

---

# 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 Neural Networks(DNNs) require huge GPU memory when training on modern image/video databases. Unfortunately, the GPU memory in off-the-shelf devices is always finite, which limits the image resolutions and batch sizes that could be used for better DNN performance. In this paper, we propose a novel training approach, called Re-forwarding, that substantially reduces memory usage in training. Our approach automatically finds a subset of vertices in a DNN computation graph, and stores tensors only at these vertices during the first forward. During backward, extra local forwards (called the Re-forwarding operations) are conducted to compute the missing tensors. The total training memory cost becomes the sum of (1) the memory cost of the subset of vertices and (2) the maximum memory cost of local forwards. Re-forwarding trades time overheads for memory costs and does not compromise any performance in testing. We present theories and algorithms that achieve optimal memory solutions on DNNs with both linear and arbitrary computation graphs. Experiments show that Re-forwarding cuts down up-to 80% of training memory with a moderate time overhead (around 40%) on popular DNNs such as Alexnet, VGG, ResNet, Densenet and Inception net.

## 1 Introduction

Deep Neural Networks(DNNs) require huge GPU memory when training on modern image/video databases. For 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 5 GB. 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] and can easily consume more than 10 GB with just a small batch size. The memory issue is even worse for video-based DNNs, such as CDC [22], C3D [13] and 3D-ResNet [10]. To model complex activities in video, the input video would be as long as 64 frames and could easily go beyond 10 GB with a moderate network. Memory issue also occurs 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 presented three main approaches: (1) Better single GPUs. Recent GPUs provide larger memory at the expense of exponentially growing price and power consumption. 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. (2) Parallelization among multiple GPUs [9, 21, 15, 17, 16, 28, 2, 3], which requires expensive clusters, introduces substantial I/O cost, and does not reduce the total memory cost. (3) Low-level heuristic techniques. Optimization of computation 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 are specific to certain DNN structures, data and tasks.

The regular 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.

We propose a high-level training approach that trade extra computation time for substantial saving of GPU memory. Fig. 1 (b) illustrates our main idea. Our approach finds an optimal split of the DNN computation graph that requires the smallest memory for re-forward training. During re-forward training, only tensors at a subset of layers are stored during the first forward, and the missing tensors needed during backward are computed via extra *local forwards*. Due to the extra forward process, we named our approach as **Re-forwarding**. The total memory cost is the sum of the cost at the subset of layers and the maximum memory cost among local re-forwards. Training with Re-forwarding leads to substantial memory reduction. We propose sophisticate theories and efficient algorithms that achieve the optimal memory solution of *arbitrary* computation graphs. Note that recent affordable GPUs (e.g., Nvidia GTX 1080-Ti, RTX 2080 Ti), although limited in memory ( 11GB), provide exceptional improvement in GPU cores and FLOPS. Trading computation time for memory is a very attractive solution that make it possible to train very heavy DNNs with finite GPU memory.




Figure 1: Regular Training Approach vs. Re-forwarding (ours). (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 and gradients during backward.

## 2 Related Work

To alleviate the memory pressure from a single GPU processor, many researchers utilized the well-established techniques for distributed computation [9, 21, 15, 17, 16, 28, 2, 3]. These techniques distribute memory pressure to possibly infinite GPUs or server clusters, but do not reduce the total memory cost of DNNs.

Other researchers reduced the memory on finite hardware by optimizing computation graph of DNN and performing liveness analysis. The computation graph of DNNs describes the dependencies of tensors among layers. Liveness analysis recycles garbage to manage memory. These ideas were originated from compiler optimization [4] and has been widely adopted by deep learning frameworks: Theano [5, 6], MXNet [7], Tensorflow [1] and CNTK [27]. Some other techniques efficiently swap data between CPU and GPU [26, 20]. These techniques usually cost extra I/O time and still do not actually reduce the total memory cost.

The closest work to our approach, Chen et al.[8], uses the gradient checkpoints (similar to the subset of layers in Re-forwarding). However, [8] **only worked on linear computation graph** via a heuristic method. Our approach generates optimal memory solutions for **both linear and arbitrary computation graphs**. Our algorithm reduces training memory by manipulating high-level tensors, therefore is generalizable to any DNNs and their combinations. All previous techniques are compatible to our approach and can further improve the memory efficiency of DNN training.

### 3 Overview

Our Re-forwarding approach consists of two steps: preprocessing and re-forward training. In the preprocessing step, we produce an optimal split of the network to be trained. This preprocessing step is an **one-time effort** conducted before training. In the training step, during the first forward, we only store tensors at selected vertices according to the optimal split. During backward, the tensors and gradients at missing vertices are recovered by local forward operations (called re-forward). The re-forward training costs time overheads but gains substantial savings in training memory.

In section 4, we start with the Linear Computation Graph (LCG) and formulate the optimization problem of the optimal split. We first discuss a special case of LCGs, where we can easily compute an optimal solution in analytic form and understand the effectiveness of Re-forwarding. Then we extend the solution to general LCGs.

In section 5, we present our approach on Arbitrary Computation Graphs (ACGs). Section 5 is organized by a bottom-up manner. We first introduce all the basic components, including definitions and sub-algorithms, and then the final solver based on these components. In section 6, we present extensive experiments on networks with both linear and non-linear computation graphs. Due to space limit, we cannot put all illustrative examples in the paper. Extra examples are included in the "Extra Examples" section of the supplementary material.

### 4 Linear Computation Graph (LCG)

Denote a computation graph of a DNN as  $G = (E, V)$ .  $E = \{e_i\}$  and  $V = \{v_i\}$  are the edges and vertices in the computation graph, respectively. The vertices represent the DNN tensors and the edges represent DNN operations. Denote function  $l(\cdot)$  as a measure of memory cost.  $V^R$  is the subset of vertices saved during the first forward.  $l(v_i^R)$  is defined as the memory cost of the  $i$ th vertex stored in  $V^R$ . For two adjacent vertices  $v_i^R$  and  $v_{i+1}^R$  in set  $V^R$ , suppose  $v_i^R$  corresponds to  $v_j$  in the original graph, and  $v_{i+1}^R$  corresponds to  $v_k$ , the memory cost during re-forwarding from  $v_i^R$  to  $v_{i+1}^R$  is defined as  $l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R) = \sum_{t=j+1}^{k-1} l(v_t)$ , which is the sum of cost over all the vertices between  $v_i^R$  and  $v_{i+1}^R$  in the original graph. Using these notations, reducing memory cost of training with re-forwarding is formulated as an optimization problem.

$$\min_{V^R} (\sum_i l(v_i^R) + \max_i l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R)), \tag{1}$$

where the  $\sum_i l(v_i^R)$  is the sum of the memory cost over all the stored tensors, and  $\max_i l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R)$  is the maximal cost among the local re-forwards. Solution to Eq. 1 produces the optimal split of the network by the vertices in  $V^R$ .

For easy illustration, we start by solving Eq. 1 on Linear Computation Graphs (LCG) (Fig. 2 (a)). For LCGs, Eqn. 1 can be solved in two cases.




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

**Case(1) LCG with Identical Vertex Cost:** Suppose a LCG has  $N$  vertices, 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 vertices in  $V^R$  are distributed evenly in the LCG. Suppose the number of vertices 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  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}}$ .

From Case(1), we can get a sense of the effectiveness of Re-forwarding. The original memory cost is 1, and can be reduced to  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}}$  at the time overhead of extra local forwards. When the network is deep, i.e.  $N$  is large, huge amount of memory cost can be cut off. For example, when  $N = 100$ , we can reduce the memory cost to  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the original cost.

**Case (2) LCG with Non-identical Vertex Cost:** When the assumption of identical cost does not hold, the solution to Eqn. 1 does not have an analytic form. Denote the maximal Re-forward cost  $\max_i l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R)$  as a constant  $C$ , and the solution to Eqn. 1 is reduced to solving for  $\min_{V^R} \sum_i l(v_i)$ . All the re-forward costs in an optimal solution satisfy the constraint  $l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R) \leq C$ .

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 constraints are all encoded in the accessibility graph, we can solve the unconstrained problem  $\min_{V^R} \sum_i l(v_i^R)$ , which 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 equal the one maximal term among all  $l(v_i, v_j)$  terms. To determine  $C$  of an optimal solution, we simply traverse all possible  $C$  by computing the loss of every vertex pair. Then Eqn. 1 is solved under the constraint  $l(v_i^R, v_{i+1}^R) \leq C$ . **Algorithm 1** summarizes the steps for searching an optimal solution for LCGs. For a computation graph with  $N$  vertices, the time complexity of **Algorithm 1** is  $O(N^4)$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Linear Computation Graph (LCG) 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 the total cost is smaller.
- 

## 5 Arbitrary Computation Graph(ACG)

As the generalization of LCGs, we present theory and algorithms for DNNs with Arbitrary Computation Graphs (ACG), in particular the acyclic directed graphs (Fig. 2 (b)).

For ACGs, we follow the same idea in LCGs: traverse all possible max term  $C$  and solve a constrained problem for each  $C$ . The following subsections are organized in a bottom-up manner: we first introduce all the basic components and then the final algorithm. Due to space limit, proofs and further analysis are in the supplementary material.

### 5.1 Definition and Theorem




Figure 3: Closed Set Examples: (a) Closed set in a graph. there cannot exist a closed set between  $v_2$  and  $v_4$  because  $v_3$  depends on  $v_1$ . There can exist a closed set between  $v_1$  and  $v_3$  because  $v_2$  doesn't depend on any other vertex. (b) Splittable Closed Set (Type 1).  $v_2$  is the splitting vertex of  $s_{13}$ . (c) Branched Closed Set (Type 2). (d) Non-branched Closed Set (Type 3).

**Definition 1 Closed Set:** A set  $s$  containing vertices and edges is a closed set if and only if it satisfies the following three properties: 1. All the vertices of  $s$  have a common ancestor  $v_i$  and a common descendent  $v_j$ ; 2. Denote the vertex subset of  $s$  as  $V$ , edge subset as  $E$ , and the set of edges between

two arbitrary vertices of  $V \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$  is  $E'$ , the edge from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$  (if exists) as  $e_{ij}$ .  $E$  must either be  $E'$  or  $E' - \{e_{ij}\}$ ; 3. An arbitrary  $v_1 \in V$  doesn't have edge with another arbitrary  $v_2 \notin V \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$ . For multiple valid closed sets between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , we denote the largest one as  $s_{ij}$

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

In the definition of **Closed Set**, Property 1 indicates the set only has one source vertex and one target vertex. Property 2 confines the edge subsets of  $s$  to be one of two cases:  $E'$  or  $E' - \{e_{ij}\}$ . Both cases are valid although they have different edges. Property 3 guarantees the independence of such a set  $s$ , meaning that the vertices within  $s$  have no connections with other vertices outside  $s \cup \{v_i, v_j\}$ . As there might be multiple valid closed sets between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , which corresponds to the **Branched Closed Set** in Definition 5, we denote the largest closed set between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  as  $s_{ij}$  and denote smaller closed set with an extra superscript, such as  $s_{ij}^1$ .

**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  $s_{it} \cap s_{tj} = \emptyset$

**Definition 4 Splittable Closed Set (Type 1):** A closed set with at least one splitting vertex.

**Definition 5 Branched Closed Set (Type 2):** A closed set is branched if it has 0 splitting vertex and can be divided into branches:  $s_{ij} = s_{ij}^1 \cup s_{ij}^2$  and  $s_{ij}^1 \cap s_{ij}^2 = \emptyset$

**Definition 6 Non-branched Closed Set (Type 3):** A closed set  $s_{ij}$  is non-branched if it has 0 splitting vertex and no branch:  $\nexists s_{ij}^1 \subsetneq s_{ij}$

The definition of **Splitting Vertex** is to describe whether a closed set can be divided into two linearly arranged closed set. A closed set is splittable if it has at least one splitting vertex and is defined as **Closed Set Type 1**. Among closed sets with no splitting vertex, we categorize the closed sets with branches as **Closed Set Type 2**, and the closed set without branches as **Closed Set Type 3**. The examples of different types of closed sets are shown in Fig. 3.




Figure 4: Examples on Division of Closed Sets. Members of different Closed Sets are colored. (a) Division of closed set Type 1. The division is  $\{[s_{12}], [s_{23}]\}$ . (b) Division of closed set Type 2. The division is  $\{[s_{12}^1], [s_{12}^2], [s_{12}^3]\}$ . (c) Division of closed set Type 3. The division is  $\{[s_{12}], [s_{13}], [s_{23}], [s_{24}], [s_{34}]\}$

All closed sets can be further decomposed and form a set called the Division of Closed Set. Closed set type 1 can be divided into linearly connected segments. Closed set type 2 can be divided into branches. Closed set type 3 requires closer investigation. We don't want trivial division, for example, division that is formed by every edge in the closed set. 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 (c). In the definition of maximal split, the term maximal is implied by saying that any subset of this split cannot be combined into a single closed set. If it can, then the maximal split will be formed by this larger closed set and all the rest of the previous split. For closed set type 3, we use its maximal split as its division.

**Definition 7 Maximal Split:**  $\{[s_{pq}]\}$  is a maximal split of non-branched  $s_{ij}$  if  $[s_{ij}] = \cup\{[s_{pq}]\}$  and  $\forall s_{ab}, s_{cd} \in \{[s_{pq}]\}, s_{ab} \cap s_{cd} = \emptyset$  and  $\nexists\{[s'_{pq}]\} \subsetneq \{[s_{pq}]\}$  such that  $\cup\{[s'_{pq}]\} = [s_{kt}] \subsetneq [s_{ij}]$

**Definition 8 Division of Closed Set:** For a Closed Set Type 1, its division is the linear segments separated by all its splitting vertices; for Type 2, its division is all its branches, any of which cannot be divided into more branches; for Type 3, its division is its maximal split.




Figure 5: In this tree, the root node is the whole computation graph. All the leaf nodes are single tensors. Every other node except root and leaves is a member of the division of its parent.

**Definition 9 Division Tree:** *Division tree is a representation of a computation graph, where the root node is the whole computation graph, the leaf nodes are all the single tensors in the computation graph, and for a non-leaf node, its children is the members of its division.*

With the division of 3 types of closed sets, the computation graph can be reorganized into a division tree (Figure 5) where a non-leaf node would be a closed set and its children would be its corresponding division. The root node is the whole computation graph, the largest closed set, and the leaf nodes would be single tensors in the computation graph. With the division tree, we can use divide-and-conquer method to search for optimal solution of Eqn.1.

**Theorem 1** *The division tree of a computation graph is unique and complete.*

The uniqueness of the division tree indicates that the optimal solution of the division tree would also be the optimal solution of the whole computation graph. The completeness indicates that the division tree has included all the possible members of solutions and represents the whole search space for finding the optimal solution. This theorem also indicates that the optimal solution in the division tree is equivalent to the optimal solution of the original problem. Theorem 1 is proved in the supplementary material.

## 5.2 Algorithm

We search optimal solutions for ACGs by solving several sub-problems using Algorithm 2-4 respectively. Based on these components, we present our final solver as Algorithm 5.

**Algorithm 2** judges whether a vertex is a splitting vertex of a closed set. This algorithm mainly follows the Definition 3 and uses vertex set to check the property of a splitting vertex. With this algorithm, we can judge whether a closed set is type 1 and get its division if it is. Suppose there are  $N$  vertices in  $s_{ij}$ , the time complexity of **Algorithm 2** is  $O(N^2)$ .

---

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

---

- 1: Let  $\{v_{in}\}$  be the vertices of all the vertices within  $[s_{ij}]$  that have paths to  $v_t$ . Let  $\{v_{out}\}$  be the vertices of all the vertices 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 closed set is branched. It uses a growing algorithm to check whether an independent subpart of this closed set can form a closed set. If a non-trivial closed set  $s_{ij}$  has an edge from  $v_i$  to  $v_j$ , then it is branched because this edge itself can be treated as a closed set. Combined with Algorithm 2, we can know the type of a closed set and get its division if it is type 2. Suppose there are  $N$  vertices in  $s_{ij}$ , the time complexity of **Algorithm 3** is  $O(N^2)$ .

**Algorithm 4** addresses the problem of finding the maximal split, the division of a closed set type 3  $s_{ij}$ . First get all the possible closed sets within  $s_{ij}$  and use a property of maximal split to judge

---

**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
```

---

whether this closed set is a member of the maximal split. The property is: there cannot exist another closed set  $s_{ab} \subsetneq s_{ij}$  but contains any member of this maximal split. This property is proved in Lemma 6 of the supplementary material. Suppose there are  $N$  vertices in  $s_{ij}$ , the time complexity of **Algorithm 4** is  $O(N^4)$ .

---

**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 vertices  $\{v\}$  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 closed set  $s_{kt}$  with all these vertices.
5:   for each formed closed 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** is the solver of Eqn. 1 for ACGs. First, the division tree of the computation graph is built. Similar to the linear solver, a max term list is formed to contain the costs of all the possible closed sets for traverse. Given a max term, we propose a greedy idea: for a closed set, never expand it unless the its cost exceed the max term. In other word, if the max term doesn't allow a leap over this closed set, we expand it, otherwise, do not expand it. Because once expanded, some cost of other vertices inside this closed set might be introduced, and the cost will never be smaller than not expanded. If some children of the closed set type 1 are expanded, the rest reforms a few linear segments and still can be solved by the linear solver. If some children of the closed set type 2 or 3 are expanded, the other members remain not expanded and need no changes. Suppose there are  $N$  vertices in computation graph, the time complexity of **Algorithm 5** is  $O(N^4)$ .

## 6 Experiment

We evaluated Re-forwarding on (1) networks with linear structures, such as Alexnet [14] and Vgg [23]. (2) networks with non-linear structures, such as Resnet [11], Densenet [12] and Inception net [25]. In Table 1, We compared Re-forwarding with Chen [8] and the regular training approach. **Note that [8] only works on linear computation graphs and is not applicable to non-linear computation graphs.** Our Re-forwarding approach directly works on arbitrary computation graphs.

All experiments were conducted in Pytorch 1.0. GPU memory costs (MB) are measured in Float32. To remove irrelevant cost, such as model weights and Pytorch CUDA interface, training memory costs were computed as the memory difference under two input sizes. For example, for Alexnet, we first measure the training memory under input size  $[BatchSize, Channel, Width, Height] = [16, 3, 224, 224]$  as  $r_1$  and that under input  $[32, 3, 224, 224]$  as  $r_2$ . The Alexnet memory cost under input  $[16, 3, 224, 224]$  is reported as  $r_2 - r_1$ . To make the best use of public codes, the input to Inception net is  $[BatchSize, 3, 300, 300]$ , and the input to all other networks is  $[BatchSize, 3, 224, 224]$ .

---

**Algorithm 5** Arbitrary Computation Graph (ACG) Solver

---

- 1: Get all possible closed set and their costs. Use their costs to form the max term list.
  - 2: Reorganize the computation graph into a division tree: from the root node (the computation graph), build its children from its division, until all the leaf nodes are single tensors.
  - 3: **for** each possible max term  $m$  in max term list  $\{m\}$  **do**
  - 4:   **if** current closed set is type 1 **then**
  - 5:     For all the children that have cost larger than current max term. Expand them and solve the next level.
  - 6:     All the expanded children have separated the current closed set to linear segments. Solve all the linear segments with current max term.
  - 7:   **else**
  - 8:     For all the children that have cost larger than current max term. Expand them and solve the next level.
  - 9:     All the other members remain unexpanded.
  - 10: Summarize the total loss, save the current solution if it's better.
- 

Table 1: Training memory cuts and time overheads of the regular, Chen’s approach [8] and Re-forwarding (ours). Note that [8] does not apply to non-linear computation graphs.

Linear network	Regular Memory (MB)	Chen’s [8] Memory (MB)↓	Re-forwarding Memory (ours)(MB)↓	Memory Cut (ours)↑	Regular Time (Sec)	Re-forward Training Time (our)(Sec)↓	Time Overhead (ours)↓
Alexnet batch 1024	3550	3108	<b>2620</b>	26%	1.295	1.816	40%
Vgg11 batch 64	2976	2292	<b>1802</b>	39%	0.606	0.819	35%
Vgg13 batch 64	4152	<b>2586</b>	<b>2586</b>	38%	1.020	1.333	31%
Vgg16 batch 64	4470	2894	<b>2586</b>	42%	1.307	1.696	30%
Vgg19 batch 64	4788	2894	<b>2502</b>	48%	1.593	2.060	29%
Non-linear network	Regular Memory (MB)	Chen’s[8] Memory (MB)↓	Re-forwarding Memory (ours)(MB) ↓	Memory Cut (ours)↑	Regular Time (Sec)	Re-forward Training Time (our)(Sec)↓	Time Overhead (ours)↓
Resnet18 batch 256	5402	-	<b>2898</b>	46%	1.144	1.599	40%
Resnet34 batch 128	3900	-	<b>1544</b>	60%	1.041	1.419	36%
Resnet50 batch 64	5206	-	<b>1798</b>	65%	0.740	1.027	40%
Resnet101 batch 32	3812	-	<b>970</b>	75%	0.624	0.853	37%
Resnet152 batch 16	2810	-	<b>564</b>	80%	0.450	0.628	39%
Densenet121 batch 32	3984	-	<b>776</b>	81%	0.558	0.789	42%
Densenet161 batch 16	3658	-	<b>616</b>	83%	0.511	0.708	39%
Densenet169 batch 32	4826	-	<b>848</b>	82%	0.714	1.022	43%
Densenet201 batch 16	3164	-	<b>582</b>	82%	0.449	0.651	45%
Inceptionv3 batch 32	2976	-	<b>910</b>	69%	0.563	0.763	35%

We also measured the training time per iteration (Sec) averaging over 20 iterations. [8] (only works on linear networks) has similar time overheads as Re-forwarding.

Table. 1 shows that Re-forwarding cuts down great amount of memory from the regular approach at reasonable time overheads. For instance, for linear network Vgg19, 48% memory was cut down at the expense of 29% time overhead. Due to our optimal solution on computation graphs, Re-forwarding costs less memory than [8]. For deeper and non-linear networks, [8] does not apply, while our memory cuts are even more substantial. On the deepest Resnet152, 80% memory cut was achieved with only 39% time overhead. For Densenet series, more than 80% memory cuts were achieved with around 40% time overhead.

## 7 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 computation graphs in DNNs. Re-forwarding



can be further integrated with any low-level techniques such as distributed computing, GPU/CPU swapping, computation 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.