Dynamic Selective Protection of Sparse Iterative Solvers via ML Prediction of Soft Error Impacts

Zizhao Chen¹, Thomas Verrecchia², Hongyang Sun¹ (speaker), Joshua D. Booth³, Padma Raghavan⁴

¹ University of Kansas, USA
² ENSTA Paris, France
³ University of Alabama in Huntsville, USA
⁴ Vanderbilt University, USA

Fault Tolerance for HPC at eXtreme Scales (FTXS) Workshop Nov. 12, 2023 @ Denver, CO, USA **Sparse iterative solvers** are critical in scientific computing for solving sparse systems of linear equations. However, these methods are vulnerable to **hard failures** and **soft errors**. To ensure the effective use of HPC systems, **resilience techniques** must be deployed.

Resilience Techniques

Protect scientific applications from failures or

errors at different levels



PCG Algorithm: an iterative solver for sparse linear systems

Ax = b



I_e : # iterations to converge with soft error



$$slowdown = \frac{I_e}{I_0}$$

Observation: not all errors are equal w.r.t. performance degradation







Impact varies drastically:

- Certain iterations (e.g., middle ones) suffer larger slowdowns than others;
- Location-wise, slowdowns are strongly correlated with row 2-norm of matrix:

$$||A_{i*}||_2 = \sqrt{\sum_j A_{i,j}^2}$$

Which elements to protect?

Full-protection:

100% overhead (i.e., duplicate entire computation)

Zero-protection:

Average overhead depends on expected slowdown (can be large)

Selective-protection:

Protect only elements with slowdown≥2 (i.e., ≥100% overhead)









Predicting Error Impact via ML

Binary classification:

- Class 1: slowdown ≥ 2
- Class 0: slowdown < 2</p>

with two features:

- Iteration number
- Row-2 norm of matrix A



	"cbuckle"				"bcsstk18"			
	Acc.	Recall	Prec.	F1	Acc.	Recall	Prec.	F1
LR	0.91	0.8	0.97	0.88	0.57	1	0.57	0.73
SVM	0.92	0.8	1	0.89	0.57	1	0.57	0.73
RF	0.93	0.9	0.93	0.91	0.8	0.9	0.78	0.84
KNN	0.94	0.95	0.91	0.93	0.76	0.84	0.76	0.80

LR: Logistic RegressionSVM: Support Vector MachineRF: random ForestKNN: K-Nearest Neighbor

* Total 300 runs (one random error per run): 200 for training and 100 for testing (results reported)

Our selective protection scheme based on <u>dynamic-ml</u> achieves the **lowest** average overhead

$$overhead = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{I_e} (N + n_t) - I_o N}{I_o N}$$

Static-rand:

Protect certain percentage of randomly selected elements

Static-r2n:

Protect certain percentage of selected elements with *larger* row 2-norms in matrix A

	"cbuckle"	"bcsstk18"
zero-protection	816%	3143%
full-protection	100%	100%
- static-rand (best)	91.4% (89%)	99% (99%)
🛩 static-r2n (best)	56.3% (30%)	88.4% (88%)
dynamic-ml	43.7%	87.6%

* Average **overhead** (in %) compared to error-free run

Future Work

- Improve prediction accuracy with more features and ML algorithms:
 - ✓ **For classification** (tune threshold considering error prob.)
 - ✓ For regression (i.e., predict exact slowdown)
- Train a single ML model that captures sparse matrix structures (currently, one model per matrix)
- Further validation with more matrices and solvers