

OrthCaps: An Orthogonal CapsNet with Sparse Attention Routing and Pruning

We thank all three reviewers(R1:8Daq, R2:Y96H, R3:atRF) for their constructive comments. We are encouraged that reviewers acknowledge the novelty of our ideas (R3), commend our method’s strong performance across various datasets and comprehensive ablation studies (R2), confirm our proposed method’s effectiveness against SOTA through sufficient experiments (R3) and highlight the clear mathematical illustrations (R1).

The reviewers generally express concerns about the clarity and justification of the design choices in our paper, specifically pointing out the lack of detailed explanations for OrthCaps-D and the introduction of basic layers to the Capsule network. There are also specific criticisms about the novelty claims, as some aspects, such as addressing deep redundancy and introducing orthogonality, have been previously explored in other works. Additionally, reviewers highlight the need for better positioning and comparison of our work against existing literature, along with more accurate citations and explanations of fundamental concepts from the introduction onwards.

Considering the negative feedback, we reexplain the motivation and contribution of our paper. Subsequently, we will address the specific comments from each reviewer individually.

A. Motivation and Contribution

Issue. Despite pruning at shallower layers of Capsule Networks(CapsNet), redundancy in capsules still occurs at deeper layers, as demonstrated in Fig. 6.

Problems. Following the analysis in Sec 1 L54-L85, we believe the reasons for this issue are as follows:

- 1) The need for iteration of dynamic routing.
- 2) The fully connected structure of dynamic routing.
- 3) Non-orthogonal matrices reintroduce redundancy in subsequent layers.

Motivation. To address the issue of deep redundancy, we resolve the aforementioned three problems using the following methods detailed in Sec1 L86-L110:

- 1) To solve the iteration issue, dynamic routing is replaced with attention routing.
- 2) To solve the fully connected problem, we leverage sparsemax-based attention to produce an attention map, making the coefficients of irrelevant capsules zero.
- 3) To solve the reintroducing redundancy issue, we set an efficient pruning layer at first and then orthogonalize the weight matrices to sustain the effect of pruning.

Contributions. To our knowledge, we are the first to

- 1) address the issue of deep capsule redundancy in CapsNet,
- 2) introduce sparsity into attention routing to solve fully-connected problem,

Table 7. Table 7.

Orthogonalization	MNIST	CIFAR10
None	99.62	84.25
W_Q & W_K	-	-
W_V	-	-
W_Q & W_K & W_V	99.68	87.92

Table 8. Since CapProNet in the original paper uses ResNet18 as the backbone, a direct comparison would be unfair. Therefore, we modified it to use the same 4-layer CNN as the feature extraction layer in our paper, employing the same experimental setup and hyperparameters from the supplementary material.

Model	MNIST	CIFAR10	SVHN
OrthCaps-S	99.68	87.92	96.26
CapProNet	-	80.84	93.41
OrthCaps-D	-	-	-
orthWeight	-	-	-

3) introduce orthogonalization into CapsNet to sustain the effect of pruning.

Based on that OrthCaps-S achieves SOTA performance, we believe our work can contribute positively to future capsule network pruning efforts.

B. Reviewers

Lacking ablation studies (@R1) R1 asked that performances of attention routing and pruning have to be reported. The ablation study for attention routing is presented in Sec 4.3.1, Table 2, where we thoroughly compare attention routing with dynamic routing in terms of FPS and accuracy on two datasets. We find that our attention routing can balance performance and computational efficiency. The ablation study for pruning is detailed in Sec 4.3.2, Table 3, and Figure 2. Table 3 demonstrates that pruning effectively reduces the number of parameters and enhances model accuracy. Figure 2 shows that our pruning approach, combined with orthogonality and sparsity, can effectively suppress redundancy in deeper capsules. R2 also mentioned this in paper strengths (i.e. conducting comprehensive ablation studies).

Better illustration (@R1) We will adjust the order of sections in the Introduction and Methodology to progressively develop our narrative, as your recommendation. The modifications to the Introduction are shown in Section A. We will start by discussing improvements to attention routing, followed by an introduction to the pruning layer, and finally explain the orthogonal sparse attention routing and its role in pruning.

Whether orthogonalizing W_Q, W_K or not (@R1) We will clarify in the revision that "the product of two orthogonal matrices is also an orthogonal matrix". As mentioned in Sec 3.4.1 L307-325, ensuring the orthogonality of C and W_v can maintain low capsule similarity. Orthogonalizing

$W_Q W_K^T$ maximizes the orthogonality of C . Since the product of two orthogonal matrices is also an orthogonal matrix, it is necessary to orthogonalize all W_Q , W_K , and W_V . Supplementary ablation experiments are presented in Table 7. It can be observed that the best performance is achieved only when all weight matrices are orthogonalized.

The shape of M (@R1)

The correct size of M should be $(1, n, 1)$, with B having no direct influence on M . The rationale for this configuration is as follows: M operates by setting certain capsules to zero through matrix multiplication (matmul). M will act along the n dimension (number of capsules) while maintaining the value of 1 in other dimensions ($B \times (d \times W \times H)$), ensuring that data along these dimensions is not affected.

Reviewing CapsNet (@R1) ConvCaps, Primarily Capsule layer and Flat Capsule layer is basic layers of CapsNet, which are not introduced in most papers [? ?]. We will add the introduction of these layers into supplementary material in the revision.

The reason of designing OrthCaps-D (@R2) 1) the primary issue addressed in this paper is the redundancy in deep capsule networks. After initial pruning, our OrthCaps model ensures that each layer of capsules remains streamlined, representing the maximum number of features with the minimum number of capsules. Therefore, a deeper capsule network is required to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach. As shown in Section 4.3.2, Figure 6, even at a depth of 28 layers, the similarity between capsules remains low. 2) Second, to prove the potential for deepening our network, the current reduction in parameters of our network is only evident in shallower networks. Although the performance of shallower networks is better than that of deeper ones, it is not the kind of network that is difficult to deepen. We will further deepen the network in future work and challenge more complex datasets.

Claim of Novelty (@R3)

1) DeepCaps indeed mentioned "eliminate this redundancy by routing a block of capsules". However, this grouped routing is: Since adjacent capsules share similar information, a $3 \times 3 \times 8$ convolution kernel is used to transform adjacent nine capsules into one vote (Sec3.1 P6). This method merely reduces the voting during dynamic routing, effectively making the coefficient matrix sparse. It does not involve pruning redundant capsules, and the total number of capsules remains unchanged. The authors simplified dynamic routing but did not mention or experimentally validate the redundancy in deep capsules. This is fundamentally different from the deep redundancy addressed in our paper. To avoid ambiguity, we will revise our paper to "deep capsule redundancy."

2) Both CapProNet and our work indeed involve orthogonality, and it is a reasonable thought that they are concep-

tually similar. However, the application of orthogonality differs between the two papers in terms of the target object, purpose, and weight matrices. In our paper, the object of orthogonalization is the routing weight matrix, whereas CapProNet does not perform orthogonalization but instead projects the input features orthogonally. In CapProNet, input feature vectors are orthogonally decomposed, with a part projected onto the capsule subspace and the other part perpendicular to this subspace. The purpose of orthogonalization in our work is to maintain the effect of pruning, while in CapProNet, the aim of orthogonal projection is to iteratively update the capsule subspace in the direction of the complement containing new input features. The routing weight matrix in our work is an orthogonal matrix obtained through Householder orthogonalization, whereas the orthogonal projection matrix in CapProNet is not necessarily an orthogonal matrix but is updated along the direction of the orthogonal complement. We will revise our claim of "being the first to propose orthogonality into Capsule Networks" into "being the first to use Householder orthogonal decomposition to enforce orthogonality in Capsule Networks."

Comparison with existing method(@R3) We conducted comparative experiments with CapProNet. [3] does not provide open-source code. Although the paper conducted experiments on only one dataset, we directly compare our results with those reported in the paper. Results are presented in Table 8.

We will add a comparison with existing methods in the revision.

Reference Problems(@R3) We will add the following paper into references in the revision: 1) In the Introduction, we will discuss 3 and CapProNet, whose successful application of orthogonality in capsule networks has inspired our work. Section 2.1 will detail the aspect of orthogonality, where 3 employs soft orthogonality, adding a regularization term to the loss to ensure faster convergence and improved performance. CapProNet learns the orthogonal projection matrices of capsule subspaces to train the capsule projection network, effectively enhancing the performance of the ResNet backbone. 2) We will mention (Correia et al,2019) in Introduction as it uses α -Entmax to compute the attention map in Transformers.

In the final paragraph of Section 3, the authors mention computing the l2-norm to activate capsules and encoding entity probabilities within the capsules. Therefore, there is no need to emphasize low-activity capsules.

Typos (@R3) We will fix them in the revision.