A Low-Power Sparse Deep Learning Accelerator with Optimized Data Reuse

Kai-Chieh Hsu and Tian-Sheuan Chang, Senior Member, IEEE

Institute of Electronics, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu 300093, Taiwan Email: hsukaij@gmail.com, tschang@nycu.edu.tw

Abstract-Sparse deep learning has reduced computation significantly, but its irregular non-zero data distribution complicates the data flow and hinders data reuse, increasing on-chip SRAM access and thus power consumption of the chip. This paper addresses the aforementioned issues by maximizing data reuse to reduce SRAM access by two approaches. First, we propose Effective Index Matching (EIM), which efficiently searches and arranges non-zero operations from compressed data. Second, we propose Shared Index Data Reuse (SIDR) which coordinates the operations between Processing Elements (PEs), regularizing their SRAM data access, thereby enabling all data to be reused efficiently. Our approach reduces the access of the SRAM buffer by 86% when compared to the previous design, SparTen. As a result, our design achieves a $2.5 \times$ improvement in power efficiency compared to state-of-the-art methods while maintaining a simpler dataflow.

I. INTRODUCTION

Deep learning's high computational demands lead to significant energy consumption and usage of hardware resources. To mitigate these issues, weight pruning [1] and sparse computation have been introduced for deep learning accelerators (DLAs). However, this introduces irregular data access and computation, and thus two major design challenges: complex data flow and hardware overhead, and significant SRAM access due to low data reuse.

The first challenge is due to the matching of non-zero sparse input and weight indexes for non-zero multiply-accumulate operations. This irregularity makes this index matching consume significant power and area overhead [2]. Besides, during the index matching process, the probability of successfully matching the corresponding non-zero operands decreases rapidly as sparsity increases. Thus, to prevent computation units from idle due to failed matching attempts, previous work [2] uses multiple matching units, which incurs substantial hardware costs.

For the second challenge on SRAM access, a typical accelerator for dense computation can share its weight and input for all processing elements (PEs) and thus reduce SRAM data access. To analyze the required SRAM buffer bandwidth for a given dataflow, we define an indicator called the Memory Access per MAC (MAPM), which represents the average number of data bytes accessed from the on-chip SRAM per MAC operation. This indicator is expressed as bytes per MAC (byte/MAC). Take the multiplication of two dense 4×4 matrices as an example. Assuming the inputs and outputs of the MAC units are 8 bits, if there is no data reuse, the MAPM

would be as high as 4 byte/MAC (reading two operands for the multiplication, one for the addition, and writing back the result). In contrast, with full data reuse as in typical dense computing DLAs [3], [4], such as when using a 4×4 output stationary systolic array, 32 input data are read from memory, 64 MAC operations are performed, and 16 output data are written back to memory, reducing the MAPM to 0.75 byte/MAC.

The irregular nature of the sparse data distribution makes it challenging to reuse all input and output data in PEs. For example, Sparten [2], which adopts the dot product, reuses only the output data, while SCNN [5], which uses the Cartesian product, reuses only the input data. Their MAPM values are 2.09 byte/MAC and 2.03 byte/MAC, respectively. Since accessing SRAM consumes considerable energy, insufficient data reuse significantly increases SRAM buffer read/write operations, leading to a significant increase in total chip power consumption.

To address these challenges, we propose the Effective Index Matching (EIM) and the shared index data reuse (SIDR). EIM re-sorts the bitmap representing the indexes of required data to the order of the compressed data, allowing it to determine the indexes of the required data within the buffer. SIDR merges non-zero index addresses from multiple PEs such that common index addresses will appear once to access the SRAM and reuse the accessed data for shared ones. With this approach, the hardware dataflow also becomes regular. Thus, we propose a sparse accelerator based on dense structure. It uses dense DLA designs that broadcast input and weight for maximum data reuse, but accesses SRAM and activates PEs only for non-zero operations to save SRAM access and cycle count. This combines the benefits of data regularity of dense DLAs [3], [4] and computing efficiency of sparse DLAs [2], [6].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents our proposed approach. Section III shows the experimental results. Finally, this paper is concluded in Section IV.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Overview of the approach

Fig. 2 illustrates the computation of o_{00} and o_{10} , as shown in Fig. 1, to demonstrate the typical flow in sparse DLAs [2] and the proposed *shared index data reuse*. We use the bitmap as the sparse data format to represent the original indexes of



Fig. 1. An example of the data compression using bitmap. The blue and green numbers represent the original indexes of non-zero inputs and weights, respectively, while the gray zeros represent the zero values



Fig. 2. A Simple Example for typical sparse DLAs [2] and proposed SIDR

non-zero data, as illustrated in Fig. 1, while data with zero values are skipped and stored in the buffer.

In this example, a typical sparse DLA uses index matching to determine that PE_{00} needs to read weights with original index 0, 4, 5, and 7 from buffers, while PE_{10} needs to read weights with original index 0, 2, 3, 4, and 7 from buffers. The PEs sequentially read the weights from buffers according to these indexes and perform MAC operations. Since weights with original indexes 0, 4, and 7 are read from buffers twice, causing unnecessary SRAM access, these repeatedly accessed data can be shared and reused. To enable such reuse, we propose the SIDR. The concept of the SIDR employs the hierarchical memory to buffer a set of data (referred to as the shared data) by registers (referred to as the shared register). This can be managed by a shared index, and shared among multiple PEs. The PEs fetch data through multiplexers (MUX) controlled by offset index. As a result, all weights in SRAM are read only once. The details of the SIDR will be introduced in Section II-D.

B. Shared Index Data Reuse to 2-D Arrays

Above *shared index data reuse* can be applied to two PEs directly, but this is not efficient for massive computing of deep learning. A better way is to use 2-D PE arrays and apply *SIDR* on both weight and input. A typical 2-D PE array like in [4], as shown in Fig. 3, broadcasts input and weights to all PEs for maximum data reuse. The PEs in the same row share the inputs by a shared register, while the PEs in the same column share the weights. Based on this flow, the *shared index data reuse* can be divided into three steps. The first step is to determine which multiplication is a non-zero operation that PEs must execute and identify the index to access required input and weight from buffer, referred to as effective input index (*EffI*)



Fig. 3. The DLA architecture and the dataflow of SIDR.

and effective weight index (*EffW*) respectively. Fig. 4 provides an example of the following effective index matching (EIM), which will be elaborated in Section II-C. The second step is to coordinate PEs and decide which data shall be buffered by the shared registers and broadcast. Section II-D provide a detailed description of this step. The third step is to fetch data and perform the output-stationary MAC operation.

C. Proposed Effective Index Matching (EIM) for Sparse Multiplications

The effective index matching is to identify non-zero multiplications and their effective indexes at weight and input, *EffI* and *EffW*, in a regular way. These effective indexes enable the PEs to fetch data accordingly, allowing multiple matching attempts to occur simultaneously and preventing PEs from idle due to failed matches. Fig. 4 illustrates how to get these effective indexes as shown in Fig. 1.

An intuitive approach is to identify non-zero multiplications by a bitwise AND operation on the input and weight bitmaps, *BMI* and *BMW*, respectively to obtain the non-zero operation bitmap *BMNZ*. Note that *BMNZ* indicates non-zero multiplications but also represents the indexes of the data to be read. Thus, we can get the effective index by masking *BMNZ* with *BMI/BMW* and re-sorting the indexes accordingly, resulting in the input masked bitmap (*IMBM*) and the weight masked bitmap (*WMBM*). However, this masking method is not hardware efficient due to irregular output order.

Instead, we use the following two steps to generate these effective indexes. First, we identify the original index of input and weight corresponding to each re-sorted index, referred to as input mask index and weight mask index, *IMId* and *WMId* respectively. Since each row and column of PEs uses identical input and weight bitmap with the same re-sorting order, these



Fig. 4. The process and example of EIM.

PEs share the input and weight mask indexes, respectively, thereby reducing the hardware overhead. Second, we extract non-zero operation bitmap using the input and weight mask index to obtain the input masked bitmap and weight masked bitmap, which represent the desired effective indexes. Finally, these effective indexes are sequentially pushed into the FIFOs, EIM_FIFO_I and EIM_FIFO_W , which serve as buffer between the index matching unit and MAC.

D. Detailed Dataflow of Shared Index Data Reuse

The SIDR procedure is illustrated in Algorithm 1, with an example provided in Fig. 5. SIDR buffers a range of data, enabling data sharing among multiple PEs. This method requires coordinating the PEs to ensure that their execution progress remains nearly synchronized, so the data they need is located at nearby indexes within the buffer. To achieve this, PEs that are lagging behind are given higher priority for execution, while PEs that are too far ahead are made to wait. The detailed operation is divided into the following five steps.

First, each PE obtains the effective input and weight index for upcoming multiplication by performing EIM. Second, the system determines the shared input and weight indexes, $SharedI_m$ and $SharedW_n$, for each row and column of PEs to decide which input and weight should be buffered by the shared resister and broadcasted. To prevent lagging PEs from idle, the shared input and weight indexes are set to the smallest effective input and weight indexes within the same row and column, ensuring that these PEs can successfully fetch the required data. Third, the shared input and weight registers, $RegI_m$ and $RegW_n$, buffer data from the input and weight buffers, $BufI_m$ and $BufW_n$, based on the shared input and weight indexes, and then broadcast the shared input and weight. Fourth, each PE identifies the indexes of the required input and weight in the shared register, OffsetI and OffsetW respectively, which are the differences between the effective indexes and the shared indexes. Finally, if both the required input and the weight for a PE are available in the shared register, the PE then fetches them to carry out the output-stationary MAC operation. The system repeats these steps until all operations are fully completed.

Algorithm 1 SIDR for a 16×16 2-D PE array with Shared Registers size of 8

egisters size of 8
while MACs are not completed do > Iterate sequentially
▷ Obtain Effective Index for upcoming operation
for each m, n in PE Array do \triangleright Hardware parallelism
if $PE(m, n)$ is not IDLE in last iteration then
$EffI_{m,n} \leftarrow pop(EIM_FIFO_I(m,n))$
$EffW_{m,n} \leftarrow pop(EIM_FIFO_W(m,n))$
end if
end for
\triangleright Determine SharedI to buffer Shared Input
for $m < 16$ do \triangleright Hardware parallelism
$SharedI_m \leftarrow min(EffI_{m,j}, \text{ for each } j < 16)$
$RegI_m \leftarrow BufI_m[SharedI_m : SharedI_m + 7]$
end for
\triangleright Determine <i>SharedW</i> to buffer Shared Weight
for $n < 16$ do \triangleright Hardware parallelism
$SharedW_n \leftarrow min(EffW_{i,n}, \text{ for each } i < 16)$
$RegW_n \leftarrow BufW_n[SharedW_n: SharedW_n + 7]$
end for
▷ Fetch Shared Data and execute MAC operation
for each m, n in PE Array do \triangleright Hardware parallelism
$OffsetI_{m,n} \leftarrow EffI_{m,n} - SharedI_m$
$OffsetW_{m,n} \leftarrow EffW_{m,n} - SharedW_n$
if $OffsetI_{m,n} < 8 \& OffsetW_{m,n} < 8$ then
$I_{m,n} \leftarrow RegI_m[OffsetI_{m,n}]$
$W_{m,n} \leftarrow RegW_n[OffsetW_{m,n}]$
$MAC_{m,n}$ Accumulate $I_{m,n} \times W_{m,n}$
else
$PE_{m,n}$ IDLE
end if
end for
end while

TABLE I								
COMPARISON	WITH	PREVIOUS	WORKS					

	SparTen [2]	Eyeriss v2 [7]	SIGMA [8]	SNAP 65nm-8b [9]	ORSAS [10]	Our work
Technology	45nm	65nm	28nm	65nm	55nm	28nm
Precision	-	fxp8	bfp16	fxp8	fxp8	fxp8
# of MACs	32	384	16384	252	256	256
Clock Frequency (Hz)	800M	200M	500M	250M	200M	800M
Throughput (TOPS)	0.05	0.07 [‡]	10.8	0.126	0.102	0.27
Area (mm^2)	0.766	-	65.1	9.32	7.5	0.926
# of Gates	-	2695k	-	-	-	438k
Power (W)	0.118	0.57	22.33	0.5	0.198	0.231
Energy Efficiency (TOPS/W)	0.43†	0.251 [‡]	0.48	0.25†	0.52†	1.198 2.066 [†]

† Energy efficiency are measured under the assumption of 100% PE utilization. ‡ TOPS include zero multiplication.



Fig. 5. The demonstration of performing the example in Fig. 1 using SIDR



Fig. 6. The PE utilization and speedup for each PW layer of Mobilenetv2

III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULT

To evaluate our proposed method, we developed a deep learning accelerator with a 16×16 2-D PE array to execute sparse matrix operations using EIM and SIDR, as shown in Fig. 3. The design is synthesized with TSMC's 28nm technology, runs at 0.9V, and has a clock rate at the 800MHz. Each PE includes an 8-bit fixed-point multiplier and a 24bit fixed-point adder, with each shared register capable of buffering 8 inputs or weights. The total area of our design is $0.926mm^2$, equivalent to 438K gate count.

A. Experimental Result for PW Layer of MobileNet V2

The following shows the performance evaluation results of the proposed method. We conducted inference on ImageNet [11] using unstructured sparse MobileNet V2 [12], where 75% of its weights were pruned through the global L1 fine-grained pruning [1]. The results of each pointwise convolution (PW) layer and comparison with previous work are shown in Fig. 6 and Table I. Our overall PE utilization reached 66%, achieving a $2.1 \times$ speedup. The average MAPM of our design is just 0.29 byte/MAC, representing an 86% reduction compared to SparTen [2]. By reducing memory access, we achieved an overall energy efficiency of 1.2 TOPS/W, representing a $2.5 \times$ improvement compared to SIGMA [8]. It is noteworthy that energy efficiency measurements vary across studies. For example, Eyeriss v2 [7] reports TOPS that include skipped zero computations, while SNAP [9] and ORSAS [10] measure energy efficiency under the assumption of 100% PE utilization. We adopted the most rigorous method, as used by SIGMA, where TOPS only reflects actual non-zero computations performed by the hardware, with measurements taken under realistic conditions where PE utilization is not fully maximized in sparse computations. Additionally, under



Fig. 7. Experimental result for random matrix multiplication. The horizontal axis and vertical axis represent the sparsity of the input and weight matrices, respectively.



100% PE utilization, as seen in dense computations, our design can reach up to 2.1 TOPS/W.

B. Experimental Result for Random Matrix Multiplication

We generated random 1024×1024 matrices, then pruned them to various sparsity levels and carry out matrix multiplications to analyze the performance across different input and weight sparsity combinations. The results are shown in Fig. 7. In typical model inference, input and weight sparsity generally range between 50% and 70%. Within this range, our design maintains an average utilization rate of over 50%, along with substantial acceleration.

C. Power and Area Breakdown

Figs. 8 and 9 illustrate the breakdown of power and area. It is evident that EIM incurs power and area overheads that are less than half of those of the MAC. Thanks to SIDR, the buffers usually remain in standby mode, which makes its power consumption proportionally much lower relative to its area.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we proposed an efficient sparse deep learning accelerator with complete data reuse, optimizing processing efficiency for sparse computations through effective index matching (EIM) and shared index data reuse (SIDR). EIM effectively identifies non-zero operations within compressed data with an acceptable overhead. SIDR, on the other hand, coordinates operations across PEs and maximizes data reuse. Our approach demonstrates a remarkable reduction in SRAM buffer access which not only minimizes total power consumption but also significantly improves power and area efficiency. These results validate the effectiveness of our approach, underscoring its potential for high-efficiency, lowpower applications in sparse computation.

REFERENCES

- S. Han, H. Mao, and W. J. Dally, "Deep compression: Compressing deep neural networks with pruning, trained quantization and huffman coding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.00149*, 2015.
- [2] A. Gondimalla, N. Chesnut, M. Thottethodi, and T. Vijaykumar, "Sparten: A sparse tensor accelerator for convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium* on Microarchitecture, 2019, pp. 151–165.
- [3] Y.-H. Chen, T. Krishna, J. S. Emer, and V. Sze, "Eyeriss: An energyefficient reconfigurable accelerator for deep convolutional neural networks," *IEEE journal of solid-state circuits*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 127–138, 2016.
- [4] K.-W. Chang and T.-S. Chang, "VWA: Hardware efficient vectorwise accelerator for convolutional neural network," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 145–154, 2019.
- [5] A. Parashar, M. Rhu, A. Mukkara, A. Puglielli, R. Venkatesan, B. Khailany, J. Emer, S. W. Keckler, and W. J. Dally, "Scnn: An accelerator for compressed-sparse convolutional neural networks," ACM SIGARCH computer architecture news, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 27–40, 2017.
- [6] Y. Wang, C. Zhang, Z. Xie, C. Guo, Y. Liu, and J. Leng, "Dualside sparse tensor core," in 2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA). IEEE, 2021, pp. 1083– 1095.
- [7] Y.-H. Chen, T.-J. Yang, J. Emer, and V. Sze, "Eyeriss v2: A flexible accelerator for emerging deep neural networks on mobile devices," *IEEE Journal on Emerging and Selected Topics in Circuits and Systems*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 292–308, 2019.
- [8] E. Qin, A. Samajdar, H. Kwon, V. Nadella, S. Srinivasan, D. Das, B. Kaul, and T. Krishna, "Sigma: A sparse and irregular gemm accelerator with flexible interconnects for dnn training," in 2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA). IEEE, 2020, pp. 58–70.
- [9] J.-F. Zhang, C.-E. Lee, C. Liu, Y. S. Shao, S. W. Keckler, and Z. Zhang, "Snap: An efficient sparse neural acceleration processor for unstructured sparse deep neural network inference," *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 636–647, 2020.
- [10] C. Lin, Y. Liu, and D. Shang, "Orsas: An output row-stationary accelerator for sparse neural networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 44 123–44 135, 2023.
- [11] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in 2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [12] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, "Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks," in *Proceedings* of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2018, pp. 4510–4520.