



Correction to: A compression pipeline for one-stage object detection model

Zhishan Li¹ · Yiran Sun¹ · Guanzhong Tian¹ · Lei Xie¹ · Yong Liu¹ · Hongye Su¹ · Yifan He^{2,3}

Published online: 10 February 2021
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

Correction to: Journal of Real-Time Image Processing
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11554-020-01053-z>

In the original publication of the article, there is an error in the Table 5. The data in the Table 5 should be “– 55.99%” but it has mistakenly published as “v55.99%”.

The correct table is given below.

The original article has been corrected.

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11554-020-01053-z>.

✉ Lei Xie
leix@iipc.zju.edu.cn

¹ State Key Laboratory of Industrial Control Technology and Institute of Cyber-systems and Control, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China

² Reconova Technologies Co., Ltd, Xiamen 361008, China

³ Institute of Intelligence Science and Engineering, Shenzhen Polytechnic, Shenzhen 518055, China

Table 5 Comparative experiment of pruning

Model	Method	Model size (MB)	Relative change (%)	mAP (%)	Relative change (%)
SSD	Baseline	105.2	0.00	76.27	0.00
	Network-Slimming [8]	46.2	− 56.08	72.87	− 4.46
	L1-Norm [21]	46.2	− 56.08	74.35	− 2.52
	FPGM [24]	48.4	− 53.99	74.17	− 2.75
	Rethinking-pruning [35]	46.3	− 55.99	60.63	− 20.51
	Our method	46.3	− 55.99	75.18	− 1.43
YoloV3	Baseline	142.1	0.00	78.03	0.00
	Network-slimming [8]	26.9	− 81.07	69.85	− 10.48
	L1-Norm [21]	26.2	− 81.56	73.78	− 5.45
	FPGM [24]	30.9	− 78.25	73.85	− 5.36
	Rethinking-pruning [35]	26.4	− 81.42	64.89	− 16.84
	Our method	26.4	− 81.42	75.44	− 3.32