

# Distributed Ranges: A Model for Distributed Data Structures, Algorithms, and Views

Benjamin Brock  
Intel Corporation  
Santa Clara, CA, USA  
benjamin.brock@intel.com

Robert Cohn  
Intel Corporation  
Salem, NH, USA  
robert.s.cohn@intel.com

Suyash Bakshi  
Intel Corporation  
Houston, TX, USA  
suyash.bakshi@intel.com

Tuomas Karna  
Intel Corporation  
Helsinki, Finland  
tuomas.karna@intel.com

Jeongnim Kim  
Intel Corporation  
Hillsboro, OR, USA  
jeongnim.kim@intel.com

Mateusz Nowak  
Intel Corporation  
Gliwice, Poland  
mateusz.p.nowack@intel.com

Lukasz Ślusarczyk  
Intel Corporation  
Radom, Poland  
lukasz.slusarczyk@intel.com

Kacper Stefanski  
Intel Corporation  
Warsaw, Poland  
kacper.stefanski@intel.com

Timothy G. Mattson  
Intel Corporation  
Ocean Park, WA, USA  
timothy.g.mattson@intel.com

## Abstract

Data structures and algorithms are essential building blocks for programs, and *distributed data structures*, which automatically partition data across multiple memory locales, are essential to writing high-level parallel programs. While many projects have designed and implemented C++ distributed data structures and algorithms, there has not been widespread adoption of an interoperable model allowing algorithms and data structures from different libraries to work together. This paper introduces distributed ranges, which is a model for building generic data structures, views, and algorithms. A distributed range extends a C++ range, which is an iterable sequence of values, with a concept of segmentation, thus exposing how the distributed range is partitioned over multiple memory locales. Distributed data structures provide this distributed range interface, which allows them to be used with a collection of generic algorithms implemented using the distributed range interface. The modular nature of the model allows for the straightforward implementation of *distributed views*, which are lightweight objects that provide a lazily evaluated view of another range. Views can be composed together recursively and combined with algorithms to implement computational kernels using efficient, flexible, and high-level standard C++ primitives. We evaluate the distributed ranges model by implementing a set of standard concepts and views as well as two execution runtimes, a multi-node, MPI-based runtime and a single-process, multi-GPU runtime. We demonstrate that high-level algorithms implemented using generic, high-level distributed ranges can achieve performance competitive with highly-tuned, expert-written code.

## 1 Introduction

Data structures are an essential building block for productive programming, allowing users to implement algorithms using high-level data structure primitives such as insertion, deletion, and iteration instead of directly manipulating raw data. In distributed memory programming, a lack of widely available distributed data structures has been cited as a major barrier to programmer productivity [10, 15]. Many projects have developed distributed data structures over the past few decades, although no cross-platform model for building and integrating distributed data structures has gained acceptance. Both language-based approaches [14, 21, 26, 29], which provide more power in terms of static program optimization, and library-based approaches [10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 24, 25], which can be easier to integrate with pre-existing codebases, have been developed. Recent efforts have focused on providing parallel and high-performance versions of standardized, high-level programming environments. Many hardware vendors now provide high-performance implementations of C++ standard library algorithms [4, 5, 9, 23]. These parallel versions of C++ standard library algorithms can perform computation using multiple threads or by launching work on a single GPU [4, 5, 9, 23]. At the same time, these standard algorithms are flexible and generic and can be used with many different types of data structures. They do this by depending on the iteration concepts defined in the standard library. As long as a data structure implements iterators that satisfy one of the standard iterator concepts, they can be passed into one of these algorithms. These iterators are arranged in a hierarchy based on their capabilities, including forward iterators, which can only iterate forward, as in a linked list; bidirectional iterators, which can iterate both backwards and forwards, as in a doubly linked list; random access iterators, which can iterate to any random offset, as in an array; and

**Algorithm 1** A dot product implemented using standard C++ views and algorithms. See Figure 1.

```
// using dr::shp or dr::mhp;


template <distributed_range X, distributed_range Y>
auto dot_product(X&& x, Y&& y) {
    auto z = views::zip(x, y)
        | views::transform([](auto l, auto r) {
            return l * r;
        });

    return reduce(par_unseq, z.begin(), z.end());
}
```

contiguous iterators, which represent a contiguous block of memory as in a C-style array. A data structure implementer only has to expose the generic iterator interface, and then their data structure can plug into a collection of generic algorithms.

The ranges library [3] further generalizes the iterator interface by introducing specific concepts for *ranges*, which are sequences of elements that can be iterated over using *begin* and *end* iterators that they expose. Most data structures are ranges, and some other objects, namely *views*, are also ranges. Views are lightweight objects that typically hold no data, but fulfill the range interface, usually by providing a lazily evaluated, modified view of another range. For example, a *transform\_view* represents a symbolic, lazily-evaluated view of another range with a binary function applied to each element. When views are combined with algorithms, they greatly expand expressiveness, since they allow for transformations such as combining multiple ranges, applying element-wise functions, or offsetting indices to be fused together and optimized through inlining. The combination of parallel algorithms with high-level, composable views creates a high-level functional programming environment where code written in standard C++ can automatically be executed in parallel [18]. Algorithm 1 demonstrates a parallel dot product implemented using a combination of ranges, views, and algorithms. Today, such standard C++ programs can be executed across multiple threads or on a single GPU using vendor-supplied algorithms.

For distributed programming environments, however, data is partitioned over multiple *memory locales*, such as GPUs within a single server or nodes in a cluster. In these situations, the standard range concept is insufficient, since it does not expose any concept of segmentation. While most distributed data structures libraries also have algorithms that can operate on their data structures, there is no prevailing concept for distributed data structures between libraries. Most distributed data structures have algorithms that operate only on a particular data structure, meaning that for each new data structure a new implementation of each algorithm will be required. Without a generic distributed range concept,



**Figure 1.** Diagram depicting the standard C++ dot product implementation in Algorithm 1. First, corresponding elements of the two input ranges are zipped together to form a range of tuples. Then, transform multiplies the two elements together. Finally, a parallel reduce is applied to compute the dot product in parallel. Transformations applied through views are lazy, allowing them to be fused and optimized through inlining.

it quickly becomes infeasible to write all the required algorithm implementations, and so distributed data structures libraries seldom allow views that operate over distributed data, and no distributed data structures libraries implement views like those defined in the ranges library.

In this paper, we present the *distributed ranges* model, which is a set of concepts for operating over distributed data structures. Algorithms can be written generically using the distributed ranges concepts and later used with any distributed data structure as long as it implements the distributed range interface. A distributed range is an iterable sequence of values, just like a standard range, but it also exposes how its data is partitioned into multiple segments by providing a segment's customization point. *segments* returns a range containing all the segments, each of which is a *remote range*, which is a standard range with added locality information through a rank customization point.

Being able to treat data structures generically, as long as they fulfill the distributed range concept, greatly simplifies the implementation effort necessary when adding a new data structure, since as soon as it fulfills the distributed range interface it can be plugged in to a collection of pre-existing algorithms. In addition, the distributed ranges model enables the straightforward implementation of lightweight, composable views that operate on distributed ranges. A view can simply take in another range as input, and, if that range is a distributed range, fulfill the distributed range interface itself by exposing an altered view of the base range's segments. This composability allows views to be stacked on top of each other, since a view can accept another view as its base range so long as it exposes the distributed range interface. The end result is that many standard C++ programs, such as the one shown in Algorithm 1, can be run across multiple GPUs or nodes with little or no modification.

In this paper, we propose the distributed ranges model for generic distributed data structures, algorithms, and views.

We present our implementation of distributed ranges, which consists of a set of C++ concepts and customization points, as well as a set of lightweight views that operate on distributed ranges. We also present two execution runtimes with distributed ranges algorithms and data structures: (1) *shp*, which supports single node, multi-GPU execution using SYCL and (2) *mhp*, which supports multi-node execution on CPUs and GPUs using MPI one-sided communication.

This paper makes the following contributions:

1. Propose the distributed ranges model, which generalizes the C++ standard library's range concept to support distributed data structures, algorithms, and views
2. Implement two execution runtimes for distributed ranges, for single-process, multi-GPU execution and multi-process SPMD execution.
3. Provide an implementation of cross-platform views that operate on distributed ranges. This is the first distributed implementation of the C++ ranges library's views.
4. Evaluate the performance of the distributed ranges abstraction on a set of standard C++ benchmarks, demonstrating that it can match the performance of vendor-optimized libraries on a single GPU and offer near perfect strong scaling up to 12 GPUs.

## 2 Background

Distributed data structures provide a high-level abstraction to the user by automatically partitioning data over multiple *memory locales*. A memory locale is a region of memory that is remotely accessible to all processes, but is typically local to some execution agent. For example, in a multi-node program, remote direct memory access (RDMA) can be used to make memory resident on a particular process remotely accessible to the other processes. However, the memory will still be fastest if used by the local process. A distributed data structure will typically automatically partition data into multiple *segments*, each of which will be located in a particular memory locale. Users can use the distributed data structure as if it were a traditional data structure using both data structure methods and algorithms, and the data structure will ensure that the correct remote data is accessed. In RDMA-based distributed data structure libraries [10, 15] this is done by manipulating remote memory directly over the network. In RPC-based distributed data structure libraries this is done using remote procedure calls or active messages [12, 19, 25].

While many distributed data structures libraries implement distributed algorithms that operate over data structures in parallel [10, 15], these are typically data structure-specific algorithms, not algorithms that can operate over any data structure. For data structure libraries that provide multiple different distributed data structures, this tends to limit their

utility, and there is no model that allows interoperability between data structures and algorithms from different libraries.

C++20 introduced a number of language and library features that simplify the creation of high-level libraries. Here, we provide background on some of the standard C++ features and concepts used in our work.

**Concepts** C++ concepts describe a list of requirements for a type. Similar to an interface in other languages, a concept can require that a class supports a particular method or that a particular expression involving a value of that type be valid. Concepts are particularly important for high-level libraries because they allow methods to be written so that any type can be passed as an argument to a function so long as it fulfills the requirements of one or more concepts. This also greatly simplifies function overloading, as it allows different overloads of a function to be written using different concepts, with the appropriate function selected automatically at compile time.

**Customization Points and CPOs** *Customization points* are points where one library can customize its behavior when used with another library. For example, the method or function `begin` is a customization point used to retrieve an iterator to the first element of a range of values in C++.

Libraries can provide a customization point in multiple ways. For example, a user-defined array class could implement a `begin` method, or it could implement a free-standing function `begin`. As long as it returns an iterator, either one of these would be identified by the ranges library as an implementation of the customization point `begin` for the user-defined array type. This is a key feature of customization points, since implementing a customization point for a pre-existing class does not necessarily require modifying it.

C++20 also introduced customization point objects (CPOs). A CPO is a function object that at compile time automatically selects the appropriate customization point implementation. For example, it may first check for a `begin` method, and, if that does not exist, then look for a free-standing function `begin` using argument-dependent lookup.

**Ranges Library** Building on new mechanisms such as concepts and CPOs, C++20 introduced the *ranges library* [3]. Ranges build on top of iterators, which are generalized pointers to the beginning and end of a sequence of values. A range is a type that implements the `begin` and `end` customization points, exposing those iterators. Having objects that represent an entire range instead of individual iterators greatly simplifies the implementation of *views* and *algorithms*. Views are lightweight objects that usually provide a non-owning view of another range. Commonly used views include `transform_view`, which applies an element-wise unary function similar to a *map* operation, `zip_view`, which zips together corresponding elements of two or more ranges, and `take_view`, which creates a view of the first  $n$  elements of a range. Views can be used recursively, effectively fusing

multiple transformations together at compile-time. Views enable the high-level implementation of parallel kernels when used together with standard parallel algorithms.

**Parallel Algorithms** C++17 introduced parallel versions of algorithms such as `reduce`, `inclusive_scan`, and `sort`. The C++ standard supports parallel execution using generic execution policies such as `par_unseq`, which allows parallelized and vectorized execution. Standard library implementations GNU `libstdc++` and `libcxx` use these standard execution policies to support multi-threading and vector parallelism. In addition, many hardware vendors provide their own implementations of C++ standard algorithms, including Intel’s `oneDPL` [4], Nvidia’s `Thrust` [9] and `CUB` [23], and AMD’s `rocThrust` [5]. These implementations provide not only multi-threaded CPU implementations but also launching work on GPU or FPGA devices using implementation-defined execution policies.

### 3 Distributed Ranges

In order to implement generic distributed data structures that can be used together with algorithms and views, we propose a generalization of the `ranges` library called distributed ranges. This model is built on the concept `distributed_range`<sup>1</sup>, which is analogous to the standard `range`, but can be split up over multiple memory locales. There are three requirements for such a concept:

1. Algorithms can be written *generically* using the `distributed_range` concept and then used with all distributed data structures. (Although specializations can be written for improved performance.)
2. Views can be created that take in a distributed range and then expose the `distributed_range` concept themselves. Views can be nested recursively.
3. The `distributed_range` concept must expose the overall distribution of the range, as locality information is essential for performance.

A distributed data structure commonly consists of multiple segments, where each segment may be located in a different memory locale. Together, these segments make up the complete data structure. Our model begins by adding a concept of locality using a concept called a `remote_range`.

**Remote Range** To model a segment that lives in one particular memory locale, we define a concept called a `remote_range`. A `remote_range` is a standard C++ `forward_range`, with the refinement that it also implements a customization point called `rank`, which provides information about where the range is located. A `remote_range` is accessible from all execution agents in the program, but since it is located in a particular memory locale, it will be most efficient to access it from an execution agent associated with that memory

locale. For communication frameworks in which memory is not directly accessible using raw language pointers from all execution agents, such as RDMA-based communication frameworks, a `remote_range` must have a `remote_iterator` type that automatically triggers calls to the communication library in order to access elements of the range. This can be performed using the normal standard C++ mechanisms of copy to copy data into and out of the range as well as the dereference `operator*`.

In the case that these `remote iterators` add additional overhead when accessing local data, as is commonly the case with distributed memory frameworks, the customization point `local` may be provided, returning a local view of the `remote_range` that is valid only on the execution agent specified by `rank`.

To implement the `rank` customization point, a `remote_range` can implement a `rank` method or a free-standing `rank` function that accepts the range as a parameter. As long as one of these exists and returns an integer value, it will be identified by the `rank` CPO, thus fulfilling the `remote_range` concept as defined in Algorithm 2. Being able to implement the customization point as a free-standing function is important, since it enables us to turn pre-existing data structures and views into `remote ranges` without modifying them. We can do this by implementing the customization point as a free-standing function.

**Distributed Range** While a `remote_range` represents a range that is located in a single memory locale, a `distributed_range` may be split up over more than one memory locale. A `distributed_range` is a standard C++ `forward_range` that also implements the customization point `segments`. `segments` returns a range of `remote_ranges`, where each `remote_range` corresponds to one segment of the `distributed_range`. Concatenated together, these segments form the complete logical `distributed_range`.

Since a `distributed_range` is a `forward_range`, but also has a `segments` customization point, there are two ways to access the elements of a `distributed_range`. The first is to iterate through the range as a normal range. While this may be inefficient, it is useful to have this capability for printing and debugging. The second mechanism for accessing the range, the `segments` customization point, exposes the distribution of the `distributed_range`, including how many segments the range has, where each segment is located, and how large each segment is. This distribution information allows algorithms to intelligently place work on different execution agents for processing, or even to apply load balancing or work stealing algorithms based on the distribution of data within a range. A `distributed_range` can have a wide variety of different distributions, since each segment may have a different size and memory locale. The `segments` customization point can return a view, which means that the object returned from `segments`, corresponding to the logical

<sup>1</sup>For clarity, we use monospace script (`distributed_range`) for the concept and regular script (`distributed range`) for an object that fulfills the concept.



**Table 1.** Distributed ranges concepts, along with the customization points a type must implement to fulfill a concept.

Concept	Subsumes	Customization Points	Comment
remote_range	forward_range	rank, *local	A remote_range is a forward_range with a rank stating which memory locale it is in.
contiguous_remote_range	remote_range	rank, local	A contiguous_remote_range is a remote_range with a local that returns a contiguous_range valid to use in the rank execution agent.
distributed_range	forward_range	segments	A distributed_range is a forward_range with a segments that returns a range of remote_ranges.
contiguous_distributed_range	distributed_range	segments	A contiguous_distributed_range is a distributed_range with a segments that returns a range of contiguous_remote_ranges.
*optional			

**Algorithm 2** Concepts for remote and distributed ranges. A remote\_range is a standard forward\_range that also has the rank customization point, indicating locality. A distributed\_range is a standard forward\_range that also has the segments customization point, returning the distributed range’s segments.

```

template <typename T>
concept remote_range = forward_range<T> &&
    requires(T& t) { rank(t); };

template <typename T>
concept distributed_range = forward_range<T> &&
    requires(T& t) { segments(t); };

```

layout of the array, does not necessarily have to correspond to the physical layout of the array. For example, for a block cyclic array, the data structure could store all blocks on each process contiguously, returning a lazily evaluated view of the logical segments from the segments customization point.

To implement the segments customization point, a range can have a segments method or a free-standing segments function that returns a range of remote ranges. As long as one of these implementations is available, it will be identified by the segments CPO, thus fulfilling the distributed\_range concept as defined in Algorithm 2. The ability to implement customization points as a free-standing function is again important, as it enables us to promote pre-existing classes, such as views, to distributed ranges without modification.

**Additional Concepts** In addition to these fundamental concepts, we also implement some refinements of remote and distributed ranges similar to those in the standard library. For example, a remote\_contiguous\_range is a remote\_range backed by a block of contiguous memory, meaning its contents can be copied using a single memcpy operation. Similarly, a distributed\_contiguous\_range is a distributed\_range whose segments are all remote\_contiguous\_ranges, meaning that it is a distributed array whose segments are all contiguous blocks of remote memory. Additional concepts

such as these, which refine the original distributed and remote range concepts, can allow for optimizations inside of algorithms.

## 4 Implementation

Our prototype implementation of the distributed ranges has three modular components:

1. A collection of concepts and CPOs supporting distributed ranges, as well as implementations of standard C++ views supporting distributed ranges.
2. shp, a single-process execution runtime along with data structures, algorithms, and communication primitives implemented in SYCL [22], supporting multi-CPU, GPU, and FPGA execution within a single node.
3. mhp, a multi-process execution runtime along with data structures, algorithms, and communication primitives implemented using one-sided MPI [16].

Separate execution frameworks are required because single- and multi-process execution require separate execution models. Like most distributed memory programs, mhp uses a SPMD execution model in which the same program is executed on multiple processes. Operations such as constructing a new distributed data structure or invoking an algorithm must be called collectively by all processes, while operations such as accessing a particular segment of a data structure can be performed by a single process.

shp uses a single-process execution model. To perform work in parallel, it asynchronously launches work on multiple SYCL devices. In practice, programs written using standard C++ data structures, algorithms, and views can be executed using both shp and mhp, as shown in Algorithm 1.

### 4.1 Communication Operations

**Remote Pointers** Both shp and mhp expose a partitioned global address space (PGAS) model, in which memory is globally accessible, but partitioned over multiple memory locales. This is exposed through remote pointer types, which are smart pointers that behave similarly to regular language pointers, but may reference memory in another memory

locale. When remote pointers are accessed, this triggers a library call to read or write to remote memory. In `shp`, this is done using SYCL `memcpy` commands when on the host or raw pointer operations on the device. In `mhp`, this is done using `MPI_Put` and `MPI_Get` operations.

Remote pointers are iterators and support dereferencing using `operator*`, which returns a remote reference object that serves as a proxy reference to the underlying remote memory. The standard copy and `memcpy` can also be used for copying data into, out of, and between remote memory buffers.

**Asynchronous Communication** `shp` uses SYCL, whose built-in asynchronous `memcpy` operation are used to implement synchronous and asynchronous versions of copy. `mhp` uses the relaxed memory model provided by MPI RMA, in which writes return without blocking while reads block until the data is ready to be read. To ensure consistency, collective operations perform a barrier/memory flush to ensure all writes are complete before returning control. Collective operations employ asynchronous communication internally.

## 4.2 Data Structures

In our proof of concept implementations, we implemented several data structures fulfilling the distributed ranges concept. These data structure automatically distributed data over multiple memory locales: over multiple GPUs in the case of `shp` and over multiple processes in the case of `mhp`. Each data structure will automatically allocate multiple segments located in each memory locale. Upon accessing data using a global indexing mechanism, such as `operator[]`, the data structure will automatically index into the correct segment, returning a remote reference to the underlying data.

In addition, each data structure implements a `segments` method, which returns a view of the segments that make up the distributed data structure. Each element of the `segments` view is a `remote_range` representing a segment of the overall data structure that is located in a particular memory locale. A data structure's segments may directly correspond to the underlying memory—such as in our distributed vector, where the segments model a remote contiguous range—or, they may represent a more complex derived view of the underlying data. For example, in our distributed matrix data structure, each segment is a `dense_matrix_view`, which, encapsulating the 2D structure of the matrix, is more complex than a simple contiguous range while still satisfying the `remote_range` concept.

**4.2.1 Distributed Vector.** Our distributed vector data structure provides a one-dimensional array that is automatically distributed over multiple memory locales. To construct a `distributed_vector` of size  $n$  distributed over  $p$  memory locales, a block partitioning is used.  $p$  segments are allocated with room for  $\lceil n/p \rceil$  elements each. In order to fulfill the `distributed_range` concept, `distributed_vector`

has a `segments` method that returns a view holding all of these segments. Since each segment is backed by a single block of contiguous memory, each segment satisfies the concept `remote_contiguous_range`, and therefore the whole `distributed_vector` also models `distributed_contiguous_range`.

Our distributed vector supports indexing with `operator[]`, which will internally perform index arithmetic to identify which index in which segment needs to be accessed. The `begin` and `end` methods provide iterators over the global data structure. Internally, these iterators will scan over each segment of the distributed vector to traverse the entire global vector. These iterators satisfy the `distributed_iterator` concept, so they can be passed into iterator-based algorithms. Finally, the `segments` method allows direct user access to each distributed vector segment as well as allows the distributed vector to be passed into algorithms that operate on distributed ranges.

**4.2.2 Distributed Matrix.** We implement two distributed matrix data structures, a distributed dense matrix data structure, which automatically distributes a dense matrix among multiple memory locales, and a distributed sparse matrix data structure, which automatically distributes a block CSR sparse matrix. Both the dense and sparse versions utilize the same user-configurable block partitioning strategy.

**Matrix Access** Elements of the dense matrix can be accessed globally using `operator[]`, which returns a remote reference to the corresponding element. Both the dense and sparse matrix data structures also support an iterator interface based on the GraphBLAS C++ API [11], where the iterator iterates over every stored element of the matrix as a tuple value holding the corresponding row and column index as well as scalar value.

**Tile Partitioning** Our distributed matrix data structure automatically partitions a matrix into multiple tiles using a block cyclic distribution strategy that is user customizable. Users can provide explicit parameters to the distributed matrix in the form of tile dimensions, which split the matrix into a tile grid, and a processor grid, which assigns each tile to a memory locale, or they can request a distribution using high-level block partitioning descriptors such as `block_cyclic`, `block_row`, and `block_column`. Each tile is a `remote_range` matrix view that can be viewed individually using the `tile` method. Local copies of tiles can also be retrieved using `get_tile` and `get_tile_async` methods.

## 4.3 Algorithms

The distributed ranges concepts allow algorithms to be implemented in a hierarchical fashion by decomposing the distributed range into its segments and applying local versions of algorithms to each segment in parallel. Crucially, distributed algorithms can be written generically, using only

**Algorithm 3** Pseudocode for reduce algorithm.

---

```

template <distributed_range R, typename T>
void reduce(R&& r, T init) {
    // Iterate through all segments in parallel.
    parallel_for(auto segment : segments(r)) {
        // Get memory locale associated with
        auto rank = rank(segment);

        // Get execution policy associated with rank,
        // launch local reduce algorithm.
        auto policy = get_policy(rank);
        init += reduce(policy,
                      begin(segment), end(segment));
    }
    return init;
}

```

---

the distributed range concept, and then applied to any data structure that satisfies the distributed range concept.

**for\_each** The `for_each` algorithm, which executes a function for each element of an input range, is straightforward to implement using distributed ranges. The distributed `for_each` algorithm iterates over each segment in a distributed range, then launches a local version of `for_each` on each segment using the execution agent associated with that segment's rank. The `shp` implementation asynchronously launches kernels on the devices associated with each segment's rank, then waits for them to complete. The `mhp` implementation uses SPMD semantics to launch a local `for_each` on each segment's corresponding process.

**reduce** The reduce algorithm also works by launching a local algorithm on each segment, as shown in Algorithm 3. The local algorithms produce partial reductions, which are then combined together to produce the final result<sup>2</sup>. In `shp`, we iterate through each segment, launching a `reduce_async` algorithm that returns a future that will contain the local result. Once all the local algorithms are launched, we wait for the kernels to complete and add the results together. In `mhp`, each process launches a local reduce on each of its segments, followed by an `MPI_Reduce` to produce the final result.

**inclusive\_scan** Our `inclusive_scan` algorithm is implemented by first performing a local scan on each segment, with the result written into a temporary array `temp`. After these scans are complete, the rightmost element of each array `temp[temp.size()-1]` will contain the sum of all elements in the segment. These elements are written into a local array on rank 0, and a scan is performed on these elements. Element  $i - 1$  of this array now holds the sum of all elements before segment  $i$  in the original range. The corresponding element is added to each to each segment to produce the

<sup>2</sup>Our reduce and scan algorithms work with any commutative binary operator, despite the simplification to standard arithmetic in Algorithms 3-4.

final result. This is then copied from a temporary buffer into the output buffer.

In both `mhp` and `shp`, the temporary buffer can be avoided and the result written directly into the user-provided output buffer if the input and output ranges *align*, meaning that they have the same number of segments and corresponding segments all have the same sizes and ranks. In `shp`, the temporary buffer is avoided even for non-aligned ranges by using a zip view, which produces a new set of overlapping segments as discussed in Section 4.4. We currently prevent zip views with non-aligned segments from being created in `mhp`, since processing them naively would be prohibitively inefficient. Other than these differences, the implementations in `shp` and `mhp` are the same, with work being launched using SPMD-style execution or asynchronous kernel launches respectively. A similar algorithm, with minor modification, is used to implement `exclusive_scan`.

**Algorithm 4** Pseudocode for inclusive\_scan algorithm.

---

```

template <distributed_range R, distributed_range O>
void inclusive_scan(R&& r, O&& o) {
    using T = range_value_t<R>;
    local_vector<T> partial_sums(zip(r, o).size());

    int segment_id = 0;
    parallel_for(auto [in, out] : segments(zip(r, o))) {
        // Call local inclusive_scan
        auto policy = /* ... */;
        inclusive_scan(policy, in, out);

        // Add the final element to the partial results.
        partial_sums[segment_id++] = *(out.end() - 1);
    }

    // Perform scan over partial sums to compute offsets.
    inclusive_scan(partial_sums, partial_sums);

    // Add correct offset to each segment.
    parallel_for(auto&& [in, out] : zip(r, o)) {
        sum = partial_sums[segment_id-1]
        for_each(out, [](auto&& v) {
            v += sum;
        });
    }
}

```

---

**sort** We implement sort using a distributed partition sort algorithm. First, each segment is sorted in place by its corresponding execution agent. Next,  $n - 1$  medians are selected for each segment to partition the data into  $n$  chunks where  $n$  is the number of segments in the output range. These medians are then copied into a temporary buffer on rank 0, where they are again sorted and the final  $n - 1$  medians are selected to be used as splitters for partitioning the data. Given these medians, each agent counts how many of its elements will

be sent to each chunk, and these values are reduced globally to compute the size of each chunk. After the chunks are allocated, the data is redistributed to the temporary chunks, then copied into the input range<sup>3</sup>. Each execution agent then copies the data from its segments into the corresponding output buffer based on the splitters. Finally, each execution agent sorts its local buffer, and this sorted output is copied into the output range. The implementation is similar in `shp` and `mhp`, with the exception that `shp` uses shared memory and queues for the histogram and redistribution stages, while `mhp` uses `MPI_Reduce` and `MPI_Alltoallv`.

#### 4.4 Views

Views are lightweight objects that usually provide a non-owning, lazily-evaluated view of another range. They often perform lazy transformations to data, such as applying an elementwise unary function, modifying the size of a range, or combining multiple ranges together. Views provide the same range interface as data structures, allowing them to be iterated over and used in algorithms just like normal data structures. In distributed ranges, we provide a set of views that operate on normal ranges, but also on remote and distributed ranges by offering the `rank` and `segments` CPOs if they are provided by the underlying base range to which the view is applied. Distributed and remote versions of most views are implemented simply by taking a pre-existing implementation, then implementing `rank` and `segments` customization points for it as standalone functions.

To support the `rank` CPO, all views simply need to check whether the base range used to create the view is a remote range. If this is the case, the `rank` CPO is implemented by returning the value of `rank` when invoked on the base range. The `segments` CPO required by `distributed_range`, however, requires a different implementation for each view type.

**Transform** The transform view applies an elementwise function to each value of a range, analogous to a map operation in functional programming environments. To implement the `segments` CPO for transform views whose base is a distributed range, we can return a view of the base range’s segments in which each segment has a transform view applied to it using the same elementwise function. Since each segment is a remote range, the transform view of each segment will automatically be a remote range as well.

**Take and Drop** The take view shortens the length of a range to take at most the first  $l$  elements of the range. Similarly, the drop view shortens an array by dropping the first  $f$  elements. To implement take and drop, we implement a helper function called `trim_segments`. `trim_segments` takes in a range of segments as well as a two indices,  $f$  and  $l$ , referring to positions in the underlying elements. `trim_`<sub>segments</sub> then returns a “trimmed” view of these segments such that only the  $f$ ’th through  $l$ ’th elements are included.

<sup>3</sup>Note that C++’s `sort` is in place.

**Zip** The zip view takes in two or more ranges and returns a view of those ranges with the corresponding elements zipped together as a tuple. Zips are useful for performing operations that combine multiple arrays, such as a dot product as demonstrated in Algorithm 1.

Unlike the previously discussed views, a zip view involves multiple ranges. When operating on two or more distributed ranges, the inputs may or may not be *aligned*, meaning they have the same number of segments and each set of corresponding segments has the same size and rank. In `mhp`, naively operating on mixed local and remote data would incur considerable performance overhead, since it would require fine-grained remote reads and writes over the network as elements are read from and written to. In `shp`, however, execution takes place within a single node, and we are guaranteed to have SYCL peer-to-peer access, meaning each device supports load-store semantics to other devices’ memory. This load-store communication is typically performed over a high-performance fabric such as Xe Link [17], which has considerably lower latency and higher bandwidth than going out over the network. This means that naively reading and writing individual elements will likely achieve good performance in `shp`, whereas `mhp` will require bulk network operations to achieve good performance. For this reason, we prohibit the creation of zip views with non-aligned ranges in `mhp` while allowing them to be used in `shp`, creating sets of contiguous overlapping segments as described below.

For zip views where one or more of the base ranges is a remote range and no range is a distributed range, we provide a `rank` method. By convention, we select the first remote range among the base ranges and return its rank. When there are multiple remote ranges stored in different memory locales, communication will be necessary in order to access the remote segments. This communication overhead will be particularly burdensome in `mhp` due to the need to access individual elements as discussed above, so this will result in an error in `mhp`.

When zipping together two or more distributed ranges that have identical segments distributions, which is the common case, we can implement the `segments` method for zip by returning a view containing each of the corresponding segments zipped together. If the ranges are *aligned*, meaning they have the same number of segments and the segments are the same size and rank, this is straightforward. However, in the case that the base distributed ranges have nonaligned segments, we must further partition the segments of one or both arrays to produce a set of aligned segments. We can do this by iterating through all of the segments using two sets of iterators. First, we maintain a tuple, `seg`, holding iterators to the segments for each range in the zip. Second, we maintain a tuple of iterators `local` pointing to the elements currently being extracted from each segment. At initialization, `seg` holds iterators to the first segment in each base range, and `local` holds iterators to the first element in each segment



in `seg`. While there is still no iterator in `seg` that has not reached the end of its corresponding segments range, we identify the largest segment that can be created by computing the minimum distance between each element of `local` and the corresponding sentinel end iterator for the segment, obtained using `seg`. We then use `take` to create a view of the corresponding parts of each segment before zipping them together. Finally, we increment each iterator in `local`, incrementing the corresponding `seg` and moving on to the next segment if the end of the segment has been reached. Finally, once one of the segments ranges ends, we return the newly created zipped segments.

## 5 Evaluation

To evaluate the performance and usability of the distributed ranges model, we ran experiments on a multi-GPU system. First, we ran a set of standard C++ performance benchmarks that can be executed in parallel using distributed ranges with little or no modification. We compare the performance of these benchmarks to single-GPU versions implemented using vendor-provided versions of standard algorithms. In addition, we evaluate the scalability of a distributed linear algebra benchmark implemented in `shp` using high-level distributed matrix data structures that expose the distributed ranges model.

**Evaluation System.** We ran experiments on a system equipped with 6 Intel® Data Center GPU Max 1550 GPUs, codename Ponte Vecchio (PVC). Each PVC GPU is split into two tiles, each tiling having 64 GB of HBM2e memory. The tiles on a GPU can access each others’ memory using an inter-tile interconnect providing 230 GB/s of unidirectional link bandwidth. All twelve tiles can also access each others’ memory using an intra-node Xe Link interconnect offering 20 GB/s of unidirectional link bandwidth per tile. Our system is equipped with two Intel® Xeon® CPU Max 9470 CPUs and 1 TB of memory. All code was compiled using the Intel® oneAPI C++ compiler version 2023.1.0.

### 5.1 Standard C++ Benchmarks

The distributed ranges model allows users to program using standard C++ views and algorithms and to execute that code across multiple GPUs or nodes in a cluster. The standard C++ benchmarks evaluated here require minimal modification to run using distributed ranges. The algorithms themselves are unchanged except for including the `dr::shp/mhp` namespace instead of `std::ranges` and using the `distributed_range` concept in the function definition so that the function will throw an error unless called with a distributed range. The harness code must also use distributed data structures as described in Section 4.2 when allocating data. Algorithm 1 shows an implementation of the dot product algorithm using standard C++ views and algorithms as provided by distributed ranges.


**Table 2.** Performance of single-tile oneDPL baseline. Single-tile STREAM Copy bandwidth measured at 1063 GB/s.

Benchmark	Bandwidth (GB/s)	Percent of STREAM
Dot Product	903	85%
Reduce	1025	96%
Inclusive Scan	806	76%
Black Scholes	803	76%

We tested five algorithms implemented using standard C++ that can be executed using distributed ranges. For our baseline, we compare against oneDPL, which provides vendor-optimized, single-GPU standard algorithms, and oneMKL where available. Speedups shown in Figure 2 are all with respect to oneDPL running on a single tile. The bandwidth achieved by the oneDPL baseline is shown in Table 2. The “perfect scaling” line plots a unit slope, offset slightly to avoid crowding the other plotted lines.

**Dot Product** We implement a dot product as shown in Algorithm 1. As discussed in Figure 1, we use a zip view to zip together corresponding elements of the two vectors into a tuple, followed by a transform view to multiply the two elements together. Finally, the resulting view is fed into a reduce algorithm to sum together all the intermediate results. As shown in Figure 2, dot product achieves performance competitive with both a oneDPL implementation as well as with the highly optimized oneMKL library. While both oneDPL and oneMKL are limited to a single device, they can be launched on one or two tiles. This is enabled by the oneAPI runtime, which can expose a GPU’s two tiles as either separate devices or as a single composite device. The two tiles have separate HBM2e memories, leading to a loss in efficiency when naively launching across both tiles without intelligently partitioning data and work. oneMKL actually experiences a drop in performance with two tiles due to frequent cross-tile memory traffic caused by its temporary accumulation buffer. As shown, distributed ranges frequently achieves a small speedup on a single GPU (two tiles) by partitioning data and work across the tiles. `shp` experiences a slight drop in performance at 12 tiles due to scalability issues in its reduce, discussed momentarily.

**Reduce** The “Reduce” plot in Figure 2 illustrates the loss in scalability observed in `shp`’s reduce algorithm. Since `shp` relies on a single process to launch work, as scale increases, more and more work must be launched by a single process. This introduces overhead linear in the number of tiles, while in the strong scaling problem the amount of work in each kernel decreases, further exposing any overhead. For small problem sizes such as running a single reduce across 12 tiles (5ms runtime), strong scaling efficiency is reduced. `mhp`, which uses a different process for each tile, sees no such drop in performance. This drop in efficiency is fundamental to the



**Figure 2.** Distributed ranges benchmarks. All speedup numbers show strong scaling with respect to single tile oneDPL.

fan-out required when launching work from a single process execution model, and is a motivating reason for users to port their programs to a multi-process SPMD execution model if they are willing.

**Inclusive Scan** After an initial drop when moving from one to two tiles, “Inclusive Scan,” as shown in Figure 2, achieves near linear scaling. The initial drop is due to increased memory traffic—after the initial inclusive scan, another pass through the data is necessary to apply the appropriate offset to each segment. This plot also demonstrates the importance of distribution awareness, as oneDPL has significantly reduced scalability on two tiles due to the increased memory traffic and synchronization required by naively launching work across two tiles.

**Black Scholes** Our Black Scholes benchmark solves a partial differential equation in order to compute the optional prices for European-style options. The benchmark zips together various arrays associated with options prices such as the price of an asset and its drift rate, then performs a series of element-wise operations on these arrays using the `for_each` algorithm. Similar to dot product, Black Scholes matches the performance of oneDPL and achieves close to perfect strong scaling.

**Stream** The stream benchmark performs a series of element-wise updates using the `for_each` algorithm. Distributed ranges achieves near perfect scaling.

## 5.2 Linear Algebra Benchmark

To evaluate the performance of our distributed matrix data structure, we ran strong scaling experiments evaluating the

performance of dense matrix multiply (GEMM) using 32K x 32K matrices. In our distributed GEMM algorithm, the `get_tile` method is used to retrieve local copies of the tiles necessary for each local matrix multiplication, which is performed using MKL. As shown in Figure 2, our implementation achieves close to linear strong scaling and a high percentage of peak flops.

## 6 Related Work

The C++ standard library provides a collection of standard algorithms that operate over ranges of data using iterators. The power of this algorithm design is that an algorithm can be implemented once generically and then used with a variety of data structures, so long as their iterators fulfill the generic iterator requirements. Algorithms can be optimized for specific iterator types such as random access, bidirectional, or forward iterators, and implementations are even free to provide specializations for particular data structures. C++17 added parallel versions of some algorithms, allowing implementations to execute parallel algorithms using multi-threaded and vectorized execution via standard execution policies. Implementations can also provide their own implementation-specific execution policies, which have implementation-defined behavior, such as executing an algorithm on a particular execution resource such as a GPU. Many vendors have provided parallel versions of these standard algorithms for multi-threaded and single GPU execution, including Nvidia’s Thrust [9] and CUB [23], AMD’s rocThrust [5], and Intel’s oneDPL [4].

The `std::execution` proposal P2300 [2] adds a set of standard facilities for asynchrony and parallelism to the C++ standard library. These include schedulers, which can be used to launch work in a particular execution context, as well as senders and receivers, which can be used to handle asynchronous events from different libraries. If `std::execution` is adopted, we anticipate generalizing the rank customization point in distributed ranges to associate a range with an execution context or scheduler. This could potentially allow for greater interoperability between libraries by combining a generic way of launching work (schedulers) with a common data distribution (the `distributed_range`).

DASH [15] and BCL [10] both implement RDMA-based distributed data structures using PGAS programming models. While both BCL and DASH implement some high-level algorithms on top of their data structures, including some with APIs very similar to those used by the standard library's algorithms, these are data structure-specific algorithms, and there is no standard mechanism for accessing distributed data across different data structures. They also completely lack lazily evaluated views like those presented in this work.

HPX [19] provides a parallel runtime with support for standard C++ asynchronous execution, including support for algorithms and data structures. HPX's runtime system uses a task-based programming model built on top of an AGAS memory model, in which objects may migrate from one memory locale to another [20]. HPX provides two containers, a distributed vector and a distributed hash table, along with a comprehensive set of standard algorithms that operate on these containers. Unlike in the distributed ranges model, HPX's distributed data structures do not directly expose their segments [1]. Instead, users can only access a distributed data structure's segments using segmented iterators [6]. With segmented iterators, a user can transform a normal iterator into a segmented iterator, which points to a segment, as well as a local iterator, which points to an element within the segment. Segmented iterators can be awkward to use and are difficult to build on top of recursively, since iterators are invalidated once the range they belong to is destroyed. HPX does not currently have any support for views.

SHAD [12] also implements distributed data structures and algorithms using a task-based programming model and multiple backends, including Intel TBB, SHAD's multi-node GMT runtime, and HPX [27]. Similar to HPX, SHAD's data structures expose a segmented iterator design. SHAD provides a large number of distributed standard library algorithms as well as domain-specific algorithms for graph computation. SHAD lacks views, however, and these algorithms all operate directly on data structures.

STAPL [25] provides a set of distributed data structures (pContainers) that can be used with parallel algorithms (pAlgorithms). STAPL pContainers expose an iterator-based interface called a pView. pViews can represent different ways of iterating through a data structure. The C++ language has

evolved significantly since STAPL's pViews were developed using C++03, and elements of pViews' design limit their performance and usability compared to distributed ranges. In particular, pViews make heavy use of inheritance, with each pView inheriting from the base pView class `core_view`. A pView that builds on top of a base view will store a pointer to the base view, meaning that any operations on the base view will incur the overhead of a virtual function call as well as prevent inlining. This means that in order to achieve good performance, algorithms must be specifically optimized for combinations of views, limiting the usefulness of arbitrarily nested views. In addition, the pView design requires implementing all views from scratch, removing the possibility of implementing a single customization point for a pre-existing view, as is done with many views in distributed ranges. STAPL provides a number of custom, domain-specific views for matrix and graph data structures that do not exist in the C++ standard but are ripe material for future work.

In Python, libraries like Legate NumPy [7] and Legate Sparse [28] utilize Legion's logical regions data model and task-based runtime [8]. These libraries' deferred execution model allows them to expose more parallelism, waiting to synchronize and perform dependency analysis only when data is accessed directly. In contrast, the primarily static techniques discussed in this paper are more limited in their ability to uncover dynamic parallelism, but have very minimal runtime overheads compared to those of the Legion runtime.

## 7 Conclusion

This paper presents distributed ranges model, which extends the standard ranges model with concepts providing a standard way to expose the distribution of a data structure or view. This provides a flexible, high-performance mechanism to implement interoperable distributed data structures, algorithms, and views.

## References

- [1] [n. d.]. HPX v1.9.0 Documentation: Segmented Containers. [https://hpx-docs.stellar-group.org/latest/html/manual/writing\\_distributed\\_hpx\\_applications.html#segmented-containers](https://hpx-docs.stellar-group.org/latest/html/manual/writing_distributed_hpx_applications.html#segmented-containers). Accessed July 23, 2023.
- [2] [n. d.]. P2300R7 `std::execution`. <https://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2023/p2300r7.html>. Accessed March 21, 2024.
- [3] [n. d.]. Ranges library (C++20). <https://en.cppreference.com/w/cpp/ranges>. Accessed July 23, 2023.
- [4] 2023. oneAPI DPC++ Library (oneDPL). <https://github.com/oneapi-src/oneDPL>.
- [5] 2023. rocThrust. <https://github.com/ROCmSoftwarePlatform/rocThrust>.
- [6] Matthew H Austern. 2000. Segmented iterators and hierarchical algorithms. In *Generic Programming: International Seminar on Generic Programming Dagstuhl Castle, Germany, April 27–May 1, 1998 Selected Papers*. Springer, 80–90.
- [7] Michael Bauer and Michael Garland. 2019. Legate NumPy: accelerated and distributed array computing. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking,*

- Storage and Analysis* (Denver, Colorado) (SC '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 23, 23 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3295500.3356175>
- [8] Michael Bauer, Sean Treichler, Elliott Slaughter, and Alex Aiken. 2012. Legion: Expressing locality and independence with logical regions. In *SC'12: Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE, 1–11.
- [9] Nathan Bell and Jared Hoberock. 2012. Thrust: A productivity-oriented library for CUDA. In *GPU computing gems Jade edition*. Elsevier, 359–371.
- [10] Benjamin Brock, Aydin Buluç, and Katherine Yelick. 2019. BCL: A Cross-Platform Distributed Data Structures Library. In *Proceedings of the 48th International Conference on Parallel Processing (Kyoto, Japan) (ICPP 2019)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 102, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3337821.3337912>
- [11] Benjamin Brock, Scott McMillan, Aydin Buluç, Timothy G. Mattson, and José E. Moreira. 2022. GraphBLAS: C++ Iterators for Sparse Matrices. In *2022 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (IPDPSW)*. 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPSW55747.2022.00053>
- [12] Vito Giovanni Castellana and Marco Minutoli. 2018. SHAD: The Scalable High-Performance Algorithms and Data-Structures Library. In *18th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing, CCGRID 2018, Washington, DC, USA, May 1-4, 2018*, Esam El-Araby, Dhableswar K. Panda, Sandra Gesing, Amy W. Apon, Volodymyr V. Kindratenko, Massimo Cafaro, and Alfredo Cuzzocrea (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 442–451. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CCGRID.2018.00071>
- [13] Soumen Chakrabarti, Etienne Deprit, Eun-Jin Im, Jeff Jones, Arvind Krishnamurthy, Chih-Po Wen, and Katherine Yelick. 1995. Multipol: A distributed data structure library. In *PPoPP*.
- [14] UPC Consortium et al. 2005. UPC language specifications v1. 2. *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory* (2005).
- [15] Karl Furlinger, Tobias Fuchs, and Roger Kowalewski. 2016. DASH: A C++ PGAS Library for Distributed Data Structures and Parallel Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 18th IEEE International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC 2016)*. Sydney, Australia, 983–990. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCC-SmartCity-DSS.2016.0140>
- [16] Robert Gerstenberger, Maciej Besta, and Torsten Hoefler. 2014. Enabling highly-scalable remote memory access programming with MPI-3 one sided. *Scientific Programming* 22, 2 (2014), 75–91.
- [17] Wilfred Gomes, Altug Koker, Pat Stover, Doug Ingerly, Scott Siers, Srikrishnan Venkataraman, Chris Pelto, Tejas Shah, Amreesh Rao, Frank O'Mahony, et al. 2022. Ponte Vecchio: A multi-tile 3D stacked processor for exascale computing. In *2022 IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference (ISSCC)*, Vol. 65. IEEE, 42–44.
- [18] Michael Haidl, Michel Steuwer, Hendrik Dirks, Tim Humernbrum, and Sergei Gorbach. 2017. Towards Composable GPU Programming: Programming GPUs with Eager Actions and Lazy Views. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Programming Models and Applications for Multicores and Manycores*. 58–67.
- [19] Hartmut Kaiser, Patrick Diehl, Adrian S Lemoine, Bryce Adelstein Lelbach, Parsa Amini, Agustín Berge, John Biddiscombe, Steven R Brandt, Nikunj Gupta, Thomas Heller, et al. 2020. Hpx - The C++ Standard Library for Parallelism and Concurrency. *Journal of Open Source Software* 5, 53 (2020), 2352.
- [20] Hartmut Kaiser, Thomas Heller, Bryce Adelstein-Lelbach, Adrian Serio, and Dietmar Fey. 2014. HPX: A task based programming model in a global address space. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Partitioned Global Address Space Programming Models*. ACM, 6.
- [21] Ken Kennedy, Charles Koelbel, and Hans Zima. 2011. The Rise and Fall of High Performance Fortran. *Commun. ACM* 54, 11 (11 2011), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2018396.2018415>
- [22] Ronan Keryell, Ruyman Reyes, and Lee Howes. 2015. Khronos SYCL for OpenCL: A Tutorial. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on OpenCL*. 1–1.
- [23] Duane Merrill. 2015. CUB. *NVIDIA Research* (2015).
- [24] Jaroslaw Nieplocha, Robert J Harrison, and Richard J Littlefield. 1996. Global arrays: A nonuniform memory access programming model for high-performance computers. *The Journal of Supercomputing* 10, 2 (1996), 169–189.
- [25] Gabriel Tanase, Antal Buss, Adam Fidel, Harshvardhan, Ioannis Papadopoulos, Olga Pearce, Timmie Smith, Nathan Thomas, Xiabing Xu, Nedal Mourad, Jeremy Vu, Mauro Bianco, Nancy M. Amato, and Lawrence Rauchwerger. 2011. The STAPL Parallel Container Framework. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (San Antonio, TX, USA) (PPoPP '11)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1941553.1941586>
- [26] Michele Weiland. 2007. Chapel, Fortress and X10: novel languages for HPC. *EPCC, The University of Edinburgh, Tech. Rep. HPCxTR0706* (2007).
- [27] Nanmiao Wu, Vito Giovanni Castellana, and Hartmut Kaiser. 2022. Towards Superior Software Portability with SHAD and HPX C++ Libraries. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers (Turin, Italy) (CF '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 251–257. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3528416.3530784>
- [28] Rohan Yadav, Wonchan Lee, Melih Elibol, Manolis Papadakis, Taylor Lee-Patti, Michael Garland, Alex Aiken, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Michael Bauer. 2023. Legate Sparse: Distributed Sparse Computing in Python. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (, Denver, CO, USA.) (SC '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 13, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581784.3607033>
- [29] Kathy Yelick, Luigi Semenzato, Geoff Pike, Carleton Miyamoto, Ben Liblit, Arvind Krishnamurthy, Paul Hilfinger, Susan Graham, David Gay, Phillip Colella, et al. 1998. Titanium: A high-performance Java dialect. *Concurrency Practice and Experience* 10, 11-13 (1998), 825–836.

Optimization Notice: Software and workloads used in performance tests may have been optimized for performance only on Intel microprocessors. Performance tests, such as SYSmark and MobileMark, are measured using specific computer systems, components, software, operations and functions. Any change to any of those factors may cause the results to vary. You should consult other information and performance tests to assist you in fully evaluating your contemplated purchases, including the performance of that product when combined with other products. For more information go to <http://www.intel.com/performance>.

Intel, Xeon, and Intel Xeon Phi are trademarks of Intel Corporation in the U.S. and/or other countries.