

Accelerated Rotation-Invariant Convolution for UAV Image Segmentation

Manduhu Manduhu, Alexander Dow, Gerard Dooly, James Riordan

Abstract—Rotation invariance is essential for precise, object-level segmentation in UAV aerial imagery, where targets can have arbitrary orientations and exhibit fine-scale details. Conventional segmentation architectures like U-Net rely on convolution operators that are not rotation-invariant, leading to degraded segmentation accuracy across varying viewpoints. Rotation invariance can be achieved by expanding the filter bank across multiple orientations, however, this will significantly increase computational cost and memory traffic. In this paper, we introduce a GPU-optimized rotation-invariant convolution framework that eliminates the traditional data-lowering (im2col) step required for matrix-multiplication-based convolution. By exploiting structured data sharing among symmetrically rotated filters, our method achieves multi-orientation convolution with greatly reduced memory traffic and computational redundancy. We further generalize the approach to accelerate convolution with arbitrary (non-symmetric) rotation angles. Across extensive benchmarks, the proposed convolution achieves 20–55% faster training and 15–45% lower energy consumption than cuDNN, while maintaining accuracy comparable to state-of-the-art rotation invariant methods. In the eight-orientation setting, our approach achieves up to 45% speedup and 41% energy savings on 256×256 inputs, and 32% speedup and 23% lower energy usage on 1024×1024 inputs. Integrated into a U-Net segmentation model, the framework yields up to 6% improvement in accuracy over the non-rotation-aware baseline. These results demonstrate that the proposed method provides an effective and highly efficient alternative to existing rotation invariant CNN frameworks.

Index Terms—Dense convolution, Scatter operation, Rotation invariant, Acceleration, GPU

I. INTRODUCTION

ROBUST semantic segmentation in high-resolution aerial images requires rotation invariance, because objects of interest—whether vegetation, buildings, vehicles, or other land-surface features—can occur at any orientation and often contain complex fine-scale detail. Yet the convolution operator used in mainstream deep learning segmentation architectures (e.g., U-Net) is translation equivariant but not rotation invariant, leaving performance sensitive to object orientation. Convolution is fundamental in deep learning due to its ability to efficiently extract spatial and hierarchical features from input data [1]. Convolution layers routinely account for the bulk of total FLOPs, memory traffic, and energy use in convolution-based networks. They therefore dominate training

time and bound inference throughput, making their optimization a central focus of prior works [2], [3], [4]. These costs are further amplified when pursuing rotation-invariant convolution, which typically requires evaluating kernels across multiple orientation samples. Despite the additional computational burden, achieving rotation invariance is essential for many aerial remote sensing applications—including satellite imagery [5, 6, 7], UAV imaging [8], and geospatial image localization [9]—because feature extraction must remain consistent under arbitrary rotations of the target object in the image; this need is further underscored by recent UAV studies in geology (dual-spectrum hot-spring fluid segmentation) [10], urban scene segmentation (UAVformer) [11], and UAV visual perception (CCTseg) [12] under varying altitudes and viewpoints.

The extracted feature maps are rotation equivariant, i.e., feature maps whose outputs are rotated in a predictable way, as we rotate the input. A special case of equivariance is invariance [13], where the output values of the feature map are not affected by rotations of the input. In essence, the rotation invariance can be achieved by directly encoding rotation equivariance into the convolution layer followed by a global pooling operation. Multiple rotated versions of the canonical filter are applied at the same input to generate rotation equivariant feature maps. For instance, Cohen & Welling [14] propose a group convolution, code-name G-convolution, in which symmetric rotations (rotation angle is multiple of 90 degrees) are applied to the same filter, generating a rotation equivariant feature map. However, such rotation equivariant convolution introduces significant overhead on the computation. For example, with G-convolution, the computational overhead increases by 4 times compared to conventional convolution in 2D space, since four symmetric rotations are applied at each filter. A single rotation equivariant convolution is equivalent to four conventional convolutions. The computational overhead possibly increases by 24 times in 3D space because there are 24 symmetric transformations available in 3D space [15]. The number of symmetric rotations and therefore the computational overhead increases along with increasing dimension of the input data. In this paper, we show how to use the proposed convolution operation to accelerate this kind of rotation equivariant convolution which is based on the filter weight sharing scheme.

Modern Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) play a crucial role in deep learning, providing the computational power necessary for training deep neural networks. Their parallel processing capabilities enable efficient handling of large-scale matrix operations, significantly accelerating deep learning workloads. Matrix multiplication is an efficient method for implementing convolution on GPU, as demonstrated by [16].

Manduhu Manduhu, Alexander Dow and James Riordan are with the Drone Systems Lab, School of Computing, Engineering, and Physical Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Glasgow, Scotland.

Corresponding author: Manduhu Manduhu (email: manduhu.manduhu@uws.ac.uk).

Gerard Dooly is with the Centre for Robotics & Intelligent Systems, Department of Electronic & Computer Engineering, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland.

This requires transforming the input image into matrices that are suitable for fast multiplication. This transformation can be achieved by lowering the input data (im2col) with duplication. The GPU implementation of the proposed method in this paper is also based on fast GPU matrix multiplication, but without data lowering.

As described in our previous work [17], conventional (gather-style) convolution accumulates contributions at each output location: every neighboring input pixel is multiplied by its corresponding kernel weight, and the results are summed into the central output position. In contrast, our scatter convolution reverses this data flow: each input pixel is multiplied by a bank of filter weights and the resulting products are scattered directly to their destination output locations. We originally introduced this formulation to support sparse convolutions on irregularly sampled LiDAR data. In this paper, we generalize the scatter approach to (i) dense, standard grid convolution and (ii) rotation-invariant convolution. The scatter mapping removes the im2col-style data-lowering step typically required by matrix multiplication based implementations, reducing memory traffic and simplifying the kernel. Moreover, because the scatter mapping exposes weight sharing across symmetric rotations, intermediate results can be reused—collapsing the number of distinct multiplications to one per symmetry group and substantially lowering computational cost.

Our main contributions are as follows:

- **GPU-optimized single-orientation convolution:** Since a single-orientation convolution reduces to the standard convolution, we propose an efficient GPU implementation of standard convolution using matrix multiplication without data lowering (im2col), which significantly reduces computational operations and memory access overhead.
- **Symmetric rotation optimization:** For symmetric rotations (90° , 180° , 270° , and 360°), we exploit data sharing via scatter operations, allowing each multiplication to be computed once and reused across all symmetric orientations.
- **Arbitrary rotation acceleration:** The framework is further generalized to support arbitrary rotation angles, achieving efficient convolution under continuous rotational transformations.
- **Comprehensive evaluation:** Experimental results demonstrate substantial throughput gains and energy savings across all evaluated workloads, with the proposed method achieving approximately 20–55% faster training and 15–45% lower energy consumption compared with cuDNN. The approach maintains accuracy competitive with state-of-the-art rotation-equivariant methods, and when integrated into a baseline network without rotation handling, it further improves segmentation accuracy by up to 6%.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Segmentation of remote sensing imagery

Early semantic segmentation models were largely based on convolutional neural networks (CNNs) [18]. A key milestone was the fully convolutional network (FCN) introduced in

[19], which adopts an encoder–decoder architecture composed entirely of convolutional layers, without any fully connected layers. Building on this foundation, [20] proposed an improved FCN framework for remote sensing image segmentation, incorporating multi-scale feature extraction, enhanced encoder–decoder connections, and refined upsampling to better handle complex, high-resolution imagery. To obtain larger receptive fields without lowering image resolution via down-sampling, DeepLab was introduced in [21], utilizing atrous convolutions to achieve dense, multi-scale feature extraction. The work in [22] further improves DeepLab by aggregating multi-scale features to enhance aerial image segmentation. Many early segmentation models did not fully exploit low-level features in the decoder, resulting in the loss of fine spatial detail. U-Net [23] addresses this limitation by introducing skip connections that link encoder and decoder features, enabling more effective fusion of detailed and high-level information. U-Net and its variants have also been widely adopted for UAV and aerial image segmentation, as in UVID-Net for UAV video segmentation [24] and Res-U-Net-based coastal boundary detection from high-resolution UAV imagery [25].

Transformer-based architectures have also been used for aerial image segmentation. SegHSI [26] introduces a head-free backbone with cluster attention and a spatial-aware feed-forward network to capture spectral–spatial correlations in HSI data. The work in [27] employs a transformer based encoder–decoder for UAV forestry segmentation, enabling accurate delineation of diseased pine canopies in high resolution imagery.

B. Rotation Invariance in Remote Sensing Imagery

Rotation invariance (or equivariance) is crucial for accurate object-level segmentation in UAV imagery, as targets often appear in arbitrary orientations. The work in [28] introduces a CNN-based framework for vehicle instance segmentation in UAV images that uses rotated bounding boxes instead of standard axis-aligned boxes to better match the true orientation of vehicles. The method in [29] learns rotation-invariant deep embeddings by aligning features from multiple rotated views of the same image, enabling robust analysis of remote sensing images under arbitrary orientations. FRINet, introduced in [30], is built on CNN feature extractors and incorporates a rotation-adaptive matching mechanism to enable few-shot, rotation-invariant segmentation of aerial images. The paper [31] proposes a mechanism-assured convolution that embeds rotation invariance directly into the operation itself, avoiding reliance on data augmentation and ensuring consistent feature responses under rotated inputs. RIC-CNN [32] achieves rotation invariance by embedding polar coordinate information into convolution operations, enabling the network to generate stable feature representations under arbitrary rotations. The method in [33] embeds rotation equivariance into UNet by using the discrete rotation group C_8 (45° increments) as the symmetry group, enabling stable feature representations that improve both deforestation segmentation and driver classification under arbitrary image orientations. In this paper, we introduce a computationally efficient rotation-invariant convo-

lution and incorporate it into a U-Net architecture for semantic segmentation of UAV imagery.

C. Single-orientation rotation convolution

As single-orientation convolution reduces to standard convolution, we review efficient implementations of standard convolution in this section. Several FFT-based approaches [2, 34, 35, 36] have been proposed to reduce the computational cost for standard convolution on different hardware. FFT-based approaches can significantly lower the work complexity of convolution, but it is only effective for convolution with larger filters [16].

Lavin & Gray [37] proposed a method based on the Winograd algorithm [3] for convolution with small filters. The key idea of Winograd-based convolution is similar to the one based on FFT which performs multiplications in the complex domain. However, unlike FFT-based convolution, the Winograd-based convolution operates on real numbers, thus requiring fewer operations. For a filter with larger size, Winograd-based convolution shows poor performance, since it needs to perform a significant amount of extra arithmetic such as additions and data transformations.

To reduce the substantial memory usage in convolution with matrix multiplication, Lu *et al.* [38] proposed new data-lowering techniques. However, their method still requires data duplication. In [39], Chang *et al.* proposed an approach to improve memory efficiency in convolution operations by effectively utilizing the on-chip memory of GPUs. In [40], a matrix multiplication-based approach without data lowering is proposed. However, it requires recomputing writing positions, preventing direct pointwise operations.

D. Rotation-equivariant convolution for multi-orientation rotations

A general theory of an equivariant CNN can be found in [41]. The mathematical formulation of equivariance through a weight sharing scheme is exhibited in [42].

G-convolution [14] applies a group of filters to each feature map, where each filter is a transformed version of the original filter. Two different groups are proposed in [14], code-name $p4$ group and $p4m$ group. The $p4$ group consists of 4 filters where each filter is obtained by rotating the original filter by 0 degrees, 90 degrees, 180 degrees and 270 degrees, respectively. The $p4m$ group consists of 8 filters which are obtained by combining $p4$ group and reflection transformations. The convolution with $p4$ group or $p4m$ group will increase the computational overhead by 4 or 8 times. There are multiple works [15, 43] applying the G-convolution on 3D volume data. In [15], different groups code-name *Cube Group*, *Klein's Four-group* and *Tetrahedral Group* are proposed. Among these groups, the largest group is the *Cube Group* which consists of 24 filters resulting in an increase of computational overhead by 24 times. Obviously, the number of filters in a group will increase along with increasing dimension of the input data and therefore the computational overhead. Hexagonal group convolution [44] rotates a filter by any multiple of 60 degrees, without interpolation. They define the following two hexagonal

group convolutions: groups $p6$ and $p6m$, which contain integer translations (orientation cycling), rotations with multiples of 60 degrees, and mirroring for $p6m$. The paper [45] proposes Gauge-equivariant convolutional network for manifolds, which uses Hexagonal group convolution to implement the weight sharing scheme for Gauge-equivariant. The work in [46] proposes a shallow network which performs convolution with rotated versions of each canonical filter, where the rotation is with arbitrary angle. The convolution is followed by a global pooling over orientations. The number of rotations applied is 32 i.e. the angle increment between successive two rotations is $\frac{\pi}{16}$. Bicubic interpolation is used for sampling after rotation.

Oriented Response Network (ORN) [47] introduces active rotating filters that generate orientation-aware feature maps, allowing CNNs to model rotations explicitly and achieve rotation invariance or equivariance without heavy data augmentation. The work in [48] provides a unified framework for designing steerable CNNs that are equivariant to all $E(2)$ transformations and offers the widely used E2CNN library for generating rotation-equivariant features.

Filters with steerability can be reconstructed at any orientation as a finite, linear combination of base filters. This eliminates the need to learn multiple filters at different orientations. Harmonic Network proposed in [13] achieves rotation equivariance in continuous rotations by learning coefficients of base filters, where these base filters are used to form the filters (steerable) of the CNN model. In the network proposed in [49], rotation equivariance is guaranteed by using the G-convolution in which the number of rotation is more than four. The rotated filter (steerable) in a group is constructed by manipulating coefficients of the base filter. In this way, it avoids the use of interpolation which usually introduces artifacts in the rotated filter. The network shown in [50] achieves rotation equivariance by multiplying each convolutional filter by several oriented Gabor filters [51]. In the back propagation stage, only the convolutional filters are updated. The method in [52] reduces the number of parameters and computational complexity of rotation-equivariant CNNs by decomposing convolutional filters (steerable) under joint steerable bases over space and rotations simultaneously. Meanwhile, the performance is preserved.

Rotation equivariance typically leads to a rapid increase in feature dimensionality as the number of sampled orientations grows. To tackle this problem of exploding dimensionality, a rotation equivariant convolution is usually followed by an orientation pooling operation, after which the layer becomes rotation invariant. The orientation pooling can be implemented in two different ways: point-wise average pooling [53] or point-wise max pooling [46].

In this paper, we describe how our proposed convolution operation is applied to accelerate a rotation invariant convolution layer, which combines symmetric rotation and steerable transformations.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Acceleration of Single-Orientation Convolution

In the single-orientation case, the operation reduces to standard convolution because only one fixed kernel orientation

is applied and no orientation-dependent processing is required. In standard convolution, each filter element is multiplied by its overlapping input element, and the resulting products are summed to produce the output value at the corresponding spatial location, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). Alternatively, as demonstrated in our previous work [17], convolution can also be performed using a scatter-based approach (which we employed to implement sparse convolution). In this approach, each input pixel is multiplied by different kernel elements, and the resulting values are added to their corresponding neighboring output positions, as shown in Fig. 1(b). This distributes computation across output locations rather than accumulating it at a single pixel, enabling convolution without data lowering while benefiting from the high-throughput matrix multiplication capabilities of modern GPUs. In this paper, we extend the scatter-based approach to support dense convolution.




Fig. 1: (a) Standard convolution where x_i, w_i, y_i represent input, filter and output, respectively. (b) Convolution with scatter operation where each input element is multiplied by each filter element and the results are added with those of neighboring elements.

Let the input be $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_{in} \times H \times W}$ and the filters $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_{out} \times C_{in} \times K_h \times K_w}$, where C_{in} and C_{out} denote the numbers of input channels and output channels, respectively, and H and W represent the height and width of the input feature map, while K_h and K_w denote the kernel height and width. For valid convolution, the output spatial size is

$$H' = H - K_h + 1, \quad W' = W - K_w + 1.$$

The convolution output is

$$Y_{c_o, h, w} = \sum_{c_i=0}^{C_{in}-1} \sum_{i=0}^{K_h-1} \sum_{j=0}^{K_w-1} W_{c_o, c_i, i, j} X_{c_i, h+i, w+j}, \quad (1)$$

$$h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\}$$

$$w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\}$$

$$c_o \in \{0, \dots, C_{out} - 1\}$$

which is the standard sliding-window inner product formulation. To convert convolution into matrix multiplication, every $K_h \times K_w$ receptive field from \mathbf{X} is flattened into a column, forming $\mathbf{X}_{col} \in \mathbb{R}^{(C_{in} K_h K_w) \times (H' W')}$. Formally,

$$X_{col}(k, t) = X(c_i, h + i, w + j), \quad (2)$$

where

$$k = c_i K_h K_w + i K_w + j, \quad t = h W' + w,$$

and h and w enumerate output spatial locations ($h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\}$, $w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\}$), while i and j enumerate positions inside the $K_h \times K_w$ receptive field ($i \in \{0, \dots, K_h - 1\}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, K_w - 1\}$). Thus $X(c_i, h + i, w + j)$ selects the input element covered by the kernel at offset (i, j) for input channel c_i . Each column corresponds to one sliding patch, and each row indexes one element in the flattened receptive field.

Each filter kernel is flattened into a row vector:

$$\mathbf{W}_{row} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_{out} \times (C_{in} K_h K_w)},$$

with

$$W_{row}(c_o, k) = W(c_o, c_i, i, j).$$

The convolution can now be computed as a single matrix multiplication:

$$\mathbf{Y}_{col} = \mathbf{W}_{row} \mathbf{X}_{col}.$$

Clearly, flattening the receptive fields of \mathbf{X} causes each input element to be replicated $K_h K_w$ times, i.e., \mathbf{X}_{col} contains up to $K_h K_w$ copies of each element of \mathbf{X} . Consequently, the number of multiplications increases by a factor of $K_h K_w$.

For a single-channel input and a single filter, the general formula of the convolution with scattering operation is given as follows:

$$Y_{h-m+[K_h/2], w-n+[K_w/2]} = X_{h, w} \times W_{m, n} \quad (3)$$

$$m \in \{0, \dots, K_h - 1\}, n \in \{0, \dots, K_w - 1\}$$

$$h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\}, w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\}$$

For C_{in} input channels and C_{out} output channels, the convolution with scattering can be expressed as follows:

$$Y_{c_o, i-m+[K_h/2], j-n+[K_w/2]} = \sum_{c_i=0}^{C_{in}-1} X_{c_i, h, w} \times W_{c_o, c_i, m, n} \quad (4)$$

$$m \in \{0, \dots, K_h - 1\}, n \in \{0, \dots, K_w - 1\}$$

$$h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\}, w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\}$$

$$c_o \in \{0, \dots, C_{out} - 1\}$$

As shown on the right-hand side of Formula (4), the matrix multiplication is used to perform channel-wise multiplication

and summation. The results are then added to the corresponding output positions following the scatter rules. This approach eliminates the need for data duplication when performing convolution using matrix multiplication.

The pseudocode for single-channel scatter convolution is shown in Algorithm 1. The number of multiplications and additions required is the same as standard convolution, it is $O(H \times W \times K_h \times K_w)$.

Algorithm 1: Convolution with scatter operation

Input: An image $X(i, j)$ of size $H \times W$ and a filter $W(m, n)$ of size $K_h \times K_w$
Output: A new image $Y(x, y)$ after convolution
for $i \leftarrow 0$ **to** $H - 1$ **do**
 for $j \leftarrow 0$ **to** $W - 1$ **do**
 for $m \leftarrow 0$ **to** $K_h - 1$ **do**
 for $n \leftarrow 0$ **to** $K_w - 1$ **do**
 $x \leftarrow i - m + \lfloor K_h/2 \rfloor$;
 $y \leftarrow j - n + \lfloor K_w/2 \rfloor$;
 $Y(x, y) \leftarrow Y(x, y) + X(i, j) \times W(m, n)$;
 end
 end
 end
end
return $Y(x, y)$;

B. Acceleration of symmetric rotation invariant convolution

Symmetric rotation equivariant can be achieved by rotating a filter under the discrete rotational symmetries of 0° , 90° , 180° , and 270° . This set of four rotations defines the $p4$ group. A single base kernel is rotated by these four angles, producing four orientation-specific filters that capture features consistently across different orientations.

Let the four discrete rotations be indexed by $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, corresponding to angles $0^\circ, 90^\circ, 180^\circ, 270^\circ$. Let R_r denote the action that rotates spatial coordinates by the angle associated with r . For an input $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_{in} \times H \times W}$ and kernels $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{C_{out} \times C_{in} \times K_h \times K_w}$, the r -rotated kernels are defined by

$$\mathbf{W}_{c_o, c_i}^{(r)} = R_r(\mathbf{W}_{c_o, c_i}), \quad c_o \in \{0, \dots, C_{out} - 1\}, \quad c_i \in \{0, \dots, C_{in} - 1\}. \quad (5)$$

For valid convolution, the output spatial size is

$$H' = H - K_h + 1, \quad W' = W - K_w + 1. \quad (6)$$

The output has an orientation channel for each r :

$$Y_{c_o, r, h, w} = \sum_{c_i=0}^{C_{in}-1} \sum_{i=0}^{K_h-1} \sum_{j=0}^{K_w-1} W_{c_o, c_i, i, j}^{(r)} X_{c_i, h+i, w+j}, \quad (7)$$

$$c_o \in \{0, \dots, C_{out} - 1\},$$

$$r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\},$$

$$h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\},$$

$$w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\}$$

While this improves rotational equivariance, it also increases computational cost because each rotated filter must be evaluated separately. To mitigate this cost, we demonstrate how

$p4$ group convolution on a 2D input can be accelerated using the scatter operation. In the $p4$ group, the original filter is rotated four times at 0° , 90° , 180° , and 270° , respectively. Figure 2 illustrates the scatter-based convolution process for each rotated filter when applied to the input pixel x_{13} . It is clear the same product between a filter weight and an input element appears in all 4 convolutions albeit in different locations. For example, the multiplication $x_{13} \times w_9$ appears in 4 different corners of all convolutions. We can compute the multiplication $x_{13} \times w_9$ for the convolution with the first filter and use the result of this multiplication in the other convolutions directly. The multiplication is performed for only one filter. The index of the output location in which we add the result of the multiplication can be pre-computed for each filter. The same idea also can be applied to $p4m$ group convolution in which the original filter transformed 8 times (rotation and reflection). The multiplication is performed for the first filter and the result is reused by the other 7 filters directly.




Fig. 2: Implementation of $p4$ group convolution with scatter operation where the original filter is rotated (a) 0° (b) 90° (c) 180° (d) 270° .

Formally, for the four symmetric rotations $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, corresponding to $0^\circ, 90^\circ, 180^\circ$, and 270° , let $(m', n') = R_r(m, n)$ denote the rotated kernel coordinates obtained by applying the spatial rotation operator R_r to the original offsets (m, n) . Under this rotation, the scatter-based convolution

becomes

$$Y_{c_o, i-m'+\lfloor K_h/2 \rfloor, j-n'+\lfloor K_w/2 \rfloor} + = \sum_{c_i=0}^{C_{in}-1} X_{c_i, h, w} W_{c_o, c_i, m, n}, \quad (8)$$

$$m \in \{0, \dots, K_h - 1\}, \quad n \in \{0, \dots, K_w - 1\},$$

$$h \in \{0, \dots, H' - 1\}, \quad w \in \{0, \dots, W' - 1\},$$

$$c_o \in \{0, \dots, C_{out} - 1\}, \quad r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}.$$

In this expression, the channel-wise multiplication and accumulation term $\sum_{c_i=0}^{C_{in}-1} X_{c_i, h, w} W_{c_o, c_i, m, n}$ is computed only once. For each rotation r , this accumulated product is added to a different output location because the kernel coordinate (m, n) is transformed to its rotated counterpart $(m', n') = R_r(m, n)$. Thus, only the scatter location changes across rotations, while the channel-wise multiplication and accumulation is reused for all four orientations.

A rotation-invariant response can be obtained by group pooling over the four orientations. For example, average pooling yields

$$\tilde{Y}_{c_o, h, w} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{r=0}^3 Y_{c_o, r, h, w}. \quad (9)$$

Alternatively, max pooling over orientations may be used:

$$\tilde{Y}_{c_o, h, w} = \max_{r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}} Y_{c_o, r, h, w}. \quad (10)$$

For symmetric rotation equivariant convolution, the number of filters will increase with the increase of the dimension of the input data. Consequently, the computational overhead also increases. However, with the scatter operation, the multiplication just needs to be performed for one filter and the result of the multiplication can be reused by the other filters directly. It means the number of multiplications is a constant (with respect to the number of directions) and the convolution is only dominated by the addition operation.

Now we introduce the gradient computation for the rotation-invariant convolution. During backpropagation, the loss gradient propagates from the output toward the input. The incoming (upstream) gradient from the next layer is denoted by

$$G_{c_o, h, w} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \tilde{Y}_{c_o, h, w}}.$$

where \tilde{Y} is the rotation-invariant output feature map obtained after orientation pooling. We derive the gradients with respect to the rotation-equivariant feature maps $Y_{c_o, r, h, w}$, the input feature maps X , and the base convolution kernel W .

For average pooling, the gradient is distributed equally:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial Y_{c_o, r, h, w}} = \frac{1}{4} G_{c_o, h, w}. \quad (11)$$

For max pooling, we define

$$r^*(c_o, h, w) \in \arg \max_r Y_{c_o, r, h, w}.$$

Then the gradient passes only through the maximal rotation:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial Y_{c_o, r, h, w}} = G_{c_o, h, w} \mathbf{1}[r = r^*(c_o, h, w)]. \quad (12)$$

Let

$$\Delta_{c_o, r, h, w} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial Y_{c_o, r, h, w}}$$

for compactness in the following derivations.

For each rotation $r \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, the gradients with respect to the input and the r -rotated kernel $W^{(r)}$ are given by the standard convolution backward formulas:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial X_{c_i, h, w}}^{(r)} = \sum_{c_o=0}^{C_{out}-1} \sum_{i=0}^{K_h-1} \sum_{j=0}^{K_w-1} W_{c_o, c_i, i, j}^{(r)} \Delta_{c_o, r, h-i, w-j}, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_{c_o, c_i, i, j}^{(r)}} = \sum_{h=0}^{H'-1} \sum_{w=0}^{W'-1} X_{c_i, h+i, w+j} \Delta_{c_o, r, h, w}. \quad (14)$$

The total gradient with respect to the input feature map is the sum over the four rotated branches:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial X_{c_i, h, w}} = \sum_{r=0}^3 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial X_{c_i, h, w}}^{(r)}. \quad (15)$$

To obtain the gradient with respect to the unrotated base kernel W , each rotated kernel gradient is first inverse-rotated and then accumulated:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_{c_o, c_i, i, j}} = \sum_{r=0}^3 R_{-r} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_{c_o, c_i, i, j}^{(r)}} \right). \quad (16)$$

Here R_{-r} denotes a rotation of the gradient by $-r \times 90^\circ$, mapping each rotated kernel's gradient back to the base orientation.

C. Parallelization of the scatter operation

The parallelization of the convolution with scatter operation is shown in Fig. 3. In each parallel step, every processor P_i reads the corresponding input data x_i and multiplies it with the same filter weight, then the results of those multiplications will be added to the different output locations. Multiplication with the same filter weight can avoid Write after Write hazard, if there is a synchronization between two parallel steps. For G-convolution, the multiplication is performed only once using this approach.




Fig. 3: Parallel scatter operation, where each processor P_i corresponds to each input data.

The scatter operation is a cache friendly operation and can be easily vectorized. As shown in Fig. 4, if all reading positions in the input data are in the same row and are

multiplied by the same filter weight, then all writing positions in the output are always in the same row, no matter which filter weight is multiplied. Even if the filter is rotated symmetrically, all writing positions in the output are also in the same row, see Fig. 5. It meets the data locality requirement of modern SIMD architecture. On the other hand, this figure also shows us a way to reduce the number of synchronizations required. All processors multiply its own input data with the same filter weight and add the result in 4 different outputs. Obviously, before completing the last addition, all processors have no need to be synchronized since they are writing different memory positions of different outputs. We just insert a synchronization after the last addition. The number of synchronizations can be reduced 4 times.




Fig. 4: Illustration of scatter operation by multiplying each input data with another filter weight. No matter which filter weight it is multiplied by, all writing positions in the output are always in the same row.




Fig. 5: Output positions for the rotated filter with data reuse. No matter how the filter is rotated, all writing positions in the output are always in the same row if the processors process input data in one row.

D. Acceleration of arbitrary rotation convolution

An interpolation is required for sampling after rotation with arbitrary angle. However, it can introduce artifacts that

degrade the performance of rotation-invariant models. In this subsection, we propose an approach which takes the advantage of symmetric rotation and steerable filter to implement rotation-invariant convolution with filter arbitrarily rotated. The proposed method accelerates the training process while eliminating the need for interpolation.




Fig. 6: Symmetric correspondents of 45° rotated image in other quadrants of coordinate plane

The sampled orientations are usually evenly distributed in rotation space for rotation equivariance convolution. For example, the angle increment between every two successive rotations is $\frac{\pi}{12}$, if the number of sampled orientations is 24. We observe the rotation angle in the first quadrant of coordinate plane always has a symmetric correspondent in each of other quadrants, see Fig. 6. As shown in the figure, the rotated versions of image with angles 135° , 215° and 305° can be obtained by symmetrically rotating the 45° -rotated image by 90° , 180° and 270° , respectively. This observation gives us a chance to accelerate the rotation equivariance convolution with filter arbitrarily rotated. We apply filter rotations when the rotation angle falls within the first quadrant. Rotations in other quadrants can be obtained by symmetrically mapping the correspondence from the first quadrant. The number of rotations is reduced by 75%. This indicate that we can rotate the filter in the first quadrant of coordinate plane, and perform the multiplication for the rotations in the first quadrant. We then reuse these multiplication results for the rotation in the other quadrants.

As steerable filters can generate rotated responses without relying on interpolation, we construct the filter in the first quadrant of the coordinate plane using the following steerable filter formulation as in [54]:

$$\psi_\theta(x, y) = \sin(\theta) \cdot f_x(x, y) + \cos(\theta) \cdot f_y(x, y) \quad (17)$$

Equation (17) defines the steerable filter $\psi_\theta(x, y)$ at a given rotation angle θ , where $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ denotes the spatial

coordinates. The functions $f_x(x, y)$ and $f_y(x, y)$ represent the learned base filters oriented along the horizontal (x-axis) and vertical (y-axis) directions, respectively. The steerable filter $\psi_\theta(x, y)$ is constructed as a linear combination of these directional basis filters using fixed orientation-dependent coefficients $\sin(\theta)$ and $\cos(\theta)$, enabling efficient and continuous steering of the filter to any desired angle θ .

To encourage the learned base filters to exhibit steerable behavior, we add two regularization losses to the standard cross-entropy objective. The overall loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}} + \lambda_{\text{mag}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{mag}} + \lambda_{\text{orth}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{orth}}, \quad (18)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{CE} denotes the task-specific cross-entropy loss, and λ_{mag} and λ_{orth} are scalar weighting coefficients controlling the strength of the magnitude and orthogonality regularizations, respectively.

The magnitude-matching loss encourages the two base filters to maintain similar energy levels:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mag}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left(\left\| \mathbf{w}_b^{(x)} \right\|_2 - \left\| \mathbf{w}_b^{(y)} \right\|_2 \right)^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_b^{(x)}$ and $\mathbf{w}_b^{(y)}$ denote the flattened kernel weights associated with the b -th filter in the base filters f_x and f_y , respectively, and B is the total number of filters.

The orthogonality loss penalizes the correlation between the two directional bases, promoting rotational independence:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{orth}} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left(\frac{\left\langle \mathbf{w}_b^{(x)}, \mathbf{w}_b^{(y)} \right\rangle}{\left\| \mathbf{w}_b^{(x)} \right\|_2 \left\| \mathbf{w}_b^{(y)} \right\|_2 + \varepsilon} \right)^2, \quad (20)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ ensures numerical stability during training. Together, these regularization terms guide the base filters f_x and f_y toward forming an approximately steerable pair that preserves orientation consistency across rotations.

IV. GPU IMPLEMENTATION

A. GPU implementation of single-orientation convolution with scatter operation

The convolution operation can be efficiently implemented on GPU using matrix multiplication, as shown in [55]. This approach requires transforming the input image and the convolution kernel into matrices that can exploit the fast multiplication capabilities of the GPU. This transformation involves duplicating the input data to lower its dimensionality.

In our GPU implementation of convolution with scatter operation, we use matrix multiplication to perform the channel-wise multiplication and summation of the input and a filter kernel. To achieve a higher performance, NVIDIA cuBLAS library [56], a library of highly optimized matrix multiplication routines, is used to perform the channel-wise multiplication and summation. The results are then scattered to the corresponding output positions according to the scattering rule. Unlike the method in [55], we do not apply any data lowering in our GPU implementation. Our GPU implementation follows gather-GEMM-scatter dataflow [57] but gather without data lowering.

Considering that cuBLAS accesses matrices in column-major order, we arrange the input image in CNHW layout and the filter in NHCW layout, as shown in Fig. 7. The resulting matrix ensures coalesced access for the parallel implementation of the scatter operation, as described in Section III-C.




Fig. 7: Memory layout of the input image and filter kernel for matrix multiplication, where $P_{i,j}$ represents an image pixel, $F_{m,n}$ represents an element of the filter kernel, $c_{i,j,L}$ and $c'_{m,n,L}$ are channel values. Only a single image and a single filter are depicted.

After performing matrix multiplication, the results need to be added to the output image using the parallel scattering operation. However, directly writing to off-chip memory (i.e., the global memory of CUDA) is time-consuming, as each element of the output image needs to be accessed k^2 times. To avoid this, we tile the output image as in Fig. 8 so that each tile can be accommodated in on-chip memory (i.e., the shared memory of CUDA). The scatter operation will be performed in on-chip memory, and the results will then be written to off-chip memory. There is an overlapping region between adjacent tiles, which ensures that elements on the borders can be scattered to neighboring positions completely.

B. GPU implementation of symmetric rotation invariant convolution with scatter operation

The main idea behind accelerating symmetric rotation invariant convolution using the scatter operation is the reuse of intermediate multiplication results, as described in Section III-B. The matrix-multiplication outputs are shared across all rotations, eliminating redundant computation. To make the layer rotation invariant, an orientation-pooling operation is applied afterward, which can be implemented in two ways: point-wise average pooling or point-wise max pooling.

For point-wise average pooling, each element in the result of the matrix multiplication is divided by r , the number of




Fig. 8: Output image tiling scheme for scattering operation with on-chip memory of GPU, where the size of overlap between tiles is $\lfloor k/2 \rfloor$.

rotations, before being added to the output image. This means that the required on-chip memory size is equal to the tile size. However, for point-wise max pooling, the on-chip memory must be twice the tile size—one part for computing the current tile and another for storing the previous maximum values. After finishing additions for the current tile, the point-wise max operation is performed between the current tile and the previously stored max tile. This is necessary because max pooling is a non-linear operation, meaning the maximum value cannot be determined before the additions are completed. Additionally, the overlapping region between adjacent tiles must be extended to $\lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1$ to ensure correct max pooling calculations. Only the central part of each tile, excluding $\lfloor k/2 \rfloor + 1$ border lines, is used in the final output. This ensures that the max values are computed correctly without missing contributions from neighboring tiles.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

We implemented the rotation-invariant convolution using four different approaches: (1) our scatter based kernel, (2) a cuDNN based pipeline, (3) an Oriented Response Networks (ORN) implementation, and (4) an equivariant convolution implementation using the e2cnn library.

In our scatter based approach, the four symmetric rotations are processed within a single fused convolution, so each input element is multiplied only once. In contrast, the cuDNN based pipeline must treat every rotated filter as an independent kernel, performing four separate convolution and therefore four distinct multiply-accumulate passes before the results can be combined. The ORN and e2cnn implementations follow their respective rotation-equivariant formulations and are included as additional baselines for comparison. Among these, we implemented the backward pass for the scatter-based and cuDNN-based versions, as automatic gradient computation is not available for these custom rotation-invariant operations, ensuring that gradients propagate correctly through every rotated filter.

A. Model for Evaluation

To evaluate the performance of the scatter based rotation invariant convolution in a real segmentation application, we

replaced the first convolution of base convolution block in UNet [23] with the rotation invariant convolution described above (see Fig. 9 for illustration). To balance performance and the memory-expansion problem, we apply max pooling across every four symmetric rotations; for example, with eight rotations, this produces two orientation features, each corresponding to a group of four symmetric rotations. The second convolution within the base block uses a standard convolution, we found through experiments that this design improves performance.




Fig. 9: Unet architecture with rotation invariant convolution block.

B. Datasets for Training and Testing

The modified UNet were trained and tested on two datasets: an in-farm plant-segmentation dataset captured with a DJI M300 drone [58] equipped with a P1 photogrammetry camera [59], and the public Semantic Segmentation Drone Dataset [60]. All experiments were conducted on an Ubuntu 22.04 system equipped with eight NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPUs.

1) *Plant segmentation dataset*: Accurately measuring species composition in pasture and forage systems is fundamental for biodiversity monitoring and precision agriculture because it informs management decisions on seeding, fertilization, and grazing intensity. However, mixed-species pastures are highly heterogeneous: the realized stand rarely matches the seed plan and can vary widely across a field and over time. This variability places stringent demands on automated, high-resolution, plant-level segmentation of aerial/UAV imagery. Because leaves and other canopy structures appear at arbitrary orientations in overhead views, incorporating rotation invariance into the segmentation pipeline is critical for robust species discrimination in multi-species pastures.

We mapped pasture species composition from high-resolution UAV imagery acquired with a DJI drone equipped with a Zenmuse P1 camera. Flights were conducted at approximately 12 m above ground level, yielding a nominal ground sampling distance (GSD) of 0.15 cm per pixel. Forward image overlap was 80%, and each P1 frame covered roughly 12.31 x 8.20 m² on the ground. This dataset contains 1000 samples and we use 800 samples for training and 100 for validation and 100 for test.

2) *Semantic Segmentation Drone dataset*: The Semantic Drone Segmentation dataset contains 400 high-resolution nadir-view images of urban residential scenes, captured at

altitudes between 5 m and 30 m above ground and annotated with detailed pixel-level semantic labels covering 24 object categories. In our experiments, we use 328 images for training, 32 for validation, and 40 for testing.

C. Evaluation with Different Convolution Approaches

1) *Single orientation convolution*: Given that single-orientation rotation convolution collapses to standard convolution, we first conduct a direct comparison between our scatter-based convolution API and cuDNN’s standard convolution API. The corresponding results are reported in Appendix A.

We compare our approach with the state-of-the-art ORN [47] and E2CNN [48] frameworks, both of which provide APIs for achieving rotation invariant. Tables I and II present the performance of cuDNN, ORN, E2CNN, and our scatter-based convolution under the single-orientation setting. Because single-orientation rotation convolution degenerates to standard convolution, all methods achieve nearly identical accuracy. Nevertheless, meaningful differences appear in computational cost. On the plant dataset with 256×256 inputs, scatter-based convolution trains approximately 9.2% faster than cuDNN and reduces energy consumption by about 6.9%. At 1024×1024 resolution, scatter achieves roughly a 7.0% reduction in training time and a 7.6% reduction in energy usage. Similar trends are seen on the drone dataset, where scatter-based convolution is about 9.8% faster at 256 resolution and 7.1% faster at 1024 resolution, while saving approximately 5.9% and 7.9% energy, respectively. These results show that even in the absence of multi-orientation modeling, the scatter based convolution offers consistent efficiency gains without sacrificing accuracy. Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 show representative segmentation predictions for plant dataset and drone view datasets.

TABLE I: Plant Data Segmentation Using Various Single-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cuda based conv	8604.0	0.379	73.59
	ORN conv	7758.0	0.362	73.63
	E2CNN conv	7116.0	0.315	73.73
	scatter based conv	7808.0	0.353	73.62
1024	cuda based conv	26153.0	1.758	71.32
	ORN conv	25538.0	1.719	71.38
	E2CNN conv	27405.0	2.213	71.66
	scatter based conv	24317.0	1.625	71.28

2) *Symetric four orientation convolution*: Tables III and IV summarize the results for the symmetric four-orientation configuration. Relative to single-orientation convolution, accuracy improves slightly, particularly for E2CNN, reflecting the benefit of limited rotation modeling. The computational advantages of scatter-based convolution become more pronounced under this setting. On the plant dataset, scatter reduces training time by approximately 45.8% at 256 resolution and 28.8% at 1024 resolution, while lowering energy consumption by about 38.4% and 18.5%, respectively. On the drone dataset, scatter provides comparable benefits, achieving about 46.7% faster training at 256 resolution and 32.9% at 1024 resolution,




Fig. 10: Visualization of segmentation results on plant data.

TABLE II: Semantic drone segmentation Using Various Single-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cuda based conv	3242.2	0.1408	90.62
	ORN conv	2945.1	0.1359	90.67
	E2CNN conv	2705.7	0.1186	90.73
	scatter based conv	2925.6	0.1325	90.65
1024	cuda based conv	9865.5	0.6618	88.71
	ORN conv	9726.3	0.6498	88.74
	E2CNN conv	10392.7	0.8372	88.78
	scatter based conv	9166.9	0.6094	88.69

with corresponding energy reductions of roughly 39.1% and 22.8%. These results indicate that symmetric four-orientation convolutions provide a strong balance between improved segmentation accuracy and computational efficiency, with scatter based convolution offering the best performance–efficiency trade-off.

3) *Symetric eight orientation convolution*: Tables V and VI report the eight-orientation results, which represent the highest degree of rotation invariance in our experiments. Increasing the number of modeled orientations leads to further accuracy improvements, especially for the plant dataset. The scatter-based convolution continues to provide substantial efficiency benefits. On the plant dataset, scatter is approximately 45.4% faster than cuDNN at 256 resolution and about 20.8% faster at 1024 resolution, while reducing energy usage by approximately 41.2% and 12.9%, respectively. On the drone dataset, scatter achieves around 56.9% faster training at 256




Fig. 11: Visualization of segmentation results on Semantic Segmentation Drone dataset.

TABLE III: Plant Data Segmentation Using Various Four-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cuda based conv	20234.6	0.943	75.64
	ORN conv	20154.2	0.921	75.69
	E2CNN conv	18575.8	0.783	75.71
	scatter based conv	10962.6	0.581	75.61
1024	cuda based conv	82081.0	5.564	72.92
	ORN conv	81706.5	5.623	72.98
	E2CNN conv	76175.0	5.118	73.05
	scatter based conv	58433.9	4.532	72.95

resolution and 32.9% at 1024 resolution, with energy savings of about 44.3% and 22.8%. These comparisons show that as rotation resolution increases, rotation-invariant convolutions become more accurate, and the scatter-based implementation remains significantly more efficient than ORN and E2CNN, consistently delivering between 20% and 55% faster training and 15% to 45% lower energy consumption.

TABLE IV: Semantic drone segmentation Using Various Four-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cuda based conv	7713.1	0.3570	91.88
	ORN conv	7651.6	0.3501	91.93
	E2CNN conv	6908.2	0.2943	92.06
	scatter based conv	4109.6	0.2175	91.88
1024	cuda based conv	30936.5	2.103	90.39
	ORN conv	31025.2	2.203	90.41
	E2CNN conv	28925.6	1.946	90.62
	scatter based conv	20761.8	1.623	90.43

TABLE V: Plant Data Segmentation Using Various Eight-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cuda based conv	36866.0	1.675	78.69
	ORN conv	36188.0	1.612	76.13
	E2CNN conv	33408.0	1.561	78.15
	scatter based conv	20133.0	0.9844	78.64
1024	cuda based conv	81361.0	5.553	75.87
	ORN conv	79179.0	5.412	73.64
	E2CNN conv	73003.0	5.024	75.64
	scatter based conv	64434.0	4.835	75.85

D. Post-Segmentation Processing and Visualization

The rotation invariant U-Net segmentation network was trained to classify plant species in the imagery, and species-label outputs from all frames (see Fig. 12) were georeferenced and mosaicked into a seamless orthomosaic. The resulting species-labeled mosaic was exported to Google Earth Pro for visualization (Fig. 13) and for analysis of species distribution across the field.

As shown in Fig. 14, the plant area consists of 51.41% clover leaf, 37.89% grass, 3.13% dock leaf, and 7.56% weeds and other vegetation, indicating clover as the dominant ground cover followed by grass, with minimal presence of dock leaves and miscellaneous weeds.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, replacing cuDNN's dense kernels with our single-pass scatter convolution accelerates both standard (single-orientation) and rotation-invariant layers without affecting accuracy. For standard convolutions, the scatter kernel lowers memory pressure and computational load, reducing training time and energy consumption on small- and medium-sized feature maps with deep channels. When rotations are required it fuses all filters into one pass, yielding even larger speed-and-energy gains. Results on the Semantic Drone and plant-segmentation benchmarks confirm consistent improvements across input sizes, establishing scatter convolution as a practical drop-in upgrade for modern CNNs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is funded by the UK Natural Environment Research Council under project FLORA-SAGE - Federated Learning Optimised for Remote Assessment of Species

TABLE VI: Semantic drone segmentation Using Various Eight-Orientation Rotation-Invariant Convolutions

Image size	Convolution applied	Training time (s)	Energy (kWh)	Test accuracy (%)
256	cudnn based conv	14002.8	0.6345	93.98
	ORN conv	13798.3	0.6132	92.76
	E2CNN conv	12682.3	0.5894	93.67
	scatter based conv	6042.28	0.3533	93.91
1024	cudnn based conv	30936.2	2.103	92.44
	ORN conv	29956.3	2.056	91.20
	E2CNN conv	27548.6	1.894	91.99
	scatter based conv	20761.8	1.623	92.40




Fig. 12: Original P1 RGB imagery (left) and corresponding segmentation masks (right).

in Agricultural Grassland Ecosystems (grant award number UKRI053) and UKRI Digital Dairy Value-Chain for South-West Scotland and Cumbria (Strength in Places Fund) (grant award number 99890)

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Li, F. Liu, W. Yang, S. Peng, and J. Zhou, “A survey of convolutional neural networks: analysis, applications, and prospects,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 6999–7019, 2021.
- [2] T. Abtahi, C. Shea, A. Kulkarni, and T. Mohsenin, “Accelerating Convolutional Neural Network With FFT on Embedded Hardware,” *IEEE Transactions on Very*






Fig. 13: Geo-referenced P1 RGB imagery mosaic (a) and corresponding Geo-referenced mask mosaic (b) displayed in Google Earth Pro.

Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1737–1749, 9 2018.


- [3] S. Winograd, *Arithmetic complexity of computations / Shmuel Winograd*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics Philadelphia, 1980.
- [4] Z. Fan, W. Li, Z. Wang, T. Liu, H. Wu, Y. Liu, M. Wu, X. Wu, X. Ye, D. Fan, N. Sun, and X. An, “Accelerating convolutional neural networks by exploiting the sparsity of output activation,” *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 3253–3265, 2023.
- [5] S. Zheng, Z. Wu, Q. Du, Y. Xu, and Z. Wei, “Oriented object detection for remote sensing images via object-wise rotation-invariant semantic representation,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 62, pp. 1–15, 2024.
- [6] S. Mei, R. Jiang, M. Ma, and C. Song, “Rotation-invariant feature learning via convolutional neural network with cyclic polar coordinates convolutional layer,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 61, pp. 1–13, 2023.
- [7] P. Shamsolmoali, M. Zareapoor, J. Chanussot, H. Zhou, and J. Yang, “Rotation equivariant feature image pyramid network for object detection in optical remote sensing



(a) Visualization of DSM (white) and Soil segmentation mask (black inside white DSM).



(b) Visualization of Clover leaf segmentation mask.



(c) Visualization of Grass segmentation mask.



(d) Visualization of Dock leaf segmentation mask



(e) Visualization of weeds and other plant segmentation mask.

Fig. 14: Visualization of individual species masks

imagery,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 60, pp. 1–14, 2022.

- [8] Y. Chen and J. Jiang, “An oblique-robust absolute visual localization method for gps-denied uav with satellite imagery,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 62, pp. 1–13, 2024.
- [9] Y. Tian, X. Deng, Y. Zhu, and S. Newsam, “Cross-time and orientation-invariant overhead image geolocalization using deep local features,” in *2020 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, 2020, pp. 2501–2509.
- [10] S. Yi, M. Chen, X. Yuan, S. Guo, and J. Wang, “An interactive fusion attention-guided network for ground surface hot spring fluids segmentation in dual-spectrum uav images,” *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 220, pp. 661–691, 2025.
- [11] S. Yi, X. Liu, J. Li, and L. Chen, “Uavformer: A composite transformer network for urban scene segmentation of uav images,” *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 133, p. 109019, 2023.
- [12] S. Yi, J. Li, G. Jiang, X. Liu, and L. Chen, “Ctseg: A cascade composite transformer semantic segmentation network for uav visual perception,” *Measurement*, vol. 211, p. 112612, 2023.
- [13] D. E. Worrall, S. J. Garbin, D. Turmukhambetov, and G. J. Brostow, “Harmonic networks: Deep translation and rotation equivariance,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 5028–5037.
- [14] T. Cohen and M. Welling, “Group Equivariant Convolutional Networks,” in *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 48, 2016, pp. 2990–2999.
- [15] D. Worrall and G. Brostow, “CubeNet: Equivariance to 3D Rotation and Translation,” in *ECCV 2018*, pp. 585–602.
- [16] S. Chetlur, C. Woolley, P. Vandermersch, J. Cohen, J. Tran, B. Catanzaro, and E. Shelhamer, “cuDNN: Efficient Primitives for Deep Learning,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1410.0759, 2014.
- [17] M. Manduhu, A. Dow, P. Trslic, G. Dooly, B. Blanck, and J. Riordan, “Airborne sense and detect of drones using deep learning and lidar point clouds,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09589>
- [18] M. Kampffmeyer, A.-B. Salberg, and R. Jenssen, “Semantic segmentation of small objects and modeling of uncertainty in urban remote sensing images using deep convolutional neural networks,” in *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, 2016, pp. 680–688.
- [19] E. Shelhamer, J. Long, and T. Darrell, “Fully convolutional networks for semantic segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 640–651, 2017.
- [20] G. Chen, X. Tan, B. Guo, K. Zhu, P. Liao, T. Wang, Q. Wang, and X. Zhang, “Sdfcnv2: An improved fcn framework for remote sensing images semantic segmentation,” *Remote Sensing*, vol. 13, no. 23, 2021.
- [21] L.-C. Chen, G. Papandreou, I. Kokkinos, K. Murphy, and A. L. Yuille, “Deeplab: Semantic image segmentation with deep convolutional nets, atrous convolution, and fully connected crfs,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 834–848, 2018.
- [22] G.-V. Nguyen and T. Huynh-The, “Enhancing aerial semantic segmentation with feature aggregation network for deeplabv3+,” *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, vol. 21, pp. 1–5, 2024.
- [23] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, “U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation,” in *Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention—MICCAI 2015: 18th international conference, Munich, Germany, October 5–9, 2015, proceedings, part III 18*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [24] S. Girisha, U. Verma, M. M. Manohara Pai, and R. M. Pai, “Uvid-net: Enhanced semantic segmentation of uav aerial videos by embedding temporal information,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, vol. 14, pp. 4115–4127, 2021.
- [25] Q. Wang, N. J. Kavhiza, F. Islam, I. A. Huqqani, M. Abbas, and S. Barman, “Multi-sensor data fusion for coastal boundary detection by res-u-net implementation using high-resolution uav imagery,” *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 2025.
- [26] H. Liu, W. Li, X.-G. Xia, M. Zhang, Z. Guo, and L. Song,

- “Seghshi: Semantic segmentation of hyperspectral images with limited labeled pixels,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 33, pp. 6469–6482, 2024.
- [27] H. Liu, W. Li, W. Jia, H. Sun, M. Zhang, L. Song, and Y. Gui, “Clusterformer for pine tree disease identification based on uav remote sensing image segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 62, pp. 1–15, 2024.
- [28] S. El Amrani Abouelassad and F. Rottensteiner, “Vehicle instance segmentation with rotated bounding boxes in uav images using cnn,” *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, vol. V-1-2022, pp. 15–23, 2022.
- [29] J. Kang, R. Fernandez-Beltran, Z. Wang, X. Sun, J. Ni, and A. Plaza, “Rotation-invariant deep embedding for remote sensing images,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 60, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [30] Q. Cao, Y. Chen, C. Ma, and X. Yang, “Few-shot rotation-invariant aerial image semantic segmentation,” *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 62, pp. 1–13, 2024.
- [31] H. Mo and G. Zhao, “Achieving rotation invariance in convolution operations: Shifting from data-driven to mechanism-assured,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11309*, 2024.
- [32] —, “Ric-cnn: rotation-invariant coordinate convolutional neural network,” *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 146, p. 109994, 2024.
- [33] J. Mitton and R. Murray-Smith, “Rotation equivariant deforestation segmentation and driver classification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13097*, 2021.
- [34] V. Nicolas, J. Jeff, M. Michael, C. Soumith, P. Serkan, and L. Yann, “Fast convolutional nets with fbfft: A GPU performance evaluation,” *arXiv:1412.7580*, 2014.
- [35] A. Zlateski, K. Lee, and H. S. Seung, “ZNN - A Fast and Scalable Algorithm for Training 3D Convolutional Networks on Multi-core and Many-Core Shared Memory Machines,” in *2016 IEEE 30th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, 2016, pp. 801–811.
- [36] M. Mathieu, M. Henaff, and Y. Lecun, “Fast training of convolutional networks through FFTs,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR2014)*, 2014.
- [37] A. Lavin and S. Gray, “Fast Algorithms for Convolutional Neural Networks,” *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 4013–4021, 2015.
- [38] S. Lu, J. Chu, L. Guo, and X. T. Liu, “Im2win: An efficient convolution paradigm on gpu,” in *European Conference on Parallel Processing*. Springer, 2023, pp. 592–607.
- [39] Q. Chang, M. Onishi, and T. Maruyama, “Fast convolution kernels on pascal gpu with high memory efficiency,” in *Proceedings of the High Performance Computing Symposium*, ser. HPC ’18, San Diego, CA, USA, 2018.
- [40] A. Anderson, A. Vasudevan, C. Keane, and D. Gregg, “High-performance low-memory lowering: Gemm-based algorithms for dnn convolution,” in *2020 IEEE 32nd International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD)*, 2020, pp. 99–106.
- [41] T. Cohen, M. Geiger, and M. Weiler, “A general theory of equivariant cnns on homogeneous spaces,” *arXiv:1811.02017*, 2018.
- [42] S. Ravanbakhsh, J. Schneider, and B. Poczos, “Equivariance through parameter-sharing,” in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning—Volume 70*, 2017, pp. 2892–2901.
- [43] M. Winkels and T. S. Cohen, “3D G-cnns for pulmonary nodule detection,” *arXiv:1804.04656*, 2018.
- [44] E. Hoogetboom, J. W. T. Peters, T. S. Cohen, and M. Welling, “HexaConv,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2018.
- [45] T. Cohen, M. Weiler, B. Kicanaoglu, and M. Welling, “Gauge Equivariant Convolutional Networks and the Icosahedral CNN,” in *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 97, 2019, pp. 1321–1330.
- [46] D. Marcos, M. Volpi, and D. Tuia, “Learning rotation invariant convolutional filters for texture classification,” in *23rd International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 2016, pp. 2012–2017.
- [47] Y. Zhou, Q. Ye, Q. Qiu, and J. Jiao, “Oriented Response Networks,” *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 4961–4970, 2017.
- [48] M. Weiler and G. Cesa, “General E(2)-Equivariant Steerable CNNs,” in *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019.
- [49] M. Weiler, F. A. Hamprecht, and M. Storath, “Learning Steerable Filters for Rotation Equivariant CNNs,” *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 849–858, 2017.
- [50] S. Luan, C. Chen, B. Zhang, J. Han, and J. Liu, “Gabor convolutional networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 4357–4366, 2018.
- [51] T. P. Weldon, W. E. Higgins, and D. F. Dunn, “Efficient Gabor filter design for texture segmentation,” *Pattern recognition*, vol. 29, no. 12, pp. 2005–2015, 1996.
- [52] X. Cheng, Q. Qiu, R. Calderbank, and G. Sapiro, “RotDCF: Decomposition of Convolutional Filters for Rotation-Equivariant Deep Networks,” *arXiv:1805.06846*, 2018.
- [53] S. Dieleman, J. De Fauw, and K. Kavukcuoglu, “Exploiting cyclic symmetry in convolutional neural networks,” *arXiv:1602.02660*, 2016.
- [54] W. Freeman and E. Adelson, “The design and use of steerable filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 891–906, 1991.
- [55] S. Chetlur, C. Woolley, P. Vandermersch, J. Cohen, J. Tran, B. Catanzaro, and E. Shelhamer, “cudnn: Efficient primitives for deep learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.0759*, 2014.
- [56] NVIDIA Cooperation, “cuBLAS documentation,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/cublas/>

- [57] H. Tang, S. Yang, Z. Liu, K. Hong, Z. Yu, X. Li, G. Dai, Y. Wang, and S. Han, "Torchsparse++: Efficient training and inference framework for sparse convolution on gpus," in *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, 2023.
- [58] DJI. (2020) Matrice 300 rtk. DJI Enterprise. [Online]. Available: <https://www.dji.com/matrice-300>
- [59] —. (2025) Zenmuse p1 photogrammetry camera. DJI Enterprise. [Online]. Available: <https://enterprise.dji.com/zenmuse-p1>
- [60] Awsaf. (2020) Semantic drone dataset. Kaggle. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/awsaf49/semantic-drone-dataset>
- [61] NVIDIA Cooperation, "cuDNN developer guide," 2019. [Online]. Available: https://docs.nvidia.com/deeplearning/sdk/cudnn-archived/cudnn_761/pdf/cuDNN-Developer-Guide.pdf



Gerard Dooly received the B.Eng. degree from the Electronic and Computer Engineering Department, University of Limerick, in 2003, and the Ph.D. degree from the Optical Fibre Sensors Research Centre, University of Limerick, in 2008, on the topic "An Optical Fibre Sensor for the Measurement of Hazardous Emissions from Land Transport Vehicles." For over ten years, he has worked extensively in field robotics at UL. His research interests include real-time 3-D reconstruction, machine vision, machine learning, optical fibre sensors, subsea structural health monitoring, teleoperation, and automated docking and intervention. He is involved in robotics for harsh environments in offshore setting and is developing systems to address beyond visual line of sight operations for UAS. He is focused on the design and development of robotics and has engaged in numerous field operations and survey missions both in Ireland and on the continent. Some of his recent offshore operations involved environmental sensing, anti-mine countermeasure ops, remote UAS for incident response, archaeological survey, and hybrid long range UAS technologies.



Manduhu Manduhu received the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in information engineering from Hiroshima University, Japan, in 2010 and 2013, respectively. He is currently a PostDoc researcher at the Drone Systems Lab of the University of the West of Scotland. His research interests include parallel algorithms, physics-based simulation, and deep learning for object detection and segmentation.



Alexander Dow received his B.S. in sound engineering and production from Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK in 2016 and his M.S. in digital signal and image processing from the University of Sussex, Brighton, UK in 2020. He is currently pursuing his Ph.D. in drone-based computer vision at the University of the West of Scotland, Lanarkshire, Scotland.

He currently works as a Post-Doctoral Research Assistant in the Drone Systems Lab at the University of the West of Scotland. His research interests include computer vision, artificial intelligence on embedded systems, LiDAR and hyperspectral imaging.




James Riordan received the B.Eng. degree in electronic engineering specializing in aircraft simulation systems and the Ph.D. degree in real-time processing of acoustic signals from the University of Limerick, Ireland.

Currently, he is a Full Professor with the University of the West of Scotland, U.K., where he is also the Director of the Drone Systems Laboratory. He is also a Principal Investigator of multiple research projects funded by European Commission and U.K. Research and Innovation. His research interests include artificial intelligence, computer vision, and sensing methods to extend the safe and sustainable application of autonomous vehicles in land, air, and sea.

APPENDIX A


PERFORMANCE OF SCATTER-BASED CONVOLUTION COMPARED TO cuDNN CONVOLUTIONS

In the single-rotation case, the rotation-invariant convolution reduces to a standard convolution. We evaluate our scatter-based convolution (single orientation) through a series of experiments and benchmark it against NVIDIA’s cuDNN convolution library, which is widely used in deep-learning applications [61]. In our implementation, the fastest cuDNN kernel is automatically selected by the cuDNN autotuner. The GPU used for evaluation is NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3080 Ti with 16GB video memory. The version of CUDA 12.3 and cuDNN 8.9.6.50 are installed in a Windows 10 system.




Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (a) 4×4 input




Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (b) 8×8 input




Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (c) 16×16 input




Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (d) 32×32 input



Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (e) 64×64 input



Primary X-axis: Number of filters
Secondary X-axis: Number of input channels

Fig.15 (f) 128×128 input

NVIDIA’s cuDNN offers eight distinct forward-convolution implementations, and for every experiment we measure the fastest of those eight via cuDNN’s autotuner. As shown in Fig.15 (a)-(g), across the seven plots (input sizes $4 \rightarrow 256$) our scatter-based kernel still dominates that “best-of-eight” cuDNN baseline in the majority of layer configurations. Counting every (resolution \times input-channel \times filter) triplet, the scatter variant is quicker in most cases, with typical speed-ups of $1.1\times$ – $1.6\times$ and a peak of $\approx 2\times$ for the very small 4×4 activations. The gain is most pronounced whenever the spatial footprint is modest ($\leq 32 \times 32$) or the channel-filter product is under $\sim 16\text{K}$, where kernel-launch latency and global-memory traffic dominate the cost of convolution; the single-pass scatter design removes the data-lowering staging


Fig.15 (g) 256×256 input

Fig. 15: Performance comparison of cuDNN (blue) and the proposed scatter convolution (orange) across seven input resolutions.

step and sustains higher memory-bandwidth utilisation in that regime. As the resolution grows beyond 64×64 and the workload becomes compute-bound, cuDNN paths occasionally pull ahead, yet even at 256×256 our kernel still wins for 4 of the 9 channel-filter pairs tested. In practice, this means the scatter kernel is the better choice for mid-to-deep layers where spatial dimensions have shrunk and channel depth has increased, while cuDNN remains preferable only for the first one or two encoder layers of very high-resolution networks.