

GPU-ACCELERATED FACTORIZATION SETS IN NUMERICAL SEMIGROUPS VIA PARALLEL BOUNDED LEXICOGRAPHIC STREAMS

THOMAS BARRON

ABSTRACT. We describe a method for parallelizing the lexicographic enumeration algorithm for the factorization set of an element in a numerical semigroup via bounds. This enables the use of GPU and distributed computing methods. We provide a CUDA implementation with measured runtimes.

1. INTRODUCTION

The factorization set problem in numerical semigroups¹ concerns itself with computing the set of all nonnegative solutions (a_1, \dots, a_d) to the heterogeneous linear Diophantine equation $a_1g_1 + \dots + a_dg_d = n$, for fixed nonnegative g_i and n ; d is called the *dimension*. That is, with respect to a set of generators $(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$, the **factorization set** of an element $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{Z} : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^d)$$

$$\mathbf{Z}(n, (g_1, \dots, g_d)) := \left\{ (a_1, \dots, a_d) \mid \sum_i a_i g_i = n \right\}$$

Finding the set of nonnegative solutions to general linear Diophantine equations, which may have variables on both sides of the equation, is a long-studied question in numerical computing. [6] provides a brief comparison of efficient single-threaded algorithms for computing such. Contemporary approaches can also include parallel techniques [2] [4].

Restricting to the numerical semigroup case, with all variables on the left, allows for algorithmic optimizations as the solution set is much smaller, contained in the first orthant. Dynamic programming techniques [1] are possible in this restricted case.

Lexicographic enumeration of nonnegative integer solutions to a diophantine linear equation is a particularly well-described technique, with algorithms dating to at least 1977 [3].

In this work we describe, and provide a reference CUDA implementation for, a method of **parallelizing** lexicographic enumeration of $\mathbf{Z}(n, (g_1, \dots, g_d))$, by assigning many workers a distinct upper- and lower-bounded work slice of the final output.

In particular we note that the parallelization of lexicographic succession we describe is of a different nature than that described by Perekhod in [4]. The parallelism of [4] is limited to a parallel summing step and a parallel comparison step during the evaluation of the successor function; it evaluates the stream of successor values sequentially. In comparison, our parallelism splits the result set, that is the results of the successor function, among multiple workers.²

Date: May 14, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 68W10 (11D04, 11-04).

Key words and phrases. numerical semigroup; numerical monoid; factorization set; diophantine linear equation; nonnegative integer solutions; lexicographic enumeration; parallel algorithms.

¹Properly speaking, a *numerical semigroup* is a cofinite subsemigroup of the naturals with addition; and furthermore, each numerical semigroup has a unique minimal set of generators. However, the present algorithm does not require its inputs to be the minimal generating set of a numerical semigroup: it can accept any stream of positive integer inputs, regardless of order, setwise coprimality, or minimality, including outright repeated generators.

²In the language of [8] for parallel branch-and-bound algorithms in integer optimization, [4] exhibits *type 1* parallelism, whereas our implementation exhibits *type 2*.

2. STREAMS

Informally, a **stream** is a potentially infinite list-like data type whose elements are produced and/or consumed one at a time.

A stream is emitted by a *producer* and is transformed or consumed by a *consumer*. One consumer may have the ability to consume multiple streams; in the case of GPU parallelism, the CPU has the ability to consume the results of multiple streams produced in parallel on the GPU.

The `nextCandidate` stream we will describe will have the property that its next stream output value depends only on the previous stream output value (where relevant internal state members are included in the returned struct). It can therefore be described as a data struct *State* and a pure function $nextState : State \rightarrow State$, although in practice this function may be implemented in-place to avoid copies.

As we define a stream producer for factorizations, potential consumers include: saving the factorizations to disk or in memory, to retain the entire result set; incrementing a counter for each result, to retain only the cardinality of the result set; or setting a boolean variable based on a predicate’s value for each result, to retain whether any elements of the factorization set satisfy the predicate.

3. LEXICOGRAPHIC ENUMERATION

An algorithm is called “greedy” if at each step it chooses the locally optimal solution, that is, the best solution available at each step.

In our case the presented algorithm `nextCandidate` is greedy in that it attempts to produce the lexicographically next-greatest factorization; if what it produces is not a factorization, it is a “candidate” $\in \mathbb{N}^d$ that is lexicographically greater than the next factorization.

3.1. The stream data struct. In the following structs, \mathbb{N} is represented in the usual fixed-bit-depth representation using B bits, such that all values involved are less than 2^B . Arbitrary-precision integer implementations such as Java’s `BigInteger` [5] would enable the same function to handle all possible sizes of inputs without the need to fix a precision, with less predictable memory and performance characteristics.

3.1.1. *The (single-worker) lexicographic state struct.*

```
type LexicographicState := { element :  $\mathbb{N}$ , generators :  $\mathbb{N}^d$ ,
  previousCandidate :  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , wasValid : bool, endOfStream : bool }
```

3.1.2. *Bound for enabling division of work.* The preceding struct enables a single individual worker to iteratively produce the entire desired set of factorizations. In order to enable multiple workers working in a parallel or distributed manner on the same factorization set, while maintaining a uniqueness guarantee, we can provide the stream struct with a *bound*, which when reached will denote that the given worker’s job is complete.

```
type ParallelLexicographicState := { element :  $\mathbb{N}$ , generators :  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , bound :  $\mathbb{N}^d$ ,
  previousCandidate :  $\mathbb{N}^d$ , wasValid : bool, endOfStream : bool }
```

The single-worker case, as well as the case of the first worker from which all other workers will split their work, can be represented by a bound of $(0, \dots, 0)$ as this is, trivially, lexicographically less than any valid factorization.

The matter of the heuristic for choosing this bound will be addressed in a later section.

3.2. The lexicographic next-candidate algorithm. We compute candidates in lexicographic decreasing order. We note that this technique could readily be modified to proceed in increasing order.

3.2.1. *First candidate.* The first returned candidate is defined to be $(x, 0, \dots, 0)$ where $x = (n + g_1 - 1)/g_1$, where $/$ denotes integer division with remainder discarded. We note that this is n/g_1 if $n \equiv 0 \pmod{g_1}$, or $(n/g_1) + 1$ if n/g_1 has a remainder; and thus that $xg_1 \geq n$, and that x is the “minimal” x such that $xg_1 \geq n$.

If valid, then this factorization is lexicographically the greatest: for any other factorization (a_1, \dots, a_d) must have nonzero a_i in some index other than the first, so $xg_1 = a_1g_1 + y$ where $y = \sum_{i=2}^d a_i g_i$ is nonzero, implying its first index a_1 to be less than x , and thus \vec{a} is lexicographically less than $(x, 0, \dots, 0)$.

If invalid, then this is lexicographically greater than any factorization: for no factorization \vec{a} can be of the form (x, a_2, \dots, a_d) , as $\sum_i a_i g_i \geq xg_1 > n$. Thus any valid factorization will have $a_1 < x$ and will be lexicographically less than $(x, 0, \dots, 0)$.

3.2.2. *Subsequent candidates.* We define $\phi : \vec{a} \mapsto \sum_i a_i g_i$. We here define a function `decrementAndSolve` : $(\vec{a} : \mathbb{N}^d, i : \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$, which is defined to decrement a_i and set a_{i+1} to the minimal m such that $n - \phi(\vec{a}) - mg_{i+1} \leq 0$. We note that this value is $(n - \phi(\vec{a}))/g_{i+1}$ if $(n - \phi(\vec{a})) \equiv 0 \pmod{g_{i+1}}$, or $((n - \phi(\vec{a}))/g_{i+1}) + 1$ if $(n - \phi(\vec{a}))/g_{i+1}$ has a remainder.

For subsequent candidates, use Algorithm 3.1, which can be described as follows: Take index $1 \leq i < d$ maximal such that $a_i > 0$ (note the exclusion of index d); set $a_d = 0$; perform `decrementAndSolve`(\vec{a}, i); and return \vec{a} .

3.2.3. *End of stream.* If the previous candidate was of the form $(0, \dots, 0, x)$, then it returns `endOfStream = true`. Similarly, if the candidate it would return is less-or-equal than the worker’s `bound`, then it returns `endOfStream = true`.

Algorithm 3.1 (The lexicographic greatest next-candidate algorithm).

`nextCandidate` : $ParallelLexicographicState \rightarrow ParallelLexicographicState$

Input: $(n, (g_1, \dots, g_d), (a_1, \dots, a_d), (b_1, \dots, b_d), wasValid, endOfStream)$

Output: The input variables, modified (the function operates in-place)

1. if `(endOfStream)` return; ³
2. let $i = 0$; for (let $j = 1$; $j \leq dim$; $j++$) { if $(a_j > 0)$ $i = j$ }.
(Finding the rightmost nonzero index excluding the final.)
3. if $(i = 0)$ { `endOfStream = true`; return; }, detecting if the last candidate was the final
4. $a_d = 0$, resetting the final index to zero in case it was nonzero from having been solved for previously;
5. $a_i --$, which is the first step of `decrementAndSolve`(\vec{a}, i), consisting of steps 5-11
6. let $p = n - \phi(\vec{a})$, the element to attempt to factor by g_{i+1}
7. let $m = p/g_{i+1}$, where division denotes integer division with remainder discarded.
8. let $r = p - m * g_{i+1}$, the remainder;
9. let `wasValid = true`, temporarily;
10. if $(r \neq 0)$ { $m++$; `wasValid = false`; }
11. $a_{i+1} = m$
12. if $((a_1, \dots, a_d) \leq_{lex} bound)$ { `endOfStream = true` }
13. Return $(n, (g_1, \dots, g_d), (a_1, \dots, a_d), (b_1, \dots, b_d), wasValid, endOfStream)$

We can directly observe the space complexity of (one iteration of) `nextCandidate` by summing the space used by the inputs, outputs, and any temporary variables allocated in the function. In this case, we have one \mathbb{N} (B bits), three \mathbb{N}^d ($3 * d * B$), and 2 bools (2 bits) in the inputs, plus 5 temporary \mathbb{N} (i, j, p, m, r) and one temporary bool, summing to $(3d + 6)B + 3$ bits, for $\mathcal{O}(d * B)$ space complexity.

³This step allows the function to safely no-op in the case that the current worker didn’t successfully receive a fresh slice of work during work division; see “Division of labor” section.

Theorem 3.2. *Let \vec{z} be a previousCandidate and let $\vec{a} = \text{nextCandidate}(\vec{z})$. Assume that z_d is “minimal” in that there exists no valid factorization (z_1, \dots, z_{d-1}, x) for any $x < z_d$. Then the next candidate algorithm produces either the lexicographically next factorization, or else, if not a valid factorization, a candidate that is greater than the next factorization.*

Proof. Let i be from step 2 above. Then $\vec{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_i, [0, \dots, 0], z_d)$ and $\vec{a} = (z_1, \dots, z_i - 1, a_{i+1}, [0, \dots, 0])$, with z_d possibly zero, and possibly zero zeroes. We show that there lies no factorization \vec{x} between \vec{a} and \vec{z} .

As \vec{a} and \vec{z} share the first $i - 1$ indices, a factorization \vec{x} lying in between them must as well. In index i , $z_i - 1 \leq x_i \leq z_i$, giving two cases.

If $x_i = z_i$, then $\vec{x} = (z_1, \dots, z_i, [0, \dots, 0], x_d)$ for some $x_d < z_d$. But, per the assumption, there exists no such factorization as z_d was “minimal”.

If $x_i = z_i - 1$, then $\vec{x} = (z_1, \dots, z_i - 1, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$. We note that this shares the first i coordinates with \vec{a} . We note $x_{i+1} \geq a_{i+1}$ as we assumed $\vec{a} <_{lex} \vec{x}$.

If $x_{i+1} > a_{i+1}$, then $\phi(\vec{x}) > n$ because a_{i+1} is the minimal such that $\phi(z_1, \dots, z_i - 1, 0, \dots, 0) + a_{i+1}g_{i+1} \geq n$, as it was set using `decrementAndSolve`(($z_1, \dots, z_i, 0, \dots, 0$), i).

If $x_{i+1} = a_{i+1}$, then x_j must be nonzero for some $i + 2 \leq j \leq d$, making $\phi(\vec{x}) > \phi(\vec{a}) \geq n$. □

We note that `nextCandidate` itself outputs a *previousCandidate* which satisfies the assumption of Theorem 3.2, as it sets a_d to either zero in step 4 or, if $d = i + 1$, precisely the “minimal” value in step 11.

Theorem 3.3. *`nextCandidate` will reach the lexicographically next factorization in a finite number of steps, and thus will enumerate the entire factorization set in a finite number of steps.*

Proof. The output will always be less than the input, by virtue of decrementing a certain index and leaving all indices to the left unchanged; and the output space is a bounded subset of \mathbb{N}^d , and thus finite, by virtue of all coordinate modifications in the algorithm either setting to zero, decrementing by one, or performing `decrementAndSolve`, so each index a_i will be set less than $n/g_i + 1$. By the pigeonhole principle it will reach any point in the output space, in particular the lexicographically next or final factorization, in a finite number of steps. □

3.2.4. Optional modulo optimization for penultimate index.⁴ Let the rightmost nonzero index i from step 1 be $d - 1$, such that the rest of the steps consist of decrementing index $d - 1$ and solving for index d . If the last candidate was valid, meaning $\phi(\dots, a_{d-1}, b) = 0$, then $(\dots, a_{d-1} - 1, x)$ will have $\phi(\dots, a_{d-1} - 1, x) \equiv -g_{d-1} \pmod{g_d}$ for all x . This means there will be no valid candidates until index $d - 1$ decrements to m where m is the order of a in \mathbb{Z}_{g_d} . Since invalid candidates do not affect the final result set of factorizations, this means an implementer may optionally choose to use the above logic in Algorithm 3.1 for the case $i = d - 1$, skipping straight to $(\dots, a_{d-1} - m, x)$.

Similarly, if the last 2 generators have a common denominator D , and $\phi(\dots, a_{d-2}, x, y) = 0$, then $\phi(\dots, a_{d-2} - 1, z, w) \equiv -g_{d-2} \pmod{D}$ for all z, w . The same applies if the last n generators share a common denominator.

This was implemented in our reference CUDA implementation for index $d - 1$ and runtimes were collected with it enabled vs disabled. We found significant runtime reductions in all cases when enabled.

⁴This is likely the “congruence-based algorithm”, mentioned in [7] as a direct predecessor of the “slopes algorithm”, whose performance was benchmarked in [6].

3.3. Wrapper stream for returning only factorizations. If one wanted to define a stream that produced actual factorizations, rather than factorization candidates, one would wrap this algorithm in another which only yields values when a valid factorization was produced, ignoring invalid candidates.

Algorithm 3.4 (Wrapper stream for returning only factorizations).

`nextFactorization` : $GreedyState \rightarrow GreedyState$

Input: ($prevState$: $GreedyState$)

Output: $GreedyState$

1. *let* $result = \text{nextCandidate}(prevState)$;
2. *while* ($\neg result.wasValid$) $result = \text{nextCandidate}(result)$;
3. Return $result$

Considered as GPU kernels directly (see GPU implementation section below), `nextCandidate` exhibits better SIMD (same instruction multiple data) performance compared to the `nextFactorization` function. This is because `nextCandidate` allows each iteration to return after only having decremented one coordinate and solved for one other, regardless of whether that successfully resulted in a factorization; as opposed to `nextFactorization` which performs that action in an unbounded while loop (meaning that some threads would be idle if their while loop finishes before others). For this reason we will work directly with the next candidate stream rather than the next factorization stream, such that checking validity of and saving the resulting candidates will be the responsibility of the calling code.

4. PARALLELIZATION

As lexicographic order is a total order on \mathbb{N}^d , the overall result set can be partitioned into nonoverlapping subsets for each worker via the use of a **bound**, as mentioned in the above section on the stream data struct. Specifically, if an existing worker's previous candidate was \vec{a} and existing bound was \vec{b} , the introduction of a new bound \vec{c} lying in the range (\vec{a}, \vec{b}) allows the existing worker's work slice to be bifurcated into the ranges (\vec{a}, \vec{c}) and (\vec{c}, \vec{b}) which will be taken by the existing and new workers respectively. If \vec{c} is a valid factorization, it must be saved either now during bound splitting, or later as part of one of the workers' results.

The nonoverlapping nature of the resulting repeatedly bifurcated result sets allows the results to be consumed directly without any intermediate step to check a new result against existing results for duplication or minimality.

4.1. Division of labor. While there surely are many valid ways to find a new bound lying in an existing range, one very simple work division example would be, with last candidate \vec{a} , bound \vec{b} , new bound \vec{c} :

Algorithm 4.1 (Example work-splitting algorithm).

`splitWork` : $ParallelLexicographicState \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$

1. Copy \vec{b} to \vec{c} .
2. Set $1 \leq i < d$ minimal such that $a_i > 0$ and $a_i \neq b_i$.
3. Set $c_j = 0$ for $j \geq i + 2$
4. Perform `decrementAndSolve`(\vec{c}, i)

This is, in short, performing `decrementAndSolve` on the *leftmost* suitable coordinate, instead of the *rightmost* as in `nextCandidate`.

This leaves the remainder of the solutions \vec{d} with $d_j = a_j \forall 1 \leq j \leq i$ to the first worker, and the lets the second worker solve solutions lexicographically less than \vec{c} .

Remark 4.2. We note that the resulting \vec{c} satisfies the assumption of Theorem 3.2 as it sets c_d to either zero or, if $i + 1 = d$, it sets c_{i+1} to the required “minimal” value. This guarantees that `nextCandidate` continues to return either the next factorization or a candidate greater than the next factorization, when given a *previousCandidate* which was the result of Algorithm 4.1 instead of Algorithm 3.1.

We do not prove that the above work-splitting function will always succeed in producing a new bound lying strictly between the existing worker’s previous candidate and bound. After all, if the number of workers exceeds the number of remaining `nextCandidate` stream values, the pigeonhole principle dictates that it is impossible to assign each worker a nonempty result set. We caution implementers of future work division functions that it is important to check whether the proposed new bound does indeed lie in the range (\vec{a}, \vec{b}) , discarding the proposed new bound if not.

Various additional heuristics could be used to optimize desired properties of the new bound, which may take into account relative worker processing power, the approximate expected result size of each resulting slice, the number of workers wishing to receive new work at once, etc.⁵ Our implementation is agnostic to these concerns: it keeps the “original” work slice at the tail of its list of work slices; work splitting starts at the tail and works backwards; and each work slice i , if it needs fresh work, tried to split slice $i + 1, i + 2, \dots$ until it succeeds or reaches the tail.

4.2. Distributed and multi-core CPU systems. In addition to the reference GPU implementation we describe below, the above technique of bounded lexicographic enumeration is directly applicable to distributed environments and multithreaded CPU systems. Rather than “workers” being GPU cores operating on distinct slices of a GPU memory grid, they are distributed nodes operating on the node’s host memory or CPU cores operating on the CPU’s memory, respectively.

5. GPU IMPLEMENTATION

As GPUs offer many cores on which work can simultaneously operate, GPUs are well suited for handling parallel tasks. We provide a reference CUDA implementation in the supplementary code files.

A GPU **kernel** is a function defined to run on one *thread* in a *block* of a *grid* on a GPU. When the function is called from the CPU with certain grid parameters, it launches the kernel on many threads in each block on the grid in parallel, splitting blocks among the GPU’s SMs (streaming multiprocessors), blocking the CPU call until all threads in the grid have completed the kernel.

In our implementation, a grid of *ParallelLexicographicState* structs is allocated on the device. Initially, `splitWork` is called for each grid element to attempt to split work from some existing state. Then `nextCandidate` is repeatedly run as a CUDA kernel, operating on all grid elements simultaneously. Then the results will be checked for validity and saved if valid (although, see the below section on device buffers). Work splitting reoccurs periodically (see section 5.1.2).

The matter of choosing optimal the grid characteristics (threads per block and blocks per thread) greatly affects overall runtime, but the optimal values are highly dependent on both the particular hardware used and the particular problem chosen (dimension and generators).

5.1. Transfer bottleneck. GPU computing remains bottlenecked by relatively slow transfer speeds between host and device memory (CPU and GPU respectively). It is therefore worthwhile to attempt to minimize the frequency with which this bottleneck is encountered.

⁵See [8, Section 2.3 Algorithmic Design Issues] for more discussion of the “initial generation and allocation of work units” and “subsequent allocation and sharing of work units”, where “the objectives of such a policy should be to balance the workload among processes”.

5.1.1. *Large device buffer for each worker.* If the ratio of device and host memory to grid size involved is comfortably high, it is feasible to implement a method of utilizing separate on-device buffers for each worker, which will be dumped when any worker’s buffer becomes full. As the buffer is only written one element at a time (per thread), it is advantageous to make the device buffers large (perhaps 1000 factorizations per grid element) to allow as many consecutive kernel calls as possible before needing to copy from device buffer to host.

5.1.2. *Running multiple kernels between bound splitting.* If work splitting happens on the host (as it does in the provided reference implementation), it involves copying all states to and from the device, which is a relatively expensive task if attempted to be performed after every single `nextCandidate` kernel call. A number `kernelCallsBetweenFreshBounds` can be used to call several (perhaps 1024) kernels in a row before attempting to give all the workers fresh bounds, allowing a higher amount of work to be performed before requiring any host-device transfers.

5.2. **Performance.** Table 1 shows the runtimes of both our CUDA implementation and the GAP [9] function `FactorizationsElementWRTNumericalSemigroup` [10] on a fixed set of inputs. The CUDA implementation was run with the “modulo” optimization disabled and enabled respectively for comparison on select inputs.

The runtimes show that compared to the GAP implementation, our CUDA implementation is comfortably faster in low dimensions, specifically $d \leq 5$, with the advantage increasing as the element n increases. The GAP function was faster in dimension 5 for small elements, but became slower as the elements became larger. In dimensions greater than 5, the GAP function was faster in all measured cases.

6. FUTURE WORK

6.1. **Dynamic behavior.** In `nextCandidate`, if e.g. $i = d - 3$, after decrementing a_i and zeroing a_d , all of the remaining factorizations \vec{c} of the form $(a_1, \dots, a_i, c_{d-2}, c_{d-1}, c_d)$ are in bijection with $Z(n - \phi(\vec{a}), (g_{d-1}, g_{d-1}, g_d))$. If $Z(x, (g_{d-2}, g_{d-1}, g_d))$ is stored for all $0 \leq x \leq m$ for some small value of m , and these sets are made accessible to each worker during their `nextCandidate` evaluation, then when index $i = d - 3$ and $\phi(\vec{a}) \leq m$, the remaining solutions \vec{c} with $c_j = a_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d - 3$ could be returned all at once by copying $Z(n - \phi(\vec{a}), (g_{d-2}, g_{d-1}, g_d))$ and prepending (a_1, \dots, a_i) to each. (The signature and behavior of the `nextCandidate` function and its calling code would need to be modified appropriately to allow an output of more than one result.)

We give the above example of dynamic behavior for $i = d - 3$, but it is valid for any number of the trailing indices.

6.2. **Work division improvement.** As noted in the Work division section, it may be possible to improve the division of labor between workers, perhaps increasing the average number of `nextCandidate` stream results returned per worker before reaching its assigned bound, which would improve overall throughput as work reassignment only happens every `kernelsBetweenFreshBounds` kernels (1024 in our implementation).

6.3. **Hybrid CPU-GPU work pool.** The provided CUDA implementation uses only one CPU thread, which is blocked for the duration of the next candidate kernel calls (and does not perform any `nextCandidate` calls itself, only work-splitting). As modern CPUs can run many threads in parallel (the Ryzen 3900X which evaluated the performance comparisons has 12 cores offering 24 simultaneous threads, 23 of which of which were sitting idle), it would be possible to simultaneously run workers on many CPU threads as well, receiving work slices during the work division steps and running the next candidate function while the GPU kernels are running.

Generators	n	$ Z(n) $	CUDA (s)	CUDA w/ modulo (s)	GAP 4.13 [10] (s)
13,37,38	1000	30	0		0
	20000	10991	0		0.9
	45000	55503	1		9
	70000	134209	1		36
	150000	615856	4		620
	225000	1385404	10		
	300000	2462699	18		
	500000	6840027	52		
...,40	1000	274	1	1	0
	5000	29601	2	1	0.75
	9000	169752	4	2	6
	13000	508263	9	5	34
	17000	1132667	20	9	112
	20000	1841247	31	16	163
	23000	2796813	44	22	279
	27000	4518931	66	34	635
	45000	20861676	197	132	OOM
...,41	1000	1920	1	1	0.015
	3000	125780	13	7	2.4
	5000	928872	91	29	28
	7000	3501274	240	69	143
	9000	9466814		131	486
...,42	1000	10873		4	0.1
	1500	70427		19	2
	2000	273456		53	4
	3000	1910466		335	40
...,43	1000	52036		27	0.5
	1500	473670		201	6.7
	2000	2369185		760	38

TABLE 1. Runtimes in seconds for computing $Z(n)$. Computations were performed on a machine with an AMD Ryzen 3900X CPU and an NVIDIA RTX 3080 GPU. CUDA implementation parameters were $68 * 2$ grid size (the 3080 has 68 SMs), 8 threads per block, 1000 buffer per thread, and 1024 *kernelsBetweenNewBounds*. Our implementation disables the modulo optimization in dimension 3.

We note that while the GAP function can run out of memory for extremely large result sets, our implementation does not have a comparable memory limitation as it does not need to store the result set in memory, as each iteration of `nextCandidate` only needs access to the previous iteration's returned state struct.

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Barron, Christopher O'Neill, Roberto Pelayo. *On dynamic algorithms for factorization invariants in numerical monoids*, Mathematics of Computation 86 (2017), 2429-2447. arxiv:1507.07435
- [2] D. Zaitsev, S. Tomov and J. Dongarra. *Solving Linear Diophantine Systems on Parallel Architectures*. IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 1158-1169, 1 May 2019, doi: 10.1109/TPDS.2018.2873354
- [3] Gerald Huet. *An algorithm to generate the basis of solutions to homogeneous linear diophantine equations*. Information Processing Letters, 7(3):144 – 147, 1978.
- [4] I.A. Perekhod. *Parallel algorithm for linear diophantine equations*, J Math Sci 72, 3354-3358 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01261696>

- [5] Java™ Platform, Standard Edition 7 API Specification, (2017). *Class BigInteger*. [online] Available at: <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/api/java/math/BigInteger.html>
- [6] Valeriu Motroi, Stefan Ciobaca. *A Note on the Performance of Algorithms for Solving Linear Diophantine Equations in the Naturals*, preprint. Available at [arXiv:2104.05200](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.05200)
- [7] Miguel Filgueiras and Ana Paula Tomas. *A fast method for finding the basis of non-negative solutions to a linear diophantine equation*, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 19(6):507–526, 1995.
- [8] Bernard Gendron and Teodor Gabriel Crainic. *Parallel Branch-And-Bound Algorithms: Survey and Synthesis*, Operations Research, Vol. 42, No. 6 (Nov. - Dec., 1994), pp. 1042-1066
- [9] The GAP Group, *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.13.0*; 2024, <https://www.gap-system.org>.
- [10] M. Delgado, P. García-Sánchez, and J. Morais, *GAP Numerical Semigroups Package*, <http://www.gap-system.org/Manuals/pkg/numericalsgps/doc/manual.pdf>.
Function FactorizationsElementListWRTNumericalSemigroup: <https://gap-packages.github.io/numericalsgps/doc/chap9.html>

DENVER, CO

Email address: t@tbarron.xyz