1 Introduction

The recent technological advances have significantly contributed to a rapid increase in the algorithmic complexity of various applications, from digital signal processing to autonomous aerial, ground and underwater systems [1]. In order to control and manage this increased algorithmic complexity, heterogeneous computing systems require intelligent, flexible, and highly efficient programming strategies to provide high performance while minimizing energy costs [2, 3]. However, the current monolithic programming models and task mapping to compute engines do not fully exploit the recent architectural innovations and can exacerbate the load imbalance and communication inefficiencies [4].

In order to fully utilize the capabilities of hardware platforms, the compilation of parallel programs requires expert heuristics to decide how many threads to spawn and how to schedule them onto heterogeneous computing systems [5]. Due to workload imbalance, synchronization overhead, and resource sharing contention, the overall performance may lead to sub-optimal executions.

To address these issues, we need to predict the optimal processor (e.g., CPU or GPU) using machine learning models to provide better performance given a software kernel, which is formally defined as the device mapping problem [6]. It is analyzed and solved [5, 7, 8] by using machine learning approaches to outperform the inefficient heuristics. However, as applications become more diverse and complex, it is inefficient to map them only onto one type of processors. For example, autonomous car driving distributes the visualization and recognition tasks, consisting of many for loops, onto cores in GPUs to provide higher parallelization. At the same time, sequential decisions based on if-else statements require CPUs to provide a fast execution on a single critical thread. There is a tradeoff between GPUs and CPUs. Therefore, to combine the benefits of both CPUs and GPUs, as opposed to the traditional device mapping problem, we formulate a new problem to be considered within the high performance computing and machine learning contexts:

Given a complex software application, the goal is to learn a mapping function that predicts which code segments would run best on a specific hardware device in heterogeneous hardware platforms.

Computations in programs can be considered as a graph where each node represents a compute instruction and each edge represents an information flow from one instruction to another. This graph representation of programs enables us to model the dynamic dependency structures of software programs and helps analyze program characteristics and automatically compile programs in heterogeneous platforms. The automation is achieved via graph learning models to
Figure 1: Overview of the proposed Programmable Graph Learning framework (PGL). PGL constructs a dynamic dataflow graph for each input software program via LLVM IR. PGL then utilizes a novel feature extraction algorithm based on random walks and multi-fractal analysis to construct node features that capture the topological dependencies and structures in dynamic dataflow graphs. These features are further used by a graph autoencoder to partition the graph into clusters (i.e., software kernels) and a graph neural network model to predict the best hardware device for each kernel.

predict the type of each program from an initial feature matrix. In order to obtain the representative feature matrix from a graph, we apply multi-fractal analysis [9] to quantitatively measure the topological structures hidden in a graph.

To solve this challenging optimization problem, we propose a unified, end-to-end, programmable graph representation learning (PGL) framework capable of mining the complexity of high level programs down to the universal IR, extracting the specific computational patterns, and predicting which code segments run best on a specific core in heterogeneous hardware platforms. The proposed PGL framework, shown in Figure 1, is flexible and capable of working with various graph representations of software codes (e.g., regardless of abstract syntax tree, data-control flow graph). We also propose and evaluate a dynamic data flow graph representation constructed from a partially executed trace of a code, where nodes represent LLVM intermediate representation (IR) instructions and edges represent control, data, and memory dependencies, which can better identify the structural information flow and capture memory dependencies.

We evaluate the proposed PGL framework on a heterogeneous platform consisting of 32 CPUs and 32 GPUs. The GNN is first trained with C styled kernels converted from OpenCL from seven benchmark suites to learn the weights of GNNs. Next, we integrate the trained GNN model with the GAE into the framework and test new incoming applications. Experimental results demonstrate a maximum speedup of 6.42x when compared to the thread-based execution and 2.02x higher compared to the state-of-the-art technique.

Contributions. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We formulate a new challenging system optimization problem to be considered in the areas of machine learning and computing systems: Given a software program, the goal is to learn a mapping function that predicts which code segment should run on which hardware device in a heterogeneous computing system.
- We propose a unified, end-to-end, programmable graph representation learning framework (PGL) that automatically maps the computations of complex software applications to the appropriate hardware device in heterogeneous hardware platforms.
- The proposed PGL framework uses a novel topological feature extraction algorithm based on random walks and multi-fractal graph analysis to capture the local topological structures of a graph obtained from a program through advanced static and dynamic compiler analysis techniques.

2 Related Work

We summarize the related work into two areas: (1) deep learning models in compiler optimization, and (2) graph representation learning for code representation.

Deep Learning in Compiler Optimization. Heuristics used in compilers require expert knowledge to optimize programs on heterogeneous systems and often lead to sub-optimal performance due to synchronization overhead and
resource management. Machine learning techniques, in particular, deep learning methods, are being applied during the optimization phase to generate efficient machine code [10, 11, 2]. The recent work in [12] proposed an end-to-end deep reinforcement learning (DRL) method for ML compiler graph optimizations where the learned policies are generalized to new graphs and transferable to different tasks. [13, 14] proposed an end-to-end framework utilizing DRL for handling loop vectorization. In addition, machine learning techniques are also used to optimize the execution time of tensor computation graphs [15] as well as deep neural networks in TASO [16] and SOAP [17].

Graph Representation Learning for Code Representation. While many prior works have employed machine learning methods from natural language processing to represent programs as sequence of lexical tokens [18, 5], recently there emerged a number of graph-based machine learning works that aims to capture the structure of programs along with the syntactic and semantic information in the graph representation [19, 20, 21]. It has been observed that the graph-based representation learning strategies tend to have superior learning ability on the programs for many code analysis tasks, such as code similarity learning [22], program classification [23], etc. For instance, [21] uses abstract syntax trees (ASTs) and control-data flow graphs (CDFGs) independently to represent programs and apply GNNs for learning predictive compiler tasks on these graphs, which outperforms the recurrent neural networks (RNNs) on the token sequence representation of the programs. [7] models the program’s control, data and call dependencies as a graph, and applies a GNN to learn representations from the graph for both node-level and graph-level tasks including compiler analysis, program classification and device mapping.

However, compared to previous frameworks, we propose a unified end-to-end programmable graph representation learning (PGL) framework to solve the challenging task of heterogeneous device mapping. The framework has the offline training and online inference, yet it is fully autonomous, it does not require programmer intervention. Therefore, for a new platform with untrained machine learning models, we first learn the optimal mapping of code segments by adjusting the network weights. Once models are well trained, a new incoming program has to be compiled and executed once, next driven into GAE and GNN to predict which code segments are suitable for CPUs or GPUs.

3 Programmable Graph-based Learning Framework (PGL)

In this section, we describe the proposed PGL framework, which consists of four steps as shown in Figure 1. The descriptions of these steps are detailed in the next sections. Section 3.1 discusses the general approach to transform an application into a dynamic dataflow graph. Then, in Section 3.2, we develop a novel node feature extraction algorithm based on random walks and multi-fractal graph analysis to quantitatively measure the local fractal structures of a graph. Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 discuss the GAE graph partitioning and GNN heterogeneous device mapping prediction, respectively.

3.1 Input Program Modelling

Recently, various graph representations were proposed to represent and capture the latent information flow in a program (e.g., abstract syntax tree (AST) [19], contextual flow graph (XFG) [20], and control and data flow graph (CDFG) [21]). These graph representations allow the compiler to analyze the effectiveness and correctness of programs, as well as enable parallel programming via graph partitioning in high performance computing [4]. However, these statically compiled graphs have several limitations. First, memory dependencies are difficult to be identified. If not handled properly, this can exacerbate the data communication overhead and reduce the application performance. Second, the number of iterations in for and while loops cannot be statically determined. This plays a significant role in predicting whether the code is running in either CPU or GPU based on the workload. For example, if the number of iterations is small, it is ideal to run the code in CPU, because of the faster clock frequency. Otherwise, GPU is preferred because the number of cores on each chip is much denser to provide higher parallelism. Therefore, in order to overcome these drawbacks, we use information generated from static compiler analysis and dynamic compilation to model the information flow in high-level programs as a dynamic dataflow graph. Next, we propose the following representation.

Definition 3.1 (Dynamic Dataflow Graph). A dynamic dataflow graph is a weighted directed acyclic graph \( G = (V, E, W) \), where each node \( v \), associated with an attribute \( va \) indicating the type of the node (e.g., add, sub, store, or load), \((v, va) \in V \) represents an LLVM IR instruction; each edge \( e \), associated with an attribute \( ea \) indicating the type of dependencies (e.g., control, data, or memory), \((e, ea) \in E \) represents a dependency between two instructions; a weight \( w \in W \) on each edge \( e \) represents the amount of data communication between two instructions and the time to execute the instruction. It allows us to quantify communication overhead in the memory hierarchy with L1, L2, and L3 caches.
To construct these dynamic dataflow graphs, we first collect the representative dynamic trace generated from executing a program. This trace contains a sequence of LLVM IR instructions to be executed. Then, for each instruction, we check if one of the following dependencies exists and insert a directed edge to construct the graph:

- **Data dependency**: Source registers of the current instruction depend on the destination registers of the previous instructions.
- **Control dependency**: Source registers of the function calls and branches depend on the destination register of the previous instructions.
- **Memory dependency**: Memory locations of current store-load instruction are the same as the previous store-load instructions. We perform this memory alias analysis using "-basicaa -aa-eval -print-allalias-modref-info" in the LLVM environment.

Figure 2 shows the graph representation of forward propagation in a neural network with one hidden layer. Note that a node is an LLVM IR instruction, not an operand or a high level language (e.g., C/C++, Java) statement. Different from AST, XFG, and CDFGs, this specific graph representation in Figure 2 makes explicit some hidden program information flows from the execution trace generated at run-time and analyzed via data, control, and memory dependencies. One most recurring pattern is the cone structure due to the LLVM IR "getelementptr" generated from the pointers in for-loops to distribute data to different iterations.

### 3.2 Feature Extraction

Each node in a GNN is associated with numerous features, which are further used for clustering or classification to make decisions at node level or graph level. In the literature, the code2vec [19] and inst2vec [20] are commonly used to extract features by encoding programs via AST paths. However, the trained representations can put larger weights on names rather than code structure, which can lead to misclassification.

In order to exploit the graph structural information flow of programs, random walks reason about the number of adjacent nodes and the density of connections around a node [24]. A random walk is defined as a series of nodes, starting from \( n_0 \), the \( j \)th node is generated by the following distribution with a fixed length \( l \).

\[
P(n_j = j|n_i = i) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{w_{ij}}{\sum_j w_{ij}} & \text{if } (i, j) \in E \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( w_{ij} \) is the edge weight between node \( i \) and node \( j \). In addition, multifractal analysis mathematically studies the structural complexity and topological heterogeneity of graphs [9]. The multifractal properties such as generalized fractal dimensions provides the higher order statistics of a graph, which can be quantified by a finite box-covering method. That is, to study the different fractal structures in a graph, the box-covering method uses the box of the same size to cover the graph and then studies the relationship of the size of a box \( l \) and the number of nodes in the \( i \)th box of size \( l \) \( (N_i(l)) \) as

\[
\sum_i N_i(l)^q \sim l^{\tau(q)}
\]

where \( q \) is the distortion factor to differentiate the topological difference of fractal structures, and \( \tau(q) \) is the mass exponent. Next, we can obtain the generalized fractal dimensions \( D(q) \) from \( \tau(q) \), which characterizes the different fractal structures of a graph.

\[
D(q) = \frac{\tau(q)}{q - 1}
\]

Therefore, to mine the local and scale dependent topological properties of programs, we propose Algorithm 1 which exploits random walks and multifractal concepts for encoding topological interdependencies (See the Appendix A for the full details of Algorithm 1.). Random walks explore the local topological density around a node \( i \) in a graph by finding random paths starting from node \( i \) to node \( j \). Once a random path is identified, we backtrack to the final destination node \( j \) to find the subgraph \( SG \) starting from \( i \) to \( j \). Next, we perform a multifractal analysis on the subgraph...
to estimate its generalized fractal dimension. The time complexity of Algorithm 1 is bounded by the Dijkstra strategy to find the shortest path for each node to every other nodes, which is \(O(E \log V)\), where \(E\) and \(V\) are the number of edges and nodes, respectively. Finding all shortest paths in a graph has a time complexity of \(O(EV \log V)\).

### 3.3 Graph Representation Learning

Once we extracted the initial node features from the dynamic dataflow graph, we design a deep graph representation learning module with GNNs [25] for the graph partition and device mapping prediction problem. Specifically, we propose to use a graph autoencoder (GAE) for partitioning the graph into kernels and a GNN to predict the correct label.

#### 3.3.1 GAE-based Graph Partitioning

Graph auto-encoders (GAEs) [26] are a category of GNNs that aims at representing nodes into low-dimensional vectors in an unsupervised training fashion. They are different from other GNNs that are typically used for supervised or semi-supervised learning tasks. In our framework, the goal of the graph partitioning stage is to obtain a good partition for each LLVM graph based on a learned representation that captures the intrinsic structural information of the graph, such that the subgraphs preserve the inherent characteristics of the data, control and memory dependencies in the LLVM graph. To this end, we propose a graph partitioning strategy based on the GAE [27] and spectral clustering [28] for our task, as shown in Appendix B.

#### 3.3.2 GNN-based Device Mapping Prediction

Once the graph is partitioned into different clusters/kernels, next for each kernel, we use a GNN to predict the correct platform to execute the kernel by updating the node vectors iteratively in a similar fashion to the message passing. Note that our proposed PGL is a general framework that can leverage various GNN models for the device mapping prediction stage, whereas in this paper, we adopt three different variants of the GNN models: GCN [29], graph attention network (GAT) [30, 31] and gated graph neural network (GGNN) [32], respectively, for this task discussed briefly in Appendix B. We also empirically investigate the comparative effectiveness of these GNN strategies in representation learning on the partitioned LLVM graphs for the graph classification task in heterogeneous device mapping.

### 4 Experiments

**Setup.** Given a software program, our goal is to identify the subgraphs (i.e., code segments) that are optimal to run on CPUs or GPUs.¹ Our developed end-to-end framework discussed in the previous section consists of two components: a GAE and a GNN. Unsupervised learning model GAE is used to partition the new complicated program into several clusters/kernels to be mapped onto heterogeneous systems. Supervised learning model GNN predicts the correct label for each kernel. In the implementation, we use kernels written in OpenCL [5] as training and testing data with 5-fold cross validation for the GNN model. The ground-truth labels are either CPU or GPU for the kernels. In order to evaluate the PGL framework, we first use the GAE model to partition the graphs, to find kernels suitable for either CPU or GPU. Next, different GNN models are used to predict the correct label to the underlying hardware. Table 3 (in Appendix C.1) lists the configuration parameters of the heterogeneous system used in this section.

**Datasets.** We start by using the 256 heterogeneous device mapping OpenCL kernels in [5] for training and validation of GNNs. These kernels are labelled with CPU vs. GPU; we use the NVIDIA dataset. We then manually convert these kernels to C code. Furthermore, we use standard application benchmarks in Table 4 (in Appendix C.2) to validate the overall PGL framework.

**Baseline Comparisons.** When comparing the accuracy of the prediction results from GNN models, we use the following: (1) GCN; (2) GAT; and (3) GGNN. We compare our graph representation to the ProGraML [7] graph representation, NCC [20], and DeepTune [5], state-of-the-art techniques to represent programs as graphs. To quantify the benefits of graph partitioning, we compare the PGL framework with the following baselines in terms of the application performance: (1) K-means clustering connected with GCNs (KM+GCN); (2) hierarchical divisive clustering where all observations start in one cluster, and divisions are performed recursively as one moves down the hierarchy, connected with GCNs (HDC+GCN); (3) modularity-based community detection where an optimization model is proposed to measure the structure of graphs [33, 4], connected with GCNs (MOD+GCN); (4) METIS graph partitioning [34] connected with GCNs (METIS+GCN); (5) feed-forward neural network, connected with GCNs [3] (NN+GCN). In addition, we compare the PGL framework in terms of the application performance with the following baselines: (1)

¹Performance varies by use, configuration and other factors. Learn more at www.Intel.com/PerformanceIndex.
threads in parallel programming (PAR); (2) modularity based community detection to partition the graph into clusters and a heuristic mapping [4] (CommDet); (3) sliding window based neural network to locate specialized structures with a reinforcement learning based mapping (NN+RL) [3]; (4) gem5-aladdin, an end-to-end SoC simulation [35].

4.1 Graph Representation Comparison

In order to validate the effectiveness of PGL, we compare it with state-of-the-art techniques in terms of the accuracy of the prediction results on the same dataset [5]. We compare against the DeepTune and NCC using the code released by their authors. We also compare our graph representation against the ProGraML graph representation by extracting ProGraML graphs from the C versions of the kernels and training a GGNN on the graphs. As we can see from Table 1, DeepTune and NCC can only give

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>( F_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeepTune</td>
<td>67.31% ± 3.89%</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>76.57% ± 3.13%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProGraML-GGNN</td>
<td>80.83% ± 3.37%</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGL-GCN</td>
<td>86.38% ± 2.78%</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGL-GAT</td>
<td>89.65% ± 2.24%</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGL-GGNN</td>
<td>91.39% ± 2.59%</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Ablation study on the impact of various parameters in PGL on the overall accuracy: the number of random walkers, the cut-off range, GNN model, the number of neurons in a hidden layer, different graph features, and GNN architecture.
The ProGraML representation provides 80.83% accuracy. However, according to neural architecture search, PGL can provide up to 91.39% accuracy. The reason is that our graph representation of a program differs from the same program with different number of iterations in for loops. This enables the graph representation with more information.

4.2 Ablation Study

In this section, we measure different accuracy results from different parameters in PGL by running each experiment 5 times for different number of neurons in the hidden layer, as shown in Figure 3. The default parameters include 16 random walkers, cut-off range in multifractal analysis to be the diameter of the graph, GGNN graph model, 64 neurons in a hidden layer, and its architecture to be one input, hidden, and output layer. In the experiments, we vary one parameter while fixing the rest. In the end, we compare the range and distribution of the accuracy for each parameter.

**Random Walkers.** We first vary the number of random walkers from 2 to 64 to show how much contribution in random walks. As we can see, increasing the number has a diminishing return beyond 16 walkers as the median accuracy starts at around 73% at 2 walkers and reaches over 91% at 16 walkers. It is because when the number of walkers becomes large, some walkers may visit the same nodes, which leads to the same features in multifractal analysis.

**Cut-off Range in Multifractal Analysis.** Next, we vary the cut-off range in multifractal analysis to illustrate how important is multi-fractal analysis. Cut-off range is used in the Dijkstra algorithm in multifractal analysis and defined as the length (sum of edge weights) at which the search is stopped. Therefore, controlling the range allows us to exploit the local structures around a node. In the experiment, we vary it from 2 to 64. As we can see, when the cut-off range is only 2, the accuracy is only 55.97%. It is because the multifractal analysis in this case does not provide meaningful features to the GNN model. However, as we increase the cut-off range to 64, which is the upper bound of network diameters in the dataset, the accuracy reaches to over 90% because the multifractal analysis has the full visibility of the graphs and is able to find the correct features.

**GNN Model.** PGL provides common interfaces to connect GNNs to the rest of the pipeline. It is flexible enough to support different GNN models. Therefore, in this experiment, we choose three commonly used models to be analyzed, namely, GCN, GAT, and GGNN. As we can see, GGNN provides the highest accuracy with smallest standard deviation (on average over 92%) whereas GCN and GAT can only provide 81.56% and 86.4% on average, respectively. This is mainly due to the fact that GGNN uses the gated recurrent unit (GRU) for long-term propagation of information across a graph structure [32], which enables it to better capture long-range dependencies from the code graphs compared to GCN and GAT.

**Neuron Count.** We validate different combinations of parameters with respect to the number of neurons in a hidden layer on the final accuracy, i.e., (GCN, multifractal), (GAT, multifractal), (GGNN, multifractal), and (GGNN, degree). In general, 64 or 128 neurons provide higher accuracy compared to others. Especially in the case of (GGNN, multifractal), 128 neurons provide smaller standard deviation compared to others. We believe it is because that when using a too small or too large number of neurons, the models cannot accurately learn the hidden structures of a graph.

**Graph Feature Embedding.** Next, we vary the graph features from node degree and weights to multifractal properties, using the default GGNN architecture. As we can see from Figure 3, multifractal features can provide at most 93.98% accuracy and over 90% on average whereas degree and weight features can only achieve at most 82.51% and 88.66% accuracy, respectively. This validates that our proposed graph feature extraction algorithm mentioned in Algorithm 1 can exploit the topological structures of a graph and find the local information around nodes.

In addition, we compare the proposed feature extraction algorithm based on random walk and multifractal analysis concepts rather than simply using the node degree, or edge weight as a feature, and the state-of-the-art inst2vec [20] on the same GCN architecture to validate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm. As we can see in Table 2, simple node features such as degree and edge weight cannot guarantee stable prediction results on the testing graph data as it only provides up to 72.2% accuracy. Compared with the state-of-the-art learnable representation of code semantics inst2vec, our feature extraction strategy can provide 14.77% higher accuracy due to the fact that the trained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Feature</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>48.54% ± 4.33%</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>68.93% ± 3.32%</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst2vec</td>
<td>75.7% ± 3.51%</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGL</td>
<td>91.23% ± 2.75%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representation of inst2vec puts large weights on semantics rather than the code structure. Therefore, our algorithm can achieve better results by quantifying local structures of the code.

GNN Architecture. Finally, in order to see the impact of deep GNNs on the final accuracy, we vary the number of hidden layers from 1 to 3. We observe that the average accuracy is decreasing (92.43%, 90.19%, and 89.37%) and the standard deviation is increasing (1.15%, 1.29%, and 1.44%) when the number of hidden layers increases. It is mainly due to the over-squashing issue that tends to occur when increasing the number of layers in GNNs. This causes the information on graphs is compressed and fails to learn long-range signals [36].

4.3 Parameter Tuning

As we can see from the ablation study, many hyperparameters could have a significant impact on the overall accuracy of the model we are training. Therefore, in order to find optimal values for the parameters of the GNN model which is later used in the application-level evaluation in Section 4.4, we rely on grid search to automate parameter tuning. For each parameter discussed in Section 4.2, we select a range of values to search for and use GridSearchCV to improve the accuracy of our model. Experimental results suggest that the number of random walkers be 16, cut-off range be 128, the GNN model be GGNN, the number of neurons be 64, the graph feature be multifractal properties, and the number of hidden layers be 1.

4.4 Application-level Evaluation

Training. First, in order to see how the training step has an impact on the overall accuracy, for each application, we vary the number of epochs used during training of the GGNN model and directly use the model to predict labels for clusters generated from GAE. Finally, we measure the application performance executed in a heterogeneous platform in Table 3 to figure out how well the model is trained. As we can see from Figure 4, compared to randomly selecting a label for each cluster (slow execution at 10%-30% training), a fully trained model can provide up to 3.8x performance improvement.

Graph Partitioning. Next, in order to validate the advantages of the GAE used to partition the large input application into small kernels in the PGL framework, we fix the graph neural network as GCN with two hidden layers and 32 neurons per layer, which is used to predict the correct label for each kernel. We compare the GAE with different partitioning algorithms such as K-means (KM), hierarchical divisive clustering (HDC), modularity-based community detection (MOD), METIS, and feed-forward neural network (NN) in terms of the total application execution speedup. As shown in Figure 5, for the partitioning models without machine learning such as KM, HDC, MOD, and METIS, the normalized execution speedup is smaller compared to the learning models such as NN and GAE. It is mainly because the kernels after graph partitioning are not well recognized by the GCN model. For the learning models, GAE outperforms NN by up to 32% in a sense that the GAE takes into account the graph structures of code.

The PGL Framework. The proposed PGL framework is able to predict which code segments run best on a specific processor. Therefore, in order to validate the framework including the GAE and GNN models, we use the trained
models discussed in Section 3 to predict each application in Table 4. As shown in Figure 6, we use the traditional thread based parallel programming running on CPUs as our baseline and compare the PGL framework with community detection, neural network with reinforcement learning, and gem5-aladdin. We observe that the PGL framework can provide up to 6.42x speedup compared to the baseline and 2.02x speedup higher compared to the state-of-the-art.

5 Conclusion

We proposed an end-to-end learnable PGL framework to predict which code segments run best on a specific hardware device. We first develop a node feature extraction algorithm based on random walks and multifractal analysis concepts to quantify the local structures of a program. Next, we build the GAE together with a decoder and spectral clustering to find cluster partition from the distance matrix. Then, we use graph neural networks as the learning model to predict the type of each cluster. Our evaluation on 32 CPUs and 32 GPUs concludes that the PGL framework can provide up to 6.42x speedup compared to the baseline and 2.02x higher speedup compared to the state-of-the-art technique.
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Appendix

A Random Walk based Fractal Analysis

Algorithm 1 Random Walk based Fractal Analysis

1: **INPUTS**: An LLVM graph \( G \) with \( N \) nodes, \( K \) random walks, \( D \) walk length, \( Q \) distortion factors
2: **OUTPUT**: \( N \) by \((K \times Q)\) node features \( F \)
3: Create a feature matrix \( F \) of size \( N \) by \( K \times Q \)
4: for each node indexed by \( i \) in the graph \( G \) do
5: \hspace{1em} **for** \( K \) times do
6: \hspace{2em} /* Perform a random walk */
7: \hspace{3em} for \( D \) times do
8: \hspace{4em} Calculate the probability of the transition to node \( j \)
9: \hspace{4em} Select the next node and set it as the current node
10: \hspace{3em} end for
11: /* So far we find the destination node denoted as \( j \) */
12: /* Find the subgraph \( SG \) starting from \( i \) to \( j \) */
13: Backtrack the node \( j \) to find all nodes until the node \( i \)
14: /* Find the generalized fractal dimension from the \( SG \) */
15: Set the distortion factor \( q \) to be a vector of -10 to 10
16: \( w = \text{GFD}(SG, q) \)
17: \( F[i].\text{append}(w) \)
18: end for
19: end for
20: **Function**: \( \text{GFD} \)
21: **INPUTS**: a graph \( G \), distortion factor \( q \) of size \( Q \)
22: **OUTPUT**: generalized fractal dimension of size \( Q \)
23: \( \text{diameter} = \text{Diam}(G) \)
24: for each node \( i \) in the graph \( G \) do
25: Calculate the shortest path length from \( i \) to every node
26: Calculate the ratio of nodes to be covered with a box size \( l \)
27: end for
28: for each \( qv \) in \( q \) do
29: Apply linear regression to find the exponent \( \tau \) in Eq. (2)
30: \( \tau.\text{append}(\tau) \)
31: end for
32: \( \text{gfd} = \tau / (q - 1) \)

B GAE Partitioning

Algorithm 2 GAE Partitioning

1: **INPUTS**: A graph \( G \) and a feature matrix \( X \)
2: **OUTPUT**: A cluster partition
3: \( \text{repeat} \)
4: Perform the GAE with two graph convolutional layers to get the embedding \( Z \)
5: Calculate the symmetric distance matrix \( D \) by \( \hat{A} = ZZ^T, D = \frac{1}{2}(|\hat{A}| + |\hat{A}|^T) \)
6: Obtain the partition via spectral clustering on \( D \)
7: until \( 99\% \) of nodes in the partition are stabilized.

Given the graph \( G = (V, E) \) with an adjacency matrix \( A \) and node features in an \( N \times D \) matrix \( X \), we apply the graph auto-encoder (GAE) model introduced in [27] with two graph convolutional layers. We calculate embeddings \( Z \) and the reconstructed matrix \( \hat{A} \) as follows:

\[
\hat{A} = \sigma(ZZ^T), \text{ with } Z = GCN(X, A) \tag{4}
\]

After we obtain the node embeddings via GAE, we use spectral clustering [28] on the node embeddings for the graph partitioning. The overall workflow of this stage is shown in Algorithm 2. Specifically, we first perform the GAE with
two graph convolutional layers to learn the latent embedding $Z$. Next, we maintain an inner product decoder $\hat{A} = ZZ^T$ to learn the pairwise distance between nodes. We then perform spectral clustering after calculating the symmetric and non-negative distance matrix $D = \frac{1}{2}(|A| + |A|^T)$.

B.1 Graph Neural Networks

Graph Convolutional Network. We consider a multi-layer graph convolutional network (GCN) with the layer-wise propagation rule proposed in [29]. Assume $H^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is the matrix of activations in the $l$-th layer, according to the propagation rule, we have

$$H^{(l+1)} = \sigma(\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{A} \tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)})$$

(5)

where $\tilde{A} = A + I_n$ is the weight matrix of the graph, $I_n$ is an identity matrix, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal degree matrix of the graph, and $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the activation function. $\Theta$ is a layer-specific trainable weight matrix. $H^{(0)} = X$ is the input feature matrix of the graph.

Graph Attention Network. Unlike the GCNs discussed above, where the node neighborhoods are aggregated with equal weights, graph attention network (GAT) introduces an attention mechanism into GCNs to allow variance in the influences of neighbors. We use the GAT introduced in [30, 31] and define the propagation rule in GAT as:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \sigma\left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \alpha_{ij}^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)} \right)$$

(6)

where $\alpha_{ij}^{(l)}$ is node $v_i$’s attention to node $v_j$ in the $l$-th layer:

$$\alpha_{ij}^{(l)} = \frac{\exp(\text{LeakyReLU}(\mathcal{F}(h_i^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)}, h_j^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)})))}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \exp(\text{LeakyReLU}(\mathcal{F}(h_i^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)}, h_k^{(l)} \Theta^{(l)})))}$$

(7)

where $\mathcal{N}(i)$ is the set of neighboring nodes of node $i$ in the graph, $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a function to be learned. In our experiments, we use a single-layer feedforward neural network for the attention mechanism parameterized by a weight vector, and apply the LeakyReLU nonlinearity.

Gated Graph Neural Network. Gated graph neural network (GGNN) incorporates gate mechanism like Gate Recurrent Units (GRU) [37] or Long Short-term Memory (LSTM) [38] in the propagation stage in the GNN models to improve the long-term information propagation across the graph. In this work, we use the GGNN with GRU introduced in [32] and define the recurrence of the propagation as follows:

$$a_i^t = A_i^T [h_i^{t-1} \cdots h_N^{t-1}]^T + b$$

$$z_i^t = \sigma(W^z a_i^t + U^z h_i^{t-1})$$

$$r_i^t = \sigma(W^r a_i^t + U^r h_i^{t-1})$$

$$\vec{h}_i^t = \tanh(W a_i^t + U (r_i^t \odot h_i^{t-1}))$$

$$h_i^t = (1 - z_i^t) \odot h_i^{t-1} + z_i^t \odot \vec{h}_i^t$$

where the node $i$ first aggregates message from its neighbors, and $A_i$ is the sub-matrix of the graph adjacency matrix $A$, which denotes the connections between node $i$ and its neighbors. $z$ and $r$ are the update and reset gates, respectively. As such, the GRU update functions incorporate information from the other nodes and from the previous timestamp to update the hidden state of each node $i$.

Once the feature embedding is learned from the GNN models, we use two fully connected feed-forward neural network layers to predict the correct label for each kernel.
C  Experiment Setup and Benchmarks

C.1  Experiment Setup

Table 3: Configuration parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cores</td>
<td>32 cores, 16 MSHRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clock frequency</td>
<td>2.4 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 private cache</td>
<td>64KB, 4-way associative 32-byte blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 shared cache</td>
<td>256KB, distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>4 GB, 8 GB/s bandwidth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GPU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clock frequency</td>
<td>575 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory capacity</td>
<td>768 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory bandwidth</td>
<td>86.4 GB/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Network</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topology</td>
<td>Mesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routing algorithm</td>
<td>XY routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow control</td>
<td>Virtual channel flit-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.2  Benchmarks

Table 4: Applications and descriptions. We use the following eight benchmarks to validate the benefits of the PGL framework whereas we use the dataset [5] to train the graph neural network in the framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Input Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dijkstra</td>
<td>Find the shortest path</td>
<td>100 nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fft</td>
<td>Fast Fourier transform</td>
<td>vector of size 4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kmeans</td>
<td>K cluster partitioning</td>
<td>256 2D tuples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandel</td>
<td>Calculate Mandelbrot set</td>
<td>4092 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>Molecular dynamics</td>
<td>1024 particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn</td>
<td>Neural network</td>
<td>5 hidden FC layers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuron</td>
<td>ReLU neurons</td>
<td>1024 neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnn</td>
<td>Conv. neural network</td>
<td>conv-pool-FC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Application graph statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>No. Nodes</th>
<th>No. Edges</th>
<th>Avg Path Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dijkstra</td>
<td>502,897</td>
<td>588,046</td>
<td>17.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fft</td>
<td>456,183</td>
<td>572,053</td>
<td>15.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kmeans</td>
<td>705,184</td>
<td>839,125</td>
<td>22.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandel</td>
<td>235,051</td>
<td>260,042</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md</td>
<td>1,799,353</td>
<td>2,361,213</td>
<td>34.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn</td>
<td>227,766</td>
<td>286,714</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neuron</td>
<td>987,184</td>
<td>1,174,843</td>
<td>52.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cnn</td>
<td>361,464</td>
<td>520,596</td>
<td>13.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D  Run-time Mapping

At run-time, the tasks generated from each application are mapped onto the system. The mapping exploits and optimizes the parallelism while considering data communication between tasks and resource utilization [39].

In order to improve performance, the run-time mapping should exploit and optimize the parallelism while considering data communication between tasks and resource utilization. Therefore, the run-time mapping algorithm takes as inputs the tasks, their interactions, and data communication and schedules a mapping from tasks to processors with the objective of improving application performance. If data are transferred between two different tasks, then the greedy run-time scheduler tried to allocate two available cores that are the closest based on the Manhattan distance.