arXiv:2208.11552v1 [cs.SE] 24 Aug 2022

CheapET-3: Cost-Efficient Use of Remote DNN Models

Michael Weiss
michael.weiss@usi.ch
Università della Svizzera italiana
Lugano, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

On complex problems, state of the art prediction accuracy of Deep Neural Networks (DNN) can be achieved using very large-scale models, consisting of billions of parameters. Such models can only be run on dedicated servers, typically provided by a 3rd party service, which leads to a substantial monetary cost for every prediction. We propose a new software architecture for client-side applications, where a small local DNN is used alongside a remote large-scale model, aiming to make easy predictions locally at negligible monetary cost, while still leveraging the benefits of a large model for challenging inputs. In a proof of concept we reduce prediction cost by up to 50% without negatively impacting system accuracy.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software and its engineering → Designing software**.

KEYWORDS

neural networks, software architecture, network supervision

ACM Reference Format:
Michael Weiss. 2022. CheapET-3: Cost-Efficient Use of Remote DNN Models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (ESEC/FSE '22), November 14–18, 2022, Singapore, Singapore.* ACM, New York, NY, USA, 3 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3559082

1 INTRODUCTION

Advances in machine learning showed a clear trend towards building ever larger Deep Neural Networks (DNNs): AlexNet [9], the highly influential imagenet model released in 2012 set a milestone, with its then considered huge scale 60M parameters. Now, some models exceed even the trillion parameter threshold [2]. Such huge models cannot be executed on resource constrained devices and environments such as microprocessors, mobile devices or in web browsers, but are instead hosted in server centers with specialized hardware, causing substantial financial cost. E.g., a single request to the popular GPT-3 models [1] is billed up to $0.48[1].

In this research abstract, we present a software architecture designed to reduce the monetary costs of using large-scale DNNs.

[1] 4000 tokens on a fine-tuned davinci-model (0.12$ per 1000 tokens) in July 2022. See beta.openai.com.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
ESEC/FSE '22, November 14–18, 2022, Singapore, Singapore
© 2022 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9413-0/22/11…$15.00
https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3559082




Figure 1: Proposed Architecture

We show a proof of concept (POC) of our approach using the the Imdb sentiment classification benchmark [10], with 25'000 training samples and 2000 randomly chosen test samples, where we achieve a similar prediction performance to using pure GPT-3 predictions at only half the prediction cost.

2 PROPOSED ARCHITECTURE

Our proposed architecture is shown in Figure 1: Instead of directly passing every input to the remote DNN, each input is first given to a small-scale and less accurate local *surrogate* model, s.t. *easy, low uncertainty* predictions are made locally at negligible cost.

A supervisor [3, 5–7, 13, 15, 17, 20] is employed to detect inputs for which local predictions are confident enough to be trusted. Untrusted predictions are forwarded to the large-scale remote model for a more reliable prediction. Both local model and supervisor should be designed or chosen to account for the resource constraints: Local models can e.g. use a compressed input space (e.g. small vocabulary sizes in NLP problems) and a reduced number of layers. For supervision, a wide range of techniques exist, which we compared in our previous work [15–19]. We identified simple softmax-based supervisors, such as Vanilla Softmax (SM) [4] (for classification problems) and Mahalanobis-distance based Surprise




Figure 2: Performance of our architecture (nominal data, SM supervisor)

Adequacy (MDSA) [8] (for general problems) as efficient supervisors, which can be evaluated at negligible prediction-time cost [19]: The former is simply using the predicted softmax likelihood as a confidence score, where the latter measures uncertainty as the mahalanobis-distance [11] between a specific layer's activations for the observed input and the training set.

3 PROOF OF CONCEPT

We evaluate our design using a small transformer [14], trained with a small vocabulary of 2000 tokens, as local surrogate model; the TEXT-CURIE-001 GPT-3 model [1] (estimate 13 billion params [12], based on vocabulary with size 50257) as remote model, and independently evaluate both SM and MDSA as supervisor, using three different test sets (nominal, corrupted [19] and partially-corrupted). We then measure the resulting overall system accuracy, i.e., the accuracy given the local predictions for inputs where the supervisor trusted the local predictions, and the remote predictions for all other inputs. In practice, the threshold as to when a supervisor trusts a local prediction could be continuously adapted to reach a target performance/cost ratio, hence we report results for a flexible percentage of inputs forwarded to GPT3.

Results are shown in Figure 2. Due to space constraints, we only discuss the results for the nominal test set and the SM supervisor[2]. Clearly, our architecture allows for major cost savings, while maintaining a high prediction reliability: In fact, by only making a prediction on 48% of inputs, thus saving more than half of the GPT-3 cost, we achieve the same accuracy as if all predictions were made by GPT-3. Being even more cost-reduction oriented, with a 70% cost saving accuracy decreases by only 0.02, thus still being much better than when using only the local model. Interestingly, we found that thanks to their complementary predictive capabilities, there is a combination of local and remote model that can lead to an overall system performance higher than the standalone, expensive remote model: When sending 74% of the inputs to GPT-3, accuracy increases by 0.11 while still saving 26% on cost.

[2]The other results are similar, but with lower accuracy (i.e., the curve is shifted downward) for corrupted and partially-corrupted inputs and with slightly worse (i.e., less curved) results for MDSA.

4 CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

Our POC shows the capability of our architecture to save monetary costs while only marginally – if at all – impacting the overall system performance. The architecture seamlessly generalizes beyond our POC to other classification and regression problems. It is also likely to lead to lower energy consumption and, on average, faster response time. As future work, we plan to evaluate this architecture on different domains.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to Paolo Tonella and Andrea Stocco for their helpful advice. This work was partially supported by the H2020 project PRECRIME, funded under the ERC Advanced Grant 2017 Program (ERC Grant Agreement n. 787703).

REFERENCES

[1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.

[2] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2021. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity.

[3] Raul Sena Ferreira, Jean Arlat, Jeremie Guiochet, and Helene Waeselynck. 2021. Benchmarking Safety Monitors for Image Classifiers with Machine Learning. In *2021 IEEE 26th Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing (PRDC)* (2021-10-04). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/prdc53464.2021.00012

[4] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. 2016. A Baseline for Detecting Misclassified and Out-of-Distribution Examples in Neural Networks. (2016). arXiv:1610.02136v3 [cs.NE]

[5] Jens Henriksson, Christian Berger, Markus Borg, Lars Tornberg, Cristofer Englund, Sankar Raman Sathyamoorthy, and Stig Ursing. 2019. Towards Structured Evaluation of Deep Neural Network Supervisors. In *2019 IEEE International Conference On Artificial Intelligence Testing (AITest)*. IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/aitest.2019.00-12

[6] Jens Henriksson, Christian Berger, Markus Borg, Lars Tornberg, Sankar Raman Sathyamoorthy, and Cristofer Englund. 2019. Performance Analysis of Out-of-Distribution Detection on Various Trained Neural Networks. In *2019 45th Euromicro Conference on Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA)*. IEEE, 113–120.

[7] Manzoor Hussain, Nazakat Ali, and Jang-Eui Hong. 2022. DeepGuard: a framework for safeguarding autonomous driving systems from inconsistent behaviour. *Automated Software Engineering* 29, 1 (2022), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10515-021-00310-0

[8] Seah Kim and Shin Yoo. 2020. Evaluating surprise adequacy for question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering Workshops*. 197–202. https://doi.org/10.1145/3387940.3391465

[9] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2012. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).

[10] Andrew L. Maas, Raymond E. Daly, Peter T. Pham, Dan Huang, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2011. Learning Word Vectors for Sentiment Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Portland, Oregon, USA, 142–150. http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P11-1015

[11] Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobis. 1936. On the generalized distance in statistics. National Institute of Science of India.

[12] Zilun Peng and Akshay Budhkar. 2021. *GPT-Neo vs. GPT-3: Are Commercialized NLP Models Really That Much Better?* https://medium.com/georgian-impact-blog/gpt-neo-vs-gpt-3-are-commercialized-nlp-models-really-that-much-better-f4c73ffce10b

[13] Andrea Stocco, Michael Weiss, Marco Calzana, and Paolo Tonella. 2020. Misbehaviour prediction for autonomous driving systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. ACM, 12 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3377811.3380353

[14] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

[15] Michael Weiss, Rwiddhi Chakraborty, and Paolo Tonella. 2021. A Review and Refinement of Surprise Adequacy. In *2021 IEEE/ACM Third International Workshop on Deep Learning for Testing and Testing for Deep Learning (DeepTest)*. 17–24. https://doi.org/10.1109/DeepTest52559.2021.00009

[16] Michael Weiss, André García Gómez, and Paolo Tonella. 2022. A Forgotten Danger in DNN Supervision Testing: Generating and Detecting True Ambiguity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10495* (2022).

[17] Michael Weiss and Paolo Tonella. 2021. Fail-Safe Execution of Deep Learning based Systems through Uncertainty Monitoring. In *2021 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. IEEE, IEEE, 24–35. https://doi.org/10.1109/icst49551.2021.00015

[18] Michael Weiss and Paolo Tonella. 2021. Uncertainty-Wizard: Fast and User-Friendly Neural Network Uncertainty Quantification. In *2021 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST)*. 436–441. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICST49551.2021.00056

[19] Michael Weiss and Paolo Tonella. 2022. Simple Techniques Work Surprisingly Well for Neural Network Test Prioritization and Active Learning (Replicability Study). In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis* (Virtual, South Korea) *(ISSTA 2022)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1145/3533767.3534375

[20] Yan Xiao, Ivan Beschastnikh, David S. Rosenblum, Changsheng Sun, Sebastian Elbaum, Yun Lin, and Jin Song Dong. 2021. Self-Checking Deep Neural Networks in Deployment. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, IEEE, 372–384. https://doi.org/10.1109/icse43902.2021.00044