

A ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

We present additional results for our sampling and mixture studies. As observed in the main body of the paper, the positive trends we observe for 3 bpc weaken for 4 bpc allocations.

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate				Ember2 Bit Error Rate			
	LA	FLA	LA+AC	FLA+AC	LA	FLA	LA+AC	FLA+AC
25%	11.0 \pm 1.4%	11.0 \pm 1.4%	11.0 \pm 1.4%	11.0 \pm 1.3%	10.0 \pm 1.2%	10.0 \pm 1.2%	9.8 \pm 1.1%	11.0 \pm 1.1%
50%	10.0 \pm 0.88%	10.0 \pm 0.88%	9.3 \pm 0.57%	9.1 \pm 0.48%	11.0 \pm 0.77%	11.0 \pm 0.77%	8.8 \pm 0.86%	9.3 \pm 0.83%
75%	9.4 \pm 0.65%	9.4 \pm 0.65%	8.6 \pm 0.4%	8.4 \pm 0.37%	9.5 \pm 0.53%	9.5 \pm 0.53%	8.0 \pm 0.43%	7.9 \pm 0.35%
90%	9.1 \pm 0.41%	9.1 \pm 0.41%	8.1 \pm 0.012%	8.1 \pm 0.012%	9.8 \pm 0.92%	9.8 \pm 0.92%	7.8 \pm 0.33%	7.8 \pm 0.41%
100%	9.1%	9.1%	8.1%	8.1%	9.0%	9.0%	7.7%	7.6%

Table 7: Effect of dataset size on ECC overhead in level allocation (3 bpc).

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate			Ember2 Bit Error Rate		
	LA	FLA	LA+AC	LA	FLA	LA+AC
25%	3.8 \pm 0.17%	4.1 \pm 0.35%	3.7 \pm 0.1%	4.0 \pm 0.14%	4.4 \pm 0.21%	3.9 \pm 0.082%
50%	3.6 \pm 0.22%	4.1 \pm 0.26%	3.6 \pm 0.17%	3.9 \pm 0.13%	4.3 \pm 0.22%	3.7 \pm 0.12%
75%	3.7 \pm 0.19%	3.9 \pm 0.12%	3.5 \pm 0.11%	3.9 \pm 0.15%	4.2 \pm 0.16%	3.8 \pm 0.11%
90%	3.6 \pm 0.1%	4.0 \pm 0.09%	3.5 \pm 0.11%	3.8 \pm 0.12%	4.2 \pm 0.2%	3.7 \pm 0.12%
100%	3.6%	3.7%	3.6%	3.7%	4.0%	3.5%

Table 8: Effect of dataset size on bit error rate (BER) in level allocation (4 bpc).

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate			Ember2 Bit Error Rate		
	LA	FLA	LA+AC	LA	FLA	LA+AC
25%	32.0 \pm 1.1%	32.0 \pm 1.1%	32.0 \pm 0.68%	34.0 \pm 0.97%	34.0 \pm 0.97%	33.0 \pm 0.54%
50%	31.0 \pm 1.4%	31.0 \pm 1.4%	31.0 \pm 1.1%	33.0 \pm 0.84%	33.0 \pm 0.84%	32.0 \pm 0.74%
75%	32.0 \pm 1.2%	32.0 \pm 1.2%	31.0 \pm 0.73%	33.0 \pm 0.99%	33.0 \pm 0.99%	32.0 \pm 0.63%
90%	31.0 \pm 0.67%	31.0 \pm 0.67%	31.0 \pm 0.76%	33.0 \pm 0.77%	33.0 \pm 0.77%	32.0 \pm 0.78%
100%	32%	32%	31%	32%	32%	31%

Table 9: Effect of dataset size on ECC overhead in level allocation (4 bpc).

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate								Ember2 Bit Error Rate							
	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR	FLA+AC	FLA+AC+FR	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR	FLA+AC	FLA+AC+FR
100/0	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	8.1%	8.1%	8.1%	8.1%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	7.7%	7.6%	7.6%	7.6%
50/50	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.6%	9.1%	9.6%	9.2%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	8.6%	8.6%
10/90	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	12.0%	11.0%
0/100	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	11.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%	12.0%

Table 10: Interchip level allocation (3 bpc) comparison on ECC overhead. A mix of $x/y = x\%$ target chip's dataset plus $y\%$ from another chip.

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate						Ember2 Bit Error Rate					
	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR
100/0	3.6%	3.5%	3.7%	3.7%	3.6%	3.5%	3.7%	3.7%	4.0%	3.9%	3.5%	3.5%
50/50	3.6%	3.6%	4.1%	4.2%	3.7%	3.5%	4.3%	4.3%	5.5%	5.1%	3.9%	3.9%
10/90	4.1%	4.0%	4.4%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	4.8%	4.6%	5.3%	5.3%	4.3%	3.9%
0/100	4.0%	4.1%	4.2%	4.9%	4.1%	4.1%	5.1%	5.0%	5.5%	5.3%	4.7%	4.4%

Table 11: Interchip level allocation (4 bpc) comparison on bit error rate (BER). A mix of $x/y = x\%$ target chip's dataset plus $y\%$ from another chip.

Dataset	Ember1 Bit Error Rate						Ember2 Bit Error Rate					
	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR	LA	LA+FR	FLA	FLA+FR	LA+AC	LA+AC+FR
100/0	32.0%	32.0%	32.0%	32.0%	31.0%	30.0%	32.0%	32.0%	32.0%	32.0%	31.0%	31.0%
50/50	31.0%	31.0%	31.0%	31.0%	32.0%	31.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	36.0%	33.0%	33.0%
10/90	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%	35.0%	34.0%	39.0%	39.0%	39.0%	39.0%	36.0%	33.0%
0/100	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%	34.0%	35.0%	41.0%	41.0%	41.0%	41.0%	38.0%	36.0%

Table 12: Interchip level allocation (4 bpc) comparison on ECC overhead. A mix of $x/y = x\%$ target chip's dataset plus $y\%$ from another chip.

B ADDITIONAL PSEUDOCODE

Additionally, we present pseudocode for both of our heuristic improvements, i.e., our FindAllCliques and FlexibleRefine subroutines.

B.1 FindAllCliques

Algorithm 2 FindAllCliques pseudocode.

```
1: function FINDALLCLIQUES( $G, n, \epsilon$ )
2:    $\gamma = \text{LEVELALLOC}(n, \epsilon)$ 
3:    $Cands = \text{CANDIDATEGEN}(\gamma)$ 
4:    $Cliques = \text{FINDMAXIMALCLIQUES}(G)$ 
5:    $BestBER = 1, BestClique = \text{None}$ 
6:   for  $c \in Cliques$  do
7:     if  $\text{SIZE}(c) == n$  then
8:        $Levels = \text{SORTED}(\text{List}(c))$ 
9:        $BER = \text{GETBERFROMALLOC}(Levels)$ 
10:      if  $BER < BestBER$  then
11:         $BestBER = BER, BestClique = Levels$ 
12:   return  $BestClique$ 
13:
14: function CONSTRUCTGRAPH( $Cands$ )
15:    $G = \text{INITIALIZEGRAPH}()$ 
16:   for  $node \in Cands$  do
17:      $G.\text{ADDNODE}(node)$ 
18:   for  $CandPair \in \text{COMBINATIONS}(Cands, 2)$  do
19:     if  $\text{Not IsOVERLAP}(CandPair)$  then
20:        $G.\text{ADDEDGE}(CandPair)$ 
21:   return  $G$ 
```

B.2 FlexibleRefine

Algorithm 3 FlexibleRefine (FR) pseudocode.

```
1: function FLEXIBLEREFINE( $L, n$ )
2:   for  $i \in [0, \dots, \text{LEN}(L)]$  do
3:      $MinBer = \text{GETBER}(L, n)$ 
4:      $MinBoundary = L[i][xh]$ 
5:     for  $j \in [L[i][xh] + 1, \dots, L[i+1][xl]]$  do
6:        $L[i][xh] = L[i+1][xl] = j$ 
7:        $BER = \text{GETBER}(L)$ 
8:       if  $BER < MinBER$  then
9:          $MinBoundary = j$ 
10:         $MinBER = BER$ 
11:       $L[i][xh] = L[i+1][xl] = MinBoundary$ 
12:   return  $L$ 
```
