# You Don't Need All Attentions: Distributed Dynamic Fine-Tuning for Foundation Models

Shiwei Ding<sup>†</sup>, Lan Zhang<sup>‡</sup>, Zhenlin Wang<sup>†</sup>, Giuseppe Ateniese<sup>§</sup>, Xiaoyong Yuan<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Michigan Technological University

<sup>‡</sup>Clemson University

<sup>§</sup>George Mason University

shiweid@mtu.edu, lan7@clemson.edu, zlwang@mtu.edu, ateniese@gmu.edu, xiaoyon@clemson.edu

Abstract—Fine-tuning plays a crucial role in adapting models to downstream tasks with minimal training efforts. However, the rapidly increasing size of foundation models poses a daunting challenge for accommodating foundation model fine-tuning in most commercial devices, which often have limited memory bandwidth. Techniques like model sharding and tensor parallelism address this issue by distributing computation across multiple devices to meet memory requirements. Nevertheless, these methods do not fully leverage their foundation nature in facilitating the fine-tuning process, resulting in high computational costs and imbalanced workloads. We introduce a novel Distributed Dynamic Fine-Tuning (D2FT) framework that strategically orchestrates operations across attention modules based on our observation that not all attention modules are necessary for forward and backward propagation in fine-tuning foundation models. Through three innovative selection strategies, D2FT significantly reduces the computational workload required for fine-tuning foundation models. Furthermore, D2FT addresses workload imbalances in distributed computing environments by optimizing these selection strategies via multiple knapsack optimization. Our experimental results demonstrate that the proposed D2FT framework reduces the training computational costs by 40% and training communication costs by 50% with only 1% to 2% accuracy drops on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Stanford Cars datasets. Moreover, the results show that D2FT can be effectively extended to recent LoRA, a state-of-theart parameter-efficient fine-tuning technique. By reducing 40%computational cost or 50% communication cost, D2FT LoRA top-1 accuracy only drops 4% to 6% on Stanford Cars dataset.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Foundation models are extensively trained on vast datasets that cover a wide array of topics and knowledge domains, thereby facilitating a deep understanding of real-world concepts [1]–[5]. Leveraging this foundational understanding, these models can be efficiently adapted to practical machinelearning tasks by fine-tuning their parameters from the pretrained foundation models. The fine-tuning uses fewer training epochs and fewer data inputs to achieve a low-cost adaptation. However, fine-tuning a foundation model still demands significant memory resources to store model parameters (e.g., GPT-4 [6] with 1.8 trillion parameters, Vision Transformer [7] with 86 million parameters), intermediate activations, and gradient updates, within GPU memory. This creates a tension between the growing size of neural networks and the memory constraints of commercial devices such as consumer-grade GPUs and cloud ML services, limiting the scalability potential of foundation models [8].



Fig. 1: (Full parameter) Fine-tuning performance comparison. The proposed D2FT framework outperforms existing efficient distributed learning frameworks under similar computation and communication costs on the CIFAR-100 and Stanford Cars datasets. The "Standard" means the model standard full finetuning.

To address these challenges, distributed learning paradigms like pipeline parallelism [9]–[11] and tensor parallelism [12]– [15] have become widely adopted as effective solutions. In pipeline parallelism, the neural network is divided into layerwise segments, with each segment deployed on a different device, enabling efficient use of distributed resources. Tensor parallelism, by contrast, partitions individual tensors (weight matrices) into chunks, distributing each chunk across separate devices. These methods help balance workloads by distributing parameters across devices, reducing both memory and computational demands on any single device. For instance, the vision transformer [16], [17], a widely used foundation model architecture, can be split by blocks or by attention heads (in each block) and then distributed across devices for accommodation.

While distributed training methods offer the advantage of memory saving, they are mainly investigated in the traditional training paradigm, where every model parameter is involved in all training operations. This line of research overlooks the unique potential of the foundation models, whose parameters have already encoded extensive (and somewhat redundant) prior knowledge that can facilitate more efficient fine-tuning. Inspired by this insight, we aim to design an innovative framework to selectively reduce the fine-tuning workload on foundation models. We observe that not all the attention modules in both forward pass and backward pass significantly contribute to fine-tuning a given training sample. Therefore, we can skip the operations on the specific subnet during fine-tuning, which largely saves computational and communicational costs while preserving the fine-tuning accuracy. Given a training sample, we consider three operation options for each subnet: i) performing both forward and backward operations, ii) performing the forward pass only, and iii) skipping operations entirely, detailed in Section II-A2. However, applying these operations may lead to two issues. First, fine-tuning performance drops as the foundation model does not fully learn the new knowledge due to the missing learning operations. Second and more importantly, workloads are significantly imbalanced among devices as some subnets play more critical roles than others, resulting in heavier workloads on their corresponding devices, and significantly slowing down the entire system. To tackle these challenges, we propose Distributed Dynamic Fine-Tuning (D2FT), which dynamically allocates learning operations across distributed devices for fine-tuning a foundation model. Through three innovative selection strategies, D2FT maintains the fine-tuning accuracy while significantly reducing the computational workload required for fine-tuning foundation models. Furthermore, D2FT addresses workload imbalance in distributed settings by optimizing selection strategies through multiple knapsack optimization, a classic combinatorial problem that maximizes value under capacity constraints. Additionally, we further extend D2FT to low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [18], a stateof-the-art parameter-efficient fine-tuning technique [19]. The experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of D2FT in both full-parameter and parameter-efficient fine-tuning. Therefore, our major contributions are four-fold:

- We develop a Distributed Dynamic Fine-Tuning (D2FT) framework that strategically orchestrates attention operations across devices to address high computational and communicational costs in distributed foundation model finetuning.
- We formulate the orchestration problem by introducing three innovative selection strategies and addressing it through a hierarchical decoupling of the multi-knapsack problem.
- We extend D2FT to LoRA fine-tuning by separately allocating low-rank matrices with frozen attention heads and feed-forward networks across different devices.
- The experimental results show that D2FT outperforms baseline methods, reducing the computational cost of training (fine-tuning) by 40% and the cost of training communication by 50% with a decrease in precision 1% and 2% in the CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets, respectively. In addition, the experimental results on LoRA show that D2FT can reduce LoRA computational cost by 40% and communicational cost 50%, respectively, with 4% and 6% accuracy drop, respectively.

## II. D2FT FRAMEWORK

# A. Problem Formulation

D2FT aims to derive optimal orchestration across multiple devices to meet memory constraints while achieving computational and communication efficiency in fine-tuning foundation models. Following the existing work, we first formulate the orchestration problem. Suppose a large-scale foundation model  $\mathcal{F}$  is fine-tuned on a downstream dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i\}$  with N samples. To distribute computation over K devices, the foundation model  $\mathcal{F}$  is partitioned by K subnets:  $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k, \dots, \mathcal{F}_K$  and deployed across K devices, where each subnet can be fit into the device<sup>1</sup>.

Unfortunately, existing work mainly distributes computation across devices while not fully leveraging the inherent capability of foundation models - model parameters have already included extensive and redundant prior knowledge. Thus, a large number of operations in fine-tuning are not fully essential. To fully unleash the power of foundation models, we innovatively introduce an innovative and diverse set of operation strategies to avoid unnecessary computation and communication. Specifically, for a sample  $x_i$ , each device k can select an operation from the operation set  $\mathcal{P}$ , detailed in the Section II-A2. Our goal is to optimize the selection strategies to achieve optimal fine-tuning performance within the given workload constraints in devices. Since it is nontrivial to measure the fine-tuning performance, we use a proxy measurement, data contribution, detailed in Section II-A3. We denote  $\mathcal{A}^p(\mathcal{F}_k), p \in \mathcal{P}$  as the contribution of selecting operation on the k-th subnet when training on the i-th data sample. Additionally, given an operation p, the computational cost is denoted as  $\mathcal{C}^p(\mathcal{F}_k)$ . Hence, the orchestration problem can be formulated as:

$$\max_{p} \sum_{k}^{K} \sum_{i}^{N} \mathcal{A}^{p}(\mathcal{F}_{k})$$
(1)  
s.t. 
$$\sum_{i}^{N} \mathcal{C}^{p}(\mathcal{F}_{k}) \leq C_{k} \quad (\forall k),$$

where  $C_k$  denotes workload expectation of the k-th device.  $C_k$  is calculated based on the computational capacity of each device. The objective function aims to maximize the contribution scores, i.e., learning performance, while the constraints ensure balanced workloads, i.e., no straggler devices. The imbalance of workloads can be measured as minimizing its Lagrange term  $\|\sum_{i}^{N} C^p(\mathcal{F}_k) - C_k\|$ .

To derive the optimal solutions to the orchestration problem, in the following subsection, we begin by introducing the general partitioning strategy for foundation models (Section II-A1), followed by a description of the proposed operation selections (Section II-A2). Next, we detail the measurement of contribution scores (Section II-A3) and conclude

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For simplicity, we assume that the number of subnets is set as the number of devices, which can be adjusted according to model sizes and device capacities.

with a summary of the overall optimization problem (Section II-A4).

1) Partitioning strategy: In this work, we focus on transformer-based architectures [20] due to their prevalence in foundation models. Transformer architectures generally consist of L blocks, each containing H attention heads and a feed-forward neural network. Building on recent advances in model sharding and tensor parallelism [11], [12], we apply depthwise and width-wise partitioning to the transformer to derive subnets. The minimal unit of a subnet module is one attention head with a small feed-forward network (FFN) in a block. The proposed framework can be easily extended to devices consisting of multiple attention heads and FFNs. We denote each subnet module as  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , where  $k = (l, h), 1 \le l \le L, 1 \le h \le H$ , where l and h denotes the index of attention heads and index of blocks in the foundation model.

2) Operation selection: To solve the orchestration problem, we introduce a set of operations  $\mathcal{P}$  that reshapes the learning paradigms for fine-tuning foundation models, detailed as follows:

- Full operation  $(p_f)$ . This operation aligns with the standard training paradigm in neural networks, where both forward and backward passes are conducted during training.
- Shortcut operation (*p<sub>s</sub>*). Motivated by recent work in sparse training [21], [22], we introduce the Forward-Skip (FS) operation, which bypasses all operations on a specific subnet, including both the forward and backward propagation. To minimize the impact on the rest of the operations, a shortcut is introduced to propagate activations and gradients.
- Forward-Only operation  $(p_o)$ . Bypassing forward propagation may significantly affect the model's performance since the activations are not accurately calculated. Therefore, we introduce the Forward-Only operation that remains the forward propagation but does not update the gradients, i.e., skipping backward propagation.

Note that we establish a residual route for each subnet module to ensure that forward or backward propagation is not disrupted. This route propagates activations or gradients to subsequent subnets if an  $p_s$  or  $p_o$  operation is selected, ensuring the integrity of the learning process.

3) Contribution scores: Given the intractable impact of different operations on learning performance, we introduce two innovative proxy measurements: i) backward contribution score and ii) forward contribution score. These scores respectively quantify a subnet's contribution to backward propagation and forward propagation. Note that as data samples strongly influence the importance of each subnet, the contribution scores vary across different data samples. To establish an effective measurement approach, we explore commonly used metrics for assessing sample contribution, including Fisher Information, Gradient Magnitude, Weight Magnitude, and Taylor Expansion-based Weight Importance. We explore the effectiveness of these metrics and empirically select Fisher Information and Weight Magnitude as forward and backward contribution scores, which are defined as follows.

*Fisher Information*: The contribution score of using operation p sums up all weights' empirical Fisher information in a subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , following [23]:

$$\mathcal{A}_k^p = \sum \|\nabla_{w_k}\|^2,\tag{2}$$

where  $\nabla_w$  calculates the gradients of subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$  with respect to its weights  $w_k$  a given sample  $x_i$ .

Weight Magnitude: The contribution score sums up all weights' magnitude for a subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ :

$$\mathcal{A}_k^p = \sum \|w_k\|. \tag{3}$$

Note that to calculate these scores, we feed all samples for forward and backward propagation without updating weights to calculate all subnets' Fisher information before fine-tuning. We record the magnitude of all pre-trained subnets to calculate each subnet's Weight Magnitude. The comparison with other metrics and their definitions can be found in ablation studies (Section III-B3).

4) Overall orchestration problem: We summarize the orchestration problem based on the aforementioned partitioning strategy, operation selection, and contribution scores as follows:

$$\max \sum_{k}^{K} \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}) \mathcal{A}^{p_{f}}(\mathcal{F}_{k}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \mathcal{A}^{p_{o}}(\mathcal{F}_{k}) \quad (4)$$

$$s.t. \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i})(c_{k}^{f} + c_{k}^{b}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i})c_{k}^{f} \leq C_{k},$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \leq 1, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}), \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

 $c_k^f$  and  $c_k^b$  denote the computational costs in forward and backward propagation for a subnet k, respectively.  $C_k$  is the computational cost of the k-th device.  $\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i)$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i)$ are the indicators of the operation selections for the sample  $x_i$ .  $\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) = 1$  if the full operation is selected,  $\mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) = 1$  if the forward-only operation is selected, otherwise, the shortcut operation  $p_s$  is selected. The selection of full operation and the forward-only operation conflicts for each subnet, i.e.,  $\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) + \mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \leq 1$ .

#### B. Proposed Heuristic Algorithm

This orchestration problem (Eq. 4) resembles a classic multi-knapsack problem [24], in which items (in this case, subnets or devices) are selected to optimize a certain value (contribution scores) without exceeding capacity constraints (computational costs) of multiple "knapsacks" or resources. However, it is intractable to solve this problem due to two key reasons. First, the multi-knapsack problem is, unfortunately, NP-hard [25]. Second, although the contribution scores  $\mathcal{A}^{p_f}(\mathcal{F}_k), \mathcal{A}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_k)$  can be determined by proxy metrics. However, their values are hard to determine in practice, in particular, considering balancing the scales between backward and forward contribution scores. In our experimental results (Section IV-F), we find that manually scaling the scores results in suboptimal solutions. To address this issue, we introduce a heuristic solution by two-stage decoupling. First, we decouple the multi-knapsack problem into sub-problems, each aiming to solve the orchestration problem on one device:

$$\max \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}) \mathcal{A}^{p_{f}}(\mathcal{F}_{k}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \mathcal{A}^{p_{o}}(\mathcal{F}_{k}), (\forall k)$$
(6)  
$$s.t. \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}) (c_{k}^{f} + c_{k}^{b}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) c_{k}^{f} \leq C_{k},$$
$$\mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}) + \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \leq 1, \quad \mathbb{1}_{p_{f}}(x_{i}), \mathbb{1}_{p_{o}}(x_{i}) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Second, we decouple each sub-problem into a bi-level optimization problem where the outer problem optimizes the contribution regarding backward contribution scores under the Full operation computational cost  $C_k^{p_f}$ , and the inner problem optimizes the contribution regarding forward contribution scores. Therefore, the problem becomes:

$$\max_{\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i)} \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) \mathcal{A}^{p_f}(\mathcal{F}_k) \quad \text{(outer-level)}$$
(7)  
$$s.t. \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) (c_k^f + c_k^b) \le C_k,$$
  
$$\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) + \mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \le 1,$$
  
$$\mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \in \mathcal{S}, \quad \mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i) \in \{0, 1\}$$

with

$$S = \arg \max \mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \Big\{ \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \mathcal{A}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_k) \quad \text{(inner-level)}$$

$$s.t. \sum_{i}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) c_k^f \leq C_k,$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i) \in \{0, 1\} \Big\}.$$
(8)

By decoupling the orchestration problem in a hierarchical manner, both outer-level and inner-level subproblems can be solved independently, via the classic knapsacking algorithm, e.g., dynamic programming [26], [27].

#### C. Proposed heuristic algorithm for D2FT

We detail the heuristic algorithm in Algorithm 1 and 2. Algorithm 1 shows the basic flow of the algorithm, and the algorithm 2 presents the dynamic programming solution on the bi-level optimization problem we proposed in section II-B. The output of this DP algorithm is the scheduling table containing the operation selection  $\mathbb{1}_{p_f}(x_i)$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{p_o}(x_i)$  for  $p_f$  and  $p_o$  of all samples. When training, subnets will follow this scheduling table to process every sample. We denote scheduling tables  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  for  $p_f$  and  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$  for  $p_o$ . After obtaining  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  and  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$ , we merge the results into  $T_{opt}$ . Samples selected by  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  perform  $p_f$  with a corresponding value of 1 in  $T_{opt}$  $(T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 1)$ . Samples from  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$  are assigned  $p_o$  with a value of 2  $(T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 2)$ . If a sample has been chosen



Fig. 2: The top-1 accuracy comparison under the same or similar computation and communication costs on CIFAR-10 datasets. The "Standard" means the standard full fine-tuning.

in both  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  and  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$ , it performs  $p_f$ , and we set its value in  $T_{opt}$  as 1. Samples not included in either in  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  or in  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$  are scheduled to perform  $p_s$ , with a value of 3 in  $T_{opt}$  $T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 3$ .

# D. Extended D2FT for LoRA

In addition to conventional full parameter fine-tuning, the proposed D2FT framework can be generalized to parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) algorithms to enable computational-efficient fine-tuning further. In this work, we use low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [18], an intensively investigated PEFT algorithm, to demonstrate the generalization capabilities of D2FT. In the fine-tuning process, LoRA freezes most parameters in the neural network and only optimizes low-rank matrices in adapters, thereby significantly reducing computational costs.

To extend D2FT for LoRA-based fine-tuning, we follow the standard approach of applying LoRA updates to the query, key, and value (QKV) matrices in each attention head. Each LoRA matrix is co-located with its corresponding QKV matrix on the same device to maintain computational alignment. The overall partitioning strategy remains the same as described in Section II-A1, with the only difference being that each attention head is paired with its associated LoRA matrix. During fine-tuning, the foundation model parameters remain frozen, and D2FT is applied exclusively to the LoRA matrices. Experimental results (Section III-B2) confirm the effectiveness of D2FT in this LoRA-based setting.

#### **III. EXPERIMENTS**

#### A. Experiment Settings

**Datasets.** We chose CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Stanford Cars as our test datasets. To improve efficiency, we use batch inputs and introduce micro-batches—subsets smaller than a full batch that serve as the evaluation unit. In our experiments, we replace individual samples with micro-batches. We set the batch size to 80 for CIFAR and 25 for Stanford Cars, with micro-batches of size 16 and 5, respectively, resulting in five micro-batches per batch. We also explore alternative micro-batch configurations in Appendix IV-C.

**Model.** Our model is a ViT-small base model, pre-trained using timm [28] for all experiments presented in this paper. The model consists of 12 transformer blocks, each with 6 attention heads and a feed-forward network comprising two

Algorithm 1: KnapsackScheduling

**Input** : The forward contribution scores  $\{\mathcal{A}^{p_o}\}$  and backward contribution scores  $\{\mathcal{A}^{p_f}\}$  for all subnets  $\mathcal{F}_k$  with each score list as  $\mathcal{A}^{p_o}(\mathcal{F}_k)$ and  $\mathcal{A}^{p_f}(\mathcal{F}_k)$ ; The forward computational costs  $c_k^f$  and backward computational costs  $c_k^b$ for subnet k; The total device number K, computational capacity  $C_k$  for each device, including  $C_k^{p_f}$  for Full operation and  $C_k^{p_o}$  for Forward-Only operation; Dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i\},\$ with total N data samples.

**Output:** A scheduling table  $T_{opt}$ .

- 1 Initialize Full operation  $(p_f)$  costs  $W_b$ , and Forward-Only  $(p_o)$  costs  $W_f$ ;
- 2 %Assign cost for each subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ . Columns in  $W_b$  and  $W_f$  indicate a subnet, and rows indicate a subnet.

3 for subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ,  $k \in K$  do

4 for 
$$i = 1, \dots, N$$
 do  
5  $W_c[k][i] = c_i^f$ 

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v} & \mathbf{f} [k][i] = c_k \\ \mathbf{w}_b[k][i] = c_k^f + c_k^b \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{6} & | & W_b[K][i] = c_k + \\ \mathbf{7} & | & \mathbf{end} \end{array}$$

9 % Schedule  $p_f$  and  $p_o$  using Algorithm 2.

- 10  $T_{opt}^{p_f}$  = DPSearching({ $\mathcal{A}^{p_f}$ },  $W_b$ ,  $C_k^{p_f}$ ,  $c_k^f$ ,  $c_k^b$ ) 11  $T_{opt}^{p_o}$  = DPSearching({ $\mathcal{A}^{p_o}$ },  $W_f$ ,  $C_k^{p_o}$ ,  $c_k^f$ ,  $c_k^b$ ) 12 Initialize scheduling table  $T_{opt}$  as a zero matrix, with
- rows for samples and columns for subnets.
- 13 Each element in  $T_{opt}$  can be 1 (perform  $p_f$ ), 2 (perform  $p_o$ ), or 3 (perform  $p_s$ ).

14 for subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ,  $k \in K$  do

```
for i = 1, \ldots, N do
15
            if only T_{opt}^{p_f}[k][x_i] = 1 then
16
                 T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 1
17
             end
18
            if only T_{opt}^{p_o}[k][x_i] = 1 then
19
                T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 2
20
             end
21
             % Perform p_f when device k selects sample x_i
22
              for both p_f and p_o.
             if T_{opt}^{p_f}[k][x_i] = 1 and T_{opt}^{p_o}[k][x_i] = 1 then
23
24
                 T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 1
             end
25
             % Perform p_s when device k chooses sample
26
            x_i for neither p_f nor p_o.
if T_{opt}^{p_f}[k][x_i] = 0 and T_{opt}^{p_o}[k][x_i] = 0 then
27
                 T_{opt}[k][x_i] = 3
28
             end
29
        end
30
31 end
32 Return The scheduling table T_{opt}.
```

Algorithm 2: DPSearching **Input** : The set of contribution score list  $\{A^p\}$  of operation p for all subnets. For subnet k, its contribution score list is  $\mathcal{A}^p(\mathcal{F}_k)$ ; The computational cost list  $W_p$  of operation p; The operation computational cost capacity  $C_k^p$ for all subnets; The forward computational cost  $c_k^f$  and backward computational cost  $c_k^b$ ; Number of data samples N. **Output:** A scheduling table  $T_{opt}^p$  for operation p. 1 Initialize a zero matrix searching table T, where kindexes subnets and *i* indexes samples in  $\mathcal{A}^p(\mathcal{F}_k)$ . Set w as the capacity limitation for searching. 2 Initialize  $T_{opt}^p$  as a zero matrix, with rows for samples and columns for subnets. p indicates the selection of operations, including  $p_f, p_o$ . 3 Each element in the table  $T_{opt}^p$  can be 0 (not select), or 1 (select). 4 % Phase 1: Searching for maximum contribution scores. 5 for subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ,  $k \in K$  do for *item* i = 1, 2 ... N do 6 for capacity  $w = 0, 1 \dots C_k^p$  do 7  $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{if } w \geq (c_k^f + c_k^b) \mbox{ then} \\ | \ensuremath{ T[k][i][w] = \max(T[k][i-1][w], } \end{array} \end{array}$ 8 9  $T[k][i-1][w-c] + \mathcal{A}^{p}(\mathcal{F}_{k})[i-1])$ 10 end 11 else 12 T[k][i][w] = T[k][i-1][w]13 end 14 end 15 end 16 17 end 18 %  $T[k][N][C_k^p]$  indicates the maximal contribution scores for index k in Equation 7 and 8. 19 % Phase 2: Scheduling samples according to the maximum contribution scores. 20 for subnet  $\mathcal{F}_k$ ,  $k \in K$  do 21  $i = N, w = C_k^p$ 

while i > 0 and w > 0 do 22  $\begin{array}{l} \text{if } T[k][i][w] \neq T[k][i-1][w] \text{ then} \\ & | \begin{array}{c} T_{opt}^{p}[k][i-1] = 1 \\ w = w - W_{p}[k][i-1] \end{array} \end{array}$ 23 24 25 end 26 i = 1 - 127 end 28 29 end

**30 Return** Scheduling table  $T_{opt}^p$  for operation p.

fully connected layers. We use a patch size of 16 and set the input dimensions to  $224 \times 224$ .

Hardware and tools. We use Tesla V100 GPU and use pytorch [29] tools to run each experiment.

Full fine-tuning partition settings. In our experiments, we split the ViT-small network into 74 subnets: 72 subnets correspond to the 12 transformer blocks, with 6 subnets representing each block. The remaining two subnets comprise the patch embedding layer at the start and the global pooling and classification layer at the network's end, respectively. Each subnet corresponds to a block containing one attention head and 1/6 of the feed-forward network. To exclude the impact of norm layers in forward and backward propagation, we freeze the parameter of norm layers in attention heads and replicate it for every subnet. Each subnet can deploy on a device. In the ablation study, we consider other splitting settings in appendix IV-B.

**LoRA fine-tuning partition settings.** We split the ViT-small network into 74 subnets. We assign 2 subnets to represent the patch embedding layer at the beginning and the global pooling and classification layer at the end. The other 72 subnets correspond to the 12 transformer blocks and the LoRA matrices. Each subnet of blocks contains a frozen attention head, 6 LoRA matrices for Query, Key, and Value matrices, and 1/6 of the frozen feed-forward network. The gradients are only calculated for the LoRA matrices.

Baseline methods for full fine-tuning. We consider four baseline methods applicable to distributed learning or sparsity fine-tuning, including Gshard MoE [30], two dynamic pruning methods [21], [31], and random scheduling method. The dynamic pruning baseline methods change the pruning selection with 16 iterations of fine-tuning (pruning according to the magnitude of each subnet [21] or gradient of each subnet [31]), and the pruning method is the same as the subnet selection. We denote the magnitude dynamic pruning as "DPruning M" and the magnitude-gradient dynamic pruning as "DPruning M/G". The random scheduling, denoted as "Random," randomly selects micro-batches for each subnet to do the  $p_f$ ,  $p_o$ , and  $p_s$  options. The Gshard method, denoted as "MoE Gshard", applies a gating network to schedule micro-batches to perform forward and backward propagation on different experts (experts deployed partial feed-forward network). The dynamic pruning and random scheduling share the same settings as D2FT. The Gshard methods apply 12 subnets to comprise multi-attention heads for the 12 blocks, with 3 of attention heads for each. There are 5 experts for each block (60 experts for 12 blocks), and each expert contains 1/5of the feed-forward network. To achieve a better comparison, we also add the results of our experiment model standard finetuning (denoted as "Standard", which means all parameters participate in fine-tuning for all samples) as a baseline.

**Baseline methods for LoRA fine-tuning.** We establish two LoRA fine-tuning baselines for comparison. Since the rank R affects computational cost, we define a standard LoRA fine-tuning baseline with rank R = 240, labeled as the "Standard LoRA". Additionally, we set "LoRA w/ small rank" baselines

TABLE I: Comparison of workload variance. We present the variance in computation allocated to all devices. Lower variance indicates a better workload balance. The computational budget is set around 60%. The results show the optimal workload balance achieved by D2FT.

Methods	Workload Variance
D2FT (Ours)	0.00
Random	0.23
DPruning M/G	0.25
DPruning M	0.25
MoE Gshard	0.22

using standard LoRA fine-tuning with a smaller rank R = 1, R = 60, and R = 200. In configurations where only 3 micro batches perform  $p_f$  or  $p_o$ , two perform  $p_s$ , resulting in a total computation cost comparable to LoRA fine-tuning with R = 1. When 4 micro-batches perform  $p_f$  or  $p_o$ , one perform  $p_s$ , matching the computational cost of R = 60. When 5 micro-batches perform  $p_f$  and  $p_o$ , matching the computational cost of R = 200. We will give the setting details in section III-B2. The "Standard LoRA" baseline emphasizes D2FT's computational efficiency with similar structures, while the "LoRA w/ small rank" baselines demonstrate how D2FT improves model performance at comparable computational costs.

**Evaluation metrics.** We consider five evaluation metrics to measure the performance of our proposed method.

- **Top-1 accuracy:** We apply the top-1 accuracy to measure the model performance after fine-tuning.
- **Computational costs:** The computational costs measure the percentage of computation costs after applying D2FT or baseline methods compared with full fine-tuning or LoRA fine-tuning.
- **Communicational costs:** The communicational cost evaluates the number of connections between devices after applying D2FT or baseline methods compared with full finetuning.
- Workload variance: The variance of workloads across devices in terms of computational or communicational cost. The higher variance indicates more imbalanced workloads.
- Execution time: Time for a subnet processing a batch input. We test the execution time to demonstrate the efficiency of fine-tuning methods.

We only consider the computation cost, communication cost, execution time, and load variance in fine-tuning process. In the inference, the model fine-tuned by D2FT uses all its parameters to predict the results. Therefore, we do not compare these in the inference phase.

## B. Experiment Results

In this section, we present the performance of models finetuned using D2FT compared to baseline methods, with top-1 accuracy comparisons conducted under similar computational and communicational costs. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate these comparisons across three datasets, maintaining both consistent

TABLE II: Comparison of execution time. We present the execution time for a single subnet processing assigned samples. The computational budget is set around 60%.

Methods	Execution Time	Top-1 Accuracy
D2FT (Ours)	28.80ms	89.4%
Random	30.64ms	44.4%
DPruning M/G	37.92ms	52.6%
DPruning M	37.92ms	54.4%
MoE Gshard	25.24ms	39.1%



Fig. 3: Comparison of LoRA fine-tuning. We present the top-1 accuracy under the same or similar computational and communications costs on the Stanford Cars dataset. The "Standard LoRA" shows standard LoRA fine-tuning performance with the same rank as D2FT. The "LoRA w/ small rank" shows standard LoRA fine-tuning performance with a smaller rank to match D2FT's computational costs.

computation and communication costs across all methods. Results show that D2FT outperforms baseline methods under the same computational budget. Although our method experiences a slight accuracy drop compared to standard fine-tuning (e.g., 0.9% on CIFAR-10, 2% on CIFAR-100, and 2% on Stanford Cars), it still demonstrates a 10% improvement over other baseline methods on the CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 datasets, and significantly outperforms all baseline methods on the Stanford Cars dataset.

**Comparison with Random scheduling.** D2FT achieves approximately 20% higher top-1 accuracy on the CIFAR dataset and nearly 75% higher on the Stanford Cars dataset compared to random scheduling in both computational and communication cost analyses. Since the primary distinction between our method and random scheduling is the scheduling algorithm, these results underscore the effectiveness and critical role of our scheduling strategy in optimizing model performance.

**Comparison with dynamic pruning.** The dynamic pruning method results are similar to random scheduling, but it is still ineffective in fine-tuning the model. Although these methods can dynamically change the selected subnets during iterations, they cannot overcome the problem when the pruning ratio is higher (no  $p_o$  option like D2FT); the model performance is poor.

**Comparison with Mixture of Experts (MoE).** In our setup, the MoE (Mixture of Experts) method underperforms, with fine-tuned model accuracy staying below 43% on all datasets. This is not due to MoE's inherent limitations, as it excels in scaling large models rather than supporting distributed deployment. However, in our distributed setting, MoE's performance

is inadequate.

In summary, D2FT proves to be more effective for finetuning large, distributed pre-trained models compared to baseline methods, especially in scenarios with limited training resources, such as restricted computational or communication budgets. This efficiency makes D2FT particularly advantageous in resource-constrained settings, achieving high performance while minimizing resource demands.

1) Workload balancing comparison: Our problem focuses not only on the fine-tuning of model performance but also on the workload balancing problem for every device. We choose the cases when the computation cost is equal to 60% in the workload experiments, in which 3 micro batches perform  $p_f$ in each batch. We apply two metrics—workload variance and execution time—to assess the balance of task distribution. The workload variance results present are shown in Table I, and the execution time results are shown in Table II.

**Comparison of workload variance.** The workload variance measures the difference of samples assigned to subnets in a batch. A larger variance means a more unbalanced sample assignment. From the results in Table I, we prove that our proposed method could balance assigned samples where the variance is 0, which means every subnet receives the same number of samples to process. The other methods' variances, however, are not less than 0.2, which means they cannot control the sample number assigned to every subnet.

Comparison of execution time. The execution time measures the running time for the entire network processing a batch input. From the execution time of different micro-batches processed by a single subnet, we conclude that a shorter execution time is relevant to a more balanced workload scheduling. The results in Table II show that D2FT needs 28.80ms to finish processing a batch of input, which is faster than random scheduling and dynamic pruning. This result proves that D2FT scheduled a more balanced workload for every subnet than random scheduling and dynamic pruning. On the contrary, the execution time of D2FT is longer than that of the MoE method, which shows a different conclusion. This occurs due to the balancing mechanism in the Gshard approach, where experts skip micro-batches once they hit their processing limit to ensure equitable workload distribution among most experts. However, due to workload limitations imposed on subnets by this mechanism, certain samples that require processing are skipped. Therefore, Gshard's lower execution time comes from fewer samples processed, which also causes poor model performance. In conclusion, D2FT achieves a more balanced workload than the baseline methods.

2) *Experiment results on LoRA:* We use Stanford Cars as testing datasets, following our LoRA configurations. We evaluate three settings for computational costs:

- 3 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , and 2 perform  $p_o$ , reducing the computational cost to 95% of standard LoRA fine-tuning.
- 3 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , 1 performs  $p_o$ , and 1 performs  $p_s$ , reducing the computational cost to 75%.

• 3 micro-batches perform  $p_f$  and 2 perform  $p_s$ , further reducing the computational cost to 60%.

We evaluate three settings for communicational costs:

- 3 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , and 2 perform  $p_o$ , with the communicational cost at around 90% of standard LoRA fine-tuning.
- 3 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , 1 performs  $p_o$ , and 1 performs  $p_s$ , reducing the communicational cost to 70%.
- 2 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , 1 perform  $p_o$ , and 2 performs  $p_s$ , reducing the communicational cost to 50%.

The results, shown in Figure 3, indicate that D2FT adapts well to LoRA settings, achieving computational cost and communications cost savings while maintaining performance. For the experiments of computational costs comparison, D2FT LoRA fine-tuning achieves close accuracy to the "Standard LoRA", with a drop of 4.2% top-1 accuracy while using just 60% of the computational cost for fine-tuning and drop and only a drop of 1.8% while using 75% computational costs. Meanwhile, it outperforms the "LoRA w/ small rank" baseline, boosting accuracy by 8.5% at approximately 60% of the total computational cost and by 3.6% at around 75%. When the computational cost of both the "LoRA w/ small rank" baseline and our method exceeds 90%, the model performances of the "Standard LoRA", "LoRA w/ small rank", and D2FT align closely, appearing nearly identical. We could find a similar conclusion for the experiments of communicational cost comparison. D2FT demonstrates outstanding performance while significantly reducing communication costs. When utilizing only 50% of the communication resources, D2FT achieves a top-1 accuracy that is merely 6.3% below the "Standard LoRA". As the communication cost increases to 70%, this accuracy gap narrows to just 4.6%. More importantly, D2FT substantially outperforms the "LoRA w/ small rank", enhancing top-1 accuracy by 5.7% at 50% communicational cost and 3.7% at 70%. When communicational cost increases by around 90%, the performance of "Standard LoRA", "LoRA w/ small rank", and D2FT are close. In summary, our proposed D2FT enhances training efficiency with only minimal accuracy reduction in LoRA settings, especially when computation resources are limited.

3) Different option of backward and forward scores: We propose using Fisher Information, Weight Magnitude, Gradient Magnitude, and Taylor Expansion-based Weight Importance as scoring metrics in the main content. We empirically chose Weight Magnitude as the backward score and Fisher Information as the forward score for previous experiments. This section presents experimental results evaluating various backward and forward score options in full fine-tuning and explains our chosen selections for each. In this experiment, we suppose each input batch consists of 5 micro-batches, 2 micro-batches perform  $p_f$ , 1 micro-batch perform  $p_s$ , and 2 micro-batches perform  $p_o$ . The experiment results are in table III, which indicate that using Weight Magnitude as the backward score yields better performance in full fine-tuning. A likely reason is that the pre-trained weights play a crucial role in downstream TABLE III: Impact of measurements for backward and forward contribution scores. We select different measurements for contribution scores in D2FT full fine-tuning on the Stanford Cars dataset. We tested eight combinations of backward and forward scores to identify the scoring method that yields the best model performance.

Backward score	Forward score	Top-1 accuracy
Weight Magnitude	Fisher Information	<b>79.8%</b>
Fisher Information	Weight Magnitude	75.8%
Weight Magnitude	Gradient Magnitude	79.0%
Gradient Magnitude	Weight Magnitude	71.5%
Fisher Information	Taylor Importance	74.9%
Taylor Importance	Fisher Information	74.6%
Weight Magnitude	Taylor Importance	79.7%
Taylor Importance	Weight Magnitude	75.4%

tasks and benefit from updates, so prioritizing weights with larger magnitudes ensures the model's performance. After determining the backward score, we find that when Fisher Information becomes the forward score, the fine-tuned model performance achieves the best performance. Therefore, we choose Weight Magnitude as the backward score and Fisher Information as the forward score.

## IV. ABLATION STUDY

## A. Analysis of computational and communicational cost

This subsection presents the computational and communicational cost of different operation selections.

**Computational cost analysis.** To estimate the overall network execution time, we measure the time it takes for a single subnet to perform  $p_f$  and  $p_o$ . Specifically, we evaluate the execution time for a subnet processing between 1 and 5 micro-batches. The results of these tests are presented in Table IV. We use execution time measurements to estimate the computational costs for  $Full(p_f)$  and  $Forward-Only(p_o)$ operations. Based on the data in Table IV, we observe that the forward computational cost is consistently around 40% of the total forward-backward computational cost, irrespective of the number of micro-batches. Consequently, we assume that the  $p_{0}$  option consumes 40% of the computational cost of  $p_f$ , while the  $p_s$  option incurs no computational cost. For all experiments, we employ an SGD optimizer with momentum. Using these assumptions, we calculate the computational cost metric to evaluate the efficiency of our method.

**Communicational cost analysis.** Each block's output in a transformer base model has the same size because the structure and dimensions of each block are identical. Meanwhile, the communicational cost during backward propagation is identical to that during forward propagation because the tensor sizes are the same during forward and backward. Therefore, if a device chooses the  $p_o$  for a micro-batch, it can save 50% of its communicational, and there will be no communicational if it chooses the  $p_s$  for a micro-batch. We use this to calculate the communicational

TABLE IV: The execution time for a subnet when processing a different number of micro-batch.

Micro-batch Number	Execution Time $(p_f)$	Execution Time $(p_o)$
1	2.01 ms	0.86ms
2	2.20ms	1.01ms
3	2.27ms	1.05ms
4	2.74ms	1.20ms
5	3.16ms	1.48ms

TABLE V: Impact of the number of subnets on D2FT.

Number of subnets	Top-1 accuracy
74	89.7%
38	89.4%
26	88.8%

TABLE VI: Impact of micro-batch sizes on D2FT.

Micro-batch size	Top-1 accuracy
$\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 8\\ 16\end{array}$	$90.1\%\ 89.8\%\ 89.7\%$

cost metric in our experiments.

## B. The impact of the number of subnets on D2FT

In this section, we investigate whether the number of subnets affects the fine-tuning performance of D2FT. We introduce two additional subnet configurations: 38 subnets and 26 subnets, in comparison to the 74 subnets used in the previous experiment. The batch size and micro-batch size are kept consistent with the prior setup, with each subnet selecting  $2p_f$  and  $2p_o$  for micro-batches. The CIFAR-100 dataset is used for testing, with a batch size of 80 and micro-batch size of 16. The results of this comparison are summarized in Table V.

The results indicate that reducing the number of subnets decreases the fine-tuned model's performance at the same computation ratio. This reduction occurs because fewer subnets mean each device's subnet contains more parameters. For instance, when selecting  $p_o$  or  $p_s$  in configurations with 38 or 26 subnets, the parameters affected are double and triple, respectively, compared to the 74-subnet case. These findings demonstrate that under equal computational capacity across devices, D2FT performs better with a larger number of subnets, allowing for finer granularity in parameter updates.

## C. The impact of micro-batch size on D2FT

In this section, we examine whether the size of microbatches affects the fine-tuning performance of D2FT. We evaluate three micro-batch sizes: 4, 8, and 16, to analyze their impact. Given a batch size of 80, these micro-batch sizes correspond to 20, 10, and 5 micro-batches per batch, respectively. The experiments are conducted on the CIFAR-100 dataset, with computation costs fixed at 64%. Specifically, 40% of data samples perform  $p_f$ , 40% data samples perform  $p_o$ , and 20% data samples perform  $p_s$ . The results are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VII: D2FT results on memory heterogeneity devices

Number of large memory devices	Top-1 accuracy
9 14 19	$89.7\%\ 89.8\%\ 89.8\%$

TABLE VIII: D2FT results on computation heterogeneity devices

Number of high speed devices	Top-1 accuracy
9	89.7%
14	89.9%
19	89.8%

The results indicate that top-1 accuracy remains consistent across different settings, suggesting that micro-batch size has a limited impact on performance. However, minor effects persist: as the micro-batch size increases, the fine-tuned model performance decreases slightly. This is likely because larger micro-batches may include less relevant samples within a subnet, whereas smaller micro-batches allow the algorithm to select more critical samples for each subnet, leading to better optimization.

In summary, the micro-batch size has minimal impact on our method. While it may slightly influence the model's performance, any improvements or reductions are marginal and do not significantly affect overall outcomes.

# D. D2FT Performance under heterogeneous capabilities.

The experimental results in Section IV-B prompt us to consider scenarios involving devices with heterogeneous capabilities. We continue to use a batch consisting of 5 microbatches, with each micro-batch containing 16 data samples. We consider two types of heterogeneous experiments: memory heterogeneity and computational heterogeneity. Tables VII and VIII present the results for memory and computation heterogeneity experiments, respectively.

Memory heterogeneity: Regarding memory heterogeneity, devices were categorized into two groups based on memory size: small and large. Small devices were configured to hold one attention head and a 1/6 feed-forward network from a transformer block, while large devices accommodated two attention heads and a 1/3 feed-forward network from a transformer block. We tested three configurations of large-memory device counts: 9, 14, and 19. In each batch, each device performed  $2p_f$  operations and  $2p_o$  operations. As shown in Table VII, we observe that D2FT performs effectively even in cases with heterogeneous memory. The model's finetuned performance across three different settings is consistent and remains comparable to the performance achieved with homogeneous memory devices under the same computation cost (where the homogeneous top-1 accuracy is 89.7%). This indicates that D2FT is robust to memory heterogeneity.

**Computational heterogeneity**: Regarding computational heterogeneity, we defined two categories of device computation capabilities: slow and high speed. We fixed the memory usage

TABLE IX: The Forward-Pass  $(p_o)$  effectiveness

Forward setting	Computational cost	Top-1 accuracy
$0p_o$	20.0%	77.2%
$1p_o$	28.0%	77.4%
$2p_o$	36.0%	77.7%
$3p_o$	44.0%	78.9%
$4p_o$	52.0%	79.2%
TABLE V: Bi level scheduling effectiveness		

TABLE A. DI-Tevel scheduling effectiveness			
Optimization problem $\lambda$ Top-1 accuracy			
Bi-level	N/A	89.7%	
Scaler	Max	89.8%	

Min

0.2

0.1

75.2%

77.7%

76.3%

for all devices, with each device containing one attention head and a 1/6 feed-forward network in a transformer block. The total number of devices (subnets) used in the experiment was 74. A slow-speed device processes  $2p_f$  and  $2p_o$  operations in each batch, while a high-speed device can handle  $3p_f$ and  $1p_o$  operations. Three configurations were tested for the number of high-speed devices: 9, 14, and 19. As shown in Table VIII, D2FT also performs well when devices with varying computational capabilities.

In conclusion, neither memory nor computation heterogeneity negatively affects the performance of the fine-tuned model, suggesting that D2FT is adaptable and effective under both memory and computational heterogeneity.

#### E. The impact of Forward-Only $(p_o)$

Scaler

Scaler

Scaler

We evaluate the effectiveness of the Forward-Only  $(p_o)$  operation. The  $p_o$  requires around 40% of computational costs and 50% communicational costs to the Full operation  $(p_f)$ , yet it plays a critical role in improving the fine-tuned model's performance. To test this, we fix the number of  $p_f$  operations per subnet and vary the number of  $p_o$  operations in a batch. The experiment uses a batch size of 25, divided into 5 microbatches (each containing 5 samples), with the Stanford Cars dataset. Each subnet is configured to perform  $p_f$  on only 1 microbatch. Consequently, we examine five  $p_o$  configurations, ranging from no microbatches performing  $p_o$  (with 4 microbatches perform  $p_s$ , denoted as  $0p_o$ ) to all 4 microbatches performing  $p_o$  (denoted as  $4p_o$ ). This setup allows us to assess the impact of varying  $p_o$  frequency on model performance.

Based on the results in Table IX, we observe that  $p_o$  operations significantly enhance performance. This improvement becomes more pronounced as the number of micro-batches performing  $p_o$  increases, correspondingly reducing the number of micro-batches performing  $p_s$ . In summary, when computational resources are constrained, adopting the Forward-Only( $p_o$ ) approach offers an effective trade-off, allowing for notable performance gains with only a modest increase in computational cost.

## F. The necessity for two-stage decoupling

In the methodology section, we discussed employing twostage decoupling, where a bi-level optimization problem is used to optimize  $p_f$  and  $p_o$ . This section demonstrates the effectiveness of two-stage scheduling. As a baseline method, we consider balancing the scales of backward and forward scores. To achieve this, we introduce a scaling factor  $\lambda$  to adjust the forward scores to match the scale of the backward scores. We refer to this approach as "Scaler" in our experiments. We give four options:  $\lambda$  to make all forward contribution scores smaller than backward contribution scores (denoted as "Max" scaler),  $\lambda$  to make all backward contribution scores smaller than forward contribution scores (denoted as "Min" scaler),  $\lambda = 0.1$ , and  $\lambda = 0.2$ . We specify a particular computation cost  $(2p_f, 2p_o)$ , and  $1p_s$  for five micro-batches) to test the "Scaler" performance. The comparison results are shown in Table X.

The "Max" scaler ensures that all forward contribution scores are smaller than their corresponding backward scores, aligning with the bi-level optimization framework used in two-stage decoupling. The results in Table X indicate that the "Max" scaler and bi-level optimization yield comparable model performance. Conversely, the "Min" scaler for the "Scaler" approach performs worse than the bi-level optimization of the two-stage decoupling framework. Additionally, compared to constant scalers, two-stage decoupling achieves higher model performance. This demonstrates that two-stage decoupling is more effective than simply balancing the backward and forward score scales. While the performance of the "Scaler" method depends on the choice of  $\lambda$  selection, the results in Table X suggest that finding an optimal  $\lambda$  is challenging.

#### V. RELATED WORK

Sparsely activated models and dynamic pruning, well-suited for distributed learning, help reduce computational load on individual devices during training but rarely address device load balancing. This challenge motivates our work, which aims to optimize performance in distributed settings by minimizing computation costs while effectively balancing workloads across devices.

## A. Sparsely Activated Models

Sparsely activated models (SAMs) [32] are introduced to reduce the training or fine-tuning cost of large-scale models. A model uses all its parameters for training, which is densely activated in general training or fine-tuning. SAMs choose subset models from the entire large-scale model for different inputs to decrease the training costs. To accomplish this, SAMs introduce Sparsely Gated Mixture-of-Experts (MoE), where certain layers, called MoE layers, are replicated to form multiple parallel subnets, each referred to as an "expert" within the larger model. A selection mechanism is then applied to activate only a subset of experts for training on a given task. This approach enables the network to selectively engage the most relevant experts for different downstream tasks rather than relying on the full model. The scheme for selecting experts can be routed by a gate network [32]. The gate network selects the top-K relative "experts" according to the gate network weight for each expert. However, the gating network encounters a workload imbalance among experts. While this issue can be mitigated using techniques like workload balancing loss [30], [33], limiting expert capacity (i.e., the number of samples an expert can process) [30], implementing a policy scheduler [34], or splitting the top-K gates into K top-1 gates [35], these routing methods do not enhance the parameter efficiency of SAMs [36], and therefore may not improve model performance. Alternative approaches like replacing gating mechanisms with hash-based selection [37] or using random selection alongside knowledge distillation updates [36] can aid in balancing workloads and enhancing performance. However, these methods focus solely on the workload distribution across devices with MoE layers, without considering the memory or computation constraints of the devices used for partitioning.

# B. Dynamic Pruning

Dynamic pruning removes the redundant model weights to reduce computing costs during fine-tuning and compress the model after fine-tuning. Unlike other pruning methods, such as those applied before fine-tuning [22], [38], [39], after finetuning [40]–[43], or iteratively during fine-tuning [44]–[46], which cannot recover the pruned weights, dynamic pruning computes a candidate mask that allows later pruning results cover the former pruning., thereby correct pruning errors during the fine-tuning process and minimize the drop in model accuracy. Lin [21] et al. and Sokar [31] et al. dynamically update network connections according to an importance score derived from batch gradients and weight magnitudes. Dynamic pruning demonstrates that it's unnecessary to use all input data to train every network weight. However, while dynamic pruning selects a subnet for specific inputs, in distributed learning scenarios, workload imbalance can cause certain partitioned devices to remain idle, wasting computational resources. Meanwhile, the purpose of compressing the model is to decrease the performance of the fine-tuned model unavoidably.

Compared with existing works, our proposed D2FT approach addresses computation, memory overload, and workload balancing while preserving fine-tuning performance.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a new framework, D2FT, which can dynamically allocate learning operations across distributed devices and improve workload balances across devices during fine-tuning. We formulate operation scheduling as a multiple knapsack optimization problem and optimize the finetuning schedule strategy using dynamic programming. We evaluate our proposed framework on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, and Stanford Cars datasets with four baseline methods in full fine-tuning settings. We also consider parameter-efficient finetuning, extending D2FT in LoRA settings with same rank standard LoRA and smaller rank standard LoRA fine-tuning as baseline methods. Our experimental results show that D2FT outperforms all baseline methods in full and LoRA fine-tuning settings, especially in low computational and communicational costs. The findings demonstrate that D2FT improves training efficiency with minimal accuracy loss.

#### REFERENCES

- J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1810.04805, 2018.
- [2] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, "Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692, 2019.
- [3] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 21, no. 140, pp. 1–67, 2020.
- [4] Z. Yang, Z. Dai, Y. Yang, J. Carbonell, R. R. Salakhutdinov, and Q. V. Le, "Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pretraining for language understanding," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [5] V. Sanh, L. Debut, J. Chaumond, and T. Wolf, "Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter," *arXiv preprint arXiv*:1910.01108, 2019.
- [6] S. Bubeck, V. Chandrasekaran, R. Eldan, J. Gehrke, E. Horvitz, E. Kamar, P. Lee, Y. T. Lee, Y. Li, S. Lundberg *et al.*, "Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4," *arXiv preprint arXiv*:2303.12712, 2023.
- [7] L. Yuan, Y. Chen, T. Wang, W. Yu, Y. Shi, Z.-H. Jiang, F. E. Tay, J. Feng, and S. Yan, "Tokens-to-token vit: Training vision transformers from scratch on imagenet," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 558–567.
- [8] Z. Li, E. Wallace, S. Shen, K. Lin, K. Keutzer, D. Klein, and J. Gonzalez, "Train big, then compress: Rethinking model size for efficient training and inference of transformers," in *International Conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 5958–5968.
- [9] E. Belilovsky, M. Eickenberg, and E. Oyallon, "Decoupled greedy learning of cnns," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 736–745.
- [10] B. Yuan, C. R. Wolfe, C. Dun, Y. Tang, A. Kyrillidis, and C. Jermaine, "Distributed learning of fully connected neural networks using independent subnet training," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 15, no. 8, pp. 1581–1590, 2022.
- [11] B. Yuan, Y. He, J. Davis, T. Zhang, T. Dao, B. Chen, P. S. Liang, C. Re, and C. Zhang, "Decentralized training of foundation models in heterogeneous environments," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 25464–25477, 2022.
- [12] M. Shoeybi, M. Patwary, R. Puri, P. LeGresley, J. Casper, and B. Catanzaro, "Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism," arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.08053, 2019.
- [13] Y. Xu, H. Lee, D. Chen, B. Hechtman, Y. Huang, R. Joshi, M. Krikun, D. Lepikhin, A. Ly, M. Maggioni *et al.*, "Gspmd: general and scalable parallelization for ml computation graphs," *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2105.04663, 2021.
- [14] Q. Xu and Y. You, "An efficient 2d method for training super-large deep learning models," in 2023 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS). IEEE, 2023, pp. 222–232.
- [15] Z. Bian, Q. Xu, B. Wang, and Y. You, "Maximizing parallelism in distributed training for huge neural networks," *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2105.14450, 2021.
- [16] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [17] A. Dosovitskiy, L. Beyer, A. Kolesnikov, D. Weissenborn, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, M. Dehghani, M. Minderer, G. Heigold, S. Gelly *et al.*, "An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020.
- [18] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen, "Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685, 2021.
- [19] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. De Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly, "Parameter-efficient transfer learning for nlp," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2790–2799.

- [20] K. Han, A. Xiao, E. Wu, J. Guo, C. Xu, and Y. Wang, "Transformer in transformer," Advances in neural information processing systems, vol. 34, pp. 15908–15919, 2021.
- [21] T. Lin, S. U. Stich, L. Barba, D. Dmitriev, and M. Jaggi, "Dynamic model pruning with feedback," arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07253, 2020.
- [22] H. Kohama, H. Minoura, T. Hirakawa, T. Yamashita, and H. Fujiyoshi, "Single-shot pruning for pre-trained models: Rethinking the importance of magnitude pruning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 1433–1442.
- [23] F. Ilhan, G. Su, S. F. Tekin, T. Huang, S. Hu, and L. Liu, "Resourceefficient transformer pruning for finetuning of large models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 16 206–16 215.
- [24] S. Martello and P. Toth, *Knapsack problems: algorithms and computer implementations*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1990.
- [25] A. R. Kan, L. Stougie, and C. Vercellis, "A class of generalized greedy algorithms for the multi-knapsack problem," *Discrete applied mathematics*, vol. 42, no. 2-3, pp. 279–290, 1993.
- [26] U. Pferschy, "Dynamic programming revisited: Improving knapsack algorithms," *Computing*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 419–430, 1999.
- [27] D. Bertsimas and R. Demir, "An approximate dynamic programming approach to multidimensional knapsack problems," *Management Science*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 550–565, 2002.
- [28] R. Wightman, "Pytorch image models," https://github.com/rwightman/ pytorch-image-models, 2019.
- [29] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga *et al.*, "Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019, pp. 8024– 8035.
- [30] D. Lepikhin, H. Lee, Y. Xu, D. Chen, O. Firat, Y. Huang, M. Krikun, N. Shazeer, and Z. Chen, "Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.16668*, 2020.
- [31] G. Sokar, Z. Atashgahi, M. Pechenizkiy, and D. C. Mocanu, "Where to pay attention in sparse training for feature selection?" Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, vol. 35, pp. 1627–1642, 2022.
- [32] N. Shazeer, A. Mirhoseini, K. Maziarz, A. Davis, Q. Le, G. Hinton, and J. Dean, "Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538*, 2017.
- [33] W. Fedus, B. Zoph, and N. Shazeer, "Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity," *The Journal* of Machine Learning Research, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 5232–5270, 2022.
- [34] X. Nie, X. Miao, Z. Wang, Z. Yang, J. Xue, L. Ma, G. Cao, and B. Cui, "Flexmoe: Scaling large-scale sparse pre-trained model training via dynamic device placement," *Proceedings of the ACM on Management* of Data, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–19, 2023.
- [35] A. Yang, J. Lin, R. Men, C. Zhou, L. Jiang, X. Jia, A. Wang, J. Zhang, J. Wang, Y. Li *et al.*, "M6-t: Exploring sparse expert models and beyond," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.15082*, 2021.
- [36] S. Zuo, X. Liu, J. Jiao, Y. J. Kim, H. Hassan, R. Zhang, T. Zhao, and J. Gao, "Taming sparsely activated transformer with stochastic experts," arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04260, 2021.
- [37] S. Roller, S. Sukhbaatar, J. Weston *et al.*, "Hash layers for large sparse models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 17555–17566, 2021.
- [38] N. Lee, T. Ajanthan, and P. H. Torr, "Snip: Single-shot network pruning based on connection sensitivity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02340*, 2018.
- [39] C. Wang, G. Zhang, and R. Grosse, "Picking winning tickets before training by preserving gradient flow," arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07376, 2020.
- [40] S. Han, J. Pool, J. Tran, and W. Dally, "Learning both weights and connections for efficient neural network," *Advances in neural information* processing systems, vol. 28, 2015.
- [41] Y. Guo, A. Yao, and Y. Chen, "Dynamic network surgery for efficient dnns," Advances in neural information processing systems, vol. 29, 2016.
- [42] J. M. Alvarez and M. Salzmann, "Compression-aware training of deep networks," Advances in neural information processing systems, vol. 30, 2017.
- [43] M. A. Carreira-Perpinán and Y. Idelbayev, ""learning-compression" algorithms for neural net pruning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference* on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2018, pp. 8532–8541.
- [44] J. Frankle and M. Carbin, "The lottery ticket hypothesis: Finding sparse, trainable neural networks," arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03635, 2018.

- [45] Z. Zhang, X. Chen, T. Chen, and Z. Wang, "Efficient lottery ticket finding: Less data is more," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 12 380–12 390.
- [46] S. Girish, S. R. Maiya, K. Gupta, H. Chen, L. S. Davis, and A. Shrivastava, "The lottery ticket hypothesis for object recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 762–771.