

PatrickStar: Parallel Training of Pre-trained Models via Chunk-based Memory Management

Jiarui Fang

Pattern Recognition Center, Wechat
AI, Tencent Inc
Beijing, China
jiarui.fang@tencent.com

Yang Yu

Pattern Recognition Center, Wechat
AI, Tencent Inc
Beijing, China
josephyu@tencent.com

Zilin Zhu

Pattern Recognition Center, Wechat
AI, Tencent Inc
Beijing, China
zilinzhu@tencent.com

Shenggui Li

School of Computing, National
University of Singapore
Singapore
lisg@comp.nus.edu.sg

Yang You

School of Computing, National
University of Singapore
Singapore
youy@comp.nus.edu.sg

Jie Zhou

Pattern Recognition Center, Wechat
AI, Tencent Inc
Beijing, China
withtomzhou@tencent.com

ABSTRACT

The pre-trained model (PTM) is revolutionizing Artificial intelligence (AI) technology. It can learn general language features on massive data and then be fine-tuned on task-specific data. Unfortunately, the computing hardware requirement of PTM training is prohibitively expensive, which makes it a game for a small proportion of people in the AI community. Therefore, we proposed a system called PatrickStar to lower the hardware requirements of PTMs and make them accessible to everyone. PatrickStar uses the CPU-GPU heterogeneous memory space to store the model data. Different from existing works, we first manage the model data in a fine-grained manner by organizing them in memory chunks and dynamically distributing them in the heterogeneous memory space. Guided by the runtime memory statistics collected in a warm-up iteration, chunks are orchestrated efficiently in heterogeneous memory and generate lower CPU-GPU data transmission volume. Symbiosis with the Zero Redundancy Optimizer, PatrickStar scales to multiple GPUs using data parallelism, with lower communication bandwidth requirements and more efficient bandwidth utilization. The system is capable on training tasks on bigger models and larger batch size, which cannot be completed by existing works. Experimental results show that PatrickStar trains a 12 billion parameters GPT model, 1.5x as large as the model scale limit of the SOTA works, on an 8xV100 and 240GB CPU memory node, and also achieves significant higher computing efficiency than SOTA. Even on a \$700 personal computer, it can train a 0.7 billion parameter GPT model. Our code is publicly available.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Jiarui Fang, Yang Yu, Zilin Zhu, Shenggui Li, Yang You, and Jie Zhou. PatrickStar: Parallel Training of Pre-trained Models via Chunk-based Memory Management. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at [URL_TO_YOUR_ARTIFACTS](https://github.com/PatrickStar).

1 INTRODUCTION

The pre-trained models (PTMs) such as BERT [8], GPT2 [23], and GPT3 [4] have become a milestone in the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP). PTMs use a deep neural network that stacks a number of transformer structures [32] to pre-train a general language feature representation on a large amount of text and then transfers the learned knowledge to different downstream tasks after fine-tuning. Due to potentially unlimited amounts of text from the Internet, PTMs can capture many facets of language features and achieve state-of-the-art results on downstream tasks. It is now the consensus of the AI community to adopt PTMs as the backbone for specific NLP tasks rather than training models from scratch on a task-related dataset.

The unprecedented performance of PTMs comes with numerous parameters, which put enormous demands on computing and memory resources. As the model data can no longer be accommodated in the memory of a single GPU, the most commonly used data parallelism techniques are not applicable for PTMs. Latest advances make growth in PTM size possible by utilizing parallel training to distribute model data among multiple GPU memory, such as ZeRO [24, 25], model parallelism [28, 29] and pipeline parallelism [12, 16, 18]. The state-of-the-art (SOTA) solution is to combine them together as 3D parallelism [17], which can scale PTM to trillions of parameters on thousands of GPUs.

Although successful pre-training efforts exist on models of trillions of parameters, it still has a long way to go enable PTM to be accessible to everyone. The application of PTM has two phases, the pre-training phase and the fine-tuning phase. Although the computation operations are the same, there is a huge gap in the accessible hardware quality of the two stages. The pre-training phase is trained from scratch on a super large-scale dataset with countless iterations and is extremely time-consuming. Therefore, it is usually conducted on supercomputers using hundreds of GPU nodes connected with high-speed network fabric. Such high-quality hardware is only affordable for a small proportion of people in the

AI community. In the fine-tuning phase, the pre-trained models are often fine-tuned on a much smaller downstream application-specific datasets. The hardware quality that most people can access in this phase is much lower than the pre-training phase, usually a single node equipped with multiple GPU cards. Therefore, making the model size on accessible hardware as large as possible is the critical path to the democratization of PTM. Unfortunately, the work mentioned above pays little attention to bridging the hardware requirement gap between these two stages.

Heterogeneous training [22, 25, 26] is the most promising solution to lower the hardware requirements of fine-tuning phase. This approach exploits both GPU memory, CPU memory, consisting of DRAM or NVMe memory, by accommodating the model data in both CPU and GPU and only moving data to current device if necessary. However, all of these works reported their results on nodes of the DGX-2 supercomputer, which includes 1.5TB DRAM and 3.84TB NVMe SSDs and NVLink connected between CPU and GPUs. This configuration far exceeds the average CPU and communication bandwidth standard in data centers and cloud computing platforms. When adopting these systems on commonly accessible hardware, performance is largely compromised. For example, ZeRO-Offload [25], the state-of-the-art heterogeneous training system, reported the maximal model scale on a 4xV100 GPU DGX-2H server reaches 30B (Billion) parameters. However, on a 4-V100 GPU with a 240 GB DRAM CPU server, its maximal model scale can only reach 6B parameters.

To improve the PTM scale of existing solutions, this paper proposed a heterogeneous training system named PatrickStar. We observe two types of training data that have to be managed during PTM training: the model data consists of parameters, gradients, and optimizer states whose footprints are related by the model structure definition; and the non-model data consists of the intermediate tensors generated by operators. The non-model data dynamically change according to the configuration of training tasks, such as batch size. Model data and non-model data compete for GPU memory with each other. Without considering non-model data, the existing solutions [25, 26] statically partition the model data between CPU and GPU memory, and their memory layout is constant to different training configurations. Such static partition strategy leads to several problems. First, the system will crash when the GPU memory or the CPU memory is insufficient for its corresponding model data requirements, even if there is still memory available on the other devices at the time. Second, communication is inefficient when data transferring among different memory spaces in the granularity of the tensor, and CPU-GPU communication volume is unnecessary when you can place model data on the target computing device before-wards. PatrickStar overcomes these shortcomings by managing model data in a fine-granular manner to use heterogeneous memory more efficiently. We organize the model data tensors in chunks, blocks of contiguous memory of the same size. The distribution of chunks in heterogeneous memory space is dynamically orchestrated during training according to their tensor states. Through reusing chunks that do not coexist, PatrickStar also further lowers the memory footprint of model data than SOTA solutions. We use a warm-up iteration to collect the statistics of available GPU memory for model data at runtime. An efficient

chunk eviction strategy and device-aware operator placement strategy based on the statistics collected are designed to reduce the CPU-GPU data movement volume. Chunk-based memory management can be efficiently symbiotic with data parallelism using Zero Redundancy Optimizer [24] through the collective intra-GPU communication of chunks. Our main contributions include:

- We built from scratch an innovative chunk-based memory management DNN training system called PatrickStar. Compared with the existing heterogeneous training approaches, the method support larger model size and higher computation efficiency by shrinking non-model memory footprint, improving memory efficiency and lowering CPU-GPU communication volume. The source code is publicly available.
- The chunk-based management is naturally symbiotic with Zero Redundancy Optimizer data parallelism. The chunk-based collective communication pattern leads to lower intra-GPU bandwidth requirements and higher bandwidth utilization.
- We evaluated our system on a cloud computing node with 8x V100 GPUs with 240 GB and 120 GB DRAM memory CPU. With 240 GB memory, PatrickStar trains a 12 billion parameters GPT-like model, which is 1.5 times as large as the maximal model scale of DeepSpeed. With 120 GB memory, the model scale of PatrickStar is 4x as large as DeepSpeed.
- PatrickStar has a higher computing efficiency than DeepSpeed, and achieved superlinear scalability on 8x GPUs.

2 BACKGROUNDS OF PTM

PTMs achieve significantly better performance than directly training a model from scratch. PTMs first pre-train models on a large amount of text from unsupervised learning tasks and then fine-tune further on a smaller dataset for downstream supervised NLP tasks. The benefit of PTMs come from two aspects. First, PTMs provide opportunities to leverage the vast unlabeled text data in unsupervised training, from which we can learn universal language representations. Second, with the large corpus, we can use deep learning models with numerous parameters in pre-training, which usually results in overfitting in supervised training with small training data.

PTMs tend to use transformer [32] structures due to their superior performance and compute efficiency. And to speed up convergence, adaptive gradient-based optimizer ADAM [14] are the de facto choice in transformer model training. Taking advantage of the tensor-core component on GPUs, PTM training is usually conducted in a mixed-precision way, which requires that the parameters and gradients of the model use the half precision floating point (fp16) format in FWD and BWD and the single precision floating point (fp32) format during the parameter updating. Before introducing the PTM training process, we list the types of tensors in PTM training first. We refer to activations and temporary data as **non-model data**, and the others as **model data**. Memory consumption of temporary data is often overlooked in related works. However, we found that its overhead sometimes is significant compared with activations.

- Param fp16: The model parameters of fp16 type used in FWD and BWD.
- Grads fp16: The gradients of param fp16, generated in BWD.

- **Optimizer states (OS):** State parameters required by ADAM optimizer, including momentum fp32 and variance fp32 and param fp32.
- **Activations and their gradients:** intermediate output tensors of the operators, also known as feature maps, produced in FWD and BWD.
- **Temporary data:** It consists of buffers used inside operators and memory overhead generated by implementation of a DNN framework.

The PTM training is viewed as a directed graph. As shown in Figure 1, the circular nodes represent tensor sets (param fp16, grad fp16, param fp32, momentum fp32, variance fp32), and rectangular nodes represent operator sets, including forward propagation (FWD) and backward propagation (BWD), Parameter Updating, which is implemented using ADAM optimizer in PTM context. Edges of the graph represent the data flow, and the weight of the edge is the overall amount of data (in bytes), assuming the model has M parameters.




Figure 1: Workflow of Neural Network Training (From [26])

Let us first theoretically estimate the memory requirements of PTM training. For a model with M parameters, the FWD and BWD require $4M$ bytes space for param fp16 and grad fp16 tensors combined. For the Param Updating, $4M$ (momentum fp32) + $4M$ (variance fp32) + $4M$ (param fp32) = $12M$ bytes are required. The updated param fp32 is converted to param fp16 to participate in the computation of the next iteration. In this way, the overall training process requires $2+2+14=18M$ bytes of memory space. For a GPT model with 2 billion (2B) parameters, 36 GB of GPU memory is required, more than 32 GB of V100 overall GPU memory. And we have not taken the memory usage of non-model data during the training process into account yet. The GPU memory is often more scarce than expected.

3 RELATED WORKS

Here list three lines of work to increase maximum PTM scale. Some of them are often used together.

3.1 Parallel Training

The most popular distributed training technique is data parallelism [7] (DP) which keeps a copy of the model on each GPU and partitions inputs and activations among multiple GPUs. DP works fit the entire model data in the GPU memory, which is no

longer valid in the PTM training situation. Parallel training PTM, therefore, has to partition the model data across multiple GPUs.

A set of works are proposed to adapt DP on PTM training. The Zero Redundancy Optimizer (ZeRO-DP) [24] eliminates memory redundancies of model data by partitioning them in layers among multiple GPUs, therefore using the total aggregate GPU memory capacity of a cluster. During FWD and BWD, ZeRO-DP has to conduct broadcast operations to collect parameters on remote devices.

Model parallelism (MP) is also revisited in PTM training recently. MP splits the multi-dimensional tensors of model data along one or more specific dimensions and then distributes them on multiple devices. In this case, the activations have to be accommodated on each device redundantly. MP has poor computational efficiency than DP due to additional communication of activations in both FWD and BWD. In terms of memory efficiency, MP reduces the model data footprint proportional to the number of workers while not reducing the non-model data footprint. In addition, the computing and communication pattern of model parallelism are specific to model architecture, which will induce a great initial implementation effort for different models. Megatron-LM [29] customizes model splitting schema on the transformer structure and MLP by adding collective communication operations during FWD and BWD process. Mesh-TensorFlow [28] provides a high-level abstraction based on TensorFlow to split tensors along any tensor dimension, which provides a convenient way for users to design customized model parallel schema. Recent works in MP [3, 15, 33, 34] also adopted different algorithms for tensor splitting at different levels of granularity.

Pipeline Parallelism (PP) [12, 16, 18] is another approach for distributed training that divides the model’s layers into stages that the model can process in a pipeline manner. As one stage completes the FWD or BWD for a micro-batch, the activation tensors are communicated to the next stage, and the gradients of activations are passed to the previous stage in the pipeline. Although PP communicates over an order of magnitude less volume than the DP and MP, it has overheads during the start of the pipeline, and it requires the number of devices to scale with the model depth and not just the layer size. Another challenge in PP is load balancing, as the different layers have different amounts of parameters. Thus, it requires a careful layer dividing policy to avoid memory bottlenecks on a certain device.

Readers should note that DP, PP, and MP are orthogonal to each other. In the very-large-scale PTM training, a combination of ZeRO-DP, MP, PP to form a 3D parallelism, DeepSpeed [17] carefully trades off these parallelisms and maps workload onto the workers. It is recommended to restrict MP and DP among GPUs inside a node and PP among nodes.

3.2 Heterogeneous Training

The above works mainly focus on distributing the model data on the homogeneous GPU memory space of multiple GPUs. To train PTM with model data larger than the overall GPU memory size, some recent works try to utilize heterogeneous memory space which consists of both CPU and GPU. L2L [22] accommodates the model data in CPU by default, and the GPU device memory is populated only with the executing layer’s model data at any

given moment in training. However, It leads to frequent CPU-GPU data movement, in units of tensors. Moreover, L2L is implemented on one GPU one CPU system, no multiple GPU scaling result is presented. ZeRO-Offload [26] advanced the ZeRO-DP by offloading the OS data and grad fp16 on CPU and executes ADAM on CPU. It has to transfer grad fp16 and param fp16 between CPU and GPU during training. ZeRO-Infinity [25] extends the offloading method to NVMe memory.

3.3 Activation Checkpointing and Offloading.

In addition to reducing GPU model data, another line of related work reduces the GPU memory consumption of activations. The activation checkpointing, as known as activation rematerialization, first proposed in work [6] to trade off activation memory with more computation and is implemented in PyTorch [19]. During FWD, only a subset of activations are checkpointed on GPU while the missing activations are recomputed from the nearest checkpoint in BWD. After that, people further explore the optimal rematerialization schedule in context of unrolled recurrent DNN [10], linear structure DNNs [11] as well as non-linear structure DNNs [13].

Offloading is an alternative approach which consists in offloading some of forward activations from GPU to CPU. Work vDNN [27] and its variant [30] propose a simple strategy by sending to CPU either all activations or only those of convolutional layers during CNN training. Work [1, 2] analyze the complexity of offloading problem and proposed an optimal algorithm to find combinations of offloading and checkpointing with a preprocessing performance modeling. Capuchin [21] combines offloading and checkpointing techniques based on dynamic tensor access pattern tracked at runtime. Considering PTMs are linearly structured, ZeRO-style works [24] also offloads activation checkpoints to CPU in a manual manner.

4 MOTIVATIONS

This work is devoted to paving the way for the application of PTM in industrial and academic scenarios. PTM goes through two stages: pre-training, fine-tuning. In the pre-training stage, AI supercomputers are widely applied. Work in Section 3.1 are mainly focused on this stage. The hardware settings of Megatron-LM’s 8.3 B model and ZeRO-Infinity-3D’s 500 B model are the latest AI supercomputer with 32 DGX-2H nodes¹. Not to mention the device itself costs millions of dollars, only pre-training the model once will also cost tens of thousands of dollars. While expanding the pre-training model scale is only a game for a small proportion of people in the AI community, the fine-tuning stage must involve most people playing with their datasets. Industrial and academic AI developers commonly use the equipment from data centers or self-purchased small servers. Their computing scale, storage capability, and communication bandwidth are lower than AI supercomputers, i.e. the CPU memory in the data center devices is far below the TeraByte level and is much less than that of a DGX-2 node. In addition, the communication bandwidth across nodes is usually very limited. Therefore, the most economical hardware setting accessible is a single node equipped with multiple GPUs. To our knowledge, a

¹The 32 DGX-2H nodes have a total of 512 Tesla V100 GPUs. Each node has a 1.5 TB CPU memory. The intra-node communication bandwidth reaches 300 GB/sec, and the inter-node communication bandwidth reaches 100 GB/Section

majority of DL offline tasks in a GPU data center of an industrial AI lab are running on a scale of fewer than 8 GPUs. Besides improving hardware qualities, developing a software system to bridge the computing power gap between the pre-training and fine-tuning stages is the key to democratizing PTM.

The most successful effort to democratize PTM fine-tuning is the heterogeneous training approach. DeepSpeed [17] integrated with optimizations of ZeRO-Offload, ZeRO-Infinity and Zero-DP [24–26] train a 13B model on a single V100 of a DGX-2H server. As shown in Figure 3, they statically manage model data in heterogeneous memory space such that the param fp16 data are stored in GPU while the grad fp16 and OS data are stored in CPU or NVMe. The param fp16 and grad fp16 data, overall 4M bytes, are moved between CPU and GPU during each iteration. It is worth noting that the experiment environment of DeepSpeed has 1.5TB CPU memory, which undertakes most of the model data storage. However, when decreasing the amount of CPU memory, the maximum model scale drops a lot, e.g. executing it with 240 GB CPU memory, the maximum model scale of it is lowered to 4B. At this time, the system heterogeneous memory space reaches 272 GB. However, the theoretical maximal overall memory allocated of 4B model is only 72 GB. Moreover, its computing efficiency decreases as the model scale increases. It only achieves 33 Tflops on the 4B model compared with 47 Tflops on the 1B model. It shows that we can still further improve the memory and computing efficiency of heterogeneous training.




Figure 2: GPU memory footprint of non-model data during 4 iterations of a 6B GPT-like model training with PyTorch using different activation memory optimization plans. The batch size is 16.




Figure 3: The static memory partition in DeepSpeed.

DeepSpeed is relatively fragile and inefficient on lower quality computing hardware. During FWD and BWD, GPU memory has to accommodate peak non-model data in addition to overall param fp16. During param updating (ADAM), the CPU has to accommodate all of the model data. The memory of model-data depends on the configuration of the model structure, which we call *model-related configuration*. However, the memory of non-model data is not only related to model-related configuration, but also related to the *task-related configuration*, e.g. batch size, the activation optimization scheme. It should be noted that the memory consumption of non-model cannot be ignored. As shown in the figure, even if the checkpointing and offloading optimization are used, there is still a peak memory consumption of close to 5GB for this task, and activation offloading has been slowing down the overall training speed. Using the above static partition strategy, the model-related configuration is strongly affected by task-related configuration. Once the param fp16 space exceeds the GPU free space excluding non-model, the system will fail. As for efficiency, DeepSpeed transfers param fp16 and grad fp16 data between CPU and GPU in granularity of tensor. Data centers often use PCI-E to connect CPU and GPU, whose bandwidth utilization is lower than NVLINK in DGX-2H. Considering it sometimes use small batch size and have activation optimizations to train a large model, most of time is wasted on data transmission and the GPUs are under-utilization. As a remedy, ZeRO-Offload proposed one-step delayed parameter updating to broke the synchronization restriction, but the convergence is theoretically inconsistent with the ADAM algorithm.

To improve the existing heterogeneous training method, model data needs to be dynamically managed in a fine-grained manner. Splitting the model data into small pieces so that they can be flexibly placed on the GPU or CPU is able to avoid the memory waste in Figure 3. In this way, the system becomes more robust by decoupling the limit of model-related configuration with task-related configuration. Additionally, through smart dynamic memory management, it brings opportunity to reduce the amount of CPU-GPU memory movement. The intuitive idea is to transmit data in units of tensor. However, tensors vary in size, which leads to inefficient utilization of the transmission bandwidth for small tensors. In DeepSpeed, for parallel computing, tensor will be further partitioned into pieces to transfer, which exacerbates bandwidth utilization problems. Different from existing works, we organize the model data in **chunk**, a piece of fixed-sized contiguous memory space. With improving model scale and efficiency as the main goal, our chunk-based memory management comes with the following benefits:

- Lower CPU and GPU memory requirements for PTM training by fine-grain layout of model data in chunks. It can train larger model or train with larger batch size on the same model compared with SOTA heterogeneous training approaches.
- Reducing overall memory footprint by chunk reusing of parameter fp16 and gradient fp16.
- Lower data transmission volume with smart chunk layout.
- The transmission in chunks can better utilize the CPU-GPU and intra-GPU bandwidth than in tensors.

- Parallel-friendly. Through collective communication of a set of chunks, it is easy to combine data parallelism and obtain the lowest communication volume.

5 DESIGN OVERVIEW

We design a parallel PTM training system called PatrickStar, and its principle on a single GPU is shown in Figure 4. PatrickStar improves the model scale and efficiency of existing heterogeneous training by managing the model data into chunks and store them in the heterogeneous space (details in Section 6). The circle in the figure represents the element of the parameters, and they are arranged in memory in chunks. When the computation of an operator is triggered (the colorful part of right figure), PatrickStar schedules the chunk where the parameter is located to be located on the required computing device. We propose optimizations to orchestrate chunks efficiently in heterogeneous memory space (Section 8). Moreover, it is scalable to multiple GPUs combining with a Zero Redundancy Optimizer [24] (details in Section 7). The chunks are moved to the required device during the training process when necessary.




Figure 4: The strategy of PatrickStar.

6 SYSTEM DESIGN ON A SINGLE GPU

PatrickStar works as middleware between PyTorch and heterogeneous memory as shown in Figure 5. The system consists of the static modules that work in the preprocessing stage, and the runtime modules work in the training stage. The static modules of PatrickStar conduct preprocessing before training. They construct the mapping schema between tensor and chunk based on the neural network structure. The runtime modules take over the memory access of PyTorch during the training process by redirecting of tensors to the chunk-based memory space managed and using a chunk manager to manage the chunks in heterogeneous memory space smartly.




Figure 5: The software architecture of PatrickStar.

6.1 Preprocessing Stage

Before the training begins, each tensor of the model data is assigned a piece of chunk space in a preprocessing stage, and a chunk-tensor mapping schema is generated. An efficient mapping schema needs to have the following three features: 1. increase the locality of tensor access. 2. reduce peak memory consumption. 3. be friendly to parallel.

An efficient mapping schema is derived in the following procedure. Chunks are divided into four types according to types of tensors in model data, i.e., param fp16 list, param fp32 list, momentum list, and variance list, overall $14M$ bytes (M is parameter number). Chunks have the same size, so different chunks can reuse the same memory and are friendly to collective communications in parallel training. Specially, PatrickStar does not allocate a grad fp16 list. The grad fp16 tensors can reuse chunk space of the param fp16 list since as elaborated in Section 6.2, we eliminate the dependency of grad fp16 tensors on param fp16 tensors. PatrickStar shrinks the memory footprint compared to ZeRO-Offload [26] whose minimal model-data memory footprint is $16M$ bytes. Additionally, it allocates extra GPU memory holding the gradients to be moved to the CPU, while PatrickStar eliminates this overhead. Therefore, the model data memory footprint of PatrickStar is smallest compared with other PTM training solutions. We first build the param fp16 chunk list in the order of model initialization. The first param fp16 tensor is allocated at the beginning of a chunk. The following tensor is allocated after the previous tensor one by one. When a new tensor exceeds the remaining space of a chunk, a new chunk is appended to the chunk list. In this way, when accessing a tensor in a chunk, the neighboring tensors used soon have already been in the same chunk. Therefore, the access locality is well guaranteed. For param fp32, momentum, and variance tensors, their corresponding chunk lists are mapped in the same way as param fp16. As a result, the offsets in the chunk list of param fp16, param fp32, momentum, and variance tensors of the same parameter are consistent. Scaling to multiple processes, four chunk lists are split along the same position. Therefore the chunks used by ADAM is in the local process and avoids cross-process communication.

6.2 Training Stage

During the training process, PatrickStar needs to orchestrate chunks in the heterogeneous memory space correctly and efficiently. This section introduces the mechanism to guide the correct movement of chunks, and later we introduce an optimization strategy to improve its efficiency in Section 8. PatrickStar’s tensor is stateful as shown in Table 1. We refer to the last three states as HOLD-like states. The COMPUTE state indicates the tensor is about to be computed by an operator on a specific computing device, e.g., CPU or GPU. The HOLD-like states indicate that the tensor is not involved in computing right now, but its payload must be maintained in memory, either CPU or GPU. We distinguish the HOLD state after FWD and BWD, which is crucial for the following algorithm design.

A chunk’s possible location in heterogeneous space is determined by the states of all its tensors. When all tensors of a chunk are in the FREE state, the chunk’s memory space can be reused by other chunks or released. If any of the tensors of a chunk is in COMPUTE state, the chunk must be located on the required computing device.

Table 1: States of Tensor in PatrickStar.

STATE NAME	EXPLANATION	PLACEMENT
FREE	No payload space	-
COMPUTE	Participate in computing	Computing Device
HOLD	Hold payload	CPU or GPU
HOLD_AFTER_FWD	Hold payload after FWD	CPU or GPU
HOLD_AFTER_BWD	Hold payload after BWD	CPU or GPU

If none of its tensors is in COMPUTE and at least one of its tensors is in a HOLD-like state, we can place the chunk in heterogeneous memory space, i.e., it can be located on CPU or GPU memory.

ALGORITHM 1: Access Tensor

```

1 Function Access(param: Torch.Parameter, comp_dev)
2   Require: Chunks(a vector of chunks);
3   chunk_id = get_chunk_id(param);
4   if is_distributed() then
5     | FetchRemoteChunk(chunk_id, comp_dev);
6   end
7   prepare payload on comp_dev for Chunks[chunk_id];
8   param.data ← payload inside Chunks[chunk_id];
9   old_state = param.ps_attr.get_state();
10  if old_state is FREE then
11    | param.data.zero();
12  end
13  param.ps_attr.set_state(COMPUTE);
14  return param.data;
15 end

```

ALGORITHM 2: Release Tensor

```

1 Function Release(param: Torch.Parameter, training_stage,
   target_state)
2   Require: Chunks(a vector of chunks);
3   chunk_id = get_chunk_id(param);
4   param.ps_attr.set_state(target_state);
5   if is_distributed() then
6     | ReleaseRemoteChunk(chunk_id, training_stage,
7       status, training_stage is BWD));
7   end
8   param.data ← dummy
9 end

```

The state of param fp16 tensor is set to HOLD after being initialized (randomly initialized or loaded from the pre-train model). Before operator FWD computing starts, PatrickStar uses Algorithm 1 to access the tensors from chunks. In Line 7, the chunk containing the param fp16 to be computed has to exist on the computing device. If the chunk is not there, the chunk manager will move the chunk to computing device from other devices, which may move out chunks on the computing device if necessary. The details of chunk eviction strategy of chunk manager will be elaborated in Section 8.3. State of

the tensor is converted to COMPUTE (Line 13), which is stored in the attribute called `ps_attr` of the tensor. Line 4 is used for parallel training and will be elaborated Section 7. After the computing is finished, we release tensor using Algorithm 2 by setting `training_stage` as FWD and `target_state` as HOLD_AFTER_FWD. The tensor states become HOLD_AFTER_FWD, so that the tensor does not have to be held in the computing device and can be evicted to other device if necessary.

After all operators of the model finished FWD, the states of all param fp16 tensors are reset to HOLD to ensure the correct execution of BWD. This is because the activation checkpointing optimization [5, 6] will conduct FWD computation between two checkpoints during BWD. In this way, if the HOLD states generated by FWD and BWD are not distinguished, we cannot know whether all the tensors in the chunk have finished BWD.

For BWD, the inputs of a BWD operator are activations and param fp16 tensors of the current operator, and the outputs are the gradient of activations and grad fp16 tensors. Figure 6 shows how to reuse param fp16 chunk for grad fp16 tensors. The operator accesses the param fp16 tensors before computation, and their states become COMPUTE again. During the operator BWD computing, generated grad fp16 tensors are allocated on temporary memory space. After the computing is completed, since param fp16 is no longer needed, we copy the grad fp16 data from the temporary memory space to the memory space of the corresponding param fp16 tensors and change the tensor state to HOLD_AFTER_BWD.




Figure 6: Reusing param fp16 chunk with grad fp16. Operator computes on param 5 and 6. P is param and G is grad.

Before ADAM computing, OS tensors (param fp32, momentum, and variance) are set to COMPUTE. During computing, grad fp16 chunks are converted to fp32 on the fly to save memory. After computing, the updated param fp32 tensors and used OS tensors are set to HOLD. When all tensors in a param fp32 chunk are in HOLD state, param fp32 chunks are copied into the corresponding param fp16 chunk.




Figure 7: The state transition diagram of a param fp16 tensor.

Figure 7 shows the state transition of a param fp16 tensor during training. The implementation of PatrickStar is agnostic to PyTorch users. PatrickStar uses the hook mechanism to hijack the access of PyTorch tensors. Before an operator is executed, the data or grad tensor of the PyTorch parameter is pointed to the memory piece in

the chunk of PatrickStar. After the operator is finished, the payloads of PyTorch tensors are pointed to dummy data. In this way, PyTorch does not manage the real payload.

7 SCALING TO MULTIPLE GPUS

PatrickStar uses multi-process to perform data parallelization among multiple GPUs [20]. We assume the number of processes is $nproc$. Each process is in charge of a single GPU, while all the processes share the CPU. The heterogeneous memory space of a process consists of the entire memory of a GPU and $1/nproc$ of CPU memory space. The process manages the $1/nproc$ of the total chunks located in its local heterogeneous memory space in a fashion the same as the Zero Redundancy Optimizer [24]. The chunk in the local space is named **local chunk**, and the chunk not in local space is **remote chunk**. As shown in Figure 8, a **communication group** is composed of $nproc$ continuous chunks of a chunk list, where each chunk belongs to a different process. Owing to the chunk tensor mapping schema in Section 6.1, we can design a communication scheme for data parallelism with the minimal inter-process communication volume. The processes only need to communicate the param fp16 and grad fp16 during the FWD and BWD stages. The ADAM stage, which requires the largest amount of data (including momentum, variance, param fp32 and grad fp16), is executed locally.




Figure 8: Distributing chunks in a three GPU training task.




Figure 9: Communication pattern for fetching remote chunks in before FWD computing of Layer 0.

In short, before FWD or BWD operator computing, a process needs to fetch the required tensors belonging to remote chunks from the other processes via GPU-GPU communication; After FWD or BWD operator finished computing, we release remote chunks. We add additional logic for data parallelism in Algorithm 1 (line 4) and Algorithm 2 (line 5).

ALGORITHM 3: Remote Chunks Fetching

```
1 Function FetchRemoteChunks(chunk_id, comp_dev)
2   Require: Chunks(a vector of chunks);
3   comm_grp_ids = get_comm_grp(chunk_id);
4   local_chunk_id = comm_grp_ids[get_local_rank()];
5   for id in comm_grp_ids do
6     if any tensor in Chunks[id] is not FREE then
7       return;
8     end
9   end
10  chunk_list = list[];
11  for id in comm_grp_ids do
12    prepare payload on comp_dev for Chunks[id] and
    its all tensors are set to HOLD;
13    pin Chunks[id] on comp_dev and shall not be
    moved to other devices;
14    chunk_list.append(Chunks[id]);
15  end
16  ALLGATHER(chunk_list, Chunks[local_chunk_id]);
17  for id in comm_grp_ids do
18    unpin Chunks[id] from comm_grp_ids;
19  end
20 end
```

Algorithm 3 shows how we fetch remote chunks during tensor access. When accessing a param fp16 tensor that is the first visited tensor among the tensors of its the chunk communication group, (this will happen iff there is a state FREE tensor in the communication group, as shown in Line 6), the communication group triggers an all-gather operation to collect remote chunks of the group to local compute device. Figure 9 shows a snapshot when an operator before the operator FWD computing on the layer 0 of a deep DNN on 3 GPUs. The dashed box is the remote chunk and the solid box is the local chunk. In this example, Proc #0 possesses chunk 0 in its own heterogeneous memory space which consists with param fp16 of layer 0-3, while Proc #1 and Proc # possesses chunk 1 and chunk 2 respectively. And the communication group consists of these 3 chunks. Before FWD computing of layer 0, each process would find a tensor of state FREE in the communication group. Therefore, they will use all-gather to fetch remote chunks. The green arrow in the figure indicates the direction of data transfer. After collecting remote chunks, all processes will have their own copy of chunk 1 to chunk 3 and all tensor states in the remote chunk are set to HOLD. The memory accessing before BWD is the same as the FWD: when the first tensor in a chunk communication group is accessed, this time starting from the last layer, all-gather is triggered to fetch the remote chunks.

As shown in Algorithm 4, when the states of all tensors in a communication group are all HOLD_AFTER_FWD/BWD after FWD/BWD operator finished computing, the tensors in the remote chunk are set to FREE, and the remote chunk is released. During FWD, we pass *training_stage* as FWD and *is_allreduce* as False to the function, while during BWD, we pass *training_stage* as BWD and *is_allreduce* as True to the function to average the fp16 tensors

ALGORITHM 4: Gradient Averaging and Remote Chunk Releasing

```
1 Function ReleaseRemoteChunk(chunk_id, training_stage,
   status, is_allreduce)
2   Require: Chunks(a vector of chunks);
3   comm_grp_ids = get_comm_grp(chunk_id);
4   local_chunk_id = comm_grp_ids[get_local_rank()];
5   for id in comm_grp_ids do
6     if training_stage is FWD and not all tensor in
       Chunks[id] is HOLD_AFTER_FWD then
7       return;
8     end
9     if training_stage is BWD and not all tensor in
       Chunks[id] is HOLD_AFTER_BWD then
10      return;
11    end
12  end
13  if is_allreduce then
14    chunk_list = [];
15    for id in comm_grp_ids do
16      prepare Chunks[id] on comp_dev;
17      pin Chunks[id] on comp_dev;
18      chunk_list append Chunks[id];
19    end
20    REDUCE_SCATTER(Chunks[local_chunk_id],
      chunk_list, AVG);
21    for id in comm_grp_ids do
22      unpin Chunks[id] from comp_dev;
23    end
24  end
25  for id in comm_grp_ids do
26    if i is not local_chunk_id then
27      release payload of Chunks[id] and set all
      tensors to FREE;
28    end
29  end
30 end
```

among processes: when all the tensor state of the communication group are set to be HOLD_AFTER_BWD, a reduce-scatter operation is triggered to get the averaged gradients of each local chunk if all_reduce as True. The reduce-scatter operation requires that all chunks be on the GPU.

PatrickStar obtains lower intra-GPU bandwidth requirements and higher bandwidth utilization compared to related work. According to the cost model [31], the bandwidth requirement of PatrickStar is $2(p-1)/p \times 2M$ (all-gathers) + $(p-1)/p \times 2M$ (reduce-scatter) = $6(p-1)/p \times M$, where p is parallel degree and M is number of parameters. In ZeRO-Offload [26] and ZeRO-DP [24], parameters of each layer are owned by a single process and are broadcast to the rest. Compared with all-gather, the broadcast concentrates data transmission on a single GPU and under-utilizes the aggregated bandwidth. The bandwidth requirement of broadcast-based

approaches is $4(p-1)/p \times 2M$ (broadcast) + $(p-1)/p \times 2M = 10(p-1)/p \times M$, which is increased by 2/3 compared with PatrickStar. Although, ZeRO-Infinity [25] also adopt the all-gather-based approach, PatrickStar still has a higher bandwidth utilization. It has been proven that the bucketization strategy [20], which arranges sequence tensor as a large block (bucket) to transfer, could results in higher bandwidth utilization, as it will transmitting more data each communication. The chunk-based method in PatrickStar is naturally bucketized, while the transmission unit of ZeRO-Infinity is tensor. PatrickStar further avoid the data copy overhead to enhance performance.

8 OPTIMIZATION

Compared with hosting the model data in GPU memory, heterogeneous training approaches introduce extra CPU-GPU data movement overhead. ZeRO-Offload [26] proposed that both FWD and BWD, mainly consisting of computing-intensive operators, have to be done on GPU, and ADAM consisting of memory-intensive operators has to be done on CPU. The communication volume between CPU and GPU is the total size of param fp16 and grad fp16 tensors. PatrickStar also regards GPU as the first choice for FWD and BWD execution and CPU as the first choice for ADAM. Optimizations to chunk-based memory management make it more efficient and powerful. First, It can layout operators in a fine-grained manner so that memory-intensive operators are not on their first choice devices, but it can reduce the amount of data movement and improve the system’s overall efficiency. A device-aware operator placement optimization (Section 8.2) is proposed for this purpose. Second, when data cannot permanently reside on their operator’s computing device, chunks are evicted if not in use. In addition to improving on the larger model scale, PatrickStar also minimize chunk eviction volume with a chunk eviction strategy (Section 8.3).

In order to achieve the above optimizations, we must have a good knowledge of during training how much GPU memory space on each device can be allocated to chunks, which is named as **chunkable memory** in this section. For this reason, PatrickStar provides method to collect chunkable memory statistics at runtime (Section 8.1).

8.1 Collecting Chunkable Memory Statistics

PatrickStar obtains the runtime statistics of chunkable GPU memory by measuring the amount of GPU non-model data during training. As mentioned in Section 2, the data generated in PTM training can be divided into model data and non-model data. Both of them share the GPU memory space. Therefore, chunkable memory can be figured out by subtracting the amount of non-model data from the overall GPU memory at a particular moment.

It is not feasible to get the footprint of non-model data via theoretical estimations. Even if the shape of each activation tensor is preciously available, Accumulation of all activations tensor sizes is not equal to realistic memory consumption because it does not measure GPU memory fragmentation and the CUDA context memory. Although there exists work to estimate memory consumption [9], they are coupled with the implementation of allocator and innovation activation checkpointing optimizations like checkpoint and offloading make it infeasible in actual cases.

In a warm-up training iteration, we depict the footprint of non-model data at runtime. Since the computing pattern is the same for different iterations, the non-model data GPU memory footprint statistics collected in a warm-up iteration also remain on other iterations. Figure 11 illustrates how we measure non-model data memory footprint in the warm-up iteration. At the time an operator starts and finishes, which is called as **moment** by us, PatrickStar obtains the real-time GPU memory consumption R . PatrickStar can accurately know the consumption of chunkable memory C since they are allocated by itself. The non-model data memory consumption is obtained by $R-C$. In the warm-up iteration, we also record a list of moments related to each chunk.

To avoid out of GPU memory during the warm-up iteration, we use GPU memory cautiously. During the FWD and BWD, when we detect that the GPU memory consumption exceeds a specific limit, for example, 80%, at the moment, chunks are evicted from the GPU to meet the limit. Note that, at this time, the eviction strategy is not derived. It simply evicts chunks in the order of the chunk list. After BWD finishing, because the non-model has be deleted, optimizations in Section 8.3 are executed to derive a smart chunk eviction strategy.

8.2 Device-aware Operator Placement

Operators of PTM training exhibit different computing and memory access characteristics. For example, the computing-intensive operator like the Linear has to be executed on GPU. Memory-intensive operators like embedding and the element-wise ones in ADAM can be executed on both CPU and GPU. The memory-intensive operators take up a small amount of overall training time. The intelligent layout of memory-intensive operators can improve end-to-end performance by reducing the volume of CPU-GPU memory movement, even if it slightly slows their computing speed.

Using the runtime chunkable memory statistics, PatrickStar designs a device-aware placement for optimizer states (OS). **GPU margin space** is the remaining space after removing peak non-model data from the overall GPU memory. We place as many OS chunks in the margin space as possible. This way, CPU-GPU communication volume during ADAM is reduced without introducing extra chunk eviction in FWD and BWD.

The embedding operators in FWD and BWD can be placed on the CPU to reduce communication volume. The parameter number of the embedding is $O(VH)$, V is vocabulary size, and H is hidden size. Since V is often very large, moves parameters between CPU and GPU is time-consuming. Executing embedding on the CPU, only the activations, whose parameter number is $O(BH)$, where B is batch size, are transferred between the CPU and GPU. Specially, embedding parameters are not managed by chunk.

8.3 Chunk Eviction Strategy

When a chunk is moved to a target device where free chunkable memory is not enough, a chunk in the HOLD-like state should be evicted from the target device. Designing an efficient eviction strategy and minimizing chunk movement is the key to improving the system’s overall performance. With the runtime chunkable memory statistics mentioned in Section 8.1, theoretically, the optimal chunk eviction strategy can be derived. A greedy algorithm is adopted




Figure 10: PatrickStar can handle situations where DeepSpeed is incompetent.




Figure 11: Measuring non-data footprint at runtime.

here, which evicts the chunk that is the latest to be needed next time on this computing device.

8.4 Comparison with DeepSpeed

As shown in Figure 10, PatrickStar is competent in two situations where DeepSpeed fails. In case of GPU is not enough (left figure), for DeepSpeed, when the overall size of param fp16 tensors and peak size of non-model data exceeds GPU memory, unsatisfied GPU memory crashes the system. With the help of the chunk eviction strategy, PatrickStar makes it work by evicting unsatisfied GPU to CPU efficiently. If CPU memory is not enough (right figure), unsatisfied CPU memory is generated in DeepSpeed. Then, the margin space on GPU can accommodate unsatisfied OS chunks to make the system work smoothly and efficiently.

8.5 Usability

PatrickStar is agnostic with the model definition, and adding a few lines of code on your PyTorch script can bring end-to-end speedup.

Listing 1: Example code of PatrickStar

```

1 from patrickstar.runtime import initialize_engine
2 def model_func():
3     return MyModel(...)
4 model, optimizer = initialize_engine(model_func=model_func,
5                                     config=config)
6 ...
7 for data in dataloader:
8     optimizer.zero_grad()
9     loss = model(data)
10    model.backward(loss)
11    optimizer.step()

```

9 EVALUATION

9.1 Evaluation Methodology

Testbed. We conduct our experiments on the cloud computing system call YARD used in WeChat AI, serving for over 300 researcher members in Tencent. We apply for a node configured with a 12-core CPU 240,000 MB memory and 8x V100 GPU.

Workloads. The same as related work, the PTM tasks used for evaluation are GPT-2 like transformer-based models. The number of parameters is varied by adjusting the hidden dimension and layer number as shown in Table 2. The head number is 16, and the sequence length is 1024 for all cases.

Table 2: Model Configuration

#params	#layer	hidden dim	#params	#layer	hidden dim
1,2 B	20,40	2048	6,8B	53, 72	3072
4B	64	2304	10B	50	4096
12B	60, 65	4096			

Baselines. We compare the PatrickStar with PyTorch Distributed-DataParallel (DDP) and the state-of-the-art (SOTA) reported heterogeneous training solution using DeepSpeed², it has integrated the latest heterogeneous training and model parallel optimizations of the work [24, 26, 29]. The running configuration of DeepSpeed is adopted from the official example³. We use the zero3 stage, indicating using ZeRO-Offload/Infinity optimization. For all the three software, we apply activation checkpointing optimization on them. We choose the best performance with and without activation CPU offloading for PatrickStar and DeepSpeed. Except that, we use the other activation optimization by default for the DeepSpeed. We update the parameters for each iteration of training, which is more practical in real scenarios.

9.2 Experimental Results

We first elaborate the performance of 3 systems on one GPU. Second, we analyze the performance and scalability when scaling to 8 GPUs. We conduct experiments with various batch sizes on each GPU, including 4, 8, 16, 32, 64.

²<https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed> v0.4.3

³https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeedExamples/blob/master/Megatron-LM-v1.1.5-ZeRO3/examples/ds_pretrain_gpt2-zero3.sh

9.2.1 Model Scale. Table 3 reported the model scale of three systems. To meet the energy efficiency requirements, our cluster requires each GPU achieves at least 60% of peak computing efficiency. The maximal model scale is defined as the maximal model size supported with throughput over 30 TFlops. DeepSpeed-MP indicates ZeRO-Offload/Infinity are combined with different MP degrees using Megatron-LM⁴. It requires customized code modification for model definition. Since we only want to measure the end-to-end speedup of using the API from List 8.5, we do not apply MP on PatrickStar, but they can be used together in future with some extra programming effort.

On a 1 GPU node, PatrickStar improves model scale of DeepSpeed-DP from 4B to 12B, **3x** improvement, and increases PyTorch DPP from 1B to 12B, **12x** improvement. PatrickStar can train a 12B model on a single GPU and keeps this record when scaling to multiple GPUs. When scaling to 8 GPUs, DeepSpeed can improve model size to 6B on 2 and 4 GPUs. However, it decreases the size back to 4B on 8 GPUs. Compared with DeepSpeed+MP, PatrickStar still improves scale from 8B to 12B. Some entries miss values because MP introduces more communication overhead and is unable to meet the efficiency bar. The phenomena is analyzed in Section 9.2.3.

Table 3: The max model scale of 3 systems. (DS=DeepSpeed, PS=PatrickStar)

# GPU	Torch	DS-DP	DS-2MP	DS-4MP	DS-8MP	PS
1	1B	4B	-	-	-	12B
2	1B	6B	8B	-	-	12B
4	1B	6B	8B	8B	-	12B
8	1B	4B	8B	8B	-	12B

We analyze the impacts of system design on maximal model scale. PyTorch can only train the model of which model data and non-model data must be in the GPU. When the model size is 2B, the data must in GPU reaches $2 \times 18 = 36$ GB and exceeds the 32 GB V100 GPU memory size. DeepSpeed can train the model for which overall param fp16 and peak non-model data must be in GPU. When the model size exceeds 4B on a single GPU, the unsatisfied GPU overflows. By partitioning the param fp16 among multiple GPUs, DeepSpeed increases the model scale to 6B on 2 and 4 GPUs. DeepSpeed fails to scale the 6B model on 8 GPU. We believe it is an implementation problem. It needs to store extra buffer on GPU proportional to the number of processes for collective communication, which brings greater memory pressure.

As analyzed in Section 8.4, even if the overall size of parameters fp16 and peak non-model data exceed the GPU memory size, PatrickStar still trains the model smoothly since it can smartly evict current not in use chunks to CPU memory. If the model data size and the maximum chunk size in COMPUTE state exceed the GPU memory limit, PatrickStar will not work. The peak memory consumption of PatrickStar is related to the chunk size, which does not change with the increase of GPU number. For this reason, the model scale remains the same on multiple GPUs.

9.2.2 Computing Efficiency On One GPU. Figure 12 shows the performance of three systems on one GPU. DeepSpeed and PyTorch




Figure 12: Training throughput of PyTorch, DeepSpeed and PatrickStar on one GPU.

fail in some cases, which are marked as OOM (Out of Memory). The efficiency of PatrickStar PyTorch is similar on the 1B model and higher than DeepSpeed. PatrickStar knows that both model data and non-model can be hosted in the GPU with the help of the memory profiling (Section 8.1) and the device-aware operator (Section 8.2) optimizations. PatrickStar achieves higher efficiency than DeepSpeed on these cases by avoiding CPU-GPU data transmission. Moreover, compared with DeepSpeed, PatrickStar is more efficient in all of 2B and 4B cases. PatrickStar puts OS data in the GPU as much as possible and leads to less CPU-GPU data transmission than DeepSpeed. For example, for 4B model training with a batch size of 16, 12 chunks out of 96 chunks are placed in GPU. As the batch size decreases, the efficiency of DeepSpeed decreases since the proportion of data transmission overhead becomes larger. This phenomenon also exists on PatrickStar using model larger than 1B.

When the model size is 6B, 8B, and 10B, PatrickStar achieves efficiency as 56, 40, and 44 TFlops. For the 12B model, PatrickStar still achieves 34 TFlops. The decrease in performance comes from the overhead of CPU-GPU data transmission because, at this time, param fp16 data cannot always be in the GPU and needs to be swapped in and out from GPU during FWD and BWD. Thanks to the chunk eviction strategy (Section 8.3), PatrickStar does not lead to severe performance degradation. The transmission overhead comes from the limited transmission bandwidth of PCI-E, which can be alleviated when scaling to multiple GPUs.

9.2.3 Computing Efficiency On Multiple GPUs. Figure 13 presents the performance of 3 systems on 1, 2, 4, 8 GPUs with DP only. The y-axis is re-scaled by logarithmic. The points represent the best results tested with batch sizes 4, 8, 16, 32 and 64 on one GPU. The value around the circle point indicates PatrickStar’s throughput in TFlops and its speedup to DeepSpeed.

PyTorch only works in the cases of the 1B model. PatrickStar is 1.37x faster than PyTorch on 8 GPUs and is similar to PyTorch in the 1,2,4 GPU cases. In 8 GPU cases, the maximum batch size of PyTorch is 4 while PatrickStar is 64, and small-batch size decreases the efficiency of hardware utilization. This indicates the fine-grained memory management of PatrickStar can avoid unnecessary CPU-GPU transmissions.

PatrickStar is superior to DeepSpeed in most cases (12 out of 14) and is the only solution to train model size between 8B and 12B with DP only. The improvement is pronounced (0.90x-1.49x), especially for small models. The reason is also that PatrickStar shrinks CPU-GPU data transmission volume. PatrickStar does not

⁴<https://github.com/NVIDIA/Megatron-LM>




Figure 13: Training throughput of PyTorch, DeepSpeed and PatrickStar using DP on multiple GPUs.

significant decrease computational efficiency when the scaling the model size. On 8 GPUs, the 377 Tflops performance on 12B model is 86% of 434 Tflops on 1B. This shows that PatrickStar is very robust on model scale with the help of efficient chunk orchestrating. Moreover, PatrickStar shows superlinear scalability when scaling GPU numbers as shown in Table 4. It is because the communication bandwidth of intra-GPU is higher than that of PCI-E. When the parallelism increases, CPU-GPU data movement is transferred to inter-GPU data movement. It proves that the chunk-based collective communication pattern proposed in Section 7 is very efficient.

Table 4: Scalability of PatrickStar. The entry contains speedups to their performance of 1 GPU.

gpu	1B	2B	4B	6B	8B	10B	12B
2	2.04	1.81	1.81	1.52	1.77	1.68	2.24
4	4.09	4.16	3.97	3.37	4.02	4.01	5.55
8	8.18	8.40	8.32	7.74	8.94	8.90	11.18




Figure 14: Training throughput of PatrickStar and DeepSpeed with different MP degrees using 8x V100 GPUs.

We also compared the PatrickStar with Model Parallel solutions. Figure 14 reports performance of DeepSpeed with 2-MP and 4-MP plan on 8 GPU cards. The batch size is the total batch size / GPU

number. PatrickStar achieves the largest model scale, 12B vs 8B, and the best performance efficiency on all of test cases. Except on 8B model, PatrickStar supports the largest batch size. DeepSpeed-DP fails on model larger than 4B and 1B-4B model with batch size larger than 32. With the help of MP, DeepSpeed extends model scale to 8B. However, MP introduces more communication overhead, the performance is significant lower than PatrickStar and DeepSpeed-DP. Therefore, most of DeepSpeed MP results (less than 30 TFlops per GPU) are not feasible in real industrial scenarios.

9.2.4 Lower hardware requirements. To test PatrickStar’s ability to reduce hardware requirements, we extend experiments by lower the CPU memory of the testbed from 240 GB to 120 GB. On 8 GPUs, as shown in Figure 15, PatrickStar succeeds in training the 8B model in 48.78 Tflops while DeepSpeed with MP only scales to the 4B model in 32.32 Tflops.




Figure 15: Training throughput on various model scale of DeepSpeed and PatrickStar on 120 GB memory CPU using 8 V100 GPUs. (ds=DeepSpeed)

PatrickStar is deployed on a self-purchased personal computer worth 700\$ equipped with an AMD Ryzen 7 3700X (16GB CPU DRAM) and a GeForce RTX 2060 (8GB GPU memory). It successfully trains a 0.7B GPT-like model and achieves 18.46 Tflops. Both PyTorch and DeepSpeed scale maximal model size to 0.11B base Bert and achieves 21.02 Tflops and 18.92 Tflops performance, respectively.

The above two evaluations show that PatrickStar can significantly reduce the hardware requirements and make PTM accessible to more people in the AI community.

10 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We proposed an innovative heterogeneous training system called PatrickStar. It organizes model data into chunks, therefore orchestrates them more flexibly in heterogeneous memory space. The system is symbiotic with the Zero Redundancy Optimizer data parallel. PatrickStar successfully lowers the hardware requirements for PTM training and scales to multiple GPUs more efficiently. On an 8xGPU 240 GB CPU node in cloud computing platform, it improves 2x on the maximal model scale to SOTA and is faster than SOTA.

Some future work can be investigated on PatrickStar. First, a better the chunk eviction method can be derived by co-optimizing with strategies of non-model data checkpoint and offloading. Second, the chunk-based heterogeneous approach can be combined with other parallel training approaches for multi-node scaling.

REFERENCES

- [1] Olivier Beaumont, Lionel Eyraud-Dubois, and Alena Shilova. 2020. Optimal GPU-CPU Offloading Strategies for Deep Neural Network Training. In *European Conference on Parallel Processing*. Springer, 151–166.
- [2] Olivier Beaumont, Lionel Eyraud-Dubois, and Alena Shilova. 2021. Efficient Combination of Rematerialization and Offloading for Training DNNs. In *NeurIPS 2021 Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [3] Zhengda Bian, Qifan Xu, Boxiang Wang, and Yang You. 2021. Maximizing Parallelism in Distributed Training for Huge Neural Networks. *arXiv:2105.14450* [cs.DC]
- [4] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165* (2020).
- [5] Y Bulatov. 2018. Fitting larger networks into memory.
- [6] Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174* (2016).
- [7] Jeffrey Dean, Greg S Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Quoc V Le, Mark Z Mao, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, et al. 2012. Large scale distributed deep networks. (2012).
- [8] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [9] Yanjie Gao, Yu Liu, Hongyu Zhang, Zhengxian Li, Yonghao Zhu, Haoxiang Lin, and Mao Yang. 2020. Estimating gpu memory consumption of deep learning models. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 1342–1352.
- [10] Audrunas Gruslys, Rémi Munos, Ivo Danihelka, Marc Lanctot, and Alex Graves. 2016. Memory-efficient backpropagation through time. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 29 (2016), 4125–4133.
- [11] Julien Herrmann, Olivier Beaumont, Lionel Eyraud-Dubois, Julien Hermann, Alexis Joly, and Alena Shilova. 2019. Optimal checkpointing for heterogeneous chains: how to train deep neural networks with limited memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.13214* (2019).
- [12] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, et al. 2019. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019), 103–112.
- [13] Paras Jain, Ajay Jain, Aniruddha Nrusimha, Amir Gholami, Pieter Abbeel, Kurt Keutzer, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E Gonzalez. 2019. Checkmate: Breaking the memory wall with optimal tensor rematerialization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02653* (2019).
- [14] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [15] Shenggui Li, Fuzhao Xue, Yongbin Li, and Yang You. 2021. Sequence Parallelism: Making 4D Parallelism Possible. *arXiv:2105.13120* [cs.LG]
- [16] Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Shiyuan Guo, Danyang Zhuo, Hao Zhang, Dawn Song, and Ion Stoica. 2021. TeraPipe: Token-Level Pipeline Parallelism for Training Large-Scale Language Models. *arXiv:2102.07988* [cs.LG]
- [17] Microsoft. 2020. DeepSpeed: Extreme-scale model training for everyone. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/deepspeed-extreme-scale-model-training-for-everyone/>. [Online; accessed July-2021].
- [18] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R Devanur, Gregory R Ganger, Phillip B Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. PipeDream: generalized pipeline parallelism for DNN training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 1–15.
- [19] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. 2017. Automatic differentiation in pytorch. (2017).
- [20] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 8026–8037.
- [21] Xuan Peng, Xuanhua Shi, Hulin Dai, Hai Jin, Weiliang Ma, Qian Xiong, Fan Yang, and Xuehai Qian. 2020. Capuchin: Tensor-based gpu memory management for deep learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 891–905.
- [22] Bharadwaj Pudipeddi, Maral Mesmakhosroshahi, Jinwen Xi, and Sujeeth Bharadwaj. 2020. Training large neural networks with constant memory using a new execution algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05645* (2020).
- [23] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [24] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE, 1–16.
- [25] Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, Jeff Rasley, Shaden Smith, and Yuxiong He. 2021. ZeRO-Infinity: Breaking the GPU Memory Wall for Extreme Scale Deep Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07857* (2021).
- [26] Jie Ren, Samyam Rajbhandari, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Shuangyan Yang, Minjia Zhang, Dong Li, and Yuxiong He. 2021. ZeRO-Offload: Democratizing Billion-Scale Model Training. In *2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 21)*. USENIX Association, 551–564. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc21/presentation/ren-jie>
- [27] Minsoo Rhu, Natalia Gimelshein, Jason Clemons, Arslan Zulfiqar, and Stephen W Keckler. 2016. vDNN: Virtualized deep neural networks for scalable, memory-efficient neural network design. In *2016 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 1–13.
- [28] Noam Shazeer, Youlong Cheng, Niki Parmar, Dustin Tran, Ashish Vaswani, Penporn Koanantakool, Peter Hawkins, HyoukJoong Lee, Mingsheng Hong, Cliff Young, et al. 2018. Mesh-tensorflow: Deep learning for supercomputers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.02084* (2018).
- [29] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2019. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053* (2019).
- [30] SB Shriram, Anshuj Garg, and Purushottam Kulkarni. 2019. Dynamic memory management for gpu-based training of deep neural networks. In *2019 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*. IEEE, 200–209.
- [31] Rajeev Thakur, Rolf Rabenseifner, and William Gropp. 2005. Optimization of collective communication operations in MPICH. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications* 19, 1 (2005), 49–66.
- [32] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 5998–6008.
- [33] Boxiang Wang, Qifan Xu, Zhengda Bian, and Yang You. 2021. 2.5-dimensional distributed model training. *arXiv:2105.14500* [cs.DC]
- [34] Qifan Xu, Shenggui Li, Chaoyu Gong, and Yang You. 2021. An Efficient 2D Method for Training Super-Large Deep Learning Models. *arXiv:2104.05343* [cs.LG]