

Allspark: Workload Orchestration for Visual Transformers on Processing In-Memory Systems

Mengke Ge, Junpeng Wang, Binhan Chen, Yingjian Zhong, Haitao Du,
Song Chen, *Member, IEEE*, and Yi Kang, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The advent of Transformers has revolutionized computer vision, offering a powerful alternative to convolutional neural networks (CNNs), especially with the local attention mechanism that excels at capturing local structures within the input and achieve state-of-the-art performance. Processing in-memory (PIM) architecture offers extensive parallelism, low data movement costs, and scalable memory bandwidth, making it a promising solution to accelerate Transformer with memory-intensive operations. However, the crucial challenge lies in efficiently deploying the entire model onto a resource-limited PIM system while parallelizing each transformer block with potentially many computational branches based on local attention mechanisms.

We present Allspark, which focuses on workload orchestration for visual Transformers on PIM systems, aiming at minimizing inference latency. Firstly, to fully utilize the massive parallelism of PIM, Allspark empolys a finer-grained partitioning scheme for computational branches, and format a systematic layout and interleaved dataflow with maximized data locality and reduced data movement. Secondly, Allspark formulates the scheduling of the complete model on a resource-limited distributed PIM system as an integer linear programming (ILP) problem. Thirdly, as local-global data interactions exhibit complex yet regular dependencies, Allspark provides a greedy-based mapping method to allocate computational branches onto the PIM system and minimize NoC communication costs. Extensive experiments on 3D-stacked DRAM-based PIM systems show that Allspark brings $1.2\times\sim 24.0\times$ inference speedup for various visual Transformers over baselines, and that Allspark-enriched PIM system yields average speedups of $2.3\times$ and energy savings of $20\times\sim 55\times$ over Nvidia V100 GPU.

Index Terms—Processing in-memory, Scheduling, Visual Transformer, Spatial architecture, Model parallelism.

I. INTRODUCTION

TRANSFORMER, an attention-based neural network, has attracted tremendous interests due to their effectiveness in various domains such as language, computer vision (CV), and reinforcement learning [1], [2]. Visual Transformers, such as ViT [3] and PVT [4], have shown impressive performance in CV tasks such as image classification, object detection, and

semantic segmentation, even outperforming the go-to architecture CNNs, thanks to their larger receptive fields capable of capturing long-range dependencies between patches [2]. Recently, local-attention visual Transformers (LVTs) [5]–[9] have enjoyed great popularity. By virtue of their adeptness at effectively capturing the local structure in the input, LVTs have shown noteworthy improvements in performance compared to original visual Transformers, and are well ahead of the leaderboards of various CV datasets [10].

Unfortunately, Transformer runs significantly sluggishly on general-purpose platforms such as GPU and CPU. Due to the high memory footprint, low data reuse, and complex data movement of operations such as self-attention, Transformers exhibit memory-intensive characteristics [11]–[13], and the communication overhead required to transfer weights from memory to computing modules becomes a crucial bottleneck, resulting in under-utilization of computational units and low computational intensity (FLOPs/Byte). To accelerate Transformer inference, domain-specific accelerators [12], [14]–[16] have been developed to offload either self-attention operation or the entire model from general-purpose platforms. However, these accelerators necessitate loading data from off-chip memory, and still have limited parallelism and restricted memory bandwidth, thus limiting acceleration performance.

Processing in-memory (PIM) or Processing near-memory architectures have the ability to effectively alleviate the memory wall problem by moving the computations closer to the data locations in the main memory, and have been used to accelerate memory-intensive applications [17]–[23]. For DNN acceleration, PIM architectures typically employ a spatial structure (tiled structure) [18], [20], [21], [24], [25], which is a scalable 2D array of compute nodes connected via network-on-chip (NoC). Each node (**PIM-node**) comprises a memory subsystem (typically DRAM [18], [20], [21] or SRAM [24]) and a processing engine. With its extensive parallelism, low cost of data movement, and scalable memory bandwidth, PIM architecture has reaped more attention to accelerate Transformers. TransPIM [11], a PIM accelerator based on high bandwidth memory (HBM), delivers more than $20\times$ speedup on NLP Transformers compared to GPUs. MAT [26] employs a PIM architecture based on hybrid memory cube (HMC) to accelerate long-sequence attention, yielding significant performance and energy efficiency gains.

Original Transformers employ global attention whose computational complexity is quadratic over all the input [2], and the attention computation acts as a bottleneck when dealing with dense visual inputs, such as pixel-level seman-

This paper was produced by the IEEE Publication Technology Group. They are in Piscataway, NJ. Manuscript received April 19, 2021; revised August 16, 2021. (*Corresponding authors: Song Chen and Yi Kang*)

Mengke Ge is with Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Hefei Comprehensive National Science Center, Hefei, China.

Junpeng Wang, Binhan Chen, Haitao Du, Song Chen, and Yi Kang are with School of Microelectronics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China.

Yingjian Zhong is with Anhui University, Hefei, China.

Email: mengke.ge@iai.ustc.edu.cn, songch@ustc.edu.cn, ykang@ustc.edu.cn

tic segmentation of high-resolution images. To reduce the computational complexity and memory requirements, LVTs are born, which introduce a local attention mechanism that divides all image patches into many small-sized local regions (subsets of neighboring patches), each of which independently serves as an input to the attention computation. These local regions typically have the fixed shapes such as windows [5]–[7] and block patterns of fixed strides [9]. By effectively capturing local structures in the input, LVTs exhibit superior expressiveness and generalization [2].

Visual Transformer consists of many consecutive transformer blocks. For LVTs, there are many local region-based attention computations (called *computational branches*) on each transformer block, allowing for high computational parallelism. Moreover, many visual Transformers exhibit a multi-stage hierarchical structure (see Section III-A), causing variations in the amount of computational branches and computation in the transformer block at different stages. Existing accelerators [11], [12], [14]–[16] for original Transformers leverage a fixed and uni-patterned parallel method, such as patch-level or attention-head-level parallelism, specifically targeting the global attention. However, the crucial challenge lies in efficiently deploying the entire visual Transformers onto a PIM system while parallelizing each transformer block, with potentially many local-attention-based computational branches. Besides, visual Transformers up to tens or even hundreds of millions of parameters are computational and memory demanding, and challenging to deploy in resource-limited PIM systems with distributed characteristics. We propose a deployment framework for visual Transformers, which efficiently enables end-to-end execution of inference on PIM systems without off-chip memory. Our contributions are outlined below:

- Allspark endeavours to orchestrate the workload for visual Transformers on PIM systems, aiming at minimizing inference latency. To the best of our knowledge, Allspark is the first deployment framework dedicated to accelerating visual Transformers inference on PIM systems, providing a new perspective on efficient PIM solutions.
- To fully utilize the massive parallelism of PIM, Allspark employs a finer-grained partitioning for computational branches, and format a systematic layout and interleaved dataflows with maximized data locality and reduced frequent data movement between PIM-nodes.
- Allspark formulates the scheduling of the complete model on a resource-limited distributed PIM system as an ILP problem, and all computational branches are temporally and spatially scheduled to maximize resource utilization.
- As local-global data interactions exhibit complex yet regular dependencies, Allspark provides a greedy-based mapping method to allocate all computational branches onto the PIM-node array and minimize NoC communication costs.
- Extensive experiments on DRAM-based PIM systems show that Allspark brings $1.2\times\sim 24.0\times$ inference speedup over baselines, and that Allspark-enriched PIM system yields average speedups of $2.3\times$ and energy savings of $20\times\sim 55\times$ over Nvidia V100 GPU.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Transformer Accelerators

Recently, a plethora of ASIC-based Transformer accelerators have emerged [12], [14]–[16]. These accelerators employ a software-architecture co-design approach, aiming to accelerate the execution of self-attention mechanisms, or the inference of the entire NLP Transformer and the original vision Transformer, both of which rely on the conventional global attention mechanism. Table I provides a summary of these advanced accelerators. However, ASIC-based accelerators face a bottleneck in off-chip memory bandwidth, particularly for memory-intensive layers in Transformers. In contrast, PIM systems offer a solution by storing all data in memory, eliminating the need for costly off-chip data transfers.

TransPIM [11] is a software-hardware co-design solution based on the PIM architecture for inference acceleration in NLP Transformers. TransPIM introduces token-based dataflow and lightweight modifications into the high bandwidth memory (HBM) architecture to support computation and memory operations in Transformers. MAT [26], a PIM framework to accelerate long-sequence attention, adopts a memory-efficient processing flow to process sub-sequences in a pipeline with a small memory footprint, yielding significant improvements in speed and energy consumption. However, MAT is only targeted at the attention layer. In short, PIM-based architectures bring notable acceleration performance gains in both NLP and CV domains for Transformers based on global attention.

B. Scheduling and Mapping Space Exploration

Extensive studies have addressed the problem of mapping DNNs on scalable tiled accelerators with monolithic off-chip DRAM. These efforts mainly focus on loading data from off-chip DRAM and then writing back data in processing DNNs, with mapping and dataflows are determined in a layer-level granularity. As in the case of inter-layer pipelining across multi-tiles [18], [27], [28] and DNN partitioning [29]–[32], which sequentially partition each DNN layer to harness intra-layer parallelism. However, these efforts have not yet covered how to map DNN layers to efficiently exploit distributed architectures, which can have a significant impact on the performance of PIM systems. Besides, previous research [11], [13] has proven that layer-based parallelism are not suitable for Transformers because the significant non-computational overheads introduced by layer-based dataflows, necessitating the transfer and processing of large amounts of input data and weights from layer to layer.

As shown in Table I, emerging accelerators adopt either attention-head-level (**AH**) [14], [16] or patch(token)-level (**P**) [11], [12], [15], [26] paralleling, respectively, to accelerate inference for Transformers based on global attention. The model is simply partitioned along attention heads, or the long sequence of inputs are partitioned into several equal fractions for parallel processing. However, LVTs are characterized by many computational branches and even hierarchical representations (see Section III-A), thus these fixed and uni-patterned approaches to parallelism are not efficient when deploying

TABLE I
 SUMMARY OF SOTA TRANSFORMER ACCELERATORS.

Architecture	Processing Unit	Model	Partitioning&Mapping Method
SpAtten [15]	Dedicated Arch.+Model Pruning	Vector-Matrix Mult.	Patch-level
TransPIM [11]	Dedicated PIM-based Accelerator	Vector Mult.	Patch-level
MAT [26]	DRAM-based PIM	-	Patch-level
FACT [12]	Dedicated Arch.+Model Pruning	Matrix Mult.	Patch-level
DOTA [16]	Dedicated Arch.+Model Pruning	Reconfigurable Matrix Mult.	Attention-head-level
ViTCod [14]	Dedicated Arch.+Model Pruning	Matrix Mult.	Attention-head-level
Vanilla	DRAM-based PIM	Matrix Mult.	Branch-level
Allspark (Ours)	DRAM-based PIM	Matrix Mult.	Flexible finer-grained partitioning




Fig. 1. Visual Transformer structure.

visual Transformers on PIM systems with distributed characteristics. Crucially, model parallelism must contemplate efficient allocation of on-chip limited computational and memory resources, which has not been covered by existing researches.

III. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

A. Visual Transformers

Structure: Visual Transformer generally consists of many successive transformer blocks with a multi-stage hierarchical representation as shown in Figure 1. Most models are divided into S (typically 4) stages, each stage $s \in [1, S]$ contains N_s^{bk} sequential *transformer blocks* (encoders) that extract feature representations. Moreover, cutting-edge models (e.g. LVTs) introduce local attention for reducing computational complexity and local-global interactions for performance enhancement.

The fixed-size input RGB image $IF \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ is first partitioned into non-overlapping patches of size $a \times a$, resulting in $\frac{H}{a} \times \frac{W}{a}$ visual patches with feature set as the concatenation of the original pixel RGB values. These patches are then projected into an arbitrary dimension C using a linear embedding layer. Patch merging is applied in stage $s \in [2, S]$ to reduce the number of patches by $2 \times$ down-sampling of resolution, and the linear layer is applied to the concatenated features while setting the output dimension of s -th stage to $C_s = C \cdot 2^{s-1}$. As the network goes deeper, patch merging is repeatedly employed, so the resolution of s -th stage is $P_s = \frac{H}{a \cdot 2^{s-1}} \times \frac{W}{a \cdot 2^{s-1}}$. By varying C_s and N_s^{bk} , the model size and complexity can be scaled accordingly. Differently, there is no patch merging and downsampling for ViT model.

Transformer Block: Each transformer block consists of a linear projection (LP), an MSA module, and a feed-forward network (FFN) containing two fully-connected (FC) layers. Layernorm (LN) layer is applied before MSA and FFN, and a residual connection is applied after each module.

In LP, the input matrix is projected into three spaces, Query(Q), Key(K), and Value(V), by multiplying the weights (W^Q , W^K , and W^V). Moreover, different multiple groups of QKV corresponding to multiple heads of MSA are generated. In each head, Q is multiplied by K to obtain the attention matrix, which represents the relevance of each two patches. Each row of attention matrix is normalized to probabilities (attention scores) using the softmax function. Finally, the scores are used to weighted sum V to obtain the output embedding. These GeMMs are parameter-free, unlike the parameterized matrix multiplications in FC layers of MSA and FFN. Then, FC layer takes the output embedding of all attention heads as input and performs a linear projection. Thus, for each transformer block, there are $(3 + 1 + 2 \cdot 4) \cdot C_s^2 = 12 \cdot C_s^2$ parameters, including W^Q , W^K , W^V , W^{MSA_FC} , W^{FFN_FC1} , and W^{FFN_FC2} .

Local Attention: For LVTs, to reduce the complexity linear to the input size, all input patches of each transformer block at s -th stage are divided into $\frac{H}{a \cdot 2^{s-1} \cdot R_h} \times \frac{W}{a \cdot 2^{s-1} \cdot R_w}$ small-sized local regions of size $R_h \times R_w$, each of which independently serves as an input to the computational branch based on local attention. As in Swin [5], many and uneven computational branches appear at each stage, 1225, 324, 81, and 25, respectively, as the input image is 960×960 and R_h and R_w are 7. Note that the computational procedures and weights are the same for all branches, and there are no data dependencies between them, except for the local-global interactions.

Local-global Interaction: Before that, different computational branches extract the local information of different regions. To regain the ability to understand the global context and long-term dependencies of the whole input, LVT models exert great efforts in implementing local-global interactions, which is to interchange feature matrices or KV matrices between local regions by some sophisticated operations. Some models adopt a dual-block architecture, with the first block us-




Fig. 2. Shifted window partitioning for local-global interaction.




Fig. 3. Scalable processing in-memory systems.




Fig. 4. PIM-node utilization under branch-level parallelism. Swin is deployed to the PIM system with a node array of size 16×16 , when the input is 640^2 and the local region is 7×7 . During the execution of the most computationally intensive stage 3 and 4, the utilization is severely below 15%.

ing local region-based attention and the second block enabling cross-region interaction through shifted window partitioning (Swin [5]) or global sub-sampling (Twins [7]) or spatial shuffle operations (Shuffle [8]). Furthermore, other models work to achieve satisfactory receptive fields within every transformer block in a parallel manner, such as complementary coarse-grained global patches (Focal [6]) or cross-shape window (CSWin [9]).

B. Processing In-Memory Systems

The paradigm of PIM architecture is depicted in Figure 3, which employs a spatial structure, a scalable PIM-node array connected via network-on-chip (NoC). The spatial structure have been developed in the domain of DNN acceleration by industry and academia [18], [21], [24], [27], [30], [32], [33]. NoC is widely used as an interconnect fabric for DNN accelerators due to its good scalability and energy efficiency to handle rapidly evolving DNNs [34].

We aim to abstract the basic hardware requirements (templates) for the PIM system commonly used in DNN domains [18], [20], [21], [24], to support our research in visual Transformer deployment, as has been done in CNN deployment [25], [28]. The description of PIM architecture is as follows:

- Each PIM-node with integrated computing and memory consists of a processing engine, a router, an auxiliary computing unit (ACU), a memory controller, and a memory submodule, which can be MiB-sized DRAM banks/subarrays or a

SRAM. All memory and computing resources are distributed across the system.

- Unlike normal spatial architectures, the entire weights of the model are loaded on the on-chip distributed memory of PIM system prior to the inference execution.

- Each PIM-node can access its local memory submodule directly, or access remote memory submodules of other PIM-nodes via a mesh-based NoC.

- Each processing engine consists of a processing element (PE) array, which can be a systolic array [35], NVDLA-style array (parallel vector MAC units) [36], or coarse-grained reconfigurable array (CGRA) [37], etc, along with SRAM buffers for inputs, weights, and outputs to do multiply-and-accumulate (MAC) operations. ACU serve to do nonlinear computations, such as softmax, layernorm, and gelu.

Specifically, the scalable PIM system has a PIM-node array shaped as $H_A \times W_A$, each PIM-node has a PE array of $r \times r$, each memory submodule with capacity of $node_cap$ and bandwidth of bw , and the NoC with a link bandwidth of BW .

C. Challenges with End-to-end Inference Deployment

1. How to parallelize many computational branches: As the trendiest visual Transformers, LVTs have many computational branches based on local attention in each transformer block. However, branch (local region)-level parallelism, where each computational branch is processed on only one PIM-node, results in underutilization of PIM-nodes due to the coarse-grained partitioning, as shown in Figure 4.

2. How to fully exploit limited and distributed on-chip memory resources: Most models present a hierarchical structure, and transformer blocks in different stages have distinct computational branches and workloads. The entire parameters of the model needs to be stored on on-chip limited memory. Storing the parameters duplicated across multiple PIM-nodes reduces data movement and improves data locality, but it causes tighter on-chip memory resources. For models with tens of millions of parameters or more, the memory submodule per PIM-node is MiB in size and cannot store all the parameters. Besides, each node must allocate enough workspace for intermediate results, thus necessitating to process computational branches on each transformer block batchwise.

3. How to fulfill low-cost local-global interactions: For local-global interactions, different branches exchange their local feature matrices or KV matrices in a fixed pattern. One needs to consider the arrangement of computational branches during deployment to minimize the data transfer cost of branches with dependencies to achieve low-cost information interaction.

IV. FRAMEWORK OVERVIEW

The deployment framework, Allspark, is proposed to fulfill end-to-end inference with minimum latency for visual Transformer models on PIM systems. The overview is shown in Figure 5, which mainly consists of three parts: branch-oriented partitioning and dataflow formation, scheduling for end-to-end inference, and local-global interaction aware mapping. Given a visual Transformer model and a detailed configuration of the

PIM architecture, Allspark can fully automatically generate the optimal deployment scheme and corresponding hardware instructions for evaluating the cost of memory accesses, NoC data transfers, and intra-PIM node processing. Since the inference workloads are deterministic (fixed image size and model size), we generate the deployment solutions at compile-time.




Fig. 5. Allspark overview.

Partitioning. To fully utilize the massive parallelism capability of PIM, Allspark employs a finer-grained partitioning scheme for computational branches, and format a systematic layout and NoC-based interleaved dataflow, which realizes operator fusion-like effects on each PIM-node. That is, the output of the previous operator is stored in the local memory submodule and can be directly fetched as input by the next operator, reducing frequent data movement between PIM-nodes and maximizing data locality. Proposed scheme would provide all partitioning candidates for all computational branches.

Scheduling. Optimal exploitation of distributed computing and memory resources is the primary concern. To run the full model on a resource-limited distributed PIM system and minimize the inference latency, Allspark formulates static scheduling as a constrained optimization problem. The optimal solution is selected from all candidate partitions, and all computational branches are temporally and spatially scheduled.

Mapping. To cope with complex dependencies for local-global interactions, Allspark provides a detailed mapping of computational branches, after scheduling of the whole model. The reason is that the interaction communication cost is quite small relative to within-branch computation cost under ideal congestion-free NoC traffic conditions. For instance, the complexity of a local region is about $12nC^2 + 2n^2C$, and its local feature map is of size nC . Assuming a PE array size of 8×8 and a NoC width of 64 bits, a rough estimate indicates that, under ideal conditions, the time required for data interchange in local-global interactions is within 1% of all computation time. Hence, for the detailed mapping, each computation branch is assigned to a group of PIM-nodes while minimizing the communication cost under global-local interactions.

V. PARTITIONING AND DATAFLOW FORMATION

To parallelize each computational branch based on local attention, by virtue of the flexibility of NoC, we propose a

flexible and finer-grained partitioning, a systematic layout, and interleaved cyclic dataflows (see Figure 6). This enables an operator fusion-like effect in the case of massive parallelism, maximizing data locality and reducing data movement.

A. Key Ideas

Finer-grained partitioning and systematic layout: In each branch, all GeMMs on the MSA and MLP will be consistently sliced into pieces of smaller matrix chunks based on *fully flexible attention-head-level* and *patch-level partitioning*. These chunks are parallelized across a PIM-node subarray of variable size $u \times v$ ($u, v \geq 1$).

The critical part, MSA, consists of $h (= C/d)$ attention heads with complex data exchanges while being independent of each other and generally without interdependencies. We introduce an attention-head-level partitioning, where h heads are assigned to v groups of nodes, each group being lined up by u nodes and being given $b (= \lceil h/v \rceil, h \geq v)$ heads.

For each attention head, the feature matrix and derived QKV matrices are composed of embedding vectors corresponding to $N (= R_h \times R_w)$ patches in each local region. We evenly distribute these embedding vectors among u nodes, and each node handles p embedding vectors, thereby achieving patch-level partitioning. Finally, feature matrix $\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$ is partitioned and each node holds a partial feature matrix $\mathbf{F}' \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, where $p = \lceil N/u \rceil$ and $q = b \cdot d = C/v$.

Interleaved cyclic dataflows: The inter-layer cyclic dataflow is used for broadcasting different parts of data/weight when single DNN layer is distributed over multiple nodes [27]. Differently, in this work, we devise interleaved cyclic dataflows for both MSA and FC layers based on consistent partitioning and systematic layout. MSA requires each PIM-node to receipt partial K and V matrices generated from the remaining $u - 1$ nodes, and broadcast its own partial matrix to them. For the cyclic data transmission scheme, each node only transmits the partial K & V matrices to the nearest succeeding node, except for the last node, which exclusively transmits it to the first node, forming a cyclic path. Additionally, for FC layers, the embedding matrices generated by different attention heads are concatenated and multiplied by the weight matrix. Since each embedding vector is scattered over v nodes in different groups, we also employ a cyclic data path to propagate embedding matrices for GeMM parallelism.

Subtly, after each process phase based on the cyclic dataflows, the output matrix still maintain the same distribution as the input matrix, and each node always holds a partial of size $p \times q$. Moreover, the output result of the previous operator can be directly used by the next operator, avoiding complex data dependencies. Thanks to the well-organized systematic layout, these interleaved cyclic dataflows streams for data multicasting form a pattern of alternating *vertical* and *horizontal* circulation (top right of Figure 6), which avoids contention for NoC bandwidth and relieves traffic pressure.

B. NoC-based Dataflow Implementation

Linear transformation: Initially, each PIM-node holds a partial feature matrix $\mathbf{F}' \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, and can further access the




Fig. 6. Attention-head-level partitioning and patch-level partitioning (Take $N = 4$, $h = 3$, $u = 4$, and $v = 3$ as an example).

$\mathbf{F}_{p \times C}$ through $v - 1$ rounds of *horizontal* cyclic dataflows. For each attention head, the weights W^Q , W^K , and $W^V \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times d}$ are pre-stored on each counterpart PIM-node. On each node, $\mathbf{F}_{p \times C}$ is multiplied by these weight matrices to obtain three sub-matrices Q^i , K^i , and $V^i \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}$, respectively. Then, Q , K , and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ are distributed across u PIM-nodes.

Attention: For each attention head, $\text{softmax}(Q_{p \times d} \cdot K_{N \times d}^T) \cdot V_{N \times d}$ is calculated on each node. Although only $K_{p \times d}^i$ and $V_{p \times d}^i$ are stored on each node, the fully-size K and V distributed over all u nodes are available to each node, using $u - 1$ rounds of *vertical* cyclic dataflows (bottom left of Figure 6). In each round, each node sends only a partial matrix of size $p \times d$ to the succeeding node. Differently, each node sends one locally generated in the first round, and sends the one received from the previous round in subsequent rounds.

The assigned b attention heads are processed sequentially on each node, and the above steps are repeated b times to obtain the output matrix $Z_{p \times q}$. Ultimately, the volume of the partial \mathbf{F} or K or V matrix to be transmitted at each node is $D^{\mathbf{F}} = D^K = D^V = b \times (u - 1) \times p \times d = (u - 1) \times p \times q$.

Fully-connected layer and patch merging: After the self-attention, each node starts with only a partial matrix $Z_{p \times q}$, and we use $v - 1$ rounds of *horizontal* cyclic dataflows so that each node acquires the matrices $Z_{p \times aC}$ distributed across v nodes, as shown in the bottom right of Figure 6. For FC layer and patch merging, each node calculates $Z_{p \times aC} \cdot W'_{aC \times q} = O_{p \times q}$, where $a \geq 1$ expresses the scaling of the weight size. The full-size weight matrix $W_{C \times aC}$ or $W_{aC \times C}$ is also pre-partitioned and pre-stored to the counterpart v node groups, respectively, and all u nodes in the same group store the same $W'_{aC \times q}$. Note that no weight matrices and intermediate results are transferred

between nodes in these phases. After computation, the full-size output matrix O remains evenly distributed across the node subarray of size $u \times v$, so subsequent FC layers can still be executed using the cyclic data transfer described above.

LayerNorm: LayerNorm is to normalize the embedding vector of each patch, though each vector is sliced into v PIM-nodes, and each node's ACU calculates the mean and standard-deviation of the vector segment it holds. These two intermediate result matrices of size $p \times 1$ are aggregated from the other nodes to each node during the computation, using $v - 1$ rounds of *horizontal* cyclic dataflows in Section V-B.

Finally, for one FC layer of MSA, two FC layers of FFN, layernorm, and patch merging, the amount of data transmitted per PIM-node is $D^{\text{MSA_FC}} = (v - 1) \times p \times q$, $D^{\text{FFN}} = (v - 1) \times p \times q + (v - 1) \times p \times a_1 q$, $D^{\text{LN}} = 2 \times (v - 1) \times p \times 1$, and $D^{\text{PM}} = (v - 1) \times p \times a_2 q$, where $a_1 = 4$ and $a_2 = 2$.

C. Processing Procedures and Weight Burdens per PIM-node

Each PIM-node of the subarray executes the same computational procedure consisting of nine phases, as shown in Figure 7. At each phase, the PE array on every PIM-node performs a specified GeMM. Then, in some phases, each PIM-node needs to retrieve partial matrices scattered across other PIM-nodes, utilizing the cyclic dataflows described above.

Briefly, all the weights used by each branch (totaling $12 \cdot C_s^2$) are stored in the PIM sub-array of size $u \times v$. Once a individual branch is partitioned into v groups of nodes on attention-head level, each group of nodes will use distinct weights, so we tentatively divide each of the weighting matrices into v parts, with only one part pre-stored for each group of PIM-nodes.




Fig. 7. Processing procedures on each PIM-node.




Fig. 8. Scheduling of each transformer block.

VI. SCHEDULING FOR END-TO-END INFERENCE

For model inference, pipeline parallelism and tensor parallelism are widely used model parallelism schemes [38]. Typically, the former yields high throughput and the latter enables low inference latency. To minimize the inference latency, we propose a scheduling method based on tensor parallelization, which processes all transformer blocks of the whole model sequentially. Moreover, each transformer block is partitioned to occupy all distributed resources of PIM system, and all computational branches are temporally and spatially scheduled. Main strategies are as follows and shown in Figure 8:

1) Consistent partitioning: since transformer blocks within the same model stage have the equal amount of branches and compute workloads, a consistent partitioning and scheduling is applied to these. Transformer blocks are executed sequentially, with each one utilizing all PIM-nodes via tensor parallelism.

2) Multi-lot processing for computational branches: each branch can be parallelized on a PIM-node subarray, but the system probably cannot handle all branches on a transformer block concurrently. Thus, all branches are allowed to be executed in multiple lots, with each occupying all the nodes.

3) Equal partitioning of branches in each lot: we employ the same partitioning scheme for branches within the same lot, and define the parallelization of each lot as a **temporal layer**. There are multiple temporal layers as all branches are organized into several lots. For more flexible scheduling, different partitioning schemes can be used between temporal layers. For example, branches in two temporal layers could be assigned to node subarrays of size 2×2 or 3×4 , respectively.

4) Memory capacity constraint: for each PIM-node, the associated memory submodule shall store all weight matrices used and the intermediate results generated during inference execution. Therefore, the memory space required MUST NOT exceed the capacity of the memory submodule per PIM-node.

 TABLE II
KEY NOTATION.

Variables		Constants		Indices	
X	binary matrix to represent a schedule	N_s^{tl}	temporal layers	s	model stage
		N_s^{br}	branch counts	i	branch index
		N_s^{bk}	block counts	j	temporal layer
Y	auxiliary binary matrix	u	subarray rows	α	U_s index
Z	auxiliary binary matrix	v	subarray columns	β	V_s index

Furthermore, we formulate the problem as an integer linear programming (ILP). This allows us to determine the number of temporal layers for each transformer block, and the number of computational branches and the partitioning schemes on each temporal layer. In addition, to alleviate the memory burden of each PIM-node, we propose weight sharing and weight reuse.

A. Variables and Constants

Binary variable $X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta}$ indicates whether there are a total of i branches in j -th temporal layer of each Transformer block in s -th model stage, and each branch is assigned to a PIM-node sub-array of variable size $u_{s,j} \times v_{s,j}$, where $i \leq N_s^{br}$, $j \leq N_s^{tl}$, $s \leq S$. N_s^{tl} and N_s^{br} mean temporal layer counts and branch counts on each transformer block in s -th stage, respectively. As every branch entirely occupies a temporal layer, this implies the most amount of temporal layers, so $N_s^{tl} = N_s^{br}$.

Let the branch containing H attention heads of MSA and P patches is assigned to a sub-array of variable size $u_{s,j} \times v_{s,j}$, then $u_{s,j}$ takes from $\{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{H}{2} \rceil, H\}$ as an array U_s , and $v_{s,j}$ takes from $\{1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{P}{2} \rceil, P\}$ as another array V_s , where $P = \frac{P}{p_{min}}$ and p_{min} is the minimum granularity of patch chunks (for the PE array size). Here, α and β are the indexes of U_s and V_s respectively, namely $u_{s,j} = U_s[\alpha]$ and $v_{s,j} = V_s[\beta]$. Integer variables $V_{s,j}^{dyn}$, and auxiliary binary variables $Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}$ and $Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}$ in the below subsection are presented.

B. Constraints

These variables and constants serve to express constraints:

$$\sum_i X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \leq N_{\alpha,\beta} \quad (1)$$

$$\sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \cdot i = N_s^{br} \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} = 1 \quad (3)$$

$$B_{s,j} \geq B_{s,j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{s,j} = \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \cdot i \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_s V_s^{wt} \cdot N_s^{bk} + \max_{s,j} \{V_{s,j}^{dyn}\} \leq \text{node_cap} \quad (5)$$

Constraint 1 is that branches on j -th temporal layer are assigned to the node subarrays of size $u_{s,j} \times v_{s,j}$, respectively, and the number of branches assigned cannot exceed the upper limit $N_{\alpha,\beta}$, which is the maximum number of subarrays with size $u_{s,j} \times v_{s,j}$ that can be packed by the PIM system. Section VII-B1 states how to derive the value of $N_{\alpha,\beta}$. Constraint 2 is that all branches of each transformer block must be assigned, and that each branch can only be assigned to one temporal layer. Constraint 3 is that all branches on each temporal layer are identically partitioned and assigned to a node sub-array

with the same size. Constraint 4 is that the number of branches allocated to different temporal layers decreases progressively.

Constraint 5 implies that, under the current scheduling solution, the sum of the stored weights and the required workspace should not exceed the memory submodule's capacity on each PIM-node. The required workspace is used to store the input/output feature maps and intermediate data during the computation of each computational branch. For each PIM-node, V_s^{wt} is the volume of weight parameters that need to be stored for each block in the s -th model stage, while $V_{s,j}^{dyn}$ is the volume of workspace required during the computation of the j -th temporal layer in the s -th model stage. According to Figure 7, for each temporal layer, the computation per node consists of nine phases. Notably, phases 2, 6, and 8 exhibit a higher demand for workspace, surpassing the other phases.

$$p_{s,j} = \lceil N/u_{s,j} \rceil; q_{s,j} = \lceil C_s/v_{s,j} \rceil; b_{s,j} = \lceil h/v_{s,j} \rceil \quad (6)$$

$$V_s^F = \sum_j (p_{s,j} \times q_{s,j}) \cdot N^{bt} \quad (7)$$

$$V_{s,j,p2}^{dyn} = V_s^F + C_s \times (p_{s,j} + d) + (p_{s,j} \times d) \cdot N^{bt} \quad (8)$$

$$V_{s,j,p6}^{dyn} = V_s^F + N \times (p_{s,j} + q_{s,j}) + (p_{s,j} \times q_{s,j}) \cdot N^{bt} \quad (9)$$

$$V_{s,j,p8}^{dyn} = V_s^F + (C_s + 1) \times (p_{s,j} + aq_{s,j}) \cdot N^{bt} \quad (10)$$

where V_s^F is the volume of feature matrix, and N^{bt} is the batch size (default 1). Thus, $V_{s,j}^{dyn} = \max\{V_{s,j,p2}^{dyn}, V_{s,j,p6}^{dyn}, V_{s,j,p8}^{dyn}\} \in [0, node_cap]$, which is easily rewritten as linear expressions with some auxiliary variables.

However, if we were to pre-store all weights associated with the computations assigned to each node across all temporal layers, it would impose a substantial storage burden. For PIM systems with limited memory resources, the constraint 5 is so hard that no feasible solution even exists, and even if a feasible solution exists, it does not yield the ideal inference speedup.

C. Memory Constraint-driven Weight Sharing and Reuse

To alleviate the memory burden on each PIM-node, we propose weight sharing and weight reuse. The former refers to the sharing of weights across nodes on a sub-array on the *same temporal layer*, whereas the latter relates to the reuse of weights among nodes across *different temporal layers*.

Weight sharing: At each temporal layer, each branch is assigned to a PIM-node subarray of size $u_{s,j} \times v_{s,j}$, on which the weight parameters of $W_{C_s \times q}^{PM}$, $W_{C_s \times d}^Q$, $W_{C_s \times d}^K$, $W_{C_s \times d}^V$, $W_{C_s \times q}^{FC}$, and $W_{C_s \times aq + C_s \times q}^{FFN}$ need to be stored. Specifically, as shown in Figures 6 and 7, in attention-head-level partitioning, the weight parameters are equally distributed among the $v_{s,j}$ node sets. Moreover, in patch-level partitioning, each node set consisting of $u_{s,j}$ nodes stores identical weight parameters.

We distribute these identical weights equally across the $u_{s,j}$ PIM-nodes. Then, $u_{s,j} - 1$ rounds of cyclic dataflows are executed before the phase 2~4 and 7~9 of each computation, allowing each node to share its own stored weights to other nodes. To minimize the cost of weight sharing, the weights at each phase are used for batch inputs and released promptly after each phase to minimize memory usage.

Ultimately, the volume of the weights to be transmitted at each node in PM, MSA, FC and FFN are $W^{PM} = (u_{s,j} -$

$$1) \times \lceil \frac{2C_s \times q_{s,j}}{u_{s,j}} \rceil, W^{MSA} = b_{s,j} \times 3 \times (u_{s,j} - 1) \times \lceil \frac{C_s \times d}{u_{s,j}} \rceil, W^{FC} = (u_{s,j} - 1) \times \lceil \frac{C_s \times q_{s,j}}{u_{s,j}} \rceil, \text{ and } W^{FFN} = (u_{s,j} - 1) \times (\lceil \frac{C_s \times aq_{s,j}}{u_{s,j}} \rceil + \lceil \frac{C_s \times q_{s,j}}{u_{s,j}} \rceil), \text{ respectively.}$$

Weight reuse: All branches of the same transformer block use the same weights, but each node stores only a partial one, the below cases allow to reuse weights across temporal layers:

- 1) If, at a specific temporal layer, the branch is assigned to only one PIM-node, i.e., $u_{s,j} = v_{s,j} = 1$, then this PIM-node stores all the weight parameters;
- 2) If branches on two temporal layers of the same Transformer block follow the same partitioning scheme.

These cases can be expressed as follows:

$$V_s^{wt} = \begin{cases} 12 \cdot C_s^2, & \exists i, j; X_{s,i,j,0,0} = 1 \text{ (Term1)} \\ \sum_j vol_{s,j}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

$$vol_{s,j} = \begin{cases} 0, & \exists j' \text{ and } 0 < j' < j < N_s^{tl}, \\ & \sum_i X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} = \sum_i X_{s,i,j',\alpha,\beta}; \\ & \text{(Term 2)} \\ \frac{12 \cdot C_s^2}{U_s[\alpha] \times V_s[\beta]}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

By introducing two auxiliary binary variables $Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}$ and $Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}$, the above can be transformed into a linear expression:

$$\begin{cases} 1 - \sum_i X_{s,i,j',0,0} \geq Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}; \\ \sum_i X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} - \sum_i X_{s,i,j',\alpha,\beta} - \sum_i X_{s,i,j',0,0} \leq Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}; \\ \sum_i X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \geq Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}; \\ 1 - \sum_i X_{s,i,j',\alpha,\beta} \geq Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta}; \\ 0 \leq j' < j < N_s^{tl}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{cases} j - \sum_{j'=0}^{j-1} Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta} \leq j \cdot Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}; \\ \sum_{j'=0}^{j-1} Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta} + Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta} \leq j. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

where $Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta} = 1$ indicates that branches at j -th temporal layer will reuse weights from other layers for the transformer block of s -th model stage, and 0 otherwise. $Y_{s,j,j',\alpha,\beta} = 1$ says that the branches at j -th temporal layer will reuse weights from j' -th temporal layer (meeting case 1 or 2); and 0 otherwise.

With reuse, weights for each transformer block stored on each PIM-node in the s -th stage is expressed as:

$$V_s^{wt} = \sum_j vol_{s,j} \quad (15)$$

$$vol_{s,j} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (1 - Z_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}) \cdot \frac{12 \cdot C_s^2}{U_s[\alpha] \times V_s[\beta]} \quad (16)$$

D. Objectives

All transformer blocks shall be executed in temporal layers order, and the inference latency includes data transfer and weight sharing between nodes, and intra-node computation across all temporal layers of an entire model. N^{bt} defaults to 1, otherwise, to mitigate the latency associated with weight sharing, the weights for each processing phase on each PIM-node are used for small-batch inference. It is expressed as:

$$\text{Minimize } T_{total} = \sum_{s,j} [N^{bt} \cdot (T_{s,j}^c + T_{s,j}^t) + T_{s,j}^{ws}] \quad (17)$$

Thanks to the well-organized systematic layout and cyclic dataflows as in Section V, there is no contention for NoC bandwidth resources between the packets, and it is practical

to conduct a runtime assessment at each phase based on the amount of data transferred between every two PIM-nodes.

Weight sharing: As stated in Section VI-C, prior to the weight-inclusive matrix multiplication, each node must fetch the required weights using NoC-based cyclic dataflows. The time cost of weight sharing is as follows:

$$T_{s,j}^{ws} = \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \cdot [W_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{PM}} + (W_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{MSA}} + W_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{FC}} + W_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{FFN}}) \cdot N_s^{\text{bk}}] / BW. \quad (18)$$

Data Transfer: Pursuant to Section V-A, the parallelization of computational branches causes feature maps to be transferred between nodes during intervals of matrix computation operations via vertical or horizontal cyclic dataflows.

$$T_{s,j}^t = \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \cdot [D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{PM}} + (D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{K}} + D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{V}} + D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{MSA_FC}} + D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{FFN}} + 2 \cdot D_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{LN}}) \cdot N_s^{\text{bk}}] / BW \quad (19)$$

Intra-node Computation: For each temporal layer, the processing engine on each node performs nine phases of matrix multiplication sequentially (as depicted in Figure 7), and we can derive the overall computing time for each temporal layer.

$$T_{s,j}^c = \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} X_{s,i,j,\alpha,\beta} \cdot [t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{PM}} + (t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{LT}} + t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{MSA}} + t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{FFN}} + t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{NC}}) \cdot N_s^{\text{bk}}] \quad (20)$$

Given matrix multiplications and their dimensions for each phase, we can employ the existing search-based intra-node mapping strategies [29], [39] for loop ordering and tiling to assess the computing time on processing engine. GeMM expressed as three nested loops has low data reuse relative to convolutional operations, and PIM-node has a concise memory hierarchy, which allows the search to be done in a short time. Based on the quantization methods [40], [41], the delays $t_{s,j,\alpha,\beta}^{\text{NC}}$ is obtained for nonlinear computations on the ACUs.

There are totally $\sum_s |U_s| \cdot |V_s| \cdot N_s^{\text{br}} \cdot (2N_s^{\text{br}} + 1)$ binary variables and $\sum_s N_s^{\text{br}}$ integer variables, where all variables relate to the model size, and $|V_s|$ and N_s^{br} rely on the input size. We use Gurobi [42] to solve the ILP problem. To combat possible oversized models, the complexity can be reduced by coarsening the partition granularity and shrinking $|U_s|$.

VII. LOCAL-GLOBAL INTERACTION AWARE MAPPING

Given the temporal-layer-based partitioning and scheduling results of entire model, which specify the number of temporal layers n_s^{tl} for each transformer block, the branch count $n_{s,j}^{\text{br}}$ for each temporal layer $j = 1, \dots, n_s^{\text{tl}}$, and their respective partitioning schemes $[u_{s,j}, v_{s,j}]$, this section is to map all the branches on transformer blocks to the PIM-node array for minimizing the communication cost in local-global interactions.

A. Data Dependency for Local-Global Interaction

As demonstrated in Section III-A, LVTs employ various complex operations to achieve local-global interaction within or between transformer blocks in the same model




Fig. 9. Data dependencies between branches. Given an input image of size 224^2 , the figures depict data dependencies between branches on transformer block in the second model stage. Red edges mark the data dependency of the 6th branch. As each PIM-node has to broadcast data to all the remaining nodes (e.g., CSWin), to avoid extremely cumbersome NoC communication, we also employ cyclic data transfers.

stage. Despite their complexity, these operations exhibit regular patterns, leading to regularized data dependencies between computational branches. To represent the distinct local-global interactions employed by LVTs, we construct a graph $G_{dp}(V_{bk}, E_{bk})$ to represent the data dependencies as in Figure 9.

B. Two-stage Mapping Method

The issue at hand involves mapping the computational branches of $|V_{bk}|$ local regions onto n_{tl} temporal layers, where within each temporal layer, n_{br} **uniformly-sized** sub-arrays are to be arranged on a node array of size $H_A \times W_A$ in a non-overlapping manner. This issue falls under the category of simplified 3D floor-planning problems in VLSI design. To address this issue, we propose a two-stage heuristic of layout followed by placement, as shown in Figure 10.

1) *Structured layout:* for each temporal layer, we systematically arrange n_{br} uniformly-sized sub-arrays on the PIM-node array to ensure a maximum PIM-node occupancy, as shown in Algorithm 1. Note that, temporal layers with the same partition scheme adopt the *same* sub-array layout. The following example illustrates the structural layout when $H_A = 3$, $W_A = 4$, $u = 2$, and $v = 1$ with up to 6 sub-arrays:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset & \emptyset \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow[\&Place]{\text{Rotate}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 5 & 5 & 6 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$$

where \emptyset stands for an unoccupied PIM-node.

2) *Greedy-based placement:* with the regularized data dependency graph and the well-structured sub-array layout for transformer block of each model stage, we propose a greedy-based placement method to place the branches to specific PIM-nodes. Firstly, we select the first computational branch and then place it on the top-left sub-array of the first temporal layer. Next, based on G_{dp} , we select the branch with the most dependencies on already mapped branches and then place it on the sub-array with the minimal distance among

Algorithm 1 Structured Layout

Require: H_A, W_A, u, v

Ensure: Structured layout for a maximum number of sub-arrays.

- 1: $max_num_i, Layout_I = StrcLay(H_A, W_A, u, v)$
- 2: $max_num_ii, Layout_II = StrcLay(H_A, W_A, v, u)$
- 3: **return** $(max_num_i \geq max_num_ii)? Layout_I : Layout_II$

Function $StrcLay(A, B, a, b)$:

- 4: $x_1 = \lfloor A/a \rfloor, y_1 = \lfloor B/b \rfloor, n_1 = x_1 * y_1$;
- 5: Place the a -side along the A -side and the b -side along the B -side to form an $x_1 \times y_1$ grid layout.
- 6: **if** $a > b$:
- 7: $A = A - x_1 * a; x_2 = \lfloor A/b \rfloor; y_2 = \lfloor B/a \rfloor$.
- 8: **else**
- 9: $B = B - y_1 * b; x_2 = \lfloor B/a \rfloor; y_2 = \lfloor A/b \rfloor$.
- 10: Rotate and then place the sub-array to refine the layout.
- 11: $n_2 = x_2 * y_2$;
- 12: **return** $n_1 + n_2$ and layout




Fig. 10. Local-global interaction aware mapping.

all temporal layers. This process is repeated iteratively until all computational branches are mapped. As in Figure 10, the feature map of each computational branch distributed across its sub-array nodes are first **i)gathered** to the top-leftmost PIM-node, then **ii)transferred** to the top-leftmost PIM-node of the other sub-array, and finally **iii)scattered** to the other PIM-nodes. Therefore, the distance is computed as the Manhattan distance between the top-leftmost PIM-nodes of every two sub-arrays. The method has a time complexity of $O(n_{br}^2)$.

VIII. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experiment Setting

Proposed Allspark is implemented using Python on a Linux server with an Intel Xeon Gold 6254 CPU@3.10GHz server.

PIM architecture: we adopt emerging 3D-stacked DRAM [20], [23] as the substrate of our PIM architecture, which provides a high-density, high-energy-efficient PIM solution built with logic-to-DRAM hybrid bonding technology. Furthermore, the processing engine is built with the widely used NVDLA-style architecture [33], [36]. This configuration allows the processing engines to be positioned closer to the memory, which significantly reduces the latency and power consumption of memory accesses, and achieves an impressive energy efficiency of 0.66 pJ/bit [20]. The detailed configurations of PIM systems are shown in Table III.

Simulation: we utilize a DNN accelerator evaluation tool, Timeloop+Accelerergy [29], to obtain the computation, memory accesses, and energy consumption of NVDLA-style processing engines in PIM system. To simulate DRAM access within and between PIM-nodes and energy consumption, we

employ cycle-accurate simulation tools: Ramulator-PIM [43] in conjunction with BookSim2.0 [44] and DRAMPower [45]. Following the integer quantization methods i-BERT [40] and FQ-ViT [41], we synthesize dedicated ACU of 8-bit integers based on 28nm process technology using commercial logic synthesis tools to obtain processing delay for nonlinear computations. Note that the computation remains unchanged during the inference on the PIM system and the accuracy of the visual model is unaffected.

TABLE III
CONFIGURATION OF THE DRAM-BASED PIM SYSTEM.

Module	Parameters	Configuration
Logic Die	Technology & Clock Frequency	28nm & 400MHz
	PIM-node Array & PE Array	16 × 16 & 8 × 8
	SRAM Buffers	48 KiB
	Bank Count per Node	One or more
	Router	Input-queued architecture
	Routing Algorithm Flit width & Energy	Dimension-order 64-bit & 1.1 pJ/bit/hop
DRAM Die	Technology	25nm
	Bank Capacity & Bandwidth	8 MiB & 128 bit
	Energy	0.66 pJ/bit

Baselines: state-of-the-art accelerators use either **attention-head-level(AH)** partitioning [14], [16] or **patch-level(P)** partitioning [11], [12], [15], [26] for parallelization. We conduct comparative assessments against AH, P and **branch-level(B)** partitioning on the PIM system for various models.


In addition, we compare the inference latency of visual Transformers on a DRAM-based PIM system with Allspark against Nvidia V100 GPU. We use PyTorch to implement the inference of different models running on GPU, and measure power consumption using nvidia-smi. To this end, we scale the size of the node arrays and PE arrays of PIM system to achieve a peak throughput (14.7 TOPS@INT8) equivalent to that of GPU (15.7 TFLOPS). The GPU and PIM have aggregated memory capacities of 32GiB and 4.5GiB, respectively, and bandwidths of 900GB/s and 3.35TB/s, respectively.

Workloads: we evaluate mapping methods across ViT [3], PVT [4], and four state-of-the-art LVT models, namely Swin [5], Focal [6], Twins [7], and CSWin [9], using ImageNet dataset. Differently, PVTs are deployed onto a node array of size 8 × 8 due to its low parallelism. Each model is available in several sizes: tiny(T), small(S), base(B), large(L), and huge(H). These models typically have parameters ranging from 20 to 700 million and computational loads of several hundred GFLOPs.


B. Effectiveness of Allspark

The average searching overheads of Allspark are 0.8s(small models) and 3.4s(largest models) for input sizes of 224 × 224, increasing to 12.5min(small models) and 2.1h(largest models) for input sizes of 960 × 960, etc. For different models, the overhead difference is not significant. The Allspark optimization evaluation is within 10% deviation from simulation results.

1) Inference Speed-up: as shown in Figure 11, with the support of the proposed Allspark, the inference latency of models on the PIM system significantly improves. For original



(a)



(b)

Fig. 11. Normalized speedups (w.r.t B) achieved by Allspark.

visual Transformers, compared to B, P, and AH partitioning methods, the inference latency is improved on average by 28.8×, 6.7×, and 1.2×, respectively. For LVTs, the average speedup is 40.0×, 5.1×, and 4.2×, respectively. This improvement is particularly pronounced for larger input image sizes and larger models (except for CSWin). In such cases, each transformer block has a greater number of attention heads and patches in the branch based on local regions, resulting in more partitioning possibilities. Other methods use fixed and uni-patterned partitioning, while Allspark allows for fully flexible partitioning for each transformer block of models. For larger input image and model sizes, CSWin Transformer has a higher number of branches (local regions) within its transformer block compared to other models. Therefore, on CSWin, there is no significant speedup in Allspark compared to the branch-level method. The figure also gives the ideal performance which assumes perfect hardware utilization.

2) PIM-node Utilization: We provide the PIM-node utilization for the staged and full stage of models, expressed as

$$Node_Util_s = \frac{\sum_j N_{node_occupied}^{s,j} \cdot Exec_Time_{s,j}}{\sum_j (H_A \times W_A) \cdot Exec_Time_{s,j}} \quad (21)$$

where $Exec_Time_{s,j}$ and $N_{node_occupied}^{s,j}$ are the runtime and the number of nodes occupied for the j -th temporal layer of the transformer block in the s -th model stage, respectively.






Fig. 12. Node utilization at each stage and all stages.



(a) Latency breakdown (cycle)



(b) Normalized comparison

Fig. 13. Inference latency breakdown and normalized comparison when Swin-B as well as the input image of size 640 × 640.

Figure 12 shows node utilization of LVTs with different mapping methods at each stage and for all stages. Using Allspark, PIM system has the highest node utilization in every stage of LVTs, and an overall utilization of over 96% (Swin-B) and over 74% (Twins-B), respectively. In contrast, the node utilization of PIM system under other methods is below 20%. Overall, the node utilization tends to decrease from stage to stage due to the downsampling performed in each stage, which causes a decreasing number of local regions (branches) in transformer blocks. Furthermore, node utilization is dominated by the third model stage, which has the most transformer blocks (about 3 to 9 times more than other stages) and accounts for a large proportion of the computation.

3) Latency Breakdown: Figure 13a reveals the inference latency breakdown, highlighting that Allspark enables LVTs to have minimal inference latency due to its high PIM-node utilization. Furthermore, the time taken for feature map transfer and weight sharing is only 13% to 41% of theirs compared to other methods. As the normalized comparison in Figure 13b, apart from the unchanged computation and MAC counts, Allspark enables PIM system to have less NoC workload, DRAM accesses, and energy consumption, with the patch-level partitioning approach showing the highest values, which are 6.7, 3.6, and 2.8 times higher than that of Allspark, respectively. Those methods based on fixed and uni-pattern partitioning cause a heavy transmission for key-value (KV) matrices and massive weight sharing between PIM-nodes.

For different batch sizes(BS), Figure 14 shows the normal-




Fig. 14. Normalized average latency for small-batch inference.

ized average latency. Overall, the computing time and feature map transfer time exhibit slight differences, while the average time taken for weight sharing decreases gradually as batch size increases, since weights are used in all batches after weight sharing at each computation phase, and when batch size is very large the weight sharing time is negligible. As in Section III-C, the time spent on feature map transmission between transformer blocks (part of the feature map transfer in Figure 14) is less than 1%, confirming the soundness of prioritizing resource-driven partitioning and scheduling in Allspark.

4) Memory Usage: The solution provided by Allspark satisfies Constraint 5, where the memory capacity per PIM-node meets the space requirements during inference. For Swin-B ($R_h=R_w=7$) and images of size 640×640 , with a memory capacity of 8 MiB per PIM-node, the solution for Allspark is in Table IV. Table V provides an overview of memory usage. After weight reuse and sharing, total memory usage drops to 7.96 MiB. However, without either of them, memory required for each PIM-node would exceed its capacity (8 MiB).

TABLE IV
PARTITIONING AND SCHEDULING RESULT OF ALLSPARK.

Stage	Temporal Layers	Partitioning Scheme [§]	Weight Reuse
1	3	[1,1], [1,1], [4,2]	Yes
2	2	[2,1], [4,4]	No
3	3	[8,2], [8,2], [16,4]	Yes
4	1	[4,4]	No

[§]Blue text indicates the temporal layer at which weight reuse occurs.

TABLE V
MEMORY REQUIREMENTS (MiB) FOR A SINGLE NODE.

Case	Weights	Workspace	Total
w/ Reuse+Sharing	6.94	1.02	7.96 (✓)
w/o Reuse	11.64	1.02	12.66 (✗)
w/o Sharing	59.8	1.02	60.82 (✗)

5) Impact of PIM system configurations: The effectiveness of Allspark varies across PIM architectures, and Figure 15 shows the average normalized speedup for all base-size models. As node array size and memory submodule scaling, Allspark has increasingly better performance over baselines due to its fully flexible partitioning and scheduling. Memory submodule capacity per PIM-node is a hard constraint that governs the solution and affects the acceleration performance.

C. Performance of Allspark-enriched PIM Systems

Normalized speedup and energy efficiency for small-batch inference on a 3D-stacked DRAM-based PIM system with Allspark and Nvidia V100 GPU are shown in Figure 16. Allspark-enriched PIM systems have on average $2.3\times$ speedup




Fig. 15. Effectiveness of Allspark against the PIM-node array size and the memory capacity on each PIM-node.




Fig. 16. Speed and energy efficiency improvements of DRAM-based PIM systems for small-batch inference over V100 GPU.

in latency as well as an improvement of $20\times\sim 55\times$ in energy efficiency compared to GPUs for different models, model sizes, and batch sizes. Especially for non-batched inference, the PIM system delivers the most significant speed gains, up to $3.5\times$, and the speedups stabilize as batch size increases. For the same model, the PIM system exhibits greater speedup when processing larger image sizes, attributed to a higher utilization of PIM-nodes, as in Figure 12. The difference between small and base models lies in the channel size, resulting in no significant variation in speedup. Compared with other methods, Allspark brings over $2\times$ speedup, exploiting the strengths of PIM system to achieve a high node utilization, due to its flexible partitioning strategy and scheduling scheme.

Continuously, we shrink the aggregate memory bandwidth of PIM to be the same as that of GPUs, at which point the PIM system has a smaller node array but a larger PE array per node. As shown in Table VI, the Allspark-enriched PIM system still earns $1.95\times$ average inference speedup.

TABLE VI
PERFORMANCE GAINS WITH SCALED BANDWIDTH.

Memory Bandwidth	900 GB/s	1.12 TB/s	1.49 TB/s	3.35 TB/s
Average speedup	1.95	2.15	2.30	2.30

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Allspark endeavours to workload orchestration for visual Transformers on PIM systems, with the goal of minimizing inference latency. Against the distributed nature of PIM system, Allspark endows a flexible partitioning strategy and elegant dataflows, partitioning and scheduling for end-to-end execution, and interaction-oriented mapping, so that the system acquires high computational node utilization, reasonable weight arrangement, and efficacious data communication. As evaluation on 3D-stacked DRAM-based PIM systems across various visual Transformers show that Allspark delivers significant inference speedups over baselines, and that Allspark-

enriched PIM system yields notable improvements in inference latency and also energy-efficiency over Nvidia V100 GPUs. Visual models are evolving rapidly and may continue to spawn variants of Transformer models, but Transformer serves as the key constituent with a significant computational and memory footprint, and remains the bottleneck for deployment. Allspark still works for Transformer module and offers fertile ground for further enhancements.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2017, pp. 6000–6010.
- [2] K. Han, Y. Wang, H. Chen, X. Chen, J. Guo, Z. Liu, Y. Tang, A. Xiao, C. Xu, Y. Xu, Z. Yang, Y. Zhang, and D. Tao, "A survey on vision transformer," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (TPAMI)*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 87–110, 2023.
- [3] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly, J. Uszkoreit, and N. Houlsby, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [4] W. Wang, E. Xie, X. Li, D.-P. Fan, K. Song, D. Liang, T. Lu, P. Luo, and L. Shao, "Pyramid vision transformer: A versatile backbone for dense prediction without convolutions," in *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021, pp. 548–558.
- [5] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2021, pp. 10012–10022.
- [6] J. Yang, C. Li, P. Zhang, X. Dai, B. Xiao, L. Yuan, and J. Gao, "Focal attention for long-range interactions in vision transformers," in *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 30008–30022.
- [7] X. Chu, Z. Tian, Y. Wang, B. Zhang, H. Ren, X. Wei, H. Xia, and C. Shen, "Twins: Revisiting the design of spatial attention in vision transformers," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 9355–9366.
- [8] Z. Huang, Y. Ben, G. Luo, P. Cheng, G. Yu, and B. Fu, "Shuffle transformer: Rethinking spatial shuffle for vision transformer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03650*, 2021.
- [9] X. Dong, J. Bao, D. Chen, W. Zhang, N. Yu, L. Yuan, D. Chen, and B. Guo, "Cswin transformer: A general vision transformer backbone with cross-shaped windows," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2022, pp. 12 124–12 134.
- [10] Papers with code: Latest papers with code. [Online]. Available: <https://paperswithcode.com/sota>
- [11] M. Zhou, W. Xu, J. Kang, and T. Rosing, "Transpim: A memory-based acceleration via software-hardware co-design for transformer," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2022, pp. 1071–1085.
- [12] Y. Qin, Y. Wang, D. Deng, Z. Zhao, X. Yang, L. Liu, S. Wei, Y. Hu, and S. Yin, "Fact: Ffn-attention co-optimized transformer architecture with eager correlation prediction," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579371.3589057>
- [13] S.-C. Kao, S. Subramanian, G. Agrawal, A. Yazdanbakhsh, and T. Krishna, "Flat: An optimized dataflow for mitigating attention bottlenecks," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 295–310. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3575693.3575747>
- [14] H. You, Z. Sun, H. Shi, Z. Yu, Y. Zhao, Y. Zhang, C. Li, B. Li, and Y. Lin, "Vitcod: Vision transformer acceleration via dedicated algorithm and accelerator co-design," in *2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2023, pp. 273–286.
- [15] H. Wang, Z. Zhang, and S. Han, "Spatten: Efficient sparse attention architecture with cascade token and head pruning," in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2021, pp. 97–110.
- [16] Z. Qu, L. Liu, F. Tu, Z. Chen, Y. Ding, and Y. Xie, "Dota: Detect and omit weak attentions for scalable transformer acceleration," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, New York, NY, USA, 2022, pp. 14–26.
- [17] G. Dai, T. Huang, Y. Chi, J. Zhao, G. Sun, Y. Liu, Y. Wang, Y. Xie, and H. Yang, "Graphh: A processing-in-memory architecture for large-scale graph processing," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 640–653, 2019.
- [18] D. Kim, J. Kung, S. Chai, S. Yalamanchili, and S. Mukhopadhyay, "Neurocube: A programmable digital neuromorphic architecture with high-density 3d memory," in *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2016, pp. 380–392.
- [19] M. He, C. Song, I. Kim, C. Jeong, S. Kim, I. Park, M. Thottethodi, and T. N. Vijaykumar, "Newton: A dram-maker's accelerator-in-memory (aim) architecture for machine learning," in *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, 2020, pp. 372–385.
- [20] S. Wang, B. Yu, W. Xiao, F. Bai, X. Long, L. Bai, X. Jia, F. Zuo, J. Tan, Y. Guo, P. Sun, J. Zhou, Q. Zhan, S. Hu, Y. Zhou, Y. Kang, Q. Ren, and X. Jiang, "A 135 gbps/gbit 0.66 pj/bit stacked embedded dram with multilayer arrays by fine pitch hybrid bonding and mini-tsv," in *2023 IEEE Symposium on VLSI Technology and Circuits (VLSI Technology and Circuits)*, 2023, pp. 1–2.
- [21] M. Gao, J. Pu, X. Yang, M. Horowitz, and C. Kozyrakis, "Tetris: Scalable and efficient neural network acceleration with 3d memory," *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 751–764, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3093337.3037702>
- [22] S. Lee, K. Kim, S. Oh, J. Park, G. Hong, D. Ka, K. Hwang, J. Park, K. Kang, J. Kim, J. Jeon, N. Kim, Y. Kwon, K. Vladimir, W. Shin, J. Won, M. Lee, H. Joo, H. Choi, J. Lee, D. Ko, Y. Jun, K. Cho, I. Kim, C. Song, C. Jeong, D. Kwon, J. Jang, I. Park, J. Chun, and J. Cho, "A 1ynm 1.25v 8gb, 16gb/s/pin gddr6-based accelerator-in-memory supporting 1tflops mac operation and various activation functions for deep-learning applications," in *2022 IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference (ISSCC)*, vol. 65, 2022, pp. 1–3.
- [23] D. Niu, S. Li, Y. Wang, W. Han, Z. Zhang, Y. Guan, T. Guan, F. Sun, F. Xue, L. Duan, Y. Fang, H. Zheng, X. Jiang, S. Wang, F. Zuo, Y. Wang, B. Yu, Q. Ren, and Y. Xie, "184qps/w 64mb/mm2 3d logic-to-dram hybrid bonding with process-near-memory engine for recommendation system," in *2022 IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference (ISSCC)*, vol. 65, 2022, pp. 1–3.
- [24] E. Talpes, D. Williams, and D. D. Sarma, "Dojo: The microarchitecture of tesla's exa-scale computer," in *2022 IEEE Hot Chips 34 Symposium (HCS)*, 2022, pp. 1–28.
- [25] J. Wang, M. Ge, B. Ding, Q. Xu, S. Chen, and Y. Kang, "Nicepim: Design space exploration for processing-in-memory dnn accelerators with 3d-stacked-dram," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, pp. 1–1, 2023.
- [26] M. Zhou, Y. Guo, W. Xu, B. Li, K. W. Eliceri, and T. Rosing, "Mat: Processing in-memory acceleration for long-sequence attention," in *2021 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*, 2021, pp. 25–30.
- [27] M. Gao, X. Yang, J. Pu, M. Horowitz, and C. Kozyrakis, "Tangram: Optimized coarse-grained dataflow for scalable nn accelerators," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 807–820. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304014>
- [28] J. Wang, H. Du, B. Ding, Q. Xu, S. Chen, and Y. Kang, "Ddam: Data distribution-aware mapping of cnns on processing-in-memory systems," *Acm Transactions on Design Automation of Electronic Systems (TODAES)*, vol. 28, no. 3, mar 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576196>
- [29] A. Parashar, P. Raina, Y. S. Shao, Y.-H. Chen, V. A. Ying, A. Mukkara, R. Venkatesan, B. Khailany, S. W. Keckler, and J. Emer, "Timeloop: A systematic approach to dnn accelerator evaluation," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 2019, pp. 304–315.

- [30] S. Zheng, X. Zhang, L. Liu, S. Wei, and S. Yin, "Atomic dataflow based graph-level workload orchestration for scalable dnn accelerators," in *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, 2022, pp. 475–489.
- [31] Q. Huang, M. Kang, G. Dinh, T. Norell, A. Kalaiiah, J. Demmel, J. Wawrzynek, and Y. S. Shao, "Cosa: Scheduling by constrained optimization for spatial accelerators," in *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2021, pp. 554–566.
- [32] J. Cai, Y. Wei, Z. Wu, S. Peng, and K. Ma, "Inter-layer scheduling space definition and exploration for tiled accelerators," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579371.3589048>
- [33] Y. S. Shao, J. Clemons, R. Venkatesan, B. Zimmer, M. Fojtik, N. Jiang, B. Keller, A. Klinefelter, N. Pinckney, P. Raina, S. G. Tell, Y. Zhang, W. J. Dally, J. Emer, C. T. Gray, B. Khailany, and S. W. Keckler, "Simba: Scaling deep-learning inference with multi-chip-module-based architecture," in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 14–27. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358302>
- [34] S. M. Nabavinejad, M. Baharloo, K.-C. Chen, M. Palesi, T. Kogel, and M. Ebrahimi, "An overview of efficient interconnection networks for deep neural network accelerators," *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 268–282, 2020.
- [35] N. P. Jouppi, C. Young, N. Patil, D. Patterson, G. Agrawal, R. Bajwa, S. Bates, S. Bhatia, N. Boden, A. Borchers, R. Boyle, P.-l. Cantin, C. Chao, C. Clark, J. Coriell, M. Daley, M. Dau, J. Dean, B. Gelb, T. V. Ghaemmaghami, R. Gottipati, W. Gulland, R. Hagmann, C. R. Ho, D. Hogberg, J. Hu, R. Hundt, D. Hurt, J. Ibarz, A. Jaffey, A. Jaworski, A. Kaplan, H. Khaitan, D. Killebrew, A. Koch, N. Kumar, S. Lacy, J. Laudon, J. Law, D. Le, C. Leary, Z. Liu, K. Lucke, A. Lundin, G. MacKean, A. Maggiore, M. Mahony, K. Miller, R. Nagarajan, R. Narayanaswami, R. Ni, K. Nix, T. Norrie, M. Omernick, N. Penukonda, A. Phelps, J. Ross, M. Ross, A. Salek, E. Samadiani, C. Severn, G. Sizikov, M. Snellman, J. Souter, D. Steinberg, A. Swing, M. Tan, G. Thorson, B. Tian, H. Toma, E. Tuttle, V. Vasudevan, R. Walter, W. Wang, E. Wilcox, and D. H. Yoon, "In-datacenter performance analysis of a tensor processing unit," in *2017 ACM/IEEE 44th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, 2017, pp. 1–12.
- [36] Nvidia, "Nvidia deep learning accelerator," 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://nvidia.org>.
- [37] J. Lee and J. Lee, "Specializing cgras for light-weight convolutional neural networks," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems (TCAD)*, vol. 41, no. 10, pp. 3387–3399, 2022.
- [38] Y. Sheng, L. Zheng, B. Yuan, Z. Li, M. Ryabinin, B. Chen, P. Liang, C. Re, I. Stoica, and C. Zhang, "Flexgen: High-throughput generative inference of large language models with a single GPU," in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, vol. 202. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023, pp. 31 094–31 116. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/sheng23a.html>
- [39] A. Samajdar, J. M. Joseph, Y. Zhu, P. Whatmough, M. Mattina, and T. Krishna, "A systematic methodology for characterizing scalability of dnn accelerators using scale-sim," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 2020, pp. 58–68.
- [40] S. Kim, A. Gholami, Z. Yao, M. W. Mahoney, and K. Keutzer, "I-bert: Integer-only bert quantization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.01321*, 2021.
- [41] Y. Lin, T. Zhang, P. Sun, Z. Li, and S. Zhou, "Fq-vit: Post-training quantization for fully quantized vision transformer," in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 7 2022, pp. 1173–1179.
- [42] G. Optimization. (2023) Gurobi optimizer reference manual. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gurobi.com/>
- [43] Y. Kim, W. Yang, and O. Mutlu, "Ramulator: A fast and extensible dram simulator," *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 45–49, 2016.
- [44] N. Jiang, D. U. Becker, G. Michelogiannakis, J. Balfour, B. Towles, D. E. Shaw, J. Kim, and W. J. Dally, "A detailed and flexible cycle-accurate network-on-chip simulator," in *2013 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 2013, pp. 86–96.
- [45] K. Chandrasekar, C. Weis, Y. Li, S. Goossens, M. Jung, O. Naji, B. Akesson, N. Wehn, and K. Goossens, "DRAMPower: Open-source DRAM power & energy estimation tool," 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://www.drampower.info>