

---

# Cutting Down Training Memory by Re-forwarding

---

Jianwei Feng and Dong Huang

Robotics Institute

Carnegie Mellon University

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

jffeng1@andrew.cmu.edu, donghuang@cmu.edu

## Abstract

Deep Neutral Networks(DNN) require huge GPU memory when training on modern image/video databases. Unfortunately, the GPU memory is always finite, which limits the image resolution, batch size, and learning rate that could be tuned for better performances. In this paper, we propose a novel approach, called **Re-forwarding**, that substantially reduces memory usage in training. Our approach only saves the tensors at a subset of layers during the first forward, and conduct extra local forwards (the Re-forwarding process) to compute the missing tensors needed during backward. The total memory cost becomes the sum of (1) the cost at the subset of layers and (2) the maximum cost of the re-forwarding processes. We propose theories and algorithms that achieve the optimal memory solutions for DNNs with either linear or arbitrary optimization graphs. Experiments show that Re-forwarding cut down huge amount of training memory on all popular DNNs such as Alexnet, VGG net, ResNet, Densenet and Inception net.

## 1 Introduction

The standard DNN training process consists of two alternated stages: forward and backward. Fig. 1 (a) illustrates an example of feed-forward neural networks. In the forward stage, the network takes an input tensor,  $[BatchSize \times Channel \times Width \times Height]$ , and computes the tensors at each layer until producing the output. In the backward stage, difference between the output and ground truth is passed back along the network to compute the gradients at each layer. The regular training approach saves tensors at all layers during forward, because they are all needed to compute gradients during backward. The total memory cost is the sum of cost over all layers.

In popular backbone DNNs for feature extraction of images, such as AlexNet[14], VGG[23] and ResNet[11], the memory cost increases quadratically with the input image resolution and network depth. For example, given a median size input tensor of  $(32, 3, 224, 224)$ , ResNet101 requires around 5000 MB. In more challenging tasks, DNNs that detect small objects and large number of object categories require input image resolution of more than  $600 \times 600$  [19, 24, 18]. The memory issue is worse for video-based DNNs, such as CDC[22], C3D[13] and 3D-ResNet[10]. To model complex activities in video, the input tensor may contain 64 frames. Moreover, DNN training takes much more memory than testing. In order to train DNNs with large databases and big learning rate, the batch size can be up to 64. In training DNN compositions, such as Generative adversarial networks (GANs), multiple generator and discriminator networks are simultaneously stored in GPU memory.

Existing efforts to address memory issues are three main approaches: (1) Better single GPUs. Recent GPUs provide larger memory at the expense of exponentially growing price and supporting resources. For instance, from TitanXp, Quadro P6000 to Tesla V100, for 1-2.7 times increase in memory, the prices increase 2.8-8.5 times. The memory deficiency in training heavy DNNs is not practical to be solve by only adding GPUs. (2) Parallelization among multiple GPUs [9][21][15][17][16][28][2][3],




Figure 1: Regular Training Approach vs. Re-forwarding (our). (a) The regular approach saves all tensors during forward, and uses these tensors to compute gradients during backward. (b) Re-forwarding (our) saves a subset of tensors during the first forward, and conducts “Re-forward” to compute tensors for gradients during backward.

which is very expensive and do not reduce the total memory cost. (3) Low-level heuristic techniques. Optimization of computational graphs[4], which merges inplace operations into non-inplace operations to cut down memory. Liveness analysis [4], which dynamically recycles garbage tensors in training epochs. These approaches rely significantly on specific DNN structures, data and tasks.

To address the above issues, we propose a fundamental approach that explores trade-off between memory and computation power of GPUs. Note that recent affordable GPUs, although limited in memory ( 12GB), provide exceptional improvement in GPU cores and FLOPS. Trading computational time for memory is a very attractive solution that enables training very heavy DNNs with finite GPU memory. Our approach only saves tensors at a subset of layers during the first forward, and conduct only extra *local forwards* to compute the missing tensors needed during backward. We call the extra forward process as **Re-forwarding**. Now the total memory cost becomes the sum of (1) the cost at the subset of layers and (2) the maximum cost of the re-forward processes. Training with Re-forwarding, see Fig. 1 (b), leads to substantial memory reduction. We propose sophisticate theories and algorithms that achieve the optimal memory solution of *arbitrary* optimization graphs.

## 2 Related Work

To alleviate the memory pressure from a single GPU processor to multiple GPUs or clusters, many researchers focus on the well-established techniques for parallelization and distributed computation [9][21][15][17][16][28][2][3]. Although these techniques can greatly reduce memory cost on single processor, they do not reduce the total memory cost of deep learning.

Other researchers reduce the memory on a single GPU by optimizing computational graph of DNN and performing liveness analysis. The Computational graph of DNNs describes the dependencies of tensors among layers. Liveness analysis recycles garbage to manage memory. These ideas was originated from compiler optimizations [4] which make the efficient usage of memory, and has been widely adopted in deep learning frameworks: Theano[5][6], MXNet[7], Tensorflow[1] and CNTK [27]. Some other techniques attempt to efficiently swap between CPU and GPU [26][20]. These techniques usually have extra time cost and do not actually reduce the total memory.

The closest work to our approach, Chen et al. [8], uses the gradient checkpoints (similar to the subset of layers in Re-forwarding). However, they only considered linear optimization graph and gave a heuristic algorithm. Our work presents optimal solutions for both the linear and arbitrary optimization graphs. Our approach reduces memory by only manipulating high-level tensors, therefore is generalizable to any DNNs and their compositions. All other low-level techniques are compatible to our approach and can be used to further boost the performance of our approach.

## 3 Linear Optimization Graph

For easy illustration, we formulate Re-forwarding with linear optimization graphs (Fig. 2 (a)). Denote an optimization graph as  $G = (E, V)$ .  $E = \{e_i\}$  and  $V = \{v_i\}$  are the edges and vertexes in the

optimization graph, respectively. In deep neural networks, the vertexes represent the tensors and the edges represent operations. Denote function  $l(\cdot)$  as a measure of memory cost.  $V_R$  is the subset of vertexes saved during the first forward.  $l(v_i)$  is defined as the memory cost of storing vertex  $v_i$ . For two adjacent vertexes  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  in set  $V_R$ , the memory cost during re-forwarding from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  is defined as  $l(v_i, v_j) = \sum_{t=i+1}^{j-1} l(v_t)$ , which is the sum of cost over all the vertexes between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . Using these notations, the memory cost of training with re-forwarding is formulated as

$$\min_{V_R} \sum_i l(v_i) + \max_j l(v_j, v_{j+1}), \quad (1)$$

where, the first term is the sum of the cost of all the stored tensors and the second term is the maximal cost of the re-forwards. For linear optimization graphs, Eqn. 1 can be solved in two cases.




Figure 2: (a) Linear Optimization Graph. “s” denotes the start vertex, “t” denotes the end vertex. (b) Arbitrary Optimization Graph. The structure between “s” and “t” vertexes may contain arbitrary branches and connections.

### 3.1 Linear Optimization Graph with Identical Vertex Cost

Suppose a linear optimization graph has  $n$  vertexes, each of which has the same cost  $l(v_i) = \frac{1}{n}$  and the total cost is 1. Obviously, the optimal solution is reached when vertexes in  $V_R$  are distributed evenly in the linear optimization graph. Suppose the number of vertexes in  $V_R$  is  $k$ . The total cost is then  $\frac{k}{N} + \frac{1}{k}$ . The optimal solution of Eqn. 1 is  $k = \sqrt{n}$ , and the optimal total cost is  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}$ .

### 3.2 Arbitrary Linear Optimization Graph

When the assumption of identical cost does not hold, the solution to Eqn. 1 does not have an analytic form. We first study the case where the term  $\max_j l(v_j, v_{j+1})$  is a constant, and only solve for

$$\min_{V_R} \sum_i l(v_i).$$

Denote the maximal Re-forward cost as  $C$ , all the Re-forward cost in an optimal solution satisfy the constraint  $l(v_j, v_{j+1}) \leq C$ . We solve Eqn. 1 by constructing a new graph, called Accessibility Graph  $G^A = (E^A, V)$ . The edges of  $G^A$ , called Accessibility edge  $e_{ij}^A$ , exists between vertex  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  if and only if  $l(v_i, v_j) \leq C$ . Now the problem of solving  $\min_{V_R} \sum_i l(v_i)$  is equivalent to finding the shortest path from the source vertex and the target vertex in the Accessibility Graph. Notice that in the optimal solution, the max term would equal the cost of one  $l(v_i, v_{i+1})$ . To traverse all possible max terms, we can simply compute the loss of every vertex pair and use it as a possible max term. Given a max term  $C$ , suppose the actual max term of the solution under  $C$  is  $B$  and  $B < C$ . It’s obvious that for all the max terms  $B \leq \max < C$ , the solution would be the same solution. Therefore, these max terms can be skipped. **Algorithm 1** summarizes the process for searching an optimal solution.

## 4 Arbitrary Optimization Graph

As generalization of linear optimization graphs, we present theoretical<sup>1</sup> and algorithmic results for the arbitrary acyclic directed graph(Fig. 2 (b)).

---

**Algorithm 1** Linear Optimization Graph Solver
 

---

- 1: **for** each vertex pair  $(v_i, v_j)$  in  $G$  **do**
  - 2:   Set the maximal term as  $l(v_i, v_j)$
  - 3:   Construct Accessibility Graph
  - 4:   Find the shortest path in the Accessibility Graph as the solution
  - 5:   Compute the actual total cost of the solution
  - 6:   Save the solution if it's better.
  - 7:   Suppose the actual max term of this solution is  $B$ , and  $l(v_i, v_j) = C$ , skip the loops where  $B \leq l(v_i, v_j) < C$
- 




Figure 3: Close Set Examples: (a) Close set in a graph.  $v_2$  and  $v_4$  cannot form a close set because  $v_3$  depends on  $v_1$ .  $v_1$  and  $v_3$  can form a close set because  $v_2$  doesn't depend on any other vertex. (b) Close set with splitting vertex.  $v_2$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{13}$ . (c) Branched close set with 0 splitting vertex. (d) Non-branched close set with 0 splitting vertex.

#### 4.1 Definition and Theorem

**Definition 1 Close Set:** A set of vertexes and edges that start from  $v_i$  and end at  $v_j$  but doesn't include  $v_i, v_j$ .  $s_{ij} = \{v, e\}$  is called a close set such that  $\forall v_1 \in s_{ij}$ ,  $v_1$  has no edge to any  $v_2 \notin s_{ij} \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$ .  $v_i$  is the ancestor of  $\forall v \in s_{ij}$ .  $v_j$  is the descendant of  $\forall v \in s_{ij}$ . The edges of  $s_{ij}$  are all the edges between  $v_1, v_2 \in s_{ij}$ , all the edges between  $v_i$  and  $v \in s_{ij}$ , all the edges between  $v_j$  and  $v \in s_{ij}$ . The edges of  $s_{ij}$  can include or not include the edge between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . The two situations define valid but different close sets.

We define **Close Set** to describe end to end independent segment within the optimization graph. An independent segment means that the vertexes inside this segment don't have connections with other vertexes outside this segment. The close set  $s_{ij}$  is a set of edges and vertexes, starting from vertex  $v_i$  and ending at vertex  $v_j$ . For convenience of definitions and theorems, the close set  $s_{ij}$  doesn't include  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ . If  $v_i$  has an edge to  $v_j$ , there would be two valid close set: one has this edge, the other has not. We make this special case clear in this definition for the convenience of defining **Branched Close Set** in Definition 4. Figure 3 illustrate examples of Close Set. For convenience of presentation, in Definition 2, we define notations to describe whether a set has the starting and ending vertexes, just as the open and close interval.

**Definition 2**  $[s_{ij}] = s_{ij} \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$ .  $(s_{ij}) = s_{ij} \cup \{v_i\}$ .  $(s_{ij}) = s_{ij} \cup \{v_j\}$

**Theorem 1** If  $s_{ij} \cap s_{kt} \neq \emptyset$  and  $s_{ij} \not\subset s_{kt}$  and  $s_{kt} \not\subset s_{ij}$ , then  $s_{ij} \cap s_{kt} = s_{kj}$  or  $s_{ij} \cap s_{kt} = s_{it}$

Theorem 1 shows that if two close sets have non-trivial overlap, then this overlap must also be a close set starting from one of the starting vertexes of the close sets and ending at one of the ending vertexes of the close sets. This property is important in the way that it guarantees there's no weird overlap between two close sets. Close sets overlap in the way similar to line segments, as shown in Fig. 4

**Definition 3 Splitting Vertex:** A vertex  $v_t \in s_{ij}$  is a splitting vertex of  $s_{ij}$  if and only if  $s_{it}$  exists,  $s_{tj}$  exists and  $s_{ij} = s_{it} \cup s_{tj} \cup \{v_t\}$  and  $s_{it} \cap s_{tj} = \emptyset$

The definition of Splitting Vertex is to describe whether a close set can be decomposed into two linearly arranged close set. If a close set has 0 splitting vertex, it's unable to be decomposed linearly.

---

<sup>1</sup>All proofs of Theorems are in the supplementary material due to space limitation.




Figure 4: (a) Example of **Theorem 1-3**.  $s_{13} \cap s_{24} = s_{23}$ .  $v_2$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{13}$ .  $v_3$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{24}$ .  $s_{14}$  has 2 splitting vertexes  $v_2, v_3$  and can be split into 3 segments  $s_{12}, s_{23}, s_{34}$  (b) Example of maximal split.  $\{[s_{12}], [s_{13}], [s_{23}], [s_{24}], [s_{34}]\}$  is the maximal split of  $s_{14}$

**Theorem 2** *If  $s_{ij} \cap s_{kt} = s_{kj} \neq \emptyset$ , then  $v_k$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{ij}$  and  $v_j$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{kt}$*

Theorem 2 builds the relationship between close set overlap and splitting vertex: if there exists non-trivial overlap between two close sets, then there exists splitting vertex within both close sets. This theorem is also used in the proof of Theorem 3.

**Theorem 3** *If  $s_{ij}$  has  $n$  splitting vertexes  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ , then  $s_{ij} = s_{i1} \cup s_{12} \cup \dots \cup s_{nj} \cup \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$*

Theorem 3 goes one step further to show a close set is able to be divided into  $n + 1$  linearly arranged segments if it has  $n$  splitting vertexes. By hiding the details between splitting vertexes, an arbitrary optimization graph is able to be solved by the linear solver (although not yet optimal).

**Definition 4 Branched Close Set:** *A close set is branched if  $s_{ij} = s_{ij}^1 \cup s_{ij}^2$  and  $s_{ij}^1 \cap s_{ij}^2 = \emptyset$*

**Definition 5 Non-branched Close Set:** *A close set  $s_{ij}$  is non-branched if  $\nexists s_{ij}^1 \subsetneq s_{ij}$*

The definition of Branched Close Set is to deal with the case where there can be multiple valid close sets with the same starting and ending vertexes. An example of branched close set is shown in Fig.3 (c). Now with this definition, a close set can be divided into three categories: close set with splitting vertexes, branched close set without splitting vertex, non-branched close set without splitting vertex. The examples of these categories are shown in Fig. 3

**Definition 6 Maximal Split:**  *$\{[s_{pq}]\}$  is a maximal split of non-branched  $s_{ij}$  if  $[s_{ij}] = \cup\{[s_{pq}]\}$  and  $\forall s_{kt}, s_{pq} \in \{[s_{pq}]\}, s_{kt} \cap s_{pq} = \emptyset$  and  $\nexists \{[s'_{pq}]\} \subsetneq \{[s_{pq}]\}$  such that  $\cup\{[s'_{pq}]\} = [s_{kt}] \subsetneq [s_{ij}]$*

For close set with splitting vertexes, it can be decomposed into linearly arranged segments. For branched close set without splitting vertex, it can be decomposed into branches. So here we investigate non-branched close set without splitting vertex to see whether it can be decomposed into some substructures. As we don't want trivial decomposition, for example, decomposition that is formed by every edge, we define maximal split to describe the split such that each member of the split is as large as possible. An example of maximal split is shown in Fig. 4

**Definition 7**  *$\{[s_{ij}^k]\}$  is the maximal split of branched  $s_{ij}$  such that any  $s_{ij}^k$  is non-branched.*

We merge the concept of maximal split for branched close set without splitting vertex. The maximal split of a branched close set is the set of all its branches. This maximal split is obviously unique.

**Theorem 4** *If  $\{[s_{pq}]\}$  is a maximal split of non-branched  $s_{ij}$  and  $|\{[s_{pq}]\}| > 2$ , then this maximal split is unique.*

**Theorem 5** If non-branched  $s_{ij}$  has at least 1 vertex but has 0 splitting vertex, then its maximal split has length  $> 2$

Theorem 4 and 5 shows the uniqueness of maximal split of non-trivial non-branched 0-splitting-vertex close set. If we also treat the linear segments of close set with splitting vertexes as maximal split, with these two theorems, we can draw the conclusion that any non-trivial close set has a unique maximal split. This conclusion allows us to develop the final solution by divide-and-conquer.

## 4.2 Algorithm

We search optimal solutions for arbitrary optimization graphs by solving several sub-problems using Algorithm 2-5 respectively. Based on these components, we present our final solver as Algorithm 6.

**Algorithm 2** judges whether a vertex is a splitting vertex of a close set. This algorithm mainly follows the Definition 3 and uses vertex set to check the property of a splitting vertex.

---

**Algorithm 2** Judge whether a vertex  $v_t$  is a splitting vertex of close set  $s_{ij}$

---

- 1: Let  $\{v_{in}\}$  be the vertexes of all the vertexes within  $[s_{ij}]$  that have paths to  $v_t$ . Let  $\{v_{out}\}$  be the vertexes of all the vertexes within  $[s_{ij}]$  that have paths from  $v_t$ .
  - 2: **if**  $\{v_{in}\} \cup \{V_{out}\} \cup \{v_t\} = \{v | v \in [s_{ij}]\}$  and  $\{v_{in}\} \cap \{V_{out}\} = \emptyset$  and  $\nexists v_1 \in \{v_{in}\}, v_2 \in \{v_{out}\}, v_1, v_2$  have connections **then**
  - 3:     Return true
  - 4: **else**
  - 5:     Return False
- 

**Algorithm 3** examines whether a close set is branched. It uses a growing algorithm to check whether an independent subpart of this close set can form a close set. If a non-trivial close set  $s_{ij}$  has an edge from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$ , then it's branched because this edge itself can be treated as a close set.

---

**Algorithm 3** Judge whether  $s_{ij}$  is branched

---

- 1: **if**  $s_{ij}$  has at least 1 vertex **then**
  - 2:     **if**  $s_{ij}$  includes an edge from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  **then**
  - 3:         Return true
  - 4:     **else**
  - 5:         Initialize a vertex set  $s = \{v_k\}$ .  $v_k \in s_{ij}$  is a randomly chosen vertex.
  - 6:         **while** True **do**
  - 7:             For any  $v_t \in s_{ij}, v_t \notin s$  that has connection to any  $v_k \in s$ , add  $v_t$  to  $s$ .
  - 8:             **if** No more vertex can be added to  $s$  **then**
  - 9:                 Break
  - 10:             **if**  $s = \{v \in s_{ij}\}$  **then**
  - 11:                 Return false
  - 12:             **else**
  - 13:                 Return true
  - 14:     **else**
  - 15:         Return false
- 

**Algorithm 4** addresses the problem of finding the maximal split of a non-branched  $s_{ij}$  with 0 splitting vertex. First get all the possible close sets within  $s_{ij}$  and use a property of maximal split to judge whether this close set is a member of the maximal split. The property is: there cannot exist another close set  $s_{ab} \subsetneq s_{ij}$  but contains any member of this maximal split.

**Algorithm 5** reforms the current hierarchy into two hierarchies. For the close set with splitting vertexes, the details of the segments are hidden into next hierarchy. For the close set without splitting vertexes, the details of the member of the maximal split are hidden into next hierarchy.

**Algorithm 6** is the solver of arbitrary optimization graph. First, the single hierarchy re-organizer is recursively called to reform the optimization graph into multi-hierarchy structure. Similar to

---

**Algorithm 4** Find the maximal split of a non-branched  $s_{ij}$  with 0 splitting vertex

---

- 1: **for** each vertex pair  $(v_k, v_t)$  except  $(v_i, v_j)$  in  $[s_{ij}]$  **do**
  - 2:   For all the vertexes  $\{v\}$  that have paths from  $v_k$  and have paths to  $v_t$ .
  - 3:   **if**  $\nexists v_2 \notin \{v\}$  and  $v_2 \neq v_k, v_t, v_2$  has connection to a  $v_1 \in \{v\}$  **then**
  - 4:     Form a close set  $s_{kt}$  with all these vertexes.
  - 5: **for** each formed close set  $s_{kt}$  **do**
  - 6:   If there doesn't exist a  $s_{ab}$  such that  $s_{kt} \subsetneq s_{ab} \subsetneq s_{ij}$ , put  $s_{kt}$  into the maximal split.
- 

**Algorithm 5** Single Hierarchy Re-organizer

---

- 1: Find all the splitting vertexes of the close set.
  - 2: **if** the close set has at least 1 splitting vertexes **then**
  - 3:   Split the close set into linearly arranged segments. Hide all the content within the segments into the next hierarchy and represent these segments as edges.
  - 4: **else**
  - 5:   **if** the close set has at least 1 vertex **then**
  - 6:     Use the maximal split of this close set to represent current hierarchy. For each member of the maximal split, hide all the content of it into the next hierarchy and represent it as an edge.
  - 7:   **else**
  - 8:     It's the trivial case. Just return.
  - 9: The cost of a sub-hierarchy is the sum of the cost of all the vertex within the close set of this sub-hierarchy
- 

the linear solver, a max term list is formed by the cost of all the possible close sets for traverse. Given a max term, we propose a greedy idea: never expand the sub-hierarchy unless the cost of it exceed the max term. In other word, if the max term doesn't allow the sub hierarchy, we expand it, otherwise, do not expand it. Because once expanded, some cost of other vertexes inside this sub-hierarchy might be introduced, and the cost will never be smaller than unexpanded. If some components of the linear hierarchy are expanded, the rest forms a few linear segments and still can be solved by the linear solver. If some components (members of the maximal split) of the non-linear hierarchy are expanded, the other members remain unexpanded and need no changes.

---

**Algorithm 6** Arbitrary Optimization Graph Solver

---

- 1: Get all possible close set and their costs. Use their costs to form the max term list.
  - 2: Recursively call the single hierarchy re-organizer to re-organize the optimization graph.
  - 3: **for** each possible max term  $m$  in max term list  $\{m\}$  **do**
  - 4:   **if** current hierarchy is linear **then**
  - 5:     For all sub-hierarchy that have cost larger than current max term. Expand them and solve the next hierarchy.
  - 6:     All the expanded sub-hierarchy have separated the current linear structure to linear segments. Solve all the linear segments with current max term.
  - 7:   **else**
  - 8:     For all members of the maximal split that have cost larger than current max term. Expand them and solve the sub-hierarchy.
  - 9:     All the other members remain unexpanded.
  - 10: Summarize the total loss, save the current solution if it's better.
- 

## 5 Experiment

We evaluated Re-forwarding on two main groups of neural networks (1) networks with linear structures (2) networks with non-linear structures. Linear networks include Alexnet [14] and vgg series [23]. Non-linear networks include Resnet series [11], Densenet series [12] and Inception net [25]. We compared Re-forwarding with Chen[8] and the regular approach. As [8] only deals with linear networks, to compare on non-linear networks, we re-organized all the non-linear networks into

Table 1: Memory comparison between the regular, Chen[8] and Re-forwarding (ours) approach on linear and non-linear optimization graph. “Measured Ratio” and “Theoretical Ratio” are computed as Re-forwarding (ours)/Regular, which are the lower the better.

Linear Network	Regular(MB)	Chen[8](MB)	Re-forwarding (ours) (MB)	Measured Ratios	Theoretical Ratios
Alexnet batch size 1024	3550	3108	<b>2620</b>	0.7380	0.5787
vgg11 batch size 64	2976	2292	<b>1802</b>	0.6055	0.4961
vgg13 batch size 64	4152	<b>2586</b>	<b>2586</b>	0.6228	0.5305
vgg16 batch size 64	4470	2894	<b>2586</b>	0.5785	0.4928
vgg19 batch size 64	4788	2894	<b>2502</b>	0.5226	0.4668
Non-linear Network	Regular(MB)	Chen[8](MB)	Re-forwarding (ours)(MB)	Measured Ratios	Theoretical Ratios
Resnet18 batch size 256	5402	<b>2898</b>	<b>2898</b>	0.5365	0.3720
Resnet34 batch size 128	3900	1936	<b>1544</b>	0.3959	0.2726
Resnet50 batch size 64	5206	2332	<b>1798</b>	0.3454	0.2482
Resnet101 batch size 32	3812	1216	<b>970</b>	0.2545	0.1887
Resnet152 batch size 16	2810	636	<b>564</b>	0.2007	0.1593
Densenet121 batch size 32	3984	1012	<b>776</b>	0.1948	0.1861
Densenet161 batch size 16	3658	744	<b>616</b>	0.1684	0.1583
Densenet169 batch size 32	4826	998	<b>848</b>	0.1757	0.1616
Densenet201 batch size 16	3164	600	<b>582</b>	0.1839	0.1432
Inceptionv3 batch size 32	2976	1026	<b>910</b>	0.3058	0.2376

linear networks with their splitting vertexes, and fed them to [8]. For each network, its optimization graph is built such that every vertex is a tensor, every edge is a non-inplace operation, and the memory cost of a vertex is its tensor size.

All the experiments are conducted with Pytorch. To remove irrelevant GPU memory cost, such as model and Pytorch CUDA interface cost, all networks training memory were measured with two different input sizes and compute the difference between two measurements. For example, to measure the memory cost of Alexnet with input size  $[BatchSize, Channel, Width, Height]=[16, 3, 224, 224]$ , we first record the training memory of input  $[16, 3, 224, 224]$  as  $r_1$ , and input of  $[32, 3, 224, 224]$  as  $r_2$ . The actual memory cost given  $[16, 3, 224, 224]$  input is measured as  $r_2 - r_1$ . To see how well the reality matches with the theory, We also compute the “Measured Ratios” as the measured memory of Re-forwarding divided by the regular approach and the “Theoretical Ratios” given by **Algorithm 6**. To use existing DNN codes, the input of Inception net is  $[Batchsize, 3, 300, 300]$ , and the input of all other networks is  $[Batchsize, 3, 224, 224]$ .

Table. 5 shows that Re-forwarding constantly outperformed Chen [8], and supports our claim that Re-forwarding is optimal. Re-forwarding also cuts down huge amount of memory from the regular approach: nearly 30% off for Alexnet, 50% off for Vgg series. For Resnet series, the deeper network, the more memory was cut down. On the deepest Resnet152, 80% off was achieved. For Densenet series, more than 80% off was achieved. Observe that, all “Measured Ratios” are slightly bigger than the theoretical ratios. This is because, in implementing Re-forwarding, the optimization graphs we constructed do not perfectly match the reality. We assume that for each non-inplace operation, the tensor it needs for backward is its input. In reality, this assumption does not always hold. Some operations might only need to store small tensors instead of storing the whole input for backward.

## 6 Conclusion

Re-forwarding is a fundamental approach that explores trade-off between memory and computation power of GPUs. By saving tensors at a subset of layers during forward, and conducting extra *local forwards* for backward, Re-forwarding makes it possible to train very heavy DNNs with finite GPU memory. To our knowledge, our theoretical and algorithmic results are the first top-down work that achieve an optimal memory solution for arbitrary optimization graphs in DNNs. Re-forwarding can be further embedded and optimized with any low-level techniques such as distributed computing, GPU/CPU swapping, computational graph optimization and liveness analysis.



## References

- [1] Martín Abadi, Ashish Agarwal, Paul Barham, Eugene Brevdo, Zhifeng Chen, Craig Citro, Greg S Corrado, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, et al. Tensorflow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous distributed systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.04467*, 2016.
- [2] Alekh Agarwal, Olivier Chapelle, Miroslav Dudík, and John Langford. A reliable effective terascale linear learning system. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1111–1133, 2014.
- [3] Alekh Agarwal and John C Duchi. Distributed delayed stochastic optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 873–881, 2011.
- [4] Alfred V Aho, Ravi Sethi, and Jeffrey D Ullman. Compilers, principles, techniques. *Addison Wesley*, 7(8):9, 1986.
- [5] Frédéric Bastien, Pascal Lamblin, Razvan Pascanu, James Bergstra, Ian Goodfellow, Arnaud Bergeron, Nicolas Bouchard, David Warde-Farley, and Yoshua Bengio. Theano: new features and speed improvements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.5590*, 2012.
- [6] James Bergstra, Olivier Breuleux, Frédéric Bastien, Pascal Lamblin, Razvan Pascanu, Guillaume Desjardins, Joseph Turian, David Warde-Farley, and Yoshua Bengio. Theano: A cpu and gpu math compiler in python. In *Proc. 9th Python in Science Conf*, volume 1, 2010.
- [7] Tianqi Chen, Mu Li, Yutian Li, Min Lin, Naiyan Wang, Minjie Wang, Tianjun Xiao, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Zheng Zhang. Mxnet: A flexible and efficient machine learning library for heterogeneous distributed systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.01274*, 2015.
- [8] Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174*, 2016.
- [9] Jeffrey Dean, Greg Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Mark Mao, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, Ke Yang, Quoc V Le, et al. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1223–1231, 2012.
- [10] Kensho Hara, Hirokatsu Kataoka, and Yutaka Satoh. Learning spatio-temporal features with 3d residual networks for action recognition. In *Proceedings of the ICCV Workshop on Action, Gesture, and Emotion Recognition*, volume 2, page 4, 2017.
- [11] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [12] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Laurens van der Maaten. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, volume 1, page 3, 2017.
- [13] Shuiwang Ji, Wei Xu, Ming Yang, and Kai Yu. 3d convolutional neural networks for human action recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(1):221–231, 2013.
- [14] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.
- [15] John Langford, Alexander J Smola, and Martin Zinkevich. Slow learners are fast. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 22:2331–2339, 2009.
- [16] Ryan McDonald, Keith Hall, and Gideon Mann. Distributed training strategies for the structured perceptron. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 456–464. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2010.

- [17] Ryan Mcdonald, Mehryar Mohri, Nathan Silberman, Dan Walker, and Gideon S Mann. Efficient large-scale distributed training of conditional maximum entropy models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1231–1239, 2009.
- [18] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. Yolov3: An incremental improvement. *CoRR*, abs/1804.02767, 2018.
- [19] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 91–99, 2015.
- [20] Minsoo Rhu, Natalia Gimelshein, Jason Clemons, Arslan Zulfiqar, and Stephen W Keckler. vdn: Virtualized deep neural networks for scalable, memory-efficient neural network design. In *Microarchitecture (MICRO), 2016 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2016.
- [21] Qinfeng Shi, James Petterson, Gideon Dror, John Langford, Alex Smola, Alex Strehl, and Vishy Vishwanathan. Hash kernels. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 496–503, 2009.
- [22] Zheng Shou, Jonathan Chan, Alireza Zareian, Kazuyuki Miyazawa, and Shih-Fu Chang. Cdc: convolutional-de-convolutional networks for precise temporal action localization in untrimmed videos. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1417–1426. IEEE, 2017.
- [23] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [24] Bharat Singh, Hengduo Li, Abhishek Sharma, and Larry S. Davis. R-FCN-3000 at 30fps: Decoupling detection and classification. *CoRR*, abs/1712.01802, 2017.
- [25] Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2818–2826, 2016.
- [26] Linnan Wang, Jinmian Ye, Yiyang Zhao, Wei Wu, Ang Li, Shuaiwen Leon Song, Zenglin Xu, and Tim Kraska. Superneurons: Dynamic gpu memory management for training deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.04380*, 2018.
- [27] Dong Yu, Adam Eversole, Mike Seltzer, Kaisheng Yao, Zhiheng Huang, Brian Guenter, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Yu Zhang, Frank Seide, Huaming Wang, et al. An introduction to computational networks and the computational network toolkit. *Microsoft Technical Report MSR-TR-2014-112*, 2014.
- [28] Martin Zinkevich, Markus Weimer, Lihong Li, and Alex J Smola. Parallelized stochastic gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2595–2603, 2010.