Abstract

Software-based implementations of deep neural network predictions consume large amounts of energy, limiting their deployment in power-constrained environments. Hardware acceleration is a promising alternative. However, it is challenging to efficiently design accelerators that have both low prediction error and low energy consumption. Bayesian optimization can be used to accelerate the design problem. However, most of the existing techniques collect data in a coupled way by always evaluating the two objectives (energy and error) jointly at the same input, which is inefficient. Instead, in this work we consider a decoupled approach in which, at each iteration, we choose which objective to evaluate next and at which input. We show that considering decoupled evaluations produces better solutions when computational resources are limited. Our results also indicate that evaluating the prediction error is more important than evaluating the energy consumption.

1 Introduction

Making predictions with Deep Neural Networks (DNN) is very expensive in battery-powered devices with limited computational capabilities. Therefore, in these systems it is desirable to speed up DNN predictions. A promising solution for this problem is to use hardware accelerators [10].

When designing accelerators for DNN predictions it is important to achieve an optimal trade-off between objectives. Here we focus on the minimization of the energy consumption and the prediction error. This is a multi-objective optimization problem with expensive black-box functions. Evaluating the prediction error is a costly black-box process because we have to train a DNN on large amounts of data to finally measure the DNN’s predictive accuracy on some validation data. Similarly, evaluating the energy consumption is an expensive black-box process because it involves simulating in software the operations performed by the hardware accelerator during prediction [10].

Bayesian optimization (BO) methods can be used to accelerate optimization problems with expensive black-box functions [5]. These methods can also efficiently solve multi-objective optimization problems [5]. However, most of the existing multi-objective BO methods assume that the different objectives will always be evaluated in a coupled way, that is, one objective after the other and at the same input location. By contrast, in the case of designing DNN hardware accelerators, the two objectives (energy and error) can be evaluated in a decoupled way, that is, at each step we can choose whether to collect data from one objective or the other [3]. Decoupled evaluations are possible because the energy consumption is independent of the value of the DNN weights. This means that...
we do not have to train the DNN to evaluate the energy consumption since the DNN weights can be assigned random values when we evaluate this objective. The differences between coupled and decoupled evaluations are illustrated in the bottom-right plot in Figure 1.

Decoupled evaluations are more flexible than coupled ones, since the latter are a particular case of the former. Therefore, we expect the decoupled approach to perform better, especially with limited computational resources. For example, when there is only a single computer node available for function evaluations. In this case, we can use the data collected after each objective evaluation to make better decisions about which objective to evaluate next. In this work, we consider this single-computer-node scenario and analyze the performance of the decoupled approach with respect to other coupled baselines. We show that considering decoupled evaluations produces better solutions and also that evaluating the prediction error is more important than evaluating the energy consumption.

2 Decoupled multi-objective Bayesian optimization

In general, BO methods decide where to collect data by maximizing an acquisition function $\alpha(x)$ with respect to the design parameters $x$, with $\alpha(x)$ returning the expected utility obtained by evaluating the objective at $x$ [9]. The expectation in $\alpha$ is computed with respect to the predictions of a probabilistic model trained on the available data, typically a Gaussian process (GP) model.

We now focus on the problem of designing DNN accelerators. In the coupled evaluation case, there is only a single acquisition function $\alpha_{\text{Energy-Error}}(x)$, which is optimized to determine where to evaluate the two objectives (energy consumption and prediction error) next. By contrast, in the decoupled case, there is a different acquisition function for each objective, that is, $\alpha_{\text{Energy}}(x)$ and $\alpha_{\text{Error}}(x)$ [6]. At each iteration, these two acquisition functions are globally optimized and the one achieving the highest value determines which objective function will be evaluated next and at which location.

The differences between the coupled and the decoupled approach are illustrated in a toy example in Figure 1. The plots in the left part of this figure show the available data for the energy and error objectives, along with the corresponding GP predictive distributions. In the decoupled case, the GP predictions are mapped into the acquisition functions $\alpha_{\text{Energy}}(x)$ and $\alpha_{\text{Error}}(x)$, shown in the plots in the middle of Figure 1. Each of these functions is maximized to determine which objective evaluation produces the highest utility on average and at which location. In this case, evaluating the energy consumption at $x = 0.4$ produces the highest expected utility. Therefore, with only a single computer node available, we would then evaluate next the energy objective at $x = 0.4$. After collecting the data, the GP predictive distributions are updated and the whole process repeats. In the coupled case,
We consider the problem of designing a hardware accelerator for a DNN with 3 hidden layers that makes predictions on the MNIST data set. We compared PESMO using decoupled evaluations (decoupled BO) with three other baselines: a version of PESMO that always performs coupled evaluations (coupled BO), an evolutionary strategy based on the NSGA-II algorithm (NSGA-II) and finally, a random search approach (Random).

### 2.1 Predictive Entropy Search for Multi-objective BO

Predictive Entropy Search for Multi-objective (PESMO) BO is a state-of-the-art BO method for multi-objective optimization problems. PESMO often outperforms other baselines in the coupled evaluation scenario. Importantly, PESMO is the only existing method that allows to perform decoupled evaluations with multiple objectives. The source code for PESMO is publicly available [here](https://github.com/nitishsrivastava/deepnet). PESMO’s acquisition function approximates the expected gain of information on the solution to the optimization problem, where information is measured in terms of the entropy of the corresponding random variable. The solution to the multi-objective optimization problem is the Pareto set, a collection of optimal values for the design parameters. The Pareto set is optimal because from each point in that set one cannot improve one of the objectives without deteriorating the other. PESMO’s acquisition functions for the decoupled and coupled scenario are

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_{\text{Energy-Error}}(x) & \approx H(\mathcal{X}^*|D) - E_{y|D}[H(\mathcal{X}^*|D \cup \{(x, y)\})] , \\
\alpha_{\text{Error}}(x) & \approx H(\mathcal{X}^*|D) - E_{y_{\text{Error}}|D}[H(\mathcal{X}^*|D \cup \{(x, y_{\text{Error}})\})] , \\
\alpha_{\text{Energy}}(x) & \approx H(\mathcal{X}^*|D) - E_{y_{\text{Energy}}|D}[H(\mathcal{X}^*|D \cup \{(x, y_{\text{Energy}})\})] , \tag{1}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \mathcal{X}^* \) represents the Pareto set, \( D \) is the data collected so far, \( y \), \( y_{\text{Energy}} \) and \( y_{\text{Error}} \) are respectively the data collected for the two objectives, the energy objective and the error objective for the value of the design parameters \( x \) and finally, \( H(\cdot) \) computes the entropy of a random variable.

### 3 Experiments

We compared PESMO using decoupled evaluations (decoupled BO) with three other baselines: a version of PESMO that always performs coupled evaluations (coupled BO), an evolutionary strategy based on the NSGA-II algorithm (NSGA-II) and finally, a random search approach (Random). We consider the problem of designing a hardware accelerator for a DNN with 3 hidden layers that makes predictions on the MNIST data set.

Table 1 shows the design parameters that we consider for tuning. Each of them has an effect on the energy objective (En), the error objective (Er) or both. The last two parameters in the table indicate the numerical precision used to encode the DNN weights and the data in the accelerator. To train the DNN, we used the DeepNet python library. The energy consumption was estimated using the Aladdin simulator.

The accelerator design flow is shown Figure 2. Each pass through this 4-step process produces one data point by evaluating one of the objectives. First, Spearmint selects one objective function

![Figure 2: Decoupled evaluations flow.](https://example.com/fig2.png)

![Table 1: Design parameters to be optimized.](https://example.com/fig1.png)
We repeated the optimization problem 20 times and then report average results. The left plot in Figure 3 shows the average Pareto front obtained by each method. The decoupled BO approach is the best performing technique, producing accelerators with much better trade-offs between prediction error and energy consumption. The coupled BO approach performs slightly better than the evolutionary strategy and the random approach is the worse performing one. Table 2 reports the average hypervolume obtained by each method. Again, the ranking of the different methods is Decoupled BO, Coupled BO, NSGA-II and Random.

3.1 Results

We repeated the optimization problem 20 times and then report average results. The left plot in Figure 3 shows the average Pareto front obtained by each method. The decoupled BO approach is the best performing technique, producing accelerators with much better trade-offs between prediction error and energy consumption. The coupled BO approach performs slightly better than the evolutionary strategy and the random approach is the worse performing one. Table 2 reports the average hypervolume obtained by each method. Again, the ranking of the different methods is Decoupled BO, Coupled BO, NSGA-II and Random.

To better understand the superior performance of the decoupled approach, we report in the right plot of Figure 3 the average number of evaluations of each objective by Decoupled BO. This plot clearly shows that Decoupled BO evaluates more often the prediction error objective, which seems to be more difficult to learn than the energy consumption. Interestingly, the energy consumption is also the objective that is most expensive to evaluate. Therefore, besides finding better solutions, Decoupled BO also spends less time performing function evaluations. This is illustrated by the results from Table 3, which shows the average time spent by each BO method evaluating the objective functions.

Table 2: Avg. Hypervolume and corresponding standard errors obtained by each method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Hypervolume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>258.90±0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSGA-II</td>
<td>259.55±0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO Coupled</td>
<td>262.73±0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO Decoupled</td>
<td>264.96±0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Average time spent by each BO method evaluating the objective functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Avg. Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coupled BO</td>
<td>554,098 s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoupled BO</td>
<td>374,369 s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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