

CS 521: Topics in PL

Probabilistic &

Approximate


Computing

<http://misailo.web.engr.illinois.edu/courses/cs521>


Medium quality,
Medium cost





High quality,
High cost



Low quality,
Low cost







Original
Computation

Accuracy
Requirement

Accuracy-Aware Optimization

- **Find** an approximate program
- **Various** automatic or user-guided approaches

Optimized Computation +





Safari:

ACCURACY ~ CORRECTNESS

Precision

Repeatability or fineness of control





Less Precise


More Precise

Accuracy

Difference from the correct value



More Accurate





Less Accurate

Less Precise

More Precise

Reality

We often do not have the full picture



More Accurate



Less Accurate

Less Precise

More Precise

Reality

We often do not have the full picture

x
x x
x x

x x
x x

More Accurate?

x
x x
x

x x
x x



Less Accurate?

Less Precise?

More Precise?

Reality

We often do not have the full picture
(but decide on proxy references)



≈ **More Accurate**



≈ **Less Accurate**

≈ **Less Precise**

≈ **More Precise**



Reliability

Probability that a system has been functioning correctly, continuously over the time interval $[0, t]$

Conventionally denoted by the function $R(t)$

Sometimes we implicitly use without t , meaning that reliability is over the period of operation

Another Thought Experiment




R 99
G 186
B 237

What if we change magnitude of the pixel?

What if we change frequency of the pixel (sometimes it's just black)?

Function's and Program's Accuracy


Magnitude of Noise



Difference *d* between the exact and approximate pixel values that interpolation kernel produces (for all color components)

Function's and Program's Accuracy

Frequency of Noise



Probability p with which interpolation kernel produces the correct pixel

We observe

Small Errors

Most of the Time

Accuracy Requirement

Specify Metric and Threshold



- **Each application has its own**
- Requires domain problem expertise
- For visual data, historically PSNR has often been used (with all its imperfections)
- But one can think of other better perceptory metrics

More details on the roles of metrics:
Karpuzcu et al., On Quantification of Accuracy Loss
in Approximate Computing, WDDD 2015.

Definition [\[edit\]](#)

PSNR is most easily defined via the [mean squared error](#) (*MSE*). Given a noise-free $m \times n$ monochrome image I and its noisy approximation K , *MSE* is defined as:

$$MSE = \frac{1}{m n} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} [I(i, j) - K(i, j)]^2$$


The PSNR (in [dB](#)) is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} PSNR &= 10 \cdot \log_{10} \left(\frac{MAX_I^2}{MSE} \right) \\ &= 20 \cdot \log_{10} \left(\frac{MAX_I}{\sqrt{MSE}} \right) \\ &= 20 \cdot \log_{10}(MAX_I) - 10 \cdot \log_{10}(MSE) \end{aligned}$$

Here, MAX_I is the maximum possible pixel value of the image. When the pixels are represented using 8 bits per sample, this is 255. More generally, when samples are represented using linear [PCM](#) with B bits per sample, MAX_I is $2^B - 1$.

Accuracy Requirement

Specify Metric and Threshold



Accuracy Specifications

End-to-end: program output


- You can compare outputs only at the end of the run
- Often better understood for representative domains

Kernel-level: each function has its specification

- Fine-grained control + checking of intermediate results
- Often ad-hoc or not intuitive
- While in general can lead to composition, hard to propagate all errors

Accuracy Requirement

Specify Metric and Threshold



Analytic Derivation


Use properties of the algorithm and implementation

Local Specification: Kernel computes the pixel with reliability r

Global Specification: PSNR of the image

Computation Pattern: Data parallel loop

$$PSNR(D, D') = 20 \cdot \log(255) - 10 \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{h \cdot w} \sum_{i,j} (D_{ij} - D'_{ij})^2 \right)$$

$$r \cdot 0 + (1 - r) \cdot 255$$


Analytic Derivation

Use properties of the algorithm and implementation

Local Specification:	Pixel kernel reliability <i>r</i>
Global Specification:	PSNR of the image
Computation Pattern:	Data parallel loop

$$\mathbb{E}[PSNR(D, D')] \geq -10 \cdot \log(1 - r)$$



Original



Perforated



Original



Perforated

**Any pixel
difference**



Original



Perforated

**> 1% pixel
difference**



Original



Perforated

**> 5% pixel
difference**

x264 Motion Estimation

Reference Frame



Current Frame



x264 Block Matching

```
score = 0;

for (i = 0; i < block_height; i++) {
    for (j = 0; j < block_width; j++) {

        idx1 = IDX(i, j, cur_start);
        idx2 = IDX(i, j, prev_start);
        diff = cur_frame[idx1] - prev_frame[idx2];
        adif = abs(diff);
        score = score + adif;

    }
}

return score;
```

x264 Block Matching

```
score = 0;

for (i = 0; i < block_height; i+=2) {
    for (j = 0; j < block_width; j+=2) {

        idx1 = IDX(i, j, cur_start);
        idx2 = IDX(i, j, prev_start);
        diff = cur_frame[idx1] - prev_frame[idx2];
        adif = abs(diff);
        score = score + adif;

    }
}

return score;
```

x264 Block Matching

```
score = 0;

for (i = 0; i < block_height; i+=2) {
    for (j = 0; j < block_width; j+=2) {


        idx1 = IDX(i, j, cur_start);
        idx2 = IDX(i, j, prev_start);
        diff = cur_frame[idx1] - prev_frame[idx2];
        adif = abs(diff);
        score = score + adif;

    }
}

return score * 4;
```

Absolute Error of Perforation

With Bias Compensation



Most of the time errors of individual approximation computations are small!

Several Patterns Amenable to Approximation

- Map
- Reduce (sum, average, min, max, median)
- Stencil
- Scatter/Gather
- Iterative refinement loop
- ...

Original ✓
Computation

Accuracy ✓
Requirement


Accuracy-Aware Optimization

- **Find** an approximate program
- **Apply** transformations that change semantics

Optimized Computation +



Tradeoffs



Key Intuition

Original Program Execution


Transformations induce a space of approximate executions

Many of these executions will be similar to the original execution

Sometimes, we can enforce that approximate programs must always execute near the original.

It can help the analysis, but is not necessary.

We want their final **results to be similar** (i.e., low accuracy loss)
Ideally, we want the execution that **runs the fastest**



General Optimization Problem

Select Program Configuration $X \in \text{Configs}$ to

maximize $(\text{Speedup}(X, i), \text{Accuracy}(X, i))$
forall $i \in \text{InputSet}$

But these are most often competing objectives.

Rephrase: for every accuracy loss threshold δ

maximize $\text{Speedup}(X, i)$
subject to $\text{AccuracyLoss}(X, i) \leq \delta$
forall $i \in \text{InputSet}$

Multiobjective Optimization

Functions to optimize are called **objectives**

- Accuracy Loss – lower is better (or accuracy – higher is better)
- Speedup – higher is better (or normalized time – lower is better)
- Energy saving – higher is better (or consumption – lower is better)

They are the functions of program configuration – setting of knobs


Two candidate program configurations X and Y:

- X **Pareto dominates** Y if X is as good as Y in all objectives, and is better in at least one objective


Pareto frontier: the set of points that are not dominated by other points

We will come back and formalize these notions later in the course!

Example



Example



Example



Example




Example




Example




Example




Example



Pareto Fronts (aka Tradeoff curves)



Spread of Solutions:



Often to have a useful set of points, a developer would like to have points spread across the entire space, not located only at the corners


Original ✓
Computation

Accuracy ✓
Requirement

Accuracy-Aware Optimization

- **Find** an approximate program
- **Apply** transformations that change semantics

Optimized Computation +



Safari:

SOFTWARE TRANSFORMATIONS

Transformations

Dimensions of impact:

- **Reducing computation**
- **Reducing data**
- **Reducing communication/synchronization**

Floating Point Optimizations

```
double[] x, y  
double z = f(x,y)
```



```
float[] x, y  
float z = f(x,y)
```


$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{\text{Original program time}}{\text{Approximate program time}}$$

Table 2: Speedup observed after precision tuning

Program	Error Threshold			
	10^{-10}	10^{-8}	10^{-6}	10^{-4}
arclength	41.7%	41.7%	11.0%	33.3%
simpsons	13.7%	7.1%	37.1%	37.1%
bessel	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
gaussian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
roots	6.8%	6.8%	4.5%	7.0%
polyroots	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
rootnewt	0.5%	1.2%	4.5%	0.4%
sum	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%
fft	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	13.1%
blas	0.0%	0.0%	24.7%	24.7%
ep	-	33.2%	32.3%	32.8%
cg	4.6%	2.3%	0.0%	15.9%

Loop Perforation


```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```



```
for (i = 0; i < n; i += 2) { ... }
```

Loop Perforation


```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```



```
for (i = 0; i < n/2; i++) { ... }
```

Loop Perforation


```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```




```
for (i = 0; i < n/2; i++) { ... }
```

Loop Perforation


```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```




```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    if (rand(0.5)) continue;  
}
```




1: x264 (exhaustive)




2: Bodytrack (exhaustive)




3: Swaptions (exhaustive)



4: Ferret (exhaustive)



5: Canneal (exhaustive)



6: Streamcluster (exhaustive)


Reduction Sampling

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    y = f( x[i] );  
    s = s + y;  
}
```



```
for (i = 0, z = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    if (rand(0.75)) {z++; continue;}  
    y = f( x[i] );  
    s = s + y;  
}  
s = s * n / (n - z);
```

Tradeoff curve for the main component of Bodytrack



Approximate Memoization

```
InType[] x; OutType[] y;  
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { y[i] = f(x[i]); }
```



```
var table = new Map<InType, OutType>;  
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    if  $\exists x', v . x' \in [x[i] - \epsilon, x[i] + \epsilon] \ \&\& \ (x', v) \in \text{table}$   
        y[i] = v;  
    else {  
        y[i] = f(x[i]);  
        table[x[i]] = y[i];  
    }  
}
```

Approximate Tiling

```
InType[] x; OutType[] y;  
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { y[i] = f(x[i]); }
```




```
InType prev;  
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
    if (i%2 == 1)  
        y[i] = prev;  
    else {  
        y[i] = f(x[i]);  
        prev = y[i];  
    }  
}
```

Chaudhuri et al. Proving Programs Robust, FSE '11

Samadi et al., Paraprox Pattern-Based Approximation for Data Parallel Applications, ASPLOS'14

Image Perforation: Automatically Accelerating Image Pipelines by Intelligently Skipping Samples, SIGGRAPH'16

Figure 15: The impact of approximate memoization on four functions on a GPU. Two schemes are used to handle inputs that do not map to precomputed outputs: *nearest* and *linear*. *Nearest* chooses the nearest value in the lookup table to approximate the output. *Linear* uses linear approximation between the two nearest values in the table. For all four functions, *nearest* provides better speedups than *linear* at the cost of greater quality loss.






Figure 1. Execution time breakdown of all PARSEC 3.0 benchmarks that LLVM could compile. The AVG column presents the average breakdown across all benchmarks. The AVG (eval.) column presents the average breakdown across the benchmarks we consider in the remainder of this study (which exclude bodytrack, freqmine, and canneal, which have almost no pure or extended pure functions). Pure functions cover a small fraction of the total execution time, while extended pure functions achieve significantly higher coverage.

Tziantzioulis et al., Temporal Approximate Function Memoization (IEEE Micro Magazine 2017)





Figure 4: TAF-Memo distortion versus relative runtime. TAF-Memo achieves significant speedups with small distortion for most applications.

Fig. 8. Image perforation and loop perforation results for four image pipelines from top to bottom: **bilateral filter**, **bilateral grid**, **blur**, **demosaic**, **median** and **unsharp mask**. Each row compares optimized pipelines computed using each method for similar speedup factors. Please consult the supplemental document for extensive comparisons for each of these pipelines. Note that one can zoom in to see the Bayer mosaic pattern for the demosaic input. From top to bottom row, credits: © Charles Roffey, Trey Ratcliff, Neal Fowler, Eric Wehmeyer, Duncan Harris, Sandy Glass.



Function Substitution

$$y = f(x);$$



$$y = f'(x);$$

Version	TimeSpec	ErrorSpec
$f(x)$	Time1	Err1
$f'(x)$	Time2	Err2

For instance, polynomial approximation of transcendental functions:

$$\sin(x) \approx x - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} - \dots \text{ for } x \text{ near } 0$$

$$R(x) \leq |x|^{n+1} / (n + 1)!$$

Function Substitution


$$y = f(x);$$



$$y = f'(x);$$

Version	TimeSpec	ErrorSpec
$f(x)$	Time1	Err1
$f'(x)$	Time2	Err2

Neural Network:



Esmailzadeh et al., Neural Acceleration for
General-Purpose Approximate Programs, MICRO '12





Figure 6: Cumulative distribution function (CDF) plot of the applications' output error. A point (x, y) indicates that y fraction of the output elements see error less than or equal to x .

The Parrot transformation degrades each application's average output quality by less than 10%, a rate commensurate with other approximate computing techniques.

Dynamic Function Substitution

$y = f(x);$




Version	TimeSpec	ErrorSpec
$f(x)$	Time1	Err1
$f'(x)$	Time2	Err2

$y = \text{runtime.executeApprox}()?$
 $f'(x): f(x);$

- Baek et al., Green: A Framework for Supporting Energy-Conscious Programming using Controlled Approximation, PLDI 2010
- Hoffmann et al., Dynamic Knobs for Efficient Power Aware Computing, APSLOS 2011
- Mitra et al., Phase-aware Approximation in Approximate Computing CGO 2017


Dynamic Approximation

swaptions



During the power cap, we either restart or suffer through poor performance.

Dynamic Approximation



Skipping Tasks *(at Barrier Points)*

```
task {      task {      task {      task {      task {      task {  
  x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...  
  y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...  
}           }           }           }           }           }
```

Continue execution after all tasks finish



```
task {      task {      task {      task {      task {      task {  
  x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...   x = ...  
  y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...   y = ...  
}           }           }           }           }           }
```

**Continue execution after all tasks finish *before timeout*,
Otherwise kill delayed or non-responsive tasks**

Removing Synchronization

```
lock();  
x = f(x,y);  
y = g(x,y);  
unlock();
```

```
lock();  
x = f(x,y);  
y = g(x,y);  
unlock();
```



```
lock();  
x = f(x,y);  
y = g(x,y);  
unlock();
```

```
lock();  
x = f(x,y);  
y = g(x,y);  
unlock();
```

Transformation	Speedup (max 8)	Relative Speedup	Accuracy Loss
Original	6.21	1.00	0.000 \pm 0.000
BarrierInterf	6.34	1.02	0.027 \pm 0.082
BarrierPoteng	6.48	1.04	0.035 \pm 0.032
LockForces	6.34	1.02	0.004 \pm 0.001

Table 1. Empirical Results for Individual Transformations

Transformation	Speedup (max 8)	Relative Speedup	Accuracy Loss
Original	6.21	1.00	0.000 \pm 0.000
BarrierInterf + LockForces	6.44	1.03	0.027 \pm 0.044
BarrierPoteng + LockForces	6.79	1.09	0.042 \pm 0.033
BarrierInterf + BarrierPoteng	7.10	1.14	0.053 \pm 0.063
All Three	7.44	1.20	0.051 \pm 0.070

Table 2. Empirical Results for Combinations of Transformations

Transformations

Dimensions of impact:

- **Reducing computation**
(perforation, memoization, tiling, function substitution)
- **Reducing data**
(floating point optimizations)
- **Reducing communication/synchronization**
(skipping tasks and lock elision)

Some Key Characteristics:

- **Approximate Kernel Computations**
(have specific structure + functionality)
- **Accuracy vs Performance Knob**
(tune how aggressively to approximate kernel)
- **Magnitude and Frequency of Errors**
(kernels rarely exhibit large output deviations)

Applying Transformations

Selecting **where in the code** to approximate

- **Programmer-guided:** programmer writes annotations
- **Automatic:** system identifies the code and tunes the approximation
- **Combined:** programmer writes some annotations, system infers the rest
- **Interactive:** system identifies the code and presents the results to the developer who accepts/rejects

Applying Transformations

Choosing **the time to do** the approximation:

- Off-line: before execution starts
- On-line: during execution
- Combined: improve off-line models with on-line data

We will discuss the algorithms and systems that help with approximating programs in detail!

(a) Data Structure Optimization

```
double[] x, y;
double z = f(x,y)
```



```
float[] x, y;
float z = f(x,y)
```

(b) Loop Perforation

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```



```
for (i = 0; i < n; i += 2) { ... }
```

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) { ... }
```



```
for (i = 0; i < n/2; i++) { ... }
```

(c) Reduction Sampling

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
  y = f( x[i] );
  s = s + y;
}
```



```
for (i = 0, z = 0; i < n; i++) {
  if (rand(0.75)) {z++; continue;}
  y = f( x[i] );
  s = s + y;
}
s = s * n/(n-z);
```

(d) Approximate Tiling

```
InputType[] x; OutType[] y;
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
  y[i] = f(x[i]);
}
```



```
InputType prev;
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
  if (i%2 == 1) y[i] = prev;
  else {
    y[i] = f(x[i]);
    prev = y[i];
  }
}
```

(e) Function Substitution

```
y = f(x);
```



```
y = f'(x);
```

Each approximate version has its time and error specifications:


Version	TimeSpec	ErrorSpec
f(x)	T1	Err1
f'(x)	T2	Err2

For instance, polynomial approximation of transcendental functions:

$$\sin(x) \approx x - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} - \dots \text{ for } x \text{ near } 0$$

$$Err(x) \leq |x|^{n+1} / (n + 1)!$$

Another example: replace the function with a neural network



(f) Dropping Tasks

```
task 1 { task 2 { task 3 { task 4 {
  x = recv() x = recv() x = recv() x = recv()
  send(f(x)) send(f(x)) send(f(x)) send(f(x))
}
```

Master task: send inputs and receive outputs from 1...4



```
task { task { task { task {
  x = recv() x = recv() x = recv() x = recv()
  send(f(x)) send(f(x)) send(f(x)) y = send(f(x))
}
```

Master task: send inputs and receive outputs from 1...4 before timeout. Otherwise kill delayed or non-responsive tasks

(g) Remove Locks

```
lock(); lock();
x = f(x,y); x = f(x,y);
y = g(x,y); y = g(x,y);
unlock(); unlock();
```



```
lock(); lock();
x = f(x,y); x = f(x,y);
y = g(x,y); y = g(x,y);
unlock(); unlock();
```

Data races are possible after the transformation