

Pruning then Reweighting: Towards Data-Efficient Training of Diffusion Models

Yize Li¹, Yihua Zhang², Sijia Liu², Xue Lin¹

¹ Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Northeastern University, Boston, USA
{li.yize, xue.lin}@northeastern.edu

² Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, USA
{zhan1908, liusiji5}@msu.edu

Abstract—Despite the remarkable generation capabilities of Diffusion Models (DMs), conducting training and inference remains computationally expensive. Previous works have been devoted to accelerating diffusion sampling, but achieving data-efficient diffusion training has often been overlooked. In this work, we investigate efficient diffusion training from the perspective of dataset pruning. Inspired by the principles of data-efficient training for generative models such as generative adversarial networks (GANs), we first extend the data selection scheme used in GANs to DM training, where data features are encoded by a surrogate model, and a score criterion is then applied to select the coreset. To further improve the generation performance, we employ a class-wise reweighting approach, which derives class weights through distributionally robust optimization (DRO) over a pre-trained reference DM. For a pixel-wise DM (DDPM) on CIFAR-10, experiments demonstrate the superiority of our methodology over existing approaches and its effectiveness in image synthesis comparable to that of the original full-data model while achieving the speed-up between $2.34\times$ and $8.32\times$. Additionally, our method could be generalized to latent DMs (LDMs), e.g., Masked Diffusion Transformer (MDT) and Stable Diffusion (SD), and achieves competitive generation capability on ImageNet.

Index Terms—diffusion model, data-efficient training, data reweighting

I. INTRODUCTION

Diffusion Models (DMs) [1]–[4] belong to a recent class of generative models, which have achieved state-of-the-art generation performance [5]–[12]. Despite their superiority in terms of training stability, versatility, and scalability, DMs are known for their slow generation speeds due to the requirement of reverse diffusion processing by passing through the generator at massive times. Consequently, there is considerable interest in enhancing the inference speed of DMs [13]–[16]. Furthermore, DMs are recognized for their high training costs. Modeling complicated and high-dimensional data distributions requires numerous iterations, resulting in exponential growth in training costs under the increasing resolution and diversity of the data.

Several works have considered speeding up diffusion training by the progressive patch size [17], masked patches [18], [19], momentum stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [20] and a clamped signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) weight at time-step [21].

However, none of them attempted to achieve efficient training through the lens of dataset pruning (or coreset selection). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to investigate how the coreset size of training data influences the generation ability of DMs. In this study, we first utilize a GAN-based data selection method [22] for diffusion training, which consists of feature embedding and data scoring. To refine training data distribution, a perceptually aligned embedding function [23], such as the latent space of a pre-trained image classifier (e.g., Inceptionv3 [24]) is to acquire the data feature space. Then, a scoring criterion (e.g., Gaussian model) is to rank each data point in the embedding space and remove less relevant data. Nevertheless, we discover that such a data selection approach may generalize poorly to DMs on small-scale datasets. Hence, there is a pressing need for innovations to enhance the current data selection scheme for diffusion-based generative models.

We summarize our proposed pipeline in Fig. 1, which investigates the encoder and scoring method to implement data selection in DMs. Inceptionv3 [24], ResNet-18 [25], CLIP [26] and DDAE [27] are adopted as the choices of surrogate models (encoder) and the scoring functions (dataset pruning methods) are Gaussian model [22] and Moderate-DS [28], which keep data points with scores within the scoring threshold. One key observation is that simply pruning the dataset might lower generation capability, with the generative capacity of each class decreasing to varying extents in Fig. 2. To address this issue, we leverage a class-wise reweighting strategy by distributionally robust optimization (DRO [29], [30]), to optimize the class weights that are dynamically updated according to the marginal loss on each class. Experimental results on the pixel-level DDPM [1], the latent-level Masked Diffusion Transformer (MDT) [31] and Stable Diffusion (SD) [4] demonstrate that our method could accelerate diffusion training from $2.34\times$ up to $8.32\times$ while maintaining comparable or even superior generation ability. The main contributions are highlighted below.

- We investigate the problem of efficient DM training through the lens of dataset pruning for the first time, which selects coreset from the latent space through surrogate models.
- We develop a novel class-wise reweighting strategy to

*Note: Under Review

enhance generation capacity by minimizing the variance between the target proxy model and the reference model.

- We achieve comparable performances on DDPM and notable sampling improvements on latent diffusion models (LDMs) while obtaining gains in computation efficiency.




Fig. 1. Overview of our Data-Efficient Diffusion Training approach: Given input images (e.g., image size of 32×32 for DDPM [1] and 256×256 for MDT [31] and SD [4]), we use a surrogate model as an encoder to obtain latent features and the following scoring function is to prune the datasets. The pre-trained reference DM facilitates the training of a proxy DM using distributionally robust optimization (DRO [29], [30]) across classes to generate class weights. Subsequently, DMs are trained on the weighted subset.

II. RELATED WORK

Diffusion models [1]–[3], [34] are proposed to capture the high-dimensional nature of data distributions, which are dominating a new era by exceeding the Generative adversarial networks (GANs) [35], [36]. The backbone networks of DMs generally include the convolutional U-Net [37], and the transformer-based architectures [5], [38], [39] with attention layers.

A. Efficiency in Diffusion Models

The sampling of DMs is typically costly because of the iterative denoising process with UNet and the DM training is always time-consuming by massive steps. To address these issues, existing works concentrate on reducing sampling steps through step distillation [13], [14], [40] and efficient sampling solvers, including DDIM [33] and DPM-Solver [41]. Other recent works consider compression [15], [42] and utilize the property of the model architecture [43], [44]. Furthermore, accelerating diffusion training is achieved by gradually scaling up image size [17], or token merging and masking [18], [19], [31], [45] in transformer-based DMs.

B. Dataset Pruning

Dataset pruning, also known as coreset selection, refers to reducing training data by creating a more compact dataset [46], [47]. A small representative subset can be approximated based on training dynamics as the score criterion [48], [49], and loss or gradient perspectives, such as GRAD-MATCH [50], RHO-LOSS [51] and InfoBatch [52].

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Background

Diffusion models. DMs include a forward noising process and a backward denoising process to estimate the distribution of

data iteratively [1], [2], [4], [33]. Given the clean input x_0 , it is gradually turned into the noisy x_T over T time steps (x_t at each time step t) by Gaussian noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ in the forward diffusion process. In the backward sampling process, a noisy sample $x_T \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ is progressively denoised to generate an uncorrupted output. The objective of DM can be simplified by minimizing the noise approximation error

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}, c, \epsilon, t} [\|\epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t, c, t) - \epsilon\|^2], \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t, c, t)$ represents the noise estimator at time step t over trainable parameter θ regarding with the condition c (e.g., class label or text prompt). In conditional DDPM [1], x_t denotes the input image, while in latent diffusion model (LDM) [4], x_t is the latent feature. Classifier-free guidance [32] has been demonstrated to significantly enhance the sample quality of class-conditioned DMs. Specifically, a guidance weight $w \geq 0$ is introduced to balance generation quality and sample diversity, where a conditional DM with the condition c is jointly trained with an unconditional DM. The new noise estimation from Eq. (1) is formulated as $\epsilon_{\theta}^w(\mathbf{x}_t, c, t) = (1 + w)\epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t, c, t) - w\epsilon_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_t, t)$.

B. Dataset Pruning

Dataset pruning consists of two parts, embedding by a surrogate model and ranking by a scoring function. Given a pre-trained network $f(\mathbf{x}, y) = g(h(\mathbf{x}, y))$, where h means the encoder that converts inputs to latent representations, and g is the classification head. $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y_i \in [K]$ are the input sample and its corresponding label, respectively. The representations z are obtained as $\{z_1 = h(x_1, y_1), \dots, z_n = h(x_n, y_n)\}$. The Gaussian model [22] then computes a score for each embedded sample z_i by the empirical mean μ and the covariance Σ , which is defined by $S_{\text{Gaussian}}(z_i) = -\frac{1}{2} [(z_i - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (z_i - \mu) + \ln(|\Sigma|) + d \ln(2\pi)]$, where d denotes the dimension of z_i . After scoring each sample, we preserve all data points with scores larger than a threshold τ , which equals a certain percentile of the scores, ensuring that the top $N\%$ (data ratio R) of the highest-scoring data points are retained to formulate a coreset D_s .

Moderate-DS [28] selects samples that have the closest distances to the class median feature z^j , where the class-wise mean of the embeddings is computed by averaging across all representation dimensions. To determine the distance from each representation to its corresponding class median, the scoring criterion is computed as $S_{\text{Moderate-DS}}(z_i) = \|z_i - z^j\|^2$, which is the squared Euclidean distance between embeddings $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ and class medians $\{z^1, \dots, z^k\}$. Subsequently, with a given data ratio R , the coreset D_s is defined as all data points within a distance of $\frac{R}{2}$ from the median.

C. Class-wise Reweighting

Distinct differences in sampling abilities persist across all classes, as shown in Fig. 2. Class-wise reweighting aims to improve overall generative performance after dataset pruning by considering these differences between diverse domains. To

TABLE I

CIFAR-10 FID RESULTS (32×32) FOR CLASSIFIER-FREE GUIDED [32] DDPM [1] BY DDIM SAMPLER [33] ON [10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 100%] OF TRAINING DATA. WITH RESNET-18 AS THE ENCODER AND CLASS-WISE REWEIGHTING, OUR APPROACH SIGNIFICANTLY OUTPERFORMS OTHER BASELINES AND IS COMPARABLE TO THAT UNDER FULL DATASET TRAINING.

Surrogate Model	Selection Method	FID (\downarrow) under Data Ratio				
		10%	20%	30%	40%	100%
N/A	Uniform Random	8.12	5.64	4.86	4.45	
Inceptionv3	Gaussian	22.03	15.65	11.70	9.34	
DDAE	Moderate-DS	7.54	5.35	4.69	4.58	3.66
CLIP	Moderate-DS	7.78	5.89	5.04	4.93	
ResNet-18	Moderate-DS	7.39	5.26	4.54	4.31	
	+ Reweighting	6.71	4.95	4.44	4.18	

acquire class weights, a proxy model is trained by the worst-case loss [29], [30] over classes, which follows a mini-max optimization as distributionally robust optimization (DRO):

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\alpha \in \Delta} \sum_{i=1}^K [\alpha (\ell_i(\theta; D_{s_i}) - \ell_{\text{ref}}(\theta_0; D_{s_i}))], \quad (2)$$

where K is the number of image classes, $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K\}$ signifies the corresponding class weights, Δ denotes the probability simplex constraint (*i.e.*, $\alpha_i > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i = 1$), $\ell_i(\theta; D_{s_i})$ and $\ell_{\text{ref}}(\theta_0; D_{s_i})$ represent the loss of the proxy model and the reference model over the subset of images within class i (denoted as D_{s_i}) respectively. The proxy and reference model share an identical architecture, whereas the proxy model is trainable on the selected subset and the reference model is pre-trained on the full training dataset. The margin loss $\ell_i(\cdot) - \ell_{\text{ref}}(\cdot)$, which is only reserved to be greater than 0, quantifies the improvement space for the proxy model relative to the reference model on example x from the coreset. Instances with higher excess loss are learnable and worth learning, where the reference model obtains a low loss, yet the proxy model still exhibits a high loss. DRO adjusts class weights through gradient updates on the proxy model weights over training steps t , thereby amplifying the proxy model’s gradient updating on some classes. The average class weight $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha^t$ over the T training step is returned as the final class weight.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

We vary the surrogate models as the encoder by Inceptionv3 [24], ResNet-18 [25], ResNet-50-based CLIP [26] and DDAE (an unconditional DDPM) [27] on three datasets with class labels, including CIFAR-10 with image size of 32×32 , ImageNet [53] and ImageNette (a subset containing 10 easy classes from ImageNet) with image size of 256×256 . The pixel-wise DM is DDPM [1] with classifier-free guidance [32] and LDMs are MDT [31] with the size of S, mask ratio 0.3 and Adan optimizer [54], and SD [4]. DDPM is trained from scratch on 2000 epochs, MDT is trained on 60 epochs and SD is fine-tuned on 50 epochs. Generation quality is evaluated in Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [55] on 50k generated samples. Both DDPM and SD are efficiently inferred by

DDIM sampler [33] with 100 and 50 steps, class classifier-free guidance [32] w as 0.3 and 5 respectively. MDT is evaluated with 250 DDPM sampling steps and 3.8 classifier-free guidance [32]. Considering a more reliable and unbiased estimator of image quality on ImageNet, we adopt CMMD [56] by Vision-Transformer-based CLIP embeddings and the maximum mean discrepancy distance with the Gaussian kernel. The DDPM proxy model on class reweighting follows the same setups mentioned above. The MDT proxy model follows similar settings except for 6 training epochs.




Fig. 2. Class-wise DDPM FIDs (lower is better) before and after reweighting on 10% of CIFAR-10 training data. Reweighting leads to improved generation performance across all 10 classes; the class weights larger than the initial weight are from the easily generated categories.

B. DDPM Results

We first investigate the data-efficient training of DMs on CIFAR-10 with low resolution (32×32). In Table I, DMs trained on pruned dataset size ranging from 5000 (10% data ratio) to 20000 (40%) show different generative capabilities. We discover that the GAN-based instance selection [22] is generalized poorly to DMs, where FID scores are even greatly worse than those of Uniform Random, which selects data for each class randomly in a unified way. The performance decline is from 4.90 up to 13.91 with the decrease in dataset size, proving that it is difficult to describe the compact feature space by such an encoder and data pruning method. Therefore, we execute tentative experiments on surrogate encoding models, including ResNet-18 [25], CLIP [26], and DDAE (an

unconditional self-supervised learner based on DDPM) [27] as image encoders. The scoring function is changed to Moderate-DS [28], choosing those data samples close to the median. As shown in Table I, ResNet-18 and DDAE yield more effective coresets compared to CLIP, which achieves lower FID than Uniform Random. The potential explanation, as supported by Table V, is that both ResNet-18 and DDAE are trained solely on CIFAR-10 without any data transformations aimed at enlarging image size. In contrast, CLIP is pre-trained on a larger dataset with higher-resolution images. Consequently, latent features from CLIP on CIFAR-10 are somewhat expanded and sub-optimal. Another observation is that different classes maintain diverse generative abilities, as depicted in Fig. 2. To tackle this problem, class-wise reweighting is leveraged to enhance the generation levels from a class-specific perspective. Equipped with class-wise reweighting, DDPM trained on the coreset selected by ResNet-18 and Moderate-DS achieves a 6.71 FID score under 10% of data and an FID score of 4.18 with 40% of training samples. Inspired by InfoBatch [52], we consider a pruned dataset training ratio of 0.875 in Annealing to improve further generation abilities, where DDPM is trained on the subset before the 87.5% training epoch and then on the full dataset until the end. We find that Annealing is significantly helpful in enhancing generative qualities especially when the dataset size is smaller and our approach outperforms InfoBatch [52] in Table II. Due to the partial full data training, the training speed is affected by Annealing in Table III, showing the trade-offs between computational efficiency and image synthesis capacity.

TABLE II

DDPM FID COMPARISON RESULTS ON 10%-40% OF CIFAR-10 WITH ANNEALING. OUR METHOD LARGELY SURPASSES LOSSLESS TRAINING ACCELERATION FRAMEWORK INFOBATCH [52].

Selection Method	FID (\downarrow) under Data Ratio			
	10%	20%	30%	40%
InfoBatch + Annealing	5.09	4.28	4.23	4.04
Moderate-DS w/ Reweighting + Annealing	4.58	4.19	4.12	3.92

TABLE III

CIFAR-10 TRAINING SPEED-UP ON DDPM [1] BY 10%-40% OF DATA. THE ACCELERATION IS UP TO **8.89** AND REWEIGHTING HAS A MINOR IMPACT ON THE TRAINING SPEED. HOWEVER, ANNEALING LOWERS THE TRAINING ACCELERATION BECAUSE OF FEW FULL-DATA TRAINING STEPS.

Surrogate Model	Selection Method	Speed-Up under Data Ratio			
		10%	20%	30%	40%
ResNet-18	Moderate-DS	8.89 ×	4.55 ×	3.09 ×	2.36 ×
	+ Reweighting	8.32 ×	4.48 ×	3.09 ×	2.34 ×
	+ Annealing	4.38 ×	3.14 ×	2.45 ×	2.02 ×

C. MDT Results

Our dataset pruning is further extended to MDT [31] on ImageNet. MDT learns the contextual relation among object semantic parts by masking certain tokens in the latent space. Gaussian model selects a more superior and compact subset than Moderate-DS via feature embedding from Inceptionv3.

Furthermore, class-wise reweighting is general to all data pruning approaches and different pruning ratios. Remarkably, as shown in Table IV, MDT equipped with reweighting on merely 20% of data samples achieves a better FID score (13.94 vs. 17.11) than the model trained on the entire dataset. It demonstrates the possibility of both saving training costs and achieving qualified class-conditional image generation.

TABLE IV
IMAGENET 256×256 FID AND CMMD EVALUATIONS FOR CLASS-CONDITIONAL MDT [31] ON [10%, 20%, 100%] OF TRAINING SET. MDT TRAINED ON A SUBSET COULD OUTPERFORM THE MODEL TRAINED ON THE FULL DATASET.

Surrogate Model	Selection Method	FID / CMMD (\downarrow) under Data Ratio			
		10%	20%	100%	
Inceptionv3	N/A	130.81 / 2.55	51.18 / 1.45		
	Uniform Random	95.68 / 2.44	18.49 / 1.02		
	Gaussian	85.74 / 2.22	13.94 / 0.91		17.11 / 0.86
	+ Reweighting	123.60 / 2.51	50.63 / 1.46		
	Moderate-DS + Reweighting	115.62 / 2.46	47.85 / 1.43		

D. SD Results

We evaluate dataset pruning on ImageNette, a subset from ImageNet, by fine tuning SD (Stable Diffusion ‘v1-4’ [4]). The prompt for sampling is ‘a photo of a *class name*’. By computing FID on a total of 50k sampling images in 256×256 resolution under classifier-free guidance, SD fine-tuned on only 40% of the data significantly surpasses the model on the entire dataset in Table V. An interesting finding is that all models fine-tuned on the subsets show even better generation capability, highlighting the potential data redundancy in large LDM fine-tuning. Note that class-wise reweighting is not applied in this case, because SD fine-tuned on the subset has surpassed the one on the entire dataset, and thus majority of margin loss from Eq. (2) is clipped to 0.

TABLE V

IMAGENETTE 256×256 FID EVALUATIONS FOR CLASSIFIER-FREE GUIDED SD [4] ON [20%, 40%, 60%, 100%] OF TRAINING SET. IMAGES OF HIGHER QUALITY ARE GENERATED BY A DM FINE-TUNED ON FEWER DATA SAMPLES.

Surrogate Model	Selection Method	FID (\downarrow) under Data Ratio			
		20%	40%	60%	100%
N/A	Uniform Random	20.33	21.21	23.44	
CLIP	Moderate-DS	20.27	20.20	23.19	25.91
ResNet-18		20.05	18.51	20.94	

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate data-efficient DM training by data selection and class reweighting. As the first study on data-pruned DM training, we demonstrate its remarkable robustness across various, reducing computing overhead by up to 8×. Furthermore, we reveal the presence of training data redundancy in both pixel-level and latent-level DMs. Overall, we believe our findings and approach provide a solid foundation for building scalable and efficient artificial intelligence-generated content systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [2] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole, "Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations," *ICLR*, 2021.
- [3] P. Dhariwal and A. Nichol, "Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis," *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [4] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2022.
- [5] W. Peebles and S. Xie, "Scalable diffusion models with transformers," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [6] J. Ho, T. Salimans, A. Gritsenko, W. Chan, M. Norouzi, and D. J. Fleet, "Video diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [7] P. Li, Q. Huang, Y. Ding, and Z. Li, "Layerdiffusion: Layered controlled image editing with diffusion models," *SIGGRAPH Asia 2023 Technical Communications*, 2023.
- [8] Y. Xin, S. Luo, H. Zhou, J. Du, X. Liu, Y. Fan, Q. Li, and Y. Du, "Parameter-efficient fine-tuning for pre-trained vision models: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02242*, 2024.
- [9] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, "Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [10] F. Liang, B. Wu, J. Wang, L. Yu, K. Li, Y. Zhao, I. Misra, J.-B. Huang, P. Zhang, P. Vajda *et al.*, "Flowvid: Taming imperfect optical flows for consistent video-to-video synthesis," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [11] S. Li, K. Sun, Z. Lai, X. Wu, F. Qiu, H. Xie, K. Miyata, and H. Li, "Ecnnet: Effective controllable text-to-image diffusion models," *arXiv preprint:2403.18417*, 2024.
- [12] P. Li, Q. Nie, Y. Chen, X. Jiang, K. Wu, Y. Lin, Y. Liu, J. Peng, C. Wang, and F. Zheng, "Tuning-free image customization with image and text guidance," *ECCV*, 2024.
- [13] T. Salimans and J. Ho, "Progressive distillation for fast sampling of diffusion models," *ICLR*, 2022.
- [14] C. Meng, R. Rombach, R. Gao, D. Kingma, S. Ermon, J. Ho, and T. Salimans, "On distillation of guided diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [15] Y. Li, H. Wang, Q. Jin, J. Hu, P. Chemerys, Y. Fu, Y. Wang, S. Tulyakov, and J. Ren, "Snapfusion: Text-to-image diffusion model on mobile devices within two seconds," *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [16] X. Liu, X. Zhang, J. Ma, J. Peng, and Q. Liu, "Instaflow: One step is enough for high-quality diffusion-based text-to-image generation," *ICLR*, 2024.
- [17] Z. Wang, Y. Jiang, H. Zheng, P. Wang, P. He, Z. Wang, W. Chen, and M. Zhou, "Patch diffusion: Faster and more data-efficient training of diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [18] H. Zheng, W. Nie, A. Vahdat, and A. Anandkumar, "Fast training of diffusion models with masked transformers," *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*, 2024.
- [19] Z. Ding, M. Zhang, J. Wu, and Z. Tu, "Patched denoising diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis," *ICLR*, 2024.
- [20] Z. Wu, P. Zhou, K. Kawaguchi, and H. Zhang, "Fast diffusion model," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06991*, 2023.
- [21] T. Hang, S. Gu, C. Li, J. Bao, D. Chen, H. Hu, X. Geng, and B. Guo, "Efficient diffusion training via min-snr weighting strategy," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [22] T. DeVries, M. Drozdal, and G. W. Taylor, "Instance selection for gans," *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [23] R. Zhang, P. Isola, A. A. Efros, E. Shechtman, and O. Wang, "The unreasonable effectiveness of deep features as a perceptual metric," *CVPR*, 2018.
- [24] C. Szegedy, V. Vanhoucke, S. Ioffe, J. Shlens, and Z. Wojna, "Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision," *CVPR*, 2016.
- [25] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," *CVPR*, 2016.
- [26] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," *ICML*, 2021.
- [27] W. Xiang, H. Yang, D. Huang, and Y. Wang, "Denoising diffusion autoencoders are unified self-supervised learners," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [28] X. Xia, J. Liu, J. Yu, X. Shen, B. Han, and T. Liu, "Moderate coreset: A universal method of data selection for real-world data-efficient deep learning," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [29] S. Sagawa, P. W. Koh, T. B. Hashimoto, and P. Liang, "Distributionally robust neural networks for group shifts: On the importance of regularization for worst-case generalization," *ICLR*, 2020.
- [30] S. M. Xie, H. Pham, X. Dong, N. Du, H. Liu, Y. Lu, P. Liang, Q. V. Le, T. Ma, and A. W. Yu, "Doremi: Optimizing data mixtures speeds up language model pretraining," *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [31] S. Gao, P. Zhou, M.-M. Cheng, and S. Yan, "Masked diffusion transformer is a strong image synthesizer," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [32] J. Ho and T. Salimans, "Classifier-free diffusion guidance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022.
- [33] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, "Denoising diffusion implicit models," *ICLR*, 2021.
- [34] P. Esser, J. Chiu, P. Atighehchian, J. Granskog, and A. Germanidis, "Structure and content-guided video synthesis with diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [35] T. Karras, S. Laine, and T. Aila, "A style-based generator architecture for generative adversarial networks," *CVPR*, 2019.
- [36] A. Sauer, K. Schwarz, and A. Geiger, "Stylegan-xl: Scaling stylegan to large diverse datasets," *SIGGRAPH*, 2022.
- [37] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," *MICCAI*, 2015.
- [38] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *ICLR*, 2021.
- [39] F. Bao, S. Nie, K. Xue, Y. Cao, C. Li, H. Su, and J. Zhu, "All are worth words: A vit backbone for diffusion models," *CVPR*, 2023.
- [40] T. Yin, M. Gharbi, R. Zhang, E. Shechtman, F. Durand, W. T. Freeman, and T. Park, "One-step diffusion with distribution matching distillation," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [41] C. Lu, Y. Zhou, F. Bao, J. Chen, C. Li, and J. Zhu, "Dpm-solver: A fast ode solver for diffusion probabilistic model sampling in around 10 steps," *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [42] G. Fang, X. Ma, and X. Wang, "Structural pruning for diffusion models," *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- [43] X. Ma, G. Fang, and X. Wang, "Deepcache: Accelerating diffusion models for free," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [44] C. Si, Z. Huang, Y. Jiang, and Z. Liu, "Freeu: Free lunch in diffusion u-net," *CVPR*, 2024.
- [45] C. Wei, K. Mangalam, P.-Y. Huang, Y. Li, H. Fan, H. Xu, H. Wang, C. Xie, A. Yuille, and C. Feichtenhofer, "Diffusion models as masked autoencoder," *ICCV*, 2023.
- [46] Z. Borsos, M. Mutný, and A. Krause, "Coresets via bilevel optimization for continual learning and streaming," *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [47] Y. Li, P. Zhao, X. Lin, B. Kailkhura, and R. Goldhahn, "Less is more: Data pruning for faster adversarial training," *SafeAI Workshop on AAAI*, 2023.
- [48] M. Paul, S. Ganguli, and G. K. Dziugaite, "Deep learning on a data diet: Finding important examples early in training," *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [49] S. Yang, Z. Xie, H. Peng, M. Xu, M. Sun, and P. Li, "Dataset pruning: Reducing training data by examining generalization influence," *ICLR*, 2023.
- [50] K. Killamsetty, D. S. G. Ramakrishnan, A. De, and R. Iyer, "Gradmatch: Gradient matching based data subset selection for efficient deep model training," *ICML*, 2021.
- [51] S. Mindermann, J. M. Brauner, M. T. Razzak, M. Sharma, A. Kirsch, W. Xu, B. Hölting, A. N. Gomez, A. Morisot, S. Farquhar *et al.*, "Prioritized training on points that are learnable, worth learning, and not yet learnt," *ICML*, 2022.
- [52] Z. Qin, K. Wang, Z. Zheng, J. Gu, X. Peng, Z. Xu, D. Zhou, L. Shang, B. Sun, X. Xie, and Y. You, "Infobatch: Lossless training speed up by unbiased dynamic data pruning," *ICLR*, 2024.
- [53] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," *CVPR*, 2009.
- [54] X. Xie, P. Zhou, H. Li, Z. Lin, and S. Yan, "Adan: Adaptive nesterov momentum algorithm for faster optimizing deep models," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [55] M. Heusel, H. Ramsauer, T. Unterthiner, B. Nessler, and S. Hochreiter, "Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium," *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [56] S. Jayasumana, S. Ramalingam, A. Veit, D. Glasner, A. Chakrabarti, and S. Kumar, "Rethinking fid: Towards a better evaluation metric for image generation," *CVPR*, 2024.