

# A Novel Structure-Agnostic Multi-Objective Approach for Weight-Sharing Compression in Deep Neural Networks

Rasa Khosrowshahli, *Student Member, IEEE*, Shahryar Rahnamayan, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Beatrice Ombuki-Berman, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Deep neural networks suffer from storing millions and billions of weights in memory post-training, making challenging memory-intensive models to deploy on embedded devices. The weight-sharing technique is one of the popular compression approaches that use fewer weight values and share across specific connections in the network. In this paper, we propose a multi-objective evolutionary algorithm (MOEA) based compression framework independent of neural network architecture, dimension, task, and dataset. We use uniformly sized bins to quantize network weights into a single codebook (lookup table) for efficient weight representation. Using MOEA, we search for Pareto optimal  $k$  bins by optimizing two objectives. Then, we apply the iterative merge technique to non-dominated Pareto frontier solutions by combining neighboring bins without degrading performance to decrease the number of bins and increase the compression ratio. Our approach is model- and layer-independent, meaning the weights are mixed in the clusters from any layer, and the uniform quantization method used in this work has  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  complexity instead of non-uniform quantization methods such as k-means with  $\mathcal{O}(Nkt)$  complexity. In addition, we use the center of clusters as the shared weight values instead of retraining shared weights, which is computationally expensive. The advantage of using evolutionary multi-objective optimization is that it can obtain non-dominated Pareto frontier solutions with respect to performance and shared weights. The experimental results show that we can reduce the neural network memory by  $13.72 \sim 14.98\times$  on CIFAR-10,  $11.61 \sim 12.99\times$  on CIFAR-100, and  $7.44 \sim 8.58\times$  on ImageNet showcasing the effectiveness of the proposed deep neural network compression framework.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE demand for compressing leading convolutional networks (CNNs) or ConvNets is increasing to enable their application in low-resourced devices such as self-driving autonomous vehicles and mobile assistant robots [33]. In fact, storing the set of parameters known as weights for these models in mobile memory is a significant challenge. Over the past decade, ConvNets have been steadily developed and improved to function accurately in image classification since AlexNet [28] in 2012, then ResNet [20] in 2016, and Vision Transformers (ViT) [8] in 2020. These models are now extremely complex in capturing and extracting features

accurately, leading to large networks with millions of parameters. Recent years have seen a lot of research focused on compressing the deep neural networks (DNNs), which has produced networks that fit in 1 MB and have a top-1 accuracy of 71% on ImageNet-1K classification [41], [45]. However, some applications, such as multi-task learning, require merging or combining ConvNets or language models [4], [15]. To optimize a coupled network like encoder-decoder architecture, it is suggested to adopt a hard or soft parameter-sharing technique that reduces the functional parameters [9]. Hard parameter sharing is commonly suggested to have multiple task-specific layers and one shared layer that contains the shared parameters. In general, sharing parameters not only reduces the memory but also eases the optimization.

One can ask if we really need  $D$  quantities of variables to describe one object. The answer is no. The intrinsic dimensionality of a space refers to the *required* quantity of information elements needed to formally characterize each object within the space [29]. For instance, in signal processing of multi-dimensional signals, the intrinsic dimension of a signal represents the necessary variables to generate a good approximation of the signal [29]. In contrast, the number of quantities we use is called extrinsic  $D$ -dimensionality of the space [29]. The intrinsic dimensionality of space is smaller than its extrinsic dimensionality when the size of the subspace is a subset of full extrinsic space. This concludes with the essence of a new, smaller, and more efficient space than the full  $D$ -dimensional space, which is called subspace.

In the case of neural networks, let us consider a network with  $N$  total weights as parameters and let  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$  be a parameter vector in a parameter space of dimension  $N$ . It is possible to envision the objective landscape as a collection of “hills and valleys” in  $N$  dimensions, with a value of the loss associated with each point in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  [4]. One solution is to reduce the dimensionality of space from the full extrinsic dimensions  $D$  to intrinsic dimensions  $D'$ , but it must not change the location of the parameter vector in the objective landscape known as performance degradation.

Various methods are studied for compressing neural networks, such as quantization, pruning, low-rank approximation, and knowledge distillation, which are the most popular approximation techniques [38]. The primary focus is to find the intrinsic weights with the least possible performance loss. The main difference is maintaining or cutting the connections between neurons in neural networks. In particular, pruning is

R. Khosrowshahli and Beatrice Ombuki-Berman are with Bio-Inspired Computational Intelligence Group (BICIG), Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Mathematics and Science, Brock University, St Catharines, ON L2S 3A1, Canada

R. Khosrowshahli and S. Rahnamayan are with Nature-inspired Computational Intelligence (NICI) lab, Department of Engineering, Brock University, St Catharines, ON L2S 3A1, Canada

used to trim the least important connections of the network by zeroing the weight value, which reduces the number of non-zero parameters and increases network efficiency. However, pruning influences the performance of the network to pitfall by overfitting the network into training data. Quantization is a widely studied area that explores various methods for reducing the precision of numerical representations in neural networks. It involves minimizing the precision of values used for weights, biases, and/or activations. The primary objective is to decrease the model’s computational and memory demands while preserving a satisfactory level of accuracy. There are two types of quantization that aim to quantize networks but in distinct approaches described as follows. The first type is Bit-precision quantization, which focuses on reducing weight precision by mapping weights to a discrete range based on bit-width. In general, weights are stored and represented in float 32 bits equally, but it is not essential to maintain high resolution and accurate values to build up the network where it performs the same. The second approach focuses on representing the network’s weights with significantly fewer unique values while maintaining its performance. This is accomplished by reducing weight diversity through clustering techniques. Clustering, an unsupervised method, identifies groups of similar values. Similarity within the weight space is determined by minimizing the distance between weights and cluster centroid.

Han *et al.* [17] proposed a weight-sharing quantization method using clustering techniques such as k-means for weight quantization, where each weight belonging to the same cluster is represented by a shared centroid weight. These clustering techniques use distance metrics to find the representative centroid and group of closest and similar weights based on their values. They are limited to finding the golden  $k$  parameter, which determines the a priori numbers of quantization levels as clusters. That said, grouping the weights using the k-means algorithm has  $\mathcal{O}(Nkt)$  complexity where  $t$  is the number of iterations to optimize, making it costly to optimize for millions of parameters  $N$  in DNNs. Most previous works used distance-based clustering algorithms with the representative centroid value and achieved good performance with pruning [16], [17], [39], [46], [47]. The resulting clusters and cluster centroid values are not the optimal form of quantization, leading to accuracy loss reported by Pikoulis *et al.* [36]. The majority of these methods and [44] recommended retraining the constrained network with a small set of weights in order to recover the performance of the compressed network. Retraining, however, can be expensive and resource-intensive. Nonetheless, there has to be an efficient and effective way to cluster and share representative weights without requiring retraining. In order to avoid retraining, Dupuis *et al.* [10], [11] proposed a *retraining-free* weight-sharing for network compression approach using heuristics on ImageNet-1K dataset.

Studying in DNNs, weights are initialized by Normal distribution  $w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$  where  $\mu = 0$  [34] and trained on normalized data inputs. More accurate quantization can be achieved if the distribution of quantization levels is in line with the distribution of the weights in DNNs, which is commonly initialized with the Normal distribution. Uni-

form quantization methods approximate the Normal distributed weights by mapping to discrete levels within a uniform grid. They are usually used for bit-precision quantization purposes. In comparison with non-uniform quantization, uniform quantization is more efficient but less precise in terms of clustering quality.

Although the compression and quantization focus on finding optimal clusters of weights, the primary question of “*how many clusters?*” is still not satisfied, which has a major impact on compression rate and performance. Instead of relying on grid search, we aim to determine the optimal  $k$  clusters by leveraging evolutionary multi-objective algorithms like NSGA-II [6], which are designed to simultaneously optimize two (and more) objectives where we set one objective as number of shared weights and the other objective as evaluation performance. It is important to mention that our work does not include pruning of weights similar to previous works, so it is expected to see a lower compression rate in comparison to previous works that used pruning and weight sharing. Due to repeatedly calling objectives in evolutionary algorithms, expensive objectives could be out of interest. In a large-scale parameter reduction problem, we are searching for optimal  $k$ , which requires quantization. Non-uniform quantization methods such as k-means become extremely time-consuming, whereas uniform quantization methods such as uniform binning run in  $\mathcal{O}(N)$  complexity. Such a reduction in time allows fast exploration over a wide range of possible  $k$ s, which varies between the kind of neural network architecture, target task, and data. To further reduce the size of the codebook, we propose iterative merging of neighboring block intervals with respect to performance to prevent over-compression.

Their work introduces a compression method that can be integrated into any neural network architecture trained on any task and data, regardless of the types and combinations of layers, offering a model-, task- and data-agnostic solution with a high compression rate. Unlike other approaches that focus on separately compressing specific layer types, our method treats all the parameters of neural networks as a unified system, making it both model-agnostic and task-agnostic.

The remainder of this paper is categorized as follows: Section II reviews previous related works. Section III gives details of the proposed multi-objective uniform-based deep neural network compression. Section IV shows and analyzes experiments conducted on three well-known benchmark datasets on various types of DNNs. Lastly, this paper is concluded in Section V.

## II. RELATED WORKS

In this section, we provide the background and summarize related works on the compression of neural networks. We review a wide range of literature covering various methods and techniques used to compress neural networks, including quantization and dimensionality reduction.

### A. Quantization

There are two types of quantization known as scalar and vector quantization. Scalar quantization techniques limit the

values of parameters to use bits that are stored in memory. Vector quantization (VQ) can be grouped into product quantization and weight-sharing. Product quantization (PQ) was initially proposed by Gong *et al.* [16] on fully-connected (FC) layers which is the most memory-occupying part of ConvNets. Later, Wu *et al.* [46] explored PQ to compress both FC and convolutional layers of ConvNets; however, they observed that minimizing the quantization error is correctly reaching by sequentially quantizing layers [46].

Weight-sharing aims to group  $N$  weights into  $k$  clusters ( $k \ll N$ ) and replace values with a shared weight. Thus, it allows the storing of only  $k$  32-bit float shared weights instead of  $N$  32-bit float weights. Usually, a look-up table (i.e., codebook) is constructed to map the shared representative weights to the associated weights in the neural network. Each cluster that includes neural network weight addresses is connected to a shared weight, so the total number of clusters is equal to the number of shared weights. The rate of compression (CR) is calculated by using the following equation:

$$CR = \frac{N \times b_W}{k \times b_W + \lceil \log_2 k \rceil \times \sum_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{C}_i + 1|} \quad (1)$$

Where  $N$  is the total number of weights in the network,  $k$  is the number of clusters or shared weights,  $b_W$  is the number of bits used to represent weight values after training, which is usually 32 floating-point and  $\mathcal{C}_i$  is the  $i$ -th cluster of weights in the network. The ceiling function  $\lceil \log_2 d \rceil$  in Eq. 1 defines the number of bits required to represent the indices of codebook.

Han *et al.* [17] proposed weight-sharing quantization using k-means clustering to construct a codebook of weight addresses, and to further lower the compression rate, they applied Huffman coding. Their work consists of two compression techniques such as 1) pruning connections (weights) by iteratively training the network, 2) quantizing by k-means clustering weights and generating a codebook; however, they retrained the pruned network with the quantized centroid weights, and 3) Huffman encoding weights and the representation indices. They showed that Huffman coding saves 20%-30% of memory. In this direction, the CR (Eq. 1) is modified by changing fixed-length bit indexing to variable-length indexing as follows:

$$CR = \frac{N \times b_W}{k \times b_W + \sum_{i=1}^k b_{\mathcal{C}_i} \times |\mathcal{C}_i + 1|} \quad (2)$$

Where  $b_{\mathcal{C}_i}$  is the number of bits representing the index of cluster  $\mathcal{C}_i$  in the compressed encoded codebook.

Choi *et al.* [2] proposed Hessian-weighted k-means clustering to quantize the network parameters after pruning. Inspired by uniform quantization [14], they uniformly spaced thresholds and divided network parameters into clusters whose cluster centers are obtained by taking the Hessian-weighted mean of network parameters instead of the non-weighted mean. However, Hessian computation needs to evaluate the second-order partial derivative of the differentiable loss function, which is a costly operation. Stock *et al.* [41] use PQ to compress convolutional and FC layers using a clustering technique designed to minimize the reconstruction error of the layer outputs, followed by end-to-end training of cluster

centroids via distillation. Their approach does not optimize the grouping of the network parameters for quantization. Martinez *et al.* [31] used an annealed quantization algorithm to reduce quantization error further. Their procedure consists of three steps: 1) permute: search for a permutation of each layer that results in subvectors that are easier to quantize, 2) quantize: obtain codes and codebooks for each layer by minimizing the reconstruction error between approximated weights and the permuted weights, and 3) fine-tune on training dataset via gradient-based optimization which is costly.

Dupuis *et al.* [11] proposed a weight-sharing optimization heuristic approach using NSGA-II. They focused on bi-level optimization where the first level is finding optimal  $k$  clusters using k-means for each layer of the network with  $l$  layers, and the second level is finding the optimal combination of each layer's  $ks$  based on accuracy loss prediction and CR. In the first level, they search for an optimal set of  $ks$  in a small range for one layer, irrespective of considering the crucial impact of quantization in other layers on the whole network. As the second level is designed to find an optimal combination of  $ks$ , this kind of design space exploration can be ineffective, resulting in a non-global optimality solution. Considering a network with  $l$  layers and  $N$  weights, the cost of the second optimization level is expensive as  $\mathcal{O}(\prod_{i=1}^{N+1} |\phi_i|)$  where  $\phi_i$  is the set of optimal  $ks$  from the first optimization level. Thus, they analyzed the layers of networks and cluster weights in layers separately to reduce the overjumping of shared weights across the network. Having a combination of various  $ks$  results in different sizes of codebooks for each layer; however, they did not clarify the total size of multiple codebooks in their CR equation. Distance-based clustering methods may not effectively capture or leverage the statistical properties of neural network weight distributions, especially if they deviate from the clustering method's assumptions. In addition, one can understand that using different  $ks$  for layers in the network requires the construction of multiple codebooks. For example, consider a network with  $l = 5$  layers where its layer's optimal  $ks$  are  $k = \{5, 10, 18, 8, 200\}$ , the minimum and maximum number of bits required to store indices of codebooks are  $b_{min} = \lceil \log_2 5 \rceil = 3$  and  $b_{max} = \lceil \log_2 200 \rceil = 8$ . Although another approach is to use a single codebook, the maximum number of bits required to store indices  $b_{max}$  will be used. As DNNs get deeper and more complex, compressing parameters of all layers together is even more advantageous since we can avoid layer-by-layer compression rate optimization [2]. It takes exponential time complexity with respect to the number of layers to optimize compression ratios jointly across all individual layers. This can be attributed to the fact that the number of layers increases exponentially with the entire number of possible combinations of compression ratios for individual layers.

There are also works that use different clustering techniques, such as DP-net [48], which suggests using the dynamic programming technique rather than the k-means algorithm. Although they use a fixed and uniform number of shared values for each layer, they provide performance results after retraining. Pikoulis *et al.* [36] suggested a dictionary-learning-based weight clustering method that lowers the overall compu-

tational complexity by giving the centroids a unique structure. Ullrich *et al.* [44] employed soft weight-sharing, a neural network regularization technique originally introduced by Nowlan and Hinton [32], to pre-train neural networks. Their method distributed 16 Gaussian mixture components uniformly across the range of pre-trained weights, aiming to model the weight distribution through variational learning. However, this approach is computationally intensive and susceptible to network collapse if the Gamma hyper-prior parameter for the variances of the mixture components is not included.

In summary, compressing deep neural networks while preserving their accuracy and performance by weight-sharing compression is a challenging task. In our view, the performance of the compressed network is highly dependent on two criteria: 1) the quality of grouping weights in the whole network and 2) the approximation of representative weight to be shared among weights of the network with efficiency.

### B. Dimensionality Reduction in Hybrid Training

By taking into consideration the histogram of pre-trained weights, Gheorghe and Ivanovici [13] proposed a model-based weight quantization method that uses the double exponential probability density function to define quantization limits. However, their work is limited to modifying fully connected layers with convolutional layers and changing activation functions to implement on a hardware FPGA device.

Recently, Khosrowshahli *et al.* [26] proposed an efficient hybrid fine-tuning of DNNs approach using evolutionary meta-heuristics. They argued that training deep neural networks such as ResNet-18 using gradient-descent (GD) optimization without learning rate schedulers does not guarantee generalization. We are aware that training DNNs using GD has a quick convergence due to the nature of being a local search algorithm. In this work, they suggested a sequential hybridization of GD and gradient-free optimization. To achieve a gradient-free optimization, they employed the macro-averaged F1-score as the objective function. For parameter fine-tuning, they utilized an evolutionary meta-heuristic algorithm, specifically differential evolution (DE). This algorithm uses a population of candidate solutions to enhance diversity within the search space, necessitating a substantial DRAM capacity of  $2 \times NP \times D$ . Instead of decreasing population size, they devised a massive dimension reduction method that uses histogram uniform blocking of weights after training by GD. Previously, the efficiency of random blocking of dimensions was approved on large global black-box optimization problems where the dimension of search space is  $D = 10,000$  and  $D = 100,000$  [22]. The search space dimensionality reduction opens the horizon to population-based evolutionary optimization algorithms such as DE, PSO, and CMA-ES. In addition, multi-task learning problems which employ  $M$  objectives for  $T$  tasks can be effectively addressed by evolutionary multi-objective algorithms such as NSGA-II [6] (for  $M \leq 3$ ) and NSGA-III [5] (for  $M > 3$ ).

## III. PROPOSED METHOD

In this work, we propose a multi-objective neural network compression technique using meta-heuristic optimization. An

overview of the proposed compression framework is illustrated in Figure 1. We consider quantizing every weight and bias of all layers in a neural network together at once as a  $1-d$  vector. DNNs scale up to millions and billions of parameters, increasing the sparsity and, likewise, the complexity of quantization. In order to approximate the optimal intrinsic parameters efficiently, we propose an optimal quantization method that quantizes and constructs codebooks for extrinsic parameters with  $O(N)$  time complexity. In the following, we explain the different sections of our work.

### A. Uniform Binning

Let a network with  $N$  parameters be valued in a range of  $[\theta_{min}, \theta_{max}]$ . As we have discussed before, it is proven that neural network weights follow a normal distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma)$  with  $\mu = 0$ . It can be understood that a subset of parameters that follows the distribution of full-precision parameters has a uniform likelihood. As much as weight values become closer to zero, the redundancy of values increases, and replacing them with a shared weight ( $\approx 0$ ) prevents the network output from changing drastically. This observation tells us that the density of values closer to zero goes up, which results in massive compression. However, the far weights from zero are crucial to map to a shared weight that prevents performance degradation. Keeping the weight-sharing technique for compression as simple as possible is our main goal, which is to uniformly distribute equal-sized  $k$  bins. The size of each bin is equally calculated with respect to the length of minimum and maximum parameters  $\theta$  in the network as follows:

$$\Delta = \frac{\theta_{max} - \theta_{min}}{k}. \quad (3)$$

As a result each bin  $B_i$  has an interval of  $B_i \subseteq [B_{min,i}, B_{max,i}]$ . What follows, we can locate the corresponding index of parameters in bin  $B_i$  is calculated:

$$b_i = \left\lfloor \frac{\theta - \theta_{min}}{\Delta} \right\rfloor \quad (4)$$

Where  $b_i$  represents the bin index for the  $\theta_i$ . Determining the range of parameters can run in  $O(N)$  time complexity and computing bin widths involves  $O(B)$  time complexity and assigning each parameter to determine which bin it belongs to runs in  $O(N)$  time complexity. Since  $|B| < N$ , the total time complexity for our proposed quantization method with  $N$  weights is  $O(N)$ . Since the bin widths are equal and calculated based on two extreme points, min and max parameter values, it is expected to see bins do not locate any parameters. As a result, the empty bins needs to be removed which reduces the expected uniform intervals  $k$  to a lower and unknown number of bins  $d = |B|$  and  $d < k$  which is equal to the number of shared centroid weight values. Using the indices of bins and centroid values, we construct a codebook  $C$  to map the  $N$  weights in the network to  $d$  shared centroid weight values. A centroid value  $c$  for  $i$ -th bin is calculated with non-weighted averaging on weights in bins as follows:

$$c_i = \frac{1}{|B_i|} \sum_{j \in B_i} \theta_j \quad (5)$$




Fig. 1: Diagram illustrates the proposed compression pipeline for deep neural network parameters. The first stage is to find optimal  $k$  for ordinary equal-width histogram clustering using evolutionary multi-objective optimization, which results in a set of Pareto frontier for various  $k$ s with respect to the resulting number of shared weights  $d$ . The second stage is to utilize solutions above the baseline threshold for an iterative merge for extra compression of  $d$ s to get  $m$  shared weights. In the last stage, we reduced the size of codebooks from using fixed-length codes to variable-length codes by Huffman coding, which results in the shown Huffman tree.

While previous works used the centroid of clusters optimized by inertia, we are inspired to adopt center-based sampling [37] to quickly and optimally approximate the shared weight value from Khosrowshahli *et al.* [23]–[25]. They applied center-based sampling to solutions in clusters to generate high-quality center-based solutions, which accelerated the convergence in black-box optimization problems.

### B. Multi-objective Uniform Binning

Compression, similar to many other learning problems, can be considered a multi- or many-objective (MO) case study where two main objectives are minimized. These objectives are described as follows:

- $f_1$ : Number of shared weights representing the codebook size containing non-empty bins of pre-trained weights. Since the aim is to reduce the shared weights, it is indeed a minimization objective.
- $f_2$ : F1-score is used to evaluate the performance on a balanced validation dataset. In optimization, we convert to error value for the sake of minimization by deducting the F1-score by one as follows:  $1 - F1$ .

Where F1-score is a metric used to evaluate the performance of classification models. It is the harmonic mean of Precision and Recall, providing a single measure that balances both concerns. It is formulated as follows:

$$F1 = 2 \times \frac{Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall} \quad (6)$$

Similar to [11], we use NSGA-II as an MO algorithm to search for a single variable  $k$  using the two objectives defined

above. In this way, a Pareto frontier set of solutions shows a wide range of choices for the user. We tend to find a sweet spot that does not lower the F1-score of the trained network. For simplicity, only a single variable is required as a decision variable in solutions, which is the number of bins  $k$  in the histogram-clustering. We observed that the initialization of candidate solutions has a crucial impact on leading the optimization. To prevent budget waste and increase convergence, we assign a  $[lb, ub]$  to limit the  $k$  for a local search. In any iteration, we do not retrain the network with the shared weights as it requires extra cost, making the compression method inefficient. Instead, we feed-forward validation data to the network and calculate the F1-score as  $f_2$ . Since we are liberating our model from gradients, we tend to use evaluation metrics directly on the quantized weights instead of differentiable loss functions such as cross entropy. For a detailed description of the proposed compression algorithm, a pseudo-code is provided in Algorithm 1. For the initialization of candidate solutions in population for NSGA-II algorithm, we used linear spacing (see Algorithm 2 to uniformly distribute single  $k$  decision variables within the  $[lb, ub]$  range to make sure the algorithm fairly initializes to search in a wide range and avoid skipping. The  $k$  is only optimal when the minimum number of shared weights  $d$  is the least for the performance same or above the baseline threshold. Our proposed uniform binning uniformly spaces the intervals with equal steps in the range of parameters and calculates the centroid of non-empty bins as the representative shared weight bins. With indices of bins to centroids, we construct a lookup table (i.e., codebook)

to store the bin indices for parameters in the neural network. For selection, we evaluate the shared centroid weights in the neural network on validation data using F1-score. F1-score is typically a maximization metric where  $F1 = 1.0$  is the best and  $F1 = 0.0$  is worst. For optimization, the F1-score is transformed into an error value formulated as follows:  $1 - F1$ .

After reaching the maximum number of iterations  $Max_{iter}$ , the resulting population undergoes non-dominated sorting to retrieve the Pareto frontier solutions in the first level.

---

**Algorithm 1** Pseudo-code for the MO-UB method.

---

**Input:** Number of maximum iteration  $Max_{iter}$ , Population size  $NP$ , lower and upper bounds in population  $k_{lb}, k_{ub}$ , network  $\mathcal{N}$ , pre-trained parameters  $\theta$ , validation dataset  $D_v$ .

**Output:** Pareto frontier  $PF$ .

$$\Delta \leftarrow \frac{\theta_{max} - \theta_{min}}{k}$$

Initialize population  $P \sim \text{LINEARSPACING}^2(k_{lb}, k_{ub}, NP)$ .

Set iteration counter zero  $t \leftarrow 0$ .

**while** ( $t < Max_{iter}$ ) **do** ▷ MO iterations

$Q_t \leftarrow \text{ask NSGA-II}(P_t)$ . ▷ Offspring generation

**for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $NP$  **do** ▷ Offspring evaluation

$k \leftarrow Q_t(i)$ . ▷  $k$  bin decision variable.

$B, c \leftarrow \text{UNIFORM BINNING}(\theta, \Delta)$ .

$C \leftarrow \text{CODEBOOK}(B)$ . ▷ LUT construction.

$f_{Q_t}^1 \leftarrow \text{len}(C)$ . ▷ Number of shared centroids.

$f_{Q_t}^2 \leftarrow 1 - F1(\mathcal{N}, D_v, c, \text{codebook})$ . ▷ Evaluation.

**end for**

$P_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{tell NSGA-II}(P_t \cup Q_t, f_{P_t} \cup f_{Q_t})$ .

$t \leftarrow t + 1$ .

**end while**

$PF \leftarrow \text{NDS}(P_t)$  ▷ Non-dominated sorting to get Pareto frontier solutions ( $PF$ ) [6]

**return**  $PF$

---

### C. Iterative Merge of Bins

In order to further reduce the number of blocks in the codebook, we can conditionally merge bins to transform uniform to non-uniform quantization. Theoretically, the bins of weights are constructed by mapping uniformly spaced bins to trained weights in the network. For instance, two neighboring bins  $B_i$  and  $B_{i+1}$  have boundaries as follows:

$$B_i \subseteq [B_{min,i}, B_{max,i}), B_{i+1} \subseteq [B_{min,i+1}, B_{max,i+1}). \quad (7)$$

Since they are initially spaced with uniform intervals, it concludes the following:

$$B_{max,i} = B_{min,i+1}. \quad (8)$$

Let the network performance with the shared weights using F1-score metric be  $f_{curr}$ . In this direction, we iteratively merge the neighboring bins (left and right sides) with the pointing bin and decide to accept either the left or right merge based on  $argmax$  of three F1-scores ( $f_L, f_R, f_{curr}$ ). In case the condition approves the merging, two bins are replaced with the merged bin to update the codebook and do  $f_{curr} = \max(f_L, f_R, f_{curr})$ . The iteration proceeds without advancing the pointer index, allowing the left or right losing neighbor to be merged once more in the subsequent iteration.

TABLE I: Memory comparison of the compression schemes on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. The resulting set of Pareto frontier solutions are shown in (min, max) bounds.

Model	Method	$k$	# Params	Avg. bits (↓)	CR (↑)
ResNet-18 (CIFAR-10)	Baseline	–	11.2M	32.0	1.0
	Random UB ( $k = 1024$ )	1024	538	10.0	4.00
	Ours: MO-UB*	[231, 311]	[152, 197]	[8.0, 8.0]	[4.0, 4.0]
	Ours: MO-UB + M†	[231, 311]	[41, 79]	[6.0, 7.0]	[4.57, 5.33]
	Ours: MO-UB + M + H‡	[231, 311]	[41, 79]	[2.13, 2.33]	[13.72, 14.98]
ResNet-18 (CIFAR-100)	Baseline	–	11.2M	32.0	1.0
	Random UB ( $k = 1024$ )	1024	773	10.0	3.20
	Ours: MO-UB	[173, 215]	[158, 192]	[8.0, 8.0]	[4.0, 4.0]
	Ours: MO-UB + M	[173, 215]	[41, 76]	[6.0, 7.0]	[4.57, 5.33]
	Ours: MO-UB + M + H	[173, 215]	[41, 76]	[2.46, 2.76]	[11.61, 12.99]

\* MO-UB: Multi-Objective Uniform Binning

† M: Iterative Merge

‡ H: Huffman Coding

As we have checked and merged every possible pair of bins, it is guaranteed that no more restarting is required when the pointer reaches the last block. Even while merging and re-evaluating  $f_L$  and  $f_R$  is an expensive procedure, it significantly reduces the size of the codebook and the number of shared weights while improving performance. Nevertheless, it is more efficient than transferring a single or batch of parameters from one block to another.

### D. Huffman Coding

In the compression of models, the weight of the lookup table (codebook) usually outstands the size of the shared weight in full-precision format. Nevertheless, we can use a better indexing system than a simple lookup table, which has an efficient memory, to be able to use fewer bits for indexing. Inspired by [2], [17], we apply Huffman coding, which is an optimal prefix code commonly used for lossless data compression. The notion is to give input characters variable-length codes, the lengths of which are determined by the frequency of the matching characters. It generates a deep Huffman tree where the first depths have the largest frequency, and the last depths have the smallest.

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

To verify the effectiveness of the proposed multi-objective deep neural network compression by weight-sharing, we conduct experiments on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet-1K datasets. We first introduce the datasets and provide experimental settings for the multi-objective optimization in Section IV-A, followed by the comparison to previous weight-sharing quantization methods and analysis of the Pareto frontier solutions using visualization to show how MO captures the optimal solution in Section IV-B.

### A. Experimental Settings

a) *Datasets:* The experiments are carried out on three publicly available three RGB format image classification datasets, namely, CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and ImageNet-1K. CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 [27] datasets have 50,000 training and 10,000 test  $32 \times 32$  pixel tiny images in 10 and 100 classes, respectively. Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC) ImageNet-1K [28] dataset has 1.2 million

TABLE II: Performance of the compression schemes on test sets in CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. The resulting set of Pareto frontier solutions are shown in (min, max) bounds.

Model	Method	Top-1 (% , $\uparrow$ )	CR ( $\uparrow$ )
ResNet-18 (CIFAR-10)	Baseline	94.8	1.0
	Random UB ( $k = 1024$ )	94.8	3.20
	Ours: MO-UB*	[94.8, 95.4]	4.00
	Ours: MO-UB + M <sup>†</sup>	[94.4, 94.7]	[4.57, 5.33]
	Ours: MO-UB + M + H <sup>‡</sup>	[94.4, 94.7]	<b>[13.72, 14.98]</b>
ResNet-18 (CIFAR-100)	Baseline	75.9	1.0
	Random UB ( $k = 1024$ )	76.1	3.20
	Ours: MO-UB	[75.2, 75.5]	4.00
	Ours: MO-UB + M	[74.4, 74.5]	[4.57, 5.33]
	Ours: MO-UB + M + H	[74.4, 74.5]	<b>[11.61, 12.99]</b>

\* MO-UB: Multi-Objective Uniform Binning

† M: Iterative Merge

‡ H: Huffman Coding

training images and 50,000 validation varying high resolution images in 1000 classes. For all experiments, we require 10% validation data from unseen (test) datasets to ensure the constructed codebook by given  $k$  in MO aligns with the performance of the baseline network. For a fair comparison, we made sure the validation set was not included in the final test dataset.

*b) Network Structures and Parameters:* We adopt ResNet-[18,34,50,101] [19] and AlexNet [28] DNN models. For each model, we use pre-trained weights on the ImageNet-1K dataset found in the PyTorch model zoo [30], [35]. For CIFAR-10/100 datasets, we are required to change the output of the last layers of models to 10 and 100, and this also requires us to train the model from scratch. For the sake of simplicity and fair comparison, we used ResNet-18 to pre-train on CIFAR-10/100 datasets. In this direction, we use a Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) [42] optimizer with a multi-step learning rate decay scheduler. The initial learning rate is set to 0.1, momentum is equal to 0.9, and weight decay is equal to  $5e^{-4}$ . We set the gamma to 0.2 and use [60, 120, 160] milestones in the multi-step learning rate scheduler. We trained for 200 epochs to ensure convergence, in line with empirically established practices. For all our experiments, we use a single NVIDIA A100 GPU with 128 data batch sizes, as supported by previous empirical findings. Our proposed quantization approach does not require retraining, unlike other previous works. We only use the validation dataset to evaluate the network using the shared weights of the desirable codebook in the function evaluation of NSGA-II candidate solutions and then for validation of the iterative merge of blocks.

*c) Multi-objective Optimization:* We use the NSGA-II algorithm proposed by Deb *et al.* [6], which is an evolutionary genetic algorithm designed for optimizing a set of decision variables based on multiple conflicted objectives or tasks using a non-dominated sorting algorithm. This algorithm has the ability to differentiate and select solutions that optimize multiple criteria simultaneously to provide a balanced set of Pareto frontier. We use the publicly available pymoo library [1] and their default setting for NSGA-II. They set the population size to  $NP = 100$ , the crossover type to Simulated Binary

Crossover (SBX) [7] with  $eta = 15$  and  $prob = 0.9$  and mutation type to Polynomial Mutation (PM) with  $eta = 20$ . Given that the decision variable size is small as  $D = 1$ , we set the number of iterations as  $Max_{iter} = 10$  to make sure it investigates the majority of the possible  $k$ s in  $[k_{lb}, k_{ub}]$ . In the evaluation phase, we construct the codebook for a given  $k$  to calculate the number of shared weights as  $f_1 = d$  and load the shared weights using the constructed codebook of pre-trained weights into the network to evaluate its performance as  $f_2$ .




Fig. 2: The transition from many  $k = 1024$  uniform intervals (Figure 2a) to fewer  $d = 538$  uniform intervals (Figure 2b) after removing non-associated intervals for quantization of parameters in ResNet-18 model trained on CIFAR-10.




Fig. 3: The graphs in the first row show the procedure of computing bins of weights by uniform quantization with  $k$  bins and then removing empty bins to get  $d$  clusters. In the second row, the graphs show the extra compression of clusters that resulted from the proposed iterative merge. Here, the left and right graph shows the merged clusters before and after rearranging block indices by removing indices of merged neighbors.

## B. Results

*a) CIFAR-10/100:* Using the aforementioned configuration, we train the ResNet-18 model until convergence based

on cross-entropy loss. Before starting the compression framework, we test a random  $k$  value to analyze the sensitivity of the parameters in a network. Specifically, we examined a random number of bins  $k = 1,024$  for the trained ResNet-18 parameters to evaluate the performance of shared weights. After applying uniform binning, we discover the number of non-empty bins is  $d = 538$ , corresponding to the weights, while the remaining 586 empty bins were removed. This represents a reduction of nearly 57% in the number of bins. Fig. 2 illustrates the histograms of bin sizes with respect to their indices, showing the transition from  $k = 1024$  to  $d = 538$  bins after removing the empty ones. Reporting in Table I, we observe that the ResNet-18 with  $k = 1,024$  bins and ultimately  $d = 538$  and  $d = 773$  shared weights maintain the performance on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, demonstrating low sensitivity to the quantization process. To search for optimal  $k$  using NSGA-II, we set the boundaries of  $k$  decision variable to  $[k_{lb}, k_{ub}] = [2^1, 2^{10}]$ . As NSGA-II provides a set of Pareto frontier solutions, we use the baseline model as threshold  $\tau = F1\text{-score}(base)$  to choose solutions based on the following condition:  $1 - f_2 \geq \tau$ . This ensures that only the top Pareto frontier solutions with the highest F1-scores above the threshold are selected for further processing.

Our proposed DNN compression framework includes three sequential steps, which we apply and analyze as follows:




Fig. 4: Resulting Pareto optimal frontier solutions by MO-UB on ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10/100.

Firstly, we compare our proposed MO-UB approach to the baseline model by calculating the compression ratio using Eq. 1; the proposed method has compressed the memory required to  $CR = 4.0$  for both datasets. In this case, a tiny performance loss (0.6%) can be seen in CIFAR-100 from Table V. This huge memory reduction has the advantage of storing a codebook of weights associated with the index of representative weight and their values in FP32 format. It is worth mentioning that we plot the Pareto frontier solutions in Figure 4 to analyze the curvature of solutions diversity for various  $d$  shared-weights that can perform relatively close to the baseline pre-trained model. It is interesting to discover that the network trained on a dataset with a lower number of classes has less sensitivity of a higher  $d$  shared weights for instance,  $d < 100$  on CIFAR-10 and  $d < 150$  on CIFAR-100 leads to worse performance where it can lead to a full collapse of network for  $d < 50$  on both datasets which related to network structure, not an effect of data dependence.

Secondly, we apply the iterative merge to increase the size of neighboring blocks, which results in a massive reduction of shared weights for example, shown in Table V,  $d = 173$  blocks are reduced to  $d = 41$  blocks, which places the required fixed bits for indices of the codebook in the level of 6 bits ( $\lceil \log_2 41 \rceil = 6$ ). The resulting codebooks by MO-UB+Merge(M) are constructed based on blocks of weights in the network, and their representative shared weight index.

In the ResNet-18 codebook with 11.2M weights, each block of weights has at least one weight, and the size can be varied up to  $C_i = 10^7$  for CIFAR-10 (see Figure 6a) and  $C_i = 3 \times 10^6$  for CIFAR-100 (see Figure 6a). Moreover, we rejected candidate solutions whose F1-score value on validation data does not meet the  $\tau$  condition after iterative merging. Looking at Figure 5b, the relocation of codebooks after iterative merging results in fewer numbers of shared weights. The final overview of shared weights histograms of the ResNet-18 model trained on CIFAR-10 in each step of the framework can be observed in Figure 3. The performance of the merged Pareto frontier solutions is slightly dropped (see Table V); however, the number of shared weights dramatically decreased from [173, 215] range to [41, 76], which is almost 14% ~ 33% more compression rate for both datasets.

As we have discussed in Section III-D, the majority of memory used in compression is for the constructed simple lookup table. However, we can use loss-less compression techniques such as Huffman coding to use a more efficient indexing system like a binary search tree. Looking at Table I, we use Huffman coding, resulting in a  $CR = 15.29$  for CIFAR-10 and  $CR = 12.99$  for CIFAR-100.

We present the final results compared to the baseline pre-trained network with full-precision weights in Table I, which details compression metrics, and Table II, which evaluates performance on Test.




Fig. 5: Resulting Pareto optimal frontier solutions by MO-UB on ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10/100.

*b) ImageNet-1K:* Since the pre-trained weights provided by the PyTorch library [30], [35] were used, we did not train or fine-tune the models to be as is for a fair comparison. Our proposed DNN compression has three consecutive steps, which we apply and analyze as follows:

Due to the unknown optimal  $k$  bins, we begin the compression with our proposed MO approach on uniform binning. As the number of outputs in the last fully connected layer of networks is as large as 1000, we observe that it would be hard to achieve a small  $k$  that does not degrade the performance






Fig. 6: Histogram of optimal codebook by MO-UBM method on ResNet-18 trained on CIFAR-10/100 datasets.

of the model using  $d$  shared weights. Therefore, we set the boundaries to  $[k_{lb}, k_{ub}] = [2^1, 2^{13}]$  for all to ensure the network does not collapse (i.e., 0% accuracy) with  $d$  shared weights. We present the results of fast MO exploration for Pareto frontier solutions in Tables VI and VII. The “MO-UB” shows the outcome of accepted Pareto frontier solutions by multi-objective uniform binning on DNNs. Here, it can be seen the  $CR$  for all of them are in the range of  $CR = 2.91$  for ResNet-50 and ResNet-101 and  $CR = 3.56$  for ResNet-34, AlexNet, and ViT-B-16 networks. The accepted solutions are plotted in Fig. 7 based on performance that meets the threshold  $\tau$  criteria.

In the latter, we apply iterative merging to the candidate solutions that survived the condition  $\tau$  and show their results by the “MO-UB + Merge” tag. Looking at Tables VI and VII, it can be seen that using iterative merge is extremely helpful as it drops two bits of codebook indices for ResNet-18 and AlexNet models and one bit for ResNet-34 and ResNet-50 models. For a better understanding, the transition of accepted solutions from MO-UB to MO-UB+Merge(M) are plotted in Fig. 8. The representation of weight histograms are demonstrated in Fig. 9 for each DNN trained on the ImageNet dataset after applying iterative merging, increasing the density of network weights in blocks. This figure is important to understand the importance of weight distribution in clusters, which exponentially increases as the values become closer to zero. One can see the potentiality of pruning network weights placed in the central blocks with zero value, which results in an extreme quantization. In addition, histograms obtained from weight blocks in models ResNet-50 and ResNet-101 show a similar pattern but are different from the others. This is because the optimal number of shared weights our proposed method found is much greater than other models showing higher sensitivity to weight sharing.

Furthermore, most memory sizes for saving compressed networks depend on fixed-length indices in the codebook. We aim to use Huffman coding to use variable-length indices, which shrinks the size of the codebook dramatically. Looking at Table VI, encoding the Pareto frontier solutions could increase the compression ratio of our proposed method from  $CR = 4.0$  to  $CR_{min} = 7.70$  and  $CR_{max} = 8.41$  for ResNet-18 model without losing performance. Moreover, looking at Table VII, the highest compression is achieved in the AlexNet model, in which the  $CR$  is doubled from 4.57 to 8.58. The average bits column in the Table shows the average of bits

in the variable-length indices of the codebook, which resulted in approximately  $CR = 4$ . In contrast, the average of fixed-length indices is varied between 7 (min) to 11 (max) based on  $\lceil \log_2 d \rceil$  for all the models.

As we discussed before, most works such as [2], [3], [17], [34], [41], [43] proposed their neural network compression framework by adding weight-sharing after pruning which few works only applied weight-sharing to full precision and non-pruned networks such as [11], [12], [40]. As can be expected, the combination of pruning and weight-sharing results in a high compression ratio but with a high cost of performance degradation. To resolve this issue, they retrained/fine-tuned the neural network with shared weights to fit the pruned connections. In this work, we only apply the weight-sharing technique to compress the neural networks and use the centroid of bins as a representative weight to share among weights in the bin, thus discarding retraining of weights for a better cost. We gather and showcase two types of compression techniques for each DNN: 1) weight-sharing and 2) pruning + weight-sharing. In this way, it could be easily comparable that our work has a higher compression ratio with the same evaluation performance in comparison to just weight-sharing techniques. It is worth mentioning that our method has the most efficient quantization technique in comparison to non-uniform quantization techniques, which allows us to use evolutionary algorithms to effectively search for the Pareto optimal solutions to the best model-agnostic and data-agnostic compression.

We compare our final results to the baseline and other previous works where the results are in Tables III and IV by evaluating our method on the ImageNet-1K classification dataset for ResNet, AlexNet, and ViT-B-16 networks. Using the MO approach has the advantage of trying a wide range of  $k$ s and finding the Pareto frontier solutions by a non-dominated sorting algorithm instead of a grid search algorithm. In Figure 7, we demonstrate the location of Pareto frontier solutions on the two objectives,  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ , where the x-axis represents the  $f_1$  and the y-axis represents the opposite of  $f_2$  as validation F1-score equal to  $1 - f_2$ . We can see the resulting sharp curvature on the Pareto front on every network, telling us that there is a minimal border between model collapsing and model steadiness. Using the MO approach, we can iteratively optimize the  $k$ s to find the sweet spot and investigate optimally instead of random or grid search as the worst-case. It is interesting to see the threshold of the model collapsing in every network has a similar pattern. For example, the number of shared weights  $d < 50$  in AlexNet,  $d < 300$  in ResNet-101, and  $d < 120$  in ResNet-18 leads to losing learned information and 100% error rate.

### C. Weight Representation

One important question one can ask is *how the weights are well clustered in each layer?*

Since we adopted weights of the whole network without considering where they come from, overjumping between layers is expected. Nevertheless, we saw the performance of the network can still be consistent by using shared weights.




Fig. 7: Resulting Pareto optimal frontier solutions by MO-UB on various models trained on ImageNet-1K.

TABLE III: Comparative analysis for proposed compression methods on various models trained on ImageNet-1K. The resulting set of Pareto optimal frontier solutions are shown in (min, max) bounds.

Model	Method	$k$	# Params	Avg. bits ( $\downarrow$ )	$CR$ ( $\uparrow$ )
ResNet-18	Baseline	-	11.7M	32	1.00
	Random UB	8192	3012	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB + M + H	[1136, 1324]	[155, 215]	[4.15, 4.47]	[7.70, 8.41]
ResNet-34	Baseline	-	21.8M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	8192	3737	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB + M + H	[590, 838]	[133, 153]	[3.77, 4.29]	[7.44, 8.49]
ResNet-50	Baseline	-	25.6M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	8192	2265	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB + M + H	[5091, 5091]	[1079, 1192]	[3.92, 3.94]	[8.13, 8.17]
ResNet-101	Baseline	-	44.5M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	8192	3271	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB + M + H	4490	1322	3.97	8.05
AlexNet	Baseline	-	61.1M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	8192	1648	11.0	2.91
	MO-UB + M + H	1430	97	3.73	8.58
ViT-B-16	Baseline	-	86.6M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	8192	5269	13.0	2.46
	MO-UB + M + H	[357, 458]	[195, 266]	[4.40, 4.89]	[6.54, 7.28]

\* MO-UB: Multi-Objective Uniform Binning

† M: Iterative Merge

‡ H: Huffman Coding

Opposite to previous works, we aim our proposed method to be model-agnostic and do not consider layer-wise clustering. This causes overjumping of weights between layers that do not have the same spatial size and same type, e.g., convolutional and fully connected layers. Accordingly, we plot the representations of weights in heatmap coloring style for better




Fig. 8: Transition from MO-UB to MO-UB+M. Applying iterative merge on performance meeting threshold ( $\tau$ ) criteria shown with densely dash-dotted red line MO-UB's Pareto optimal frontier solutions shown with points.

explainability and interoperability in Fig. 10. As an example, we choose the resulted  $d = 41$  codebook size from the set of Pareto frontier solutions represented in Table I and build up a network with weight sharing. We know each weight of the network is addressed to memory with bin indices and weights with the same bin indices are clustered together. For reference, we select 6 layers in the ResNet-18 network and demonstrate the 3-D weight matrix in a 2-D view by reshaping and flattening kernel weights. The subfigures represent one ResNet-18 layer's weight heatmap according to their bin index ranging from  $[0, 40]$  for this case scenario. For reference, the captions are written with the layer's names according to PyTorch model zoo [30] implementation. For readability, we randomly zoom into the Heatmap matrix and show a square of weight indices. Comparing the subfigures, it is clear that the neighboring weights are grouped, and very few of the weights are distinct. This is due to such a huge reduction from 11M parameters to 41 clusters, and the median bins have the largest probability of showing up in any random crop of weights. For instance, bin  $i = 20$  is the most repeated in all the layers, especially in layer "layer1.0.conv1.weight" shown in Fig.10a.

## V. CONCLUSION REMARKS

In this study, we proposed a multi-objective compression framework for deep neural networks to optimally search for




Fig. 9: Histogram representation of optimal codebooks resulted by MO-UB+M on ResNet and AlexNet models trained on ImageNet-1K datasets.

the shared weights, preserving the performance of the pre-trained network. Previous works focused on using non-uniform quantization methods such as k-means, which optimize the distance between weight values to a centroid point used as the shared weight but are practically expensive to fit and infeasible to evaluate many various  $k$  cluster sizes. In this work, we proposed uniformly binning to distribute  $k$  bins evenly across the range of parameters to associate with the pre-trained weights. In weight-sharing quantization, the memory required for storing the codebook of weight indices is dependent on two factors: 1) the size of blocks and 2) the bit-wise length of indices. For the first factor, we propose an iterative merge method to merge neighboring two clusters of weights to make one if the performance does not drop, which effectively reduces the shared weights. To the best of our knowledge, we did not retrain shared weights to regain the performance and find the adjustment of shared values on the cluster; instead, we used centroid as the representative shared parameter and achieved the same performance. Furthermore, this work and previous quantization work prove that the weights in neural networks are redundant and over-parametrized, demanding the use of a smaller number of weights.

By finding different clusters of weights for various datasets and problems, we can understand that minimal weight-sharing is highly data-dependent and model-dependent. The shortcoming of our work is using uniform quantization, which does not fit the clusters accurately to the weights, which results in empty bins, but non-uniform is expensive for reparative and iterative calls in multi-objective evolutionary algorithms. Moreover, our framework suffers from being data-dependent




Fig. 10: Heatmap representation of weights sharing in various layers of ResNet-18 model trained on CIFAR-10 dataset. The number of shared weights is 41 according to Table I.

for evaluation purposes. Since the clusters of weights can not accurately be calculated with non-uniform quantization algorithms due to unknown intrinsic dimensionality, we focused on finding optimal intrinsic dimensions for various networks and data with minimal quantization complexity. Our findings reveal that uniform binning can quantize pre-trained weights with suboptimal clustering but achieve optimal  $k$  bins, resulting in a high compression ratio while maintaining the same performance as the original pre-trained weights.

In future works, we aim to move our scope to quantization-aware training [38] by gradient-free evolutionary meta-heuristic algorithms such as CMA-ES [18], PSO [21] for single-objective problems, and NSGA-II [6] for multi-objective problems. Using a population of candidate solutions can be advantageous in diversifying solutions and avoiding trapping into local optima; however, the memory space cost is expensive, and it is nearly impossible to execute evolutionary algorithms. Weight-sharing quantization can be helpful in reducing the dimensionality of search space to an optimal

TABLE IV: Performance of the compression schemes on test sets in ImageNet-1K dataset. The resulting set of Pareto optimal frontier solutions are shown in (min, max) bounds.

Model	Method	Top-1 (%), †	CR (†)	
ResNet-18	Baseline: Pre-trained	69.14	1.00	
	Pruning + Weight-sharing			
	Stock <i>et al.</i> [41]	65.81	<b>29.00</b>	
	Weight-sharing			
	SqueezeBlock [40]	[68.82, <b>73.61</b> ]	[4.24, 5.76]	
	Dupuis <i>et al.</i> [12]	69.15	5.80	
ResNet-34	Baseline: Pre-trained	72.79	1.00	
	Weight-sharing			
	Random UB	<b>72.84</b>	2.67	
	MO-UB + M + H	[72.33, 72.45]	<b>[7.44, 8.49]</b>	
	MO-UB + M + H	[68.38, 68.56]	[7.70, 8.41]	
ResNet-50	Baseline: Pre-trained	80.07	1.00	
	Pruning + Weight-sharing			
	Clip-Q [43]	73.70	15.30	
	Stock <i>et al.</i> [41]	73.79	<b>19.00</b>	
	Weight-sharing			
	SqueezeBlock [40]	[74.91, 79.24]	[4.24, 5.76]	
	Dupuis <i>et al.</i> [11]	76.00	[5.3, 5.6]	
	Random UB	80.07	2.67	
	MO-UB + M + H	[79.75, 79.76]	[8.13, 8.17]	
	ResNet-101	Baseline: Pre-trained	81.34	1.00
Weight-sharing				
Random UB		81.32	2.67	
MO-UB + M + H		81.22	<b>8.05</b>	
AlexNet	Baseline: Pre-trained	57.22	1.00	
	Pruning + Weight-sharing			
	Deep Compression [17]	57.22	35.00	
	Choi <i>et al.</i> ( <i>k</i> -means) [2]	56.12	30.53	
	Choi <i>et al.</i> (Hessian-weighted <i>k</i> -means) [2]	56.04	33.71	
	Choi <i>et al.</i> (Uniform) [2]	56.20	40.65	
	Choi <i>et al.</i> (ECVQ) [3]	56.20	40.65	
	[17] + Weighted-Entropy Quantization [34]	56.30	37.50	
	Clip-Q [43]	<b>57.90</b>	<b>51.10</b>	
	Weight-sharing			
	Random UB	55.75	2.91	
	MO-UB + M + H	55.32	8.58	
	ViT-B-16	Baseline: Pre-trained	80.82	1.00
		Weight-sharing		
SqueezeBlock [40]		[79.80, <b>81.35</b> ]	[4.24, 5.76]	
Random UB		80.81	2.46	
MO-UB + M + H	[80.40, 80.58]	<b>[6.54, 7.28]</b>		

\* MO-UB: Multi-Objective Uniform Binning

† M: Iterative Merge

‡ H: Huffman Coding

number of quantization levels during training, which allows for the benefit of evolutionary optimization. If the resource is available, we suggest using the proposed iterative merging during optimization on every possible candidate solution, not after optimization and applying on above baseline threshold Pareto optimal solutions. In this way, the expected Pareto frontier solutions would result in a more compression ratio while maintaining performance.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Blank and K. Deb. pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in python. *IEEE Access*, 8:89497–89509, 2020.
- [2] Y. Choi, M. El-Khamy, and J. Lee. Towards the limit of network quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.01543*, 2016.
- [3] Y. Choi, M. El-Khamy, and J. Lee. Universal deep neural network compression. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 14(4):715–726, 2020.
- [4] Y.-M. Chou, Y.-M. Chan, J.-H. Lee, C.-Y. Chiu, and C.-S. Chen. Merging deep neural networks for mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 1686–1694, 2018.
- [5] K. Deb and H. Jain. An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm using reference-point-based nondominated sorting approach, part i: solving problems with box constraints. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, 18(4):577–601, 2013.
- [6] K. Deb, A. Pratap, S. Agarwal, and T. Meyarivan. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii. *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, 6(2):182–197, 2002.
- [7] K. Deb, K. Sindhya, and T. Okabe. Self-adaptive simulated binary crossover for real-parameter optimization. In *Proceedings of the 9th annual conference on genetic and evolutionary computation*, pages 1187–1194, 2007.
- [8] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [9] L. Duong, T. Cohn, S. Bird, and P. Cook. Low resource dependency parsing: Cross-lingual parameter sharing in a neural network parser. In *Proceedings of the 53rd annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th international joint conference on natural language processing (volume 2: short papers)*, pages 845–850, 2015.
- [10] E. Dupuis, D. Novo, I. O’Connor, and A. Bosio. Cnn weight sharing based on a fast accuracy estimation metric. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 122:114148, 2021.
- [11] E. Dupuis, D. Novo, I. O’Connor, and A. Bosio. A heuristic exploration of retraining-free weight-sharing for cnn compression. In *2022 27th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, pages 134–139. IEEE, 2022.
- [12] E. Dupuis, D. Novo, I. O’Connor, and A. Bosio. Sensitivity analysis and compression opportunities in dnns using weight sharing. In *2020 23rd International Symposium on Design and Diagnostics of Electronic Circuits & Systems (DDECS)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2020.
- [13] S. Gheorghie and M. Ivanovici. Model-based weight quantization for convolutional neural network compression. In *2021 16th International Conference on Engineering of Modern Electric Systems (EMES)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2021.
- [14] H. Gish and J. Pierce. Asymptotically efficient quantizing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 14(5):676–683, 1968.
- [15] C. Goddard, S. Siriwardhana, M. Ehghaghi, L. Meyers, V. Karpukhin, B. Benedict, M. McQuade, and J. Solawetz. Arcee’s mergekit: A toolkit for merging large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.13257*, 2024.
- [16] Y. Gong, L. Liu, M. Yang, and L. Bourdev. Compressing deep convolutional networks using vector quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6115*, 2014.
- [17] S. Han, H. Mao, and W. J. Dally. Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and Huffman coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*, 2015.
- [18] N. Hansen. The cma evolution strategy: A tutorial. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.00772*, 2016.
- [19] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *arXiv e-prints. arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03385*, 10, 2015.
- [20] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [21] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart. Particle swarm optimization. In *Proceedings of ICNN’95-international conference on neural networks*, volume 4, pages 1942–1948. IEEE, 1995.
- [22] R. Khosrowshahli and S. Rahnamayan. Block differential evolution. In *2023 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2023.
- [23] R. Khosrowshahli, S. Rahnamayan, and A. A. Bidgoli. Clustering center-based differential evolution. In *2022 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2022.
- [24] R. Khosrowshahli, S. Rahnamayan, A. Ibrahim, A. Asilian Bidgoli, and M. Makrehchi. Population-level center-based sampling for meta-heuristic algorithms. Available at SSRN 4939115, 2024.
- [25] R. Khosrowshahli, S. Rahnamayan, A. Ibrahim, and M. Makrehchi. Ranking center-based nsga-ii. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, pages 4162–4169. IEEE, 2023.
- [26] R. Khosrowshahli, S. Rahnamayan, and B. Ombuki-Berman. Massive dimensions reduction and hybridization with meta-heuristics in deep learning. In *2024 IEEE Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering (CCECE)*, pages 469–475. IEEE, 2024.
- [27] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.

- [28] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
- [29] C. Li, H. Farkhoor, R. Liu, and J. Yosinski. Measuring the intrinsic dimension of objective landscapes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.08838*, 2018.
- [30] S. Marcel and Y. Rodriguez. Torchvision the machine-vision package of torch. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1485–1488, 2010.
- [31] J. Martinez, J. Shewakramani, T. W. Liu, I. A. Bãrsan, W. Zeng, and R. Urtasun. Permute, quantize, and fine-tune: Efficient compression of neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 15699–15708, 2021.
- [32] S. J. Nowlan and G. E. Hinton. Simplifying neural networks by soft weight-sharing. *Neural Computation*, 4(4):473–493, 1992.
- [33] K. Ota, M. S. Dao, V. Mezaris, and F. G. D. Natale. Deep learning for mobile multimedia: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, 13(3s):1–22, 2017.
- [34] E. Park, J. Ahn, and S. Yoo. Weighted-entropy-based quantization for deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5456–5464, 2017.
- [35] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [36] E. V. Pikoulis, C. Mavrokefalidis, S. Nousias, and A. S. Lalos. A new clustering-based technique for the acceleration of deep convolutional networks. *Deep Learning Applications, Volume 3*, pages 123–150, 2022.
- [37] S. Rahnamayan and G. G. Wang. Center-based sampling for population-based algorithms. In *2009 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 933–938. IEEE, 2009.
- [38] B. Rokh, A. Azarpeyvand, and A. Khanteymoori. A comprehensive survey on model quantization for deep neural networks in image classification. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 14(6):1–50, 2023.
- [39] S. Son, S. Nah, and K. M. Lee. Clustering convolutional kernels to compress deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 216–232, 2018.
- [40] M. Song, J. Wu, Y. Ding, and H. K.-H. So. Squeezeblock: A transparent weight compression scheme for deep neural networks. In *2023 International Conference on Field Programmable Technology (ICFPT)*, pages 238–243. IEEE, 2023.
- [41] P. Stock, A. Joulin, R. Gribonval, B. Graham, and H. Jégou. And the bit goes down: Revisiting the quantization of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.05686*, 2019.
- [42] I. Sutskever, J. Martens, G. Dahl, and G. Hinton. On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1139–1147. PMLR, 2013.
- [43] F. Tung and G. Mori. Clip-q: Deep network compression learning by in-parallel pruning-quantization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7873–7882, 2018.
- [44] K. Ullrich, E. Meeds, and M. Welling. Soft weight-sharing for neural network compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.04008*, 2017.
- [45] K. Wang, Z. Liu, Y. Lin, J. Lin, and S. Han. Haq: Hardware-aware automated quantization with mixed precision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8612–8620, 2019.
- [46] J. Wu, C. Leng, Y. Wang, Q. Hu, and J. Cheng. Quantized convolutional neural networks for mobile devices. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4820–4828, 2016.
- [47] J. Wu, Y. Wang, Z. Wu, Z. Wang, A. Veeraraghavan, and Y. Lin. Deep k-means: Re-training and parameter sharing with harder cluster assignments for compressing deep convolutions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5363–5372. PMLR, 2018.
- [48] D. Yang, W. Yu, A. Zhou, H. Mu, G. Yao, and X. Wang. Dp-net: Dynamic programming guided deep neural network compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09615*, 2020.

APPENDIX  
PSEUDO CODE

---

**Algorithm 2** Pseudo-code for “LinearSpacing” function.

---

```

1: function LINEARSPACING( $lb, ub, NP$ )
2:    $\delta \leftarrow \frac{ub-lb}{NP-1}$ .
3:    $result \leftarrow []$ .
4:   for  $i = 1$  to  $NP$  do
5:      $value \leftarrow start + i \times \delta$ .
6:     Append  $value$  to  $result$ .
7:   end for
8:   return  $result$ 
9: end function

```

---

APPENDIX  
CUMULATIVE RESULTS

TABLE V: Comparison table for the proposed compression method on parameters of ResNet-18 network trained on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets. The set of Pareto frontier solution evaluation results are shown in (min, max).

Dataset	Model	Method	Val F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	Test F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	$k$ intervals	# Parameters	Avg. bits	CR
CIFAR-10	ResNet-18	Baseline	0.9511	0.9478	-	11.2M	32.0	1.0
		Random UB	0.9511	0.9480	1024	538	10.0	3.20
		MO-UB	(0.9511, 0.9541)	(0.9476, 0.9542)	(231, 311)	(152, 197)	8.0	4.00
		MO-UB + Merge	(0.9521, 0.9542)	(0.9444, 0.9467)	(231, 311)	<b>(41, 79)</b>	(6, 7)	(4.57, 5.33)
		MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(0.9521, 0.9542)	(0.9444, 0.9467)	(231, 311)	<b>(41, 79)</b>	<b>(2.13, 2.33)</b>	<b>(13.72, 14.98)</b>
CIFAR-100	ResNet-18	Baseline	0.7481	0.7593	-	11.2M	32.0	1.0
		Random UB	0.7497	0.7606	1024	773	10.0	3.20
		MO-UB	(0.7517, 0.7551)	(0.7515, 0.7552)	(173, 215)	(158, 192)	8.0	4.00
		MO-UB + Merge	(0.7526, 0.7572)	(0.7437, 0.7449)	(173, 215)	<b>(41, 76)</b>	(6, 7)	(4.57, 5.33)
		MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(0.7526, 0.7572)	(0.7437, 0.7449)	(173, 215)	<b>(41, 76)</b>	<b>(2.46, 2.76)</b>	<b>(11.61, 12.99)</b>

---

TABLE VI: Comparison table for the proposed compression method and other methods for models trained on ImageNet-1k dataset. The set of Pareto frontier solution evaluation results are shown in (min, max) order.

Model	Method	Val F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	Test F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	$k$ intervals	# Parameters	Avg. bits	CR
ResNet-18	Baseline	69.72	69.14	-	11.7M	32	1.00
	Random UB	69.75	69.12	8192	3012	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB	(69.77, 69.91)	(68.99, 69.05)	(1136, 1324)	<b>(617, 701)</b>	10.0	3.20
	MO-UB + Merge	(69.76, 69.78)	(68.38, 68.56)	(1136, 1324)	<b>(155, 215)</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>4.00</b>
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(69.76, 69.78)	(68.38, 68.56)	(1136, 1324)	<b>(155, 215)</b>	<b>(4.15, 4.47)</b>	<b>(7.70, 8.41)</b>
ResNet-34	Baseline	0.73.15	0.72.79	-	21.8M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	73.22	72.84	8192	3737	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB	(73.16, 73.22)	(72.50, 72.80)	(590, 838)	(434, 587)	(9.0, 10.0)	(3.56, 3.20)
	MO-UB + Merge	(73.17, 73.21)	(72.33, 72.45)	(590, 838)	<b>(133, 153)</b>	8.0	4.00
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(73.17, 73.21)	(72.33, 72.45)	(590, 838)	<b>(133, 153)</b>	<b>(3.77, 4.29)</b>	<b>(7.44, 8.49)</b>
ResNet-50	Baseline	0.8016	0.8007	-	25.6M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	80.10	80.07	8192	2265	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB	(80.29, 80.81)	(79.75, 79.82)	(5030, 5091)	(1497, 1517)	11.0	2.91
	MO-UB + Merge	(80.58, 80.70)	(79.75, 79.76)	(5091, 5091)	<b>(1079, 1192)</b>	11.0	2.91
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(80.58, 80.70)	(79.75, 79.76)	(5091, 5091)	<b>(1079, 1192)</b>	<b>(3.92, 3.94)</b>	<b>(8.13, 8.17)</b>
ResNet-101	Baseline	81.81	81.34	-	44.5M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	81.89	81.32	8192	3271	12.0	2.67
	MO-UB	81.97	81.28	4490	1670	11.0	2.91
	MO-UB + Merge	82.18	81.22	4490	<b>1322</b>	11.0	2.90
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	82.18	81.22	4490	<b>1322</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>8.05</b>

TABLE VII: Comparison table for the proposed compression method and other methods for models trained on ImageNet-1K dataset. The set of Pareto frontier solution evaluation results are shown in (min, max) order.

Model	Method	Val F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	Test F1 score ( $\uparrow$ )	$k$ intervals	# Parameters	Avg. bits	CR
AlexNet	Baseline	55.51	55.79	-	61.1M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	55.47	55.75	8192	1648	11.0	2.91
	MO-UB	55.59	55.71	1430	408	9.0	3.56
	MO-UB + Merge	55.62	55.32	1430	<b>97</b>	7.0	4.57
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	55.62	55.32	1430	<b>97</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>8.58</b>
ViT-B-16	Baseline	80.80	80.82	-	86.6M	32.0	1.00
	Random UB	80.82	80.81	-	5269	13.0	2.46
	MO-UB	(80.87, 81.01)	(80.42, 80.59)	(357, 458)	(303, 381)	9.0	3.56
	MO-UB + Merge	(81.04, 81.11)	(80.40, 80.58)	(357, 458)	<b>(195, 266)</b>	(8.0, 9.0)	(3.20, 3.56)
	MO-UB + Merge + Huffman	(81.04, 81.11)	(80.40, 80.58)	(357, 458)	<b>(195, 266)</b>	<b>(4.40, 4.89)</b>	<b>(6.54, 7.28)</b>