

# DEYO: DETR with YOLO for End-to-End Object Detection

Haodong Ouyang  
Southwest Minzu University  
Chengdu, China

ouyanghaodong@stu.swun.edu.cn

## Abstract

The training paradigm of DETRs is heavily contingent upon pre-training their backbone on the ImageNet dataset. However, the limited supervisory signals provided by the image classification task and one-to-one matching strategy result in an inadequately pre-trained neck for DETRs. Additionally, the instability of matching in the early stages of training engenders inconsistencies in the optimization objectives of DETRs. To address these issues, we have devised an innovative training methodology termed step-by-step training. Specifically, in the first stage of training, we employ a classic detector, pre-trained with a one-to-many matching strategy, to initialize the backbone and neck of the end-to-end detector. In the second stage of training, we froze the backbone and neck of the end-to-end detector, necessitating the training of the decoder from scratch. Through the application of step-by-step training, we have introduced the first real-time end-to-end object detection model that utilizes a purely convolutional structure encoder, DETR with YOLO (DEYO). Without reliance on any supplementary training data, DEYO surpasses all existing real-time object detectors in both speed and accuracy. Moreover, the comprehensive DEYO series can complete its second-phase training on the COCO dataset using a single 8GB RTX 4060 GPU, significantly reducing the training expenditure. Source code and pre-trained models are available at <https://github.com/ouyanghaodong/DEYO>.

## 1. Introduction

Object detection is a fundamental task within the field of computer vision, tasked with the precise localization and identification of various object categories within images or videos. This technology is a cornerstone for many computer vision applications, including autonomous driving, video surveillance, facial recognition, and object tracking. In recent years, advancements in deep learning, particularly methods based on Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [12], have led to groundbreaking progress in object detec-




Figure 1. DEYO has surpassed other real-time object detectors in speed and accuracy; all detectors were exclusively trained on the COCO dataset without any additional datasets.

tion tasks, establishing themselves as the predominant technology in this domain.

DEtection TRansformer (DETR) [3] introduces an end-to-end approach for object detection, comprising a CNN backbone, transformer encoder, and transformer decoder. DETR employs a Hungarian loss to predict a one-to-one set of objects, thereby eliminating reliance on the manually tuned component of Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS), which significantly streamlines the object detection pipeline through end-to-end optimization.

Although end-to-end object detectors based on Transformers (DETRs) have achieved notable success in terms of performance, these detectors typically rely on pre-training their backbone networks on the ImageNet dataset. Should a new backbone be selected, it necessitates pre-training on ImageNet before training the DETRs or utilizing an existing pre-trained backbone. Such dependency limits the flexibility in designing the backbone and escalates development costs, and when the task dataset significantly diverges from ImageNet, this pre-training strategy may result in subopti-

mal fine-tuning outcomes for DETRs on specific datasets.

Furthermore, since DETRs employ the Hungarian matching algorithm for direct one-to-one set prediction of objects, and the complexity of their decoder is quadratic in relation to the length of the input sequence, the number of queries receiving direct supervision signals during training is substantially less than that in classic object detectors using a one-to-many matching strategy. Coupled with the inherent limitations of image classification tasks, this results in the neck of DETRs not being sufficiently pre-trained. Additionally, during the early stages of DETR [3] training, the same query often matches with different objects at different times within the same image, leading to an optimization process that is both ambiguous and unstable, thereby undermining the pre-trained backbone.

To address the aforementioned challenges, we introduce an innovative training paradigm termed "step-by-step training." This approach commences with a pre-training phase on a custom dataset, utilizing a classic detector for the task of object detection, thereby circumventing the need for additional datasets. Subsequently, in the second phase of training, the backbone and neck of the classically trained detector refined through one-to-many matching during the initial phase are employed to initialize an end-to-end detector. During this phase, the backbone and neck components of the end-to-end detector are frozen, allowing for the exclusive retraining of the decoder from scratch. The step-by-step training approach yields a notable enhancement in performance compared to the conventional training methodology of DETRs. Concurrently, this step-by-step training substantially reduces the training costs for the detector: the first phase of training can be completed with just 16GB of VRAM, while the second phase requires a mere 8GB of VRAM.

Leveraging a step-by-step training approach, we introduce the first real-time end-to-end object detector employing a purely convolutional architecture as the encoder, named DETR [3] with YOLO [23–25] (DEYO). Specifically, we commence by training a robust YOLO object detection model on custom datasets to initialize the backbone and neck of DEYO. Subsequently, we combine the pretrained neck with a straightforward feature projection to construct DEYO's lightweight decoder. Owing to the high-quality pretraining provided to DEYO's backbone and neck in the initial phase, DEYO surpasses contemporary state-of-the-art real-time object detectors in terms of speed and accuracy.

DEYO-tiny achieves 37.6% AP on COCO [16] val2017 and operates at 497 FPS on the NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU, while DEYO-X attains 53.7% AP and 65 FPS. Furthermore, by discarding the reliance on NMS, DEYO demonstrates a notable performance enhancement over YOLOv8 [9] on the CrowdHuman [27] dataset. Without

additional training data, DEYO outperforms all comparable real-time detectors in speed and precision, establishing a new state-of-the-art for real-time object detection.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

1. We propose the first training method that does not require additional datasets to train DETRs: step-by-step training. Compared with conventional training methods for DETRs, step-by-step training can provide high-quality pre-training for the detector's neck and fundamentally solve the damage to the backbone due to unstable binary matching in the early stage of training, thereby significantly improving the performance of the detector.
2. Using step-by-step training, we develop the first real-time end-to-end object detector DEYO using a purely convolutional structure as the encoder, which surpasses the current state-of-the-art real-time detectors in both speed and accuracy, and no post-processing is required, so its inference speed is lag-free and stable.
3. We conduct a series of ablation studies to analyze the effectiveness of our proposed method and the model's different components.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. DETECTION TRANSFORMERS (DETR)

Carion et al. proposed an end-to-end object detector based on transformers, named DETR (DETECTION TRANSFORMER) [3], which has attracted significant attention from researchers due to its end-to-end nature in object detection. Specifically, DETR eliminates the anchor and NMS components in traditional detection pipelines and adopts a bipartite graph matching label assignment method to directly predict one-to-one sets of objects. This strategy dramatically simplifies the object detection process and alleviates the performance bottleneck caused by NMS. However, DETR suffers from slow convergence speed and query ambiguity issues. To address these problems, several variants of DETR have been proposed, such as Deformable-DETR [34], Conditional-DETR [22], Anchor-DETR [30], DAB-DETR [18], DN-DETR [14], and DINO [31]. Deformable-DETR enhances the efficiency of attention mechanisms and accelerates training convergence by utilizing multi-scale features. Conditional-DETR and Anchor-DETR reduce the optimization difficulty of queries. DAB-DETR introduces 4D reference points and optimizes predicted boxes layer by layer. DN-DETR speeds up training convergence by introducing query denoising. DINO improves upon previous work and achieves state-of-the-art results. However, the aforementioned improvements do not address the issue of high computational cost in DETR. RT-DETR [20] designs an efficient hybrid encoder to replace the original




Figure 2. We eliminated the encoder usage and instead employed the multi-scale features  $\{P3, P4, P5\}$  provided by the neck. Following feature projection, these features were utilized as input for the encoder while simultaneously generating candidate bounding boxes and filtering them through the query selector. Subsequently, this information was passed into a decoder with an auxiliary prediction head, enabling iterative optimization for generating bounding boxes and scores.

transformer encoder, reducing unnecessary computational redundancy in the DETR encoder and proposing the first end-to-end object detector.

## 2.2. You Only Look Once (YOLO)

Over the years, the YOLO [23–25] series has been one of the best single-stage real-time object detector categories. YOLO transforms the object detection task into a regression problem, predicting the positions and categories of multiple objects in a single forward pass, achieving high-speed object detection. After years of development, YOLO has developed into a series of fast models with good performance. Anchor-based YOLO methods include YOLOv4 [1], YOLOv5 [8], and YOLOv7 [28], while anchor-free methods are YOLOX [7], YOLOv6 [13], and YOLOv8 [9]. Considering the performance of these detectors, anchor-free methods perform as well as anchor-based methods, and anchor boxes are no longer the main factor limiting the development of YOLO. However, all YOLO variants generate many redundant bounding boxes, which NMS must filter out during the prediction stage, which significantly impacts the detector’s accuracy and speed and conflicts with the design theory of real-time object detectors.

## 3. DEYO

### 3.1. Model Overview

Fig 2 illustrates the comprehensive architecture of our proposed DEYO. DEYO employs YOLOv8 [9] as its one-to-many branch, wherein YOLOv8 comprises a backbone, a

Feature Pyramid Network (FPN) [17], and a Path Aggregation Network (PAN) [19] that together form the neck structure, in addition to a head capable of producing predictions at three different scales. Conversely, DEYO’s one-to-one branch utilizes a lightweight, purely convolutional encoder and a Transformer-based decoder. Moreover, we have also incorporated a CDN component identical to that used in DINO [31] to enhance the model’s precision.

### 3.2. One-to-many Branch

The YOLO [23–25] model’s generalization capabilities and practicality have been extensively validated and widely acknowledged within the field of computer vision. Even without the aid of additional datasets, YOLO demonstrates exceptional performance in processing complex scenes, executing multi-object detection, and adapting to real-time applications. Leveraging these benefits, we selected YOLO as the one-to-many branch for our DEYO model, providing DEYO with a high-quality, pre-trained backbone and neck structure. This branch features three multi-scale output layers capable of generating up to 8,400 candidate regions. Unlike the one-to-one label assignment strategy adopted by the DETR model, YOLO benefits from a one-to-many label assignment strategy during its training process, which, due to a higher quantity of positive samples, offers more comprehensive supervision of the network in its initial training stages. These candidate regions are tasked with more than mere classification; they confront the more complex challenge of object detection. This further cultivates a robust neck structure, supplying the decoder with rich multi-




Figure 3. We decouple the generation of bounding boxes from embeddings, allowing for more effective compression of multiscale information emanating from the neck through enhanced feature projection.

scale information, thereby significantly enhancing the overall performance of the model.

### 3.3. Efficient Encoder

Contrary to DETR [3], which employs a transformer as its encoder, DEYO harnesses the purely convolutional architecture of YOLO’s Neck, which is pre-trained in the initial phase to encode multi-scale features. These encoded features are then fed into a feature projection module to align them with the hidden dimensions. Owing to the neck’s robust multi-scale feature extraction capabilities, acquired through efficient pretraining at the outset, the encoder can supply the decoder with high-quality keys, values, and proposed bounding boxes. Compared to DETR’s randomly initialized multi-scale layers and transformer encoder, DEYO’s purely convolutional structure achieves remarkable speed. The process can be summarized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_1 &= Proj(P_3, P_4, P_5) \\
 S_2 &= Concat(S_1) \\
 Q &= K = V = S_2
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

### 3.4. Query Generation

As illustrated in Fig 3, DEYO’s query generation method diverges from DETR’s conventional two-stage strategy. Specifically, DEYO employs a decoupled generation method for bounding boxes and embeddings, allowing for more efficient compression of multi-scale information from the neck by the feature projection. Concurrently, DEYO inherits a one-to-many branch pre-trained bounding box head, transitioning the learning strategy from dense to sparse rather than training from scratch.

### 3.5. One-to-one Branch

As illustrated, DEYO’s one-to-one branch adopts an architecture akin to that of DINO, harnessing the Transformer’s self-attention mechanism to capture inter-query relationships, thereby establishing score differentials that suppress redundant bounding boxes. Within each layer of the




Figure 4. DEYO inherits a one-to-many branch pre-trained bounding box head, transitioning the learning strategy of the bounding box head from dense to sparse rather than training from scratch.

transformer decoder, the queries are progressively refined, culminating in predictions that correspond on a one-to-one basis with objects. This design significantly streamlines the object detection process within DEYO and eliminates the dependency on Non-Maximum Suppression (NMS), ensuring a consistent inference speed. During the second stage of DEYO’s training, we freeze the backbone and neck of DEYO to fundamentally circumvent the instability of bipartite matching during the initial stages of training, which could otherwise detrimentally affect the pretrained backbone. Benefiting from the high-quality initialization provided by the first phase, DEYO achieves rapid convergence and exceptional performance, even when supervising only a few hundred queries in the one-to-one branch and training from scratch.

## 4. Experiment

### 4.1. Setups

**COCO** To evaluate the performance of our method in object detection tasks, we conducted experiments on the widely used Microsoft COCO [16]. We trained the DEYO using the train2017 and evaluated the performance using the val2017.

**CrowdHuman** To evaluate the end-to-end effectiveness of DEYO in dense detection compared to classical detectors, we conducted experiments on CrowdHuman [27]. We leveraged the comprehensive full-body annotations available in the dataset and conducted our evaluation on the validation set. In terms of optimizer-related parameters, we adopted the same settings as the COCO. All experimental post-processing is referred to the paper of Iter-Deformable-DETR [33] without any modification.

**Implementation Details** In the first stage of training, we follow [9] the strategy and hyperparameters of training from scratch. In the second stage of training, we used a 6-layer

Model	Backbone	Epochs	#Params (M)	GFLOPs	FPS <sub>bs=1</sub>	AP	AP <sub>50</sub>	AP <sub>75</sub>	AP <sub>S</sub>	AP <sub>M</sub>	AP <sub>L</sub>
<i>Real-time Detectors</i>											
YOLOv5-N [8]	–	–	2	5	79	28.0	46.2	29.2	14.1	32.2	36.7
YOLOv5-S [8]	–	–	7	17	76	37.4	57.2	40.2	21.1	42.3	49.0
YOLOv5-M [8]	–	–	21	49	67	45.4	64.4	48.9	27.8	50.4	58.1
YOLOv5-L [8]	–	–	47	109	59	49.0	67.6	53.1	31.8	54.4	62.3
YOLOv5-X [8]	–	–	87	206	44	50.7	68.9	54.6	33.8	55.7	65.0
YOLOv8-N [9]	–	–	3	9	163	37.3	52.5	40.5	18.6	41.0	53.5
YOLOv8-S [9]	–	–	11	29	143	44.9	61.8	48.6	25.7	49.9	61.0
YOLOv8-M [9]	–	–	26	79	106	50.2	67.2	54.6	32.0	55.8	66.4
YOLOv8-L [9]	–	–	44	165	82	52.9	69.8	57.5	35.3	58.3	69.8
YOLOv8-X [9]	–	–	68	258	58	53.9	71.0	58.7	35.7	59.3	70.7
<i>End-to-end Object Detectors</i>											
DETR [3]	R50	500	41	187	–	43.3	63.1	45.9	22.5	47.3	61.1
Anchor-DETR [30]	R50	50	39	172	–	44.2	64.7	47.7	23.7	49.5	62.3
Conditional-DETR [22]	R50	108	44	195	–	45.1	65.4	48.5	25.3	49.0	62.2
Efficient-DETR [26]	R50	36	35	210	–	45.1	63.1	49.1	28.3	48.4	59.0
SMCA-DETR [6]	R50	108	40	152	–	45.6	65.5	49.1	25.9	49.3	62.6
Deformable-DETR [34]	R50	50	40	173	–	46.2	65.2	50.0	28.8	49.2	61.7
DAB-Deformable-DETR [18]	R50	50	48	195	–	46.9	66.0	50.8	30.1	50.4	62.5
DN-Deformable-DETR [14]	R50	50	48	195	–	49.5	67.6	53.8	31.3	52.6	65.4
DINO [31]	R50	36	47	279	5	50.9	69.0	55.3	34.6	54.1	64.6
<i>Real-time End-to-end Object Detectors</i>											
RT-DETR-R18 [21]	R18	72	20	60	240	46.5	63.8	–	–	–	–
RT-DETR-R34 [21]	R34	72	31	92	172	48.9	66.8	–	–	–	–
RT-DETR-R50 [21]	R50	72	36	100	120	53.1	71.3	57.7	34.8	58.0	70.0
RT-DETR-R101 [21]	R101	72	42	136	78	54.3	72.7	58.6	36.0	58.8	72.1
RT-DETR-L [21]	HGNetv2	72	32	110	126	53.0	71.6	57.3	34.6	57.3	71.2
RT-DETR-X [21]	HGNetv2	72	67	234	80	54.8	73.1	59.4	35.7	59.6	72.9
<i>No Extra Training Data</i>											
DEYO-tiny	–	96	4	8	497	37.6	52.8	40.6	17.9	41.3	54.2
DEYO-N	–	96	6	10	396	39.7	55.6	42.7	20.5	43.1	56.4
DEYO-S	–	96	14	26	299	45.8	62.9	49.3	26.8	49.9	62.5
DEYO-M	–	96	33	78	140	50.7	68.4	55.0	32.8	55.5	67.2
DEYO-L	–	96	51	155	100	52.7	70.2	57.0	36.0	57.3	69.4
DEYO-X	–	96	78	242	65	53.7	71.3	58.4	35.5	57.9	70.5

Table 1. Main results. Real-time detectors and our DEYO utilize a consistent input size of 640, while end-to-end detectors employ an input size of (800, 1333). The end-to-end speed results are reported on a T4 GPU with TensorRT FP16, following the method proposed in RT-DETR. We do not test the speed of DETRs, as they are not real time detectors.

Method	Epochs	AP <sub>50</sub>	mMR	Recall
ATSS [32]	36	89.6	44.4	95.9
DW [15]	36	89.0	57.6	97.4
Cascade R-CNN [2]	36	86.0	44.1	89.2
Sparse R-CNN [26]	50	89.2	48.3	95.9
Deform DETR [34]	50	89.1	50.0	95.3
DeFCN [29]	36	91.0	46.5	97.9
DEYO-X	300	<b>92.3</b>	<b>43.3</b>	97.3

Table 2. Performance on CrowdHuman (full body).

Transformer decoder as the decoder of DEYO. We trained the detector following the [9] hyperparameters, but we used the AdamW [11] optimizer. The learning rate is set to 0.0001, and the weight decay is set to 0.0001. The data enhancement strategy in the second stage is the same as the

first stage of training, including random color distortion, inverse translation, flipping, resizing, mosaic, and other operations. On the COCO [16] dataset, except DEYO-tiny, which uses 100 queries, DEYO of other scales uses 300 queries. All evaluations were conducted using a Tesla T4 GPU, complemented by an 8 vCPU Intel Xeon Processor (Skylake, IBRS). The experiments utilized PyTorch version 1.9.0, integrated with TensorRT 8.6.1.

## 4.2. Main Results

We compared the scaled DEYO with YOLOv5 [8], YOLOv8 [9], and RT-DETR [21] in Table 1. Compared to YOLOv8, DEYO significantly improves accuracy by 2.4 AP / 0.9 AP / 0.5 AP at scales N, S, and M while achieving a 143% / 110% / 32% increase in FPS. At scales L and X, DEYO continues to exhibit a better trade-off between ac-

Model	Epochs	Queries	#Params (M)	GFLOPs	FPS <sub>bs=1</sub>	AP <sub>50</sub>	mMR	Recall
<i>Classic Object Detectors</i>								
YOLOv8-N [9]	300	–	9	163	–	82.7	50.4	87.2
YOLOv8-S [9]	300	–	29	143	–	85.4	46.0	88.2
YOLOv8-M [9]	300	–	79	106	–	86.8	43.8	89.0
YOLOv8-L [9]	300	–	44	165	–	87.6	43.1	89.6
YOLOv8-X [9]	300	–	68	258	–	88.1	42.9	90.0
<i>Query-based Object Detectors</i>								
DEYO-N	300	300	6	10	391	86.6	50.4	94.1
DEYO-S	300	300	14	26	296	89.3	46.6	95.2
DEYO-M	300	300	33	78	138	91.0	44.4	96.1
DEYO-L	300	500	51	158	91	92.0	44.1	97.1
DEYO-X	300	500	78	246	62	92.3	43.3	97.3

Table 3. Comparative of YOLOv8 and DEYO Performance on the CrowdHuman (full body). Owing to DEYO’s abandonment of reliance on NMS, a notable enhancement in performance has been achieved.

Model	Epochs	AP	AP <sub>50</sub>
DEYO-N	12	35.9	50.6
DEYO-S	12	43.6	61.2
DEYO-M	12	49.4	66.9
DEYO-L	12	51.7	68.9
DEYO-X	12	52.9	70.3
DEYO-N	24	37.2	52.4
DEYO-S	24	44.4	61.2
DEYO-M	24	49.7	67.3
DEYO-L	24	52.0	69.5
DEYO-X	24	53.2	70.7

Table 4. Results for DEYO coco val2017 trained with more epochs (12, 24).

curacy and speed. As shown in Table 3, DEYO performs exceptionally well in dense scenarios with real-time speed. Specifically, DEYO-X has attained an impressive 92.3 AP and 43.3 mMR, with a remarkable performance of 97.3 recall within the CrowdHuman [27].

### 4.3. Ablation Study

Table 5 presents the training outcomes for the YOLO [23–25] and DEYO models utilizing three distinct training methodologies on the CrowdHuman [27] dataset: the YOLO approach, the DETR approach, and a step-by-step training strategy. The findings indicate that the YOLOv8-N [9] model can achieve an Average Precision (AP) of 82.6, even when trained from scratch without relying on supplementary datasets, by leveraging the abundant supervisory information provided through a one-to-many training strategy. In contrast, the DEYO-N model, constrained by a one-to-one matching training strategy that offers limited supervisory signals, achieved a performance ceiling of

Model	Strategy	Epochs	AP <sub>50</sub>
<i>Train from Scratch</i>			
DEYO-N	DETR	300	77.2
YOLOv8-N [9]	YOLO	300	<b>82.6</b>
DEYO-N	DETR	72	78.3
DEYO-N	Step-by-step	72	<b>83.0</b>

Table 5. Comparing different methods trained on the CrowdHuman dataset, it should be noted that for this experiment, we computed the AP50 metric utilizing the tools provided by YOLOv8.

72.1AP despite undergoing the same number of iterations as its YOLO counterpart. Moreover, when the DEYO-N model’s backbone was initialized using YOLOv8-N-CLS, pre-trained from ImageNet [5], and combined with the DETR training strategy, DEYO-N’s performance reached 78.3AP. Notably, implementing the step-by-step training significantly enhanced DEYO-N’s performance, with an increase of 4.7AP.

In Table 7, we examined the significance of the high-quality multi-scale features provided by the Neck component, pre-trained in the first phase within the DEYO model. The model’s performance markedly decreased by 18.8 average precision points, only achieving 68.3 average precision, when solely utilizing the pre-trained backbone without the pre-trained Neck for step-by-step training. These findings clearly indicate that the key to the DEYO model’s superior performance does not lie in the employment of a more sophisticated backbone pre-trained beyond ImageNet but rather in the first-phase pre-trained Neck, which furnishes the model with high-quality multi-scale features.

In Table 8, we analyze the enhancement resulting from fundamentally addressing the instability of early bipartite graph matching by freezing the DEYO’s backbone and neck during the second stage of training, which positively im-

Method	#Epochs	w/ Step-by-step Training	AP	AP <sub>50</sub>	AP <sub>75</sub>	AP <sub>S</sub>	AP <sub>M</sub>	AP <sub>L</sub>
Baseline	12	×	23.8	36.6	25.1	11.1	25.8	33.4
Baseline	12	✓	36.3	51.4	39.1	17.3	39.9	52.2
Group-DETR [4]	12	×	24.1	36.3	25.6	9.8	26.0	35.4
Group-DETR [4]	12	✓	36.4	50.8	39.3	17.1	39.8	52.2
H-DETR [10]	12	×	24.3	36.7	25.8	10.1	26.3	35.5
H-DETR [10]	12	✓	36.4	50.9	39.4	17.2	39.9	52.2
DINO [31]	12	×	24.6	36.7	25.8	10.1	26.3	35.5
DINO [31]	12	✓	36.5	51.1	39.5	18.3	39.9	52.2

Table 6. Comparison of different methods under the 12-Epoch training setting for DEYO-N. Compared to our approach, previous methodologies could not effectively address the training challenges posed by insufficient supervisory signals, which also resulted in additional training costs.

Model	Backbone	Neck	AP <sub>50</sub>
DEYO-N	✓	×	68.3
DEYO-N	✓	✓	<b>87.1</b>

Table 7. Results of the ablation study on step-by-step training. (CrowdHuman)

Model	w/Frozen	w/Mosaic	AP
DEYO-L	×	×	51.6
DEYO-L	✓	×	52.5
DEYO-L	✓	✓	<b>52.7</b>

Table 8. Exploring the impact of a frozen operation and mosaic data augmentation.

pacts network performance. Compared to fine-tuning the backbone and neck throughout the second phase, the act of freezing yields a 1.1 AP increase in DEYO’s performance. Moreover, as the first phase of DEYO involves pre-training on the COCO [16] dataset for the object detection task, it allows for the implementation of more robust data augmentation strategies during the second stage of training. Consequently, unlike DETRs, adopting Mosaic data augmentation does not result in performance degradation; instead, it contributes to a 0.2 AP improvement.

#### 4.4. Analysis

Experimental outcomes presented in Table 6 elucidate a pronounced degradation in performance for DINO[31], H-DETR[10], and Group-DETR[4] when a step-by-step training strategy is not employed, in stark contrast to our method. Compared to our approach, methodologies proposed in references [4, 10, 31] fail to effectively navigate




Figure 5. Owing to the initial phase of DEYO being pre-trained on the COCO dataset for the task of object detection, it was afforded the capability to employ more robust data augmentation strategies during the second stage of training. Consequently, DEYO’s adoption of the Mosaic data augmentation technique did not result in performance degradation, in contrast to the experience with DETRs.

the training challenges precipitated by a lack of supervisory signals while culminating in inflated training expenditures. Conversely, as delineated in Table 9, our training regimen not only circumvents the imposition of additional training overheads but also significantly curtails the training expenses for the detector (the 3300 queries required by Group-DETR could potentially sextuple the training duration). The initial phase of the DEYO model’s training necessitates a mere 16GB of VRAM, while the subsequent phase demands even less, at 8GB of VRAM. For scenarios with constrained training resources, DEYO can deactivate the CDN feature to mitigate VRAM requirements fur-




Figure 6. A comprehensive comparison between DEYO and RT-DETR shows that although there is a particular gap on a larger scale, DEYO does not rely on additional training data and has significantly reduced training costs. We believe that DEYO possesses its unique advantages on custom datasets.

Model	Neck	Hidden Dimension	GPU Memory
YOLOv8-N [9]	(64, 128, 256)	–	3247MiB
YOLOv8-S [9]	(64, 128, 512)	–	4857MiB
YOLOv8-M [9]	(192, 384, 576)	–	7081MiB
YOLOv8-L [9]	(256, 512, 512)	–	10503MiB
YOLOv8-X [9]	(320, 640, 640)	–	13069MiB
DEYO-tiny	(64, 128, 256)	64	2238MiB
DEYO-N	(64, 128, 256)	128	4746MiB
DEYO-S	(64, 128, 256)	128	5062MiB
DEYO-M	(192, 384, 576)	256	6444MiB
DEYO-L	(256, 512, 512)	256	6476MiB
DEYO-X	(320, 640, 640)	320	6888MiB
<i>No Contrastive DeNoising Training</i>			
DEYO-tiny	(64, 128, 256)	64	1514MiB
DEYO-N	(64, 128, 256)	128	2700MiB
DEYO-S	(64, 128, 512)	128	3108MiB
DEYO-M	(192, 384, 576)	256	3948MiB
DEYO-L	(256, 512, 512)	256	4216MiB
DEYO-X	(320, 640, 640)	320	5194MiB

Table 9. Detailed configurations of YOLO and DEYO as well as their GPU memory usage.

ther. As demonstrated in Table 6, the progressive training strategy affords DEYO a high-caliber pretraining foundation during its first phase, ensuring that even with CDN deactivated, performance detriments remain manageable.

As depicted in Fig 6, on the X scale, DEYO exhibits some discrepancies when compared to RT-DETR-X, which utilizes pre-training on ImageNet [5]. However, this gap can be attributed to RT-DETR’s [21] incorporation of a more efficient backbone. Furthermore, it is our contention that performance on the COCO [16] dataset does not wholly encapsulate the merits and demerits of a detector. Considering that DEYO does not require additional training data, it can leverage more robust data augmentation strategies and incur lower training costs. Consequently, DEYO possesses unique advantages when applied to custom datasets.

Without altering the original backbone and neck of YOLO [23–25], DEYO effortlessly achieved state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance, demonstrating the plug-and-play characteristic of the DEYO model’s design philosophy. However, we have observed that the neck of YOLOv8 [9] and the model scaling strategy do not fully align with DEYO. As the model size increases, the performance gains of DEYO diminish incrementally. We postulate that one reason for this is the mismatch between the output dimensions of YOLOv8’s neck and the hidden dimensions of DEYO’s decoder. This discrepancy underscores the untapped potential of the DEYO model. We believe that a backbone, neck, and model scaling strategy specifically tailored for DEYO and Step-by-step Training could propel DEYO’s performance to unprecedented levels.

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have innovatively developed a training strategy that not only circumvents the need for additional datasets but also successfully addresses a problem that previous methods could not surmount: performance degradation due to insufficient training of multi-scale feature layers. This approach not only enhances model performance but also significantly reduces training costs. By integrating our meticulously designed lightweight encoder with this revolutionary strategy, we have introduced the DEYO, which surpasses all existing real-time object detectors without relying on supplemental datasets.

We consider DEYO to be a specific instance of the fusion between classic detectors and query-based detectors. We are convinced that other methodologies exist that could satisfy even higher precision requirements. Nevertheless, DEYO’s innovative detector design introduces new challenges, such as the need to redesign the backbone and neck to fully realize DEYO’s potential. We anticipate that future research will yield effective solutions to these challenges.



## References

- [1] Alexey Bochkovskiy, Chien-Yao Wang, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2004.10934, 2020. [3](#)
- [2] Zhaowei Cai and Nuno Vasconcelos. Cascade r-cnn: Delving into high quality object detection. *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6154–6162, 2017. [5](#)
- [3] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, pages 213–229, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#)
- [4] Qiang Chen, Xiaokang Chen, Gang Zeng, and Jingdong Wang. Group detr: Fast training convergence with decoupled one-to-many label assignment. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.13085, 2022. [7](#)
- [5] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, K. Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 248–255, 2009. [6](#), [8](#)
- [6] Peng Gao, Minghang Zheng, Xiaogang Wang, Jifeng Dai, and Hongsheng Li. Fast convergence of detr with spatially modulated co-attention. *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 3601–3610, 2021. [5](#)
- [7] Zheng Ge, Songtao Liu, Feng Wang, Zeming Li, and Jian Sun. Yolox: Exceeding yolo series in 2021. *ArXiv*, abs/2107.08430, 2021. [3](#)
- [8] Jocher Glenn. Yolov5 release v7.0. . <https://github.com/ultralytics/yolov5/tree/v7.0>, 2022. [3](#), [5](#)
- [9] Jocher Glenn. Yolov8. . <https://github.com/ultralytics/ultralytics/tree/main>, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [10] Ding Jia, Yuhui Yuan, Hao He, Xiao pei Wu, Haojun Yu, Weihong Lin, Lei huan Sun, Chao Zhang, and Hanhua Hu. Detr with hybrid matching. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.13080, 2022. [7](#)
- [11] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *CoRR*, abs/1412.6980, 2014. [5](#)
- [12] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE*, 86:2278–2324, 1998. [1](#)
- [13] Chuyin Li, Lu Li, Hongliang Jiang, Kaiheng Weng, Yifei Geng, L. Li, Zaidan Ke, Qingyuan Li, Meng Cheng, Weiqiang Nie, Yiduo Li, Bo Zhang, Yufei Liang, Linyuan Zhou, Xiaoming Xu, Xiangxiang Chu, Xiaoming Wei, and Xiaolin Wei. Yolov6: A single-stage object detection framework for industrial applications. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.02976, 2022. [3](#)
- [14] Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Shi guang Liu, Jian Guo, Lionel Ming shuan Ni, and Lei Zhang. Dn-detr: Accelerate detr training by introducing query denoising. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 13609–13617, 2022. [2](#), [5](#)
- [15] Shuai Li, Chenhang He, Ruihuang Li, and Lei Zhang. A dual weighting label assignment scheme for object detection. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9377–9386, 2022. [5](#)
- [16] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2014. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [8](#)
- [17] Tsung-Yi Lin, Piotr Dollár, Ross B. Girshick, Kaiming He, Bharath Hariharan, and Serge J. Belongie. Feature pyramid networks for object detection. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 936–944, 2016. [3](#)
- [18] Shilong Liu, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Xiao Yang, Xianbiao Qi, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, and Lei Zhang. Dab-detr: Dynamic anchor boxes are better queries for detr. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. [2](#), [5](#)
- [19] Shu Liu, Lu Qi, Haifang Qin, Jianping Shi, and Jiaya Jia. Path aggregation network for instance segmentation. *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8759–8768, 2018. [3](#)
- [20] Wenyu Lv, Shangliang Xu, Yian Zhao, Guanzhong Wang, Jinman Wei, Cheng Cui, Yuning Du, Qingqing Dang, and Yi Liu. Detr beat yolos on real-time object detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.08069, 2023. [2](#)
- [21] Wenyu Lv, Shangliang Xu, Yian Zhao, Guanzhong Wang, Jinman Wei, Cheng Cui, Yuning Du, Qingqing Dang, and Yi Liu. Detr beat yolos on real-time object detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.08069, 2023. [5](#), [8](#)
- [22] Depu Meng, Xiaokang Chen, Zejia Fan, Gang Zeng, Houqiang Li, Yuhui Yuan, Lei Sun, and Jingdong Wang. Conditional detr for fast training convergence. *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 3631–3640, 2021. [2](#), [5](#)
- [23] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolo9000: Better, faster, stronger. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6517–6525, 2016. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [24] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *ArXiv*, abs/1804.02767, 2018.
- [25] Joseph Redmon, Santosh Kumar Divvala, Ross B. Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 779–788, 2015. [2](#), [3](#), [6](#), [8](#)
- [26] Byung-Seok Roh, Jaewoong Shin, Wuhyun Shin, and Saehoon Kim. Sparse detr: Efficient end-to-end object detection with learnable sparsity. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.14330, 2021. [5](#)
- [27] Shuai Shao, Zijian Zhao, Boxun Li, Tete Xiao, Gang Yu, Xianguyu Zhang, and Jian Sun. Crowdhuman: A benchmark for detecting human in a crowd. *ArXiv*, abs/1805.00123, 2018. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [28] Chien-Yao Wang, Alexey Bochkovskiy, and Hong-Yuan Mark Liao. Yolov7: Trainable bag-of-freebies sets new state-of-the-art for real-time object detectors. *ArXiv*, abs/2207.02696, 2022. [3](#)
- [29] Jianfeng Wang, Lin Song, Zeming Li, Hongbin Sun, Jian Sun, and Nanning Zheng. End-to-end object detection with

- fully convolutional network. *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15844–15853, 2020. [5](#)
- [30] Yingming Wang, X. Zhang, Tong Yang, and Jian Sun. Anchor detr: Query design for transformer-based detector. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.07107, 2022. [2](#), [5](#)
- [31] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Siyi Liu, Lei Zhang, Hang Su, Jun-Juan Zhu, Lionel Ming shuan Ni, and Heung yeung Shum. Dino: Detr with improved denoising anchor boxes for end-to-end object detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.03605, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [32] Shifeng Zhang, Cheng Chi, Yongqiang Yao, Zhen Lei, and Stan Z. Li. Bridging the gap between anchor-based and anchor-free detection via adaptive training sample selection. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9756–9765, 2019. [5](#)
- [33] Anlin Zheng, Yuang Zhang, Xiangyu Zhang, Xiaojuan Qi, and Jian Sun. Progressive end-to-end object detection in crowded scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 857–866, 2022. [4](#)
- [34] Xizhou Zhu, Weijie Su, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Xiaogang Wang, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable detr: Deformable transformers for end-to-end object detection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. [2](#), [5](#)