



**FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-
UNIVERSITÄT
JENA**

A Comparison of Different Algorithms for Sparse Einsum

BACHELOR THESIS

to be Awarded the Academic Degree

Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)

in Informatics

FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-UNIVERSITY JENA

Faculty for Mathematics and Informatics

Submitted by Leon Manthey

born on 31.10.1999 in Berlin

Supervisor: Mark Blacher

Jena, 15.05.2024

Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Fusce eleifend orci et venenatis cursus. Nullam eget ornare lacus. Donec non dolor non tellus eleifend vehicula. Sed et lorem lectus. Vestibulum sagittis sed nisi ac interdum. Duis nec accumsan velit, hendrerit malesuada magna. Aliquam erat volutpat. Cras eu ante nec est malesuada volutpat. Proin quis posuere quam. Etiam aliquam eros quis dui sagittis, a fermentum lectus rutrum. Nunc tempor mauris vel tellus facilisis rhoncus. Aliquam ut leo eget metus volutpat vestibulum. Nam non consequat ante. In rutrum felis in enim fringilla lacinia. Phasellus ut imperdiet risus. Curabitur tincidunt libero sed urna dignissim, eget rutrum felis scelerisque. Nunc ut convallis neque, non tincidunt nulla. Curabitur quis condimentum leo. Phasellus laoreet ligula vel mi commodo, id accumsan diam tristique. Maecenas euismod lorem in tempor iaculis. Orci varius natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Ut eget purus sem. Suspendisse venenatis aliquet dignissim. Integer turpis lorem, tempus non turpis et, gravida aliquet erat. Sed vel neque non ex ultrices vestibulum. Aliquam purus quam, rhoncus non ante at, convallis sagittis erat. Sed justo elit, vulputate vel accumsan non, porta eget turpis. Proin eget ultrices sem. Nunc eu velit.

Zusammenfassung

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Fusce eleifend orci et venenatis cursus. Nullam eget ornare lacus. Donec non dolor non tellus eleifend vehicula. Sed et lorem lectus. Vestibulum sagittis sed nisi ac interdum. Duis nec accumsan velit, hendrerit malesuada magna. Aliquam erat volutpat. Cras eu ante nec est malesuada volutpat. Proin quis posuere quam. Etiam aliquam eros quis dui sagittis, a fermentum lectus rutrum. Nunc tempor mauris vel tellus facilisis rhoncus. Aliquam ut leo eget metus volutpat vestibulum. Nam non consequat ante. In rutrum felis in enim fringilla lacinia. Phasellus ut imperdiet risus. Curabitur tincidunt libero sed urna dignissim, eget rutrum felis scelerisque. Nunc ut convallis neque, non tincidunt nulla. Curabitur quis condimentum leo. Phasellus laoreet ligula vel mi commodo, id accumsan diam tristique. Maecenas euismod lorem in tempor iaculis. Orci varius natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Ut eget purus sem. Suspendisse venenatis aliquet dignissim. Integer turpis lorem, tempus non turpis et, gravida aliquet erat. Sed vel neque non ex ultrices vestibulum. Aliquam purus quam, rhoncus non ante at, convallis sagittis erat. Sed justo elit, vulputate vel accumsan non, porta eget turpis. Proin eget ultrices sem. Nunc eu velit.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background	3
2.1	Tensors	3
2.2	Einstein Notation and Einstein Summation	4
2.3	Operations with Einsum	5
2.4	Tensor Contractions	5
3	Related Work	7
4	Algorithms	9
4.1	The SQL Algorithm	9
4.1.1	Portable Schema for Tensors	9
4.1.2	Mapping Einstein Summation to SQL	9
4.1.3	Optimizing Contraction Order	10
4.1.4	Implementation Details	11
4.2	The C++ Algorithm	11
4.2.1	Pre-Processing	11
4.2.2	Sparse BMM	13
4.2.3	Post-Processing	15
4.2.4	Implementation Details	15
5	Experiments	17
5.1	Random Tensor Hypernetworks	17
6	Discussion	21
6.1	Iterative Approach for Batch Matrix Multiplication (BMM) and Index Reordering	21
6.2	Precomputation of Diagonal Indices and Summed Indices	21
6.3	Memory Footprint Optimization via Multi Index Encoding	22
7	Conclusion	23

1 Introduction

Einstein notation is a powerful and compact notation for representing tensor expressions. It was introduced by Albert Einstein in the early 20th century in order to simplify tensor expressions in “The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity” [5]. Due to being brief but still comprehensive, Einstein notation has become a valuable tool in many fields such as physics, mathematics, and computer science.

The fundamental operation for evaluating tensor expressions presented in Einstein notation is Einstein summation, often referred to simply as “Einsum”. This operation allows for the calculation of various tensor expressions, including element-wise multiplications, dot products, outer products, and matrix multiplications. The predominant reason for the adoption of Einsum notation in numerous applications, ranging from machine learning to scientific computing, is its conciseness.

In many practical applications, especially in machine learning and scientific computing, the data involved is often sparse. In sparse tensors most values are zero. Handling sparse tensors efficiently requires specialized algorithms and data structures to avoid unnecessary computations and to save memory. Traditional libraries like NumPy [7] and other major artificial intelligence frameworks [11, 13] typically support Einstein summation for dense tensors, but not for sparse tensors. The only known library that aims to support Einsum operations on sparse tensors is Sparse [15]. However, like NumPy, Sparse only allows for a limited number of symbols to be used as indices, which is why we use `opt_einsum` [16]. `opt_einsum` is a package for optimizing the contraction order of Einsum expressions. More importantly for us though, `opt_einsum` can handle UTF-8 symbols and use Sparse and other libraries like Torch as a backend. Real Einstein summation problems often include expressions with hundreds or even thousands of higher order tensors. In order to express the aforementioned operations we require a large set of unique symbols. Thus, our approaches, just like `opt_einsum`, are capable of handling all symbols in the UTF-8 encoding.

This thesis explores the implementation and performance of Einstein summation across different computing paradigms, with a particular focus on sparse tensors. Specifically, it focuses on explaining our following implementations and comparing them to multiple libraries:

- **SQL-based Implementation:** This implementation is based on the algorithm presented in “Efficient and Portable Einstein Summation in SQL” by Blacher et al [1]. It constructs SQL queries dynamically using Python. While SQL is traditionally used for database operations, this approach demonstrates the ability of SQL in performing tensor operations.

- C++ Implementation: The second implementation is written in C++, with multiple versions ranging from naive to optimized approaches. The different versions aim to explore the performance trade-offs between simplicity and optimization, offering insights into how different coding strategies affect computational efficiency.

By comparing these implementations, we aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of the performance and scalability of sparse Einstein summation in diverse computing environments. The SQL-based implementation serves as a baseline for our implementations. It showcases the potential of database query languages for tensor operations. Furthermore, the C++ implementations show how low-level optimizations impact computational performance. The code for our implementations is available on GitHub at: <https://github.com/Lethey2552/Sparse-Einsum>.

We aim to determine the advantages and disadvantages of each approach by comparing our implementations against the sparse library Sparse and highly performance-tuned dense tensor libraries like Torch. This will help determine which approach is best for a given set of use cases and computational requirements. The goal of this effort is to provide researchers and practitioners in disciplines that significantly rely on tensor calculations with practical insights by expanding the understanding of tensor operations and their effective implementation.

2 Background

The following chapter serves to introduce the necessary background for tensors, Einstein notation and Einstein summation. Furthermore, we will provide various examples for operations that can be expressed using Einstein notation. Given the considerable overlap in topics, we will build on related literature [5], adapting and expanding it to meet our specific research requirements.

2.1 Tensors

Tensors are algebraic objects and a fundamental concept in mathematics, physics and computer science. They extend the idea of scalars, vectors and matrices to higher dimensions. In essence, a tensor is a multi-dimensional array with an arbitrary number of dimensions. Each dimension of a tensor is represented by an index with its own range. The number of indices is commonly referred to as the tensor's "rank" or "order." The size of a tensor is determined by the product of the maximum values of each index's range.

For example, consider a tensor T with indices i, j, k and corresponding ranges $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. The size of tensor T is calculated as follows: $2 \cdot 6 \cdot 4 = 48$. This means tensor T has a total of 48 elements. An example of a matrix A with indices i, j and a tensor A with indices i, j, k , both represented as a graph, can be seen in Figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: A matrix, a tensor and a tensor network visualized as a graph. Each index is represented by an edge. Shared indices in a tensor network are edges between nodes.

In this work, a tensor is simply a multidimensional array containing data of a primitive type. We differentiate between dense and sparse tensors.

Dense Tensors. Dense tensors have a significant number of non-zero entries. However, there is no exact threshold which determines whether a tensor is dense or sparse.

Sparse Tensors. In Sparse tensors most values are zero. They can greatly profit from specialized formats. For our tensor $T \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ in dense format we need to save $I \cdot J \cdot K$ values no matter whether they are zero or not. Now consider that, if the vast majority of T 's values are zero, we could only save the coordinates of the non-zero values, that is the index of the value for each dimension. This is what we call the coordinate (COO) format. A sparse tensor could be reduced to the COO format as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 & 10 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 \\ 2 & 0 & 5 \\ 2 & 3 & 10 \end{bmatrix}$$

Each row of the COO representation encodes a single value of the tensor with each column holding the position of the value for the corresponding dimension and the last column giving the actual value. This can be done for an arbitrary number of dimensions by simply adding more columns for their respective coordinates.

2.2 Einstein Notation and Einstein Summation

In 1916, Albert Einstein introduced the so called Einstein notation, also known as Einstein summation convention or Einstein summation notation, for the sake of representing tensor expressions in a concise manner. As an example, the contraction of tensors $A \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times M \times N}$ in Figure 2.1,

$$C_{ijmn} = \sum_k A_{ijk} \cdot B_{kmn}$$

can be simplified by making the assumption that pairs of repeated indices in the expression are to be summed over. Consequently, the contraction can be rewritten as:

$$C_{ijmn} = A_{ijk} \cdot B_{kmn}$$

To expand upon the expressive power of the original Einstein notation, modern Einstein notation was introduced. This notation is used by most linear algebra and machine learning libraries supporting Einstein summation, that is, the evaluation of the actual tensor expressions. Modern Einstein notation explicitly states the indices for the output tensor, enabling further operations like transpositions, traces or summation over non shared indices. In modern Einstein notation, the expression from the previous example would be written as:

$$A_{ijk} B_{kmn} \rightarrow C_{ijmn}$$

When using common Einstein summation APIs, tensor operations are encoded by using the indices of the tensors in a format string and the data itself.

The format string for the above operation would come down to:

$$ijk, kmn \rightarrow ijmn$$

In Modern Einstein notation, indices that are not mentioned in the output are to be summed over. For the sake of simplicity, we will from now on refer to Einstein summation as Einsum, and we will use the original, the modern notation or just the format string, depending on the context. For expressions with two tensors we will call the first tensor the left tensor and the second tensor the right tensor.

2.3 Operations with Einsum

Einsum is a powerful tool for performing various tensor operations. Table 2.1 shows some common operations that can be performed using Einsum.

Table 2.1: Example operations with Einsum.

Operation	Formula	Format string
Dot Product	$c = \sum_i a_i b_i$	i,i \rightarrow
Sum Over Axes	$b_j = \sum_i A_{ij}$	ij \rightarrow j
Outer Product	$C_{ij} = a_i b_j$	i,j \rightarrow ij
Matrix Multiplication	$C_{ij} = \sum_k A_{ik} B_{kj}$	ik,kj \rightarrow ij
Batch Matrix Multiplication	$C_{bij} = \sum_k A_{bik} B_{bkj}$	bik,bkj \rightarrow bij
Tucker Decomposition [14]	$T_{ijk} = \sum_{pqr} D_{pqr} A_{ip} B_{jq} C_{kr}$	pqr,ip,jq,kr \rightarrow ijk

These examples illustrate the versatility of Einsum in performing a wide range of tensor operations using a concise and readable notation, expressed as a format string. Note that while the examples provided are relatively simple, real-world Einstein summation problems may include thousands of tensors.

2.4 Tensor Contractions

Tensor contraction is the process of reducing one or multiple tensor's orders by summing over pairs of matching indices. Tensor networks where more than two tensors share an index are called tensor hypernetworks.

The contraction of the tensor hypernetwork $A \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times M \times N}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times L}$ in Figure 2.2,

$$T_{ijmnl} = \sum_k A_{ijk} \cdot B_{kmn} \cdot C_{kl}$$

in modern Einstein notation written as

$$ijk, kmn, kl \rightarrow ij mnl$$




Figure 2.2: A tensor hypernetwork.

can be calculated in different orders. Either way, it is possible to get the same result by contracting A and B first, followed by $(AB) \cdot C$, by contracting B and C and then $A \cdot (BC)$ or by contracting A and C , followed by $(AC) \cdot B$. While the result of the contraction orders will be the same, the underlying number of operations may differ vastly. As a result, the order in which tensors are contracted can drastically change the performance of an algorithm. We call this order the contraction path.

3 Related Work

Compared to the well-established methods for Einsum with dense tensors, Einstein summation with sparse tensors has received relatively little attention in the scientific community. Due to various tensor operations that can be expressed using Einsum notation, the underlying algorithms need to be able to handle many distinct computations. Here we introduce multiple approaches and ideas, contributing to the field of sparse Einsum.

Recent developments in integrating machine learning and linear algebra routines into databases have gained significant attention [3, 4, 9, 17]. One such approach is the translation of sparse Einsum problems into SQL queries [1]. The authors introduce four mapping rules and a decomposition scheme in which large Einsum operations are split into multiple smaller Einsum operations. In contrast to SQL-based approaches, the TACO compiler can translate known sparse linear algebra and tensor operations into optimized code directly [8]. While this produces optimized code for predefined problems with trivial contraction paths, it faces limitations in handling dynamic problems that are not known at compile time. TACO does not calculate an efficient contraction path, nor does it allow for the application of previously computed contraction paths. As a result other methods, capable of using optimized contraction paths outperform TACO, especially for large tensor expressions involving thousands of higher order tensors. Gray J. developed an Einsum function that calculates tensor expressions via a batch matrix multiplication (BMM) approach [6]. This method allows for the computation of pairwise tensor expressions by mapping them to BMMs, using summation over indices, transposition and reshaping of the tensors. A BMM approach for evaluating Einstein summation expressions is also employed by Torch within its tensor library Aten. Sparse, a library designed for operations on sparse tensors, implements an Einsum function [15]. However, when used alone, Sparse struggles with large tensor expressions due to its limitations in handling a high number of different indices. This limitation can be overcome by using Sparse as a backend for `opt_einsum`, a package that optimizes tensor contraction orders. Sparse utilizes Numba [10] to accelerate calculations; Numba is a just-in-time compiler that generates machine code from Python syntax.

4 Algorithms

In this chapter we present two algorithms for performing Einstein summation. First, we introduce our implementation of the four mapping rules developed in “Efficient and Portable Einstein Summation in SQL” [1], to generate SQL queries for solving Einsum problems. This will serve as a baseline to compare other algorithms against. Second, we explain our C++ implementations with multiple levels of optimization. The underlying algorithm of the C++ implementations builds on Torch’s strategy of mapping Einsum operations to a batch matrix multiplication kernel. Both algorithms, namely the algorithm for the SQL implementation and the algorithm used for the C++ versions, decompose large Einstein summation operations into smaller, pairwise operations to exploit efficient contraction paths.

4.1 The SQL Algorithm

In this section, we present Blacher et al.’s [1] algorithm and our implementation of it for mapping format strings and the corresponding tensors to SQL, enabling Einstein summation in databases. First, we introduce the portable schema for representing tensors, specifically sparse tensors, in SQL. We then show their four mapping rules to generate non-nested Einsum queries from arbitrary format strings. Next, we explain how we exploit efficient contraction paths by decomposing large Einsum queries into smaller parts. Finally, we present implementation details of the SQL algorithm.

4.1.1 Portable Schema for Tensors

Blacher et al. chose the COO format to represent tensors as it only uses integers and floating point numbers, which results in a vendor independent schema for encoding tensors across various database management systems (DBMS). For example, a 3D tensor $A \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J \times K}$ has the following schema:

$$A(i \text{ INT}, j \text{ INT}, k \text{ INT}, val \text{ DOUBLE})$$

Each tensor is stored in a separate table. In the example, table A stores a 3D tensor, where each value (*val*) can be addressed by specifying the corresponding indices (*i*, *j*, *k*).

4.1.2 Mapping Einstein Summation to SQL

“Efficient and Portable Einstein Summation in SQL” introduces four rules for mapping any tensor expression in Einstein notation to SQL.

R1 All input tensors are enumerated in the FROM clause.

- R2** The indices of the output tensor are enumerated in the SELECT clause and the GROUP BY clause.
- R3** The new value is the SUM of all values multiplied together.
- R4** Indices that are the same among input tensors are transitively equated in the WHERE clause.

Say we want to map the tensor operation given by $ik, k \rightarrow i$, a matrix-vector multiplication, with tensors $A \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times K}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^K$ and

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0 & 1.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 5.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} 4.0 \\ 1.0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

When applying all four rules to map the example tensor expression to SQL, we get the result seen in Listing 4.1.

Listing 4.1: Einstein summation in SQL.

<pre> WITH A(i, j, val) AS (VALUES (0, 1, 1.0), (2, 0, 5.0)), v(i, val) AS (VALUES (0, 4.0), (1, 1.0)) SELECT A.i AS i, SUM(A.val * v.val) AS val FROM A, v WHERE A.j=v.i GROUP BY A.i </pre>	<pre> -- matrix A -- vector v -- R2 -- R3 -- R1 -- R4 -- R2 </pre>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

While all four rules are needed to ensure every possible Einstein summation problem can be translated to SQL, for some tensor expressions the conditions to apply the rules R2 and/or R4 are not fulfilled. If there are no indices after the arrow in the format string, the output is scalar and does not require R2. Furthermore, if there are no common indices among the input tensors, there is no summation in the tensor expression and R4 can be omitted. The rules guarantee a correct mapping, not a mapping with minimal code size. In some cases, with additional checks, the SQL queries could be further simplified.

4.1.3 Optimizing Contraction Order

Mapping a tensor expression directly into a single, non-nested SQL query in Einstein notation is known to produce execution times that are far from optimal, especially for operations involving many tensors. The inefficiency stems from the fact that conventional query optimizers are unaware of the contraction order of the repeating indices within tensor expressions and are therefore incapable of effectively breaking down the query into smaller parts to exploit efficient contraction paths as described in Section 2.4.

One can get around this using intermediate tensors via subqueries or common table

expressions, which decomposes one large Einstein summation query into smaller pieces and lets the database engine follow a pre-defined contraction order. More precisely, using GROUP BY and SUM aggregation in intermediate computations enforces query engines to evaluate the query in the right order.

4.1.4 Implementation Details

We implemented the algorithm for mapping Einsum format strings to SQL queries proposed by Blacher et al. in Python 3.11.0 as a small package, only requiring Numpy as a dependency. When calling `sql_einsum_query()`, an Einsum notation string, the tensor names, and the tensor data have to be supplied. The path argument is optional. When not supplied with a path, an optimized contraction path is calculated using cgreedy [12]. The cgreedy package provides a greedy algorithm approach for finding an efficient contraction order for any given format string and associated tensors, utilizing multiple cost functions. The construction of the query is separated into two parts. The first part creates the tensors in COO format as SQL compatible structures and returns the appropriate query. The second part applies the decomposition schema, more precisely, it uses either the supplied or the calculated contraction path to build a contraction list. The entries of the contraction list dictate the order and the exact pairwise operations necessary to solve the Einstein summation problem. These subproblems are also specified in Einstein notation. To build the second part of the query, we iterate the contraction list and apply the four mapping rules from Subsection 4.1.2 to assemble the correct SQL strings for the given pairwise contractions. Finally, we merge the two generated query parts and return the complete query.

4.2 The C++ Algorithm

Our method expands on Torch’s strategy of mapping the Einstein summation problems to batch matrix multiplication (BMM). We give an overview of our approach that pre-processes tensors for pairwise operations, calculates the result via a sparse BMM and finally post-processes the result to fit the expected output format.

4.2.1 Pre-Processing

The pre-processing phase of the algorithm is critical for aligning the tensors in Coordinate List (COO) format with the requirements of batch matrix multiplication. In order to achieve predictable computations with the BMM, we apply the template seen in Figure 4.1. The indices of the two input tensors are grouped as follows:




Figure 4.1: The figure used by Gray J. [6] to describe the classification of indices used for the grouping. The left tensor has the index order (b, k_l, c, s_l) and the right tensor (b, c, k_r, s_r) .

Batch Indices (b)	All individual batch dimensions have to be combined into a single batch dimension.
Contracted Indices (c)	The dimensions over which the contraction takes place.
Summed Indices (s)	All indices that only have a single occurrence. Summed indices are grouped for both input tensors separately.
Kept Indices (k)	All indices and their dimensions that occur in only a single input tensor and in the output. Kept indices are grouped for both input tensors separately.

For our implementation we treat the removal of the summed indices as part of the pre-processing. This means the input tensors for the BMM only have index order (b, k_l, c) for the left term and (b, c, k_r) for the right term. For the COO format, since every index results in a column, the index order translates to the columns, followed by a last column for the value. To enable the use of this format we apply multiple pre-processing steps. First, the algorithm calculates appropriate format strings for the COO tensors. The format strings should align with the requirements of the BMM to ensure correctness and efficiency of the subsequent operation.

Besides computing the format strings, the algorithm computes the new shapes for the tensors. In doing so, this step will combine all batch, contracted and kept dimensions into one single dimension respectively and ignore dimensions not present in the format string. Precise computation of these new shapes is critical to ensure

that the tensors are aligned correctly for the BMM. The computed format strings are used to call a special, single Einsum function. This function performs Einstein summation on a single tensor, allowing for the computation of diagonals, summation over specified dimensions and the permutation thereof. The new shapes are used to reshape the tensors to comply with the dimensional requirements of the BMM. Both of these steps are only performed if necessary. The pre-processing will result in a COO tensor, which is suited for batch matrix multiplication.

4.2.2 Sparse BMM

The BMM computes the results in batches. In our case a batch only contains two elements. A COO tensors rows with the same batch index represent a two dimensional matrix in COO format. A batch contains the two matrices, one for each tensor, where the batch index is the same. Since the batch index of the matrices in a batch are the same and we compute the products within batches, we represent them without the batch index after selecting a batch. Say A and B are tensors with indices (b, k_l, c) for A and indices (b, c, k_r) for B . The multiplication for the COO tensors is performed using the following algorithm:

1. Get batches by interpreting rows of tensor A and B with the same batch index as COO matrices A' and B' . For each batch perform the following operations:
2. Transpose B' by swapping columns c and k_r and sorting the rows of B' by comparing column k_r 's entries followed by c 's entries.
3. Let a row of A' be represented as:

$$[k_l^i \quad c^i \quad v^i]$$

and a row of B' as:

$$[k_r^j \quad c^j \quad v^j]$$

where i and j are the row indices, and v^i and v^j are the corresponding values. For example, as shown in Figure 4.2, for $i = 3$ and $j = 2$ the rows are:

$$A' : [1 \quad 3 \quad 1.89], B' : [1 \quad 3 \quad 0.14]$$

Now, iterate through the rows of A' and B' . If $c^i = c^j$, compute and store:

$$[k_l \quad k_r \quad v^i \cdot v^j]$$

If the same indices already exist in the resulting matrix, sum their values and store the result.

4. Sort the rows of the resulting matrix first by column k_l and then by k_r .
5. Append the resulting COO matrix to the final tensor C with its batch index added as the first column $[b, k_l, k_r, v]$.
6. Repeat from 2. with next batch until all batches are done.

The final tensor is returned and can now be post-processed.

Step

$$\begin{aligned}
1. \quad A(b, k_l, c) &= \begin{bmatrix} b & k_l & c & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2.37 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.45 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 0.63 \\ 0 & 1 & 3 & 1.89 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1.13 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0.08 \end{bmatrix} & B(b, c, k_r) &= \begin{bmatrix} b & c & k_r & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.32 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 2.57 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1.45 \\ 0 & 3 & 1 & 0.14 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0.81 \end{bmatrix} \\
2. \quad A'(k_l, c) &= \begin{bmatrix} k_l & c & v \\ 0 & 0 & 2.37 \\ 0 & 1 & 0.45 \\ 1 & 2 & 0.63 \\ 1 & 3 & 1.89 \end{bmatrix} & B'(k_r, c) &= \begin{bmatrix} k_r & c & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0.32 \\ 0 & 1 & 1.45 \\ 1 & 3 & 0.14 \\ 2 & 0 & 2.57 \end{bmatrix} \\
3. \quad A'(k_l, c) &= \begin{bmatrix} k_l & c & v \\ 0 & 0 & 2.37 \\ 0 & 1 & 0.45 \\ 1 & 2 & 0.63 \\ 1 & 3 & 1.89 \end{bmatrix} & B'(k_r, c) &= \begin{bmatrix} k_r & c & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0.32 \\ 0 & 1 & 1.45 \\ 1 & 3 & 0.14 \\ 2 & 0 & 2.57 \end{bmatrix} \\
& \begin{bmatrix} k_l & k_r & v^i \cdot v^j \\ 0 & 0 & 2.37 \cdot 0.32 \\ 0 & 2 & 2.37 \cdot 2.57 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.45 \cdot 1.45 \\ 1 & 1 & 1.89 \cdot 0.14 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_l & k_r & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0.76 \\ 0 & 2 & 6.09 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.65 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.26 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} k_l & k_r & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0.76 + 0.65 \\ 0 & 2 & 6.09 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.26 \end{bmatrix} \\
4. \quad C'(k_l, k_r) &= \begin{bmatrix} k_l & k_r & v \\ 0 & 0 & 1.41 \\ 0 & 2 & 6.09 \\ 1 & 1 & 0.26 \end{bmatrix} \\
5. \quad C(b, k_l, k_r) &= \begin{bmatrix} b & k_l & k_r & v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.41 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 6.09 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0.26 \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4.2: An example of the sparse BMM algorithm for two tensors A and B for batch index 0. Since, in step 2 and 5, the tensors are already sorted, no additional sorting is required. For step 3 we color the rows used to compute C' with the same color.

Algorithm 1 Sparse Batch Matrix Multiplication with COO Tensors

Require: Tensors A, B

Ensure: Tensor C

```
1: Initialize  $C$  as empty
2: for each unique batch index  $b$  do
3:   Extract rows from  $A$  and  $B$  with batch index  $b$  as COO matrices  $A', B'$ 
4:   Transpose  $B'$ :
5:   Swap columns  $c$  and  $kr$  in  $B'$ 
6:   Sort rows of  $B'$  first by  $kr$ , then by  $c$ 
7:   Initialize a temporary COO matrix  $Temp$  as empty
8:   for each row  $(k_l^i, c^i, v^i)$  in  $A'$  do
9:     for each row  $(k_r^j, c^j, v^j)$  in  $B'$  where  $c^i = c^j$  do
10:      if row with indices  $(k_l^i, k_r^j)$  exists in  $Temp$  then
11:        Add  $v^i \times v^j$  to the existing rows value
12:      else
13:        Store  $(k_l^i, k_r^j, v^i \times v^j)$  in  $Temp$ 
14:      end if
15:    end for
16:  end for
17:  Sort  $Temp$ :
18:  Sort rows of  $Temp$  first by  $k_l^i$ , then by  $k_r^j$ 
19:  Append batch index and values to  $C$ :
20:  for each row  $(k_l^i, k_r^j, v)$  in  $Temp$  do
21:    Append  $(b, k_l^i, k_r^j, v)$  to Tensor  $C$ 
22:  end for
23: end for
24: return  $C$ 
```

4.2.3 Post-Processing

The result of the BMM may have to be post-processed to fit the contraction lists output specifications. The post-processing includes the reshaping of the three combined dimensions for the batch, contracted and summed indices into the required number of dimensions by treating each combined dimension as a multi-index and unraveling it. Furthermore, the final dimensions may be permuted by swapping the COO tensors columns to fit the correct output format. Again, both of these steps are only performed if necessary.

4.2.4 Implementation Details

We implemented the algorithm in Python 3.11.0 with the computation heavy parts written in C++.

5 Experiments

In this chapter, we compare five different methods—Sparse, SQL Einsum, Torch, Legacy Sparse Einsum, and Sparse Einsum—on different problems. First, we compare them on various random tensor hypernetworks and then, we evaluate their performance on five instances of the “Einsum Benchmark” [2] dataset.

5.1 Random Tensor Hypernetworks

In this section, we look at five different methods—Sparse, SQL Einsum, Torch, Legacy Sparse Einsum, and Sparse Einsum—on tensor sizes ranging from small to large. We generate Einsum problems by computing random tensor hypernetworks with a single varying parameter for each experiment. For each change of a parameter the results are evaluated using 10 differently seeded random tensor hypernetworks generated with identical parameters. We then evaluate each methods performance on the problem 10 times to get an average it/s.

First, we generate problems where we vary the maximum size of dimensions from 2 to 8. Figure 5.1 shows the performance for the different dimension sizes. The performance of all methods naturally decreases when the size of dimensions grows. However, the rate of this degradation differs significantly between the methods.




Figure 5.1: Performance of different methods vs maximum size of the dimensions. The plot shows the number of iterations per second for each method across varying dimension sizes.

Sparse performance decreases quickly when the maximum number of dimensions

that the tensors can have increases. It has the steepest decline of all the methods. In general, SQL Einsum is superior for larger maximum sizes of dimensions, although it also declines more steeply in comparison with both Sparse Einsum implementations and Torch, which are much more constant in performance. The SQL implementations iterations per second rise, when the maximum size of dimensions increases from 2 to 5 and from thereon decreases constantly with rising possible sizes for the dimensions. Sparse Einsum and the legacy version of Sparse Einsum demonstrated very similar trends, though the legacy variant was a little better at most dimension sizes than the newer implementation. This is likely due to the additional overhead introduced by parallelization, which only pays off when computing large, sparse tensors.

The results of Figure 5.2 illustrate how the computational performance of each method varies with increasing dimensionality in tensor hypernetworks. Sparse shows a rapid decline as dimensionality increases, becoming inefficient at higher dimensions. SQL Einsum exhibits an unusual pattern, performing poorly at low and high dimensions but peaking in the middle range. Torch remains relatively stable, handling dimensionality increases consistently well. Sparse Einsum initially declines but improves at higher dimensions, indicating resilience to complexity. Legacy Sparse Einsum follows a similar trend, with fairly stable performance across different dimensions, excelling at moderate to high dimensionality. Overall, Torch, Sparse Einsum, and Legacy Sparse Einsum handle the increasing dimensionality best, while SQL Einsum performs optimally at intermediate dimensions, and Sparse struggles the most with larger networks.




Figure 5.2: Performance of different methods as a function of the maximum number of dimensions. The plot shows the number of iterations per second for each method.

The plots in Figure 5.3 show each method’s performance as the number of tensors increases. Sparse starts off highest but declines sharply as the number of tensors grows, eventually becoming among the slowest methods. SQL Einsum is competitive at the start but also has a large drop-off. However, Torch displays stable perfor-

mance, gradually decreasing but remaining more efficient at higher tensor counts than Sparse and SQL. Sparse Einsum and Legacy Sparse Einsum started of lower than the other methods but perform much better than the others as the number of tensors increases. Both Sparse Einsum versions end up with slightly more iterations per second than Torch for larger number of tensors. SQL and Sparse show by far the largest performance degradation.




Figure 5.3: Performance of different methods as a function of the number of tensors. We stop the calculation early when a methods last data point is at less than 0.1 it/s.

6 Discussion

In this chapter, we discuss potential improvements to our algorithm, that could result in a better memory footprint or better performance.

6.1 Iterative Approach for Batch Matrix Multiplication (BMM) and Index Reordering

The current C++ implementation uses unordered maps to aggregate values from COO tensors. This is an inefficient way and can be slow for big tensors because it involves the maintenance of unordered maps. One such improvement can be using an iterative approach while performing the BMM. Because the contraction path delivers an unambiguous order for tensor operations, reordering indices to process tensors iteratively could grant high performance savings. Index reordering will enable the algorithm to just skip over portions of tensors already processed, hence avoiding useless computation. This approach uses the fact that, after processing a part of the tensor, it need not be visited again, and thus it traverses and processes tensor elements in a more efficient way. Not only does this decrease computational complexity, but it also avoids adding vast quantities of elements to a hash map.

6.2 Precomputation of Diagonal Indices and Summed Indices

The existing processing of tensor contractions incorporates all indices, diagonal and summed, during the actual pairwise tensor contractions. Often, this preprocessing is inefficient in that it contains computations for indices which are redundant, sometimes even able to be handled far more effectively before the main phase of contraction. One way of handling this inefficiency could be for the algorithm to traverse the contraction path, that essentially forms a binary tree structure. The tree could be traversed recursively from the root to the leafs to eliminate all diagonal indices and indices to be summed over before the actual computation. Furthermore, the indices could be rearranged to be fit the BMM's format. Such preprocessing makes it possible for the algorithm to handle only the required operations. When the main computation starts the aforementioned indices that can be removed can be processed in the first pass. Hence, extra steps are not required. By rearranging indices such that only required operations are made during the contraction phase, the algorithm can reduce the overall processing time along with the computational overhead.

6.3 Memory Footprint Optimization via Multi Index Encoding

One of the possible bottlenecks in the current implementation is that it consume a lot of memory while storing and tracking tensor indices in COO format. The current practice is to store each index separately, thus making it expensive in terms of memory usage for large tensors and high-order contractions. Extra performance gains could be attained by compressing a number of indices into a single index through multi-index encoding. For example, four 16-bit indices may be combined into a single 64-bit integer. Such compression would reduce the memory footprint and could further improve computational speed by allowing bit-wise operations on the combined index. That would complicate the tracking of the index, but the performance and memory efficiency savings could be quite big. In general, bit manipulation operations are significantly faster than the usual arithmetic operations.

7 Conclusion

We have constructed two new algorithms to solve sparse Einstein summation problems for tensor networks, one that generates SQL queries to solve Einsum problems and another one mapping the pairwise contraction operations into batch matrix multiplication with an efficient C++ backend. Our design shows significant improvements in solution for large and complex Einsum problems by utilizing sparse data structures along with their corresponding optimized strategies of computation. We have compared our methods through experiments against existing contraction algorithms, which show that they are very competitive, particularly for sparsity and computation time. We will further improve our C++ implementation and memory efficiency and include the ability to treat even larger tensor networks by higher-order contractions and denser tensors in the future.

Bibliography

- [1] Mark Blacher et al. “Efficient and Portable Einstein Summation in SQL”. In: *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1.2 (2023).
- [2] Mark Blacher et al. *Einsum Benchmark*. https://github.com/ti2-group/einsum_benchmark. 2024.
- [3] Mark Blacher et al. “Machine Learning, Linear Algebra, and More: Is SQL All You Need?” In: *Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research*. 2022.
- [4] Len Du. *In-Machine-Learning Database: Reimagining Deep Learning with Old-School SQL*. 2020. arXiv: 2004.05366.
- [5] Albert Einstein. “Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”. In: *Annalen der Physik*. Vierte Folge Band 49 (1916). pp. 781–782, pp. 769–822.
- [6] Johnnie Gray. *einsum_bmm*. https://github.com/jcmgray/einsum_bmm. 2024.
- [7] Charles R. Harris et al. “Array programming with NumPy”. In: *Nature* 585.7825 (2020), pp. 357–362.
- [8] Fredrik Kjolstad et al. “The tensor algebra compiler”. In: *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 1.OOPSLA (2017).
- [9] Arun Kumar, Matthias Boehm, and Jun Yang. “Data Management in Machine Learning: Challenges, Techniques, and Systems”. In: *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data*. SIGMOD ’17. 2017, pp. 1717–1722.
- [10] Siu Kwan Lam, Antoine Pitrou, and Stanley Seibert. “Numba: A llvm-based python jit compiler”. In: *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on the LLVM Compiler Infrastructure in HPC*. 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [11] Martín Abadi et al. *TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Systems*. 2015. URL: <https://www.tensorflow.org/>.
- [12] Sheela Orgler and Mark Blacher. *Optimizing Tensor Contraction Paths: A Greedy Algorithm Approach With Improved Cost Functions*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.09644.
- [13] Adam Paszke et al. “PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library”. In: *CoRR* abs/1912.01703 (2019).
- [14] Elina Robeva and Anna Seigal. *Duality of Graphical Models and Tensor Networks*. 2017. arXiv: 1710.01437.
- [15] Matthew Rocklin and Hameer Abbasi. *Sparse 0.15.4*. <https://github.com/pydata/sparse>. 2024.

- [16] Daniel G. a. Smith and Johnnie Gray. “opt_einsum - A Python package for optimizing contraction order for einsum-like expressions”. In: *Journal of Open Source Software* 3.26 (2018), p. 753.
- [17] Ce Zhang et al. “DeepDive: declarative knowledge base construction”. In: *Commun. ACM* 60.5 (2017), pp. 93–102.



Eigenständigkeitserklärung

1. Hiermit versichere ich, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit - bei einer Gruppenarbeit die von mir zu verantwortenden und entsprechend gekennzeichneten Teile - selbstständig verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt habe.
Ich trage die Verantwortung für die Qualität des Textes sowie die Auswahl aller Inhalte und habe sichergestellt, dass Informationen und Argumente mit geeigneten wissenschaftlichen Quellen belegt bzw. gestützt werden. Die aus fremden oder auch eigenen, älteren Quellen wörtlich oder sinngemäß übernommenen Textstellen, Gedankengänge, Konzepte, Grafiken etc. in meinen Ausführungen habe ich als solche eindeutig gekennzeichnet und mit vollständigen Verweisen auf die jeweilige Quelle versehen. Alle weiteren Inhalte dieser Arbeit ohne entsprechende Verweise stammen im urheberrechtlichen Sinn von mir.
2. Ich weiß, dass meine Eigenständigkeitserklärung sich auch auf nicht zitierfähige, generierende KI-Anwendungen (nachfolgend „generierende KI“) bezieht.
Mir ist bewusst, dass die Verwendung von generierender KI unzulässig ist, sofern nicht deren Nutzung von der prüfenden Person ausdrücklich freigegeben wurde (Freigabeerklärung). Sofern eine Zulassung als Hilfsmittel erfolgt ist, versichere ich, dass ich mich generierender KI lediglich als Hilfsmittel bedient habe und in der vorliegenden Arbeit mein gestalterischer Einfluss deutlich überwiegt. Ich verantworte die Übernahme der von mir verwendeten maschinell generierten Passagen in meiner Arbeit vollumfänglich selbst.
Für den Fall der Freigabe der Verwendung von generierender KI für die Erstellung der vorliegenden Arbeit wird eine Verwendung in einem gesonderten Anhang meiner Arbeit kenntlich gemacht. Dieser Anhang enthält eine Angabe oder eine detaillierte Dokumentation über die Verwendung generierender KI gemäß den Vorgaben in der Freigabeerklärung der prüfenden Person.
Die Details zum Gebrauch generierender KI bei der Erstellung der vorliegenden Arbeit inklusive Art, Ziel und Umfang der Verwendung sowie die Art der Nachweispflicht habe ich der Freigabeerklärung der prüfenden Person entnommen.
3. Ich versichere des Weiteren, dass die vorliegende Arbeit bisher weder im In- noch im Ausland in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form einer anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt wurde oder in deutscher oder einer anderen Sprache als Veröffentlichung erschienen ist.
4. Mir ist bekannt, dass ein Verstoß gegen die vorbenannten Punkte prüfungsrechtliche Konsequenzen haben und insbesondere dazu führen kann, dass meine Prüfungsleistung als Täuschung und damit als mit „nicht bestanden“ bewertet werden kann. Bei mehrfachem oder schwerwiegendem Täuschungsversuch kann ich befristet oder sogar dauerhaft von der Erbringung weiterer Prüfungsleistungen in meinem Studiengang ausgeschlossen werden.

Jena, 21/08/2024

Ort und Datum



Unterschrift