

Xel-FPGAs: An End-to-End Automated Exploration Framework for Approximate Accelerators in FPGA-Based Systems

Bharath Srinivas Prabakaran^{*,§}, Vojtech Mrazek^{†,§}, Zdenek Vasicek[†], Lukas Sekanina[†], Muhammad Shafique[‡]

^{*}Institute of Computer Engineering, Technische Universität Wien (TU Wien), Austria
bharath.prabakaran@tuwien.ac.at

[†]Faculty of Information Technology, IT4Innovations Centre of Excellence, Brno University of Technology, Czech Republic
{mrazek, vasicek, sekanina}@fit.vutbr.cz

[‡]eBrain Lab, Division of Engineering, New York University Abu Dhabi (NYUAD), United Arab Emirates (UAE)
muhammad.shafique@nyu.edu

Abstract—Generation and exploration of approximate circuits and accelerators has been a prominent research domain to achieve energy-efficiency and/or performance improvements. This research has predominantly focused on ASICs, while not achieving similar gains when deployed for FPGA-based accelerator systems, due to the inherent architectural differences between the two. In this work, we propose a novel framework, Xel-FPGAs, which leverages statistical or machine learning models to effectively explore the architecture-space of state-of-the-art ASIC-based approximate circuits to cater them for FPGA-based systems given a simple RTL description of the target application. We have also evaluated the scalability of our framework on a multi-stage application using a hierarchical search strategy. The Xel-FPGAs framework is capable of reducing the exploration time by up to 95%, when compared to the default synthesis, place, and route approaches, while identifying an improved set of Pareto-optimal designs for a given application, when compared to the state-of-the-art. The complete framework is open-source and available online at <https://github.com/ehw-fit/xel-fpgas>.

Index Terms—Approximate Computing, Accelerator, FPGA, ASIC, Arithmetic Units, Regression, Models, Synthesis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs) act as a lucrative computing platform in various applications, especially ones that need to be updated and/or modified on-the-go, due to their ability of partial run-time reconfiguration, *i.e.*, field-programmability. Since their introduction in 1984 [1], FPGAs have gained a lot of popularity due to their decreased time-to-market and lower prototype costs, when compared to Application Specific Integrated Circuits (ASICs). Besides their deployment in embedded use-cases and cyber-physical systems, FPGAs are also deployed in servers and high-performance computing clusters to offer on-demand performance acceleration to complex compute-intensive algorithms [2]. These reconfigurable platforms include hard IPs (IC realization) of low-power ARM processor cores and commonly used hardware accelerators like video codecs, besides the soft IP cores, which are used to realize the

custom accelerators [3]. Due to these wide-ranged capabilities, FPGAs can act as a *Programmable-System-on-chip* (PSoC) for embedded use-cases or as a service for on-demand compute acceleration. However, FPGAs tend to be more power hungry, with decreased throughput, when compared to ASICs.

Besides the use of conventional power-reduction approaches, like Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS) [4] and clock-gating [5], *Approximate Computing* appears to be quite suitable for increasing the energy-efficiency of a system. The primary notion behind approximating the computational units of a system, stems from the fact that these systems and their algorithms are inherently error-resilient, *i.e.*, they do not lead to “significant” degradation in output quality [6]. This inherent error-resilience property is exhibited by applications encompassing several domains like recognition, mining, and synthesis, to include data analysis [7], audio, image, or video processing [8], speech and image recognition [9], etc. The resilience exhibited by these applications can be attributed to four key factors, namely, (1) redundant input data, (2) implicit error attenuation by the deployed algorithms, (3) non-distinguishable, user-level, differences in the output quality, and (4) lack of a single golden output. These factors have been exploited widely in various research works, spanning academia and industry, focusing on both hardware and software to obtain either power, latency, or energy benefits [10]–[22].

The state-of-the-art tends to primarily focus on generating approximate circuits (AC) and/or accelerators to obtain power, latency, and/or energy benefits for ASIC-based systems. Several past works have illustrated that the approximate computing principles and techniques developed for ASIC-based systems tend to offer dissimilar benefits when realized for FPGA-based systems [12]–[20]. For instance, approximate arithmetic units developed for ASICs can achieve up to 70% energy reduction when synthesized for ASIC platforms; the same designs offer minimal savings, or at times negative savings, when synthesized for FPGA platforms [12]. Ullah *et al.* [14] proposed a

[§]These two authors have contributed to this work equally.

methodology for systematically generating a wide-range of approximate multiplier architectures that offer similar benefits when deployed on FPGA platforms. The methodology also includes a small-scale design space exploration stage to identify approximate accelerator designs suitable for the application. On the other hand, Prabakaran *et al.* [15] illustrate the benefits of exploring the vast architecture-space of approximate ASIC-based arithmetic circuits to identify a set of Pareto-optimal¹ designs suitable for the target FPGA platform. This is subsequently leveraged by a large-scale automated approximate accelerator exploration strategy to identify near-optimal approximate accelerators for an application. However, these works do not holistically explore the large architecture-space of approximate accelerators that can be constructed using several arithmetic ACs, which might cause the exploration to overlook certain trade-offs that are clearly situated on the Pareto front for the application.

A. Motivational Analysis

To further illustrate the differences between ASICs and FPGAs, we explore approximate accelerator variants of a Gaussian filter composed of nine 8-bit multipliers and eight 16-bit adders. The approximate accelerator variants are built using the Pareto-optimal ACs present in the evolutionary approximate arithmetic circuit library [23] and the ACs identified as Pareto-optimal for FPGAs [15]. The range of approximate accelerators obtained by identifying exhaustive combinations of these designs are synthesized using the Vivado 2017.2 tool-chain for the Xilinx xc7vx485tffg1157-1 FPGA. We also disable the use of DSP blocks on the FPGA to ensure that the accelerator is mapped onto the reconfigurable logic. The quality of these variants, in terms of average Peak Signal to Noise Ratio (PSNR), are determined using their software models for a set of input signal samples. These experimental results are illustrated in Fig. 1, from which we make the following **key observations**:

- (1) Approximate accelerators that are Pareto-optimal for ASIC-based platforms are not necessarily Pareto-optimal when synthesized for an FPGA, especially when considering the different hardware parameters, such as power and latency.
- (2) The time required for synthesizing a subset of approximate accelerators, composed of 1000 random designs, is 2.8 days. This overhead can be attributed primarily to the high-level mapping algorithms of the Vivado tool-chain.
- (3) Although quite a few research works focus on designing custom-made approximate circuits and accelerators for FPGAs [13], [18], they are not as beneficial in achieving similar improvements in hardware costs, when compared to automated generation and exploration of approximate circuits, as reinforced by [15], [23].

From these observations, we have identified the following **research challenges**:

¹By Pareto-optimal, we mean the best solution obtained by a given method.




Fig. 1: Analysis of the Pareto-optimal Approximate Accelerators.

- Given the amount of time required to explore the large number of approximate accelerator variants for a simple Gaussian filter, the time required for exploring larger applications would be in the order of months or years.
 - How can we leverage statistical or machine learning models to efficiently reduce the exploration time for FPGA-based approximate accelerators?
 - Can non-conventional features and tools be used, besides the traditional hardware requirements obtained from an FPGA synthesis tool, to reduce the exploration time?
- There is no single tool that can identify approximate accelerator variants for FPGAs given an application.
 - Can we build an end-to-end framework that can generate and explore approximate accelerator variants for FPGAs given the application’s hardware and software models?

To address these research challenges, we propose the following **novel contributions**:

- An end-to-end automated framework, *Xel-FPGAs*, for systematically exploring the architecture-space of FPGA-based approximate accelerator variants given a target application.
- Our framework employs statistical learning models to traverse the architecture-space of approximate accelerators for FPGAs without synthesizing each individual design.
- To further reduce the exploration time of the approximate accelerator architecture-space, we use the ABC tool [24] for estimating the number of lookup tables, power, and latency of the accelerator on our target FPGA.
- The complete *Xel-FPGAs* framework, including the approximate accelerators discussed in this work, are open-source and available online at <https://github.com/ehw-fit/xel-fpgas>, to enable wide-spread adoption and research in this area.

II. THE AUTOMATED FRAMEWORK

Fig. 2 presents an overview of the proposed *Xel-FPGAs* framework. The framework is made of three key stages, namely, Model Training, Architecture Exploration, and Final Evaluation. In the first stage, we train and test various statistical learning models that can be used to estimate the parameters of a given hardware accelerator module. Next, the models are used to estimate the potential output quality and hardware requirements of all approximate accelerators in the architecture-space. Finally, the selected accelerator designs are




Fig. 2: An Overview of the Xel-FPGAs Framework.

re-evaluated by simulating and synthesizing their software and hardware models, respectively.

A. Model Training

We start with a set of ACs that can replace the arithmetic units in the target algorithms. We consider the wide-ranged evolutionary approximate component library [23], which is composed of both adders and multipliers, to evaluate the efficacy of our framework. The use of other adder and multiplier libraries [14] are orthogonal to the use of this library and can be easily incorporated into *Xel-FPGAs*.

The current architecture-space exploration pipeline requires the system designers to generate all possible approximate accelerator variants and synthesize them using an FPGA synthesis tool in order to determine their hardware requirements. Similar exploration strategies need to be carried out using software models for determining the quality-of-result (QoR) achievable by these variants. As emphasized earlier, this can lead to an exhaustive architecture-exploration stage that can potentially last for months or even years. To circumvent this bottleneck, we propose to train and deploy statistical learning models that can be used to estimate the hardware requirements and QoR capabilities of an accelerator variant, thereby drastically reducing the time needed for synthesizing and evaluating each individual approximate accelerator. Previous works [15] have evaluated similar models for approximate circuits and determined that *statistical regression* models achieve maximum correlation, in comparison to other approaches like Stochastic Gradient Descent, Adaptive Boosting, or even Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). We focus primarily on *statistical regression* models, which are lightweight, instead of larger machine learning models, to reduce the overall time required for training the models and exploring the architecture-space.

Fig. 3 illustrates the model training pipelines explored in our work to determine the optimal setup that can quickly and efficiently explore the architecture-space of approximate accelerators. (A) denotes the default exhaustive exploration approach discussed earlier, which requires each approximate accelerator to be synthesized by our FPGA tool-chain. Since this is not feasible, we propose to generate a feature-set (composed of power, lookup tables, and delay) by synthesizing the arithmetic ACs present in our library. This feature-set is used to estimate the hardware parameters for a set of 1000 random approximate accelerators. These random approximate accelerators need to be subsequently synthesized using the FPGA tool-chain for the model to learn the relation between the features and its desired value. This pipeline is depicted in (B). However, using the Vivado tool-chain for synthesizing the complete library of ACs is a highly time-consuming process (see Section IV). Therefore, we propose to replace the Vivado tool-chain with the ABC tool [24] to estimate the features necessary for the model to learn. This pipeline is presented in (C). Another variation of this version would be to include more features that could potentially improve the accuracy of our statistical model. This variant, illustrated in (D), includes an additional step wherein the approximate accelerator variants' features are extracted by ABC and fed into the model training stage, with the vivado synthesis values of the approximate accelerators. And finally, to evaluate all possible combinations, we tested out two additional scenarios; one (i) wherein the original feature extraction pipeline, with the Vivado tool-chain, stays in place for the arithmetic ACs, while the ABC tool is used to extract the approximate accelerators' features (presented in (E)), and second (ii) where the arithmetic ACs' features are not estimated and only the approximate accelerators' features, extracted by the ABC tool, are used to train the statistical model (illustrated in (F)). We have compared the experimental results of these pipelines




Fig. 3: Overview of the Possible Model Training Pipelines.

and analysed them to determine that configuration (D) is most suitable for our framework (see Section IV).

B. Architecture Exploration

Now that we have the statistical models trained, for estimating the application-level QoR and its hardware requirements, we can efficiently explore the architecture-space of our approximate accelerator variants. Despite deploying statistical models to reduce the overhead time, we investigated the use of several state-of-the-art evolutionary algorithms to further decrease the time needed for exploring the architecture-space by selecting specific models that need to be evaluated. For example, we can start with a set of 1000 random approximate accelerator variants, which are fed to the ABC tool to determine their features. With this information, we can estimate the approximate accelerators’ hardware requirements and its QoR. The 200 best, Pareto- and near-optimal, designs are subsequently fed back to the evolutionary algorithms to act as the parent set. Using the parent set, we obtain the next generation of 1000 approximate accelerators that are to be evaluated, from which we select the 200 best designs that subsequently act as the parent set for the next generation. This process is repeated until we have 1000 approximate accelerator variant generations. We consider the 200 best approximate

accelerator variants obtained from the last generation to be the final set of Pareto-optimal designs, which we have observed to achieve optimal results. Further generation and exploration of approximate accelerator variants achieves sub-optimal results or minimalistic improvements when compared to the time needed for evaluating these designs. Therefore, we terminate the exploration stage and move to the final stage of the framework, where we evaluate its efficacy.

Evolutionary Algorithms: Besides investigating the commonly used NSGA-II [25] genetic algorithm for exploring our design space, we decided to evaluate two other approaches based on local search to investigate their applicability on our design space. Motivated by the results illustrated in [22], we chose to implement and evaluate the Hill climber algorithm [26], which ultimately turned out to be highly inefficient for exploring our design space. The algorithm was able to identify only 1 candidate solution in each iteration stage, which is then fed into our statistical models. However, these models are built in such a way that they make heavy use of vectorization and parallelism, and the evaluation on a feature-by-feature basis is slow, which is against the ultimate goal of our framework, *i.e.*, to reduce exploration time. Hence, we chose to explore the Evolution Strategy (ES) $\mu + \lambda$, where λ new candidate designs are generated from a set of best individuals (μ). In contrast to NSGA-II, which depends on “genetics” and complex “crossover” mechanisms to identify the next generation of designs, ES is only dependent on small random changes in the best individuals. We iteratively run through each design in a given Pareto-front –under a time constraint– to obtain new designs, which can be used to extract a new Pareto-frontier. The designs from this new frontier act as the base for the next generation of designs.

Our multi-objective evolutionary algorithm is described in Algorithm 1. The algorithm starts with a set of random parents (μ) using which we generate λ new candidates with random mutations on each parent. The new candidates’ power and QoR are parallelly estimated by our statistical models to determine if the design updates the Pareto-frontier P . If a new design is added to P , the design becomes a new parent, which can be subsequently used to generate other new candidates. Otherwise, we iteratively select a new candidate from the existing Pareto-frontier P in order to prevent getting stuck.

C. Final Evaluation

Once the final set of approximate accelerator variants are obtained, we synthesize and evaluate them to determine their accurate hardware requirements and QoR values, instead of the estimates obtained from the models. These values are subsequently used to construct a Pareto-frontier, which acts as the final set of Pareto-optimal variants for the target application. The system designer can then analyze the quality-hardware trade-offs of these designs to deploy the relevant approximate accelerator variant for the application based on system specifications.

Algorithm 1 Our Evolutionary Multi-objective Optimization

Input: RL – set of libraries, $RL = \{RL_1, RL_2, \dots, RL_n\}$, M_{HW} – HW costs model, M_{QoR} – quality model
Output: Pareto set $P \subseteq RL_1 \times RL_2 \times \dots \times RL_n$
function EVOLUTIONARYSTRATEGYMOO(RL, M_{QoR}, M_C)
 $ParentSet \leftarrow$
PICKRANDOM($RL_1 \times RL_2 \times \dots \times RL_n$) $\triangleright \mu$ parents
 $P \leftarrow \emptyset$
while $\neg TerminationCondition$ **do**
 for all $Parent \in ParentSet$ **do**
 $C \leftarrow \{MUTATE(Parent), \dots\}$ $\triangleright \lambda$ new candidates
 $e_{QoR} \leftarrow M_{QoR}(C)$ \triangleright Estimate the quality of C_i
 $e_{HW} \leftarrow M_{HW}(C)$ \triangleright Estimate the HW costs of C_i
 for all $c_i \in C$ **do**
 if PARETOINSERT($P, (e_{QoR}, e_{HW}), C$) **then**
 $Parent \leftarrow C$ \triangleright Replace current parent
 end if
 end for
 if $Parent \notin C$ **then**
 $Parent \leftarrow$ PICKRANDOMLYFROM(P) \triangleright Prevent stagnation
 end if
end while
return P
end function

III. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The approximate arithmetic circuit library used in this work is open-source and immediately accessible^{2,3}; they include both the hardware (Verilog) and software models (C++) of the ACs. These can be combinatorially deployed in the target application to generate different possible approximate accelerator variants. Without loss of generality, in this work we consider a sample set of 1000 random approximate accelerator variants to train our *statistical regression* model. Since our framework follows pipeline (D) from Fig. 3, we perform a component- and accelerator-level feature-extraction, from the RTL models, while also synthesizing and mapping the designs, using the Vivado Design Suite 2017.2 for the xc7vx485tffg1157-1 Xilinx FPGA, to obtain the relevant hardware parameters, such as power, number of lookup tables, and latency of the approximate accelerator. We also simulate the application with behavioral models of the accelerator in C++, using the benchmark sequences discussed in [27], to determine the application-level output quality. Using these values we train two different *regression* models, one for estimating the hardware parameters and the other for estimating the QoR of the approximate accelerator. The hardware estimator requires the features of the ACs and the approximate accelerators as input to predict the area, power, or latency of the variants, while the software estimator requires the mean and average error of the approximate circuits deployed in the application to estimate its QoR. Once the models are trained, they are used to selectively and iteratively explore the architecture-space of the accelerator using the NSGA-II and ES evolutionary algorithms, with μ set to 1 for the latter. The scripting for generating the set of approximate accelerator variants, executing the genetic algorithm, and training the statistical learning models are

²<https://github.com/ehw-fit/evoapproxlib>

³<https://github.com/ehw-fit/approx-fpgas>




Fig. 4: An Illustration of our Experimental Setup and Tool-flow.

completed in Python. The final generation of the accelerators obtained this way are synthesized and simulated to determine their accurate hardware requirements and QoR, which are then used to construct the set of Pareto-optimal hardware accelerators for the target application. An overview of this experimental setup is presented in Fig. 4.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We illustrate the efficacy of the *Xel-FPGAs* framework using the High Efficiency Video Coding application. HEVC has been shown to be resilient to errors due to its Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) function. The DCT block is composed of 8 to 14 adders and multipliers, which vary based on the type of Multiplierless Multiple Constant Multiplier (MCM) architecture deployed. These arithmetic units can be approximated to increase the system’s energy-efficiency and/or performance. More information regarding the HEVC accelerator block can be found in [27].

A. Pipeline Analysis

First, we evaluate the effectiveness and time requirements of the pipelines illustrated in Fig. 3. We do this by estimating the correlation between the feature-set established by the pipeline with the desired hardware parameter value (area or power or latency), which is obtained via Vivado Synthesis. We also evaluate the time required for each pipeline to explore our architecture-space to obtain a set of Pareto-optimal approximate accelerator variants for the target application. While there is no dependency on the search algorithm for pipelines (A), (B), and (C), the evolutionary algorithm associated selection induces a non-zero evaluation overhead of roughly 30ms for each approximate accelerator explored using the ABC tool. Fig. 5 illustrates these experimental results.




Fig. 5: Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC) and Exploration Time Analysis of the Pipelines Discussed in Fig. 3.




Fig. 6: Analyzing the PCC of *Xel-FPGAs*' 3 Fastest Pipelines (C, D, and F) - Estimating the Power of the HEVC Accelerator for Various MCM Modules Deployed in the DCT Block.

As anticipated, configuration (B) is successful in reducing the exploration time from thousands of hours (in (A)) to just 41 hours, which tends to reduce the Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC) to 0.9. We can further reduce this to just 2 minutes by replacing Vivado with ABC in (B), to obtain (C), while further dropping the PCC by 2%. Although this may not seem like much, when considering a substantially large architecture-space, such as the HEVC application, the differences in the model estimates can be quite large, leading the algorithm to explore non-optimal designs. Therefore, an approach that retains the PCC closer to 0.9 while further reducing the exploration time would be preferable. Pipeline (D), which incorporates features from the approximate accelerator variants, achieves a PCC more than 0.9, while reducing the overhead by nearly 95% for exploring 1,000,000 approximate accelerator variants. While configuration (E) achieves a higher PCC, it also increases the exploration time back to 41 hours, due to the involvement of the vivado tool-chain, whereas with pipeline (F), the PCC decreases while reducing the exploration time. Hence, pipeline (D) serves as the ideal configuration for *Xel-FPGAs*.

Besides, the reduction in exploration time, we have also performed experiments to analyze the effectiveness of the three fastest pipelines in estimating the power of the HEVC accelerator block when four different types of MCM components are deployed. The results of these experiments are presented in Fig. 6. Although pipeline (F) appears to achieve better solutions, on average, we are interested in the pipeline configuration that obtains the best possible PCC estimates. For the HEVC use-case, pipeline (D) achieves a trade-off better than the other pipelines.

B. Ablation studies

Next, we analyze the capability of three different *statistical regression* models, namely, (1) Random Forest, (2) Bayesian Regression, and (3) Support Vector Machines, by deploying them in our HEVC use-case. We explore these models' effectiveness in accurately estimating the QoR and power of the approximate accelerator variants using the PCC metric and pipeline (D), as established earlier. Fig. 7 illustrates the results of these models for the four different MCM accelerator components deployed in the application. As can be observed, the different models of *regression* achieve varying




Fig. 7: Pearson Correlation Coefficient (PCC) Analysis for Three Different Statistical Regression Models that are Used to Estimate HEVC Accelerators' Hardware and Quality Parameters.




Fig. 8: Analysing the Convergence of ES and NSGA-II.

levels of correlation based on the parameter being estimated. For instance, *Random Forest* achieves the best results when estimating the QoR of all the accelerators in question, *i.e.*, MCM1 through MCM4. Whereas *Bayesian Regression* achieves the best power estimates for all the accelerators. Therefore, we use these two models, of the nearly 20 models pre-available in the *Xel-FPGAs* framework, to estimate the relevant parameters when exploring the architecture-space.

C. Architecture Exploration

Since we have determined the optimal regression models and their corresponding configurations for the use-case with *Xel-FPGAs*, we now move on to analyzing the framework's model generation and exploration capabilities. Our assumption is that each new generation of the models explored tends to improve the trade-offs, with respect to the previous generation, thereby leading to a set of Pareto-optimal hardware




Fig. 9: Analyzing the Percentage of Total Pareto-optimal Designs (*Density*) Generated by ES and NSGA-II in Each Generation.

accelerators by the end of our search. We do this by first analyzing the capabilities of the evolutionary algorithms used in our framework. Besides the Hill climber algorithm, which was not very beneficial for our use-case, we have evaluated the NSGA-II and the Evolution Strategy (ES) algorithms on the HEVC application, as stated in Section II-B. These algorithms were executed with similar population settings and ran with the same design time overhead. Fig. 8 illustrates the number of Pareto-optimal points obtained by the ES and NSGA-II algorithms in each generation of their execution. Fig. 9, on the other hand, illustrates the percentage of total number of Pareto-optimal designs obtained, termed *density*, in each iteration of algorithm execution. From the former, we can observe that the simpler MCM3 and MCM4 modules converge faster, *i.e.*, reach a maximum earlier in the number of Pareto-optimal designs obtained, as opposed to the more complex MCM2 and MCM1 modules. The simpler modules have hardly achieved better solutions since generation 300, which is more clearly visible in ES. On the other hand, NSGA-II requires a few more generations of search before achieving a similar number of Pareto-optimal designs when compared to ES. The reason behind this becomes

clearer when we analyze Fig. 9. A large portion of the Pareto-optimal designs obtained by the NSGA-II algorithm are obtained in the first 300 iterations, especially for the more complex modules. Hence, a second peak is observed for the MCM1 and MCM2 modules where-in another large percentage of the Pareto-optimal designs are identified. Since the NSGA-II algorithm starts with a large population set it is able to identify a significant percentage of the Pareto-optimal designs in the earlier generation of search. The same is not true for the ES algorithm, which has a more uniform distribution in identifying the Pareto-optimal designs through the search iterations. Hence, ES might be more suitable for identifying a large number of design trade-offs for the target application, whereas NSGA-II might be better suited to achieve good quality solutions quickly, which contradicts our initial assumption.

Next, we move on to the main goals of our framework. Fig. 10 illustrates the result of generating hardware accelerators using the ES and NSGA-II algorithms, wherein we depict the estimated PSNR and power values of the approximate accelerator variants searched by each generation. Although the points identified by *Generation 0* illustrate a random distribution, as expected, only *Generation 1000*'s outcomes are clearly visible while the others outcomes appear to be missing. This is because the outcomes of *Generation 1000* are masking the outcomes of the other generations, *i.e.*, the newer generation outcomes mask the earlier generation outcomes, because their outcomes are similar to the past generations. This offers the *opportunity of further reducing the exploration time by a factor of 10*, to reduce the overall exploration time by 99%. Moreover, as anticipated, there are a lot more Pareto-optimal points that are obtained by the ES algorithm when compared to NSGA-II search.

D. Final Evaluation

With all the intermediate evaluations complete, we move on to evaluating the overall effectiveness of the framework and




Fig. 10: Analysis of the Pareto-optimal HEVC Approximate Accelerators from Each Generation of ES (top) and NSGA-II (bottom).




Fig. 11: Comparison of the Approximate Accelerators Obtained by our *Xel-FPGAs* Framework and the State-of-the-Art [15].




Fig. 12: Final Comparison Between *Xel-FPGAs* and the SoA [15].

comparing it with the current state-of-the-art in approximate accelerator exploration. We have re-implemented the technique discussed in ApproxFPGAs [15], to generate approximate accelerator variants with a set of Pareto-optimal FPGA-based ACs for our HEVC use-case. Fig. 11 illustrates the accelerator-level comparison between the set of Pareto-optimal approximate accelerator variants obtained by our *Xel-FPGAs* framework and the state-of-the-art ApproxFPGAs approach. As can be observed, for each of the four accelerator types (MCM1 through MCM4), our framework outperforms the state-of-the-art and random search to obtain a better set of Pareto-optimal approximate accelerator variants for the HEVC application. The use of ES increases the number of Pareto-optimal designs obtained, *i.e.*, it further pushes the Pareto-frontier by obtaining candidate designs that lie on the Pareto-frontier. Similarly, the combination of evolutionary algorithms in the *Xel-FPGAs* framework clearly identifies better design trade-offs in comparison to ApproxFPGAs, when we perform an application-level analysis of the Pareto-optimal approximate accelerators obtained, as illustrated by the




Fig. 13: Analyzing the Scalability of *Xel-FPGAs*.

Pareto-fronts in Fig. 12. Moreover, we have also managed to identify design points that reduce the area requirements of the applications, in terms of the number of lookup tables required, which is another benefit of using our *Xel-FPGAs* framework.

E. Scalability

Finally, in order to evaluate the ability of our framework to scale for a multi-stage application, we consider an approximate version of the bio-signal processing Pan-Tompkins algorithm discussed in [28]. The algorithm is made up of five application stages each of which is a filter composed using a varying combination of adders and multipliers, accumulating to 73 arithmetic units. Hence, the primary goal of this experiment is to evaluate whether the framework is better suited for decomposing the exploration into multiple-stages (*n-stage*), *i.e.*, a search for each application stage followed by a combined search with Pareto-optimal designs from each stage, or to design everything at once (*1-stage*). As emphasized in the article [28], we use the application-level quality metric –number of heartbeats– to evaluate the quality of an application stage by embedding the behavioral model of an approximate variant into the application. Fig. 13 presents an overview of the results obtained when using the *1-stage* and *2-stage* (in this case, $n=2$) exploration strategy. We can observe that the *2-stage* strategy designs, obtained from both ES and NSGA-II, significantly out-perform the designs obtained from the *1-stage*. Hence, we can conclude that the hierarchical and successive approximation strategy (*n-stage*) is better at identifying an improved set of Pareto-optimal designs, which are more suitable for the application.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented *Xel-FPGAs*, which is an end-to-end automated framework for architecture-space exploration of approximate accelerators given a target application that is to be deployed in FPGAs. We train and use *statistical regression* models to estimate the hardware requirements and output quality of an application, thereby effectively reducing the time needed for exploring the architecture-space. We also propose to use the ABC tool as a feature extractor for the ACs and our approximate accelerators, to further reduce the exploration time of our framework while not lowering the quality of our estimations. Using these features we efficiently explore the architecture-space of approximate accelerators, iteratively using the NSGA-II algorithm, to identify a set of 200 Pareto-optimal approximate accelerators at the end

of 1000 generations. These designs are re-synthesized and simulated to compute their accurate hardware requirements and quality to determine the final set of Pareto-optimal approximate accelerator variants for the target application. The trade-offs between these approximate accelerator variants can be analyzed by the system designer to select one that meets the system specification and quality requirements of the application. The *Xel-FPGAs* framework outperforms the state-of-the-art in identifying a better set of Pareto-optimal approximate accelerator variants, while also reducing the exploration time by nearly 95%. We have also illustrated the scalability of our framework using a multi-stage application to discuss the benefits of using a hierarchical search strategy. Our *Xel-FPGAs* framework is open-source and accessible online at <https://github.com/ehw-fit/xel-fpgas>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was partially supported by the Doctoral College Resilient Embedded Systems, which is run jointly by the TU Wien's Faculty of Informatics and the UAS Technikum Wien, and partially by the Czech Science Foundation project 21-13001S. This research is also supported by ASPIRE, the technology program management pillar of Abu Dhabi's Advanced Technology Research Council (ATRC), via the ASPIRE Awards for Research Excellence.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. M. S. Trimberger, "Three ages of fpgas: a retrospective on the first thirty years of fpga technology: this paper reflects on how moore's law has driven the design of fpgas through three epochs: the age of invention, the age of expansion, and the age of accumulation," *IEEE Solid-State Circuits Magazine*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 16–29, 2018.
- [2] R. Watanabe, S. Ura, Q. Zhao, and T. Yoshida, "Implementation of fpga building platform as a cloud service," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on Highly-Efficient Accelerators and Reconfigurable Technologies*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [3] L. H. Crockett, R. A. Elliot, M. A. Enderwitz, and R. W. Stewart, *The Zynq book: embedded processing with the ARM Cortex-A9 on the Xilinx Zynq-7000 all programmable SoC*. Strathclyde Academic Media, 2014.
- [4] P. Mantovani, E. G. Cota, K. Tien, C. Pilato, G. Di Guglielmo, K. Shepard, and L. P. Carloni, "An fpga-based infrastructure for fine-grained dvfs analysis in high-performance embedded systems," in *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2016, pp. 1–6.
- [5] S. Huda, M. Mallick, and J. H. Anderson, "Clock gating architectures for fpga power reduction," in *2009 International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 112–118.
- [6] V. K. Chippa, S. T. Chakradhar, K. Roy, and A. Raghunathan, "Analysis and characterization of inherent application resilience for approximate computing," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2013, pp. 1–9.
- [7] M. Samadi, D. A. Jamshidi, J. Lee, and S. Mahlke, "Paraprox: Pattern-based approximation for data parallel applications," in *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on Architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, 2014, pp. 35–50.
- [8] W. El-Harouni, S. Rehman, B. S. Prabhakaran, A. Kumar, R. Hafiz, and M. Shafique, "Embracing approximate computing for energy-efficient motion estimation in high efficiency video coding," in *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2017. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1384–1389.
- [9] V. K. Chippa, D. Mohapatra, K. Roy, S. T. Chakradhar, and A. Raghunathan, "Scalable effort hardware design," *IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 2004–2016, 2014.
- [10] H. Saadat, H. Javaid, and S. Parameswaran, "Approximate integer and floating-point dividers with near-zero error bias," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [11] S. Hashemi, R. I. Bahar, and S. Reda, "Drum: A dynamic range unbiased multiplier for approximate applications," in *2015 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 418–425.
- [12] S. Ullah, S. Rehman, B. S. Prabhakaran, F. Kriebel, M. A. Hanif, M. Shafique, and A. Kumar, "Area-optimized low-latency approximate multipliers for fpga-based hardware accelerators," in *Proceedings of the 55th annual design automation conference*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [13] B. S. Prabhakaran, S. Rehman, M. A. Hanif, S. Ullah, G. Mazaheri, A. Kumar, and M. Shafique, "Demas: An efficient design methodology for building approximate adders for fpga-based systems," in *2018 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 917–920.
- [14] S. Ullah, S. S. Sahoo, N. Ahmed, D. Chaudhury, and A. Kumar, "Appaxo: Designing application-specific approximate operators for fpga-based embedded systems," *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1–31, 2022.
- [15] B. S. Prabhakaran, V. Mrazek, Z. Vasicek, L. Sekanina, and M. Shafique, "Approxfpgas: Embracing asic-based approximate arithmetic components for fpga-based systems," in *2020 57th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [16] J. Echavarria, S. Wildermann, A. Becher, J. Teich, and D. Ziener, "Fau: Fast and error-optimized approximate adder units on lut-based fpgas," in *2016 International Conference on Field-Programmable Technology (FPT)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 213–216.
- [17] S. Ullah, S. S. Sahoo, and A. Kumar, "Clapped: A design framework for implementing cross-layer approximation in fpga-based embedded systems," in *2021 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 475–480.
- [18] S. Ullah, S. Rehman, M. Shafique, and A. Kumar, "High-performance accurate and approximate multipliers for fpga-based hardware accelerators," *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 211–224, 2021.
- [19] S. Ullah, S. S. Murthy, and A. Kumar, "Smapproxlib: Library of fpga-based approximate multipliers," in *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Design Automation Conference*, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [20] Z. Vasicek and L. Sekanina, "Search-based synthesis of approximate circuits implemented into fpgas," in *2016 26th International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications (FPL)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–4.
- [21] S. Venkataramani, V. K. Chippa, S. T. Chakradhar, K. Roy, and A. Raghunathan, "Quality programmable vector processors for approximate computing," in *Proceedings of the 46th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, 2013, pp. 1–12.
- [22] V. Mrazek, M. A. Hanif, Z. Vasicek, L. Sekanina, and M. Shafique, "autoax: An automatic design space exploration and circuit building methodology utilizing libraries of approximate components," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [23] V. Mrazek, R. Hrbacek, Z. Vasicek, and L. Sekanina, "Evoapprox8b: Library of approximate adders and multipliers for circuit design and benchmarking of approximation methods," in *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2017. IEEE, 2017, pp. 258–261.
- [24] A. Mishchenko *et al.*, "Abc: A system for sequential synthesis and verification," URL <http://www.eecs.berkeley.edu/alanmi/abc>, vol. 17, 2007.
- [25] K. Deb, A. Pratap, S. Agarwal, and T. Meyarivan, "A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii," *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 182–197, 2002.
- [26] S. H. Jacobson and E. Yücesan, "Analyzing the performance of generalized hill climbing algorithms," *Journal of Heuristics*, vol. 10, pp. 387–405, 2004.
- [27] Z. Vasicek, V. Mrazek, and L. Sekanina, "Towards low power approximate dct architecture for hevcd standard," in *Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2017. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1576–1581.
- [28] B. S. Prabhakaran, S. Rehman, and M. Shafique, "Xbiosip: A methodology for approximate bio-signal processing at the edge," in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Design Automation Conference 2019*, 2019, pp. 1–6.