






# Benchmarking Quantum Red TEA on CPUs, GPUs, and TPUs

Submission to the 10<sup>th</sup> bwHPC Symposium

Daniel Jaschke<sup>a,b,c</sup> , Marco Ballarin<sup>b,c</sup> , Nora Reinić<sup>b,c</sup> , Luka Pavešić<sup>b,c</sup> ,  
Simone Montangero<sup>a,b,c</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> Institute for Complex Quantum Systems, Ulm University, Albert-Einstein-Allee 11, 89069 Ulm, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia "G. Galilei" & Padua Quantum Technologies Research Center, Università degli Studi di Padova, Italy I-35131, Padova, Italy

<sup>c</sup> INFN, Sezione di Padova, via Marzolo 8, I-35131, Padova, Italy

## Abstract

We benchmark simulations of many-body quantum systems on heterogeneous hardware platforms using CPUs, GPUs, and TPUs. We compare different linear algebra backends, e.g., numpy versus the torch, jax, or tensorflow library, as well as a mixed-precision-inspired approach and optimizations for the target hardware. *Quantum red TEA* out of the *Quantum TEA* library specifically addresses handling tensors with different libraries or hardware, where the tensors are the building block of tensor network algorithms. The benchmark problem is a variational search of a ground state in an interacting model. This is a ubiquitous problem in quantum many-body physics, which we solve using tensor network methods. This approximate state-of-the-art method compresses quantum correlations which is key to overcoming the exponential growth of the Hilbert space as a function of the number of particles. We present a way to obtain speedups of a factor of 34 when tuning parameters on the CPU, and an additional factor of 2.76 on top of the best CPU setup when migrating to GPUs.


# 1 Introduction

Tensor network (TN) methods used for the simulation of quantum many-body systems rely heavily on HPC resources. Carefully optimizing and benchmarking these algorithms can result in significant savings of resources. This is essential to emulate bigger systems, include more details in the description of the system, or increase precision. Today's heterogeneous computing platforms open even more possibilities for optimization and a combination of various approaches. We demonstrate where computational gains are possible. As using various hardware requires flexibility, we implement a software design with interchangeable numerical libraries.

Tensor network methods have long been established as a method for the simulation of many-body quantum systems, see Refs. (Schollwöck, 2011; Orús, 2014; Bañuls, 2023). Today, they are used to numerically solve problems in fields ranging from condensed matter physics and lattice gauge theories and quantum simulation, to quantum circuit design (Montangero, 2018). Quantum-inspired methods employ TNs to solve optimization problems, partial differential equations, or machine learning tasks (Lucas, 2014; Gourianov et al., 2022; Stoudenmire, 2018). The variety of applications and their computational cost make TN methods an excellent target for exploring optimizations and benchmarking.

We benchmark the *Quantum TEA* (Quantum Tensor network Emulator Applications) library (Silvi et al., 2019; Bacilieri et al., 2024; Ballarin et al., 2024) with a ground state search for a two-dimensional quantum Ising model (Sachdev, 2011). *Quantum TEA leaves* implements various TN algorithms as a Python package. *Quantum Red TEA* enables additional tensor classes. We choose the groundstate search of the two-dimensional quantum Ising model on a  $16 \times 16$  lattice as the benchmark problem, because of its relevance for the current research. The tensor contractions and linear algebra decompositions are either solved with numpy/cupy, pytorch, jax, or tensorflow (Harris et al., 2020; Okuta et al., 2017; Ansel et al., 2024; Bradbury et al., 2018; Abadi et al., 2015). In total, we outline seven approaches where we expect a potential speedup. We successfully demonstrate how to leverage the different libraries, e.g., we gain a speedup factor of 34 in the CPU benchmark.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we introduce TN methods to the extent necessary to follow the benchmarks and describe the setup. In Sec. 3, we evaluate the benchmark results for CPUs, GPUs, and TPUs. We conclude in Sec. 4.



**Figure 1: Algorithm and simplified library setup.** **a** A binary tree tensor network represents the wavefunction  $|\psi\rangle$  and the energy  $E(|\psi\rangle)$  is minimized via a series of sweeps, where each sweep consists of local tensor optimizations. With each optimization, the wavefunction converges towards the ground state with its ground state energy  $E_0$ . **b** We consider two python packages from *Quantum TEA* for the ground state search. The *qtealeaves* library comes with the tensor network algorithms as well as with an abstract class for tensors; moreover, the default tensors are implemented with *numpy/cupy*. Any implementation of the abstract tensor class is suitable for the algorithms. The *qredtea* library leverages the abstract class to implement optional tensors using *pytorch*, *jax*, and *tensorflow*. Moreover, *qredtea* encodes block-sparse tensors with an Abelian symmetry.

## 2 Methods and benchmark setup

The benchmark is set up around three main choices: (a) we choose a binary tree tensor network (TTN) representation for the wavefunction  $|\psi\rangle$ ; (b) we consider a ground state search, i.e., minimizing the energy  $E$  of the wavefunction  $|\psi\rangle$ ; (c) the underlying model is a two-dimensional quantum Ising model with nearest-neighbor interactions. We discuss the rationale behind and consequences of the choices below.

In short, TN methods are based on efficiently, but approximately, representing states of quantum systems, i.e., vectors living in a given Hilbert space, as products of a set of tensors. Didactically, the approach separates a large vector into a set of tensors with singular value decomposition, where only a set of states associated with the largest singular values is kept. Due to an intrinsic relation between entanglement, i.e., quantum correlation, and the distribution of the singular values, this is an optimal way to approximate quantum states. The number of kept singular values, i.e., the maximal size of a tensor’s link, uniquely determines the accuracy of the approximation. The *maximal bond dimension*  $\chi$  is thus a central parameter of TN algorithms.

We choose the TTN as it is particularly apt for representing quantum systems with long-range interactions. These long-range interactions arise in the 2D quantum Ising model when it is mapped into a 1D chain. The physical sites of the lattice are represented as the leaves of the tree, while the rest of the network is there to "transfer" entanglement

between the distant sites. For a more detailed discussion of TN methods, we direct the reader to (Schollwöck, 2011), while specifics of TTNs are reviewed in (Silvi et al., 2019).

To find the ground state of a given model, we iterate, i.e., we *sweep*, through the network and locally optimize each tensor in a way that minimizes the energy. This procedure involves contracting the tensor with its environment, locally solving an eigenproblem to find the smallest eigenvalue, and performing decompositions to update the neighboring tensors afterwards. The ground state is reached by repeating this process multiple times, until convergence is reached. See Fig. 1a) for a sketch of an 8-qubit TTN and its first two sweeps. The computational workload thus dominantly comes from a large number of linear algebra tasks and manipulations of the tensors: tensor contractions, sparse eigenproblems, as well as SVD, QR, and eigen-decompositions. Because the TTN uses rank-three tensors of dimensions up to  $\chi \times \chi \times \chi$ , the complexity of these operations scales as  $\mathcal{O}(\chi^4)$ . The simplified sketch of the library is shown in Fig. 1b) with the two python modules, one abstract tensor class, five different tensor backends, i.e., implementations of the abstract tensor class, as well as the algorithms and simulations using the tensor classes.

We choose the ground state search as it is a ubiquitous problem in quantum physics, but also because it leads to an easily accessible interpretation of the benchmark. Because the ground state energy  $E_0$  is a global minimum of energy, lower energies represent a better outcome of the algorithm. Comparison of computational time versus obtained energy is our main figure of merit.

The Hamiltonian  $H$  for the ground state search of the quantum Ising model in 2d is

$$H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x - g \sum_i \sigma_i^z, \quad (1)$$

where sites are labeled with  $i = (i_x, i_y)$  and  $j$  referring to positions in a 2d lattice and  $\langle i, j \rangle$  contains all pairs of nearest-neighbors, The Pauli matrices  $\sigma^x$  and  $\sigma^z$  define the interactions with coupling  $J = 1$  and the local field with coupling  $g$ . The linear system size is denoted by  $N$ , so that the total number of qubits is  $N^2$ . In the following, we set  $N = 16$ . The ratio  $g/J$  is set so that the system is close to the quantum critical point. In this point, the ground state is strongly correlated, which imposes sufficient computational challenges.

We anticipate the potential for optimization in the following choices:

- i) *Picking linear algebra libraries*: numpy is the defacto-standard for numerical computation in python and is therefore the standard backend in *qtealeaves*. However, the alternatives to numpy/cupy provide all necessary interfaces in terms of tensor contractions and linear algebra decompositions to run the ground state search. Our implementation approach relies on an abstract tensor class, which allows us to easily run the same TN algorithm with numpy/cupy, pytorch, jax, and tensorflow. We provide an initial comparison between these libraries for *Quantum TEA* and its TTN ground state search. Note that the different libraries introduce different dependencies for low-level linear algebra, i.e., BLAS/LAPACK versus Eigen or Arpack versus a custom Lanzos solver.
- ii) *Exact renormalization group tensors (ERGT)*: Each tensor in the lowestlayer of the TTN contains two physical sites, which contain  $d$  degrees of freedom (in our case  $d = 2$ ). These tensors thus have dimensions at most  $d \times d \times d^2$ , and can be represented exactly. Written as a matrix  $(d \times d) \times (d^2)$ , it is an exact unitary transformation with a complete set of orthonormal vectors. Depending on the maximum bond dimension, more ERGTs exist in lower layers. Any optimization on the ERGTs can be accounted for in their parent tensors as no relevant degree of freedom has been truncated yet. We explore if skipping the ERGTs leads to a speedup.
- iii) *Mixed-precision tailored to TN methods*: the algorithm starts in a random guess state, which is far from optimum. Multiple iterations optimize the TN until it approximates the target state as good as possible with the given parameters of the algorithm. As arithmetic for single precision is faster than double precision, we exploit this by executing the first iterations in single-precision before moving the last sweeps to double-precision numbers.
- iv) *Parallelization on CPUs*: We investigate the parallel speedup of one simulation on CPUs for the different backend libraries. Parallelization occurs at the level of the BLAS/LAPACK or Eigen library.
- v) *GPUs-support*: The benefit of GPUs is well established and all four linear algebra libraries support GPUs. We benchmark simulations on CPU versus GPU.
- vi) *Optimization of tensor dimensions*: GPUs reach peak performance at matrix dimensions which respect the underlying hardware, e.g., rows of a matrix being a multiple of 128 bytes. We study whether enforcing such a dimension benefits the execution time of the complete algorithm as it does for matrix-matrix multiplications (NVIDIAUsersGuide, 2023).

- vii) *TPUs support for simulations*: TPUs are another class of accelerators with features such as just-in-time compilation of functions for the best performance. The first step towards profiting from the platform is the migration towards the hardware, which we achieve by leveraging our different backend libraries.

Together, the approaches encode the heterogeneous computing platforms from various aspects including hardware and precision. The benchmark executes on an *Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8480+* node or with a *NVIDIA A100-SXM-64GB* mounted on an *Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8358* on *leonardo* (CINECA). The TPU benchmark runs on Google's TPU v4-8.


## 3 Quantum Red TEA benchmark

The first part of the benchmark in Sec. 3.1 uses CPUs where we analyze higher-level optimization, like the mixed-precision approach tailored to the ground state search. Based on the results, we look into the speedup that can be gained for GPUs in Sec. 3.2. The number of simulation parameters is too large to consider all combinations, so we in general focus on one aspect of the simulation and pick one data point to compare with the next optimization.

### 3.1 CPU benchmark

In the following section, we establish the baseline for further optimization. We also use the opportunity to show the scaling of the simulation time with the bond dimension  $\chi$ . The bond dimension  $\chi$  directly influences the underlying matrix dimension for the linear algebra operations. The Hamiltonian of a quantum system can be complex in general, although many models, including the one in Eq. (1) can be represented with real-valued Hamiltonians. Typically, simulations run with double-complex by default to capture complex Hamiltonians; the mixed-precision implementation requires flexibility in the data types, i.e., single-real, double-real, single-complex, and double-complex are available, and we also have the opportunity to compare real versus complex arithmetic.

In Fig. 2a), we address the effects of points *i*) and *ii*) for different bond dimensions; here, we start with a complex-valued ansatz. We compare the obtained energy with computation time. To enable log-log plots, we plot the energy relative to the lowest energy obtained across all simulations  $E_{\min}$  and manually set the best simulation's error to the next smaller power of ten, here  $10^{-4}$ . We expect simulations with higher bond




**Figure 2:** CPU benchmark: baseline and mixed-precision tailored to tensor networks.

**a** The baseline for the ground state search benchmark with no optimizations is given by the data with «rgskip=False». To allow for log-error plots, we plot  $\max(E - \min_{\chi, \text{lib}, \text{rgskip}}(E(\cdot)), \epsilon = 10^{-4})$ . The largest markers refer to the largest bond dimension out of  $\chi \in \{16, 32, 64\}$  for each backend library, where the different backend libraries perform differently. Then, we tune our setting and skip small exact tensors in the optimization, see «rgskip=True», leading only to a speedup for jax. **b** Mixed-precision allows to increase precision as we converge to the ground state in multiple sweeps. We perform six sweeps with single-real (S), double-real (D), and double-complex (Z) data types and show selected entries. Mixed-precision always leads to a speedup; note that precision decreases for numpy and tensorflow with more single-precision sweeps, while the precision fluctuates for torch and jax.

dimensions to achieve better precision at the cost of a longer computation time; the diagonal trend in Fig. 2a) reflects the improvement with bond dimension. We use  $\chi \in \{16, 32, 64\}$ , with the size of the marker corresponding to the bond dimension used. Surprisingly, we find a difference in runtime of a factor of two between libraries, e.g., torch versus numpy at  $\chi = 64$ . We find that the order from the fastest to slowest at  $\chi = 64$  is: jax, tensorflow, torch, and numpy. Our results demonstrate the advantage of choosing the most suitable backend-library.

The speedup gained by skipping exactly represented tensors in optimization sweeps, see point *ii*), is also shown in Fig. 2a): the data set with squared markers and dashed lines skips small tensors. The impact depends on the choice of library and  $\chi$ , from no clear impact for numpy, torch, and tensorflow, to a slight improvement in runtime and precision for jax.

In Fig. 2b), we investigate the effect of mixed-precision by performing six sweeps while changing the precision. The label S denotes a sweep with single-real precision, and D with double-real precision. The final obtained energy total wall-time ought to be compared to six sweeps in double-complex, label «ZZZZZZ». The simulation time decreases for more single-precision sweeps; the speedup comes with losing the precision




**Figure 3: Built-in CPU parallelization via the linear algebra libraries.** **a** The energies show no significant trend when changing the number of threads. The wall times can decrease moderately for torch, jax, and tensorflow. In contrast, parallelization even slows down simulations with the numpy-backend as well as for torch with many cores. **b** The parallel speedup  $S$  over the number of threads  $n_T$  reflects the data of the table in a) with parallel speedup except for numpy. The use of multiple CPU is not justified by the observed speedup for any backend, except for torch with two and four cores.

of the ground state energy for numpy and tensorflow. In contrast, the precision fluctuates for torch and jax and no clear dependency with the number of single-precision sweeps is visible. For example, we find that the numpy backend loses one digit of precision for an SSSSDD pattern. These results show that it is possible to gain a speedup at a reasonable precision by choosing a suitable strategy for approach *iii*).

As the last step for the CPU benchmark, we consider parallelization on a single node. Numerical libraries like openBLAS come with threading; therefore, we expect to observe a parallel speedup when increasing the number of threads. No additional parallelization in our TN algorithms is required to profit from this parallelization. Figures 3a) and b) indicate a speedup for the torch, jax and tensorflow backend. torch peaks at a speedup of about 2 for 4 cores; jax and tensorflow reach their maximum speedup at 112 cores. Potential explanations for the features in the speedup are optimizations for powers of 2 for torch, see each local maxima at 8, 16, 32, and 64 threads, or the NUMA node size of 14 for jax, see local maxima for 14 or 28 threads. The configuration of numpy seems ill-configured for the profile on leonardo. Overall, the parallel speedup stays behind the number of cores and saturates for the given problem sizes below 3. Additional tuning is necessary to leverage the resources and identify bottlenecks.

To conclude, we find that optimizing approaches *i*) through *iv*) provides a potential speedup, but the improvement depends on picking the right library-backend in the first place. This applies to the question of parallelization in particular. The overall speedup





**Figure 4: GPU benchmark for mixed-precision and block-size optimization.** **(a)** We port the mixed-precision simulations to the GPU and compare their speedup to their corresponding CPU version. We iterate over the bond dimensions  $\chi \in \{16, 32, 64\}$  where the largest bond dimension in each curve is indicated with the bigger markers. **(b)** Matrix-matrix multiplications are optimized in CUDA for the block-size of the memory, i.e., tiles are enforced internally. We can enforce our tensor shapes to be a multiple of this tile size and observe if there is additional speedup; but tiling leads to a slowdown for all backends. Each curve consists of bond dimension  $\chi \in \{60, \dots, 68\}$  with the biggest bond dimension indicated by a bigger marker.

we gain is significant, with a factor of 34 with the torch-backend for the optimized setup (4 threads, SSSSDD sweep pattern, skip ERGT) in comparison to the original double-complex simulation with the numpy-backend.

### 3.2 GPU benchmark

In the following, we first address the migration to the GPU, i.e., approach *v)*, and then look into fine-tuning the tensor dimensions as proposed in approach *vi)*. We compare a single CPU core to a single GPU. Executing the simulation on the GPU comes with some additional constraints and options. The main constraint of the GPU is the 64GB of memory, where we are not exceeding this 64GB for 256 sites and  $\chi = 64$ . Moreover, we tune the preference of the linear algebra algorithms according to our preliminary studies, e.g., solving SVDs via eigendecompositions. The settings of the algorithm require SVDs and truncated bond dimensions are possible.

Figure 4a) compares the energy obtained with different bond dimensions  $\chi$  and different libraries on CPU and GPU. We use a sweep pattern of four single-precision plus two double-precision sweeps with a real-valued ansatz. We see that for both devices the torch-backend is much faster while achieving equal or almost equal precision as other libraries. Note that the increase in computational time with increasing  $\chi$  is much slower for the GPU than for the CPU. We find that the GPUs are slower for very small  $\chi$ ,

but provide a sizeable speedup over CPU already for  $\chi = 32$ . As expected, approach *v)* is successful and leads to an additional speedup over the best CPU simulation of 2.76 times.

Now, we move to the tiling size, which potentially helps to improve performance as demonstrated in Ref. (NVIDIAUsersGuide, 2023). Figure 4b) shows two data sets for  $\chi \in \{60, \dots, 68\}$  without and with enforcing a tiling, solid versus dotted lines. If activated, we enforce a tiling of 128 bytes; note that  $\chi = 64$  enforces only the maximal bond dimension, while tensors may have other bond dimensions due to the truncation of singular values. We expect a separation of the two data sets in case enforcing the tiling has an effect, but the data does not support the claim. In contrast, the runtime increases slightly when enforcing tiling on our side. Therefore, we conclude that *vi)* provides no benefit.

In summary, the migration to the GPU as approach *v)* is successful with a total speedup of 94 over the double-complex numpy-backend baseline on CPUs. Further tuning as enforcing a tiling dimension does not lead to an additional speedup.

### 3.3 TPU benchmark

We move to the TPU benchmark, which has as an accelerator similar challenges for an implementation as GPUs, e.g., data transfer between host and device. Torch, tensorflow, and jax support TPUs. We focus on jax after an initial assessment and considering previous studies on linear algebra with jax (Lewis et al., 2022). Jax relies on just-in-time (jit) compilation of functions that are cached for each data type, shape, etc. The jit compiler opens up possibilities for optimization, e.g., avoiding unnecessary compilation.

We benchmark on Google’s TPU v4-8 for three bond dimensions  $\chi \in \{32, 64, 128\}$ , six single-precision sweeps, and tiling on/off. The computation times of the TPU v4-8 cannot compete with GPUs and are closer to the ones of CPUs, see Fig. 5a). At bond dimension  $\chi = 64$ , there is a speedup of the TPU over the CPU, albeit with a smaller precision. The difference in wall time when doubling the bond dimensions is less than 1.1 on the TPU, which is far below the expected scaling with  $\mathcal{O}(\chi^4)$ . This means that other contributions still present a significant contribution in comparison to the expensive linear algebra steps.

As each function has to be compiled for each set of parameters, approach *vi)* seems to fit into the beneficial optimization for TPUs: limiting the number of possible bond dimensions also limits the number of compile events. Surprisingly, it is not beneficial;

<b>a</b>				<b>b</b>			
Bond dimension	CPU	XLA	XLA + tile=128	XLA compile log	CPU	XLA	XLA + tile=128
$\chi = 32$	t=1065s	1131s	n.a.	Time ( $\chi = 64$ )	41s	32s	48s
	E=-688.51693	-687.98895	n.a.	Counter	459	459	742
$\chi = 64$	t=1823s	1180s	1625s	Time ( $\chi = 128$ )	42s	56s	140s
	E=-688.61092	-687.06878	-684.32439	Counter	459	459	1207
$\chi = 128$	t=4692s	1244s	1701s				
	E=-688.57309	-686.84771	-668.38448				


**Figure 5:** TPU benchmark for single-precision and block-size optimization with jax. **a** We port the mixed-precision simulations to the TPU and compare different parameterizations. We observe approximately a factor 2 in difference in simulation time for doubling the bond dimension  $\chi$ . The two data points per line refers to four versus six single-precision steps with the bigger marker for six single-precision sweeps. Finally, we check if tiling bond dimensions to 128 bytes has any effect, e.g., due to tiling or fewer jit-compiling efforts. **b** We extract the number of jit-compile events and their cumulated time. A change in data types leads to about 20 more calls to the compiler. Higher bond dimensions lead to more compilation time. Tiling does not overcome this problem as truncations do not lead to different dimensions in our example.

computation time increases, and the compile time of the jit-compiler also increases, because the number of compile events increases. In figure 5b), we extract the actual number of jit-compiler calls and the compile time to track the effects of bond dimension and tiling. The higher number of jit-compilations for tiling can be explained by additional compilations of functions only needed for tiling as a first hypothesis. An additional look into the data shows further that simulations without tiling max out their bond dimension and therefore encounter only a limited number of combinations.

These results concerning the precision are not *per se* a statement against TPUs as the scaling of the computation with the bond dimension  $\chi$  is promising. Further optimization steps remain unexplored. For example, removing trivial dimensions before jit-compiling functions, enabling jited-functions in our library instead of completely relying on the jax-backend. The smallest size of the TPU used here also allows one to further scale it up as successfully shown for linear algebra in Ref. (Lewis et al., 2022). A comparison with newer hardware is another future step; TPU v4-8 has been released in 2021.

### 3.4 Block-sparse tensors for conserved symmetries

As the last part of the benchmark, we demonstrate that the abstract tensor class extends into block-sparse tensors. These block-sparse tensors enable us to handle quantum systems with conserved quantities. The Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) has a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  Abelian symmetry. The block-sparse tensors rely on the abstract tensor in two ways. First, block-sparse tensors have to comply with the abstract tensor class so that the TTN algorithms can em-



**Figure 6: Block-sparse tensor benchmark for conserved symmetries.** **(a)** We analyze the TTN with a conserved  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry and its energies and runtimes for both CPU and GPU. As linear algebra operations are on smaller problems, GPUs do not yet show a speedup for  $\chi \leq 64$ . **(b)** We compare the data with and without symmetries via the ratios of the energy and wall time. Ratios in the red (green) rectangle are a decline (improvement) with respect to both energy and wall time. CPUs profit with respect to the wall time.

ploy them as tensors for a TN. Second, the block-sparse tensors have to contain a tensor for each block; these are dense tensors based on numpy/cupy, torch, jax, or tensorflow.

In Fig. 6a), we show the computation time over the energy of the ground state with symmetry for different bond dimensions  $\chi \in \{16, 32, 64\}$ . In Fig. 6b) we compare to the same simulation without the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry. By taking the ratio of energies and wall times, we see whether both aspects improved (see green rectangle) or whether both aspects deteriorate (red rectangle). For  $\chi = 64$ , we find a speedup in computation time for CPUs with numpy when using block-sparse tensors, although convergence is still slightly worse. The expected speedup of block-sparse tensors depends on the exploited symmetry. Our Hamiltonian only splits into two blocks and the upper bound for a speedup is 4. Because the matrix dimension for linear algebra operations is effectively smaller when using symmetric tensors, the GPU has less impact in comparison with the CPU for the bond dimensions  $\chi \leq 64$  shown here. To summarize, the concept of abstract classes extends to symmetric tensors, however, parallel loops of decompositions are not exploited yet and have the potential for an additional speedup in the future.

## 4 Conclusions

We have demonstrated a benchmark for tensor network algorithms used to simulate many-body quantum systems. Due to the uprise of quantum-inspired methods, this class of algorithms has raised interest beyond quantum systems, e.g., for optimization or

machine learning problems. We identify seven aspects that have the potential to reduce computation time spanning different hardware, i.e., CPUs, GPUs, and TPUs, backend libraries, and precision of the underlying arithmetic.

When using CPUs, we find that the most important aspect is the choice of the linear algebra library. Additionally, using lower precision for initial iterations also provides a sizeable speedup. Combined with the other approaches like parallelization, this strategy leads to a speedup factor of 34 compared to the initial baseline.

For GPUs, we demonstrate an additional speedup of 2.76 for the pytorch-backend over the best CPU implementation (4 threads, SSSSDD sweep pattern, skip ERGT). The overall speedup from the initial starting point to the optimal GPU implementation is 94.


We see further potential in matching the strengths of the linear algebra libraries with the type of hardware. An example is the TPU architecture, where we achieve a working example, but no significant speedup at sufficient precision yet. Extracting the best computational performance requires in the future considering just-in-time compilation and rewriting functions with this aspect in mind. This approach then benefits both TPUs and GPUs.


### Corresponding Author

Daniel Jaschke: [daniel-1.jaschke@uni-ulm.de](mailto:daniel-1.jaschke@uni-ulm.de)


Institute for Complex Quantum Systems, Ulm University, Germany


### ORCID

Daniel Jaschke  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7658-3546>

Marco Ballarin  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3215-3453>

Nora Reinić  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9490-2536>

Luka Pavešić  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9800-9200>

Simone Montangero  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8882-2169>

### Data availability

The scripts and source code are available via Refs (Bacilieri et al., 2024) and (Ballarin et al., 2024). We provide the datasets and figures via Ref. (Jaschke et al., 2024).

## Acknowledgements

We thank Alessandro Lonardo, Francesco Simula, Ilaria Siloi, and Pietro Silvi for discussions and feedback. We acknowledge financial support from the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR) via PRIN2022 project TANQU, and the Departments of Excellence grant 2023-2027 Quantum Frontiers; from the European Union via H2020 projects EuRyQa and textarossa, the QuantERA projects QuantHEP and T-NISQ, and the Quantum Flagship project Pasquans2, from the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) via the funding program quantum technologies – from basic research to market – project QRydDemo, and from the World Class Research Infrastructure – Quantum Computing and Simulation Center (QCSC) of Padova University. We also acknowledge computation time supported support by the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC and the German Research Foundation (DFG) through grant no INST 40/575-1 FUGG (JUSTUS 2 cluster), on Cineca’s *leonardo* machine, the dibona cluster via the project textarossa, and via Google’s TPU Research Cloud program.

## References

- Abadi, M. et al. (2015). *TensorFlow: Large-Scale Machine Learning on Heterogeneous Systems*. Software available from tensorflow.org. URL: <https://www.tensorflow.org/>.
- Ansel, J. et al. (2024). »PyTorch 2: Faster Machine Learning Through Dynamic Python Bytecode Transformation and Graph Compilation«. In: *29th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2 (ASPLOS '24)*. ACM. DOI: 10.1145/3620665.3640366.
- Bañuls, M. C. (2023). »Tensor Network Algorithms: A Route Map«. In: *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* 14.1, pp. 173–191. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-040721-022705.
- Bacilieri, D. et al. (2024). *Quantum TEA: qtealeaves*. Version 1.2.30. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13383350.
- Ballarin, M., D. Jaschke, S. Montangero, L. Pavešić and N. Reinić (2024). *Quantum TEA: qredtea*. Version 0.0.15. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13385250.
- Bradbury, J. et al. (2018). *JAX: composable transformations of Python+NumPy programs*. Version 0.3.13. URL: <http://github.com/google/jax>.
- Gourianov, N. et al. (2022). »A quantum-inspired approach to exploit turbulence structures«. In: *Nature Computational Science* 2.1, pp. 30–37. ISSN: 2662-8457. DOI: 10.1038/s43588-021-00181-1.
- Harris, C. R. et al. (2020). »Array programming with NumPy«. In: *Nature* 585.7825, pp. 357–362. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2.

- Jaschke, D., M. Ballarin, N. Reinić, L. Pavešić and S. Montangero (2024). *Simulation data and figures for "Benchmarking Quantum Red TEA on CPUs, GPUs, and TPUs"*. Version v0.0.15. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13386420.
- Lewis, A. G. M. et al. (2022). »Large-scale distributed linear algebra with tensor processing units«. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119.33, e2122762119. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2122762119.
- Lucas, A. (2014). »Ising formulations of many NP problems«. In: *Frontiers in Physics*. ISSN: 2296-424X. DOI: 10.3389/fphy.2014.00005.
- Montangero, S. (2018). *Introduction to Tensor Network Methods*. Cham, CH: Springer Nature Switzerland AG. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-01409-4.
- NVIDIAUsersGuide (2023). *User's Guide | NVIDIA Docs: Matrix Multiplication Background*. URL: <https://docs.nvidia.com/deeplearning/performance/pdf/Matrix-Multiplication-Background-User-Guide.pdf>.
- Okuta, R., Y. Unno, D. Nishino, S. Hido and C. Loomis (2017). »CuPy: A NumPy-Compatible Library for NVIDIA GPU Calculations«. In: *Proceedings of Workshop on Machine Learning Systems (LearningSys) in The Thirty-first Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*. URL: [http://learningsys.org/nips17/assets/papers/paper\\_16.pdf](http://learningsys.org/nips17/assets/papers/paper_16.pdf).
- Orús, R. (2014). »A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states«. In: *Annals of Physics* 349, pp. 117–158. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: 10.1016/j.aop.2014.06.013.
- Sachdev, S. (2011). *Quantum Phase Transitions*. 2nd. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511973765.
- Schollwöck, U. (2011). »The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states«. In: *Annals of Physics* 326.1. January 2011 Special Issue, pp. 96–192. ISSN: 0003-4916. DOI: 10.1016/j.aop.2010.09.012.
- Silvi, P. et al. (2019). »The Tensor Networks Anthology: Simulation techniques for many-body quantum lattice systems«. In: *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes*, p. 8. DOI: 10.21468/SciPostPhysLectNotes.8.
- Stoudenmire, E. M. (2018). »Learning relevant features of data with multi-scale tensor networks«. In: *Quantum Science and Technology* 3.3, p. 034003. DOI: 10.1088/2058-9565/aaba1a.