# TRANSFERING KNOWLEDGE INTO EFFICIENT TINY MODELS FOR OBJECT DETECTION WITH DUAL PROMPT DISTILLATION

Anonymous authors

006

008 009 010

011

013

014

015

016

017

018

019

021

023

025

026

027

028

029

031

032

035

Paper under double-blind review

#### ABSTRACT

Knowledge Distillation (KD) has demonstrated significant benefits for learning compact models for object detection. Most current work focuses on general distillation settings, where student models are relatively large and learnable, then compete with the distillation performance. However, due to the model scale and inference speed, these models are seldom deployed in real-world applications. In this paper, we dive into a challenging but more applicable setting: how to distill rich teacher knowledge into tiny, faster models for object detection? We first show that simply applying previous KD strategies under such settings cannot achieve satisfying results, due to the extremely large model capacity gap between the teacher-student pairs. To this end, we propose a simple prompt-based object detection distillation framework, namely DualPromptKD, which aims to improve knowledge transfer efficiency from both teacher and student perspectives. Specifically, by distilling teacher representations into compact external prompts, we enable the student model to fully leverage proficient teacher knowledge even at inference time. In terms of the limited learning ability of the student model, we introduce lightweight internal prompts tailored to bolster the feature imitation capability for the target model. Extensive experimental results on the COCO benchmarks validate the effectiveness and generalization of our approach, including different image backbones and detector types. Notably, our DualPromptKD surpasses the previous best distillation strategies by more than 2.0 mAP under various experimental settings. The code will be available.

034 1 INTRODUCTION

The field of object detection has made remarkable advancements with the emergence of deep learning models (Cai & Vasconcelos, 2019; He et al., 2017; Tian et al., 2019; Li et al., 2020). However, the 037 practical deployment of large and computationally intensive models in real-world applications poses significant challenges in terms of model size, inference speed, and resource constraints. Knowledge Distillation (KD) (Hinton et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2017; Chang et al., 2023; Cao et al., 2022), trans-040 ferring knowledge from a well-performing teacher model to the target student model, has emerged 041 as a promising technique to address these challenges. Current research primarily focuses on extract-042 ing scenarios where teacher and student models have comparable sizes (Huang et al., 2022a; Cho 043 & Hariharan, 2019; Mirzadeh et al., 2020; Son et al., 2021; Cao et al., 2023). For example, DIST 044 (Huang et al., 2022a) replaces the traditional KL divergence with a correlation-based loss function to better extract knowledge from a strong teacher model; MTPD (Cao et al., 2023) constructs a curriculum of teacher models to progressively transfer knowledge from complex teacher models to student 046 model, effectively bridging the capacity gap and significantly enhancing the student's performance 047 on object detection tasks. However, distilling knowledge into much smaller and faster models, which 048 receives more attention in practical scenarios, is seldom discussed in previous studies. 049

In this paper, we delve into the problem of distilling rich teacher knowledge into efficient small
models for object detection, considering the substantial model capacity gap. As shown in the Fig. 1,
we attempt several state-of-the-art KD algorithms (Yang et al., 2022a; Cao et al., 2022; Huang et al.,
2022a;b) to distill the GFL (Li et al., 2020) with GhostNet (Han et al., 2020), while they only
achieve limited improvement. Among them, MasKD (Huang et al., 2022b) exhibits significantly

068

069

071

073

074

075 076 077

090

054





Figure 1: Comparing the performance of several current distillation methods with our approach on the COCO validation subset, where GFL-Res101 072 and GFL-GhostNet are utilized as the teacher and student models, respectively. The first column represents the baseline without distillation.

Figure 2: Visualization of the feature from the first layer of FPN outputs. Teacher:GFL-Res101. Student: GFL-GhostNet. (a) Original image. (b) Feature of teacher. (c) Feature of student. (d) Feature of student distilled with DualPromptKD.

079 smaller performance improvement compared to its ResNet-50 student model, and FGD (Yang et al., 080 2022a) even harms the performance of the model with extremely low parameter count. Besides, 081 we further demonstrate that the large model capacity gap manifests as significant differences in the feature distributions of the teacher and student models, as shown in Fig. 2, primarily attributable to the varying feature extraction capabilities of their image backbones. Based on this, we have the 083 following conclusions: 084

085 • When there is a significant disparity in parameter quantities between models, directly applying distillation can be suboptimal and even degrade performance due to the existence of the divergence 087 in feature representations.

 Previous approaches have primarily focused on ResNet-50 style distillation on the detector, lacking effective supervision for the shallow layers of the backbone network.

• Large models, with their parameter redundancy, can effectively capture the relationship between 091 the pre-training task and the detection task, facilitating transfer learning. However, efficient back-092 bones, constrained by network capacity, often exhibit poor performance even on in-domain training tasks. Consequently, their performance saturates relative to network size, necessitating additional 094 parameter quantities. 095

To address these issues, we propose DualPromptKD, an efficient knowledge distillation framework 096 specialized for tiny detectors. Alongside the conventional feature distillation for FPN features, DualPromptKD incorporates two additional components: During the training process, we employ a set 098 of *external prompts* to adaptively extract important representation characteristics from the teacher backbone using attention mechanisms, which are updated in a momentum-based manner. During 100 the inference process, these extracted prompts are attached to the student backbone, enabling the 101 student model to benefit from the comprehensive knowledge provided by the teacher. The attention 102 mechanism, acting as a soft association, helps mitigate the domain gap between the teacher and 103 student model representations. Additionally, we introduce lightweight *internal prompts* to guide 104 the LoRA (Hu et al., 2021; Aleem et al., 2024) as adapters using dynamically generated masks, 105 enhancing the feature extraction capability of the student model. The learnable prompts match student features through the hard association of dot products and the generated soft mask can highlight 106 important areas while suppressing noisy areas. Internal prompts are only coupled with the student 107 model, thereby preventing the drawback of blindly injecting knowledge from the teacher model.

We extensively evaluate our approach on the COCO benchmarks (Lin et al., 2014), considering various backbones and detector types. The experimental results validate the effectiveness and generalization of DualPromptKD, surpassing the previous state-of-the-art distillation strategies by more than 2.0 mAP under diverse experimental settings, demonstrating appealing robustness and practicality.

In summary, our proposed DualPromptKD framework offers an efficient solution for knowledge distillation on object detection, bridging the gap between large teacher models and compact student models. We hope it can provide a promising approach for the practical deployment of highly performant yet computationally efficient object detection models.

117 118 119

120

121

2 RELATED WORKS

#### 2.1 KNOWLEDGE DISTILLATION FOR DETECTION

122 Knowledge Distillation (KD) (Romero et al., 2014; Huang & Wang, 2017; Liu et al., 2019; Wang 123 et al., 2019; Zhang & Ma, 2020), is a kind of model compression and acceleration approach aiming 124 at transferring knowledge from a teacher model to a student model. It was first proposed by Hinton 125 (Hinton et al., 2015), using the output as soft labels to transfer the dark knowledge from a large 126 teacher network to a small student network for the classification task. Recently, some works have 127 successfully applied knowledge distillation to detectors (Cao et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022a; Chang 128 et al., 2023; Lao et al., 2023). Chen et al. (2017) first calculated the distillation loss on the detector's neck and head. The key to distillation for object detection is where to distill, due to the extreme 129 imbalance between foreground and background. PKD (Cao et al., 2022) proposes imitating features 130 with Pearson Correlation Coefficient to focus on the relational information from the teacher and relax 131 constraints on the magnitude of the features. FGD (Yang et al., 2022a) proposes focal distillation 132 which forces the student to learn the teacher's crucial parts and global distillation which compensates 133 for missing global information. MGD (Yang et al., 2022b) first proposes masking out the feature 134 maps in the knowledge distillation branch and using a generator to restore the teacher feature. And 135 MasKD (Huang et al., 2022b) distills the valuable information in the features and ignores the noisy 136 regions by learning to identify receptive regions that contribute to the task precision.

137 138

139

#### 2.2 PROMPT LEARNING

140 Prompt-based learning approaches have been extensively studied in NLP (Liu et al., 2023; Schick 141 & Schütze, 2020; Shin et al., 2020). The pioneer language model as GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) 142 has shown its great few-shot or zero-shot potential across various tasks. The core of prompt-based 143 learning is to modify the input sample into a prompted version and embed the expected output 144 information as an unfilled slot inside the prompt. Prompting has also been applied to vision models recently. CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) introduces the prompt-based learning approach into the image 145 recognition task by embedding the textual labels of the to-be-recognized objects into descriptive 146 texts, and the classification procedure can be transformed into a video-text matching problem. CoOp 147 (Zhou et al., 2022) utilizes learnable tokens as textual prompts and gains a promotion on few-shot 148 image classification. There have also been initial approaches that attempt to prompt with images. 149 CPT (Yao et al., 2024) converts visual grounding into a fill-in-the-blank problem by creating visual 150 prompts with colored blocks and color-based textual prompts. Visual prompt tuning (Jia et al., 151 2022) proposes visual prompts specific to Vision Transformers (Dosovitskiy et al., 2020), using deep 152 prompt tuning (Li & Liang, 2021) by prepending a set of tunable parameters to each Transformer 153 encoder layer.

154 155

#### 2.3 EFFICIENT TINY MODELS

156

In order to deploy on mobile devices for real-world applications, many light-weight CNN models
with reduced parameter amounts and limited computational burdens are proposed (Howard et al., 2017; Chollet, 2017; Han et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2023). MobileNetV1 (Howard et al., 2017) and
Xception (Chollet, 2017) propose the depth-wise separable convolution to decouple the regular convolution into depth-wise convolution and point-wise convolution, which alleviates a large amount of computation and parameters and has been a widely-adopted design element for modern efficient



Figure 3: **Overview of DualPromptKD**. We first perform our feature distillation on the feature 185 pyramid and then introduce two additional prompt KD. Among them, external prompt KD establishes a soft association to inject knowledge into the student from the teacher model, while internal prompt KD utilizes the hard connection to store student-relevant knowledge and performs enhance-188 ment. 189

191 CNN models. MobileNetV2 (Sandler et al., 2018) introduces the inverted residual block. Mo-192 bileNetV3 (Howard et al., 2019) enhances MobileNetV2 with squeeze-and-excitation module and 193 neural architecture search. GhostNet (Han et al., 2020) utilize a few small filters to generate more feature maps from the original convolutional layer, with an extremely efficient architecture and high 194 performance. FasterNet (Chen et al., 2023) raises partial convolution to conduct regular convolution 195 on part of the channels, which not only reduces the number of floating point operations required but 196 also increases the processing speed per second. 197

However, when these lightweight networks are used as the backbone for the student model during 199 distillation, the distillation effect is often unsatisfactory. This is due to the significant differences between the models, making it challenging for the student model to acquire effective knowledge. In 200 this paper, we propose a novel prompt-based object detection distillation method that focuses more 201 on supplementing feature information for small models, thereby achieving better performance. 202

#### 3 METHOD

206 The objective of our work is to present an extension method for knowledge distillation that can be 207 applied in extreme situations where there are significant differences between the two models. Fig. 3 208 illustrates the three pipelines that make up our proposed methodology: Feature Distillation, Internal 209 Prompt Distillation, and External Prompt Distillation.

210 211 212

203 204

205

187

190

3.1 FEATURE DISTILLATION

213 The feature distillation process follows the current paradigm of feature-level distillation for detectors (Cao et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022b). It utilises models with a large-parameter backbone as the 214 teachers and models with a small-parameter backbone as the students. This is because most detectors 215 utilise FPN (Lin et al., 2017a) to aggregate multi-scale information. Consequently, the most typical manner is to transfer knowledge from the teacher to the student through the feature map after the
 neck. Feature distillation increases the similarity of features between the two models pixel-wisely,
 allowing students to obtain additional supervision with richer information. Formally, the distillation
 of the features can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{feat} = \frac{1}{CHW} \sum \mathcal{M} \left( F^T - f(F^S) \right)^2, \tag{1}$$

where  $F^T \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C^T}$  and  $F^S \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times C^S}$  denote the feature of the teacher and student, respectively. H, W denote the height and width of the feature map and C is the channel. f is a projection layer to adapt the channel of  $F^S$  to the same as  $F^T$ . The mask  $\mathcal{M}$  is a filter, and recent methods often customise different  $\mathcal{M}$  to select meaningful regions for KD. In this section, we adopt the strategy employed in PKD (Cao et al., 2022), whereby the mask is filled with a scalar value of 1 rather than being delicately designed. We request that the normalized student features, denoted by  $\hat{F^S}$ , imitate the normalized features of the teacher, denoted by  $\hat{F^T}$ , as per Eq. 2. We place the task of selecting important features in the upstream backbone, prior to the FPN, as described in the next section.

$$\mathcal{L}_{feat} = \frac{1}{CHW} \sum \left( \hat{F^T} - f(\hat{F^S}) \right)^2,\tag{2}$$

235 236 237

238

249

250

220 221

222

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232 233 234

#### 3.2 PROMPT DISTILLATION

239 Although current feature-level distillations have achieved superior performance, traditional 240 paradigms are inherently limited. To illustrate, distilling features after the neck can facilitate the propagation of supervised signals throughout the entire feature extraction module. However, the 241 gradient of KD signals is prone to disappear in shallow stages, making it difficult to optimize ef-242 fectively. Furthermore, when the discrepancy in the number of parameters between the teacher and 243 student models is further amplified, constrained by the capacity of the model, relying solely on 244 the student is insufficient to accurately predict the teacher's output. To address these limitations, 245 we propose the introduction of the Prompt Distillation technique, which utilizes additional inserted 246 prompts as a storage medium for knowledge, effectively bridging the performance gap between the 247 teacher and student models at minimal additional cost. 248

#### 3.2.1 EXTERNAL PROMPT DISTILLATION

251 The teacher model exhibits superior feature extraction capabilities due to its intricate and precise 252 structure, which enables the effective enhancement of the information in the foreground region and the suppression of noise in the background region. The utilisation of only the predicted features of 253 the teacher model as supervision is a suboptimal approach. It is anticipated that the general features 254 of the important regions extracted by the teacher model will be summarised and incorporated as part 255 of the student model input. A set of learnable prompts, denoted by  $P^E \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times C}$  is introduced, 256 where T represents the length of the prompts and C represents the number of channels, which is 257 consistent with the number of channels in the teacher model features  $F^T$ . These prompts are sparse 258 and are used to store the characteristic regions predicted by the teacher model. Before training, this 259 is randomly initialised and will be updated dynamically during the distillation process. To prevent 260 the storage of duplicate information, the different prompts are passed through a self-attention layer, 261 making them visible to each other, as shown in the following Eq. 3:

$$\boldsymbol{P}^{E} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{W}_{m} \left[ Attn(Q = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}, K = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}) \cdot \boldsymbol{W}_{m}'(V = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}) \right],$$
(3)

265 266

262

264

Subsequently,  $W_m$  and  $W'_m$  are learnable weights, the query is generated from  $P^E$  and the key and value are taken to be the features of the teacher model. The cross-attention mechanism is employed to extract useful feature information from the context predicted by the teacher. The attention mechanism establishes a soft association between each prompt and its corresponding cluster of features, 270 thus avoiding the hard association artificially introduced for different input images. However, the 271 feature maps from the teacher model contain a significant amount of noisy background information. 272 Interacting with dense feature pixels can lead to a decrease in the efficiency of attention, while also 273 leading to unnecessary computational consumption. In order to obtain keys and values containing 274 useful information in advance, we propose an initialization strategy for the above features. We normalise the channel dimension of the teacher's features and select the top-N pixels as candidates. 275 Furthermore, since object features are often strongly correlated with the category, we combine the 276 feature with a category-aware embedding, which is encoded by the one-hot category vector. 277

278 279

281

283

284

287

290

291

$$\boldsymbol{P}^{E} = (1-\beta) \sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{W}_{m} \left[ Attn(Q = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}, K = Init(F^{T})) \cdot \boldsymbol{W}_{m}'(V = Init(F^{T})) \right] + \beta \boldsymbol{P}^{E},$$
(4)

The update formula for prompt  $P^E$  from the teacher model is given by Eq. 4, where  $\beta = 0.8$  is the momentum coefficient. It should be noted that the interaction between the prompts and the teacher model is limited to the training phase; in contrast, the prompts trained during the testing phase 285 only participates in subsequent interactions with the student model. Consequently, the strategy of momentum updating gives prompts itself a larger weight, which is beneficial in ensuring that the prompts for the student model is relatively consistent as input during both the training and testing 288 processes. Subsequent to this, the student model takes the generated prompts as input knowledge 289 and also employs the cross-attention mechanism to search for effective information to enhance its representation ability. As illustrated in Eq. 5, we also initialise the features of the student model and utilise them as query. The prompts generates key and value, and the fused query is interpolated and transformed into a residual term.

292 293

295 296 297

298

$$F^{S} = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{W}_{m} \left[ Attn(Q = Init(F^{S}), K = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}) \cdot \boldsymbol{W}_{m}'(V = \boldsymbol{P}^{E}) \right] + F^{S},$$
(5)

#### 3.2.2 INTERNAL PROMPTS DISTILLATION

**N** /

299 Given the substantial disparity in the structure and quantity of parameters between the teacher and 300 student models, as well as the limitations of blindly injecting knowledge from the teacher model, it is 301 also essential to ensure that the student model retains its own effective internal information. To this end, we introduce the learnable prompt as the internal knowledge base of the student model. Since 302 it does not involve cross-model interaction, we adopt the hard association method of dot product. 303 As described in Eq. 6, the prompts  $P^{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$  describes the dependencies of N clusters, and the 304 number of channels C is consistent with the features of the student model. The degree to which 305 pixels are rich in information can be obtained by calculating the similarities between the prompts 306 and the feature map in the spatial dimension. 307

$$\mathcal{M} = \sigma \left( \boldsymbol{P}^{I} \times F^{S} \right), \tag{6}$$

(7)

where  $\sigma$  denotes Sigmoid function and mask  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times H \times W}$ . Similarly, it is necessary to ensure 310 that the different prompts, represented by the matrices  $\mathcal{M}_{i}$ , in the prompts focus on different feature 311 templates. As shown in Eq. 7, 8, we utilize the Dice coefficient following MasKD (Huang et al., 312 2022b) to supervise the learning of prompts. 313

 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \rho_{\text{dice}} \left( \mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{M}_j \right),$ 

308

317

320

$$\rho_{\text{dice}}\left(\boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{b}\right) = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{M} a_i b_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{M} a_j^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{M} b_k^2},\tag{8}$$

Dice coefficient  $\rho_{dice}$  is typically employed to assess the resemblance between two vectors. It 321 is regarded as a penalty term for prompts, with the objective of preventing the system from be-322 coming trapped in local optima. Subsequently, the crucial information from the original stu-323 dent features is matched with prompts  $\mathcal{M}$ , and the enhanced features are obtained as follows:

 $F^{S} = \frac{1}{N} \left( \mathcal{M} \odot F^{S} \right) + F^{S}.$  Furthermore, an additional ConvLoRA (Aleem et al., 2024) is introduced as a residual term inserted into the student model, which serves to preserve effective features and suppress noise signals through the compression and decompression processes.

#### 4 MAIN EXPERIMENTS

#### 4.1 DATASETS AND EVALUATION METRIC.

To verify the effectiveness of our method, we conduct extensive experiments on the challenging MS-COCO 2017 dataset (Lin et al., 2014). The COCO dataset contains 80 object classes with 118k images for training and 5k images for testing, respectively. The performance is evaluated by the mean Average Precision (mAP) metric across the IoU threshold from 0.5 to 0.95 over all classes. Specific experimental details and parameter designs are provided in the appendix.

#### 4.2 MAIN RESULTS

Results on different backbones. Here, we show that our method is effective regardless of the backbone architectures. We utilize GFL (Li et al., 2020) as the detector. Three types of efficient tiny backbones are used by the students, including GhostNet (Han et al., 2020), MobileNetV2 (San-dler et al., 2018) and FasterNet (Chen et al., 2023). The ResNet 101 (He et al., 2016) is used by the teachers. We compared our method with five recent state-of-the-art distillation methods (Yang et al., 2022b;a; Cao et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2022a;b). As shown in Tab. 1, our distillation method surpasses other state-of-the-art distillation methods. All the student detectors gain significant im-provements in AP with the knowledge transferred from teacher detectors, e.g., GFL with GhostNet achieves a 3.5% mAP improvement on the COCO dataset. These results indicate the effectiveness and generality of our method across different backbones. 

Table 1: Results of the proposed method with different backbones on the COCO dataset. T and S mean the teacher and student detector, respectively.

Method	schedule	mAP	$AP_{50}$	$AP_{75}$	$AP_S$	$AP_M$	$AP_L$
GFL-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	44.9	63.1	49.0	28.0	49.1	57.2
GFL-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	32.6	49.0	35.2	18.0	35.0	43.7
FGD (Yang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	31.4 (-1.2)	46.7	33.7	17.2	33.1	42.7
MGD (Yang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	34.6 (+2.0)	51.3	37.1	19.8	37.6	45.5
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	33.5 (+0.9)	49.3	36.2	16.6	36.0	47.5
DIST (Huang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	33.0 (+0.4)	49.5	35.3	17.1	35.4	45.5
MasKD (Huang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	34.0 (+1.4)	50.2	36.8	18.0	36.7	46.2
Ours	$2 \times$	36.2 (+3.6)	52.8	39.2	18.4	39.1	50.1
GFL-MobileNetV2 (S)	$2 \times$	30.0	44.7	32.0	16.3	31.7	39.5
FGD (Yang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	33.0 (+3.0)	48.3	35.3	18.3	35.0	44.7
MGD (Yang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	35.1 (+5.1)	51.1	38.0	20.0	37.3	46.9
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	36.5 (+6.5)	52.8	39.5	19.9	39.7	50.0
DIST (Huang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	31.5 (+1.5)	47.0	33.8	16.1	33.3	42.7
MasKD (Huang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	34.6 (+4.6)	50.3	37.5	19.4	36.8	45.8
Ours	$2 \times$	37.4 (+7.4)	53.9	40.3	20.2	41.0	51.2
GFL-FasterNet (S)	$2 \times$	32.5	49.2	34.5	17.5	35.3	43.2
FGD (Yang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	33.1 (+0.6)	49.2	35.4	19.1	35.6	43.9
MGD (Yang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	34.5 (+2.0)	51.1	37.2	19.2	37.3	46.1
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	36.0 (+3.5)	52.3	38.9	18.7	39.0	49.4
DIST (Huang et al., 2022a)	$2 \times$	33.1 (+0.6)	50.1	35.3	17.2	35.8	45.2
MasKD (Huang et al., 2022b)	$2 \times$	35.3 (+2.8)	51.8	37.9	18.9	37.9	47.8
Ours	$2 \times$	37.7 (+5.2)	54.3	40.8	20.0	41.1	51.8

**Results on different detectors.** Our method can be applied to different detection frameworks easily, so we conduct experiments on three popular detectors, including a two-stage detector (Faster RCNN (Ren et al., 2015)), an anchor-based one-stage detector (RetinaNet (Lin et al., 2017b)) and an anchor-free one-stage detector (RepPoints (Yang et al., 2019)). The same backbone of ResNet 101 and GhostNet is used by the teachers and students respectively. And we compare the results with PKD (Cao et al., 2022), which is another effective and general distillation method. As shown in Tab. 2, our method consistently boosts the performance of all the student-teacher pairs, surpassing the counterpart in all cases. 

Table 2: Results of the proposed method with different detection frameworks on the COCO dataset.

Method	schedule	mAP	$AP_{50}$	$AP_{75}$	$AP_S$	$AP_M$	$AP_L$
Faster RCNN-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	39.8	60.1	43.3	22.5	43.6	52.8
Faster RCNN-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	28.9	47.0	30.5	16.7	30.8	38.8
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	30.3 (+1.4)	47.8	32.4	15.5	33.2	42.1
Ours	$2 \times$	33.0 (+4.1)	51.6	35.5	16.5	35.8	45.9
RetinaNet-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	38.9	58.0	41.5	21.0	42.8	52.4
RetinaNet-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	29.2	47.9	30.2	15.4	31.8	39.6
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	29.6 (+0.4)	46.7	31.0	16.0	32.7	40.9
Ours	$2 \times$	31.9 (+2.7)	49.6	33.3	16.8	34.8	44.5
RepPoints-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	42.9	63.8	46.5	25.1	47.1	57.0
RepPoints-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	31.6	50.3	33.3	17.6	34.1	42.6
PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	32.6 (+1.0)	51.0	34.2	17.5	34.9	44.8
Ours	$2 \times$	34.4 (+2.8)	53.3	36.3	18.3	36.8	47.9

Table 3: Results of the proposed method with different heterogeneous detector pairs on the COCO dataset.

MethodschedulemAP $AP_{50}$ $AP_{75}$ $AP_S$ $AP_M$ RetinaNet-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $38.9$ $58.0$ $41.5$ $21.0$ $42.8$ RepPoints-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $31.6$ $50.3$ $33.3$ $17.6$ $34.1$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $31.7$ (+0.1) $50.0$ $33.6$ $16.9$ $34.9$ Ours $2 \times$ $34.1$ (+2.5) $52.7$ $36.3$ $17.5$ $37.0$ Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $39.8$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5$ (-0.7) $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8$ (+2.6) $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$								
RetinaNet-Res101 (T) RepPoints-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $38.9$ $31.6$ $58.0$ $50.3$ $41.5$ $21.0$ $21.0$ $42.8$ $34.1$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2\times$ $2\times$ $31.7$ (+0.1) $50.0$ $50.3$ $33.6$ $16.9$ $34.9$ $34.9$ $31.7$ (+0.1)Ours $2\times$ $2\times$ $34.1$ (+ $2.5$ ) $52.7$ $36.3$ $17.5$ $37.0$ Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $2\times$ $39.8$ $2\times$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $30.2$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ $31.8$ $41.5$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $44.8$ $30.0$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $2\times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $30.1$ $14.7$ $31.2$ $31.2$ Ours $2\times$ $31.5$ (+ $2.3$ ) $48.8$ $33.1$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2\times$ $2\times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ $23.0$	Method	schedule	mAP	$AP_{50}$	$AP_{75}$	$AP_S$	$AP_M$	$AP_L$
RepPoints-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $31.6$ $50.3$ $33.3$ $17.6$ $34.1$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $31.7$ (+0.1) $50.0$ $33.6$ $16.9$ $34.9$ Ours $2 \times$ $34.1$ (+2.5) $52.7$ $36.3$ $17.5$ $37.0$ Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $39.8$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5$ (-0.7) $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8$ (+2.6) $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	RetinaNet-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	38.9	58.0	41.5	21.0	42.8	52.4
PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $31.7 (+0.1)$ $50.0$ $33.6$ $16.9$ $34.9$ Ours $2 \times$ $34.1 (+2.5)$ $52.7$ $36.3$ $17.5$ $37.0$ Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $39.8$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5 (-0.7)$ $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8 (+2.6)$ $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9 (-0.3)$ $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5 (+2.3)$ $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	RepPoints-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	31.6	50.3	33.3	17.6	34.1	42.6
Ours $2 \times$ <b>34.1</b> (+2.5) <b>52.736.317.537.0</b> Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $39.8$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5$ (-0.7) $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ <b>31.8</b> (+2.6) <b>49.533.816.234.4</b> Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ <b>31.5</b> (+2.3) <b>48.833.115.934.3</b> Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	31.7 (+0.1)	50.0	33.6	16.9	34.9	42.3
Faster RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $39.8$ $60.1$ $43.3$ $22.5$ $43.6$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5$ (-0.7) $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8$ (+2.6) $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	Ours	$2 \times$	34.1 (+2.5)	52.7	36.3	17.5	37.0	47.7
RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5$ (-0.7) $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8$ (+2.6) $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	Faster RCNN-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	39.8	60.1	43.3	22.5	43.6	52.8
PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.5 (-0.7)$ $44.8$ $30.0$ $13.8$ $31.6$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.8 (+2.6)$ $49.5$ $33.8$ $16.2$ $34.4$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9 (-0.3)$ $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5 (+2.3)$ $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	RetinaNet-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	29.2	47.9	30.2	15.4	31.8	39.6
Ours $2\times$ <b>31.8 (+2.6)49.533.816.234.4</b> Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2\times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$ RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2\times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2\times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2\times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2\times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	28.5 (-0.7)	44.8	30.0	13.8	31.6	40.7
Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ 40.861.044.523.045.0RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ 47.9 $30.2$ 15.4 $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3)44.9 $30.8$ 14.7 $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	Ours	$2 \times$	31.8 (+2.6)	49.5	33.8	16.2	34.4	45.8
RetinaNet-GhostNet (S) $2 \times$ $29.2$ $47.9$ $30.2$ $15.4$ $31.8$ PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9$ (-0.3) $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5$ (+2.3) $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	Mask RCNN-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	40.8	61.0	44.5	23.0	45.0	54.1
PKD (Cao et al., 2022) $2 \times$ $28.9 (-0.3)$ $44.9$ $30.8$ $14.7$ $31.2$ Ours $2 \times$ $31.5 (+2.3)$ $48.8$ $33.1$ $15.9$ $34.3$ Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) $2 \times$ $40.8$ $61.0$ $44.5$ $23.0$ $45.0$	RetinaNet-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	29.2	47.9	30.2	15.4	31.8	39.6
Ours         2× <b>31.5 (+2.3) 48.8 33.1 15.9 34.3</b> Mask RCNN-Res101 (T)         2×         40.8         61.0         44.5         23.0         45.0	PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	28.9 (-0.3)	44.9	30.8	14.7	31.2	40.6
Mask RCNN-Res101 (T) 2× 40.8 61.0 44.5 23.0 45.0	Ours	$2 \times$	31.5 (+2.3)	48.8	33.1	15.9	34.3	44.1
	Mask RCNN-Res101 (T)	$2 \times$	40.8	61.0	44.5	23.0	45.0	54.1
GFL-GhostNet (S) $2 \times 32.6$ 49.0 35.2 18.0 35.0	GFL-GhostNet (S)	$2 \times$	32.6	49.0	35.2	18.0	35.0	43.7
PKD (Cao et al., 2022) 2× 31.6 (-1.0) 46.3 34.3 15.6 33.7	PKD (Cao et al., 2022)	$2 \times$	31.6 (-1.0)	46.3	34.3	15.6	33.7	45.5
Ours 2× 34.6 (+2.0) 50.9 37.5 17.6 37.3	Ours	$2 \times$	34.6 (+2.0)	50.9	37.5	17.6	37.3	48.6

428 Results on heterogeneous detector pairs. The majority of existing methods have been tailored 429 for homogeneous detector pairs, whereas our approach possesses the versatility to facilitate knowl-430 edge transfer across both homogeneous and heterogeneous detector pairs. In this context, we have 431 extended our experimentation to encompass a broader array of detectors, leveraging more sophisticated heterogeneous teacher detectors, as detailed in Tab. 3. Our findings demonstrate that our method exhibits enhanced adaptability to heterogeneous models and consistently leads to superior
 performance improvements.

434 435 436

4.3 Ablation Studies

## 437 Effects of components

438 in DualPromptKD. We 439 conducted experiments to 440 demonstrate the impact 441 of each component within our DualPromptKD frame-442 work, as detailed in Tab. 4. 443 Our approach encompasses 444 three distinct distillation 445 phases: Feature distil-446 lation, Internal prompt 447 distillation, and External 448 prompt distillation. We 449 initially assessed the ef-450 ficacy of the two novel 451 prompt distillation types in

Table 4: Ablation study of components on GFL ResNet-101 teacher and GFL GhostNet student. FD stands for Feature distillation; EPD stands for External prompt distillation; IPD stands for Internal prompt distillation without ConvLoRA.

Distillations	AP	$AP_S$	$AP_M$	$AP_L$
None	32.6	18.2	34.6	47.5
FD	33.5 ( <b>+0.9</b> )	16.6	36.0	47.5
FD + ConvLoRA	34.2 ( <b>+1.6</b> )	17.1	35.8	48.5
FD + EPD	34.7 ( <b>+2.1</b> )	17.3	37.1	48.7
FD + IPD + ConvLoRA	35.6 ( <b>+3.0</b> )	18.1	37.6	49.4
FD + EPD + IPD	35.8 ( <b>+3.2</b> )	17.7	38.3	50.3
FD + EPD + IPD + ConvLoRA	36.2 ( <b>+3.6</b> )	18.4	39.1	50.1

conjunction with Feature distillation. To better illustrate the roles of different modules, we also
conducted ablation experiments on the ConvLoRA. Our findings indicate that each component
substantially enhances the student model's performance when utilized individually. Moreover,
the synergistic application of all components yields optimal results, suggesting that external and
internal prompt distillation each encapsulate distinct aspects of knowledge and are mutually
complementary.

457

Sensitivity study of the length and dimensions of the prompts. In the realm of external prompt 459 distillation, we utilize a trainable set of prompts, denoted as  $P^E \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times C}$ , to capture the distinc-460 tive regions highlighted by the teacher model. The prompt dimensions, T and C, are pivotal in 461 determining the effectiveness of knowledge transfer. To evaluate their influence, we performed an 462 ablation study, as shown in Fig. 4. Our findings reveal that the model's performance remains stable 463 across various T and C values, with the maximum mAP decrease at 0.3 points from the optimal 464 setup. Further analysis shows that while a larger prompt size can escalate model complexity, the 465 performance gains are marginal. Significantly, the  $32 \times 64$  prompt size exemplifies the efficiency 466 of our method, achieving considerable performance improvements with a minor parameter increase. 467 This underscores the fine balance our approach strikes between model complexity and performance enhancement. 468

469

470 Effectiveness and necessity of the distillation process. Our DualPromptKD proposes a method that utilizes prompts to enrich the information of the student model, which can also be used without 471 employing distillation. In this section, we validate the effectiveness and necessity of the distillation 472 process, and the experimental results are shown in Fig. 5. The results indicate that while introducing 473 prompts without using distillation does yield some performance improvement, the improvement is 474 quite limited compared to the results obtained with the distillation process. For instance, on Mo-475 bileNetV2, using only prompts results in a 0.4 mAP improvement, whereas incorporating distillation 476 leads to a 7.4 mAP performance enhancement. 477

478 479

480

### 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce DualPromptKD, an innovative framework for object detection distilla tion that employs prompts to bolster knowledge transfer between teacher and student models. Our
 approach integrates three specialized distillation modules: Feature Distillation, Internal Prompt Dis tillation, and External Prompt Distillation. Utilizing supplementary prompts for knowledge transfer,
 our method adeptly reduces the performance gap between teacher and student models with a modest
 overhead. Comprehensive experiments on diverse architectures and detectors affirm the simplicity

490

491

492

493

494

495

496 497

498

499

500

501

504

505

506 507 508

509

510 511 512

513

514

515 516

517

518

519

523

524

525

530

531



Figure 4: Comparison of model performance and parameter count under different prompt shapes. The horizontal axis represents the length and dimensions of the prompts. The "baseline" denotes the scenario where no prompt is used, i.e., only feature distillation.



Figure 5: Comparison of student model performance under different conditions. "baseline" represents the original student model, "prompts" indicates the model is applied with prompts without using distillation, "prompts+distillation" signifies that the model incorporates both prompts and distillation. All student models utilize GFL for detectors, and GFL-Res101 is used as the teacher model.

and efficacy of our approach. We envision DualPromptKD as a catalyst for future innovation in the field of knowledge distillation for compact models.

#### REFERENCES

- Sidra Aleem, Julia Dietlmeier, Eric Arazo, and Suzanne Little. Convlora and adabn based domain adaptation via self-training. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04964, 2024.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- 520 Zhaowei Cai and Nuno Vasconcelos. Cascade r-cnn: high quality object detection and instance segmentation. IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence, 43(5):1483–1498, 521 2019. 522
  - Shengcao Cao, Mengtian Li, James Hays, Deva Ramanan, Yu-Xiong Wang, and Liangyan Gui. Learning lightweight object detectors via multi-teacher progressive distillation. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 3577–3598. PMLR, 2023.
- 527 Weihan Cao, Yifan Zhang, Jianfei Gao, Anda Cheng, Ke Cheng, and Jian Cheng. Pkd: General 528 distillation framework for object detectors via pearson correlation coefficient. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:15394–15406, 2022. 529
- Jiahao Chang, Shuo Wang, Hai-Ming Xu, Zehui Chen, Chenhongyi Yang, and Feng Zhao. Detrdistill: A universal knowledge distillation framework for detr-families. In *Proceedings of the* 532 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pp. 6898–6908, 2023.
- 534 Guobin Chen, Wongun Choi, Xiang Yu, Tony Han, and Manmohan Chandraker. Learning efficient 535 object detection models with knowledge distillation. Advances in neural information processing 536 systems, 30, 2017.
- Jierun Chen, Shiu-hong Kao, Hao He, Weipeng Zhuo, Song Wen, Chul-Ho Lee, and S-H Gary 538 Chan. Run, don't walk: Chasing higher flops for faster neural networks. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 12021–12031, 2023.

540 541 542	Kai Chen, Jiaqi Wang, Jiangmiao Pang, Yuhang Cao, Yu Xiong, Xiaoxiao Li, Shuyang Sun, Wansen Feng, Ziwei Liu, Jiarui Xu, et al. Mmdetection: Open mmlab detection toolbox and benchmark. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07155</i> , 2019.
543 544 545	Jang Hyun Cho and Bharath Hariharan. On the efficacy of knowledge distillation. In <i>Proceedings</i> of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, pp. 4794–4802, 2019.
546 547	François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In <i>Proceedings</i> of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 1251–1258, 2017.
548 549 550	MMRazor Contributors. Openmmlab model compression toolbox and benchmark. https://github.com/open-mmlab/mmrazor, 2021.
551 552 553 554	Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929</i> , 2020.
555 556 557 558	Kai Han, Yunhe Wang, Qi Tian, Jianyuan Guo, Chunjing Xu, and Chang Xu. Ghostnet: More features from cheap operations. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition</i> , pp. 1580–1589, 2020.
559 560 561	Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recog- nition. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition</i> , pp. 770–778, 2016.
562 563 564	Kaiming He, Georgia Gkioxari, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Mask r-cnn. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pp. 2961–2969, 2017.
565 566	Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, et al. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. <i>arXiv</i> preprint arXiv:1503.02531, 2(7), 2015.
567 568 569	Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Grace Chu, Liang-Chieh Chen, Bo Chen, Mingxing Tan, Weijun Wang, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Vijay Vasudevan, et al. Searching for mobilenetv3. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision</i> , pp. 1314–1324, 2019.
571 572 573	Andrew G Howard, Menglong Zhu, Bo Chen, Dmitry Kalenichenko, Weijun Wang, Tobias Weyand, Marco Andreetto, and Hartwig Adam. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861, 2017.
574 575 576	Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685</i> , 2021.
577 578 579	Tao Huang, Shan You, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, and Chang Xu. Knowledge distillation from a stronger teacher. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10536</i> , 2022a.
580 581	Tao Huang, Yuan Zhang, Shan You, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, Jian Cao, and Chang Xu. Masked distillation with receptive tokens. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14589</i> , 2022b.
582 583 584	Zehao Huang and Naiyan Wang. Like what you like: Knowledge distill via neuron selectivity transfer. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01219</i> , 2017.
585 586 587	Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In <i>European Conference on Computer Vision</i> , pp. 709–727. Springer, 2022.
588 589 590	Shanshan Lao, Guanglu Song, Boxiao Liu, Yu Liu, and Yujiu Yang. Unikd: Universal knowledge distillation for mimicking homogeneous or heterogeneous object detectors. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision</i> , pp. 6362–6372, 2023.
592 593	Xiang Li, Wenhai Wang, Lijun Wu, Shuo Chen, Xiaolin Hu, Jun Li, Jinhui Tang, and Jian Yang. Generalized focal loss: Learning qualified and distributed bounding boxes for dense object detec- tion. <i>Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems</i> , 33:21002–21012, 2020.

604

622

629

637

594	Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation arXiv
595	preprint arXiv:2101.00190, 2021.
596	$\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{r}$

- Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr 597 Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In Computer 598 Vision-ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13, pp. 740–755. Springer, 2014. 600
- 601 Tsung-Yi Lin, Piotr Dollár, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, Bharath Hariharan, and Serge Belongie. 602 Feature pyramid networks for object detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on com-603 puter vision and pattern recognition, pp. 2117-2125, 2017a.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Focal loss for dense 605 object detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pp. 606 2980-2988, 2017b. 607
- 608 Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pretrain, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language pro-609 cessing. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(9):1-35, 2023. 610
- 611 Yufan Liu, Jiajiong Cao, Bing Li, Chunfeng Yuan, Weiming Hu, Yangxi Li, and Yunqiang Duan. 612 Knowledge distillation via instance relationship graph. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Confer-613 ence on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pp. 7096–7104, 2019. 614
- Seyed Iman Mirzadeh, Mehrdad Farajtabar, Ang Li, Nir Levine, Akihiro Matsukawa, and Hassan 615 Ghasemzadeh. Improved knowledge distillation via teacher assistant. In Proceedings of the AAAI 616 conference on artificial intelligence, volume 34, pp. 5191-5198, 2020. 617
- 618 Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, 619 Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual 620 models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 621 8748-8763. PMLR, 2021.
- Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object 623 detection with region proposal networks. Advances in neural information processing systems, 28, 624 2015. 625
- 626 Adriana Romero, Nicolas Ballas, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Antoine Chassang, Carlo Gatta, and 627 Yoshua Bengio. Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. arxiv 2014. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550, 2014. 628
- Mark Sandler, Andrew Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mo-630 bilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on 631 computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 4510-4520, 2018. 632
- 633 Timo Schick and Hinrich Schütze. Exploiting cloze questions for few shot text classification and natural language inference. arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.07676, 2020. 634
- 635 Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. Autoprompt: 636 Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15980, 2020. 638
- 639 Wonchul Son, Jaemin Na, Junyong Choi, and Wonjun Hwang. Densely guided knowledge distillation using multiple teacher assistants. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference 640 on Computer Vision, pp. 9395–9404, 2021. 641
- 642 Zhi Tian, Chunhua Shen, Hao Chen, and Tong He. Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object 643 detection. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, pp. 644 9627-9636, 2019. 645
- Tao Wang, Li Yuan, Xiaopeng Zhang, and Jiashi Feng. Distilling object detectors with fine-grained 646 feature imitation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern 647 Recognition, pp. 4933-4942, 2019.

648 649 650	Ze Yang, Shaohui Liu, Han Hu, Liwei Wang, and Stephen Lin. Reppoints: Point set representation for object detection. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision</i> , pp. 9657–9666, 2019.
652 653 654	Zhendong Yang, Zhe Li, Xiaohu Jiang, Yuan Gong, Zehuan Yuan, Danpei Zhao, and Chun Yuan. Focal and global knowledge distillation for detectors. In <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Confer-</i> <i>ence on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition</i> , pp. 4643–4652, 2022a.
655 656	Zhendong Yang, Zhe Li, Mingqi Shao, Dachuan Shi, Zehuan Yuan, and Chun Yuan. Masked gener- ative distillation. In <i>European Conference on Computer Vision</i> , pp. 53–69. Springer, 2022b.
658 659	Yuan Yao, Ao Zhang, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Maosong Sun. Cpt: Colorful prompt tuning for pre-trained vision-language models. <i>AI Open</i> , 5:30–38, 2024.
660 661 662	Linfeng Zhang and Kaisheng Ma. Improve object detection with feature-based knowledge distilla- tion: Towards accurate and efficient detectors. In <i>International Conference on Learning Repre-</i> <i>sentations</i> , 2020.
663 664 665	Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision- language models. <i>International Journal of Computer Vision</i> , 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.
666 667 668	
669 670	
671 672 673	
674 675	
677 678	
679 680	
682 683	
684 685 686	
687 688	
689 690 691	
692 693	
694 695 696	
697 698	
700 701	

## 702 A APPENDIX

# A.1 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

We train the student models with a batch size of 16 for 24 epochs (known as a 2× schedule). The initial learning rate is set by 0.01 for one-stage detectors and 0.02 for two-stage detectors. We reduce the learning rate by 0.1× at the 16th and 22nd epochs. We use SGD as the optimizer and set the momentum and weight decay by 0.9 and 0.0001, respectively. All the experiments are conducted on 8 GPUs with mmdetection (Chen et al., 2019) and mmrazor (Contributors, 2021) on PyTorch.

In the Feature Distillation Module, our primary training strategy was inspired by PKD cao2022pkd. For the hyperparameter loss weight, we set it to 100 for both GFL and RepPoint, and to 10 for both RetinaNet and Faster R-CNN. In the External Prompt Distillation module, we employed prompts of size  $32 \times 64$  to convey knowledge, with a momentum coefficient set to 0.8. Within the Internal Prompts Distillation, the dimensionality of the prompts must match the output feature dimensions of each layer of the backbone. For GhostNet, these dimensions are 24, 40, 112, and 160; for Mo-bileNetV2, they are 24, 32, 96, and 1280; and for FasterNet, they are 40, 80, 160, and 320. The length was uniformly set to 8. 

#### A.2 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON THE SEGMENTATION TASK.

Although our method is designed for object detection tasks, its strong versatility allows it to be applied to different datasets and downstream tasks. In the Tab. 5 below, we present the experimental results on the segmentation task using the Cityscape dataset.

Table 5: The semantic segmentation results on the Cityscape dataset. T and S mean the teacher andstudent detector, respectively. DualPromptKD represents the use of our method for distillation.

Model	aACC	mIoU	mAcc
PSPNet-Res101(T)	96.33	79.76	86.57
PSPNet-GhostNet(S)	90.96	50.58	57.79
DualPromptKD	92.09 ( <b>+1.64</b> )	53.91 ( <b>+3.13</b> )	62.76 ( <b>+4.97</b> )

A.3 DISCUSSION

Limitation. Our research methodology faces a limitation in enriching the feature representation of
 the student model using prompts extracted from the teacher model, which introduces noise due to
 inherent model differences. Furthermore, the limited information obtained through prompts restricts
 further performance improvement. Future research should address this limitation to achieve more
 significant gains in performance.

Broader Impact. Our research delves into prompt-based distillation techniques for compact models, presenting a versatile and innovative framework. As object detection models gain prevalence in
real-world applications, the demand for lightweight networks grows, driving interest in their development. Our meticulously crafted distillation methodology not only enhances the detection capabilities of lightweight networks but also sets the stage for novel approaches and insights in distillation
strategies. We anticipate that our contributions will inspire further exploration and innovation in
lightweight network optimization and the broader field of knowledge distillation.