

# Mesa: A Memory-saving Training Framework for Transformers

Zizheng Pan Peng Chen Haoyu He Jing Liu Jianfei Cai Bohan Zhuang<sup>†</sup>  
 Dept of Data Science and AI, Monash University

## Abstract

There has been an explosion of interest in designing high-performance Transformers. While Transformers have delivered significant performance improvements, training such networks is extremely memory intensive owing to storing all intermediate activations that are needed for gradient computation during backpropagation, especially for long sequences. To this end, we present *Mesa*, a memory-saving resource-efficient training framework for Transformers. Specifically, *Mesa* uses exact activations during forward pass while storing a low-precision version of activations to reduce memory consumption during training. The low-precision activations are then dequantized during backpropagation to compute gradients. Besides, to address the heterogeneous activation distributions in the multi-head self-attention layers, we propose a head-wise activation quantization strategy, which quantizes activations based on the statistics of each head to minimize the approximation error. To further boost training efficiency, we learn quantization parameters by running estimates. More importantly, by re-investing the saved memory in employing a larger batch size or scaling up model size, we may further improve the performance under constrained computational resources. Extensive experiments on ImageNet, CIFAR-100 and ADE20K demonstrate that *Mesa* can reduce half of the memory footprints during training while achieving comparable or even better performance. Code is available at <https://github.com/zhuang-group/Mesa>.

## 1. Introduction

Transformers have demonstrated stunning success in a wide range of natural language processing (NLP) [18, 29] and computer vision (CV) tasks [6, 45, 50]. Inspired by the previous works on model scaling [22, 40], the recent researches on Transformers further push the performance forward with an increasing model size [5, 30, 45]. However, training Transformer models requires a formidable amount of memory footprints, prohibiting common users with limited computational resources from doing related researches. For example, training a Swin-T [30] with a batch size of 128 on  $224 \times 224$  images consumes at least 12G GPU memory,

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. Email: bohan.zhuang@monash.edu




Figure 1. Comparisons of memory footprints during training with several state-of-the-art vision Transformers on ImageNet. “AMP” denotes the default automatic mixed-precision training [32]. “Mesa + AMP” means that we train models with Mesa along with AMP. The memory footprint is measured with a batch size of 128 and an image resolution of  $224 \times 224$  on a single GPU. The proposed Mesa reduces around half of the memory consumption during training while achieving similar or even better performance compared to the default AMP training.

while Swin-B cannot fit into a 32GB V100 GPU under the same settings. Consequently, only a few parties can afford to train such large models. The huge memory consumption and the increasing resource inequalities make it difficult for the academic community to follow up on this area, based on the fact that most of the recent advanced Transformers are developed with industry participation.

Fortunately, great efforts have been made to train deep neural networks with low memory. For example, existing representative techniques include sparsity [33], low-precision training [32], micro-batching [24], checkpointing [11] and gradient quantization [1]. Among the existing memory-saving techniques, one promising direction is the activation compressed training (ACT) [7]. Specifically, ACT stores low-precision approximate copies of activations at each layer while computing the forward pass exactly, which helps to reduce the overall memory consumption during training. The saved activations are then dequantized to the original precision in the backward pass to calculate gradients. This approach has been successfully

applied to train ResNet [22] variants. However, existing works on ACT [7, 9, 21] either focus on dedicated architectures or specifically target on convolutional neural networks (CNNs). At present, there is no literature on compressing the commonly used operations in Transformers (*e.g.*, Softmax, GELU [23] and LayerNorm [2]). Moreover, no previous work considers the unique activation distributions in the multi-head self-attention (MSA) layers, especially the attentions. Therefore, none of the existing ACT frameworks can be directly applied to Transformer-based models.

To tackle the above challenges, we present **Mesa**, a **Memory-saving** 8-bit training framework for Transformers. Mesa covers all memory-hungry operations in Transformers, including linear projection, Softmax, LayerNorm and GELU. Moreover, we propose a head-wise activation quantization strategy, which quantizes the activations based on each self-attention head. The motivation comes from two aspects. First, group-wise quantization, derived from product quantization [26], has shown to be effective in minimizing quantization error. The proposed head-wise quantization can be seen as a special case of group-wise quantization where the number of groups is equal to the number of self-attention heads. Second, previous studies have revealed that different self-attention heads in Transformers tend to learn different attention patterns [14]. Empirically, we can also observe a large divergence of statistics among different heads as shown in Figure 4. Therefore, using shared quantization parameters across self-attention heads may result in highly degraded estimates of statistical quantities.

Besides, Mesa learns quantization parameters with efficient running estimates during training. Such approach brings additional benefits compared with gradient-based approaches [4, 12] or per-sample statistics [9] as it avoids extra computational and memory cost for learning quantization parameters. In practice, we also observe that the running estimates performs favourably against the per-sample statistics in terms of both training speed and performance.

To the best of our knowledge, Mesa is the first ACT framework for Transformer-based models. It is also orthogonal to other memory saving techniques such as low-precision training [32] and checkpointing [11]. As a by-product of significant memory reduction during training, we can use a larger batch size and/or train a larger Transformer model to enable fully-utilization of available GPU cores. For example, by training DeiT-Ti with a batch size of 2,048 under Mesa, we obtain further 0.8% gain in the Top-1 accuracy on ImageNet. Furthermore, we are able to re-invest the saved memory during training by constructing  $3.3\times$  deeper or  $2.2\times$  wider DeiT-B, or training DeiT-B with  $1.5\times$  larger image resolution. In a nutshell, we summarize our contributions as follows:

- We propose a memory-saving 8-bit training framework for Transformers, namely Mesa. Mesa is implemented

with a fast CUDA kernel and can be easily adapted to any Transformer projects.

- To address the heterogeneously distributed activations in self-attention heads, we propose a head-wise activation quantization strategy to minimize the approximation error in MSA layers. Besides, we use running estimates to learn quantization parameters, which performs well with negligible additional cost.
- Extensive experiments on ImageNet, CIFAR-100 and ADE20K have demonstrated that Mesa can reduce  $\sim 50\%$  memory footprint during training with comparable or even better performance than the standard mixed-precision training scheme.

## 2. Related Work

**Transformers.** Transformer is initially proposed by Vaswani *et al.* [42] for machine translation. A standard Transformer consists of an embedding layer, several Transformer blocks and a task-specific head, where each block contains an MSA layer and a position-wise feed-forward (FFN) layer. Later on, Transformer has been extended into a wide range of tasks. In the area of computer vision, vision Transformers (ViTs) have attracted great attentions recently. For example, Dosovitskiy *et al.* [19] proposed a standard Transformer architecture for image recognition, which achieved competitive results on ImageNet compared to CNNs. Subsequent works have improved ViTs from different aspects, such as incorporating pyramid features [30, 35, 45], adopting convolutional layers to enhance the model locality [47], or exploring a well performed architecture with neural architecture search (NAS) [8, 10]. However, to train a Transformer usually requires intensive computational resources. For example, the typical setting [41] to train a ViT on ImageNet requires a batch size of 1,024 on 8 NVIDIA V100 GPUs. As a result, only a few parties are capable of running such experiments. Besides, it also makes it difficult for researchers to explore a larger design space for Transformer architectures. To address this problem, we propose to reduce the memory cost of Transformers during training by 8-bit activation compressed training, making the experiments affordable.

**Quantized training.** Quantized training aims to improve the model efficiency at training time or inference time by quantizing model weights, activations or gradients into low-precision values. Existing methods can be roughly categorised into two folds: 1) quantizing a pretrained model with or without retraining [20, 27, 34, 44], and 2) training a quantized model from scratch [1, 15, 32, 37]. In Transformers, the majority of the literature belongs to the first category. For example, 8-bit [39, 48] or even lower-bits [3] quantization has been proposed to speed up the inference. In contrast, this paper focuses on training Transformers

from scratch. Different from previous works [48, 49] that carry out low-precision computations during either the forward pass or the backward pass, we store the approximated low-precision activations for memory saving during training while still computing the forward pass exactly. Therefore, we do not change the forward pass behavior of models.

**Memory-efficient training.** Low-memory training is appealing as it enables large-scale model training in resource-constraint scenarios. A plethora of methods have been proposed in this area. For example, Mostafa *et al.* [33] proposed to reduce the model and optimizer memory by dynamic sparse reparameterization. Mickevičius *et al.* [32] introduced mixed precision training, which utilizes half-precision (16-bits) instead of full-precision (32-bits) for training. Huang *et al.* [24] proposed to split the mini-batch into smaller subsets and then accumulate the gradients until the entire minibatch has been processed. Besides, gradient checkpointing [11] is also a common practice to reduce the activation memory.

Orthogonal to the above approaches, activation compressed training (ACT) [7] has recently been proposed to reduce the storage of activations that are required for gradient computation. Specifically, ACT stores low-precision activations to reduce the memory footprint at training time and uses the exact activations during the forward pass. The saved activations will be dequantized during backpropagation to calculate gradients. This method was first introduced by Chakrabarti *et al.* [7] for ResNet training. Subsequent works such as TinyScript [21] and ActNN [9] extend this framework by introducing non-uniform quantization and mixed-precision quantization, respectively. However, all these methods specifically target on CNNs and do not consider the unique components of Transformers, such as LayerNorm, Softmax and GELU. Moreover, the quantization scheme for them is problematic for Transformers due to the heterogeneous activation distributions in an MSA layer. Consequently, none of the existing methods can be directly applied to Transformer-based models. In this paper, we customize the ACT framework to significantly reduce the resource requirement of training Transformers while keeping their outstanding performance.

### 3. Method

In this section, we first describe the overall framework of Mesa. Then we introduce our proposed head-wise activation quantization and the strategy for learning quantization parameters. Lastly, we provide the details of the system implementation and discuss the overhead of Mesa.

#### 3.1. Overview of Mesa

To reduce the memory consumption of Transformers at training time, we introduce Mesa, a generic memory-saving




Figure 2. The pipeline of the proposed Mesa for training Transformers, where we compress the activations into low-precision values during training to achieve memory reduction while still propagating the exact activations during the forward pass. The dequantized activations are used to compute gradients during backpropagation. Blue and red lines represent the forward and backward passes, respectively.

training framework for Transformers. The overall pipeline of Mesa is depicted in Figure 2. In general, Mesa saves low-precision approximated activations during training for backpropagation while still using exact activations for the forward pass. Specifically, denoting  $\mathbf{X}_{l-1}$  as the input to the  $l$ -th layer in a Transformer, the output of the  $l$ -th layer can be formulated by

$$\mathbf{X}_l = F_l(\mathbf{W}_l, \mathbf{X}_{l-1}), \quad (1)$$

where  $F_l$  and  $\mathbf{W}_l$  represent the function and learnable parameters of the  $l$ -th layer, respectively.

In a standard training, the input  $\mathbf{X}_{l-1}$  is saved in the GPU memory in order to calculate gradients during backpropagation, where the saved activations at all layers take up the majority of the memory consumption during training, especially when equipped with a large batch size. To reduce the memory footprint, we propose to only save the compressed activations  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{l-1}$  instead of the full-precision counterparts  $\mathbf{X}_{l-1}$  during the forward pass. Such compression is achieved by quantization, which quantizes the exact activations into low-precision values. During backpropagation,  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{l-1}$  is dequantized into the original precision values  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{l-1}$  for gradient calculation. In this way, the gradients at the  $l$ -th layer can be approximated by

$$\hat{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}_{l-1}}, \hat{\nabla}_{\mathbf{W}_l} = G_l(\hat{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}_l}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{l-1}, \mathbf{W}_l), \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\nabla}_{\mathbf{X}_{l-1}}, \hat{\nabla}_{\mathbf{W}_l}$  represent the approximated gradients for the input  $\mathbf{X}_{l-1}$  and the learnable parameters  $\mathbf{W}_l$ , and  $G_l$  is the gradient function at the  $l$ -th layer.

It is worth noting that this strategy minimizes the effect on the training performance, since it only introduces modest approximation errors to the natural gradient noise




Figure 3. The different group-wise bucketing strategies in Mesa. For a standard input sequence, we group the activations based on a certain number of hidden channels. For the queries, keys, values and attentions, we group the activations based on self-attention heads. Different colors represent different groups.  $B$ ,  $N$  and  $D$  represent the batch size, the sequence length and the number of hidden channel dimensions, respectively.  $N_h$  and  $D_h$  refer to the number of self-attention heads and the head dimensions, respectively. Best viewed in color.

from distributed training and stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [17, 46]. In the next section, we introduce a head-wise activation quantization scheme to further improve the fidelity of gradients during training.

### 3.2. Head-wise Activation Quantization

As shown in [26], a fine quantization granularity is favorable to minimize the approximation error. In practice, layer-wise quantization is fast but may introduce a large quantization error, while channel-wise quantization can be more accurate but comes with extra computational and memory cost. In light of this, group-wise quantization balances the two sides and has been widely adopted in the literature [39, 48].

A naive grouping strategy in the previous works [9, 21] is to slice a tensor into fixed-size buckets regardless of the tensor dimensions, which is however problematic for Transformers as it ignores the fact that different self-attention heads usually have quite different attention patterns [14], *i.e.*, the activation distributions across heads are with distinct means and variances in an MSA layer. In Figure 4, we visualize the activations before the Softmax layer at the 11-th block of DeiT-S. Clearly, the activation at each self-attention head should have its unique clipping range and offset. Such phenomenon can be observed for the queries, keys, values and attentions across all Transformer blocks.

**Quantization scheme.** To address the heterogeneously distributed activations in self-attention heads, we propose a head-wise activation quantization strategy. Specifically, with  $x \in \mathbf{X}^h$  being one element in the input activations at the  $h$ -th head in an MSA layer, we quantize the activations to 8-bit by

$$\bar{x} = \text{clip}(\text{round}((x - \beta^h) \cdot \frac{255}{\alpha^h}), 0, 255), \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha^h$  and  $\beta^h$  are learnable parameters representing the quantization clipping range and the offset at the  $h$ -th head,




Figure 4. Activation distributions before the Softmax layer at the 11-th block of DeiT-S [41]. We slice the activation tensor into different groups based on self-attention heads and visualize each group in different colors. Best viewed in color.

respectively.  $\text{clip}(x, x_{low}, x_{up})$  clips any number  $x$  into the range of  $[x_{low}, x_{up}]$ .  $\text{round}(\cdot)$  denotes the rounding function. Here we adopt the stochastic rounding [15] as it theoretically guarantees smaller probabilistic error bounds [16] compared to the nearest rounding. Specifically, it can be formulated as

$$\text{round}(x) = \begin{cases} \lceil x \rceil & \text{with probability } p = x - \lfloor x \rfloor, \\ \lfloor x \rfloor & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

During backpropagation, we dequantize the activations at this layer into the original precision by

$$\hat{x} = \bar{x} \cdot \frac{\alpha^h}{255} + \beta^h. \quad (5)$$

The dequantized activations are then used to calculate gradients as in Eq. (2). In Section E and Section D, we will show the effectiveness of the proposed quantization scheme by comparing it to other strategies, such as symmetric quantization and nearest rounding.



**Learning quantization parameters with running estimates.** To calculate the quantization parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  at each layer, some previous works propose to use per-sample statistics [9, 21] or gradient-based approaches [4, 12]. Specifically, the methods of per-sample statistics utilise the current min-max values of each sample at each layer to calculate quantization parameters, which is inefficient and consumes additional memory for storing the quantization parameters. For gradient-based approaches, asymmetric quantization methods such as LSQ+ [4] may increase the memory footprint as they need to save both the compressed activations and a large amount of context (*e.g.*, the rounding errors for learning  $\alpha$ ) that are needed to calculate gradients during backpropagation, contradicting our aim of memory saving. Alternatively, symmetric quantization approaches such as PACT [12] do not have this problem as they only require binary values to calculate the gradients for  $\alpha$ . However, we will show in Section E that symmetric quantization achieves poor performance on Transformers compared to both baselines and asymmetric quantization.

To this end, we propose to utilise running estimates [25] to update the quantization parameters during training, which can be expressed as

$$\alpha^h = \lambda\alpha^h + (1 - \lambda)(\max(\mathbf{X}^h) - \min(\mathbf{X}^h)), \quad (6)$$

$$\beta^h = \lambda\beta^h + (1 - \lambda)\min(\mathbf{X}^h), \quad (7)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter. As the quantization parameters are shared within each head across different samples, using running estimates can save more memory at training time. For example, letting  $N_h$  be the number of self-attention heads in an MSA layer and  $B$  be the batch size, with running estimates, we only need to store  $2N_h$  additional parameters for the Softmax layer, which is negligible compared to the overall memory footprint. In contrast, using per-sample statistics requires to save  $2BN_h$  additional parameters for one layer. Furthermore, we will show in Section 4.2 that using running estimates can achieve faster throughput at training time.

**Other types of activations.** It is worth noting that we adopt the head-wise bucketing strategy for queries, keys, values and attentions in a Transformer model. For other types of activations such as the standard input sequence in FFN layers, we apply the channel group-wise quantization scheme where multiple channel dimensions of activations are grouped. Figure 3 summarizes the different bucketing strategies of Mesa.

### 3.3. System Implementation

Mesa is built upon the popular PyTorch [36] framework. It is a standalone package that can be directly adopted into

any Transformer projects. To further accelerate the quantization procedure (*i.e.*, Eq. (3) and Eq. (5)) during training, we implement a fast CUDA kernel to improve the training efficiency. Overall, Mesa is able to compress all memory-hungry layers in a Transformer, including the FC layer, LayerNorm, Softmax and GELU. Moreover, to support downstream tasks such as semantic segmentation, we also cover commonly used layers in CNNs, such as the convolutional layer and ReLU. For these layers, we adopt the standard group-wise quantization strategy as mentioned in Section 3.2 where we group the convolutional activations based on a fixed number of channels. By default, we set the number of quantization groups to be the number of heads at a Transformer block.

### 3.4. Discussion

Note that there is a trade-off between speed and memory consumption at training time for all ACT frameworks [9, 21], including our proposed Mesa. Concretely, Mesa introduces additional computational overhead by compressing activations during training. Therefore, the more layers we compress, the lower the training speed is but with more memory reduction. In an extreme case, Mesa could result in the throughput decrease by half on a single GPU when compressing a whole model. On the other hand, considering that distributed training has been widely adopted in modern deep learning [18, 19, 45], the training cost can be dominated by data loading and communication overhead among GPUs, especially for small models. For example, we will show in Section 4.1 that training PVT-Ti [45] with Mesa only requires additional 15% GPU hours. Besides, to further mitigate the additional training overhead, we modularize Mesa such that it can flexibly target different components in a model during training. In practice, we suggest to compress the most memory-hungry modules (*e.g.*, backbones) to achieve a good speed and memory trade-off. In Section A and Section B, we will provide the experiments on compressing different types of modules (*e.g.*, MSA and FFN) and operations (*e.g.*, Softmax and GELU) for reference.

Moreover, apart from the 8-bit quantization used in Mesa, mixed-precision quantization [43] could potentially bring more benefits. However, it will also introduce extra training overhead as it has to calculate the quantization bits for each layer. For this reason, we choose the fixed 8-bit quantization in Mesa for a better trade-off between training speed and model performance.

## 4. Experiment

### 4.1. Main Results

**Dataset and evaluation metrics.** We conduct experiments on the ImageNet (ILSVRC2012) [38] dataset, which




Figure 5. Training curves comparison between DeiT-B and DeiT-B with Mesa on ImageNet.

Table 1. Classification results on ImageNet. “\*” denotes our retrained baseline. The training time memory footprint is measured with a batch size of 128. All models use the default mixed-precision training [32]. We measure the total training time by GPU hours w.r.t. a single NVIDIA V100 GPU. Note that for inference, Mesa does not increase the model parameter (1st column) and does not affect the computational cost measured in FLOPs (2nd column).

Method	Param (M)	FLOPs (G)	Train Memory (MB)	GPU Hours	Top-1@Acc. (%)
DeiT-Ti* [41]	5	1.3	4,171	440	71.9
<b>DeiT-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	5	1.3	<b>1,858</b>	540	<b>72.1</b>
DeiT-S	22	4.6	8,459	520	79.8
<b>DeiT-S w/ Mesa</b>	22	4.6	<b>3,840</b>	620	<b>80.0</b>
DeiT-B	86	17.5	17,691	600	81.8
<b>DeiT-B w/ Mesa</b>	86	17.5	<b>8,616</b>	1,170	<b>81.8</b>
Swin-Ti [30]	29	4.5	11,812	480	81.3
<b>Swin-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	29	4.5	<b>5,371</b>	820	<b>81.3</b>
PVT-Ti [45]	13	1.9	7,800	520	75.1
<b>PVT-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	13	1.9	<b>3,782</b>	600	74.9

contains  $\sim 1.2$ M training images from 1K categories and 50K validation images. Following the common practice [19, 41], we measure the model performance by Top-1 accuracy. In addition, we also report the memory consumption at training time and the overall GPU hours for training each model.

**Compared methods.** To demonstrate the effectiveness of Mesa, we evaluate our framework on several state-of-the-art vision Transformers, including DeiT [41], Swin [30] and PVT [45]. DeiT is a standard vision Transformer which inherits the similar architecture from the original Transformer [42]. Swin and PVT are recently proposed hierarchical vision Transformers (HVTs) which achieve promising results on various vision tasks. Moreover, as recent models usually have multiple variants in terms of the model depth and width, we denote them as “Model-Ti/S/B” to represent their tiny, small and base settings.

**Implementation details.** By default, all models are trained on 8 V100 GPUs with a total batch size of 1,024 (128 per GPU) on ImageNet. We adopt AdamW [31] optimizer with a cosine decay learning rate scheduler. We set the initial learning rate and weight decay as  $1 \times 10^{-3}$  and

$5 \times 10^{-2}$ , respectively. Furthermore, we adopt the same training strategies when comparing to each baseline. All experiments have adopted automatic mixed-precision training [32] (also called FP16 or half-precision training) as it is widely used in recent work to accelerate the training process. The  $\lambda$  in Eqs. (6) and (7) is set to 0.9, which is determined by a simple grid search on CIFAR-100.  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are initialised by the min-max values from the activations at the first training iteration. In Section C and Section F, we conduct experiments of using different  $\lambda$  to train DeiT-Ti on CIFAR-100 and provide visualisations for the evolution of quantization parameters.

**Results.** In Table 1, we report the ImageNet classification results of training DeiT and recent HVTs with Mesa. In general, Mesa can reduce around half of the memory consumption at training time while achieving comparable or even better performance than the strong baselines. For example, on DeiT-B and Swin-Ti, Mesa achieves the same performance as the baselines while reducing the memory footprint by 51% and 55%, respectively. Remarkably, DeiT-Ti/S with Mesa even outperform the baselines by 0.2% in the Top-1 accuracy. Our conjecture is that the approximated activations help to regularize the stochastic gradients when training Transformers, which therefore improves the model

Table 2. Performance comparisons on DeiT-Ti with Mesa by using per-sample statistics (PS) and running estimates (RE). We report the Top-1 accuracy on ImageNet and CIFAR-100. “\*” denotes our retrained baseline. Both experiments adopt the PyTorch implementation of Mesa.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	ImageNet Top-1(%)	CIFAR-100 Top-1(%)
DeiT-Ti* [41]	4,149	1,196	71.9	64.8
+ Mesa w/ PS	2,117	372	71.9	65.1
+ Mesa w/ RE	2,000	431	72.1	65.2

performance. Apart from this, we also visualize the training curves of DeiT-B with Mesa in Figure 5. As it shows, all curves under Mesa are consistent with those of baseline DeiT-B or even perform slightly better. For PVT-Ti, we observe a slight performance drop of 0.2% in the Top-1 accuracy. Our speculation is that PVTs are quite sensitive to train as the authors find that a deeper PVT even cannot converge with the same settings of PVT-Ti/S<sup>1</sup>.

Besides, we notice that Mesa slows down the training speed. As discussed in Section 3.4, such training overhead can be largely offset by the data loading and communication cost in distributed training. For example, the training time of PVT-Ti with Mesa on ImageNet is only 15% longer (520 vs. 600 GPU hours). However, we also notice that the total GPU hours for training DeiT-B and Swin-Ti with Mesa are almost doubled. This suggests that training speed reduction varies among different architectures and model sizes, while the worst case may double the training time.

## 4.2. Ablation Studies

In this section, we provide ablation studies of Mesa. By default, we use a CUDA implementation of Mesa for the following experiments. The throughput and memory consumption at training time are measured with a batch size of 128 and an image resolution of  $224 \times 224$  on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. Unless otherwise specified, we adopt the same training strategy as in Section 4.1 for ImageNet experiments. On CIFAR-100, we train models with a total batch size of 256 on 2 GPUs and keep all other experiment settings as same as in Section 4.1 except that the initial learning rate is linearly scaled to  $2.5 \times 10^{-4}$ .

**Per-sample statistics vs. running estimates for updating quantization parameters.** Previous ACT frameworks such as TinyScript [21] and ActNN [9] use per-sample statistics (PS) to calculate the quantization parameters. As discussed in 3.2, such approach can result in more additional memory consumption and computational cost during training. In Table 2, we compare the approach of using per-sample statistics with using running estimates (RE) on ImageNet and CIFAR-100. From the results, we

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/whai362/PVT/issues/2>

Table 3. Performance comparisons on DeiT-Ti with Mesa under different quantization granularities on CIFAR-100. “Mesa w/ Layer” means we train DeiT-Ti with Mesa under the layer-wise quantization. “Head” indicates our proposed head-wise quantization.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	4,168	1,196	64.8
+ Mesa w/ Layer	1,855	655	64.7
+ Mesa w/ Head	1,855	586	65.2

observe that while both methods perform favourably against the baseline in terms of the Top-1 accuracy, the strategy of using running estimates achieves better performance, less memory consumption and faster throughput than using per-sample statistics. Note that both of the PS/RE experiments in Table 2 adopt a PyTorch implementation of Mesa, thus the memory consumption and throughput at training time are slightly different from that of CUDA implementation. Besides, although the throughput on a single GPU is reduced by using Mesa, the total training time on ImageNet is similar to that of baseline DeiT-Ti as the communication overheads have more impact on the training speed under the distributed training scheme.

**Effect of different quantization granularities.** To explore the effect of different quantization granularities in Mesa, we train DeiT-Ti with Mesa and compare the proposed strategy to layer-wise quantization on CIFAR-100. The results are shown in Table 3. Overall, benefiting from using running estimates in Mesa, all strategies consume a similar amount of memory during training as each layer only needs to save a few quantization parameters. With the layer-wise quantization, all activations at the same layer are quantized based on the same clipping range and offset, but it does not outperform the baseline. On the other hand, the proposed head-wise quantization utilizes the bucketing strategies as in Figure 3 which distinguishes different statistics over different heads and channel groups. It achieves better performance than both the layer-wise strategy and the baseline, while making a good trade-off to the training speed. Additionally, we notice that grouping activations (except queries, keys, values and attentions) based on each hidden channel makes DeiT-Ti fail to converge on ImageNet. This suggests an appropriate quantization granularity is needed to stabilize Transformer training.

**Effect of larger batch size under the same memory budget.** As Table 1 indicates, Mesa is able to reduce around half of the memory consumption at training time compared to the standard mixed-precision training. More importantly, with Mesa, it is possible to train a Transformer with a larger

Table 4. Performance comparisons with larger batch size based on DeiT-Ti and Swin-S with Mesa. “Total Memory” indicates the total memory consumption over 8 GPUs. The GPU hours are calculated w.r.t. a single NVIDIA V100 GPU. We report the Top-1 accuracy on ImageNet.

Method	Batch Size	Total Memory (GB)	GPU Hours	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	1,024	33.4	440	71.9
<b>DeiT-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	2,048	<b>28.8</b>	500	<b>72.9</b>
Swin-S [30]	1,024	150.7	968	83.0
<b>Swin-S w/ Mesa</b>	2,048	<b>120.8</b>	1,160	<b>83.1</b>

Table 5. Comparisons of the largest models Mesa can train before out-of-memory with the same batch size of 128 on one NVIDIA V100 32GB GPU. “Depth” refers to the model depth or the number of Transformer blocks. “Width” means the model width or the number of self-attention heads at each block. “Resolution” denotes the input image resolution during training.

Dim	DeiT-B	DeiT-B w/ Mesa	Ratio
Depth	12	40	<b>3.3×</b>
Width	12	26	<b>2.2×</b>
Resolution	224	336	<b>1.5×</b>

batch size under the same memory budget. For example, training DeiT-Ti with the default strategy requires at least 34GB GPU memory under a total batch size of 1,024. However, with the same memory budget, we can double the batch size to better utilise available GPU cores and explore potential benefits of using larger batch size. Specifically, we train DeiT-Ti with Mesa using a total batch size of 2,048 on ImageNet with 8 NVIDIA V100 GPUs. As we can see from Table 4, Mesa still consumes less memory than that of mixed-precision training with a batch size of 1,024 (33.4GB vs. 28.8GB). Furthermore, it achieves 0.8% gains in the Top-1 accuracy. Moreover, while the default training for Swin-S with a batch size of 2,048 will result in out of memory on 8 V100 GPUs, training with Mesa under the same batch size again consumes less memory and even achieves 0.1% improvement in the Top-1 accuracy compared to the baseline. The overall performance indicates that Mesa can lead to better accuracy by re-investing the saved GPU memory to a larger batch size.

**Largest models that Mesa can train.** With the help of Mesa, we can also re-invest the reduced memory by constructing a larger model or training with a larger image resolution. In Table 5, we report the largest models that Mesa can train before out-of-memory based on DeiT-B. Overall, Mesa is able to scale up the model depth by 3.3× and width by 2.2×. Moreover, Mesa can train DeiT-B with 1.5× larger image resolution. In practice, one can also decrease the expansion ratios in the FFN layers to scale up more on the depth/width/resolution. In Table 5, we adopt the default expansion ratio of four in DeiT-B.

Table 6. Semantic segmentation performance on ADE20K [51] based on Semantic FPN [28]. We use Swin-Ti as backbone and measure the performance by mIoU.

Backbone	Batch Size	GPUs	mIoU (%)
Swin-Ti [30]	16	8	41.5
<b>Swin-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	16	8	<b>42.2</b>
<b>Swin-Ti w/ Mesa</b>	16	2	<b>42.4</b>

**Semantic segmentation.** To explore the performance of Mesa on downstream tasks, we use Swin-Ti as backbone and Semantic FPN [28] as the framework to evaluate the performance of semantic segmentation on ADE20K [51]. Following common practice [13], we use AdamW optimizer with a poly learning rate schedule and train models with 80,000 iterations. We set the initial learning rate to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$ . All backbones are pretrained on the ImageNet dataset. As Table 6 shows, training with Mesa outperforms the baseline by 0.7% in mIoU. Furthermore, with the reduced memory footprint, we train the model with only two GPUs under the same setting while achieving 0.2% more gains in mIoU, which again demonstrates the advantage of Mesa under the finite hardware resources.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work, we have presented Mesa, a memory-saving resource-efficient training framework for Transformers. Specifically, we save a low-precision approximated activations during training to achieve memory saving while using exact activations for the forward pass. The saved activations are used to calculate gradients during the back-propagation. Moreover, we identify the heterogeneous activation distributions in an MSA layer of a Transformer. For this, we proposed a head-wise activation quantization strategy, which groups the activations based on each self-attention head to capture better quantization clipping ranges and offsets. With Mesa, we can re-invest the reduced memory footprint by constructing a larger model or training with a larger batch size to explore potential benefits. Extensive experiments on ImageNet, CIFAR-100 and ADE20K have shown that Mesa can reduce around half of the memory consumption during training while achieving comparable or even better performance than the default training strategy.

**Social impact and limitations.** As discussed in Section 3.4, Mesa may slow down the training speed. In this case, it potentially results in more carbon emission due to more training time on GPU servers, especially when training with larger models and datasets. Future works may consider combining gradient quantization [1] or utilize lower-bits quantization [3, 49] to achieve better training efficiency.



## References

- [1] Dan Alistarh, Demjan Grubic, Jerry Li, Ryota Tomioka, and Milan Vojnovic. QSGD: communication-efficient SGD via gradient quantization and encoding. In *NIPS*, pages 1709–1720, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [8](#)
- [2] Jimmy Ba, J. Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Layer normalization. *ArXiv*, abs/1607.06450, 2016. [2](#)
- [3] Haoli Bai, Wei Zhang, Lu Hou, Lifeng Shang, Jin Jin, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, Michael R. Lyu, and Irwin King. Binarybert: Pushing the limit of BERT quantization. In *ACL/IJCNLP*, pages 4334–4348, 2021. [2](#), [8](#)
- [4] Yash Bhalgat, Jinwon Lee, Markus Nagel, Tijmen Blankevoort, and Nojun Kwak. LSQ+: improving low-bit quantization through learnable offsets and better initialization. In *CVPR*, pages 2978–2985, 2020. [2](#), [5](#)
- [5] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. [1](#)
- [6] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *ECCV*, pages 213–229, 2020. [1](#)
- [7] Ayan Chakrabarti and Benjamin Moseley. Backprop with approximate activations for memory-efficient network training. In *NIPS*, pages 2426–2435, 2019. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [8] Boyu Chen, Peixia Li, Chuming Li, Baopu Li, Lei Bai, Chen Lin, Ming Sun, Junjie Yan, and Wanli Ouyang. Glit: Neural architecture search for global and local image transformer. In *ICCV*, 2021. [2](#)
- [9] Jianfei Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Zhewei Yao, Dequan Wang, Ion Stoica, Michael W. Mahoney, and Joseph Gonzalez. Actnn: Reducing training memory footprint via 2-bit activation compressed training. In *ICML*, pages 1803–1813, 2021. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [10] Minghao Chen, Houwen Peng, Jianlong Fu, and Haibin Ling. Autoformer: Searching transformers for visual recognition. In *ICCV*, 2021. [2](#)
- [11] Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174*, 2016. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [12] Jungwook Choi, Zhuo Wang, Swagath Venkataramani, Pierce I-Jen Chuang, Vijayalakshmi Srinivasan, and Kailash Gopalakrishnan. PACT: Parameterized clipping activation for quantized neural networks, 2018. [2](#), [5](#), [12](#)
- [13] Xiangxiang Chu, Zhi Tian, Yuqing Wang, Bo Zhang, Haibing Ren, Xiaolin Wei, Huaxia Xia, and Chunhua Shen. Twins: Revisiting the design of spatial attention in vision transformers. In *NeurIPS 2021*, 2021. [8](#)
- [14] Jean-Baptiste Cordonnier, Andreas Loukas, and Martin Jaggi. On the relationship between self-attention and convolutional layers. In *ICLR*, 2020. [2](#), [4](#)
- [15] Matthieu Courbariaux, Yoshua Bengio, and Jean-Pierre David. Binaryconnect: Training deep neural networks with binary weights during propagations. In *NIPS*, pages 3123–3131, 2015. [2](#), [4](#)
- [16] Matteo Croci, Massimiliano Fasi, Nicholas Higham, Theo Mary, and Mantas Mikaitis. Stochastic rounding: Implementation, error analysis, and applications. 2021. [4](#)
- [17] Jeffrey Dean, Greg Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Quoc V. Le, Mark Z. Mao, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Andrew W. Senior, Paul A. Tucker, Ke Yang, and Andrew Y. Ng. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *NIPS*, pages 1232–1240, 2012. [4](#)
- [18] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186, 2019. [1](#), [5](#)
- [19] 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. *ICLR*, 2021. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [11](#)
- [20] Steven K. Esser, Jeffrey L. McKinstry, Deepika Bablani, Rathinakumar Appuswamy, and Dharmendra S. Modha. Learned step size quantization. In *ICLR*, 2020. [2](#), [12](#)
- [21] Fangcheng Fu, Yuzheng Hu, Yihan He, Jiawei Jiang, Yingxia Shao, Ce Zhang, and Bin Cui. Don’t waste your bits! squeeze activations and gradients for deep neural networks via tynyscript. In *ICML*, pages 3304–3314, 2020. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [22] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778, 2016. [1](#), [2](#)
- [23] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv: Learning*, 2016. [2](#)
- [24] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Xu Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V. Le, Yonghui Wu, and Zhifeng Chen. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. In *NIPS*, pages 103–112, 2019. [1](#), [3](#)
- [25] Benoit Jacob, Skirmantas Kligys, Bo Chen, Menglong Zhu, Matthew Tang, Andrew G. Howard, Hartwig Adam, and Dmitry Kalenichenko. Quantization and training of neural networks for efficient integer-arithmetic-only inference. In *CVPR*, pages 2704–2713, 2018. [5](#)
- [26] Herve Jegou, Matthijs Douze, and Cordelia Schmid. Product quantization for nearest neighbor search. *PAMI*, (1):117–128, 2010. [2](#), [4](#)
- [27] Sangil Jung, Changyong Son, Seohyung Lee, JinWoo Son, Jae-Joon Han, Youngjun Kwak, Sung Ju Hwang, and Changkyu Choi. Learning to quantize deep networks by optimizing quantization intervals with task loss. In *CVPR*, pages 4350–4359, 2019. [2](#)

- [28] Alexander Kirillov, Ross B. Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Panoptic feature pyramid networks. In *CVPR*, pages 6399–6408, 2019. 8
- [29] Zhenzhong Lan, Mingda Chen, Sebastian Goodman, Kevin Gimpel, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. ALBERT: A lite BERT for self-supervised learning of language representations. In *ICLR*, 2020. 1
- [30] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *ICCV*, 2021. 1, 2, 6, 8
- [31] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *ICLR*, 2019. 6
- [32] Paulius Micikevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory F. Diamos, Erich Elsen, David García, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, and Hao Wu. Mixed precision training. In *ICLR*, 2018. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [33] Hesham Mostafa and Xin Wang. Parameter efficient training of deep convolutional neural networks by dynamic sparse reparameterization. In *ICML*, pages 4646–4655, 2019. 1, 3
- [34] Markus Nagel, Mart van Baalen, Tijmen Blankevoort, and Max Welling. Data-free quantization through weight equalization and bias correction. In *ICCV*, 2019. 2
- [35] Zizheng Pan, Bohan Zhuang, Jing Liu, Haoyu He, and Jianfei Cai. Scalable visual transformers with hierarchical pooling. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2
- [36] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. In *NIPS*, pages 8024–8035. 2019. 5
- [37] Mohammad Rastegari, Vicente Ordonez, Joseph Redmon, and Ali Farhadi. Xnor-net: Imagenet classification using binary convolutional neural networks. In *ECCV*, pages 525–542, 2016. 2
- [38] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *IJCV*, pages 211–252, 2015. 5
- [39] Sheng Shen, Zhen Dong, Jiayu Ye, Linjian Ma, Zhewei Yao, Amir Gholami, Michael W. Mahoney, and Kurt Keutzer. Q-BERT: hessian based ultra low precision quantization of BERT. In *AAAI*, pages 8815–8821, 2020. 2, 4
- [40] Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. EfficientNet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *ICML*, pages 6105–6114, 2019. 1
- [41] Hugo Touvron, Matthieu Cord, Matthijs Douze, Francisco Massa, Alexandre Sablayrolles, and Hervé Jégou. Training data-efficient image transformers & distillation through attention. In *ICML*, 2021. 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12
- [42] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NeurIPS*, pages 5998–6008, 2017. 2, 6
- [43] Kuan Wang, Zhijian Liu, Yujun Lin, Ji Lin, and Song Han. HAQ: hardware-aware automated quantization with mixed precision. In *CVPR*, pages 8612–8620, 2019. 5
- [44] Peisong Wang, Qiang Chen, Xiangyu He, and Jian Cheng. Towards accurate post-training network quantization via bit-split and stitching. In *ICML*, pages 9847–9856, 2020. 2
- [45] Wenhai Wang, Enze Xie, Xiang Li, Deng-Ping Fan, Kaitao Song, Ding Liang, Tong Lu, Ping Luo, and Ling Shao. Pyramid vision transformer: A versatile backbone for dense prediction without convolutions. In *ICCV*, 2021. 1, 2, 5, 6
- [46] Wei Wen, Cong Xu, Feng Yan, Chunpeng Wu, Yandan Wang, Yiran Chen, and Hai Li. Terngrad: Ternary gradients to reduce communication in distributed deep learning. In *NIPS*, pages 1509–1519, 2017. 4
- [47] Li Yuan, Yunpeng Chen, Tao Wang, Weihao Yu, Yujun Shi, Francis EH Tay, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. Tokens-to-token vit: Training vision transformers from scratch on imagenet. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2
- [48] Ofir Zafrir, Guy Boudoukh, Peter Izsak, and Moshe Wasserblat. Q8BERT: quantized 8bit BERT. In *EMC2@NeurIPS*, pages 36–39, 2019. 2, 3, 4
- [49] Wei Zhang, Lu Hou, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xiao Chen, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. Ternarybert: Distillation-aware ultra-low bit BERT. In *EMNLP*, pages 509–521, 2020. 3, 8, 12
- [50] Sixiao Zheng, Jiachen Lu, Hengshuang Zhao, Xiatian Zhu, Zekun Luo, Yabiao Wang, Yanwei Fu, Jianfeng Feng, Tao Xiang, Philip H. S. Torr, and Li Zhang. Rethinking semantic segmentation from a sequence-to-sequence perspective with transformers. In *CVPR*, pages 6881–6890, 2021. 1
- [51] Bolei Zhou, Hang Zhao, Xavier Puig, Tete Xiao, Sanja Fidler, Adela Barriuso, and Antonio Torralba. Semantic understanding of scenes through the ADE20K dataset. *IJCV*, pages 302–321, 2019. 8

## Appendix

We organize our supplementary material as follows.

- In Section A, we study the effect of compressing different modules based on DeiT-Ti.
- In Section B, we show the effect of compressing different operations based on DeiT-Ti.
- In Section C, we explore the effect of different decay rates in Mesa to learn the quantization parameters.
- In Section D, we compare the stochastic rounding used in Mesa to the nearest rounding.
- In Section E, we compare asymmetric quantization to symmetric quantization for compressing activations.
- In Section F, we visualize the evolution of the learned quantization parameters during training.

By default, we use the CUDA implementation of Mesa for the following experiments. The throughput and memory consumption at training time are measured with a batch size of 128 and an image resolution of  $224 \times 224$  on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. For ImageNet experiments, we train models with 8 GPUs and adopt the same training strategy as in DeiT [41]. On CIFAR-100, we train models with 2 GPUs with a total batch size of 256 and an initial learning rate of  $2.5 \times 10^{-4}$ . Other experiment settings such as the data augmentation strategies are the same as in ImageNet experiments.

### A. Effect of Compressing Different Modules

Table 7. Performance comparisons of compressing different modules based on DeiT-Ti with Mesa. We report the Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	4,149	1,196	64.8
+ Mesa w/ MSA	3,037 (-26.8%)	772	65.0
+ Mesa w/ FFN	3,294 (-20.6%)	888	64.8
+ Mesa w/ MSA + FFN	1,856 (-55.3%)	597	64.9

MSA and FFN layers are the main modules of a Transformer model. Meanwhile, they consume most of the GPU memory at training time. To study the effect of compressing different modules, we train DeiT-Ti with Mesa on CIFAR-100 and report the results in Table 7. Overall, training DeiT-Ti with Mesa achieves on par or better performance compared to the baseline. In particular, compressing the MSA or FFN layers in DeiT-Ti can reduce 27% and 21% memory footprint at training time, respectively. However, while

compressing MSA layers can save more memory, it also results in slower throughput during training compared to compressing FFN layers. Finally, compressing MSA and FFN layers simultaneously brings the most memory savings, but it also leads to the slowest training speed. However, this overhead could be offset by the communication cost in distributed learning.

### B. Effect of Compressing Different Operations

Table 8. Performance comparisons of compressing different operations based on DeiT-Ti with Mesa. We report the Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	4,149	1,196	64.8
+ Mesa w/ MatMul	3,505 (-15.5%)	729	65.3
+ Mesa w/ GELU	3,540 (-14.7%)	1,031	64.9
+ Mesa w/ LayerNorm	3,844 (-7.4%)	1,059	64.4
+ Mesa w/ Softmax	3,485 (-16.0%)	998	64.8
+ Mesa w/ All	1,855 (-55.3%)	586	65.2

A standard Transformer [19, 41] consists of matrix multiplication (MatMul), GELU, LayerNorm and Softmax. The activations that are generated from these operations consume the most of the GPU memory during training. In Table 8, we report the results of compressing different operations in DeiT-Ti based on CIFAR-100. For all models, we set the number of quantization groups to 3, which is equal to the number of heads at each MSA layer in DeiT-Ti. In general, different operations bring different memory savings while also introducing different training overheads. In particular, compressing MatMuls brings even better performance than the baseline while saving around 15% memory during training. Besides, GELU also consumes substantial memory due to the expanded hidden dimensions in FFN layers. We also notice that compressing LayerNorm performs slightly worse than the baseline. We assume the normalization layers are quite sensitive to compression, such that more quantization groups might be needed to further minimize the approximation errors. Furthermore, Softmax consumes most of the memory during training due to the resulting global attention map at each head, but compressing it in DeiT-Ti does not bring any performance drop. Last, we obtain the best memory savings when compressing all operations, while still achieving better performance than the baseline DeiT-Ti.

### C. Effect of Different Decay Rates to Learn Quantization Parameters

In Mesa, we utilise running estimates to learn the quantization parameters, which requires a decay rate  $\lambda$  to tune.

Table 9. Performance comparisons of different  $\lambda$  based on DeiT-Ti. We report the Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100.

Method	$\lambda$	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	-	64.8
+ Mesa	0.0	64.5
	0.9	65.2
	0.99	65.0
	0.999	failed

To understand the effect of different  $\lambda$  in Mesa, we conduct experiments with DeiT-Ti on CIFAR-100 and report the results in Table 9. Overall, we find that a suitable  $\lambda$  is quite essential to help Mesa achieve good performance. Particularly, when  $\lambda$  is 0, the quantization parameters only rely on the current batch statistics at each training iteration. However, such an approach cannot outperform the baseline. Besides, we find a large  $\lambda$  make DeiT-Ti fail to converge as it cannot timely adapt to the dynamic activation distributions during training. Overall, we find 0.9 achieves the best performance in practice, in which case we set  $\lambda$  as 0.9 for all experiments by default.

## D. Stochastic rounding vs. Nearest Rounding

Table 10. Performance comparisons on DeiT with Mesa under stochastic rounding (SR) and nearest rounding (NR). We report the Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100 and ImageNet.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	ImageNet Top-1(%)	CIFAR-100 Top-1(%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	4,149	1,196	71.9	64.8
+ Mesa w/ NR	1,855	635	failed	64.7
+ Mesa w/ SR	1,855	586	72.1	65.2

To explore the effect of stochastic rounding in Mesa, we compare it with the commonly used nearest rounding by training DeiT-Ti with Mesa on CIFAR-100 and ImageNet. We report the results in Table 10. As it shows, although training DeiT-Ti with nearest rounding can achieve competitive results on CIFAR-100, it fails to converge on ImageNet. Therefore, we speculate that stochastic rounding is important to guarantee good performance in Mesa. Also note that stochastic rounding does not increase the memory footprint during training. However, it is slightly slower than that of using nearest rounding, which attributes to the additional overhead from the implementation of stochastic rounding.

## E. Asymmetric quantization vs. symmetric quantization.

Apart from the asymmetric quantization that used in Mesa, symmetric quantization is also widely adopted in the previous works [12, 20]. Under this scheme, the input  $X$

Table 11. Performance comparisons between symmetric quantization and asymmetric quantization on DeiT-Ti with Mesa. Both experiments adopt a PyTorch implementation of Mesa. We report the Top-1 accuracy on CIFAR-100.

Method	Train Memory (MB)	Train Throughput (images/s)	Top-1 (%)
DeiT-Ti [41]	4,149	1,196	64.8
+ Mesa w/ symmetric	2,045	472	63.2
+ Mesa w/ asymmetric	2,000	431	65.2

is quantized by a scale factor  $s = (2^b - 1)/\max(|X|)$  only, where  $b$  is the bit width. In Table 11, we compare the two quantization schemes based on CIFAR-100. From the results, we observe that although symmetric quantization achieves faster throughput during training, it does not surpass the baseline in terms of the Top-1 accuracy. The result is also consistent with a previous observation [49] for quantizing BERT models. In fact, the activations in Transformers are skewed into negative values. We assume asymmetric quantization can provide a more tighter clipping range such that it helps to minimize the quantization error during training.

## F. Evolution of Quantization Parameters

In this section, we visualize the evolution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in DeiT-Ti during training on CIFAR-100. We set the number of quantization groups at each layer to 3.

**Evolution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in MSA layers.** In Figure 6 and Figure 7, we show the evolution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in MSA layers during training, respectively. In general, the quantization parameters at each head evolve differently, emphasizing the necessity of head-wise activation quantization in MSA layers. Besides, we find the quantization clipping range  $\alpha$  increases significantly at the early stages, then becomes stable or decreases at the later stages. On the other hand, the quantization offset  $\beta$  keeps decreasing at the beginning while tends to be stable or increases later during training. In particular, we find the quantization offsets are skewed to negative values, which indicates that the activations in MSA layers contain more negative values, except for the attentions after Softmax as they are non-negative values.

**Evolution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in FFN layers.** Figure 8 and Figure 9 show the evolution of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in FFN layers during training, respectively. Overall, the phenomenon is quite similar to that of MSA layers. In particular, we find the quantization offset at the second FC layer of FFN is always the minimum value (-0.17) of GELU. This indicates that  $\beta$  can be fixed to -0.17 at this layer during training, which may help to reduce more training overhead. We leave the space of further optimization for future work.






Figure 6. Evolution of  $\alpha$  in the MSA layers of DeiT-Ti. We visualize the results for different blocks (columns) and activations (rows). Different colors represent different quantization groups. Best viewed in color.




Figure 7. Evolution of  $\beta$  in the MSA layers of DeiT-Ti. We visualize the results for different blocks (columns) and activations (rows). Different colors represent different quantization groups. Best viewed in color.




Figure 8. Evolution of  $\alpha$  in the FFN layers of DeiT-Ti. We visualize the results for different blocks (columns) and layers (rows). Different colors represent different quantization groups. Best viewed in color.




Figure 9. Evolution of  $\beta$  in the FFN layers of DeiT-Ti. We visualize the results for different blocks (columns) and layers (rows). Different colors represent different quantization groups. Best viewed in color.