

---

# CONV\_EINSUM: A FRAMEWORK FOR REPRESENTATION AND FAST EVALUATION OF MULTILINEAR OPERATIONS IN CONVOLUTIONAL TENSORIAL NEURAL NETWORKS

---

Tahseen Rabbani\*, Jiahao Su\*, Xiaoyu Liu, David Chan, Geoffrey Sangston, Furong Huang

Department of Computer Science

University of Maryland

{trabbani, jiahaosu, xliu1231, dhchan, gsangsto, furongh}@umd.edu

## ABSTRACT

Modern ConvNets continue to achieve state-of-the-art results over a vast array of vision and image classification tasks, but at the cost of increasing parameters. One strategy for compactifying a network without sacrificing much expressive power is to reshape it into a tensorial neural network (TNN), which is a higher-order tensorization of its layers, followed by a factorization, such as a CP-decomposition, which strips a weight down to its critical basis components. Passes through TNNs can be represented as sequences of multilinear operations (MLOs), where the evaluation path can greatly affect the number of floating point operations (FLOPs) incurred. While functions such as the popular `einsum` can evaluate simple MLOs such as contractions, existing implementations cannot process multi-way convolutions, resulting in scant assessments of how optimal evaluation paths through tensorized convolutional layers can improve training speed. In this paper, we develop a unifying framework for representing tensorial convolution layers as `einsum`-like strings and a meta-algorithm `conv_einsum` which is able to evaluate these strings in a FLOPs-minimizing manner. Comprehensive experiments, using our open-source implementation, over a wide range of models, tensor decompositions, and diverse tasks, demonstrate that `conv_einsum` significantly increases both computational and memory-efficiency of convolutional TNNs.

## 1 Introduction

Modern neural networks are both expressive and accurate over a wide variety of learning and classification problems, but at the cost of increased width and depth. State-of-the-art convolutional models, for example, can contain up to several billion parameters [1, 2, 3]. The size and training costs of such networks are at odds with a rapidly emerging industrial and academic interest in performing learning tasks on low-fidelity hosts such as IoT and mobile devices [4, 5, 6]. An increasingly popular approach for generating compact yet expressive models is to use Tensorial Neural Networks (TNNs) [7, 8, 9, 10], which factorize each layer’s weight tensor into several smaller factors. As a result, each TNN layer is a multilinear operation of its input and weight factors.

One method by which a TNN can arise is reshaping a network weight into a higher order tensor. These reshaped weights are then decomposed into factorized forms, such as canonical polyadic (CP), tensor train (TT), and Tucker (TK) decompositions. Factorization of a reshaped tensor is an efficient way of representing underlying properties such as periodicity and modularity invariances/similarities, which often exist in neural network models [7, 11, 10, 12], and preserved in the factorization. In addition to their lighter weight, TNNs can preserve the same predictive power level over several popular backbone networks and tasks.

However, in contrast to the availability of high performance libraries for convolutional neural networks (CNNs), e.g., NVIDIA’s cuDNN for GPUs or Intel’s MKL for CPUs), solutions for efficient evaluation of multilinear operations (MLOs) through their tensor-decomposed counterparts are relatively unavailable. Emphasis in existing literature and implementations has been placed on speed-up via compression, i.e., reducing the number of MLOs required by tensorial

---

\*Equal contribution.

convolutional kernels by reducing the number of their parameters via rank-reduction. Few works have focused on the reduction of convolutional MLOs when the size of the layer is fixed. Since the convolution operator is fundamental in many cutting-edge architectures and highly optimized by parallel computing libraries such as CUDA, support for this multilinear operation in TNN training, would benefit the tensor network community.

In this work: **(1)** We introduce a framework for representation and optimal evaluation order of multilinear floating point operations (FLOPs) through convolutional tensor layers. **(2)** Using our framework, one can represent a tensorial forward or backward computation as a *generalized einsum* graph/sequence and submit it to our novel meta-algorithm `conv_einsum` for FLOPs-minimized evaluation. Here, “generalized” means including convolutions, an operation not supported by any existing `einsum` implementation. To determine an optimal evaluation path, we develop an extension of the `netcon` algorithm [13] to support the expense of convolutions in its underlying cost model. **(3)** We present theory and a comprehensive set of experiments which demonstrate significant improvements in computational and memory efficiency by using `conv_einsum` to train TNNs. **(4)** Our code is available as an open-source library for training tensorized ResNets under a variety of compression rates and factorizations.

## 2 Tensor Operations and einsum

In this section, we outline multi-linear operations (MLOs) common to TNNs. In brief, MLOs are nested summations over one or more indices/modes of a tensor and described in full generality in Appendix A.2. Many of these operations are systematically expressible and computable via the popular notational framework and function `einsum`, first introduced by the Python library NumPy [14]. Therefore, we will first review the most important tensor network operations and their corresponding `einsum` representations. We then formally introduce TNNs.

**Notations.** We use lower case letters (e.g.,  $v$ ) to denote vectors, upper case letters (e.g.,  $M$ ) denote matrices, and curly letters (e.g.,  $\mathcal{T}$ ) denote tensors. For a tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_1 \times I_2 \times \dots \times I_N}$ , we refer to a specific entry by the subscript notation  $T_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ , where  $1 \leq i_n \leq I_n$  for  $1 \leq n \leq N$ . We refer to  $N$  as the order, a single index  $n$  as a mode, and the magnitude of a mode  $I_n$  as dimension size. For example, a tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 4 \times 5}$  is a 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensor that has dimension size 4 at its second mode.

### 2.1 Representations of Multilinear Operations

The `einsum` function allows definitions of multilinear operations via string inputs. In this subsection, we highlight an example of a multilinear operation involving three primitive operations (*contraction*, *batch product*, *outer product*) in the language of `einsum`. Consider two 3<sup>rd</sup>-order tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times I}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times R \times T}$ , and a multilinear operation between them:  $\mathcal{T}_{b,i,j} = \sum_{c=1}^C \mathcal{T}_{b,c,i}^{(1)} \mathcal{T}_{b,c,j}^{(2)}$ .

We can denote the operation above in `einsum` as:

```
T = einsum("bci,bcj->bij", T1, T2)
```

where the string in the quotation mark precisely specifies the operation, which is known as an `einsum` string. In this string, the letter "c" indicates *contraction* since it appears in both inputs but not the output; the letter "b" symbolizes *batch product* since it appears in both inputs and the output; lastly, the letters "i" and "j" represent *outer product* as they each appears in one of the two inputs and they both appear in the output. Detailed description of `einsum` and these operations is provided in Appendix A.2.

### 2.2 From einsum to conv\_einsum

While many popular libraries (e.g., NumPy, TensorFlow, PyTorch) implement `einsum`, none directly support convolutions, despite the ubiquity of convolutions in modern neural networks. We will generalize `einsum` to a meta-function `conv_einsum`, which can process convolutions.

*Tensor convolution* generalizes the convolution on vectors to higher-order tensors thereby extending the familiar linear convolution to a multi-linear operation. Given two tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{X \times B \times C}$  and  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D \times E}$ , we can define a convolution between the modes with dimensions  $X$  and  $L$ . The operation returns a 5<sup>th</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{X' \times B \times C \times D \times E}$ , with its entries calculated as:

$$\mathcal{T}_{:,b,c,d,e} = \mathcal{T}_{:,b,c}^{(1)} * \mathcal{T}_{:,d,e}^{(2)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $*$  denotes a convolution between two vectors. Note that the dimension sizes  $X$  and  $L$  can be different, and the output dimension size  $X'$  depends on the convolution type (e.g., a standard convolution yields  $X' = X + L - 1$ ). We write Equation (1) in our proposed `conv_einsum` as

```
T = conv_einsum("xbc,ade->xbcde|x", T1, T2)
```

In this scheme, the same letter "x" is used for different modes, even if their dimension sizes may differ. Furthermore, the placement "x" to the right of the pipe-delimiter "|" indicates that `conv_einsum` performs convolution on the corresponding modes. We can use `conv_einsum` to represent multilinear operations on more than two inputs. Consider three tensors  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times F \times S \times H \times W}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{F \times G \times K \times K}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times T \times K \times K}$ , and an operation

$$\mathcal{Y}_{b,g,t,:} = \sum_{f=1}^F \sum_{s=1}^S \mathcal{X}_{b,f,s,:} * \mathcal{K}_{f,g,:}^{(1)} * \mathcal{K}_{s,t,:}^{(2)} \quad (2)$$

which leads to an output tensor  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times G \times T \times H' \times W'}$ . This is known as *interleaved group convolution* [15]. In `conv_einsum`, it writes as

```
T = conv_einsum("bfshw, fghw, sthw->bgthw|hw", X, K1, K2)
```

### 2.3 Compact Neural Networks via `conv_einsum`

In this section, we formulate various layers of compact neural networks in terms of `conv_einsum`. Expressions for many other layer types can be found in the Appendix.

**Standard convolution layer.** We review a popular layer type in neural networks — the standard 2D-convolutional layer. Such a layer is parameterized by a 4<sup>th</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$ , which maps a 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times H' \times W'}$  to a 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times H' \times W'}$ :

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw, tshw->btshw|hw", X, W)
```

Note that a neural network typically computes its inputs in mini-batches, so the `conv_einsum` string contains an additional letter "b" to index examples in a mini-batch. Since convolutional layers include fully-connected layers as a special case when  $H = W = 1$ , we focus on designs of convolutional layers for the remainder of this subsection.

**Tensorial Neural Networks.** Convolutional layers motivate the importance and usage of TNNs since their structure has been shown to benefit from reshaping and tensorial decomposition. Numerous works propose to design *tensorial layers* where the (reshaped) convolution kernel  $\mathcal{W}$  is factorized using tensor decompositions [7, 16, 11, 17, 10]. Our proposed `conv_einsum` can handle these types of designs. Here, we present two representatives of efficient tensorial convolutional layer designs based on the CP decomposition [18].

(1) In a *CP convolutional layer* [7], the kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is factorized into 4 factors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times S}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(4)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times W}$  such that

```
W = conv_einsum("rt,rs,rh,rw->tshw", W1, W2, W3, W4)
```

Plugging this decomposition into the 2D-convolutional layer, we obtain the following `conv_einsum` output string:

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,rt,rs,rh,rw->btshw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W4)
```

(2) For a *reshaped CP convolutional layer* [10], the convolution kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is first reshaped into a higher order tensor  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times \dots \times T_M \times S_1 \times \dots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$ ,  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ , and then factorized into  $(m + 1)$  tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T_m \times S_m}$  with  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$ . For example, when  $M = 3$ :

```
W = conv_einsum("r(t1)(s1),r(t2)(s2),r(t3)(s3),rhw->(t3)(t2)(t1)(s3)(s2)(s1)", W1, W2, W3, W0)
```

We can write the layer's `conv_einsum` string as:

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,r(t1)(s1),r(t2)(s2),r(t3)(s3),rhw->n(t1)(t2)(t3)hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0)
```

For both layers,  $R$  is the *rank* of the CP decomposition, which controls the number of parameters (i.e., compression rate) of the layer.

A number of other works present alternative designs for efficient convolutional layers such as the *interleaved group convolution* [15] and *separable depth-wise convolution* [19]. As discussed in Appendix A.3.1, our proposed `conv_einsum` also covers these specialized designs. We also refer the reader to [10, 20] for more examples.

### 3 Algorithms

In the previous section, we presented how `conv_einsum` represents general multi-linear operations in (compact) neural networks. In this section, we develop a suite of algorithms to implement the `conv_einsum` function efficiently. We organize this section as follows: **(1)** First, we develop an algorithm to reduce a `conv_einsum` function with two inputs to a collection of atomic PyTorch operations, which allows us to reuse GPU-optimized functions in PyTorch to complete the computation. **(2)** Secondly, we derive an optimal sequencer which automatically decomposes a `conv_einsum` function with an arbitrary number of inputs into a FLOPs-minimal sequence of 2-input `conv_einsum` functions; **(3)** Lastly, we describe how gradient checkpointing [21] can be used to reduce the memory overhead in the backpropagation phase.

#### 3.1 Atomic Operations

We can represent a `conv_einsum` function with two inputs via GPU-optimized PyTorch functions, specifically `einsum` and `convNd` (e.g., `conv1d`, `conv2d`). In particular, we will show that any `conv_einsum` function with convolution can be realized via `convNd`. To understand why such a transformation is possible, we first analyze the `conv_einsum` string for the `conv1d` function:

```
Y = conv_einsum("bsh,tsh->bth|h", X, W)
```

where "t" stands for the output channel, "s" the input channel, "h" the length of features/filters, and "b" the batch size. Now, we can categorize these letters in terms of primitive operations. **(1)** The letter "h" is a convolution, appearing in both inputs and the output; **(2)** The letter "s" is a contraction, appearing in both inputs but not the output; **(3a)** The letter "t" is an outer product, appearing in the first input and the output; **(3b)** The letter "b" is another outer product, appearing in the second input and the output.

The `conv1d` function covers almost all mixtures of compound multi-linear operations in which each operation type appears at most once, which we refer to as an *atomic operation*, except two cases: **(4)** A batch product that appears in both inputs and the output; and **(5)** A self-contraction that appears in only one input. Fortunately, these two edge cases can be easily addressed. For **(4)**, the function `conv1d` supports a group-convolution option, which effectively extends to:

```
Y = conv_einsum("gtsh,bgsh->bgth|h", X, W)
```

where "g" stands for the filter group. In terms of tensor operations, it is a batch product, which appears in both inputs and the output. For **(5)**, such a letter can be eliminated by summing over the corresponding index in pre-processing.

In summary, **(1)-(5)** cover all possible types of tensor operations; the function `conv1d` covers **(1)-(4)** and **(5)** can be addressed via a pre-processing. Paired with index-swapping operations, `conv1d` can realize any `conv_einsum` string where each operation type appears only once.

**Multiple letters with the same operation type.** Now we will address the scenario where there are multiple letters with the same operation type. For example, if there are two different letters in a `conv_einsum` string designated for convolution, we can use `conv2d` instead of `conv1d`. Notice that `conv2d` realizes a `conv_einsum` such as:

```
Y = conv_einsum("gtshw,bgshw->bgthw|h,w", X, W)
```

where "g" stands for the filter group and "h"/"w" represent height/width of the filters/features respectively. In principle, we can use a `convNd` function to compute a `conv_einsum` function with  $N$  letters for convolution (though `convNd` for  $N \geq 4$  requires custom implementation).

For non-convolution letters, all letters with the same type can be merged into one letter in the preprocessing (i.e., the corresponding modes are reshaped into one compound mode), and the letter is converted back to multiple letters in the post-processing step (i.e., the compound mode is reshaped into its corresponding modes).

```

A=np.random.rand(4,7,9)
B=np.random.rand(10,5)
C=np.random.rand(5,4,2)
D=np.random.rand(6,8,9,2)
path_info = conv_einsum.contract_path("ijk,jl,lmq,njpq->ijknp|j", A, B, C, D)
print(path_info[1])

```

(a) **Tensor sequence generation.** We analyze a sequence over a collection of tensors  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ , involving contraction, convolution, and batch product (Python). We store the optimal sequence in a string array `path_info`.

```

Complete sequence:  ijk,jl,lmq,njpq->ijknp|j
Naive FLOP count:  4.212e+05
Optimized FLOP count:  2.056e+05
Largest intermediate:  1.944e+05 elements

```

| current          | remaining            |
|------------------|----------------------|
| lmq,jl->qj       | ijk,njpq,qj->ijknp j |
| qj,njpq->jnp j   | ijk,jnp->ijknp j     |
| jnp,ijk->ijknp j | ijknp->ijknp j       |

(b) **An optimal sequence of paths.** Visualization (via `opt-einsum`) of the optimal sequence of paths for the `conv_einsum` string submitted in Figure 1a, with our modified support for convolution symbols. We are also presented with information about the naive left-to-right cost vs the cost of the suggested path.

Figure 1: **conv\_einsum sample code.** The figure depicts the generation and analysis of a set of tensors coalesced into one tensor sequence (Python).




Figure 2: **Optimal sequencer example.** `conv_einsum` deploys the optimal sequencer to analyze the path tree of an abstract tensor sequence  $\mathcal{A} \circ_1 \mathcal{B} \circ_2 \mathcal{C} \circ_3 \mathcal{D} \circ_4 \mathcal{E}$ , where  $\circ_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$  is any collection of multi-linear operations, including convolutions, batch products, contractions, and outer products. The green path indicates the optimal path and the orange path indicates a path which satisfies a user-specified cost cap  $c$  at each node.

### 3.2 Optimal Sequencer

The `conv_einsum` strategy for optimal sequence discovery will work with an extensive variety of decompositions and with any existing open-source einsum implementation such as `numpy.einsum` (Numpy), `tf.einsum` (TensorFlow), or `opt-einsum` [22], which sits on top of NumPy. These functions/libraries can natively handle determining the FLOPs-optimal evaluation order of tensor networks involving (non-convolutional) operations via the `netcon` algorithm [13]. We add support for convolutions inside the `netcon` algorithm; we refer to the extended algorithm as the *optimal sequencer* within our framework. We forked and modified the `opt-einsum` library to handle convolutions as a proof of concept. We present a high-level overview of the optimal sequencer which can be used for a `numpy.einsum` or `tf.einsum` implementation.

**Better than left-to-right evaluation.** `netcon` was designed to handle general contraction sequences in tensor networks. For example, for  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ ,  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times L}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times M}$ , one might be interested in the optimal order of evaluation of the tensor  $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{A}_{:,j,:} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{j,l} \otimes \mathcal{C}_{l,:}$ . Let us momentarily suppress the index and summation notation of this equation, i.e., let  $(AB) \triangleq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \mathcal{A}_{:,j,:} \mathcal{B}_{j,l}$ ,  $(BC) \triangleq \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathcal{B}_{j,l} \mathcal{C}_{l,:}$ . The possible paths we may take to arrive at  $\mathcal{T}$

include  $(AB) \rightarrow (AB)C$  (the so-called **left-to-right** path), or  $(BC) \rightarrow A(BC)$ . Each of these paths has a predictable *contraction cost*, or number of multiplications/additions (FLOPs), dependent on the dimensions of the tensor modes involved in each intermediate product. `netcon` is designed to efficiently traverse such cost-path trees and determine the FLOPs-optimal path in a fast manner.

In particular, `netcon` is capable of handling all types of MLO sequences we have described except for those containing convolutions. For example, consider the tensor  $\mathcal{T}_{p, :, q, r, t} = \sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{B}_{n,p} (\mathcal{A}_{n, :, r} * \mathcal{C}_{:, q}) \mathcal{D}_{r,t}$  which contains a convolution.

Our optimal sequencer extends the `netcon` paradigm to handle convolutions by replacing the contraction cost function with a more general `tnn-cost` function, which adds the cost (FLOPs-wise) of the convolutions (if present) within an intermediate product at each node. Further details of the logic is deferred to Appendix B. Figure 2 depicts the optimal sequencer analyzing an abstract tensor sequence. Since `einsum`-like evaluation of tensorial convolutional layers was previously not possible, training speed up via optimal path evaluation of MLOs containing convolutions was difficult to explore. We now present a pair of theorems which assert the existence of cheaper-than-naive evaluation path for an RCP or RTK convolutional layer.

**Theorem 1 (CP reduction).** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times S \times H' \times W'}$  be the input to a reshaped CP (RCP) convolutional kernel  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots T_M \times S_1 \cdots S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$ ,  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$  are factored into  $(m+1)$  rank- $R$  CP factor tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T_m \times S_m}$  with  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$ . Assume  $H' \gg H$  and  $W' \gg W$  are large; in particular  $SH'W' > aHW$  and  $BH'W' > aS$  for some constant  $a \geq 1$ . Furthermore, let  $R \geq S$ . Then the forward pass through the RCP kernel (in the syntax of `conv_einsum`),*

$$Y = \text{conv\_einsum}("b(s1)(s2)(s3)\cdots(sM)hw, r(t1)(s1), r(t2)(s2), r(t3)(s3), \dots, r(tM)(sM), rhw \rightarrow r(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw | hw'', X, W1, W2, W3, \dots, WM, W0)$$

has a pairwise evaluation path which costs less FLOPs than the naive left-to-right evaluation,

$$Y = \text{conv\_einsum}("br(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw, rhw \rightarrow br(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw | hw'', YM, W0)$$

where

$$Ym = \text{einsum}("r(s1)(s2)\cdots(s(m-1))(t1)(t2)\cdots(t(m-1)), r(sm)(tm) \rightarrow r(s1)(s2)\cdots(sm)(t1)(t2)\cdots(tm), Y(m-1), Wm)$$

for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , noting that for tensor object  $YM$ , its mode symbols  $h, w$  correspond to dimensions  $H', W'$ , and  $b$  corresponds to an arbitrary batch size.

**Theorem 2 (Tucker reduction).** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times S \times H' \times W'}$  be the input to a reshaped Tucker (RTK) convolutional kernel  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots T_M \times S_1 \cdots S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$ ,  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$  are factored into  $(m+1)$  rank- $R_m$  CP factor tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_m \times T_m \times S_m}$  with  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$  and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_0 \times R_1 \times \cdots \times R_M}$ . Assume  $H' \gg H$  and  $W' \gg W$  are large; in particular  $SH'W' > aHW$  and  $BH'W' > aS$  for some constant  $a \geq 1$ . Furthermore, let  $\prod_{i=1}^M R_m \geq S$ . Then the forward pass through the RCT kernel (in the syntax of `conv_einsum`),*

$$Y = \text{conv\_einsum}("b(s1)(s2)(s3)\cdots(sM)hw, (r1)(t1)(s1), (r2)(t2)(s2), (r3)(t3)(s3), \dots, (rM)(tM)(sM), (r0)hw, (r0)(r1)(r2)\cdots(rM) \rightarrow b(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw | hw'', X, W1, W2, W3, \dots, WM, W0, C)$$

has a pairwise evaluation path which costs less FLOPs than the naive left-to-right evaluation,

$$Y = \text{conv\_einsum}("br(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw, rhw \rightarrow br(t1)(t2)(t3)\cdots(tM)hw | hw'', YM, W0)$$

where

$$Ym = \text{einsum}("r(m-1)(s1)(s2)\cdots(s(m-1))(t1)(t2)\cdots(t(m-1)), (rm)(sm)(tm) \rightarrow r(s1)(s2)\cdots(sm)(t1)(t2)\cdots(tm), Y(m-1), Wm)$$

for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , noting that for tensor object  $YM$ , its mode symbols  $h, w$  correspond to dimensions  $H', W'$ , and  $b$  corresponds to an arbitrary batch size.

*Proof sketches.* The full proof is deferred to the Appendix. It uses an example path which sequentially reconstructs  $\overline{\mathcal{W}}$  avoids the addition of a large  $O(H'W')$  cost to all intermediates, which occurs in the CP and Tucker naive evaluations.

### 3.3 Checkpointing

Since we evaluate a tensor network in a pairwise manner, computing a tensor network with  $N$  inputs leads to  $(N - 1)$  intermediate results. If we use an autograd-like function, we will need to save these intermediates in memory, causing high memory overhead. To avoid storing intermediate products, one can use gradient checkpointing [21] which recomputes the gradient during the backward pass rather than saving all intermediate results in memory. Normally, in the forward pass, the model caches all values of the activation neurons and reuses them in the backwards pass calculation, which gradient checkpointing avoids.

## 4 Related works

**Tensor networks.** Tensor networks are widely used in quantum physics [23], numerical analysis [24], and machine learning [25, 26]. In neural networks, [27] and [28] use tensor networks to prove the expressive power of convolutional and recurrent neural networks. Recently, [20] combine tensor networks with genetic algorithms to search for efficient layer designs. Traditional tensor networks do not support *convolutions* in their operations, which is essential in convolutional neural networks. However, in recent years, so-called quantum convolutional neural networks (QCNNs) used for tasks such as quantum phase classification have been shown to share the same circuit structure as multiscale entanglement renormalization ansatzes (MERAs), which are classical tensor networks used to simulate many-body systems. Interestingly enough, [13] used `netcon` to optimize multilinear operations through MERAs, but did not consider convolutions.

**Low-rank factorization.** Various types of low-rank factorization have been proposed to reduce the number of parameters in linear layers. Pioneering works proposed to flatten/unfold the parameters in convolutional layers into matrices (known as *matricization*), followed by (sparse) dictionary learning or matrix decomposition [29, 30, 31]. Subsequently, [7] and [16] showed that it is possible to compress the parameters directly by standard tensor decompositions (in particular, CP or Tucker [18]). These decompositions, particularly of convolutional kernels, can occasionally result in degenerate components with high intensity/Frobenius norm, so error-corrective mechanisms have since been introduced [32]. Further groundbreaking work [33, 11] demonstrated that the low-order weights can be efficiently compressed by the tensor-train decomposition [34] by first reshaping the parameters into higher-order tensors. This paradigm was later extended in two directions: (1) the tensor-train decomposition is used to compress LSTM/GRU layers in recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [35] and higher-order RNNs [36, 37]; and (2) other decompositions are explored for better compression, such as the tensor-ring decomposition [38] and block-term decomposition [39].

**Existing Libraries/Algorithms.** Various libraries support tensor operations. (1) **Pytorch** [40] supports specialized tensor operations commonly used in neural networks, including various convolutional layers. However, its `torch.einsum` cannot evaluate convolutional MLOs. (2) **TensorLy** [41] supports tensorization of common layer types across various platforms, including PyTorch and TensorFlow. (3) **NumPy** [14] is a general computation library that has an optimal sequencer in its `einsum` function, but it does not support convolutions. (4) **OptEinsum** [22] interfaces with most other `einsum` implementations and can further accelerate their computation via specialized BLAS routines. Due to its native implementation of `netcon` and path visualization capabilities, we develop `conv_einsum` inside this library. (5) **Einops** [42] extends the `einsum` functionality to GPUs. (6) **Gnetcon** [43] attempts to extend `einsum` to convolutions but does not support multi-way convolution. (7) **TedNet** [44] is a toolkit for computing low-rank tensor decompositions of common layer types. (8) **Tensor Comprehensions (TC)** [45] provides a language for expression for MLOs, including 2D convolutions, but it cannot easily process higher order convolutions.

## 5 Experiments

In this section, we demonstrate that `conv_einsum` greatly improves computational and memory efficiency of convolutional TNN training over a variety of tasks.

**Tasks.** (1) A classic two-stream convolutional neural network [46] is used for a video classification task, trained on the UCF-101 data set [47]. ResNet-101 [48] was chosen as the ConvNet for both the spatial and temporal streams, pre-trained on ImageNet [49]. The two-stream network is adapted from [50]. (2) An Automatic Speech Recognition task using the Conformer architecture [51], which incorporates convolution modules between the attention modules and the feed-forward modules of a Transformer model [52]. The model is trained from scratch with random normal initialization on the LibriSpeech dataset [53]. (3) Image classification tasks with model trained from scratch on CIFAR10 [54] and ImageNet datasets using ResNet-34.

Weight decay is set to  $5 \times 10^{-4}$ , momentum is set to 0.9, and learning rate is initialized as 0.05 with decay rate of 0.5 every 30 epochs. An NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080Ti is used for all experiments. All training is implemented in



PyTorch. For all RCP experiments,  $M = 3$ , and only the input and output channel modes are reshaped to a third order tensor.

**TensorFlow vs PyTorch.** Although all our training is done in PyTorch, we can reduce higher-order convolutions to atomic conv1d and conv2d operations in both PyTorch *and* TensorFlow per Section 4. Computation of MLOs in both PyTorch and TensorFlow ultimately reduces to the same CUDA backend, so we expect performance comparisons to be similar. Furthermore, the number of FLOPs required to compute a fixed layer type is independent of the backend library and purely a function of the tensor dimensions and base types of MLOs involved.

**Baselines.** We compare `conv_einsum`-assisted training against two baselines across all tasks: **naive left-to-right** evaluation of tensorial forward passes with and without checkpointing. In particular, we compare the usage of `conv_einsum` to optimally evaluate tensorial forward passes against these naive implementations to demonstrate the benefits of evaluating MLOs in a FLOPs-minimal order. For all backpropagation, autograd is used.

A compression rate (CR) of  $x\%$  indicates that the size of each learnable layer of the TNN model  $x\%$  the number of original layer. To achieve this, we first form the specified tensor decomposition of the learnable layer with rank  $R$  such that it is equal in size to the original layer. We then trim off  $x\%^2$  of the least significant components, i.e., reduce the rank, until it contains  $\leq x\%$  of the original parameters.

We stress that this work is not focused on improving the accuracy of TNNs, which is an orthogonal topic of research. Accuracy drop, especially due to degeneracy in tensor decompositions, is a well-known phenomenon independent of MLO evaluation. In any case, we report TNN accuracy for various tasks as supplementary experimental data in Appendix D.

## 5.1 Runtime and FLOPs results

We used `conv_einsum` and its optimal sequencer to evaluate a tensorial forward pass in an order which incurs the minimum number of FLOPs. A naive implementation will evaluate a tensorial sequence from left to right as given. Additionally, `conv_einsum` uses gradient checkpointing by default to avoid memory overflow for backward passes.

Table 1: **Run-time (minutes per epoch) comparison between `conv_einsum` and PyTorch for ImageNet Classification w/ checkpointing.** We use a RCP ( $M = 3$ ) ResNet-34 architecture and batch size of 256. Left-to-right evaluation runs into memory overflow without checkpointing. `conv_einsum` significantly improves training time. Runtimes are averaged over 3 runs.

| CR   | <code>conv_einsum</code> |      | Naive w/ ckpt |      |
|------|--------------------------|------|---------------|------|
|      | Train                    | Test | Train         | Test |
| 5%   | 21.8                     | 1.06 | 32.4          | 1.42 |
| 10%  | 23.4                     | 1.47 | 35.7          | 1.77 |
| 20%  | 28.9                     | 1.95 | 39.9          | 2.35 |
| 50%  | 34.1                     | 2.54 | 50.1          | 3.54 |
| 100% | 41.6                     | 3.08 | 65.6          | 4.08 |

(1) *The optimal sequencer used in `conv_einsum` significantly improves the runtime efficiency of training and test in TNNs.* In Figures 3,4 and Table 1, we compare the training and test times between `conv_einsum` and naive left-to-right (with and w/o checkpointing) implementations over a range of model scales and decompositions. The IC and VC tasks use RCP ( $M = 3$ ) decompositions, while the ASR task uses a standard CP decomposition. In the VC task, for each model size, we use the maximal allowable batch size, while in the ASR task, we use the same batch size across scales. We observe that when memory is the bottleneck of a task (such as VC), checkpointing helps accelerate the runtime by allowing more batches. On the other hand, when the batch sizes are the same (as in ASR), checkpointing trades computational complexity for space, thus increasing the overall runtime. In either scenario, `conv_einsum` achieves the fastest runtimes.

<sup>2</sup>In the case of 100% compression, the ranks of the reshaped tensors are selected so as to match the original backbone model size with no further reduction. The performance of such a TNN will not be equivalent to an un-tensorized counterpart despite containing the same number of parameters, since it is merely an approximation.






Figure 3: **Run-time comparison between `conv_einsum` and naive evaluation for image classification (IC) and automatic speech recognition (ASR) (CP-TNN) tasks.** A RCP-TNN ( $M = 3$ ) and CIFAR-10 is used for IC while a CP-TNN and LibriSpeech dataset is used for ASR. 'ckpt' denotes checkpointing. Runtimes are averaged over 3 runs.

(2) *`conv_einsum` improves computation through weight tensors of differing sizes and decompositions.* `conv_einsum` serves as a general solution for improving efficiency and is tensor-structure-agnostic. The networks we have experimented with contain weights of vastly differing sizes. As shown in Figures 3 and 4, `conv_einsum` exhibits competitive results against standard left-to-right implementation (with or without) checkpointing over various tensor scales. Furthermore, Tables 5 and 6 in the Appendix shows the results of our `conv_einsum` training using different forms of tensor decomposition in both a high-performance (GPU) and low-performance (CPU) environment. We observe that `conv_einsum` outperforms naive implementation with/without checkpointing in all cases.

(3) *`conv_einsum` greatly reduces the number of FLOPs needed to process tensorial convolutional layers.* Given a forward pass through a tensorial convolutional layer expressible as a `conv_einsum` string, an optimal evaluation path can be determined. Evaluation of an MLO sequence from left-to-right will result in an excessive amount of FLOPs as predicted by Theorem 1 and shown in Table 2, which lists the number FLOPs saved by optimal path evaluation through CP convolutional layer blocks of ResNet-34.

## 5.2 Memory Results

*Naive evaluation of tensorial forward passes suffers from high intermediary memory costs during training.* `conv_einsum` significantly reduces these costs. In TNNs, during training computation of some intermediate data objects can be prohibitively large and thus difficult to fit into memory. In Table 3, we present the maximal batch size




Figure 4: **Run-time comparison between `conv_einsum` and naive left-to-right PyTorch implementations for a video classification machine learning task** An RCP-TNN ( $M = 3$ ) is trained on the UCF-101 dataset. All tests were run using the maximum allowable batch size. Naive w/ ckpt only ran without memory overflow for compression rates 1% - 10% and naive w/o ckpt was only able to run for compression rate 1%. 'ckpt' denotes checkpointing. Averaged over 3 runs.

Table 2: **FLOPs per CP convolutional layer in ResNet-34.** We calculate the FLOPs incurred by forward passes through CP convolutional layers (CR= 100%), using a batch size of 128. Layer nomenclature and associated kernel structure correspond with architecture description in [48].

| Layer   | Left-to-Right         | <code>conv_einsum</code> | Speedup $\times$ |
|---------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| conv1   | $1.51 \times 10^{15}$ | $3.87 \times 10^{13}$    | 3.90             |
| conv2_x | $1.38 \times 10^{14}$ | $3.09 \times 10^{13}$    | 4.47             |
| conv3_x | $5.85 \times 10^{13}$ | $9.67 \times 10^{12}$    | 6.05             |
| conv4_x | $6.03 \times 10^{13}$ | $3.71 \times 10^{12}$    | 16.25            |
| conv5_x | $4.25 \times 10^{13}$ | $4.72 \times 10^{11}$    | 90.04            |

allowed for two large-scale tasks under different compression rates: video classification (VC) and automatic speech recognition (ASR). We observe that if the size of a TNN matches the original backbone model size (i.e., CR=100%), the maximal allowed batch size in a standard PyTorch implementation is 0 without checkpointing. Even if we compress the

Table 3: **Maximum batch size for a speech and video task.** The maximal batch size allowed for data under varying compression rates and using different libraries on (1) an ASR on LibriSpeech and (2) a VC task for spatial (S) and temporal (T) streams of a two-stream network on UCF-101. `conv_einsum` permits larger batch sizes.

| Automatic speech recognition task |                          |                  |                   | Video classification task |                          |    |                  |   |                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----|------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| CR                                | <code>conv_einsum</code> | Naive<br>w/ ckpt | Naive<br>w/o ckpt | CR                        | <code>conv_einsum</code> |    | Naive<br>w/ ckpt |   | Naive<br>w/o ckpt |   |
|                                   |                          |                  |                   |                           | S                        | T  | S                | T | S                 | T |
| 1%                                | 14                       | 8                | 6                 | 1%                        | 20                       | 30 | 2                | 4 | 1                 | 2 |
| 2%                                | 14                       | 8                | 6                 | 2%                        | 20                       | 30 | 2                | 4 | 0                 | 0 |
| 5%                                | 12                       | 6                | 4                 | 5%                        | 20                       | 30 | 2                | 4 | 0                 | 0 |
| 10%                               | 10                       | 4                | 2                 | 10%                       | 18                       | 30 | 1                | 2 | 0                 | 0 |
| 20%                               | 8                        | 2                | 0                 | 20%                       | 16                       | 27 | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 0 |
| 50%                               | 6                        | 2                | 0                 | 50%                       | 12                       | 22 | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 0 |
| 100%                              | 4                        | 1                | 0                 | 100%                      | 4                        | 14 | 0                | 0 | 0                 | 0 |

model to 1% of the original number of parameters, the maximal allowed batch size is still limited, making computation infeasible or slow. We theorize that optimal evaluation order results in uniformly smaller intermediate products.

## 6 Conclusions and Discussions

In this work, we introduce an `einsum`-like notational framework and meta-algorithm `conv_einsum`, which is capable of expressing and efficiently computing passes through convolutional TNNs. `conv_einsum`-assisted training is competitive against, and in many cases, superior to standard PyTorch TNN training. For future work, we plan to accelerate training and test times through incorporation of parallel computation libraries such as TensorRT. Additionally, our experiments do not make use of low-rank decomposition stabilizing algorithms [32, 29] which improve the quality of factorized components. Combining `conv_einsum` with such methods could result in exceptionally light, accurate, and fast TNNs.

## Acknowledgments

All authors, at the time of writing, acknowledge support by the National Science Foundation NSF-IIS-FAI program, DOD-ONR-Office of Naval Research, DOD-DARPA-Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Guaranteeing AI Robustness against Deception (GARD), Adobe, Capital One and JP Morgan faculty fellowships. Rabbani was additionally supported by NSF DGE-1632976.

## References

- [1] Asifullah Khan, Anabia Sohail, Umme Zahoora, and Aqsa Saeed Qureshi. A survey of the recent architectures of deep convolutional neural networks. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53(8):5455–5516, 2020.
- [2] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1–9, 2015.
- [3] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Nee-lakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [4] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
- [5] He Li, Kaoru Ota, and Mianxiong Dong. Learning iot in edge: Deep learning for the internet of things with edge computing. *IEEE network*, 32(1):96–101, 2018.
- [6] Peter Kairouz, H Brendan McMahan, Brendan Avent, Aurélien Bellet, Mehdi Bennis, Arjun Nitin Bhagoji, Kallista Bonawitz, Zachary Charles, Graham Cormode, Rachel Cummings, et al. Advances and open problems in federated learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04977*, 2019.
- [7] V Lebedev, Y Ganin, M Rakhuba, I Oseledets, and V Lempitsky. Speeding-up convolutional neural networks using fine-tuned cp-decomposition. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015-Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [8] Jean Kossaifi, Aran Khanna, Zachary Lipton, Tommaso Furlanello, and Anima Anandkumar. Tensor contraction layers for parsimonious deep nets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 26–32, 2017.
- [9] Jean Kossaifi, Zachary C Lipton, Arinbjorn Kolbeinsson, Aran Khanna, Tommaso Furlanello, and Anima Anandkumar. Tensor regression networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(123):1–21, 2020.
- [10] Jiahao Su, Jingling Li, Bobby Bhattacharjee, and Furong Huang. Tensorial neural networks: Generalization of neural networks and application to model compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10352*, 2018.
- [11] Timur Garipov, Dmitry Podoprikin, Alexander Novikov, and Dmitry Vetrov. Ultimate tensorization: compressing convolutional and fc layers alike. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.03214*, 2016.
- [12] Wenqi Wang, Yifan Sun, Brian Eriksson, Wenlin Wang, and Vaneet Aggarwal. Wide compression: Tensor ring nets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9329–9338, 2018.
- [13] Robert NC Pfeifer, Jutho Haegeman, and Frank Verstraete. Faster identification of optimal contraction sequences for tensor networks. *Physical Review E*, 90(3):033315, 2014.
- [14] Charles R Harris, K Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J Smith, et al. Array programming with numpy. *Nature*, 585(7825):357–362, 2020.
- [15] Ting Zhang, Guo-Jun Qi, Bin Xiao, and Jingdong Wang. Interleaved group convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 4373–4382, 2017.
- [16] Yong-Deok Kim, Eunhyeok Park, Sungjoo Yoo, Taelim Choi, Lu Yang, and Dongjun Shin. Compression of deep convolutional neural networks for fast and low power mobile applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06530*, 2015.
- [17] Po-An Wang and Chi-Jen Lu. Tensor decomposition via simultaneous power iteration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3665–3673, 2017.
- [18] Tamara G Kolda and Brett W Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM review*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- [19] François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1251–1258, 2017.
- [20] Kohei Hayashi, Taiki Yamaguchi, Yohei Sugawara, and Shin-ichi Maeda. Exploring unexplored tensor network decompositions for convolutional neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32:5552–5562, 2019.

- [21] Tianqi Chen, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Carlos Guestrin. Training deep nets with sublinear memory cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.06174*, 2016.
- [22] G Daniel, Johnnie Gray, et al. Opt\\_einsum-a python package for optimizing contraction order for einsum-like expressions. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3(26):753, 2018.
- [23] Román Orús. A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states. *Annals of Physics*, 349:117–158, 2014.
- [24] Lars Grasedyck, Daniel Kressner, and Christine Tobler. A literature survey of low-rank tensor approximation techniques. *GAMM-Mitteilungen*, 36(1):53–78, 2013.
- [25] Andrzej Cichocki, Namgil Lee, Ivan Oseledets, Anh-Huy Phan, Qibin Zhao, Danilo P Mandic, et al. Tensor networks for dimensionality reduction and large-scale optimization: Part 1 low-rank tensor decompositions. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 9(4-5):249–429, 2016.
- [26] Andrzej Cichocki, Anh-Huy Phan, Qibin Zhao, Namgil Lee, Ivan Oseledets, Masashi Sugiyama, Danilo P Mandic, et al. Tensor networks for dimensionality reduction and large-scale optimization: Part 2 applications and future perspectives. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 9(6):431–673, 2017.
- [27] Nadav Cohen and Amnon Shashua. Convolutional rectifier networks as generalized tensor decompositions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 955–963, 2016.
- [28] Valentin Khruikov, Alexander Novikov, and Ivan Oseledets. Expressive power of recurrent neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [29] Max Jaderberg, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Speeding up convolutional neural networks with low rank expansions. In *Proceedings of the British Machine Vision Conference. BMVA Press*, 2014.
- [30] Emily L Denton, Wojciech Zaremba, Joan Bruna, Yann LeCun, and Rob Fergus. Exploiting linear structure within convolutional networks for efficient evaluation. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1269–1277, 2014.
- [31] Xiangyu Zhang, Jianhua Zou, Xiang Ming, Kaiming He, and Jian Sun. Efficient and accurate approximations of nonlinear convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1984–1992, 2015.
- [32] Anh-Huy Phan, Konstantin Sobolev, Konstantin Sozykin, Dmitry Ermilov, Julia Gusak, Petr Tichavský, Valeriy Glukhov, Ivan Oseledets, and Andrzej Cichocki. Stable low-rank tensor decomposition for compression of convolutional neural network. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 522–539. Springer, 2020.
- [33] Alexander Novikov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Anton Osokin, and Dmitry P Vetrov. Tensorizing neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 442–450, 2015.
- [34] Ivan V Oseledets. Tensor-train decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33(5):2295–2317, 2011.
- [35] Yinchong Yang, Denis Krompass, and Volker Tresp. Tensor-train recurrent neural networks for video classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3891–3900. PMLR, 2017.
- [36] Rose Yu, Stephan Zheng, Anima Anandkumar, and Yisong Yue. Long-term forecasting using tensor-train rnns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00073*, 2017.
- [37] Jiahao Su, Wonmin Byeon, Furong Huang, Jan Kautz, and Animashree Anandkumar. Convolutional tensor-train lstm for spatio-temporal learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09131*, 2020.
- [38] Qibin Zhao, Guoxu Zhou, Shengli Xie, Liqing Zhang, and Andrzej Cichocki. Tensor ring decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05535*, 2016.
- [39] Jinmian Ye, Guangxi Li, Di Chen, Haiqin Yang, Shandian Zhe, and Zenglin Xu. Block-term tensor neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 2020.
- [40] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32:8026–8037, 2019.
- [41] Jean Kossaifi, Yannis Panagakis, Anima Anandkumar, and Maja Pantic. Tensorly: Tensor learning in python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(26):1–6, 2019.
- [42] Alex Rogozhnikov and Cristian Garcia. Einops. <https://github.com/arogozhnikov/einops>, 2020.
- [43] Alexander Reustle, Tahseen Rabbani, and Furong Huang. Fast gpu convolution for cp-decomposed tensorial neural networks. In *Proceedings of SAI Intelligent Systems Conference*, pages 468–487. Springer, 2020.

- [44] Yu Pan, Maolin Wang, and Zenglin Xu. Tednet: A pytorch toolkit for tensor decomposition networks. *Neurocomputing*, 469:234–238, 2022.
- [45] Nicolas Vasilache, Oleksandr Zinenko, Theodoros Theodoridis, Priya Goyal, Zachary DeVito, William S Moses, Sven Verdoolaege, Andrew Adams, and Albert Cohen. Tensor comprehensions: Framework-agnostic high-performance machine learning abstractions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04730*, 2018.
- [46] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 568–576, 2014.
- [47] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *ArXiv*, abs/1212.0402, 2012.
- [48] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [49] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009.
- [50] Yi Huang and Rajat Shrivastava. Two-stream action recognition. <https://github.com/jeffreyyihuang/two-stream-action-recognition>, 2019.
- [51] Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, et al. Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08100*, 2020.
- [52] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [53] Vassil Panayotov, Guoguo Chen, Daniel Povey, and Sanjeev Khudanpur. Librispeech: an asr corpus based on public domain audio books. In *2015 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5206–5210. IEEE, 2015.
- [54] A Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. *Master’s thesis, University of Tront*, 2009.
- [55] Bijiao Wu, Dingheng Wang, Guangshe Zhao, Lei Deng, and Guoqi Li. Hybrid tensor decomposition in neural network compression. *Neural Networks*, 132:309–320, 2020.

## Appendix

### A Supplementary Material for Tensor Operations and einsum

#### A.1 Examples of primitive operations

**Contraction.** *Tensor contraction* generalizes matrix multiplication to higher-order tensors. For instance, given two 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times B \times C}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times D \times E}$ , we can define a contraction between the modes with shared dimension size  $A$ . The operation returns a 4<sup>th</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times D \times E}$  with its entries calculated as:  $\mathcal{T}_{b,c,d,e} = \sum_{a=1}^A \mathcal{T}_{a,b,c}^{(1)} \cdot \mathcal{T}_{a,d,e}^{(2)}$ . This contraction would be submitted to einsum as:

```
T = einsum("abc,ade->bcde", T1, T2)
```

Here, the modes are ordered and represented by concatenated letters (which can be case-sensitive). These sub-strings, corresponding to each input tensor, are separated by commas and lie to the left of the arrow. The output, which lies to the right of the arrow, concatenates all mode letters in a single string sans the letter "a" to indicate that a contraction must occur over these modes. The remaining parameters correspond to the ordered set of tensors. This method will fail if the modes denoted by the same letters do not share dimension sizes. So a contraction corresponds to a letter that appears in all inputs, but not the output.

**Outer product.** *Tensor outer product* generalizes outer product to higher-order tensors. For instance, an outer product of two 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times B \times C}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times E \times F}$  returns a 6<sup>th</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times B \times C \times D \times E \times F}$ . The entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as:  $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,c,d,e,f} = \mathcal{T}_{a,b,c}^{(1)} \cdot \mathcal{T}_{d,e,f}^{(2)}$ . In the language of einsum, we write this as:

```
T = einsum("abc,def->abcdef", T1, T2)
```

Notice that a letter for the outer product only appears in one of the inputs and in the output.

**Batch product.** *Tensor batch product* is a variation of the outer product. Given tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times B \times C}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times E \times D}$ , the batch product over the dimensional-shared mode  $C$  returns a 5<sup>th</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{A \times B \times C \times D \times E}$ . The entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as:  $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,c,d,e} = \mathcal{T}_{a,b,c}^{(1)} \cdot \mathcal{T}_{a,d,e}^{(2)}$ . The einsum implementation is

```
T = einsum("abc,cde->abcde", T1, T2)
```

Notice that the letter corresponding to the batch product appears in both inputs and the output.

In this section, we will outline the multi-linear operations covered in preliminaries in full generality along with their conv\_einsum representations and other tensor decompositions of TNNs. Much of this content adapts and follows the notation of Su et al. [10].

#### A.2 Fully General Multilinear operations

**Multi-operations among multiple tensors.** We can simultaneously perform a series of multi-linear operations among a group of tensors. Let  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times T \times S}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J \times R \times T}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times S \times R}$ . We can define a simultaneous contraction on modes with dimension sizes  $R$ ,  $S$ , and  $T$ . This simultaneous contraction returns a 3<sup>rd</sup> order tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ , with its entries computed as

$$\mathcal{T}_{i,j,k} = \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{T}_{i,t,s}^{(1)} \mathcal{T}_{j,r,t}^{(2)} \mathcal{T}_{k,s,r}^{(3)} \quad (3)$$

Equivalently, via conv\_einsum, we can write it as:

```
T = conv_einsum("its,jrt,ksr->ijk", T1, T2, T3)
```

Below we outline a simpler example that performs multiple operations between two tensors.

**Tensor contraction** Given tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \dots \times I_k \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \dots \times J_l \times \dots \times J_{n-1}}$ , the mode- $(k, l)$  contraction returns an order  $(m + n - 2)$  tensor



| Operation                              | Definition  | conv_einsum   |
|--|---|---|
| mode- $(k, l)$<br>Tensor Contraction   | $\mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}$<br>$= \langle \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)}, \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} \rangle$  | $I_0 \cdots I_{k-1} I_{k+1} \cdots I_{m-1}, J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} J_{l+1} \cdots J_{n-1}$<br>$\rightarrow I_1 I_{k-1} I_{k+1} I_{m-1} J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} J_{l+1} \cdots J_{n-1}$ |
| mode- $(k, l)$<br>Tensor Convolution   | $\mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(2)}$<br>$= \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} * \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)}$           | $I_0 \cdots I_{k-1} C \cdots I_{m-1}, J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} C \cdots J_{n-1}$<br>$\rightarrow I_1 I_{k-1} C I_{k+1} I_{m-1} J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} C J_{l+1} \cdots J_{n-1}   C$     |
| mode- $(k, l)$<br>Tensor Batch Product | $\mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, r, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, r, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(0)}$<br>$= \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, r, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, r, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)}$ | $I_0 \cdots I_{k-1} C \cdots I_{m-1}, J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} J_l \cdots J_{n-1}$<br>$\rightarrow I_1 I_{k-1} I_k I_{k+1} I_{m-1} J_0 \cdots J_{l-1} J_{l+1} \cdots J_{n-1}$       |
| Tensor Outer Product                   | $\mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_k, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_l, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(0)}$<br>$= \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(1)} * \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)}$                                   | $I_0 \cdots I_{m-1}, J_0 \cdots J_{n-1}$<br>$\rightarrow I_1 \cdots I_{m-1} J_0 \cdots J_{n-1}$   |

Table 4: **Primitive tensor operations.**  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$  are the input tensors and  $\mathcal{T}$  is the output tensor. Note that both mode- $(I_k, J_l)$  tensor contraction, mode- $(I_k, J_l)$  tensor batch product are legal only if  $I_k = J_l$ . The outer product can be performed with any two tensors. Red highlighted modes are owned by  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)}$  while blue highlighted modes belong to  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)}$ .

$\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_{k-1} \times I_{k+1} \times \cdots \times I_{m-1} \times J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{l-1} \times J_{l+1} \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ . The entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^{I_k-1} \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, r, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} \cdot \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, r, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} \\ &= \langle \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)}, \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

**Tensor Convolution** Given tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ , the mode- $(k, l)$  convolution returns an order  $(m + n - 1)$  tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I'_k \times \cdots \times I_{m-1} \times J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{l-1} \times J_{l+1} \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ . For any convolution operator  $*$  the entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}} \\ &= \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} * \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} \\ &= \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} * \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} \end{aligned}$$

Here we have intentionally left  $*$  and the dimension of the  $k$ -th mode  $I'_k$  ambiguous, as it will vary depending on the type of convolution specified by the user. For example, with max padding, we have that  $I'_k = \max\{I_k, J_l\}$ , and with same-padding we have  $I'_k = I_k$ .

**Tensor Batch Product** Given tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_{k-1} \times I_{k+1} \times \cdots \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{l-1} \times J_{l+1} \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ , the mode- $(k, l)$  batch product returns an order  $(m + n - 1)$  tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_k \times \cdots \times I_{m-1} \times J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{l-1} \times J_{l+1} \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ . The entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, r, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, r, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}} \\ &= \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{k-1}, r, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{l-1}, r, j_{l+1}, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$

**Tensor Outer Product** Given tensors  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ , the outer product returns an order  $(m + n)$  tensor  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \cdots \times I_k \times \cdots \times I_{m-1} \times J_0 \times \cdots \times J_{n-1}}$ . The entries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are calculated as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{m-1}, j_0, \dots, j_{n-1}} = \mathcal{T}_{i_0, \dots, i_{m-1}}^{(0)} \mathcal{T}_{j_0, \dots, j_{n-1}}^{(1)}. \quad (4)$$

Table 4 summarizes these multi-linear operations along with their conv\_einsum input representations.

### A.3 Tensorial Neural Networks

**CP decomposition** [18]. (1a) In a *CP convolutional layer* [7], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is CP factored as:

```
W = conv_einsum("rt,rs,rh,rw->tshw", W1, W2, W3, W4).
```

As a result, the layer is parameterized by 4 weight matrices  $\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times S}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(4)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times W}$ . We can write this layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,rt,ts,rh,rw->bthw|hw", X, W1)
```

(1b) In a *reshaped CP convolutional layer* [10], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W}$  is first reshaped as  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots \times T_M \times S_1 \cdots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , then the reshaped kernel is factorized by a CP decomposition as

```
W = conv_einsum("r(t1)(s1),r(t2)(s2),r(t3)(s3),rhw->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0).
```

As a result, the layer is parameterized by  $(M + 1)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T_m \times S_m}$  and  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$ . We can write the layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,r(t1)(s1),r(t2)(s2),r(t3)(s3),rhw->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0)
```

**Tucker (TK) decomposition** [18]. (2a) In a *TK convolutional layer* [7], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is factorized by TK as:

```
W = conv_einsum("(r1)t,(r2)s,(r1)(r2)hw->tshw", W1, W2, W0)
```

Consequently, the layer has 3 weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times T}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_2 \times S}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times R_2 \times H \times W}$  as parameters. We can write the layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,(r1)t,(r2)s,(r1)(r2)hw->bthw|hw", X, W1, W2, W0)
```

(2b) In a *reshaped TK convolutional layer* [10], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W}$  is first reshaped as  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots \times T_M \times S_1 \cdots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , the reshaped kernel is then factorized by a TK decomposition as

```
W = conv_einsum("(r1)(t1)(s1),(r2)(t2)(s2),(r3)(t3)(s3),(r0)hw,(r0)(r1)(r2)(r3)->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0, C)
```

Therefore, the layer has  $(M + 2)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T_m \times S_m}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_0 \times R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3}$ . We can write the layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,(r1)(t1)(s1),(r2)(t2)(s2),(r3)(t3)(s3),(r0)hw,(r0)(r1)(r2)(r3)->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0, C)
```

**Tensor-Train (TT) decomposition** [34]. (3a) In a *TT convolutional layer*, the original kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is factorized by TT as:

```
W = conv_einsum("(r1)t,(r1)(r2)h,(r2)(r3)w,(r3)s->tshw", W1, W2, W3, W4)
```

Consequently, the layer has 4 weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times T}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times R_2 \times H}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_2 \times R_3 \times W}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}^{(4)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times S}$  as parameters. We can write the layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,(r1)t,(r1)(r2)h,(r2)(r3)w,(r3)s->bthw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W4).
```

(3b) In a *reshaped TT convolutional layer* [11], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W}$  is first reshaped as  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots \times T_M \times S_1 \cdots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , the reshaped kernel is then factorized by a TT decomposition as

```
W = conv_einsum("(r1)(t1)(s1),(r1)(r2)(t2)(s2),(r2)(r3)(t3)(s3),(r3)hw->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0).
```

Therefore, the layer has  $(M + 1)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times T_1 \times S_1}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_{m-1} \times R_m \times T_m \times S_m}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times H \times W}$ . The layer in `conv_einsum` is

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,(r1)(t1)(s1),(r1)(r2)(t2)(s2),(r2)(r3)(t3)(s3),(r3)hw->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0).
```

**Tensor-Ring (TR) decomposition** [38]. (4a) In a *TR convolutional layer*, the original kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  is factorized by TR as:

```
W = conv_einsum("(r0)(r1)t,(r1)(r2)h,(r2)(r3)w,(r3)(r0)s->tshw", W1, W2, W3, W4)
```

Consequently, the layer has 4 weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times T}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_0 \times R_1 \times R_2 \times H}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_2 \times R_3 \times W}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}^{(4)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times R_0 \times S}$  as parameters. We can write the layer in `conv_einsum` as

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,(r0)(r1)t,(r1)(r2)h,(r2)(r3)w,(r3)(r0)s->bthw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W4)
```

(4b) In a *reshaped TR convolutional layer* [10], the original kernel  $\mathcal{W}$  is first reshaped as  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times \dots \times T_M \times S_1 \times \dots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , the reshaped kernel is then factorized by a TR decomposition as

```
W = conv_einsum("(r0)(r1)(t1)(s1),(r1)(r2)(t2)(s2),(r2)(r3)(t3)(s3),(r3)(r0)hw->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0)
```

Therefore, the layer has  $(M + 1)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_{m-1} \times R_m \times T_m \times S_m}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times R_0 \times H \times W}$ . The layer in `conv_einsum` is

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,(r0)(r1)(t1)(s1),(r1)(r2)(t2)(s2),(r2)(r3)(t3)(s3),(r3)(r0)hw->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0)
```

**Block-Term (BT) decomposition** [39]. In a *reshaped BT convolutional layer*,  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times \dots \times T_M \times S_1 \times \dots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , the reshaped kernel is then factorized by a BT decomposition as

```
\textcolor{blue}{W = conv_einsum("r(r1)(t1)(s1),r(r2)(t2)(s2),r(r3)(t3)(s3),r(r0)hw,r(r1)(r2)(r3)(r0)->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0, C)}
```

Consequently, the layer has  $(m + 1)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R_1 \times T_1 \times S_1}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R_2 \times T_2 \times S_2}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R_3 \times T_3 \times S_3}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R_0 \times H \times W}$ , and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times R_1 \times R_2 \times R_3 \times R_0}$ . The layer in `conv_einsum` is

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,r(r1)(t1)(s1),r(r2)(t2)(s2),r(r3)(t3)(s3),r(r0)hw,r(r1)(r2)(r3)(r0)->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0, C)
```

**Hierarchical-Tucker (HT) decomposition** [55]. In a *reshaped HT convolutional layer*,  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times \dots \times T_M \times S_1 \times \dots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$  and  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$ . Suppose  $M = 3$ , the reshaped kernel is then factorized by a HT decomposition as

```
W = conv_einsum("(r1)(t1)(s1),(r2)(t2)(s2),(r3)(t3)(s3),(r0)hw,(r1)(r2)(r4),(r3)(r0)(r5),(r4)(r5)->(t1)(t2)(t3)(s1)(s2)(s3)hw", W1, W2, W3, W0, C1, C2, C3)
```

Consequently, the layer has  $(2m + 1)$  weight tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times T_1 \times S_1}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_2 \times T_2 \times S_2}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times T_3 \times S_3}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_0 \times H \times W}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_1 \times R_2 \times R_4}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_3 \times R_0 \times R_5}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}^{(3)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_4 \times R_5}$ . The layer in `conv_einsum` is

```
Y = conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)hw,(r1)(t1)(s1),(r2)(t2)(s2),(r3)(t3)(s3),(r0)hw,(r1)(r2)(r4),(r3)(r0)(r5),(r4)(r5)->b(t1)(t2)(t3)hw|hw", X, W1, W2, W3, W0, C1, C2, C3)
```

### A.3.1 Efficient Convolutional Layers

A number of works design efficient convolutional layers by modifying the linear operations in deep networks. These types of convolutional layers can be thought as special cases of TNNs. Our proposed `conv_einsum` can cover these alternative efficient designs as well. Here, we review two representative designs, namely the *interleaved group convolution* [15] and *separable depth-wise convolution* [19], in the language of `conv_einsum`.

(1) In an *interleaved group convolution*, the layer partitions the input channels  $S$  into two modes  $M$  and  $S'$  such that  $S = MS'$ , and the output channel  $T$  into two modes  $N$  and  $T'$  such that  $T = NT'$ . As a result, the layer has two 4<sup>th</sup> order tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M \times H \times W}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{T' \times S' \times H \times W}$  as parameters and computes its output as:

```
Y = conv_einsum("bmshw,nmhw,tshw->bnthw|hw", X, W1, W2).
```

(2) In a *separable depth-wise convolution*, we assume the input and output channels are the same, i.e.,  $T = S$ . The layer is parameterized by two matrices  $\mathcal{W}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times H}$  and  $\mathcal{W}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times W}$  such that

```
Y = conv_einsum("bshw,sh,sw->bshw|hw", X, W1, W2)
```

We refer to [20] for more examples.

## B Optimal Sequencer

opt-einsum [22] determines the optimal evaluation path of a tensor contraction sequence via the `netcon` algorithm [13]. The algorithm considers the cost of evaluating intermediate products as it explores the path tree. We do not cover the tree traversal strategy here (we refer the reader to [13]), but instead discuss how our `conv_einsum` generalizes `netcon` by calculating the cost of a tensorial intermediate product. We first review the cost (i.e., number of additions/multiplications) of each primitive operation in FLOPs. Let  $\mathcal{T}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{I_0 \times \dots \times I_k \times I_{m-1}}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{J_0 \times \dots \times J_l \times \dots \times J_{n-1}}$ :

1. The mode- $(k, l)$  contraction cost is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\prod_{p=0}^{m-1} I_p\right)\left(\prod_{q=0, q \neq l}^{n-1} J_q\right)\right). \quad (5)$$

2. The mode- $(k, l)$  batch product cost is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\prod_{p=0}^{m-1} I_p\right)\left(\prod_{q=0, q \neq l}^{n-1} J_q\right)\right). \quad (6)$$

3. The outer product cost is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\prod_{p=0}^{m-1} I_p\right)\left(\prod_{q=0}^{n-1} J_q\right)\right). \quad (7)$$

4. The mode- $(k, l)$  convolution cost (without a Fast Fourier Transform) is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\prod_{p=0}^{m-1} I_p\right)\left(\prod_{q=0}^{n-1} J_q\right)\right). \quad (8)$$

Now, as `netcon` explores the path tree associated to contraction sequence (which includes batch products, outer products as special cases of contractions), it invokes a `COST` method which relies on Equations (5) and (7) to analyze an intermediate tensor product along a path. The `tnn-cost` method replaces the standard `COST` function of `netcon` to fully realize the optimal sequencer by adding in the convolution cost model of Equation (8) (in addition to complex string handling to accommodate one letter of convolution type being associated to several dimensional sizes).

**Convolution Varieties.** In our preceding discussions, we subtly assume commutative property of the convolution operation for optimal order evaluation. However, in practice, the convolutions used in neural networks are not necessarily commutative, since one input corresponds to features and another corresponds to filters. Specifically, if the convolution is not standard (e.g., dilated or strided) or not circularly padded, the convolution operation will not be commutative. To make our `OpenTNN` compatible with neural network practice, we support non-commutative convolutions if a letter for convolution only appears in two inputs. When non-commutative convolution is used, we assume the input with larger dimension size at the specified mode as features and another input as filters. However, if a letter for convolution appear more than twice in the inputs (i.e., the convolution is multi-way), we will only support commutative convolution with circular padding for now.

**Modification of the cost model for training.** Existing `einsum` implementations only consider forward computation in tensor networks. However, in a neural network setting, we also need to consider the backpropagation computation. Further modification of `tnn-cost` is needed to incorporate backpropagation costs, which are once again tensorial sequences dictated by the same cost equations. In practice, we submit a flag to `conv_einsum` to indicate that the optimal sequencer is being used for training.

Specifically, given two inputs  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)}$ , which interact through an atomic operation  $f$  resulting in an output tensor  $\mathcal{T} = f(\mathcal{T}^{(1)}, \mathcal{T}^{(2)})$ , a standard `netcon`-driven `einsum` sequencer will calculate the cost of computing  $\mathcal{T}$  without any concern for associated backpropagation calculations. However, the backpropagation algorithm needs to compute  $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\mathcal{T}^{(1)} = g_1(\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^{(2)})$  and  $\partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\mathcal{T}^{(2)} = g_2(\mathcal{T}^{(1)}, \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\mathcal{T})$ , where  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are gradient calculations dependent on  $f$ . Therefore, we modify the cost from `cost(f)` to `cost(f) + cost(g_1) + cost(g_2)`. For instance, consider  $f$  as a standard 2D-convolution, where the operation between the input  $\mathcal{T}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times S \times X \times Y}$  and the weight  $\mathcal{T}^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times S \times H \times W}$  leads to the output  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times T \times X' \times Y'}$ . We have `cost(f) = O(BHWXYTS)` for the forward pass, and `cost(g_1) = O(BHWX'Y'TS)`, `cost(g_2) = O(BXYX'Y'TS)` for the backward pass. In order to achieve optimal scheduling, we further modify the cost function of `netcon` to consider all three such costs.

## C Proof of Theorem 1 and 2

**Theorem (CP reduction).** Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times S \times H' \times W'}$  be the input to a reshaped CP (RCP) convolutional kernel  $\overline{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \cdots T_M \times S_1 \cdots S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$ ,  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$  are factored into  $(m+1)$  rank- $R$  CP factor tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times T_m \times S_m}$  with  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$ . Assume  $H' \gg H$  and  $W' \gg W$  are large; in particular  $SH'W' > aHW$  and  $BH'W' > aS$  for some constant  $a \geq 1$ . Furthermore, let  $R \geq S$ . Then the forward pass through the RCP kernel (in the syntax of `conv_einsum`),

```
Y=conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)⋯(sM)hw,r(t1)(s1),r(t2)(s2),r(t3)(s3),⋯, r(tM)(sM),rhw->r(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw",
X, W1, W2, W3, ..., WM, W0)
```

has a pairwise evaluation path which costs less FLOPs than the following naive left-to-right evaluation,

```
Y=conv_einsum("br(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw, rhw -> br(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw| hw", YM, W0)
```

where

```
Ym=einsum("r(s1)(s2)⋯(s(m-1))(t1)(t2)⋯(t(m-1)),r(sm)(tm)->r(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm), Y(m-1), Wm)
```

for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , noting that for tensor object  $YM$ , its mode symbols  $h, w$  correspond to dimensions  $H', W'$ , and  $b$  corresponds to an arbitrary batch size.

*Proof.* We first evaluate the number of multiplications and additions of the left-to-right evaluation. Let  $U_k = \prod_{i=k}^M S_i \prod_{i=1}^k T_i$  for  $1 \leq k \leq M-1$  and  $U_M = T$ . According to the cost formulae and general definitions of the multilinear operations involved, the number of multiplications for the left-to-right evaluation is

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{naive}} &= BRH'W' \sum_{i=1}^M U_i + BRT H W H' W' \\ &= BRH'W' \left( \sum_{i=1}^M U_i + THW \right). \end{aligned}$$

Additions are incurred by contractions over the  $s_i$ , and by the formula for a general multilinear contraction, in less frequency than the resulting multiplications, so to prove our claim, we only concern ourselves with demonstrating there is a path with less multiplications. Now, we will choose the following path,

```
Ym=conv_einsum("r(s1)(s2)⋯(s(m-1))(t1)(t2)⋯(t(m-1)),r(tm)(sm)->r(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm)", Y(m-1), Wm),
```

for  $2 \leq m \leq M$ . We then perform

```
Y0=conv_einsum("r(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm),rhw->(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm)hw, YM, W0)
```

followed lastly by

```
Y=conv_einsum("(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm)hw,b(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)hw->br(t1)(t2)⋯(tm)hw|hw, Y0, X).
```

Let  $V_k = \prod_{i=1}^k S_i T_i$ . The number of multiplications of this path is

$$M_{\text{reduced}} = R \sum_{i=1}^M V_i + RSTHW + BSTHWH'W'.$$

Now, for the first term of  $M_{\text{reduced}}$ ,

$$R \sum_{i=1}^M V_i < RS \sum_{i=1}^M \prod_{j=1}^i T_j < \frac{BRH'W'}{a} \sum_{i=1}^M U_i.$$

with the last inequality following from our assumption that  $BH'W' > aS$ . For the second term we have that

$$\begin{aligned} RSTHW &< \frac{RTH'W'}{a} \\ &< \frac{(a-1)RTH'W'}{a} \\ &< \frac{(a-1)RH'W' \sum_{i=1}^M U_i}{a} \\ &< \frac{(a-1)BRH'W' \sum_{i=1}^M U_i}{a}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact  $T < U_M$  (since  $U_M$  contains  $T$ ), therefore the entire series is larger than  $T$ . By the preceding two final inequalities we have then that

$$R \sum_{i=1}^M V_i + RSTHW < BRH'W' \sum_{i=1}^M U_i \quad (9)$$

For the last term, by our assumption  $R \geq S$ , we have that

$$BSTHWH'W' < BRTHWH'W'. \quad (10)$$

Combining the upper bounds given by equations 9 and 10, we establish our result,  $M_{\text{reduced}} < M_{\text{naive}}$ .

*Remarks.* (1) Our proof demonstrates the existence of a cheaper path. The FLOPs-minimal path is more complicated and depends on the sizes of the factor tensors  $S_i, T_i$ . (2) Our assumption  $H', W' \gg H, W$  is common in image processing, natural one – image size often greatly exceed filter size.  $\square$

**Theorem (Tucker reduction).** Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times S \times H' \times W'}$  be the input to a reshaped Tucker (RTK) convolutional kernel  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_1 \times \dots \times T_M \times S_1 \times \dots \times S_M \times H \times W}$  such that  $T = \prod_{m=1}^M T_m$ ,  $S = \prod_{m=1}^M S_m$  are factored into  $(m+1)$  rank- $R_m$  CP factor tensors  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_m \times T_m \times S_m}$  with  $\mathcal{W}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times H \times W}$  and  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{R_0 \times R_1 \times \dots \times R_M}$ . Assume  $H' \gg H$  and  $W' \gg W$  are large; in particular  $SH'W' > aHW$  and  $BH'W' > aS$  for some constant  $a \geq 1$ . Furthermore, let  $\prod_{i=1}^M R_m \geq S$ . Then the forward pass through the RCT kernel (in the syntax of `conv_einsum`),

```
Y=conv_einsum("b(s1)(s2)(s3)⋯(sM)hw,(r1)(t1)(s1),(r2)(t2)(s2),(r3)(t3)(s3),⋯,(rM)(tM)(sM),(r0)hw,(r0)(r1)(r2)⋯(rM)->b(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw|hw",X,W1,W2,W3,⋯,WM,W0,C)
```

has a pairwise evaluation path which costs less FLOPs than the naive left-to-right evaluation,

```
Y=conv_einsum("br(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw,rhw->br(t1)(t2)(t3)⋯(tM)hw|hw",YM,W0)
```

where

```
Ym=einsum("r(s1)(s2)⋯(s(m-1))(t1)(t2)⋯(t(m-1)),r(sm)(tm)->r(s1)(s2)⋯(sm)(t1)(t2)⋯(tm),Y(m-1),Wm)
```

for  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , noting that for tensor object  $Ym$ , its mode symbols  $h, w$  correspond to dimensions  $H', W'$ , and  $b$  corresponds to an arbitrary batch size.

*Proof.* The proof follows a nearly identical argument as in the proof of previous Theorem with instead with the only difference being slightly different intermediate osts according to the  $R_m$  modes of the  $\mathcal{W}^{(m)}$ , which may all be upper-bounded by  $R$ .  $\square$

## D Supplementary Experimental Data

In this section, we report on additional data relating to not included in the manuscript.

Table 5: **Run-time (seconds per epoch) comparison between conv\_einsum and PyTorch implementation of TNNs using different tensor decomposition forms in the image classification task on the CIFAR-10 dataset.** The base architecture used is ResNet-34. We observe that conv\_einsum outperforms PyTorch under different tensor decompositions. Here, RXX denotes the reshaped XX decomposition, with reshaping factor  $M=3$ .

| Tensor Form | conv-einsum |      | Naive w/o ckpt |      | Naive w/ ckpt |      |
|-------------|-------------|------|----------------|------|---------------|------|
|             | Train       | Test | Train          | Test | Train         | Test |
| RCP         | 14          | 2.14 | 22             | 2.57 | 29            | 2.61 |
| RTR         | 8           | 1.41 | 16             | 1.86 | 16            | 1.86 |
| RTT         | 8           | 1.37 | 16             | 1.61 | 16            | 1.68 |
| RTK         | 6           | 1.34 | 17             | 1.47 | 17            | 1.54 |

Table 6: **TNN performance under various model scales for image classification under low resources (4-core CPU).** CIFAR10 classification using RCP ( $M = 3$ ) ResNet-34 and a batch size of 128. Result is seconds per epoch.

| Compression Rate (CR) | RCP-train | RCP-test | TK-train | TK-test |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|
| 100%                  | 2030      | 132      | 187      | 12.9    |
| 50%                   | 1378      | 97       | 151      | 10.6    |
| 20%                   | 1054      | 76       | 150      | 10.1    |
| 10%                   | 872       | 65       | 160      | 9.5     |
| 5%                    | 785       | 58       | 147      | 9.0     |

Table 7: **TNN performance under various model scales for diverse machine learning tasks.** Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) on LibriSpeech is measured by Word Error Rate (WER) (the lower, the better). Image classification (IC) on CIFAR10 (results from [10]) is measured by top-1 precision. Video classification (VC) on UCF-101 is measured by top-1 accuracy. Averaged over 3 runs.

| Compression Rate (CR) | IC    | ASR  | VC    |
|-----------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Original              | 93.2  | 2.1  | 88.98 |
| 100%                  | -     | 2.08 | 89.00 |
| 50%                   | -     | 2.29 | 88.61 |
| 20%                   | -     | 2.36 | 88.10 |
| 10%                   | 91.28 | 2.43 | 87.63 |
| 5%                    | 89.86 | 3.01 | 86.62 |
| 2%                    | 85.70 | 3.76 | 86.41 |