

CFGPNNet: Cross-Attention-Based Fused Gradient Programmed Network Framework for Multispectral Object Detection

Nima Hatami^a, Karim Faez^a, Saeed Sharifian^a, Hamidreza Amindavar^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Electrical Engineering, Amirkabir University of Technology, 15914, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

Multispectral object detection combines visible and thermal imagery to improve perception under challenging illumination and environmental conditions. However, differences in modality appearance and reliability can introduce redundant or conflicting responses, limiting the use of complementary information. Complex fusion mechanisms further increase computational cost, creating a persistent trade-off between detection accuracy and efficiency. To address these challenges, CFGPNNet is proposed, a cross-attention-based fused gradient programmed network. The framework incorporates re-parameterized RepViT blocks into the YOLOv9 architecture to strengthen spatial and channel representations while maintaining efficient feature extraction. Cross Computation Efficient Attention (CrossCEA) exchanges spatial attention maps between modalities at multiple detection scales, allowing each stream to emphasize regions supported by the other while preserving modality-specific information. Attention Selection and Aggregation Fusion (ASAF) combines dense feature aggregation with selection of the strongest responses from multiple attention branches to form compact, discriminative fused representations. A programmable gradient information pathway provides auxiliary supervision during training to improve feature learning. This pathway is removed after training, adding no parameters or operations at inference. Experiments on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, VEDAI, and MFAD demonstrate favorable accuracy–efficiency trade-offs across three model scales, with the smallest variant requiring 15.3 million parameters and 56.9 GFLOPs. The code is available at <https://github.com/NimaHatami99/CFGPNNet>.

Keywords:

Multispectral Object Detection, Cross-Modal Feature Fusion, Cross-Modal Interaction, Cross-Attention

1. Introduction

Multispectral object detection combines visible and thermal imagery to improve perception under changing illumination and weather. Visible images provide color, texture, and fine spatial detail, whereas thermal images preserve object-related responses when visible contrast is degraded. Their complementarity is useful for driver assistance, pedestrian detection, and vehicle detection in aerial imagery, but the modalities differ in appearance, noise, and spatial reliability. Simple concatenation or fixed fusion can therefore propagate redundant or conflicting responses and may even reduce the benefit of the stronger modality [1, 2, 3].

Recent methods improve fusion with global cross-modal reasoning, iterative attention, illumination-aware weighting, and hierarchical interaction [4, 5, 6, 7]. Other approaches address channel–spatial complementarity and feature alignment, including cross-dimension interaction, progressive channel exchange, adaptive dual cross-attention, and offset-aware or selective fusion [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. These designs improve robustness, yet their additional streams and attention blocks increase computational cost, while modality failure remains possible when

one stream is weak or misaligned. Adaptive distillation reduce deployment cost while highlighting the trade-off between compactness and complementary feature learning [13].

To address these issues, CFGPNNet is proposed, a cross-attention-based fused gradient programmed network for efficient RGB–T detection. The framework uses a GELAN¹-based backbone and a training-only programmable gradient path to improve feature learning without retaining the auxiliary computation at inference [14]. CrossCEA exchanges modality-derived spatial attention maps at multiple detection scales, allowing each stream to emphasize regions supported by the other. The resulting features are combined by ASAF, which selects and aggregates complementary responses through dense and attention-guided paths. Three model scales provide different accuracy–efficiency operating points.

As shown in Fig. 1, CFGPNNet performs favorably across the benchmark datasets, combining high mAP_{50:95} with low parameter count and GFLOPs. The main contributions are:

- CFGPNNet, a cross-attention-based fused gradient programmed framework for RGB–T detection, with three model scales spanning practical accuracy–efficiency operating points.

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: nima.h@aut.ac.ir (Nima Hatami), kfaez@aut.ac.ir (Karim Faez), sharifian_s@aut.ac.ir (Saeed Sharifian), hamidami@aut.ac.ir (Hamidreza Amindavar)

¹generalized efficient layer aggregation network




Fig. 1. CFGPNet-m versus state-of-the-art multispectral detectors.

- A RepViT-based re-parameterized GELAN backbone that strengthens spatial and channel representations.
- CrossCEA, which exchanges modality-derived spatial attention maps across detection scales before fusion.
- ASAF, which combines dense aggregation with branch-selective attention to produce compact, discriminative multiscale fused features.
- Extensive evaluation on FLIR [15], M3FD [16], LLVIP [17], VEDAI [18], and MFAD [6], demonstrating favorable accuracy–efficiency performance against recent multispectral detectors.

2. Related Work

2.1. Multispectral Object Detection Methods

Multispectral object detection combines the complementary properties of visible and infrared (IR) imagery: visible images provide rich texture and color information, whereas IR images can remain informative under some adverse conditions. Most early systems therefore adopted two-stream backbones with intermediate fusion. CFT uses Transformer self-attention to model global relationships between RGB and thermal features, while ICAFusion performs iterative query-guided cross-attention to refine the two streams [4, 5]. MMI-Det jointly optimizes fusion and detection with contour enhancement, contrastive modality bridging, and information-guided supervision, thereby avoiding the objective mismatch of a separate fusion-then-detection pipeline [2]. For lightweight mid-level fusion, CSSA replaces weak channels across modalities and applies parameter-free spatial attention, whereas C²DFF-Net augments differential feature learning with spatial–frequency fusion for small objects in remote-sensing imagery [1, 19].

Recent detectors increasingly make fusion adaptive to illumination, scale, and deployment constraints. EI²Det combines cross-modal interaction with illumination-aware weighting and edge-guided fusion, and DHANet uses modality-specific enhancement, hierarchical interaction, and decision fusion for object detection in images captured by drones [6, 7]. CDFNet

models complementary information at both channel and spatial levels before cross-dimension fusion; CrossModalNet progressively aligns low-level features and refines high-level semantics with convolutional and bidirectional attention [8, 9]. Lightweight alternatives include PFI-Net, which separates parallel interaction paths to reduce cross-modal interference, and SAFF, which emphasizes spatially reliable IR cues while retaining RGB semantics [20, 21]. Other efforts reduce the cost of two-stream inference through adaptive modal-fusion distillation or foundation-model features [13, 22]. Nevertheless, redundant branches, modality imbalance, and fusion-induced degradation remain recurring concerns, especially when the two sensors are misaligned or one modality is unreliable [3].

2.2. Cross-Modality Information Interaction

Cross-modal interaction has evolved from direct concatenation or summation toward reciprocal, selective, and alignment-aware exchange. CFT and ICAFusion use global Transformer attention and iterative cross-attention, respectively, to capture long-range dependencies that are difficult to obtain with local convolutions [4, 5]. CrossModalNet combines local convolutional attention with bidirectional channel interaction, while ADCA-Net dynamically switches the reference modality through dual cross-attention and adaptive max–average down-sampling [9, 10]. CDFIT further separates dual-stream feature interaction to alleviate modality imbalance, and CDFNet explicitly models cross-modal dependencies in both channel and spatial dimensions [23, 8].

Several methods refine how information is transferred when one modality is noisy or spatially displaced. CARNet decomposes features into strong and weak components and reconstructs each modality through cross-attention-guided interaction; PFI-Net maintains parallel interaction paths to limit destructive transfer; and M²Fre-LDF first strengthens intra-modality channels before using deformable convolution for local cross-modal fusion [24, 20, 3]. MMI-Det uses contrastive learning to reduce the modality gap, whereas EI²Det and DHANet adapt the interaction to illumination and modality characteristics [2, 6, 7]. For severe registration errors, COMO introduces cross-Mamba interaction with offset-guided fusion,

TGRDet performs filter-assisted alignment followed by transfer graph reasoning, and SCFDet combines mutual-guided alignment with selective salient-region fusion [25, 11, 12]. AFFNet extends this idea to local consistency-based weighting, assigning different fusion weights to spatial regions according to the reliability of RGB and IR evidence [26]. These approaches improve correspondence and complementarity, but their interaction modules can increase memory, latency, or architectural complexity.

2.3. Multispectral Attention Approach

Attention is used in multispectral detection to select informative channels, spatial regions, and scales while suppressing modality-specific noise. CrossFormer propagates bidirectional cross-guided attention hierarchically across scales [27]. DHANet uses asymmetric global-local attention for modality-specific enhancement, while CSSA combines channel switching with parameter-free spatial attention to obtain a compact fusion operation [7, 1]. C²DFF-Net also couples channel and spatial attention with frequency-domain features, illustrating the benefit of jointly modeling spatial and spectral evidence [19].

Attention has also been coupled with task-aware, fine-grained, or interpretable fusion. EI²Det predicts illumination-dependent modality weights and preserves boundaries with edge-guided fusion; CDFIT uses dual-stream Transformer interaction to control cross-modal interference; and SCFDet adds top- K region selection, sparse expert routing, and channel-aware enhancement [6, 23, 12]. SAFF and AFFNet use spatially aware or connected-region consistency to focus computation on reliable local cues, whereas CAMF derives interpretable channel weights from class activation mapping for image fusion [21, 26, 28]. A unified fusion-enhanced network further transfers spatial and channel attention across modalities and across high-level tasks [22]. These designs demonstrate the value of adaptive attention, but they often rely on multiple attention branches or heavy Transformer blocks.

The efficiency problem is also addressed at the backbone and optimization levels. YOLOv9 introduces GELAN and training-only Programmable Gradient Information (PGI), providing a compact inference path with improved gradient supervision [14]. AMFD distills modality-specific teacher features into an efficient student rather than forcing the student to imitate a fused representation [13]. The modality-failure analysis of M²FRe-LDF further shows that strong cross-modal fusion is insufficient when individual streams are under-represented [3]. These observations motivate CFGPNet, which combines a YOLOv9-based efficient backbone and training path with cross-modal attention exchange and compact attention-guided aggregation.

3. Method

3.1. Overview of the Proposed Framework

In CFGPNet, modality-specific feature extraction, cross-modal refinement, and multispectral fusion are integrated

within a YOLOv9-based architecture for RGB-T object detection [14]. As shown in Fig. 2, registered visible and thermal images are processed by independent backbones, from which modality-specific multiscale features are obtained. At the P3–P5 detection scales, spatial attention maps are derived from each modality by CrossCEA and applied to the opposite stream before fusion. The enhanced features are then fused by ASAF and passed through the multiscale neck to the detection head. The improved backbone, CrossCEA, ASAF, and training-time auxiliary gradient path are described in the subsequent subsections.

3.2. Improved Backbone Structure

The GELAN architecture of YOLOv9 is adopted as the backbone template because different computational units can be incorporated within its flexible aggregation structure [14]. As shown in Fig. 3, the original RepVGG-based units are replaced with RepViT-based blocks [29], and RepViTBottleneck, RepViTCSP, and RepViTCSPELAN4 are thereby constructed for use in both the backbone and neck.

3.2.1. RepViT-Based GELAN Backbone

Within GELAN, the original RepVGG-derived computational units [30] are replaced by RepViT blocks [29], while the layer-aggregation topology is retained. Spatial and channel mixing are separated within each block, and structural reparameterization is used to maintain a compact inference structure.

SE attention [31] is enabled in all RepViT blocks for channel-wise recalibration. As shown in Fig. 3, RepViTBottleneck is formed by replacing the original RepNBottleneck transformation, and RepViTCSP and RepViTCSPELAN4 are subsequently constructed by cascading this block.

3.2.2. Multi-Head Attention

Multi-head self-attention [32] is incorporated into selected RepViTBottleneck blocks for global contextual refinement. Query, key, and value projections are implemented using 1×1 convolutions, while a depthwise 5×5 convolution is applied to the value branch for positional encoding. As shown in Fig. 3(c), the attention path is placed parallel to the skip connection and is enabled only in the GELAN modules of the neck to limit computational cost.

3.2.3. Marginal Feature Extractor

The Marginal Feature Extractor (MFE) is introduced to preserve peripheral and boundary responses that can be weakened by the center-concentrated effective receptive fields of deep CNNs [33]. As shown in Fig. 4, four progressively connected branches are constructed using 1×1 , 3×3 , 5×5 , and 7×7 convolutional kernels paired with 3×3 dilated convolutions at rates 1, 3, 5, and 7. Multiscale context is thereby captured without spatial downsampling [34], while a new input projection is combined with the preceding output at each subsequent stage.

The branch outputs are concatenated, channel-shuffled with four groups [35], and refined by a 1×1 depthwise convolution.




Fig. 2. Overview of the proposed CFQNet framework. The auxiliary branch (green area) is used only during training for gradient enhancement and is removed during inference. The Silence module splits the six-channel input into two three-channel tensors: infrared (channels 1–3) and visible (channels 4–6). The diagram reports each module name, the number of output channels in brackets, and the output spatial dimension, all based on a 640×640 input image size.

Within RepViTBottleneck (Fig. 3(c)), MFE replaces the identity path. MFE is confined to the training-only auxiliary branch in CFQNet-m/c and is retained in the CFQNet-e backbone at inference.

3.2.4. Optional Learnable Aggregation Factors

Two optional channel-wise scaling factors are considered in RepViTCSPELAN4, as illustrated in Fig. 3(a). The concatenated outputs of the two 3×3 branches are modulated by $\gamma_{x_{12}}$ before the final 1×1 projection (yellow area), whereas the projected output is modulated by γ_{out} before residual addition when $c_1 = c_2$ (green area). Both factors are initialized to 10^{-2} so that their initial contributions remain small. These factors are examined as potential mechanisms for regulating feature aggregation and stabilizing optimization, with their actual effect evaluated in the ablation study.

3.3. Programmable Gradient Information

Programmable Gradient Information (PGI), introduced in YOLOv9 [14], is adopted as a training-only auxiliary pathway. Multilevel features from the main RGB-T pathway are routed through the auxiliary branch, where predictions are generated solely for computation of an auxiliary loss. Gradients from this loss are propagated to the main-path parameters through the routed features, and supplementary supervision is thereby provided during optimization.

After training, the entire auxiliary branch is removed. Only the main detection head is retained, and its predictions alone are passed to non-maximum suppression. No predictions, parameters, or operations from the auxiliary branch are included during inference; consequently, the parameter count and GFLOPs are reduced relative to the full training architecture.

3.4. Cross Computation Efficient Attention

CrossCEA is applied to the P3–P5 features before ASAF fusion. Its underlying Computation Efficient Attention (CEA)

operator, as illustrated in Fig. 5(c), is built on the grouped local-global structure of EMA² [36] (Fig. 5(b)). The Coordinate Attention (CA) module [37] used in the local branch of EMA is replaced by the axis-wise encoding of ELA³ [38] (Fig. 5(a)). Height- and width-wise descriptors from the resulting local branch are then cross-coupled with those from the global convolutional branch before a two-dimensional attention map is formed. CEA therefore remains closely related to EMA and ELA, with strengthened local-global interaction being its principal extension.

In CrossCEA, a CEA attention map is computed independently for each modality and applied to the opposite stream. Only the spatial attention maps are exchanged, while the modality-specific feature values are preserved until ASAF fusion. The operation at each feature scale is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Here B, C, H, W denote batch size, channels, height, and width. GROUPCHANNELS reshapes the input to $(BG, C/G, H, W)$, with $G = 32$ and $G \mid C$. STRIPPOOL returns $(\text{Avg}_w(X), \text{Avg}_h(X))$, averaging over width and height, respectively; GAP averages both spatial axes. σ denotes sigmoid, $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication with broadcasting, and the softmax subscript specifies its normalization axis. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_c$ sums channel-wise products, and $\text{Outer}(a, b) = ab^T$. RESTOREANDBROADCAST broadcasts each group map over its C/G channels and restores shape (B, C, H, W) . DWConv1D uses kernel size 7; GN denotes group normalization with one channel per normalization group. CEA parameters are shared across modalities, and the axis encoders share convolution and normalization parameters. The temperature τ is learned and initialized to 1.

²efficient multi-scale attention

³efficient location attention




Fig. 3. Architectures of (a) RepViTCSPELAN4, (b) RepViTCSPELAN4, and (c) RepViTBottleneck. For each operation, the two channel arguments denote the input and output channels, respectively; c_1 and c_2 denote the module-level input and output channels, and $\oplus$ denotes element-wise addition.

3.5. Attention Selection and Aggregation Fusion Network

At each detection scale, the CrossCEA-enhanced visible and infrared features are fused into a single representation by the Attention Selection and Aggregation Fusion (ASAF) network. As shown in Fig. 6, the upper path combines dense connectivity [39] with CBAM⁴ refinement [40], whereas the MBatt⁵ path incorporates ELA-based axis encoding [38], coordinate attention [37], and SE⁶ recalibration [31].

In the dense path, modality features are progressively aggregated and refined. In MBatt, three attention candidates are generated after axis-wise encoding, and their element-wise maximum is selected at each channel and spatial position. The outputs of both paths are subsequently concatenated and projected to the required channel dimension. The complete procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Here C_1 is the concatenated input channel count, $C_2 = C_1/2$, and Cat_c concatenates along channels. With $g = C_2/4$, $\mathcal{R}_\ell$ produces g new channels using 1×1 and 3×3 convolutions with $4g$ and g outputs, respectively, each preceded by batch normalization and ReLU. In the ELA path, Conv1D is depthwise with kernel size 5; GN uses 32 groups, and convolution and normalization parameters are shared across axes. CA_i and SE_i denote coordinate and squeeze-and-excitation attention, with separate parameters for each candidate i . Their outputs $\mathcal{A}_i$ are recalibrated feature tensors; Max selects the largest value across can-

⁴convolutional block attention module

⁵multi-branch attention

⁶squeeze and excitation

Algorithm 1 CrossCEA at one feature scale

Require: $F^I, F^V \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times H \times W}$, groups G , temperature τ
Ensure: Cross-enhanced features $\bar{F}^I, \bar{F}^V$

```

1: function CEAMAP( $F, G, \tau$ )
2:    $X \leftarrow \text{GROUPCHANNELS}(F, G)$ 
3:    $(p_h, p_w) \leftarrow \text{STRIPPOOL}(X)$ 
4:    $g_h \leftarrow \sigma(\text{GN}(\text{DWConv1D}(p_h)))$ 
5:    $g_w \leftarrow \sigma(\text{GN}(\text{DWConv1D}(p_w)))$ 
6:    $X_\ell \leftarrow \text{GN}(X \odot g_h \odot g_w)$ 
7:    $X_g \leftarrow \text{Conv}_{3 \times 3}(X)$ 
8:    $(H_\ell, W_\ell) \leftarrow \text{STRIPPOOL}(X_\ell)$ 
9:    $(H_g, W_g) \leftarrow \text{STRIPPOOL}(X_g)$ 
10:   $q_\ell \leftarrow \text{Softmax}_c(\text{GAP}(X_\ell))$ 
11:   $q_g \leftarrow \text{Softmax}_c(\text{GAP}(X_g))$ 
12:   $s_h \leftarrow \langle q_\ell, H_g \rangle_c + \langle q_g, H_\ell \rangle_c$ 
13:   $s_w \leftarrow \langle q_\ell, W_g \rangle_c + \langle q_g, W_\ell \rangle_c$ 
14:   $\alpha_h \leftarrow \text{Softmax}_h(s_h/\tau)$ 
15:   $\alpha_w \leftarrow \text{Softmax}_w(s_w/\tau)$ 
16:   $\Omega \leftarrow \text{RESTOREANDBROADCAST}(\sigma(\text{Outer}(\alpha_h, \alpha_w)), G)$ 
17:  return  $\Omega$ 
18: end function
19:  $\Omega^I \leftarrow \text{CEAMAP}(F^I, G, \tau)$ 
20:  $\Omega^V \leftarrow \text{CEAMAP}(F^V, G, \tau)$ 
21:  $\bar{F}^I \leftarrow F^I \odot \Omega^V$ 
22:  $\bar{F}^V \leftarrow F^V \odot \Omega^I$ 
23: return  $\bar{F}^I, \bar{F}^V$ 

```

didates at each tensor entry. CBAM applies channel attention followed by spatial attention.

3.6. Loss Function

The standard YOLOv9 detection objective is retained for the main and training-only auxiliary heads [14]. In addition, a feature-distribution regularizer is applied to the CrossCEA outputs at each detection scale. Let the paired features at scale s be represented as $T^{(s)} = [Z_1^{(s)} | Z_V^{(s)}]$, where the two channel partitions correspond to the infrared and visible streams. After vectorization, a distribution is formed for each modality as

$$z_M^{(s)} = \text{Softmax}(\text{vec}(Z_M^{(s)})), \quad M \in \{I, V\}, \quad (1)$$

where vec flattens the channel and spatial dimensions of each sample, and softmax normalizes its $D_s = C_s H_s W_s$ feature elements.

Using cross-entropy [41] and KL divergence [42], the quantities implemented at scale s are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^{(s)}(p, q) &= -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{d=1}^{D_s} p_{bd} \log(q_{bd} + \varepsilon), \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{KL}, \varepsilon}^{(s)}(p||q) &= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{d=1}^{D_s} p_{bd} [\log p_{bd} - \log(q_{bd} + \varepsilon)], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where B is the batch size, $\varepsilon = 10^{-10}$, and logarithms are natural. The entries p_{bd} and q_{bd} are probabilities for sample b and feature element d . Below, S denotes the number of regularized scales in the branch, and $\mathcal{H}(p) = -B^{-1} \sum_{b,d} p_{bd} \log p_{bd}$ denotes batch-averaged entropy. The implemented CE-KL regularizer




Fig. 4. Architecture of the MFE module.

is then

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE-KL}} = \sum_{s=1}^S \left[\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon}^{(s)}(z_I^{(s)}, z_V^{(s)}) + \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon}^{(s)}(z_V^{(s)}, z_I^{(s)}) - \mathcal{D}_{\text{KL},\varepsilon}^{(s)}(z_I^{(s)} \| z_V^{(s)}) - \mathcal{D}_{\text{KL},\varepsilon}^{(s)}(z_V^{(s)} \| z_I^{(s)}) \right]. \quad (3)$$

Because $\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon}(p, q) - \mathcal{D}_{\text{KL},\varepsilon}(p \| q) = \mathcal{H}(p)$, Eq. 3 is equivalently written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CE-KL}} = \sum_{s=1}^S \left[\mathcal{H}(z_I^{(s)}) + \mathcal{H}(z_V^{(s)}) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Accordingly, concentrated CrossCEA responses are encouraged independently in both modalities; direct minimization of their distributional discrepancy is not imposed.

During training, this regularizer is added to the YOLOv9 detection objective with a weight of 1.0. The same losses are applied to the auxiliary branch with a global weight of 0.25. Only the main branch is retained during inference.

3.7. CFGPNet Framework Scales

Three variants, CFGPNet-m⁷, CFGPNet-c⁸, and CFGPNet-e⁹, are instantiated for different computational budgets. The topology shown in Fig. 2 is shared by CFGPNet-m and CFGPNet-c, with reduced channel widths used in CFGPNet-m. In CFGPNet-e, the channel widths and block depths are

⁷medium

⁸compact

⁹extended

increased, and additional multilevel routing is incorporated into the training-time auxiliary pathway, as shown in Fig. 7. The CrossCEA, ASAF, and main detection stages are retained across all variants. In each case, the auxiliary pathway is removed after training, and only the main pathway is used for inference. Detailed configurations are provided in Table A.18.

4. Experiments

CFGPNet is evaluated on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, VEDAI, and MFAD. Accuracy, efficiency, ablation on MFAD, and qualitative evaluations are reported.

4.1. Datasets

FLIR: The aligned subset provided by [43] is used, with misregistered RGB-T pairs excluded. Person, car, and bicycle instances from daytime and nighttime scenes are evaluated. (Download link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xHDMG16HJZwtarNWkEV3T409X4ZQYz2Y/view>)

M3FD: Registered RGB-T road scenes covering daytime, overcast, nighttime, and challenging conditions are provided. An 8:2 train-test split is used. (Download link: <https://github.com/JinyuanLiu-CV/TarDAL>)

LLVIP: Registered visible-infrared pedestrian pairs captured under low-light conditions are provided. The official split is used. (Download link: <https://github.com/bupt-ai-cz/LLVIP>)

VEDAI: Co-registered color and infrared aerial images containing small vehicles are provided. The 1024 × 1024 images and predefined Split 1 are used, with the split fixed *a priori* for




Fig. 5. Architectures of (a) ELA, (b) EMA, and (c) CEA.

all variants. For external comparisons, reported single-split results are retained; when all splits are reported separately, Split 1 is used, whereas ten-split averages are excluded. (Download link: <https://downloads.greyc.fr/vedai/>)

MFAD: Registered RGB-T driving scenes covering varied roads, illumination levels, and weather conditions are provided. The official split is used. (Download link: <https://github.com/hukefy/EI2Det>)

Only publicly released images and annotations were used. The evaluated dataset statistics are summarized in Table 1.

Collectively, the benchmarks cover low-light pedestrian, road, adverse-weather, and small-object detection in aerial imagery.

4.2. Evaluation Metrics

Detection accuracy is evaluated using Precision, Recall, mAP50, and mAP50:95. For a predicted box B_p and ground-truth box B_{gt} , intersection over union is defined as

$$\text{IoU}(B_p, B_{gt}) = \frac{|B_p \cap B_{gt}|}{|B_p \cup B_{gt}|}. \quad (5)$$

Algorithm 2 Attention Selection and Aggregation Fusion

Require: Enhanced features $\tilde{F}^I$ and $\tilde{F}^V$; output channels $C_2 = C_1/2$; $N_b = 3$

Ensure: Fused feature $\mathcal{Y}_{\text{ASAF}}$

$\Phi_{1 \times 1}^{a \rightarrow b}$ denotes a 1×1 convolution from a to b channels, followed by batch normalization and SiLU.

- 1: $\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \text{Cat}_c(\tilde{F}^I, \tilde{F}^V)$
- 2: $\mathcal{D}_0 \leftarrow \Phi_{1 \times 1}^{C_1 \rightarrow C_2/4}(\mathcal{X})$
- 3: $\mathcal{D}_1 \leftarrow \Phi_{1 \times 1}^{C_2/4 \rightarrow C_2/4}(\mathcal{D}_0)$
- 4: **for** $\ell = 2, 3, 4$ **do**
- 5: $\mathcal{Q}_\ell \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_\ell(\mathcal{D}_{\ell-1})$
- 6: $\mathcal{D}_\ell \leftarrow \text{Cat}_c(\mathcal{D}_{\ell-1}, \mathcal{Q}_\ell)$
- 7: **end for**
- 8: $\mathcal{U}_d \leftarrow \text{CBAM}(\mathcal{D}_4)$
- 9: $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \Phi_{1 \times 1}^{C_1 \rightarrow C_2}(\mathcal{X})$
- 10: $\mathcal{E}_h \leftarrow \sigma(\text{GN}(\text{Conv1D}(\text{Avg}_w(\mathcal{P}))))$
- 11: $\mathcal{E}_w \leftarrow \sigma(\text{GN}(\text{Conv1D}(\text{Avg}_h(\mathcal{P}))))$
- 12: $\mathcal{P}_e \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \odot \mathcal{E}_h \odot \mathcal{E}_w$
- 13: **for** $i = 1, \dots, N_b$ **do**
- 14: $\mathcal{A}_i \leftarrow \text{SE}_i(\text{CA}_i(\mathcal{P}_e))$
- 15: **end for**
- 16: $\mathcal{A}_{\max} \leftarrow \text{Max}_{i=1, \dots, N_b}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ ▷ element-wise
- 17: $\mathcal{U}_a \leftarrow \mathcal{P}_e \odot \mathcal{A}_{\max}$
- 18: $\mathcal{Y}_{\text{ASAF}} \leftarrow \Phi_{1 \times 1}^{2C_2 \rightarrow C_2}(\text{Cat}_c(\mathcal{U}_d, \mathcal{U}_a))$
- 19: **return** $\mathcal{Y}_{\text{ASAF}}$

Table 1: Statistics of the five multispectral datasets used in our experiments.

Dataset	Resolution (VIS/IR)	#Classes	Train	Test	Total
FLIR	640 × 512	3	4,129	1,013	5,142
M3FD	1024 × 768 [‡] 640 × 512	6	3,360	840	4,200
LLVIP	1080 × 720	1	12,024	3,464	15,488
VEDAI	1024 × 1024	9	1,125	123	1,248
MFAD	1280 × 960 [‡] 640 × 512	6	9,897	2,473	12,370

[‡] This image size is used for both modalities.

At threshold τ , a correctly classified prediction with $\text{IoU} \geq \tau$ is counted as a true positive (TP); unmatched predictions and ground-truth instances are counted as false positives (FP) and false negatives (FN), respectively. Precision and Recall are computed as

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}, \quad \text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}. \quad (6)$$

For C classes, mean average precision at threshold τ is

$$\text{mAP}[\tau] = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^C \text{AP}_c[\tau], \quad (7)$$

where

$$\text{AP}_c[\tau] = \int_0^1 P_c(R; \tau) dR \quad (8)$$

is obtained from the precision-recall curve by varying the confidence threshold. mAP50 is evaluated at $\tau = 0.50$, whereas




Fig. 6. Architecture of the ASAF network.

mAP50:95 is averaged over ten thresholds from 0.50 to 0.95 in increments of 0.05.

Computational cost is characterized by parameter count, GFLOPs, and inference throughput. Parameters and GFLOPs are computed from the inference graph after removal of the training-only auxiliary pathway. For each dataset, all N_{test} paired test samples listed in Table 1 are processed with a batch size of 1. If t_i is the forward-pass latency in seconds for the i -th RGB-T pair, excluding data loading and preprocessing, throughput is computed as

$$\bar{t} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} t_i, \quad \text{FPS} = \frac{1}{\bar{t}} = \frac{N_{\text{test}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} t_i}. \quad (9)$$

One paired RGB-T sample is treated as one inference instance.

4.3. Training Setup

The models were implemented in PyTorch 1.12.1 with Python 3.10, CUDA 11.8, and Ubuntu 20.04. Training was performed from scratch on a workstation with an Intel Core i7-12700 CPU, 96 GB RAM, and two NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPUs. Inference was measured on one RTX 3090 using native PyTorch, without deployment acceleration, quantization, or pruning.

All variants were trained for 600 epochs at 640×640 resolution. Global batch sizes of 18, 10, and 6 were used for CFGPNet-m, CFGPNet-c, and CFGPNet-e, respectively. The optimization and augmentation settings are reported in Table A.17. Geometric augmentations were synchronized between paired visible and thermal images to preserve their spatial correspondence.

Dataset-specific NMS thresholds were selected using a held-out subset containing 10% of each training set, without access to the evaluation images, and were fixed across all variants. The selected values are reported in Table 2.

Table 2: Dataset-level NMS IoU thresholds used for CFGPNet inference.

Dataset	FLIR	M3FD	LLVIP	VEDAI	MFAD
NMS IoU threshold	0.6	0.5	0.65	0.45	0.55

4.4. Comparison with State-of-the-Art Methods

CFGPNet is compared with published RGB-T detectors on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, VEDAI, and MFAD using the metrics defined in Section 4.2. Results for the compared methods are taken from their respective publications, whereas all CFGPNet variants are evaluated under the protocol described in Section 4.3. Dataset-specific accuracy is reported in the following subsections, and the computational profiles of the three variants are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Framework specifications of CFGPNet model scales (input size: 640×640). These specifications are obtained after deleting the auxiliary reversible branch from all models. Specifications of original trained weights are given in parentheses.

	CFGPNet-m	CFGPNet-c	CFGPNet-e
#Param. (M)	15.3 (21.0)	44.9 (71.7)	128.0 (180.9)
GFLOPs (G)	56.9 (94.6)	199.7 (362.2)	406.1 (560.7)
FPS	91.7 (52.2)	52.6 (32.0)	25.7 (18.6)
Model Size (MB)	30.3 (41.6)	87.1 (138.8)	248.2 (349.6)
#Layers	816 (1165)	816 (1165)	1388 (1806)

Notes: #Param. and GFLOPs are reported for a single forward pass at $1 \times 6 \times 640 \times 640$. FPS is calculated as the reciprocal of the mean forward-pass latency over all paired test samples listed in Table 1, excluding data loading and preprocessing, as defined in Section 4.2.

FLIR. In Table 4, the FLIR results are separated most clearly by the stricter localization metric. With CFGPNet-e, 80.7% mAP50 and 45.0% mAP50:95 are obtained; its mAP50 is within 1.2 points of the highest listed values from CDFNet (81.9%) and CrossModalNet (81.7%) [8, 9], while margins of 1.7 and 2.5 points over CrossModalNet and CDFNet, respectively, are recorded for mAP50:95. Values of 43.1% and 43.6% mAP50:95 are obtained with CFGPNet-m and CFGPNet-c.




Fig. 7. Training architecture of CFGPNet-e with additional multilevel routing in the auxiliary pathway. Module names, output channels in brackets, and spatial resolutions are reported for a 640×640 input.

Table 4: Quantitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the **FLIR** dataset. The best, second-best, and third-best accuracy results are highlighted in bold.

	Model	#Param.(M)	GFLOPs(G)	mAP50	mAP50:95
T	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	—	—	74.2	38.0
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	—	—	75.3	38.9
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	—	—	72.9	36.0
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	—	—	73.1	36.6
RGB	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	—	—	67.6	30.1
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	—	—	68.9	31.9
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	—	—	66.9	30.2
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	—	—	67.3	30.7
RGB-T	MMI-Det[2] (2024)	207.6	229.2	79.8	40.5
	CFT[4] (2021)	196.9	224.4	78.7	40.2
	ICAFusion[5] (2024)	120.2	192.6	79.2	41.4
	CSSA[1] (2023)	—	—	79.2	41.3
	C ² DFF-Net[19] (2025)	6.6	14.6	76.9	40.8
	CrossFormer[27] (2024)	—	361.7	79.3	42.1
	El ² Det[6] (2025)	127.7	—	80.2	—
	CAMDet[48] (2025)	—	—	76.3	37.1
	DHANet[7] (2025)	—	—	74.3	—
	MCOR[49] (2025)	—	—	78.2	39.9
	CDFNet[8] (2026)	84.8	199.6	81.9	42.5
	CrossModalNet[9] (2026)	92.8	—	81.7	43.3
	ADCA-Net[10] (2026)	34.0	—	78.9	—
	M ² Fre-LDF[3] (2026)	128.3	140.1	78.3	39.7
	CFGPNNet-m	15.3	56.9	80.0	43.1
	CFGPNNet-c	44.9	199.7	79.8	43.6
	CFGPNNet-e	128.0	406.1	80.7	45.0

Notes: #Param. denotes the number of parameters in millions. “—” indicates that the value is not reported in the corresponding reference. Single-modality results in Tables 4-7 are obtained from [9].

The corresponding positions in Fig. 8 are distributed along a scale-dependent accuracy–cost curve, with lower-cost operating points obtained from the compact variants and the highest localization score obtained from CFGPNet-e.

M3FD. In Table 5, strong performance is recorded on M3FD under both evaluation criteria. For CFGPNet-e, 89.9% mAP50 and 63.4% mAP50:95 are obtained, compared with 89.3%/58.6% for MDSF-Det and 88.6%/59.9% for CDFNet [51, 8]; margins of 0.6 and 4.8 points over MDSF-Det are thereby recorded. For the compact and medium variants, 89.0%/62.2% and 87.8%/60.3% are obtained, respectively, so competitive localization is retained below the largest configuration. The larger separation under mAP50:95 is consistent with improved localization across IoU thresholds.

LLVIP. In Table 6, near-saturation behavior is observed on LLVIP at mAP50: 98.9% is reported for MMI-Det, while 97.8%, 97.7%, and 97.5% are obtained with CFGPNNet-m, CFGPNNet-c, and CFGPNNet-e, respectively [2]. The principal separation is observed at mAP50:95, where 67.1%, 68.8%, and 68.9% are obtained; relative to the strongest listed prior value, 65.9% from AFFNet, a gain of 3.0 points is recorded by CFGPNNet-e [26]. Nearly the same localization score is obtained with CFGPNNet-c using 44.9M parameters as with CFGPNNet-e using 128.0M, while 67.1% is obtained with CFGPNNet-m at 15.3M parameters. The principal differences are consequently found in localization and parameter efficiency, since the headline mAP50 values are tightly grouped.




Fig. 8. Effectiveness–efficiency comparisons of CFGPNet and state-of-the-art methods on (a,f) FLIR, (b,g) M3FD, (c,h) LLVIP, (d,i) VEDAI, and (e,j) MFAD. The first row shows accuracy versus the number of parameters, while the second row shows accuracy versus computational cost in GFLOPs.

Table 5: Quantitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the **M3FD** dataset. The best, second-best, and third-best accuracy results are highlighted in bold.

	Model	#Param.(M)	GFLOPs(G)	mAP50	mAP50:95
T	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	–	–	78.5	49.0
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	–	–	81.2	50.8
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	–	–	79.3	49.5
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	–	–	80.7	50.3
RGB	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	–	–	80.8	51.1
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	–	–	83.7	54.3
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	–	–	82.1	51.3
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	–	–	84.0	52.7
RGB-T	MMI-Det[2] (2024)	207.6	229.2	76.6	42.7
	CFT[4] (2021)	196.9	224.4	85.0	54.5
	ICAFusion[5] (2024)	120.2	192.6	85.1	53.5
	EI ² Det[6] (2025)	127.7	–	86.2	55.5
	MCOR[49] (2025)	–	–	87.2	57.3
	CrossModalNet[9] (2026)	92.8	–	87.3	55.6
	IVHL[22] (2025)	271.0	423.0	83.4	55.8
	CARNet[24] (2026)	271.7	286.9	84.3	–
	PFI-Net[20] (2025)	14.9	–	82.9	53.2
	SAFF[21] (2026)	19.1	55.6	87.4	60.1
	AlignFree-Net[50] (2026)	38.5	46.5	86.3	–
	M ² Fre-LDF[3] (2026)	128.3	140.1	86.8	55.9
	CDFNet[8] (2026)	84.8	199.6	88.6	59.9
	MDSF-Det[51] (2026)	–	151.6	89.3	58.6
	CFGPNet-m	15.3	56.9	87.8	60.3
	CFGPNet-c	44.9	199.7	89.0	62.2
	CFGPNet-e	128.0	406.1	89.9	63.4

Notes: “–” indicates that the value is not reported in the corresponding reference.

VEDAI. Under the fixed Split 1 protocol used for VEDAI, the highest result in Table 7 is obtained with CFGPNet-c: 83.3% mAP50 and 56.9% mAP50:95. Against the closest high-scoring entries, gains of 1.6 mAP50 points over COMO (81.7%) and 5.9 mAP50:95 points over CARNet (51.0%) are recorded [25, 24]; 82.9%/54.2% and 79.8%/52.4% are obtained with CFGPNet-e and CFGPNet-m, respectively. The absence of a monotonic gain with model size is explicit: higher values on both metrics are obtained with the 44.9M-parameter CFGPNet-c than with the 128.0M-parameter CFGPNet-e. This pattern is consistent with a dataset-specific capacity requirement for small objects in aerial imagery.

MFAD. In Table 8, a clear scale response is observed

Table 6: Quantitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the **LLVIP** dataset. The best, second-best, and third-best accuracy results are highlighted in bold.

	Model	#Param.(M)	GFLOPs(G)	mAP50	mAP50:95
T	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	–	–	95.4	61.5
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	–	–	95.1	60.9
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	–	–	93.2	59.7
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	–	–	93.8	60.2
RGB	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	–	–	90.1	52.2
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	–	–	90.2	52.6
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	–	–	88.6	50.3
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	–	–	89.5	51.4
RGB-T	MMI-Det[2] (2024)	207.6	229.2	98.9	64.4
	CFT[4] (2021)	196.9	224.4	97.5	63.6
	CAMDet[48] (2025)	–	–	96.5	62.7
	MCOR[49] (2025)	–	–	97.6	64.9
	CSSA[1] (2023)	–	–	94.3	59.2
	CAMF[28] (2023)	–	–	89.0	55.6
	ICAFusion[5] (2024)	120.2	192.6	96.3	62.3
	DHANet[7] (2025)	–	–	97.7	–
	CDFIT[23] (2026)	121.4	210.6	97.6	63.4
	IVHL[22] (2025)	271.0	423.0	95.8	62.6
	CrossFormer[27] (2024)	–	361.7	97.4	65.1
	AMFD[13] (2025)	–	–	95.2	58.3
	COMO[25] (2026)	16.3	14.0	97.2	65.3
	CME-Det[52] (2026)	115.5	205.1	97.0	64.7
	CrossModalNet[9] (2026)	92.8	–	97.7	64.7
	KDET-HPFL[53] (2025)	–	–	–	65.1
	EI ² Det[6] (2025)	127.7	–	98.0	63.9
	MCFF-Det[54] (2025)	–	–	96.0	64.0
	VIF-YOLO[55] (2025)	–	–	96.3	64.5
	AFFNet[26] (2026)	120.4	93.6	98.2	65.9
	ADCA-Net[10] (2026)	34.0	–	97.6	–
	CDFNet[8] (2026)	84.8	199.6	97.5	65.4
	M ² Fre-LDF[3] (2026)	128.3	140.1	97.5	65.1
	IVD-NET[56] (2026)	27.9	60.9	96.7	61.9
	MDSF-Det[51] (2026)	–	151.6	94.9	62.9
	TGRDet[11] (2026)	27.8	20.5	96.5	–
	CMMS-DETR[57] (2026)	92.4	259.8	97.3	65.0
	CFGPNet-m	15.3	56.9	97.8	67.1
	CFGPNet-c	44.9	199.7	97.7	68.8
	CFGPNet-e	128.0	406.1	97.5	68.9

Notes: “–” indicates that the value is not reported in the corresponding reference.

on MFAD. The pairs 79.6%/56.7%, 82.0%/59.9%, and 83.4%/61.8% are obtained with CFGPNet-m, CFGPNet-c, and CFGPNet-e, respectively, and the highest values on both metrics are therefore obtained with CFGPNet-e. Relative to the strongest prior entry listed, EI²Det at 79.0%/53.3% [6], gains

Table 7: Quantitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the **VEDAI** dataset. Individually reported single-split results are included; when results for all ten splits are available separately, the Split 1 result is used. Studies reporting only the ten-split average are excluded. The best, second-best, and third-best results are highlighted in bold.

	Model	#Param.(M)	GFLOPs(G)	mAP50	mAP50:95
T	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	—	—	54.2	38.2
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	—	—	62.2	43.6
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	—	—	56.6	37.4
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	—	—	57.5	37.8
RGB	Fast R-CNN[44] (2015)	—	—	60.8	41.2
	YOLOv11[45] (2024)	—	—	67.9	44.1
	MobileFormer[46] (2022)	—	—	62.1	42.2
	EfficientViT[47] (2023)	—	—	64.5	42.9
RGB-T	CFT[4] (2021)	196.9	224.4	77.2	—
	ICAFusion[5] (2024)	120.2	192.6	76.6	44.9
	VIF-YOLO[55] (2025)	—	—	75.1	44.9
	DHANet[7] (2025)	—	—	78.2	—
	MCOR[49] (2025)	—	—	76.2	46.3
	AFFNet[26] (2026)	120.4	61.8	75.2	39.7
	C ² DFF-Net[19] (2025)	6.6	14.6	79.8	50.2
	CARNet[24] (2026)	271.7	286.9	81.4	51.0
	COMO[25] (2026)	16.3	14.0	81.7	50.3
	CrossModalNet[9] (2026)	92.8	—	79.3	49.2
	SAFF[21] (2026)	19.1	55.6	63.3	43.3
	SCFDet[12] (2026)	34.8	130.1	80.5	50.6
	CFGPNNet-m	15.3	56.9	79.8	52.4
	CFGPNNet-c	44.9	199.7	83.3	56.9
	CFGPNNet-e	128.0	406.1	82.9	54.2

Notes: “—” indicates that the value is not reported in the corresponding reference.

Table 8: Quantitative comparison with state-of-the-art methods on the **MFAD** dataset. The best, second-best, and third-best results are highlighted in bold.

	Model	#Param.(M)	GFLOPs(G)	mAP50	mAP50:95
T	YOLOv5-l[58] (2022)	—	—	70.0	42.8
	YOLOv7-x[59] (2022)	—	—	66.5	40.6
	YOLOv10-l[60] (2024)	—	—	65.7	41.8
RGB	YOLOv5-l[58] (2022)	—	—	74.9	49.1
	YOLOv7-x[59] (2022)	—	—	72.9	48.8
	YOLOv10-l[60] (2024)	—	—	71.1	48.9
RGB-T	CFT[4] (2021)	196.9	224.4	77.8	52.5
	MMI-Det[2] (2024)	207.6	229.2	76.9	51.4
	ICAFusion[5] (2024)	120.2	192.6	77.6	52.7
	EI ² Det[6] (2025)	127.7	—	79.0	53.3
	CFGPNNet-m	15.3	56.9	79.6	56.7
	CFGPNNet-c	44.9	199.7	82.0	59.9
	CFGPNNet-e	128.0	406.1	83.4	61.8

Notes: “—” indicates that the value is not reported in the corresponding reference. Single-modality results are obtained from [6].

of 4.4 mAP50 points and 8.5 mAP50:95 points are recorded by CFGPNNet-e; gains of 3.0 and 6.6 points are still obtained with CFGPNNet-c using 44.9M parameters. Across the five benchmarks, the deployment choices are made explicit by the parameter- and GFLOP-accuracy plots in Fig. 8: 91.7 FPS at 56.9 GFLOPs is obtained with CFGPNNet-m, 52.6 FPS at 199.7 GFLOPs with CFGPNNet-c, and 25.7 FPS at 406.1 GFLOPs with CFGPNNet-e.

Cross-dataset precision-recall behavior for CFGPNNet-e is summarized in Fig. 9; high precision is retained over the recall range on all five benchmarks, with aggregate mAP50 values spanning 80.7% on FLIR to 97.5% on LLVIP. The class-wise values in Table 9 provide the corresponding detail: high per-class mAP50 is obtained for M3FD Bus (95.9%), VEDAI Plane (99.5%), and MFAD Car and Bus (92.1% and 92.2%), whereas lower values are observed for FLIR Bicycle (63.6%), VEDAI




Fig. 9: Illustration of precision-recall curves for CFGPNNet-e on (a) FLIR, (b) M3FD, (c) LLVIP, (d) VEDAI, and (e) MFAD datasets.

Table 9: Detailed per-class and overall detection results of CFGPNNet variants on all evaluated datasets. Values are reported in the format Precision/Recall/mAP50/mAP50:95 (%).

	Class	CFGPNNet-m	CFGPNNet-c	CFGPNNet-e
FLIR	person	83.2/78.4/85.9/44.5	82.3/79.8/86.0/45.1	83.5/78.9/86.6/46.1
	car	81.4/87.1/91.2/61.8	80.8/87.9/91.5/62.6	83.0/86.8/91.7/63.5
	bicycle	73.1/54.3/62.8/23.1	67.3/54.3/61.9/23.2	68.4/54.9/63.6/25.3
	all	79.2/73.3/80.0/43.1	76.8/74.0/79.8/43.6	78.3/73.5/80.7/45.0
M3FD	People	86.0/78.1/84.7/53.5	87.6/78.6/86.1/55.6	86.9/80.9/86.6/56.6
	Car	90.4/88.1/92.9/70.4	91.1/87.9/93.1/71.2	90.8/89.0/93.9/72.1
	Bus	91.7/92.5/95.5/80.3	91.9/93.0/95.5/82.4	91.7/92.5/95.9/82.2
	Motorcycle	87.5/71.6/81.0/46.0	88.0/79.4/84.9/48.4	89.5/80.4/84.2/49.1
	Lamp	87.1/77.2/83.7/46.5	89.2/78.0/85.0/48.9	90.3/81.1/88.0/51.7
LLVIP	Truck	88.9/84.4/88.9/65.2	89.7/87.2/89.5/66.6	89.8/88.4/90.9/68.8
	all	88.6/82.0/87.8/60.3	89.6/84.0/89.0/62.2	89.9/85.4/89.9/63.4
VEDAI	person	96.2/93.8/97.8/67.1	96.2/93.1/97.7/68.8	96.8/92.5/97.5/68.9
	all	96.2/93.8/97.8/67.1	96.2/93.1/97.7/68.8	96.8/92.5/97.5/68.9
	car	88.4/73.9/88.8/58.4	90.1/81.2/91.5/59.6	92.1/86.7/94.6/60.7
	truck	77.5/63.3/78.2/52.0	78.2/59.9/78.0/49.3	68.3/76.7/87.1/62.4
	boat	72.9/41.2/66.4/38.9	74.2/58.8/69.6/41.0	89.6/50.9/70.5/45.7
	tractor	92.6/65.7/76.7/46.6	83.4/63.2/84.0/53.3	100.0/56.6/70.9/45.3
	camping car	60.9/76.9/73.7/53.2	67.1/78.6/78.2/54.4	71.6/84.2/81.5/55.8
	pick-up	81.3/71.6/83.8/54.2	85.2/83.2/87.5/54.6	86.0/84.3/92.6/60.9
	plane	65.6/100.0/99.5/79.6	71.2/100.0/99.5/99.5	43.7/100.0/99.5/59.7
	other	87.4/34.7/56.7/29.1	84.3/53.8/70.8/36.2	69.2/45.0/59.9/32.2
MFAD	van	100.0/85.9/94.3/59.2	87.7/70.0/90.9/64.0	90.7/70.0/89.5/65.0
	all	80.7/68.1/79.8/52.4	80.2/72.1/83.3/56.9	79.0/72.7/82.9/54.2
	Car	88.4/85.3/90.8/69.9	90.0/85.1/91.4/71.6	90.0/86.1/92.1/72.8
	Bus	87.8/87.8/90.9/71.3	91.1/88.6/92.2/73.7	89.9/89.1/92.2/74.4
	Truck	87.9/82.5/87.0/65.6	90.1/81.9/88.6/68.9	91.3/84.3/90.4/71.4

“Other” (59.9%), and MFAD Cyclist (63.5%). For mAP50:95, the highest aggregate values are obtained with CFGPNNet-e on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, and MFAD, while the strongest VEDAI result is obtained with CFGPNNet-c.

4.5. Ablation Studies

All ablations were conducted on MFAD using CFGPNNet-m. Except for the factor under study, the architecture, training schedule, data split, and evaluation protocol were held fixed.

RepViT as the backbone baseline. Table 10 shows that replacing RepVGG with RepViT increased mAP50/mAP50:95 from 76.4%/53.9% to 79.6%/56.7%. At the same time, GFLOPs decreased from 60.8 to 56.9, parameters from 15.9M to 15.3M, and FPS increased from 82.3 to 91.7. This improvement is consistent with the separation of spatial and channel mixing and the use of structural re-parameterization in RepViT. RepViT was therefore retained as the GELAN backbone.

Table 10: Controlled ablation of RepVGG and RepViT as the GELAN backbone baseline. All other CFGPNet components and training/inference settings are kept fixed. The best result is highlighted in bold.

Baseline	mAP50	mAP50:95	GFLOPs (G)	#Param. (M)	FPS
RepVGG	76.4	53.9	60.8	15.9	82.3
RepViT	79.6	56.7	56.9	15.3	91.7

Effect of PGI. With training-time PGI supervision, mAP50 and mAP50:95 were increased from 78.9% and 56.4% to 79.6% and 56.7%, respectively (Table 11). Because the auxiliary

Table 11: Controlled ablation of model performance with and without PGI. All other CFGPNet components and training/inference settings are kept fixed. The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

Method	mAP50	mAP50:95	GFLOPs (G)	#Param. (M)	FPS
Without PGI	78.9	56.4	56.9	15.3	93.5
With PGI	79.6	56.7	56.9	15.3	91.7

branch is removed after training, the inference cost remained unchanged at 15.3M parameters and 56.9 GFLOPs. A modest accuracy gain was therefore obtained without increasing deployment complexity.

Ablation on fusion loss terms. The fusion-loss ablation is reported in Table 12. The CE-KL regularizer defined in Sec-

Table 12: Ablation study on fusion loss terms. The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

Loss term	mAP50	mAP50:95
None	79.7	56.6
MSE	79.1	55.4
SSIM	73.8	51.1
CE-KL	79.6	56.7
MSE + SSIM + CE-KL	74.3	51.5

tion 3.6 was compared with no auxiliary fusion loss, MSE, SSIM, and their combination. The alternative terms were computed from the split CrossCEA outputs. Structural similarity (SSIM) [61] was used to constrain structural consistency:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SSIM} = \sum_{s=1}^S \left(1 - \text{SSIM}(p^{(s)}, q^{(s)}) \right),$$

$$p^{(s)} = \sigma(Z_1^{(s)}),$$

$$q^{(s)} = \sigma(Z_V^{(s)}), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{SSIM}(p, q) = \text{Mean} \left[\frac{2\mu_p\mu_q + C_1}{\mu_p^2 + \mu_q^2 + C_1} \frac{2\sigma_{pq} + C_2}{\sigma_p^2 + \sigma_q^2 + C_2} \right],$$

$$\mu_p = \mathcal{G} * p,$$

$$\sigma_p^2 = \mathcal{G} * (p^2) - \mu_p^2, \quad (11)$$

$$\sigma_{pq} = \mathcal{G} * (pq) - \mu_p\mu_q,$$

$$C_1 = (0.01L)^2, \quad C_2 = (0.03L)^2.$$

Here $p = p^{(s)}$ and $q = q^{(s)}$ at each scale, $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes sigmoid, and $L = 1$ is the feature range after sigmoid. $\mathcal{G}$ is a normalized

11×11 Gaussian kernel with standard deviation 1.5; * denotes channel-wise spatial convolution without padding. Mean averages over samples, channels, and valid window positions. The statistics for q are defined analogously. An MSE^{10} term was used to penalize pointwise deviations after sigmoid normalization:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MSE}} = \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{1}{BD_s} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{d=1}^{D_s} (p_{bd}^{(s)} - q_{bd}^{(s)})^2, \quad (12)$$

where $p^{(s)}$ and $q^{(s)}$ are the sigmoid-normalized features in Eq. 10, and d indexes their flattened channel and spatial dimensions.

The main-branch coefficients were $\lambda_{\text{CE-KL}} = 1.0$, $\lambda_{\text{SSIM}} = 3.0$, and $\lambda_{\text{MSE}} = 300.0$; each auxiliary-branch term was multiplied by 0.25. Without fusion loss, 79.7%/56.6% was obtained for mAP50/mAP50:95, whereas CE-KL yielded 79.6%/56.7%. CE-KL was therefore retained for its higher mAP50:95. MSE, SSIM, and MSE+SSIM+CE-KL yielded 79.1%/55.4%, 73.8%/51.1%, and 74.3%/51.5%, respectively. Pointwise and structural alignment thus reduced performance, consistent with over-regularization of modality-specific cues.

As shown in Fig. 10, declines were observed in the box, class, DFL¹¹, and fusion losses, while precision, recall, mAP50, and mAP50:95 converged over 600 epochs. The fusion-loss value




Fig. 10. Evolution of training losses and evaluation metrics for CFGPNet-m on the MFAD dataset during 600 training epochs: (a) box, class, DFL, and fusion loss values; (b) precision, recall, mAP@50, and mAP@50:95 scores.

decreased sharply over the first ten epochs, from approximately 8×10^1 at epoch 1 to 10^{-1} at epoch 10.

Ablation on learnable aggregation factors. Table 13 shows that the highest performance was obtained without an aggregation factor, reaching 79.6% mAP50 and 56.7% mAP50:95. Introducing γ_{out} caused a limited decrease to 78.2%/56.0%,

Table 13: Ablation study on learnable aggregation factors in the improved GELAN backbone. The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

Aggregation factor	mAP50	mAP50:95
None	79.6	56.7
γ_{x12}	70.8	48.3
γ_{out}	78.2	56.0
$\gamma_{x12} + \gamma_{out}$	74.9	51.8

¹⁰mean squared error

¹¹distribution focal loss

whereas $\gamma_{x_{12}}$ reduced the scores to 70.8%/48.3%; using both factors resulted in 74.9%/51.8%. The stronger degradation caused by $\gamma_{x_{12}}$, which rescales the intermediate concatenated features, indicates that channel-wise modulation disrupts feature aggregation in this configuration. The unscaled aggregation path was therefore retained.

Number of attention branches in MBatt. Table 14 shows that the highest accuracy was obtained with three branches in ASAF, reaching 79.6% mAP50 and 56.7% mAP50:95 at 56.9 GFLOPs, 15.3M parameters, and 91.7 FPS. Two branches re-

Table 14: Ablation study on the number of attention branches inside the MBatt structure implemented in the ASAF module. The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

Number of branches	mAP50	mAP50:95	GFLOPs (G)	#Param. (M)	FPS
2	77.0	53.8	56.9	15.3	92.9
3	79.6	56.7	56.9	15.3	91.7
4	74.8	52.8	57.1	15.4	89.8
5	79.4	56.6	57.3	15.5	87.3
6	76.7	54.4	57.5	15.5	85.5

duced accuracy without lowering computational cost, while four branches caused a further decline. Five branches approached the three-branch result (79.4%/56.6%) but increased computational cost and reduced throughput; six branches provided no gain. Three branches were therefore retained as a suitable balance between attention diversity and efficiency.

Effect of SE, MHA¹², and MFE in the improved backbone. Table 15 shows that each component improved detection accuracy individually. SE produced the strongest single-

Table 15: Ablation study on SE attention (in RepViT baseline), multi-head attention, and MFE module (in RepViTBottleneck). The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

Component	mAP50	mAP50:95	GFLOPs (G)	#Param. (M)	FPS
None	74.6	53.5	54.4	14.2	143.0
SE	77.7	56.6	54.4	14.3	139.3
MFE	77.1	55.9	54.4	14.2	143.0
MHA	77.3	55.2	55.3	14.5	96.6
SE + MFE + MHA	79.6	56.7	56.9	15.3	91.7

component result at 77.7%/56.6% mAP50/mAP50:95, while MFE and MHA yielded 77.1%/55.9% and 77.3%/55.2%, respectively. With all three components, the highest scores of 79.6%/56.7% were obtained at 56.9 GFLOPs, 15.3M parameters, and 91.7 FPS, suggesting complementary contributions; the joint configuration was therefore retained.

Effect of attention design in the cross-attention stage. Table 16 shows that attention-based interaction improved mAP50:95 over direct concatenation, from 53.8% to at least 54.7%. Exchanging attention maps improved each corresponding module: Cross ELA, Cross EMA, and Cross CEA increased mAP50/mAP50:95 by 0.5/0.2, 0.5/0.7, and 0.4/0.6 points, respectively, over their non-cross counterparts. Cross EMA achieved the highest mAP50 (79.9%), whereas Cross CEA achieved the highest mAP50:95 (56.7%) with 56.9 GFLOPs,

Table 16: Ablation study on the effect of different attention modules in the cross-attention stage. The best value in each column is highlighted in bold.

module	mAP50	mAP50:95	GFLOPs (G)	#Param. (M)	FPS
Concat	76.8	53.8	56.4	15.3	95.0
ELA	76.5	54.7	56.4	15.3	93.7
EMA	79.4	55.8	56.9	15.3	89.4
CEA	79.2	56.1	56.9	15.3	91.7
Cross ELA	77.0	54.9	56.4	15.3	93.7
Cross EMA	79.9	56.5	56.9	15.3	89.4
Cross CEA	79.6	56.7	56.9	15.3	91.7




Fig. 11. Illustration of inference results for CFT, C²DFF-Net, ICAFusion, EI²Det, and CFGPNet-e on the FLIR dataset. The yellow arrow annotations show "Miss" (missed detection), "False" (false alarm), "Lower" (low-confidence detection), and "BBBox" (inaccurately positioned bounding boxes).

15.3M parameters, and 91.7 FPS. Cross CEA was therefore retained for its stronger localization performance at unchanged model complexity.

4.6. Visualization

Qualitative results on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, VEDAI, and MFAD are presented in Figs. 11–15. Representative cases are used to examine localization, confidence, missed detections, and false alarms under difficult illumination, occlusion, truncation, and scale conditions.

Across FLIR, M3FD, and LLVIP (Figs. 11–13), tighter localization and higher confidence in the illustrated cases were generally obtained with CFGPNet than with the compared detectors. The clearest differences were observed for crowded FLIR scenes, small or occluded objects in M3FD, and truncated LLVIP pedestrians. Isolated errors remained, including a false

¹²multi-head attention




Fig. 12. Illustration of inference results for CFT, ICAFusion, EI²Det, and CFGPNet-e on the M3FD dataset. The yellow arrow annotations show "Miss" (missed detection), "False" (false alarm), "Lower" (low-confidence detection), and "BBox" (inaccurately positioned bounding boxes).

pedestrian on FLIR, a missed distant motorcycle on M3FD, and a missed heavily occluded pedestrian on LLVIP; these cases were visually ambiguous and were also difficult for the comparison methods.

On VEDAI and MFAD (Figs. 14–15), fewer false alarms and more precise boxes were generally observed for small, occluded, and truncated objects. The low-confidence camping-car prediction on VEDAI was visually plausible and was also produced by the comparison methods, while an additional border vehicle detected by CFGPNet-c may reflect incomplete annotation. The remaining difficult cases were concentrated around partial visibility and class ambiguity, consistent with the quantitative results.

5. Conclusion

In this work, CFGPNet was developed for RGB-T object detection. An improved GELAN backbone with RepViT blocks was combined with CrossCEA for cross-modal attention exchange and ASAF for compact feature fusion. A PGI auxiliary branch was used only during training and removed at inference. Competitive performance was obtained on FLIR, M3FD, LLVIP, VEDAI, and MFAD across three model scales, providing distinct accuracy–efficiency operating points.




Fig. 13. Illustration of inference results for CFT, ICAFusion, COMO, and CFGPNet-e on the LLVIP dataset. The yellow arrow annotations show "Miss" (missed detection), "False" (false alarm), "Lower" (low-confidence detection), and "BBox" (inaccurately positioned bounding boxes).

The final configuration was supported by the MFAD ablations: CE–KL was retained as the fusion loss, three MBatt branches were selected, learnable aggregation factors were omitted, and SE, MFE, MHA, and CrossCEA were jointly used. Since the PGI branch was removed after training, additional supervision was provided without enlarging the inference model. Further validation across multiple random seeds and additional VEDAI splits remains for future work.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the Machine Vision Research Laboratory at Amirkabir University of Technology for providing the computational resources used in this study.

Funding

This research did not receive any grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Appendix A. Implementation Details

This appendix summarizes the implementation details required to reproduce the CFGPNet variants. The optimization




Fig. 14. Illustration of inference results for CFT, COMO, ICAfusion, C²DFF-Net, and CFGPNet-c on VEDAI Split 1. The yellow arrow annotations show "Miss" (missed detection), "False" (false alarm), "Lower" (low-confidence detection), and "BBox" (inaccurately positioned bounding boxes).

schedule, loss gains, warm-up settings, and augmentation parameters are reported in Table A.17, while the layer-wise network configurations are provided in Table A.18.

The same overall computational architecture is used for CFGPNet-m and CFGPNet-c, with different channel widths. CFGPNet-e is implemented with wider channels, deeper blocks, and an expanded multilevel auxiliary pathway. In Table A.18, the route, filter, depth/select, kernel-size, and stride settings specify the input connections, channel dimensions, repetitions, and spatial operations of each layer. These specifications make the differences among the three variants explicit and support their reproduction.

References

- [1] Y. Cao, J. Bin, J. Hamari, E. Blasch, Z. Liu, Multimodal object detection by channel switching and spatial attention, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2023, pp. 403–411.
- [2] Y. Zeng, T. Liang, Y. Jin, Y. Li, Mmi-det: Exploring




Fig. 15. Illustration of inference results for CFT, ICAfusion, EI²Det, and CFGPNet-e on the MFAD dataset. The yellow arrow annotations show "Miss" (missed detection), "False" (false alarm), "Lower" (low-confidence detection), and "BBox" (inaccurately positioned bounding boxes).

multi-modal integration for visible and infrared object detection, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology 34 (11) (2024) 11198–11213.

- [3] Y. Yu, Z. Zhang, Z. Song, X. Ou, M2fre-ldf: Multiscale intra-modality feature refinement and local deformable convolution fusion for multispectral object detection, Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation (2026) 104936.
- [4] F. Qingyun, H. Dapeng, W. Zhaokui, Cross-modality fusion transformer for multispectral object detection, arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00273 (2021).
- [5] J. Shen, Y. Chen, Y. Liu, X. Zuo, H. Fan, W. Yang, Icafusion: Iterative cross-attention guided feature fusion for multispectral object detection, Pattern Recognition 145 (2024) 109913.
- [6] K. Hu, Y. He, Y. Li, J. Zhao, S. Chen, Y. Kang, Ei 2 det: Edge-guided illumination-aware interactive learning for visible-infrared object detection, IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology (2025).
- [7] X. Wu, L. Wang, J. Guan, H. Ji, L. Xu, Y. Hou, A. Fei, Dhanet: Dual-stream hierarchical interaction networks for multimodal drone object detection, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing (2025).

Table A.17: Training hyperparameter settings of CFGPNet, including the learning-rate schedule, warm-up configuration, loss gains, and data-augmentation parameters.

hyperparameter	Value
epochs	600
optimizer	SGD
initial learning rate	0.01
final learning rate	0.0001
learning rate decay	linear
momentum	0.937
weight decay	0.0005
warm-up epochs	3
warm-up momentum	0.8
warm-up bias learning rate	0.1
box loss gain	7.5
class loss gain	0.5
DFL loss gain	1.5
HSV saturation augmentation	0.7
HSV value augmentation	0.4
translation augmentation	0.1
scale augmentation	0.9
mosaic augmentation	1.0
MixUp augmentation	0.15
copy & paste augmentation	0.3
close mosaic epochs	15

Table A.18: Network configurations of the three CFGPNet variants. The left subtable presents CFGPNet-m and CFGPNet-c, while the right subtable presents CFGPNet-e.

(a) Network configurations of CFGPNet-m and CFGPNet-c. The Filters column is reported as m/c when the two variants differ.

Index	Module	Route	Filters (m/c)	Depth/Select	Size	Stride
0	Silence	-	3, 3	-	-	-
1	Conv	-	64	1	1	2
2	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	128, 128, 64	2, 1	3	2
3	Down	-	64	1	1	2
4	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	128, 128, 64	2, 1	3	2
5	Down	-	64	1	1	2
6	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	256, 256, 128	2, 1	3	2
7	Down	-	128	1	1	2
8	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	384, 384, 192	2, 1	3	2
9	Down	-	192	1	1	2
10	Conv	-	64	1	1	2
11	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	128, 128, 64	2, 1	3	2
12	Down	-	64	1	1	2
13	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	128, 128, 64	2, 1	3	2
14	Down	-	64	1	1	2
15	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	256, 256, 128	2, 1	3	2
16	Down	-	128	1	1	2
17	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	384, 384, 192	2, 1	3	2
18	Down	-	192	1	1	2
19	ConvCEA	-	128	1	1	2
20	ConvCEA	-	128	1	1	2
21	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
22	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
23	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
24	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
25	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
26	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
27	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
28	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
29	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
30	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
31	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
32	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
33	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
34	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
35	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
36	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
37	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
38	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
39	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
40	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
41	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
42	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
43	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
44	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
45	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
46	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
47	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
48	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
49	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
50	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
51	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
52	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
53	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
54	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
55	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
56	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
57	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
58	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
59	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2

(b) Network configuration of CFGPNet-e.

Index	Module	Route	Filters	Depth/Select	Size	Stride
0	Silence	-	3, 3	-	-	-
1	Conv	-	64	1	1	2
2	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	256, 128, 64	2, 2	3	2
3	Down	-	128	1	1	2
4	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	512, 256, 128	2, 2	3	2
5	Down	-	256	1	1	2
6	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
7	Down	-	512	1	1	2
8	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
9	Down	-	512	1	1	2
10	Conv	-	64	1	1	2
11	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
12	Down	-	512	1	1	2
13	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
14	Down	-	512	1	1	2
15	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
16	Down	-	512	1	1	2
17	RepViTUSPELAN4	-	1024, 512, 256	2, 2	3	2
18	Down	-	512	1	1	2
19	ConvCEA	-	128	1	1	2
20	ConvCEA	-	128	1	1	2
21	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
22	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
23	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
24	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
25	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
26	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
27	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
28	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
29	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
30	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
31	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
32	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
33	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
34	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
35	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
36	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
37	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
38	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
39	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
40	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
41	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
42	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
43	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
44	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
45	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
46	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
47	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
48	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
49	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
50	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
51	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
52	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
53	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
54	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
55	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
56	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
57	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
58	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2
59	ASAF	-	128	1	1	2

[8] W. Wu, X. Zhang, H. Yin, H. Zeng, C. Wei, L. Yu, Y. Zhang, Cdfnet: Cross-dimension fusion network with dual feature enhancement for multimodal object detec-

tion, Expert Systems with Applications (2026) 132380.

- [9] H. Li, L. Xiao, L. Cao, D. Wu, Y. Liu, Y. Li, Y. Zhang, H. Bao, Crossmodalnet: A dual-modal object detection network based on cross-modal fusion and channel interaction, Expert Systems with Applications (2025) 129677.
- [10] J. Zhang, X. Song, Y. Li, D. Liang, Z. Zhang, J. Cai, Adaptive dual cross-attention network for multispectral object detection in autonomous driving, Expert Systems with Applications (2026) 132012.
- [11] X. Xue, H. Chen, K. Song, Y. Yan, B. Li, Q. Meng, Transfer graph reasoning network for misaligned visible-thermal object detection, Knowledge-Based Systems (2026) 116271.
- [12] F. Luo, Y. Guan, C. Fu, T. Guo, Z. Nan, T. Xiang, B. Du, Scfdet: Selective cross-modal fusion network for rgb-infrared object detection in remote sensing, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing (2026).
- [13] Z. Chen, Y. Qian, X. Yang, C. Wang, M. Yang, Amfd: Distillation via adaptive multimodal fusion for multispectral pedestrian detection, IEEE Transactions on Multimedia (2025).
- [14] C.-Y. Wang, I.-H. Yeh, H.-Y. Mark Liao, Yolov9: Learning what you want to learn using programmable gradient information, in: European conference on computer vision, Springer, 2024, pp. 1–21.
- [15] Teledyne FLIR, FREE Teledyne FLIR Thermal Dataset for Algorithm Training, Available online: <https://oem.flir.com/solutions/automotive/adas-dataset-form/>, (Accessed on 25 December 2025) (2018).
- [16] J. Liu, X. Fan, Z. Huang, G. Wu, R. Liu, W. Zhong, Z. Luo, Target-aware dual adversarial learning and a multi-scenario multi-modality benchmark to fuse infrared and visible for object detection, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2022, pp. 5802–5811.
- [17] X. Jia, C. Zhu, M. Li, W. Tang, W. Zhou, Llvip: A visible-infrared paired dataset for low-light vision, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, 2021, pp. 3496–3504.
- [18] S. Razakarivony, F. Jurie, Vehicle detection in aerial imagery: A small target detection benchmark, Journal of Visual Communication and Image Representation 34 (2016) 187–203.
- [19] Y. Zhang, J. Chen, J. Wang, D. Shi, S. Han, L. Deng, C2dff-net for object detection in multimodal remote sensing images, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing 63 (2025) 1–16. doi:10.1109/TGRS.2025.3614295.

- [20] X. Wang, J. Xi, F. Yang, Y. Yang, M. Li, Pfi-net: A parallel feature interaction network for infrared and visible target detection, *Pattern Recognition* (2025) 113003.
- [21] H. Xiao, J. Zhuang, B. Yang, J. Hu, J. Zhu, Z. Lian, S. Zhao, Y. Zhou, Saff: A spatially-aware fusion framework for effective and efficient aerial object detection, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* (2026).
- [22] F. Liu, C. Gao, F. Chen, P. Li, J. Guo, D. Meng, A fusion-enhanced network for infrared and visible high-level vision tasks, *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2025).
- [23] Z. Huang, W. Li, Y. Zhang, J. Guo, J. Zheng, G. Ji, Y. Tao, Cdfit: A transformer using cross-modal dual-stream feature interaction for multispectral pedestrian detection, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2026).
- [24] S. Wang, G. Sun, L. Dong, B. Zheng, Carnet: Cross-attention guided feature reconstruction for rgb-t object detection, *Expert Systems with Applications* (2025) 129865.
- [25] C. Liu, X. Ma, X. Yang, Y. Zhang, Y. Dong, Como: Cross-mamba interaction and offset-guided fusion for multi-modal object detection, *Information Fusion* 125 (2026) 103414.
- [26] Z. Tang, Z. Wu, M. Li, J. Wen, B. Zhang, Y. Xu, J. Li, Adaptive fine-grained fusion network for multimodal uav object detection, *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* (2026).
- [27] S. Lee, J. Park, J. Park, Crossformer: Cross-guided attention for multi-modal object detection, *Pattern Recognition Letters* 179 (2024) 144–150.
- [28] L. Tang, Z. Chen, J. Huang, J. Ma, Camf: An interpretable infrared and visible image fusion network based on class activation mapping, *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 26 (2023) 4776–4791.
- [29] A. Wang, H. Chen, Z. Lin, J. Han, G. Ding, Repvit: Revisiting mobile cnn from vit perspective, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2024, pp. 15909–15920.
- [30] X. Ding, X. Zhang, N. Ma, J. Han, G. Ding, J. Sun, Repvgg: Making vgg-style convnets great again, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 13733–13742.
- [31] J. Hu, L. Shen, G. Sun, Squeeze-and-excitation networks, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 7132–7141.
- [32] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [33] W. Luo, Y. Li, R. Urtasun, R. Zemel, Understanding the effective receptive field in deep convolutional neural networks, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [34] F. Yu, V. Koltun, Multi-scale context aggregation by dilated convolutions, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.07122* (2015).
- [35] X. Zhang, X. Zhou, M. Lin, J. Sun, Shufflenet: An extremely efficient convolutional neural network for mobile devices, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 6848–6856.
- [36] D. Ouyang, S. He, G. Zhang, M. Luo, H. Guo, J. Zhan, Z. Huang, Efficient multi-scale attention module with cross-spatial learning, in: *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [37] Q. Hou, D. Zhou, J. Feng, Coordinate attention for efficient mobile network design, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 13713–13722.
- [38] W. Xu, Y. Wan, W. Zhao, Ela: efficient location attention for deep convolution neural networks, *Journal of Real-Time Image Processing* 22 (4) (2025) 1–14.
- [39] G. Huang, Z. Liu, L. Van Der Maaten, K. Q. Weinberger, Densely connected convolutional networks, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 4700–4708.
- [40] S. Woo, J. Park, J.-Y. Lee, I. S. Kweon, Cbam: Convolutional block attention module, in: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 3–19.
- [41] C. E. Shannon, A mathematical theory of communication, *The Bell system technical journal* 27 (3) (1948) 379–423.
- [42] S. Kullback, *Information theory and statistics*, Courier Corporation, 1997.
- [43] H. Zhang, E. Fromont, S. Lefevre, B. Avignon, Multispectral fusion for object detection with cyclic fuse-and-refine blocks, in: *2020 IEEE International conference on image processing (ICIP)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 276–280.
- [44] R. Girshick, Fast r-cnn, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2015, pp. 1440–1448.
- [45] R. Khanam, M. Hussain, Yolov11: An overview of the key architectural enhancements, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17725* (2024).

- [46] Y. Chen, X. Dai, D. Chen, M. Liu, X. Dong, L. Yuan, Z. Liu, Mobile-former: Bridging mobilenet and transformer, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2022, pp. 5270–5279.
- [47] X. Liu, H. Peng, N. Zheng, Y. Yang, H. Hu, Y. Yuan, Efficientvit: Memory efficient vision transformer with cascaded group attention, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2023, pp. 14420–14430.
- [48] J. Jang, J. Lee, J. Paik, Camdet: Condition-adaptive multispectral object detection using a visible-thermal translation model, in: ICASSP 2025-2025 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), IEEE, 2025, pp. 1–5.
- [49] J. Jang, C. Park, H. Kim, J. Lee, J. Paik, Multispectral object detection enhanced by cross-modal information complementary and cosine similarity channel resampling modules, in: 2025 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), IEEE, 2025, pp. 9437–9446.
- [50] P. Lu, S. Yu, Z. Li, Alignfree-net: A registration-free hybrid framework for infrared-visible object detection via semantic feature matching, in: 2026 11th International Conference on Intelligent Computing and Signal Processing (ICSP), IEEE, 2026, pp. 2107–2111.
- [51] Z. Zhang, G. Lv, Y. Gao, G. Ma, Mdsf-det: Modality decoupling and synergistic fusion detector, in: ICASSP 2026-2026 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), IEEE, 2026, pp. 10377–10381.
- [52] G. Li, G. Ren, J. Wang, M. Zhi, Z. Yu, B. Jiang, H. Guan, Q. Guo, Cross-modal edge-enhanced detector for uav-based multispectral object detection, Scientific Reports (2025).
- [53] R. Lan, Y. Zhang, Z. Wang, W. Liu, R. Yang, Kdet-hpfl: A personalized federated learning framework for multi-modal pedestrian detection with adaptive feature selection, IEEE Internet of Things Journal (2025).
- [54] X. Zhai, F. Xu, Y. Pan, Mcff-det: Multispectral coarse-to-fine fusion for object detection, in: 2025 IEEE 35th International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP), IEEE, 2025, pp. 1–6.
- [55] R. Chen, H. Sun, H. Fan, P. Wu, Vif-yolo: Visible-infrared fusion yolo for remote sensing small object detection, in: 2025 IEEE 31th International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Systems (ICPADS), IEEE, 2025, pp. 1–8.
- [56] H. Wu, P. Yuan, W. Liu, A. Wang, L. Yu, G. Molnar, Ivd-net: An adaptive dual-branch network for small object detection in multi-modal remote sensing images, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing (2026).
- [57] Y. Wang, J. Mu, Q. Yang, G. Gao, J. He, J. Yu, X. Chou, Cmms-detr: Cross-modal multi-scale feature fusion network for uav remote sensing detection, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing (2026).
- [58] G. Jocher, A. Chaurasia, A. Stoken, J. Borovec, Y. Kwon, K. Michael, J. Fang, Z. Yifu, C. Wong, D. Montes, et al., ultralytics/yolov5: v7. 0-yolov5 sota realtime instance segmentation, Zenodo (2022).
- [59] C.-Y. Wang, A. Bochkovskiy, H.-Y. M. Liao, Yolo7: Trainable bag-of-freebies sets new state-of-the-art for real-time object detectors, in: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2023, pp. 7464–7475.
- [60] A. Wang, H. Chen, L. Liu, K. Chen, Z. Lin, J. Han, G. Ding, Yolo10: Real-time end-to-end object detection, Advances in neural information processing systems 37 (2024) 107984–108011.
- [61] Z. Wang, A. C. Bovik, H. R. Sheikh, E. P. Simoncelli, Image quality assessment: from error visibility to structural similarity, IEEE transactions on image processing 13 (4) (2004) 600–612.