

Auto-HPCnet: an Automatic Framework to Build Neural Network-based Surrogate for HPC Applications

Wenqian Dong*^, Gokcen Kestor# and Dong Li*

*University of California, Merced

^Florida International University

#Pacific Northwest National Laboratory







Published in HPDC'23

What is the neural network-based surrogate?



Replace a numerical solver or an execution phase in the HPC application with a neural network (NN) model

Goal: achieve performance improvement (i.e., reducing run time) without losing application-outcome quality

Replace a numerical solver or an execution phase in the HPC application with a neural network (NN) model



- NN and execution phase share the same input/output
- The HPC application must tolerate approximation
- This method is not universal

Benefits of neural network-based surrogate

New opportunities for performance optimization

- Remove data dependency in the original code
- Remove irregular memory-access patterns

Adaptive to emerging AI accelerators



Success of neural network-based surrogate



- Eulerian fluid simulation: Smart-fluidnet (SC'19)
- 590× speedup while providing better simulation quality



- Power-grid simulation: Smart-PGSim (SC'20)
- 2.60× speedup over 10,000 problems without losing solution optimality.

Success of neural network-based surrogate



- Eulerian fluid simulation: Smart-fluidnet (SC'19)
- 590× speedup while providing better simulation quality



- **Power-grid simulation**: Smart-PGSim (SC'20)
- 2.60× speedup over 10,000 problems without losing solution optimality.



Challenges of building neural network (NN) – based surrogate





Democratize the usage of NN-based surrogate



Component 3- 2D Neural Architecture Search

Component 1- Compiler-based feature extraction

Identify the input/output features of NN surrogates automatically

Step1: Trace generation

Use LLVM-Tracer to generate a dynamic LLVM instruction trace



An example of acquiring input and output variables 10

Component 1- Compiler-based feature extraction

Identify the input/output features of NN surrogates automatically

Step1: Trace generation

• Use LLVM-Tracer to generate a dynamic LLVM instruction trace

Step2: Identification of input and output variables

 Generate dynamic data dependency graph (DDDG) to identify input (leaf of DDDG) and output (root of DDDG) features



Component 1- Compiler-based feature extraction

Identify the input/output features of NN surrogates automatically

Step1: Trace generation

• Use LLVM-Tracer to generate a dynamic LLVM instruction trace

Step2: Identification of input and output variables

 Generate dynamic data dependency graph (DDDG) to identify input (leaf of DDDG) and output (root of DDDG) features

Step3: Generating Training Samples

Introduce perturbation to input and collect the corresponding output results



Handle input sparsity and reduce input-feature redundancy

Input features from HPC applications (sparse matrix)



Limit support of sparse matrix formats (COO, CSR, or CRS) in current ML frameworks



X Unfolding introduces computation inefficiency and storage inefficiency



- Autoencoder: reduce redundancy in input features
- **Embedding API**: matrix multiplication $A_{sparse} * B_{sparse} = C_{dense}$

- Autoencoder: reduce redundancy in input features
- **Embedding API**: matrix multiplication $A_{sparse} * B_{sparse} = C_{dense}$

Offline (training autoencoder)1) Take dense representation as input2) Generate the Encoder matrix



- Autoencoder: reduce redundancy in input features
- **Embedding API**: matrix multiplication $A_{sparse} * B_{sparse} = C_{dense}$



Input Matrix (COO)

- Autoencoder: reduce redundancy in input features
- **Embedding API**: matrix multiplication $A_{sparse} * B_{sparse} = C_{dense}$



Reduce redundancy and translate sparse format simultaneously

Component 3- 2D neural architecture search



We must consider the impact of input feature reduction during NN model construction

Component 3– 2D neural architecture search



An example of hierarchical Bayesian optimization

Implementation



Implementation



Platform

• NVIDIA DGX-1 cluster with 8 nodes, and each node is equipped with two Intel Xeon E5-2698 v4 CPUs and eight NVIDIA TESLA V100 (Volta) GPUs.

• Applications

Type-I: Numerical solvers **Type-II:** the PARSEC parallel benchmark suite **Type-III:** the Exascale Computing Project (ECP) Proxy Applications Suite 4.0.

| Туре | Application: replaced function | Description | Quality of Interest (QoI) |
|------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ι | CG:CG_solver | Conjugate Gradient | Solution of linear equations |
| | FFT : <i>FFT_solver</i> | Fast Fourier Transform | Output sequence of FFT |
| | MG:MG_solver | Multi-Grid method | The final residual of the solver |
| II | Blackscholes: BlkSchlsEqEuroNoDiv | Investment pricing | The computed price |
| | Canneal:Annealing | VLSI routing | Routing cost |
| | fluidanimation:NS_equation | Fluid dynamics | Particle distance |
| | streamcluster:Dimension_reduction | Online clustering | Cluster center distance |
| | X264:Encoding | Video encoding | Structure similarity |
| | miniQMC:Determinant | Quantum Monte Carlo | Particle energy |
| III | AMG:PCG_solver | Solver of linear systems | Solution of linear systems |
| | Laghos: SolveVelocity | Compressible gas dynamics | Velocity Divergence |

Overall performance



Speedup and prediction HitRate of Auto-HPCnet.

Speedup Performance

Ground truth: the original code;

 $Speedup = \frac{T_{Numerical_solver}}{T'_{NN_infer} + T'_{Data_load} + T_{Other_part}}$

HitRate Performance

The ratio of successful cases with NN surrogates to the total number of cases;

HitRate =
$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1, \text{ if } |V'_i - V_i| \le \mu |V_i|)$$

Overall performance



Speedup and prediction HitRate of Auto-HPCnet.

Speedup Performance

1.89× - 16.8× speedup with a harmonic mean of 5.50×;

HitRate Performance

★ Four applications → above 90%;
★ 100% in other seven applications:

100% in other seven applications;

Comparison with the state-of-the art approximation methods



Performance comparison with existing approximation methods

- **ACCEPT** : the state-of-the art framework for NN-bases approximation
- Loop perforation: every a couple of iterations skip one iteration
- Autokeras: an AutoML framework
 - Auto-HPCnet outperforms ACCEPT and Loop perforation by more than 40% and 5x on average
 - Autokeras causes slowdown in applications whose inputs are high-dimensional sparse matrices (CG, FFT, MG, miniQMC, and AMG)

Overhead Analysis

Offline phases

| Auto-HPCnet | Time overhead |
|--|---------------|
| Component 1: LLVM trace generation, etc | 24-59 minutes |
| Component 2: AutoEncoder training | 1.4-2.2 hours |
| Component 3: 2D Neural Architecture search | 6-13 hours |

Once the NN model is developed and well-trained, it can be integrated into the HPC applications for repeated use.

Online phases

| (1) Fetching input data to GPU memory | 21.2% |
|---|-------|
| (2) Encoding input data to low-dimensional features | 10.1% |
| (3) Loading a pre-trained surrogate model | 1.6% |
| (4) Running the surrogate model and retrieving the model output for the application | 67.1% |

Conclusions

- The NN-based surrogate is powerful to accelerate HPC applications, but is difficult to use
- Auto-HPCnet automates the process of feature identification, performance and application quality control, and NN model construction



Accelerating Scientific Discovery through HPC + Al







Questions?

