# Magneton: Optimizing Energy Efficiency of ML Systems via Differential Energy Debugging

Yi Pan<sup>1,3,\*</sup>, Wenbo Qian<sup>2,\*</sup>, Dedong Xie<sup>1</sup>, Ruiyan Hu<sup>3</sup>, Yigong Hu<sup>2</sup>, Baris Kasikci<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Washington, <sup>2</sup>Boston University, <sup>3</sup>Shanghai Jiao Tong University

# **Abstract**

The training and deployment of machine learning (ML) models have become extremely energy-intensive. While existing optimization efforts focus primarily on hardware energy efficiency, a significant but overlooked source of inefficiency is software energy waste caused by poor software design. This often includes redundant or poorly designed operations that consume more energy without improving performance. These inefficiencies arise in widely used ML frameworks and applications, yet developers often lack the visibility and tools to detect and diagnose them.

We propose differential energy debugging, a novel approach that leverages the observation that prominent ML systems often implement similar functionality with vastly different energy consumption. Building on this insight, we design and implement Magneton, an energy profiler that compares energy consumption between similar ML systems at the operator level and automatically pinpoints code regions and configuration choices responsible for excessive energy use. Applied to 9 popular ML systems spanning LLM inference, general ML frameworks, and image generation, Magneton detects and diagnoses 16 known cases of software energy inefficiency and further discovers 8 previously unknown cases, 7 of which have been confirmed by developers.

## 1 Introduction

With the growing prevalence of large language models (LLMs) and other machine learning (ML) applications, ML systems now consume large amounts of energy. For example, generating a single response from Llama3-405B reportedly consumes 3352.92 Joules (about what it costs for a 60W lamp to be lit for a minute) on NVIDIA H100 GPUs [8], and training GPT-4 has an estimated electricity consumption of approximately 50 GWh [11]. Thus, optimizing energy efficiency in




Figure 1: Software energy waste, performance issues, and performance-energy trade-offs in the design space.

ML systems is critical for both cost efficiency and sustainable development. Acknowledging this critical challenge, major companies such as Google and government agencies have launched initiatives aimed at promoting energy-efficient practices [10, 13, 23].

Most existing energy optimization efforts focus on improving hardware energy efficiency, such as limiting GPU power, tuning GPU frequency, or scheduling tasks on low-power GPUs in heterogeneous clusters [7,22,24,33]. However, another significant but often overlooked source of energy inefficiency is poor software design, which we call *software energy waste*. For example, PyTorch's DistributedDataParallel (DDP) manager, a package commonly used for data parallel training, requires all GPUs to perform asynchronous all-reduce operations during data-parallel training. If data is imbalanced, GPUs that finish early still have to do synchronization until the slowest worker completes its computation, rather than entering an idle state [1]. Since hardware-centric methods cannot distinguish such redundant operations from useful work, they remain ineffective at addressing software energy waste.

Addressing software energy waste requires a two-pronged approach. First is detecting (identifying the symptom of) energy waste, and second is diagnosing (finding the root cause of) it. Automating the detection is important because modern

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution.

ML systems often consist of millions of lines of code, and manually detecting software energy waste would be timeconsuming and error-prone. Diagnosis is important, because even when an energy hotspot is found, developers may lack clear guidance on whether and how the energy hotspot can be restructured to drain less energy.

Ostensibly, performance profilers can help address software energy waste, but in practice they fall short. First, they are designed to detect performance problems, not energy inefficiency. While some performance issues also lead to energy waste, *software energy waste* (Figure 1) often causes little slowdown and is therefore difficult for performance profilers to detect. Second, profilers mainly find hotspots in the source code but provide little guidance on how to fix them.

To make matters worse, existing energy profilers [19,33] used in ML systems also fall short due to their coarse profiling granularity. For instance, Zeus [33] requires a minimum profiling window of 100ms for accurate measurements—even longer than the typical end-to-end latency of an entire transformer inference iteration. This makes it hard to detect software energy waste, which usually happens at the granularity of an individual operator. Moreover, these profilers neither identify the root causes of energy waste nor provide guidance for improving them.

In this paper, we first study real-world ML systems and make two observations. First, due to the widespread use of generative AI, each popular ML system typically has several competing alternatives with similar functionality. Second, we analyze 8 widely-used ML systems [2,5,14,18,21,29,31,35] across three categories: LLM frameworks, ML libraries, and image generation and observe significant differences in energy consumption when performing the same tasks. These findings suggest that the energy consumption differences among functionally similar ML systems can be leveraged to identify potential opportunities for reducing waste.

Building on this insight, we propose a new energy profiling method, **differential energy debugging**, to detect and diagnose software energy waste in ML systems. The basic idea is that when several ML systems implement the same task, their differences in implementation can lead to different energy footprints. By comparing these systems, we can detect energy-inefficient implementations whose energy consumption is significantly higher than their peers, and we can use the more efficient implementations to provide concrete guidance on how the wasteful implementation can be corrected.

A core challenge of differential energy debugging is that ML systems have very different internal code structures, which makes direct source-code comparison unreliable. This motivates the need for a common abstraction level at which different systems can be compared. A too coarse-grained abstraction level, such as a full transformer iteration, includes many operations together and therefore hides the root cause of energy waste. A too fine-grained abstraction level such as CUDA code is impractical due to unavailable source code and

lack of hardware telemetry to measure energy at that level.

We observe that ML systems rely on **operators** as their fundamental execution units. These operators, such as matrix multiplication (GEMM), convolution, and communication primitives, provide semantic meaningfulness for comparison, as they construct common mathematical logic across diverse ML systems. Moreover, they dominate the energy consumption of ML workloads, accounting for nearly 100% of the total energy usage in our analysis of 8 ML systems. Therefore, we argue that the operator is the natural abstraction level for differential analysis across different ML systems.

The second challenge is how to perform the comparison at the operator granularity to detect energy inefficiencies. Naive approaches like one-to-one operator mapping or source-code analysis are infeasible, as many computational tasks in ML systems are implemented by combinations of operators with large differences at the source code level. To address this, we compare **the sequence of operators** that perform the same task in the model, which we call semantically equivalent subgraphs. By constructing the computational graph and analyzing its dataflow, we match subgraphs with the same inputs and outputs across workloads, identifying them as semantically equivalent implementations of the same task.

The third challenge is diagnosing the source of energy waste. After detecting an energy hotspot, differential energy debugging needs to explain how and why different implementations of the same computational task diverge in their energy use. It analyzes the control flow and dataflow paths that lead from the semantically equivalent subgraphs back to their call sites. By comparing these paths across ML systems, it identifies the first point where the control flow diverges. This deviation is the likely root cause because it explains why the two systems invoke different combinations of operators and consume different amounts of energy.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of differential energy debugging, we design Magneton, a general energy profiler for ML systems and apply it to 9 popular ML systems: vLLM, SGlang, Huggingface Transformers, Megatron-LM, pytorch, jax, tensorflow, Stable Diffusion and Diffusers. we collect and reproduce 16 real-world cases of software energy waste and Magneton detects and diagnoses all of them. Furthermore, Magneton detects and diagnoses 8 previously unknown cases of software energy waste. Among these, 7 cases are confirmed by developers.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We propose a novel approach, differential energy debugging, to systematically identify and optimize software energy inefficiencies in ML systems.
- We design and implement Magneton, a differential energy profiler that measures energy consumption at the computational graph level.
- We evaluate Magneton on 9 popular ML systems and




Figure 2: Total energy consumption and breakdowns of top 5 operators in HuggingFace Transformers.

```
# .../transformers/pytorch_utils.py

def forward(self, x):
    size_out = x.size()[:-1] + (self.nf,)
    x = torch.addmm(self.bias, x, self.weight)
    x = x.view(size_out)
    return x
```

Figure 3: Code snippet from HuggingFace related to the energy inefficiency issue.

demonstrate its effectiveness in detecting and diagnosing real-world software energy waste.

#### 2 Motivation

### 2.1 Case Studies

To better understand the characteristics of software energy waste and why it is difficult to detect, we analyze three real-world cases from three widely used machine learning systems: PyTorch, an ML library; HuggingFace Transformers, an LLM inference framework; and Stable Diffusion, an image generation application. These cases have different root causes and exhibit different energy waste patterns. We selected these three cases to provide a representative coverage of a broad range of energy inefficiency issues in modern ML systems.

Case 1: API misuse. HuggingFace Transformers is a popular framework that allows users to run and fine-tune pretrained transformer models. The framework implements the linear layer with bias using the torch.addmm API. However, in earlier versions, the underlying implementation of this API had an inefficiency that led to excessive energy consumption under large batch sizes while providing little performance benefit. In contrast, replacing the call with separate torch.add and torch.matmul kernels for large models significantly reduces energy usage [27].

To quantify the energy inefficiency, we ran a single-layer GPT-2 model with a batch size of 8 and an input length of 1024 on an NVIDIA H200 GPU. As shown in the first column of Figure 2, the original implementation with torch.addmm consumes 10.0% more energy during inference compared to the modified version. However, the performance of the two versions is nearly the same, where the modified version brings



Figure 4: The power consumption of the join and early exit in DDP manager.

1% performance improvement. This software energy waste is therefore difficult to detect using traditional performance profiling.

While the root cause of this issue is in a single line of code (shown in Figure 3), locating this root cause is challenging. Existing energy profilers only report the total energy usage of the model without providing operator-level breakdowns. With Magneton, we can breakdown the energy consumption and list the top 5 energy-consuming operators (shown in Figure 3), which provide detailed insights into the energy inefficiency issue

Case 2: Redundant operation. PyTorch's DistributedDataParallel manager is widely used for data-parallel training. It requires all GPUs to execute asynchronous all-reduce operations during the model's backward pass to compute gradients. As a result, when there is a workload imbalance across different GPUs, developers often have to manually handle early exits. With PyTorch 1.10, a new feature called dist. Join was introduced to automatically manage this situation. However, this feature can introduce redundant operations and energy waste [26]. Specifically, dist.Join forces all GPUs to communicate even after some complete their tasks, blocking the GPU from going idle.

To reproduce this inefficiency, we trained an MLP model with a batch size of 128 for 20 iterations on two H200 GPUs. To create an uneven workload, we distributed inputs across GPUs with a ratio of 1.3:1, causing one GPU to finish earlier than the other. As shown in Figure 4, with the handwritten early exit logic, the GPU with a lesser workload can enter an idle state, reducing overall energy consumption by about 23% compared to DDP with dist.Join.

Case 3: Misconfiguration. Stable diffusion [5] is a popular image generation application. It uses PyTorch as its underlying library. PyTorch v1.7 provides a new feature that uses TensorFloat-32 (TF32) for matrix multiplications. TF32 is a faster and more energy-efficient data type than the default float32 that leverages the tensor core in NVIDIA GPUs. PyTorch introduces a new configuration allow\_tf32 but this is disabled by default. However, as the developers of stable diffusion were not aware of this new feature, they left kept TF32 disabled [28] which led to energy waste. Later, in release 1.10.1, developers noticed this and enabled TF32, reducing the end-to-end energy consumption by 12.5%.

# 2.2 Approach to Address Energy Inefficiency

To detect energy inefficiency, an intuitive way is to use traditional performance profilers, which primarily trace execution time and resource utilization. However, these tools are fundamentally insufficient for energy analysis because execution time may not be a perfect proxy for energy consumption. For example, in case 1 of our case study (§2.1), a performance profiler would report no significant performance degradation since both APIs show similar execution times even if they have completely different energy consumption. Similarly, asynchronous operations that waste energy may appear indistinguishable in terms of performance, even though they consume substantially more energy.

Since performance profilers are insufficient for detecting and diagnosing energy inefficiency, we need accurate energy profiling tools to guide the optimization. However, existing energy profilers [19,33] suffer from two key limitations. First, their sampling rates are too low to provide fine-grained measurements, which is needed to capture the energy consumption of short-lived operators with milliseconds of latency. Second, and more fundamentally, even with operator-level energy data, it remains unclear whether an energy hotspot truly represents an optimization opportunity. For example, matrix multiplication is almost always an energy hotspot, but its implementation may already be optimally efficient. Thus, operator-level profiling alone cannot determine whether excess energy use is avoidable.

Another potential solution is to identify code patterns associated with energy waste using static analysis. However, as shown in §2.1, energy waste has diverse root causes, and diagnosing them requires deep semantic and domain-specific knowledge that static analyzers lack. For example, in case 3, locating an incorrectly set allow\_tf32 flag as the root cause among thousands of PyTorch configurations requires domain knowledge about NVIDIA GPUs, making static analysis alone insufficient.

These limitations reveal that it is challenging to address the energy waste without knowing what a more efficient implementation looks like.

# 3 Key Insights

In this section, we highlight our key insights that motivate the design of Magneton.

### 3.1 Similarity across ML Systems

In recent years, generative AI technologies have made ML a vibrant and competitive ecosystem where multiple systems often solve the same problem. At the library level, PyTorch, TensorFlow, and JAX offer competing implementations for core deep learning functionalities. For specific tasks like high-throughput LLM inference, frameworks such as vLLM and




Figure 5: (a) Summary of popular machine learning repositories grouped by category. (b) Energy consumption per token of different LLM inference systems during offline inference, (x,y) means each request contains x input and y output tokens. (c) Energy consumption of the convolution operator in different ML libraries. (d) Energy consumption per image patch of different image generation systems.

SGLang provide similar solutions with different custom implementations. While their internal logic and code structure may differ, these systems do ultimately perform the same underlying mathematical computations to produce correct results.

# 3.2 Different Energy Consumption

The existence of these functional alternatives motivates a question: do different implementations exhibit different energy profiles when performing the same task? To investigate this, we conducted an empirical study comparing state-of-the-art systems across three representative categories:

- LLM inference frameworks: we compare the energy consumption (in Joules per token) of vLLM [18], SGLang [35], and Huggingface Transformers [31]. Each system serves a Llama-3-8B model with an identical scheduling policy and workload.
- ML libraries: we benchmark the energy consumption of the convolution API in PyTorch [21], TensorFlow [2], and JAX [14] using identical input tensors (batch size 128, hidden dimension 512).
- Image generation frameworks: We measure and compare the total energy consumption of Huggingface diffusers [29] and stable diffusion [5] to generate an image with the stable-diffusion-3 model.




Figure 6: System architecture and workflow of Magneton.

The comparison result is shown in Figure 5. Surprisingly, we find that they have a significant difference in energy consumption when doing the exact same task. For example, the difference in the end-to-end energy consumption of SGLang and Huggingface Transformers can be as high as 2.97x. Even if we just compare a single operator, the energy difference of the 2D convolution operator between JAX and TensorFlow can also reach 3.35x.

### 3.3 Differential Energy Debugging

Building on these observations, we propose differential energy debugging to leverage the widely existing similarity across different ML systems to detect and diagnose software energy waste. The fundamental principle is straightforward: when different systems are doing the same task, their energy consumption should theoretically be comparable, and significant deviations indicate potential inefficiencies. However, realizing this approach encounters three principal challenges: (1) At what abstraction level should we compare different ML systems to effectively detect software energy waste? (2) How do we perform comparisons across systems that implement similar functionality with vastly different approaches? (3) How do we diagnose the root cause of energy waste when the detected symptoms may not directly reveal the underlying inefficiencies?

### 4 Design

To address these challenges, we design and implement Magneton, an end-to-end differential energy profiler that systematically detects and diagnoses software energy waste in ML systems. Figure 6 presents the system architecture and workflow of Magneton.

Magneton realizes our differential energy debugging through three steps: (1) it uses operators as the comparison granularity to balance detection precision with analysis feasibility (§4.1); (2) it identifies semantic equivalence between

operators across different systems to locate the inefficient operators (§4.2); (3) it diagnoses the root cause by static analysis (§4.3), supported by fine-grained energy tracing and profiling capabilities (§5).

The usage of Magneton is straightforward: developers simply need to identify a system with similar functionality, provide identical workloads to both systems, and Magneton automatically detects energy waste and diagnoses its root cause.

# 4.1 Operator as the Diffing Granularity

The first design challenge of differential energy debugging is determining the appropriate abstraction level for comparing energy consumption across different ML systems. This choice fundamentally affects both the detectability of energy waste and the actionability of the results.

Both coarse-grained and fine-grained approaches have significant limitations. Coarse-grained comparisons (e.g., modellevel or iteration-level) aggregate energy differences across many operations, making it useless for locating fine-grained root causes. For example, in §3.2 we see that Huggingface Transformers can consume 2.97x more energy than SGLang when doing the same task, but this data alone does not provide much insight into energy optimization. Fine-grained approaches (e.g., intra-CUDA kernel analysis) face the opposite problem: excessive implementation diversity creates noise rather than insight, as there can be completely different lowerlevel implementations. More critically, fine-grained analysis encounters insurmountable practical barriers that we cannot obtain energy consumption data for individual lines of GPU kernel code, nor can we access the source code of proprietary GPU libraries like cuBLAS.

We identify operators as the optimal granularity for differential energy debugging. Operators, such as matrix multiplication (GEMM), convolution, and communication primitives, are fundamental units of an ML model. They provide semantic meaningfulness since different ML systems performing the same high-level function typically execute largely the same

set of operators. They offer sufficient granularity for detection, with operator-level energy consumption varying by 1.2x to 3.8x across systems in our analysis (§3.2). Most importantly, operator-level inefficiencies map directly to actionable optimization targets such as algorithm selection or configuration adjustments.

# 4.2 Locating Inefficient Operators

Comparing different systems at the operator granularity requires identifying semantic equivalence to determine whether two **sets of operators** perform the same task. Traditional approaches like source code analysis are infeasible due to the scale of modern ML systems and the diversity of their implementations. Semantically equivalent operators often differ in naming and internal logic; for instance, a matrix multiplication might be implemented as Linear in vLLM but as Conv1D (with kernel size 1) in HuggingFace Transformers (Figure 3). Such mathematical equivalences are difficult to detect via static analysis.

To overcome these barriers, we ignore the source code and leverage the *computational graph* (DAG). In this representation, operators are nodes and tensors are edges. This structures the problem as finding equivalent subgraphs, allowing us to identify equivalence through data flow patterns rather than syntax.

However, simply checking if two operators produce identical outputs for identical inputs is insufficient, as it ignores crucial context. For example, query and key projections in an attention module are mathematically identical operations, but they serve fundamentally different roles in the model architecture. To address this limitation, we develop a more robust approach that leverages the deterministic data flow properties of computational graphs. Since computational graphs form DAGs, the data flow patterns within them are unique and deterministic for any given model input. This leads us to define a stricter and more context-aware criterion for semantic equivalence:

**Hypothesis 1.** Operator  $op_1$  in application A and operator  $op_2$  in application B are **semantically equivalent** if and only if they are consistently invoked **semantically equivalent** inputs and produce the **semantically equivalent** output across all possible model inputs.

Based on this hypothesis, we first build a tool to match semantically equivalent tensors, then apply it to different systems and computational graphs to find semantically equivalent subgraphs.

Matching Equivalent Tensors. A naive approach to check tensor equivalence would perform element-wise comparison (e.g., torch.allclose), as commonly done in unit tests. However, this fails as semantically equivalent tensors can have different layouts across different ML systems. For example,




Figure 7: Matching semantically equivalent subgraphs in the computational graph.

Huggingface Transformers and SGLang use different attention backends with distinct tensor layouts: Huggingface uses HND (attention head first) while SGLang uses NHD (sequence length first). These layouts differ only by a permute operation, but this breaks straightforward element-wise matching.

To address this challenge, we propose a robust matching method based on the statistical properties of tensors. We observe that layout transformations (e.g., permute, reshape) merely reorder entries without changing the singular-value spectra of tensor unfoldings. For an r-way tensor  $\mathcal{T}$ , we enumerate non-trivial subsets  $G \subset [r-1]$  and matricize the tensor by grouping dimensions in G as rows and the complement  $G^c$  as columns. This yields  $\mathbf{T}(G) \in \mathbb{R}^{M_G \times N_G}$  where  $M_G = \prod i \in Gn_i$  and  $N_G = \prod_{j \in G^c} n_j$ . We then compute the thin SVD:

$$\mathbf{T}_{(G)} = \mathbf{U}_{G} \Sigma_{G} \mathbf{V}_{G}^{T}, \text{where } \Sigma G = \text{diag}(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, \dots, \sigma \text{min}(M_{G}, N_{G}))$$

Here  $\sigma(\mathbf{T}(G)) = [\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma \min(M_G, N_G)]^T$  are sorted in descending order. Then we can compute the multi-mode SVD invariant set:

$$S(T) = \sigma(\mathbf{T}_{(G)}) : G \subset 0, \dots, r-1, G \neq \emptyset, G \neq 0, \dots, r-1$$

Two tensors are declared equivalent if their invariant sets match under a chosen numerical tolerance. Despite requiring  $2^r-2$  unfoldings, typical tensors have low order  $(r \le 5)$ , making the overall complexity  $O\left((2^r-2)\times \max_G(M_G^2N_G)\right)$  tractable and amenable to parallel SVD implementations.

**Matching Equivalent Subgraphs.** However, even with this efficient tensor matching algorithm, it is still non-trivial to apply the hypothesis to a large computational graph. A naive approach that checks all possible subgraph pairs between graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  requires  $O(2^{|G_1|} \cdot 2^{|G_2|})$  comparisons, which is unacceptable for large graphs with thousands of operators.

To address this challenge, we design a topology-aware approach that exploits the structure of computational graphs to prune the search space. Our key insight is that if two graphs are semantically equivalent, their dominator trees also exhibit similar patterns. This allows us to use a divide-and-conquer strategy to recursively match subgraphs.

```
Algorithm 1 Topology-Aware Subgraph Matching
    Inputs: G_1, G_2: computation graphs, Eq: pairs of equiva-
    lent tensors
    Note: n_1 > n_2 means n_1 dominates n_2 in the graph
    function RECURSIVEMATCH(G_1, G_2, Eq)

    ⊳ Set of matched subgraphs

          T_1, T_2 \leftarrow \text{DominatorTree}(G_1, G_2)
          s_1, e_1 \leftarrow \text{Source}(T_1), \text{Sink}(T_1)
          s_2, e_2 \leftarrow \text{Source}(T_2), \text{Sink}(T_2) \Rightarrow \text{Get dominator path}
          P_1 \leftarrow \langle t_{1,i} \mid t_{1,1} = s_1, t_{1,n_1} = e_1, t_{1,i} \succ t_{1,i+1} \rangle
          P_2 \leftarrow \langle t_{2,j} \mid t_{2,1} = s_2, t_{2,n_2} = e_2, t_{2,j} \succ t_{2,j+1} \rangle
          \mathcal{E} \leftarrow \{(t_{1,i}, t_{2,j}) \in P_1 \times P_2 \mid (out(t_{1,i}), out(t_{2,j})) \in Eq\}
                                                                      if |\mathcal{E}| = 1 then
                return G_1, G_2
          for k = 1 to |\mathcal{E}| do
                                                                Divide and conquer
                V_{1,k} \leftarrow \{v \in G_1 \mid t_{1,i_k} \succ v, v \succ t_{1,i_{k+1}}\}
V_{2,k} \leftarrow \{v \in G_2 \mid t_{2,j_k} \succ v, v \succ t_{2,j_{k+1}}\}
G_{1,k} \leftarrow G_1[V_{1,k}], G_{2,k} \leftarrow G_2[V_{2,k}]
```

 $\triangleright G_{1,k}$  and  $G_{2,k}$  are equivalent

Algorithm 1 presents our approach. We first perform pairwise tensor matching across all edges in  $O(|G_1|\cdot|G_2|)$  time to identify semantically equivalent tensor pairs. Then, for two graphs with the same input and outputs (which, by hypothesis, are semantically equivalent), we construct their dominator trees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  and extract the dominator paths  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  from source to sink nodes. We identify equivalent tensor pairs  $\mathcal E$  along these dominator paths and use them as "cut points" to recursively divide the graphs into smaller subgraphs until there are no finer subgraphs.

 $\mathcal{M}_{sub} \leftarrow \text{RecursiveMatch}(G_{1,k}, G_{2,k})$ 

 $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_{sub}$ 

return  $\mathcal{M}$ 

Figure 7 illustrates this process: by tensor matching, we identify semantically equivalent tensors marked with the same labels (1-4) across both applications. These equivalent tensor pairs serve as natural cut points (shown by dashed vertical lines) that divide the computational graphs into manageable subgraphs. For instance, App A's attention mechanism (Q, K, V, and Attn) is matched against App B's equivalent subgraph (QKV, Split, and Attn), while the subsequent feed-forward components (Mul, Add operations vs. F.linear) form separate comparable subgraphs. This recursive partitioning enables efficient comparison of complex ML computational graphs.

Since all the graphs processed at the same recursion depth share no common edges, and they are smaller than the graphs processed at the previous depth, the recursion depth and the total complexity of each depth are all O(N), where  $N = \max(|G_1|, |G_2|)$ . Therefore, the overall complexity of the subgraph matching is controlled to  $O(N^2)$ .

```
Algorithm 2 Finding Deviation Point and Key Variable
  Inputs: path_1, path_2: backtraces of two invoked GPU ker-
  nels; k_1, k_2: GPU kernels invoked by the applications
  function FINDDEVIATIONPOINT(path_1, path_2, k_1, k_2)
      for i = 0 to \min(|path_1|, |path_2|) - 1 do
          if path_1[i] \neq path_2[i] then
              func \leftarrow path_1[i-1]
                   ▶ Last common function before deviation
              return FINDKEYVAR(func)
  function FINDKEYVAR(func)
      Instrument() ▷ Instrument all basic blocks for tracing
      trace_1, trace_2 \leftarrow RUNANDCOLLECT()
           ▶ Re-run with instrumentation to get block traces
      for i = 0 to \min(|trace_1|, |trace_2|) - 1 do
          if trace_1[i] \neq trace_2[i] then
              lastCommon \leftarrow trace_1[i-1]
              control \leftarrow GetControlInstruction(lastCommon)
              key \leftarrow \text{ExtractControlVariable}(control)
                > Handle branch, switch, or function pointer
              return key
```

# 4.3 Root-cause Diagnosis

After identifying semantically equivalent subgraphs with different energy consumption, we need to diagnose the root cause of the inefficiency. When applications use different API combinations to implement the same functionality, the diagnosis is straightforward—developers can directly replace the inefficient combination with the more efficient alternative.

The primary challenge arises when both applications call the same framework API but different configurations cause the underlying framework to select different implementations. For example, in case 3 in §2.1, both versions call the same API but invoke different CUDA kernels due to different values of the global flag torch.backends.matmul.allow\_tf32, which affects PyTorch's internal dispatch logic.

To diagnose such cases, we initially considered tracing the complete execution path from the framework API entry point (e.g., torch.matmul) down to the actual GPU kernel invocation (e.g., cublasSgemm), inspired by the inflection point hypothesis [34]. This hypothesis suggests that in distributed systems, the first point where execution traces diverge between a working and failing system indicates the root cause of the failure. In our context, this would mean comparing the execution traces of energy-efficient and energy-inefficient implementations to find where they first differ and treating that as the root cause.

However, we found that this approach is inadequate for diagnosing energy waste in ML systems. In the above example, the first deviation occurs when PyTorch accesses its dispatch table, because the two applications have different internal states. Yet the actual root cause is much deeper: the CUDABlas function reads the allow tf32 flag and branches

to different code paths, ultimately selecting different CUDA kernels with different energy characteristics. This example shows that execution traces between different ML applications naturally contain numerous differences in framework internals, CPU buffer allocations, and auxiliary operations, most of which are irrelevant to energy consumption. This makes us realize that we only need to trace back to understand why GPU kernels consume different amounts of energy—either because different kernels are invoked, or because the same kernel receives different parameters or configurations.

Based on this insight, we develop a targeted approach that focuses specifically on differences between GPU kernels. The detailed algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2. Instead of comparing entire execution traces, we extract only the call paths that directly lead to GPU kernel invocations and find deviation points using FINDDEVIATIONPOINT. Then, the FINDKEY-VAR function analyzes these deviation points by instrumenting relevant functions with basic block tracing, re-running both applications, and comparing execution paths to identify the specific branching condition or variable that leads to different GPU kernel selections. Once we identify the key variable, we perform backward data-flow analysis to trace it to its ultimate source, typically a configuration parameter or API argument that developers can modify to eliminate the energy waste.

# 5 Implementation

To realize the differential debugging approaches in §4, we build a tracing and profiling framework to capture the control-flow, data-flow (§5.1), and energy consumption (§5.2) in ML systems.

### 5.1 Tracing Software Events

Tracing ML applications presents unique challenges due to cross-layer Python, C/C++, and GPU execution with asynchronous programming models. We address this through a multi-layer tracing approach that captures GPU events using CUPTI Activity API for kernel executions, memory transfers, and timestamps with minimal overhead.

We intercept ML library calls <sup>2</sup> and CUDA runtime functions via CUPTI Callback API to capture both high-level operations and low-level GPU invocations. To establish complete execution context, we capture native C/C++ call stacks using libunwind and Python via PyEval\_SetProfile hooks.

In order to correlate asynchronous GPU events with CPU calls, we use CUPTI correlation IDs that uniquely link CPU-side API calls to their corresponding GPU kernel executions, enabling us to construct unified traces reflecting the relationship between CPU scheduling and GPU execution.

# 5.2 Energy Profiling

To support the analysis approaches in §4, Magneton needs fine-grained attribution of GPU energy use to individual kernels, which often run in tens to hundreds of microseconds. Native GPU energy profiling libraries provided by GPU vendors, including NVIDIA management library (NVML) and AMD system management interface, expose GPU power counters but with an update frequency of only 10-50 Hz, and can be delayed by hundreds of milliseconds [32]. This results in a divergence from ground truth by a physical power meter by up to 80%. As a result, vendor-provided energy profiling and previous works based on that (e.g., Zeus [33]) cannot capture the power of a single kernel and provide inaccurate averages across many kernels. Physical power meters, by contrast, offer microsecond-level resolution and high accuracy, but are not always available to users or easily attached to the server.

Magneton incorporates both approaches in a modular design. Users can either use a power meter for direct runtime measurement or use Magneton's replay-based software energy profiling approach. Specifically, if the hardware power meter is not available, Magneton will first use the coarse-grained native GPU energy interface to record iteration-level energy consumption. If an energy difference is detected across frameworks, we will replay this iteration with recorded input and outputs. During this process, we replay each operator to have an execution time long enough to average out delays and stabilize readings from GPU energy interfaces, by operator-level framework interception. This enables accurate power measurement even when users cannot install a physical power meter.

# 6 Evaluation

Our evaluation aims to answer the following questions:

- How effective is Magneton in detecting and diagnosing software energy wastes?
- How can Magneton uncover unknown software energy wastes?
- What is the accuracy, sensitivity, and overhead of the proposed designs?

### 6.1 Setup

**Testbed.** We run the evaluations on two server setups: (1) Testbed-A: 1 node with 1 NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU and 2 AMD Threadripper Pro 5955WX CPUs; (2) Testbed-B: 1 node with 8 NVIDIA H200 GPUs connected through NVLink and 2 AMD EPYC 9534 CPUs.

**Target Systems.** We implement and evaluate Magneton on 9 state-of-the-art ML systems, including (1) LLM inference and training systems: SGLang [35], vLLM [18], Megatron-LM [20], and Huggingface Transformers [31]; (2) Image

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>e.g.,$  PyTorch's aten::addGlobalCallback

Id	Case	Category	Description
c1	vllm-9471	Misconfiguration	Prefill attention consumes more energy with tensor cores disabled.
c2	vllm-10811	Redundant	Decode attention incurs energy waste via redundant data copy.
c3	sglang-5128	API misuse	Top-k implementation launches energy-ineffcient APIs.
c4	megatron-543	Redundant	Redundant repeat_interleave results in energy waste.
c5	hf-14450	Misconfiguration	Default tensor format causes energy-intensive layout transformations.
c6	hf-34570	API misuse	torch.linalg.eigvals ignores selects energy-inefficient kernels.
c7	diffusers-12131	API misuse	Unnecessary concat/split ops consume extra memory access energy.
c8	sd-279	Misconfiguration	Linear layers fail to utilize energy-efficient tensor core instructions.
c9	pytorch-181115	Redundant	dist.Join prevents a finished GPU from going to idle mode.
c10	pytorch-141210	API misuse	torch.addmm selects kernels with higher energy consumption.
c11	pytorch-28224	Misconfiguration	Suboptimal flags cause CPU busy-waiting, preventing low-power states.
c12	pytorch-76012	API misuse	Non-contiguous inputs in LayerNorm trigger inefficient access patterns.
c13	pytorch-141822	API misuse	F.cross_entropy launches kernels with higher energy consumption.
c14	jax-28614	API misuse	jax.scipy.signal.stft calls inefficient low-level APIs.
c15	jax-9239	Redundant	Redundant computations in jax.scipy.linalg.expm.
c16	tf-60772	API misuse	count_nonzero triggers implicit energy-inefficient data copies.

Table 1: Known issues and their descriptions.

generation systems: Stable Diffusion [5] and Diffusers [29]; (3) ML frameworks: PyTorch [21], JAX [14], and TensorFlow [2].

Baselines and Setups. We compare Magneton with two state-of-the-art profilers for ML systems and their variants: (1) Zeus [33] is a state-of-the-art energy monitoring and optimization tool. (2) PyTorch profiler [25] is a widely used performance profiler for PyTorch. It can obtain the latency of each operator in the model. (3) Zeus-replay is implemented on top of Zeus with operator-level replay to address limitations described in §5.2 and enable accurate power monitoring.

We apply these baselines to gather operator-level performance and energy statistics, evaluating their ability to detect inefficiencies and the correlation between energy inefficiencies and performance. For PyTorch profiler, we use the key averages () API to get the latency of each operator of all PyTorch-based systems For Zeus and Zeus-replay, we first locate the software code of each operator in the model, and then manually instrument the source code by wrapping operators with the begin\_window and end\_window APIs For Zeus-replay specifically, we implement a loop to execute each operator 1,000 times with identical inputs, verifying outputs to ensure no side effects are introduced. However, this instrumentation requires manually locating and modifying the source code for every operator, which is time-consuming and not practical for large end-to-end systems. Consequently, we limit the evaluation of Zeus-based baselines to cases containing fewer than 100 operators.

For Magneton, we configure the detection threshold for energy inefficiency at a 10% energy difference between the semantically equivalent subgraphs. Empirically, we find this threshold can be reduced to 5% without identifying false

positives caused by GPU power fluctuations. To strictly classify an inefficiency as software energy waste rather than a performance-energy trade-off, we enforce a tight tolerance: the efficient variant must not degrade performance by more than 1% nor exceed a 1% element-wise relative difference in output values.

Manual Effort of Magneton. The manual effort to integrate Magneton into the target systems is minimal. For ML frameworks, users can wrap any defined models or operators with Magneton's energy profiler. For task-specific ML systems, the integration requires only two steps: (1) Identify the model callable in the system and wrap it with Magneton's energy profiler; (2) Add annotations to custom operators to specify the input and output tensors. The manual effort is minimal for all the target systems, as the required code changes are all less than 100 lines.

### **6.2 Diagnosing Known Issues**

To evaluate the effectiveness of Magneton in diagnosing known issues, we collect 16 real-world energy inefficient cases from the target systems. We collect them from GitHub issues, developer forums, and blog posts. Since software energy wastes are not well-studied, some of the cases are collected by searching some other related keywords like redundant, inefficient, waste, etc. As summarized in Table 1, those selected energy inefficiencies span across different ML systems and exhibit different bug patterns, making them representative for evaluating the effectiveness of diagnosing energy issues.

To use Magneton to diagnose the issues, we run the target systems with our profiler attached under the following set-

Id	Magneton		PyTorch Zeus		Zeus-replay	
	Diag.	Diff.	Rank	Rank	Rank	
c1	✓	12.6%	42th	-	-	
c2	✓	1.4%	>100th	-	-	
c3	✓	2.5%	2nd	-	-	
c4	1	6.7%	12th	-	7th	
c5	1	58.8%	13th	-	2nd	
c6	1	29.1%	1st	1st	1st	
c7	✓	6.1%	>100th	-	19th	
c8	✓	12.5%	>100th	-	-	
c9	✓	7.0%	35th	1st*	17th	
c10	✓	9.1%	14th	-	1st	
c11	X	<1%	-	-	-	
c12	✓	16.3%	1st	-	1st	
c13	✓	2.6%	5th	-	6th	
c14	✓	7.7%	-	-	2nd	
c15	✓	2.1%	-	-	3rd	
c16	✓	27.8%	-	-	3rd	

Table 2: Magneton detection and diagnosis result. - means baselines are unable to perform fine-grained profiling on this case. \* means the profiling result is incorrect.

tings. For end-to-end ML systems, including categories (1) and (2), we run the specific version of the target systems with the same configuration and workload provided by the developers. Then, we find other systems with the same functionality and run them with under the same settings. For ML frameworks, we run the cases with the an end-to-end workload that contains the inefficient implementation, which is collected in the bug report or the model library of the target system like torch.nn. Then, we compare its energy profiles with those of an alternative implementation from the other version of the target system or other ML frameworks. If Magneton correctly locates the energy inefficient design, we mark the case as diagnosed.

In total, Magneton successfully diagnoses 15 of the 16 cases. The results are summarized in Table 2. In those diagnosed cases, Magneton correctly locates the energy inefficient design at the level of (1) problematic API calls for API misuse cases; (2) the key configuration for misconfiguration cases; (3) redundant operations for redundant cases. For example, in case c2, Magneton points out that vLLM passes use\_tensor\_cores=False to FlashInfer when serving the Llama 3.1-8B model.

We also evaluate the difference between the end-to-end energy consumption on the targeted system before and after the issue is fixed. The average energy reduction is 13.6% for the diagnosed cases. In some cases of the end-to-end systems, although the problematic operator itself is not an energy hotspot, optimizing it can still bring non-negligible energy savings. For example, in case c7, the concat operator consumes less

Case (Category)	Description
pytorch-157334 (M)	Conv2D is inefficient under NCHW layout.
hf-39072 <b>(A)</b>	Inefficient memory resharding in the attention layer.
jax-29875 <b>(A)</b>	cuDNN grouped-conv kernels are inefficient.
pytorch-153195 <b>(M)</b>	Default math mode is inefficient.
hf-38977 <b>(R)</b>	LMHead processes redundant to- kens.
vllm-20174 <b>(A)</b>	Default vLLM prefill attention can be inefficient.
tf-96396( <b>A</b> )	TensorFlow's custom convolution kernels are inefficient.
hf-39073 <b>(M)</b>	Default GELU backend is inefficient.

Table 3: New issues that Magneton identifies with their descriptions. M, A, R refer to misconfiguration, API misuse, and redundant operations, respectively.

energy than all dense operators (e.g. matmul) in the model. However, it occurs in each layer of the model, and removing it can reduce the energy consumption of the model by 6.1%. Magneton fails to detect c11, as this issue manifests as CPU polling with minimal impact on GPU energy consumption.

We compare Magneton's capability of diagnosing energy inefficiencies with baselines. Notably, these baselines are not initially designed for diagnosing the root cause of energy inefficiencies. For fair comparison, we use them to monitor the model and report the rank of the performance and energy consumption of the problematic operator in the end-to-end workload. In comparison, among the 12 cases that PyTorch profiler can profile, it only ranks c3, c6, and c12 as the top 3 performance bottlenecks. Zeus can only accurately get the energy consumption of case c6, where the problematic kernel runs longer than the minimum measurement window of Zeus (100ms). For case c9, although it can get the energy consumption of the redundant all-reduce operation, its ranking is incorrect since it just marks the energy of all other operators as 0. Zeus-replay ranks 3 cases as the top 1 energy hotspot and 7 cases as the top 5 energy hotspots. However, although it can locate the energy hot spots for some cases, it does not provide information about the root cause of the energy issues, making it difficult for developers to fix them.

### **6.3** Exposing New Issues

Besides diagnosing known issues, we also evaluate Magneton's ability to expose unknown energy wastes. Since all the target systems are popular and widely used, most of the issues we find, especially those that also cause performance degrada-




Figure 8: The sensitivity of Magneton's semantic equivalence detection algorithm.


tion, have been reported in the open-source community. Still, we find 8 new energy issues that can be triggered under certain workloads. We report all these issues with the alternative designs to the developers, and 7 of them have been confirmed. Table 3 lists the details of the issues.

When comparing different LLM serving systems, we serve GPT-2, Llama 3.1 8B, and Llama 3.1 70B models on them with the same configuration and input, and then use Magneton to collect the energy profiles during runtime. Although the overall logic of these systems is similar, we found that they call different CUDA kernels in some operators. In the GELU operator of the GPT-2 model, Huggingface Transformers calls a custom implementation with 5 CUDA kernels, while vLLM calls a fused kernel that reduces the memory read from HBM to SRAM. This can reduce the energy consumption of the GELU operator by 77.4% on average and end-to-end energy consumption by 12%. Interestingly, while vLLM is considered to be a high-performance LLM serving system, we still find energy inefficient designs in its prefill attention compared with Huggingface Transformers.

When comparing different ML frameworks, we fuzz popular models and operators with random inputs to detect energy inefficiencies. By comparing PyTorch and TensorFlow convolution operators, we discover that they call different CUDA kernels with layout-dependent energy trade-offs: TensorFlow's custom kernels are more energy-efficient under NCHW layout, while PyTorch's cuDNN grouped-conv kernels perform better under NHWC layout. We reported this trade-off to both PyTorch and TensorFlow developers, who have confirmed the issue.

### **6.4** Semantic Equivalence Matching

**Sensitivity.** We first measure the sensitivity of the semantic equivalence matching algorithm to its key parameter: the comparison threshold  $\varepsilon$ . We vary  $\varepsilon$  from 1e-7 to 0.2 and evaluate matching accuracy across two workloads: (1) GPT-2 inference (comparing Huggingface Transformers vs. vLLM) and (2) Stable Diffusion v3 model (comparing Diffusers vs. the reference implementation) using 10,000 identical inputs. We manually annotated the ground truth for subgraph equivalence to calculate F1 scores. Figure 8 demonstrates that






Figure 9: The efficiency of Magneton's semantic equivalence detection algorithm.

Figure 10: The overhead of Magneton's tracing module on Huggingface Transformers and vLLM

Op	Physical	Zeus		Magneton	
	Value	Value	Error%	Value	Error%
arange contiguou linear	266W as 317W 455W	73W 73W 88W	-72.5% -77.0% -80.7%	255W 311W 459W	-4.1% -1.9% +0.9%

Table 4: Power measurement methods and relative error rate for different operators.

Magneton is highly robust to parameter tuning: it maintains an F1 score above 0.8 across a wide magnitude of thresholds  $(10^{-4} \text{ to } 1.8 \times 10^{-2})$  and approaches 1.0 within the optimal range. This confirms that Magneton reliably identifies semantic equivalence without requiring precise, case-by-case threshold tuning.

Efficiency and Scalability. We evaluate the efficiency of Magneton's topology-aware matching algorithm against a strawman approach that employs heuristic search with pruning. Figure 9 compares the execution latency on computational graphs extracted from vLLM and Huggingface Transformers when serving GPT-2 and Llama-3-8B. On the GPT-2 graphs (vLLM: 757 nodes, Transformers: 408 nodes), Magneton identifies 71 pairs of equivalent subgraphs (average size: 8.2 nodes; max size: 27 nodes) in just 167ms. For the larger Llama-3-8B model, Magneton demonstrates better efficiency and scalability: while the brute-force approach times out after 5 minute due to combinatorial explosion, Magneton completes the matching in 1.4s. This confirms that our divide-and-conquer strategy effectively prunes the search space, making Magneton practical for larger systems and models.

### 6.5 Tracing and Profiling

**Overhead.** We first evaluate the runtime overhead introduced by Magneton's software tracing modules by comparing end-to-end latency with and without Magneton enabled. Using a mixed workload of 1 prefill request (128 tokens) and 128 decode requests, Magneton introduces minimal overhead: 4.4% for Huggingface Transformers and 5.9% for vLLM, as shown

in Figure 10. Additionally, the offline diagnosis module completes within 2 minutes for all evaluated cases. This low overhead demonstrates that Magneton can be deployed in production environments without significantly impacting system performance.

**Accuracy.** We then evaluate the accuracy of the Magneton's energy profiler under software replay mode. We analyze GPU kernel-level power measurement for energy consumption using three methods on testbed-A with a GPT-2 model (batch size 256, input length 128): (1) Magneton with physical power meter: we attach an Elmorlabs Power Measurement Device (PMD2) [12] with an instrumented PCIe riser to measure the ground truth power draw of the GPU; (2) Zeus [33], which uses NVML as its profiling backend; and (3) Magneton with operator-level replay. We evaluate three representative operators in PyTorch: aten::arange, aten::contiguous, and aten::linear. As shown in Table 4, Zeus exhibits high error rates ( $\tilde{8}0\%$ ) compared to the ground truth, while Magneton's replay approach achieves accuracy comparable to the physical measurement. This demonstrates that Magneton provides reliable energy consumption measurements in both hardwareaccessible and software-only deployment scenarios.

### 7 Related Work

Energy Consumption of ML. Previous work has focused on optimizing ML energy consumption through hardware tuning and model configuration. EnvPipe [6] and Perseus [7] leverage DVFS during pipeline bubbles, Zeus [33] combines adaptive batch sizing with DVFS, and DynamoLLM [24] explores parallelization strategies for LLM inference. While these systems achieve energy savings through model-level optimizations, Magneton targets operator-level software inefficiencies.

Differential Analysis Diffing has been broadly applied across diverse domains. In data systems, data diffing has been used for storage [17], computer networks [3, 4], and in-memory data structures [9], as well as in mobile applications [15]. Beyond data, execution-trace diffing has been exploited to detect deviations from expected behavior in systems, including failure diagnosis (Kairux [34], PeerPressure [30]) and mobile inefficiency (DiffProf [16]). Magneton extends this line of work by applying differential analysis of program traces with energy profiling to the larger and more complex setting of ML frameworks and applications.

Among them, prior work on detecting semantically similar code operates under assumptions that break in ML systems. Approaches like DiffProf [16] assume application behavior can be grouped as contiguous blocks of code or callgraph slices. DiffProf follows a bottom-up strategy: using dynamic execution traces to construct call-graph slices, which are treated as coarse-grained tasks for differential energy analysis. In ML systems, however, an operator's behavior spans Python code, C++ dispatch, GPU libraries, and dynamically

selected GPU kernels. Because these events are highly concurrent, asynchronous, and cross-layer, they cannot be easily grouped into stable code segments via bottom-up analysis. To address this, Magneton takes an operator-centric differential analysis. It first partitions the execution using ML operators as the semantic units. When Magneton detects energy inefficiency in an operator, it then examines the operator's source code and the control- and data-flow to diagnose how the operator is invoked and how it invokes underlying GPU kernels. Comparing Divergent Execution. The idea of leveraging divergent execution to locate root causes has been explored in systems like Kairux [34]. Kairux diagnoses failures by identifying the control-flow divergence point between failing and non-failing executions, isolating the minimal root cause. Magneton adapts this approach to the energy domain, using differential comparison of operator-level energy consumption to detect the root causes of energy inefficiencies.

### 8 Conclusion

Software-induced energy inefficiencies are a major but often overlooked source of waste in modern ML systems, and detecting and diagnosing these issues is highly challenging. We introduce Magneton, a differential energy profiler designed to uncover and localize the root causes of software energy waste. Magneton leverages differential energy debugging with fine-grained energy profiling and static analysis to pinpoint inefficient implementations, redundant operations, and misconfigurations. Our evaluation on nine state-of-the-art ML systems shows that Magneton not only diagnoses known energy inefficiencies but also discovers previously unknown issues, demonstrating its effectiveness in detecting and diagnosing energy waste at scale.

#### References

- [1] Pytorch ddp consuming more power for uneven data distribution.
- [2] Martín Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, et al. {TensorFlow}: a system for {Large-Scale} machine learning. In 12th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 16), pages 265–283, 2016.
- [3] Ashok Anand, Archit Gupta, Aditya Akella, Srinivasan Seshan, and Scott Shenker. Packet caches on routers: the implications of universal redundant traffic elimination. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2008 Conference on Data Communication*, SIGCOMM '08, page 219–230, New York, NY, USA, 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [4] Ashok Anand, Vyas Sekar, and Aditya Akella. Smartre: an architecture for coordinated network-wide redundancy elimination. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIG-COMM 2009 Conference on Data Communication*, SIG-COMM '09, page 87–98, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [5] AUTOMATIC1111. Stable Diffusion Web UI, August 2022.
- [6] Sangjin Choi, Inhoe Koo, Jeongseob Ahn, Myeongjae Jeon, and Youngjin Kwon. EnvPipe: Performancepreserving DNN training framework for saving energy. In 2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23), pages 851–864, Boston, MA, July 2023. USENIX Association.
- [7] Jae-Won Chung, Yile Gu, Insu Jang, Luoxi Meng, Nikhil Bansal, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. Reducing energy bloat in large model training. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 30th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '24, page 144–159, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] Jae-Won Chung, Jiachen Liu, Jeff J. Ma, Ruofan Wu, Oh Jun Kweon, Yuxuan Xia, Zhiyu Wu, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. The ml.energy benchmark: Toward automated inference energy measurement and optimization, 2025.
- [9] Anthony Cozzie, Frank Stratton, Hui Xue, and Samuel T. King. Digging for data structures. In *Proceedings* of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI'08, page 255–266, USA, 2008. USENIX Association.
- [10] cra.org. Energy and water development spending bill, 2025.
- [11] economist. Data centres improved greatly in energy efficiency as they grew massively larger, 2024.
- [12] ElmorLabs. Elmorlabs pmd2, 2025.
- [13] Hugging Face. Displaying carbon emissions for your model, 2023.
- [14] Roy Frostig, Matthew James Johnson, and Chris Leary. Compiling machine learning programs via high-level tracing. In *SysML conference 2018*, 2018.
- [15] Chanyou Hwang, Saumay Pushp, Changyoung Koh, Jungpil Yoon, Yunxin Liu, Seungpyo Choi, and Junehwa Song. Raven: Perception-aware optimization of power consumption for mobile games. In *Proceedings of the* 23rd Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, MobiCom '17, page 422–434, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.

- [16] Abhilash Jindal and Y Charlie Hu. Differential energy profiling: energy optimization via diffing similar apps. In 13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, 2018.
- [17] Purushottam Kulkarni, Fred Douglis, Jason LaVoie, and John M. Tracey. Redundancy elimination within large collections of files. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, ATEC '04, page 5, USA, 2004. USENIX Association.
- [18] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '23, page 611–626, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [19] Seyed Morteza Nabavinejad, Sherief Reda, and Masoumeh Ebrahimi. Batchsizer: Power-performance trade-off for dnn inference. In *Proceedings of the 26th Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference*, pages 819–824, 2021.
- [20] Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary, Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prethvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro, et al. Efficient large-scale language model training on gpu clusters using megatron-lm. In Proceedings of the international conference for high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis, pages 1–15, 2021.
- [21] 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, 2019.
- [22] Pratyush Patel, Esha Choukse, Chaojie Zhang, Aashaka Shah, Íñigo Goiri, Saeed Maleki, and Ricardo Bianchini. Splitwise: Efficient generative llm inference using phase splitting. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Interna*tional Symposium on Computer Architecture, ISCA '24, page 118–132. IEEE Press, 2025.
- [23] Google Research. Good news about the carbon footprint of machine learning training, 2022.
- [24] Jovan Stojkovic, Chaojie Zhang, Íñigo Goiri, Josep Torrellas, and Esha Choukse. Dynamollm: Designing Ilm inference clusters for performance and energy efficiency. In 2025 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), pages 1348–1362, 2025.

- [25] PyTorch Team. Pytorch profiler.
- [26] PyTorch Team. Pytorch ddp consuming more power for uneven data distribution, 2023.
- [27] PyTorch Team. Addmm is not always better than add + mm, 2024.
- [28] Stable Diffusion Forge Team. Misconfiguration of allow tf32 in stable diffusion, 2023.
- [29] Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Anton Lozhkov, Pedro Cuenca, Nathan Lambert, Kashif Rasul, Mishig Davaadorj, Dhruv Nair, Sayak Paul, Steven Liu, William Berman, Yiyi Xu, and Thomas Wolf. Diffusers: State-of-the-art diffusion models.
- [30] Helen J. Wang, John C. Platt, Yu Chen, Ruyun Zhang, and Yi-Min Wang. Automatic misconfiguration troubleshooting with peerpressure. In *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Symposium on Operating Systems Design & Implementation Volume 6*, OSDI'04, page 17, USA, 2004. USENIX Association.
- [31] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online, October 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [32] Zeyu Yang, Karel Adamek, and Wesley Armour. Accurate and convenient energy measurements for gpus: A detailed study of nvidia gpu's built-in power sensor. In SC24: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, pages 1–17, 2024.
- [33] Jie You, Jae-Won Chung, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. Zeus: Understanding and optimizing GPU energy consumption of DNN training. In 20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23), pages 119–139, Boston, MA, April 2023. USENIX Association.
- [34] Yongle Zhang, Kirk Rodrigues, Yu Luo, Michael Stumm, and Ding Yuan. The inflection point hypothesis: a principled debugging approach for locating the root cause of a failure. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, SOSP '19, page 131–146, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.

[35] Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Chuyue Livia Sun, Jeff Huang, Cody Hao Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Sglang: Efficient execution of structured language model programs. Advances in neural information processing systems, 37:62557–62583, 2024.