# Heuristic optimization with heterogeneous AI frameworks

Zsolt Kisander PTE-MIK, Department of Automation



# Typical AI framework architecture



# Out of box hardware acceleration

- Modern AI frameworks are built on top of hardware accelerated math libraries (MKL, CUDA, etc.)
- They provide easy to use, high level APIs
- Drop-in replacement for popular Python math and ML libraries
- Seamless transition between different computing architectures (deployment)

Optimized Mathematical Building Blocks Library Intel® Math Kernel Library (Intel® MKL)



# Autodiff and autograd

- Serves as the basis of the backpropagation algorithm, but not restricted to neural networks
- PyTorch module: torch.autograd
- Automatic differentiation of arbitrary scalar valued functions (loss fn)
- Supports automatic computation of gradient for any computational graph
- If we define a computational model with a scalar valued performance metric, then we can use autograd to tune the model parameters







#### **Motivation - Summary**

- Al frameworks provide high-level abstraction over mathematical libraries
- Uniform API across different computing architectures
- Not restricted to neural network models
- Hardware acceleration can be used to solve non-Al problems

## Example - Four coloring

- No more than four colors are required to color the regions of any map so that no two adjacent regions have the same color
- In graph-theoretic terms, the theorem states that for loopless planar graph, its chromatic number is less than or equal four



#### Example - US states



#### **Graph of US states**

|                         | Alabama | Arizona | Arkansas | California | Colorado | Connecticut | Delaware | District<br>of<br>Columbia | Florida | Geor |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|----------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|---------|------|
| Alabama                 | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 1       |      |
| Arizona                 | 0       | 0       | 0        | 1          | 1        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Arkansas                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| California              | 0       | 1       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Colorado                | 0       | 1       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Connecticut             | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Delaware                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| District of<br>Columbia | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Florida                 | 1       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Georgia                 | 1       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 1       |      |
| Idaho                   | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Illinois                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Indiana                 | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| lowa                    | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Kansas                  | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 1        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Kentucky                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Louisiana               | 0       | 0       | 1        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Maine                   | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Maryland                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 0           | 1        | 1                          | 0       |      |
| Massachusetts           | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | 1           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |
| Michigan                | 0       | 0       | 0        | 0          | 0        | n           | 0        | 0                          | 0       |      |



tensor([[0, 0, 0, 1], [0, 0, 0, 1],[0, 0, 1, 0],[0, 1, 0, 0],[0, 0, 1, 0], [0, 1, 0, 0], [1, 0, 0, 0]. [1, 0, 0, 0], [1, 0, 0, 0], [0, 0, 1, 0], tensor([[0.0145, 0.1547, 0.2028, 0.6280], [0, 0, 0, 1], [1, 0, 0, 0],[0, 1, 0, 0],[0.0380, 0.3634, 0.3822, 0.2164], [0, 0, 1, 0], [0.4776, 0.0215, 0.0645, 0.4364], [1, 0, 0, 0],[0.5077, 0.1789, 0.0715, 0.2420], [0, 0, 1, 0], [0.0919, 0.4041, 0.2066, 0.2973], [1, 0, 0, 0], [0.0605, 0.0551, 0.5995, 0.2849], [0, 0, 1, 0],[0.1468, 0.2879, 0.5467, 0.0187], [0.1868, 0.0508, 0.2139, 0.5485], [0, 0, 0, 1], [0.1415, 0.1145, 0.1192, 0.6248], [1, 0, 0, 0], [0.0386, 0.3112, 0.3116, 0.3386], [1, 0, 0, 0], [0.1767, 0.1166, 0.2088, 0.4979], [1, 0, 0, 0], [0.0604, 0.0554, 0.8131, 0.0710], [0.6682, 0.0555, 0.0716, 0.2048], [0.2157, 0.5020, 0.2151, 0.0671], [0.7103, 0.0238, 0.0353, 0.2306], [0.2241, 0.1507, 0.3075, 0.3178], [0.2021, 0.2389, 0.0416, 0.5173], [0.4137, 0.0380, 0.0844, 0.4639]], grad\_fn=<SoftmaxBackward0>)

# Problem formulation in PyTorch I.

Let A be the m×m adjacency matrix of a finite, loopless planar graph. Let C be an m×n matrix, where each row represents a vertex and each row vector is a one-hot encoded color vector candidate. In Torch, the default variable is the "tensor".

Initially, fill C with i.i.d. random numbers. Apply row-wise softmax normalization after each update on C to ensure one-hot encoding for row vectors.

$$softmax(r)_i = \frac{\exp(r_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{\sum_{i=1}^{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=$$

[0.5330, 0.1573, 0.1309, 0.1788], [0.3996, 0.4051, 0.0592, 0.1361],

# Problem formulation in PyTorch II.

- Take the product C\*C<sup>T</sup> (matmul). In the m×m result, each element can be interpreted as a "color similarity"
- 2. Mask the resulting matrix with the adjacency matrix by calculating the elementwise product
- 3. Sum all the elements to get a scalar valued metric of coloring error (loss)
- 4. Minimize the error w.r.t C, using torch.autograd

$$L(C) = \sum \sum [(CC^{T}) \circ A]$$

### Problem formulation in PyTorch III.

return torch.mul(torch.matmul(co, co.T), adj).sum().sum()

```
class Colors(nn.Module):
    def __init__(self, initial_t=1, t_reduce_factor=0.99):
        super(Colors, self).__init__()
        self.colors = torch.randn((len(counties), nb_colors), requires_grad=True, device="cuda:0")
        self.T = initial_t
        self.factor = t_reduce_factor
    def forward(self):
        return nn.functional.softmax((1.0/self.T)*self.colors, dim=1)
    def reduce_T(self):
        self.T *= self.factor
def loss_fn(co, adj):
```

# "Training" loop

- In the forward step, we evaluate the model (simply outputting the color candidates)
- In the backward step, we calculate the loss gradients and modify the model parameters
- Repeat until an acceptable result
- Due to its heuristic nature, the algorithm does not guarantee convergence to an optimal coloring, therefore restart conditions should be defined
  - patience restart if the loss fails to decrease after some number of steps

```
zero = 1e-12
loss = loss_fn(cc(), adjacency)
while loss > zero:
    loss = loss_fn(cc(), adjacency)
    optimizer.zero_grad()
    loss.backward()
    optimizer.step()
```

# Results I.

- Using the %%timeit magic function from Jupyter
- Devices
  - o i5-5300u CPU
  - Nvidia GTX 1050 Ti GPU
  - Google Colab Nvidia T4 GPU instance
- D-Wave Leap QPU as "baseline" using the hybrid CQM solver and the "graph-coloring" example https://github.com/dwave-examples/graph -coloring



#### **Results II. - xPU time**

|         | i5-5300u CPU | GTX 1050 Ti GPU | T4 GPU<br>instance** | D-Wave QPU  |
|---------|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| mean    | 24.1 s       | 17.3 s          | 9.2 s                | QPU_ACCESS_TIME<br>0.032 s<br>CHARGE_TIME<br>5.000 s<br>RUN_TIME<br>5.214 s |
| std-dev | 0.32 s       | 0.47 s          | 3.75 s               | -   |

#### Remarks

- An AI framework was successfully used to solve a non-AI problem
- The solution can be executed on a diverse set of hardwares, without any modification in the code
- Moving the computation between CPU and GPU is a one line command; torch\_tensor.to(device) or setting the "device=" argument

# Thank you for your attention!