
Automated Tensor Model Parallelism with Overlapped Communication for Efficient Foundation Model Training

Shengwei Li, Zhiquan Lai, Yanqi Hao, Weijie Liu, Keshi Ge, Xiaoge Deng,
Dongsheng Li, Kai Lu

College of Computer

National University of Defense Technology

{swli, zqlai, yqhao, liuweijie, gekeshi, dengxg, dsli}@nudt.edu.cn

Abstract

Deep learning is experiencing a rise in foundation models that are expected to lead in various fields. The massive number of parameters necessitates the use of tensor model parallelism (TMP) in foundation model training. However, TMP requires frequent communication operations which significantly reduces the training efficiency. In this paper, we present Oases, an automated TMP method with overlapped communication to accelerate foundation model training. Oases proposes a fine-grained training schedule to maximize overlapping communication and computation operations that have data dependence. Additionally, we design the Oases planner that searches for the best model parallel strategy to achieve further accelerations. Unlike existing methods, Oases planner is specifically tailored to model the cost of overlapped communication-computation operations. We evaluate Oases on various model settings and train environments, and compare Oases to four state-of-the-art implementations. Experimental results demonstrate that Oases achieves speedups of $1.01\text{--}1.48\times$ over the fastest baseline, and speedups of up to $1.95\times$ over Megatron-LM.

1 Introduction

Recent works have demonstrated the success of transformer-based foundation models [3] in various downstream tasks. For example, large generative models [4] have enabled fundamentally new capabilities on copilot applications. The accuracy of transformer-based models increases with its model size [17], but these giant models are frequently well beyond the memory capacity of a single device. Training such models consumes a significant amount of time and resources [41], so improving the overall performance of end-to-end training matters for foundation models.

Model-parallel training is necessary to accommodate large models in device memories. Designed for the transformer-based models, the widely-used tensor model parallelism [43] (TMP) partitions the computation of specific operators into parallel devices. However, TMP involves an extensive amount of exclusive communication operations, which becomes the main performance bottleneck, particularly in commercial GPU servers. For example, when training a large model on 3090 GPUs with NVLink, the communication overhead of TMP can reach to 64.6% (Figure 2).

Communication-computation overlap is a common technique to reduce communication overhead. However, communication and computation are data-dependent in TMP training, making it challenging to exploit the full potential of overlapping. Existing approaches from the literature apply sub-optimal training schedules since they only overlap communication with computation within operators or single propagation pass. Wang et al. [53] and AccTFM [55] propose intra-op overlapping methods where

they decouple and overlap the communication and computation operations of matrix productions. Merak [20] suggests an inter-op overlapping schedule by splitting batches within forward and backward passes, but they fail to incorporate the recomputation technique [5], which is also necessary for giant model training. Therefore, the first core problem this paper tries to answer is how to *optimize the TMP training schedule that maximizes overlapping communication and computation*.

Automated parallelization for large-scale models can leverage unutilized device resources to accelerate TMP training. However, finding an appropriate distributed training scheme for communication-computation overlapping schedules is non-trivial, because it is difficult to estimate the cost of overlapped operations. Previous studies can hardly give consideration to both overlapping and model parallel strategy searching, overlooking the potential of further training acceleration. Communication-computation overlap works lack modeling of their methods, while auto-parallelism approaches [59, 21, 49] do not optimize communication overlapping. Hence, another primary objective of this paper is to *automatically find the optimal model parallel strategies for overlapping training schedules*.

In this paper we propose Oases, an operation overlapping and automated model partitioning approach to accelerate TMP training of foundation models. Oases features two novel modules to address the above issues, respectively. The first module is a **fine-grained overlapping TMP training schedule**, which overlaps communication with computation whenever feasible, thereby accelerating TMP training. In this module, we develop a *cross-pass overlapping schedule* to break the barriers between recomputation and backward passes, which allows us to schedule operations in both the recomputation and backward. We also propose a *fine-grained recomputation strategy* to arrange the tensors saved for recomputation during forward, enabling the communication reduction in the recomputation and more computation operations for overlapping. The second module is an automatic model parallel strategy planner named **Oases planner**, to attain further accelerations. In this module, we propose a *new cost model* which can estimate the performance of models considering the training schedules with overlapped communications. Then, we formulate the parallel strategy optimization process under the memory footprint constraint as an integer linear programming (ILP) problem, which can be solved with existing solvers efficiently. We summarize the contributions of Oases as follows:

- We present a fine-grained overlapping schedule of Oases, which jointly schedules the forward, recomputation, and backward passes of TMP training. Additionally, Oases can avoid communication in recomputation by utilizing its redundancy. The communication operations of TMP can be overlapped with a maximum number of computation operations.
- We design the Oases planner which can model the performance of communication overlapping schedules and efficiently search for a parallel strategy with the best performance. To the best of our knowledge, Oases is the first work to model communication-computation overlap for TMP parallel strategy searching.
- We comprehensively evaluate the performance of Oases with seven models of varying sizes on two GPU clusters. Compared to four popular model-parallel training methods including the state-of-the-art libraries, Oases accelerates the overall training process with up to $1.48\times$ speedup over the best baseline, and up to $1.95\times$ speedup and $2.18\times$ device efficiency over Megatron-LM.

2 Background and motivation

Foundation model architecture. Most recent foundation models [4, 48, 57, 39] are based on Transformer [51] architecture. Researchers scale models to various sizes by stacking transformer layers with different hidden sizes. An example computation schedule of transformer decoder layers is shown in Figure 1. Each transformer layer consists of an attention block and a two-layer feed-forward network (FFN). The heavy computational loads of transformer blocks are matrix multiplications, and their parallelization has been well studied [11, 50].

Data parallelism (DP). DP [10, 22, 16] is the most common method of distributed model training. In DP, each device holds an entire model replica and trains on a data partition. Gradients are aggregated through collective communications, such as AllReduce [32], before updating parameters to maintain




Figure 1: The process of training a L transformer layer model with TMP.

Table 1: Major notations and their meanings in the training schedule

| Notation | Meaning |
|--------------|--|
| F_i | Forward computation of the i^{th} operator |
| R_i | Recomputation of the i^{th} operator |
| B_i | Backward computation of the i^{th} operator |
| $C_i(\cdot)$ | Communication operation in forward (F), recomputation (R), or backward (B) |

synchronization between models. However, DP may not be adequate for foundation models that could surpass the device’s capacity, the usage of other parallelization is inevitable.

Tensor model parallelism (TMP). TMP is a model-parallel approach proposed by Megatron-LM [43] and is well-known for large-scale transformer model training [14, 20, 2]. TMP is an expert-optimized strategy for transformer-based models, it partitions weight matrices across row or column dimensions, and adds AllReduce operations as shown in Figure 1, to ensure correctness. Although TMP can reduce memory usage in foundation model training, the default TMP schedule introduces a large number of blocked AllReduce communication operations during both forward and backward passes, which can significantly slow down the model training.

Recomputation. The intermediate outputs of the forward pass are called activations, which are used by the backward pass for gradients calculation. The recomputation technique [13, 5, 19] evicts activation values and recomputes them when necessary, incurring a computation overhead increase of approximately 1/3. However, this approach can significantly reduce memory requirements, allowing larger batches to be processed and preserving more model parameters on single devices. Recomputation is widely adopted [25, 37, 14, 44] in foundation model training, but its default implementation [31] simply runs the forward function again before backpropagation.

2.1 Motivational study

Figure 2 shows breakdowns of TMP training iterations in two transformer-based models using the popular Megatron-LM [43] framework on four 3090 GPUs. Communication comes from TMP accounts for 64.7% and 59.2% of overall training time in Megatron-LM, which becomes a significant factor in degrading training performance and wasting resources. As shown by the ‘Oases’ bar, communication in Oases contributes much less to each iteration. A large amount of communication is overlapped through simultaneous scheduling of forward, recomputation, and backward operations, with the help of Oases fine-grained training schedule (Section 3). And the overall iteration time of Oases is less than the communication time of Megatron-LM, as Oases estimates the redundant communication (Section 3.2) during recomputation and reduces the communication volume by searching for the best model partitioning scheme with Oases planner (Section 4).




Figure 2: TMP training iteration breakdown of two transformer-based models. H represents the model hidden size and L represents the number of transformer layers.

3 Overlapping TMP training schedule

We introduce the fine-grained overlapping training schedule of Oases in this section, which schedules the forward, recomputation, and backward together. We first design the cross-pass schedule which breaks the barrier passes during backward, thereby scheduling both recomputation and backward. Next we schedule the operations in forward to drop the redundant communication, with the proposed fine-grained recomputation strategy. Table 1 lists common notations used in this work.

3.1 Cross-pass scheduling

In TMP training, take the forward operator sequence $(F_i, C_i(F), F_j)$ as an example, which is consistent with the FFN and attention layers in transformer-based models. And its recomputation enabled backward pass will be $(R_i, C_i(R), R_j), (B_j, B_i, C_i(B))$. Figure 3a illustrates the default backward




Figure 3: Execution timelines of computation and communication streams during TMP backward.

schedule, the exclusive operators results in low device utilization. The default implementation of recomputation involves dividing the continuous backward process into interleaved recomputation and backward passes, resulting in barriers between passes, and the recomputation pass directly aligns with the forward pass.

The computation and communication streams can work independently in most deep-learning systems. A straightforward solution is to partition the data batch into two sub-batches. We can use superscripts, such as (R_i^0, R_i^1) , to represent the related operators of sub-batches. Data dependency only relies on the operators with identical superscripts, the operations with different superscripts can be pipelined. As shown in Figure 3b, this basic pipelined backward schedule can speed up the recomputation and backward passes individually, making it practical in non-recomputation scenarios [20]. However, the consistency of operations is restricted due to the pass barriers.

To jointly optimize the recomputation and backward, we design **a cross-pass overlapping schedule**. In our implementation, we break the barriers between passes in the backward to overlap communications with a maximal number of computation operators. As shown in Figure 3c, we merge the operator sequence of each sub-batch and schedule them simultaneously, (R_j^1, B_j^1, B_i^1) can be executed continuously and the communication of recomputation $C_i^0(R)$ can be properly hidden. Generally the granularity of recomputation is the transformer layer [29], and each of them will cause a pass barrier. Thus breaking these barriers will bring a remarkable acceleration.

3.2 Redundant communication in recomputation

As described in Section 3.1, an FFN or attention layer will involve three communication operators in a TMP training iteration. The communication primitive is AllReduce, we can formulate the output y of an AllReduce operation for given inputs x among w devices as $y = \sum_{i=0}^w x_i$, where we can get $\frac{\partial y}{\partial x_i} = 1$. Denoting the loss function as ϕ , we have:

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} \frac{\partial y}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y}. \quad (1)$$

Equation (1) implies that the gradients of AllReduce's inputs coincide with the gradients of its outputs. In other words, when the AllReduce serves as the output of the recomputation sequence, it can be omitted during the recomputation. Thus we can propose **a fine-grained recomputation strategy**, which initializes recomputation after communication operators in forward. Consider the example forward operators $(F_i^1, C_i^1(F), F_j^1)$, we can apply recomputation on both $(F_i^1, C_i^1(F))$ and (F_j^1) , its backward will become $(R_j^1, B_j^1, R_i^1, B_i^1, C_i^1(B))$, the communication in recomputation $C_i^1(R)$ is

Algorithm 1: TMP forward schedule with overlapped communication.

Input: Model operator sequence O
Output: Operator sequence array A

```

1  $(o_0^0, o_0^1, \dots, o_k^0, o_k^1) \leftarrow \text{Split}(O)$ 
2  $x, i, j \leftarrow 0, A \leftarrow [], \text{handler} \leftarrow \text{null}$ 
3 while  $i \leq k$  do
4   if  $o_i^x$  is a computation operation then
5      $\text{Forward}(o_i^x), i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
6   else
7      $\text{Sync}(\text{handler})$ 
8      $\text{handler} \leftarrow \text{StartAsync}(o_i^x)$ 
9      $A.append((o_j^x, \dots, o_{i-1}^x))$ 
10    if  $x = 1$  then  $j \leftarrow i + 1;$ 
11     $x \leftarrow x \text{ XOR } 1, i \leftarrow j$ 
```

Algorithm 2: TMP backward schedule with overlapped communication.

Input: Saved operator sequence array A

```

1  $\text{handler} \leftarrow \text{null}, O'_b \leftarrow []$ 
2 while  $A$  is not empty do
3    $O \leftarrow A.PopLast$ 
4    $O_b \leftarrow \text{Recompute}(O)$ 
5   while  $o \leftarrow O_b.PopLast \neq \text{null}$  do
6     if  $o$  is a computation operation then
7        $\text{Backward}(o)$ 
8     else
9        $\text{Sync}(\text{handler})$ 
10       $\text{handler} \leftarrow \text{StartAsync}(o)$ 
11      while  $o' \leftarrow O'_b.PopLast \neq \text{null}$  do
12         $\text{Backward}(o')$ 
13       $O'_b \leftarrow O_b$ 
14    Break
```

eliminated. Figure 3d shows the backward schedule with fine-grained recomputation, the number of communication is reduced, and the communication of backward can be overlapped with more recomputation operations.

When training with multiple FFN and attention layers, our backward schedule can run across layers and the speedup can be more significant. The number of recomputation sequences is not increased since we only change the start positions. We summarize our training schedule in Algorithm 1–2. DNN training can be presented by a directed acyclic graph. We flatten the model graph to an operator sequence O . During the forward schedule, we split the data batch into two sub-batches and execute their related operators in a pipeline: when one sub-batch is computing, another sub-batch will communicate. Specifically, whenever meeting a communication operator, we start it asynchronously and switch the sub-batch. And we save the operator sequence after each communication operator for recomputing and drop the forward communications in recomputation. Some operations in the warm-up and cool-down phases are omitted for simplification. In the backward schedule, we can simply follow the saved operator sequence from the forward in a reversed order. We recompute the saved operators to get the corresponding backward operator sequences and overlap communication and computation with a sub-batch pipeline as well.

4 Parallel strategy planner

With our fine-grained overlapping schedule, the communication is overlapped by computation as much as possible. We observe that: i) the parallel strategy is uniform across layers in TMP training, but there is a considerable memory consumption gap between different TMP settings. We can model the communication volume of an AllReduce [32] as $2K(N - 1)/N$, where K is the message size and N is the TMP degree. This indicates a TMP module can trade extra memories for smaller N and thus less communication volume. And ii) in our schedule, the communication overhead during forward is equal to backward, while the computation overhead in the forward is approximately 1/3 of it in the backward (includes recomputation overhead). The communication in the forward may be exposed and cause performance bottlenecks.

Based on the above observations, finding a proper parallel strategy for foundation models has potential performance benefits. But it is challenging to model the complicated overlapping training schedule. To address the problem, we propose the **Oases planner**, which can automatically generate a high throughput parallel training strategy.

4.1 Problem formulation

Given an model graph G , global batch size b , device memory capacity m , and possible parallel strategies p of a training cluster, the goal of Oases planner is to maximize the training throughput. We assume the model runs with a uniform TMP strategy to initialize communication operators. The

parallel training strategy s , inspired by Alpa [59], can be represented by a collection of one-hot decision vectors $s_i \in \{0, 1\}^p \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ for each graph node i . $s_{ij} = 1$ means node i is using the j -th partitioning scheme. Let S denotes the entire space of strategies and $f(\cdot)$ estimates per iteration execution time for strategy s . We can formulate the optimization problem of Oases planner as follows:

$$s^* = \arg \min_{s \in S} f(s; G, b, m, p). \quad (2)$$

To simplify the model graph under our fine-grained overlapping TMP training schedule, we merge computation operators between adjacent communication operators into computation sequences. The resulting forward and backward model graphs are composed of alternating computation sequences and communication operators. Model graphs typically start with a computation sequence, we can further group each computation sequence with its subsequent communication operator, forming a block that comprises a computation sequence and a communication operator. Consequently, we can update the model graph as $G(V, E)$, where each node $v \in V$ is an aforementioned block and E is the set of edges that connect pairs of nodes.

4.2 Cost model

We can estimate the $f(\cdot)$ in (2) by summing the costs of all nodes and edges, conditioned on the user-specified model, global batch size, and training cluster. For each node i , it has computation cost vectors $d_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and communication cost vectors $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The operation costs of a given parallel strategy can be presented by the dot production, e.g., $s_i^\top c_i$. Additionally, we denote $d(F), d(B)$ and $c(F), c(B)$ as the corresponding forward and backward cost vectors, and $(\cdot)^\top$ denotes the transpose of a vector. For the forward graph nodes, as described in Algorithm 1, each block is executed with two sub-batches. Computation and communication can be aligned by right-shifting the communication operation of sub-batches. Specifically, the computation of a sub-batch will overlap the last communication of another sub-batch, and the cost after overlapping can be estimated using the max function. Therefore, we can present the cost of node i by summing the computation costs of two sub-batches, i.e., $\max\{s_i^\top d_i^0, s_{i-1}^\top c_{i-1}^1\} + \max\{s_i^\top d_i^1, s_i^\top c_i^0\}$. The node costs in backward can be estimated in the same method with different cost vectors. When considering the first and last node, the node cost T_V of k nodes is formulated as follows:

$$T_V(d, c) = s_0^\top d_0^0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \max\{s_i^\top d_i^0, s_{i-1}^\top c_{i-1}^1\} + \sum_{i=0}^k \max\{s_i^\top d_i^1, s_i^\top c_i^0\} + s_k^\top c_k^1. \quad (3)$$

When using different parallel strategies between adjacent nodes, an exclusive AllGather communication is required for data resharing, converting the tensor layouts between nodes. These additional costs can be treated as the graph edge costs, which include two aspects: i) the communication overhead of the AllGather, and ii) the costs of adjacent nodes that can no longer overlap because of the blocked AllGather operation. Let $\mathcal{R}_{vu} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ denotes the edge cost matrix, where the element \mathcal{R}_{vuij} is the edge cost from the output of i -th strategy of node v to the input of j -th strategy of node u . The AllGather happens during the forward when $i < j$, and during the backward when $i > j$. We can formulate each edge cost as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_{vuij} = \begin{cases} T_{\text{allgather}}(F, i, j) + \min\{s_v^\top c_v^1(F), s_u^\top d_u^0(F)\}, & i < j \\ T_{\text{allgather}}(B, i, j) + \min\{s_v^\top c_v^1(B), s_u^\top d_u^0(B)\}, & i > j \\ 0, & i = j \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Combining the (3)- (4), we can express $f(\cdot)$ by summing the node costs in forward, node costs in backward, and edge costs. And the cost minimization problem in (2) can be formulated as an ILP problem with the following objective:

$$\min_s \left\{ T_V(d(F), c(F)) + T_V(d(B), c(B)) + \sum_{(v,u) \in E} s_v^\top \mathcal{R}_{vu} s_u \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, we denote the memory cost vectors of model parameter state, saved input tensors, and backward runtime with $m_s, m_t, m_r \in \mathbb{R}^p$, respectively. We can estimate the memory consumption and derive the following ILP constraint of device memory:

$$s_k^\top m_r + \sum_{v \in V} s_v^\top m_s + s_v^\top m_t < m. \quad (6)$$

Most foundation models share the same and repeating architecture, we run an offline profiling to get the accurate costs for $d(\cdot)$, $c(\cdot)$, and m_r . We limit the possible partitioning schemes to the power of two, model the overhead of AllGather [47] with message sizes, and count m_s and m_t according to model config and our training schedule. Now we can solve (5)- (6) optimally with an open source solver [9]. The planner optimization performances are reported in Appendix.

5 Evaluations

5.1 Experiment setup

Cluster configurations. We evaluate Oases on two 8-node clusters with two types of commodity GPUs. The first cluster, referred as the "NVLink 3090", where each node features four NVIDIA RTX3090 GPUs and two four-slot NVLink 3.0 connections, providing a total bandwidth of 900 Gbps between GPU 0 and 1, and between GPU 2 and 3. And nodes in the second cluster "3090" are equipped with four NVIDIA RTX3090 GPUs. All nodes are interconnected via 100 Gbps InfiniBand, and each GPU connects to CPU via PCIe 4.0. A detailed environmental setup is shown in Appendix.

Models. Many popular models of various tasks such as BERT [6], LLaMA [48], and ViT [7] are based on transformer layers. We evaluate the performance of Oases using the transformer decoder-based model, as its effective representative for large-scale pretraining. The hidden size and number of transformer layers are adjusted to vary model sizes, guided by parameters used in previous studies [29, 43]. It is worth noting that limited by device numbers, the numbers of transformer layers used in experiments are much smaller than general foundation models. We believe evaluating a wider model is more substantial for foundation models, since TMP is usually used accompanied by pipeline model parallelism [21, 12], which is responsible to deepen models. We denote the evaluated transformer models with the hidden size and number of transformer layers.

Baselines. We compare Oases with four approaches in experiments: (i) **Megatron-LM** [29, 43] proposes the expert-designed TMP for training homogeneous transformer-based LMs on GPUs. To ensure a fair comparison, we grid-search the TMP and DP degree settings on a given model and global batch size, and report the best results. (ii) **Alpa** [59] is the current state-of-the-art system for auto-parallelism training, which is able to automatically generate an execution plan for given models, but without overlapping communication with computation. (iii) **Merak** [20] is the state-of-the-art 3D parallelism library for transformer-based models training. To train the same models, we apply recomputation on Merak to avoid out-of-memory. And (iv) **Wang et al. [53]** decouples communication and computation thus overlapping them in Einsum operators of models. Unfortunately it is close-sourced, we implement it based on Megatron-LM to the best of our abilities. We disable the pipeline model parallelism as it is orthogonal to our work, unless otherwise stated.

Metrics. Oases is a synchronous method that can maintain the convergence of models, therefore we focus on comparing training throughputs. Reported values are taken from an average of the latest 20 iterations [21], out of a total of 100 training steps. And all experiments use 32 GPUs simultaneously.

5.2 End-to-end performance

We compare the end-to-end performance of Oases with baselines on seven models and two clusters. We report the normalized training throughputs in Figure 4 and the detailed model settings in Appendix.

Oases attains exceptional results for both NVLink 3090 and 3090 cluster, achieving speedups of $1.01\text{--}1.31\times$ and $1.20\text{--}1.48\times$ over the best baseline, and up to $1.63\times$ and $1.95\times$ over Megatron-LM, respectively. The smallest speedup is observed for the model with hidden size 1024 on NVLink 3090, where the TMP degree is 2 and communications occur only through NVLink. The communication performance bottleneck is not obvious under this high bandwidth scenario, as all methods exhibit similar results. Alpa slightly outperforms Megatron-LM in some cases with auto-searched parallel strategies, but Megatron-LM and Alpa present unsatisfactory speeds as they are unable to overlap communications of TMP. Though Merak partially overlaps communications and is the best baseline in most cases, Oases can offer more speedups through our fine-grained training schedule and optimized parallel strategy. Wang et al. [53] performs well on smaller models ($H \leq 4096$). But for larger models with TMP degree 8, which requires inter-node communications, its decoupling increases the number of operations and slows down the training process. Oases provides more remarkable speedups on cluster 3090, where communication is a more substantial performance bottleneck. Oases




Figure 4: End-to-end training performance on different transformer models. Throughput are normalized by Megatron-LM. H refers to the model hidden size and L is the number of transformer layers.

Table 2: Averaged device efficiency during TMP training of models in end-to-end experiments.

| Cluster | Methods | Model hidden size | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 1024 | 2048 | 3072 | 4096 | 6144 | 8192 | 12288 |
| NVLink 3090 | Megatron-LM | 83.9% | 47.2% | 53.7% | 57.5% | 32.9% | 37.4% | 44.4% |
| | Oases | 97.8% | 88.5% | 90.1% | 93.2% | 62.7% | 70.4% | 77.9% |
| 3090 | Megatron-LM | 56.2% | 36.4% | 43.2% | 47.4% | 28.6% | 32.5% | 39.7% |
| | Oases | 96.4% | 78.9% | 87.0% | 90.0% | 62.3% | 70.0% | 77.9% |


can find a more efficient partitioning scheme and effectively support overlapping communication with computation, especially during backpropagation, where the communication volume is reduced and communication could be overlapped with more computation.

5.3 Device efficiency

To study the reasons behind Oases’ acceleration, we can consider the device efficiency. Exposed communications can idle devices, thereby reducing efficiency. We apply stream multiprocessor efficiency [38] of GPUs to represent the device efficiency during training, and the results are shown in Table 2. The device efficiency of Megatron-LM decreases obviously when communications of TMP across NVLink only ($H = 1024$), intra-node only, and inter-node ($H \geq 6144$). Compared to Megatron-LM, Oases achieves 1.17–2.18 \times higher device efficiency, and its performance is less affected by bandwidth. And these improved efficiencies will result in overall training speedups.

5.4 Combining with pipeline model parallelism

In large-scale model training, pipeline model parallelism (PMP) is often combined with TMP to accommodate a complete model. We integrate Oases into Megatron-LM PMP and test it on GPT [4] models with parameter sizes of 18.4B and 39.1B. Model details along with additional scalability experiments are shown in Appendix. To ensure an unbiased evaluation, we adopt the 1F1B PMP schedule [29], and use the same PMP parallelism degree and micro batch size. The transformer layers are evenly divided into PMP groups. Figure 5 shows the throughput results of different global batch sizes. Oases integrated training improves speed by 1.10–1.35 \times over the best baseline and 1.25–1.72 \times over Megatron-LM. For the GPT-18.4B model, Oases gets a modest improvement on



(a) GPT-18.4B, Oases speedup Merak by $1.10\text{--}1.27\times$. (b) GPT-39.1B, Oases speedup Merak by $1.31\text{--}1.35\times$.

Figure 5: Performance of training complete models with pipeline model parallelism and Oases.

Table 3: Ablation study. Throughput (k tokens/s) and speedups over Megatron-LM.

| Cluster | Model hidden size | Methods | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Megatron-LM | Merak | Cross-pass schedule | + Fine-grained recomputation | + Planner (Oases) |
| NVLink 3090 | 2048 | 31.4 | 37.3 (1.19 \times) | 41.2 (1.31 \times) | 43.9 (1.40 \times) | 50.9 (1.62 \times) |
| | 4096 | 18.1 | 21.5 (1.18 \times) | 22.6 (1.25 \times) | 23.8 (1.31 \times) | 25.2 (1.39 \times) |
| | 8192 | 5.6 | 6.9 (1.25 \times) | 7.7 (1.39 \times) | 8.9 (1.60 \times) | 9.1 (1.63 \times) |
| 3090 | 2048 | 23.0 | 29.2 (1.27 \times) | 32.6 (1.42 \times) | 42.5 (1.85 \times) | 44.7 (1.95 \times) |
| | 4096 | 14.0 | 17.9 (1.28 \times) | 22.4 (1.60 \times) | 23.8 (1.69 \times) | 24.3 (1.73 \times) |
| | 8192 | 5.3 | 6.2 (1.18 \times) | 7.7 (1.46 \times) | 8.9 (1.68 \times) | 9.0 (1.71 \times) |

cluster NVLink 3090. This is because the fewer TMP degrees and fewer layers per device results in less communication in TMP, and improvements of TMP thus contributing less to the throughput. When communication becomes a more apparent bottleneck on cluster 3090, the performance decline of Oases is more minor. And Oases achieves good acceleration on the GPT-39.1B model.

5.5 Ablation study

We conduct an ablation study on diverse models and clusters to investigate the contributions of Oases’s optimizations, and the results are shown in Table 3. Our cross-pass schedule provides stable accelerations, as the joint scheduling efficiently hides TMP communications. The fine-grained recomputation provides additional acceleration in models with more communication constraints, such as the $H = 2048$ model on the 3090 cluster and the $H = 8192$ model on both clusters, which also exhibit lower device efficiency in Megatron-LM. Our planner performs better in models with more layers, specifically on the NVLink 3090 cluster. More model blocks bring a larger optimization space, and the optimized parallel strategy will let TMP communication of some model blocks use only NVLink, bringing a more obvious acceleration. The detailed parallel strategies are shown in the Appendix. The planner provides minor speedups on the model with $H = 8192$ due to its larger data resharding overhead, which is covered marginally by performance gains from shrunk TMP degrees.

5.6 Limitations and discussion

Oases only searches parallel strategy on communication and computation blocks of models. Modeling in a finer granularity is possible, but will exponentially expand the search space. Besides, our training schedule requires batch splitting, which potentially reduces arithmetic density. Therefore, some accelerations of the end-to-end throughput may not match the improvement of device efficiency. We think the resulting loss of arithmetic density is acceptable when compared to the gained performances. And the arithmetic density is guaranteed in larger models. Additionally, we currently implement and evaluate Oases only on transformer-based models. The ideas behind this work could be easily extended to other model-parallel powered training, which will be our future work.

6 Conclusion

We present Oases in this paper, a training approach that can overlap communication and computation of TMP training and search the best model parallel strategy upon overlapping training schedule. Oases can accelerate model-parallel training by $1.01\text{--}1.63\times$ in a NVLink cluster, and by $1.20\text{--}1.95\times$ in 3090 servers. Additionally, Oases sees an acceleration in complete foundation model training of up to $1.72\times$ when combined with PMP. We hope Oases will be used with other distributed methods to democratize the foundation model training, especially in commodity hardware.

References

- [1] Ravichandra Addanki, Shaileshh Bojja Venkatakrishnan, Shreyan Gupta, Hongzi Mao, and Mohammad Alizadeh. Placeto: learning generalizable device placement algorithms for distributed machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3981–3991, 2019.
- [2] Yulong Ao, Zhihua Wu, Dianhai Yu, Weibao Gong, Zhiqing Kui, Minxu Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Liang Shen, Yanjun Ma, Tian Wu, et al. End-to-end adaptive distributed training on paddlepaddle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.02752*, 2021.
- [3] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [5] Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174*, 2016.
- [6] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [7] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YicbFdNTTy>.
- [8] Shiqing Fan, Yi Rong, Chen Meng, Zongyan Cao, Siyu Wang, Zhen Zheng, Chuan Wu, Guoping Long, Jun Yang, Lixue Xia, et al. DAPPLE: A pipelined data parallel approach for training large models. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 431–445, 2021.
- [9] John Forrest and Robin Lougee-Heimer. Cbc user guide. In *Emerging theory, methods, and applications*, pages 257–277. INFORMS, 2005.
- [10] Shaoduo Gan, Jiawei Jiang, Binhang Yuan, Ce Zhang, Xiangru Lian, Rui Wang, Jianbin Chang, Chengjun Liu, Hongmei Shi, Shengzhuo Zhang, et al. Bagua: scaling up distributed learning with system relaxations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(4):804–813, 2021.
- [11] Evangelos Georganas, Jorge González-Domínguez, Edgar Solomonik, Yili Zheng, Juan Tourino, and Katherine Yelick. Communication avoiding and overlapping for numerical linear algebra. In *SC’12: Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–11. IEEE, 2012.
- [12] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, et al. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [13] Paras Jain, Ajay Jain, Aniruddha Nrusimha, Amir Gholami, Pieter Abbeel, Joseph Gonzalez, Kurt Keutzer, and Ion Stoica. Checkmate: Breaking the memory wall with optimal tensor rematerialization. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:497–511, 2020.

- [14] Xianyan Jia, Le Jiang, Ang Wang, Wencong Xiao, Ziji Shi, Jie Zhang, Xinyuan Li, Langshi Chen, Yong Li, Zhen Zheng, Xiaoyong Liu, and Wei Lin. Whale: Efficient giant model training over heterogeneous GPUs. In *2022 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 22)*, pages 673–688, Carlsbad, CA, July 2022. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-29-57. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc22/presentation/jia-xianyan>.
- [15] Zhihao Jia, Matei Zaharia, and Alex Aiken. Beyond data and model parallelism for deep neural networks. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 1:1–13, 2019.
- [16] Yimin Jiang, Yibo Zhu, Chang Lan, Bairan Yi, Yong Cui, and Chuanxiong Guo. A unified architecture for accelerating distributed dnn training in heterogeneous GPU/CPU clusters. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 463–479, 2020.
- [17] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.
- [18] Can Karakus, Rahul Huilgol, Fei Wu, Anirudh Subramanian, Cade Daniel, Derya Cavdar, Teng Xu, Haohan Chen, Arash Rahnema, and Luis Quintela. Amazon sagemaker model parallelism: A general and flexible framework for large model training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05972*, 2021.
- [19] Marisa Kirisame, Steven Lyubomirsky, Altan Haan, Jennifer Brennan, Mike He, Jared Roesch, Tianqi Chen, and Zachary Tatlock. Dynamic tensor rematerialization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=Vfs_2Rn0D0H.
- [20] Zhiquan Lai, Shengwei Li, Xudong Tang, Keshi Ge, Weijie Liu, Yabo Duan, Linbo Qiao, and Dongsheng Li. Merak: An efficient distributed dnn training framework with automated 3d parallelism for giant foundation models. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 34(5):1466–1478, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TPDS.2023.3247001.
- [21] Dacheng Li, Hongyi Wang, Eric Xing, and Hao Zhang. AMP: Automatically finding model parallel strategies with heterogeneity awareness. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VoLXW01L-43>.
- [22] Shen Li, Yanli Zhao, Rohan Varma, Omkar Salpekar, Pieter Noordhuis, Teng Li, Adam Paszke, Jeff Smith, Brian Vaughan, Pritam Damania, et al. Pytorch distributed: Experiences on accelerating data parallel training. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 13(12).
- [23] Shengwei Li, Zhiquan Lai, Dongsheng Li, Yiming Zhang, Xiangyu Ye, and Yabo Duan. Embrace: Accelerating sparse communication for distributed training of deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 51st International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [24] Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Shiyuan Guo, Danyang Zhuo, Hao Zhang, Dawn Song, and Ion Stoica. Terapipe: Token-level pipeline parallelism for training large-scale language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6543–6552. PMLR, 2021.
- [25] Peng Liang, Yu Tang, Xiaoda Zhang, Youhui Bai, Teng Su, Zhiquan Lai, Dongsheng Li, et al. A survey on auto-parallelism of neural networks training. 2022.
- [26] Weijie Liu, Zhiquan Lai, Shengwei Li, Yabo Duan, Keshi Ge, and Dongsheng Li. Autopipe: A fast pipeline parallelism approach with balanced partitioning and micro-batch slicing. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing (CLUSTER)*, pages 301–312. IEEE, 2022.
- [27] Kshiteej Mahajan, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Srinivas Sridharan, and Aditya Akella. Better together: Jointly optimizing ML collective scheduling and execution planning using SYNDICATE. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*, pages 809–824, Boston, MA, April 2023. USENIX Association. ISBN 978-1-939133-33-5. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/mahajan>.
- [28] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R Devanur, Gregory R Ganger, Phillip B Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. PipeDream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for dnn training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 1–15, 2019.
- [29] Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary, Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prethvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro, et al. Efficient large-scale language model training on gpu clusters using megatron-lm. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–15, 2021.

- [30] Hyungjun Oh, Junyeol Lee, Hyeongju Kim, and Jiwon Seo. Out-of-order backprop: an effective scheduling technique for deep learning. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 435–452, 2022.
- [31] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [32] Pitch Patarasuk and Xin Yuan. Bandwidth optimal all-reduce algorithms for clusters of workstations. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, 69(2):117–124, 2009.
- [33] Yanghua Peng, Yibo Zhu, Yangrui Chen, Yixin Bao, Bairen Yi, Chang Lan, Chuan Wu, and Chuanxiong Guo. A generic communication scheduler for distributed dnn training acceleration. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 16–29, 2019.
- [34] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. ZeRO: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–16. IEEE, 2020.
- [35] Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, Jeff Rasley, Shaden Smith, and Yuxiong He. ZeRO-infinity: Breaking the gpu memory wall for extreme scale deep learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–14, 2021.
- [36] Jie Ren, Samyam Rajbhandari, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Shuangyan Yang, Minjia Zhang, Dong Li, and Yuxiong He. ZeRO-Offload: Democratizing billion-scale model training. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pages 551–564, 2021.
- [37] Xiaozhe Ren, Pingyi Zhou, Xinfan Meng, Xinjing Huang, Yadao Wang, Weichao Wang, Pengfei Li, Xiaoda Zhang, Alexander Podolskiy, Grigory Arshinov, et al. Pangu- Σ : Towards trillion parameter language model with sparse heterogeneous computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10845*, 2023.
- [38] Jason Sanders and Edward Kandrot. *CUDA by example: an introduction to general-purpose GPU programming*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2010.
- [39] Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. BLOOM: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*, 2022.
- [40] Alexander Sergeev and Mike Del Balso. Horovod: fast and easy distributed deep learning in tensorflow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.05799*, 2018.
- [41] Or Sharir, Barak Peleg, and Yoav Shoham. The cost of training nlp models: A concise overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08900*, 2020.
- [42] Shaohuai Shi, Xiaowen Chu, and Bo Li. MG-WFBP: Efficient data communication for distributed synchronous SGD algorithms. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 172–180. IEEE, 2019.
- [43] Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. Megatron-LM: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053*, 2019.
- [44] Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, et al. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*, 2022.
- [45] Xiaoyang Sun, Wei Wang, Shenghao Qiu, Renyu Yang, Songfang Huang, Jie Xu, and Zheng Wang. Stronghold: fast and affordable billion-scale deep learning model training. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–17, 2022.
- [46] Jakub M Tarnawski, Deepak Narayanan, and Amar Phanishayee. Piper: Multidimensional planner for dnn parallelization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:24829–24840, 2021.
- [47] Rajeev Thakur, Rolf Rabenseifner, and William Gropp. Optimization of collective communication operations in mpich. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 19(1): 49–66, 2005.

- [48] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [49] Colin Unger, Zhihao Jia, Wei Wu, Sina Lin, Mandeep Baines, Carlos Efrain Quintero Narvaez, Vinay Ramakrishnaiah, Nirmal Prajapati, Pat McCormick, Jamaludin Mohd-Yusof, et al. Unity: Accelerating DNN training through joint optimization of algebraic transformations and parallelization. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*, pages 267–284, 2022.
- [50] Robert A Van De Geijn and Jerrell Watts. SUMMA: Scalable universal matrix multiplication algorithm. *Concurrency: Practice and Experience*, 9(4):255–274, 1997.
- [51] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [52] Boxiang Wang, Qifan Xu, Zhengda Bian, and Yang You. Tesseract: Parallelize the tensor parallelism efficiently. In *Proceedings of the 51st International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [53] Shibo Wang, Jinliang Wei, Amit Sabne, Andy Davis, Berkin Ilbeyi, Blake Hechtman, Dehao Chen, Karthik Srinivasa Murthy, Marcello Maggioni, Qiao Zhang, et al. Overlap communication with dependent computation via decomposition in large deep learning models. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1*, pages 93–106, 2022.
- [54] Xiangyu Ye, Zhiqian Lai, Shengwei Li, Lei Cai, Ding Sun, Linbo Qiao, and Dongsheng Li. Hippie: A data-parallelized pipeline approach to improve memory-efficiency and scalability for large dnn training. In *50th International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 1–10, 2021.
- [55] Zihao Zeng, Chubo Liu, Zhuo Tang, Kenli Li, and Keqin Li. Acctfm: An effective intra-layer model parallelization strategy for training large-scale transformer-based models. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 33(12):4326–4338, 2022.
- [56] Hao Zhang, Zeyu Zheng, Shizhen Xu, Wei Dai, Qirong Ho, Xiaodan Liang, Zhiting Hu, Jinliang Wei, Pengtao Xie, and Eric P Xing. Poseidon: An efficient communication architecture for distributed deep learning on gpu clusters. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, volume 1, pages 1–2, 2017.
- [57] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. OPT: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- [58] Yanli Zhao, Andrew Gu, Rohan Varma, Liang Luo, Chien-Chin Huang, Min Xu, Less Wright, Hamid Shojanazeri, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, et al. Pytorch FSDP: Experiences on scaling fully sharded data parallel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11277*, 2023.
- [59] Lianmin Zheng, Zhuohan Li, Hao Zhang, Yonghao Zhuang, Zhifeng Chen, Yanping Huang, Yida Wang, Yuanzhong Xu, Danyang Zhuo, Eric P Xing, et al. Alpa: Automating inter-and intra-operator parallelism for distributed deep learning. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*, pages 559–578, 2022.
- [60] Quan Zhou, Haiquan Wang, Xiaoyan Yu, Cheng Li, Youhui Bai, Feng Yan, and Yinlong Xu. MPress: Democratizing billion-scale model training on multi-gpu servers via memory-saving inter-operator parallelism. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 556–569. IEEE, 2023.
- [61] Yonghao Zhuang, Hexu Zhao, Lianmin Zheng, Zhuohan Li, Eric P Xing, Qirong Ho, Joseph E Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Hao Zhang. On optimizing the communication of model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05322*, 2022.

Summary of appendix

Appendix A provides relevant related works and the difference between them and ours.

Appendix B includes a more detailed description of our experimental environment and model settings.

Appendix C presents the accuracy evaluation of the cost model used in the Oases planner.

Appendix D covers detailed parallel strategies found by Oases planner along with optimization time.

Appendix E provides additional scalability experiments of Oases on two model settings.

A Related works

Large-scale model training. Researchers use a variety of parallel methods for foundation model training. Data parallelism is commonly achieved using Horovod [40] and PyTorch-DDP [22]. Restricted by the massive number of parameters, a single device cannot hold an entire foundation model. Recent works rematerialize runtime memories [5, 13, 45], reduce the redundant memory across data-parallel devices [34, 58, 60], and employ extensional memories [36, 35]. While model parallelism scatters models into device groups. Pipeline model parallelism [12, 26] divides model layers into stages and executes them in a pipeline, but may still encounter memory limitations with giant models. Tensor model parallelism (TMP) [43, 52, 18] partitions model operators and drastically reduces the memory usage but results in high communication overhead. A combination of these methods is often necessary for foundation model training [14, 59, 49, 20] and can complement our work since Oases focus on the communication-computation overlap of TMP.

Automatic model partitioning. Recent studies have proposed automated methods for optimizing model partitioning. For pipeline model parallelism, works use algorithms including heuristic algorithm [26] and dynamic programming [8, 28, 24] to balance the overhead between pipeline stages. For model-parallel training, researchers search for partition schemes with methods such as randomized Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) [15] and reinforcement learning [1]. Finding an optimal parallel strategy for multiple parallel methods together will greatly enlarge the optimization space. Prior works [21, 46, 14, 49, 59] mainly focus on how to simplify and solve this problem. The training schedule of Oases can be applied to the model-parallel methods to achieve efficient training. And existing automatic model partition methods cannot apply to overlapped TMP training, which is the core problem Oases planner tries to answer.

Communication-computation overlap. Overlapping is an effective technique to reduce communication overhead. To reduce the gradient aggregation overhead in data-parallel training, communication scheduling is intensively studied. The communication of gradients can be overlapped with backpropagation [56, 42] and forward propagation of the subsequent iteration [33, 23, 27]. In pipeline model parallelism, peer-to-peer communications happen between pipeline stages, and methods [30, 54, 61] focus on overlapping this communication with computation. Works on data parallelism and pipeline model parallelism are orthogonal to Oases since TMP is generally combined with them. The communication of TMP holds a larger proportion in foundation model training, approaches [53, 55, 20] overlap the communications with decoupled operations or data. And Oases propose a more exhaustive overlapped training schedule for TMP in this paper.

B Experiment setup

B.1 Environment

We conduct experiments of Oases on two 8-node commodity GPU clusters. The clusters differed based on whether they were equipped with NVLink. The hardware of each node includes four NVIDIA GeForce RTX3090 GPUs each with 24GB memory, two Intel Xeon 4214R@2.40GHz CPUs, and 128GB DDR4 RAM. Nodes within each cluster are connected via a 100Gbps InfiniBand, and intra-node GPUs interconnect via 16-lane PCIe 4.0. All servers run 64-bit Ubuntu 18.04, CUDA 11.3, cuDNN 8.2.1, NCCL 2.10.3, GPU driver 510.68.02, and PyTorch 1.10.0.

B.2 Model settings

Model configurations used for end-to-end performance experiments. Table 4 lists the model settings used in end-to-end performance (Section 5.2), device efficiency (Section 5.3), and ablation study (Section 5.5) experiments. The sequence length is set to 1024, and each experiment uses 32 GPUs. The TMP and DP degrees are the best strategies used in baselines and might be changed with Oases planner. In the experiment result analysis, we represent these models with their hidden size and number of transformer layers. The model settings are derived from previous studies [29, 43], and are consistent with popular foundation models. For instance, the model with a hidden size of 1024 corresponds to the BERT model [6]. The model layers with hidden sizes of 4096 and 8192 are in line

Table 4: The model configurations of end-to-end performance experiments in Figure 4, and Table 2- 3.

| Model hidden size (H) | Number of layers (L) | Attention heads | TMP degree | DP degree | Global batch size |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1024 | 24 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 256 |
| 2048 | 24 | 32 | 4 | 8 | 128 |
| 3072 | 24 | 48 | 4 | 8 | 32 |
| 4096 | 16 | 64 | 4 | 8 | 32 |
| 6144 | 16 | 96 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| 8192 | 8 | 128 | 8 | 4 | 8 |
| 12288 | 4 | 192 | 8 | 4 | 8 |

Table 5: The model configurations of complete model experiments in Figure 5.

| Model name | Hidden size | Number of layers | Attention heads | PMP degree | TMP degree | DP degree | Micro batch size |
|------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|
| GPT-18.4B | 6144 | 40 | 48 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| GPT-39.1B | 8192 | 48 | 64 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 |

with the layers used in LLaMA models [48]. The model layer with a hidden size of 12288 aligns with the GPT3 [4] and OPT [57] model layers.

Model configurations used for complete model experiments. Table 5 lists the model settings used in training complete models with pipeline model parallelism (PMP) (Section 5.4). The model settings follow those of Megatron-LM [29]. Due to GPU memory limitations, employing more GPUs is necessary to accommodate each model in our experiments.

C Cost model accuracy

To evaluate the accuracy of Oases planner cost model in Section 4.2, we compare the estimated iteration time from the cost model to the actual iteration time, and the results are shown in Figure 6. Since the objective of Oases planner is to provide a strategy with the best performance, we evaluate the precision of the cost model based on its efficiency to rank different parallel strategies, with less emphasis on the absolute value of its prediction. The Spearman correlation results of 0.844 and 0.876 show a strong positive correlation between the outcome of cost model and the real situation.




Figure 6: Iteration time comparisons between the cost model estimate and actual cost. The Spearman correlation ranges from -1 to 1, with a value of 0.5 regarded as a relatively strong positive correlation.

Table 6: The parallel strategies of Table 3 and the optimization time of Oases planner.

| Cluster | Model hidden size | # of layers | Algorithm | Parallel strategy | Optim. time (ms) | Throughput (k tokens/s) |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| NVLink 3090 | 2048 | 24 | w/o Planner | [[4] * 24] | - | 43.9 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[2] * 8 + [4] * 16] | 451.6 | 50.9 |
| | 4096 | 16 | w/o Planner | [[4] * 16] | - | 23.8 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[2] * 10 + [4] * 6] | 380.4 | 25.2 |
| | 8192 | 8 | w/o Planner | [[8] * 8] | - | 8.9 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[4] * 2 + [8] * 6] | 157.7 | 9.1 |
| 3090 | 2048 | 24 | w/o Planner | [[4] * 24] | - | 42.5 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[2] * 8 + [4] * 16] | 495.4 | 44.7 |
| | 4096 | 16 | w/o Planner | [[4] * 16] | - | 23.8 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[2] * 10 + [4] * 6] | 410.0 | 24.3 |
| | 8192 | 8 | w/o Planner | [[8] * 8] | - | 8.9 |
| | | | w/ Planner | [[4] * 2 + [8] * 6] | 162.7 | 9.0 |




Figure 7: Scaling performance compared to the Megatron-LM and corresponding ideal linear results.

D Parallel strategy

Table 6 presents parallel strategies (TMP degrees) for each layer and the time taken for Planner optimization of the experiments conducted in Section 5.5. A decreasing TMP degree of some layers will accelerate the model training. Although the Planner overhead increased with the number of model layers, all optimization processes are completed within only half a second in our experiments.

E Scalability experiment

We can evaluate the scalability of Oases by analyzing the weak scaling results, where we increase the global batch size along with the number of GPUs. As shown in Figure 7, we compare the training throughputs with the Megatron-LM and corresponding ideal linear scaling results. Both Megatron-LM and Oases demonstrate good scalability. Due to the limited scope of our cluster, we cannot conduct tests on more GPUs. Nevertheless, given the good scalability of Oases, we expect it to have a continuous advantage on more devices.