

TRIOT: Faster iteration over multidimensional arrays in C++11

Oliver Serang
 Freie Universität Berlin and
 Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB)
 orserang@uw.edu

30 July, 2016

Abstract

Tensor indexing is a fundamental component of numeric algorithms and is used in many programming languages and across many fields. This manuscript proposes a new template-recursive design pattern for implementing faster vectorizing over tensors of different shapes in C++11. The proposed method, “template-recursive iteration over tensors”, is comparable to using nested `for` loops in C and to vectorized code in Fortran, and it outperforms `numpy`, C-style tuple iteration, C-style integer reindexing, and `boost::multi_array`, and unlike some of those methods, it can be used when the dimension of the tensor is unknown at compile time.

Introduction

Tensors (*i.e.*, multidimensional arrays) are extremely important in many areas of research, including physics [1] (where it prominently features in numerical simulations in a discretized space), statistics [2] (where tensors represent multidimensional probability mass functions and where tensor convolutions are bijective to sums and differences between variables), and signal processing [3] (where tensors are used to represent multidimensional images, *e.g.*, tomography on magnetic resonance imaging scans). The most fundamental tasks for tensor code are to efficiently retrieving data from a particular index and to use those indexing routines to vectorize many such indexing operations (and possible modifications at each index).

However, where 1-dimensional vector lookup is simple (it can be performed as a pointer addition and a pointer dereference or as a single LDR load relative assembly instruction), tensor indexing is more complicated, because indices are integer tuples (note: this manuscript uses “tuple” in the mathematical sense rather than as a type-heterogeneous list as denoted by `std::tuple`). Although this type of lookup can be avoided when vectorizing operations over the flat array (*e.g.*, performing an element-wise multiplication on every element in a tensor), it cannot be performed via the flat array when vectorizing operations over two or more tensors of different shapes (this is very common when multiplying to probability mass functions with different support or zero padding a tensor to perform convolution via the multidimensional fast Fourier transform). In that case, tuple indexing must be performed. Consider a tensor x with dimension d and shape $x.shape = (s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{d-1})$. Lookup of index tuple $t = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{d-1})$ (where $\forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$, $t_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s_i - 1\}$) is performed

by computing the corresponding integer index in the flat vector $x.flat$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 x[t] = x.flat [t_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \\
 t_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \\
 t_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \cdots \\
 \cdots + t_{d-2} \cdot s_{d-1} \\
 + t_{d-1}],
 \end{aligned}$$

assuming row-major order of the flat vector (as used in the C programming language). This can be rewritten more efficiently using Horner's rule:

$$x[t] = x.flat[(\cdots ((t_0 \cdot s_1 + t_1) \cdot s_2 + t_2) \cdot s_3 + t_3) \cdot s_4 + \cdots + t_{d-2} \cdot s_{d-1}) + t_{d-1}].$$

The classic manner for iterating over the tensor x is therefore to use nested `for` loops (**Algorithm 1**).

Algorithm 1: Iterating over a tensor with nested for loops. The algorithm iterates over tensor x with shape $x.shape$, where $x.dimension$ is the dimensionality of x .

```

typedef unsigned long*__restrict__ const tup_t;
typedef const unsigned long*__restrict__ const const_tup_t;

void nested_for_loops(const_tup_t shape) {
    // Writing $x.dimension$ nested for loops:
    for (unsigned long i0=0; i0<shape[0]; ++i0)
        for (unsigned long i1=0; i1<shape[1]; ++i1)
            for (unsigned long i2=0; i2<shape[2]; ++i2)
                // ...
                {
                    // Inside innermost loop:
                    unsigned long x_index = ((i0*shape[1] + i1)*shape[2] + i2)*
                        shape[3] /* + ...
                                using each loop variable once */ ;

                    // Perform operations on x.flat[x_index] for some tensor x
                    in global scope:
                }
    }
}

```

However, to write those nested `for` loops, it is necessary to know how many loops there are, which means it is necessary to know the dimensionality d at compile time. Of course, if a method is simply applying a single operation to each index (e.g., `x[x_index] += 1`), the loop can be performed by iterating with an integer index over the flat index values $\in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, s_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \cdots s_{d-1} - 1\}$. But when performing operations on tensors of different shapes, that is not a viable solution. For instance, \forall valid tuples t in range of shape s , `x[t] += y[t]` (or equivalently `x[x_index] += y[y_index]` for the appropriate flat index values) could be performed by initializing `x_index=0` and incrementing it inside the innermost `for` loop. This would allow `x_index` to be computed trivially, but `y_index` would still need to be computed as `x_index` is in **Algorithm 1**.

When the dimensionality d is not known at compile time, one can consider a tuple index stored in an array. Looking up the flat index value can be performed in a simple C-style routine (**Algorithm 2**).

Algorithm 2: Tuple to flat index with respect to shape. The algorithm takes a tuple `tup` and a shape `shape`, both of length `dimension`, and returns the flat index of `tup` with respect to `shape`.

```
unsigned long tuple_to_index(tup_t tup, tup_t shape, unsigned int
    dimension) {
    unsigned long res = 0;
    unsigned int k;
    for (k=0; k<dimension-1; ++k) {
        res += tup[k];
        res *= shape[k+1];
    }
    res += tup[k];
    return res;
}
```

What is less trivial is advancing the tuple index to the next lexicographic tuple index (note that other advancing strategies may be possible, but lexicographic ordering corresponds to the ideal order for caching). The lexicographic ordering can be iterated through just as one would count numbers with carry operations (**Algorithm 3**).

Algorithm 3: Advance tuple with respect to shape. The algorithm takes a tuple `tup` and a shape `shape`, both of length `dimension`, and advances `tup` to its next lexicographic value with respect to `shape`.

```
void advance_tuple(unsigned long*__restrict__ tup, const_tup_t shape,
    unsigned int dimension) {
    ++tup[dimension-1];

    for (unsigned int k=dimension-1; k>=1; --k)
        if ( tup[k] >= shape[k] ) {
            // Perform carry operation:
            ++tup[k-1];
            tup[k] = 0;
        }
        else
            // No more carry operations:
            return;
}
```

For a problem of dimension d , this `advance_tuple` routine runs in $O(d)$ in the worst case, but in the average case it is more efficient because it returns early once there are no further carry operations to perform. Consider that for a random valid tuple t with respect to shape s , the chances of returning after 1 iteration (*i.e.*, performing no carry operations at all) will be $\frac{s_{d-1}-1}{s_{d-1}}$, because that carry operation will only be performed when $t_{d-1} = s_{d-1}$ before calling `advance_tuple`. The chances of performing the second carry are even smaller $\frac{s_{d-1}-1}{s_{d-1}} \cdot \frac{s_{d-2}-1}{s_{d-2}}$, so that the chances of progressing to each next carry will decay exponentially for tensors with non-trivial shapes (*i.e.* for tensors with no axis i along which $s_i = 1$); Therefore, the

expected number of iterations of the `for` loop in **Algorithm 3** will be a constant (because it is bounded above by summing a geometric series). Since each valid tuple will be visited, the average cost becomes the amortized cost, and the runtime of `advance_tuple` will be in $O(1)$.

However, at least one `if` statement is needed for each call to `advance_tuple`, and so the runtime can be seriously affected by the extra `BR` branch line in the resulting assembly code. Because of this and because the loop in `advance_tuple` cannot be easily unrolled, using tuple iteration and the `advance_tuple` routine can be significantly slower than performing the equivalent nested `for` loops.

An alternative to tuple iteration is to use a number-theoretic strategy, which iterates over a single flat index with respect to a first shape and then preforms reindexing to convert it to a flat index with respect to another shape. For some unknown tuple t , suppose `x_index` is the flat integer index with respect to s and `y_index` is the flat integer index with respect to s' :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{x_index} = & t_0 \cdot s_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \\ & t_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \\ & t_2 \cdot s_3 \cdot s_4 \cdots s_{d-1} + \cdots \\ & \cdots + t_{d-2} \cdot s_{d-1} \\ & + t_{d-1} \end{aligned}$$

Consider that in the sum to compute `x_index`, every term is multiplied with s_{d-1} except t_{d-1} , meaning that `x_index` $\equiv t_{d-1} \pmod{s_{d-1}}$. Furthermore, for every axis i , a valid tuple t with respect to shape s is always in range $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, s_{d-1} - 1\}$. Together these imply that $t_{d-1} = \text{x_index} \% s_{d-1}$. Subtracting the computed value of t_{d-1} from `x_index` and dividing by s_{d-1} yields an expression of the same form, and so it is possible to compute the full tuple t . From there, it is possible to compute the value of `y_index`:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{y_index} = & t_0 \cdot s'_1 \cdot s'_2 \cdot s'_3 \cdot s'_4 \cdots s'_{d-1} + \\ & t_1 \cdot s'_2 \cdot s'_3 \cdot s'_4 \cdots s'_{d-1} + \\ & t_2 \cdot s'_3 \cdot s'_4 \cdots s'_{d-1} + \\ & \vdots \\ & + t_{d-2} \cdot s'_{d-1} \\ & + t_{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

These steps can be combined into a single loop that computes `y_index` while it computes each next t_i (**Algorithm 4**).

Algorithm 4: Reindex flat index from one tensor shape to another tensor shape.

The algorithm takes a flat integer index with respect to `shape` and converts it to a flat integer index with respect to `new_shape`, where both shapes have length `dimension`.

```
unsigned long reindex(unsigned long index, const_tup_t shape,
    const_tup_t new_shape, unsigned int dimension) {
```

```

unsigned long new_index = 0;
unsigned long new_axis_product_from_right = 1;
for (int i=dimension-1; index>0 && i>=0; --i) {
    unsigned long next_axis = shape[i];
    unsigned long new_next_axis = new_shape[i];

    unsigned long next_value = index % next_axis;

    new_index += next_value * new_axis_product_from_right;
    index /= next_axis;

    new_axis_product_from_right *= new_next_axis;
}
return new_index;
}

```

Reindexing means that for some applications it is possible to completely avoid storing the tuple and simply iterate over flat integer indices in one tensor and then map each to its appropriate flat integer index in the other tensor. Although this method seems promising, it simply moves the computational cost from `advance_tuple` into `reindex`, and because division and modulo operation are almost always slower than multiplication and addition, this method is slower than tuple iteration in practice.

Here a novel design pattern is proposed for efficiently vectorizing over tensors in C++11. This strategy allows iterating over tuples with speed comparable to the C-style nested `for` loops but with the generality of tuple iteration and where the dimensionality does not need to be known at compile time.

Methods

It is first assumed the dimension of the tensors is known at compile time, and denote it `DIMENSION`, and then that implementation is generalized to allow the dimension to be known only at runtime. First, **Algorithm 2** is re-implemented to exploit compile-time knowledge of the dimension (**Algorithm 5**). Second, nested `for` loops over a given shape are produced via template recursion (**Algorithm 6**). Note that this proposed strategy is distinct from fully unrolling loops on flat integer indices via template recursion; while forced loop unrolling can sometimes be fast, it can also lead to an enormous executable (which in turn can also burden the cache and end up making slower code).

Algorithm 5: Tuple to flat index with respect to shape (special case for fixed dimension). Equivalent to **Algorithm 2**, but where the dimension is restricted to a constant known at compile time.

```

template <unsigned int DIMENSION>
inline unsigned long tuple_to_index_fixed_dimension(const_tup_t tup,
    const_tup_t shape) {
    unsigned long res = 0;
    unsigned int k;
    for (k=0; k<DIMENSION-1; ++k) {
        res += tup[k];
        res *= shape[k+1];
    }
}

```

```

    res += tup[k];
    return res;
}

```

Algorithm 6: Nesting loops via template recursion.

```

template <unsigned int DIMENSION, unsigned int CURRENT>
class ForEachFixedDimensionHelper {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        for (counter[CURRENT]=0; counter[CURRENT]<shape[CURRENT]; ++
            counter[CURRENT])
            ForEachFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION-1, CURRENT+1>::apply(
                counter, shape, function, args...);
    }
};

```

```

template <unsigned int CURRENT>
class ForEachFixedDimensionHelper<1u, CURRENT> {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        for (counter[CURRENT]=0; counter[CURRENT]<shape[CURRENT]; ++
            counter[CURRENT])
            function(args.flat[tuple_to_index_fixed_dimension<CURRENT+1>(
                counter, &args.shape[0])]);
    }
};

```

```

template <unsigned int DIMENSION>
class ForEachFixedDimension {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        ForEachFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION,0>::apply(counter, shape,
            function, args...);
    }
};

```

When invoking `ForEachFixedDimension<DIMENSION>::apply`, the typename `FUNCTION` and the template parameter pack `typename ...TENSORS` can be inferred at compile time based on the contents of the tensor `args...` and the argument types to `function`. Also note that `function` can have type as a C-style function pointer, a `std::function`, or any functor (*i.e.*, any object that defines an `()` operator). This so-called “duck typing”, means that the method can be used whenever valid type substitutions can be found. It also offers variadic support while ensuring type safety (unlike the unsafe C-style `...` used to implement a varargs function like `printf`). Note that the tuple value can be safely declared `__restrict__`,

meaning that it is referred to from no other location in memory, because it will be constructed specifically for iteration and then deallocated.

Template recursion can likewise be used to convert a runtime value into a compile-time constant (**Algorithm 7**). Note that here, even though template recursion is used, the dimension need not be known until runtime. This is essentially achieved by using templates as a form of just-in-time (JIT) compilation, precomputing strategies for all dimensionalities of interest and then looking up the correct one at runtime. As shown, this runtime lookup will be unrolled into a series of branches that will give a lookup runtime linear in the dimension queried. Note that log search (rather than linear search) would also be possible, but it would not amortize out the runtime the same: here only $O(d)$ steps are used, which is already a prerequisite cost for processing d -dimensional tensors. Likewise, instead of linear search, virtual functions can be used via a base class that offers an interface for shared functionality regardless of d . This can be used to construct a table of derived objects (or a table of factories) where the compile-time constant corresponds to its index in the table, and then the table can be queried to retrieve a pointer to a derived object (cast as base class pointer). Although virtual functions would achieve this lookup in $O(1)$ rather than $O(d)$, they shield function calls from inlining and thus can impede compiler optimizations. For these reasons, the linear search is preferred.

Algorithm 7: Dynamic linear template lookup. Searches linearly from MINIMUM to MAXIMUM to find a compile-time constant matching a value known only at runtime.

```
typedef unsigned int TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE;
template <TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE MINIMUM, TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE
    MAXIMUM, template <TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE> class WORKER>
class LinearSearch {
public:
    template <typename...ARG_TYPES>
    static void apply(TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE v, ARG_TYPES && ... args
        ) {
        if (v == MINIMUM)
            WORKER<MINIMUM>::apply(std::forward<ARG_TYPES>(args)...);
        else
            LinearSearch<MINIMUM+1, MAXIMUM, WORKER>::apply(v, std::forward<
                ARG_TYPES>(args)...);
    }
};

template <TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE MAXIMUM, template <
    TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE> class WORKER>
class LinearSearch<MAXIMUM, MAXIMUM, WORKER> {
public:
    template <typename...ARG_TYPES>
    static void apply(TEMPLATE_SEARCH_INT_TYPE v, ARG_TYPES && ... args
        ) {
        assert(v == MAXIMUM);
        WORKER<MAXIMUM>::apply(std::forward<ARG_TYPES>(args)...);
    }
};
```

Algorithm 6 and **Algorithm 7** can be invoked together to efficiently iterate over a tuple with dimension known only at runtime (**Algorithm 8**). This can be called elegantly with λ -functions from C++11, which can even modify external state using variable capture.

Algorithm 8: Template-recursive iteration over tensors (TRIOT). Pairing **Algorithm 6** with **Algorithm 7** enables mapping of functions over tensors. An example is shown that uses variable capture to compute the inner product between two tensors of different shape.

```
const unsigned int MAX_TENSOR_DIMENSION = 32u;
template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
/* Note: using simple in-house vector type (not std::vector), which
   is also used as tensor.flat */
void for_each_tensors(unsigned int dimension, FUNCTION function,
    const vector<unsigned long> & shape, const TENSORS & ...args) {
    tup_t counter = aligned_calloc<unsigned long>(dimension);
    LinearSearch<1u,MAX_TENSOR_DIMENSION,Vectorize::
        ForEachFixedDimension>::apply(dimension, counter, &shape[0],
        function, args...);
    free(counter);
}

double dot_product(const tensor & x<double>, const tensor<double> & y
) {
    // This function written for homogeneous types, but not unnecessary
    double tot = 0.0;
    for_each_tensors(DIMENSION, [&tot](double xV, double yV) {
        tot += xV * yV;
    },
    x.shape, /* Iterate over valid tuples for x.shape; as written, this
        line assumes x has smaller shape, but this is not required */
    x, y);
    return tot;
}
```

Using the same approach, similar functions can be defined to allow modification (or modification of only one argument as implemented in `apply_tensors`) of tensor data by function (**Algorithm 9**). Likewise, this pattern can be trivially extended to pass a `const` view of the tuple counter through as the first argument to function (**Algorithm 10**). When combined with variable capture, this enables fast vector operations with a much greater generality. For example, `numpy` is very efficient for straightforward vector operations, but loops must be used when the tuple index is needed. For example, there is no native way in `numpy` to efficiently find the bounding box containing all nonzero values in a tensor. Likewise, the type of iteration used by `boost` to vectorize operations of tensors is inherently hierarchical, and thus does not have access to the index tuple. Using the template-recursive iteration over tensors (TRIOT) design pattern, it would be trivial to find the nonzero bounding box for the element-wise product of two tensors. Importantly, classic and numerically demanding problems such as marginalization and expected value computation require the tuple index to compute their results (simple example shown in **Algorithm 11**).

Algorithm 9: Alternative functions to allow external modifications of the tensors.

```
// Allows modifications to all arguments:
template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...DEST_TENSORS>
```



```

void modify_tensors(unsigned int dimension, FUNCTION function, const
    vector<unsigned long> & shape, DEST_TENSORS & ...args) {
    tup_t counter = aligned_calloc<unsigned long>(dimension);
    LinearSearch<1u,MAX_TENSOR_DIMENSION,Vectorize::
        ForEachFixedDimension>::apply(dimension, counter, &shape[0],
        function, args...);
    free(counter);
}

// Allows modifications only to dest:
template <typename FUNCTION, typename DEST_TENSOR, typename ...
    SOURCE_TENSORS>
void apply_tensors(unsigned int dimension, FUNCTION function, const
    vector<unsigned long> & shape, DEST_TENSOR & dest, const
    SOURCE_TENSORS & ...source_args) {
    tup_t counter = aligned_calloc<unsigned long>(dimension);
    LinearSearch<1u,MAX_TENSOR_DIMENSION,Vectorize::
        ForEachFixedDimension>::apply(dimension, counter, &shape[0],
        function, dest, source_args...);
    free(counter);
}

```

Algorithm 10: Providing safe access to the current tuple index.

```

template <unsigned int DIMENSION, unsigned int CURRENT>
class ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        for (counter[CURRENT]=0; counter[CURRENT]<shape[CURRENT]; ++
            counter[CURRENT])
            ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION-1, CURRENT
                +1>::apply(counter, shape, function, args...);
    }
};

template <unsigned int CURRENT>
class ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper<1u, CURRENT> {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        for (counter[CURRENT]=0; counter[CURRENT]<shape[CURRENT]; ++
            counter[CURRENT])
            // Cast the counter to a const_tup_t pointer so that its
            // contents cannot be modified by function:
            function(static_cast<const_tup_t>(counter), CURRENT+1, args.flat[
                tuple_to_index_fixed_dimension<CURRENT+1>(counter, &args.shape
                    [0])]);
    }
};

```

```

template <unsigned int DIMENSION>
class ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimension {
public:
    template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
    inline static void apply(tup_t counter, const_tup_t shape, FUNCTION
        function, TENSORS & ...args) {
        ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION,0>::apply(
            counter, shape, function, args...);
    }
};

template <typename FUNCTION, typename ...TENSORS>
void enumerate_for_each_tensors(unsigned int dimension, FUNCTION
    function, const vector<unsigned long> & shape, const TENSORS & ...
    args) {
    tup_t counter = aligned_calloc<unsigned long>(dimension);
    LinearSearch<1u,MAX_TENSOR_DIMENSION,Vectorize::
        ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimension>::apply(dimension, counter,
        &shape[0], function, args...);
    free(counter);
}

```

Algorithm 11: Example of TRIOT using the index tuple. The index tuple is passed to the function to compute a sum over all tuples, as weighted by all tensor arguments.

```

vector<double> result(DIMENSION);
result.fill(0.0);
enumerate_for_each_tensors(DIMENSION, [&result](const_tup_t counter,
    const unsigned int dim, double xV, double yV, double zV) {
    /* Could capture DIMENSION instead, but as written, dim will (
        strangely) be a compile-time constant, inside the function,
        which can beget greater optimization */
    for (unsigned int k=0; k<dim; ++k)
        result[k] += counter[k] * xV * yV * zV;
},
x.shape(),
x, y, z);

```

Results

The TRIOT design pattern is compared to alternative methods: tuple iteration; tuple iteration where the dimension is known at compile time; integer reindexing; integer reindexing where the axes are restricted to powers of 2 (see **Algorithm 12**; this is an unrealistic constraint in practice, but it is interesting to investigate the performance gains from converting % operations to & operations and / and * operations to >> and << operations, respectively); `numpy`; `boost::multi_array` (using version 1.61.0); C-style for loops (hard coded for each problem size). Note that of these methods only tuple iteration, integer reindexing, `numpy`, and TRIOT are possible when the dimension is not known at compile time.

Algorithm 12: Reindex flat index from one tensor shape to another tensor shape (special case where axes are all powers of 2). The algorithm takes a flat integer index with respect to `shape` and converts it to a flat integer index with respect to `new_shape`, where both shapes have length `dimension`.

```

unsigned long reindex_powers_of_2(unsigned long index, const unsigned
    int*__restrict__ const log_shape, const unsigned int*__restrict__
    const new_log_shape, unsigned int dimension) {
    unsigned long new_index = 0;
    unsigned int new_axis_sum_from_right = 0;
    for (int i=dimension-1; index>0 && i>=0; --i) {
        unsigned long next_log_axis = log_shape[i];
        unsigned long new_next_log_axis = new_log_shape[i];

        unsigned long next_value = index & ((1ul<<next_log_axis)-1);

        new_index += (next_value << new_axis_sum_from_right);
        index >>= next_log_axis;

        new_axis_sum_from_right += new_next_log_axis;
    }
    return new_index;
}

```

These methods are compared on four test problems: In benchmark 1, data is copied from a tensor of shapes (10071,10013) to a tensor of shape (2716,9813). In benchmark 2, data is copied from a tensor of shapes $(2^{10}, 2^9, 2^8)$ to a tensor of shape $(2^9, 2^9, 2^5)$. In benchmark 3, an inner product between two tensors of shapes $(2^{10}, 2^9, 2^8)$ and $(2^9, 2^9, 2^5)$ is computed (visiting only tuple indices shared by both). In benchmark 4, $x[t] \leftarrow x[t] + y[t] \cdot x[t] - z[t]$ is performed for all tuples t that are valid with respect to the shape of x , using $x.shape = (2^7 + 1, 2^5, 2^3 + 5, 2^4)$, $y.shape = (2^8 - 3, 2^6, 2^6, 2^4 + 7)$, and $z.shape = (2^8, 2^5 + 7, 2^6, 2^5 + 1)$. Wherever possible, the competing methods (but not TRIOT) are allowed to exploit the fact that lexicographically iterating over all tuples in tensor x is the same as iterating over all flat indices in order. Runtimes for initializing the tensors are not reported. For each benchmark, each method is run 64 times on a cold boot with no other programs running, and the mean time is reported **Table 1**. All C / C++ programs, including `boost` were compiled with `clang++-3.8 -std=c++11 -Ofast -march=native -mtune=native -ffast-math -fomit-frame-pointer`, and the Fortran programs were written using Fortran 95 and compiled with `f95 -Ofast -march=native -mtune=native -ffast-math -fomit-frame-pointer`. All methods also had bounds checking explicitly disabled for greater speed (*e.g.*, using `#define NDEBUG` and `#define BOOST_DISABLE_ASSERTS` for the `boost` benchmarks). Because benchmark 2 was the only one easily available for all methods considered, their respective implementations are shown in **Algorithm 13**.

`boost` was not able to be used for benchmarks 3 and 4 because no operators are provided for `boost::multi_array`, and performing the inner product on tensors of different shapes (benchmark 3) is difficult to do via iterators (because the shapes iterated over do not match); however, benchmark 3 is designed to with the same number of tensors and same shape as benchmark 2, in which `boost` was comparable to tuple iteration. As such, benchmark 3 and benchmark 4 would essentially need to be written using nested `for` loops in a manner

identical to the C method.

Algorithm 13: Various implementations of benchmark 2.

```
// Tuple iteration (DIMENSION must be compile-time constant):
vector<unsigned long> t(DIMENSION);
t.fill(0);
unsigned long k;
for (k=0; k<x.flat_size(); advance_tuple_fixed_dimension<DIMENSION>(&
    t[0], &x.shape[0]), ++k)
    x[k] = y[tuple_to_index_fixed_dimension<DIMENSION>(&t[0], &y.shape
        [0])];

// boost:
x[ boost::indices[range(0, x.shape[0])][range(0,x.shape[1])][range(0,
    x.shape[2])] ] = y[ boost::indices[range(0,x.shape[0])][range(0,x.
    shape[1])][range(0,x.shape[2])] ];

! Fortran 95
x = y(1:2**9,1:2**9,1:2**5)

// Hard-coded for loops in C:
unsigned long k;
for (k=0; k<x.shape[0]; ++k) {
    for (unsigned long j=0; j<x.shape[1]; ++j) {
        unsigned long x_bias = (k*x.shape[1] + j)*x.shape[2];
        unsigned long y_bias = (k*y.shape[1] + j)*y.shape[2];
        for (unsigned long i=0; i<x.shape[2]; ++i)
            x[x_bias + i] = y[y_bias + i];
    }
}

// Integer reindexing:
unsigned long k;
for (k=0; k<x.flat_size(); ++k)
    x[k] = y[reindex(k, &x.shape[0], &y.shape[0], DIMENSION)];

// Integer reindexing (axes are powers of 2):
unsigned long k;
for (k=0; k<x.flat_size(); ++k)
    x[k] = y[reindex_powers_of_2(k, &x_log_shape[0], &y_log_shape[0],
        DIMENSION)];

// Tuple iteration (DIMENSION unknown at compile time):
vector<unsigned long> t(DIMENSION);
t.fill(0);
unsigned long k;
for (k=0; k<x.flat_size(); advance_tuple(&t[0], &x.shape[0],
    DIMENSION), ++k)
    x[k] = y[t];

# numpy
```

```

# Note that this is hard coded for DIMENSION=3, but it can be
  implemented generically via list comprehensions; this is written
  so as to not penalize numpy for python's interpreter and let the
  code get to numpy's underlying C/Fortran underpinnings as quickly
  as possible
x[:, :, :] = y[:, x_sh[0], :x_sh[1], :x_sh[2]]

// TRIOT (DIMENSION unknown at compile time):
apply_tensors(DIMENSION, [(double & xV, double yV) {
  xV = yV;
}],
x.shape,
x, y);

```

| | Benchmark 1 | Benchmark 2 | Benchmark 3 | Benchmark 4 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| (d known during compilation) | | | | |
| Tuple iteration, const d | 0.04508 | 0.02595 | 0.02541 | 0.003355 |
| boost::multi_array | 0.03231 | 0.02505 | ————— | ————— |
| Fortran 95 | 0.03381 | 0.01156 | 0.01081 | 0.003000 |
| Hard-coded for loops in C | 0.03228 | 0.01343 | 0.01010 | 0.002749 |
| (d unknown during compilation) | | | | |
| Integer reindexing | 0.4902 | 0.2355 | 0.2355 | 0.05385 |
| Integer reindexing (powers of 2) | ————— | 0.04245 | 0.04437 | ————— |
| Tuple iteration | 0.04507 | 0.02602 | 0.02540 | 0.003270 |
| numpy | 0.03306 | 0.01542 | 0.03209 | 0.006041 |
| TRIOT | 0.03161 | 0.01239 | 0.01017 | 0.002699 |

Table 1: **Runtimes of vectorized operations over tensors (in seconds)**. Integer reindexing is the slowest; even when the axes are restricted to powers of 2, reindexing is slower than tuple iteration, which does not bode well for ideas that would attempt to embed tensors into larger shapes with relatively prime indices and perform fast reindexing via the Chinese remainder theorem. Tuple iteration, `numpy`, and `boost` perform better than reindexing, but are slower than hard-coded C- style looping. TRIOT is similar runtime to hard-coded `for` loops in C and vectorized `Fortran`, even though TRIOT doesn't require the dimension to be fixed during compilation. As the dimensionality, flat length, and complexity of operations increase, so does the speed advantage of the TRIOT pattern over other methods.

Discussion

The use of λ -functions is not necessary for this design pattern, and could even be replaced by expression templates [4, 5], which could be generated in the standard manner, via the parse trees produced automatically at compile time by defining operators on tensors (+, -, etc.); however, the generality permitted by variable capture and by directly accessing the index tuple is a great benefit to the λ -function implementation. Furthermore, unlike expression templates, no care needs to be taken to prevent parse trees from obscuring underlying mathematical properties (e.g., $x[t] = y[t] + y[t] + y[t] + \dots$ can sometimes be

optimized as $x[t] = y[t]*K$ for some unsigned integer K known at compile time). Because the function code never is never converted into a data structure and then back into code, such considerations are unnecessary.

Also, because of the way that operations are vectorized, it is easy to safely read and write from the same tensor (*e.g.*, $x[t] += y[t] * x[t]$) by simply applying a two-argument λ -function with a reference parameter (for the $x[t]$ reference) and one value parameter (for the $y[t]$ value). `apply_tensors` would be called with only two tensor arguments x , y . Pairing TRIOT with expression templates would make this guarantee much more difficult, since the tensor x would appear multiple times in the expression tree. This distinction is important to allow the underlying flat vector pointer to be of type `T*_restrict_`, which guarantees the compiler that it will not be modified from one view while read from another view. The end result is that values indexed by such pointers do not need to be re-read from memory when another pointer is dereferenced and changed. This “pointer aliasing” problem and the making of copies when using operators ($+$, $-$, \dots) on tensors are together often referred to casually as the only reasons that `Fortran` is faster than `C / C++`, but `_restrict_` pointers would not be an issue with the λ -function version of TRIOT, because the value or reference can occur multiple times in the λ -function, but the tensor reference need only be included once. The runtimes presented use `_restrict_` pointers internally in the `vector<T>` type, and so the hard-coded `for` loops in `C`, vectorized `Fortran`, and TRIOT methods are all comparable.

Bounds checking can also be performed to make code safe but perform a single check over shapes rather than over indices (this would make a significant difference compared to `boost`, where bounds checking on the benchmark problems yielded $2\times$ the runtime of `boost` without bounds checking). The method can also be trivially paired with contiguous slices (which reference the original tensor and store a bias added when performing all flat index operations), provided multiple slices are not treated as distinct source and destination vectors.

Parallelism could be automatically exploited by specializing the classes in the template recursion that correspond to the outermost `for` loops (template `<unsigned int DIMENSION> class ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION, 0>`, template `<unsigned int DIMENSION> class ForEachVisibleCounterFixedDimensionHelper<DIMENSION, 1>`, *etc.*). This would allow multiple processors / cores / GPUs to simultaneously process partitions of tensors.

The only real downside of the proposed method is compile time, which increases with the maximum dimension permitted: When the maximum dimension is set 16, it compiles in 16 seconds and when the maximum tensor dimension is set to 32, it compiles in 1 minute; however, this can be solved easily by compiling the tensor code offline so that the resulting library is already optimized for all realistic tensor dimensions. Note that if no axes are trivial, then the memory usage to store the tensor must grow in $\Omega(2^d)$, so it is reasonable to assume that the dimensionality should be limited; if some axes have trivial length 1, then those axes can simply be ignored to operate on a tensor in a lower dimension. Even if the dimensionality is not known at compile time, a tight bound on the maximum dimensionality should be reasonably known (in comparison, `Fortran 95` only supports dimensions up to 7). Furthermore, the compile time is reduced when dimensionality can be inferred at compile time (the $d_{\max} = 32$ case compiled in 3 seconds).

The real advantage of this pattern is in its simultaneous simplicity and flexibility, which

allows very high performance while still allowing both the dimension and the shape to be unknown at compile time but while still providing a simple interface to the programmer. This is a large advantage over libraries like `boost`, which required more complicated code, was slower in benchmarks, requires the dimension of all tensors must be known at compile time. Such methods are crucially important for computing in fields of research where the dimensionality may be changing dynamically during runtime, for example iterative machine learning algorithms for which the sparsity of solutions increases as convergence is reached, thus restricting tensors to subspaces of lower dimension.

Availability

A small tensor library demonstrating these ideas is available at <https://bitbucket.org/orserang/triot>.

References

- [1] R. Sonnenschein. An improved algorithm for molecular dynamics simulation of rigid molecules. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 59(2):347–350, 1985.
- [2] O. Serang. A fast numerical method for max-convolution and the application to efficient max-product inference in Bayesian networks. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 22:770–783, 2015.
- [3] András Kelemen, Gábor Székely, and Guido Gerig. Elastic model-based segmentation of 3-d neuroradiological data sets. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 18(10):828–839, 1999.
- [4] T. Veldhuizen. Expression templates. C++ Report, 7 (5), 26–31, 1995.
- [5] D. Vanderboorder and N. M. Josuttis. C++ Templates: the complete guide, 2003.