

Tracking Many Solution Paths of a Polynomial Homotopy on a Graphics Processing Unit*

Jan Verschelde[†] and Xiangcheng Yu[‡]

Department of Mathematics, Statistics, and Computer Science
University of Illinois at Chicago, 851 South Morgan (M/C 249)
Chicago, IL 60607-7045, USA

1 May 2015

Abstract

Polynomial systems occur in many areas of science and engineering. Unlike general nonlinear systems, the algebraic structure enables to compute all solutions of a polynomial system. We describe our massive parallel predictor-corrector algorithms to track many solution paths of a polynomial homotopy. The data parallelism that provides the speedups stems from the evaluation and differentiation of the monomials in the same polynomial system at different data points, which are the points on the solution paths. Polynomial homotopies that have tens of thousands of solution paths can keep a sufficiently large amount of threads occupied. Our accelerated code combines the reverse mode of algorithmic differentiation with double double and quad double precision to compute more accurate results faster.

Keywords. algorithmic differentiation, continuation methods, double double, Graphics Processing Unit (GPU), path tracking, polynomial system, polynomial homotopy, quad double.

1 Introduction

Many problems in computational algebraic geometry can be solved by computing solutions of polynomial systems. As the number of solutions can grow exponentially in the degrees, the number of variables and equations, the computational complexity of these problems are hard. GPUs provide a promising technology to deliver significant speedups over traditional processors, but may require a complete overhaul of the algorithms we use in our polynomial system solvers.

This paper describes the application of numerical continuation methods to track many solution paths defined by a polynomial homotopy. A polynomial homotopy is a family of polynomial systems in which the solutions depend on one real parameter t . Starting at $t = 0$, there are many solution paths originating at known solutions of a start system. These paths end at $t = 1$, at solutions of a polynomial system we want to solve. A common homotopy links the start system $g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ to the target system $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ linearly as

$$\gamma(1-t)g(\mathbf{x}) + tf(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}, \quad (1)$$

where γ is a random complex constant. The random γ ensures that paths originating at the regular solutions of $g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ will stay regular for all $t < 1$. For this regularity result to hold, all arithmetic must be complex. Our problem is the tracking of m solution paths in complex n -space.

*This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant ACI-1440534.

[†]email: jan@math.uic.edu, URL: www.math.uic.edu/~jan

[‡]email: xyu30@uic.edu

The difficulty with implementing the predictor-corrector algorithms to track solution paths defined by polynomial homotopies is that the traditional formulation of the algorithms does not match the data parallelism for which GPUs are designed for. For instance, while each solution path can be tracked independently, the number of predictor-corrector stages may fluctuate significantly depending on the geometric shape of the path. The type of high level parallelism that is applied in distributed memory message passing or shared memory multithreaded processors does not apply to our problem. On GPUs, a relatively small number of multiprocessors can independently launch a large number of threads that perform the same synchronized sequences of instructions.

Applying Newton’s method as a corrector, in every step, we evaluate all polynomials and all their derivatives in the system. To achieve a high level of parallelism for this task, the terms in each polynomial are decomposed as the product of the variables that occur in the term with a positive exponent and the factor that is common in all derivatives of the term. The reverse mode of algorithmic differentiation [6] applied to each product of variables then reaches a high level of parallelism. Its cost matches optimal complexity bounds for the evaluation and differentiation problem. The linear systems in each Newton step we solve in the least squares sense via the modified Gram-Schmidt method. In [24] and [25] our computations were executed on randomly generated regular data sets. In [27], we integrated and improved the evaluation and differentiation codes to run Newton’s method on some selected benchmark polynomial systems. We extended this in [26] to track one *single* path of a polynomial homotopy on a GPU. The focus in this paper is on the tracking of *many* paths.

For applications, achieving speedup is not enough, the numerical results must be accurate as well. As the degrees and the number of solution paths increase, the numerical conditioning is likely to worsen as well. To improve the quality, we calculate with double double and quad double arithmetic, using the QD library [9] on the host and its CUDA version [16] on the device. While for complex double arithmetic, the evaluation and differentiation algorithms are memory bound, for complex double double and quad double arithmetic, these algorithms become compute bound. The double digit speedups compensate for the extra cost overhead caused by the extended precision. With the accelerated versions of our code we are often able to obtain more accurate results faster than without the use of GPUs. We obtain speedup and *quality up*.

Although solving polynomial systems may seem a very specific problem (we refer to [15] for a survey), many software packages have been developed for this problem, e.g.: Bertini [1], HOM4PS [5], HOM4PS-2.0 [13], HOM4PS-3 [2], PHoM [7], NAG4M2 [14], and HOMPACT [28, 29]. Many of these packages are still under active development. To the best of our knowledge, our code provides the first path tracker for polynomial systems for a GPU.

Related research in computer algebra concerns the implementation of polynomial operations on GPUs. Reports on this research are [8] and [17]. Computer algebra is geared towards exact computations, often over finite number fields. Our approach is numerical and we improve the accuracy of our results with double double and quad double arithmetic. This type of arithmetic is described in the section of error-free transformations in [19]. Interval arithmetic on CUDA GPUs [3] is an alternative approach to improve the quality of numerical computations.

The description of our path tracker consists of two parts. First we define the scheduling of the threads and then we outline the organization of the memory. Polynomial systems with ten of thousands of solutions are at the bottom of the threshold for which we start to notice the beneficial effect of our accelerated codes.

2 SIMT Path Tracking

The Single Instruction Multiple Threads (SIMT) execution model in GPUs implies that threads are either executing the same instruction or they are idle. In our application, the threads are evaluating and differentiating the same polynomial system, at different approximations for the solutions along the path. In the SIMT model, we run the same arithmetic circuit at different data. Table 1 shows a simplified model.

| path0 | path1 | path2 |
|----------|----------|----------|
| predict | predict | predict |
| evaluate | evaluate | evaluate |
| correct | correct | correct |
| evaluate | | evaluate |
| correct | | correct |
| | | evaluate |
| | | correct |

Table 1: Simplified SIMT predictor-corrector steps on three paths. The first path needs three, the second path needs only one, and the third path needs two `evaluate-correct` steps to converge.

We distinguish three stages in a predictor-corrector algorithm. The first stage is called `predict` in Table 1. The predictor consists of the application of an extrapolation algorithm, applied to each coordinate of the solution separately. Typically, a fourth order predictor uses the current and four previous points on the path to predict the coordinates of the solution. This stage is naturally parallel and has a linear cost in the dimension. In the `evaluate` stage, the polynomial system is evaluated and differentiated at the solution. As this stage can have a cost that is cubic (or higher) in the dimension, it is separate from the `correct` stage. In the `correct` stage, a linear system is solved to compute the update to the solution.

For every path we execute a prediction step and at least one `evaluate-correct` step. Some paths may need two or even three such steps for Newton’s method to converge so the residuals and size of the updates are sufficiently small. While the instructions are the same, it is important that all the data are distinct. Not only the coordinates of each solution, but also the value for the continuation parameter t and the step size differ. The length of the total execution time is bounded from below by the time required for the most difficult solution path.

For memory considerations, paths that have been tracked to their end are relabeled and their work space in memory is swapped to the end. In the schematic of Table 2, the paths of Table 1 are reordered.

| job0 | job1 | job2 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| predict0 | predict1 | predict2 |
| evaluate0 | evaluate1 | evaluate2 |
| correct0 | correct1 | correct2 |
| evaluate0 | evaluate2 | |
| correct0 | correct2 | |
| evaluate2 | | |
| correct2 | | |

Table 2: Simplified SIMT predictor-corrector steps on three paths. For each stage, each job is associated with its `path_idx` and empty jobs are removed.

When we track one single path, as in [26], the step size control can be performed by the host. When tracking many solution paths, every solution path has its own step size and current value of the continuation parameter t . In this situation, the step size control is executed on the device.

After each evaluation and correction, there is a check kernel to determine the success status is represented as 0, -1 and 1. 0 is to continue, -1 is failure and 1 is success. A parallel scan [20] to count of all paths with 0's can generate the *path_idx* for the new round, see Table 3.

| | path0 | path1 | path2 | path3 | path4 | ... |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| status | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | ... |
| scan for 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | ... |
| <i>job_idx</i> | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | ... |
| <i>path_idx</i> | 0 | | 2 | | 4 | ... |

Table 3: Generated *path_idx* from current iteration status for the next round of computation

Thus, the only number passed between CPU and GPU each step is total number of paths to continue, which can be easily determine from the the last element of scan.

3 SIMT Evaluation and Differentiation

The speedups we obtain are mainly due to the fine granularity of the arithmetic circuits to evaluate and differentiate the polynomials in the system. Table 4 outlines the major differences in the organization of the algorithms for the host (CPU) and the device (GPU).

Table 4: At the top is pseudo code for the host to evaluate and differentiate a polynomial system. At the bottom is the corresponding pseudo code for the device.

Pseudo code on the host:

for each polynomial do

 for each monomial do

1. compute the coefficient $c(t)$ for this monomial;
2. evaluate the monomial and its derivative;
3. add the values to the polynomials and to the Jacobian matrix.

Pseudo code on the device:

launch the following three kernels

1. compute the coefficient $c(t)$
 for all monomials in all polynomials;
2. evaluate the monomial and its derivatives
 for all monomials in all polynomials;
3. add to the value of the polynomial and to the Jacobian matrix
 for all monomials in all polynomials.

For evaluation of single path, the evaluated and differentiated monomials are the operands in a long summation operation, executed to calculate the evaluated polynomials and the evaluated Jacobian matrix of the system. The values of the evaluated and differentiated monomials are positioned in an irregular pattern in memory. Therefore to the sum kernel, it appears as if the data is at random positions in memory. But for evaluations of multiple paths, all terms, at the same position of Jacobian matrix, follow the same instruction to sum the same positions of its own path. If the matrix of evaluated and differentiated monomials is transposed, the sum kernel can benefit from memory coalescing. The transposition is illustrated in Table 5.

Instead of transposing matrix after monomial evaluation, we redesign the monomial kernel. The reverse

| | monomials in memory | | | |
|--------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| path 0 | $a_0a_1a_2$ | a_1a_2 | a_0a_2 | a_1a_2 |
| path 1 | $b_0b_1b_2$ | b_1b_2 | b_0b_2 | b_1b_2 |
| path 2 | $c_0c_1c_2$ | c_1c_2 | c_0c_2 | c_1c_2 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

↓

| path 0 | path 1 | path 2 | ... |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----|
| $a_0a_1a_2$ | $b_0b_1b_2$ | $c_0c_1c_2$ | ... |
| a_1a_2 | b_1b_2 | c_1c_2 | ... |
| a_0a_2 | b_0b_2 | c_0c_2 | ... |
| a_1a_2 | b_1b_2 | c_1c_2 | ... |

Table 5: Tranposition of the matrix of evaluated and differentiated monomials, evaluated at different points. In the example, we consider $x_0x_1x_2$ at the points (a_0, a_1, a_2) , (b_0, b_1, b_2) , (c_0, c_1, c_2) , ...

mode [6] is used to generate vertical values and the same monomial of multiple paths are computed together in blocks. This directly fit our goal to transpose the monomial values. Also, all threads in each block shared the same instructions to evaluate monomials, which save the instruction reading time. The organization of the evaluation of a monomial and its derivatives is displayed in Table 6.

| | $x_1x_2x_3x_4$ and its four derivatives evaluated | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | path 0 | path 1 | path 2 |
| 0 | a_1 | b_1 | c_1 |
| 1 | $a_1 \star a_2$ | $b_1 \star b_2$ | $c_1 \star c_2$ |
| 2 | $a_1a_2 \star a_3$ | $b_1b_2 \star b_3$ | $c_1c_2 \star c_3$ |
| 7 | $a_1a_2a_3 \star a_4$ | $b_1b_2b_3 \star b_4$ | $c_1c_2c_3 \star c_4$ |
| 6 | $a_1a_2 \star a_4$ | $b_1b_2 \star b_4$ | $c_1c_2 \star c_4$ |
| 3 | $a_3 \star a_4$ | $b_3 \star b_4$ | $c_3 \star c_4$ |
| 4 | $a_1 \star a_3a_4$ | $b_1 \star b_3b_4$ | $c_1 \star c_3c_4$ |
| 5 | $a_2 \star a_3a_4$ | $b_2 \star b_3b_4$ | $c_2 \star c_3c_4$ |

Table 6: The sequence of steps in evaluating one monomial and its derivatives for three paths at different points (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) , (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) , and (c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) . Each new multiplication is marked by a \star .

Compared with the tree mode [27], this consecutive mode has more memory bandwidth. Although monomial evaluation part has twice memory access than tree mode, summation has more speedup due to consecutive memory. Also, multiple threads in a single block use the same instruction to avoid redundant reading. Thus, this consecutive mode is more suitable for evaluation of multiple paths.

All path join its work space of evaluation vertically, and a relatively small matrix transpose of Jacobian is used before correction. Linear systems in the corrector are solved with a QR decomposition. Table 8 shows the organization of the memory.

4 Computational Results

We developed and executed our code on a Linux workstation. Our benchmark applications were selected for the diversity of the research areas and their size. Because our application benefit the most from the accelerated evaluation and differentiation algorithms, we report first on computations done separately from the path tracking.

| | name | double | double double | quad double |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|---------------|-------------|
| Mon | <code>cyclic10</code> | 190.41 | 124.78 | 25.70 |
| | <code>nash8</code> | 206.68 | 143.30 | 27.62 |
| | <code>pieri44</code> | 209.47 | 147.31 | 27.32 |
| Sum | <code>cyclic10</code> | 104.91 | 126.63 | 123.13 |
| | <code>nash8</code> | 121.38 | 128.52 | 126.56 |
| | <code>pieri44</code> | 87.26 | 80.41 | 77.56 |

Table 7: Memory bandwidth of 1,000 evaluations of the same polynomial system in complex(GB/s)

| instructions | | work space for multiple path | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|---------|--------------------------------|
| idx | cff | evaluate-joint | | correct | |
| | | eff | mon | Jac | Jac', R , $\Delta\mathbf{x}$ |

Table 8: Schematic organization of the memory. Instructions to evaluate and differentiate a polynomial system are stored by indices (`idx`) and coefficients (`cff`). We store the coefficients (`cff`), evaluated at the value of the continuation parameter t , the evaluated monomials (`mon`), and the Jacobian matrix (`Jac`) joint vertically for all path. For corrector, the transpose of `Jac`, R and the update $\Delta\mathbf{x}$ to the solution.

4.1 Hardware and Software

Our code is compiled with version 6.5 of the CUDA Toolkit and `gcc -O2`. A Red Hat Enterprise Linux workstation of Microway, with Intel Xeon E5-2670 processors at 2.6 GHz is the host for the NVIDIA Tesla K20C, which has 2496 cores with a clock speed of 706 MHz. To prepare the benchmark data we used Python, in particular `phcpy` [23], the Python interface to PHCpack [22].

The double double and quad double arithmetic is provided by the QD library [9]. This QD library has been ported to GPUs, we used the code available at [16].

4.2 Applications

We selected three examples of polynomial systems, which arose in different applications. The examples can be formulated for any number of equations and variables. We selected three systems and in each case we applied the homotopy (1) to solve the systems. Below is a brief description of each system:

(1) `cyclic10`: the cyclic 10-roots problem is a 10-dimensional system with 34,940 isolated complex solutions. Except for the last equation (which has two terms), every polynomial has 10 monomials. The k -th polynomial in this system is of degree k . These roots appear in the study of complex Hadamard matrices [21].

(2) `nash8`: the solutions of this system give all totally mixed Nash equilibria in a game with 8 players, where each player has two pure strategies, see [4], [18]. For generic payoff matrices, this 8-dimensional system has 14,833 equilibria. Every polynomial in this system has 130 monomials of degrees ranging from one till seven.

(3) `pieri44`: there are 24,024 four dimensional planes that meet 16 four dimensional planes, given in general position. This system is a 16-dimensional problem and can be interpreted as a matrix completion problem [12], see also [10], [11]. Every polynomial in the system is of degree 4 and has 246 monomials.

As is typical for polynomial systems, the number of isolated solutions grows exponentially in the dimensions and the degrees. The systems we selected are large enough to notice a benefit of the accelerated code and small enough so we can still compute all isolated solutions. Table 9 summarizes their characteristics.

The number of isolated solutions equals the number of solution paths in the polynomial homotopy. In

| name | dim | #paths | #monomials |
|-----------------------|-----|--------|------------|
| <code>cyclic10</code> | 10 | 34,940 | 92 |
| <code>nash8</code> | 8 | 14,833 | 1,040 |
| <code>pieri44</code> | 16 | 24,024 | 3,936 |

Table 9: Name, dimension, number of paths, and number of monomials in the benchmark applications.

a massively parallel application we launch about 10,000 of threads. In these applications, the parallelism comes from evaluating the same system at about 10,000 different solution paths.

4.3 Evaluations

In Tables 10, 11, and 13 we list times and speedups for the evaluation of the three systems. With the number of simultaneous evaluations we go as far as the memory of the device allows us. The speedups were computed by taking the time on the K20C over the time on one 2.6 GHz CPU. With the NVIDIA profiler, times on the GPU are reported for the three kernels (defined in Table 4), in the columns with headers `mon`, `sum`, and `coeff`.

Although the number of variables is small (10, 8, and 16), there are already sufficiently many monomials to achieve a large enough parallelism to obtain good speedups. For double arithmetic, the problem is memory bound. The speedups become really good in complex double double and quad double arithmetic, because then the problem is compute bound.

The corresponding speedups are shown in Figure 1. Observe that the more monomials the system has, the fewer number of evaluations (respectively the fewer number of paths) are required to reach double digit speedups.

4.4 path tracking

Results for tracking many paths for the cyclic 10-roots problem are summarized in Table 15. Observe the quality up. Tracking 10,000 paths in double double arithmetic takes 10 seconds on the GPU, while on the CPU it takes 26.562 seconds in double arithmetic. With our accelerated code we obtain solutions in a precision that is twice as large in a time that is more than twice as fast.

The data in Table 15 is visualized in Figure 2. Compared to the speedups for evaluation and differentiation, the speedups for path tracking are roughly about half of those of evaluation and differentiation, for double double and quad double arithmetic.

Table 12 lists times and speedups for tracking many paths of the Nash equilibrium system. In Figure 3 we visualize these data. Notice that, as the Nash equilibrium system has more monomials than the cyclic 10-roots system, the speedup for `nash8` are better than those from `cyclic10`. The speedups improve slightly for the Pieri problem, but with a larger of number of monomials the memory allows for fewer paths to be tracked simultaneously.

References

- [1] D. J. Bates, J. D. Hauenstein, A. J. Sommese, and C. W. Wampler. Bertini: Software for numerical algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.nd.edu/~sommese/bertini/>.
- [2] T. Chen, T.-L. Lee, and T.-Y. Li. Hom4PS-3: a parallel numerical solver for systems of polynomial equations based on polyhedral homotopy continuation methods. In H. Hong and C. Yap, editors, *Mathematical Software – ICMS 2014, 4th International Conference, Seoul, South Korea, August 4-9*,

- 2014, *Proceedings*, volume 8592 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 183–190. Springer-Verlag, 2014.
- [3] S. Collange, M. Daumas, and D. Defour. Interval arithmetic in CUDA. In Wen mei W. Hwu, editor, *GPU Computing Gems Jade Edition*, pages 99–107. Elsevier, 2012.
- [4] R.S. Datta. Finding all nash equilibria of a finite game using polynomial algebra. *Economic Theory*, 42(1):55–96, 2009.
- [5] T. Gao, T.-Y. Li, and X. Li. HOM4PS, 2002. Available at <http://www.csulb.edu/~tgao/RESEARCH/Software.htm>.
- [6] A. Griewank and A. Walther. *Evaluating Derivatives: Principles and Techniques of Algorithmic Differentiation*. SIAM, second edition, 2008.
- [7] T. Gunji, S. Kim, M. Kojima, A. Takeda, K. Fujisawa, and T. Mizutani. PHoM – a polyhedral homotopy continuation method for polynomial systems. *Computing*, 73(4):55–77, 2004.
- [8] S. A. Haque, X. Li, F. Mansouri, M. M. Maza, W. Pan, and N. Xie. Dense arithmetic over finite fields with the CUMODP library. In H. Hong and C. Yap, editors, *Mathematical Software – ICMS 2014*, volume 8592 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 725–732. Springer-Verlag, 2014.
- [9] Y. Hida, X. S. Li, and D. H. Bailey. Algorithms for quad-double precision floating point arithmetic. In *15th IEEE Symposium on Computer Arithmetic (Arith-15 2001), 11-17 June 2001, Vail, CO, USA*, pages 155–162. IEEE Computer Society, 2001. Shortened version of Technical Report LBNL-46996, software at <http://crd.lbl.gov/~dhbailey/mpdist>.
- [10] B. Huber, F. Sottile, and B. Sturmfels. Numerical Schubert calculus. *J. Symbolic Computation*, 26(6):767–788, 1998.
- [11] B. Huber and J. Verschelde. Pieri homotopies for problems in enumerative geometry applied to pole placement in linear systems control. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 38(4):1265–1287, 2000.
- [12] M. Kim, J. Rosenthal, and X. Wang. Pole placement and matrix extension problems: A common point of view. *SIAM J. Control. Optim.*, 42(6):2078–2093, 2004.
- [13] T. L. Lee, T.-Y. Li, and C. H. Tsai. HOM4PS-2.0: a software package for solving polynomial systems by the polyhedral homotopy continuation method. *Computing*, 83(2-3):109–133, 2008.
- [14] A. Leykin. Numerical algebraic geometry. *The Journal of Software for Algebra and Geometry: Macaulay2*, 3:5–10, 2011.
- [15] T.-Y. Li. Numerical solution of polynomial systems by homotopy continuation methods. In F. Cucker, editor, *Handbook of Numerical Analysis. Volume XI. Special Volume: Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 209–304. North-Holland, 2003.
- [16] M. Lu, B. He, and Q. Luo. Supporting extended precision on graphics processors. In A. Ailamaki and P.A. Boncz, editors, *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Data Management on New Hardware (DaMoN 2010), June 7, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana*, pages 19–26, 2010. Software at <http://code.google.com/p/gpuprec/>.
- [17] M. M. Maza and W. Pan. Solving bivariate polynomial systems on a GPU. *ACM Communications in Computer Algebra*, 45(2):127–128, 2011.
- [18] R.D. McKelvey and A. McLennan. The maximal number of regular totally mixed Nash equilibria. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 72:411–425, 1997.

- [19] S.M. Rump. Verification methods: Rigorous results using floating-point arithmetic. *Acta Numerica*, 19:287449, 2010.
- [20] S. Sengupta, M. Harris, and M. Garland. Efficient parallel scan algorithms for GPUs. Technical Report NVR-2008-003, NVIDIA, 2008.
- [21] F. Szöllösi. *Construction, classification and parametrization of complex Hadamard matrices*. PhD thesis, Central European University, Budapest, 2011. [arXiv:1110.5590v1](#).
- [22] J. Verschelde. Algorithm 795: PHCpack: A general-purpose solver for polynomial systems by homotopy continuation. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 25(2):251–276, 1999.
- [23] J. Verschelde. Modernizing PHCpack through phcpy. In P. de Buyl and N. Varoquaux, editors, *Proceedings of the 6th European Conference on Python in Science (EuroSciPy 2013)*, pages 71–76, 2014.
- [24] J. Verschelde and G. Yoffe. Evaluating polynomials in several variables and their derivatives on a GPU computing processor. In *Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE 26th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (PDSEC 2012)*, pages 1391–1399. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [25] J. Verschelde and G. Yoffe. Orthogonalization on a general purpose graphics processing unit with double double and quad double arithmetic. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE 27th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (PDSEC 2013)*, pages 1373–1380. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.
- [26] J. Verschelde and X. Yu. Accelerating polynomial homotopy continuation on a graphics processing unit with double double and quad double arithmetic. [arXiv:1501.06625v2](#).
- [27] J. Verschelde and X. Yu. GPU acceleration of Newton’s method for large systems of polynomial equations in double double and quad double arithmetic. In *Proceedings of the 16th IEEE International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communication (HPCC 2014)*, pages 161–164. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.
- [28] L. T. Watson, S. C. Billups, and A. P. Morgan. Algorithm 652: HOMPACT: a suite of codes for globally convergent homotopy algorithms. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 13(3):281–310, 1987.
- [29] L. T. Watson, M. Sosonkina, R. C. Melville, A.P. Morgan, and H.F. Walker. HOMPACT90: A suite of Fortran 90 codes for globally convergent homotopy algorithms. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 23(4):514–549, 1997.

| complex double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 0.062 | 0.017 | 0.008 | 0.004 | 0.028 | 2.19 |
| 20 | 0.078 | 0.020 | 0.008 | 0.004 | 0.033 | 2.39 |
| 50 | 0.188 | 0.024 | 0.011 | 0.005 | 0.040 | 4.69 |
| 100 | 0.379 | 0.030 | 0.016 | 0.006 | 0.051 | 7.39 |
| 150 | 0.553 | 0.038 | 0.021 | 0.007 | 0.066 | 8.41 |
| 200 | 0.732 | 0.042 | 0.026 | 0.008 | 0.076 | 9.60 |
| 250 | 0.928 | 0.049 | 0.032 | 0.009 | 0.090 | 10.31 |
| 300 | 1.132 | 0.056 | 0.037 | 0.010 | 0.103 | 11.04 |
| 500 | 1.824 | 0.087 | 0.056 | 0.015 | 0.157 | 11.61 |
| 750 | 2.786 | 0.126 | 0.079 | 0.021 | 0.226 | 12.32 |
| 1000 | 3.748 | 0.155 | 0.101 | 0.026 | 0.282 | 13.30 |
| 1250 | 4.748 | 0.203 | 0.127 | 0.032 | 0.363 | 13.08 |
| 1500 | 5.563 | 0.235 | 0.149 | 0.039 | 0.423 | 13.14 |
| 2000 | 7.381 | 0.299 | 0.191 | 0.050 | 0.540 | 13.67 |
| 3000 | 11.148 | 0.459 | 0.284 | 0.082 | 0.826 | 13.50 |

| complex double double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 0.587 | 0.066 | 0.011 | 0.011 | 0.088 | 6.65 |
| 20 | 1.135 | 0.066 | 0.012 | 0.011 | 0.089 | 12.79 |
| 50 | 2.808 | 0.072 | 0.017 | 0.012 | 0.101 | 27.90 |
| 100 | 5.598 | 0.092 | 0.028 | 0.017 | 0.137 | 40.81 |
| 150 | 8.601 | 0.121 | 0.036 | 0.022 | 0.179 | 48.03 |
| 200 | 11.225 | 0.145 | 0.043 | 0.025 | 0.213 | 52.64 |
| 250 | 13.951 | 0.154 | 0.053 | 0.029 | 0.236 | 59.11 |
| 300 | 16.821 | 0.181 | 0.060 | 0.037 | 0.278 | 60.56 |
| 500 | 27.912 | 0.263 | 0.092 | 0.052 | 0.408 | 68.47 |
| 750 | 41.877 | 0.379 | 0.137 | 0.074 | 0.590 | 71.01 |
| 1000 | 55.871 | 0.472 | 0.175 | 0.096 | 0.743 | 75.24 |
| 1250 | 69.835 | 0.587 | 0.220 | 0.117 | 0.924 | 75.54 |
| 1500 | 83.920 | 0.691 | 0.257 | 0.139 | 1.087 | 77.20 |
| 2000 | 112.040 | 0.917 | 0.338 | 0.183 | 1.438 | 77.92 |
| 3000 | 167.568 | 1.383 | 0.502 | 0.278 | 2.163 | 77.47 |

| complex quad double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 5.572 | 0.632 | 0.042 | 0.072 | 0.705 | 7.91 |
| 20 | 11.129 | 0.622 | 0.043 | 0.073 | 0.738 | 15.07 |
| 50 | 27.769 | 0.633 | 0.054 | 0.075 | 0.762 | 36.44 |
| 100 | 55.566 | 0.931 | 0.080 | 0.130 | 1.141 | 48.70 |
| 150 | 83.369 | 1.213 | 0.098 | 0.179 | 1.491 | 55.92 |
| 200 | 111.027 | 1.438 | 0.120 | 0.224 | 1.782 | 62.29 |
| 250 | 138.872 | 1.428 | 0.144 | 0.235 | 1.808 | 76.82 |
| 300 | 166.546 | 1.641 | 0.161 | 0.277 | 2.079 | 80.11 |
| 500 | 277.978 | 2.486 | 0.257 | 0.436 | 3.178 | 87.46 |
| 750 | 416.268 | 3.435 | 0.369 | 0.594 | 4.398 | 94.64 |
| 1000 | 554.742 | 4.582 | 0.485 | 0.786 | 5.853 | 94.77 |
| 1250 | 694.084 | 5.715 | 0.591 | 0.943 | 7.249 | 95.75 |
| 1500 | 833.445 | 6.809 | 0.699 | 1.183 | 8.691 | 95.89 |
| 2000 | 1111.412 | 8.916 | 0.929 | 1.532 | 11.377 | 97.69 |
| 3000 | 1676.977 | 13.244 | 1.375 | 2.245 | 16.864 | 99.44 |

Table 10: Timings in milliseconds for the evaluation of the polynomials and the Jacobian matrix of the cyclic 10-roots problem on the CPU and GPU.

| complex double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 0.311 | 0.042 | 0.050 | 0.015 | 0.106 | 2.92 |
| 20 | 0.586 | 0.057 | 0.069 | 0.015 | 0.072 | 8.10 |
| 50 | 1.417 | 0.079 | 0.075 | 0.027 | 0.181 | 7.81 |
| 100 | 2.813 | 0.140 | 0.113 | 0.032 | 0.285 | 9.86 |
| 150 | 4.181 | 0.202 | 0.134 | 0.045 | 0.380 | 11.00 |
| 200 | 5.586 | 0.244 | 0.169 | 0.057 | 0.470 | 11.89 |
| 250 | 6.927 | 0.295 | 0.187 | 0.064 | 0.546 | 12.68 |
| 300 | 8.302 | 0.349 | 0.224 | 0.078 | 0.651 | 12.75 |
| 500 | 13.834 | 0.567 | 0.314 | 0.125 | 1.006 | 13.75 |
| 750 | 20.650 | 0.863 | 0.470 | 0.193 | 1.527 | 13.53 |
| 1000 | 27.509 | 1.111 | 0.608 | 0.254 | 1.973 | 13.94 |
| 1250 | 34.433 | 1.435 | 0.772 | 0.319 | 2.526 | 13.63 |
| 1500 | 41.253 | 1.682 | 0.892 | 0.390 | 2.964 | 13.92 |
| 2000 | 55.157 | 2.209 | 1.179 | 0.523 | 3.910 | 14.11 |
| 3000 | 82.710 | 3.303 | 1.742 | 0.877 | 5.922 | 13.97 |

| complex double double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 4.345 | 0.195 | 0.116 | 0.050 | 0.361 | 12.03 |
| 20 | 8.664 | 0.201 | 0.125 | 0.056 | 0.382 | 22.66 |
| 50 | 21.587 | 0.226 | 0.141 | 0.062 | 0.429 | 50.26 |
| 100 | 43.239 | 0.411 | 0.219 | 0.120 | 0.750 | 57.68 |
| 150 | 65.571 | 0.602 | 0.247 | 0.159 | 1.008 | 65.04 |
| 200 | 86.489 | 0.762 | 0.321 | 0.215 | 1.297 | 66.67 |
| 250 | 108.585 | 0.839 | 0.351 | 0.255 | 1.445 | 75.14 |
| 300 | 130.030 | 1.016 | 0.422 | 0.299 | 1.737 | 74.85 |
| 500 | 216.220 | 1.623 | 0.598 | 0.491 | 2.712 | 79.74 |
| 750 | 325.524 | 2.445 | 0.910 | 0.719 | 4.074 | 79.90 |
| 1000 | 431.826 | 3.203 | 1.182 | 0.957 | 5.341 | 80.86 |
| 1250 | 540.026 | 4.057 | 1.501 | 1.197 | 6.755 | 79.94 |
| 1500 | 647.817 | 4.778 | 1.722 | 1.439 | 7.939 | 81.60 |
| 2000 | 864.464 | 6.361 | 2.299 | 1.936 | 10.596 | 81.58 |
| 3000 | 1301.577 | 9.517 | 3.420 | 2.984 | 15.922 | 81.75 |

| complex quad double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 43.425 | 1.956 | 0.502 | 0.506 | 2.964 | 14.65 |
| 20 | 86.566 | 1.977 | 0.522 | 0.534 | 3.033 | 28.55 |
| 50 | 216.214 | 2.154 | 0.552 | 0.537 | 3.244 | 66.66 |
| 100 | 433.039 | 4.150 | 0.807 | 1.051 | 6.009 | 72.07 |
| 150 | 650.377 | 5.990 | 0.878 | 1.569 | 8.437 | 77.09 |
| 200 | 866.149 | 8.051 | 1.171 | 2.077 | 11.299 | 76.66 |
| 250 | 1082.852 | 8.478 | 1.239 | 2.142 | 11.859 | 91.31 |
| 300 | 1297.308 | 10.046 | 1.474 | 2.537 | 14.057 | 92.29 |
| 500 | 2161.734 | 16.866 | 1.938 | 4.182 | 22.986 | 94.05 |
| 750 | 3245.388 | 25.008 | 2.874 | 6.189 | 34.071 | 95.25 |
| 1000 | 4327.603 | 33.228 | 3.852 | 8.173 | 45.253 | 95.63 |
| 1250 | 5407.600 | 41.280 | 4.769 | 10.153 | 56.202 | 96.22 |
| 1500 | 6497.880 | 51.975 | 5.514 | 12.679 | 70.168 | 92.61 |
| 2000 | 8652.404 | 68.903 | 7.380 | 16.727 | 93.010 | 93.03 |
| 3000 | 12977.386 | 100.940 | 10.799 | 24.771 | 136.510 | 95.07 |

Table 11: Times in milliseconds for the evaluation of the polynomials and the Jacobian matrix of the Nash equilibrium system on the CPU and the GPU.

| complex double arithmetic | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------|---------|
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 0.152 | 0.196 | 0.77 |
| 20 | 0.330 | 0.239 | 1.38 |
| 50 | 0.815 | 0.292 | 2.79 |
| 100 | 1.512 | 0.341 | 4.43 |
| 200 | 2.894 | 0.462 | 6.26 |
| 500 | 7.257 | 0.809 | 8.97 |
| 1000 | 14.171 | 1.343 | 10.55 |
| 2000 | 28.524 | 2.514 | 11.35 |
| 5000 | 72.292 | 6.156 | 11.74 |
| complex double double arithmetic | | | |
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 2.130 | 0.595 | 3.58 |
| 20 | 4.496 | 0.641 | 7.01 |
| 50 | 11.215 | 0.720 | 15.59 |
| 100 | 20.813 | 0.831 | 25.04 |
| 200 | 40.018 | 1.124 | 35.62 |
| 500 | 100.446 | 2.057 | 48.82 |
| 1000 | 194.243 | 3.462 | 56.11 |
| 2000 | 392.615 | 6.345 | 61.87 |
| 5000 | 992.708 | 15.504 | 64.03 |
| complex quad double arithmetic | | | |
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 20.745 | 4.593 | 4.52 |
| 20 | 42.969 | 4.835 | 8.89 |
| 50 | 106.348 | 5.101 | 20.85 |
| 100 | 198.098 | 5.926 | 33.43 |
| 200 | 383.885 | 8.846 | 43.40 |
| 500 | 986.145 | 16.407 | 60.10 |
| 1000 | 1876.226 | 28.365 | 66.15 |
| 2000 | 3805.213 | 52.710 | 72.19 |
| 5000 | 9618.930 | 128.948 | 74.60 |

Table 12: Times in seconds and speedups for tracking a number of paths of the Nash equilibrium system.

| complex double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 1.129 | 0.137 | 0.138 | 0.049 | 0.324 | 3.48 |
| 20 | 2.127 | 0.168 | 0.156 | 0.050 | 0.373 | 5.70 |
| 50 | 5.223 | 0.239 | 0.208 | 0.097 | 0.544 | 9.60 |
| 100 | 10.226 | 0.447 | 0.306 | 0.113 | 0.866 | 11.80 |
| 150 | 15.303 | 0.654 | 0.396 | 0.162 | 1.212 | 12.63 |
| 200 | 20.239 | 0.794 | 0.475 | 0.206 | 1.475 | 13.72 |
| 250 | 25.369 | 0.971 | 0.575 | 0.237 | 1.783 | 14.23 |
| 300 | 30.387 | 1.157 | 0.671 | 0.289 | 2.116 | 14.36 |
| 500 | 50.778 | 1.890 | 1.113 | 0.471 | 3.474 | 14.62 |
| 750 | 75.665 | 2.895 | 1.589 | 0.729 | 5.213 | 14.51 |
| 1000 | 102.170 | 3.718 | 2.074 | 0.958 | 6.751 | 15.13 |
| 1250 | 127.156 | 4.821 | 2.698 | 1.215 | 8.735 | 14.56 |
| 1500 | 154.357 | 5.645 | 3.126 | 1.494 | 10.265 | 15.04 |
| 2000 | 201.537 | 7.425 | 4.064 | 2.003 | 13.492 | 14.94 |
| 3000 | 302.158 | 11.108 | 6.138 | 3.351 | 20.597 | 14.67 |

| complex double double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 15.116 | 0.559 | 0.266 | 0.170 | 0.995 | 15.19 |
| 20 | 29.886 | 0.582 | 0.287 | 0.202 | 1.071 | 27.91 |
| 50 | 75.020 | 0.659 | 0.391 | 0.217 | 1.267 | 59.22 |
| 100 | 151.854 | 1.263 | 0.573 | 0.437 | 2.273 | 66.80 |
| 150 | 228.841 | 1.887 | 0.732 | 0.598 | 3.217 | 71.14 |
| 200 | 298.554 | 2.425 | 0.907 | 0.781 | 4.113 | 72.59 |
| 250 | 373.088 | 2.696 | 1.101 | 0.932 | 4.729 | 78.89 |
| 300 | 447.931 | 3.264 | 1.287 | 1.113 | 5.664 | 79.09 |
| 500 | 746.392 | 5.299 | 2.129 | 1.862 | 9.289 | 80.35 |
| 750 | 1120.713 | 8.042 | 3.104 | 2.726 | 13.873 | 80.79 |
| 1000 | 1491.030 | 10.570 | 4.080 | 3.649 | 18.299 | 81.48 |
| 1250 | 1867.582 | 13.400 | 5.217 | 4.568 | 23.185 | 80.55 |
| 1500 | 2251.611 | 15.851 | 6.006 | 5.510 | 27.367 | 82.27 |
| 2000 | 2990.387 | 21.057 | 7.908 | 7.429 | 36.394 | 82.17 |
| 3000 | 4478.135 | 31.423 | 12.001 | 11.455 | 54.879 | 81.60 |

| complex quad double arithmetic | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| #evals | CPU | GPU | | | total | speedup |
| | total | mon | sum | coeff | | |
| 10 | 146.920 | 5.329 | 1.132 | 1.867 | 8.328 | 17.64 |
| 20 | 293.975 | 5.369 | 1.188 | 1.935 | 8.493 | 34.61 |
| 50 | 734.441 | 6.104 | 1.954 | 1.468 | 9.526 | 77.10 |
| 100 | 1470.332 | 12.760 | 2.123 | 3.895 | 18.778 | 78.30 |
| 150 | 2206.220 | 18.763 | 2.490 | 5.891 | 27.144 | 81.28 |
| 200 | 2942.909 | 25.181 | 3.149 | 7.859 | 36.189 | 81.32 |
| 250 | 3676.626 | 29.401 | 8.068 | 3.598 | 41.067 | 89.53 |
| 300 | 4415.752 | 30.987 | 4.207 | 9.617 | 44.810 | 98.54 |
| 500 | 7346.943 | 58.511 | 6.909 | 15.901 | 81.321 | 90.35 |
| 750 | 11049.214 | 86.933 | 9.707 | 23.621 | 120.261 | 91.88 |
| 1000 | 14697.217 | 113.970 | 13.027 | 31.309 | 158.306 | 92.84 |
| 1250 | 18394.761 | 134.100 | 16.487 | 38.865 | 189.452 | 97.09 |
| 1500 | 22045.021 | 177.920 | 19.023 | 48.569 | 245.512 | 89.79 |

Table 13: Times in milliseconds for the evaluation of the polynomials and the Jacobian matrix of the Pieri hypersurface system on the CPU and the GPU.

| complex double arithmetic | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|--------|---------|
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 0.757 | 0.506 | 1.50 |
| 20 | 1.580 | 0.603 | 2.62 |
| 50 | 3.883 | 0.890 | 4.36 |
| 100 | 7.800 | 1.229 | 6.35 |
| 200 | 15.813 | 1.801 | 8.78 |
| 500 | 39.861 | 3.713 | 10.74 |
| 1000 | 80.347 | 6.898 | 11.65 |
| 2000 | 161.498 | 13.232 | 12.21 |
| 5000 | 401.001 | 33.050 | 12.13 |

| complex double double arithmetic | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 11.307 | 2.042 | 5.54 |
| 20 | 23.558 | 2.231 | 10.56 |
| 50 | 58.339 | 3.010 | 19.38 |
| 100 | 113.878 | 3.883 | 29.32 |
| 200 | 232.249 | 5.120 | 45.36 |
| 500 | 586.282 | 10.141 | 57.81 |
| 1000 | 1183.342 | 18.317 | 64.60 |
| 2000 | 2376.400 | 34.497 | 68.89 |

| complex quad double arithmetic | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 111.498 | 19.403 | 5.75 |
| 20 | 234.984 | 20.642 | 11.38 |
| 50 | 583.908 | 25.590 | 22.82 |
| 100 | 1168.055 | 34.496 | 33.86 |
| 200 | 2375.275 | 47.696 | 49.80 |
| 500 | 5986.772 | 91.191 | 65.65 |
| 1000 | 12075.740 | 165.244 | 73.08 |

Table 14: Times in seconds and speedups for tracking a number of paths of the hypersurface Pieri system.




Figure 1: Speedups for evaluating and differentiating the cyclic 10-roots problem, the Nash equilibrium and the hypersurface Pieri systems in complex double, double double, and quad double arithmetic.

Table 15: Times in seconds and speedups for tracking a number of paths of the cyclic 10-roots system.

| complex double arithmetic | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 0.040 | 0.128 | 0.31 |
| 20 | 0.075 | 0.139 | 0.54 |
| 50 | 0.158 | 0.147 | 1.07 |
| 100 | 0.277 | 0.155 | 1.79 |
| 200 | 0.482 | 0.181 | 2.67 |
| 500 | 1.239 | 0.250 | 4.96 |
| 1000 | 2.609 | 0.432 | 6.03 |
| 2000 | 5.341 | 0.768 | 6.96 |
| 5000 | 13.358 | 1.711 | 7.81 |
| 10000 | 26.562 | 3.334 | 7.97 |
| complex double double arithmetic | | | |
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 0.563 | 0.344 | 1.63 |
| 20 | 1.082 | 0.386 | 2.80 |
| 50 | 2.248 | 0.404 | 5.56 |
| 100 | 3.706 | 0.421 | 8.81 |
| 200 | 6.480 | 0.458 | 14.15 |
| 500 | 16.802 | 0.729 | 23.05 |
| 1000 | 35.683 | 1.315 | 27.14 |
| 2000 | 83.601 | 2.397 | 34.87 |
| 5000 | 210.287 | 5.246 | 40.09 |
| 10000 | 414.332 | 10.063 | 41.18 |
| complex quad double arithmetic | | | |
| #paths | CPU | GPU | speedup |
| 10 | 5.859 | 2.696 | 2.17 |
| 20 | 11.189 | 2.852 | 3.92 |
| 50 | 24.018 | 2.866 | 8.38 |
| 100 | 38.782 | 2.966 | 13.08 |
| 200 | 67.703 | 3.568 | 18.97 |
| 500 | 174.769 | 6.203 | 28.17 |
| 1000 | 368.449 | 11.175 | 32.97 |
| 2000 | 851.255 | 21.432 | 39.72 |
| 5000 | 2164.485 | 48.495 | 44.63 |




Figure 2: The speedups for tracking many paths of the cyclic 10-roots problem, compared to speedups for evaluating and differentiating, in complex double, double double, and quad double arithmetic.




Figure 3: The speedups for tracking many paths of the cyclic 10-roots problem, compared to speedups for tracking many paths of the Nash equilibrium system and of the hypersurface Pieri system, in complex double, double double, and quad double arithmetic.