $\sim 0.0002\%$  of the parameters in a EENet-110 (akin to ResNet-110) designed for a 10-class dataset). In short, the additional parameters coming from early-exit blocks do not significantly increase the computational cost, hence, they can be ignored.

During training of EENets, in addition to the classical classification loss, the computational cost of inference is taken into account as well. As a result, the network adapts its confidence branches to the inputs so that less computational resources are spent for easy examples. That is, when the confidence (i.e.  $h_i$  in Fig. 1) at a certain exit block is larger than a predetermined threshold, the inference process stops for that specific example.

Defining a proper way to train a EENet network is important because the model could be biased towards wrong decisions such as early or late termination. These wrong decisions could either decrease accuracy or increase the computational cost unnecessarily. Deciding at which point an input can be classified and the execution can be terminated is the key challenge of the problem. To address this problem, we propose a novel loss function which balances computational cost and classification loss in a single expression enabling the training of the base neural network and all the exit blocks simultaneously.

Our experiments show that EENets achieve similar accuracy compared to their counterpart ResNets (He et al., 2016) with relative computational costs of 30% on SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011), 20% on CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky, 2009) and 42% on Tiny-ImageNet (Fei-Fei et al., 2014) datasets.

## 1.1 Contributions

In the context of previous related work, our contributions with the introduction of EENets are as follows:

- EENet has a single stage training as opposed similar previous work which are trained in multiple stages.
- EENets are compact models not requiring additional hyper parameters such as non-termination penalty or confidence threshold variables.
- The confidence scores of EENets are learnable and they do not depend on heuristic calculations. As a consequence, their initialization is not an issue and they can be initialized just like other parameters of the network.
- Our loss function considers both accuracy and cost simultaneously and provides a trade-off between them via an hyper-parameter.
- All exit blocks of an EENet are fed by all inputs even if some inputs are classified in early stages of

the model. This avoids a possible dead unit problem (which is a frequent problem in previous work) where some layers are not trained at all.

## 2 Related Work

Neural networks that adapt their computations based on the input’s characteristic can be examined in the following main categories: early termination networks, layer skipping networks, specialized branches with wide networks, neural trees, cascaded networks and pruning methods such as channel gating networks. In addition, some studies focus on the confidence degree of image classification (Wan et al., 2018).

### 2.1 Early Termination Networks

Early termination network are based on the idea that it might not be necessary to run the whole network for some inputs. Similar to EENets, early termination networks (Huang et al., 2017; Teerapittayanon et al., 2016; Berestizshevsky and Even, 2018; Figurnov et al., 2017; Panda et al., 2016) have multiple exit blocks that allow early termination based on an input’s characteristics. All of these studies have some kind of confidence scores to decide early termination.

One of the early termination networks, BranchyNets (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016) have multiple exit blocks each of which consists of a few convolutional layers followed by a classifier with softmax. In other words, BranchyNets have one head just for classification at their exit blocks. The exit blocks of Berestizshevsky and Even (2018)’s model are composed of pooling, two fully-connected (FCs) and batch normalization layers. Like BranchyNets, one conventional head at an exit block is trained for classification. The confidence scores are derived via some heuristics. In the training procedure of the model of Beretizshevsky and Even, the weights of only convolutional and the last FC layers are firstly optimized. Later, the remaining FC layers are optimized, one by one. On the other hand, MSDNets (Huang et al., 2017) have multi-scaled features with dense connectivity among them. Exits of MSDNets consist of two convolutional layers followed by a pooling and a linear layer. However, similar to BranchyNets, MSDNets do not have confidence branches at their exit blocks.

In these models, the confidence scores are derived from the predicted classification results (i.e. the maximum over the softmax). Because such confidence scores are not learnable, deciding on the termination criteria or threshold of an exit branch becomes an important

issue. The exit threshold providing the maximum accuracy should be empirically discovered in these models. Unlike EENets, the loss functions of these models do not encourage an early-exit by considering the computational cost. In addition, they have a *dead layer problem* coming from improper initialization of the confidence scores in the training. The scores may be biased to exit always early and deeper layers may not receive learning signals properly. To avoid this situation, the model of Berestizshevsky and Even (2018) use a multi-stage training. In the first stage, it optimizes all the convolutional weights together with the weights of the last FC layers. After that, it optimizes the weights of the remaining FC components, one by one.

Spatially Adaptive Computation Time for Residual Networks, shortly SACTs (Figurnov et al., 2017), is another study in the category. Exit blocks of the model consist of a pooling and a fully-connected layer followed by a sigmoid function like our model. However, the final confidence score of early termination (namely “halting score” in their paper) is calculated by the cumulative learnable scores of the previous exit blocks. As soon as the cumulative halting score reaches a constant threshold (i.e.  $T \geq 1.0$ ), the computation is terminated. Unlike EENets, the classification output vector of SACTs (i.e. the output of the softmax branch) is derived from weighted summation of the inputs of the confidence branches so far. While EENets directly train the confidence scores by taking them into account in the loss function, SACTs employ the number of executed layers as non-termination penalty in the loss function. Another work, Conditional Deep Learning (CDL) (Panda et al., 2016) has multiple exit blocks each of which consists of just a linear classifier. Starting from the first layer, linear classifiers are added to the end of each convolutional layer iteratively as long as this addition process does not decrease the accuracy. In CDL, a user defined threshold is used to decide if the model is sufficiently confident to exit. The training procedures of SACTs and CDLs are also multi-stage.

### 2.2 Layer Skipping Networks

Layer skipping networks (Veit and Belongie, 2018; Wang et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018) adapt their computation to the input by selectively skipping layers. In these networks, a gating mechanism determines, for a specific input, whether the execution of the layer can be skipped. The main challenge here is learning the discrete decisions of the gates. AdaNets (Veit and Belongie, 2018) use Gumbel Sampling (Jang et al., 2016) while SkipNets (Wang et al., 2018) and BlockDrop (Wu et al., 2018) apply reinforcement learning to this end. None of these

models has a separate confidence branch at the gate blocks. Similar to the early-exit blocks of early termination nets, the gates of the layer skipping networks may die and lose their functionality if they incline to be too much turned off during training. Thus, the actual capacity usage decreases. On the other hand, if the gates tend to be turned on, the networks cannot reduce computational cost effectively. As a result, the networks can not only perform as counterpart static models but also spend additional computational cost for the gate functions (i.e. the same capacity with more cost). In order to avoid such cases, the gate blocks require to be initialized carefully and trained properly. Thus, models in this category (i.e. layer skipping networks) have a complicated multi-stage training.

### 2.3 Specialized Branches with Wide Networks

As wide networks, HydraNets (Mullapudi et al., 2018) is another approach in the area. HydraNets contain distinct branches specialized in visually similar classes. HydraNets possess a single gate and a combiner. The gate decides which branches to be executed at inference. And the combiner aggregates features from multiple branches to make a final prediction. In training, given a subtask partitioning (i.e. dividing dataset into visually similar classes), the gate and the combiner of the HydraNets are trained jointly. The branches are indirectly supervised by the classification predictions after combining the features computed by the top- $k$  branches.

### 2.4 Neural Trees

Adaptive Neural Trees, ANTs (Tanno et al., 2018), can be considered as a combination of decision trees (DTs) with deep neural networks (DNNs). It includes the features of the conditional computation of DTs with the hierarchical representation learning and gradient descent optimization of DNNs. ANTs learn routing functions of a decision tree thanks to the training feature of DNNs. While doing this, instead of a classical entropy, ANTs use stochastic routing, where the binary decision is sampled from Bernoulli distribution with mean  $r^\theta(x)$  for input  $x$  ( $r^\theta$  can be a small CNN). However, ANTs are trained in two stages: *growth phase* during which the model is trained based on local optimization and *refinement phase* which further tunes the parameters of the model based on global optimization.

### 2.5 Cascaded Networks

Some other approaches focus on cascaded systems. The model by Bolukbasi et al. (2017) adaptively chooses a deep network among the state-of-the-arts such as AlexNet (Krizhevsky et al., 2012), GoogleNet (Szegedy et al., 2014), and ResNet (He et al., 2016) to be executed per example. Each convolutional layer is followed by the decision function to choose a network. But it is hard to decide if termination should be performed just by considering a convolutional layer without employing any classifier. It has a multi-stage training procedure where the gates are trained independently from the rest of the model.

### 2.6 Pruning Methods

Channel Gating Neural Networks (Hua et al., 2018) dynamically prune computation on a subset of input channels. Based on the first  $p$  channels, a gate decides whether to mask the rest of the channels. Similar to SACTs (Figurnov et al., 2017), when the classification confidence score reaches a threshold, the remaining channels are not computed.

### 2.7 Novelty of EENets

Table 1 summarizes the differences between our proposed EENets and related previous work.

As discussed above, many models from different categories have the *dead layer/unit problem*. In EENets, we avoid this problem with our novel loss function (described in Section 3) which enables the training of all exit blocks by all inputs, even if some inputs are classified in the early stages of the model.

Another contribution of EENets is the separate confidence branches at their exit blocks. Unlike most of the previous adaptive computational approaches, the confidence scores of EENets are trainable and do not depend on heuristic calculations. Having separate learnable parameters allows the confidence branches to be not biased towards classification results. Their initialization is not an issue and they can be initialized just like other parameters of the network. This separate confidence branches approach makes EENets easier to use/train compared to the previous work.

Another novelty of EENets is the loss function that takes both accuracy and the cost spending into account simultaneously and provides a trade-off between them through the confidence scores. In contrast to most of the previous studies, our cost values employed in the loss function are not hyper-parameters but are based on

Model	Single Stage Training	Non-specialized Initialization	Learnable Confidence	Loss Func. Includes
AdaNet (Veit and Belongie, 2018)	✓	✗	✓	acc and #exec. layers
ANT (Tammo et al., 2018)	✗	✗	-	accuracy
Berestizshevsky and Even (2018)	✗	✗	✗	accuracy
BlockDrop (Wu et al., 2018)	✗	✗	✓	accuracy and cost
Bolukbasi et al. (2017)	✗	✓	✓	accuracy and cost
BranchyNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016)	✓	✗	✗	accuracy
CDL (Panda et al., 2016)	✗	✗	✗	accuracy and cost
Channel gating (Hua et al., 2018)	✗	✗	✓	accuracy and cost
HydraNet (Mullapudi et al., 2018)	✓	✗	-	acc of top-k branches
MSDNet (Huang et al., 2017)	✓	✓	✗	acc of top-k classifier
SkipNet (Wang et al., 2018)	✗	✗	✗	accuracy and cost
SACT (Figurnov et al., 2017)	✗	✗	✓	acc and #exec. layers
EENet (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	accuracy and cost

**Table 1 Differences with related work.** The features of the related work are compared in terms of whether they have a single stage training, a non-specialized initialization process and learnable confidence scores in the table above. Check mark represents whether the model has the feature or not. The last column shows what their loss functions include (e.g. the classical classification loss as the accuracy or the number of executed layers (# exec. layers) as the computational cost). The term of “accuracy and cost” just shows that the loss function takes both of them into account but note that the accuracy and cost values of different models can be obtained in different ways. Some features may not be applicable for some models. In such cases, we use “-” symbol.

the actual number of floating-point operations. Unlike most of the previous studies, EENets have a single stage training in spite of having multiple exit-blocks. EENets do not require additional hyper-parameters such as non-termination penalty or confidence threshold variables.

### 3 Model


In this section, we describe the architecture of EENets, the details about types of exit blocks, how to distribute early-exit blocks to a network, feed-forward and backward phases of the model and the proposed loss function.

#### 3.1 Architecture

Any given convolutional neural network (CNN) can be converted to an early-exit network by adding early-exit blocks at desired locations. To achieve this, first, one has to decide how many exit-blocks are going to be used. This is a design choice. Next, the locations where to connect the exit-blocks need to be decided. We propose various ways of doing this in Section 3.4. Finally, one needs to decide which type of exit-blocks to use. In the following paragraphs, we describe three different types of exit-blocks.

Each EE-block consists of two fully-connected (FC) heads, namely the confidence branch and the classification softmax branch. Both take the same channel-based feature maps (from the previous layer) as input.

We define three types of early-exit blocks, namely, *Plain*, *Pool* and *Bnpool*. The *Plain*-type exit is composed



**Fig. 2** Architecture of *plain*, *Pool*, and *Bnpool* early-exit blocks. The *plain*-type exits are composed of just separate fully-connected (FC) layers and input of that block is directly processed in the FC branches. The *Pool* exits have a global average pooling layer before FC branches. Lastly, the *Bnpool*-type exit blocks consist of a batch normalization layer followed by a ReLU activation and a global average pooling layer. The input of the early-exit block,  $x$ , passes onto these layers before entering the separate FC branches.  $h$  and  $\hat{y}_n$  denote the confidence score and the predicted classification label. “fc  $X$ , activation” denotes the fully-connected heads which have  $X$  number of outputs. The activation is the last activation function of branches.

of two separate fully-connected (FC) layers and input feature maps are directly fed to these FC branches. The *Pool* exit has a global average pooling layer before the FC branches. Lastly, the *Bnpool*-type exit block consists of a batch normalization layer followed by a ReLU activation and a global average pooling layer before the FC confidence and classification branches. Figure 2 presents the architectures of the three different types of early-exit blocks.

In the *Pool* and *Bnpool* early-exit blocks, the size of the input feature map is reduced by global average pooling that is denoted by  $z(\mathbf{x})$ . The purpose of this is to reduce the computational cost at early-exit blocks. Our experiments show that the early-exit blocks that have a global average pooling layer yield more accurate results (Section 4). The average pooling function is as follows:

$$z_{n,c}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{H * W} \sum_{i=1}^H \sum_{j=1}^W \mathbf{x}_{n,c,i,j} \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  denotes the batch size and  $c$  denotes the number of channels.  $H$  and  $W$  denote height and width of the feature maps, respectively.

The pooled data passes onto two separate FC branches, the classification branch and the confidence branch. The number of outputs of the classification branch is same as the number of classes in the dataset. This branch has a softmax activation at the end. The confidence branch uses a sigmoid activation function which outputs a scalar representing the confidence of the work at that specific exit block.

Formally, let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the input to the  $n^{th}$  early-exit block.  $\mathbf{x}$  is actually the output of the CNN layers (see Figure 1) immediately preceding the  $n^{th}$  early-exit (EE) block. In the EE-block, two things are computed: (i)  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_n$ , the class prediction vector, and (ii)  $h_n$ , the confidence level of the network for the prediction  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_n$ . They are given in Eq. (2) where  $\mathbf{w}_1$  and  $\mathbf{w}_2$  are the parameters of separate fully-connected layers of the softmax and confidence branches, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n &= \text{softmax}(\mathbf{w}_1^T z(\mathbf{x})) \\ h_n &= \sigma(\mathbf{w}_2^T z(\mathbf{x})) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

### 3.2 Inference

The Early-exit Convolutional Neural Networks (EENets) have a certain threshold in order to decide early termination in the inference procedure. If the confidence score of an early-exit block is above the threshold, the classification results of the current stage will be the final prediction. Each input is classified based on their individual confidence scores predicted by the early-exit blocks.

Thus, one input can be classified and terminated early while others continue being processed by the model.

Early termination threshold is  $T = 0.5$ . It is the midpoint of the output range of the sigmoid function (used by the confidence branches). The threshold is employed only in the inference phase. During training, all examples are processed by the entire network; thus, all early-exit blocks contribute to the loss function (see Section 3.3) for all examples even if some of them can be classified early.

The pseudo-code of the inference procedure of EENets is given in Algorithm 1 where  $\text{EEBlock}_i$  represents the  $i^{th}$  early-exit (EE) block of the model and  $\text{CNN\_Layers}_i$  denotes the sequence of intermediate blocks (CNN layers) between  $(i-1)^{th}$  EE-block and  $i^{th}$  EE-block.  $\text{CNN\_Layers}_0$  is the initial CNN layers of the model before entering any EE-block.  $N$  denotes the total number of early-exit blocks.  $h_i$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$  shows the confidence score and classification output vector of  $i^{th}$  EE-block.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Inference of Early-exit Convolutional Neural Networks

---

```

1:  $i \leftarrow 0$ 
2: while  $i < N$  do
3:    $x \leftarrow \text{CNN\_Layers}_i(x)$ 
4:    $h_i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \leftarrow \text{EE\_Block}_i(x)$ 
5:   if  $h_i \geq T$  then
6:     return  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ 
7:   end if
8:    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
9: end while
10:  $x \leftarrow \text{CNN\_Layers}_i(x)$ 
11:  $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \text{Exit\_Block}(x)$ 
12: return  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ 

```

---

### 3.3 Training

During training, the goal is to learn the parameters of the CNN and all the early-exit blocks simultaneously so that an input is processed minimally on average to predict its label correctly. This leads us to combine both losses in a single loss function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{MC}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{Cost}} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{MC}}$  is the multi-class classification loss,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Cost}}$  is the computational cost and  $\lambda$  is a trade-off parameter between accuracy and cost.

Let  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$  be the classification vector output by the  $i^{th}$  early-exit block and  $c_i$  be the computational cost of the network, measured in number of floating-point operations (FLOPs), up to this early-exit block. The

inference procedure (Section 3.2) dictates the following final classification output vector:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{I}_{\{h_0 \geq T\}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_0 + \mathbf{I}_{\{h_0 < T\}} \{ \mathbf{I}_{\{h_1 \geq T\}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 + \mathbf{I}_{\{h_1 < T\}} \{ \dots \mathbf{I}_{\{h_{N-1} \geq T\}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{N-1} + \mathbf{I}_{\{h_{N-1} < T\}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_N \} \dots \} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{I}_{\{\cdot\}}$  is the indicator function and  $N$  is the number of early-exit blocks.  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_N$  denotes the final softmax output of the CNN (it is not the output of an early-exit block).

We cannot directly use the expression in Eq. (4) for training because it is not differentiable due to the indicator functions. The indicator function can be approximated by the sigmoid function, and because our confidence scores ( $h_i$ ) are produced by sigmoid activation functions, we obtain the following *soft* classification output vector:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_0 = h_0 \hat{\mathbf{y}}_0 + (1 - h_0) \{ h_1 \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 + (1 - h_1) \{ \dots h_{N-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{N-1} + (1 - h_{N-1}) \hat{\mathbf{y}}_N \} \dots \} \quad (5)$$

which can be more conveniently expressed as a recursive formula:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i = h_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i + (1 - h_i) \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{i+1} \quad \forall i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1 \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_N = \hat{\mathbf{y}}_N.$$

We can similarly define the *soft* version of the computational cost as:

$$C_i = h_i c_i + (1 - h_i) C_{i+1} \quad (7)$$

$$C_N = c_N$$

where  $c_N$  denotes the computational cost of the whole network from start to the final softmax output.

Given the definitions above, we can finally write the first version of our loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{v1} = \text{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_0) + \lambda C_0 \quad (8)$$

where  $\text{CE}(\cdot)$  is the cross-entropy loss and  $\mathbf{y}$  denotes the ground-truth label.

The problem with  $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$  is that, due to the recursive natures of  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_0$  and  $C_0$ , the later an early-exit block, the smaller its contribution to the overall loss. To see this, consider the multiplicative factor of  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_N$  in Eq. (5):  $\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} (1 - h_i)$ . Since each  $h_i \in [0, 1]$ , as  $i$  grows (i.e. going deeper), the contribution of early-exit block  $i$  to the overall loss goes down, consequently, it receives less and less supervisory signal. In our experiments, we observed that EENets trained using  $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$  showed little diversity in the exit blocks preferred by the inputs and an early stage exit-block (small  $i$ ) was dominant. Hence, EENets trained with  $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$  performed poorly.

To address the shortcoming of  $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$ , we consider the exit block from which the input would possibly not exit

as a latent variable and minimize an expected loss over it.

Suppose for a specific input, we knew upto which early-exit block it would **not** exit. For example, if we knew that a specific input would exit at the final output of the CNN (therefore, it will not exit from any of the early-exit blocks), then, for this example, it would be sufficient to consider only the loss term related to  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_N$ , and ignore the loss term related to earlier exits. Similarly, if we knew that an example would not exit from early-exit block 0, then we would not add the losses related to this block into the overall loss.

However, we do not apriori know from which early-exit block a specific example would exit (or not exit). For this reason, we can consider the index of the block from which the example would pass (without exiting) as a latent variable. If we assume a uniform prior over all exit blocks, minimizing the expected value of the loss over this latent variable, we arrive at:

$$\mathcal{L}_{v2} = \sum_{i=0}^N (\text{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_i) + \lambda C_i). \quad (9)$$


We propose to use  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$  to train EENets, where each early-exit block has a chance to contribute to the loss and, hence, receive supervision signal.

Overall, all exit blocks contribute to the loss function for all examples, even if easy examples can be classified at the earlier early-exit blocks. Multiple outputs coming from all exit blocks are trained jointly in  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ . Thanks to our novel loss function,  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ , (i) EENets avoid the dead layer problem occurring in many previous work (Huang et al., 2017; Teerapittayanon et al., 2016; Berestizshevsky and Even, 2018), and (ii) EENets do not require a complicated multi-stage training process neither.

### 3.4 Distributing Early-exit Blocks to a Network

The number of early-exit blocks (EE-blocks) and how they are distributed over the base CNN are other important factors in the architecture of EENets. The additional parameters introduced by the EE-blocks are very small and usually negligible (e.g.  $\sim 0.0002\%$  of the total parameters of EENet-110 for each EE-block on a 10-class datasets), the early-exit blocks can be added as much as desired.

We propose five different ways for determining where a given number of EE-blocks should be added in a given base CNN: (i) Pareto, (ii) Golden Ratio, (iii) Fine, (iv) Linear and (v) Quadratic. According to the Pareto principle, 80% of the results come from 20% of the work. Our *Pareto* distribution is inspired by this principle: the



**Fig. 3** Distributing early-exit blocks to a network. *Pareto*, *Golden Ratio* and *Fine* can be represented in the **upper** figure. The  $\varphi$  denotes the ratio used in the methods. For example,  $\varphi$  will be 0.2, 0.6180 and 0.05 for *Pareto*, *Golden Ratio* and *Fine* distributions, respectively.  $N$  shows the number of early-exit blocks. The **below** figure shows the *Linear* distribution where the computational costs between consecutive early-exit blocks are same and this cost can be calculated by the desired number of the early-exit blocks. Notice that the total cost is represented by 1 since our cost terms are rates (i.e.  $c_i \in [0, 1]$ ).

first EE-block splits the network according to the Pareto principle where 20% of the total computational cost is calculated in terms of the number of floating-point operations (FLOPs). Similarly, the second EE-block splits the rest of the network (i.e. starting right after the first EE-block until the end) again into 20%-80%. This pattern continues until all EE-blocks are added. In the *Fine* distribution method, each EE-block divides the network at 5%-95% based on the total FLOPs. The *Golden ratio* distribution uses the golden ratio, 61.8%-38.2%.

The *Linear* and *Quadratic* distributions split the network in such a way that the computational cost of the layers between two consecutive EE-blocks increases in linear or quadratic form, respectively. Figure 3 illustrates some of the distribution methods. Note that there is not a best distribution method for all EENets or datasets. The effects of the distribution method used should be observed empirically on the specific problem.

## 4 Experiments

In our experiments, we chose ResNets (He et al., 2016) as our base CNNs for their widespread use (although, our

early-exit blocks can be applied to any CNN architecture). We obtained early-exit (EE) versions of ResNets and compared their performance to that of non-EE (i.e. original) versions on MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998), CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky, 2009), SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011) and Tiny-ImageNet (Fei-Fei et al., 2014) datasets. In addition to ResNets, we also experimented with a small, custom CNN on the MNIST dataset.

The experiments are diversified in order to observe the effects of EENets in different aspects and certain conditions. In this section, we try to answer the following questions through comprehensive experiments:

- Do EENets really work? That is, is the inference process terminated for individual examples at different exit locations? Is there a variety in the exit locations chosen per example by the network?
- Are EENets successful when compared to their counterparts in terms of computational cost and accuracy?
- Which type of early-exit block yield better results?
- How does the distribution of early-exit blocks affect the accuracy and the computational cost?

We conducted our experiments on a machine with a i7-6700HQ CPU processor with 16GB RAM and two NVIDIA Tesla P100 16GB. We implemented EENets both in two different frameworks (Keras (v2.1.5) and PyTorch (v1.0.1)) to verify behavior and performance. We chose PyTorch for its flexibility<sup>1</sup>. Both Keras and PyTorch implementations are available at GitHub<sup>2</sup>. Unless otherwise noted, all results reported in this section were produced by the PyTorch code.


In MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998) and Tiny-ImageNet (Fei-Fei et al., 2014) experiments, the models were optimized by Adam with *learning rate* = 0.001. The mini-batch size in the experiments was 32. Most of the models were trained up to 200 epochs unless otherwise stated.

On SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011) and CIFAR10 datasets (Krizhevsky, 2009), we trained the models using the configurations given in the ResNet paper (He et al., 2016). In these experiments, we used SGD with a mini-batch size of 256. The learning rate starts from 0.1 and is divided by 10 per 100 epochs. The models were trained for up to 350 epochs. We used *weight decay* = 0.0001 and *momentum* = 0.9.


<sup>1</sup> For example, it is not straightforward in Keras to write different feed-forward functions for training and testing. During training, each example passes through the whole network, whereas during testing, execution might stop in any of the early-exit blocks due to hard-thresholding.

<sup>2</sup> PyTorch: <https://github.com/eksuas/eenets.pytorch>, Keras: <https://github.com/eksuas/eenets.keras>





**Fig. 4** EENet-101 model with three early-exit blocks. The *Pool*-type of early-exit blocks and the bottleneck blocks are employed. The architecture is in the form of Naive ResNet models.



**Fig. 5** EENet-110 model with two early-exit blocks. The early-exit blocks are in the *pool*-type. It is another example of the architectures in the  $6n+2$  ResNet form.

#### 4.1 Experimented Architectures

We added early-exit blocks to ResNet models (He et al., 2016) with both basic and bottleneck architectures. The early-exit (EE) ResNets based on bottleneck architectures consist of 50, 101 and 152 layers. By modifying the  $6n+2$  layers ResNet models (He et al., 2016), we have constructed 20, 32, 44 and 110 layers EENets. Various numbers of early-exit blocks were distributed based on the capacity of the models. The models which have a large capacity were trained on CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky, 2009) and SVHN (Netzer et al., 2011). In addition, the early-exit version of Naive<sup>3</sup> ResNets such as EENet-18 were evaluated on Tiny-ImageNet (Fei-Fei et al., 2014).

On the other hand, the models having a smaller capacity were evaluated on MNIST (LeCun et al., 1998) to observe how EENets perform in the situation of a dataset forcing the capacity of the model. These small capacity networks are composed of 6, 8 and 18 layers with a small number of filters.

Some of the ResNet based architectures that are evaluated in our experiments are shown in Figures 4 and 5. Our own design EENet-8 is a very small CNN having between 2 to 8 filters in its layers. We ran this low capacity model on the MNIST dataset.

#### 4.2 Results on MNIST

First, we performed a set of experiments on the MNIST dataset (LeCun et al., 1998) to see if the confidence scores are meaningful (i.e. they are related to the accuracy of the predictions made by these early-exit blocks) and if they have a variety in inputs. In these basic tests, the EENet-8 model was employed with quadratically distributed two *Pool*-type early-exit blocks whose number of floating-point operations (FLOPs) and costs are given in Table 2. The exit distribution of the MNIST examples on the EENet-8 models trained with different loss functions are given in Table 2 as well. We used  $\lambda = 1$  in these experiments.

As expected, the model EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$  terminates the executions at the first early-exit block by considering only the computational cost while EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$  classifies all examples at the last exit block to get the highest accuracy. On the other hand, the EENet-8 model trained with  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$  takes both the cost and accuracy into account; as a consequence, it maintains the accuracy

<sup>3</sup> The ResNet paper (He et al., 2016) introduced two types of models: *Naive* and  $6n+2$  layer types. The larger capacity *Naive* models were designed for the ImageNet dataset and they consist of four main stages. The other,  $6n+2$  layers type, has three main stages whose total number of layers equal to  $6n+2$  for integer  $n$ .

A. Exit distribution on EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ 

Exit Blocks	FLOPs	Relative Cost	#examples that exit
EE-block0	546	0.08	47
EE-block1	1844	0.26	2247
Last Exit	6982	1.00	7706

B. Benchmark of different loss functions

Model	# examples that exit from			Accuracy	Relative Cost
	EE-block0	EE-block1	Last Exit		
ResNet-8	-	-	10000	97.38	1.00
EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$	0	0	10000	97.42	1.00
EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$	10000	0	0	10.32	0.08
EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$	6614	3386	0	54.05	0.14
EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$	47	2247	7706	96.55	0.82

**Table 2** Exit distribution of the MNIST examples with different loss functions. This table shows the results of MNIST examples evaluated on the EENet-8 model with 20 epochs. In the **upper** table, the computational cost rates and the number of FLOPs from the beginning to the early-exit blocks are given in the **Relative Cost** and **FLOP** columns, respectively. **# examples that exit** shows the number of examples that are classified at that exit block. The exit distribution of the MNIST test examples (10000 examples) on the EENet-8 models are shown in the **lower** table where EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$ , EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ , EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$  and EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$  are the EENet-8 models trained with only the  $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$  loss functions, respectively. **Last Exit** represents the last exit block. Testing accuracy is given in the **Accuracy** column. Note that the cost of ResNet-8 is always 1 since it computes the whole model. Since early-exit blocks are not available for ResNets, “-” is placed in the early-exit columns.

by spending less computational cost (0.82 of the original). EENet-8- $\mathcal{L}_{v1}$  performs poorly as expected (see Section 3.3 for the discussion). Moreover, we observe that examples exit at a variety of locations (Table 2): 47, 2247 and 7706 numbers of test examples of MNIST are classified at the early-exit (EE) block-0, EE-block-1 and the last exit layer of the EENet-8 model, respectively. This experiment shows that our loss function,  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ , performs as expected and maintains the balance between the accuracy and computational cost.

The computational cost, accuracy and loss values per epoch are shown in Figure 6. We evaluate the model with different optimizers and learning rates. Adam optimizer with learning rate 0.001 gives the best results.

We performed another set of experiments on MNIST to observe the effects of  $\lambda$  trade-off on the loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ . The results are presented in Table 3 and Figure 7. The best balance between the accuracy and the computational cost is observed with  $\lambda 0.95$ . However, the effects of  $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$  or  $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$  can be changed through the  $\lambda$  trade-off if more accurate results or less computational cost consumption are desired (e.g.  $\lambda$  can be decreased to obtain more accurate results if the computational cost is not an issue).

Random MNIST examples classified with EENet-8 which consists of two early-exit (EE) blocks are shown in Figures 8, 9 and 10 as classified at the EE-block-0, EE-block-1 and the last exit blocks of the model, respectively. We observe that the early-exit blocks are specialized in visually similar examples of the same class

or in a few visually similar classes. For example, the EE-block-0 is only specialized in the class of the digit eight in this model (i.e. visually similar examples of the same class). On the other hand, the EE-block-1 seems to be specialized in digits one, four and seven. Note that these classes are visually similar as well.


Finally, we tested different distributions of the early-exit blocks. We observe that keeping the first early-exit blocks in the very beginning of the model decreases the cost excessively. Due to this, the *Quadratic* distribution with a small number of EE-blocks can be a good choice in this situation.

#### 4.3 Results on Tiny-ImageNet


We evaluated EENet-18 on the Tiny-ImageNet dataset (Fei-Fei et al., 2014) which consists of 200 classes with 500 training and 50 validation images (down-sampled to 64-by-64) per class, from the original ImageNet dataset (Russakovsky et al., 2012). EENet-18 accuracies together with average wall-clock time during inference for varying  $\lambda$  are given in Table 5. As expected, the average wall clock time is inversely correlated with the relative computational cost rates. An interesting observation is that on Tiny-ImageNet, higher values of  $\lambda$  yield better accuracies, although, higher  $\lambda$  values give more importance to the  $\mathcal{L}_{Cost}$  component of the overall loss function ( $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ ).

$\lambda$	Accuracy	Time ( $\mu$ s)	Relative Cost	# examples that exit from		
				EEB-0	EEB-1	Last Exit
0.50	98.84	638.0	1.00	0	0	10000
0.70	98.52	711.6	1.00	0	0	10000
0.90	97.46	681.4	0.78	1120	1498	7382
0.95	97.48	643.3	0.74	1230	1883	6887
1.00	96.22	615.0	0.82	359	1879	7762
1.05	97.53	593.6	0.85	168	1771	8061
1.10	98.34	641.9	0.85	3	1939	8058
1.15	85.93	557.8	0.45	48	7245	2707
1.30	86.96	487.3	0.26	0	9996	4
1.50	85.19	476.4	0.26	0	9997	3

**Table 3** Effects of  $\lambda$  trade-off on the loss functions  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ . EENet-8 model starting with 4 filters is evaluated on MNIST. The model is trained with different  $\lambda$  trade-off by using ADAM optimizer on 20 epochs. The exit distribution of the MNIST test examples (10000 examples) is shown in the table where the values are the results of the last epoch. Testing accuracy is given in the *Accuracy* column. *Time* column shows the average wall clock time of inference procedure in microseconds ( $\mu$ s). The computational cost rates are given in the *Relative Cost* column. # *examples that exit from* shows the number of examples that are classified at that exit block.



**Fig. 6** Epochs vs accuracy (orange), loss (blue) and computational cost (shown with green color) of the EENet-8 model on MNIST are given above where the values of accuracy and cost are  $\in [0, 1]$ .



**Fig. 7** The accuracy and computational cost vs  $\lambda$  trade-off on EENet-8.

Block Type	Accuracy	Relative Cost
Plain	90.05	0.01
Pool	94.59	0.06
Bnpool	94.45	0.06

**Table 4** Types of the early-exit blocks. The type of early-exit blocks: *Plain*, *Pool* and *Bnpool* are evaluated within the EENet-50 model on the SVHN dataset. (Results in this table were obtained using the Keras code.)

#### 4.4 Results on SVHN

On the SVHN dataset (Netzer et al., 2011), we first examined the performance of different types of early-exit blocks on the EENet-50 model. The results are given in Table 4. The *Pool*-type early-exit block produces the most accurate results with a very small margin over the *Bnpool*-type. Consequently, we employed the *Pool*-type early-exit blocks in the rest of the experiments.

We evaluated ResNet 6n+2 architectures (He et al., 2016) with four different depths (Table 6) and their early-exit (EE) counterpart (Table 7) on SVHN. EENets achieve similar accuracy as their non-EE versions while reducing the computational cost upto 30% of the original (cf. the cost of the EENet-110 model with Fine distribution in Table 7).

We observe that, in general, EENets with “Fine”ly distributed EE-blocks minimize the computational cost while maintaining accuracy. EENets with *Linear* distribution yield slightly better accuracy than models with Fine distribution, however, they cost more (cf. rows corresponding to Linear and Fine in Table 7). The main reason behind that the first early-exit block of the *Linear* distributed model is located in much deeper layers than the first EE-block of the model of other

Model	Accuracy	Time ( $\mu$ s)
ResNet-18	38.98	557.6

$\lambda$	Accuracy	Time ( $\mu$ s)	Relative Cost
0.4	38.96	521.7	0.99
0.6	38.63	553.7	0.98
0.7	39.08	503.3	0.91
0.8	39.47	411.0	0.70
0.9	39.61	389.6	0.67
1.0	40.78	338.8	0.51
1.1	40.39	336.1	0.48
1.2	41.21	316.3	0.43
1.3	41.40	286.3	0.44
1.5	41.49	317.2	0.42
1.7	41.75	322.7	0.42
1.9	41.15	328.4	0.42

$\lambda$	Accuracy	Time ( $\mu$ s)	Relative Cost
0.4	42.63	515.4	67.44
0.5	42.49	488.1	65.64
0.6	42.28	496.2	65.47
0.7	42.84	464.1	64.69
0.8	43.28	505.4	64.69
0.9	42.84	473.0	64.66
1.0	43.00	487.9	64.67
1.1	43.50	474.9	64.46
1.2	43.45	478.6	64.32
1.3	42.85	469.1	64.25
1.4	43.46	462.7	64.28
1.5	43.36	454.1	62.47

**Table 5** Effects of  $\lambda$  trade-off on the loss functions  $\mathcal{L}_{v2}$ . Tiny-ImageNet dataset is evaluated on ResNet-18 (*upper table*). It is also evaluated on EENet-18 model with 3 (*middle table*) and 5 (*lower table*) EE-blocks. The models are trained with different  $\lambda$  trade-off by using ADAM optimizer on 20 epochs. Validation accuracy, average wall clock time and relative computational cost rates (according to ResNets) are given above.

Model	Accuracy	#Params	FLOPs (MMac)
ResNet-20	95.61	0.27M	41.41
ResNet-32	95.72	0.47M	70.06
ResNet-44	95.79	0.67M	98.72
ResNet-110	95.68	1.74M	256.32

**Table 6** Results of 6n+2 based ResNets on SVHN. The average number of floating-point operations are given in the column of *FLOP*. *#Params* denotes the total number of model parameters. The given accuracy in the table is the testing accuracy.



Fig. 8 Randomly sampled MNIST examples that exit from the first early-exit block.



Fig. 9 Randomly sampled MNIST examples that exit from the second early-exit block.



Fig. 10 Randomly sampled MNIST examples that exit from the base CNN.

distributions. For example, the first EE-block of the EENet-32 with *Linear* distribution spends 21% of the total computational cost while the one with *Fine* distribution spends only 8%. The other explicit observation is that the computational cost decreases while the model capacity increases in EENet models.

#### 4.5 Results on CIFAR10

We tested a variety of EENet models on the CIFAR10 dataset (Krizhevsky, 2009). The pattern of results is similar to that of the SVHN dataset. Tables 8 and 9

show the results of the 6n+2 and the naive ResNet based models, respectively.

EE-block versions of 6n+2 architectures achieve similar accuracy with their non-EE counterparts while reducing the computational cost upto 24% of the original (e.g. the cost of the EENet-110 model with *Golden Ratio* distribution). As seen in Table 9, the models with *Golden Ratio* and *Fine* distributions spend less computational costs than the models having other distribution methods. However, their accuracies are not as high as models with the Pareto distribution.

	Model	Accuracy	# Early-exit Blocks	Cost Percent of EE-Blocks	Relative Cost
Fine	EENet-20	93.74	3	13,24,36	1.00
	EENet-32	94.30	5	8,14,21,28,35	0.87
	EENet-44	94.43	6	5,10,15,20,25,30	0.77
	EENet-110	94.46	10	6,11,15,19,23,27,30,34,37,41	0.30
Pareto	EENet-20	93.65	3	24,36,57	0.93
	EENet-32	94.22	5	21,40,54,61,68	0.60
	EENet-44	95.06	6	20,38,53,63,67,76	0.62
	EENet-110	95.54	10	21,37,50,60,69,74,80,83,87,91	0.83
G.Ratio	EENet-20	94.12	3	24,45,68	1.00
	EENet-32	94.78	5	14,21,28,40,68	0.91
	EENet-44	94.88	6	10,15,20,25,38,63	0.83
	EENet-110	95.62	10	2,4,6,8,10,11,15,25,39,63	0.57
Linear	EENet-20	93.79	3	36,57,77	0.95
	EENet-32	94.85	5	21,35,54,68,86	0.86
	EENet-44	95.02	6	15,30,43,58,76,90	0.90
	EENet-110	95.55	10	10,19,28,37,47,56,65,74,83,93	0.76

**Table 7 Results of the 6n+2 based EENets on SVHN.** The computational cost rates and the average number of floating-point operations per example are given in the columns of *Cost* and *FLOP*, respectively. The distribution methods of models are given in the first column. *#E* denotes the number of EE-blocks. *Cost Percent of EE-Blocks* shows the distribution of cost percent of EE-blocks. The given accuracy in the table is the testing accuracy.

Model	Accuracy	#Params	FLOPs (MMac)
ResNet-32	93.31	0.47M	70.06
ResNet-44	85.46	0.67M	98.72
ResNet-110	93.80	1.74M	256.32

**Table 8 Results of 6n+2 based ResNets on CIFAR10.** The average number of floating-point operations per example are given in the column of *FLOP*. *#Params* denotes the total number of model parameters. The accuracy is the testing accuracy.

#### 4.5.1 Comparison with previous work on CIFAR10

It is not a trivial task to compare the performances of networks with adaptive computational structures. There are not any standard protocols, not every paper gives results on the same datasets, the concept of computational cost differs from work to work, the base networks are not always the same and source codes are not always available. Nevertheless, a number of studies present results on ImageNet (Russakovsky et al., 2012) and Cifar10 (Krizhevsky, 2009). Due to our low budget for computational resources, we were not able to produce any EENet results on the ImageNet dataset<sup>4</sup> We collected CIFAR10 results from various papers in Table 10. Note that these results depend on the implementation and training parameters (e.g. optimizer and learning rate), and also the base network used. To avoid the confusion, we have collected the results of ResNets and AlexNets

<sup>4</sup> Our experiments are still running and we hope to include ImageNet results in a few weeks.

(Krizhevsky et al., 2012) given in these studies. Note that the number of layers of some of the studies are not specified since these are not given in the original papers. EENet with Pareto distribution yields a similar accuracy to that its counterpart ResNet with a relative cost of 50%.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose the Early-exit Convolutional Neural Networks (EENets) which reduce the computational cost of convolutional neural networks (CNN) during inference. EENets have multiple exit blocks and they can classify input examples based on their characteristics at early stages of processing through these exit blocks. Thus, EENets terminate the execution early when possible and avoid wasting the computational cost on average.

The early-exit (EE) blocks of EENets consist of a confidence branch and a classification branch. The confidence branch computes the confidence of the network in classification and exiting (i.e. stopping the inference process) at that location. On the other hand, the classification branch outputs a classification probability vector. Both branches are trainable and they are independent of each other.

EENets are trained with our proposed loss function which takes both the classical classification loss and the computational cost of inference into consideration. As a result, confidence branches are adapted to the inputs so that less computation is spent for easy examples without

	Model	Accuracy	# Early-exit Blocks	Cost Percent of EE-Blocks	Relative Cost
Fine	EENet-20	75.74	3	13,24,36	0.36
	EENet-32	78.82	5	8,14,21,28,35	0.28
	EENet-44	80.94	6	5,10,15,20,25,30	0.28
	EENet-110	85.93	10	6,11,15,19,23,27,30,34,37,41	0.36
Pareto	EENet-20	83.59	3	24,36,57	0.56
	EENet-32	86.34	5	21,40,54,61,68	0.60
	EENet-44	87.25	6	20,38,53,63,67,76	0.62
	EENet-110	91.17	6	21,37,50,60,69,74	0.50
G.Ratio	EENet-20	85.29	3	24,45,68	0.68
	EENet-32	77.91	5	14,21,28,40,68	0.28
	EENet-44	78.21	6	10,15,20,25,38,63	0.20
	EENet-110	84.24	6	6,10,15,25,39,63	0.24
Linear	EENet-20	83.92	3	36,57,77	0.56
	EENet-32	87.00	5	21,35,54,68,86	0.67
	EENet-44	86.92	6	15,30,43,58,76,90	0.57
	EENet-110	87.94	10	10,19,28,37,47,56,65,74,83,93	0.38

**Table 9 Results of the 6n+2 based EENets on CIFAR10.** The computational cost rates and the average number of floating-point operations per example are given in the columns of *Cost* and *FLOP*, respectively. The distribution methods of models are given in the first column.  $\#E$  denotes the number of EE-blocks. *Cost Percent of EE-Blocks* shows the distribution of cost percent of EE-blocks. The given accuracy in the table is the testing accuracy.

Model	Accuracy	Relative Cost
ResNet-110 (Veit and Belongie, 2018)	94.39	-
AdaNet-110 (Veit and Belongie, 2018)	94.24	0.82
AlexNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016)	78.38	-
B-AlexNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016)	79.19	0.42
ResNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016)	80.70	-
B-ResNet (Teerapittayanon et al., 2016)	79.17	0.53
ResNet-110 (Wang et al., 2018)	93.60	-
SkipNet-110 (Wang et al., 2018)	88.11	0.36
Our ResNet-110	93.80	-
EENet-110 (Pareto)	91.17	0.50
EENet-110 (Fine)	85.93	0.36
EENet-110 (GoldenRate)	84.24	0.24
EENet-110 (Linear)	87.94	0.38

**Table 10 Benchmark of related work on CIFAR10.** The computational cost rates are given in the columns of *Cost*. The results are taken from the original papers. Note that results can change according to implementation details and training parameters (e.g. optimizer and learning rate). To avoid the confusion, we have shared the results of ResNets and AlexNets given in the these studies. Consequently, we can compare the results of only convenient work.

harming accuracy. Inference phase is similar to conventional feed-forward networks, however, when the output of a confidence branch reaches a constant threshold (i.e.  $T = 0.5$ ), the inference stops for that specific example and it is classified by that exit block.

We conducted comprehensive experiments on MNIST, SVHN, CIFAR10 and Tiny-ImageNet datasets using both the 6n+2 and naive versions ResNets and their EENet counterparts. We observed that EENets significantly reduce the computational cost (to 20% of the original in ResNet-44 on CIFAR10) by maintaining the testing accuracy.

Note that the idea behind EENets is applicable to any feed-forward neural network. However, in this paper, we demonstrated its use on convolutional neural networks and specifically on ResNets. Other types of networks (multi-layer perceptrons, recurrent neural networks) can be converted to their early-exit versions, too, which we leave as future work.

## References

Berestizshevsky K, Even G (2018) Sacrificing accuracy for reduced computation: Cascaded inference based on softmax confidence. arXiv preprint arXiv:180510982

- Bolukbasi T, Wang J, Dekel O, Saligrama V (2017) Adaptive neural networks for efficient inference. International Conference on Machine Learning
- Fei-Fei L, Karpathy A, Johnson J (2014) Tiny imagenet visual recognition challenge URL <https://tiny-imagenet.herokuapp.com/>
- Figurnov M, Collins MD, Zhu Y, Zhang L, Huang J, Vetrov D, Salakhutdinov R (2017) Spatially adaptive computation time for residual networks. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition
- He K, Zhang X, Ren S, Sun J (2016) Deep residual learning for image recognition. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition
- Hua W, Sa CD, Zhang Z, Suh GE (2018) Channel gating neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:180512549
- Huang G, Chen D, Li T, Wu F, van der Maaten L, Weinberger KQ (2017) Multi-scale dense networks for resource efficient image classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:170309844
- Jang E, Gu S, Poole B (2016) Categorical reparameterization with gumbel-softmax. arXiv preprint arXiv:161101144
- Krizhevsky A (2009) Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, University of Toronto URL <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/learning-features-2009-TR.pdf>
- Krizhevsky A, Sutskever I, Hinton GE (2012) Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems
- LeCun Y, Cortes C, Burges CJ (1998) Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. Proceedings of the IEEE URL <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>
- Mullapudi RT, RMark W, Shazeer N, Fatahalian K (2018) Hydranets: Specialized dynamic architectures for efficient inference. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition
- Netzer Y, Wang T, Coates A, Bissacco A, Wu B, Ng AY (2011) Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. Advances in Neural Information Processing URL <http://ufldl.stanford.edu/housenumbers/>
- Panda P, Sengupta A, Roy K (2016) Conditional deep learning for energy-efficient and enhanced pattern recognition. Design and Automation Test in Europe
- Russakovsky O, Deng J, Su H, Krause J, Satheesh S, Ma S, Huang Z, Karpathy A, Khosla A, Bernstein M, Berg AC, Fei-Fei L (2012) Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV) 115(3):211–252, DOI 10.1007/s11263-015-0816-y
- Szegedy C, Liu W, Jia Y, Sermanet P, Reed S, Anguelov D, Erhan D, Vanhoucke V, Rabinovich A (2014) Going deeper with convolutions. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge
- Tanno R, Arulkumaran K, Alexander DC, Criminisi A, Nori A (2018) Adaptive neural trees. arXiv preprint arXiv:180706699
- Teerapittayanon S, McDanel B, Kung H (2016) Branchynet: Fast inference via early exiting from deep neural networks. International Conference on Pattern Recognition
- Veit A, Belongie S (2018) Convolutional networks with adaptive inference graphs. European Conference on Computer Vision
- Wan S, Wu TY, Wong WH, Lee CY, Lee CY (2018) Confnet: Predict with confidence. International Conference on Acoustics and Speech and Signal Processing
- Wang X, Yu F, Dou ZY, Darrell T, Gonzalez JE (2018) Skipnet: Learning dynamic routing in convolutional networks. European Conference on Computer Vision
- Wu Z, Nagarajan T, Kumar A, Rennie S, Davis LS, Grauman K, Feris R (2018) Blockdrop: Dynamic inference paths in residual networks. IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition