

The EDGE Language: Extended General Einsums for Graph Algorithms

TOLUWANIMI O. ODEMUYIWA, JOEL S. EMER, and JOHN D. OWENS

In this work, we propose a unified abstraction for graph algorithms: the Extended General Einsums language, or EDGE. The EDGE *language* expresses graph algorithms in the language of tensor algebra, providing a rigorous, succinct, and expressive mathematical framework. EDGE leverages two ideas: (1) the well-known foundations provided by the graph-matrix duality, where a graph is simply a 2D *tensor*, and (2) the power and expressivity of Einsum notation in the tensor algebra world. In this work, we describe our design goals for EDGE and walk through the extensions we add to Einsums in order to support more complex operations common in graph algorithms. Additionally, we provide a few examples of how to express graph algorithms in our proposed notation. Our hope is that a single, mathematical notation for graph algorithms will (1) allow researchers to more easily compare different algorithms and different implementations of a graph algorithm; (2) enable developers to factor complexity by separating the concerns of *what* to compute (described with the extended Einsum notation) from the lower level details of *how* to compute; and (3) enable the discovery of different algorithmic variants of a problem through algebraic manipulations and transformations on a given EDGE expression.

1 INTRODUCTION

From fraud detection in banks [69, 79], to our familial, social and professional connections [44, 49], to analyzing how various proteins impact disease expression [10], graphs—or *networks*—are ubiquitous in our daily lives and the infrastructure of society. A graph is an abstract data structure that captures data entities and the complex connections between them.

Graph algorithms have been fundamental to answering questions about this data, allowing analysis that focuses on the relationship between various entities. Given a specific problem (e.g., find the connected components or communities within a graph), there may typically be numerous algorithmic alternatives *and* even a variety of choices for realizing the chosen algorithm as a software implementation or hardware module. For example, the well-studied weakly connected components problem—with algorithmic solutions earlier than 1973 [40]—has grown to have hundreds of algorithms and implementations, each with its own time and space complexity. Researchers and developers continue to discover new algorithms and specific implementations for well-studied algorithms even today [26, 54]. Even the problem of finding the shortest path to all other entities in a graph given a starting point (single-source shortest path)—often considered a well-solved problem—still yields new implementations [25].

To invent a new algorithm, researchers often “think really hard” to determine the high-level steps. Algorithms are then lowered to the implementation level, where a software developer or hardware designer may iterate on the implementation multiple times to optimize for runtime or energy efficiency. Both algorithmic development and software or hardware implementation are hard; **is there a way to systematically think about inventing algorithms and implementing solutions?**

Additionally, different graph frameworks describe their implementations in imprecise natural language or pseudocode, at times using different terminology and program structure even when describing the same algorithm. Moreover, most graph frameworks focus on highly performant implementations for a single target backend, with abstractions that do not enable fully exploring the algorithmic and implementation space. This makes it difficult to directly compare different

implementations, iterate on an implementation, and port one implementation from one environment to another. **Is there a unified way of thinking about and expressing an implementation?**

An ideal approach to graph algorithms breaks down the problem into smaller pieces, each of which tools or developers can individually explore. Overall, **is there a way to further factor the complex graph problem space into several, smaller concerns?** Such an approach will enable developers to focus on specific aspects of a graph solution, transforming the design space into a tunable space with several degrees of freedom.

In this work, we propose the use of *Einsums* or tensor algebra notation to represent graph algorithms. We extend Einsum notation to express graph algorithms, thus providing a unified way to approach graph problems. Our inspiration is from the tensor algebra research space, where researchers have successfully found a unifying abstraction for tensor computations, which in turn enabled several works that systematically explore the implementation space by factoring the tensor computation space into smaller subproblems. In tensor algebra, extended Einsum notation is a powerful language for expressing tensor algebra computations. Einsums essentially act as a *declarative* language, expressing *what* needs to be computed. Tools leveraging Einsums specify *how* computation occurs outside the Einsum, as a separate specification [47, 61, 65].

The Tensor Algebra Space. We use the adjective “extended” to refer to the notation used by the programming language, compiler, and accelerator modeling community (e.g., TACO [47], Timeloop [65], and TeAAL [61]), as distinguished from the traditional mathematical expressions used in multilinear algebra, which includes the fields of statistical mechanics [32], quantum chemistry [77], Ricci calculus [52, 91], and tensor contraction theory [77], among others. For brevity, in this paper we will generally drop the “extended” word in “extended Einsums”, and refer to this programming language/compiler/modeling community as the “tensor algebra world.” Einsums are the language that enables the compiler and modeling tools to precisely describe the computations present in the mathematical field of multilinear algebra.

In this work, we aim to cast graph problems to the space of tensor algebra. We propose a unified abstraction for graph algorithms: the Extended General Einsums language, or EDGE. The *EDGE language* expresses graph algorithms in the language of tensor algebra, providing a rigorous, succinct, and expressive mathematical framework. EDGE leverages two ideas: (1) the well-known foundations provided by the graph-matrix duality, where a graph is simply a 2D *tensor*, and (2) the power and expressivity of Einsum notation in the tensor algebra world.

In this paper, we highlight our language design goals, then walk through how we extend traditional Einsums to express graph algorithms, with examples throughout. As much as possible, our extensions stay within the tensor machinery, a departure from GraphBLAS which uses *linear* algebra computations within the larger context of an imperative program (see Section 4). Our extensions enable expressing the following: (1) user-defined data values and types; (2) initialization of tensors; (3) generic user-defined operators that express computation between two tensor values (map, Section 5.3.1), reduction of values (reduce, Section 5.3.2), and the (potentially filtered) assignment of the output tensor (populate, Section 5.3.3); (4) a separation of computations on graph entities/tensor coordinates (merge, Section 5.4) from graph values/tensor data (compute, Section 5.4); (5) iterative algorithms (Section 5.6); and (6) constraints that represent when particular computations occur based on certain conditions (rank variable expressions, Section 5.8).

The notation and abstractions presented in this paper are the foundation of a larger *EDGE framework*, where the presented notation is the declarative, precise specification of what needs to be computed. The EDGE language allows us to leverage the separation of concerns found in tensor algebra, decoupling *what* we want to compute from the various concerns of *how* we compute it. Developing this framework is future work, but in it, we hope to do the following: given an




Fig. 1. Uncompressed 2D tensors, A and B , where locations containing zero are empty. This also shows the *tensor data spaces* of A and B , which are the set of data values at each coordinate of each tensor.

EDGE expression, at the next level of concern, we can algebraically manipulate these Einsums (via substitution, reassociation, induction, etc.) to generate new variations of the original Einsum. Next, we can explore the mapping space in terms of loop nest order, data tiling, parallelism, and other loop transformations. Using Einsums allows us to leverage prior tensor algebra tools such as TACO [47], Timeloop/Sparseloop [65, 84], and TeAAL [61] to explore the mapping space. Given an Einsum, mapping, data format, architecture, and binding specifications, we can then implicitly or explicitly *bind* the computation to hardware execution—either as generated code or for hardware performance estimations [61, 84]. Mapping, data format, architecture and binding specifications all aid in specifying *how* compute occurs in space and time. Finally, by separating out *what* we compute from *how* we compute, EDGE has the potential to target different backends.

Overall, such an end-to-end extended Einsum framework will:

- (1) Provide a precise, elegant, and expressive abstraction to describe graph problems.
- (2) Enable explorations (with the potential for automation) of different graph algorithm and implementation choices. These explorations are based on algebraically manipulating Einsum expressions and exploring the mapping space.
- (3) Enable the separation of platform-dependent and platform-independent implementation choices, such that a single platform-independent layer can target multiple backends that map to different systems (including accelerators, CPUs, and GPUs).

Again, we note that different parts of this framework we leave to future work. The goal of this paper is to present the first stage of the framework: the extensions to Einsums to enable the expression of graph algorithms as tensor algebra.

2 PRELIMINARIES

This section briefly describes relevant graph and tensor algebra terminology.

2.1 Graph Algorithms

A graph describes relationships between entities. Suppose we have a graph, G . It contains two entities: its *vertex set* ($G.V$) and its *edge set* ($G.E$) [23]. V is the set of all vertices in the graph, $|V|$ is the number of vertices in the graph, and E is the set of all edges. A vertex or node, v , in a graph, is an entity possibly connected to other vertices by an edge, e .



(a) The two possible fibertree representations of A .(b) The two possible fibertree representations of B .

Fig. 2. Fibertree representations of the uncompressed tensors in Figure 1.

We describe an undirected edge, $e \in E$, by an unordered set of vertices $s \in V, d \in V$, with the edge connecting vertices s and d . A directed edge is a tuple of ordered vertices, $(s \in V, d \in V)$, with the edge starting from s and ending at d . The starting point of an edge (s) is a *source* or *parent* vertex, while the ending point (d) is a *destination* or *child* vertex.

A given graph may be directed or undirected, where we can also describe an edge in an undirected graph as two directed edges: (s, d) and (d, s) . A graph may also be unweighted or weighted. An *unweighted* graph assumes all edges have a cost, or “weight” of one, while a *weighted* graph stores a quantity on each edge. A *node-weighted* graph assigns weights to each of its vertices. Finally, a graph may be dynamic; that is, its structure changes with time. This may include a changing vertex set, edge set, edge weights, and/or node weights [34].

Several graph algorithms require a form of *graph traversal*, where the neighbors of a vertex are successively explored [1, 18, 57, 60]. The *active vertex/edge set*, or *frontier*, refers to the subset of nodes and/or edges that are actively participating in the graph computation at a particular step in time [75, 82]. To explore the ideas between graph algorithms and tensor algebra, in this paper we will use breadth-first search (BFS), a graph traversal algorithm, as a running example. BFS iteratively

finds all vertices reachable from a starting node, recording the depth at which each vertex is found. In BFS, all vertices at a particular depth are discovered before any vertex with a larger depth.

2.2 Tensors

Tensor algebra describes computations between *tensors*, which are multidimensional views of data. We employ the term *rank* for the axes or indices of a given tensor [61]. Thus, a 3D tensor has three ranks, a 2D tensor (or matrix) has two ranks, a 1D tensor (or vector) has one rank, and a 0D tensor is simply a scalar. Let $A_{k,m}$ be a 2D tensor named A . It has two ranks, M and K , each indexed by *coordinates* m and k . The *shape* of a rank is the maximum number of coordinates possible in that rank. We assume the rank name is a variable that contains its shape, and by convention is specified in upper case. The coordinate that indexes into a rank has the same variable name in lowercase. Thus, for example, coordinate m ranges from 0 to $M - 1$ unless otherwise specified. The *shape* of a tensor is the total maximum size of the tensor along each of its ranks. Thus, A has a shape of $M \times K$. We refer to the total number of non-zeros (nnz) in the tensor as its *occupancy*. The example tensor A in Figure 1 has an occupancy of 3, while B has an occupancy of 4. We often describe tensors in terms of their densities: a *dense* tensor has full or nearly full occupancy, while a *sparse* tensor has low occupancy—a few nnz values relative to the shape of the tensor.

The preceding terminology refers to abstract characteristics of a tensor; however, tensor algebra applications need to store the data in memory. Traditionally, dense tensors are stored in an *uncompressed* format: the memory location of each value matches its coordinate order. Sparse tensors present an opportunity to reduce storage, by using *compressed* data formats such as Compressed Sparse Row/Column (CSR/CSC), Coordinate Format (COO), and Compressed Sparse Fiber (CSF) [76], amongst others [19].

To abstract away formatting details, we adopt the *fibertree* terminology described by Sze et al. [80, Chapter 8], with further details provided in the excellent fibertree description of Nayak et al. [61, Section 2.1]. A fibertree is a format-agnostic representation of a tensor. A *fiber* goes beyond the concepts of rows and columns in linear algebra to denote the set of entries for a particular rank for any N -dimensional tensor. Each element in a fiber consists of a coordinate in the rank and its payload. The payload consists of a reference to the next-level fiber or a leaf data value [61]. The fibertree admits $N!$ possible representations, one for each possible *rank order* of the tensor. The rank order refers to “the order of levels” in the fibertree, going from top to bottom [61]. To change the rank order of a tensor, one must apply *rank swizzling* to the tensor. Figures 2a and 2b show example fibertrees for tensors A and B , and their corresponding representations when rank-swizzled.

Fibers with empty leaf values do not appear in the fibertree. For example, in Figure 2a the fiber $m = 2$ in A is empty. Likewise, the M fiber at $k = 1$ is also empty and thus does not appear in the fibertree representation (see swizzled representation in Figure 2a). Additionally, the *position* of a tensor value is its ordering in a zero-based numbering of the tensor’s non-zero values, under a specific rank order. For example, the value at coordinate $(1, 2)$ of tensor A , in Figure 1, has a position of 2, when following an M -major *rank order* (k varies faster than m).

A *point* refers to a specific location in a tensor, identified by its coordinate tuple. For example, point $(k = 0, n = 1)$ in B (Figure 1) contains the data value of 2. Point $(k = 0, m = 0)$ in B contains the data value of 0. A *region* refers to a set of points in a tensor. For example, the region of $(k = 0, m = :)$ refers to the entire $k = 0$ fiber. The region of $(:)$ refers to the points of the entire tensor. Thus, a point is a specific instance of a region.

A tensor creates a *tensor data space*, which is the space spanned by all possible points in a tensor. The Z tensor has a tensor data space of $[0, M) \times [0, N)$, consisting of all possible (m, n) tuple points, where m and n can each range from $[0, M)$ and $[0, N)$. For brevity, we drop the range when describing the tensor data space; thus, Z has a tensor data space of $M \times N$. Likewise, A and B have

Table 1. Tensor Terminology, expanded from Odemuyiwa et al. [62, Table 1].

Name	Description
tensor	a multidimensional view of data
coordinate	the logical index of a value or fiber
position	ignoring zero values, the index of a non-zero value or fiber under a specific rank ordering
rank order	the “major-order” in which elements are laid out in memory
point	the tuple of coordinates identifying a specific location
region	a tuple of coordinates identifying a set of points
occupancy	number of non-zero elements within a fiber or tensor
uncompressed format	the position of each value matches its coordinate order




Fig. 3. A directed graph, G , and some representations. The matrix values contain the edge ID, while the vertices are labelled alphabetically.

tensor data spaces of $M \times K$ and $N \times K$, respectively. A *projection* into the tensor data space retrieves the corresponding value at a given point or region in the tensor.


We have found this abstraction useful in describing transformations on tensors, such as partitioning, without worrying about the format-specific implementations for those transformations [41, 61, 62]. Table 1 summarizes some key tensor terminology.

2.3 From Graphs to Tensors


The matrix-graph duality [46] allows us to represent a graph as a 2D tensor. Figure 3 shows a graph and some of its various representations. As with tensors, we can leverage the format-agnostic fibertree semantics to describe graphs—and other data structures—without considering *how* they are stored in memory (Figure 4).

3 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORKS

Implementing a solution to a graph problem requires considering a large, complex problem space. As an example, consider breadth-first search (BFS), where implementations often decide between using a top-down (push), bottom-up (pull), or a hybrid, direction-optimized approach. Push-BFS first discovers neighbors of vertices in the frontier, then determines if those neighbors have been visited. Pull-BFS checks the set of all unvisited vertices, and determines if their parents are in the frontier. A hybrid approach selects between the two approaches depending on the size of the frontier and the number of unvisited nodes at the current iteration. In addition to deciding the overall algorithmic approach, developers must also decide which data structures to use for the graph, frontier, and any other data. Each choice impacts performance: for example, a graph stored using



(a) Here, we express G as a tensor where the leaf values contain edge IDs.



(b) Here, we express G as a tensor where vertex IDs are now numerical and the leaf values indicate whether there is an edge connecting vertex s to vertex d , where T is True and F (the empty value) is False.

Fig. 4. The example graph in Figure 3 as two different fibertrees.

a CSR representation will have sequential access to the neighbors of a vertex, but many random accesses when finding the parents of a vertex. Meanwhile, an uncompressed representation of the graph will take up more storage in memory, but provide efficient random accesses. Other aspects to consider when considering a graph solution include: deciding computation order; the “unit of computation” [21] including vertex-centric [55, 56] or edge-centric [73, 86, 88, 90] computations; parallelization and load-balancing strategies [15, 63, 64, 82]; how to partition the graph [21, 56, 87]; and the target platform (CPU, GPU, FPGA, etc.).

In the graph world, the dominant approach is to first implement a baseline solution, observe its performance, then update the baseline solution by changing different design aspects. A developer iterates on this process until the implementation achieves the desired performance. Most often, this approach does not separate graph algorithms from scheduling the computation of that algorithm, making full exploration of the combined design space a significant challenge.

Researchers have recognized this challenge with work that more efficiently searches the space of possible implementations. For instance, GraphIt [87], a graph framework for shared-memory systems, provides a menu of options for users (the schedule) after a user specifies the high-level

Table 2. Selected works in the tensor algebra space and the concerns on which they expand. Works are sorted by date of publication.

	Representing the Workload	Enabling Algebraic Manipulations	Representing the Mapping Space	Exploration of the Mapping Space	Representing the Data Format	Exploring the Format Space	Representing the Architecture	Exploring Architectures	Performance Modeling	Software Implementation
TACO [47]	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra		X		X					X
Timeloop [65]	Dense Tensor Algebra		X	X			X		X	
Maestro [50]	DNN		X	X			X		X	
GAMMA [43]	DNN		X	X					X	
Sparseloop [84]	Sparse Tensor Algebra				X		X		X	
CoSA [42]	DNN								X	
Mind Mappings [37]	Dense Tensor Algebra			X					X	
CIN-P Autoscheduler	Sparse Tensor Algebra		X	X						X
WACO [83]	Sparse Tensor Algebra			X		X				X
LoopTree [30]	Dense Tensor Algebra		X				X		X	
DOSA [39]	DNN			X				X		
TeAAL [61]	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra, Cascades of Einsums		X			X	X		X	
EDGE Language (This Paper)	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra, Graph Algorithms	X			←----- Enabled for graph algorithms through EDGE ----->					

description of the graph algorithm. However, this is specific to shared-memory systems, and does not fully cover all the options in the complex problem space. G2 [15] extends GraphIt to support a GPU backend. We view many of the proposed, GPU-specific optimizations in G2 as platform-independent mapping choices in the Einsum framework.

When dealing with a complex problem space, a common design philosophy is *separation of concerns*. In this approach, designers factor the problem space into smaller, manageable subproblems that can be independently solved.

The tensor algebra space has successfully leveraged a separation-of-concerns design philosophy to factor its problem space into manageable parts. It has also incorporated sparse tensor algebra into this philosophy, despite the additional complexity introduced by the irregular nature of sparse tensor workloads. In order to leverage the separation-of-concerns approach already established in that field, we map graph algorithms to tensor algebra. We now turn to the different concerns on which tensor algebra tools focus.

3.1 Factoring Complexity in Sparse Tensor Algebra

In the sparse tensor algebra accelerator space, the design process involves using block diagrams, natural language, or pseudocode to describe the algorithm and model the architecture, followed by a custom simulator for evaluation, then an attempt at comparing to prior work [61]. Features such as the sparse tensor format are ingrained into the architecture; for example, the MatRaptor [78] accelerator relies on its custom C^2SR data format (CSR/CSC-like) to mine parallelism, making it difficult to directly compare it with accelerators that are built around other data formats. Even iterating over a design requires starting over at the algorithmic and modeling phase [61]. Likewise, there is a similar pattern in the tensor algebra software space: given a tensor algebra problem, application developers often plunge directly into a highly performant, low-level implementation [47, 48]. This mirrors the approach used by graph developers.

Different works within the large space of work in this area focus on different aspects: (1) expanding the set of concerns, (2) enabling expressivity of a particular concern, or (3) exploring the design space enabled by the separation of concerns. Figure 5 shows our view of the complex tensor algebra space. Starting with a problem specification, an implementation must somehow optimize over the space of possible tensor algebra representations (algebraic space), over different architectures, over different data formats, and over different space-time mappings. To factor complexity, prior




Fig. 5. Our view of the complex design space in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes indicate *processes* (searching the space), white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs to the system. Given a problem, a tensor algebra implementation must try to optimize across the possible data formats, possible algebraic variants of the computation, and the mapping space, as well as selecting the best architecture. Tools tend to either model performance (for domain-specific accelerators), or generate platform-specific code. The results may be used to search for better points in the implementation space.




Fig. 6. One common approach to factoring the design space in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes with side borders indicate *processes*, plain shaded boxes indicate *specifications* for a concern, while white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs. Tools search subspaces to select a point within that space (e.g., a mapper selecting a mapping), then pass the selected point to the next subspace to inform its search (e.g., given a mapping, select the best data format).

tensor algebra tools separate out the concerns, representing each concern with a specification or language (Figure 6). Rather than searching the complex space in Figure 5, various tools can now explore searching different points in the subspaces of each concern (see Figure 6). EDGE expands on this concept by extending Einsums to support graph algorithms. Now, in the domain of tensor algebra, most problems map to a single algorithm that solves that problem. The graph world is different. Even the most fundamental problems (e.g., finding the depth of each vertex from a single source vertex) have various algorithmic variants (e.g., push vs. pull BFS, or a variant that deletes edges from the graph [31, 86]). Thus, our work differs from tensor-algebra systems in adding




Fig. 7. An instance of a factored design space with our extended general Einsums for graph algorithms. EDGE introduces another concern to the factored space: algebraic manipulation of the Einsums. The algebraic manipulator produces a new Einsum that produces the same result as the original, input Einsum. By casting graph problems as extended Einsums, we can leverage the existing problem space found in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes with side borders indicate *processes*, solid gray boxes indicate *specifications* for a concern, while white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs.

one more concern—algebraic manipulation. Our hypothesis—and experience—is that the different algorithmic variants that may solve a particular problem are algebraically equivalent, and that algebraic manipulation starting with one algorithmic variant can allow us to find both existing and novel new variants.

We believe there are two aspects to the separation-of-concerns philosophy:

- (1) What are the concerns? Then, given a concern, how does one *specify* the concern?
- (2) Since the problem has been factored into smaller subproblems, how does one *search* the new, factored space for efficient implementations?

With these in mind, we can now explore the different concerns of tensor algebra. These concerns will also apply to our characterization of graph computation as Einsums, and thus we will be able to leverage the insights from the tensor algebra community—and the corresponding separation of concerns—in graph computation.

3.1.1 Concern: What is the computation? An English description of a problem is often imprecise. For example, suppose the problem description is “do a linear projection of a set of vectors in one space to a set of vectors in another space”. Rather than this, within the tensor algebra community, the convention is to describe what to compute in precise and succinct notation called Einstein summations, or Einsums. Originally proposed by Einstein [27], Einsums since been extended by the tensor algebra community. The traditional Einsum for the above problem description (i.e. matrix-matrix multiplication) is:

$$Z_{m,n} = \sum_{k=0}^K A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n} \quad (1)$$

Current extended Einsum notation—or tensor index notation [47]—drops the \sum :

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n} \quad (2)$$

Although Einsums of this form have existed for several years (see NumPy [35] and PyTorch [66]), we recently formalized an *operational definition of an Einsum* (ODE) that describes how to evaluate a given expression [61, Section 2.2].

Previously we noted that each tensor has its own data space (its *tensor data space*, see Section 2.2). We define two new spaces for an Einsum *expression*, which (possibly) involves multiple tensors: the *Einsum expression data space* (abbreviated to “data space”), and the *iteration space*. The *Einsum expression data space* is simply the set of the *tensor data spaces* of all tensors involved in the Einsum expression. In Equation (2), this data space is the set of tensor data spaces of Z , A , and B ($[0, M] \times [0, N]$, $[0, M] \times [0, K]$, $[0, N] \times [0, K]$).

The *iteration space* is the set of all possible coordinate tuples across all tensors in an Einsum expression. We assert that the coordinate variables that compose the iteration space originate from the variables in the subscripts of an Einsum expression. Thus, Equation (2) specifies an *iteration space* of $[0, M] \times [0, K] \times [0, N]$, where indices m , n and k each range from $[0, M]$, $[0, K]$, and $[0, N]$, respectively. For each (m, n, k) point in the iteration space, evaluating this Einsum requires projecting into the Einsum’s *data space*—which in turn is a projection into each *tensor data space*—and retrieving/writing the corresponding values in the input/output tensors. The Einsum multiplies these values, placing the result in the corresponding output location in the output tensor, Z . The Einsum reduces—through addition—the computed (multiplied) values that map to the same output m, n point in Z .

The Einsum itself relates the iteration space to the data space. Coordinate expressions in the subscripts of an Einsum indicate *how* each iteration space point maps to a data space point (see Section 5.8). For example, the following expression shifts the input values by one:

$$Z_m = A_{m+1}, \quad (3)$$

In Equation (3), the Einsum expresses a projection into the data space of A , where for each m point in the iteration space, an implementation must access both the $m + 1$ point in A ’s data space (due to the coordinate expression of $m + 1$), and the m point in Z ’s data space. The iteration space here is $[0, M]$, and the data space consists of the tensor data spaces of Z ($[0, M]$) and A (also $[0, M]$). Due to the coordinate expression, however, this computation will never access the A_0 data point. Additionally, if a projection maps to a point in the data space that does not exist—for example, when $m = M - 1$, the corresponding data space point of $A_{(M-1)+1}$ (or simply, A_M) is out of bounds on A —we assume a returned value of 0.

Overall, (1) the iteration space expresses the set of all possible point tasks for a given Einsum, (2) the data space expresses the set of possible memory locations that the execution may access, and (3) the Einsum expresses the mapping from the iteration space to the data space.

This operational definition determines if a particular expression or extension to Einsums is valid (see Section 4). To execute any Einsum, our operational definition specifies that the implementation must (1) walk each point in the iteration space; (2) for each point, retrieve the corresponding values in the data space; (3) perform the pairwise computation indicated by the right-hand side of the Einsum (e.g., multiplication); (4a) place the corresponding result of computation (for that point) in the output tensor indicated on the left-hand side of the Einsum; and (4b) when multiple computations map to the same output point, *reduce* them using the specified operator (e.g., addition).

An Einsum simply specifies *what* computation to perform, and not *how* to perform that computation (e.g., the order in which to walk the iteration space). Thus, the Einsum could also be written as

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \times B_{k,n}, \quad (4)$$

because coordinate order does not matter.

Instead, iteration order is left to a different concern: *mapping* [65]. We leave other aspects of *how* computation occurs in space and time to other concerns such as mapping, data format selection, and binding to a specific architecture (see Figure 6). In fact, Einsums enable a separation of concerns.

Tools such as Halide [71] use Einsum-like expressions to declaratively represent the computation, then represent the aspects of how computation occurs into other concerns. EDGE builds on this operational definition, adding extensions that denote constraints that optimize computation (see Section 5.4).

Prior Work: Extending Einsum Notation. To specify their workloads, both TACO [47] and Timeloop [65] use Einsums together with additional workload specifications such as tensor shapes. Timeloop extends this concept to allow *affine* coordinate expressions, which broaden the scope of expressible computations to include (for example) convolution. For instance, the following expression indicates a 1D convolution with a window size of S [61]:

$$Z_q = I_{q+s} \times F_s, \quad (5)$$

where the iteration space is $Q \times S$ and a reduction occurs over s . Sparseloop [84], an analytical model for sparse tensor algebra accelerators, in addition to Einsums, adds workload specifications for sparsity. Finally, our prior work TeAAL [61] introduces the concept of a *cascade of Einsums*, which represents problems as a directed acyclic graph (DAG) of Einsum expressions. In EDGE, these will appear as a sequence of sub-Einsum expressions. This is particularly relevant for graph problems that are composed of multiple computational steps.

3.1.2 Concern: How do we walk the iteration space? The next step after specifying an Einsum is to specify a *mapping*—how to walk the iteration space in both logical space and time. A common approach is to lower the Einsum to an abstract loop nest program such as HiFiber [2, 61], then explore various ways to transform that loop nest. For example, both TACO [47] and Timeloop [65] represent the mapping space as a series of nested loop nests, either using the polyhedral model [47] or with a custom specification language [65]. However, the loop nest approach does not adequately capture the space-time aspects of computation, such as uneven distributions of computation across space or time. Works like Maestro [50] adopt a *data-centric* approach to representing the mapping space, which enables a description of mapping aspects such as multicasting data and pipelining computations [50].

Our current approach derives from TeAAL [2, 61], which adopts a loop nest paradigm; however, future work will explore adopting a more data-centric mapping approach to better accommodate graph algorithms on architectures like GPUs.

Prior Work: Defining the Mapping Space. One aspect of work in this area is defining the mapping space and the types of eligible transformations to go from one mapping to another. There are two aspects to mapping: transformations on the *data* and transformations on the *iteration space*. Transformations on data take the input tensor(s) and rearrange their layout in memory or at runtime in some way. For example, swapping the ranks of a tensor (rank-swizzling), reordering values, or partitioning the data into chunks all constitute data transformations. Nayak et al. separate out transformations on data as *content-preserving transformations* [61]. Transformations on the iteration space describe how to walk the iteration space, such as processing particular points in parallel or sequentially, walking in a particular order, or dividing the iteration space into parallel chunks that are then each processed sequentially.

The mapping space for *dense* tensor algebra is well-supported due to compilation support for dense loop nests [9, 47, 89], including dependency analysis [14] and polyhedral analysis [5, 14, 51, 68]. On the other hand, *sparse* tensor algebra presents new challenges, all stemming from the idea that an efficient implementation should not need to touch every point in the iteration space but instead only those points in the iteration space that map to non-zero values in the data space [47].

Additionally, there is the added complexity of accessing various sparse storage formats, each of which have different access costs.

```

for m1 in range(0, M1):
  for n1 in range(0, N1):
    for k1 in range(0, K1):
      for m0 in range(0, M0):
        for n0 in range(0, N0):
          for k0 in range(0, K0):
            Z[M0 * m1 + m0, N0 * n1 + n0] +=
              A[M0 * m1 + m0, K0 * k1 + k0] *
              B[K0 * k1 + k0, N0 * n1 + n0]

```

Fig. 8. An example mapping for tiled dense matrix-matrix multiplication.

Prior Work: Searching the Mapping Space. Different mappings have different implications on temporal and spatial locality, reuse, and overall performance. For example, suppose we have a three-deep sequential loop nest for dense matrix-matrix multiplication (GEMM), without any tiling. Equation 2 represents the Einsum for this computation. There are six different possible mappings. The mappings with m and n in the outer loop nests are output-stationary, i.e., they enable perfect reuse on the output tensor. However, they have poor reuse and temporal locality on the input tensors, where values in A and B are accessed N times and M times, respectively. To improve reuse across the input tensors, an implementation may choose to tile the tensors [36, 62]. Figure 8 shows an example tiled GEMM loop nest. By adding a level of tiling, we increase the shape of the iteration space to $M1 \times N1 \times K1 \times M0 \times N0 \times K0$. This also increases the number of possible mappings (based on loop order alone) to ninety! We calculate this number by counting the number of possible tiled GEMM loop nests, each with a different ordering. This does not account for the possible choices for tile sizes, or the possible choices on which loop levels should be parallel or sequential.

Thus, a huge space of tensor algebra work focuses on how to explore the enumerable mapping space based on a cost model. Techniques include manually searching the space [61], and automated searches such as random search [65], integer linear programming [42], genetic algorithms [43], neural networks [37], and asymptotic cost analysis [4]. Note that several of these require some concept of the underlying architecture, including the number of memory levels and compute levels in the memory and compute hierarchies.

3.1.3 Concern: How is data stored? Performance is closely tied to the data format of tensors. Since the operands in an Einsum are simply an algebraic abstraction of a tensor, they do not themselves indicate *how* the tensors are stored in memory. Choosing a data format requires considering the costs for iterative access, random access, and insertion or deletion of values. Chou et al. provide a format abstraction that describes each rank of a tensor as a level-based format [19], and integrate this into the TACO compiler as a format specification language. In this model, each rank level has encoding choices, including dense, compressed, singleton, range, and hashed [19, 84], among others. For example, a format specification for the A tensor may indicate that m is uncompressed, and k is

compressed. This, in turn, maps to a CSR data format [19]. These abstractions have been adapted in subsequent tensor algebra work [36, 61, 62, 65, 84].

3.1.4 Concern: What is the architecture? To allow an implementation to execute on different architectures, the tensor algebra accelerator community defines separate *architecture specifications*. First introduced with Timeloop [65], an architecture specification indicates the available accelerator compute units, on-chip network information, and memory hierarchy.

3.1.5 Concern: How do we bind computation? Software frameworks take the first three concerns (Einsum, Mapping, and Format) and compile them into platform-specific code [48]. The accelerator community, however, has an additional concern, called *binding*, where mapping and data choices are bound to physical hardware units like memory modules or compute units [30, 61, 65, 84]. A binding specification describes which data components reside at each storage level, how data is accessed (eagerly or lazily [61]), and how long data can reside there [61, 67]. For computation units, binding specifies the computation allowed on each compute component in the architecture specification.

3.2 A Complex Optimization Space

Figure 5 shows the intertwined design space of tensor algebra, where, ideally, an optimizer can look at the combinatorial space of concerns and select the best design point. As mentioned earlier, this is too complex, hence tensor algebra tools have instead focused on separating concerns and exploring the optimization space within those concerns (Figure 6). Given a problem, the standard process is to provide a specification for each of the concerns and interfacing logic that understands each of the concerns, then combining them to generate a (hopefully) performant implementation. The accelerator community focuses on modeling performance in hardware. A designer can then go on to synthesize a domain-specific accelerator, but now, iterating on the design involves simply changing one of the concerns. Meanwhile, the software community focuses on compiling to platform-specific code, but now, iterating on an implementation involves changing the specifications of one of the concerns.

More recently, tools are trying to now search over multiple concerns to generate better design points. WACO [83] is a co-optimizer that searches the design space by taking into account both mapping *and* data format, while DoSA [39] co-optimizes by searching both the mapping space and the architecture space. Table 2 shows prior work and the concerns on which they focus.

3.3 Graph Algorithms to Tensor Algebra

Our work, EDGE, seeks to extend Einsum notation to support graph algorithms. The matrix-graph duality is a well-known concept in the graph algorithm community. *Graph theory* focuses on transforming graph problems into linear algebra problems by leveraging this duality, where linear algebra concepts like matrix decomposition, matrix inverses, and eigenvectors become relevant [20]. Our work does not focus on this aspect.

Our work is closer to GraphBLAS, which provides a framework for implementations built using high-performance building blocks based on linear algebra primitives [45, 46]. However, GraphBLAS does not separate concerns to the extent of tensor algebra tools: instead, in GraphBLAS, imperative variables are combined with linear algebra expressions and computations do not operate on tensors beyond 2D matrices. Additionally, unlike our EDGE notation, GraphBLAS intertwines computation on vertex and edge entities with computations on their features (see Section 5.4).

In our case, Einsum notation is strictly used as a *language* or specification for graph algorithms, with certain rules (see Section 3.1) on how the language can be manipulated. By using Einsums, we can leverage the separation of concerns found in tensor algebra, and the corresponding space of

work in that area. If such a systematic approach can be used for graph algorithms, it will unlock a new space of principled design exploration and analysis of this problem domain. To enable this, we *extend* Einsums so that we can fully express various graph algorithms as tensor algebra computations. We hope that future graph systems using our advances will leverage existing tensor algebra systems, whose tools will need to support searching a problem space that allows general user-defined datatypes and computations (Section 5.2), exploring algebraic variants of the Einsum (Section 8), and incorporating optimizations based on computations occurring on coordinates (Section 5.4).

4 WHY EXTEND EINSUMS FURTHER?

While current Einsum notation is expressive, graph algorithms introduce new challenges that are not fully addressed by current notation. Current Einsums do not fully denote, among other aspects, (1) user-defined computations beyond semirings, (2) user-defined data values, (3) partial updates of tensors, or (4) recursive and iterative computations.

We extend the language of Einsums with the following goals in mind:

- (1) The language should enable a separation of concerns.
- (2) Every extension to Einsums must adhere to the operational definition of an Einsum (see Section 3.1.1).
- (3) As a direct consequence of design goal 2, the extensions should still support traditional tensor algebra computations enabled by existing tools (e.g., TACO [47], TeAAL [61] and Timeloop [65]). In this way, we hope to leverage prior work in the tensor algebra space.
- (4) Where possible, the language should expose key optimization opportunities to an underlying compiler or modeling tool. Moreover, there should be as few restrictions as possible on a compiler processing the EDGE language.
- (5) At the same time, the language should be as simple and elegant as possible, while precisely describing the computation.
- (6) The language should be expressive and powerful enough to capture *as many as possible* graph algorithms of interest.
- (7) The language should enable transformations between equivalent expressions in clear, distinct steps.

In addition to these main design goals, we also have the following lower-priority goals that we pursue only if they do not conflict with our primary goals:

- (8) The language should “look” like mathematics as much as possible.
- (9) Where possible, one should be able to apply traditional mathematical rules when manipulating EDGE expressions (see **design goal 7**).
- (10) While aiming for expressivity, our goal is *not* to be a general-purpose programming language. However, we hope to better express other traditionally irregular applications using EDGE, for example (but not limited to) sparse LU factorization (a step commonly used to reorder graphs [29]), various sorting algorithms, and common parallel primitives such as prefix-sum.

The EDGE language is our answer to these design goals. While EDGE targets graph algorithms, we believe it will also potentially enable the succinct and precise description of computations beyond the scope of graph algorithms, including transformers, matrix decomposition, and general neural network applications. Finally, we hope this work will help bridge the tensor algebra community with the graph community. In the following sections, we describe the EDGE language and when possible, indicate where we factor in specific design goals.

5 EDGE FEATURES

BFS is one of the simplest graph algorithms to understand and analyze, and is the basis of other, more complex algorithms [23]. We now walk through different aspects of the EDGE language, building the notation and extensions to Einsums step-by-step, with BFS as the running example (see Section 2). Note that EDGE expressions remain valid regardless of the density/sparsity of the involved tensors. We present the final, full BFS EDGE specification near the end of this section (BFS Example 11).

Overall, EDGE consists of the following features:

- Specifications for user-defined data values and types and any empty value (see Section 5.1, **design goal 6**)
- Specifications to indicate how a user wants to initialize tensor values (Section 5.1.2, **design goal 6**)
- Specifications for generic user-defined operators (Section 5.2, **design goal 6**) enabled through map, reduce, and populate actions (Section 5.3, **design goals 2, 5, 6**)
- A separation of merge operations (operations on entities) from compute operations (operations on attributes) (Section 5.4, **design goals 2, 5, 6**)
- Enables iteration and recursion (Section 5.6, **design goals 1, 2, 5, 6**)
- A special *populate* action to handle more complex output updates (Section 5.7, **design goal 6**)
- Rank variable expressions to enable conditionals and constraints on the iteration space (Section 5.8, **design goal 6**)

5.1 What is the problem we are solving?

Before specifying the algorithm, we need to understand the problem: what are the inputs and the outputs? What do they mean? This concern corresponds to the “data properties” portion of “workload specs” in Figures 6 and 7.

BFS Example Part 1: BFS Problem Description

The problem specification (in English) for BFS is:

- Input: An unweighted graph with $|V|$ vertices and $|E|$ edges.
- Input: An initial set of starting vertices, which we will call the input *frontier*, along with their starting depths.
- Output: The set of vertices reachable from the input frontier, and the corresponding depths for each vertex.

5.1.1 Tensor Declarations. We begin by defining the tensors used in a computation. The EDGE language provides a separate specification for properties of involved tensors, indicating:

- (1) The input and output tensor names.
- (2) For each tensor, its corresponding *rank names* and *rank shapes*. To distinguish between the *rank names* of a tensor and *accessing* these ranks, we call the lower case subscripts (rank accesses) *rank variables*. Rank names are indicated by superscripts. In any subsequent Einsum expression, the rank variables refer to accessing these ranks, which must be listed in the same order as the rank names, regardless of the rank variable names. Since rank names/variables can be multi-lettered, we use commas to delineate rank names and rank variables in a list of rank names/variables: e.g., $G_{sm,dm}$ contains two rank variables *sm* and *dm*.

- (3) For each tensor, its *datatype* and *empty value*. While tensor algebra data is nearly always numerical, graph algorithms use a wider range of datatypes, including tuple datatypes and key-value labels used in property graphs [6, 70]. Thus, in EDGE, we allow any user-defined datatype beyond the traditional types of integers, floating points, and Booleans used by tensor algebra [47, 65]. EDGE also allows any value (not just zero) to indicate “empty”. Identifying the empty value exposes an optimization opportunity (**design goal 4**), where a sparse tensor can compress away *empty* values, instead of just zero values (Section 2.2). This extension is also supported in prior works [16, 24, 38].

BFS Example 2 provides an example for BFS.

BFS Example Part 2: BFS Declaration Specification in EDGE

▷ Tensors

$$G^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (6a)$$

$$F^{S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty \quad (6b)$$

$$P^{D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty} = \text{False} \quad (6c)$$

Equation (6) defines three tensors: G (for the graph), F (for the frontier), and P (for the set of visited nodes). Rank S in G has a shape of $|V|$, that is, it has a coordinate for every vertex in the graph. Likewise, rank D has a shape $|V|$. Each possible coordinate in S refers to all the possible source vertices and each possible coordinate in D refers to all the possible destination vertices. The frontier, F , and the set of visited nodes, P , are both 1D tensors, with shapes equal to the number of vertices in the graph. The integer value of F indicates the current depth at which BFS finds the corresponding vertex (indicated by the S coordinate). The Boolean value of P indicates whether BFS has visited the corresponding vertex. F has an empty value of ∞ for vertices not yet discovered, and P has an empty value of `False` (Equations (6a)–(6c)).

Overall, we assume $G_{s,d}$ contains a weight value of 1 whenever an edge exists between vertices s and d , and 0 otherwise. Here, the s, d subscripts indicate a *rank access* or reference into the tensor; that is, a projection into the G data space to retrieve the values at data point (s, d) .

Tensor F_s represents the active set of source vertices (the “frontier”). At a given s point in F , its *value* is either empty if s is not in the active set, or its integer depth count otherwise. P_d is a Boolean tensor that indicates if a vertex d has been visited (True data value) or not (False data value).

Finally, although G has *rank names* of S and D (indicated by the superscripts), we can use different letters to indicate *rank accesses* (indicated by subscripts in an expression). In the expression “ $G_{q,r}$ ”, the q *coordinate/rank variable* accesses G ’s S rank, and the r rank variable accesses the D rank.

EDGE’s explicit declaration section removes ambiguity from the main Einsum expressions with respect to tensor datatypes, shapes, and empty values (**design goal 5**). Additionally, the declaration section provides clues to an underlying compiler on how to cast datatypes of computations when operands contain different datatypes (**design goal 4**). For example, suppose we declare Z in the GEMM computation (Equation (4)), to be a *Boolean* datatype, while A and B are integers. An underlying compiler can (1) cast the GEMM computation to Boolean values or (2) optimize the multiplication and reduction steps to use Boolean checks instead.

5.1.2 Tensor Initializations. Secondly, the EDGE language provides a section to specify *initializations* (as in BFS Example 3). By default, all tensors are initialized with their empty values. The initialization

section indicates which tensors are user-specified, as well as any algorithm-based initializations that need to occur. Algorithm-based initializations are themselves Einsum expressions (see Section 6.2).

BFS Example Part 3: BFS Initialization Specification in EDGE

In our BFS example, the initialization specification is:

► Initialization

$$G = \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (7a)$$

$$F_{s:s \in id} = 0 \quad (7b)$$

$$P_{d:d \in id} = \text{True}, \quad (7c)$$

where we can assume id is a user specified list of starting vertices. In this case, G is user-specified. A program based on the EDGE language may allow a user to load a file (such as a matrix-market file [13]) or create a graph data structure.

Expressions (7b) and (7c) are Einsums indicating that only s coordinates in F and d coordinates in P that are in the id list may be initialized to non-empty values (initial depth 0 and True for the visited starting node, respectively). These Einsum expressions use our extended notation for *conditionals*, which we describe in Section 5.8.

5.2 Enabling General Computations

We extend Einsum expressions to fully support graph algorithms and expose common graph optimizations to tools in the optimization space (**design goal 4**).

Graph algorithms typically involve mathematical or logical operations beyond traditional multiplication and addition computations; thus, EDGE allows user-defined computation (**design goal 6**), specifically:

- (1) any user-defined computation between two tensors,
- (2) any user-defined computation that gathers results into a single value,
- (3) any user-defined computation that takes an input expression and places it into an output tensor, and
- (4) any user-defined computation that applies a unary function to an input tensor.

Additionally, tensors can contain any datatype and contain any empty value.

Inset 1: Design Alternatives for Expressing User-Defined Computations

Enforcing Semiring Constraints: One design alternative is to enforce certain algebraic properties on all computations. GraphBLAS maps all computations to overloaded linear algebra operations, described as semirings. A semiring consists of a *monoid* and its *identity* value, and a *multiply operator* [24, 45].

Scalar addition found in matrix multiplication becomes a *monoid*, where a monoid is a binary operator that has an identity value (applying the monoid to a value and the monoid's identity should return the value), and must be associative and commutative. Any user-defined computation overloading addition must adhere to these constraints.

The multiply operator is likewise binary, and takes two input values to produce an output value. The datatype of the output value must match the monoid's identity type.

With this approach, users can only express computations that they can cast as semirings. Other computations, like having one tensor be the exponent of another tensor, are not possible (**design goal 10**). We believe the more general user-defined computation we allow will be useful in both

graph computations and computations in other domains (see Sections 7.4 and 7.5). Additionally, our use of merge operators in addition to compute operations (see BFS Example 6) admits expressions beyond semirings. Semiring computation is a *subset* of computations of which our future algebra engine can take advantage.

We now incrementally build the EDGE notation using sparse-sparse matrix multiplication (SpGEMM) as an example.

- (1) First, given Equation (4), which explicitly calls out the specific computation of multiplication, we drop the \times operator, and replace it with a general *operation label*, denoted by “.”:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} \quad (8)$$

The operation label denotes a generic pairwise operation between the data values accessed by the corresponding point in the iteration space. We assume all operation labels operate on two tensor operands.

- (2) However, in EDGE, we would like the computation to still be a part of the notation. To address this, we use postfix notation to indicate the user-defined computation, with the specific compute operation defined after the main Einsum expression (after “::”, which we call the EDGE-modifier):

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \times \quad (9)$$

We feel using postfix notation enables a reader to clearly see the traditional Einsum expression that indicates computation on an iteration space. The postfix expression after “::” (EDGE-modifier) describes how the EDGE expression specifies computation as it walks the iteration space.

Inset 2: Design Alternatives for postfix Notation

Valid alternatives to postfix notation are infix notation and prefix notation, respectively. However, we feel both clutter the Einsum expression. Infix notation allows readers to clearly see the computation in use between two tensors; however, this becomes unwieldy as expressions become more complex.

Postfix notation enables readers to separate computation into two phases:

- (a) The notation to the left of the EDGE-modifier (“::”) strictly focuses on the iteration space and coordinate access variables. This portion allows a reader to focus only on the iteration space and how the computation accesses the data space. This portion of the expression maps easily to standard Einsum expressions found in NumPy [35], Timeloop [65], TACO [47], etc.
- (b) To the right of the EDGE-modifier, we see the computation that happens at each point the space, as well as any constraints the expression places on the iteration space (see Section 5.4).

Infix notation visually intertwines both phases, while prefix notation would place the EDGE-modifier expression *before* the expression has defined the iteration space.

- (3) An operation (\cdot) inputs two tensor operands and combines them in some way to create a new tensor. However, there are several ways to combine two tensors. In a GEMM computation, the operation label encapsulates two types of computations: (1) pairwise multiplication of scalar values and (2) *gathering* a list of computed values (K multiplications for each (m, n) pair) and reducing them into a single value through addition. Thus, our postfix

notation in Equation (9) must denote *both* multiplication (\times) and addition ($+$), rather than just multiplication.

To clearly indicate these two types of computation, we generalize the two classes of computation we see in GEMM (Equation (4)) as the *map* action—denoted by \wedge —and the *reduce* action—denoted by \vee . The *map* action identifies how a pair of data values from both input operands are combined, and a *reduce* action identifies how a list of data values is combined into a single value. We delve into more details in Section 5.3. We can now more precisely express GEMM in EDGE as:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times \bigvee_k + \quad (10)$$

The subscript for \bigwedge_k indicates a map action between values in both operands that share the same k coordinate, while \bigvee_k indicates a reduction over the k rank.

In English, we read Equation (10) as “Assign each m, n value in tensor Z to the dot products of the m -fibers in tensor A by the n -fibers in tensor B , where we multiply pairs of values in A and B that have matching k coordinates, then add the multiplied values together across all possible k ’s for a given m, n point.”

- (4) Certain computations benefit from optimizations where ineffectual operations (those resulting in an empty value) are skipped. In such cases, only a subset of the iteration space needs to be traversed—usually due to the presence of sparsity in one or more of the input tensors. Thus, we separate *merge* operations, which operate on the coordinates of tensors, from *compute* operations, which operate on the data *values* of tensors. Precisely specifying these merge operations allow us to avoid ineffectual compute operations.

For *map* actions, *merge* operations determine the range of coordinates to access in both tensor operands for the given rank on which map is acting. For *reduce* actions, *merge* operations determine which coordinates to select for reduction on their corresponding values. In GEMM, multiplication uses the merge operation of *intersection* (denoted by \cap) [36], meaning that we only should consider multiplications where both operands are non-zero (we can safely ignore computations that fail the intersection, as they are ineffectual). The addition uses the merge operation of *union* (denoted by \cup) [38], meaning that we should only consider additions where at least one operand is non-zero. Section 5.4 further details merge and compute operations in EDGE.

Adding the merge operators results in the following EDGE expression for GEMM:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times (\cap) \bigvee_k + (\cup) \quad (11)$$

- (5) Several graph algorithms are iterative or recursive. Using Einsums enables us to naturally express iteration by adding a *generative* rank to all tensors that change with time. Section 5.6 provides further details on iterative ranks. We can express a GEMM computation where the output of one iteration of GEMM is an input to the next, for 5 iterations, as:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{i+1,m,n} &= A_{k,m} \cdot Z_{i,k,n} \\ &:: \bigwedge_k \times (\cap) \bigvee_k + (\cup) \\ \diamond : i &\equiv 5 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

- (6) Finally, to express operations such as concatenation and conditionals, EDGE allows arbitrary rank variable expressions that determine how to access tensors (see Section 5.8).

What is the programming model for the above extensions? How do these extensions enable algorithms more complex than GEMM? The following subsections provide further details on the extensions EDGE adds to Einsums.

5.3 Extension: Map, Reduce, and Populate Actions

Every Einsum expression consists of a combination of one or more patterns:

- (1) shared indices that appear in multiple input tensors (e.g., k in Equation (12)),
- (2) indices that appear in one or more input tensors but not the output tensor (e.g., k in Equation (12)),
- (3) indices that appear both in the input and the output (e.g., m and n in Equation (12)), and
- (4) indices that appear in the output tensor but in none of the input tensors (e.g., p in the expression $Z_{m,p} = A_m$ (13)).

In non-EDGE Einsums, pattern 1 indicates multiplication on the corresponding values (or an overloaded multiplication), pattern 2 indicates reduction (via overloaded addition) over the corresponding values, pattern 3 indicates assignment to the output tensor, and pattern 4 indicates repetition (where each value in A_m is repeated n times for a given m for Equation (13)).

Traditional Einsums conflate the patterns of computation with the actual computation operators. Since we want to enable a separation of concerns and allow for general user-defined computations (**design goals 1, 6**), EDGE explicitly calls out these patterns, grouping them into three classes of actions: a *map* action (pattern 1), a *reduce* action (pattern 2), and a *populate* action (patterns 3 and 4). EDGE specifies each action, explicitly specifying (1) its operator and (2) on which rank variables it operates. Separating computations into map, reduce, and populate actions allows EDGE to classify the large space of possible user-defined computations. Each is operating on different kinds of data: *map* operates between a pair of values, *reduce* operators on a series of values that need to be combined into a single value, while *populate* determines how to place input values into an output location. This, in turn, exposes potential optimization opportunities (**design goal 4**), where an implementation can optimize the common computation *pattern*, regardless of the underlying user-defined function. For example, a hardware designer may implement each of these actions as hardware primitives—where reduce is mapped to a reduction tree, map to a merger network, etc.—or even combine all three actions into a single network to reduce area overhead [59].

5.3.1 The Map Action. *Map* processes the specified ranks of two operands. We denote *map* actions with $\bigwedge_{\langle \text{list of indices} \rangle}$, subscripted by a list of rank indices to process. Each map action applies to a specific operation label (\cdot) and compute operations follow all map actions. When multiple operation labels exist in an expression, EDGE identifies each label with a subscript. For example, we describe element-wise multiplication across 3 vectors in the following way:

$$Z_m = (A_m \cdot^1 B_m) \cdot^2 C_m \quad (14)$$

$$\therefore \bigwedge_m^1 \times \bigwedge_m^2 \times, \quad (15)$$

where \bigwedge^1 refers to a map action between A and B (for operation label 1, or \cdot^1); and \bigwedge^2 refers to a map action between the first expression and C (for operation label 2). This expression applies the compute operation of multiplication (\times) to both map actions. We need two map actions as (for now) we enforce that map actions will always operate on two operands (see Inset 4).

Programming Model for Map: As an implementation walks the iteration space, the map action indicates which regions of the data spaces of two operands to combine. For each point in the iteration space, the Einsum indicates the data space accesses. For example, given a map action of

$\bigwedge_k^1 \times$, one can read the expression as follows: “for a given point in the iteration space, multiply the corresponding data values for the two operands of operation label 1, that share the corresponding k coordinate.”

Likewise, for a map action of $\bigwedge_{m,n,o}^4 +$, one can read the expression as follows: “for a given point in the iteration space, add the corresponding data values for the two operands of operation label 4, for each (m, n, o) coordinate in the data space.” Note that the term “ (m, n, o) coordinate” refers to the corresponding coordinates of tensors in the data space. Note that without *merge* operators (see Section 5.4), the coordinate subscripts do not affect the map action, as map simply indicates how to combine the data values of two operands at a particular point in the iteration space. Section 5.4 provides further details on how the list of rank indices impacts the Einsum.

Example 1: Element-Wise Addition

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} +, \quad (16)$$

Following the operational definition of an Einsum, an implementation will walk the $M \times N$ iteration space. For each (m, n) point, the implementation projects into the data space and accesses the corresponding data values in A and B . The data values correspond to the same (m, n) point in both A and B , thus, since the *map* action is also on each (m, n) point, the implementation combines the two accessed values through addition (+).

Finally, note that *map* actually goes beyond combining shared indices; map can also combine disparate indices.

Example 2: Outer Product

For example, the following Einsum—with EDGE extensions—expresses the outer product of two vectors:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_m \cdot B_n :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times \quad (17a)$$

$$(17b)$$

Here, subscript m, n on the map operator indicates the Einsum is combining every m rank variable with every n variable.

5.3.2 The Reduce Action. In the operational definition of an Einsum, when an output point already contains a value, the Einsum will *reduce* the value there with the computed value on the right-hand side (RHS) of the Einsum. Thus, *reduce* gathers values that correspond to the same output point into a single result. Often, this manifests as gathering the values of a given rank(s) into a single value, such that the reduced rank *does not appear in the output result*.

We denote *reduce* actions with $\bigvee_{\langle \text{list of indices} \rangle}$ subscripted by a list of rank indices to reduce. A compute operation must follow a reduce action—that is, the computation applies to the reduce action. Additionally, each reduce action pertains to a tensor on the RHS of the Einsum: either a single input tensor or the implicit, partial tensor created by an operation label (\cdot) expression. The compute operation for reduction must be binary.

Programming Model for Reduce: When viewing the iteration space, the reduce action essentially fixes the value of every other rank not specified by the action’s subscripts. That is, the rank variables indicated by the (reduce action) subscripts are now free variables. Then, an implementation gathers

all the data values corresponding to every possible coordinate the rank variables can take, and reduces them using the given compute operator. Since reduction applies only to a tensor (whether an explicit tensor or implicitly created tensor), for a given operation label, and at particular iteration space point, *map* actions—which combine two tensor operands—must be applied before reduce actions *for a given point in the iteration space*. There are no other constraints on order—thus, an implementation can interleave map actions with reduce actions *across iteration space points* (see two mapping choices in Example 3.).

```

for k in range(0, K):
    for m in range(0, M):
        Z[m] = min(Z[m], A[m, k])
    ### Another mapping option
    for m in range(0, M):
        for in range(0, K):
            Z[m] = min(Z[m], A[m, k])

```

Fig. 9. Two example loop nests for Equation (18).

Example 3: Single Operand Reduction

Suppose we want to reduce the k rank of a tensor by selecting the minimum value within the k rank:

$$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \bigvee_k \min \quad (18a)$$

$$(18b)$$

At each point in the output tensor, we copy the corresponding $A_{m,k}$ into the output location. If multiple $A_{m,k}$ values correspond to the same m location—which will be the case when the same m fiber in A contains multiple non-zero k entries—the Einsum machinery will apply the min operator between the value already at Z_m and the current input value at that iteration space point.

Note that an *implementation* will have to make various mapping choices, including the order in which to apply reduction. For example, an implementation may iterate in an $m \rightarrow k$ order, with m varying the slowest. In this case, to execute the reduce action, we fix m , and apply the min compute operator to all the data values corresponding to the k coordinates for the particular m region of the iteration space. More precisely, at each (m, k) point, reduce applies the min operator to the current Z_m value and the newly “computed” RHS value of $A_{m,k}$.

Another implementation may iterate in a $k \rightarrow m$ order. Now, given a specific k coordinate, we update all m locations of Z with $A_{m,k}$. For the next k value, we perform a similar update, this time checking for the minimum between the new update (for a given m) and the previously placed value. Figure 9 shows two example implementations of this Einsum expression.

Note that these are just two possible implementation for the reduction; if, for instance, a particular compute operator for reduction is associative, then an implementation may choose to use a reduction tree or other parallel methods to execute the reduce action.

Example 4: Reduction on a Compute Label

Suppose we have an expression that performs GEMM on two tensors A and B , then does an element-wise addition with a third tensor, C .

$$Z_{m,n} = (A_{k,m} \cdot^1 B_{k,n}) \cdot^2 C_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_k^1 \times \bigvee_k^1 + \bigwedge_{m,n}^2 \quad (19a)$$

$$(19b)$$

Here, the reduce action applies to the implicit, temporary *tensor* created by the first operation label (\cdot^1). Thus, *for a given point in the iteration space*, an implementation must apply the *map* action first (multiplication between two data values), before applying the reduce action. Note that this is the only constraint. The implementation may choose to create an entire $M \times N \times K$ partial tensor resulting from the map action on operation label 1, then reduce the k rank before applying the second operation label (element-wise addition with C , \cdot^2). Alternatively, an implementation may choose to process the entire Einsum point-by-point, multiplying two data values in A and B and adding the result to the current value in C 's (m, n) location. Note that since the second operation label is addition, the addition with C can only occur once.

In general, for a given implicit or explicit tensor, reduce actions are applied in order of their appearance in the EDGE expression. Note that algebraic manipulations to the expression (see Figure 5 and Section 8) may change the order depending on whether the compute operators for the reduce actions are commutative.

Example 5: Order of Operations with Multiple Reduce Actions

Suppose we have the following (malformed) Einsum expression that inputs a 3D tensor and outputs a 1D tensor:

$$Z_p = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee_j \times \bigvee_k + \quad (20a)$$

Here, we are trying to express reduction first over the j rank by fixing each possible (p, k) region of the iteration space, and multiplying (\times) the corresponding data values for all the j coordinates in the data space. This produces an implicit, temporary tensor with ranks P and K . Then, we fix the p rank, and for each fixed p region, reduce over k using addition as the compute operator.

Suppose we want to reduce over k first, then over j . The resulting (malformed) Einsum expression is as follows:

$$Z_p = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee_k + \bigvee_j \times \quad (21a)$$

This gives a different result.

Both of the above expressions are malformed: they break the operational definition of an Einsum and how the *reduce* action works: At a given (p, j, k) point in the iteration space, we must reduce the given value on the right-hand side (RHS, $A_{p,j,k}$) with the given value on the left-hand side (LHS, Z_p). Both Equations (20) and (21) are ambiguous on *how* we reduce: do we reduce using multiplication (\times) or addition ($+$)?

To remove any ambiguity, and to leave order of computation to the mapping stage (**design goal 1**), when specifying a computation, the Einsum specifier should split Equation (20) into two

sub-Einsums (or a cascade of Einsums):

$$T_{p,k} = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee_j \times \quad (22a)$$

$$Z_p = T_{p,k} :: \bigvee_k + \quad (22b)$$

In Equation (22), it is now clear that the reduction over j must occur before the reduction over k . At a given (p, j, k) point in the iteration space, the Einsum now reduces into $T_{p,k}$ by multiplying the RHS value with the LHS value (Equation (22a)). The Einsum can then reduce into Z_p by adding (+) the RHS value ($T_{p,k}$) to the current LHS value (Z_p , Equation (22b)). Note that an implementation may also choose to fully create the first temporary tensor, T , before Z , instead of processing them point-by-point.

Example 6: Reading a Reduce Action

Suppose we want to reduce a tensor over two ranks, using addition. We specify the computation by indicating a single reduce action over both j and k :

$$Z_p = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee_{j,k} + \quad (23a)$$

We read the reduce action as follows: For a given p region of the iteration space, gather all data values in the data space corresponding to all the possible j and k coordinates. Add the data values together and place in their corresponding p location in the Z tensor. More precisely, at a given point in the iteration space, add the RHS value ($A_{p,j,k}$) to the current value in the LHS (Z_p).

5.3.3 The Default Populate Action. Populate is the act of filling (or “populating”) the output tensor with values. For a given point in the iteration space, the default populate action takes the currently computed value (determined by the RHS of the Einsum) and places it at the corresponding data point of the output element (see the operational definition of an Einsum in Section 3.1.1). Note that the Einsum notation separates the LHS and the RHS of the Einsum by an assignment symbol (=). Thus, the default populate operation is simply assignment (=). *Assignment* assumes the initial state of the output tensor is entirely filled with empty values. After fully computing the Einsum expression, *assignment* (or the default populate action) replaces the output tensor with the computed values. This maps to pattern 3 in Section 5.2.

Example 7: Assignment as the Default Populate Action

As an example, suppose we have the following Einsum:

$$Z_m = A_m \cdot B_m \quad (24)$$

The assignment to Z indicates that the computation on the RHS completely fills (“populates”) the corresponding m rank of the output. This assignment exists in every expression: every Einsum consists of an output tensor that the Einsum fills with the computation indicated on the RHS.

Pattern 4 in Section 5.2 highlights the situation where an output tensor may have a rank that does not appear in any of the input tensors. Suppose the shape of that rank is N . In such a scenario, the Einsum *broadcasts* or copies the computed value on the RHS to the corresponding output rank N times. Again, a simple assignment symbol (=) is enough to represent this pattern.

Example 8: Broadcast and the Default Populate Action

Equation (26) shows an example:

$$Z_{m,p} = A_m \cdot B_m \quad (25)$$

Following the operational definition of an Einsum, each point m, p in the iteration space computes a value on the RHS and places it at the corresponding m, p location in Z . But note that no input on the RHS has a p rank. Thus, the output Einsum broadcasts the computed value at each m coordinate to every coordinate in the p rank.

Every Einsum has a default populate action, implied by the assignment symbol ($=$), where non-empty coordinates appearing on the right-hand side are copied to the matching rank on left-hand side. If coordinates on one side do not appear on the other side, then a reduction or broadcast *must* occur (see Section 5.3, points 2 and 4). Several problems need more complex populate operators, where the Einsum fills (populates) only the elements in the output tensor that satisfy a user-defined predicate, leaving the other elements unchanged. We discuss this further in Section 5.7.

5.3.4 Unary Operators. Finally, EDGE allows a programmer to specify any user-defined unary function. A unary operation takes as input a data value and transforms it in some way. When applied to a tensor, the unary function individually transforms each element in the tensor, without consideration of the other elements in the tensor.

Example 9: Applying Unary Functions

A unary function transforms each element of a tensor. For example, if we assume B is a Boolean tensor, the following expression performs an element-wise AND between A and the complement of B ($\neg B$).

$$Z_m = A_m \cdot \neg B_m :: \bigwedge \text{AND} \quad (26)$$

Here, for each m point in the iteration space, an implementation will project into the data space and access the corresponding data values in A and B . For B , the unary function \neg will return the complement of the current value at that m point.

5.3.5 Combining Actions. EDGE factors user-defined functions into four classes. For a given point in the iteration space, the order of actions is as follows: for a given operation label, process (1) all unary operators first, (2) all map actions, then (3) all reduce actions, then (4) all populate actions.

Inset 3: Design Alternatives for Expressing Common Computational Patterns: GraphBLAS

GraphBLAS [24, 45]: Operators in GraphBLAS are in one of five classes:

- (1) overloaded multiplication, denoted \otimes
- (2) overloaded addition, denoted \oplus ,
- (3) the accumulation operator, denoted \odot (overloaded element-wise “update” operator),
- (4) the mask operator, denoted $\langle M \rangle$, which the GraphBLAS machinery applies to the output as: $Z \langle M \rangle$,
- (5) any user-defined unary operator
- (6) *extract*, which assigns an output vector/matrix to a subset of the input vector/matrix
- (7) *assign*, which assigns a subset of the output vector/matrix to the input vector/matrix
- (8) *transpose*, which transposes a vector/matrix

GraphBLAS further groups some of these operators into a *semiring*, which consists of:

- (1) the monoid: an identity value and the overloaded addition (\oplus) operator for reduction, and
- (2) the multiply operator: the overloaded multiplication operator (\otimes)

In EDGE, both overloaded multiplication and addition are simply user-defined functions that a specification applies to map or reduce actions. Likewise, the GraphBLAS mask operator, which applies a mask on the RHS computation, is simply a specific instantiation of map, (\wedge) in EDGE.

For example, to mask the GEMM output using a mask tensor M , we can write the following EDGE specification:

$$Z_{m,n} = (A_{k,m} \cdot^1 B_{k,n}) \cdot^2 M_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_k^1 \times \bigvee_k^1 + \bigwedge_{m,n}^2 \times, \quad (27)$$

where the map operation on operation label 2 essentially masks the GEMM computation from operation label 1. EDGE does not need a separate class of computations to specify this!

Likewise, the GraphBLAS semiring is a specific instantiation of a combination of map and reduce actions: specifically, the GraphBLAS semiring (\oplus, \otimes, I) will always correspond to the following EDGE specification pattern:

$$Z_{Z_r} = A_{A_r} \cdot B_{B_r} :: \bigwedge_{A_r \cap B_r} \otimes \bigvee_{A_c \cap B_r} \oplus \quad (28)$$

, where Z_r, A_r, B_r correspond to the rank variables of Z, A , and B , respectively.

The GraphBLAS accumulation operator, which updates an output tensor instead of entirely replacing it, maps to a combination of applying an iterative rank to the Einsum expression (see Section 5.6) and a compute operation between the old version of the output tensor and the computation that will update the tensor (see Section 5.6).

EDGE naturally expresses other GraphBLAS operators—including *extract*, *assign*, and *transpose*—as rank expressions that may constrain the iteration space (see Section 5.8).

Inset 4: Design Alternatives for Expressing Common Computational Patterns: Allow Any Pattern

Sparse Array Programming Model: The sparse array programming model, proposed by Henry et al. [38], allows for generalized functions that must explicitly define the iteration space. There are no “classes” of operations; instead, in the most general case, a specification will contain user-defined functions that take as input any number of *scalar* inputs and produce a scalar output. The compiler then applies these scalar functions to the tensors indicated by the corresponding Einsum expression. The model implicitly maps compute functions to “element-wise operations, reductions, and broadcasts” [38] through the index notation (see Section 5.3). EDGE can represent all of these patterns (see Section 5.3).

Additionally, the array programming model goes beyond unary and binary operators to allow for any n -ary operator. For example, an n -ary operator may take in n inputs, and always select the fifth input. In EDGE, every compute operator is a binary operator. We maintain this invariant to make it easier for algebraic manipulation—such as commuting variables, distributing computations, etc.—in a system that uses EDGE to find other algorithmic variants of a problem (see Figure 5 and Section 8, and goal 5).

BFS Example Part 4: Gather Neighbors of a Frontier

A key step in BFS, and many other graph algorithms, is gathering the neighbors of a set of query vertices. Assuming the default multiplication/addition compute operators for now, in addition to the tensor declarations in Equations (6) and (7), we can describe this phase in EDGE as:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s \times \bigvee_s + \quad (29)$$

This Einsum specifies an $S \times D$ iteration space. For each (s, d) point in the iteration space, the execution will project into the data space and retrieve the edge weight of edge (s, d) from G , as well as the current depth of vertex s from F (data value of F). We will call the depth of vertex s the “vertex weight” in future examples. If the current depth of s is non-empty (i.e., it is not ∞ —see BFS Example 2), then each (s, d) edge in G for this given s connects that s vertex to a d vertex. That is, the set of all d coordinates for all (s, d) points in G —where s is fixed—is the set of all neighbors of the s vertex. Execution will multiply the two values from G and F , and place the value in the corresponding d coordinate in the output frontier tensor, $F1$. The result is an integer value indicating the depth at which computation found the d vertex.

If multiple s coordinates in the frontier connect to the same d coordinate in G , then the Einsum in Equation 29 will reduce the values through addition. In this particular example, the reduced values have no meaning, other than indicating the total number of parents/paths to each d vertex. BFS Example 6 replaces this operation with \min , which simply indicates there is a path from s to d . In graph terms, if multiple s vertices in the frontier share the same destination vertex (d coordinate in G), execution will reduce the computed values and store the reduced value at the d vertex location for the output frontier ($F1$).

5.4 Extension: Separating Out Merge From Compute

Most algorithms for graphs view edges and vertices as graph *entities* that have associated *attributes* [23, Chapter 22.1]. A graph entity refers to the components that make up a graph: either an edge or a vertex. Each graph entity has an ID (see Section 2.1). For example, the graph in Figure 3 contains vertices A to G (or when numerically labelled, vertices 0–6), and ten edges with IDs 0–9. An *attribute* describes a particular property of an entity. For example, each vertex or edge may have an associated weight vector (common in road networks or graph neural networks).

BFS Example Part 5: Entities and Attributes in BFS

In BFS, each vertex has an attribute that changes throughout the course of the algorithm: its discovery depth. Aside from the query node, each vertex begins with a starting depth attribute of ∞ , and ends with a final value of its minimum distance from the query node(s).

The \times computation for the map action in Equation (29) does not make sense in this scenario; for BFS, we need to set the depth of a destination vertex to the depth of its parent plus one (the default edge weight that connects that parent to the destination vertex). We can reformulate the EDGE expression for the gather step as follows:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s + \bigvee_s \min, \quad (30)$$

where, for a given (s, d) point in the iteration space, the corresponding data values in G and F are *added* together to generate a new depth value for that (s, d) point. When multiple parent vertices (s coordinates) share the same destination (d coordinates), we can reduce over s by selecting the

minimum calculated depth for d across all s coordinates (min operation). In graph terms, given a destination vertex d , and new depth counts between that destination vertex and each of its parent, s vertices, we select and store the minimum depth.

Overall, in the EDGE formulation of BFS found in Equation (30), the s and d coordinate values identify a vertex *entity*. Edge entities in this formulation consist of (s, d) tuples in G . If we number each element in the list of all non-empty (s, d) tuples in G , then we can obtain the original edge IDs of 0–9 found in Figure 3.

The promise of any sparse computation is that it need not touch every point in the iteration space. For example, in element-wise multiplication between two sparse vectors, an efficient implementation will only access data values that exist in *both* vectors. (If we know a value does not exist in either vector, then we know the result of the multiplication will be zero, and thus we need not perform the multiplication.) By *intersecting* the coordinates to determine the pairs that contain non-empty values in both tensors, an implementation can determine the subset of the possible data values that will result in a meaningful product [36], and not access ineffectual values that will not. When tensors are tiled or multidimensional, implementations can employ *hierarchical* intersection, which eliminates unnecessary accesses to larger regions of the data space [36].

Additionally, certain operations require only touching the entities and not the data values. For example, simply gathering the neighbors of the set of vertices in F (see BFS Example 5) does not actually require processing their data values. It simply requires access to the shared non-zero s coordinates in both G and F , to determine which d coordinates (neighbors) exist in G for a given s coordinate (parent) in F . In general, we can make our computations more efficient by (1) only accessing entities when necessary, and when accessing entities *is* necessary, by (2) not accessing data values unless that is also necessary.

Let’s take a closer look at the execution of Equation (30). It requires two steps: (1) gather neighbors of parent vertices (s coordinates in F) by walking the iteration space and projecting into the data space, then (2) compute on the retrieved data values.

In EDGE, we generalize these two steps into two types of operators: (1) the *merge* operator and (2) the *compute* operator. We explain each below.

Earlier, we stated that every map and reduce action must be followed by a compute operator (see Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2). We now expand this: every map and reduce action consists of a *merge operator* and a *compute operator*, denoted by $[\wedge \mid \vee] < \text{compute_operator} > (< \text{merge_operator} >)$.

5.4.1 What is compute? Compute operators process computations on *data values* after an implementation projects into the data space. For map actions, the *compute* operator operates on a pair of data values at a given point in the iteration space. For reduce actions, at a given point in the iteration space, compute takes as input the current value on the LHS (at the output location) of the Einsum, and the current *computed* value on the RHS of the Einsum to generate a single value. EDGE allows any user-defined compute operator that meets these constraints.

5.4.2 What is merge? Merge operators process rank variables, culling which points an implementation needs to touch in the iteration space. Without the merge operator, the EDGE expression becomes a traditional tensor expression, where execution traverses the entire iteration space. However, by separating out merge from compute, EDGE enforces “lazy” computation, where an implementation accesses data values only if the corresponding iteration space point indicates that data value is non-empty. This information (empty vs. non-empty points) is usually present in the metadata of a tensor [36, 62].

EDGE applies merge to a specified operation label over a list of specified ranks (indicated by the subscripts in the map or reduce actions). At a given point in the iteration space, merge takes as input whether the corresponding coordinate (for the specified ranks) exists in the left-hand operand and whether the corresponding coordinate exists in the right-hand operand. Given these inputs, merge determines if the output coordinate will exist, and what the coordinate will be. For example, given a map action over rank k (\wedge_k) at a given point in the iteration space, the merge operator for this map action will check if the corresponding k coordinate is empty or non-empty in both operand tensors, then using that merge operator, decide if the output will contain that k coordinate. If the output contains the k coordinate, then the EDGE machinery will apply the compute operator to the corresponding data values of the input operands.

An example merge operator is intersection (\cap), which need only touch points in the iteration space where a non-empty value exists for *both* operands. Another merge operator, union (\cup), needs only touch points where *at least one* of the operands is non-empty. Overall, there are sixteen possible merge operators, which correspond to the sixteen truth tables possible given a binary operator that checks whether a given point contains an empty value or not in both operands. Appendix A lists the 16 possible merge operators.

BFS Example Part 6: Intersection in the Gather Step

Note that if G or F is sparse in Equation (30), there is no need to walk the entire iteration space. For example, if the frontier (F_s) contains a single vertex in its rank s , our operational definition of an Einsum states that evaluating an operation that involves F_s will walk every s point in the iteration space. However, an ideal, optimized implementation would only touch the points in the s rank that are present in both F and G .

Let us expand Equation (30) to include merge operators:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup), \quad (31)$$

Now, the map action performs an intersection (\cap) on the s indices of G and F , then applies the $+$ operator to the values that survive intersection ($\wedge_s^1 +(\cap)$). In graph terms, we only compute the sum of vertex weight plus edge weight if the source vertex is in the frontier *and* it is connected to the destination vertex by an edge. If F contains a single vertex, then an intersection merge operator would allow computation with the single-vertex frontier described above to only visit one point in the s rank (one vertex in the graph G) rather than all points (all vertices).

The reduce action looks at all the non-empty s points (\cup), and applies the min operator to their values.

Inset 5: Design Alternatives for Merge

In EDGE, we explicitly choose to input two Booleans for each point in the iteration space, where the Boolean corresponds to whether a coordinate exists or not (see truth tables in Appendix A). These Booleans come from attributes rather than data values.

A design alternative is to consider more complex inputs to determine how to cull the iteration space. For example, the sparse array programming model [38] allows the equivalent of multi-operand merge operators by allowing the program specifier to indicate specific points at which to cull the iteration space. However, in keeping with **design goal 5**, and noting our earlier constraint that all operation labels are binary (see Section 5.2), EDGE maintains that merge operators (at a given data point) are also binary. Additionally, enabling non-binary merge operators would allow

EDGE to support non-binary reduce operators (see Inset 3 and 4); however, we find that we have not lost expressivity by constraining our operators to be binary (**design goal 6**). Thus, our merge operators are both simple and effective.

5.4.3 Understanding Merge and Compute Operators. For graph algorithms, merge operators tend to correspond to operations on graph entities, while compute operators correspond to operations on attributes. EDGE *parameterizes* the compute operator by a merge operator.

One can view the merge operator in three ways:

- (1) The merge operator is necessary to fully *define* the desired compute operation. For example, consider the unconventional “take-left” compute operator (\leftarrow), which, given two non-empty operands, selects the first, left-hand operand. However, suppose we want this computation to return an empty value if either operand is non-empty. To fully define this operation, a specifier needs to include the intersection (\cap) merge operator: $\wedge \leftarrow (\cap)$.
- (2) The merge operator gives additional information about the compute operator. Merge tells one whether there is actual work to be done given particular values that are being given to the compute operator, i.e., is the operation *effectual* (resulting in non-empty values) or *ineffectual*? This information is often clear and implied by the normal use of the compute operation; for example, multiplication has an intersection (\cap) merge operator because multiplication by an empty value of zero is ineffectual.
- (3) There are cases where one cannot infer the merge operation from the nominal compute operation. For example, traditional addition uses the union (\cup) merge operator, which needs at least one operand to be non-zero. However, suppose a computation requires addition that adds two values *only* when both operands are non-zero. In this scenario, the program specifier will write an addition operation with an intersection merge operator: $\wedge +(\cap)$ (see Equation (31)). Here, specifying only the addition operator does not provide enough information to allow a compiler to generate the most efficient computation.

Now, the operational definition of an Einsum needs the precise definition of the merge operation, the compute operation, and their outputs to fully specify computations on the iteration space and the data space.

5.5 Execution Model of an EDGE Einsum

We are now ready to precisely specify how to execute an EDGE Einsum that contains map/reduce actions (which, in turn, contain merge/compute operators). We begin by walking the iteration space specified by the rank variables in the expression.

- (1) At **each point in that space**, process each specified operation label in the expression:
 - (a) Apply all map actions first, where, for each map action:
 - (i) If specified, process the merge operator. Only “touch” points in the iteration space that survive the merge operation; that is, if the current iteration space point does not survive the merge operation, immediately exit and move to the next point in the iteration space. Overall, a failed merge will abort the entire iteration space point.
 - (ii) If the current iteration space point survives the merge operation, then project into the data space and apply the compute operator to the corresponding data values.

Each map action for a given point in the iteration space produces an output coordinate(s) and data value, which, when viewing all points in the iteration space, creates an implicit temporary output tensor.

- (b) Apply all reduce actions, where for each reduce action:
- (i) If specified, process the merge operator (see the map action).
 - (ii) If a point survives the merge operation, reduce the corresponding data value on the RHS with that on the LHS by applying the compute operator.

Each reduce action for a given point in the iteration space eliminates one or more output coordinate(s), which, when viewing all points in the iteration space, produces an implicit, incomplete output tensor with fewer ranks than the ranks present in the iteration space.

- (2) For the given point, take the output from that operation label and pass it as an input operand to the next operation label (if any) in the expression.
- (3) If no other operation labels are present in the EDGE Einsum, populate the corresponding point in the output tensor.

Example 10: Merge and Compute in GEMM

Let us return to the GEMM example:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup), \quad (32)$$

We walk each (m, n, k) point in the $M \times N \times K$ iteration space. Note that the *order* in which we walk this space will be determined by the mapping (not discussed in this work). At each point, we will first apply the map action on the k rank. The intersection merge operator (\cap) evaluates whether the k coordinate is non-empty in both A and B for the given (m, n, k) point. If the k coordinate is non-empty, we can then apply the compute operator of multiplication (\times) between A at data point (m, k) and B at data point (n, k) . This computation will produce a new, temporary RHS value at iteration point (m, n, k) .

For all the generated temporary values, produced by the map action, we need to reduce them with the specified reduce action. For any given two (m, n, k) points, we apply the union (\cup) operator on the k coordinate: if at least one of the corresponding points are non-empty, we project into the data space and add together the two temporary values. This continues until we process all (m, n, k) points. We place the final, reduced value at the corresponding (m, n) location in Z . Another way to view the reduce action is for a given (m, n, k) point in the iteration space, we populate the corresponding (m, n) location in the output, applying the reduce action on the current value in the output and the temporary value at the current (m, n, k) point.

Note that the Einsum does not actually specify the overall order in which to walk the iteration space; it only specifies the order of operations when looking at a specific *point* in the iteration space. Thus, an implementation may first apply the map action to *all* points in the iteration space, producing an “incomplete” tensor of shape $M \times N \times K$, before reducing over the K rank of that tensor. An implementation may also choose to instead incrementally multiply and reduce data values at each point in the iteration space.

Additionally, although we described merge and compute as point-by-point steps, an implementation may even choose to apply a merge operation to all iteration space points first, before applying the compute operator. For example, an implementation of the GEMM expression above may first intersect the *entire* k rank of A and B by gathering all non-empty coordinates of A and B , performing a set intersection between them, and producing an output stream of k coordinates that are shared by both A and B . Now, execution need only access regions of the $M \times N \times K$ space that contain k coordinates that survived intersection.

Example 11: Merge in Multi-Rank Map Actions

Let us add an intersection merge operator to the outer product example:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_m \cdot B_n :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times (\cap) \quad (33)$$

At any given point in the iteration space, computation will proceed only if the corresponding m and n coordinates in A and B , respectively, both contain non-empty values. The addition of this merge operator allows an implementation to decide whether to perform the computation or not based only on information from graph entities, potentially reducing references into their attributes.

BFS Example Part 7: Describing One Iteration of BFS in EDGE

We now have all the notational tools to fully express the *first iteration* of BFS in EDGE:

▷ Extended Einsum

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (34a)$$

$$F1_d = T_d \cdot \neg P_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (34b)$$

$$P1_d = P_d \cdot F1_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (34c)$$

We can describe each step from the “graph world” perspective and from the Einsum perspective:

- (1) **Graph View:** Equation (34a) gathers the neighbors of vertices in the frontier (F), updates the depth of each discovered neighbor by one, and removes any duplicate depths for the same neighbor by selecting the minimum depth.

Einsum View: Equation (34a) creates an $S \times D$ iteration space. We intersect F and G on s . That is, we only project into the data space when F and G both contain non-empty s coordinates (i.e., F has one or more query vertices and those vertices exist as parent vertices in G). After projecting into the data space, we add the current depth in F at coordinate s to the edge weight in G at point (s, d) . We place the resulting value at coordinate d in the output tensor, reducing using the min operator when multiple depth values for d exist (due to multiple non-empty s coordinates in F connecting to the same d coordinate in G). T_d contains the temporary results of this step, where each non-empty d vertex/coordinate has a data value equal to one more than the data value of its parent in F .

- (2) **Graph View:** Equation (34b) takes the gathered neighbors and filters out neighbors that have already been visited, i.e., neighbors that appear in P . This produces a new output frontier, $F1_d$.

Einsum View: In Einsum terms, we apply the unary complement operator (\neg) to P , such that accessing the Boolean data value of P at point d returns the complement of that value. In fact, we can interpret the entire expression of $\neg P_d$ as a tensor whose values are the complement of P . For this Einsum, we only project into the data space when both T and $\neg P$ contain non-empty values (intersection merge operator). Once in the data space, we apply the special, “take-left” compute operator, which selects the data value of the first operand as the output value.

- (3) **Graph View:** Finally, Equation (34c) updates the set of visited nodes and places this update in a new tensor $P1_d$.

Einsum View: At each d point in the iteration space, if either P or the new frontier, $F1$, are non-empty (union merge operator— \cup), project into the data space. The compute operator is the Boolean OR function; since the output is Boolean, the Einsum machinery enforces that the integer value at $F1_d$ (see BFS Example 2) will be cast to a Boolean value of True when a non-empty value exists, and False, otherwise. Thus, the final output tensor, $P1$, will contain non-empty (i.e., no False values) at d locations where P was non-empty as well as where $F1$ is non-empty. That is, $P1$ is an updated copy of P , with new values from the new frontier.

Inset 6: Design Alternatives for Merge vs. Compute

Linear algebra tools that support graph algorithms tend to conflate computations on graph entities with computations on graph attributes. For example, GraphBLAS represents the “gather” step of BFS—which gathers the neighbors of vertices in a frontier—as a single, bulk step of matrix-vector multiplication between the adjacency matrix of the graph G and the vector frontier, F . EDGE essentially factors this into two components: first gather the neighboring vertices of parents in the frontier (operating on *entities*), then update the *values* or attributes of those neighbors.

We now present three more cases where the design alternative of conflating merge with compute does not suffice.

Case 1: Matrix-vector multiplication is simply a series of dot-products between the columns of G and the vector frontier. In GraphBLAS, the semiring for BFS uses min for reduction, + (addition) for multiplication, and a “zero value”—which is GraphBLAS’ equivalent of EDGE’s empty value—of ∞ [45]. In EDGE, merge operators simply take as input whether the coordinates of a rank are empty or not in either tensor operand. This enables an EDGE implementation to potentially optimize computation by removing ineffectual computations, looking only at the coordinates before processing data values. However, in GraphBLAS, this optimization is not as obvious. Optimizations are fully at the mercy of the underlying data format: an uncompressed format for G and F would result in a GraphBLAS implementation accessing each element of a given column in G and each element of F , regardless of whether or not the computation will be effectual. Meanwhile, a CSR data format for G that uses s as the rows enables a GraphBLAS implementation to skip any d vertices (column coordinates in CSR) that are not present in the CSR representation. In EDGE, we are explicitly telling the compiler “find a way to track when coordinates exist, and leverage the existence of coordinates to cull the iteration space.” A compiler can then choose to select the appropriate data format and optimization strategy based on the optimization opportunity the EDGE expression exposes (**design goal 4**).

Case 2: Additionally, note that G ’s empty value is 0, while F ’s empty value is infinity (∞) (see BFS Example 2). Consider the expression for the “gather” step, which intersects the s coordinates of G and F for the map action, repeated here:

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (35)$$

Suppose we replace the intersection with union:

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (36)$$

In the first example, the merge intersection operator enforces that projection into the data space occurs only when an s coordinate is present both in F (with non-infinity values) and in G (with non-zero values). For the second example, the merge *union* (\cup) operator now enforces that

projection into the data space occurs when at least one of the operands is non-empty at a given s coordinate. In many instances of BFS, the s rank of G will be dense—that is, nearly every vertex in the graph has neighbors (and thus is a parent). Now, an implementation walking the iteration space will project into the data space for nearly every s coordinate—regardless of the sparsity of F . Thus, the EDGE specification can clearly indicate the optimization opportunities available to an underlying compiler or implementation (**design goal 4**). Meanwhile, GraphBLAS cannot differentiate between the two scenarios.

Case 3: Finally, suppose we want to perform GEMM, but with addition replacing the multiplication step:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k +(\cup) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (37)$$

Here, the map action uses a union operator (\cup), since that is the natural merge operator for addition.

Now, suppose we want the addition (for the map action) to only apply when both operands are non-empty. If one of the operands contains an empty value, the output should be zero. In graph terms, if the m vertex in A has a k neighbor that does not exist in B , the path-weight between from m to k should be set to zero. This is simple to represent in EDGE (**design goal 5**):

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k +(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (38)$$

Here, we replace the “natural” union operator for addition with an intersection operator. Equations (37) and (38) will produce different results.

5.6 Extension: Expressing Iteration

Many graph algorithms, including BFS, are iterative or recursive. These algorithms also tend to update data structures on each iteration. Additionally, this computation pattern is not typical for traditional tensor algebra.

In BFS Example 7 (Equation (34)), note the use of $F1$ and $P1$, instead of directly updating the frontier tensors F and P . Compilers often benefit from static single-assignment form (SSA) [22] (**design goals: 4, 5**). Thus, EDGE requires that Einsums must also be SSA.

BFS Example Part 8: Specifying Multiple Iterations of BFS

Equation (34) is only one iteration of BFS. A full BFS computation repeats until the frontier is empty. However, as previously mentioned, Einsums must be in static single-assignment form. One way to express this is as a cascade of Einsums (Section 3.1.1), where each iteration is a sequence of gather, filter, and update steps:

► Extended Einsum

$$T1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (39a)$$

$$F1_d = T_d \cdot \neg P_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (39b)$$

$$P1_d = P_d \cdot F1_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (39c)$$

$$T2_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F1_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (39d)$$

$$F2_d = T1_d \cdot \neg P1_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (39e)$$

$$P2_d = P1_d \cdot F2_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (39f)$$

...

However, Equation (39) is unwieldy. How do we indicate the number of times to repeat the cascade? How do we codify the pattern of gather, filter, and update in a way that is easy to read?

Traditional matrix algebra and GraphBLAS is limited to a maximum tensor dimensionality of 2 (a matrix). Einsums impose no limits on the number of dimensions of a tensor. EDGE leverages this: to represent iteration, EDGE adds a special *generative* (or iterative) rank, I , to the iteration space. Any tensor that changes from iteration to iteration will also include this dimension. Thus, simply by adding a rank, we are able to naturally represent a key component of many graph algorithms while maintaining the operational definition of an Einsum (**design goals 2, 5**).

When a generative rank is present in an EDGE Einsum, we assume the expressions repeat until a stopping condition, indicated by \diamond : < Boolean Expression >, where the stopping condition can be any expression that returns True or False. When walking the iteration space, the stopping condition simply indicates the shape of I , which may not be known until runtime.

BFS Example Part 9: Specifying All the Iterations of BFS

In the case of BFS, both the F tensor and the set of visited nodes (P) change on each iteration, hence they include the i rank.

The new EDGE expression, with the generative rank, is:

► – Extended Einsum –

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{min}(\cup) \quad (40a)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (40b)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (40c)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (40d)$$

In our BFS example, several tensors have a generative rank (every use of i). Einsums (40a), (40b), and (40c) repeat until a stopping condition (indicated by \diamond) is satisfied. Equation (40d) indicates

the *occupancy* or number of non-zeros in the current active vertex set. Computation stops once that occupancy is zero. One can view adding a generational rank to F , for example, as a form of collapsing the F_1, F_2, \dots tensors in the unrolled cascade of Einsums (Equation (39)) into a single, 2D tensor, whose generational rank, I , is unbounded.

Note that a compiler can perform liveness analysis on generational tensors, such as those in Equation (40) (see **design goal 4**). In this case, such an analysis would reveal only two copies of the frontier are needed at any given time, leading to software optimizations like using two copies of the frontier and alternating between them (“ping-ponging”) [74, 82].

For a given point in the iteration space (e.g., one containing $i + 1$), determining the corresponding value for the output requires a value from a different point in the iteration space (e.g., one containing i). This point-by-point dependency is the only constraint the EDGE machinery places on computation. An actual implementation may choose to take a bulk-synchronous approach, which processes all points for a given i region in the iteration space, before incrementing i . Other implementations may instead choose an asynchronous, or fine-grained synchronicity approach, such as skipping ahead and buffering computation at a particular point until dependencies are resolved, or having certain points of the iteration space computed before others, etc.

Overall, our choice to represent iteration and dependencies using generative ranks does not limit an underlying implementation to a particular approach (**design goals 4**). We desire this flexibility for EDGE; it enables a separation of concerns between expressing *what* computation to perform at each point in the iteration space and *how* to actually walk the iteration space and map the points both in time and in space (to hardware/software units like threads or processing engines) (**design goals 1, 4, and 6**).

Finally, we note that at Einsum granularity, a cascade of Einsums is SSA. However, during execution of a single Einsum, the process is not SSA due to reduction or rank-granularity populate (see Section 5.7). This introduces an implementation constraint on dependent operations since the dependent operation must wait for the final update (from reduction or populate) or operate speculatively.

BFS Example Part 10: Replacing Minimum with ANY

In Equation (40), notice that we filter vertices that have already been visited (Equation (40b)). Thus, the output frontier for the current iteration, $F_{i+1,d}$, will always contain either the empty value (∞) or depth values equal to $i + 1$. Likewise, the input frontier for the current iteration, $F_{i,d}$, will always contain either the empty value or depth values equal to i . When performing the gather step (Equation (40a)), since the depth values will always increase by one (G 's values are all 1 or 0), we can replace the min compute operator for the reduce action with ANY:

▷ – Extended Einsum –

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(U) \quad (41a)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (41b)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(U) \quad (41c)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (41d)$$

The compute operator ANY selects any of the non-zero values in rank s when reducing over s . This is a powerful manipulation of the original Einsum that used min (Equation (40)): rather than walking every s coordinate to ensure computation is selecting the minimum for a given d coordinate, an implementation can optimize reduction by exiting early once *any* of the s coordinates return a non-empty value. This “early-exit” optimization is common in high-performance BFS implementations [85, Section 5.3] (**design goals 4 and 7**). By representing BFS as an Einsum, it becomes easier for an Einsum writer to notice the possibility of replacing min with ANY. This manipulation is a *manual* manipulation, as it goes beyond the capabilities of a compiler.

Inset 7: Design Alternatives for Expressing Iteration

An alternative approach to expressing iteration is to place the Einsum expression for one step of computation inside a for loop. In fact, GraphBLAS does exactly this: it places computation within a loop nest, and steps out of the matrix abstraction to encode depth (or “level” information) as a separate, scalar variable [24, Figure 2]. Implicitly, this imposes a bulk-synchronous implementation and compute order, where all computations for all query nodes and neighbors must occur for this iteration first, before moving to the next iteration. This approach entangles the concerns of *what* the computation is with *how* computation maps in space and time (**design goals 1**).

BFS Example Part 11: Full EDGE Specification for BFS

Finally, we can express the full EDGE specification for BFS:

– Tensors –

$$G^{I,S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=0 \quad (42a)$$

$$F^{I,S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=\infty \quad (42b)$$

$$T^{I,D \equiv V} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=\infty \quad (42c)$$

$$P^{I,D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty}=\text{False} \quad (42d)$$

– Initialization –

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (42e)$$

$$F_{0,s:s \in id} = 0 \quad (42f)$$

$$P_{0,d:d \in id} = \text{True} \quad (42g)$$

– Extended Einsum –

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (42h)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (42i)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (42j)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (42k)$$

Now, tensor $F_{i,s}$ represents the active set of source vertices for the i 'th iteration (i.e., at depth i). $P_{i,d}$ indicates if a vertex d has been visited by the start of iteration i . The output $F_{i+1,d}$ denotes the resulting set of discovered vertices at depth $i+1$ (and their corresponding depths). The output $P_{i+1,d}$




Fig. 10. (Top Left) A directed graph, G , with edge weights in red. (Top Right) A fibertree representation of the graph, $G_{s,d}$. The leaf values contain the edge weight. (Bottom Left) Resulting tensor, W , that records the minimum outgoing edge weight for each vertex in the graph (see Equation (43)). (Bottom Right) Resulting tensor, N , that records the destination vertex ID of the outgoing edge with the minimum edge weight.

denotes the total set of visited vertices after i iterations. The initialization section (Equations (42f)–(42g)) now specifies the state of F and P on the first iteration ($i = 0$).

Equation (42h) gathers the neighbor list of the frontier (F), then adds the current depth of each source in the frontier to the edge weight of each neighbor (recall that the adjacency graph G stores a 1 for each pair of connected vertices). Equation (42i) removes any neighbors that have already been visited, thus generating the new frontier. Once we gather neighbors, we apply the compute $+$ operator to the current depth of active vertices (values in F) and the resulting (s, d) points in G . Since neighbors (d vertices) may belong to multiple sources, we need to select which source updates a neighbor. We do this using the reduce action, which merges the neighbor lists into a new active vertex set by reducing over the s rank. In this particular expression, the ANY operator selects any one of the duplicate sources. We intersect the resulting temporary tensor $-T_{i,d}$ with the complement of the P tensor ($\neg P$). Since P is a boolean tensor, and the output needs to contain the new active vertex set with their depths, the compute operator is a “take-left” operation (\leftarrow), which selects the value in the first operand. This corresponds to filtering out neighbors that have already been visited. Finally, Equation (42j) updates the visited tensor with the results of the new active set of vertices, in a similar manner as the single-step Equation (34c) in BFS Example 7.

5.7 Extension: Expanding the Populate Action

Up to this point, we have assumed that when we compute something, we copy the result directly into the corresponding output location. This “default populate action” (defined earlier in Section 5.3.3) is sufficient for many graph algorithms, including BFS. As it turns out, different algorithms may require more flexible ways to write into the output, which we characterize as variations on populate.




Fig. 11. The two input graphs, W and G , involved in the Einsum expression that finds the neighbors of the minimum weighted vertex (see Equation (45)). Red circles indicate the intersection of the d rank, when $s = 0$, between W and G . The result is in output tensor Z . Z does not contain vertex $s = 5$ as its minimum weighted neighbor, vertex 6, has no neighbors. The values in Z indicate the cost of going from vertex s to vertex p through the minimum-weighted neighbor of s .

EDGE extends Einsums to support these variations, while still maintaining the operational definition of an Einsum (**design goal 2**).

Thus far, we have expanded on two EDGE actions:

- (1) map, which, at a given iteration space point, retrieves data space points on the RHS, computes on them, and places them at an output data space point on the LHS; and,
- (2) reduce, which, at a given iteration space point, retrieves the computed data space point on the RHS and the current output data space point on the LHS, merges the two, and updates the output data space point with the new value.

Both actions only retain information related to *the current iteration space point*. Several algorithms use computations that require information on data related to other iteration space points. Populate aims to expand on this. For example, what if we want the output rank to store only the result of the minimum three non-empty coordinates? Or, what if we want the output rank to contain the maximum three computed values? These questions cannot be computed through map or reduce actions alone, both of which, by definition, apply their merge and compute operators point-by-point in the iteration space and read/update the corresponding *points* of the data space.

To enable this new class of computation, EDGE introduces the specialized *populate* action. Populate goes beyond standard assignment. In EDGE, we denote specialized populate as follows:

$$\lll\text{mutable_rank_list} \langle \text{compute_operator} \rangle (\text{coordinate_operator}).$$




Fig. 12. Top half: An EDGE expression using populate, where Y is a filtered version of A that contains only A 's maximum three values (Eq. (47)). We show example input tensors A and Y , and a specific mapping specification on how execution should walk the D iteration space. Bottom Half: The state of Y and its mutable d rank after execution has processed certain points in the iteration space.

Here, \lll denotes the populate action, subscripted by the mutable rank variable(s) on which it operates. The rank variables will always be an output rank, with an asterisk superscript, “*”, to indicate the Einsum will modify the rank or ranks indicated by the mutable rank list.

At a given iteration space point, populate retrieves the computed data space point on the RHS, and the entire, current output *fiber* (not point) corresponding to the mutable rank on the LHS. Thus, rather than taking as input data space points (two RHS points for map, one RHS point and one LHS point for reduce) and setting or updating an output data space point, populate takes as input a data space point on the RHS and a fiber on the LHS, and updates an output fiber.

Populate uses two user-defined operators, each with different roles:

- (1) The coordinate operator: this is a user-defined operator that takes as input both the rank variables and their corresponding data values (*coordinate_operator*). Since populate handles a *fiber*, this operator goes beyond the merge operator used by map and reduce to enable it to process the set of coordinates and values in both the fiber and the data space point on the RHS. This allows the populate action to update the output based on a user-defined operation on the *coordinates* in addition to the values.
- (2) The compute operator: As with map and reduce, populate allows any user-defined compute operator, which specifies how to process the *values* being placed in the output.

5.7.1 An Example: Using Reduce versus Populate.

Example 12: Finding the Minimum Edge Weight For Each Vertex

Suppose we want to express the computation where, for each source in a graph, we want to select the minimum outgoing edge weight (see Figure 10, Bottom Left). Given the input graph G , we can




Fig. 13. Execution steps after processing iteration space point $d = 1$ from the problem in Figure 12. Dots are points in the iteration space (dots). Black points indicate execution has already occurred, dots with red x's indicate the Einsum culled that point (due to sparsity), and green indicates the current point execution is processing ($d=4$). We first skip all culled points in the iteration space. This leads us to touch iteration space point $d = 4$ (Step 1). At this point, we can project into the Einsum expression data space and perform compute on the RHS (Step 2). To process populate, we first retrieve the fiber corresponding to the mutable rank of the output tensor—in this case d^* (3a.), then retrieve the current iteration space point—in this case $d = 4$ (3b.), then retrieve the computed RHS value at the current point—in this case, the value at A_4 (3c.), and finally, we apply the coordinate operator of selecting the maximum three values of the current partial output fiber Y_d and the current data point on the RHS (A_4) (3d). This process updates the output tensor (4).

return a weight vector W that stores the minimum edge weight for each source vertex, s . If the edge weights represent the capacity along that link (edge) in a network, such a computation is useful in graph problems like the minimum-cut problem or single-source shortest paths (SSSP) in weighted graphs. The EDGE computation for this expression is:

$$W_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \min(\cup) \quad (43)$$

Equation (43) reduces over d for each s coordinate, selecting the (s, d) value that is the smallest (min compute operator) across all the d coordinates (\cup merge operator). The output, W_s , contains the minimum edge weight for each source in the graph. Figure 10 (bottom left) shows an example graph and the corresponding weight tensor.

This operation tells us the minimum outgoing edge weight at each vertex. However, it does not tell us *to which* neighbor the edge weight corresponds.

Suppose we want to record *to which* neighbor the minimum edge weight corresponds (see Example 12). The classic operator for this type of query, where we want to know where the solution occurs as opposed to what the solution is, is the argmin compute operator:

Example 13: Why not use argmin?

Example 12 does not tell us *to which* neighbor the edge weight corresponds. The compute min operator returns the minimum value, while argmin returns the coordinate to which the minimum value belongs. Note that using argmin instead of min as the compute operator would return the coordinate as a *value*:

$$N_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \text{argmin}(\cup) \quad (44)$$

Here, for a given s coordinate, the compute operator finds the minimum value across the d rank and returns—as a *data value*—the corresponding d coordinate that gave that minimum value. That is, the corresponding s location in W now contains, as a data value, the d vertex that had the minimum edge weight. Figure 10 (bottom right) shows an example graph and the corresponding weight tensor.

Oftentimes, however, we need the d vertex as a *coordinate* in the output. For example, we may want to find the neighbors of the minimum d vertex in the next sub-Einsum expression that uses W as an input, using this “gather” expression:

$$Z_{s,p} = G_{d,p} \cdot W_{s,d} :: \bigwedge_d +(\cap) \bigvee_d \text{min}(\cup). \quad (45)$$

Here, $W_{s,d}$ contains a single non-zero value for each s fiber, where the corresponding non-zero d coordinate is the neighbor with the minimum-weighted edge. Intersecting the graph, G , with W retrieves the neighbors (p coordinates) of each d vertex in W . The final result, Z , contains the neighbors of the minimum-weighted neighbor of each vertex s in the graph. Figure 11 shows an example graph (G), the desired W tensor, and the corresponding Z output that records the path cost from an s vertex to p vertex through s 's minimum-weighted neighbor.

This computation requires d to appear in W as a coordinate and not a value. The tensor output, W , must have a shape of $S \times D$, where each point in $W_{s,d}$ contains a data value of the edge weight if d is the minimum-weighted vertex of s . Notice we cannot write the following—which uses the reduce action, as it breaks the operational definition of an Einsum (ODE) (**design goal 2**):

$$W_{s,d} = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \text{min}(\cup) \quad \text{this violates the ODE} \quad (46)$$

The ODE implies that in this Einsum, the reduction rank variable *cannot* appear in the output. Why is this? Ignoring the EDGE-modifier, the expression indicates an $S \times D$ iteration space. As we walk the iteration space and project into the data space, values in G at each point in the space directly populate the corresponding point in W . Now let us consider the reduce action after the EDGE-modifier: for each (s, d) point, reduce the corresponding RHS value into the corresponding LHS location. However, in this expression, every (s, d) point on the RHS corresponds to exactly one (s, d) point on the LHS (due to the operational definition of an Einsum). There is no reduction!

Another way to view this expression is as follows: for each s , the reduce action says we must look at the d rank and select the minimum *value* across all non-empty values of d . The d rank will disappear. Yet this expression indicates the d rank is present in the output. At which location in the output tensor should we place the computed minimum values? We will return to how we address this problem in a little while, but begin by discussing the mechanism by which we will solve it: the populate action.

For a given point in the iteration space, the default populate action (i.e., assignment) modifies the corresponding point in the data space of the output tensor. Now we introduce a more general populate action: for a given point in the iteration space, the general populate action *may modify*

other points (within a specific fiber) in the output. We must now look at an entire fiber of the output tensor to determine how to update it based on computation at a point on the RHS of the expression. In EDGE, we call the rank of the fiber that may be modified the “mutable rank”, demarcated by an asterisk (*) on the rank in the output tensor. For example, if `populate` can alter the d fiber of an output tensor, Y , the LHS of the Einsum will look as follows:

$$Y_{d^*} = A_d :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-val-3}) \quad (47)$$

Here, `populate` (\lll) will modify the d fiber, hence we subscript Y by d^* . One might read Equation (47) as follows: “For each d^* point in Y , check if it contains one of the maximum three values of all values seen thus far. Remove any values that are not in the maximum three values.” This particular expression returns a vector, Y , that only contains values at d locations that correspond to the maximum three values in A . The compute operator, $\mathbb{1}$, is a “pass-through” computation; it copies the values that survive the coordinate operation to the output. Figure 12 shows an example input tensor A , the corresponding desired final output Y , and the state of Y after touching specific points in the iteration space.

Example 14: Finding the maximum three values in a tensor.

Using Equation (47) as an example (see Figure 13), at a specific d point in the iteration space (e.g., $d = 4$), `populate` takes as input the corresponding computed *point* of the corresponding RHS expression. In this example, the computed point is simply a projection into the data space of A . `Populate` also takes as input the corresponding current fiber of the *output* data space on the LHS—or the “incomplete” fiber (Y_{d^*} in this example) at the current point in execution. We call this fiber “incomplete” as it is not the final state of the output fiber. The fiber is finalized when execution touches all points in the iteration space.

`Populate` outputs a modified incomplete fiber, consisting of a set of non-empty coordinate locations and their corresponding values (output Y fiber after each d point in Figure 12). Overall, at a given point in the iteration space, `populate` results in an output fiber with updated values at locations both at the current data space point and optionally at other data space points. In this example, from one iteration point to the next, `populate` will result in an output fiber that contains the maximum three values seen *thus far*. By the time execution has touched all points in the iteration space, the output fiber will contain the maximum three values of the input.

Note that certain computations may require both the Einsum and a mapping specification (such as iteration order) to fully specify the computation. An example is when the coordinate operator outputs different results depending on the order of traversal.

5.7.2 Programming and Execution Model for `Populate`.

Programming Model: From the programming model perspective, `populate` processes a region of the iteration space, and outputs an updated region. The coordinate operator considers the coordinates and values of the LHS fiber, and the coordinate and value of the corresponding RHS point. The coordinate operator then outputs a set of coordinates and values for the updated LHS fiber. The *compute* operator, in this case, can modify the values outputted by the coordinated operator.

Execution Model for `Populate`: Given an EDGE expression, for a given point in the iteration space, an implementation must first process all map and reduce actions (see Section 5.4.3). This generates an implicit, incomplete/partial “tensor” with data coordinates corresponding to each point of the iteration space (which may be reduced due to any reduce actions) and data values corresponding to the computation at the processed points in the iteration space. This incomplete/partial tensor

will contain empty values at data points that execution has not processed yet in the iteration space (e.g., after $d = 0$ in bottom half of Figure 12, every other d point in Y contains empty values of 0).

The default populate action will simply walk the iteration space created by this incomplete tensor and copy the corresponding data values to the output locations. If a more complex populate action is present, the following will occur:

- (1) The coordinate operator of the populate action takes as input the current point in the iteration space, the corresponding data value for this point on the RHS (i.e., the data value for the incomplete tensor), all the non-empty *coordinates* of the mutable rank(s) (indicated by the mutable rank variable list), and the corresponding data values for those coordinates in the current partial output fiber.
- (2) The coordinate operator will then use the input coordinates and/or the input data values to process which coordinates will now be present in the mutable rank populate is processing. That is, the coordinate operator will return a new list of valid coordinates for that rank. Since coordinates represent points/regions of the iteration space, which are numerical,¹ the coordinate operator must accept coordinate *numbers* as input, and output a set of numbers. For graph algorithms, to the best of our knowledge, coordinates will always be integers.
- (3) The compute operator processes the set of data values and returns the computed values for the valid set of coordinates returned by the coordinate operator.
- (4) The final output fiber contains non-empty locations corresponding to the coordinate list produced by the coordinate operator, with values corresponding to the computed values.

Overall, for a given point in the iteration space, map and reduce only modify the given data space points corresponding to the iteration space point. On the other hand, populate may modify other data space points that are not related to the current iteration space point.

For example, in Figure 12 (bottom half), touching iteration space point $d = 5$ results in an update of outpost regions $d = 4$ and $d = 5$, even though $d = 4$ has no direct relationship (through rank variable expressions in the subscripts) to the current iteration point.

Note that although we describe populate in a point-by-point manner, execution can parallelize populate, by processing iteration space points in parallel. An underlying implementation will need to resolve simultaneous updates to the output fiber in a way that is consistent with the computation specified by the Einsum.

5.7.3 More Populate Examples.

Example 15: Finding the Neighbor Vertex With Minimum Edge Weight

We can now properly express the intent of the (incorrect) Equation (46) as:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} ::\lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{min-val-1}) \quad (48)$$

Here, we assume the coordinate operator—“min-val-1”—is a user-defined function that returns the d coordinate corresponding to the minimum value of the current state of W (at a specific s) and $G_{s,d}$ for the current iteration space point. If multiple values have the same minimum value, we assume the function has a way of selecting one (such as randomly picking one of the values.)

What is this Einsum saying? At each (s, d) point in the iteration space, retrieve the corresponding data space value of G , and the current d fiber (both non-empty coordinates and values) in W for the given s . Then process populate, by first applying the coordinate operator, which returns a valid

¹It is possible a future incarnation of EDGE will allow non-numerical coordinates, and thus a non-numerical iteration space, but for now, we limit the space to a numerical space.

set of d coordinates that corresponds to the minimum value seen across the data value for $G_{s,d}$ and the current d fiber of W (at s).

Now, execution applies the compute operator—“pass-through”—which simply keeps the data value corresponding to the valid coordinate outputted from the coordinate operator.

To actually read Equation (48), one can follow the following recipe:

- (1) Starting from *the tensor on the left of the EDGE-modifier*, look at all the non-empty points in the *mutable_rank_list* of the output.
- (2) For each non-empty s input region of the iteration space, consider each d point.
- (3) For the corresponding *values* of the partial output, and the corresponding value in the input d point, select the minimum value. Place this minimum value in its matching d location in the output.
- (4) Set the output value of all other d locations to empty values.

Example 16: Path Through a Minimum-Weighted Neighbor

With the populate operator in Example 15, we can now fully express the cost of going from each vertex s , to every neighbor 2 hops away (p) if there exists a 2-hop path that passes through the minimum-weighted neighbor of s :

▷ Tensors

$$G^{S=|V|,D=|V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (49a)$$

$$W^{S=|V|,D=|V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (49b)$$

$$Z^{S=|V|,D=|V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (49c)$$

▷ Extended Einsum

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{min-val-1}) \quad (49d)$$

$$Z_{s,p} = G_{n,p} \cdot W_{s,n} :: \bigwedge_n +(\cap) \bigvee_n \min(\cup) \quad (49e)$$

In Equation (49d) we find the neighbor with the minimum edge weight for each source vertex in G . Tensor W represents the subgraph of G that only contains sources and their corresponding neighbors with the minimum edge weight (of all their original neighbors).

Equation (49e) then finds the neighbors of those neighbors, where the d rank in W of the previous sub-Einsum (Equation (49d)) is now renamed to the n rank. The p rank represents the neighbors of these neighbors. The output tensor, Z , now contains the original source vertices in the graph (s), and the neighbors of each s 's minimum-weighted neighbor. Each $Z_{s,p}$ value contains the distance from s to p . Note that the min compute operator on the reduce action is not effectual, since the n rank has an occupancy of one from the populate action in the previous sub-Einsum. This expression precisely describes the example in Figure 11.

Example 17: Find the Top Three Edge Weights

We can extend the computation in Equation (47) (Example 14) to express selecting the top three edge weights and their corresponding neighbors:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-val-3}) \quad (50)$$

Now, for a given s coordinate in W , the d fiber will contain the maximum three values. tput.

Example 18: Finding the Maximum Neighbor ID

Suppose we want to select the *ID* of the maximum neighbor for each source vertex in a graph. The corresponding EDGE Einsum is as follows:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-coord-1}) \quad (51)$$

Equation (50) takes advantage of the flexible *coordinate operator*. For each (s, d) point in the iteration space, the populate action will check if the current d coordinate is greater than the d^* coordinate(s) present in the incomplete output tensor W (where s is fixed to the s portion of the iteration point.) If it is, populate fills the old d^* coordinate in W with an empty value, and updates the corresponding d^* coordinate (that matches d) with the value at $G_{s,d}$. The compute operator $\mathbb{1}$ simply means “pass-through”, that is, it copies the value whose coordinate(s) survived the coordinate operation into the output.

Example 19: The Default Populate Action

Finally, note that we can express the default populate operator—or assignment (=)—explicitly as:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{1}), \quad (52)$$

where all d coordinates and values are directly passed-through (the $\mathbb{1}$ function) to the output.

Example 20: A Common Transformation Pattern for Populate

Some populate expressions modify a single output point based on a set of input values. We can recast such expressions in terms of a cascade of two Einsums that use map and reduce actions. For example, we can transform Equation (49d), which uses populate to get the vertex with the minimum weighted incoming edge, as follows:

$$T_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \min(\cup) \quad (53a)$$

$$W_{s,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot T_s :: \bigwedge_s \text{return-if-equal}(\cap). \quad (53b)$$

Here, Equation (53a) finds the value of the minimum-weighted outgoing edge for each s vertex, using a reduce action on d ($\bigvee_d \min(\cup)$). Equation (53b) then uses a map action between G and T to filter out edges (or (s, d) pairs) whose value is not equal to the minimum-weighted edge for the corresponding s vertex. The compute operation of “return-if-equal” checks if two values are equal and returns the value if they are, otherwise it returns the empty value.

Although, note that this transformation only works if each s vertex has only one neighbor (d) with the minimum-weighted edge. If multiple neighbors have the same minimum-weighted edge, Equation (53b) will return all of those neighbors. Populate, on the other hand, can specify in its coordinate operator how to resolve which neighbor to select.

This is a transformation pattern to go from specific instances of populate to a combination of reduce and map. We can also transform Einsum in the opposite direction if an expression contains the pattern in Equations (53a)- (53b). Such patterns are useful in algebraic manipulations of Einsums, when generating one Einsum from another (**design goal 7**). We show an example algebraic manipulation in Section 7.2 where we use this transformation pattern when deriving a single-source shortest path algorithm from another algorithm.

The concept of `populate` is new and potentially powerful, and previous work in tensor algebra does not support this. However, as shown in the previous examples, graph algorithms *need* `populate`. Another relevant application for `populate` is in graph sampling—a common step in graph neural networks and database applications—which selects vertices and edges from a given graph [53]. In this case, the coordinate operator of `populate` is now a general user-defined sampling function (rather than just `max-val`, etc.) that determines which vertices/edges to include in the final, sampled graph.

5.7.4 Map/Reduce vs. Populate. Computations within `map` and `reduce` actions operate on a point-by-point basis. For `map`, a given point in the iteration space corresponds to specific points in the input and output data space, returning a single data value for each tensor. Computation occurs between the data values for each input tensor *at the current point in the iteration space*.

At a given point in the iteration space, `reduce` tries to place the computed value on the RHS in the corresponding output location on the LHS. If the location already contains a value, `reduce` applies its compute operator between both values.

For `populate`, a point in the iteration space corresponds to specific points in the input data space, and a *region* in the output data space. That is, for a given data value determined by computing the RHS, `populate` updates an entire fiber in the LHS variable (i.e., possibly writing a new element(s) and/or removing an old element(s)).

Both `map` and `reduce` actions use a merge operator, which, for a given iteration point, checks if a given coordinate exists or not in the involved input tensor operands. If the coordinate exists, it passes both that coordinate (for all involved tensors) and the corresponding data values to the compute operand. `Populate` uses a coordinate operator, which, for a given iteration point, looks at the coordinate and value corresponding to the computed RHS point and the list of coordinates and values corresponding to the partial output region. The operator returns a list of valid coordinates, which it passes on to the compute operator for processing of the data values. We consider `merge` to be a special type of coordinate operator: it checks if a data value is an empty value to determine if the coordinate exists or not.

Overall, `populate` allows us to do two new things not possible with `map/reduce`: (1) operate on coordinates themselves and (2) modify an incomplete/partial output fiber. One should consider `populate` if a graph computation is performing complex operations on the vertex IDs of a graph or the *coordinates* of a tensor. Examples include sampling vertices or filtering out which vertices to use based on the vertex ID themselves. Additionally, any computation that scatters updates, where multiple inputs may update the same output, may benefit from `populate`. Note that because `populate` takes a list of coordinates as one of its inputs (from the incomplete/partial output fiber), simple binary merge operators no longer suffice. Hence, the coordinate operator allows any user-defined function that operates on coordinates as though they are values.

5.8 Extension: Enabling Rank Variable Expressions

In EDGE Einsums, tensor subscripts can contain expressions, which we call *rank variable expressions*. These expressions enable features such as incorporating conditional computations into the Einsum (common in graph algorithms, see Section 7), selecting a subregion of a tensor, and enabling “windowing” operations—such as those found in convolution.

The previous examples in this section use only rank variables to access the tensors. There are two types of rank variable expressions:

- (1) Expressions on *how* to project into the data space given a point in the iteration space. This involves any expression that maps the rank variable, which walks the iteration space, to a point in the data space. For example, A_s maps the s variable in the iteration space to the

corresponding s point in data space (accessing A). The expression A_{s+5} maps the s variable in the iteration space to the $s + 5$ point in the data space. EDGE places no restrictions on the types of expressions allowed, as long as the expression is a function that maps the rank variable from one point to another. Convolution (see Equation (5)) is an example of such an expression.

- (2) Expressions that filter which regions of the iteration space an Einsum touches (i.e., *conditional rank variable expressions*), essentially creating a subspace of the data space. Einsums contain this type of expression when the problem explicitly requires filtering of points in the iteration space. For example, suppose we want to create the upper triangle of a given 2D tensor. The corresponding EDGE Einsum is:

$$L_{s:s<d,d} = G_{s,d}, \quad (54)$$

where one can read the rank expression $s : s < d$ as “ s , such that s is less than d ”. The Einsum machinery enforces that **a constraint applied to the rank variable of one tensor** (e.g., L in this case), **applies to all tensors containing that rank variable**. This is because the constraint is modifying the *iteration space*, which impacts which regions of the data space to access. By convention, we will generally write constraints on the rank variables of the output tensor.

Equation (54) places a constraint on which points are valid in the iteration space. Without the constraint, the valid region of the iteration space is $S \times D$, or more precisely:

$$s \in [0, S) \quad (55a)$$

$$d \in [0, D) \quad (55b)$$

With the constraint, the valid region of the iteration space is now:

$$s \in [0, d) \quad (56a)$$

$$d \in [0, D) \quad (56b)$$

Note that manipulations are possible on the given iteration space expressions (**design goal 7**). In Equation (56), when d is 4, s can only take on coordinate values from 0 to 3 (inclusive). When d is 5, s can only take on coordinate values from 0 to 4. From the perspective of the operational definition of an Einsum, the constraints in Equation (56) state the following: for a given (s, d) point, we consider this point valid if and only if $s < d$. Thus, the constraint can be rewritten as:

$$0 \leq s < d < D. \quad (57)$$

Note the default constraints on any rank variable are 0 to its shape (see Equation (55)). Since $S \equiv D \equiv |V|$, we can update the constraint in Equation (57) to:

$$0 \leq s < d < S. \quad (58)$$

Using the transitive property, we rewrite the above constraint to express the valid domain of s and d separately:

$$s \in [0, S) \quad (59a)$$

$$d \in (s, S) \quad (59b)$$

and its corresponding Einsum:

$$L_{s,d:d>s} = G_{s,d}. \quad (60)$$

5.8.1 Selective Computations. By definition, **if an Einsum does not touch a point in the iteration space due to rank variable expressions, the corresponding output data space point is by default empty.** For example, the following expression results in empty values along Z 's diagonal:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n:n \neq m} \quad (61)$$

EDGE supports the assignment of different expressions to different regions of an output tensor, using case statements:

$$Z_{m,n} = \begin{cases} A_{m,n} & n \neq m \\ B_{k,m} \cdot C_{k,n} :: \wedge_k \times(\cap) \vee_k +(\cup) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

At each point in the iteration space, Equation (62) selects the appropriate sub-Einsum expression. Here, the diagonal of Z now contains the dot product of fibers in B and C when $m = n$. Refer to Equation (76) for an alternate way to express this computation using map, reduce and rank variable expressions.

5.9 Rank Variables as Tensors

EDGE allows rank variables to appear as tensors within an expression. Suppose we have the following expression:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot m :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times(\cap). \quad (63)$$

Here, each m scales each A_m fiber. For example, when $m = 2$, this expression multiplies all the values in the $m = 2$ fiber of A by 2. In the execution model, at each point in the iteration space, we project into the dataspace of A , and cast the m coordinate as a value for use in the map action. At a higher level, one can consider the m term in the expression to simply be a scalar that changes depending on the current iteration space point.

5.10 Concluding Thoughts:

Although both the specialized populate extension (Section 5.7) and conditional expressions are entirely new to the Einsum world (to the best of our knowledge), *they still adhere to the ODE (design goal 2)*. These two extensions are extremely powerful in expressing graph computations that filter certain vertex or edge IDs or perform certain operations only when certain conditions are met (**design goal 6**). Graph computations *unlike tensor computations* require unique functionalities of filter operations and conditional expressions, and thus we extended Einsums in a flexible and generic way while still conforming to the operational definition. Section 7 describes more complex algorithms that utilizes these extensions.

6 EDGE SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS

The main contributions of this paper are the design decisions and the development of the abstractions for edge. This section summarizes the *syntax* and expands on the semantics previously described in Section 5. Figures 14 and 15 highlight the EDGE language grammar for tensor declaration/initialization and extended Einsums, respectively. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the key aspects of operators (compute, merge, and coordinate) and actions (map/reduce/populate). Additionally, Table 5 summarizes default operators (and actions) when not specified in Einsum expressions.

```

    <EDGE> → <declarations> <initializations> <main-edge>
    <declarations> → “-Tensors-” <declaration-list>
    <declaration-list> → <declaration-list> <tensor-declaration>
    | <tensor-declaration>
    <tensor-declaration> → <tensor-name> (shape-definition) → <data-type> “,” “empty=” <empty-
    value>
    <tensor-name> → /[A-Z]+/[A-Za-z0-9]*/
    <shape-definition> → <shape-definition> “,” <shape-declaration> | <shape-declaration>
    <shape-declaration> → <rank-name> “≡” <rank-shape>
    <rank-name> → /[A-Z]+/
    <rank-shape> → /[A-Z]+/[0-9]+/
    <initializations> → “-Initialization-” <initialization-list>
    <initialization-list> → <initialization-list> <einsum> | <einsum>
  
```

Fig. 14. Grammar for the tensor declaration and initialization sections of the EDGE language.

```

    <main-edge> → “---Extended Einsum---” <cascade-of-cascades>
    <cascade-of-cascades> → <einsum-cascade>
    | <generational-rank-initialization> <cascade-of-cascades> <stopping-condition>
    | <cascade-of-cascades> <stopping-condition>
    <generational-rank-initialization> → <rank-id> “=” <affine-expression>
    <stopping-condition> → “◊ :” <boolean-function>
    <einsum-cascade> → <einsum-cascade> <einsum> | <einsum>
    <einsum> → <iteration-spec> | <iteration-spec> “: :” <computation-spec-list>
    <iteration-spec> → <output-tensor> “=” <expression>
    <expression> → <input-tensor>
    | <unary-operator> <input-tensor>
    | <expression> “,” binary-label <expression>
    | “(” <expression> “)”
    <computation-spec-list> → <computation-spec-list> <computation-spec>
    | <computation-spec>
    <computation-spec> → <map-reduce> binary-label rank-list <compute-operator> “(” <merge-operator> “)”
    | <populate> <compute-operator> rank-list “(” <coordinate-operator> “)”
    <map-reduce> → “∧” | “∨”
    <populate> → “≪≪”
    <binary-label> → /[0-9]+/
    <output-tensor> → <tensor-projection>
    <input-tensor> → <tensor-projection>
    <tensor-projection> → <tensor-name> rank-expression-list
    <rank-expression-list> → <rank-expression-list> “,” <rank-expression> | <rank-expression>
    <tensor> → <tensor-name> rank-list
  
```

Fig. 15. Grammar for the Extended Einsum section of the EDGE language.

Table 3. The three possible operators in an EDGE expression along with their inputs and outputs at a given point in the iteration space. In addition to the inputs specified in the “Inputs” column, all operators take as input the current iteration space point.

	Inputs		Output	Computation Type
Merge Operator	On RHS: existence of non-empty data space point in the left operand	On RHS: existence of non-empty data space point in the right operand	Valid or empty coordinate <i>for that point in the iteration space</i>	One of 16 merge operators (see Appendix A)
Compute Operator	On RHS: left operand value at that point	On RHS: right operand coordinate and value at that point	A value	User-defined
Coordinate Operator	On RHS: computed data value at that point	On LHS: current entire partial output fiber (both coordinates and values) for the mutable rank on populate	Set of valid or empty coordinates	User-defined
Unary Operator (on a tensor)	On RHS: value at the data space point of the tensor		New value at that data space point	User-defined unary function

Table 4. Summary of what each action does.

Action	What it does at each point in the iteration space
Map	Retrieve the data space values for each operand on the RHS and apply compute between them.
Reduce	Given a computed point on the RHS, if a non-empty value already exists in the LHS, apply the reduce action between them.
Populate	Given a compute point on the RHS, update the mutable fiber on the LHS.

Table 5. Default specifications for each operator. Note that an action cannot appear in an expression without an accompanying compute operator (see Table 8), hence, there is no entry for compute operators.

When this is not present:	Then the default action is:	Shorthand Example	Fully Specified Version
Merge Operator (in Map)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times (\mathbb{1})$
Merge Operator (in Reduce)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \bigvee_k +$	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \bigvee_k + (\mathbb{1})$
Coordinate Operator (in Populate)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_{m^*} = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} \mathbb{1}$	$Z_{m^*} = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} \mathbb{1} (\mathbb{1})$
Compute Operator	N/A	N/A	N/A

6.1 Tensor Declaration

The tensor declaration section (see Section 5.1) should specify the tensor rank names, shape, datatype, and empty values for all tensors that appear in the “Extended Einsum” section of an EDGE language specification (see BFS Example 11 and Equation (42a)–(42d)). If a rank of a tensor is unbounded, such as the *generative* rank, no shape will be indicated. The purpose of this section is to remove any ambiguity of expressions in the Extended Einsum section (**design goals 4, 5**). Specifically, these declarations remove ambiguity on the size of the iteration space, which ranks a computation is accessing, and how merge operators behave when interacting with empty values (see the example in Section 6.3.4).

6.2 Initialization

The initialization specifies how to initialize any *input* tensors. EDGE assumes tensors not appearing in this section are empty. All extended Einsum expressions are valid in this section, where specified input tensors are assigned to some expression (see Inset 11, Equation (42f)).

6.3 Extended Einsum

A fully-specified extended Einsum is composed of a cascade of Einsums. EDGE extends the concept of cascades, first introduced by Nayak et al. [61], to allow a **cascade of cascades (design goal 6)**. This is particularly useful for graph algorithms that contain modular computations that feed into a larger computation, such as in Louvain’s method [12], or in simple concurrent connected components [54] (see Equation (223)).

6.3.1 Cascade of Einsums. A cascade consists of a sequence of Einsum expressions. If a cascade is iterative, we must also specify a generational rank variable, the initial value of the generational rank variable, and how the variable is updated at the end of one pass through the cascade (see i and j in Equation (223)). If nothing is specified, the default generational rank variable is i , the default initial value of a generational rank variable is 0, and each generational rank increments by one at the end of one pass through the cascade. Equation (42), the full EDGE BFS Einsum, uses the default specifications.

6.3.2 An Einsum Expression. Each expression contains the iteration space specifications (“iteration-spec”), followed by the corresponding specifications for map, reduce, and populate actions (in the “EDGE-modifier”). In Equation (42h), the iteration-spec is the portion containing the input and output tensors, their corresponding rank variable expressions, and the operation label (\cdot): ($T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s}$).

An individual Einsum expression can contain more than two input operands. In such a scenario, we require explicit indication of precedence. Parentheses—“(” and “)”—must surround every binary operation. The expression between parentheses produces a partial tensor that is then used as input to the operator outside the parenthesis. Note that an *implementation* may choose to produce one point in that partial tensor, then use that point-result to compute the remaining expression outside the parenthesis. An implementation may also choose to compute a set of points in that partial tensor (up to and including the entire partial tensor), then use that set of points to compute the expression outside of the parenthesis.

For example, using algebraic manipulation (see Section 8), we can express both neighbor gathering (Equation (42h), and \cdot^1 below) and neighbor filtering (Equation (42i), and \cdot^2 below) in a single Einsum step:

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 F_{i,s}) \cdot^2 \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap), \quad (64)$$

An implementation may choose to first get a single neighbor of a single element in the frontier (first operation label), then check if that neighbor is in the visited list (second operation label), before getting the next neighbor or element in the frontier. Another implementation may decide to gather all the neighbors of all the vertices in the frontier (first operation label), then check the list of gathered neighbors against the set of visited nodes (second operation label).

6.3.3 On Actions Within An Einsum Expression. Table 4 summarizes the programming model for map, reduce, and populate actions, respectively. Table 6 and Table 7 summarize the syntax when actions are present in an Einsum expression.

Table 6. Syntax summary of the three actions in EDGE.

Action	Symbol	Operators Supported
Map	$\wedge_{rank_variable_list}$	compute operator (merge operator)
Reduce	$\vee_{rank_variable_list}$	compute operator (merge operator)
Populate	$\lll_{mutable_rank_list}$	compute operator (coordinate operator)

Table 7. Default specifications for each action. Note that a fully-specified action cannot appear in an expression without an accompanying compute and merge operator (see Table 8).

When this is not present:	Then the default action is:	Shorthand Example	Fully Specified Version
Map Action (between 2 operands)	$\wedge \times (1)$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n}$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \wedge_{m,n} \times (1)$
Reduce Action	$\vee + (1)$	$Z_m = A_{m,k}$	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \vee_k + (1)$
Populate Action	$\lll 1(1)$	$Z_m = A_m$	$Z_m^* = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} 1(1)$

Table 8. Summary of required symbols in an Einsum expression. When a given action or operator appears in an expression, it must accompany the “Required” symbols and may accompany the “Optional” symbols. For example, a reduce action must accompany a rank variable list and may accompany an operation label. When a given action/operator is not present in the expression, one can assume the defaults (see Table 5).

When this action/ operator is present:	Then EDGE also requires these symbols:	But these are optional:
Map Action	Operation Label AND Rank Variable List	
Reduce Action	Rank Variable List	Operation Label
Populate Action	Modifiable Rank	
Merge Operator	Map Action OR Reduce Action AND Compute Operator	
Coordinate Operator	Populate Action AND Compute Operator	
Compute Operator	Map Action OR Reduce Action OR Populate Action	

Every map action *must* correspond to an *operation label* ($\cdot^{(binary_label)}$) in the iteration specs, while reduce/populate actions *may* correspond to an operation label (see Table 5 and Table 8). For example, a single-operand Einsum contains no operation labels:

$$Degree_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_s + (U) \quad (65)$$

The above expression finds the degree of every source vertex in G by reducing over the d rank.

Meanwhile, a two-operand Einsum may contain a reduction action on an operation label:

$$MaskedDegree_s = G_{s,d} \cdot Mask_s :: \bigwedge_s AND(\cap) \bigvee_s +(\cup), \quad (66)$$

where the reduce action at a given point corresponds to the result after the map action masks the graph (G). This expression filters out the vertices in the graph that are in a mask tensor ($Mask$), before gathering the degrees of the filtered graph.

If we wanted to gather the degrees of all s vertices first, and then mask the result, we would need to specify a cascade of Einsums:

$$Degree_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_s +(\cup) \quad (67a)$$

$$MaskedDegree = Degree_s \cdot Mask_s :: \bigwedge_s AND(\cap) \quad (67b)$$

Note that in the first expression (Equation (66)) we perform fewer addition operations than the second expression (Equation (67)). Future work will explore how to automate the algebraic manipulations necessary to go from one form to the other (**design goal 7**, see Section 8).

6.3.4 On Merge and Coordinate Operators. Table 6 summarizes the inputs and outputs of merge, coordinate, and compute operators.

When an Einsum expression uses multiplication and addition operators in the traditional sense (as in GEMM, Equation (2)), we can drop the map, reduce, and populate actions (**design goal 3**). Note that the default *merge* operator for such an Einsum is the “pass-through” operator, which touches all coordinates regardless of whether they contain empty values or not (see Appendix A, item 1).

Merge/coordinate operators are optional, while compute operators must be specified (see Table 8). If a particular operation label does not contain a merge operator, the EDGE machinery applies the compute operator to every point in the iteration space.

For example, the gather step in BFS (BFS Example 11, Equation (42h)) *needs* the intersection (\cap) operator on the map action to execute efficiently. Intersection will ignore all s points in the iteration space where F_s contains an empty value of ∞ . EDGE guarantees that points that survive intersection will be non-empty (i.e., non-infinite) values. If we remove the merge operator such that the expression becomes:

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot {}^1 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s {}^1 + \bigvee_s ANY(\cup), \quad (68)$$

then the $+$ compute operator will add infinity from empty values in F to the edge weights in G . Note that the above expression assumes the default merge operator of $\mathbb{1}$ (pass-through). While this will still produce a valid result in this particular scenario, the implementation cannot take advantage of the optimization opportunity to only process effectual computations.

6.3.5 On Rank Variable Expressions. Rank variable expressions are functions that map iteration space variables to specific points in the rank of a tensor (see Section 5.8, **design goal 6**). Thus, ternary expressions are possible:

$$Z_{d:d \equiv (w < a ? w : a)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge_{w,a} (\cap) \bigvee_d OR(\cup) \quad (69)$$

In Equation (69), we can read the constraint on d as “ d such that d is equivalent (*equiv*) to the result of the expression in parentheses”, where the Boolean expression essentially returns the minimum of w and a as we walk the iteration space. Note that this expression requires a reduce action on d ,

as multiple points in the iteration space may correspond to the same point in Z 's data space. For example, $(w, a) = (0, 1)$ will update $d = 0$, and $(w, a) = (1, 0)$ will also update $d = 0$. If the P tensor is one-hot, that is, its a rank has at most an occupancy of 1, then this expression returns the set of coordinates in G less than the occupied a coordinate in P , as well as the coordinate in P if any coordinate in G is equal to or greater than that a coordinate. This type of computation is common in algorithms like connected components, which often includes a step where computation replaces an ancestor vertex (a) with a smaller-valued connected vertex (w).

In general, we can summarize a rank variable expression on the rank of a tensor, Z , as:

$$Z_{d:d=f(\text{iteration space variables})}, \quad (70)$$

where f can be any user-defined function that takes as input the iteration space points, and outputs a single coordinate.

We could rewrite Equation (69) as:

$$Z_{d:d=f(a,w)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge_{w,a} (\cap) \bigvee_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (71)$$

Function definitions :

$$f(a, w) \rightarrow \text{if } w < a \text{ then return } w \text{ else return } a, \quad (72)$$

or as:

$$Z_{d:d=\max(a,w)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge_{w,a} (\cap) \bigvee_d \text{OR}(\cup). \quad (73)$$

6.3.6 On User-Defined Functions in Map/Reduce. EDGE allows compute operators to be any general, user-defined function in both map and reduce actions. Each function takes as input the current iteration space point, and the left and right operand values at that point. EDGE allows any user-defined function using these three input values, with the function defined in a language such as C or Python. The output must be a data value. Table 3 summarizes the operations for compute and merge operators on map and reduce.

6.3.7 On User-Defined Functions in Populate. EDGE allows compute and coordinate operators to be any general, user-defined function in populate. The compute operator takes as input the iteration space point, and a single data value corresponding to the computed value on the RHS of the Einsum at that point. The output must be a single data value, thus, compute within populate acts as a unary operator.

The coordinate operator takes as input the current iteration space point, the compute data value at that point, and the current entire partial output fiber on the LHS—consisting of the coordinates and their values—for the mutable rank on which populate is operating. This allows a user-defined function to use both the coordinates and the values to determine which coordinates will exist in the output fiber. The coordinate operator returns a set of valid and empty coordinates for the output fiber. Table 3 summarizes the input and outputs of the coordinate operator.

6.3.8 On Shorthand Notations. Figures 14 and 15 show the full EDGE language specification. However, the authors have found the following shorthand notation useful in developing and discussing algorithms, but the shorthand is not part of the Einsum language:

- (1) Dropping the tensor declaration and initialization sections.
- (2) Using infix notation to specify simple computations. For example, we may write element-wise addition as $Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} + B_{m,n}$.
- (3) Using “<<” (update) instead of “=” (assignment) to express the assignment of a generational tensor with both the previous iteration's values and the newly computed values. This is a

common computation pattern. For example, we can rewrite in shorthand the update to the set of visited nodes in Equation (42j) as:

$$P_{i+1,d} \ll F_{i+1,d} \quad (74)$$

The proper EDGE expression corresponds to a map action:

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \ll (\cup), \quad (75)$$

where the compute operator of \ll (“update”), combined with the union merge operator, has the following properties:

- if both operands are empty, return an empty value;
- if the left operand (P) is empty or both operands contain values, return the value on the right; and
- if the right operand (F) is empty, return the value on the left.

Note that the case statement introduced in Section 5.8 is syntactic sugar. One can express all case statements using map/reduce/populate actions with the update operator and rank variable expressions. For example, we can express Equation (62) as:

$$T1_{m,n} = B_{k,m} \cdot C_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (76a)$$

$$T2_{m,n:n \neq m} = A_{m,n} \quad (76b)$$

$$Z_{m,n} = T1_{m,n} \ll T2_{m,n} \quad (76c)$$

$$(76d)$$

We expect shorthand notation is for informal communication purposes only; we do not expect to support it in an underlying compiler. Regardless, whenever reading an EDGE expression, the guiding principle is always: apply the operational definition of an Einsum to the expression.

7 SOME EXAMPLES IN EDGE

We now show a few examples of expressing graph algorithms in EDGE.

7.1 Reachability BFS Variants

Reachability BFS is a variant of graph traversal that determines which nodes are reachable from a set of query nodes. This algorithm may be used in more complex algorithms such as connected components. Equation (77) provides an EDGE expression for this problem, where all tensors are Boolean:

▷ Extended Einsum

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 F_{i,s}) \cdot^2 \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_s^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_d^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (77a)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (77b)$$

Assuming all involved tensors contain Boolean values, this expression gathers the neighbors of vertices in F ($G \cdot F$), filtering out those that have already been visited (intersection with $\neg P$). It then updates the set of visited nodes by combining the newly created frontier (F_{i+1}) with the current set of visited nodes (P_i).

Green provides a variant of BFS that *updates the graph* on each iteration, deleting edges as they are visited on each iteration [31, 86]. By performing a series of inductive steps on the EDGE expression

followed by substitution (algebraic manipulation), we can derive the following EDGE expression for Green's BFS variant:

► Initialization

$$GG_{0,s,d} = G_{s,d} \quad (78a)$$

► Extended Einsum

$$F_{i+1,d} = GG_{i,s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (78b)$$

$$GG_{i+1,s,d} = GG_{i,s,d} \cdot \neg F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (78c)$$

In this expression, GG_0 contains the original, unmodified graph. On each iteration, we first gather the neighbors of vertices in F_i to produce a new output frontier, F_{i+1} . We then update the graph (GG) by deleting all edges from GG whose destinations are in the newly created frontier ($GG_i \cdot \neg F_{i+1}$).

Likewise, through commutation, reassociation, and applying a specific mapping choice, we can also derive pull-BFS (below) from push-BFS (Equation (77)):

► Extended Einsum

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 \neg P_{i,d}) \cdot^2 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_d^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_s^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s^2 \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (79a)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup). \quad (79b)$$

Here we begin with push-BFS (Equation (77)) and specify a loop order mapping choice where s is in the outer loop nest and d is in the inner loop nest. The derivable pull-BFS (Equation (79)) can be combined with a loop order mapping choice where d is in the outer loop nest and s is in the inner loop nest. This corresponds to an implementation that iterates through each unvisited vertex ($\neg P$), determines if it has parents in the frontier and adds itself to the output frontier (F_{i+1}) if so.

Thus, EDGE enables the discovery of algorithmic and implementation variants of graph algorithms (**design goals 1, 6, and 7**). This is possible due to the algebraic way EDGE describes algorithms, and the separation of concerns it enables.

7.2 Single Source Shortest Paths

Single source shortest paths (SSSP) takes as input a starting source vertex, then seeks to find the shortest path to all vertices reachable from that source. Each vertex has a corresponding value in a *Distances* array, which stores the weight of the path to the vertex. If a vertex is not reachable, the algorithm sets its distance to infinity.

We express the Bellman-Ford algorithm [11, 28] as follows:

–Tensors– (80)

$$G^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (81)$$

$$C^{I, S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty} = \text{False} \quad (82)$$

$$N^{I, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty \quad (83)$$

$$D^{I, S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty \quad (84)$$

–Initialization– (85)

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user - specified} \rangle \quad (86)$$

$$D_{0, s \in \text{root_id}} = 0 \quad (87)$$

$$Q_{0, s} = T \quad (88)$$

–Extended Einsum– (89)

Get all the edges. But we can stream-line it by only processing non-empty D's (90)

$$N_{i, d} = G_{s, d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i, s} \cdot^2 D_{i, s}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 + (\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (91)$$

Check which of the new neighbor distances are less than their current distances (92)

$$C_{i, d} = N_{i, d} \cdot D_{i, d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (93)$$

Update the set of visited nodes (94)

$$D_{i+1, d} = D_{i, d} \ll (C_{i, d} \cdot N_{i, d}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (95)$$

We only end iteration once the old value of D is equal to the new value of D (96)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (97)$$

We can express the Shortest Paths Faster Algorithm [58], as follows:

Select ANY of the non-empty distances (98)

$$S = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap) \bigwedge_s \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (99)$$

$$F_{i,s} = D_{i,s} \cdot S :: \bigwedge_s \text{if-equals-return-val}(\cap) \quad (100)$$

Now the next iteration is going to pick ANY of the the items in D (101)

but we want to first remove this item from our queue since we've processed it for now (102)

$$T_{i+1,s} = Q_{i,s} \neg F_{i,s} \quad (103)$$

Now get the neighbors of the vertex we selected (104)

$$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot^1 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s^1 + (\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \text{min}(\cup) \quad (105)$$

Compare (106)

$$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (107)$$

Update the set of visited nodes (108)

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll (C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (109)$$

What is allowed in the next iteration? (110)

Our old Q without the vertex we just processed AND the new vertices we just visited (111)

$$Q_{i+1,s} = T_{i+1,s} \cdot C_{i+1,d} \quad (112)$$

We only end iteration once the old value of D is equal to the new value of D (113)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (114)$$

7.2.1 Algebraic Manipulations for SSSP. We can algebraically manipulate the Bellman-Ford Einsum expression to produce the SPFA algorithm and the common Dijkstra's SSSP algorithm [23] through the subsequent steps.

Starting with the Bellman-Ford expression, for this i iteration, expand each Einsum out such that we process each source vertex as its own Einsum. Note that we assume "n+1" is the number of

non-infinity distances in the current D :

$$N0_{i,d} = G_{0,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,0} \cdot^2 D_{i,0}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (115)$$

$$N1_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 D_{i,1}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (116)$$

$$\dots \quad (117)$$

$$Nn_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 D_{i,1}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (118)$$

$$(119)$$

Check which of the new neighbor distances are less than their current distances (120)

$$C0_{i,d} = N0_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (121)$$

$$C1_{i,d} = N1_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (122)$$

$$\dots \quad (123)$$

$$Cn_{i,d} = Nn_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (124)$$

$$(125)$$

Update the set of visited nodes (126)

$$D0_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll (C0_{i,d} \cdot N0_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (127)$$

$$\dots \quad (128)$$

$$Dn_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll (Cn_{i,d} \cdot Nn_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (129)$$

We only end iteration once the old value of D is equal to the new value of D (130)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (131)$$

Let us reorder so that we process one vertex in this iteration before the next:

$$N0_{i,d} = G_{0,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,0} \cdot^2 D_{i,0}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (132)$$

$$C0_{i,d} = N0_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (133)$$

$$D0_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} << (C0_{i,d} \cdot N0_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (134)$$

Now process the next vertex (135)

$$N1_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 D_{i,1}) :: \quad (136)$$

$$\bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (137)$$

$$C1_{i,d} = N1_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (138)$$

$$D1_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} << (C1_{i,d} \cdot N1_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (139)$$

...

$$Nn_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 D_{i,1}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (141)$$

Check which of the new neighbor distances are less than their current distances (142)

...

$$Cn_{i,d} = Nn_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (144)$$

Update the set of visited nodes (145)

...

$$Dn_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} << (Cn_{i,d} \cdot Nn_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (147)$$

Update the distances tensor with the distances (148)

from all the vertices we just processed in this iteration. (149)

$$D_{i+1,d} = D0_{i+1,d} \cdot D1_{i+1,d} \cdot \dots \cdot Dn_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \min(\cup) \quad (150)$$

We only end iteration once the old value of D is equal to the new value of D (151)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (152)$$

Note that the following two expressions are equivalent (they can be considered as rewrite rules [81]):

$$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (153)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} << (C_{i,d} \cdot N_{id}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap), \quad (154)$$

$$(155)$$

and

$$T_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \min(\cup) \quad (156)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll (T_{i,d}) \quad (157)$$

$$(158)$$

With this in mind, note that (1) each vertex within an iteration updates each point in D with the minimum of its neighbor distances and the current value of D , and (2) for a given point in D , we select the minimum of all the updates (see D_{i+1} step in previous expression). Thus, we can actually pass each vertex's individual update to D ($D0, D1$, etc.,) as input to the next source vertex we look at:

$$N0_{i,d} = G_{0,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,0} \cdot^2 D_{i,0}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (159)$$

$$T0_{i,d} = N0_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \min(\cup) \quad (160)$$

$$D0_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll T0_{i,d} \quad (161)$$

$$\text{Now process the next vertex} \quad (162)$$

$$N1_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 D0_{i+1,1}) :: \quad (163)$$

$$\bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (164)$$

$$T1_{i,d} = N1_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \min(\cup) \quad (165)$$

$$D1_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll T1_{id} \quad (166)$$

$$\dots \quad (167)$$

$$Nn_{i,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (Q_{i,1} \cdot^2 Dn_{i-1,d}) :: \bigwedge_s^1 +(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge_s^2 \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (168)$$

$$\text{Check which of the new neighbor distances} \quad (169)$$

$$\text{are less than their current distances} \quad (170)$$

$$\dots \quad (171)$$

$$Tn_{i,d} = Tn_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leq (\cup) \quad (172)$$

$$\text{Update the set of visited nodes} \quad (173)$$

$$\dots \quad (174)$$

$$Dn_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll Tn_{id} :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (175)$$

$$\text{Update the distances tensor with the last vertex' updates} \quad (176)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = Dn_{i+1,d} \quad (177)$$

$$\text{We only end iteration once the old value} \quad (178)$$

$$\text{of } D \text{ is equal to the new value of } D \quad (179)$$

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (180)$$

Note that each vertex has similar Einsum expressions. Thus, let each source vertex be in its own iteration. Collapse this new iteration into the i rank, where boolean tensor $Q_{0,s}$ is initially set to be true where the D tensor contains non-empty values, and it tracks which vertices we have left to process. Additionally, apply our rewrite rule for min to explicitly keep track of the updated neighbor vertices in the C tensor:

Select ANY of the non-empty distances to start off (181)

Here, $F_{i,s}$ is equivalent to our $D0_{i,s}$, $D1$, $D2$, etc., (182)

But we need to specify HOW we selected which vertex is $D0$, $D1$, etc., (183)

$$S = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (184)$$

If a value in D equals the S scalar, return the value, otherwise return an empty value. (185)

$$F_{i,s} = D_{i,s} \cdot S :: \bigwedge_s \text{if-equals-return-val}(\cup) \quad (186)$$

Now the next iteration is going to pick ANY of the items in D (187)

but we want to first remove this item from our (188)

list of vertices to process since we've just processed it (189)

$$T_{i+1,s} = Q_{i,s} \neg F_{i,s} \quad (190)$$

Now get the neighbors of the vertex we selected (191)

$$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot {}^1 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s {}^1 + (\cap) \bigvee_s \text{min}(\cup) \quad (192)$$

Compare and set (193)

(194)

Update the set of visited nodes (195)

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \ll (C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (196)$$

Add ONLY the updated vertices C to the list of vertices we want to process. (197)

$$Q_{i+1,d} = T_{i+1,d} \cdot C_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (198)$$

We only end iteration once the old value of D is equal to the new value of D (199)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (200)$$

Note that we used the compute ANY to select which source to explore on a given iteration. If we select our ANY to be a min operator, we get Dijkstra’s sequential algorithm!

Select ANY of the non-empty distances to start off (201)

Here, $F_{i,s}$ is equivalent to our $D0_{i,s}$, $D1$, $D2$, etc., (202)

But we need to specify HOW we selected which vertex is $D0$, $D1$, etc., (203)

$$S = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (204)$$

If a value in D equals the S scalar, (205)

return the value, otherwise return an empty value. (206)

$$F_{i,s} = D_{i,s} \cdot S :: \bigwedge_s \text{if-equals-return-val}(\cup) \quad (207)$$

Now the next iteration is going to pick ANY of the items in D (208)

but we want to first remove this item from our (209)

list of vertices to process since we’ve just processed it (210)

$$T_{i+1,s} = Q_{i,s} \neg F_{i,s} \quad (211)$$

Now get the neighbors of the vertex we selected (212)

$$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot {}^1 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s {}^1 + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (213)$$

Compare and set (214)

Update the set of visited nodes (215)

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} << (C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d}) :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (216)$$

Add ONLY the updated vertices C to the list (217)

of vertices we want to process. (218)

$$Q_{i+1,d} = T_{i+1,d} \cdot C_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (219)$$

We only end iteration once the old value (220)

of D is equal to the new value of D (221)

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (222)$$

7.3 Connected Components

Equation (223) presents the Einsum for a more complex graph algorithm: simple concurrent connected components, specifically “Algorithm S” in Liu and Tarjan’s work [54]. Overall, connected components seeks to group all vertices in an undirected graph into *components*, where a component consists of all vertices in the graph reachable from every other vertex within the component. Liu and Tarjan’s algorithms track the “parents” of each vertex, altering parents until all vertices within a connected component share the same parent. Algorithm S consists of three key components: the initialization step, the “parent-connect” step, and the “shortcut” step. The initialization step assigns each vertex as its own parent. The parent-connect step looks at each edge (pair of vertices) in the graph, and for the vertex with the lower vertex ID, it assigns the minimum of its own parent or

the parent of the other vertex. Finally, the shortcut step assigns each vertex's parent to its parent's parent (the grandparent becomes its parent).

In Algorithm S, after initialization, components are assigned based on the parent-connect step, followed by multiple rounds of the shortcut step until no components change. This process of parent-connect followed by rounds of shortcuts repeats until the number of connected components stops changing. In summary, Algorithm S can be implemented as a doubly-nested loop where the inner loop nest assigns the grandparent as a vertex's parent and the outer loop assigns the parent of a neighbor to a vertex.

EDGE can describe this:

►— Tensors —

$$G^{I,S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (223a)$$

$$P^{I,C \equiv |V|, M \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (223b)$$

►— Initialization —

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (223c)$$

$$P_{0,v,v} = \text{True} \quad (223d)$$

►— Extended Einsum —

$$\diamond (\text{Begin Outer Cascade}) \quad (223e)$$

$$i = 0 \quad (223f)$$

Parent Connect

$$VAV_{i,v,w,av} = G_{v,w} \cdot P_{i,v,av} \quad :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (223g)$$

$$WAW_{i,av,aw} = VAV_{i,v,w,av} \cdot P_{i,w,aw} \quad :: \bigwedge_w \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w} \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (223h)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i+1,gs,d:(gs < ad?gs:(ad:av > aw?aw:av))} &= WAW_{i,av,aw} \cdot P_{i,as:(av > aw?aw:av),gs} \\ &:: \bigwedge_{av,aw} \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_d \min(\cup) \end{aligned} \quad (223i)$$

$$\diamond \diamond (\text{Begin Inner Cascade}) \quad (223j)$$

Shortcut

$$j = i + 1 \quad (223k)$$

$$P_{j+1,v,gv} = P_{j,v,av} \cdot P_{j,av,gv} \quad :: \bigwedge_{av} \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av} \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (223l)$$

$$j = j + 1 \quad (223m)$$

$$\diamond \diamond : P_{j+1} == P_j \quad (223n)$$

$$i = j; \quad (223o)$$

$$\diamond : P_{i+1} == P_i \quad (223p)$$

On the i 'th iteration, the P tensor contains the set of vertices (M rank) that belong to a component (C rank). We express this algorithm as a cascade of cascades, with two generational ranks i and j . Equation (223) also contains rank variable expressions that select which ancestor should appear in the P tensor. Equation (223b) creates $|V|$ components, where each vertex is initially in its own component. In the "Parent Connect" step, each edge in the graph, with endpoints of v and w , retrieves the parents of its connected vertices (av and aw), then compares which parent has a

greater ID ($av > aw$ in Equation (223i)). The “Shortcut” step “replaces the parent (av) of every vertex v by its grandparent (gv)” [54]. It repeats this process until no more parents are changing (Equation (223n)). It then returns to the outer cascade, the “Parent Connect” step, and repeats the process again. There is no need to fully understand this Einsum: the key takeaway is that with the few extensions EDGE adds to traditional Einsum notation, *a complex algorithm is now expressible in a succinct and precise manner.*

7.3.1 *What about GraphBLAS?* GraphBLAS can express the Awerbuch-Shiloach variant of connected components [7, 8]. This variant checks if all vertices belong to a star (if its parent is the same as its grandparent), connects the parents of edges with at least one vertex in the star (“conditional hooking” and “unconditional hooking” [8]), and performs a shortcut step. This process repeats itself until the parents of each vertex does not change from one iteration to the next.

We can also express this variant of the algorithm in EDGE as follows:

$$\triangleright \text{ — Tensors —} \quad (224a)$$

$$G^{I,S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (224b)$$

$$F^{I,C \equiv |V|, M \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (224c)$$

$$GF^{I,C \equiv |V|, M \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (224d)$$

$$S^{I,S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (224e)$$

$$\triangleright \text{ — Initialization —} \quad (224f)$$

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (224g)$$

$$F_{0,v,v} = \text{True} \quad (224h)$$

$$\triangleright \text{ — Extended Einsum —}$$

$$i = 0; \quad (224i)$$

— *Conditional Star Hooking* —

$$S_{i,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (224j)$$

Get v 's parent (av) but only if v is part of a star. (v, w) is an edge in the graph.

$$VAV_{i,v,w,av} = (G_{v,w} \cdot^1 F_{i,v,av}) \cdot^2 S_{i,v} :: \bigwedge_v^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (224k)$$

Get w 's parent (aw), get v 's grandparent (gv), and store the new parents of av in a temporary tensor.

$$\begin{aligned} TF0_{i,av,aw} &= (VAV_{i,v,w,av} \cdot^1 F_{i,w,aw}) \cdot^2 F_{i,av:av>aw,gv} \\ &:: \bigwedge_w^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w}^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_{av}^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_{aw} \min(\cup) \end{aligned} \quad (224l)$$

Update av 's parent.

$$F_{i+1,av,d} = F_{i,av,d} \lll TF0_{i,av,d} \quad (224m)$$

— *Unconditional Star Hooking* —

$$S_{i+1,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (224n)$$

Does v belong to a star? Get it (for each (v, w) edge).

$$VAV_{2i+1,v,w,av} = (G_{v,w} \cdot^1 F_{i+1,v,av}) \cdot^2 S_{i+1,v} :: \bigwedge_v^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (224o)$$

Update v 's parents iff av is not equal to aw .

$$\begin{aligned} TF1_{i+2,av,aw} &= (VAV2_{i+1,v,w,av:av \neq aw} \cdot^1 F_{i+1,w,aw}) \cdot^2 F_{i+1,av,gv} \\ &:: \bigwedge_w^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w}^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_{av}^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_{aw} \min_1(\cup) \end{aligned} \quad (224p)$$

Update av 's parent.

$$F_{i+2,av,d} = F_{i+1,av,d} \ll TF1_{i,av,d} \quad (224q)$$

– Shortcut –

$$S_{i+2,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (224r)$$

Update v 's parent to its grandparent iff v is not in a star.

$$\begin{aligned} TF2_{i+3,v,gv} &= (F_{i+2,v,av} \cdot^1 F_{i+2,av,gv}) \cdot^2 \neg S_{i+2,v} \\ &:: \bigwedge_{av}^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av}^1 \text{ANY}(\cup) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \end{aligned} \quad (224s)$$

$$i = i + 3; \quad (224t)$$

$$F_{i+3,v,d} = F_{i+2,v,d} \ll TF2_{i+3,v,d} \quad (224u)$$

$$\diamond : F_{i+3} == F_i \quad \text{*Iterate until F does not change.*} \quad (224v)$$

The “STARCHECK” is expressible as follows:

$$\text{STARCHECK} \quad (225a)$$

$$\triangleright \text{ – Tensors –} \quad (225b)$$

$$F^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (225c)$$

$$GF^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (225d)$$

$$S^{S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (225e)$$

$$\triangleright \text{ – Extended Einsum –} \quad (225f)$$

$$T1_v = \text{True} \quad (225g)$$

$$GF_{v,gv} = F_{v,av} \cdot F_{av,gv} :: \bigwedge_{av} \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (225h)$$

$$T1_v = T_v \ll \neg(F_{v,av} \cdot GV_{v,gv:gv \neq av}) :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{gv,av} \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (225i)$$

$$T2_{gv} = T1_v \ll \neg(F_{v,av} \cdot GV_{v,gv:gv \neq av}) :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,av} \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (225j)$$

$$S_v = F_{v,av} \cdot T2_{av} :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av} \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (225k)$$

Again, we note how EDGE stays within the tensor machinery to express iteration while the GraphBLAS formulation uses three different procedures and steps out of the linear algebra primitives to encode iteration as loop nests [8, Algorithms 3–5]. Additionally, note that in Equation (224), various implementations are possible through further algebraic manipulation and/or through mapping choices (**design goals 1 and 7**), such as fusing substituting Einsum expressions or performing liveness analysis to determine how many generations of each tensor need to be stored at a time. Such manipulations are not obvious in the GraphBLAS implementation.

7.4 Expressing Exponents

Suppose we want to combine two tensors through element-wise exponentiation. This is common in neural networks, such as the sigmoid function used in GraphSAGE [33]. One possible EDGE expression for this is:

▷ – Tensors –

$$Z^{M=\langle M \rangle, N=\langle N \rangle} \rightarrow \text{float, empty}=0 \quad (226a)$$

$$A^{M=\langle M \rangle, N=\langle N \rangle} \rightarrow \text{float, empty}=0 \quad (226b)$$

$$B^{M=\langle M \rangle, N=\langle N \rangle} \rightarrow \text{float, empty}=0 \quad (226c)$$

▷ – Extended Einsum –

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \exp(\mathbb{1}), \quad (226d)$$

where \exp is a user-defined function that takes computes $A_{m,n}^{B_{m,n}}$ for a specific m, n . In shorthand notation, we can rewrite Equation (226d) as:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n}^{B_{m,n}} \quad (227)$$

To express exponentiation, such as e^B , where B is a matrix on which we apply exponentiation, we can write it as a unary operation:

$$Z_{m,n} = e(B_{m,n}), \quad (228)$$

where the user-defined exponentiation function, e -exp, applies e to every element in B .

We can also directly express it as follows:

$$Z_{m,n} = e^{(B_{m,n})}, \quad (229)$$

where e is replacing A in Equation (227). We can view e as a scalar that the Einsum automatically expands to a tensor of shape $M \times N$, where each element contains e .

7.5 Flipping a Coin on a Vertex

Suppose we want to randomly determine whether to explore a vertex for a particular computation. This step is common in approaches that randomize which vertices or edges to explore, such as the random-mate connected components algorithm [72].

$$F_{i+1,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \text{user-rand-func}(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (230)$$

If all the tensors are Boolean, then user-rand-func is a user defined function that—given the vertices that successfully intersected (\cap)—randomly decides whether to include the corresponding s vertex (True) or skip exploring that vertex’ neighbors (return False).

8 WHAT NEXT?

We have described the EDGE language, which is the gateway to an algebraic framework for thinking about graph algorithms (see Figure 7). Since EDGE describes graph algorithms in an algebraic manner, one avenue of future work is exploring various algebraic manipulations both manually (see BFS Example 10) and within an automated system. From our preliminary explorations, algebraic manipulations enable transformations from one variant of a graph algorithm to another, potentially enabling the discovery of new graph algorithms (see Section 7.1). Manual exploration enables users to see optimizations such as replacing compute operators with more efficient operators (e.g., using *ANY* instead of *OR*). We hope manual exploration will enable a more systematic approach for graph

algorithm developers to invent new algorithms. Automated exploration will enable the generation of different Einsum variations. Note that this is also useful for tensor algebra applications (**design goal 3**).

In building this ecosystem, our current work focuses on a programmatic implementation of EDGE with a corresponding compiler, such that a user can write graph algorithms and tensor algebra applications as EDGE code. Ideally, such a programmatic implementation will interface with prior work in the tensor algebra space (see Table 2) (**design goal 3**). Additionally, future work in this space will focus on expanding these prior tools to support general user-defined operations and to recognize constraints on computations. There is a rich space of work in discovering new ways to implement algorithms; designing cost models to determine which Einsums and their corresponding mappings are more efficient than others given the properties of input data and backend; and refining both the mapping space and data format space to adequately express the mapping choices present in software (e.g., CUDA dynamic parallelism [3] or dynamic load-balancing approaches such as work-stealing [17]).

Overall, we envision an ecosystem that allows one to succinctly describe and compare different graph algorithms for the same problem in a similar notation; enables an exploration of the possible implementation space (in both hardware and software); and enables algorithm developers to approach inventing new algorithms systematically, rather than “thinking hard” about new ways to solve a problem.

Beyond graph algorithms, we have been able to use extended Einsums to express various machine learning models, variations of the Cholesky computation, and various parallel primitives such as the prefix-sum. Our hope is that the community will take this notation and apply it to their own applications to better understand the algorithmic and implementation space in their domains.

9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indebted to Nandeeka Nayak, Chris Fletcher, Michael Pellauer, and Angshuman Parashar for in-depth discussions on Einsums in the context of tensor algebra and fibertrees. Additionally, we appreciate Charles E. Leiserson, Conal Eliot, Aydın Buluç, Caleb Stanford, Jason Lowe-Power, Muhammad Osama, Serban Porumbescu, Matthew Drescher, Sean Treichler, and Jonathan Wapman for their feedback and technical discussions on graph algorithms and their mapping to tensor algebra. We thank Michael Gilbert for the shape notation we adopt in EDGE.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2013. The Graph 500 List. <http://www.graph500.org/>.
- [2] 2023. Fibertree Project. <https://github.com/Fibertree-Project/fibertree>.
- [3] Andy Adinets. 2017. Adaptive Parallel Computation with CUDA Dynamic Parallelism. Blog Post. <https://doi.org/blog/introduction-cuda-dynamic-parallelism/>
- [4] Willow Ahrens, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2022. Autoscheduling for Sparse Tensor Algebra with an Asymptotic Cost Model. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '22)*. ACM, 269–285. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519939.3523442>
- [5] Corinne Ancourt and François Irigoien. 1991. Scanning Polyhedra with DO Loops. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles & Practice of Parallel Programming (Williamsburg, Virginia, USA) (PPOPP 1991)*, David S. Wise (Ed.). ACM, 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1145/109625.109631>
- [6] Renzo Angles. 2018. The Property Graph Database Model. In *Proceedings of the 12th Alberto Mendelzon International Workshop on Foundations of Data Management (Cali, Colombia) (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 2100)*, Dan Olteanu and Barbara Poblete (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2100/paper26.pdf>
- [7] Baruch Awerbuch and Yossi Shiloach. 1987. New Connectivity and MSF Algorithms for Shuffle-Exchange Network and PRAM. *IEEE Trans. Computers* 36, 10 (1987), 1258–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1987.1676869>
- [8] Ariful Azad and Aydın Buluç. 2019. LACC: A Linear-Algebraic Algorithm for Finding Connected Components in Distributed Memory. In *IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (IPDPS 2019)*. IEEE, 2–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2019.00012>

- [9] John W. Backus, Robert J. Beeber, Sheldon Best, Richard Goldberg, Lois M. Haibt, Harlan L. Herrick, Robert A. Nelson, David Sayre, Peter B. Sheridan, H. Stern, Irving Ziller, Robert A. Hughes, and R. Nutt. 1957. The FORTRAN automatic coding system. In *Papers presented at the 1957 Western Joint Computer Conference: Techniques for Reliability* (Los Angeles, California, USA) (*IRE-AIEE-ACM 1957 (Western)*), Morton M. Astrahan (Ed.). ACM, 188–198. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1455567.1455599>
- [10] Albert László Barabási, Natali Gulbahce, and Joseph Loscalzo. 2011. Network medicine: A network-based approach to human disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 12 (1 2011), 56–68. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2918>
- [11] Richard Bellman. 1958. On a routing problem. *Quarterly of applied mathematics* 16, 1 (1958), 87–90.
- [12] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2008, 10 (Oct. 2008), P10008. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/p10008>
- [13] Ronald F. Boisvert, Roldan Pozo, Karin Remington, Richard F. Barrett, and Jack J. Dongarra. 1997. Matrix Market: a web resource for test matrix collections. In *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*. Springer US, 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-5041-2940-4_9
- [14] Pierre Boulet and Paul Feautrier. 1998. Scanning Polyhedra without Do-loops. In *Proceedings of the 1998 International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques* (Paris, France). IEEE Computer Society, 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PACT.1998.727127>
- [15] Ajay Brahmakshatriya, Yunming Zhang, Changwan Hong, Shoaib Kamil, Julian Shun, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2021. Compiling Graph Applications for GPUs with GraphIt. In *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO 2021)*. 248–261. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO51591.2021.9370321>
- [16] Aydın Buluç, Timothy Mattson, Scott McMillan, Jose Moreira, and Carl Yang. 2017. *The GraphBLAS C API Specification*. http://graphblas.org/index.php/C_language_API Rev. 1.1..
- [17] Daniel Cederman and Philippas Tsigas. 2012. Dynamic Load Balancing Using Work-Stealing. In *GPU Computing Gems Jade Edition*, Wen mei W. Hwu (Ed.). Morgan Kaufmann, Boston, MA, USA, Chapter 35, 485–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385963-1.00035-6>
- [18] Shuai Che, Michael Boyer, Jiayuan Meng, David Tarjan, Jeremy W. Sheaffer, Sang-Ha Lee, and Kevin Skadron. 2009. Rodinia: A Benchmark Suite for Heterogeneous Computing. In *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC 2009)*. 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IISWC.2009.5306797>
- [19] Stephen Chou, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2018. Format Abstraction for Sparse Tensor Algebra Compilers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (Oct. 2018), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3276493>
- [20] Fan R. K. Chung. 1997. *Spectral Graph Theory*. Vol. 92. American Mathematical Society. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1090/cbms/092>
- [21] Miguel E. Coimbra, Alexandre P. Francisco, and Luís Veiga. 2021. An analysis of the graph processing landscape. *Journal of Big Data* 8, 1 (2021), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-021-00443-9>
- [22] Keith D. Cooper and Linda Torczon. 2023. Chapter 4 - Intermediate Representations. In *Engineering a Compiler (Third Edition)* (third edition ed.), Keith D. Cooper and Linda Torczon (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, Philadelphia, 159–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815412-0.00010-3>
- [23] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2022. *Introduction to Algorithms, 4th Edition*. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262367509>
- [24] Timothy A. Davis. 2019. Algorithm 1000: SuiteSparse: GraphBLAS: Graph Algorithms in the Language of Sparse Linear Algebra. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 45, 4 (Dec. 2019), 44:1–44:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3322125>
- [25] Xiaojun Dong, Yan Gu, Yihan Sun, and Yunming Zhang. 2021. Efficient Stepping Algorithms and Implementations for Parallel Shortest Paths. In *33rd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures* (Virtual Event, USA) (*SPAA '21*), Kunal Agrawal and Yossi Azar (Eds.). ACM, 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409964.3461782>
- [26] Zhihui Du, Oliver Alvarado Rodriguez, Fuhuan Li, Mohammad Dindoost, and David Bader. 2023. Minimum-Mapping based Connected Components Algorithm. The 10th Annual Chapel Implementers and Users Workshop (CHIUW). <https://chapel-lang.org/CHIUW/2023/Du.pdf>
- [27] A. Einstein. 1916. The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity. *Annalen der Physik* 354, 7 (Jan. 1916), 769–822. <https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.19163540702>
- [28] Lester Randolph Ford. 2015. Flows in networks. (2015).
- [29] Anil Gaihr, Xiaoye Sherry Li, and Hang Liu. 2022. gSoFa: Scalable Sparse Symbolic LU Factorization on GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 33, 4 (2022), 1015–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2021.3090316>
- [30] Michael Gilbert, Yannan Nellie Wu, Angshuman Parashar, Vivienne Sze, and Joel S. Emer. 2023. LoopTree: Enabling Exploration of Fused-layer Dataflow Accelerators. *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 316–318. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ispass57527.2023.00038>

- [31] Oded Green. 2021. Inverse-Deletion BFS - Revisiting Static Graph BFS Traversals with Dynamic Graph Operations. In *IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (Waltham, MA) (HPEC 2021)*. IEEE, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC49654.2021.9622864>
- [32] Wei Guo and Jing-Mei Qiu. 2022. A low rank tensor representation of linear transport and nonlinear Vlasov solutions and their associated flow maps. *J. Comput. Phys.* 458 (2022), 111089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111089>
- [33] William L. Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (Long Beach, CA, USA) (NeurIPS 2017)*, Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 1024–1034.
- [34] F. Harary and G. Gupta. 1997. Dynamic Graph Models. *Math. Comput. Model.* 25, 7 (April 1997), 79–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177\(97\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(97)00050-2)
- [35] Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernández del Río, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. 2020. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 585, 7825 (Sept. 2020), 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>
- [36] Kartik Hegde, Hadi Asghari Moghaddam, Michael Pellauer, Neal Clayton Crago, Aamer Jaleel, Edgar Solomonik, Joel S. Emer, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2019. ExTensor: An Accelerator for Sparse Tensor Algebra. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO-52)*, 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358275>
- [37] Kartik Hegde, Po-An Tsai, Sitao Huang, Vikas Chandra, Angshuman Parashar, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2021. Mind mappings: enabling efficient algorithm-accelerator mapping space search. In *26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Virtual Event, USA) (ASPLOS 2021)*, Tim Sherwood, Emery D. Berger, and Christos Kozyrakis (Eds.). ACM, 943–958. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446762>
- [38] Rawn Henry, Olivia Hsu, Rohan Yadav, Stephen Chou, Kunle Olukotun, Saman P. Amarasinghe, and Fredrik Kjolstad. 2021. Compilation of sparse array programming models. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5, OOPSLA (2021), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485505>
- [39] Charles Hong, Qijing Huang, Grace Dinh, Mahesh Subedar, and Yakun Sophia Shao. 2023. DOSA: Differentiable Model-Based One-Loop Search for DNN Accelerators. In *56th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Toronto, ON) (MICRO '23)*. IEEE, 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623797>
- [40] John E. Hopcroft and Robert Endre Tarjan. 1973. Algorithm 447: efficient algorithms for graph manipulation. *Commun. ACM* 16, 6 (1973), 372–378. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362248.362272>
- [41] Olivia Hsu, Maxwell Strange, Ritvik Sharma, Jaeyeon Won, Kunle Olukotun, Joel S. Emer, Mark A. Horowitz, and Fredrik Kjolstad. 2023. The Sparse Abstract Machine. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS '23, Vol. 3)*, 710–726. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582051>
- [42] Qijing Huang, Aravind Kalaiah, Minwoo Kang, James Demmel, Grace Dinh, John Wawrzynek, Thomas Norell, and Yakun Sophia Shao. 2021. CoSA: Scheduling by Constrained Optimization for Spatial Accelerators. In *48th ACM/IEEE Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Valencia, Spain) (ISCA 2021)*. IEEE, 554–566. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA52012.2021.00050>
- [43] Sheng-Chun Kao and Tushar Krishna. 2020. GAMMA: Automating the HW Mapping of DNN Models on Accelerators via Genetic Algorithm. In *IEEE/ACM International Conference On Computer Aided Design (San Diego, CA, USA) (ICCAD 2020)*. IEEE, 44:1–44:9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400302.3415639>
- [44] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. 2003. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (Washington, D.C.) (KDD '03)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/956750.956769>
- [45] Jeremy Kepner, Peter Aaltonen, David Bader, Aydın Buluç, Franz Franchetti, John Gilbert, Dylan Hutchison, Manoj Kumar, Andrew Lumsdaine, Henning Meyerhenke, Scott McMillan, Jose Moreira, John D. Owens, Carl Yang, Marcin Zalewski, and Timothy Mattson. 2016. Mathematical Foundations of the GraphBLAS. In *Proceedings of the IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC.2016.7761646>
- [46] Jeremy Kepner and John R. Gilbert (Eds.). 2011. *Graph Algorithms in the Language of Linear Algebra*. Software, environments, tools, Vol. 22. SIAM. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719918>
- [47] Fredrik Kjolstad, Shoaib Kamil, Stephen Chou, David Lugato, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2017. The tensor algebra compiler. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 1, OOPSLA (Oct. 2017), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133901>

- [48] Fredrik Berg Kjolstad. 2020. *Sparse Tensor Algebra Compilation*. PhD thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA. Available at <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/128314>.
- [49] Haewoon Kwak, Changhyun Lee, Hosung Park, and Sue B. Moon. 2010. What is Twitter, a social network or a news media?. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2010, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, April 26-30, 2010*. ACM, 591–600. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772751>
- [50] Hyoukjun Kwon, Prasanth Chatarasi, Michael Pellauer, Angshuman Parashar, Vivek Sarkar, and Tushar Krishna. 2019. Understanding Reuse, Performance, and Hardware Cost of DNN Dataflow: A Data-Centric Approach. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Columbus, OH, USA) (MICRO 2019)*. ACM, 754–768. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358252>
- [51] Leslie Lamport. 1974. The Parallel Execution of DO Loops. *Commun. ACM* 17, 2 (Feb. 1974), 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1145/360827.360844>
- [52] Sören Laue, Matthias Mitterreiter, and Joachim Giesen. 2020. A Simple and Efficient Tensor Calculus. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 04 (April 2020), 4527–4534. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i04.5881>
- [53] Jure Leskovec and Christos Faloutsos. 2006. Sampling from large graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (KDD'06)*, Tina Eliassi-Rad, Lyle H. Ungar, Mark Craven, and Dimitrios Gunopulos (Eds.). ACM, 631–636. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1150402.1150479>
- [54] Sixue Cliff Liu and Robert Endre Tarjan. 2022. Simple Concurrent Connected Components Algorithms. *ACM Trans. Parallel Comput.* 9, 2 (2022), 9:1–9:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543546>
- [55] Grzegorz Malewicz, Matthew H. Austern, Aart J. C. Bik, James C. Dehnert, Ilan Horn, Naty Leiser, and Grzegorz Czajkowski. 2010. Pregel: A System for Large-scale Graph Processing. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (Indianapolis, Indiana, USA) (SIGMOD '10)*. 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1807167.1807184>
- [56] Robert Ryan McCune, Tim Weninger, and Greg Madey. 2015. Thinking Like a Vertex: A Survey of Vertex-Centric Frameworks for Large-Scale Distributed Graph Processing. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 48, 2, Article 25 (Oct. 2015), 39 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818185>
- [57] Duane Merrill, Michael Garland, and Andrew Grimshaw. 2012. Scalable GPU Graph Traversal. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (New Orleans, Louisiana, USA) (PPoPP '12)*. 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2145816.2145832>
- [58] Edward F Moore. 1959. The shortest path through a maze. In *Proc. of the International Symposium on the Theory of Switching*. Harvard University Press, 285–292.
- [59] Francisco Muñoz-Martínez, Raveesh Garg, Michael Pellauer, José L. Abellán, Manuel E. Acacio, and Tushar Krishna. 2023. Flexagon: A Multi-dataflow Sparse-Sparse Matrix Multiplication Accelerator for Efficient DNN Processing. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS 2023)*, Tor M. Aamodt, Natalie D. Enright Jerger, and Michael M. Swift (Eds.). ACM, 252–265. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582069>
- [60] Lifeng Nai, Yinglong Xia, Ilie G. Tanase, Hyesoon Kim, and Ching-Yung Lin. 2015. GraphBIG: understanding graph computing in the context of industrial solutions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC'15)*. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2807591.2807626>
- [61] Nandeeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Shubham Ugare, Christopher Fletcher, Michael Pellauer, and Joel Emer. 2023. TeAAL: A Declarative Framework for Modeling Sparse Tensor Accelerators. In *56th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO '23)*. ACM, 1255–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623791>
- [62] Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Hadi Asghari-Moghaddam, Michael Pellauer, Kartik Hegde, Po-An Tsai, Neal Crago, Aamer Jaleel, John D. Owens, Edgar Solomonik, Joel Emer, and Christopher Fletcher. 2023. Accelerating Sparse Data Orchestration via Dynamic Reflexive Tiling. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS '23, Vol. 3)*. 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582064>
- [63] Muhammad Osama, Serban D. Porumbescu, and John D. Owens. 2022. Essentials of Parallel Graph Analytics. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Graphs, Architectures, Programming, and Learning (GrAPL 2022)*. 314–317. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPSW55747.2022.00061>
- [64] Muhammad Osama, Serban D. Porumbescu, and John D. Owens. 2023. A Programming Model for GPU Load Balancing. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP 2023)*. 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3572848.3577434>
- [65] Angshuman Parashar, Priyanka Raina, Yakun Sophia Shao, Yu-Hsin Chen, Victor A. Ying, Anurag Mukkara, Rangharajan Venkatesan, Bruce Khailany, Stephen W. Keckler, and Joel Emer. 2019. Timeloop: A Systematic Approach to DNN Accelerator Evaluation. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPASS.2019.00042>

- [66] Adam Paszke, S. Gross, Francisco Massa, A. Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (NeurIPS 2019)*. 8026–8037. <https://doi.org/10.5555/3454287.3455008>
- [67] Michael Pellauer, Yakun Sophia Shao, Jason Clemons, Neal Crago, Kartik Hegde, Rangharajan Venkatesan, Stephen W. Keckler, Christopher W. Fletcher, and Joel Emer. 2019. Buffets: An Efficient and Composable Storage Idiom for Explicit Decoupled Data Orchestration. In *International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. ACM, 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304025>
- [68] Louis-Noël Pouchet, Uday Bondhugula, Cédric Bastoul, Albert Cohen, J. Ramanujam, P. Sadayappan, and Nicolas Vasilache. 2011. Loop transformations: convexity, pruning and optimization. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (Austin, TX, USA) (POPL 2011)*, Thomas Ball and Mooly Sagiv (Eds.). ACM, 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926449>
- [69] Tahereh Pourhabibi, Kok-Leong Ong, Booi Kam, and Yee Ling Boo. 2020. Fraud detection: A systematic literature review of graph-based anomaly detection approaches. *Decision Support Systems* 133 (2020), 113303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DSS.2020.113303>
- [70] Sumit Purohit, Nhuy Van, and George Chin. 2021. Semantic Property Graph for Scalable Knowledge Graph Analytics. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Orlando, FL, USA) (Big Data)*, Yixin Chen, Heiko Ludwig, Yicheng Tu, Usama M. Fayyad, Xingquan Zhu, Xiaohua Hu, Suren Byna, Xiong Liu, Jianping Zhang, Shirui Pan, Vagelis Papalexakis, Jianwu Wang, Alfredo Cuzzocrea, and Carlos Ordóñez (Eds.). IEEE, 2672–2677. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671547>
- [71] Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Connelly Barnes, Andrew Adams, Sylvain Paris, Frédo Durand, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2013. Halide: A Language and Compiler for Optimizing Parallelism, Locality, and Recomputation in Image Processing Pipelines. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Seattle, Washington, USA) (PLDI '13)*. 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491956.2462176>
- [72] John H. Reif. 1985. *Optimal parallel algorithms for integer sorting and graph connectivity*. Technical Report TR-08-85. Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- [73] Amitabha Roy, Ivo Mihailovic, and Willy Zwaenepoel. 2013. X-Stream: Edge-centric Graph Processing using Streaming Partitions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (Farmington, PA, USA) (SOSP '13)*, Michael Kaminsky and Mike Dahlin (Eds.). ACM, 472–488. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2517349.2522740>
- [74] Mo Sha, Yuchen Li, and Kian-Lee Tan. 2019. GPU-based Graph Traversal on Compressed Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) (SIGMOD Conference 2019)*, Peter A. Boncz, Stefan Manegold, Anastasia Ailamaki, Amol Deshpande, and Tim Kraska (Eds.). ACM, 775–792. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3319871>
- [75] Julian Shun and Guy E. Blelloch. 2013. Ligma: a lightweight graph processing framework for shared memory. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (Shenzhen, China) (PPoPP '13)*. 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2442516.2442530>
- [76] Shaden Smith and George Karypis. 2015. Tensor-matrix products with a compressed sparse tensor. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Irregular Applications - Architectures and Algorithms (Austin, Texas, USA) (IA3 2015)*, Antonino Tumeo, John Feo, and Oreste Villa (Eds.). ACM, 5:1–5:7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2833179.2833183>
- [77] Edgar Solomonik, Devin Matthews, Jeff R. Hammond, and James Demmel. 2013. Cyclops Tensor Framework: Reducing Communication and Eliminating Load Imbalance in Massively Parallel Contractions. In *27th IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing (Cambridge, MA, USA) (IPDPS 2013)*. IEEE Computer Society, 813–824. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2013.112>
- [78] Nitish Srivastava, Hanchen Jin, Jie Liu, David Albonesi, and Zhiru Zhang. 2020. MatRaptor: A Sparse-Sparse Matrix Multiplication Accelerator Based on Row-Wise Product. In *International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. 766–780. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO50266.2020.00068>
- [79] Sakshi Srivastava and Anil Kumar Singh. 2023. Fraud detection in the distributed graph database. *Cluster Computing* 26, 1 (2023), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10586-022-03540-3>
- [80] Vivienne Sze, Yu-Hsin Chen, Tien-Ju Yang, and Joel S. Emer. 2020. *Efficient Processing of Deep Neural Networks*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01766-7>
- [81] Ross Tate, Michael Stepp, Zachary Tatlock, and Sorin Lerner. 2009. Equality saturation: a new approach to optimization. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (Savannah, GA, USA) (POPL 2009)*, Zhong Shao and Benjamin C. Pierce (Eds.). ACM, 264–276. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1480881.1480915>
- [82] Yangzihao Wang, Yuechao Pan, Andrew Davidson, Yuduo Wu, Carl Yang, Leyuan Wang, Muhammad Osama, Chenshan Yuan, Weitang Liu, Andy T. Riffel, and John D. Owens. 2017. Gunrock: GPU Graph Analytics. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing* 4, 1 (Aug. 2017), 3:1–3:49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3108140>

- [83] Jaeyeon Won, Charith Mendis, Joel S. Emer, and Saman P. Amarasinghe. 2023. WACO: Learning Workload-Aware Co-optimization of the Format and Schedule of a Sparse Tensor Program. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS 2023, Vol. 2)*, Tor M. Aamodt, Natalie D. Enright Jerger, and Michael M. Swift (Eds.). ACM, 920–934. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3575693.3575742>
- [84] Yinnan Nellie Wu, Po-An Tsai, Angshuman Parashar, Vivienne Sze, and Joel S. Emer. 2022. Sparseloop: An Analytical Approach To Sparse Tensor Accelerator Modeling. In *55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 1377–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO56248.2022.00096>
- [85] Carl Yang, Aydın Buluç, and John D. Owens. 2018. Implementing Push-Pull Efficiently in GraphBLAS. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Processing (ICPP 2018)*. 89:1–89:11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3225058.3225122>
- [86] Guangyan Zhang, Shuhan Cheng, Jiwu Shu, Qingda Hu, and Weimin Zheng. 2018. Accelerating breadth-first graph search on a single server by dynamic edge trimming. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 120 (Oct. 2018), 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpdc.2017.09.007>
- [87] Yunming Zhang, Mengjiao Yang, Riyadh Baghdadi, Shoaib Kamil, Julian Shun, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2018. GraphIt: A High-Performance Graph DSL. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (Oct. 2018), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3276491>
- [88] Shijie Zhou, Rajgopal Kannan, Hanqing Zeng, and Viktor K. Prasanna. 2018. An FPGA framework for edge-centric graph processing. *Proceedings of the 15th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*, 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3203217.3203233>
- [89] Tong Zhou, Ruiqin Tian, Rizwan A. Ashraf, Roberto Gioiosa, Gokcen Kestor, and Vivek Sarkar. 2022. ReACT: Redundancy-Aware Code Generation for Tensor Expressions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (Chicago, Illinois) (PACT 2022)*, Andreas Klöckner and José Moreira (Eds.). ACM, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3559009.3569685>
- [90] Huanzhou Zhu, Ligang He, Matthew Leeke, and Rui Mao. 2020. WolfGraph: The edge-centric graph processing on GPU. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 111 (Oct. 2020), 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2019.09.052>
- [91] Joseph Zund. 1994. The Ricci Calculus. In *Foundations of Differential Geodesy*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 45–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-79187-1_2

A APPENDIX: MERGE OPERATORS

Merge tells us which points in the iteration space will be effectual (culls the space). In a fully specified Einsum, the merge operator is a *binary* operator that looks at the relevant coordinates in the first operand (A) and the relevant coordinates in the second operand (B). We can think of all the possible combinations of coordinates as set theory [38].

Sometimes the compute operators do not inform the merge operators. (e.g.: using + instead of multiply to overload intersection). In fact, this is the premise that GraphBLAS relies on. By overloading the multiply and addition operators with semirings, GraphBLAS essentially allows other compute operators while maintaining the same merge operators.

For some of these, leader-follower accesses work best, while for others, two-way streaming works the best (see Sparseloop [84]).

Suppose we have the following expression:

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot^1 B_k :: \bigwedge_k^1 \langle \text{compute operator} \rangle \langle \text{merge operator} \rangle \quad (231)$$

Note that once the output is populated with a coordinate, the *compute* operator then defines how the input values contribute to the output value of Z .

Given two tensors, A , and B , and a merge operation on a single rank K , there are 16 possible merge operators:

- (1) The pass-through operator ($\mathbb{1}$)

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

- (2) The no-pass operator (\emptyset).

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

- (3) Intersection (\cap).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k \times(\cap) \quad (232)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

- (4) Take if in left coordinate only (\ominus_l).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k \langle \ominus_l \rangle \quad (233)$$

Note that this could also be done with a unary operator (\neg) and an intersection:

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot \neg B_d :: \bigwedge_k < (\cap) \quad (234)$$

In fact, I believe all 16 merge operators boil down to using a unary operator and an intersection or union. However, other merge operators are important to avoid expensive unary operations. This is more of a front-end lexical transformation. By explicitly specifying all 16 transformations, a compiler can then determine other optimizations.

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

(5) Take if in left (\rightarrow).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k < (\rightarrow) \quad (235)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

(6) Take if in right coordinate only (\ominus_r).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k > (\ominus_r) \quad (236)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(7) Take if in right (\leftarrow).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k \div (\leftarrow) \quad (237)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(8) Exclusive OR (\oplus).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_d :: \bigwedge_k + (\oplus) \quad (238)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

(9) Union (\cup).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k +(\cup) \quad (239)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

(10) NOR ($\neg\cup$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k 3(\neg\cup) \quad (240)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(11) Equivalence (\equiv).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k \times(\equiv) \quad (241)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(12) Not B ($\neg \rightarrow$). This is similar to the “take if in left operand” operator.

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k <(\neg \rightarrow) \quad (242)$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

(13) B implies A ($\cup\neg$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k +(\cup\neg) \quad (243)$$

This is equivalent to

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot \neg B_k :: \bigwedge_k +(\cup) \tag{244}$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

(14) Not A ($\neg \leftarrow$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k > (\neg \leftarrow) \tag{245}$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(15) A implies B ($\neg \cup$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k +(\neg \cup) \tag{246}$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(16) NAND ($\neg \cap$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge_k +(\neg \cap) \tag{247}$$

Coordinate in A	Coordinate in B	Coordinate in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No