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Goal: Improve performance of DNNs

Two main, distinct approaches
- Program Transformation (Compilers)
  - Hardware specific optimizations
- Neural Architecture Search
  - Replace components with computationally cheaper methods

Problems
- Inaccurate choice of program transformations for a powerful architecture
- NAS limited to pre-designed list of convolutional alternatives
Overview

Combine both approaches!

Example:
- Program transformation: Loop interleaving
- NAS technique: bottlenecking
Concerns:

Legality

- NAS methods change architecture
  - do not guarantee transformation safety
- Need a way to measure new “transformation safety”
  - Fisher Potential
Polyhedral Model

- Describes program transformations
- Domain
  - Collection of statement instances
- Set of accesses
  - Mapping of iteration space to memory
- Schedule
  - Assigns timestamps
- Legality of transformation
  - If data dependence -> relative ordering must be preserved
Example

Algorithm 1 Naive implementation of $1 \times 1$ tensor convolution.

```
for (co=0; co<C0; co++)
    for (oh=0; oh<OH; oh++)
        for (ow=0; ow<OW; ow++)
            S1  0[c_o][h][w] = 0.;
            for (ci=0; ci<Ci; ci++)
                S2  0[co][oh][ow] +=
                    W[co][1][1] *
                    I[ci][oh][ow];
```

We can also describe the schedule as follows:

\[
T_{S1}(c_o, h, w) = (c_o, h, w) \\
T_{S2}(c_o, h, w, c_i) = (c_o, h, w, c_i)
\]

Loop Interchange: \[ T_{S1}(c_o, h, w) = (c_o, w, h) \]

Legality: \[ \forall i, j, S1, S2, D \quad i \rightarrow j \in d_{S1,S2} \rightarrow T(i) \leq T(j) \]
Models and Implementation

Bottlenecking:
- Reduce number of filters from $C_O$ to $C_O/B$

$$T_S(c_o, J^') = (c'_o, J^') \mid c'_o < C_o/B$$

Grouping
- Split $C_I$ input channels into $G$ groups
- Each group independently convolved
- $C_O/G$ output channels -> concatenated

$$T_S(c_o, c_i, J^{''}) = (g, c_o/G, c_i/G, J^{'})$$

Depthwise Convolution
- Special case of grouping when $C_O = C_I = G$
## Models and Implementation

| Optimization | Description |
|--------------|-------------|
| **Program Transformations** |
| reorder      | Interchange nested loops |
| tile         | Cache and register blocking |
| unroll       | Loop unrolling |
| prefetch     | Memory coalescing between threads |
| split        | Divide iteration into multiple axes |
| fuse         | Combine two axes into one |
| **Neural Architecture Transformations** |
| bottleneck   | Reduce domain by factor $B$ |
| group        | Slice and offset two loops by factor $G$ |
| **Mapping to GPU** |
| blockIdx     | Block-wise parallelism |
| threadIdx    | Threads within blocks |
| vthread       | Striding thread access |
Fisher Potential

- Total information that each loop nest (layer) contains about class labels under a simplifying assumption of conditional independence.
- Or, how much each layer would affect the loss if deleted

\[
\Delta_c = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_n^N \left( - \sum_i^W \sum_j^H A_{nij} g_{nij} \right)^2.
\]
Models and Implementation

Search over 1000 configurations

Check which candidates satisfy Fisher Potential test and select best performing one

Compared to TVM & NAS (applying NAS then using TVM to compile)
Results
Results

- **Original+TVM**
- **Ours**

- ResNet-18
- ResNet-34
- DenseNet-169
- DenseNet-201
- DenseNet-161

Top-1 Accuracy vs Inference time (ms)
3 Sequence of Operations Stood Out

1. [split → interchange → group → interchange → fuse]
   a. Group kernels over spatial domain

2. [unroll → group → interchange]
   a. Output channels unrolled by factor 16, then grouped by G = 2

3. [split → group → interchange → group]
   a. Splitting up iteration domain by applying different levels of grouping
Figure 6: Exploring different sequences of transformations for an individual layer of ResNet-34 on the Intel Core i7 CPU. NAS is the result of applying grouping with factor 2 first, then compiling with TVM. The other three sequences are interleaved transformations produced by our method.
Results

[Graph showing CIFAR-10 Error (%) vs Number of parameters for NAS networks and Ours.]

- NAS-B
- NAS-A
Critiques and Concerns

Experiments: Compare best performance? Average performance?

Scalability and deployability
- Retraining models when deployed
- Distributed training?

Skeptical about Fisher Potential
- Could have benefited from more data

Search process too naive

Usefulness of bottlenecking

Limited NAS techniques that can be applied in program transformation
Questions?