

A Survey and Empirical Evaluation of Parallel Deep Learning Frameworks

Daniel Nichols, Siddharth Singh, Shu-Huai Lin, Abhinav Bhatele

[†]Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland
College Park, USA
{dnicho,ssingh37,slin185}@umd.edu,bhatele@cs.umd.edu

ABSTRACT

The field of deep learning has witnessed a remarkable shift towards extremely compute- and memory-intensive neural networks. These newer larger models have enabled researchers to advance state-of-the-art tools across a variety of fields. This phenomenon has spurred the development of algorithms for distributed training of neural networks over a larger number of hardware accelerators. In this paper, we discuss and compare current state-of-the-art frameworks for large scale distributed deep learning. First, we survey current practices in distributed learning and identify the different types of parallelism used. Then, we present empirical results comparing their performance on large image and language training tasks. Additionally, we address their statistical efficiency and memory consumption behavior. Based on our results, we discuss algorithmic and implementation portions of each framework which hinder performance.

KEYWORDS

neural networks, deep learning, distributed training, GPUs, performance, survey

1 INTRODUCTION

The previous decade witnessed an explosion in the development of machine learning algorithms. In particular, deep learning (DL), a subset of machine learning focused on using neural networks for function approximation, has gained widespread popularity. Deep neural networks (DNNs) have enabled the advancement of the state of the art in a plethora of research areas: ranging from visual recognition [28, 55, 61, 64, 72] and natural language processing [13, 40, 45, 66] to computational chemistry and computer systems [4, 19, 21, 34, 36, 62, 63, 67]. Their popularity stems from the DNN’s ability to automatically learn low-dimensional representations from high-dimensional unstructured data such as images, text and audio. Given enough data, the representations learned by these models are often superior to handcrafted features designed by domain experts.

The advances in accelerator technology, increased memory capacity per accelerator, and faster networks have encouraged users of deep learning to train neural networks with increasingly larger numbers of parameters. Figure 1 shows the increasing number of parameters in the largest networks since 2012. Often times, it is impossible to train such networks on a single accelerator either due to large execution time or insufficient memory capacity to fit these models. The latter problem is further exacerbated for contemporary neural architectures. For example, GPT-2, an extremely popular neural network used in NLP requires 84 GB of GPU DRAM for training. This has motivated recent works in parallelizing the

task of deep learning: training large models using multiple GPUs on a single node [18, 25] or across multiple nodes connected by a network [14, 22, 31, 39, 46, 54, 70].




Figure 1: Neural networks have continued to grow in size in terms of the number of parameters. Recent language networks have further contributed to this trend.

Different parallel frameworks offer different strengths and weaknesses in terms of performance (execution time for training), memory consumption, and statistical efficiency. Ben-Nun et al. [3] surveyed parallel DL frameworks and the different ways of exploiting the concurrency in neural networks in 2018. However, many new frameworks have emerged in the last three years, and the authors limited their discussion to a qualitative analysis. In this paper, we survey the most popular parallel DL frameworks available today and perform an empirical evaluation for the ones with open-source implementations to compare various metrics. This comparative evaluation can help users of deep learning select the best parallel framework for their training tasks.

We first present a comprehensive qualitative survey of the state of the art in parallel deep learning. We classify approaches for parallelization into three categories (defined in Section 2): data parallelism, intra-layer parallelism (sometimes referred to as model parallelism), and inter-layer parallelism (sometimes referred to as pipelining.). We present the advantages and disadvantages of using each approach and discuss the capabilities of different frameworks that implement each type of parallelism.

An end user who needs a scalable DL framework for their training experiments needs to know which frameworks provide the best statistical efficiency in the shortest possible time. To the best of our knowledge, an empirical comparison of parallel DL frameworks has not been attempted before. We identify two popular

training datasets and two neural networks to benchmark several open-source DL frameworks including DDP [31], PipeDream [39], ZeRO [46], Megatron [54], TorchGPipe [25], and LBANN [16]. We use metrics that matter the most to a deep learning researcher – epoch execution times, statistical efficiency, and memory consumption. We run our experiments on two different supercomputers and clusters that are built using different generations of NVIDIA GPUs (A100s, V100s). Through these experiments, we seek to develop a consensus on the suitability of parallel frameworks to different scenarios.

In this paper we contribute:

- A comprehensive survey of current state-of-the-art techniques in distributed deep learning organized by parallelization strategy.
- An empirical evaluation of these techniques across vision and language tasks on 2 different clusters that, to our knowledge, has not been done before.
- A comparison of metrics, recorded across frameworks and architectures, that concern both the HPC and deep learning communities: runtime, scaling, statistical efficiency, and memory consumption.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section, we first give brief descriptions of deep learning terminology. We refer the reader to [?] for an in-depth review of deep learning. We then provide an outline of the three ways in which training of a deep neural network can be parallelized: data parallelism, intra-layer parallelism and inter-layer parallelism.

2.1 Definitions

Neural networks: Neural networks are parameterized functions for predicting properties of some input data. They excel at learning low dimensional representations of complex, high dimensional data.

Layers: Networks are composed of a sequence of layers, which take the previous layer’s output as input and computes some non-linear transformation.

Training and Loss: The processing of finding the best parameters for a neural network is called training. This is done by minimizing a loss function over an input data set. Loss functions, such as mean squared error, are typically chosen to represent the prediction capability of the network.

Backpropagation: Backpropagation is a dynamic programming algorithm based on reverse-mode automatic differentiation that computes the gradients of each layer with respect to the loss function.

Gradient Descent and Learning Rate: Many training algorithms use variations of gradient descent to minimize the loss function. Gradient descent iteratively updates the parameters of the neural network based on the negative gradient such that the loss moves towards a minima. The distance moved in the direction of the negative gradient is scaled by a value called the learning rate.

Mini-Batches, Epochs and Stochastic Gradient Descent: Computing gradients of the entire data set is expensive, so approximate gradients are computed using random mini-batches of data. This version of gradient descent is called batched stochastic gradient

descent. Each time the entirety of the data set is iterated over is called an epoch.

Statistical Efficiency: Statistical efficiency is a measure of the relationship between epochs and accuracy/loss. A training algorithm is said to be statistically efficient if it requires a low number of epochs to converge to a target validation loss.

2.2 Parallel Deep Learning Methods

Data Parallelism: Data parallelism refers to an even division of training data among worker GPUs. Each GPU possesses a copy of the neural network along with its parameters. Gradient calculation via backpropagation proceeds independently on all GPUs. These gradients are then subject to a collective all-reduce operation before the weight update step of the optimizer. The all-reduce step can either take place synchronously after each mini-batch, or asynchronously using a central parameter server. Implementations of data parallelism are widely available in popular deep learning frameworks like PyTorch [31], and TensorFlow [1]. Figure 2 illustrates data parallelism across 4 GPUs.




Figure 2: Processing of mini-batches over time in data parallelism. Each GPU has a copy of all the layers (shown in different colors) and different mini-batches (numbered) are processed by different GPUs.

Intra-layer Parallelism: Intra-layer parallelism distributes the work of a layer by dividing its computation across multiple GPUs. Parallelizing an entire neural network entails applying intra-layer parallelism to some or all of its constituent layers. Research in this area is focused on optimizing the multi-GPU execution of different kinds of layers - Fully Connected, Convolutional [11, 41, 53] and more recently the Transformer [54]. Intra-layer parallelism enables us to train neural networks that would not fit inside the DRAM of a single GPU.

Inter-layer Parallelism: In inter-layer parallelism contiguous subsets of layers are mapped to individual GPUs. Each GPU is thus tasked with operating on a subset of the neural network. Exchange of activations and gradients among consecutive layers on different GPUs takes place via point-to-point communication primitives. To achieve true parallelism more than one mini-batch should be

active on different GPUs at a time since the processing of a mini-batch across layers is sequential and cannot be parallelized. This is called pipelining. The maximum number of mini-batches active in the system at any given point of time is called the pipeline limit. Figure 3 shows inter-layer parallelism in action with four GPUs and a pipeline limit of four. Just like intra-layer parallelism inter-layer parallelism makes it possible to train models whose memory requirements exceed the DRAM capacity of a single GPU.




Figure 3: Processing of micro-batches in inter-layer parallelism. Each GPU holds one or more layers in the network and all mini-batches pass through all the layers/GPUs.

2.3 Related Work

Pouyanfar et al. [43] and Ben-Nun et al. [3] comprehensively survey established techniques in sequential deep learning as well as distributed. Another survey [59] covers work in processing neural networks efficiently. Distributed training on big data software stacks (such as Spark and Hadoop) is explored by Lu et al. [32]. The network demands of parallel training are presented in [2] where typical communication workloads are profiled and characterized. Tang et al. [60] further character distributed training communication via analytical models and survey current practices. We also point the reader to the MLPerf benchmarks¹, which have become popular for comparing deep learning algorithms, frameworks, and hardware.

3 LITERATURE SURVEY

In this section we present a survey of current state-of-the-art techniques and implementations for each type of distributed learning. Table 1 provides an overview of each discussed framework.

3.1 Data Parallelism

Data parallelism has been the go-to algorithm for parallelizing neural network training. It is simple in design and performs well with the correct settings.

3.1.1 Small Models. Data parallelism hinges on a synchronous all-reduce operation to gather the gradients across all GPUs. Naturally, this can become a bottleneck as the size of the gradients being shared grows. This problem is further exacerbated by the increasing computational capabilities of hardware accelerators. The ensuing decrease in the computation to communication ratio increases the severity of this problem.

Initial attempts to reduce the communication overhead targeted introducing asynchrony in the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) algorithm [10, 12, 49]. However, Chen et al. [6] demonstrate that synchronous SGD and its variants converged faster with higher accuracy than their asynchronous counterparts.

Efforts to minimize communication bottlenecks continued. Zhang et al. [71] devise a strategy known as Wait-Free Backpropagation (WFBP) to interleave GPU and CPU computation and communication. WFBP reduces bursts in network traffic and lowers overall network strain. Using WFBP, Zhang et al. achieve speed-ups in training times in 16 and 32 single-GPU machines. WFBP has become the de-facto approach for data parallelism frameworks.

PyTorch DistributedDataParallel (DDP) [31], Horovod [52] and Livermore Big Artificial Neural Network (LBANN) [16] toolkit are three open source frameworks designed to assist in transitioning models into a distributed environment. Out of these frameworks PyTorch DDP has been extremely popular among the deep learning community due to its seamless integration with PyTorch [42]. Horovod is an implementation of WFBP for TensorFlow by Uber. LBANN accelerates parallelized deep learning by taking advantage of high performance computing hardware. These implementations share an uncanny similarity in the way they optimize WFBP. Instead of having an individual all-reduce call for each parameter tensor, they fuse parameter tensors into fixed size bins. All reduce calls are made at the granularity of these fused parameter bins. This increases network bandwidth utilization and thus the overall performance of these frameworks. Although the fused tensor bin-size is kept as a tunable hyperparameter, Li et al. [31] demonstrate that the default bucket size of PyTorch DDP i.e. 25MB is a reasonable choice for efficient scaling.

3.1.2 Large Models. Given the abundance of large training datasets neural networks with increasingly larger number of parameters have led to tremendous gains in performance on a variety of training tasks. As models and datasets grow in size GPU memory capacity becomes a major bottleneck. Data parallelism requires each GPU to store its own copy of the neural network. With larger models and datasets the memory required to house the activations, gradients and parameters of these neural networks often exceeds the capacity of a single GPU DRAM. Data parallelism is thus rendered infeasible for training large models without memory optimizations.

Zero Redundancy Optimizer (ZeRO) [46] is a framework built over PyTorch to reduce per-GPU memory consumption. The paper observes that most memory during training is occupied by optimizer states, gradients, and parameters. ZeRO partitions these model states across GPUs to remove memory redundancies. With ZeRO, memory reduction scales proportionally with the number of GPUs while communication overhead only increases by a constant factor of 1.5x. The paper finds improvements in model size, training performance, and scalability with 100 billion parameter models on

¹<https://mlcommons.org/en/training-normal-07/>

Table 1: Summary of Literature Review on Parallel Deep Learning

Framework	Type of Parallelism	Largest Accelerator Count	Largest Trained Network (No. of Parameters)
FlexFlow	Hybrid	64 GPUs	24M*
PipeDream**	Inter-Layer	16 GPUs	138M
DDP**	Data	256 GPUs	345M
GPipe	Inter-Layer	8 GPUs	557M
MeshTensorFlow	Intra-Layer	512-core TPUv2	4.9B
Megatron**	Intra-Layer	512 GPUs	8.3B
TorchGPipe**	Inter-Layer	8 GPUs	15.8B
KARMA	Data	2048 GPUs	17B
LBANN**	Data	3072 CPUs	78.6B
ZeRO**	Data	400 GPUs	100B
ZeRO-Infinity	Data	512 GPUs	32T
AxonNN	Inter-Layer	384 GPUs	100B

*Note: FlexFlow does not provide a parameter size for the largest network it trains. We have defaulted to the largest network with a known network size cited in their paper.

**The following frameworks are compared quantitatively in Section 4

up to 400 GPUs using the Adam optimizer [27] and mixed precision. Researchers at Microsoft have used ZeRO to train one of the largest neural networks in language modeling literature: a 17B parameter neural network called the Turing-NLG.

Out-of core training algorithms like NVIDIA’s vDNN [50] are often used to train neural networks on a single GPU with insufficient DRAM capacity. These algorithms move data back and forth between the CPU and the GPU to free up space on the GPU. KARMA [65] is a framework built over PyTorch that extends this out-of-core approach to data parallelism on multiple GPUs. They design an efficient algorithm for automatic offloading and prefetching of activations and parameters of the neural network to and from the CPU DRAM. These capabilities are further extended to support multi-GPU models by performing weight updates on the CPU. KARMA sees a 1.52x speed-up against other state-of-the-art out-of-core methods. It provides an efficient way to utilize data parallelism for large models that would otherwise necessitate other frameworks. Zero-Infinity [47] is another framework that provides support for out-of-core data parallel training for multi-billion parameter models. Using their memory optimizations, The authors are able to deploy a 32 trillion parameter model on as little as 512 GPUs while maintaining a decent throughput of around 40% of the peak.

3.1.3 Large Effective Mini-Batch Sizes. Data parallelism is most efficient with high per-GPU workloads. This is ensured by fixing the per-GPU mini-batch size. As an example, suppose a ResNet model with a per-GPU mini-batch size of 128 is trained over 64 GPUs. This is equivalent to an effective mini-batch size of 8192 on a single GPU. It has been empirically shown that an extremely large effective mini-batch size has an adverse effect on the statistical efficiency of neural network training [17].

The naive approach to compensate for this is to increase the learning rate (LR). Krizhevsky [29] proposes to scale LR linearly with mini-batch size. Problems emerge as more workers are added

to accelerate training: large LR values result in accuracy losses and training instability.

Goyal et al. [17] propose a LR warmup scheme to combat accuracy loss. Training begins with a lower LR that slowly builds up to a target value following the linear scaling rule. The paper was able to train ResNet-50 with a mini-batch size of 8K and accuracy matching smaller mini-batch models.

You et al. [68, 70] devise Layer-wise Adaptive Rate Scaling (LARS) as an alternate approach to LR warmup. LARS adapts the global LR to create separate LRs per model layer based on the ratio between layer weights and gradient updates. The paper observes this ratio varies across layers and provides insight into the efficacy of a layer’s weight updates. You et al. utilize LARS to train AlexNet and ResNet-50 with a mini-batch size of 32K without accuracy loss.

LARS experiences inconsistent performance gains across different deep learning tasks. You et. al [69] propose a general strategy to adapt any iterative optimizer for large mini-batch training. They apply this strategy to create LAMB using the Adam optimizer as a base. Using LAMB, You et al. scale BERT training to a mini-batch size of 32K without performance degradation.

3.2 Intra-Layer Parallelism

State of the art training techniques in intra-layer parallelism span from fine-grained parallel implementations of numerical kernels to dividing the coarse-grained work of a single layer across processes. It is often used in conjunction with other parallelization strategies such as data or inter-layer parallelism.

3.2.1 Fine-Grained Parallelism. At the fine-grained level many techniques draw from existing numerical methods and adapt them to deep learning. Matrix multiplication and convolutions are the most utilized kernels and have been the focus of much optimization from the ML and broader scientific community. Many accelerators and processors have paired software libraries which implement these kernels tuned to their hardware such as CuDNN[9], MIOpen[24], and OneDNN.

Accelerators have been at the core of fine-grained parallelism within a layer. Several works have introduced techniques, some ML based, for mapping layer computations to the hardware optimally [23, 30, 58]. Here a mapping is the tiling strategy, computation order, and parallelization strategy, hence, the search space for optimal mappings can be immense.

There has been recent interest in using hardware accelerators other than GPGPUs to train deep networks. FPGAs have emerged as a viable candidate in DNN acceleration due to their lower energy consumption than GPUs and the flexibility provided by their reconfigurability. Recent work has explored optimizing DNN operations on FPGA hardware [33]. More recently, novel architectures have been proposed to improve memory re-use and parallel performance [7, 8, 26].

3.2.2 Coarse-Grained Parallelism. Orthogonal to the fine-grained compute kernels there have been techniques developed to divide work inside a layer along coarser tensor dimensions. These typically involve using optimization algorithms and/or ML to identify optimal partitions of computation and data within a layer and then developing a parallel strategy for execution. Song et al. propose a method for finding communication optimal parallel strategies on accelerator arrays in linear time [57]. Similarly, Jia et al. introduce a novel Markov Chain Monte Carlo based search for finding optimal parallelization strategies, which encompasses intra-layer in its operator dimension [22].

MeshTensorFlow accomplishes a similar effect by mapping tensor dimensions to a n-dimensional processor array or "mesh" [53]. These tensors are split and/or replicated across the mesh, such that the computation can be done in parallel using the processor array. The framework itself provides an interface for users to define a layout. Any layout will produce the same results for the same problem, however, the memory footprint and performance can be greatly improved with an optimal layout.

Dryden et al [15] also propose several algorithms for partitioning convolution tensor dimensions with the goal of reducing all-reduce time during training. Their algorithms are available in the LBANN framework. Convolutions are also parallelized in [41] with a hybrid parallelism by extending data parallelism with parallelism in the spatial domain. For language-based models Megatron [54] achieves a similar parallelism by partitioning the blocks in transformer layers across processors. Megatron has been increasingly used as language models become more common and larger (see Figure 1). It has shown up to 74% weak scaling coefficient on 512 GPUs.

Dividing layer tensor dimensions across processors is, however, very sensitive to the layer type. For instance, fully connected layers involve an all-to-all computation and therefore all-to-all communication, which is more expensive than the data parallelism's allreduce. Thus, it is hard to generalize coarser grained intra-layer parallelism for models with custom layers. To combat this some methods look strictly at compute graph operations and not model layers [22].

3.3 Inter-Layer Parallelism

True inter-layer parallelism can only be achieved by pipelining i.e. having multiple mini-batches active in the system at any given instance. There are two ways to achieve pipelining: with and without flushing. In this section, we discuss the pros and cons of both

approaches. We also provide an overview of frameworks that implement these approaches.

3.3.1 Pipelining with Flushing. Pipelining with flushing divides a mini-batch into micro-batches of equal size. These micro-batches are injected one by one into the system. GPUs accumulate gradients from all the micro-batches in the system. A GPU updates its weights only after it has finished the backward pass of the last micro-batch. The next mini-batch and its corresponding micro-batches are injected after all the GPUs have finished updating their weights. This approach to pipelining is also called micro-batching. The number of micro-batches is usually kept to be much larger than the number of workers so that each worker can compute concurrently. Ensuring optimum hardware utilization requires having a large mini-batch size. To maintain statistical efficiency at large mini-batch sizes the same set of solutions discussed in Section 3.1.3 can be used. Figure 3 shows pipelining with flushing in action. Worker GPUs incur idle time between the forward pass of the last micro-batch and the backward pass of the first micro-batch. These are called pipeline bubbles. They reduce the overall hardware utilization of the system. A load balanced mapping of layers to GPUs is absolutely critical to maximize performance. The load balancing algorithm must also be communication-aware. This is because activations and gradients exchanged at GPU boundaries can be in the magnitudes of GBs for large neural networks. An efficient implementation of pipelining with flushing must have load balancing support.

This idea was first introduced by Huang et al. in GPipe [18]. Using GPipe they trained a 557M parameter neural network - AmoebaNet-B [48] on the ImageNet [51] dataset and surpassed the state of the art in a number of downstream image classification tasks. TorchGPipe [25] is an unofficial open-source implementation of GPipe built on the PyTorch [42] backend. GEMS (GPU-Enabled Memory Aware Model-Parallelism System) [20] introduces a novel approach to increase hardware utilization. This framework proposes an algorithm to train two neural networks concurrently using pipelining without flushing on multiple GPUs. They double the throughput of the system by overlapping the forward and backward passes of the two neural networks. We refer the reader to their paper for the details of their implementation. Recently ZeRO [46] and Megatron [54] also extended support for this approach towards inter-layer parallelism. TorchGPipe [25] provides a load balancing algorithm that seeks to balance the net execution time of the forward and backward pass of a micro-batch on each GPU. However, their algorithm ignores the communication overhead of exchanging tensors across GPU boundaries. Megatron divides the layers of a transformer across GPUs, which is optimal because all the layers of a transformer are identical. ZeRO also provides an identical strategy that divides the layers equally across GPUs. Additionally, they also support a load balancing algorithm that equalizes GPU memory consumption across GPUs. AxoNN [56] introduced a novel asynchronous communication backend for inter-layer parallelism. To the best of our knowledge this is the first work that utilizes asynchrony for increasing hardware utilization by opting for MPI instead of NCCL. They also introduce a memory optimization algorithm that they use to decrease the pipeline depth, increase data parallelism and outperform the state-of-art by 15%-25% on models with as many as 100 billion parameters.

Table 2: System information about the HPC platforms used for the experiments.

System	No. of Nodes	CPU	Cores/ node	GPU	GPUs/ node	CPU Mem. / Node (GB)	GPU Mem. / Node (GB)	GPU FP64 Peak (TFlop/s)
Lassen	795	IBM Power9	44	NVIDIA V100	4	256	64	7.0
ThetaGPU	24	AMD Rome	64	NVIDIA A100	8	1024	320	9.7

3.3.2 Pipelining without Flushing. In this approach the number of mini-batches active in the system is kept constant. As soon as a mini-batch finishes its backward pass on the first GPU a new mini-batch is injected into the system to maintain full pipeline occupancy. Unlike pipelining with flushing, weight updates on a GPU take place as soon as it is done with the backward pass of a mini-batch. This method of pipelining seeks to increase hardware utilization by removing flushing induced bubbles in the pipeline. However, statistical efficiency of such a training algorithm reduces drastically. This is due to a problem called weight staleness that occurs when newer mini-batches in a pipeline encounter stale weights in forward passes which are yet to be updated with the backward pass of older mini-batches. This is one of the major reasons why pipelining without flushing has not seen widespread adoption. PipeDream [39] is a framework that implements pipelining without flushing. It employs an algorithm called weight stashing to counter weight staleness. We refer the reader to their paper for exact details of the implementation. Chen et al. [5] suggest predicting future weights from stale weights using a variant of SGD with momentum [44]. PipeDream additionally proposes a static load balancing algorithm that is communication aware. It instruments each layer and uses the profiling data in its load balancer. Their framework also has an additional provision to replicate compute-intensive layers across GPUs to increase their throughput. Replicated layers synchronize their gradients via all-reduce after each backward pass.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section we present a detailed overview of our empirical evaluation of a number of parallel deep learning frameworks.

4.1 Choice of Frameworks

We use DDP² [31], ZeRO³ [46], Megatron⁴ [54], PipeDream⁵ [39], TorchGPipe⁶ [25], LBANN⁷ [16], and AxoNN⁸ [56] for our empirical analysis. For Megatron we profile its implementations of data-parallelism and intra-layer parallel implementations separately. We refer to these as Megatron-data and Megatron-intra respectively. This subset is representative of the three types of parallelism discussed in Section 3. We select frameworks which have open-source implementations, are easy to setup, and have a relatively large user-base. We also tried to include MeshTensorFlow [53] and FlexFlow [22] in our set of frameworks. However, despite our best

efforts we could not set them up successfully for experimentation on our machines.

To prevent dataloading from being a bottleneck we copy training datasets into node-local SSDs before training. Data is loaded using PyTorch’s distributed data loader with several worker processes. We defaulted to four processes, separate from the main process, to read in data. MegatronLM implements their own data loaders, which we used with Megatron rather than PyTorch’s. In practice we found these to be much faster than the default PyTorch data loaders.

For a fair performance evaluation of each framework we used mixed precision on the V100 and A100 cards on Lassen and ThetaGPU [38]. Of the frameworks we ran DDP, Megatron, LBANN, and ZeRO were the only ones that supported mixed precision with distributed training.

All of the listed frameworks use Pytorch 1.8.0, CUDA 11.0, and CuDNN 8.0 for launching computation on GPUs. For inter-GPU communication, PipeDream uses the gloo communication library shipped with Pytorch 1.8.0, whereas all of the other frameworks use NCCL 2.7.8.

4.2 System Hardware

Table 2 describes the systems and hardware used in our training. Lassen is an IBM machine at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory with a Mellanox network. It currently sits at number 26 on the Top500 list. ThetaGPU is a GPU extension of the Cray XC40 Theta system.

Each system was selected to be representative of typical machines used for DL training. Lassen is similar to other leadership HPC systems with GPU-dense nodes. The ThetaGPU extension of Theta with dense A100 nodes is more typical of current cutting edge AI machines.

4.3 Datasets and Neural Networks

We evaluate the aforementioned subset of frameworks on two popular deep learning tasks: image classification and language modeling. For the former task we use The ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge (ILSVRC) 2012 dataset [51]. This dataset has been widely used to train large state of the art image classification neural networks throughout the last decade. It consists of more than a million RGB images of dimension 224x224 evenly divided across 1000 image classes. We use this dataset to train the VGG-16 [55] architecture on our selected subset of frameworks. Language modeling is an unsupervised learning task wherein models are trained to predict the next word in a sentence given all of the previously occurring words. We use the Wikitext-103 [37] dataset for our language modeling training workloads. This dataset is comprised of more than 28000 articles from the English Wikipedia amounting to

²[@1.8.0](https://github.com/pytorch/pytorch)

³[@0.3.13](https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed)

⁴[@2.3](https://github.com/NVIDIA/Megatron-LM)

⁵[@00931df](https://github.com/siddharth9820/pipedream)

⁶[@a1b4ee2](https://github.com/kakaobrain/torchpipe)

⁷[@0.101](https://github.com/LLNL/lbann)

⁸[@db1c6a0](https://github.com/hpcgroup/axonn/)

Table 3: Training datasets and network hyperparameters used for benchmarking in the paper

Dataset	Training Split Size	Validation Split Size	Network	Mini-Batch Size per GPU	Optimizer ^{†‡}	Learning Rate	No. of Epochs	L2 Decay
ImageNet	1,281,167	50,000	VGG-16	64 [†]	SGD [†]	0.01 [†]	90 [†]	0.0001 [†]
Wikitext-103	103,227,021	217,646	GPT2-medium	32 ^{**}	LAMB [*]	0.001 [*]	100 ^{**}	0.01 [*]

* Values directly taken from MLPerf

** Values defined as unconstrained in MLPerf

† Values directly taken from torchvision - <https://github.com/pytorch/vision/tree/master/references/classification>

†† For ZeRO, we use the Adam optimizer with 0.001 learning rate and 0.01 l2 decay as it's memory optimizations only work with Adam

a total of 100 million English words. Language modeling has gained immense popularity recently in NLP for training extremely large neural networks. Researchers have achieved stellar performance with these models in a variety of downstream tasks like question answering, textual entailment, translation, reading comprehension, etc... We train the GPT-2-medium architecture proposed by OpenAI in their paper [45] on the Wikitext-103 [37] dataset. Table 3 provides an overview of the datasets used across our experiments.

4.3.1 Hyperparameters. The epoch execution times and statistical efficiency of a training algorithm are very sensitive to the choice of hyperparameters. Learning rate schedules, optimizer choices and weight decay values can have a large impact on the statistical efficiency. Larger mini-batch sizes reduce epoch execution times at the expense of statistical efficiency.

Hyperparameters were chosen based on corresponding MLPerf [35] benchmarks, which are a standard means of comparison for DL training. Because of this we keep the parameters fixed between frameworks. For parameters not included in the MLPerf description we choose them based on the values given in their respective papers. We ensure that training with our hyperparameters gives us reasonable performance on the validation set. Table 3 provides an overview of the hyperparameters applied to each model. It is possible further tuning could improve the performance and/or statistical efficiencies.

For efficient scaling to larger GPU counts, data parallel algorithms typically use a fixed mini-batch size per GPU to maintain a constant computational workload per GPU. Thus, to ensure a fair comparison of other frameworks with DDP, AxoNN, ZeRO, LBANN and Megatron-data we do the following for each framework:

- Megatron-intra - We linearly scale the mini-batch size with increasing number of GPUs.
- TorchGPipe - We fix the size of a micro-batch and set the number of micro-batches to 4 times that of the GPU count.
- PipeDream - We fix the size of a mini-batch. PipeDream ensures constant computational workload on each GPU by increasing it's pipeline limit automatically.

4.4 Exceptions

We make the following exceptions to the experimental setups listed above. We only show results for PipeDream on a subset of the GPUs due to the framework deadlocking on higher GPU counts. We only show results for TorchGPipe upto 8 GPUs on ThetaGPU and 4 GPUs on Lassen as it is only applicable to a single node. We only show

results for LBANN on Lassen as we had difficulties building the framework on ThetaGPU. Likewise, we only show AxoNN results on Lassen due to jobs not finishing on ThetaGPU.

4.5 Evaluation Metrics

For our analysis we use metrics that matter the most to a deep learning researcher - epoch execution times, statistical efficiency, and GPU memory consumption. Statistically efficient training algorithms or frameworks require less number of epochs to reach a certain target accuracy on the validation data. When comparing parallel DL frameworks it is absolutely imperative to compare both the epoch execution times and statistical efficiency of the training runs. We have discussed the tradeoffs that parallel DL algorithms incur between these two metrics in Section 3.

We profile epoch execution times on 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32 and 64 GPUs on Lassen and ThetaGPU. While profiling the statistical efficiency for a particular framework, we use the GPU count where it has the minimum epoch execution times. For gathering memory utilization data we use 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32 and 64 GPUs on ThetaGPU. Table 3 and Table 2 gives an overview of the neural networks and machines we used for evaluating these metrics.

To measure the statistical efficiency we record the accuracy and loss for the vision tasks and perplexity for the language tasks. Loss is the output of the loss function used for training. Its magnitude depends on its definition, but the training loss should decrease towards zero as the model improves in predictive capacity. Accuracy measures the ratio of samples accurately predicted to total samples. We use the validation accuracy, which is calculated based on samples exclusive to the training set. Perplexity is commonly used in NLP to measure how well a model predicts for a certain corpus based on the cross-entropy of the model. It is defined as the exponential of the cross entropy loss on the dataset.

5 COMPARATIVE EVALUATION

In this section we present and discuss the results from our experiments on epoch execution times, statistical efficiency, and memory utilization.

5.1 Execution Time Comparison

We first look at the baseline performance of each framework. Figure 4 presents the sequential single GPU execution times on the two neural networks on Lassen. In this test TorchGPipe performs the




Figure 4: Comparison of single GPU performance and 4 GPU speedup on Lassen for VGG-16 and GPT2-medium. The labels list the speedup of each framework relative to their own 1 GPU performance.

worst on both VGG-16 and GPT2-medium by up to 1.8x and 5.2x, respectively. We also observe PipeDream is the second slowest framework. The single GPU performances differ significantly largely due to these two not supporting mixed precision. The difference is exacerbated for extremely compute intensive neural networks like the GPT2-medium.

While Megatron, DDP, ZeRO and AxoNN employ mixed precision, Megatron is considerably faster as it uses its own optimized implementation of the transformer encoder layer and Adam optimizer. Figure 4 exemplifies this, where we observe a 2x speedup on a single GPU over the native PyTorch kernel used by DDP and ZeRO. The PyTorch implementation performs worse due to its handling of the computationally intensive final softmax layer in GPT2-medium. While DDP and AxoNN compute this layer in full precision, ZeRO’s mixed precision strategy computes this layer in half precision, leading to the difference in performance between the two.

Out of all the frameworks TorchGPipe has the worst single GPU performance. This is because micro-batching provides no performance benefits as operations of different minibatches are serialized on a single GPU. It however does save memory used for stashing activations during the forward pass. We discuss this in Section 5.3.

Figure 5 shows the time spent by each framework in the forward pass, backward pass, and I/O for GPT2-medium on ThetaGPU. We observe a marked improvement in Megatron’s I/O performance due to its custom data loaders (see Section 4.1), however, these are a negligible part of the overall time per iteration. Across all frameworks, we see that the backward pass is more computationally intensive than the forward pass. This is because for each layer we not only compute the gradients for its parameters but also for its input activations which need to be backpropagated to previous layers.

Single GPU profiles in the figure also highlight the difference in the absolute computation time of the forward and backward passes for these frameworks. It further supports our above explanation for the differences in sequential performance in Figure 4.




Figure 5: Breakdown of time spent in training on 1, 2, 4, and 8 GPUs of ThetaGPU for GPT2-medium. We use NVIDIA’s NVTX SDK for annotating events and Nsight Systems for instrumentation. Megatron refers to Megatron-intra.

Figures 6 and 7 detail the results from the performance tests on each machine. We present number of seconds per epoch for each neural network as the GPU count increases from 1 to 64.

Across both machines and neural networks we observe two separate trends amongst the frameworks. First, DDP, ZeRO, LBANN, AxoNN and Megatron-data all perform similarly with only constant deviations from each other. Second, PipeDream and TorchGPipe are slower, more erratic, and scale worse than the others. Third, Megatron-intra’s speedup seems to plateau when we try to scale it across multiple nodes.

Within this first trend we observe that ZeRO’s performance trends the same as DDP and AxoNN with only 10-15% difference in absolute run time. These variations can be attributed to the different mixed precision implementations and ZeRO’s memory optimizations. As noted previously in Section 3.1.2, ZeRO reduces the per GPU memory footprint of data parallelism at the expense of added communication. However, we see that this communication overhead scales the same as standard DDP.

It is immediately apparent that these data parallel approaches strongly outperform the other frameworks in scaling. This is notably due to the embarrassingly parallel workload in data parallelism when the entire model fits within GPU memory. We also see an expected slight reduction in speedup on Lassen and ThetaGPU (shown in Figure 4) for data parallelism as the number of GPUs surpassed that of a single node. This happens as the all-reduce communication now occurs outside the fast intra-node NVLink and has to use the system network. This is a negligible issue due to how much better the data parallel algorithms scale.

Due to the lack of mixed precision support, PipeDream and TorchGPipe have the largest epoch execution times at all GPU counts across all machines. PipeDream seems to scale erratically relative to its own single GPU execution. The poor scaling can be attributed to two factors. Firstly, PipeDream uses the relatively slow Gloo library as its communication backend. Secondly, erratic scaling is usually a sign of load imbalance. Our experiments show that their communication-aware load balancing algorithm does not perform satisfactorily in practice.




Figure 6: Performance results on Lassen for VGG-16 and GPT2-medium.




Figure 7: Performance results on ThetaGPU for VGG-16 and GPT2-medium.

Along with these two major trends we also observe that Megatron-intra plateaus once it runs on multiple nodes. For larger GPU counts it scales worse than DDP, ZeRO and AxoNN. We observed that the communication overhead of Megatron-intra increases rapidly with increasing number of GPUs, ultimately reaching 52.5% of the total execution time on 16 GPUs. Based on our observations we recommend that researchers who wish to train large transformer models on language modeling task use Megatron-intra for their single GPU sequential implementations. If the model surpasses the memory capacity of a single GPU, we recommend employing Megatron’s intra-layer parallelism to fit the model inside the GPUs of a single node. Scaling to large GPU counts should be done by integrating Megatron’s intra-layer parallelism with data parallelism.

5.2 Statistical Efficiency

Figure 8 illustrates the results of our statistical efficiency experiments. Following standard practice we measure the validation accuracy and perplexity at each epoch for the image classification and language modeling tasks respectively. We report the epoch number as well as the total training time. On observing the performance of PipeDream on both the tasks it is apparent that weight staleness is a huge roadblock in the path of algorithms that seek to implement pipelining without flushing. PipeDream’s proposed weight stashing approach does not mitigate this problem satisfactorily. ZeRO, DDP and LBANN exhibit near identical validation curves. The slight

variations in the validation curves are likely due to differences in the mixed precision implementations in these frameworks. TorchGPipe and Megatron-intra exhibit greater statistical efficiencies than the data parallel frameworks on the language modeling task. We attribute the fast convergence of these frameworks due to their training runs being carried out on a small GPU count. The data parallel frameworks being trained at 64 GPUs take a slight hit in their convergence speeds due to the problem of increase effective mini-batch sizes that we highlighted in Section 3.1.3.

Figure 8 further details how the accuracies and perplexities behave over time rather than epoch. PipeDream is much slower to accuracies than the other frameworks. Such a figure presents a combined picture of the statistical efficiency and epoch execution times of a framework. We argue that plotting validation metrics against epoch times is the best way to evaluate the performance of any distributed deep learning framework. It also clearly demonstrates the superiority of data parallelism over other classes of parallel deep learning algorithms.

5.3 Memory Utilization

Figure 9 details the per GPU memory usage of each framework during the training tasks. ZeRO, while having similar performance and scaling to DDP, had between 42% and 66% of the memory footprint. We also see this improving as more GPUs are added




Figure 8: Validation performance by time for training VGG-16 and GPT2-medium on ThetaGPU. Epoch numbers are shown in labels.




Figure 9: Memory consumption by different frameworks on ThetaGPU for GPT2-medium.

similar to the layer parallel runs, while DDP remains fixed as it simply duplicates the models across GPUs.

The pipelining implementations both experienced over 2x better memory usage with more resources. More of the models were able to be partitioned amongst the GPUs. However, the memory savings begin to plateau as more GPUs are added since increase in the activation memory due to increasing batch sizes balances out the decrease in parameter memory.

The U-shaped per GPU memory curve of Megatron can be attributed to the inner workings of their intra-layer parallelism implementation. While the computation of a transformer layer is divided across multiple GPUs, the output of the last layer needs to be present in its entirety on every GPU. Since the per GPU mini-batch size is fixed the memory occupied by the input for any layer on each GPU increases linearly with an increase in GPU count. At lower GPU counts this increase is offset by the decrease in parameter memory due to the division of the layer computation across GPUs. After a while, however, the decrease is not enough to completely offset the increasing input activation memory.

6 CONCLUSION

The increasing size of contemporary neural network architectures has necessitated the development of efficient algorithms for parallelizing neural networks. The performance of parallel training of neural networks is heavily dependent on the algorithm, implementation, hyperparameters, and hardware used. In this paper we provide a comprehensive survey of parallel deep learning frameworks that have demonstrated scaling on parallel systems. We use two dataset-network combinations to study various properties of parallel deep learning frameworks such as scalability, memory requirements, and statistical efficiency as a function of performance.

Our benchmarking studies presents some interesting observations. When the entire model can fit within a single GPU, it is best to use data parallel approaches as they perform and scale well. In memory constrained environments, ZeRO [46] can save us a decent amount of memory. Their memory optimizations only add substantial cost to the computation for non-transformer models. For saving more memory we recommend using intra or inter-layer parallelism to deploy a model across a few number of GPUs and then scale it in a hybrid fashion with data parallelism.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek G. Murray, Benoit Steiner, Paul Tucker, Vijay Vasudevan, Pete Warden, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. 2016. TensorFlow: A System for Large-Scale Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (Savannah, GA, USA) (OSDI'16)*. USENIX Association, USA, 265–283.
- [2] A. A. Awan, A. Jain, C. Chu, H. Subramoni, and D. K. Panda. 2020. Communication Profiling and Characterization of Deep-Learning Workloads on Clusters With High-Performance Interconnects. *IEEE Micro* 40, 1 (2020), 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MM.2019.2949986>
- [3] Tal Ben-Nun and Torsten Hoefler. 2019. Demystifying Parallel and Distributed Deep Learning: An In-Depth Concurrency Analysis. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 52, 4, Article 65 (Aug. 2019), 43 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3320060>
- [4] Abhinav Bhatle, Andrew R. Titus, Jayaraman J. Thiagarajan, Nikhil Jain, Todd Gamblin, Peer-Timo Bremer, Martin Schulz, and Laxmikant V. Kale. 2015. Identifying the Culprits behind Network Congestion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS '15)*. IEEE Computer Society. <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2015.92>
- [5] Chi-Chung Chen, Chia-Lin Yang, and Hsiang-Yun Cheng. 2019. Efficient and Robust Parallel DNN Training through Model Parallelism on Multi-GPU Platform.

- arXiv:1809.02839 [cs.DC]
- [6] Jianmin Chen, Rajat Monga, Samy Bengio, and Rafal Jozefowicz. 2016. Revisiting Distributed Synchronous SGD. In *International Conference on Learning Representations Workshop Track*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1604.00981>
 - [7] Y. Chen, J. Emer, and V. Sze. 2016. Eyeriss: A Spatial Architecture for Energy-Efficient Dataflow for Convolutional Neural Networks. In *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 367–379. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2016.40>
 - [8] Y. Chen, T. Krishna, J. S. Emer, and V. Sze. 2017. Eyeriss: An Energy-Efficient Reconfigurable Accelerator for Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* 52, 1 (2017), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSSC.2016.2616357>
 - [9] Sharan Chetlur, Cliff Woolley, Philippe Vandermersch, Jonathan Cohen, John Tran, Bryan Catanzaro, and Evan Shelhamer. 2014. cuDNN: Efficient Primitives for Deep Learning. *CoRR abs/1410.0759* (2014). arXiv:1410.0759 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.0759>
 - [10] Trishul Chilimbi, Yutaka Suzue, Johnson Apacible, and Karthik Kalyanaram. 2014. Project Adam: Building an Efficient and Scalable Deep Learning Training System. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*. USENIX Association, Broomfield, CO, 571–582. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/chilimbi>
 - [11] Adam Coates, Brody Huval, Tao Wang, David Wu, Bryan Catanzaro, and Ng Andrew. 2013. Deep learning with COTS HPC systems (*Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 28*), Sanjoy Dasgupta and David McAllester (Eds.). PMLR, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1337–1345. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v28/coates13.html>
 - [12] Jeffrey Dean, Greg S. Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Quoc V. Le, Mark Z. Mao, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, Ke Yang, and Andrew Y. Ng. 2012. Large Scale Distributed Deep Networks. In *NIPS*.
 - [13] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
 - [14] Nikoli Dryden, Naoya Maruyama, Tim Moon, Tom Benson, Marc Snir, and Brian Van Essen. 2019. Channel and Filter Parallelism for Large-Scale CNN Training. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Denver, Colorado) (SC ’19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 10, 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295500.3356207>
 - [15] Nikoli Dryden, Naoya Maruyama, Tim Moon, Tom Benson, Marc Snir, and Brian Van Essen. 2019. Channel and Filter Parallelism for Large-Scale CNN Training. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Denver, Colorado) (SC ’19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 10, 20 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295500.3356207>
 - [16] Brian Van Essen, Hyojin Kim, Roger A. Pearce, Kofi Boakye, and Barry Chen. 2015. LBANN: livermore big artificial neural network HPC toolkit. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Machine Learning in High-Performance Computing Environments, MLHPC 2015, Austin, Texas, USA, November 15, 2015*. ACM, 5:1–5:6. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2834892.2834897>
 - [17] Priya Goyal, Piotr Dollár, Ross B. Girshick, Pieter Noordhuis, Lukasz Wesolowski, Aapo Kyrola, Andrew Tulloch, Yangqing Jia, and Kaiming He. 2017. Accurate, Large Minibatch SGD: Training ImageNet in 1 Hour. *CoRR abs/1706.02677* (2017). arXiv:1706.02677 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.02677>
 - [18] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, and zhifeng Chen. 2019. GPipe: Efficient Training of Giant Neural Networks using Pipeline Parallelism. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/093f65e080a295f8076b1c5722a46aa2-Paper.pdf>
 - [19] Tanzima Z. Islam, Jayaraman J. Thiagarajan, Abhinav Bhatel, Martin Schulz, and Todd Gamblin. 2016. A Machine Learning Framework for Performance Coverage Analysis of Proxy Applications. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC ’16)*. IEEE Computer Society. <http://doi.ieeeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/SC.2016.45>
 - [20] Arpan Jain, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Asmaa M. Aljuhani, Jahanzeb Maqbool Hashmi, Quentin G. Anthony, Hari Subramoni, Dhableswar K. Panda, Raghu Machiraju, and Anil Parwani. 2020. GEMS: GPU-Enabled Memory-Aware Model-Parallelism System for Distributed DNN Training. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Atlanta, Georgia) (SC ’20)*. IEEE Press, Article 45, 15 pages.
 - [21] Nikhil Jain, Abhinav Bhatel, Michael P. Robson, Todd Gamblin, and Laxmikant V. Kale. 2013. Predicting application performance using supervised learning on communication features. In *ACM/IEEE International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC ’13)*. IEEE Computer Society.
 - [22] Zhihao Jia, Matei Zaharia, and Alex Aiken. 2019. Beyond Data and Model Parallelism for Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, A. Talwalkar, V. Smith, and M. Zaharia (Eds.), Vol. 1, 1–13. <https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper/2019/file/c74d97b01eae257e44aa9d5bade97baf-Paper.pdf>
 - [23] Sheng-Chun Kao and Tushar Krishna. 2020. GAMMA: Automating the HW Mapping of DNN Models on Accelerators via Genetic Algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (Virtual Event, USA) (ICCAD ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 44, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400302.3415639>
 - [24] Jehadad Khan, Paul Fultz, Artem Tamazov, Daniel Lowell, Chao Liu, Michael Melesse, Murali Nandhimandalam, Kamil Nasyrov, Ilya Perminov, Tejash Shah, Vasiliy Filippov, Jing Zhang, Jing Zhou, Bragadeesh Natarajan, and Mayank Daga. 2019. MIOpen: An Open Source Library For Deep Learning Primitives. arXiv:1910.00078 [cs.LG]
 - [25] Chiheon Kim, Heungsub Lee, Myungryong Jeong, Woonhyuk Baek, Boegeon Yoon, Ildoo Kim, Sungbin Lim, and Sungwoong Kim. 2020. torchgpipe: On-the-fly Pipeline Parallelism for Training Giant Models. (2020). arXiv:2004.09910
 - [26] D. Kim, J. Kung, S. Chai, S. Yalamanchili, and S. Mukhopadhyay. 2016. Neurocube: A Programmable Digital Neuromorphic Architecture with High-Density 3D Memory. In *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 380–392. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2016.41>
 - [27] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (Eds.). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>
 - [28] Alexander Kolesnikov, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohua Zhai, Joan Puigcerver, Jessica Yung, Sylvain Gelly, and Neil Houlsby. 2020. Big Transfer (BiT): General Visual Representation Learning. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 491–507.
 - [29] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2017. ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. *Commun. ACM* 60, 6 (May 2017), 84–90. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3065386>
 - [30] H. Kwon, P. Chatarasi, V. Sarkar, T. Krishna, M. Pellauer, and A. Parashar. 2020. MAESTRO: A Data-Centric Approach to Understand Reuse, Performance, and Hardware Cost of DNN Mappings. *IEEE Micro* 40, 3 (2020), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MM.2020.2985963>
 - [31] Shen Li, Yanli Zhao, Rohan Varma, Omkar Salpekar, Pieter Noordhuis, Teng Li, Adam Paszke, Jeff Smith, Brian Vaughan, Pritam Damania, and Soumith Chintala. 2020. PyTorch Distributed: Experiences on Accelerating Data Parallel Training. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 12 (Aug. 2020), 3005–3018. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3415478.3415530>
 - [32] X. Lu, H. Shi, R. Biswas, M. H. Javed, and D. K. Panda. 2018. DLoBD: A Comprehensive Study of Deep Learning over Big Data Stacks on HPC Clusters. *IEEE Transactions on Multi-Scale Computing Systems* 4, 4 (2018), 635–648. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMSCS.2018.2845886>
 - [33] Yufei Ma, Yu Cao, Sarma Vrudhula, and Jae-seun Seo. 2017. Optimizing Loop Operation and Dataflow in FPGA Acceleration of Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays (Monterey, California, USA) (FPGA ’17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3020078.3021736>
 - [34] Aniruddha Marathe, Rushil Anirudh, Nikhil Jain, Abhinav Bhatel, Jayaraman Thiagarajan, Bhavya Kailkhura, Jae-Seung Yeom, Barry Rountree, and Todd Gamblin. 2017. Performance Modeling under Resource Constraints Using Deep Transfer Learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC ’17)*. IEEE Computer Society. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3126908.3126969>
 - [35] Peter Mattson, Christine Cheng, Cody Coleman, Greg Diamos, Paulius Micekevicius, David A. Patterson, Hanlin Tang, Gu-Yeon Wei, Peter Bailis, Victor Bittorf, David Brooks, Dehao Chen, Debojyoti Dutta, Udit Gupta, Kim M. Hazelwood, Andrew Hock, Xinyuan Huang, Bill Jia, Daniel Kang, David Kanter, Naveen Kumar, Jeffery Liao, Guokai Ma, Deepak Narayanan, Tayo Oguntebi, Gennady Pekhimenko, Lillian Pentecost, Vijay Janapa Reddi, Taylor Robie, Tom St. John, Carole-Jean Wu, Lingjie Xu, Cliff Young, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. MLPerf Training Benchmark. *CoRR abs/1910.01500* (2019). arXiv:1910.01500 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01500>
 - [36] Harshitha Menon, Abhinav Bhatel, and Todd Gamblin. 2020. Auto-Tuning Parameter Choices using Bayesian Optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS ’20)*. IEEE Computer Society.
 - [37] Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. 2016. Pointer Sentinel Mixture Models. *CoRR abs/1609.07843* (2016). arXiv:1609.07843 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.07843>

- [38] Paulius Micekevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory Diamos, Erich Elsen, David Garcia, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, and Hao Wu. 2018. Mixed Precision Training. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1gs9JgRZ>
- [39] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil Devanur, Greg Granger, Phil Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. PipeDream: Generalized Pipeline Parallelism for DNN Training. In *ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 2019)*. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/pipedream-generalized-pipeline-parallelism-for-dnn-training/>
- [40] Giannis Nikolentzos, Antoine Tixier, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2020. Message Passing Attention Networks for Document Understanding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 05 (Apr. 2020), 8544–8551. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i05.6376>
- [41] Yosuke Oyama, Naoya Maruyama, Nikoli Dryden, Erin McCarthy, Peter Harrington, Jan Balewski, Satoshi Matsuoka, Peter Nugent, and Brian Van Essen. 2020. The Case for Strong Scaling in Deep Learning: Training Large 3D CNNs with Hybrid Parallelism. [arXiv:2007.12856](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.12856) [cs.DC]
- [42] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/bdbca288fee7f92f2bfa9f7012727740-Paper.pdf>
- [43] Samira Pouyanfar, Saad Sadiq, Yilin Yan, Haiman Tian, Yudong Tao, Maria Presa Reyes, Mei-Ling Shyu, Shu-Ching Chen, and S. S. Iyengar. 2018. A Survey on Deep Learning: Algorithms, Techniques, and Applications. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 51, 5, Article 92 (Sept. 2018), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3234150>
- [44] Ning Qian. 1999. On the momentum term in gradient descent learning algorithms. *Neural Networks* 12, 1 (1999), 145–151. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080\(98\)00116-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0893-6080(98)00116-6)
- [45] Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. (2019).
- [46] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. ZeRO: Memory Optimizations toward Training Trillion Parameter Models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Atlanta, Georgia) (SC '20)*. IEEE Press, Article 20, 16 pages.
- [47] Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, Jeff Rasley, Shaden Smith, and Yuxiong He. 2021. ZeRO-Infinity: Breaking the GPU Memory Wall for Extreme Scale Deep Learning (SC '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 59, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458817.3476205>
- [48] Esteban Real, Alok Aggarwal, Yanping Huang, and Quoc V. Le. 2019. Regularized Evolution for Image Classifier Architecture Search. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33, 01 (Jul. 2019), 4780–4789. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33014780>
- [49] Benjamin Recht, Christopher Re, Stephen Wright, and Feng Niu. 2011. Hogwild!: A Lock-Free Approach to Parallelizing Stochastic Gradient Descent. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Q. Weinberger (Eds.), Vol. 24. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2011/file/218a0aef1d1a4be65601cc6ddc1520e-Paper.pdf>
- [50] Minsoo Rhu, Natalia Gimelshein, Jason Clemons, Arslan Zulfiqar, and Stephen W. Keckler. 2016. VDNN: Virtualized Deep Neural Networks for Scalable, Memory-Efficient Neural Network Design. In *The 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Taipei, Taiwan) (MICRO-49)*. IEEE Press, Article 18, 13 pages.
- [51] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)* 115, 3 (2015), 211–252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11263-015-0816-y>
- [52] Alexander Sergeev and Mike Del Balso. 2018. Horovod: fast and easy distributed deep learning in TensorFlow. [arXiv:1802.05799](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.05799) [cs.LG]
- [53] Noam Shazeer, Youlong Cheng, Niki Parmar, Dustin Tran, Ashish Vaswani, Penporn Koanantakool, Peter Hawkins, HyoukJoong Lee, Mingsheng Hong, Cliff Young, Ryan Sepassi, and Blake Hechtman. 2018. Mesh-TensorFlow: Deep Learning for Supercomputers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 31. Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2018/file/3a37abdeef1dab1b30f7c5c7e581b93-Paper.pdf>
- [54] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2020. Megatron-LM: Training Multi-Billion Parameter Language Models Using Model Parallelism. [arXiv:1909.08053](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08053) [cs.CL]
- [55] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. 2015. Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (Eds.). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.1556>
- [56] Siddharth Singh and Abhinav Bhatel. 2022 (to appear). AxiNN: An asynchronous, message-driven parallel framework for extreme-scale deep learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS '22)*. IEEE Computer Society.
- [57] L. Song, J. Mao, Y. Zhuo, X. Qian, H. Li, and Y. Chen. 2019. HyPar: Towards Hybrid Parallelism for Deep Learning Accelerator Array. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA.2019.00027>
- [58] Michel Steuwer, Toomas Rimmelg, and Christophe Dubach. 2017. Lift: A Functional Data-Parallel IR for High-Performance GPU Code Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (Austin, USA) (CGO '17)*. IEEE Press, 74–85.
- [59] V. Sze, Y. Chen, T. Yang, and J. S. Emer. 2017. Efficient Processing of Deep Neural Networks: A Tutorial and Survey. *Proc. IEEE* 105, 12 (2017), 2295–2329. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JPROC.2017.2761740>
- [60] Zhenheng Tang, Shaohuai Shi, Xiaowen Chu, Wei Wang, and Bo Li. 2020. Communication-Efficient Distributed Deep Learning: A Comprehensive Survey. [arXiv:2003.06307](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06307) [cs.DC]
- [61] Andrew Tao, Karan Sapra, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2020. Hierarchical Multi-Scale Attention for Semantic Segmentation. [arXiv:2003.06307](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06307) [cs.CV]
- [62] Jayaraman J. Thiagarajan, Rushil Anirudh, Bhavya Kailkhura, Nikhil Jain, Tanzima Islam, Abhinav Bhatel, Jae-Seung Yeom, and Todd Gamblin. 2018. PADDLE: Performance Analysis using a Data-driven Learning Environment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS '18)*. IEEE Computer Society. <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2018.00088>
- [63] Jayaraman J. Thiagarajan, Nikhil Jain, Rushil Anirudh, Alfredo Giménez, Rahul Sridhar, Aniruddha Marathe, Tao Wang, Murali Emani, Abhinav Bhatel, and Todd Gamblin. 2018. Bootstrapping Parameter Space Exploration for Fast Tuning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '18)*. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3205289.3205321>
- [64] Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Susanna Ricco, Cordelia Schmid, Rahul Sukthankar, and Katerina Fragkiadaki. 2017. SfM-Net: Learning of Structure and Motion from Video. [arXiv:1704.07804](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.07804) [cs.CV]
- [65] Mohamed Wahib, Haoyu Zhang, Truong Thao Nguyen, Aleksandr Drozd, Jens Domke, Lingqi Zhang, Ryousei Takano, and Satoshi Matsuoka. 2020. Scaling Distributed Deep Learning Workloads beyond the Memory Capacity with KARMA. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (Atlanta, Georgia) (SC '20)*. IEEE Press, Article 19, 15 pages.
- [66] Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V. Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, Jeff Klingner, Apurva Shah, Melvin Johnson, Xiaobing Liu, Lukasz Kaiser, Stephan Gouws, Yoshikiyo Kato, Taku Kudo, Hideto Kazawa, Keith Stevens, George Kurian, Nishant Patil, Wei Wang, Cliff Young, Jason Smith, Jason Riesa, Alex Rudnick, Oriol Vinyals, Greg Corrado, Macduff Hughes, and Jeffrey Dean. 2016. Google's Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the Gap between Human and Machine Translation. *CoRR abs/1609.08144* (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.08144>
- [67] Jae-Seung Yeom, Jayaraman J. Thiagarajan, Abhinav Bhatel, Greg Bronevetsky, and Tzanio Kolev. 2016. Data-dependent Performance Modeling of Linear Solvers for Sparse Matrices. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop in Performance Modeling, Benchmarking and Simulation of High Performance Computer Systems (PMBS '16)*.
- [68] Yang You, Igor Gitman, and Boris Ginsburg. 2017. Large Batch Training of Convolutional Networks. [arXiv:1708.03888](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.03888) [cs.CV]
- [69] Yang You, Jing Li, Sashank Reddi, Jonathan Hseu, Sanjiv Kumar, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Xiaodan Song, James Demmel, Kurt Keutzer, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2019. Large Batch Optimization for Deep Learning: Training BERT in 76 minutes. [arXiv:1904.00962](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.00962) [cs.LG]
- [70] Yang You, Zhao Zhang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, James Demmel, and Kurt Keutzer. 2018. ImageNet Training in Minutes. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Conference on Parallel Processing (Eugene, OR, USA) (ICPP 2018)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3225058.3225069>
- [71] Hao Zhang, Zeyu Zheng, Shizhen Xu, Wei Dai, Qirong Ho, Xiaodan Liang, Zhiting Hu, Jinliang Wei, Pengtao Xie, and Eric P. Xing. 2017. Poseidon: An Efficient Communication Architecture for Distributed Deep Learning on GPU Clusters. In *2017 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 17)*. USENIX Association, Santa Clara, CA, 181–193. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc17/technical-sessions/presentation/zhang>
- [72] Zhong-Qiu Zhao, Peng Zheng, Shou-Tao Xu, and Xindong Wu. 2019. Object Detection With Deep Learning: A Review. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 30, 11 (2019), 3212–3232. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2018.2876865>