

# Contract-Based General-Purpose GPU Programming

Alexey Kolesnichenko   Christopher M. Poskitt   Sebastian Nanz   Bertrand Meyer  
Department of Computer Science, ETH Zürich, Switzerland  
*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. An obstacle to widespread adoption, however, is the difficulty of programming them and the low-level control of the hardware required to achieve good performance. This paper suggests a programming framework, SafeGPU, that aims at striking a balance between programmer productivity and performance, by making GPU data-parallel operations accessible from within a classical object-oriented programming language. The solution is integrated 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 framework leads to modular and maintainable code that is accessible to GPGPU non-experts, while providing performance that is comparable with hand-written CUDA code. Furthermore, 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, hiding 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. This is achieved by deferring generation of CUDA kernels such that the execution of pending operations can be optimized by combining them.

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 little overhead, by executing them on the GPU.

The contribution of this work is hence a framework 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* and *efficient*, supporting the orchestration of complex computations through the composition of primitive operations with a dedicated kernel optimization strategy;
- supports the writing of *safe* and *functionally correct code* via contracts, monitored at runtime with little 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 describes the design-by-contract integration. Section V presents the kernel generation and optimization strategies. Section VI evaluates performance, code size, and contract checking across a selection of benchmark programs. Section VII describes and contrasts some related work, before Section VIII, in which we conclude.

## II. THE SAFEGPU FRAMEWORK

In this section we provide an overview of the SafeGPU framework. We describe the style of programming it supports for constructing GPU programs as well as its implementation, explaining how the integration with CUDA is achieved.

### A. Programming Style

CUDA kernels—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 simple example in Listing 1 which illustrates how a SafeGPU 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 exiting.

### 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, contracts, 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.

### III. DESIGN OF THE API

In the following, we describe in more detail the two levels of SafeGPU’s API. First, we consider the binding API, which allows expert users to run CUDA code from within Eiffel. Then we turn to the high-level library API, and in particular, its three basic classes for collections, vectors, and matrices.

#### A. CUDA Bindings

The binding API provides handles to access the GPU and raw memory. Programming with this API requires 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 about 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 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

class	description
<code>CUDA_DATA_HANDLE</code>	Represents a handle to device memory location. Supports scalar and vector data, and multi-dimensional data. Can be created from (and converted to) standard <code>ARRAYS</code> .
<code>CUDA_INTEROP</code>	Encapsulates low-level device operations, such as initialization, memory allocation, and data transfer.
<code>CUDA_KERNEL</code>	Represents a CUDA kernel, ready for execution. Can contain an arbitrary number of <code>CUDA_DATA_HANDLE</code> kernel inputs, one of which is used as output. Can be launched with configurable shared memory.
<code>LAUNCH_PARAMS</code>	Encapsulates the grid setup and shared memory size required to launch a <code>CUDA_KERNEL</code> .
<code>KERNEL_LOADER</code>	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

container in the SafeGPU framework, one must use the provided methods for resizing.

A SafeGPU collection can be created using the method `from_array`, which creates its content from that of an Eiffel array: as an array’s content is contiguous, a single call to CUDA’s analogue of `memcpy` suffices. Individual elements of the collection can then be accessed through the method `item`, and the total number of elements is returned by `count`.

The core part of the API design consists of methods for transforming, filtering, and querying collections. All these methods make use of Eiffel’s functional capabilities in the form of *agents*, which represent operations (similar to delegates in C# or anonymous classes in Java) that are applied in different ways to all the elements of a collection. Agents can be one of three types: *procedures*, which express transformations to be applied to elements (but do not return results); *functions*, which return results for elements (but unlike procedures, are side-effect free); or *predicates*, which are Boolean expressions.

To construct a new collection from an existing one, the API provides the transformation methods `for_each` and `project`. The former applies a procedure to each element of the collection, whereas the latter applies a function. For example, the call

```
c.for_each(agent (a: INT) do a := a * 2 end)
```

represents an application of `for_each` to an integer collection `c`, customized with a procedure that doubles every element. In contrast, the call

```
c.project(agent (a: INT): DOUBLE
do Result := sqrt(a) end)
```

creates from an integer collection `c` a collection of doubles, with each element the square root of the corresponding one in `c`.

To filter or query a collection, the API provides the methods `filter`, `for_all`, and `exists`, which evaluate predicates with respect to every element. An example of filtering is

`c.filter(agent (a: INT) do Result := a < 5 end)` which creates a new collection from integer collection `c`, containing only the elements that are less than 5. The method `for_all` on the other hand does not create a new collection, but rather checks whether the predicate holds for every element or not; the call

`c.for_all(agent (i: T) do Result := pred(i) end)` returns `true`, for example, if some (unspecified) predicate `pred` holds for every element of the collection `c` (and `false` otherwise). The method `exists` is similar, returning `true` if the predicate holds for at least one element in the collection.

The queries `for_all` and `exists` are particularly useful as *range contracts*, i.e. assertions about collections in pre- and postconditions that can be monitored on the GPU at runtime. We discuss these further in Section IV.

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

### 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 allows for computing the average value `avg` and `sum` of the elements of arbitrary vectors, as well as computing the minimal `min` and maximal `max` elements. These functions are all implemented by 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` (alongside in-place variants), as well as `multiply_by` and `divide_by` (alongside component-wise variants) are defined as vector operations on the GPU, e.g. a call to `plus` performs vector addition in a single action on the device side. Note that aliases can be used for value-returning operations, e.g. `v * n` instead of `v.divide_by(n)`.

An important concern in using and composing vector operations is keeping the dimensions of the data synchronized. Furthermore, certain arithmetic operations are undefined on certain data; `divide_by`, for example, requires that elements are non-zero. Such issues are managed through contracts built-in to the API that can be monitored at runtime and shield developers from inconsistencies. We discuss this further in Section IV.

### D. Matrices

The matrix API is strongly tied to the vector API: the class uses `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 is implemented by performing a copy of corresponding elements into new storage.

In the API, the queries `rows` and `columns` return the dimensions of the matrix, while `item`, `row`, and `column` return the parts of the matrix specified. Single-column or single-row matrices can be converted to vectors, by making appropriate calls to the `row` or `column` methods.

Similar to vectors, the API provides both conventional and in-place methods for addition and subtraction. Beyond these primitive arithmetic operations, the API provides built-in support for matrix-matrix multiplication (method `multiply`) since it is an important and classical application of GPGPU. The implementation optimizes performance through use of the shared device memory.

Furthermore, the API supports 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.

As for the other API classes, matrix methods are equipped with contracts in order to shield the programmer from common errors, e.g. mismatching dimensions in matrix multiplication.

## IV. 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 (see benchmarks in Section VI-C). As such, contracts can be monitored at runtime, helping to ensure correctness of the orchestrated GPU programs.

Contracts are utilized by SafeGPU programs in two ways. First, they are built-in to the API; several of its methods are equipped with pre- and postconditions, providing correctness properties that can be monitored at runtime “for free” (i.e. without requiring additional user annotations). Second, when composing the methods of the API to orchestrate more complex, compound computations, users can define and thus monitor their own contracts, expressing the intended effect of the overall computation.

The API’s built-in contracts are easily motivated by vector and matrix mathematics, for which several arithmetic operations are undefined on input with inconsistent dimensions or containing zeroes. Consider for example Listing 2, which contains the signature and contracts of the method for component-wise vector division. Calling `v1.compwise_divide(v2)` on vectors `v1` and `v2` of equal size results in a new vector, constructed from `v1` by dividing each of its elements by those in `v2` of corresponding position. As such, the method’s precondition asserts that the vectors are of equal size (via `count` in a *scalar contract*), and that all elements of the second vector are non-zero (via `for_all` in a *range contract*). The postcondition on the other hand characterizes the effect of the method, by asserting the expected relationship between the resulting vector and the input.

```

compwise_divide(other: VECTOR[T]): VECTOR[T]
require
  other.count = count
  other.for_all(
    agent (e1: T) do Result := e1 /= {T}.zero end)
ensure
  Current = old Current
  Result * other = Current
end

```

Listing 2: Contracts for component-wise vector division

In contrast, consider the signature and postcondition for quicksort in Listing 3 (adapted from the corresponding benchmark of Section VI). The implementation is not shown, but it utilizes several of the methods provided by the API. At runtime, the built-in contracts of these methods can be monitored, but they only express correctness conditions localized to their use, and nothing about their compound effect. The overall postcondition of the computation can be expressed as a user-defined postcondition of `qsort`, here asserting—using methods of the API—that the resulting vector is sorted and of the same size. This can be monitored at runtime to increase confidence that the user-orchestrated computation is correct.

```

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

```

Listing 3: Signature and postcondition for quicksort

In both examples, and in general, 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 is analogous to classical design-by-contract, in which (side-effect free) methods can be used in both specifications and implementations. Two

of the most important operations SafeGPU defines for this purpose are `for_all` and `exists`, i.e. the range contracts, which express that some predicate holds for every (resp. at least one) item of a collection (see Section III-B). These can be checked very efficiently on the GPU, and without diminishing the performance of the program; their counterparts for sequential Eiffel, on the other hand, are completely infeasible to check when the data is large. We provide detailed benchmarks in Section VI-C.

## V. KERNEL GENERATION AND OPTIMIZATION

In this section we describe how SafeGPU translates individual methods of the API to CUDA kernels, how data is managed, and how the framework optimizes kernels for compound computations.

Generating CUDA kernels for calls of individual API methods is very straightforward. Each method is associated with a kernel template, which the framework instantiates with respect to the particular collection and parameters of the method call. The SafeGPU runtime (as described in Section II-B) then handles its execution on the GPU via Eiffel’s mechanisms for interfacing with C++. Transferring data (i.e. for the kernels to operate on) to the GPU and back is expensive, and the framework attempts to minimize its occurrence. The only time that data is transferred to the GPU is upon calling method `from_array`, which creates a collection from an Eiffel array. Once the data is on the GPU, it remains there for arbitrarily many kernels to manipulate and query (including those corresponding to contracts). Operations that create new collections from existing ones (e.g. `filter`, `project`) do so without transferring data out of the GPU; this only occurs for methods that specifically query it.

While the primitive operations of the framework alone already support many useful computations (e.g. matrix multiplication, vector addition), the heart of SafeGPU is in its support for combining and chaining such operations to implement 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 method call and launch them one after the other, but the overhead of the unnecessary kernel launches is unacceptable. Instead, SafeGPU adopts a deferred execution model, analyses pending kernels, and attempts to generate more efficient kernel 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 Eiffel 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 (or inner product) of two vectors, which can be solved by combining vector multiplication and summation as in Listing 4. 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.

```
dot_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 4: Combining primitives to compute dot product

The benefit of deferring execution until necessary is that the kernel code can be optimized. Instead of generating kernels for every method call, SafeGPU uses some simple strategies to merge deferred calls and thus handle more of the combined computation in fewer kernels. 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. We illustrate a typical optimization in Figure 2, which shows the execution plans for the dot product method of Listing 4.




Figure 2: Execution plans for dot product

The plan in Figure 2a is the original one extracted from the pending operations; this would generate two separate kernels for multiplication and summation (`cmult` and `sum`) and launch them sequentially. The plan in Figure 2b, however, is the result of an optimization; here, the deferred `cmult` kernel is combined with `sum`. The combined kernel generated by this optimized execution plan would perform component-wise vector multiplication first, followed by summation, with the two stages separated using barrier

synchronization. This simple optimization pattern extends to several other similar cases in SafeGPU.

The optimizer is particularly well-tuned for computations involving vector mathematics. In some cases, 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 plans for vector mathematics

## VI. EVALUATION

To evaluate SafeGPU, we designed a set of benchmark 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 benchmarks we made three different comparisons:

- 1) the performance of the high-level API against corresponding CUDA and Eiffel implementations;
- 2) the conciseness of functionally equivalent programs in SafeGPU and sequential Eiffel;
- 3) the performance overhead of runtime contract checking, compared with checking traditional sequential contracts.

The six benchmark programs we considered were vector addition, dot product, matrix multiplication, Gaussian elimination, quicksort, and matrix transposition. Each benchmark was implemented using SafeGPU (with contracts for the GPU) and traditional Eiffel (with sequential contracts). The plain CUDA versions with the same functionality were taken or adapted from the following sources: vector addition and matrix multiplication were taken from the NVIDIA SDK, with dot product and quicksort adapted from code in the same source; Gaussian elimination came from a parallel computing research project [17]; and finally, matrix transposition came from a post [18] on NVIDIA's Parallel Forall blog.

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 benchmarks, are available online<sup>1</sup>.

### A. Performance

The goal of our first experiment was to measure the performance of SafeGPU against plain CUDA implementations with the same functionality, i.e. to find out what the high-level of abstraction translates to in terms of performance 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 the device) 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 others, which are linear.

The results provide support for our argument that using SafeGPU does not lead to performance incommensurate with that of handwritten CUDA code. Its performance is very close to that of plain CUDA across most of the benchmarks. The Gaussian elimination benchmark (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 benchmarks, 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 [19], 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 II. 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 absence of looping constructs. In sequential Eiffel, loops are frequently used to implement the benchmarks. 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	ratio
Vector Addition	15	6	2.5
Dot Product	17	7	2.4
Matrix-Matrix Multiplication	31	9	3.4
Gaussian Elimination	97	34	2.8
Quicksort	110	64	1.7
Matrix Transpose	26	8	3.2

Table II: LOC comparison

### C. Contract Performance

The goal of our final experiment was to measure the cost of checking SafeGPU contracts on the GPU against that of checking traditional sequential Eiffel ones. To allow a more fine-grained comparison, we measured the contract checking overhead in three different modes: (1) preconditions only; (2) pre- and postconditions only; and finally, (3) full contract checking, i.e. additionally checking class invariants at method entry and exit points. We remark that our benchmarks were annotated only with pre- and postconditions; invariants, however, are present in the core Eiffel libraries that were required to implement the sequential programs. Across the benchmarks and for increasingly large sizes of input, we computed ratios expressing the performance overhead resulting from enabling each of these three modes against no contract checking at all. The ratios are based on medians of ten runs (an effect of this is that some ratios can be less than 1).

Our data is presented in Table III, where a ratio  $X$  can be interpreted as meaning that the program was  $X$  times slower with the given contract-checking mode enabled. The comparison was not made for some benchmarks 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, quicksort, and matrix transposition have a combination of both scalar and range contracts (see Sections III-B and IV).

There is a remarkable difference between conventional Eiffel and SafeGPU: while the former cannot maintain reasonable contract performance on larger inputs (the average slowdown across benchmarks with input size  $10^6$ , for example, is 7.45), SafeGPU has, for the most part, little-to-no overhead. Disabling invariant-checking leads to improvements for conventional Eiffel (which, unlike SafeGPU, relies on invariant-equipped library classes), but the average

<sup>1</sup>See: [https://bitbucket.org/alexey\\_se/eiffel2cuda](https://bitbucket.org/alexey_se/eiffel2cuda)




Figure 4: SafeGPU performance evaluation

slowdown is still significant (now 4.03, for input size  $10^6$ ). Across these benchmarks, postcondition checking adds little overhead to conventional Eiffel beyond checking preconditions only (which has an average slowdown of 3.98 for input size  $10^6$ ). SafeGPU performs consistently within all modes of the experiment, with slowdown close to 1 across the top three benchmarks. The bottom three benchmarks perform similarly for precondition checking, but as they include more elaborate postconditions (e.g. “the vector is sorted”) and range contracts, checking both pre- and postconditions can lead to a small slowdown on large data (1.14 in the worst case for this experiment). Overall, the results support our claim that SafeGPU contracts can be monitored at runtime with little overhead—even with very large amounts of data. Unlike conventional Eiffel programs, contract-checking need not be limited to periods of debugging.

## VII. 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.

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 [20], 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



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	pre	1.00	0.92	1.42	0.96	3.50	0.96	3.92	0.95	3.98	1.02	4.12	1.06
	pre & post	1.00	0.92	1.42	0.96	3.66	0.96	3.93	0.95	3.98	1.02	4.29	1.06
	full	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	pre	1.00	1.02	1.25	0.99	4.00	0.97	3.95	1.01	4.00	1.10	4.01	0.95
	pre & post	1.00	1.02	1.25	0.99	4.00	0.97	3.95	1.01	4.15	1.10	4.10	0.98
	full	1.00	1.02	1.88	0.99	7.25	0.97	7.33	1.01	7.46	1.10	7.48	0.98
Matrix-Matrix Multiplication	pre	4.00	1.05	4.47	1.01	4.55	0.99	4.54	0.99	-	-	-	-
	pre & post	4.00	1.05	4.47	1.01	4.59	0.99	4.57	0.99	-	-	-	-
	full	5.00	1.05	6.73	1.01	6.79	1.01	6.76	0.99	-	-	-	-
Gaussian Elimination	pre	2.22	0.99	4.50	0.97	4.70	1.01	4.71	1.01	-	-	-	-
	pre & post	2.77	0.99	4.50	0.97	4.70	1.04	4.73	1.09	-	-	-	-
	full	4.44	0.99	6.67	0.97	6.96	1.04	6.96	1.09	-	-	-	-
Quicksort	pre	2.14	1.02	2.26	1.05	2.64	1.00	3.03	1.01	3.03	1.02	-	-
	pre & post	2.28	1.02	2.27	1.05	2.70	1.02	3.02	1.07	3.04	1.08	-	-
	full	3.64	1.02	4.14	1.05	5.07	1.02	6.38	1.07	6.49	1.09	-	-
Matrix Transposition	pre	2.00	1.05	1.25	1.01	2.40	1.02	3.71	1.01	3.86	1.02	4.02	1.01
	pre & post	2.00	1.05	1.25	1.01	2.40	1.03	3.96	1.11	4.05	1.12	4.27	1.14
	full	10.00	1.03	12.50	1.01	6.50	1.03	9.43	1.10	10.12	1.12	10.44	1.13

Table III: Contract checking overhead comparison

challenges are inherited, along with the addition of some new ones—Java programmers, for example, must manually 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 [21], 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 [22], a DSL for programming linear algebra libraries, restricting 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 through a library, 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.

While SafeGPU is concerned with the specification and runtime 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 [23] and GPUVerify [24] 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—based on tracking reads and writes in shadow memory.

Blom et al. [25] 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 expressing 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 [26] and KLEE-CL [27] are two examples, based on dynamic symbolic execution.

## VIII. 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 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 VI, 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. Finally, to provide better support for task parallelism, SafeGPU could be integrated with a CPU threading model.

*Acknowledgements.* This work has been supported in part by ERC Grant CME #291389.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] “NVIDIA: GPU applications,” <http://www.nvidia.com/object/gpu-applications.html>, accessed: March 2015.
- [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: March 2015.
- [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. 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. PDP 2013*. IEEE, 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. HPCC-ICSS 2012*. IEEE, 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. Euro-Par 2009*, ser. LNCS, vol. 5704. Springer, 2009, pp. 887–899.
- [17] “Linear algebra: Gaussian elimination,” [http://www.cs.rutgers.edu/~venugopa/parallel\\_summer2012/ge.html](http://www.cs.rutgers.edu/~venugopa/parallel_summer2012/ge.html), accessed: March 2015.
- [18] M. Harris, “An efficient matrix transpose in CUDA C/C+,” <http://devblogs.nvidia.com/parallelforall/efficient-matrix-transpose-cuda-cc/>, accessed: March 2015.
- [19] S. Nanz and C. A. Furia, “A comparative study of programming languages in Rosetta Code,” in *Proc. ICSE 2015*. IEEE, 2015, to appear.
- [20] “NVIDIA: CUDA toolkit documentation – Thrust,” <http://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/thrust/>, accessed: March 2015.
- [21] W. Thies, M. Karczmarek, and S. P. Amarasinghe, “StreamIt: A language for streaming applications,” in *Proc. CC 2002*, ser. LNCS, vol. 2304. Springer, 2002, pp. 179–196.
- [22] 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. LCTES 2014*. ACM, 2014, pp. 115–124.
- [23] G. Li and G. Gopalakrishnan, “Scalable SMT-based verification of GPU kernel functions,” in *Proc. FSE 2010*. ACM, 2010, pp. 187–196.
- [24] A. Betts, N. Chong, A. F. Donaldson, S. Qadeer, and P. Thomson, “GPUVerify: a verifier for GPU kernels,” in *Proc. OOPSLA 2012*. ACM, 2012, pp. 113–132.
- [25] S. Blom, M. Huisman, and M. Mihelčić, “Specification and verification of GPGPU programs,” *Science of Computer Programming*, vol. 95, pp. 376–388, 2014.
- [26] G. Li, P. Li, G. Sawaya, G. Gopalakrishnan, I. Ghosh, and S. P. Rajan, “GKLEE: concolic verification and test generation for GPUs,” in *Proc. PPOPP 2012*. ACM, 2012, pp. 215–224.
- [27] 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.