

# Optimizing Distributed Training Approaches for Scaling Neural Networks

\* Vishnu Vardhan Baligodugula, \*Fathi Amsaad

† Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Wright State University

Email: †{baligodugula.2,fathi.amsaad}@wright.edu

**Abstract**—This paper presents a comparative analysis of distributed training strategies for large-scale neural networks, focusing on data parallelism, model parallelism, and hybrid approaches. We evaluate these strategies on image classification tasks using the CIFAR-100 dataset, measuring training time, convergence rate, and model accuracy. Our experimental results demonstrate that hybrid parallelism achieves a 3.2× speedup compared to single-device training while maintaining comparable accuracy. We propose an adaptive scheduling algorithm that dynamically switches between parallelism strategies based on network characteristics and available computational resources, resulting in an additional 18% improvement in training efficiency.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The increasing size and complexity of deep neural networks have made distributed training essential for modern machine learning applications. While models continue to grow in parameter count and computational requirements, training efficiency has become a critical bottleneck in deep learning research and deployment. State-of-the-art models often require days or weeks of training on specialized hardware, making experimentation costly and time-consuming.

Distributed training approaches address this challenge by parallelizing computation across multiple devices. However, the optimal parallelization strategy depends on various factors including model architecture, dataset characteristics, and hardware configuration. Current approaches typically employ fixed parallelism strategies that may not adapt well to different phases of training or to different components of a neural network.

In this paper, we make the following contributions:

- We provide a systematic comparison of data parallelism, model parallelism, and hybrid approaches across different model architectures and scales.
- We propose a novel adaptive scheduling algorithm that dynamically selects the optimal parallelism strategy for different components of a neural network.
- We demonstrate significant improvements in training efficiency without sacrificing model accuracy through extensive experimentation on standard benchmarks.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Data Parallelism

Data parallelism replicates the model across multiple devices, with each device processing different batches of training data. Goyal et al. [1] demonstrated the effectiveness of large-batch training with data parallelism, achieving linear scaling

on ImageNet training by adjusting the learning rate. However, data parallelism faces communication bottlenecks due to gradient synchronization, especially as the number of devices increases [2].

### B. Model Parallelism

Model parallelism partitions the neural network across devices, allowing training of models that exceed single-device memory constraints. Megatron-LM [3] implemented tensor parallelism for large language models by partitioning individual layers. Pipeline parallelism [4] divides models into sequential stages processed by different devices, though this approach introduces pipeline bubbles that reduce hardware utilization.

### C. Hybrid Approaches

Recent work has explored combining different parallelism strategies. Shoeybi et al. [5] combined data and model parallelism for training language models with billions of parameters. These hybrid approaches have shown promise but typically employ static partitioning schemes that may not adapt to changing computational patterns during training.

### D. Adaptive Training Strategies

Adaptive methods have been explored for various aspects of deep learning, including learning rates [6] and batch sizes [7]. However, adaptive parallelism strategies remain relatively unexplored. FlexFlow [8] proposed an optimization framework for finding efficient parallelization strategies but does not adapt during training.

## III. METHODOLOGY

### A. System Architecture

Our distributed training framework consists of a coordinator node and multiple worker nodes. The coordinator manages the training process, including parallelism strategy selection and synchronization. Each worker executes assigned computations and communicates with other workers as needed. The framework supports three primary parallelism strategies:

- **Data Parallelism (DP):** The complete model is replicated across all devices, with each device processing a different subset of the training data. Gradients are synchronized across devices after each forward-backward pass.
- **Model Parallelism (MP):** The model is partitioned across devices, with each device responsible for a specific

portion of the computation graph. This approach is particularly beneficial for models that exceed single-device memory constraints.

- **Hybrid Parallelism (HP):** Combines both data and model parallelism, applying different strategies to different parts of the network based on their computational and memory requirements.

### B. Adaptive Scheduling Algorithm

The core contribution of our work is an Adaptive Scheduling Algorithm 1 (ASA) that dynamically selects the optimal parallelism strategy for each component of the neural network. The algorithm operates as follows:

- 1) The neural network is partitioned into logical components (e.g., individual layers or blocks).
- 2) During an initial profiling phase, the execution time and memory requirements of each component are measured.
- 3) The communication overhead for different parallelism strategies is estimated based on the size of activations and gradients.
- 4) An optimization problem is solved to minimize the overall training time, considering both computation and communication costs.
- 5) The selected parallelism strategy is applied for each component.
- 6) The profiling and strategy selection are periodically updated during training to adapt to changing patterns.

### C. Optimization Problem

The optimization problem in step 6 can be formalized as:

$$\min_{s_i \in \{DP, MP, HP\}} \sum_{i=1}^p \max(t_{comp}(c_i) + t_{comm}(c_i, s_i))$$

subject to memory constraints on each device:

$$\sum_{i: \text{device}(c_i)=j} \text{mem}(c_i, s_i) \leq M_j \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$$

where:

- $t_{comp}(c_i)$  is the computation time for component  $c_i$ .
- $t_{comm}(c_i, s_i)$  is the communication overhead when using strategy  $s_i$ .
- $\text{mem}(c_i, s_i)$  is the memory requirement.
- $M_j$  is the available memory on device  $j$ .

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### A. Datasets and Models

We evaluate our approach using the CIFAR-100 dataset [19], which consists of 60,000  $32 \times 32$  color images in 100 classes (50,000 for training and 10,000 for testing). We use two model architectures:

- **ResNet-50:** A convolutional neural network with 50 layers and approximately 25 million parameters.
- **Vision Transformer (ViT-B/16):** A transformer-based model with approximately 86 million parameters.

---

### Algorithm 1 Training with Parallelism Strategy Optimization

---

- 1: **Input:** Model  $M$ , Dataset  $D$ , Available Devices  $K$
  - 2: **Output:** Trained model parameters  $\theta$ , Training time  $T$
  - 3: Initialize model parameters  $\theta$  randomly
  - 4: Partition model  $M$  into  $L$  logical components  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_L\}$
  - 5: **for** each training epoch  $e$  **do**
  - 6:   Profile execution time  $t_{comp}(c_i)$  for each component  $c_i$
  - 7:   Estimate communication overhead  $t_{comm}(c_i, s)$  for each component  $c_i$  under strategy  $s \in \{DP, MP, HP\}$
  - 8:   Solve optimization:
 
$$\min \sum \max(t_{comp}(c_i) + t_{comm}(c_i, s)) \text{ for all strategies } s$$
  - 9:   Apply selected parallelism strategy  $s^*$  for each component
  - 10:   **for** each mini-batch  $b$  in  $D$  **do**
  - 11:     Distribute computation according to  $s^*$
  - 12:     Perform forward pass
  - 13:     Compute loss  $L(\theta)$
  - 14:     Perform backward pass to compute gradients  $\nabla L(\theta)$
  - 15:     Synchronize gradients across devices (if using DP or HP)
  - 16:     Update parameters:  $\theta = \theta - \eta \nabla L(\theta)$
  - 17:   **end for**
  - 18:   **if** validation metric improved **then**
  - 19:     Save checkpoint
  - 20:   **end if**
  - 21:   **if** communication patterns changed significantly **then**
  - 22:     Re-profile and update strategy
  - 23:   **end if**
  - 24: **end for**
  - 25: **Return** trained parameters  $\theta$  and total training time  $T$
- 

### B. Hardware and Software Configuration

All experiments were conducted on a cluster of 8 NVIDIA V100 GPUs (32GB memory each) connected via NVLink. We implemented our framework using PyTorch 2.0 with the NCCL communication backend. For baseline comparison, we also trained models on a single GPU with identical hyperparameters.

### C. Evaluation Metrics

We measure the following metrics:

- **Training time:** Total wall-clock time required to train the model for 100 epochs.
- **Throughput:** Number of images processed per second.
- **Convergence rate:** Validation accuracy as a function of training epochs.
- **Final accuracy:** Validation accuracy after 100 epochs.
- **Memory utilization:** Peak GPU memory usage during training.

- **Communication overhead:** Percentage of time spent on communication vs. computation.

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Training Efficiency

Our experiments demonstrate significant improvements in training efficiency using the adaptive scheduling approach. Figure 1 shows the total training time for different parallelism strategies across both model architectures.




Fig. 1. Training Time Comparison. Bar chart showing training time in hours for Single GPU, Data Parallel, Model Parallel, Hybrid Parallel, and Adaptive approaches for both ResNet-50 and ViT models.

For ResNet-50, the adaptive approach achieves a  $3.8\times$  speedup over single-GPU training and a  $1.18\times$  improvement over static hybrid parallelism. For ViT, the speedup is  $3.2\times$  over single-GPU and  $1.15\times$  over hybrid parallelism.

### B. Scalability Analysis

Figure 2 illustrates how different parallelism strategies scale with increasing numbers of GPUs.

Data parallelism shows near-linear scaling up to 4 GPUs but diminishing returns beyond that point due to communication overhead. Model parallelism scales more consistently but with lower absolute speedup. The adaptive approach maintains better scaling efficiency across the entire range.

### C. Communication Overhead

Communication overhead is a significant factor in distributed training performance. Figure 3 shows the proportion of time spent on computation versus communication for each approach.

Data parallelism exhibits high communication overhead at 8 GPUs (approximately 42% of total time), while the adaptive approach reduces this to 27% by selectively applying model parallelism to parameter-heavy layers.




Fig. 2. Scalability Analysis. Line graph showing speedup vs. number of GPUs (1, 2, 4, 8) for each parallelism strategy.




Fig. 3. Communication Overhead. Stacked bar chart showing proportion of time spent on computation vs. communication.

### D. Convergence Analysis

Figure 4 shows the validation accuracy versus training epochs for different parallelism strategies.

All approaches converge to similar final accuracy ( $\pm 0.5\%$ ), indicating that our parallelism strategies do not negatively impact model quality. The adaptive approach converges slightly faster than others, likely due to more efficient batch processing.

### E. Memory Utilization

Memory efficiency is crucial for training large models. Figure 5 shows peak GPU memory usage for each approach.

Model parallelism and hybrid approaches show significantly lower memory requirements per device, enabling training of larger models than possible with data parallelism alone. The adaptive approach optimizes memory usage by applying model parallelism to memory-intensive layers.

TABLE I  
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS SUMMARY

Metric	Single GPU	Data Parallel	Model Parallel	Hybrid	Adaptive
<i>Training Time (hours)</i>					
ResNet-50	24.6	8.2	12.8	7.6	<b>6.5</b>
Vision Transformer	38.4	14.6	18.2	13.2	<b>11.9</b>
<i>Final Accuracy (%)</i>					
ResNet-50	78.2	77.9	78.1	78.0	<b>78.3</b>
Vision Transformer	81.5	81.2	81.4	81.3	<b>81.6</b>
<i>Peak Memory (GB)</i>					
ResNet-50	12.8	14.2	<b>5.6</b>	7.8	8.2
Vision Transformer	28.4	30.1	<b>9.8</b>	12.4	13.6
<i>Communication (%)</i>					
ResNet-50	<b>0</b>	42.3	18.6	32.5	27.1
Vision Transformer	<b>0</b>	38.7	22.4	29.8	25.3




Fig. 4. Convergence Comparison. Line graph showing validation accuracy vs. epochs for different parallelism strategies.




Fig. 5. Memory Utilization. Bar chart showing peak GPU memory usage.

### F. Quantitative Results

Table I summarizes the key metrics for all parallelism strategies.

### G. Strategy Selection Analysis

A key insight from our experiments is that different layers benefit from different parallelism strategies. Figure 6 shows the strategies selected by our adaptive algorithm for different components of the ViT model.




Fig. 6. Visualization showing which parallelism strategy was selected for each component of the ViT model.

Self-attention layers benefit most from model parallelism due to their high computational intensity and memory requirements. MLP blocks show better performance with data parallelism. The embedding layer, which has high parameter count but low computational intensity, benefits from hybrid parallelism.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper demonstrates that adaptive parallelism strategies can significantly improve the efficiency of distributed deep learning training. By dynamically selecting the optimal parallelism approach for different components of the neural

network, our method achieves substantial speedups while maintaining model accuracy. The key findings are that different components of neural networks benefit from different parallelism strategies based on their computational and memory characteristics.

Additionally, adaptive scheduling can provide significant improvements over static parallelism approaches, with up to 18% faster training in our experiments. The benefits of adaptive scheduling increase with model complexity and scale.

## VII. FUTURE WORK

- Extending the approach to even larger models and more diverse architectures.
- Incorporating more fine-grained parallelism strategies such as tensor parallelism.
- Developing more sophisticated profiling and optimization techniques.
- Evaluating the approach on heterogeneous computing environments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Goyal et al., "Accurate, Large Minibatch SGD: Training ImageNet in 1 Hour," arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02677, 2017.
- [2] J. Dean et al., "Large Scale Distributed Deep Networks," in NeurIPS, 2012.
- [3] M. Shoyebi et al., "Megatron-LM: Training Multi-Billion Parameter Language Models Using Model Parallelism," arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053, 2019.
- [4] Y. Huang et al., "GPipe: Efficient Training of Giant Neural Networks using Pipeline Parallelism," in NeurIPS, 2019.
- [5] J. Rasley et al., "DeepSpeed: System Optimizations Enable Training Deep Learning Models with Over 100 Billion Parameters," in KDD, 2020.
- [6] L. N. Smith, "Cyclical Learning Rates for Training Neural Networks," in WACV, 2017.
- [7] S. L. Smith et al., "Don't Decay the Learning Rate, Increase the Batch Size," in ICLR, 2018.
- [8] Z. Jia et al., "Beyond Data and Model Parallelism for Deep Neural Networks," in SysML, 2019.
- [9] V. V. Baligodugula, F. Amsaad and N. Jhanjhi, "Analyzing the Parallel Computing Performance of Unsupervised Machine Learning," 2024 IEEE 1st Karachi Section Humanitarian Technology Conference (KHI-HTC), Tandojam, Pakistan, 2024, pp. 1-6, doi: 10.1109/KHI-HTC60760.2024.10482277.
- [10] Baligodugula, Vishnu Vardhan, and Fathi Amsaad. "Enhancing the Performance of Unsupervised Machine Learning Using Parallel Computing: A Comparative Analysis." In 2024 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Computing and Machine Intelligence (ICMI), pp. 1-5. IEEE, 2024.
- [11] Baligodugula, Vishnu Vardhan. "Unsupervised-based distributed machine learning for efficient data clustering and prediction." (2023).
- [12] Zia Ur Rahman, Md, Baligodugula Vishnu Vardhan, Lakkakula Jenith, Veeramreddy Rakesh Reddy, Sala Surekha, and Putluri Srinivasareddy. "Adaptive exon prediction using maximum error normalized algorithms." In Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence: Advances and Applications: ICAIAA 2021, pp. 511-523. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2022.
- [13] M. Ur Rahman, B. Vishnu Vardhan, L. Jenith, V. Rakesh Reddy, "Spectrum sensing using nmlmf algorithm in cognitive radio networks for health care monitoring applications" Int. J. Adv. Trends Comput. Sci. Eng., vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 1-7, 2020.
- [14] T. Ben-Nun and T. Hoefler, "Demystifying Parallel and Distributed Deep Learning: An In-Depth Concurrency Analysis," ACM Computing Surveys, 2019.
- [15] A. Mirhoseini et al., "Spotlight: Optimizing Device Placement for Training Deep Neural Networks," in ICML, 2018.
- [16] N. Dryden et al., "Channel and Filter Parallelism for Large-Scale CNN Training," in SC, 2019.
- [17] S. Rajbhandari et al., "ZeRO: Memory Optimizations Toward Training Trillion Parameter Models," in SC, 2020.
- [18] L. Zheng et al., "Alpa: Automating Inter- and Intra-Operator Parallelism for Distributed Deep Learning," in OSDI, 2022.
- [19] <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/fedesoriano/cifar100>