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Abstract—Optimising deep learning inference across edge devices and optimisation targets such as inference time, memory footprint and power consumption is a key challenge due to the ubiquity of neural networks. Today, production deep learning frameworks provide useful abstractions to aid machine learning engineers and systems researchers. However, in exchange they can suffer from compatibility challenges (especially on constrained platforms), inaccessible code complexity, or design choices that otherwise limit research from a systems perspective. This paper presents Orpheus, a new deep learning framework for easy prototyping, deployment and evaluation of inference optimisations. Orpheus features a small codebase, minimal dependencies, and a simple process for integrating other third party systems. We present some preliminary evaluation results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Deploying deep learning applications like image classification on edge devices (e.g. IoT boards, smartphones, drones) is a challenging task, since large Deep Neural Networks (DNNs) do not fit on these devices or have unacceptable performance. Turner et al. [1] showed that machine learning optimisations like model compression may not work as expected at system level where one of the main metrics considered is the inference time. However, implementing and evaluating machine learning techniques on well-known frameworks like PyTorch or TensorFlow while targeting edge devices can be very tedious and challenging, as most frameworks are complex pieces of software with many requirements and dependencies.

In this paper we present Orpheus, a new research environment for exploring optimisations of neural network inference. The Orpheus framework is designed to support straightforward integration of different backends such as OpenCL kernels or third party libraries such as ARM Compute Library, and features infrastructure to load and evaluate models exported from other training frameworks. Therefore, we can obtain inference times for different backends and multiple models quickly, from a single programming interface. Our work is focused solely on inference, though the programming model does not preclude training. The main parts of Orpheus and contributions of this paper are as follows (Figure 1):

- Custom implementations of common neural network operations in C++ with alternative algorithms that can leverage APIs such as OpenMP.
- Easy integration of third party backends like Intel DNNL or Arm Compute Library.
- Suite of unit tests to ensure correctness of all operations, and to provide ready-made assistance in the development and integration of new backends.
- Infrastructure to run multiple inference experiments, evaluating full networks, and individual layers with the option of using Python bindings.

II. COMPARISON OF DEEP LEARNING FRAMEWORKS

Table I compares different deep learning frameworks according to key features that a platform for systems research should provide (we rate features 1-3 based on our experience):

- Low-level modifications: Ability to easily access lower-level features of the platform (e.g. SIMD intrinsics).
- Model interoperability: Support for models trained in other frameworks, usually via the ONNX format.
- Platform compatibility: Ease of deployment on a range of edge devices (e.g. with different hardware features).

Table I: Comparison of Deep Learning Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Low-level modifications</th>
<th>Model interoperability</th>
<th>Platform compatibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PyTorch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TensorFlow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONNX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1: Overview of Orpheus design.
and has minimal dependencies. However, it lacks competitive performance issues, and making low-level modifications. However, the high-level API creates barriers to exploring architectures, and deploying them to server-class machines.

PyTorch [3] supports model design, training, and inference via a high-level Python API. It is ideal for prototyping network architectures, and deploying them to server-class machines. However, the high-level API creates barriers to exploring performance issues, and making low-level modifications.

DarkNet [4] is written in C and CUDA. Its small codebase makes it more accessible to change than other frameworks, and has minimal dependencies. However, it lacks competitive performance, and cannot import third party models.

TVM [5] is an open deep learning compiler stack. It provides competitive performance across a variety of platforms on some benchmarks. However, to leverage it fully, developers must become familiar with its niche programming model, and we have found areas where it performs poorly (e.g. replacing standard convolutional blocks with cheaper ones [6]).

Orpheus is an inference-only framework written in C++. Its main design goal is to transparently support experimentation with alternative backends. In Orpheus, layers are treated as first class citizens, and have multiple implementations which are selected at runtime.

III. EVALUATION

We now present some initial experimental results that compare Orpheus against some of the deep learning frameworks described in Section II. We analyse the inference time of five DNN models (WRN-40-2, MobileNetV1, RestNet-18, Inception-v3, ResNet-50) on the CPU of the HiKey 970 board (Arm Cortex-A73). Note that we consider only one core.

As we can see in Figure 2, Orpheus provides the best results for the biggest models (ResNets and Inception), whereas TVM is the best for the smallest ones (WRN and MobileNet). These results make sense, as Orpheus uses GEMM (General Matrix Multiply) convolution, which pays off for the larger matrices of the big models, while TVM uses “spatial pack” convolution which seems to work better for the small ones. PyTorch also uses GEMM, although its times are worse than Orpheus.

We also see that PyTorch performs poorly for MobileNetV1 because of an inefficient implementation of the depthwise convolution. Finally, note that we do not include results for DarkNet and TF-Lite. For DarkNet, only the ResNet models were available and had inference time measured in seconds (e.g. ~3s for ResNet-18). For TF-Lite, all models excepting ResNets were available but the Python API always selects the maximum number of threads, so we could not select one.

IV. CONCLUSION

This paper presented Orpheus, a new deep learning framework that can enable future systems research for DNNs, due to its flexible design. Orpheus has already demonstrated value in our research, where standard frameworks posed challenges for lower level systems investigation. Orpheus provides a way for researchers to export trained neural networks to a transparent inference runtime, where components can be independently altered and assayed to answer various research questions. Additionally, Python bindings improve the ease of use for embedding in other experimental workflows.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>TF-Lite</th>
<th>PyTorch</th>
<th>DarkNet</th>
<th>Orpheus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-level modifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model interoperability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Compatibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codebase accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (inference time)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: Comparison of Deep Learning frameworks.