
PIPELINED BACKPROPAGATION AT SCALE: TRAINING LARGE MODELS WITHOUT BATCHES

Atli Kosson^{*12} Vitaliy Chiley^{*3} Abhinav Venigalla¹ Joel Hestness³ Urs Köster¹⁴

ABSTRACT

New hardware can substantially increase the speed and efficiency of deep neural network training. To guide the development of future hardware architectures, it is pertinent to explore the hardware and machine learning properties of alternative training algorithms. In this work we evaluate the use of small batch, fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation, an asynchronous pipeline parallel training algorithm that has significant hardware advantages. We introduce two methods, Spike Compensation and Linear Weight Prediction, that effectively mitigate the downsides caused by the asynchronicity of Pipelined Backpropagation and outperform existing techniques in our setting. We show that appropriate normalization and small batch sizes can also aid training. With our methods, fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation using a batch size of one can match the accuracy of SGD for multiple networks trained on CIFAR-10 and ImageNet. Simple scaling rules allow the use of existing hyperparameters for traditional training without additional tuning.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the compute requirements for training state of the art deep neural networks have rapidly increased (Amodei & Hernandez, 2018). To manage the increased compute requirements, new and efficient hardware architectures are being developed for accelerating deep learning. Traditional deep learning accelerators rely on batch parallelism (sometimes called data parallelism) to hide memory bandwidth and latency issues. This can scale to large batches (Shallue et al., 2019) but can have considerable overheads that limit hardware efficiency (see Appendix A). New hardware architectures could support other, potentially more efficient, training techniques and may not be well suited for traditional methods. To guide the development of future hardware, it is therefore important to evaluate alternative training techniques and understand their advantages and limitations compared to traditional training.

One alternative to batch parallelism is pipeline parallelism (Figure 1), which divides the model into sequential segments we call pipeline stages. Each worker is assigned to one stage and inputs proceed sequentially through the stages, similar to an assembly line. This form of parallelism has the advantage that each worker only performs a subset of the computation which allows them to specialize.

^{*}Equal contribution ¹Work done while at Cerebras ²Tesla ³Cerebras Systems, Inc ⁴Google. Correspondence to: Atli Kosson <contact@kosson.is>, Vitaliy Chiley <vitaliy@cerebras.net>.




Figure 1. **Top:** batch parallelism. **Bottom:** pipeline parallelism. We show four workers and a network that can be split into four sequential transformations F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 with corresponding backwards operations B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 . The steady state is shown and for simplicity F and B are shown taking the same time. The processing of four inputs is highlighted. In pipeline parallelism workers can specialize to perform a subset of the transformations.

Fine-grained pipeline parallelism assigns one layer of the network to each stage, maximizing opportunities for specialization. Since each worker only processes one layer it only needs to access a small set of weights which may fit in local memory. This eliminates bandwidth and latency issues associated with fetching the weights. For highly configurable architectures, the limited logic set required for each worker allows for an optimized allocation of compute resources between workers, increasing overall utilization. Zhang et al. (2019c) find that fine-grained pipelining can

enable speedups of up to 3.5x in their setting. Li & Pedram (2017) and Chen et al. (2016) both report energy savings of up to 3x. Fine-grained pipelining can also enable efficient sparse processing which Chen et al. (2019) show can result in up to a 42.5x and an 11.3x improvement in throughput and energy efficiency, respectively.

Pipeline parallel training commonly implements a form of mini-batch SGD (Huang et al., 2018). This is done by dividing the batch into micro-batches that are sequentially fed into the pipeline (filling it) and waiting for the resulting gradients of all micro-batches (draining the pipeline). When the pipeline is empty, the parameters are updated and the process is then repeated for the next batch. Filling and draining the pipeline for each update can significantly lower hardware utilization when the update size is small compared to the number of pipeline stages (Figure 2). Although it is possible to train with large batch sizes, this makes the hyperparameters harder to tune for a given compute budget (Shallue et al., 2019) and hyperparameters commonly found in literature are tuned for modest batch sizes.

Pipelined Backpropagation (PB) (Pétrowski et al., 1993) is an asynchronous training technique that avoids fill and drain overhead by updating the weights without draining the pipeline first. This results in *weight inconsistency*, the use of different weights on the forward and backward passes for a given micro-batch. The weights used to produce a particular gradient may also have been updated when the gradient is applied, resulting in *stale (or delayed) gradients*. For these reasons PB resembles Asynchronous SGD (Lian et al., 2015) and is not equivalent to standard SGD. Fine-grained pipelining increases the number of pipeline stages and hence increases the weight inconsistency and delay. For a more detailed discussion of Pipelined Backpropagation and how it gives rise to weight inconsistency and gradient staleness, see Appendix B.

The formulation of Pipelined Backpropagation we use throughout this work performs an optimization step after every micro-batch. Unless otherwise specified, we use a micro-batch size of one and adjust the learning rate and momentum to keep the magnitude of a given weight update proportional to the batch size. This has several advantages. First, smaller micro-batches result in smaller weight updates and consequently reduce the effect of weight inconsistency and gradient delays in PB. Secondly, in pipeline parallelism the activation memory requirements have a quadratic dependence on the number of pipeline stages. Fine-grained pipeline parallelism with large micro-batches may not fit into memory. Small batch processing may pose an issue for traditional deep learning accelerators, such as GPUs, which commonly rely on large batch sizes to hide low memory latency and amortize the bandwidth required for loading weights. New hardware architectures with different memory




Figure 2. Utilization of different pipeline parallel modes. Idle workers are depicted in red, fully utilized workers in green and partially utilized workers (only processing either the forward or backward pass while filling or draining the pipeline) in yellow. **Top:** Small batch size fill and drain SGD. **Middle:** Large batch size fill and drain SGD. **Bottom:** Pipelined Backpropagation. The red and blue lines show the forward and backward pass of a single sample. The grey lines show the delays for two of the stages.

characteristics may not suffer from these issues, especially when the weights are stored in local memory. Finally, small batch training has the added benefit of stabilizing training, increasing generalization performance (Masters & Luschi, 2018), and easing hyperparameter tuning (Li et al., 2018).

1.1 Related Works

GPipe (Huang et al., 2018) and Megatron-LM (Shoeybi et al., 2019) combine data and pipeline parallel training but incur the fill and drain overhead. Draining the pipeline is required because of the *locking* nature of SGD (Jaderberg et al., 2017). Unlocking the forward, backward, and update operations is an active area of research (Jaderberg et al., 2017; Huo et al., 2018a;b; Xu et al., 2019; Belilovsky et al., 2019; Gaunt et al., 2017). Pétrowski et al. (1993) propose Pipelined Backpropagation which updates the weights without draining the pipeline to avoid the fill and drain overhead but introduces weight inconsistency and stale gradients.

Recent works have also explored mitigating these issues when training networks through a combination of data parallelism and PB (Chen et al., 2012; Harlap et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2019; Zhuang et al., 2019). PipeDream (Harlap et al., 2018) proposes weight stashing (WS) and vertical sync (VS). Weight stashing saves the weights used on the forward pass for use on the backwards pass and vertical sync updates the weights at the same moment in time. Chen et al. (2018) show how weight stashing is ineffective in their setting and propose a form of weight prediction called SpecTrain to mitigate the effects of both stale gradients and inconsistent weights. PipeMare (Yang et al., 2019) applies discrepancy correction (a form of backward weight prediction) to address inconsistent weights

and learning rate rescheduling (a new form of learning rate warmup) to help with stale gradients. Zhuang et al. (2019) propose Gradient Shrinking, which exponentially decays the gradients for each stage based on the delay.

Unlike prior work, we completely replace batch parallelism with fine-grained pipelined parallelism at batch size one. Compared to previous works this increases the number of pipeline stages and allows for greater worker specialization. We find that in our setting existing mitigation methods such as Weight Stashing, Gradient Shrinking and SpecTrain are insufficient while some others, such as Features Replay (Huo et al., 2018a), do not apply since each stage has a single layer. Our contributions are as follows:

- We explore the hardware aspects of small batch size, fine-grained, Pipelined Backpropagation for training deep neural networks and how Coarse-Grained Reconfigurable Arrays (Podobas et al., 2020) can be particularly well suited for this sort of training.
- We propose two methods, *Spike Compensation* and *Linear Weight Prediction* to mitigate the drawbacks of PB: inconsistent weights and stale gradients. An analysis on a simplified model shows how they can counteract the effects of stale gradients and restore the benefits of momentum in the presence of delays. We show that our methods outperform existing techniques in the fine-grained small batch PB setting, without additional hyperparameters to tune.
- We show the importance of small batches and proper normalization for this type of training. Simple scaling rules enable the use of existing hyperparameters for traditional training without further tuning. With our methods, this makes fine-grained PB a drop-in replacement for mini-batch SGD training on standard image classification benchmarks, CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009) and ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009).

2 FINE GRAINED PIPELINE PARALLELISM ON HARDWARE

Fine grained pipeline parallel training can allow workers to specialize, increasing utilization and accelerating neural network training. A Coarse-Grained Reconfigurable Array (CGRA) is an example of a hardware architecture that can significantly benefit from this. CGRAs are a grid of locally connected cores with fast interconnects and a distributed memory architecture. Pipeline parallelism can be performed by spatially distributing the layers over the compute array (Figure 3). Due to its distributed nature, the overall on-chip memory in a CGRA can be significantly larger than on traditional architectures, allowing workers to store weights locally. This enables persistent kernel execution eliminating any kernel launch overheads as well as overcoming bandwidth and latency issues for small batch processing. Using




Figure 3. Neural network (Left) computation spatially distributed across a compute fabric (Right) with many workers (w). Each worker is specialized and an appropriate amount of compute (workers) is allotted to each layer of the NN. The pipeline depth is defined by the network topology and not the compute architecture.

a small micro-batch size limits the memory required for storing activations limiting the overall memory required.

Standard *layer sequential*, large batch size training can be performed on CGRAs, but may require adding off-chip memory. Layer sequential execution eliminates the benefits of persistent kernel execution and worker specialization. Distributing model weights and reducing gradients across to all cores creates latency issues similar to those encountered in distributed training that can be difficult to mask. Fine-grained, small micro-batch size pipelining may therefore be the best way to achieve high utilization levels and has been shown to increase processing speed and energy efficiency. Architectures with distributed low latency memory architectures, such as (Lie, 2020; Vassilieva, 2020; Sambanova, 2020; Nicol, 2017; Jia et al., 2019), could benefit from pipelined training approaches. Sambanova (2020) shows how this spatial distribution of layers can be used to accelerate neural networks on their Reconfigurable Dataflow Architecture. GraphCore presents how pipelined training improves the IPU’s efficiency (Graphcore, 2020), and Lie (2020) and Vassilieva (2020) discuss how fine-grained pipelined parallelism can accelerate neural network training on the Cerebras Wafer-Scale Engine.

2.1 Simulating Pipelined Parallelism on GPUs

Since suitable hardware architectures are not widely available yet, we are not able to test our methods in a hardware setup where we expect speedups. GPUs are designed for layer sequential batch processing and are not efficient for pipeline parallel training with small batch sizes. However, they are readily available so we opt to use them for this exploratory work. In this section we describe how we simulate pipeline parallel training on GPUs. Appendix D discusses the GPU hardware limitations that prevent this mode of training from being efficient on GPUs. Therefore, our goal is only to make our experiments feasible on GPUs, not to speed up training compared to well tuned batch parallelism.




Figure 4. Pipeline Stage. The network is divided into stages that correspond to pipeline stages. Each stage contains logic for the forward, backward, and gradient computation for the corresponding network component. The use of buffers enables parallel execution, one stage can compute a new output while another stage is using the previous output.

In particular we are interested in simulating fully pipeline parallel training on networks such as ResNet-50 with a maximal number of pipeline stages and no batch parallelism. Most modern deep learning frameworks are not well suited for such experimentation. To enable efficient simulation of fully pipeline parallel training, we built a mini-framework implemented in C++ using cuDNN (Chetlur et al., 2014) kernels, custom CUDA kernels, and Thrust.

The network is split into structures we call stages that act as pipeline stages. Each stage manages all resources needed to compute the forward and backward passes for the corresponding part of the network (Figure 4). The forward, backward, and gradient computations within a stage are completely unlocked and run in parallel. In our experiments we sometimes group several network components together into a single stage. One example of this is grouping convolution, normalization, and ReLU into one stage. We use CUDA streams to run the stages in parallel. The framework also supports splitting the network over multiple GPUs and uses a different thread to launch the stages on each GPU.

3 METHODS

We introduce two compensation methods for Pipeline Backpropagation: Linear Weight Prediction and Spike Compensation. We formulate them for SGD with momentum¹ (SGDM) which we write as:

$$v_{t+1} = mv_t + g_t \quad (1)$$

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta v_{t+1} \quad (2)$$

where w_t are weights (parameters) at time t , v_t is the velocity (sometimes called momentum), m is the momentum coefficient, η is the learning rate, and g_t represents the gradient estimate applied at time t . This estimate may be delayed, and could be calculated with inconsistent weights.

PB partitions the network into S stages. Each stage has its own delay, D^s for $s \in [0, \dots, S-1]$, determined by the

¹Both methods require momentum and can be adapted for other momentum based optimizers.




Figure 5. **Left:** Momentum exponentially smooths gradients over time so the contribution of each gradient to future weights updates (the impulse response) is an exponentially decaying function from the time it arrives. **Middle:** A delayed gradient has an impulse response shifted by the delay D . The dotted line shows the baseline without delay. **Right:** With spike compensation (SC_D) the impulse response has a spike (denoted with an arrow) and then matches the no-delay case. The size of the spike matches that of the missed updates compared to the baseline shown in light gray.

network architecture. We describe and analyze our methods for a constant delay, D , without modeling the pipeline or inconsistency. When we use the methods for PB we apply them to each stage separately, with the corresponding delay set to the number of steps between the forward and backwards passes for that stage. To simplify notation we drop the superscript s representing the stage index. We write the gradient as a function of the weights alone, whereas in SGD the gradient may also depend on inputs or other data.

3.1 Spike Compensation

We introduce Spike Compensation (SC) to mitigate the effects of delayed gradients in PB. The method uses a modified weight update which increases the contribution of the latest gradient relative to the velocity. For a delay of D this can generally be written as:

$$g_t = G(w_{t-D}) \quad (3)$$

$$v_{t+1} = mv_t + g_t \quad (4)$$

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta \cdot (av_{t+1} + bg_t) \quad (5)$$

where a and b are functions of the delay. We could absorb either a or b into η but use this form to keep η consistent with other methods. We refer to this form as generalized Spike Compensation (GSC). To reason about sensible choices for a and b we can look at the contribution of each gradient over time in the no-delay case vs the delay case (see Figure 5). When a gradient g is obtained with some delay D , this gradient would already have contributed to D weight updates in the no-delay case. The total contribution of the gradient so far would have been:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{D-1} m^t g = \frac{1 - m^D}{1 - m} g \quad (6)$$

This inspires our default choice of a and b for Spike Com-

pensation which we will refer to as SC_D :

$$a = m^D \quad \text{and} \quad b = \frac{1 - m^D}{1 - m} \quad (7)$$

For this choice, the missing weight update is applied immediately and the contribution of the gradient at later time steps will match that of the no-delay case. The total contribution of each gradient to the weights over the course of training is unchanged, this only changes how the gradients are applied over time. The modified weight update can equivalently be seen as approximating the velocity in the no-delay case with $av_{t+1} + bg_t$. This uses the latest gradient to approximate the gradient terms in the velocity that have not been observed due to the delay. For a delay of zero, SC_D reduces to SGDM (2).

3.2 Linear Weight Prediction

Both the weight inconsistency and gradient delay arise from the fact that we can not access the (future) weights used on the backwards pass when we compute the forward pass. The goal of weight prediction is to approximate the backwards weights on the forward pass. We want to approximate:

$$w_{t+D} = w_t - \eta \sum_{k=0}^{D-1} v_{t+k+1} \quad (8)$$

where D is the delay (number of update steps between the forward and backwards passes). The future velocities are unknown but can be approximated by assuming a constant gradient \hat{g} over the prediction horizon, i.e. the number of iterations over which the prediction is made. This gives:

$$v_{t+k+1} \approx m^k v_{t+1} + \hat{g} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} m^i = m^k v_{t+1} + \frac{1 - m^k}{1 - m} \hat{g} \quad (9)$$

which results in predicted weights:

$$\hat{w}_{t+D} = w_t - \eta \frac{1 - m^D}{1 - m} v_{t+1} - \frac{\eta \hat{g}}{1 - m} \left(D - \frac{1 - m^D}{1 - m} \right) \quad (10)$$

We have several good choices \hat{g} including setting it to zero or estimating it based on recent gradients. In this work we focus on weight prediction where the direction of the velocity does not change, i.e. \hat{g} is collinear with v_t . We refer to this as linear weight prediction (LWP). The approximation for the weights at time t and delay D can then be written in terms of past weights and velocities as:

$$\hat{w}(t, D, T) = w_{t-D} - \eta T v_{t-D} =: \hat{w}_v(t, D, T) \quad (11)$$

Where T is a hyperparameter we call the horizon of the weight prediction. For SGDM without modifications, we can equivalently write the approximate in terms of the previous weights alone:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}(t, D, T) &= w_{t-D} + T \cdot (w_{t-D} - w_{t-D-1}) \\ &=: \hat{w}_w(t, D, T) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

When combined with Spike Compensation, or potentially when using other optimizers, the predictions given by equations (11) and (12) differ. When this is the case we refer to the two types as LWP^v (velocity form) and LWP^w (weight difference form), respectively. The update step is:

$$g_t = G(\hat{w}(t, D, T)) \quad (13)$$

$$v_{t+1} = mv_t + g_t \quad (14)$$

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta v_{t+1} \quad (15)$$

In the rest of this paper we use LWP_D to denote LWP with our default choice of $T = D$. This is equivalent to choosing $\hat{g} = (1 - m)v_{t+1}$ in (10) which would result in a constant velocity. This form is closely related to the weight prediction used in SpecTrain (Chen et al., 2018) which extends the prediction horizon and also predicts weights on the backwards pass (see Appendix G).

3.3 Combined Mitigation

Spike Compensation and weight prediction can be combined resulting in the following update step:

$$g_t = G(\hat{w}(t, D, T)) \quad (16)$$

$$v_{t+1} = mv_t + g_t \quad (17)$$

$$w_{t+1} = w_t - \eta \cdot (av_{t+1} + bg_t) \quad (18)$$

where, as before, T is the horizon of the weight prediction and a and b are the coefficients for the Spike Compensation. When combined with Spike Compensation $\hat{w}_v(t, D, T) \neq \hat{w}_w(t, D, T)$. In the combination $\hat{w}_w(t, D, T)$ can be interpreted as using Spike Compensation to approximate the velocity used in the weight prediction which also corresponds to a different choice of \hat{g} in equation (10) using the most recent gradient estimate.

3.4 Analysis for a Convex Quadratic

In this section we analyze the optimization of a convex quadratic loss with gradient delay. We find that delay causes effects that can generally not be mitigated through hyperparameter tuning but our methods:

- Improve convergence for large condition numbers
- Allow higher learning rates for large momentum values
- Restore the benefits of momentum for poorly conditioned losses

Although the loss surfaces of convex quadratics are much simpler than those of neural networks, they can be a useful tool to gain a high level understanding of various aspects of neural network optimization. For instance, Zhang et al. (2019a) accurately model the effect of batch size on neural network optimization through a noisy quadratic model. Venigalla et al. (2020), Giladi et al. (2019), and Yang et al. (2019) use quadratic models to analyze gradient




Figure 6. These plots show the magnitude of the dominant root of the characteristic polynomials given in equations (20)-(23) as a function of the normalized rate $\eta\lambda$ and the momentum m . The two leftmost plots show zero delay baselines and the other plots use a delay of $D = 1$. The blacked out region has roots with magnitudes larger than one and is therefore unstable. For a delay of one, Nesterov momentum is equivalent to Spike Compensation, but for larger delays this does not hold and Nesterov is only marginally better than GDM.

delay mitigation methods for use in asynchronous deep network training. In general we find that the insights from the convex quadratic hold surprisingly well for neural networks as shown in our experiments and the appendix.

We follow a similar approach as (O’donoghue & Candes, 2015; Goh, 2017) and write the loss in terms of an eigenbasis of the quadratic as:

$$L(\phi) = \phi^T \Lambda \phi, \quad \Lambda = \text{diag}(\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(N)}) \quad (19)$$

where $\phi = [\phi^{(1)}, \dots, \phi^{(N)}]^T$ correspond to the parameters being optimized and $\lambda^{(1)} \geq \dots \geq \lambda^{(N)} > 0$ are the eigenvalues of the quadratic. As shown in e.g. Goh (2017), any positive definite quadratic can be written in this form through a coordinate transformation. Since Λ is diagonal, each coordinate of the gradient $\nabla_{\phi} L(\phi) = \Lambda \phi$ is independent of other coordinates. This allows us to analyze the convergence for each coordinate separately. For simplicity we assume that the gradient is deterministic. A similar analysis would hold for the expected values of ϕ if each gradient sample was assumed to be noisy but unbiased.

In Appendix I we derive the state transition equations for SGDM with delay and our methods. Since the gradient here is linear, and the coordinates are independent, inserting it into the transition equations results in a linear recurrence relation for each coordinate. For component $\phi^{(k)}$, with associated eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda^{(k)}$, the characteristic polynomial for the recurrence relation of each method is:

$$\text{GDM: } p(z) = z^{\tau+1} - (1+m)z^{\tau} + mz^{\tau-1} - \eta\lambda \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GSC: } p(z) &= z^{\tau+2} - (1+m)z^{\tau+1} + mz^{\tau} \\ &+ \eta\lambda \cdot (a+b)z - \eta\lambda mb \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LWP: } p(z) &= z^{\tau+2} - (1+m)z^{\tau+1} + mz^{\tau} \\ &+ \eta\lambda \cdot (1+T)z - \eta\lambda T \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

LWP^w+GSC:

$$\begin{aligned} p(z) &= z^{\tau+3} - (1+m)z^{\tau+2} + mz^{\tau+1} \\ &+ \eta\lambda \cdot (a+b)(T+1)z^2 \\ &- \eta\lambda \cdot ((T+1)mb + T \cdot (a+b))z \\ &+ \eta\lambda Tmb \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where GDM stands for gradient descent with momentum, GSC is general Spike Compensation, LWP is linear weight prediction, z parameterizes the polynomials and other symbols have the same meaning as in Section 3.3. Note that since the gradient is linear, GSC and LWP are equivalent for a certain choice of a , b and T as shown in Appendix I. Even though this is the case, the characteristic polynomial of the combination cannot be obtained from either method.

Linear recurrence relations have a well known solution in terms of the roots of the corresponding characteristic equation. The resulting sequence for component $\phi^{(i)}$, corresponding to the characteristic polynomial $p(z)$ with roots r_1, \dots, r_n , can be written as:

$$\phi_t^{(i)} = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k(t) r_k^t \quad (24)$$

where $q_k(t)$ is a polynomial. The order of the polynomial is one less than the multiplicity of the corresponding root r_k . The coefficients of the polynomials are determined by the initial conditions.

For our analysis we assume that all components start with some error and look at the rate of convergence in the limit




Figure 7. The half-life of the error as a function of the conditioning number when optimizing a convex quadratic with delay D . All methods improve the convergence rate, $LWP_D^w+SC_D$ performs best.

$t \rightarrow \infty$. A component $\phi^{(i)}$ converges to the optimal value of 0 if $|r_{\max}| = \max_k(|r_k|) < 1$. In the limit, the slowest term of equation (24) will dominate so the error for this component, $\varepsilon^{(i)}$ will be:

$$\varepsilon_t^{(i)} = |\phi_t^{(i)} - 0| \propto |r_{\max}|^t \quad (25)$$

The overall rate of convergence is determined by the slowest component. The slowest component depends on the roots of the characteristic polynomial. These can be difficult to determine analytically, so we turn to computational analysis. For a given delay, we can compute the roots of the characteristic polynomials (20)-(23), including $|r_{\max}|$, as a function of the normalized rate $\lambda\eta$ and the momentum m . Figure 6 shows heatmaps of $|r_{\max}|$ for each method for a delay of one and our default values of a , b and T . Note that the region of stability is significantly reduced by the delay, especially for large momentum values. Our compensation methods counteract this, allowing larger learning rates to be used for high momentum values. SC_D in particular strictly increases the region of stability, the other methods slightly decrease it for small momentum coefficients.

Figure 6 also allow us to reason about more than a single component at a time. Let’s assume that we have multiple components, a condition number $\kappa = \lambda_1/\lambda_N$ and a dense spectrum of eigenvalues between λ_1 and λ_N . The same learning rate η and momentum m are used for all components. The overall convergence rate is determined by the component with the largest $|r_{\max}|$. This corresponds to the largest value in a horizontal line segment between $\eta\lambda_N$ and $\eta\lambda_1$ on the root heatmaps. With a log scale the line segment has a constant length determined by κ .

Figure 7 shows the convergence speed as a function of κ for the different methods. We measure the half-life $-\ln 2 / \ln |r^*|$ where $|r^*|$ is obtained by finding the lowest max magnitude over all intervals of sufficient length. The methods improve the rate of convergence compared to the delayed baseline. The combination performs the best which also holds for larger delays as is shown in Figure 8.




Figure 8. The optimal half-life of the error for different delays when optimizing a convex quadratic with $\kappa = 10^3$.




Figure 9. The effect of momentum and the horizon T for weight prediction on the optimal half-life when optimizing a convex quadratic with $\kappa = 10^3$ for a delay $D = 5$.

As mentioned earlier, GSC and LWP can be equivalent for a convex quadratic. The fact that LWP_D slightly outperforms SC_D indicates that our selection of $T = D$ is better than the selection of a and b as given in equation (7) in this case. Figure 9 shows the effect of different values of T . It shows that values close to $T = 2D$ are optimal but do not outperform the combination $LWP_D^w+SC_D$. This seems to indicate that “overcompensating” for the delays, by predicting weights further out in LWP or equivalently by using larger spikes in SC, seems to produce better optimization trajectories. The resulting root heatmaps resemble the ones for the no-delay Nesterov baseline (see $LWP_D^w+SC_D$ in Figure 6, LWP with $T = 2D$ looks similar). Note that adding Nesterov to the delay is not sufficient to get this effect. In Appendix J we show the effect of extended horizons for both the convex quadratic and a neural network.

Figure 9 also reveals that without mitigation ($T = 0$ is equal to GDM with delay), the optimal momentum is zero. In the no-delay case the optimal momentum is given by $m = ((\sqrt{\kappa} - 1)/(\sqrt{\kappa} + 1))^2$ (Zhang & Mitliagkas, 2017) which increases with the condition number. Our compensation methods restore the benefits of momentum for high condition numbers. Overall the combined mitigation performs the best. Extended horizons for LWP or the equivalent coefficients for GSC also outperform our default choice in this case but are unable to match the combination $LWP_D^w+SC_D$.




Figure 10. SGDM training of CIFAR-10 ResNet-20 with ON validation curves (mean \pm std.dev of 3 runs). Hyperparameter scaling rules described in Appendix E produce equivalent training.




Figure 11. Pipelined Backpropagation training of CIFAR-10 ResNet-20 using Online Normalization. Final validation accuracy decreases as batch size is increased.

Table 1. CIFAR-10 final validation accuracy (mean \pm std.dev of 3 runs) for ResNet (RN) using Online Normalization.

NETWORK	STAGES	SGDM	PB
RN20	34	92.19 \pm 0.26	92.13 \pm 0.18
RN32	52	92.86 \pm 0.04	93.05 \pm 0.13
RN44	70	92.98 \pm 0.22	93.16 \pm 0.13
RN56	88	93.21 \pm 0.07	93.37 \pm 0.13
RN110	169	93.83 \pm 0.11	93.74 \pm 0.13

4 EXPERIMENTS

The goal of our experiments is to investigate the convergence properties of small batch, fine-grained Pipeline Backpropagation and compare it to standard mini-batch gradient descent. As mentioned before, the experiments are performed on GPUs which do not benefit from pipelined training. Therefore, we do not compare wall-time to convergence, but Zhang et al. (2019c), Li & Pedram (2017), and Chen et al. (2016) have shown significant improvement in throughput and processing efficiency when pipelining neural network training on appropriate hardware. We experiment with two families of networks, VGG (Simonyan & Zisserman, 2014) and pre-activation ResNets (He et al., 2016b) on two commonly used image classification benchmarks, CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009) and ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009). We adopt the data preprocessing and hyperparameter settings for VGG and ResNet from Fu (2019) and Chiley et al. (2019) respectively. The delay created by PB is defined by the depth of the network architecture so we test various network depths. When applicable, each convolutional layer is combined with its associated activation function and normalization layer into a single pipeline stage. In our implementation the summation of a residual branch and a skip connection in residual networks also becomes a stage. In each row of Tables 1-4, the values within one standard error of the maximum accuracy are highlighted. Other details about our experimental setup can be found in Appendix M.




Figure 12. ImageNet ResNet-50 validation accuracy.

4.1 Small Batch Sizes and Effective Normalization

The memory requirements of pipeline parallelism have a quadratic dependency on the number of stages. To keep the overall memory requirements reasonable, we use a batch size of one in our PB experiments unless otherwise stated. We take the learning rate and momentum used at a reference batch size and scale them according to the rules provided in Appendix E. The rules attempt to keep the impulse response of each gradient (the contribution to weight updates over time) similar at different batch sizes. Figure 10 shows training curves for ResNet-20 on CIFAR-10 at a batch size of 1 and 128 when using Stochastic Gradient Descent with Momentum (SGDM). The curves are near identical, suggesting that the hyperparameter scaling rules produce similar training trajectories when using different batch sizes. This enables a fair comparison between PB and SGDM even though different batch sizes are used. For our SGDM baselines, we use a batch size of 128 for CIFAR-10 and 32 for ImageNet since SGDM training at batch size 1 on GPUs is slow and expensive.

In PB the delay (number of optimization steps) between the forward and backwards passes for a given stage is determined by the network architecture. The effect of the delay depends on the total weight change that occurs over the course of the delay. When the learning rate and momentum

Table 2. CIFAR-10 final validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of 5 runs) for ResNet (RN) with group normalization and VGG training.

NETWORK	STAGES	SGDM	PB	PIPEDREAM	PB+LWP _D	PB+SC _D	PB+LWP _D ^v +SC _D
VGG11	29	91.16 ±0.19	90.83±0.20	90.93±0.12	91.05±0.11	91.08 ±0.19	91.12 ±0.18
VGG13	33	92.57 ±0.15	92.59 ±0.15	92.30±0.24	92.51±0.11	92.38±0.27	92.56 ±0.14
VGG16	39	92.24±0.19	92.06±0.21	59.31±45.01 ²	92.22±0.24	92.45 ±0.30	92.38 ±0.27
RN20	34	90.63±0.31	90.44±0.24	90.36±0.06	90.68±0.30	90.80 ±0.29	90.92 ±0.25
RN32	52	91.68±0.23	91.46±0.09	91.40±0.28	91.66±0.10	91.55±0.14	92.04 ±0.13
RN44	70	92.19 ±0.14	91.71±0.25	91.72±0.14	92.00±0.14	92.13 ±0.16	92.16 ±0.26
RN56	88	92.39±0.20	91.89±0.40	91.82±0.19	92.31±0.14	92.33±0.16	92.48 ±0.11
RN110	169	92.77 ±0.22	91.81±0.15	91.92±0.33	92.76 ±0.05	92.28±0.29	92.41±0.16

Table 3. CIFAR-10 validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of 5 runs) when tuning the learning rate (LR) for ResNet-20 with GN training. The learning rate shown is used for batch size 128 SGDM training and is adjusted for batch size one PB training.

LR	SGDM	PB	PB+LWP _D ^v +SC _D
0.0125	88.76±0.45	88.77±0.22	89.32 ±0.26
0.025	89.88±0.32	89.55±0.35	90.06 ±0.23
0.05	90.47±0.22	90.10±0.40	90.80 ±0.37
0.1	90.63±0.31	90.44±0.24	90.92 ±0.25
0.2	90.69±0.25	90.22±0.11	90.89 ±0.28
0.4	89.54±0.32	88.82±0.32	89.93 ±0.20
0.8	69.16±33.08 ²	83.53±1.39	88.01 ±0.56

are scaled as we do, the magnitude of the weight change depends on the number of samples processed between the forward and backwards passes. As a result, decreasing the batch size produce smaller changes in the weights and therefore helps mitigate the effects of delay and weight inconsistency in PB. Figure 11 shows that PB performs best at batch size one.

Batch normalization has been shown to perform poorly at small batch sizes (Singh & Krishnan, 2019). We experiment with two alternatives, Group Normalization (GN) from Wu & He (2018) and Online Normalization (ON) proposed by Chiley et al. (2019), which both work at batch size one. With ON we find that PB training does not cause a loss of accuracy when training ResNets on CIFAR-10 with a small batch size (Table 1). Group Normalization does not perform as well for CIFAR-10 in general, the baseline SGDM accuracy is significantly lower. Online Normalization and Batch Normalization may benefit from a regularization effect caused by cross-sample noise in the normalization statistics. The original Group Normalization work shows good performance on ImageNet where such a regularization effect might be less important. Aside from the baseline accuracy degradation, performing PB with GN also suffers from an additional degradation depending on the pipeline depth (Fig-

²Unstable training.




Figure 13. CIFAR-10 PB with Gradient Shrinking validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of 5 runs) for ResNet-44 with GN.

ure 12³, Table 2). The choice of normalization can therefore have a significant impact on the performance of PB.

4.2 Mitigation Methods

Pipelined Backpropagation can suffer from a loss of accuracy or instability in some settings. This is more prominent in ResNets with GN and VGG networks so we use them to measure the effect of our mitigation methods and compare them to other existing methods found in literature. For LWP and SC the default hyperparameters suggested by our convex quadratic analysis (Section 3.4) are used without further tuning. The results can potentially be improved with a hyperparameter search.

Table 3 shows a learning rate sweep for training ResNet-20 with GN on CIFAR-10 with both SGDM and PB. We find that PB suffers from a small accuracy degradation that cannot be tuned away by adjusting the learning rate. The original learning rate of 0.1 adopted from He et al. (2016a) and the appropriately scaled version for batch size one training is optimal in both cases. We find that PB tolerates higher learning rates than SGDM. This could be an advantage of using small batches which Li et al. (2018) suggest makes

³Wu & He (2018) report an accuracy of 75.9%. They do this by extending and modifying the learning rate schedule we used which we adopted from (He et al., 2016a).

Table 4. CIFAR-10 (C10) validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of five runs) and ImageNet (I1k) validation accuracy (single run) comparing SpecTrain and our methods for ResNet (RN) and VGG training.

NETWORKS(DATASET)	SGDM	PB	PB+LWP _D ^v +SC _D	SPECTRAIN
VGG13 (C10)	92.57 ±0.15	92.59 ±0.15	92.56 ±0.14	92.49 ±0.12
RN20 (C10)	90.63±0.31	90.44±0.24	90.92 ±0.25	90.93 ±0.09
RN56 (C10)	92.39±0.20	91.89±0.40	92.48±0.11	92.72 ±0.10
RN50 (I1k)	75.7	75.1	75.8	75.3

hyperparameters less sensitive than for larger batch sizes. Table 3 shows our methods can improve convergence and decrease sensitivity to changes in the learning rate.

Table 2 and Figure 12 compare the accuracy of SGDM and PB training for several networks and different mitigation methods. PB suffers from an accuracy degradation depending on the network depth. Both Spike Compensation and Linear Weight Prediction help mitigate the loss of accuracy but their combination generally performs the best as suggested by our analysis (Section 3.4). The combination recovers the full SGDM accuracy for ResNet-50 training and for every CIFAR-10 experiment except for the deepest network, ResNet-110. In that case it still closes most of the gap but LWP_D performs better and produces results competitive with SGDM. Overcompensating for the delays is thus helpful in most cases but may be less effective for the large delays encountered in the deepest networks. Training with large delays may be more sensitive to individual predictions and corrections, benefiting the comparatively more conservative LWP_D.

Like Chen et al. (2018), we find that the Weight Stashing method used in PipeDream (Harlap et al., 2018) to address weight inconsistency does not aid our training (Table 2, Appendix N). In Appendix F we show that the effects of weight inconsistency only become significant at large delays that are not encountered in our setting. Figure 13 shows that Gradient Shrinking (Zhuang et al., 2019) is also not effective for this type of training, no value of the shrinking factor is able to improve PB accuracy for RN44. Out of existing methods, SpecTrain (Chen et al., 2018) performs the best (Table 4). Similar to LWP_D^v+SC_D it is able to recover or even improve accuracy on CIFAR-10. However, it is not able to recover accuracy for ResNet-50 training on ImageNet and doubles the memory and compute overhead of our combined mitigation (Appendix H). Out of the mitigation methods tested, LWP_D^v+SC_D is thus the only one that is competitive to SGDM training in both the CIFAR-10 and ImageNet experiments.

5 CONCLUSION

Fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation has several advantages for hardware compared to traditional training using

batch parallel Stochastic Gradient Descent. As discussed in Sections 1 and 2 this can give large efficiency improvements for hardware architectures that can properly exploit these properties, such as Coarse-Grained Reconfigurable Arrays. However, traditional PB training can suffer from accuracy degradation and instability compared to standard training due to delayed gradients and weight inconsistency.

We show that small micro-batch sizes are crucial for making fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation viable. Combined with an appropriate choice (or scaling) of hyperparameters, small batches reduce the negative effects of gradient delay and weight inconsistency. The use of small micro-batches also reduces the memory requirements that could otherwise be excessive. Unlike traditional training, fine-grained pipelined backpropagation can be efficient with small micro-batch sizes when combined with persistent kernels that do not need to amortize weight loading.

A good choice of normalization can also significantly aid Pipelined Backpropagation training. We experiment with two normalization options that work at batch size one, On-line Normalization and Group Normalization. We observe that ON is significantly more robust to and helps stabilize training.

For cases where fine-grained, small batch, Pipelined Backpropagation suffers from an accuracy degradation, we present two new mitigation approaches, SC and LWP. We analyze their workings on a quadratic model which suggests that the methods can increase stability, accelerate convergence, and restore the beneficial effects of momentum in the presence of gradient delays. The analysis also suggests that combining the methods and thus “overcompensating” for the delays can improve convergence. Our neural network experiments with PB confirm these advantages. We find that the combined mitigation outperforms existing mitigation strategies, allowing our PB training to match the reference accuracy on both ImageNet and CIFAR-10 with minimal overhead and without the need of additional hyperparameter tuning.

With our methods, PB is a promising alternative to traditional training. Future hardware architectures could reap significant efficiency gains from using small batch size, fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Vithursan Thangarasa, Ron Estrin, Natalia Vassilieva, and Dennis DeCoste for their feedback on the manuscript. We thank Min Xu for his help with the dataloader used in our GProp experiments and Chuan-Yung Tsai for insightful discussions.

REFERENCES

- Amodei, D. and Hernandez, D. AI and compute, 2018. URL <https://openai.com/blog/ai-and-compute/>.
- Avron, H., Druinsky, A., and Gupta, A. Revisiting asynchronous linear solvers: Provable convergence rate through randomization. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 62(6):51, 2015.
- Belilovsky, E., Eickenberg, M., and Oyallon, E. Decoupled greedy learning of cnns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08164*, 2019.
- Chen, C.-C., Yang, C.-L., and Cheng, H.-Y. Efficient and robust parallel dnn training through model parallelism on multi-gpu platform. *ArXiv*, abs/1809.02839, 2018.
- Chen, X., Eversole, A., Li, G., Yu, D., and Seide, F. Pipelined back-propagation for context-dependent deep neural networks. In *Interspeech*. ISCA, September 2012.
- Chen, Y.-H., Emer, J., and Sze, V. Eyeriss: A spatial architecture for energy-efficient dataflow for convolutional neural networks. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 44(3):367–379, 2016.
- Chen, Y.-H., Yang, T.-J., Emer, J., and Sze, V. Eyeriss v2: A flexible accelerator for emerging deep neural networks on mobile devices. *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, 9(2):292–308, 2019.
- Chetlur, S., Woolley, C., Vandermersch, P., Cohen, J., Tran, J., Catanzaro, B., and Shelhamer, E. cuDNN: Efficient primitives for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.0759*, 2014.
- Chiley, V., Sharapov, I., Kosson, A., Koster, U., Reece, R., Samaniego de la Fuente, S., Subbiah, V., and James, M. Online normalization for training neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pp. 8431–8441. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- Chiley, V., Kosson, A., and Koster, U. Error compensation mechanism in online normalization, Apr 2020. URL <https://www.cerebras.net/error-compensation-mechanism-in-online-normalization/>.
- Dauphin, Y. N. and Schoenholz, S. MetaInit: Initializing learning by learning to initialize. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 12624–12636, 2019.
- De, S. and Smith, S. L. Batch normalization biases deep residual networks towards shallow paths. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.10444*, 2020.
- Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L.-J., Li, K., and Fei-Fei, L. ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *CVPR09*, 2009.
- Diamos, G., Sengupta, S., Catanzaro, B., Chrzanowski, M., Coates, A., Elsen, E., Engel, J., Hannun, A., and Satheesh, S. Persistent rnns: Stashing recurrent weights on-chip. In Balcan, M. F. and Weinberger, K. Q. (eds.), *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2024–2033, New York, New York, USA, 20–22 Jun 2016. PMLR.
- Fu, C.-Y. pytorch-vgg-cifar10, May 2019. URL <https://github.com/chengyangfu/pytorch-vgg-cifar10>.
- Gaunt, A. L., Johnson, M. A., Riechert, M., Tarlow, D., Tomioka, R., Vytiniotis, D., and Webster, S. AMPNet: Asynchronous model-parallel training for dynamic neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.09786*, 2017.
- Giladi, N., Nacson, M. S., Hoffer, E., and Soudry, D. At stability’s edge: How to adjust hyperparameters to preserve minima selection in asynchronous training of neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12340*, 2019.
- Goh, G. Why momentum really works. *Distill*, 2017. doi: 10.23915/distill.00006.
- Graphcore. Graphcore documents, 2020. URL <https://docs.graphcore.ai/projects/tf-model-parallelism/en/latest/pipelining.html>.
- Hakimi, I., Barkai, S., Gabel, M., and Schuster, A. Taming momentum in a distributed asynchronous environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11612*, 2019.
- Harlap, A., Narayanan, D., Phanishayee, A., Seshadri, V., Devanur, N. R., Ganger, G. R., and Gibbons, P. B. PipeDream: Fast and efficient pipeline parallel dnn training. *ArXiv*, abs/1806.03377, 2018.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016a.
- He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., and Sun, J. Identity mappings in deep residual networks. In *European conference on computer vision*, pp. 630–645. Springer, 2016b.

- Huang, Y., Cheng, Y., Chen, D., Lee, H., Ngiam, J., Le, Q. V., and Chen, Z. GPipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *ArXiv*, abs/1811.06965, 2018.
- Huo, Z., Gu, B., and Huang, H. Training neural networks using features replay. In Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Larochelle, H., Grauman, K., Cesa-Bianchi, N., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31*, pp. 6659–6668. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018a.
- Huo, Z., Gu, B., qian Yang, and Huang, H. Decoupled parallel backpropagation with convergence guarantee. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 2098–2106, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm Sweden, 10–15 Jul 2018b. PMLR.
- Ioffe, S. and Szegedy, C. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 37*, ICML’15, pp. 448–456. JMLR.org, 2015.
- Jaderberg, M., Czarnecki, W. M., Osindero, S., Vinyals, O., Graves, A., Silver, D., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Decoupled neural interfaces using synthetic gradients. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1627–1635, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia, 06–11 Aug 2017. PMLR.
- Jia, Z., Tillman, B., Maggioni, M., and Scarpazza, D. P. Dissecting the graphcore ipu architecture via microbenchmarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03413*, 2019.
- Krizhevsky, A., Hinton, G., et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images, 2009.
- Li, H., Xu, Z., Taylor, G., Studer, C., and Goldstein, T. Visualizing the loss landscape of neural nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 6389–6399, 2018.
- Li, Y. and Pedram, A. Caterpillar: Coarse grain reconfigurable architecture for accelerating the training of deep neural networks. In *2017 IEEE 28th International Conference on Application-specific Systems, Architectures and Processors (ASAP)*, pp. 1–10. IEEE, 2017.
- Lian, X., Huang, Y., Li, Y., and Liu, J. Asynchronous parallel stochastic gradient for nonconvex optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2737–2745, 2015.
- Lie, S. Wafer-scale ml, 2 2020. URL <https://info.matroid.com/scaledml-media-archive-2020>.
- Masters, D. and Luschi, C. Revisiting small batch training for deep neural networks. *ArXiv*, abs/1804.07612, 2018.
- Mattson, P., Cheng, C., Diamos, G., Coleman, C., Micikevicius, P., Patterson, D., Tang, H., Wei, G.-Y., Bailis, P., Bittorf, V., Brooks, D., Chen, D., Dutta, D., Gupta, U., Hazelwood, K., Hock, A., Huang, X., Kang, D., Kanter, D., Kumar, N., Liao, J., Narayanan, D., Oguntebi, T., Pekhimenko, G., Pentecost, L., Janapa Reddi, V., Robie, T., St John, T., Wu, C.-J., Xu, L., Young, C., and Zaharia, M. Mlperf training benchmark. In Dhillon, I., Papailiopoulos, D., and Sze, V. (eds.), *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 2, pp. 336–349, 2020.
- Mitliagkas, I., Zhang, C., Hadjis, S., and Ré, C. Asynchrony begets momentum, with an application to deep learning. *2016 54th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pp. 997–1004, 2016.
- Nicol, C. A coarse grain reconfigurable array (cgara) for statically scheduled data flow computing, 2017.
- NVIDIA. Nvidia a100 tensor core gpu architecture, 2020. URL <https://www.nvidia.com/content/dam/en-zz/Solutions/Data-Center/nvidia-ampere-architecture-whitepaper.pdf>.
- NVIDIA. Nvidia data center deep learning product performance, Jan 2021. URL <https://developer.nvidia.com/deep-learning-performance-training-inference>.
- O’donoghue, B. and Candes, E. Adaptive restart for accelerated gradient schemes. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 15(3):715–732, 2015.
- Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 8024–8035, 2019.
- Pétrowski, A., Dreyfus, G., and Girault, C. Performance analysis of a pipelined backpropagation parallel algorithm. *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, 4 6:970–81, 1993.
- Podobas, A., Sano, K., and Matsuoka, S. A survey on coarse-grained reconfigurable architectures from a performance perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04509*, 2020.
- Qiao, S., Wang, H., Liu, C., Shen, W., and Yuille, A. L. Weight standardization. *CoRR*, abs/1903.10520, 2019.

- Sambanova. Accelerated computing with a reconfigurable dataflow architecture, 2020. URL <https://sambanova.ai/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/RDA-Whitepaper.pdf>.
- Serebryakov, S., Milojevic, D., Vassilieva, N., Fleischman, S., and Clark, R. D. Deep learning cookbook: Recipes for your ai infrastructure and applications. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Rebooting Computing (ICRC)*, pp. 1–9, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICRC.2019.8914704.
- Shallue, C. J., Lee, J., Antognini, J., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Frostig, R., and Dahl, G. E. Measuring the effects of data parallelism on neural network training. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(112):1–49, 2019.
- Shoeybi, M., Patwary, M., Puri, R., LeGresley, P., Casper, J., and Catanzaro, B. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using gpu model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- Simonyan, K. and Zisserman, A. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- Singh, S. and Krishnan, S. Filter response normalization layer: Eliminating batch dependence in the training of deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09737*, 2019.
- Vassilieva, N. Neural network parallelism at wafer scale, Apr 2020. URL <https://www.cerebras.net/data-model-pipeline-parallel-training-neural-networks/>.
- Venigalla, A., Kosson, A., Chiley, V., and Köster, U. Adaptive Braking for Mitigating Gradient Delay. In *International Conference on Machine Learning Workshop on Beyond First-Order Optimization Methods in Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Wu, Y. and He, K. Group normalization. In *The European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, September 2018.
- Xu, A., Huo, Z., and Huang, H. Diversely stale parameters for efficient training of cnns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02625*, 2019.
- Yang, B., Zhang, J., Li, J., Ré, C., Aberger, C. R., and De Sa, C. Pipemare: Asynchronous pipeline parallel DNN training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05124*, 2019.
- Zhang, G., Li, L., Nado, Z., Martens, J., Sachdeva, S., Dahl, G., Shallue, C., and Grosse, R. B. Which algorithmic choices matter at which batch sizes? insights from a noisy quadratic model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 8196–8207, 2019a.
- Zhang, H., Dauphin, Y. N., and Ma, T. Fixup initialization: Residual learning without normalization. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, pp. 1–16, 2019b.
- Zhang, J. and Mitliagkas, I. Yellowfin and the art of momentum tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.03471*, 2017.
- Zhang, Y., Rucker, A., Vilim, M., Prabhakar, R., Hwang, W., and Olukotun, K. Scalable interconnects for reconfigurable spatial architectures. In *2019 ACM/IEEE 46th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pp. 615–628. IEEE, 2019c.
- Zhuang, H., Wang, Y., Liu, Q., and Lin, Z. Fully decoupled neural network learning using delayed gradients. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.09108, 2019.

Table 5. GPU FLOPS utilization for training neural networks.

NETWORK	SYSTEM	#GPUS	UTILIZATION
RESNET50	A100 DGX	1	16.4%
RESNET50	A100 DGX	8	15.9%
BERT _{LARGE}	A100 DGX	8	36.8%

A DATA PARALLEL COMPUTE EFFICIENCY

The limited compute efficiency of large scale data parallel training systems is a major motivation for exploring alternative training methods. We use the theoretical utilization to quantify the compute efficiency, defined as:

$$\text{utilization} = \frac{\text{FLOPS}_U}{\text{FLOPS}_H} = \frac{\frac{\text{FLOP}_N \text{ samples}}{\text{sample sec}}}{\text{FLOPS}_H} \quad (26)$$

where FLOPS_U is the number of useful floating point operations performed each second during training, FLOPS_H denotes the rated maximum FLOPS for the hardware, and $\frac{\text{FLOP}_N}{\text{sample}}$ represents the number of floating point operations required to train the network on a single sample. Nvidia publishes the training speed (measured in samples per second) for highly optimized implementations of various common neural networks (NVIDIA, 2021). Paired with the FLOPs used per sample (Serebryakov et al., 2019) and the hardware’s max rated FLOPS (NVIDIA, 2020) we can calculate the compute utilization efficiency of training common neural networks using data parallelism on widely used deep learning hardware (Table 5). Using a higher number of accelerators can reduce the wall-clock time of training, but generally lowers the compute efficiency as can be seen from MLPerf (Mattson et al., 2020). The worker specialization that fine grained pipeline parallelism enables is promising for efficient training in terms of power, and throughput (Zhang et al., 2019c; Li & Pedram, 2017; Chen et al., 2016; 2019). This work explores ways to mitigate the downsides of pipeline-parallel training making it even more efficient.

B PIPELINED BACKPROPAGATION

Pipeline parallelism is an interesting alternative or supplement to data parallelism (Appendix C). To perform SGD training using pipeline parallelism, the same weights must be used on the forward and backwards passes. To satisfy this the pipeline needs to be empty before updating the weights. While the pipeline is filling or draining some workers sit idle which lowers utilization. The fill and drain overhead is illustrated in Figure 2.

Assume a pipeline has S pipeline stages and each stage performs a single forward and a single backward transformation at each time step. Each sample is processed in $2S - 1$ time steps. Performing a mini-batch SGD update with N

samples takes roughly $N + 2S - 2 \approx N + 2S$ steps⁴. The work performed only corresponds to N fully utilized steps so the overall utilization is upper bounded by

$$\frac{N}{N + 2S} \quad (27)$$

Unless $N \gg S$ this represents a significant overhead.

Pipelined Backpropagation (Pérowski et al., 1993) avoids the fill and drain overhead by relaxing the constraint that the same weights must be used for the forward and backwards passes. In PB the pipeline is not drained before an update is applied, instead the parameters are updated as soon as N gradients have been obtained. This keeps all workers utilized after the pipeline is filled for the first time (Figure 2). We assume a batch size (N) of one and scale hyperparameters appropriately (Appendix E). We compare the weight updates of PB and SGD. We write SGD as:

$$\theta_{t+1} = \theta_t - \eta \nabla L(x_t; \theta_t) \quad (28)$$

where θ is the set of all model weights, x_t is the sample at time t , η is the learning rate, and L is the loss function. For PB we define w_i^s to be the weights for pipeline stage $s \in [0, \dots, S - 1]$ as seen by the i^{th} sample, x_i , as it propagates backwards through the network. W_i is defined as the concatenation (denoted by \parallel) of w_i^s for all stages and corresponds to the weights on the blue line in Figure 2:

$$W_i = w_i^0 \parallel w_i^1 \parallel \dots \parallel w_i^{S-1} \quad (29)$$

The weight update for x_i can then be written as:

$$W_{i+1} = W_i - \eta G(x_i; F_i, W_i) \quad (30)$$

where G approximates the gradient and F_i is the network state used for the forward pass of the network and corresponds to the weights on the red line in Figure 2. For PB with $N = 1$:

$$F_i = w_{i-2(S-1)}^0 \parallel w_{i-2(S-2)}^1 \parallel \dots \parallel w_i^{S-1} \quad (31)$$

(29) - (31) reveal that PB differs from SGD in two ways: *inconsistent weights* and *stale gradients*.

Inconsistent Weights Different weight are used during the forward and backwards pass, $W_i \neq F_i$. The resulting sample gradient is not the true sample gradient. The inconsistency is greater for earlier stages in the pipeline. If Weight Stashing (Harlap et al., 2018) is used to mitigate weight inconsistency the update is:

$$W_{i+1} = W_i - \eta G(x_i; F_i, F_i) = W_i - \eta \nabla L(x_i; F_i) \quad (32)$$

⁴This is assuming the workers are unable to speed up processing when they only perform one of the transformations, otherwise it may be about $N + S$.

Weight Stashing (WS) requires the overhead of storing parameter versions along with the activations.

Stale Gradients In PB each gradient is obtained using weights from various time steps. When the gradient is obtained the weights have been updated. This results in stale gradients (aka. *delayed gradients*), an issue that also occurs in asynchronous SGD training (Lian et al., 2015; Avron et al., 2015). The gradient staleness varies by stage, earlier stages suffer from a greater degree of staleness. The length of the grey lines in Figure 2 is proportional to the age of the weights, which is also a measure of the gradient delay for each stage. The depth of the pipeline determines the maximum delay. Weight Stashing does not address gradient delay because F_i in (32) is a delayed version of W_i .

C BATCH PARALLEL VS PIPELINE PARALLEL COMPUTATION

Pipeline parallelism differs from batch parallelism in several ways:

- The training memory requirements differ. In both cases we assume an L layer network trained with W workers. During neural network training, the activations of many layers must be stored for the gradient calculation. For batch parallelism the activation memory required is $O(LW)$. To compute the backwards pass, each worker has to store activations for roughly every layer. In the pipeline parallel setting, each worker is responsible for storing the activations of approximately L/W layers. The first worker must store its activations for $2W$ steps. The second worker needs to keep activations for $2(W - 1)$ steps and so on. The total activation memory comes out to be approximately the same, $O(LW)$, however, the per worker memory requirements can be very different. Pipeline parallelism generally requires less memory for storing model parameters potentially requiring only a single copy of each parameter. Unless special methods are used, batch parallelism may need to keep W copies of the model.
- The communication pattern is different. In pipeline parallelism each worker sends activations and the corresponding gradients to their neighbors. In distributed mini-batch training every worker must send the gradients for all model parameters and receive updated values after every batch. The bandwidth requirements in each case depend on the exact model used, the batch size, as well as other factors.
- Both pipeline parallel training and synchronized distributed batch parallel training can suffer from worker balancing bottlenecks. When using pipeline parallelism, care must be taken to balance the throughput of all workers since the overall speed is determined by the slowest worker. This load balancing issue could

be handled in software (Harlap et al., 2018) without requiring users to manually specify the model division. In synchronized distributed SGD care must be taken to balance the throughput and master node communication of all workers since the overall speed is determined by the slowest worker.

- Batch normalization (Ioffe & Szegedy, 2015) requires batch parallelism. In our work we are interested in replacing batch parallelism with fine-grained pipeline parallelism. We therefore operate at a micro-batch size of one which does not work well with Batch Normalization. Newer normalization techniques such as Group Normalization (Wu & He, 2018), Weight Standardization (Qiao et al., 2019), Filter Response Normalization (Singh & Krishnan, 2019) and Online Normalization (Chiley et al., 2019; 2020) are alternative normalization techniques which work well and can be used with small batch sizes. Alternatively initialization methods can be used to enable training without normalization (Zhang et al., 2019b; Dauphin & Schoenholz, 2019; De & Smith, 2020).

D GPU BOTTLENECKS FOR FINE-GRAINED PIPELINED TRAINING

A GPU consists of multiple cores with limited local memory and large off-chip main memory. The main memory has high latency and relatively low bandwidth compared to the arithmetic throughput of the cores. To achieve high compute utilization, a GPU kernel must be designed to work around these memory bandwidth and latency limitations. Latency limitations are often managed by running a large number of threads in parallel and context switching to another thread when waiting on memory. Large batch operations can provide a workload with enough threads to hide latency issues but the arithmetic intensity of operations must also be high enough to alleviate bandwidth bottlenecks. Without sufficient cache reuse bandwidth becomes an issue. This can happen with small batch sizes and certain operations such as depth-wise convolutions, element-wise functions and sparse matrix multiplications.

Due to the activation memory requirements of pipelined training, modern network using this paradigm must use small batch sizes to fit in GPU memory. At small batch sizes, the amount of computation per kernel might be insufficient to utilize all compute resources, but a large number of kernels can run in parallel which can significantly increase compute utilization. The compute throughput of the GPU is equal to the rate at which kernels are launched multiplied by the work done by each kernel. As the work per kernel is decreased, the kernel launch rate must be increased to maintain compute throughput. At batch size one it may not be possible to launch kernels at a sufficient rate to keep

utilization high on small networks such as ResNet-20 for CIFAR-10. Larger networks tend to have more work done per kernel and do not suffer from this problem.

Without significant weight reuse, GPUs become memory bandwidth limited. For convolutional layers the weights are reused over the spatial and batch dimensions. Weight reuse increases as the spatial dimensions of the inputs increase. This makes bandwidth less of an issue for ImageNet (11k) scale networks when compared to CIFAR-10 scale networks.

There are a few other challenges to small batch sized training. At small batch sizes optimizer overheads become significant. Each optimizer step requires loading the entire model, consuming significant memory bandwidth. At large batch sizes this is amortized over the batch size. For a batch size of one the optimizer steps consume a large fraction of the total memory bandwidth. Similarly, the time required for any new memory allocations cannot be amortized over the batch size. While persistent kernels can enable some of the advantages and speedups of worker specialization (Diamos et al., 2016), the total on-chip memory of modern GPUs is too limited to run large models using fine-grained pipelined parallelism with persistent kernels; running multiple kernels on multiple threads concurrently limits the resources available to each threads making it impossible to keep weights in local memory or use persistent kernels for our work.

E SMALL BATCH SIZE TRAINING

We define the per-worker batch size to be the number of samples that each pipeline stage processes at a time and the update-size to be the number of samples that contribute to the gradient in each update. We set both of these to one in our experiments. Alternatively the update-size could be set to match some reference for which known hyperparameters exist but this is outside the scope of this work.

Since the optimal learning rate and momentum depend on the update size N , we scale the values used by the SGDM reference according to Chiley et al. (2019). This corresponds to scaling the effective learning rate linearly with the update size while scaling the momentum such that the decay per sample is the same. This allows for a fair comparison of techniques even though different update sizes are used. The scaling rules are:

$$m = m_r^{N/N_r}, \quad \eta = \frac{(1 - m)N}{(1 - m_r)N_r} \eta_r \quad (33)$$

where η_r , m_r and N_r are the reference learning rate, momentum coefficient and update size and η , m and N are the new values (we use $N = 1$).

Figures 14a and 14b shows that the hyperparameters produced using these scaling rule result in batch size 1 training

curves similar to the reference when training VGG11 on the CIFAR-10 dataset. A similar result can be seen for ResNet training in Figure 10.

F INCONSISTENT WEIGHTS VS STALE GRADIENTS

In Pipelined Backpropagation gradients are delayed and computed with inconsistent weights. This can lead to accuracy degradation and instability. In this section we investigate the relative importance of the effects. We do this by comparing training with delayed gradients using either inconsistent or consistent weights. In Appendix L we describe how we can simulate this in PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019) without using Pipelined Backpropagation.

Figure 15 shows the effects of delay on the final accuracy of CIFAR-10 ResNet-20 training with or without inconsistent weights. As can be seen, even modest delays affect the final accuracy of training. Weight inconsistency does not cause an additional loss of accuracy for small delays but causes a rapid loss of accuracy beyond a certain delay. This transition point where weight inconsistency starts to affect training will depend on the dataset and architecture. Harlap et al. (2018) and Chen et al. (2018) make opposing claims about the effect of weight inconsistency. Harlap et al. (2018) introduce Weight Stashing to fix weight inconsistency and claim its use is necessary for convergence. Chen et al. (2018) show that Weight Stashing has no effect on training in their experiments so it should not be used to avoid memory overhead. Our results suggest that the effects of weight inconsistency depend on the magnitude of delays reconciling the two claims.

We also investigate the effect of weight inconsistency in our fine-grained Pipelined Backpropagation setup. Table 2 compares PB training with and without Weight Stashing. The results suggest that Weight Stashing is not beneficial in our setup so we do not use it in other experiments. This indicates that weight inconsistency is likely not an issue and the accuracy losses of PB primarily stem from the gradient delay. As mentioned in the conclusion, the small batch sizes we use combined with the hyperparameter scaling may reduce the effects of the delay. For larger batch sizes weight inconsistency may be a bigger issue.

G FORMS OF WEIGHT PREDICTION

The goal of weight prediction is to approximate future weights to combat gradient delay and weight inconsistency. Linear Weight Prediction (LWP) gives a general form for predicting the network state T steps into the future by using the velocity. In Pipelined Backpropagation the delay varies for different stages. By default (LWP_D) we set T equal to the delay for every stage (see red arrows in Figure 16




Figure 14. Hyperparameter comparison using CIFAR-10 VGG11. Showing mean (shading is standard deviation) of ten runs.




Figure 15. The effect of weight inconsistency on the final validation accuracy of CIFAR-10 ResNet-20 (with Group Normalization) for different delays. **Consistent Delay** uses the same old version of the weights for both the forward and backward passes. This produces delayed gradients. **Forward Delay Only** uses old versions of the weights on the forward pass and current weights on the backwards pass, resulting in weight inconsistency. Delayed gradients result in a loss of final accuracy. Adding weight inconsistency only incurs additional degradation for large delays.

left). Other works have proposed related forms of weight prediction.

LWP is closely related to the weight prediction proposed in SpecTrain (Chen et al., 2018). SpecTrain extends the prediction horizon such that all stages predict to the same time step. This form of time synchronization is first described by Harlap et al. (2018) as Vertical Sync. The forward prediction horizon is depicted in green in Figure 16 left. With the extended prediction horizon, SpecTrain must also predict weights on the backwards pass to address inconsistency. The prediction horizon for the backward pass weights is depicted in blue in Figure 16 left. This can be seen as using a stage dependent extended prediction horizon (Appendix J).

Discrepancy correction (Yang et al., 2019) can be seen as a form of weight prediction. Whereas LWP and SpecTrain predict weights into the future to mitigate for gradient de-




Figure 16. Compute and Memory Overhead of PB Mitigations. Two of the stages are highlighted in red dashed lines and the yellow dashed line depicts a vertical synchronization boundary. **Left:** Shows the forward and backward prediction horizons of SpecTrain in green and blue respectively. The forward prediction horizon of LWP_D is shown in red and the backward prediction horizon of Pipemare’s discrepancy correction is shown in purple. **Right:** show the buffer lengths for Pipedreams Weight Stashing in blue and the gradient buffers of Vertical Sync in green.

lay and weight inconsistency, PipeMare approximates the weights used on the forward pass during the backward pass. This can only deal with weight inconsistency, but potentially provides a more accurate prediction. Discrepancy correction uses a separate exponential tracker for their prediction. LWP uses the optimizer velocity directly. In Appendix F we show that weight inconsistency is not a significant issue in our setting so we primarily focus on mitigating the effects of gradient delay.

DANA (Hakimi et al., 2019) is another variant of weight prediction that has been used in the ASGD setting but is not directly applicable to Pipelined Backpropagation.

H MITIGATION OVERHEAD

Figure 16 highlights two network stages and their associated overheads for different mitigation methods. Only two stages are highlighted but these overheads exist for every stage in the network. The two stages are highlighted with red dashed lines. The yellow dashed line shows a verti-

cal synchronization boundary. Figure 16 left depicts the forward and backward weight predictions of SpecTrain in green and blue, respectively. SpecTrain has the memory overhead of storing the forward and backward state as well as the compute overhead of predicting those states. The forward weight prediction of LWP is shown in red which has exactly half the overhead of SpecTrain. Pipemare’s discrepancy correction technique is a form of backward weight prediction (shown in purple) and has the compute and memory overhead of storing and predicting the forward pass network state for use in the backwards pass; they also introduce a state transition tracker to make this prediction. Their proposed warmup epochs would also incur the fill and drain overhead of pipelined training. Figure 16 right shows the weight and gradient tensor buffers required for Pipedream’s Weight Stashing and Vertical Sync in blue and green respectively. While Pipedream has by far the largest memory overhead, their methods which have no compute overhead. SC and Gradient Shrinking simply modify the weight update equations and have no memory or compute overhead.

I STATE TRANSITION EQUATIONS

In order to analyze and compare our methods, we view the optimization as a dynamical system in terms of its state transition equation. A similar approach is used in (O’donoghue & Candes, 2015; Goh, 2017; Giladi et al., 2019). We assume that $\bar{L}(w_t)$ is the underlying loss function we are trying to minimize where w_t are the weights at time t . For neural networks, \bar{L} could be the mean training loss, the expected loss over all training samples. We assume that for a given sample or time step, the gradient with respect to the weights is $\nabla \bar{L}(w_t) + R$ where $R = R(w_t)$ is a random variable. The expectation of R (over all samples) is assumed to be zero.

We are interested in comparing the dynamics of delayed SGDM, weight prediction, Spike Compensation and the combined mitigation. These can all be seen as special cases of the combined mitigation given in Section 3.3 for the appropriate choice of a , b and T . The velocity form of the combined mitigation, LWP^v+SC, results in a complicated state transition equation which can not be easily analyzed without further simplifications. The velocity form can be approximated with the weight difference form, LWP^w+SC. This form is simple to analyze so we use it for the rest of the analysis.

We analyze the systems in expectation and do not try to estimate the variance. Let \bar{w}_t and \bar{v}_t be the expected weights and velocity at time t . We can then write the expected state update for the combined mitigation at time t in terms of

previous expected values as:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{v}_{t+1} &= \mathbb{E}[m\bar{v}_t + g_t] \\ &= m\bar{v}_t + \bar{g}_t\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{w}_{t+1} &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_t - \eta \cdot (a\bar{v}_{t+1} + bg_t)] \\ &= \bar{w}_t - \eta \cdot (a\bar{v}_{t+1} + b\bar{g}_t)\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

where a , b are the coefficients for General Spike Compensation and $\bar{g}_t := \mathbb{E}[g_t]$ is the expected gradient arriving at time t . This gradient is calculated using weight prediction with horizon T from weights delayed by D time steps:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{g}_t &= \mathbb{E}[\nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D} + T \cdot (\bar{w}_{t-D} - \bar{w}_{t-D-1})) + R] \\ &= \nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D} + T \cdot (\bar{w}_{t-D} - \bar{w}_{t-D-1}))\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

We can isolate \bar{v}_{t+1} from equation (35):

$$\bar{v}_{t+1} = \frac{-1}{\eta a} (\bar{w}_{t+1} - \bar{w}_t) - \frac{b}{a} \bar{g}_t\quad (37)$$

Shifting the time index we obtain an expression for \bar{v}_t which we can insert into equation (34):

$$\bar{v}_{t+1} = \frac{-m}{\eta a} (\bar{w}_t - \bar{w}_{t-1}) - \frac{bm}{a} \bar{g}_{t-1} + \bar{g}_t\quad (38)$$

Combining equations (35), (36) and (38) we obtain a state transition equation in terms of the expected weights without the velocity:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{w}_{t+1} &= (1 + m)\bar{w}_t - m\bar{w}_{t-1} \\ &\quad - \eta \cdot (a + b)\nabla \bar{L}((T + 1)\bar{w}_{t-D} - T\bar{w}_{t-D-1}) \\ &\quad + \eta mb\nabla \bar{L}((T + 1)\bar{w}_{t-D-1} - T\bar{w}_{t-D-2})\end{aligned}\quad (39)$$

By inserting appropriate values for T , a and b we can obtain the state transition equations for General Spike Compensation (GSC, $T = 0$), linear weight prediction (LWP, $a = 1, b = 0$) and SGDM with delay ($a = 1, b = 0, T = 0$):

$$\text{SGDM: } \bar{w}_{t+1} = (1 + m)\bar{w}_t - m\bar{w}_{t-1} - \eta \nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D})\quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{GSC: } \bar{w}_{t+1} &= (1 + m)\bar{w}_t - m\bar{w}_{t-1} \\ &\quad - \eta \cdot (a + b)\nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D}) \\ &\quad + \eta mb\nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D-1})\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{LWP: } \bar{w}_{t+1} &= (1 + m)\bar{w}_t - m\bar{w}_{t-1} \\ &\quad - \eta \nabla \bar{L}((T + 1)\bar{w}_{t-D} - T\bar{w}_{t-D-1})\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

We note that unlike state transition equation of SGDM the equations for LWP and GSC both contain \bar{w}_{t-D-1} . This means that the mitigation methods generally do not correspond to a simple change in the hyperparameter values of SGDM. Similarly, the combination of GSC and LWP has an additional \bar{w}_{t-D-2} term and thus does not simply correspond to a different setting of a , b or T for either method.

I.1 Comparing LWP and GSC

The equations for LWP and GSC contain the same weight terms which could indicate that they operate in similar ways. If the gradient is well approximated as a linear function on the line segment:

$$\{\bar{w}_{t-D-1} + \alpha(T+1)(\bar{w}_{t-D} - \bar{w}_{t-D-1}) \mid \alpha \in [0; 1]\}$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \bar{L}((T+1)\bar{w}_{t-D} - T\bar{w}_{t-D-1}) \\ \approx (T+1)\nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D}) - T\nabla \bar{L}(\bar{w}_{t-D-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

In this case GSC and LWP are equivalent for the same learning rate and momentum if:

$$a + b = 1 + T \quad (44)$$

$$mb = T \quad (45)$$

When the approximation in equation (43) holds, LWP is equivalent to our default choice of a and b (see equation (7)) if:

$$T = m \frac{1 - m^D}{1 - m} \quad (46)$$

This is equivalent to assuming zero future gradient over the prediction horizon in equation (10) instead of a constant velocity. GSC is equivalent to LWP with horizon T for the same learning rate if the approximation in (43) holds and:

$$a = 1 - \frac{1 - m}{m}T, \quad b = \frac{T}{m} \quad (47)$$

This shows that LWP and GSC are closely related. Both methods compensate for a delay but at different points in time. Weight prediction changes how the gradient is computed, Spike Compensation changes how it is applied. Each method has its advantages. Spike Compensation has minimal overhead and doesn't require an estimate of the delay ahead of time. Weight prediction might introduce memory overhead by adding a new copy of the weights (depending on the implementation and hardware), but may help reduce weight inconsistency. The combination of the two methods can be useful in cases where we want to overcompensate for the delay. A similar effect can be achieved with either method by changing the horizon but their combination offers increased weight consistency without requiring an additional weight prediction on the backwards pass.

J EXTENDED WEIGHT PREDICTION HORIZONS

In Section 3.4 we discuss how overcompensating for delays can help improve convergence speed. One way to do this is to predict weights more than D (the delay) steps into the future with linear weight prediction. Figure 17 shows

the effect of scaling the weight prediction horizon on the convergence rate when optimizing a convex quadratic. We see that horizon lengths of around $T = 2D$ seem to give the best results.

We repeated this experiment for ResNet-20 (with group normalization) trained on CIFAR-10 using the simplified delay setup described in Appendix L. We used a delay $D = 4$ for all layers with consistent weights and a batch size of 32 for a total delay of 128 samples (which is in the range of many of our PB experiments). The learning rate and momentum were scaled according to (33) using the default reference values referenced in the experiments section. The results can be seen in Figure 18. We can see that the training loss curve looks somewhat similar to the convergence speed for the convex quadratic, with the lowest loss obtained for $T \approx 2D$. The validation accuracy also peaks for $T \approx 2D$.




Figure 17. The convergence speed for a convex quadratic with different condition numbers (κ) and delays (D). A weight prediction with horizon $T = \alpha D$ is used where α is the prediction scale shown on the horizontal axis.





Figure 18. The effects of different weight prediction horizons on the final loss and accuracy when training ResNet-20 on CIFAR-10. A prediction scale of α scales the horizon to be $T = \alpha D$ where $D = 4$ is the delay. The delay is the same for all layers and consistent weights are used. Each point is the mean of multiple runs, 25 for $1.75 \leq \alpha \leq 2.5$, and 10 for other α values.


We also test this hypothesis in the Pipelined Backpropagation setting. We explore the use of weight prediction with a horizon which is double that of the delay (LWP_{2D}). We also experiment with overcompensating for the delay by doubling the effect of Spike Compensation (SC_{2D} which re-

Table 6. CIFAR-10 validation accuracy (mean \pm std.dev of five runs) for ResNet (RN) and VGG training with overcompensation.

NETWORK	SGDM	PB	PB+LWP _D	PB+LWP _{2D}	PB+SC _D	PB+SC _{2D}
VGG11	91.16 \pm 0.19	90.83 \pm 0.20	91.05 \pm 0.11	91.27 \pm 0.14	91.08 \pm 0.19	91.03 \pm 0.22
VGG13	92.57 \pm 0.15	92.59 \pm 0.15	92.51 \pm 0.11	92.57 \pm 0.21	92.38 \pm 0.27	92.60 \pm 0.17
VGG16	92.24 \pm 0.19	92.06 \pm 0.21	92.22 \pm 0.24	92.28 \pm 0.18	92.45 \pm 0.30	92.42 \pm 0.21
RN20	90.63 \pm 0.31	90.44 \pm 0.24	90.68 \pm 0.30	91.05 \pm 0.10	90.80 \pm 0.29	90.95 \pm 0.40
RN32	91.68 \pm 0.23	91.46 \pm 0.09	91.66 \pm 0.10	91.98 \pm 0.22	91.55 \pm 0.14	91.96 \pm 0.24
RN44	92.19 \pm 0.14	91.71 \pm 0.25	92.00 \pm 0.14	92.29 \pm 0.09	92.13 \pm 0.16	92.21 \pm 0.21
RN56	92.39 \pm 0.20	91.89 \pm 0.40	92.31 \pm 0.14	92.41 \pm 0.17	92.33 \pm 0.16	92.68 \pm 0.23
RN110	92.77 \pm 0.22	91.81 \pm 0.15	92.76 \pm 0.05	71.83 \pm 36.91 ²	92.28 \pm 0.29	92.35 \pm 0.85



(a) Using consistent weights.



(b) Using inconsistent weights.

Figure 19. Effect of momentum on CIFAR-10 ResNet-20 training with delay. Showing the mean of three runs (six for the no-delay case).

places D with $2D$ in (7)). We observe that overcompensating can improve the final accuracy in most cases (Table 6⁵). We note that in these networks weight inconsistency does not seem to be an issue (see Appendix F). In cases where weight inconsistency is an issue, doubling the prediction horizon can reduce training stability. The same may apply to networks with large delays. One such example may be training ResNet-110 on CIFAR-10 (Table 6) where standard weight prediction outperforms methods which overcompensate for delay.

K EFFECTS OF MOMENTUM SCALING

Throughout this work we heuristically scale the momentum and learning rate for small batch size training according to (33). This enables us to use Pipelined Backpropagation without further hyperparameter tuning for existing networks which is important for the practicality of PB training. These rules increase the momentum significantly compared to other heuristics which might keep it constant or lower it. In Section 3.4 we show that momentum loses some of its benefits with delays. However, our compensation methods, Spike Compensation and Linear Weight Prediction, likely benefit from high momentum. In this section we look at the effects of different momentum values, while keeping the total contribution from each gradient the same. We do this

⁵In each row, in each column pair, the values within one standard error of the maximum accuracy are highlighted.

by selecting a specific value of m in (33) (ignoring the first expression) and then scaling the learning rate according to the second expression.

The experiments involve training ResNet-20 (with group normalization) on CIFAR-10 using the simplified delay setup described in Appendix L. We use a batch size of 8 and a delay of 12 for all layers for a total delay of 96 samples (which is in the range of many of our PB experiments). Figure 19a shows this when consistent weights are used. We can see that for the baseline with no delay a wide range of momentum values can be used, including no momentum, but very large values cause accuracy loss. With delay, small values of momentum are better and the accuracy falls off relatively quickly for larger values. With our compensation methods the best accuracy is obtained for large momentum values. Spike Compensation has no effect for low (zero) momentum values and therefore matches the delayed baseline for small momentum values. Weight prediction for small momentum values tries to predict future weights based on recent gradients without sufficient smoothing and performs worse than the baseline. The combined mitigation exceeds the best results for the no-delay baseline for a range of large momentum values.

Figure 19b shows the same experiment performed with inconsistent weights (using the most recent weights on the backwards pass instead of the delayed weights used on the forward pass). Most of the observations from the previous




Figure 20. Validation of the GProp framework using CIFAR-10 VGG11. Showing mean (shading is standard deviation) of ten runs.

experiment hold in this case as well. The most notable difference is the poor performance of all methods when low momentum is used. This suggests that small momentum values adversely affect weight consistency. These runs do not use a tuned learning rate or a learning rate warmup which could likely help stabilize lower momentum values. Using our formulation of momentum causes a warmup in the step size while the velocity is building up. This effect could contribute to larger momentum values performing better. Another factor may be the exponential smoothing of weight updates with momentum. Without this, a couple of relatively large gradients could cause a large weight inconsistency for some time steps, potentially destabilize training.

K.1 Tuning Momentum vs Spike Compensation

Similar to Spike Compensation, Mitliagkas et al. (2016) also adjust the momentum for asynchronous training. They propose modifying the momentum coefficient to keep the “average age” of the velocity the same as without a delay. SC instead applies the missing contribution of the delayed gradients immediately which is generally not equivalent to modifying or tuning the momentum coefficient. We experimented with the method suggested by Mitliagkas et al. (2016) but it barely changes the value of the momentum coefficient in our setting and did not aid training. One major difference is that the delays in our setting are fixed but Mitliagkas et al. (2016) assume an exponentially distributed gradient delay. For the convex quadratic, we also found that tuning the momentum coefficient is not sufficient to restore the effects of momentum in the constant delay setting.

L SIMULATING DELAYED GRADIENTS

Weight inconsistency and delayed gradients are potential issues in Pipelined Backpropagation. To better understand the issues we simulated weight inconsistency and delayed

gradients in a PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019) environment using a modified optimizer. The modified optimizer has a buffer of old parameter values. To apply a delay D , the model is loaded with parameters from D time steps ago, a forward and backward pass is performed. The resulting gradients are then used to update a master copy of the weights. Weight inconsistency is simulated by loaded the model with parameters from D time steps ago, doing the forward pass then loading the model with the master weights before doing the backwards pass. While this was not an exact model of PB, this setup allows for the simulation of PB’s issues and fast iterate of potential methods to overcome the issues. This technique can also be used to simulate PB by having different delays for different layers based on the depth of the layer. This simulation method does not allow simultaneously launching multiple kernels and is therefore not efficient for small batch sizes. Our simulations are done using a constant delay across layers. This upper bounds the effect of weight inconsistency and delayed gradients. This setup can also be used to simulated ASGD training by making D a random variable which models the distribution of GPU communications with the master node in ASGD.

M EXPERIMENT DETAILS

M.1 VGG Experiments

Simonyan & Zisserman (2014) do not provide a setup for training VGG on CIFAR-10. We adopt the VGG model, hyperparameters, and data preprocessing from Fu (2019).

M.2 GProp validation

To validate our framework implementation, we compare batch parallel SGD, and fill & drain SGD training. We trained each setting, as well as the same network in PyTorch, 10 times to validate similar behavior. Figure 20 shows the

Table 7. CIFAR-10 validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of five runs) comparing LWP_D^V and LWP_D^W on ResNet (RN) and VGG training.

NETWORK	SGDM	PB	PB+ LWP_D^V +SC _D	PB+ LWP_D^W +SC _D
VGG11	91.16 ±0.19	90.83±0.20	91.12 ±0.18	90.93±0.15
VGG13	92.57 ±0.15	92.59 ±0.15	92.56 ±0.14	92.55 ±0.08
VGG16	92.24 ±0.19	92.06±0.21	92.38 ±0.27	92.09±0.10
RN20	90.63 ±0.31	90.44±0.24	90.92 ±0.25	90.85 ±0.41
RN32	91.68 ±0.23	91.46±0.09	92.04 ±0.13	91.99 ±0.16
RN44	92.19 ±0.14	91.71±0.25	92.16 ±0.26	92.20 ±0.36
RN56	92.39 ±0.20	91.89±0.40	92.48 ±0.11	92.32±0.06
RN110	92.77 ±0.22	91.81±0.15	92.41 ±0.16	91.85±0.16

Table 8. CIFAR-10 final validation accuracy (mean±std.dev of 5 runs) for ResNet (RN) with group normalization.

NETWORK	SGDM	PB	PIPEDREAM	PIPEMARE (K=12)	PIPEMARE (K=25)	PIPEMARE (K=50)	PB+ LWP_D^V +SC _D
RN20	90.63±0.31	90.44±0.24	90.36±0.06	90.56±0.08	90.55±0.27	90.18±0.15	90.92 ±0.25
RN32	91.68±0.23	91.46±0.09	91.40±0.28	91.31±0.13	91.22±0.23	91.27±0.14	92.04 ±0.13
RN44	92.19 ±0.14	91.71±0.25	91.72±0.14	91.79±0.29	91.52±0.15	91.53±0.35	92.16 ±0.26
RN56	92.39±0.20	91.89±0.40	91.82±0.19	91.98±0.08	91.79±0.18	91.61±0.22	92.48 ±0.11

optimization of the different SGD training modes for the first 20 epochs. Numerical precision, network initialization, and data loading / augmentation randomness makes a numerical comparison for distinct runs impractical. Instead we show the mean and standard deviation of 10 runs. The different SGD modes in GProp are consistent and also match PyTorch’s SGD convergence.

M.3 ResNetv2

He et al. (2016b) modified the original ResNet formulation given by He et al. (2016a) by introducing the ResNet pre-activation block. We adopt the hyperparameters and data preprocessing from Chiley et al. (2019). Our experiments are done at batch size one where Batch Normalization is not effective. We replace Batch Normalization with Group Normalization or Online Normalization. For ImageNet ResNet-50 training, we used an initial group size of two as outlined in the Group Normalization paper. Wu & He (2018) do not tune Group Normalization for CIFAR-10 training. We use the same initial group size of two for our CIFAR-10 experiments. For our Online Normalization experiments we use the default forward and backward decay factors.

M.4 LWP_D^V vs LWP_D^W

Table 7 shows the results of using the two variants of LWP. When combined with SC, LWP_D^V outperforms LWP_D^W . When the weight form is used the most recent gradient has a large effect on the velocity estimate used for the weight prediction. For small batch sizes this approximation might be noisy decreasing the effectiveness of LWP. A similar effect can be observed for LWP in general (Appendix K) when very

small momentum values are used which also leads to noisy predictions.

N COMPARISON WITH PIPEMARE

PipeMare (Yang et al., 2019) is a recent work on stabilizing Pipelined Backpropagation. They propose two methods: Discrepancy Correction which approximates the weight stashing from PipeDream with smaller memory overhead, and learning rate rescheduling (LR_R) which is a specific type of learning rate warm-up which accounts for the delay of each stage. Table 8 compares PipeDream and PipeMare to our methods. To avoid having to tune the hyperparameter for Discrepancy Correction we instead combine learning rate rescheduling with weight stashing to approximate PipeMare. We show results for three choices of the K hyperparameter of LR_R (shown in epochs). As can be seen LR_R can help slightly in our setting but unlike our methods, it is unable to recover the baseline accuracy.

Unlike prior work on Pipelined Backpropagation we focus on a batch size of one. Although our methods do not strictly require a batch size of one, the small batch size has several advantages for hardware both hardware (Section 2) and convergence (Section 4.1). Smaller batch sizes decrease the effect of gradient delay and weight inconsistency (Figure 11) making it easier to stabilize training. Smaller batch sizes also change the relative significance of gradient delay and weight inconsistency (Appendix F). With large batch sizes, weight inconsistency is the main issue but in our setting gradient delay becomes more significant. Methods designed for the larger batch size setting, such as PipeDream, PipeMare, and Gradient Shrinking, naturally tend to focus on address-

ing weight inconsistency rather than the delay which is likely why those methods do generally not seem to perform very well in our setting. Likewise, our methods may not be optimal for the long delays and large weight inconsistencies that can arise with fine-grained PB using bigger batches. For the fine grained small batch setting surveyed in this work, SpecTrain is the only existing method we found to work well in our setting although it was not always able to fully recover SGDM accuracy (Table 4).