

# Contract-Based General-Purpose GPU Programming

Alexey Kolesnichenko   Christopher M. Poskitt   Sebastian Nanz   Bertrand Meyer  
Department of Computer Science, ETH Zürich  
firstname.lastname@inf.ethz.ch

**Abstract**—Using GPUs as general-purpose processors has revolutionized parallel computing by offering, for a large and growing set of algorithms, massive data-parallelization on desktop machines. As an obstacle to widespread adoption, programming GPUs has remained difficult due to the need of using low-level control of the hardware to achieve good performance. This paper suggests a programming framework, SafeGPU, that aims at striking a balance between programmer productivity and performance by defining an API that makes GPU data-parallel operations accessible from within a classical object-oriented programming language. We further integrate this solution with the design-by-contract approach, which increases confidence in functional program correctness by embedding executable program specifications into the program text. We show that our API leads to modular and maintainable code that is accessible to GPGPU non-experts, while providing performance that is comparable with hand-written CUDA code. Also runtime contract checking turns out to be feasible, as the contracts can be executed on the GPU.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) are being increasingly exploited as a source of inexpensive parallel-processing power, with application areas as diverse as scientific data analysis, cryptography, and evolutionary computing [1], [2]. Consisting of thousands of processors that focus on throughput over latency, they are especially well-suited to realizing *data parallel* algorithms—i.e. those performing the same tasks on multiple items of data—with potentially significant performance gains to be achieved.

The CUDA [3] and OpenCL [4] languages support the programming of GPUs for applications beyond graphics in an approach now known as General Purpose Computing on GPUs (GPGPU). They provide programmers with fine-grained control over hardware at the C++ level of abstraction. This control, however, is a double-edged sword: while it facilitates advanced, hardware-specific fine-tuning techniques, it does so at the cost of working within very restrictive and low-level programming models. Recursion, for example, is amongst the standard programming concepts prohibited, while dynamic memory management (along with several other services of high-level languages) is completely absent, with programmers themselves having to explicitly manage the allocation of memory and movement of data. Although acceptable for specialist programmers, these issues pose a significant difficulty for others, and are an obstacle to more widespread adoption.

Such challenges have not gone unnoticed: recent years have seen a plethora of attempts to alleviate the burden on programmers. Several algorithmic skeleton frameworks for C++ have been extended—or purpose built—to support the orchestration of GPU computations, expressed in terms of programming patterns that leave the parallelism implicit [5]–[9]. Higher-level languages on the other hand have seen new libraries, extensions, and compilers for enabling the execution of programs on the GPU, with the varying levels of automatic device and memory management making such programs more comprehensible than their CUDA or OpenCL counterparts [10]–[13].

These advances, while in the right direction, still necessitate an understanding of relatively low-level GPU concepts such as barrier-based synchronization between threads; a mechanism that can easily lead to perplexing concurrency faults such as data races and barrier divergence. Such concepts can stifle the productivity of programmers, and remain an obstacle to broadening the adoption of GPGPU. What programming abstractions are needed—or possible—to broaden its appeal to non-experts, and to do so without depriving them of the potential performance boosts for data-parallel problems?

In this paper, we propose the programming framework SafeGPU that aims to hit a sweet spot between, on the one hand, programmer productivity and comprehension (as seen with high-level programming languages), and on the other, performance of data-parallel programs (as seen with CUDA and OpenCL). First, SafeGPU binds a classical object-oriented language, Eiffel, to the CUDA model, allowing already for GPU programs to be written, compiled, and executed by Eiffel developers. Then, and crucially, SafeGPU offers a high-level API for orchestrating data-parallel operations on the GPU; an API that embraces the object-oriented paradigm, and hides the low-level hardware and synchronization complexities of CUDA programs. Our approach aims for programmers to focus entirely on aspects of *functionality*, offering them collections equipped with primitive data-parallel operations (e.g. sum, max, min) that can be combined to orchestrate complex computations, without performance becoming incommensurate with that of manually written CUDA solutions. We aim for modular, maintainable, and understandable code, that opens up GPGPU to a wider class of software engineers and problem domains.

Furthermore, to support the development of safe and functionally correct GPU code, we integrate the design-by-contract [14] methodology that is native to Eiffel; that is to say, SafeGPU supports the annotation of high-level GPU programs with executable preconditions, postconditions, and invariants, together specifying the properties that should hold before and after the execution of methods. In languages supporting design-by-contract, these annotations can be checked dynamically at runtime, but the significant overhead incurred means that they are often disabled outside of debugging. With SafeGPU, contracts can be constructed from the data-parallel primitives, allowing for them to be monitored at runtime—with negligible overhead—by executing them on the GPU.

The contribution of this work is hence an API for GPU programming that:

- embraces the *object-oriented paradigm*, shielding programmers from the low-level complexities of the CUDA model without depriving them of the performance benefits;
- is *modular*, supporting the orchestration of complex computations through the composition of primitive operations;
- supports the writing of *safe* and *functionally correct code* via contracts, monitored at runtime with negligible overhead.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides an overview of the framework, its capabilities, and how it is implemented. Section III explores the binding and library APIs in more detail. Section IV evaluates performance, code size, and contract checking across a selection of example programs. Section V describes and contrasts some related work, before Section VI, in which we conclude.

## II. THE SAFEGPU FRAMEWORK

In this section we provide an overview of the SafeGPU framework. First, we describe the style of programming it supports for constructing GPU programs. Then, we consider its implementation, explaining how the integration with CUDA is achieved, as well as how kernels are generated and optimized. Finally, we elaborate on the use of contracts for checking functional correctness.

### A. Programming Style

CUDA kernels—i.e. the functions that run on the GPU—are executed by an array of threads, with each thread executing the same code on different data. Many computational tasks (e.g. matrix multiplication, vector addition) fit to this execution model very naturally; but many others do not, requiring, for example, non-trivial reductions for them to be realized. This difficulty is compounded when one starts to write complex, multistage algorithms: repeatedly invoking kernels for each of the subtasks is relatively expensive, yet

combining them into one larger kernel is non-trivial, and increases the possibility of introducing faults.

SafeGPU, in contrast, emphasizes the development of GPU programs in terms of simple, compositional “building blocks”. For a selection of common data structures (including collections, vectors, and matrices), the framework provides a set of built-in primitive operations. While individually these operations are simple and intuitive to grasp (e.g. `sum`, `max`, `project`), they can also be combined and chained together to orchestrate complex GPU computations, without the developer ever needing to think about the manipulation of kernels. The aim is to allow for developers to focus entirely on functionality, with the framework itself responsible for generating kernels and applying optimizations (e.g. combining them). This focus on functionality extends to correctness, with SafeGPU supporting the annotation of programs with contracts that can be efficiently monitored at runtime.

Before we expand on these different aspects of the framework, consider the example in Listing 1 which illustrates how a simple GPU program can be constructed in practice.

```
matrix_transpose_vector_mult(matrix: G_MATRIX[DOUBLE];
    vector: G_VECTOR[DOUBLE]): G_MATRIX[DOUBLE]
require
    matrix.rows = vector.count
do
    Result := matrix.transpose.right_multiply (vector)
ensure
    Result.rows = matrix.columns
    Result.columns = 1
end
```

Listing 1: Transposed matrix-vector multiplication example

The method takes as input a matrix and a vector, then returns the result of transposing the matrix and multiplying the vector. The computation is expressed in one line through the chaining of two compact, primitive operations from the API for matrices—`transpose` and `right_multiply`—from which the CUDA code is automatically generated and optimized. Furthermore, because the latter of the operations is only defined for inputs of certain sizes ( $N \times M$  matrix;  $M$  dimension vector), the method is annotated with a precondition in the `require` clause, expressing that the size of the input vector should be equal to the number of rows in the matrix (rows, not columns, since it will be transposed). Similarly, the postcondition in the `ensure` clause expresses the expected dimensions of the resulting matrix. Both of these properties can be monitored at runtime, with the precondition checked upon entering the method, and the postcondition checked upon an exit.

### B. CUDA Integration

SafeGPU provides two conceptual levels of integration with CUDA: a binding and library level. The binding level provides a minimalistic API to run raw CUDA code within

an Eiffel program, similar to bindings like PyCUDA [15] and JCUDA [16], and is intended for experienced users who need more fine-grained control over the GPU. The library level is built on top of the binding, and provides the data structures, primitive operations, and kernel-generation facilities that form the focus of this paper.

The runtime integration of CUDA is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: SafeGPU runtime

SafeGPU actively makes use of Eiffel’s built-in mechanisms for interfacing with C++, allowing the framework to call the CUDA-specific functions it needs for initialization, data transfers, and device synchronization. These steps are handled automatically by the framework for both the binding and library levels, minimizing the amount of boilerplate code. Given a source kernel, whether handwritten at the binding level or generated from the library one, the `nvcc` compiler generates a `.ptx` file, which contains a CUDA module that the framework can use to launch the kernel.

### C. Kernel Generation and Optimization

SafeGPU is equipped from the start with a plethora of useful primitive operations for collections, vectors, and matrices, from which efficient CUDA kernels can be generated; but it is only so far that matrix multiplication or vector addition alone can go. The heart of the framework is in its support for combining and chaining such operations to solve complex, multistage algorithms on the GPU. The main challenge in providing this support is to do so without performance becoming incommensurate with that of manually written CUDA kernels. A naive solution, for example, would be to generate one kernel per primitive and launch them one after the other; but the overhead of the unnecessary kernel launches and data transfers is unacceptable. Instead, SafeGPU adopts a deferred execution model, analyses pending kernels, and attempts to generate more efficient code by combining them.

By default, a method call is not executed, but rather added to a list of pending actions for the corresponding collection. There are three ways to trigger its execution: (1) perform a function call that returns a scalar value, e.g. `sum`; (2) perform a call to `to_array` which creates an array from the collection; or (3) perform a call of the special method `update`, which forces the execution of the pending kernels.

Consider for example the problem of computing the dot product (inner product) of two vectors, which can be

solved by combining vector addition and multiplication, as shown in Listing 2. Here, the result is obtained by chaining the `a.compwise_multiplication(b)` method, which produces an anonymous intermediate result, with `vector.sum`. In this example, the computation is deferred until the call of `sum`, which returns the sum of the elements in the vector.

```

inner_product(a, b: G_VECTOR[DOUBLE]): DOUBLE
  require
    a.count = b.count
  do
    Result := a.compwise_multiplication(b).sum
    -- component-wise vector multiplication, followed by
    --      sum of its elements
  end

```

Listing 2: Combining primitives to compute dot product

The benefit of deferring execution until necessary is that the possibility arises for optimization, i.e. the generation of more efficient code for combined operations than for the operations individually. This means minimizing the number of small, distinct kernels, attempting instead to merge them into bigger, longer-running ones. In practice, the number of kernels generated will usually be smaller than the number of operations.

Before generating kernels, the optimizer constructs an execution plan from the pending operations. The plan takes the form of a DAG, representing data and kernels as two different types of nodes, and representing dependencies as edges between them. The optimizer then traverses the DAG, merging kernel vertices and collapsing intermediate dependencies where possible. Upon termination, the kernel generation takes place on the basis of the optimized DAG.

Consider for example Figure 2, which shows the execution plans for the dot product method in Listing 2.




Figure 2: Execution plan for dot product

The plan in Figure 2a is the original one extracted from the pending operations, whereas the plan in Figure 2b is the one resulting from the optimization. The original plan would generate two kernels, `cmult` and `sum` (note that summation generally requires  $\log(n)$  calls, but all calls after the first one operate on exponentially smaller problem sizes), and the framework would have to store the intermediate result in memory. The optimized plan, however, has a single call to a combined kernel which performs both component-wise vector multiplication and the first stage of summation.

Typically, an optimized kernel of this form exploits barrier synchronization to separate the two disjoint parts of the computation.

The optimizer is particularly well-tuned for computations involving vector mathematics. In this case, barriers are not needed at all; the optimizer simply modifies the main expression in the kernel body, leading to even more efficient code. For example, to compute  $aX + Y$  where  $a$  is a scalar value and  $X, Y$  are vectors, the optimizer just slightly adjusts the vector addition kernel, replacing  $C[i] = X[i] + Y[i]$  with  $C[i] = a*X[i] + Y[i]$ . Such optimizations also change the number of kernel arguments, as shown in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Execution plan for vector mathematics

#### D. Design-by-Contract Integration

To support the development of safe and functionally correct code, SafeGPU integrates the design-by-contract [14] methodology native to the Eiffel language, i.e. the annotation of methods with pre- and postconditions, expressing precisely the properties that should hold upon entry and exit, respectively. These can be monitored at runtime to help ensure the correctness of programs. In the context of GPU programs, however, in which very large amounts of data might be being processed, “classical” contracts take so long to evaluate that they need to be disabled outside of debugging. In contrast, SafeGPU supports the execution of contracts on the GPU itself, without diminishing the performance of the program—despite the volume of data. As such, contracts can be monitored at runtime, helping to ensure correctness of the orchestrated GPU programs.

Consider for example the signature and postcondition of a quicksort method, as in Listing 3. The postcondition contains two kinds of contracts: `is_sorted`—from the vector API—operates over the whole range of elements, whereas `same_length` uses only a single value. The former is executed efficiently on the GPU, whereas the latter is executed by the CPU, since the overhead of the data roundtrip from main memory to the GPU (and back) would outweigh any potential performance gain.

SafeGPU provides a simple way to write contracts that are executed on the GPU: one simply calls a method defined in terms of the primitive operations of the framework. This

```
quicksort(a_vector: G_VECTOR[DOUBLE]): G_VECTOR[DOUBLE]
require
do
  -- implementation is not shown
ensure
  is_sorted: Result.is_sorted
  same_length: Result.count = count
end
```

Listing 3: Signature and postcondition for quicksort

is analogous to classical design-by-contract, in which (side-effect free) methods can be used in both the specifications and implementations. The framework also provides the means to express so-called range contracts, i.e. contracts about a range of data that can be checked on the GPU. Two of the most important operations SafeGPU defines for this purpose are `for_all` and `exists`, which can be used to express that some predicate holds for every item of a collection (see Section III-B). Range contracts are expressed in a compact, functional style, and without deferred execution (since they all return Boolean values).

We emphasize that the capacity to check contracts on the GPU makes it possible to monitor correctness with negligible overhead. Unlike traditional sequential contracts, those supported by SafeGPU do not diminish the performance of the program, even with very large volumes of data. We provide detailed benchmarks in Section IV-C.

### III. DESIGN OF THE API

The SafeGPU API has two levels of abstraction: the binding level and the library level. The binding API—as a low-level solution—provides primitive language bindings to run CUDA code from within Eiffel. It offers functionality that the APIs at the library level are built upon, but would not typically be used directly by a developer. The library level instead is designed to provide safe but efficient access to GPU computation for users of the framework. We first briefly cover the binding API, and then describe the APIs of three basic collection classes at the library level: collections, vectors, and matrices.

#### A. CUDA Bindings

The Binding API provides handles to access the GPU and raw memory. Programming with this API requires an effort comparable to plain CUDA solutions and is therefore not a user-level API; its main purpose is to provide functionality for the high-level APIs built on top of it.

Table I provides details on the API’s classes. The two main classes are `CUDA_KERNEL` and `CUDA_DATA_HANDLE`. The former encapsulates a CUDA kernel; the latter represents a contiguous sequence of uniform objects, e.g. a single-dimensional array.

#### B. Collections

Collections are the most abstract container type provided by SafeGPU; the majority of bulk operations—operating

class	description
CUDA_DATA_HANDLE	Represents a handle to device memory location. Supports scalar and vector data, and multi-dimensional data. Can be created from (and converted to) standard ARRAYS.
CUDA_INTEROP	Encapsulates low-level device operations, such as initialization, memory allocation, and data transfer.
CUDA_KERNEL	Represents a CUDA kernel, ready for execution. Can contain an arbitrary number of CUDA_DATA_HANDLE kernel inputs, one of which is used as output. Can be launched with configurable shared memory.
LAUNCH_PARAMS	Encapsulates the grid setup and shared memory size, required to launch a CUDA_KERNEL.
KERNEL_LOADER	Is responsible for loading CUDA kernels into the calling process. If necessary, performs a kernel compilation. Can load kernels from a file or from a string.

Table I: Overview of the binding API

on an entire collection—are defined here. Collections are array-based, i.e. they have bounded capacity and count, and their items can be accessed by index. Collections do not automatically resize; if one needs to change a size of a container in the SafeGPU framework, one must use dedicated methods for resizing. The key methods of the Collection API are described in Table II. A collection can be created using the feature `from_array`, which copies its content from an Eiffel array: as an array’s content is contiguous, a single call to CUDA’s analogue of `memcpy` suffices. Feature `count` provides the number of elements, and `item` accesses a single element of the collection.

<code>from_array (array: ARRAY[T])</code>	Creates an instance of collection, containing items from the provided array.
<code>count: INT</code>	Queries the number of elements in the collection.
<code>item (i: INT): T</code>	Access to a single element.
<code>for_each (action: PROCEDURE[T]): <b>like Current</b></code>	Applies the provided action to every element of the collection.
<code>filter (condition: PREDICATE[T]): <b>like Current</b></code>	Creates a new collection, containing only items, for which the specified condition holds.
<code>for_all (condition: PREDICATE[T]): BOOLEAN</code>	Checks whether the specified condition holds for all items in the collection.
<code>exists (condition: PREDICATE[T]): BOOLEAN</code>	Checks whether the specified condition holds for at least one item in the collection.
<code>project (transform: FUNCTION[T, U]): COLLECTION[U]</code>	Performs a projection operation on the collection: each item is transformed, according to the specified transformation function.
<code>new_cursor: ITERATION_CURSOR [T]</code>	Implementation of ITERABLE[T]; is called upon iteration over the collection.
<code>update</code>	Forces execution on all pending operations associated with current collection. The execution is optimized, when possible.
<code>subset(start, finish: INT): <b>like Current</b></code>	Creates a subset of the collection that shares the same memory as the original.

Table II: Collection API

The core part of the API design consists of methods for filtering, querying, and transforming collections. All these methods makes use of Eiffel’s functional capabilities in the form of *agents*, which represent functions—similar to

delegates in C# or anonymous classes in Java. Agents in the Collections API provide a way to customize its features.

The three main types of agents used are the following: `PROCEDURE[T]` represents an action, defined on a single element of type `T`, that returns no result; `PREDICATE[T]` applied to an element of type `T` determines whether this element satisfies some boolean expression; and `FUNCTION[T, U]` applied to an element of type `T` returns a new element of type `U`.

Method `for_each` applies a procedure to every element. Here, the Eiffel type **like Current** denotes the type of the object that `for_each` is applied to. Methods `filter`, `for_all`, and `exists` apply predicates in order to filter or query the collection. For example, the call

```
c.filter(agent (a: INT) do Result := a < 5 end)
```

represents an application of `filter` to a collection `c`, customized with an agent so that a new collection that only contains elements less than 5 is created. The queries `for_all` and `exists` can also be used as range contracts, which as discussed in Section II-D, are checked at runtime on the GPU. The contract

```
c.for_all(agent (i: T) do Result := pred(i) end)
```

for example, expresses that some (unspecified) predicate `pred` holds for every element of the collection `c`.

Method `project` transforms an element using a given function agent.

Collections are embedded into Eiffel’s container hierarchy by implementing the `ITERABLE` interface, which allows enumerating their elements in foreach-style loops (**across** in Eiffel terminology). Enumerating is efficient: upon the call to `new_cursor`, a collection’s content is copied back to main memory in one single action.

Finally, `subset` resizes a given collection to a subset.

### C. Vectors

Vectors are a natural specialization of collections. Besides having the capabilities of collections, they provide a range of numerical operations.

The API for vectors is presented in Table III. It is capable of computing the average value `avg` and `sum` of the elements of arbitrary vectors, and computing the minimal `min` and maximal `max` elements. These functions are all implemented via multiple reductions at the device side; the computation is optimal in the sense that computation via reduction does not do more work than its sequential counterpart.

All numerical operations such as `plus` and `minus` (and their in-place variants), `multiply_by` and `divide_by` (and their component-wise variants) are defined as vector operations on the GPU, i.e. a call to `plus` performs vector addition in a single action on the device side. Note that for value-returning operations, aliases can be used, e.g. instead of `v.divide_by(n)` one can (simpler) write `v * n`.

A common concern in vector mathematics programming is to keep dimensions of the data in computations synchro-

```

sum: T
    Computes the sum of the vector elements.
min: T
    Computes the maximum of the vector elements.
max: T
    Computes the minimum of the vector elements.
avg: T
    Computes the average of the vector elements.
is_sorted: BOOLEAN
    Checks whether the vector is sorted.
plus(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
    Adds two vectors and returns the result.
minus(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
    Subtracts the provided vector from the current and returns the result.
inplace_plus(other: VECTOR[T])
    Adds two vectors and modifies the current vector to contain the result.
inplace_minus(other: VECTOR[T])
    Subtracts the provided vector from the current and modifies the current
    vector to contain the result.
multiply_by(factor: T): VECTOR[T]
    Multiplies the current vector by the provided scalar.
divide_by(factor: T): VECTOR[T]
    Divides the current vector by the provided scalar. The scalar should not be
    zero.
compwise_multiply(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
    Multiplies the current vector by another component-wise.
compwise_divide(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
    Divide the current vector by another component-wise. No zero elements
    are allowed in the second vector.

```

Table III: Vector API

nized. We take care of this issue via design-by-contract: every vector operation is equipped with contracts that shield developers from possible inconsistencies. As an example, contracts for component-wise vector division are shown in Listing 4.

```

compwise_divide(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
require
    other.count = count
    other.for_all(
        agent (el: T) do Result := el /= {T}.zero end
ensure
    Current = old Current
    Result * other = Current
end

```

Listing 4: Contracts for component-wise vector division

Here, the precondition disallowing zero elements in the argument is expressed via the functional capabilities discussed for collections in Section III-B. Furthermore, the effect of the routine is clear from the postcondition, which expresses that the current vector is not modified.

#### D. Matrices

The Matrix API is strongly tied to the Vector API: the class is using `VECTOR` to represent a row and a column. On the device side, a matrix is stored as a single-dimensional array with row-wise alignment. Thus, a vector handle for a row can be created by adjusting the corresponding indices. The column access pattern is more complicated, and implemented by performing a copy of corresponding elements into new storage.

Table IV presents the API. The queries `rows` and `columns` provide the dimensions of the matrix, while `item`,

```

rows: INT
    Queries the number of rows in the matrix.
columns: INT
    Queries the number of columns in the matrix.
item(i, j: INT): T
    Gets or sets the i-th, j-th element of the matrix.
row(i: INT): VECTOR[T]
    Gets the i-th row of the matrix. Modifying the result value will modify the
    matrix as well.
column(i: INT): VECTOR[T]
    Gets the i-th column of the matrix. Modifying the result value will modify
    the matrix as well.
plus(other: MATRIX[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Adds the provided matrix to the current and returns the result.
minus(other: MATRIX[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Subtracts the provided matrix from the current and returns the result.
inplace_plus(other: MATRIX[T])
    Performs element-wise addition. Modifies the current matrix.
inplace_minus(other: MATRIX[T])
    Performs element-wise subtraction. Modifies the current matrix.
multiply_by(factor: T)
    Multiplies the current matrix by the provided scalar.
multiply(other: MATRIX[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Multiplies the current matrix by another.
compwise_multiply(other: MATRIX[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Multiplies the current matrix by another component-wise.
compwise_divide(other: MATRIX[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Divide the current matrix by another component-wise. No zero elements
    are allowed in the second matrix.
left_multiply(other: VECTOR[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Multiplies the provided vector by the current matrix.
right_multiply(other: VECTOR[T]): MATRIX[T]
    Multiplies the current matrix by the provided vector.
transpose: MATRIX[T]
    Transposes the matrix.
submatrix(start_row, start_col, rows, cols: INT): MATRIX[T]
    Creates a submatrix, spanning from [start_row, start_col] to
    [start_row + rows, start_col + columns], that shares the same
    memory as the parent matrix.

```

Table IV: Matrix API

`row`, and `column` return parts of the matrix. Single-column or single-row matrices can be converted to vectors, by making appropriate calls to the `row` or `column` features.

Similar to vectors, matrices provide in-place arithmetic operations for `plus` and `minus` along with the conventional ones. Besides the primitive arithmetic operations, the API provides more complicated operations such as matrix-matrix multiplication via method `multiply`; we provide in-built support, as it is an important problem for GPGPU. The implementation makes use of the shared device memory and thus provides good performance.

The API further provides the means to perform scalar multiplication (`multiply_by`), left and right matrix-vector multiplication (`left_multiply` and `right_multiply`), component-wise multiplication and addition (`compwise_multiply` and `compwise_divide`), transposition (`transpose`), and submatrix creation.

Just as in the case of the other APIs, the Matrix API carefully adopts the design-by-contract methodology to shield the programmer from common errors: for example, using this API it is impossible to perform matrix multiplication with mismatching dimensions.

## IV. EVALUATION

To evaluate SafeGPU, we designed a set of example GPU programs encompassing both problems that fit naturally to the execution model (e.g. vector addition, matrix multiplication), as well as more general-purpose ones constructed by chaining the primitive operations of the framework (e.g. quicksort). Across these examples we made three different comparisons. First, we evaluated the performance of the high-level API against corresponding CUDA and Eiffel implementations. Second, we compared the lines of code (LOC) necessary to express the same problems in SafeGPU and sequential Eiffel. Finally, we measured the performance overhead of runtime contract checking, and compared it to checking traditional sequential contracts.

The five example programs we considered were vector addition, dot product, matrix multiplication, Gaussian elimination, and quicksort. Each example was implemented using SafeGPU (with contracts for the GPU) and traditional Eiffel (with sequential contracts). These were compared against plain CUDA versions with the same functionality. For vector addition and matrix multiplication, we used existing CUDA programs from the NVIDIA SDK, and adapted other ones to implement dot product and quicksort. For Gaussian elimination, we used the CUDA code from a parallel computing research project<sup>1</sup>.

All experiments were performed on the following hardware: Intel Core i7 8 cores, 2.7 GHz; NVIDIA QUADRO K2000M (2 GB memory, compute capability 3.0). In our measurements we are using wall time. Furthermore, we measure only the relevant part of the computation, omitting the time it takes to generate the inputs.

The version of SafeGPU used for these experiments, as well as all the examples, are available online<sup>2</sup>.

### A. Performance

The goal of our first experiment was to measure the performance of the framework against plain CUDA implementations, i.e. to find out what the high-level of abstraction translates into in terms of overhead. The results of our comparison are shown in Figure 4. The problem size ( $x$ -axis) is defined for both vectors and matrices as the total number of elements they contain (our benchmarks use only square matrices, so the number of rows or columns is always the square root). The times ( $y$ -axis) are shown in seconds, and are the medians of ten runs.

While sequential Eiffel is faster than both SafeGPU and plain CUDA on relatively small inputs (as expected, because of the overhead from launching kernels) it is outperformed by both when the size of the data becomes large. This happens particularly quickly for the non-linear algorithm (e) in comparison to the linear ones (a)–(d).

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.cs.rutgers.edu/~venugopa/parallel\\_summer2012/ge.html](http://www.cs.rutgers.edu/~venugopa/parallel_summer2012/ge.html)

<sup>2</sup>[https://bitbucket.org/alexey\\_se/eiffel2cuda](https://bitbucket.org/alexey_se/eiffel2cuda)

The results provide support for the argument that the abstraction level of SafeGPU does not lead to performance incommensurate with that of handwritten CUDA code. The performance of framework is very close to that of plain CUDA across most of the examples. The Gaussian elimination example (d) is an exception for larger inputs. This is due to the need for the SafeGPU implementation to use a loop, which has the effect of additional kernel launches in comparison to the handwritten CUDA code. In other examples, SafeGPU sometimes outperforms plain CUDA, which we believe is due to differences between the memory managers of Eiffel and C++.

### B. Code Size

The second part of our evaluation considers code size, and in particular, lines of code (LOC). We only compare the SafeGPU and sequential Eiffel programs in this part, and not the plain CUDA code. This is because it is not a particularly interesting comparison to make: it is known that higher-level languages are usually more compact than those at the C/C++ level of abstraction [17], and CUDA programs in particular are dominated by explicit memory management that is not visible in SafeGPU or Eiffel.

Our results are presented in Table V. The programs written using the framework are quite concise (as expected for a high-level API), but more surprising, are more compact than the traditional sequential Eiffel programs. One reason for this is the use of looping constructs. In sequential Eiffel, loops are frequently used to implement the examples. With SafeGPU however, loops are often avoided due to the presence of bulk operations in the API, i.e. operations that are defined to handle all of the data present in a collection. We should note that this is not always the case, as loops were required to realize both Gaussian elimination and quicksort within the framework.

problem	Eiffel	SafeGPU
Vector Addition	15	6
Dot Product	17	7
Matrix-Matrix Multiplication	31	9
Gaussian Elimination	97	34
Quicksort	110	64

Table V: LOC comparison

### C. Contract Performance

The goal of our final experiment was to measure the cost of checking SafeGPU contracts on the GPU against the cost of checking traditional Eiffel ones, i.e. to establish the overhead of monitoring pre- and postcondition satisfaction at runtime. Across the examples and for the different sizes of input, we measured performance with contract-checking enabled, and computed ratios with respect to the performance results in Section IV-A. Our data is presented in Table VI, where a ratio  $X$  can be interpreted as meaning that the program was  $X$  times slower with contract-checking




Figure 4: SafeGPU performance evaluation

enabled. The comparison was not made for some examples with the largest inputs (indicated by dashes), as it took far too long for the sequential Eiffel programs to terminate. We remark that vector addition, dot product, and matrix-matrix multiplication have only scalar contracts; Gaussian elimination and quicksort have a combination of scalar and range contracts.

There is a remarkable difference between conventional Eiffel and SafeGPU: while the former cannot maintain reasonable (relative) performance on large inputs, the latter has practically zero overhead. The results strongly support our claim that contracts can be monitored at runtime with negligible overhead—even with very large amounts of data. Unlike traditional Eiffel programs, contract-checking need not be limited to periods of debugging.

## V. RELATED WORK

There is a vast and varied literature on general-purpose computing with GPUs. We review a selection of it, focusing on work that particularly relates to the overarching themes of SafeGPU: the *generation* of low-level GPU kernels from higher-level programming abstractions, and the *correctness* of the kernels to be executed.

### A. GPU Programming and Code Generation

At the C++ level of abstraction, there are a number of algorithmic skeleton and template frameworks that attempt to hide the orchestration and synchronization of parallel computation. Rather than code it directly, programmers

express the computation in terms of some well-known patterns (e.g. map, scan, reduce) that capture the parallel activities implicitly. SkePU [5], Muesli [6], and SkelCL [9] were the first algorithmic skeleton frameworks to target the deployment of fine-grained data-parallel skeletons to the GPU. While they do not support the offloading of compound behaviors, they do provide the programmer with parallel container types (e.g. vectors, matrices) that simplify memory management by handling data transfers automatically. Arbitrary skeleton nesting is provided in FastFlow [7] (resp. Marrow [8]) for pipeline and farm (resp. pipeline, stream, loop), but concurrency and synchronization issues are exposed to the programmer. NVIDIA’s template library Thrust [18], in contrast, provides a collection of data-parallel primitives (e.g. scan, sort, reduce) that can be composed to implement complex algorithms on the GPU. While similar in spirit to SafeGPU, Thrust lacks many of its abstractions and container types. Data, for example, is modeled via separate vector types for the CPU and GPU, with explicit instructions required to transfer it between the two.

Higher-level programming languages benefit from a number of CUDA and OpenCL bindings (e.g. Java [16], Python [15]), making it possible for their runtimes to interact. These bindings typically stay as close to the original models as possible. While this allows for the full flexibility and control of CUDA and OpenCL to be integrated, all the existing challenges are inherited, along with the addition of some new ones—Java programmers, for example, must manually



problem	10 <sup>3</sup>		10 <sup>4</sup>		10 <sup>5</sup>		10 <sup>6</sup>		10 <sup>7</sup>		10 <sup>8</sup>	
	Eiffel	SafeGPU	Eiffel	SafeGPU	Eiffel	SafeGPU	Eiffel	SafeGPU	Eiffel	SafeGPU	Eiffel	SafeGPU
Vector Addition	1.00	0.92	2.86	0.96	7.00	0.96	7.81	0.95	7.82	1.02	7.97	1.06
Dot Product	1.00	1.02	1.88	0.99	7.25	0.93	7.33	1.01	7.46	1.10	7.48	0.95
Matrix-Matrix Multiplication	5.00	1.05	6.73	1.01	6.79	0.98	6.76	0.99	-	-	-	-
Gaussian Elimination	4.44	0.99	6.67	0.97	6.96	1.01	6.96	1.09	-	-	-	-
Quicksort	3.64	1.02	4.14	1.05	5.07	1.00	6.38	1.07	6.49	1.02	-	-

Table VI: Contract overhead comparison

translate complex object graphs into primitive arrays for use in kernels. Rootbeer [13], implemented on top of CUDA, attempts to alleviate such difficulties by automatically serializing objects and generating kernels from Java code. Programmers, however, must still essentially work in terms of threads—expressed as special kernel classes—and are responsible for instantiating and passing them on to the Rootbeer system for execution on the GPU.

There are several dedicated languages and compilers for GPU programming. Lime [10] is a Java-compatible language equipped with high-level programming constructs for task, data, and pipeline parallelism. The language allows programmers to code in a style that separates computation and communication, and does not force them to explicitly partition the parts of the program for the CPU and the parts for the GPU. Other languages are more domain-specific than Lime. StreamIt [19], for example, provides high-level abstractions for stream processing, and can be compiled to CUDA code via streaming-specific optimizations [11]. A more recent example is VOBLA [20], a DSL for programming linear algebra libraries, restricting on the one hand what the programmer can write, but generating highly optimized OpenCL code for the domain it supports.

A key distinction of SafeGPU is the fact that GPGPU is offered to the programmer without forcing them to switch to a dedicated language in the first place—both the high-level API and the CUDA binding are made available in a library-oriented approach, and without need for a special-purpose compiler. Firepile [12] is a related library-oriented approach for Scala, that translates syntax trees obtained by bytecode inspection to OpenCL kernels. It does not however support programming at the same level of abstraction as SafeGPU, exposing barriers and the GPU grid, for example, to developers.

### B. Correctness of GPU Kernels

While SafeGPU is concerned with the specification and run-time checking of functional properties at the level of the API, other work addressing the correctness of GPU programs has tended to focus on analyzing and verifying kernels themselves; usually with respect to concurrency faults (e.g. data races, barrier divergence).

PUG [21] and GPUVerify [22] are examples of static analysis tools for GPU kernels. The former logically encodes program executions and uses an SMT solver to verify the absence of faults such as data races, incorrectly synchronized

barriers, and assertion violations. The latter tool verifies race- and divergence-freedom using a technique—encoded in Boogie [23]—based on tracking reads and writes in shadow memory.

Blom et al. [24] present a logic for verifying both data race freedom and functional correctness of GPU kernels in OpenCL. The logic is inspired by permission-based separation logic: kernel code is annotated with assertions specifying both their intended functionality, as well as the resources they require (e.g. write permissions for particular locations).

Other tools seek to show the presence of data races, rather than verify their absence. GKLEE [25] and KLEE-CL [26] are two examples, based on dynamic symbolic execution.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We presented SafeGPU: a contract-based, modular, and efficient library for GPGPU, accessible for non-experts in GPU programming. The techniques of deferred execution and execution plan optimization helped to keep the framework performance on par with raw CUDA solutions. Unlike CUDA programs, SafeGPU programs are concise and equipped with contracts, thereby contributing to program safety. We also found that—in contrast to traditional contracts—GPU-based contracts can largely avoid the overhead of assertion checking, providing a feasible solution for widespread adoption of contracts: data size is not an issue anymore.

This work can be extended in a variety of directions. First, in the current implementation, the optimizer is tailored to linear algebra problems and reduction/scan problems. Global optimizations could be added, such as changing the order of operation. Second, as shown in Section IV, GPU computing is not yet fast enough on “small” data sets. One way of improving the performance would be a hybrid computing model, where two copies of data—both in main and GPU memory—are combined. This design would allow for switching between CPU and GPU executions, depending on the runtime context. As SafeGPU execution is structured, it would be reasonable to assume that keeping two copies in sync would be feasible. Finally, to provide better support for task parallelism, SafeGPU could be integrated with a CPU threading model.

## REFERENCES

- [1] “NVIDIA: GPU applications,” <http://www.nvidia.com/object/gpu-applications.html>, accessed: September 2014.

- [2] S. Yoo, M. Harman, and S. Ur, “GPGPU test suite minimisation: search based software engineering performance improvement using graphics cards,” *Empirical Software Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 550–593, 2013.
- [3] “NVIDIA: CUDA parallel computing platform,” [http://www.nvidia.com/object/cuda\\_home\\_new.html](http://www.nvidia.com/object/cuda_home_new.html), accessed: September 2014.
- [4] Khronos OpenCL Working Group, “The OpenCL specification: Version 1.2,” <https://www.khronos.org/registry/cl/specs/opengl-1.2.pdf>, 2012.
- [5] J. Enmyren and C. W. Kessler, “SkePU: A multi-backend skeleton programming library for multi-GPU systems,” in *Proc. International Workshop on High-Level Parallel Programming and Applications (HLPP 2010)*. ACM, 2010, pp. 5–14.
- [6] S. Ernsting and H. Kuchen, “Algorithmic skeletons for multi-core, multi-GPU systems and clusters,” *International Journal of High Performance Computing and Networking*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 129–138, 2012.
- [7] M. Goli and H. González-Vélez, “Heterogeneous algorithmic skeletons for FastFlow with seamless coordination over hybrid architectures,” in *Proc. Euromicro International Conference on Parallel, Distributed, and Network-Based Processing (PDP 2013)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2013, pp. 148–156.
- [8] R. Marqués, H. Paulino, F. Alexandre, and P. D. Medeiros, “Algorithmic skeleton framework for the orchestration of GPU computations,” in *Proc. European Conference on Parallel Processing (Euro-Par 2013)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 8097. Springer, 2013, pp. 874–885.
- [9] M. Steuwer and S. Gorlatch, “SkelCL: Enhancing OpenCL for high-level programming of multi-GPU systems,” in *Proc. International Conference on Parallel Computing Technologies (PaCT 2013)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 7979. Springer, 2013, pp. 258–272.
- [10] C. Dubach, P. Cheng, R. M. Rabbah, D. F. Bacon, and S. J. Fink, “Compiling a high-level language for GPUs: (via language support for architectures and compilers),” in *Proc. SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2012)*. ACM, 2012, pp. 1–12.
- [11] A. Hormati, M. Samadi, M. Woh, T. N. Mudge, and S. A. Mahlke, “Sponge: portable stream programming on graphics engines,” in *Proc. International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS 2011)*. ACM, 2011, pp. 381–392.
- [12] N. Nystrom, D. White, and K. Das, “Firepile: Run-time compilation for GPUs in Scala,” in *Proc. Generative Programming and Component Engineering (GPCE 2011)*. ACM, 2011, pp. 107–116.
- [13] P. C. Pratt-Szeliga, J. W. Fawcett, and R. D. Welch, “Rootbeer: Seamlessly using GPUs from Java,” in *Proc. International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communication & International Conference on Embedded Software and Systems (HPCC-ICES 2012)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2012, pp. 375–380.
- [14] B. Meyer, *Object-Oriented Software Construction, 2nd Edition*. Prentice-Hall, 1997.
- [15] A. Klöckner, N. Pinto, Y. Lee, B. C. Catanzaro, P. Ivanov, and A. Fasih, “PyCUDA and PyOpenCL: A scripting-based approach to GPU run-time code generation,” *Parallel Computing*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 157–174, 2012.
- [16] Y. Yan, M. Grossman, and V. Sarkar, “JCUDA: A programmer-friendly interface for accelerating Java programs with CUDA,” in *Proc. European Conference on Parallel Processing (Euro-Par 2009)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 5704. Springer, 2009, pp. 887–899.
- [17] S. Nanz and C. A. Furia, “A comparative study of programming languages in Rosetta Code,” <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.0252>, 2014.
- [18] “NVIDIA: CUDA toolkit documentation – Thrust,” <http://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/thrust/>, accessed: September 2014.
- [19] W. Thies, M. Karczmarek, and S. P. Amarasinghe, “StreamIt: A language for streaming applications,” in *Proc. Compiler Construction (CC 2002)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2304. Springer, 2002, pp. 179–196.
- [20] U. Beaugnon, A. Kravets, S. van Haastregt, R. Baghdadi, D. Tweed, J. Absar, and A. Lokhmotov, “VOBLA: A vehicle for optimized basic linear algebra,” in *Proc. SIGPLAN/SIGBED Conference on Languages, Compilers and Tools for Embedded Systems (LCTES 2014)*. ACM, 2014, pp. 115–124.
- [21] G. Li and G. Gopalakrishnan, “Scalable SMT-based verification of GPU kernel functions,” in *Proc. International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering (FSE 2010)*. ACM, 2010, pp. 187–196.
- [22] A. Betts, N. Chong, A. F. Donaldson, S. Qadeer, and P. Thomson, “GPUVerify: a verifier for GPU kernels,” in *Proc. Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA 2012)*. ACM, 2012, pp. 113–132.
- [23] M. Barnett, B.-Y. E. Chang, R. DeLine, B. Jacobs, and K. R. M. Leino, “Boogie: A modular reusable verifier for object-oriented programs,” in *Proc. International Symposium on Formal Methods for Components and Objects (FMCO 2005)*, ser. LNCS, vol. 4111. Springer, 2005, pp. 364–387.
- [24] S. Blom, M. Huisman, and M. Mihelčić, “Specification and verification of GPGPU programs,” *Science of Computer Programming*, 2014, in press.
- [25] G. Li, P. Li, G. Sawaya, G. Gopalakrishnan, I. Ghosh, and S. P. Rajan, “GKLEE: concolic verification and test generation for GPUs,” in *Proc. SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP 2012)*. ACM, 2012, pp. 215–224.
- [26] P. Collingbourne, C. Cadar, and P. H. J. Kelly, “Symbolic crosschecking of data-parallel floating-point code,” *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 40, no. 7, pp. 710–737, 2014.