

# A Quantitative Evaluation of Approximate Softmax Functions for Deep Neural Networks

Fabrizio Elizondo-Fernández\*, Luis G. León-Vega†, Cristina Meinhardt‡, Jorge Castro-Godínez\*

\*Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica, Cartago, Costa Rica

†Università degli Studi di Trieste, Trieste, Italia

‡Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brasil

Corresponding author: luis.leon@ieee.org jcastro@tec.ac.cr

**Abstract**—The softmax function is used as an activation function placed in the output layer of a neural network. It allows extracting the probabilities of the output classes, while introduces a non-linearity to the model. In the field of low-end FPGAs, implementations of Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) require the exploration of optimisation techniques to improve computational efficiency and hardware resource consumption. This work explores approximate computing techniques to implement the softmax function, using Taylor and Padé approximations, and interpolation methods with Look-Up Tables (LUTs). The introduction of approximations aim to reduce the required execution time while reducing the precision of results produced by the softmax function. Each implementation is evaluated using Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for accuracy assessment, and individual performance is verified by taking measurements of execution times. From our evaluation, quadratic interpolation with LUTs achieves the lowest error, but in terms of performance, Taylor and Padé approximations show better execution times, which highlights the existing design trade-off between numerical accuracy and power consumption.

**Index Terms**—Approximate computing, high level synthesis, inference algorithms, neural network compression, multilayer perceptrons.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The softmax function is a version of the logistic function used when having non-binary classifiers. It is often placed at the end of the classifiers as an activation function to extract the probabilities of each output class in a neural network, in particular, after a fully-connected layer (FCL) [1]. A typical example of this usage is in a LeNet-5 model on the MNIST dataset [2]. Apart from its role as probability extractor, it introduces a non-linearity to the model, enabling the classifications of points with non-linear mappings of data and making the embedded points linearly separable [3].

In Deep Learning (DL) inference, using 32-bit floating-point (`float32`) representations provides more precision to the network than required, leading to the concept of *quantisation*: the approximation of the model in other numerical representations with fewer bits [4]. Quantisation allows model compression, reducing the memory footprint and better exploitation of vector execution units of CPUs than `float32`. In the particular case of the activation functions, quantisation does not have an impact on the memory footprint, having relevance mostly in the computation effort.

When considering FPGA-based implementations for DL, the vast majority of the implementations for Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) inference are solutions provided by FPGA vendors, particularly tailored for high-end FPGAs, such as Xilinx Alveo, Kintex, and Virtex. In most cases, the solutions are closed, i.e., no code is available, hence restricting the optimisation possibilities [4].

This opens the opportunity to explore solutions based on low-end FPGAs for edge computing, from exploring the synthesis of algorithms to Hardware Description Languages (HDL). High-Level Synthesis (HLS) allows the possibility of implementing FPGA designs faster than traditional register transfer level (RTL) descriptions. Moreover, approximate computing techniques can be used for function calculation, bringing the chance of having smaller designs with lower power consumption in exchange of numerical accuracy [5], [6].

In this work, we explore approximate computing techniques to implement the softmax function, using Taylor and Padé approximations, and interpolation methods with Look-Up Tables (LUTs). Each implementation is evaluated using Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for accuracy assessment, while its individual performance is verified by taking measurements of execution times.

## II. OPTIMISATION FRAMEWORK

In this section, the function’s definition and its possible approximations are presented. In particular, the approximations taken into consideration in this work include Taylor approximation, Padé approximant, and piece-wise interpolation based on Look-up Tables (LUTs).

### A. Definition

The softmax function is defined as:

$$\Phi(\mathbf{v})_i = \frac{e^{v_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^k e^{v_j}} \quad (1)$$

where  $v_i$  is the  $i$ -th element of the input vector  $\mathbf{v}$  and  $k$  is the number of elements of the vector [3]. It involves the computation of the exponential function in a certain domain  $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ . The domain  $S$  can be determined according to the

input and output domains of the FCL preceding the softmax function. A FCL is described as the matrix-vector product:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}$  are input, bias and output vectors, respectively; and  $\mathbf{W}$  is the weights matrix for all the perceptrons within the FCL. For our use case, let us assume a numerical representation that supports a uniformly distributed discrete set within the domain  $S = ]-1, 1[$ , quantised in a fixed-point representation of  $\beta$  bits. Hence, an element of the output vector can be expressed as:

$$y_i = \mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{x} + b_i \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_i$  is the  $i$ -th row vector from the matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  and  $\cdot$  is the dot-product between vectors, expressed as  $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{x} = \sum_j^k w_{ij}x_j$ . Each output element involves  $k$  products and  $k$  additions including the bias. The computation is numerically vulnerable to additions, risking overflows. In other works, we have dealt with this constraint by scaling one of the operands of the matrix-vector multiplication inversely proportional to the number of elements of the input vector [7],  $n$ . Therefore,

$$y_i = \mathbf{w}_i \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{n}\right), x_i, w_{ij} \in S \implies y_i \in S \quad (4)$$

implies that scaling by the inverse of the number of inputs will numerically stabilise the outputs.

Knowing that the domain of  $v_i$  is constrained and given by  $S$ , the exponential function domain can also be given by  $S$ . As  $S$  is a uniformly distributed discrete set, the function can also be defined by the number of points of the set without incurring an under or over-discretisation.

### B. Taylor approximation

A Taylor series consists in a function approximation given by the infinite sum of elements that are expressed in terms of the target function's derivatives at a single point. For the exponential function, the Taylor series centred in  $a = 0$  is

$$e^x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!} = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \dots, \forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad (5)$$

where  $a$  is the point where the function's derivative is centred and it converges everywhere [8].

### C. Padé approximant

The Padé approximant is a function that approximates through the reason of two polynomials [9]. For a function  $f(x)$ , there is a unique approximant of order  $m, n$

$$R_{m,n}(x) = \frac{P_m(x)}{Q_n(x)} = \frac{a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_mx^m}{b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots + b_nx^n}, x \in \mathbb{C} \quad (6)$$

where  $P$  and  $Q$  are polynomials of degrees no more than  $m$  and  $n$ , respectively. When  $n = 0$ , the Padé approximant becomes the same as the  $m$ -order Taylor series. Wynn's algorithm is one of the methods to compute the Padé approximant [10].




Fig. 1. Piecewise representation by doing 8 samples within the domain  $S$  and applying a linear interpolation

### D. LUT-based piece-wise interpolation

Our version of this method consists in sampling the function in uniform, equidistant points and computing the best-fit polynomial between the points. For instance, a linear polynomial requires two points to compute, whereas a quadratic requires three points [11]. Figure 1 shows how a linear interpolation fits the  $e^x$  function by taking 8 samples and performing linear interpolation.

The piecewise function segments can be calculated at computation time (runtime) or recalculated at compile time. At runtime, the slope and intercept are computed as

$$m_p = \frac{y_{p_1} - y_{p_0}}{x_{p_1} - x_{p_0}}, b_p = y_{p_1} - m_p x_{p_1} \quad (7)$$

such that  $f_p(x) = m_p x + b_p, x_{p_0} \leq x \leq x_{p_1}$ , where  $(x_{p_0}, y_{p_0}), (x_{p_1}, y_{p_1})$  are the points before and after the point of interest  $x_p$ , respectively. In this case, the computation of the point requires: (1) storing the points in a LUT, (2) computing the linear equations, and (3) computing the value of interest. At compute time, instead, it computes (2) offline and stores the slopes and intercepts in the LUT, shortening the path from (1) to (3).

Moreover, for the sake of avoiding unwanted divisions while computing the indices of the slope-intercept pairs required for the computation, the number of points can be power of two, such that the division becomes a bit-shift, in such way that

$$p = x' \gg P \implies m_p = M[p], b_p = B[p] \quad (8)$$

where  $P$  is the number of points (power of two),  $x'$  is the quantised value of  $x$  in fixed-point,  $M$  and  $B$  are the LUTs for the slope and intercept, respectively.

### E. Numerical error metric

To assess the accuracy of the approximate models, we use the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) metric, which is widely

TABLE I  
ERROR METRICS FOR THE TAYLOR-SOFTMAX APPROXIMATION

Type	Error (RMSE)	Variance	Standard Deviation
Order 1	$3.13 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.48 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.57 \times 10^{-3}$
Order 2	$2.97 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.45 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.56 \times 10^{-3}$
Order 3	$4.18 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.84 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.62 \times 10^{-5}$

adopted to measure the estimation error [12]. Because RMSE is listed as an absolute error metric, it establishes a difference between the exact values and the approximate values, defined as:

$$\text{RMSE}(\hat{v}) = \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (v_i - \hat{v}_i)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{v}$  is the approximate vector of the model,  $N$  is the vector size, and  $v_i$  represents the exact values. This metric uses, essentially, the same formula to measure how far the model's predictions are from an actual values. Therefore, there is a direct relationship between the accuracy of the model, and the value of RMSE.

### III. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

#### A. Performance evaluation

In order to compare the performance of the different approximate softmax implementations, we focus on the execution time of each algorithm. The idea is to visualise the behaviour of each approximation of the exponential function, as well as the execution time of the developed softmax functions.

Each approximation is swept with different sizes of the input vector and each vector is full with random values within the function domain. Furthermore, the performance of each algorithm is tested using variations in the available compiler optimisations. In this case, the compiler used is `gcc` (GNU Compiler Collection) [13], with the flag `-O0`, which is the default value and performs optimisations at compile time, and `-Ofast`, which applies all available optimisations to reduce the code size and the execution time of the program.

The results in this evaluation were obtained on Core i7 (4710HQ) machine, with 2.50GHz clock frequency, 16GB DDR3 1333MHz, Ubuntu 18.04.4 as operative system, and `gcc` version 7.5.0.

#### B. Results

Tables I, III, and II show the error metrics gathered for each softmax approximation type. The results were captured by applying a test vector with 100 random values within the softmax domain  $S = ]-1, 1[$ . From all the solutions presented, the approach that generated the lowest error value was quadratic interpolation using LUTs, reaching an  $\text{RMSE} = 2.31 \times 10^{-7}$ . In the case of the Taylor approach, the order 3 approximation was the one that obtained the best error result with  $\text{RMSE} = 4.18 \times 10^{-5}$ , while using the Padé approximant,

TABLE II  
ERROR METRICS FOR THE PADÉ-SOFTMAX APPROXIMATION

Polynomial order	Error (RMSE)	Variance	Standard Deviation
1/1	$3.27 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.46 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.57 \times 10^{-3}$
1/2	$4.54 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.58 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.36 \times 10^{-3}$
1/3	$4.88 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.62 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.37 \times 10^{-3}$
2/1	$1.91 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.13 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.06 \times 10^{-3}$
2/2	$2.76 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.16 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.47 \times 10^{-3}$
2/3	$3.47 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.95 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.72 \times 10^{-3}$
3/1	$1.39 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.50 \times 10^{-7}$	$7.41 \times 10^{-4}$
3/2	$2.27 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.74 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.32 \times 10^{-3}$
3/3	$2.90 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.98 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.41 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE III  
ERROR METRICS FOR THE LUT INTERPOLATION SOFTMAX

Type	Error (RMSE)	Variance	Standard Deviation
Lineal	$3.22 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.28 \times 10^{-12}$	$2.07 \times 10^{-6}$
Quadratic	$2.31 \times 10^{-7}$	$2.60 \times 10^{-14}$	$1.61 \times 10^{-7}$

TABLE IV  
EXECUTION TIME PERFORMANCE FOR THE TAYLOR-SOFTMAX ORDER 3 APPROXIMATION

Vector size	Exponential Time (-Ofast, s)	Softmax Time (-O0, s)	Softmax Time (-Ofast, s)
100	$1.14 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.22 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.61 \times 10^{-6}$
1000	$1.79 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.81 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.72 \times 10^{-6}$
10000	$5.26 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.38 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.71 \times 10^{-5}$
100000	$3.19 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.60 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.84 \times 10^{-4}$
500000	$1.12 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.52 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.22 \times 10^{-3}$

the 3/1 order polynomial reached the lowest error value with  $\text{RMSE} = 1.39 \times 10^{-3}$ .

Subsequently, a performance analysis was applied to each type of approximation, taking as reference the versions that produced the smallest error results, which are shown in the tables IV, V, and VI. Under these circumstances, the softmax approximation using a quadratic interpolation with LUTs, collected the worst results in execution times, both for the calculation of the exponential function and for the softmax function.

Moreover, the Taylor and Padé approximations achieved better execution times, performing values very close to each other, with certain variations depending on the size of the input vector. It should be noted that all the approaches achieved better performance values, by applying the compile-time optimisations of the algorithms through the `-Ofast` flag.

Figures 2 and 3 show the behaviour of the performance for each approximation of the exponential function and the softmax function, respectively. The graphs also include the execution time of linear interpolation with LUTs, which shows an almost identical behaviour as quadratic interpolation. Similar, for the case of Taylor and Padé approximations, the execution is almost identical for the case of softmax function approximation, while being faster than the baseline. For the

TABLE V  
EXECUTION TIME PERFORMANCE FOR THE LUT QUADRATIC  
INTERPOLATION SOFTMAX

Vector size	Exponential Time (-Ofast, s)	Softmax Time (-O0, s)	Softmax Time (-Ofast, s)
100	$1.77 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.54 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.66 \times 10^{-4}$
1000	$2.05 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.10 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.64 \times 10^{-3}$
10000	$1.24 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.87 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.11 \times 10^{-2}$
100000	$6.54 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.63 \times 10^{-1}$	$6.53 \times 10^{-2}$
500000	$3.11 \times 10^{-1}$	1.32	$3.10 \times 10^{-1}$

TABLE VI  
EXECUTION TIME PERFORMANCE FOR THE PADÉ-SOFTMAX ORDER 3/1  
APPROXIMATION

Vector size	Exponential Time (-Ofast, s)	Softmax Time (-O0, s)	Softmax Time (-Ofast, s)
100	$1.07 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.17 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.37 \times 10^{-6}$
1000	$6.11 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.21 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.76 \times 10^{-6}$
10000	$8.94 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.98 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.37 \times 10^{-5}$
100000	$9.10 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.66 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.86 \times 10^{-4}$
500000	$1.28 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.69 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.39 \times 10^{-3}$




Fig. 2. Performance behaviour for the approximate softmax function using the `-Ofast` compiler optimisation flag. The vector sizes vary from 100 to 500000. Baseline softmax (no approximate) is include as a reference.

case of approximations to the exponential function, Figure 3 shows that these two approximations have a similar trend while converging for the case of larger vector size while still having smaller execution time than the baseline.

#### IV. NEXT STEPS

In addition to the techniques explored in this work, the field of approximate computation has other methods that can be applied, such as partial sums and loop perforations. Softmax is an activation function, that involves carrying out a series of iterations, which at the computational level translate into loops, and depending on their scope, they can become critical factors that affect the performance of a program. The loop perforation technique executes a subset of the total loop iterations. The idea is to reduce the amount of computational work, time,




Fig. 3. Performance behaviour for the approximate exponential function using the `-Ofast` compiler optimisation flag. The vector sizes vary from 100 to 500000. Baseline softmax (no approximate) is include as a reference.

and resource consumption, that a process requires to generate its result [14]. By reducing the number of iterations of the loop, the results obtained differ from the expected value, because it is causing an alteration to the normal flow of work. Nevertheless, the neural networks can tolerate these errors introduced in the accuracy of the calculations because its probabilistic nature. It is important to mention that this type of technique cannot be applied to any loop since, sometimes, the tolerated error has critical values, which cannot be exceeded. Despite the above, the proper functioning of loop perforation has been verified, as long as we are within a defined set of computational patterns [14], such as the *addition* pattern and the *argument minimum* pattern.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by RidgeRun, LLC, and the Costa Rica Institute of Technology under research project 5402-1360-4401. Results achieved with the funding obtained under Axis IV of the PON Research and Innovation 2014-2020 "Education and research for recovery - REACT-EU".

#### V. CONCLUSION

Through this work, we explore different softmax approximate implementations, using Taylor approximation, Padé approximant, and interpolation with LUTs. The results show that the implementation with the lower numerical error under the softmax domain corresponds to the quadratic interpolation using LUTs. However, the performance experienced presented the lowest values in terms of execution times due to the previous steps required to gather the necessary points in the interpolation formula; this also applies to linear interpolation. The softmax approximations with Taylor and Padé generated better performance results, due to the simplicity of the computations they perform when approximating the exponential function.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Skansi, *Introduction to deep learning: From Logical Calculus to Artificial Intelligence*, 2018, vol. 114, no. 6.
- [2] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, 1998.
- [3] E. Alpaydin, "Neural Networks and Deep Learning," *Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [4] T. Liang, J. Glossner, L. Wang, S. Shi, and X. Zhang, "Pruning and quantization for deep neural network acceleration: A survey," *Neuro-computing*, vol. 461, pp. 370–403, 2021.
- [5] G. Zervakis, K. Tsoumanis, S. Xydis, N. Axelos, and K. Pekmestzi, "Approximate multiplier architectures through partial product perforation: Power-area tradeoffs analysis," *Proceedings of the ACM Great Lakes Symposium on VLSI, GLSVLSI*, vol. 20-22-May-2015, pp. 229–232, 2015.
- [6] H. Saadat and S. Parameswaran, "Hardware Approximate Computing: How, Why, When and Where? (Special Session)," in *Proceedings of the 2017 International Conference on Compilers, Architectures and Synthesis for Embedded Systems Companion*, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3125501.3125518>
- [7] L. G. León-Vega, E. Salazar-Villalobos, and J. Castro-Godínez, "An Exploration of Accuracy Configurable Matrix Multiply-Addition Architectures using HLS," in *2022 IEEE 15th Dallas Circuit And System Conference (DCAS)*, 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [8] M. Abramowitz, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions, With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*,. USA: Dover Publications, Inc., 1974.
- [9] G. A. Baker and P. Graves-Morris, *Padé approximants and numerical methods*, 2nd ed., ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 67–121.
- [10] P. Wynn, "On the convergence and stability of the epsilon algorithm," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 91–122, 1966. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0703007>
- [11] R. H. Bartels, J. C. Beatty, and B. A. Barsky, *An Introduction to Splines for Use in Computer Graphics & Geometric Modeling*. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1987.
- [12] X. R. Li and Z. Zhao, "Evaluation of estimation algorithms part i: incomprehensive measures of performance," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 1340–1358, 2006.
- [13] "Options that control optimization." [Online]. Available: <https://gcc.gnu.org/onlinedocs/gcc/Optimize-Options.html>
- [14] S. Sidiroglou-Douskos, S. Misailovic, H. Hoffmann, and M. Rinard, "Managing Performance vs. Accuracy Trade-Offs with Loop Perforation," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSOFT Symposium and the 13th European Conference on Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2011, p. 124–134. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2025113.2025133>