

The EDGE Language: Extended General Einsums for Graph Algorithms

TOLUWANIMI O. ODEMUYIWA, SERBAN D. PORUMBESCU, NANDEEKA NAYAK, MICHAEL PELLAUER, JOEL S. EMER, and JOHN D. OWENS

In this work, we propose a unified abstraction for graph algorithms: the Extended General Einsums language, or EDGE. The EDGE *language* expresses graph algorithms in the language of tensor algebra, providing a rigorous, succinct, and expressive mathematical framework. EDGE leverages two ideas: (1) the well-known foundations provided by the graph-matrix duality, where a graph is simply a 2D *tensor*, and (2) the power and expressivity of Einsum notation in the tensor algebra world. In this work, we describe our design goals for EDGE and walk through the extensions we add to Einsums in order to support more complex operations common in graph algorithms. Additionally, we provide a few examples of how to express graph algorithms in our proposed notation. Our hope is that a single, mathematical notation for graph algorithms will (1) allow researchers to more easily compare different algorithms and different implementations of a graph algorithm; (2) enable developers to factor complexity by separating the concerns of *what* to compute (described with the extended Einsum notation) from the lower-level details of *how* to compute; and (3) enable the discovery of different algorithmic variants of a problem through algebraic manipulations and transformations on a given EDGE expression.

1 Introduction

From fraud detection in banks [81, 93], to our familial, social and professional connections [51, 56], to analyzing how various proteins impact disease expression [11], graphs—or *networks*—are ubiquitous in our daily lives and the infrastructure of society. A graph is an abstract data structure that captures data entities and the complex connections between them. Graph algorithms have been fundamental to answering questions about this data, allowing analysis that focuses on the relationship between various entities. Given a specific problem (e.g., find the connected components or communities within a graph), there may typically be numerous algorithmic alternatives *and* even a variety of choices for realizing the chosen algorithm as a software implementation or hardware module. For example, the well-studied weakly connected-components problem—with algorithmic solutions earlier than 1973 [46]—has grown to have hundreds of algorithms and implementations, each with its own time and space complexity. Researchers and developers continue to discover new algorithms and specific implementations for well-studied algorithms even today [30, 61]. Even the problem of finding the shortest path to all other entities in a graph given a starting point (single-source shortest path)—often considered a well-solved problem—still yields new implementations [29].

To invent a new algorithm, researchers often “think really hard” to determine the high-level steps. Algorithms are then lowered to the implementation level, where a software developer or hardware designer may iterate on the implementation multiple times to optimize for runtime or energy efficiency. Both algorithmic development and software or hardware implementation are hard; **is there a way to systematically think about inventing algorithms and implementing solutions?**

Additionally, different graph frameworks describe their implementations in imprecise natural language or pseudocode, at times using different terminology and program structure even when describing the same algorithm. Moreover, most graph frameworks focus on highly performant implementations for a single target backend, with abstractions that do not enable fully exploring the algorithmic and implementation space. This makes it difficult to directly compare different

implementations, iterate on an implementation, and port one implementation from one environment to another. **Is there a unified way of thinking about and expressing an implementation?**

An ideal approach to graph algorithms decomposes the problem into smaller pieces, each of which tools or developers can individually explore. Overall, **is there a way to further factor the complex graph problem space into several, smaller concerns?** Such an approach will enable developers to focus on specific aspects of a graph solution, transforming the design space into a tunable space with several degrees of freedom, some of which can be explored independently.

In this work, we take inspiration from the tensor algebra community, where Einsum notation has served as a compact, declarative specification of tensor computations. We cast graph problems into tensor algebra by extending Einsum notation into EDGE, the Extended General Einsums language: a language for expressing graph algorithms as precise, declarative tensor computations. EDGE leverages two ideas: (1) graph-matrix duality, where a graph can be represented as a 2D tensor, and (2) the separation of *what* is computed from *how* it is computed, with mapping, data format, and backend choices specified outside the Einsum [54, 68, 77].

The Tensor Algebra World. We use the adjective “extended” to refer to the notation used by the programming language, compiler, and accelerator modeling community (e.g., TACO [54], Timeloop [77], and TeAAL [68]), as distinguished from the traditional mathematical expressions used in multilinear algebra¹. For brevity, in this paper we will generally drop the “extended” word in “extended Einsums”, and refer to this programming language/compiler/modeling community as the “tensor algebra world”. Einsums are the language that enables the compiler and modeling tools to precisely describe the computations present in the mathematical field of multilinear algebra.

Extending Einsums. We begin by introducing the design of EDGE and illustrating how traditional Einsums are extended to express graph algorithms, with examples throughout. As much as possible, our extensions remain within the tensor machinery. In contrast, prior linear-algebra-based approaches to graph computation (e.g., GraphBLAS) express these computations within the larger context of an imperative program (see § 4). Our extensions support expressing the following language features: (1) user-defined data values and types; (2) initialization of tensors; (3) generic user-defined operators that express computation between two tensor values (*MAP*, § 5.3.1), reduction of values (*REDUCE*, § 5.3.2), and the (potentially filtered) assignment of the output tensor (*POPULATE*, § 5.3.3); (4) a separation of computations on graph entities/tensor coordinates (*Merge*, § 5.4) from graph values/tensor data (*Compute*, § 5.4); (5) iterative algorithms (§ 5.7); and (6) constraints that represent when particular computations occur based on certain conditions (rank variable expressions, § 5.9). Overall, this paper introduces EDGE as a formal algebraic language for graph computation and establishes its semantic foundations. While the framework naturally enables systematic exploration of algorithmic variants through algebraic transformation, a comprehensive study of this space—including performance characterization and automated exploration—is beyond the scope of this work and is addressed in complementary work. Our focus here is on the language design, its formal semantics, and its ability to express and relate graph computations within a unified algebraic framework.

Contributions. This paper makes the following contributions:

- (1) **The EDGE language.** We introduce EDGE, an extension of Einstein summation notation that enables the expression of graph algorithms within a unified tensor algebra framework, including support for user-defined operators, iteration, and constraints.

¹This includes the fields of statistical mechanics [38], quantum chemistry [91], Ricci calculus [59, 108], and tensor contraction theory [91], among others.

- (2) **Formal semantic foundation.** We define a set-theoretic and functional semantic model for EDGE, providing a precise interpretation of programs and serving as a foundation for reasoning about correctness and transformation.
- (3) **Algebraic formulation of graph computation.** We demonstrate how common graph algorithms can be expressed in EDGE and introduce the *eingebraic space*: the set of EDGE expressions reachable from one another through algebraic transformation. In graph algorithms, this space captures variants of the same problem, such as push and pull BFS, as algebraically related expressions within a single framework.

The notation and abstractions presented in this paper form the first stage of a larger EDGE framework. In that framework, an EDGE expression serves as the precise, declarative specification of what is computed. Future stages can then explore how that computation is realized: algebraic manipulations can derive equivalent expressions, mapping specifications can choose loop orders and tilings, data-format specifications can choose tensor layouts, and backend specifications can bind the computation to software or hardware targets. This paper focuses on the language design, formal semantics, and expressive power needed to make that broader framework possible.

1.1 Roadmap

This paper serves several audiences: it is a tutorial, a language definition, a formal semantics, and a collection of case studies. EDGE is already being applied in multiple contexts, including graph analytics, accelerator design, robotics, digital circuit simulation, and machine learning workloads [33, 35, 68–72, 74, 102, 107]. This breadth motivates a comprehensive presentation of the language and its foundations. We do not expect any single reader to need the entire paper on a first pass.

We use several visual conventions to help readers navigate the paper: general examples appear in pink boxes; BFS examples, which serve as the running example, appear in purple boxes; design alternatives appear in grey boxes; and optional mathematical or explanatory notes appear as insets. Diagrams throughout the paper complement the discussion by illustrating tensor operations and execution flows.

Example: General Examples

BFS Example Part: BFS Examples

Alternative Notes: Design Alternatives

Inset Additional Information

We suggest the following reading paths:

- **Readers wishing to express graph algorithms (and beyond!) in EDGE.** Start with § 5, which builds the language one feature at a time using BFS as the primary running example. Read the BFS example boxes closely to see how graph primitives such as gathering neighbors, filtering vertices, updating frontiers, and iteration appear in EDGE. Then read § 8 for more complex examples, including SSSP variants and concurrent connected components.

- **Readers with a tensor algebra background.** Read § 3 and § 4 to understand how EDGE relates to existing tensor algebra systems. Then focus on the extensions that go beyond traditional Einsum notation: user-defined operators (§ 5.2), the separation of Merge from Compute (§ 5.4), iteration (§ 5.7), and POPULATE (§ 5.8). To see how EDGE expressions can be manipulated algebraically, read § 8.3 and Appendix C.
- **Accelerator and backend designers.** If your interest is mapping EDGE workloads onto a tensor algebra accelerator or software backend, see also the [tensor algebra route](#); your reading overlaps with it but with different emphasis. Read § 3, especially the discussion of tensor algebra concerns summarized in Table 2. Then focus on the language features that most directly affect dataflow, scheduling, and storage: Merge and Compute (§ 5.4), iteration (§ 5.7), and POPULATE (§ 5.8). § 9 sketches how EDGE fits into a broader exploration framework. Several recent works build on EDGE to explore the implementation space, including TeAAL [68, 69, 71], FuseMax [70, 72], and related efforts [74, 107].
- **Readers implementing EDGE or a variant of EDGE.** Read § 5 for intuition about what the language is for, and § 4 for the constraints any implementation must respect—in particular, that every extension preserves the operational definition of an Einsum (**design goal 2**). Then read § 7 and § 6; together, the grammar and the formal semantics define the language. The semantics are written in a functional and set-theoretic style and should be treated as the primary reference for determining the meaning of an EDGE expression.
- **Readers looking for reference material.** If you are not reading the paper linearly and instead need to interpret an EDGE expression, § 7 provides the grammar, Appendix B offers additional syntax notes, and Appendix A catalogs all 16 merge operators.

If none of these descriptions fit, start with [the first route](#) and stop after § 8; this should provide enough intuition to identify which remaining sections are relevant to your goals.

2 Preliminaries

This section briefly describes relevant graph and tensor algebra terminology.

2.1 Graph Algorithms




Fig. 1. Uncompressed 2D tensors, A and B , where locations containing zero are treated as empty in this example. This also shows the coordinate spaces of A and B , whose points map to values in each tensor’s data space.

A graph describes relationships between entities. Suppose we have a graph, G . It contains two entities: its *vertex set* ($G.V$) and its *edge set* ($G.E$) [25]. V is the set of all vertices in the graph, $|V|$ is the number of vertices in the graph, and E is the set of all edges. A vertex or node, v , in a graph is an entity possibly connected to other vertices by an edge, e .

We describe an undirected edge, $e \in E$, by an unordered set of vertices $\{s, d\}$, where $s, d \in V$, with the edge connecting vertices s and d . A directed edge is a tuple of ordered vertices, (s, d) , where $s, d \in V$, with the edge starting from s and ending at d . The starting point of an edge (s) is a *source* or *parent* vertex,

while the ending point (d) is a *destination* or *child* vertex.

A given graph may be directed or undirected, where we can also describe an edge in an undirected graph as two directed edges: (s, d) and (d, s) . A graph may also be unweighted or weighted. An

unweighted graph assumes all edges have a cost, or “weight” of one, while a *weighted* graph stores a quantity on each edge. A *node-weighted* graph assigns weights to each of its vertices. Finally, a graph may be dynamic; that is, its structure changes with time. This may include a changing vertex set, edge set, edge weights, and/or node weights [40].

Several graph algorithms require a form of *graph traversal*, where the neighbors of a vertex are successively explored [1, 20, 64, 67]. The *active vertex/edge set*, or *frontier*, refers to the subset of nodes and/or edges that are actively participating in the graph computation at a particular step in time [88, 95]. To explore the ideas between graph algorithms and tensor algebra, in this paper we will use breadth-first search (BFS), a graph traversal algorithm, as a running example. BFS iteratively finds all vertices reachable from a starting node, recording the depth at which each vertex is found. In BFS, all vertices at a particular depth are discovered before any vertex with a larger depth.

2.2 Tensors

Tensor algebra describes computations between *tensors*, which are multidimensional views of data. We employ the term *rank* for the axes or indices of a given tensor [68]. Thus, a 3D tensor has three ranks, a 2D tensor (or matrix) has two ranks, a 1D tensor (or vector) has one rank, and a 0D tensor is simply a scalar. Let $A_{k,m}$ be a 2D tensor named A . It has two ranks, M and K , each indexed by *coordinates* m and k . The *shape* of a rank is the maximum number of coordinates possible in that rank. We assume the rank name is a variable that contains its shape, and by convention is specified in upper case. The coordinate that indexes into a rank has the same variable name in lowercase. Thus, for example, coordinate m ranges from 0 to $M - 1$ unless otherwise specified. The *shape* of a tensor is the total maximum size of the tensor along each of its ranks. Thus, A has a shape of $M \times K$. We refer to the total number of non-zeros (nnz) in the tensor as its *occupancy*. The example tensor A in Figure 1 has an occupancy of 3, while B has an occupancy of 4. We often describe tensors in terms of their densities: a *dense* tensor has full or nearly full occupancy, while a *sparse* tensor has low occupancy—a few nnz values relative to the shape of the tensor.




Fig. 2. Fibertree representations of the uncompressed tensors in Figure 1.

The preceding terminology refers to abstract characteristics of a tensor; however, tensor algebra applications need to store the data in memory. Traditionally, dense tensors are stored in an *uncompressed* format: the memory location of each value matches its coordinate order. Sparse tensors present an opportunity to reduce storage by using *compressed* data formats such as Compressed Sparse Row/Column (CSR/CSC), Coordinate Format (COO), and Compressed Sparse Fiber (CSF) [90], amongst others [12, 21].

To abstract away formatting details, we adopt the *fibertree* terminology described by Sze et al. [94, Chapter 8], with further details provided in the excellent fibertree description of Nayak et al. [68, Section 2.1]. A fibertree is a format-agnostic representation of a tensor. A *fiber* goes beyond the concepts of rows and columns






Fig. 3. A directed graph, G , and some representations. The matrix values contain the edge ID, while the vertices are labeled alphabetically.

in linear algebra to denote the set of entries for a particular rank for any N -dimensional tensor. Each element in a fiber consists of a coordinate in the rank and its payload. The payload consists of a reference to the next-level fiber or a leaf data value [68]. The fibertree admits $N!$ possible representations, one for each possible *rank order* of the tensor. The rank order refers to “the order of levels” in the fibertree, going from top to bottom [68]. To change the rank order of a tensor, one must apply *rank swizzling* to the tensor. Figures 2a and 2b show example fibertrees for tensors A and B , and their corresponding representations when rank-swizzled.



(a) Here, we express G as a tensor where the leaf values contain edge IDs.



(b) Here, we express G as a tensor where vertex IDs are now numerical and the leaf values indicate whether there is an edge connecting vertex s to vertex d , where T is True and F (the empty value) is False.

Fig. 4. The example graph in Figure 3 as two different fibertrees.

Fibers with empty leaf values do not appear in the fibertree. For example, in Figure 2a the fiber $m = 2$ in A is empty. Likewise, the M fiber at $k = 1$ is also empty and thus does not appear in the fibertree representation (see swizzled representation in Figure 2a). Additionally, the *position* of a tensor value is its ordering in a zero-based numbering of the tensor’s non-zero values, under a specific rank order. For example, the value at coordinate $(1, 2)$ of tensor A , in Figure 1, has a position of 2, when following an M -major rank order (k varies faster than m).

A *point* refers to a specific location in a tensor, identified by its coordinate tuple. For example, point $(k = 0, n = 1)$ in B (Figure 1) contains the data value of 2. Point $(k = 0, n = 0)$ in B contains the data value of 0. A *region* refers to a set of points in a tensor. For example, the region $(k = 0, n = :)$ refers to the entire $k = 0$ fiber. The region $(:)$ refers to the points of the entire tensor. Thus, a point is a specific instance of a region.

Table 1. Tensor Terminology, expanded from Odemuyiwa et al. [73, Table 1].

Name	Description
tensor	a multidimensional view of data
coordinate	the logical index of a value or fiber
position	ignoring zero values, the index of a non-zero value or fiber under a specific rank ordering
rank order	the “major-order” in which elements are laid out in memory
point	the tuple of coordinates identifying a specific location
region	a tuple of coordinates identifying a set of points
coordinate space	the set of possible coordinate points in a tensor
data space	the set of values a tensor may contain at its coordinate points
occupancy	number of non-zero elements within a fiber or tensor
uncompressed format	the position of each value matches its coordinate order

A tensor has both a *coordinate space* and a *data space*. Informally, the coordinate space is the set of possible points in the tensor, while the data space is the set of values the tensor may contain at those points. We use these notions informally in this section. In EDGE, this abstraction is extended to support richer data types and user-defined computations over tensor values. § 6 defines these concepts precisely using set-theoretic semantics, including the treatment of tensor values, empties, and user-defined data types.

The Z tensor has a coordinate space of $[0, M) \times [0, N)$, consisting of all possible (m, n) tuple points, where m and n can each range over $[0, M)$ and $[0, N)$. For brevity, we drop the range when describing coordinate spaces; thus, Z has coordinate space $M \times N$. Likewise, A and B have coordinate spaces of $M \times K$ and $K \times N$, respectively. A *projection* into a tensor maps a point or region in the coordinate space to the corresponding value in the tensor’s data space.

We have found this abstraction useful in describing transformations on tensors, such as partitioning, without worrying about the format-specific implementations for those transformations [47, 68, 73]. Table 1 summarizes some key tensor terminology.

2.3 From Graphs to Tensors

The matrix-graph duality [53] allows us to represent a graph as a 2D tensor. Figure 3 shows a graph and some of its various representations. As with tensors, we can leverage the format-agnostic fibertree semantics to describe graphs—and other data structures—without considering *how* they are stored in memory (Figure 4).

3 Background and Related Works

Implementing a solution to a graph problem requires considering a large, complex problem space. As an example, consider breadth-first search (BFS), where implementations often decide between using a top-down (push), bottom-up (pull), or a hybrid, direction-optimized approach. Push-BFS first discovers neighbors of vertices in the frontier, then determines if those neighbors have been visited. Pull-BFS checks the set of all unvisited vertices, and determines if their parents are in the frontier. A hybrid approach selects between the two approaches depending on the size of the frontier and the number of unvisited nodes at the current iteration. In addition to deciding the overall algorithmic approach, developers must also decide which data structures to use for the graph, frontier, and any other data. Each choice impacts performance: for example, a graph stored using a CSR representation will have sequential access to the neighbors of a vertex, but many random accesses when finding the parents of a vertex. Meanwhile, an uncompressed representation of the graph will take up more storage in memory, but provide efficient random accesses. Other aspects to consider when implementing a graph solution include: deciding computation order;

the “unit of computation” [23] including vertex-centric [62, 63] or edge-centric [85, 101, 104, 106] computations; parallelization and load-balancing strategies [17, 75, 76, 95]; how to partition the graph [23, 63, 103]; and the target platform (CPU, GPU, FPGA, etc.).

In the graph world, the dominant approach is to first implement a baseline solution, observe its performance, then update the baseline solution by changing different design aspects. A developer iterates on this process until the implementation achieves the desired performance. Most often, this approach does not separate graph algorithms from scheduling the computation of that algorithm, making full exploration of the combined design space a significant challenge.

Researchers have recognized this challenge with work that more efficiently searches the space of possible implementations. For instance, GraphIt [103], a graph framework for shared-memory systems, provides a menu of options for users (the schedule) after a user specifies the high-level description of the graph algorithm. However, this is specific to shared-memory systems, and does not fully cover all the options in the complex problem space. G2 [17] extends GraphIt to support a GPU backend. We view many of the proposed, GPU-specific optimizations in G2 as platform-independent mapping choices in the Einsum framework.

When dealing with a complex problem space, a common design philosophy is *separation of concerns*. In this approach, designers factor the problem space into smaller, manageable subproblems that can be independently solved.

The tensor algebra space has successfully leveraged a separation-of-concerns design philosophy to factor its problem space into manageable parts. It has also incorporated sparse tensor algebra into this philosophy, despite the additional complexity introduced by the irregular nature of sparse tensor workloads. In order to leverage the separation-of-concerns approach already established in that field, we map graph algorithms to tensor algebra. We now turn to the different concerns on which tensor algebra tools focus.

3.1 Factoring Complexity in Sparse Tensor Algebra

In the sparse tensor algebra accelerator space, the design process involves using block diagrams, natural language, or pseudocode to describe the algorithm and model the architecture, followed by a custom simulator for evaluation, then an attempt at comparing to prior work [68]. Features such as the sparse tensor format are ingrained into the architecture; for example, the MatRaptor [92] accelerator relies on its custom C^2SR data format (CSR/CSC-like) to mine parallelism, making it difficult to directly compare it with accelerators that are built around other data formats. Even iterating over a design requires starting over at the algorithmic and modeling phase [68]. Likewise, there is a similar pattern in the tensor algebra software space: given a tensor algebra problem, application developers often plunge directly into a highly performant, low-level implementation [54, 55]. This mirrors the approach used by graph developers.

Different works within the large space of work in this area focus on different aspects: (1) expanding the set of concerns, (2) enabling expressivity of a particular concern, or (3) exploring the design space enabled by the separation of concerns. Figure 5 shows our view of the complex tensor algebra space. Starting with a problem specification, an implementation must somehow optimize over the space of possible tensor algebra representations (algebraic space), over different architectures, over different data formats, and over different space-time mappings. To factor complexity, prior tensor algebra tools separate out the concerns, representing each concern with a specification or language (Figure 6). Rather than searching the complex space in Figure 5, various tools can now explore searching different points in the subspaces of each concern (see Figure 6). EDGE expands on this concept by extending Einsums to support graph algorithms.

Now, in the domain of tensor algebra, most problems map to a single algorithm that solves that problem. The graph world is different. Even the most fundamental problems (e.g., finding the depth




Fig. 5. Our view of the complex design space in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes indicate *processes* (searching the space), white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs to the system. Given a problem, a tensor algebra implementation must try to optimize across the possible data formats, possible algebraic variants of the computation, and the mapping space, as well as selecting the best architecture. Tools tend to either model performance (for domain-specific accelerators), or generate platform-specific code. The results may be used to search for better points in the implementation space.




Fig. 6. One common approach to factoring the design space in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes with side borders indicate *processes*, plain shaded boxes indicate *specifications* for a concern, while white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs. Tools search subspaces to select a point within that space (e.g., a mapper selecting a mapping), then pass the selected point to the next subspace to inform its search (e.g., given a mapping, select the best data format).

of each vertex from a single-source vertex) have various algorithmic variants (e.g., push vs. pull BFS, or a variant that deletes edges from the graph [37, 101]). Thus, our work differs from tensor-algebra systems in adding one more concern: algebraic manipulation. Our hypothesis (and experience) is that the different algorithmic variants that may solve a particular problem are algebraically equivalent, and that algebraic manipulation starting with one algorithmic variant can allow us to find both existing and novel variants.

We believe there are two aspects to the separation-of-concerns philosophy:

- (1) What are the concerns? Then, given a concern, how does one *specify* the concern?




Fig. 7. An instance of a factored design space with our extended general Einsums for graph algorithms. EDGE introduces another concern to the factored space: algebraic manipulation of the Einsums. The algebraic manipulator produces a new Einsum that produces the same result as the original, input Einsum. By casting graph problems as extended Einsums, we can leverage the existing problem space found in tensor algebra. Shaded boxes with side borders indicate *processes*, solid gray boxes indicate *specifications* for a concern, while white/black boxes indicate inputs/outputs.

Table 2. Selected works in the tensor algebra space and the concerns on which they expand. Works are sorted by date of publication.

	Representing the Workload	Enabling Algebraic Manipulations	Representing the Mapping Space	Exploration of the Mapping Space	Representing the Data Format	Exploring the Format Space	Representing the Architecture	Exploring Architectures	Performance Modeling	Software Implementation
TACO [54]	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra		X		X					X
Timeloop [77]	Dense Tensor Algebra		X	X			X		X	
Maestro [57]	DNN		X	X			X		X	
GAMMA [50]	DNN		X	X					X	
Sparseloop [99]	Sparse Tensor Algebra				X		X		X	
CoSA [48]	DNN								X	
Mind Mappings [43]	Dense Tensor Algebra			X					X	
CIN-P	Sparse Tensor Algebra		X	X						X
Autoscheduler	Sparse Tensor Algebra			X		X				X
WACO [98]	Dense Tensor Algebra		X				X			
LoopTree [34]	Dense Tensor Algebra		X				X		X	
DOSA [45]	DNN			X				X		
TeAAL [68]	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra, Cascades of Einsums		X		X		X		X	
EDGE Language (This Paper)	Dense/Sparse Tensor Algebra, Graph Algorithms (and beyond)	X								

Enabled for graph algorithms through EDGE

- (2) Since the problem has been factored into smaller subproblems, how does one *search* the new, factored space for efficient implementations?

With these in mind, we can now explore the different concerns of tensor algebra. These concerns will also apply to our characterization of graph computation as Einsums, and thus we will be able to leverage the insights from the tensor algebra community (and the corresponding separation of concerns) in graph computation.

3.1.1 Concern: What is the computation? To precisely specify computations, the tensor algebra community uses Einstein summation notation, or Einsums. For example, suppose the problem description is “do a linear projection of a set of vectors in one space to a set of vectors in another

space”. The traditional Einsum for this problem description (i.e., matrix-matrix multiplication) is:

$$Z_{m,n} = \sum_{k=0}^K A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n} \quad (1)$$

Current extended Einsum notation (or tensor index notation [54]) drops the $\sum$:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n} \quad (2)$$

Although Einsums of this form have existed for several years (see NumPy [41] and PyTorch [78]), we recently formalized an *operational definition of an Einsum* (ODE) that formally describes how to evaluate a given expression [68, Section 2.2]. The discussion here gives the reader operational intuition. § 6 gives the precise set-theoretic semantics for EDGE, including the definitions of iteration space, tensor coordinate spaces, data space sets, and empty values.

At an intuitive level, an Einsum expression involves an *iteration space* and the coordinate spaces of the tensors appearing in the expression. The iteration space is the set of coordinate tuples over which the computation ranges. The tensor coordinate spaces are the spaces into which the expression projects to read input values and write output values. § 6 refines these notions formally.

In Equation (2), the coordinate variables in the iteration space are given by the indices appearing in the subscripts of the Einsum expression. Thus, Equation (2) specifies an *iteration space* of $[0, M) \times [0, K) \times [0, N)$, where indices m , k , and n range over $[0, M)$, $[0, K)$, and $[0, N)$, respectively. For each (m, k, n) *point* in the iteration space, evaluating this Einsum projects into the coordinate spaces of A , B , and Z , retrieving values from A and B and accumulating the computed result into the corresponding output location in Z . In this example, the computation multiplies values from A and B and reduces, through addition, all computed values that map to the same output (m, n) point in Z .

The Einsum defines how each point in the iteration space maps to points in the coordinate spaces of the tensors. Coordinate expressions in the subscripts of an Einsum indicate *how* each iteration-space point maps to a tensor coordinate-space point (see § 5.9). For example, the following expression shifts the input values by one:

$$Z_m = A_{m+1}, \quad (3)$$

In Equation (3), the iteration space is $[0, M)$. For each m point in the iteration space, the expression projects to the m point in Z and the $m + 1$ point in A . Due to this coordinate expression, this computation will never access the A_0 point. Additionally, if a projection maps to a tensor coordinate that does not exist—for example, when $m = M - 1$, the projection $A_{(M-1)+1}$ (or simply, A_M) is out of bounds on A —we assume a returned empty value (e.g., 0 in this example).

Overall, (1) the iteration space expresses the set of possible point tasks for a given Einsum, (2) the tensor coordinate spaces express where those tasks read and write tensor values, and (3) the Einsum expression maps points in the iteration space to points in those tensor coordinate spaces.

This operational view determines whether a particular expression or extension to Einsums is valid (see § 4). To execute a traditional Einsum, the implementation must (1) walk each point in the iteration space; (2) for each point, retrieve the corresponding input values; (3) perform the computation indicated by the right-hand side of the Einsum; and (4) accumulate the result into the corresponding output location, reducing multiple contributions when necessary. EDGE extends this operational definition to support graph-oriented features such as user-defined values and operators, the separation of Merge and Compute, and iteration. § 6 defines this extended operational view precisely using set-theoretic semantics.

An Einsum simply specifies *what* computation to perform, and not *how* to perform that computation (e.g., the order in which to walk the iteration space). Thus, the Einsum could also be written

as

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \times B_{k,n}, \quad (4)$$

because coordinate order does not matter.

Instead, iteration order is left to a different concern: *mapping* [77]. We leave other aspects of *how* computation occurs in space and time to other concerns such as mapping, data format selection, and binding to a specific architecture (see Figure 6). In fact, Einsums enable a separation of concerns. Tools such as Halide [83] use Einsum-like expressions to declaratively represent the computation, then represent the aspects of how computation occurs into other concerns. EDGE builds on this operational definition, adding extensions that denote constraints that optimize computation (see § 5.4).

Prior Work: Extending Einsum Notation. To specify their workloads, both TACO [54] and Timeloop [77] use Einsums together with additional workload specifications such as tensor shapes. Timeloop extends this concept to allow *affine* coordinate expressions, which broaden the scope of expressible computations to include (for example) convolution. For instance, the following expression indicates a 1D convolution with a window size of S [68]:

$$Z_q = I_{q+s} \times F_s, \quad (5)$$

where the iteration space is $Q \times S$ and a reduction occurs over s . Sparseloop [99], an analytical model for sparse tensor algebra accelerators, in addition to Einsums, adds workload specifications for sparsity. Finally, our prior work TeAAL [68] introduces the concept of a *cascade of Einsums*, which represents problems as a directed acyclic graph (DAG) of Einsum expressions. In EDGE, these will appear as a sequence of sub-Einsum expressions. This is particularly relevant for graph problems that are composed of multiple computational steps.

3.1.2 Concern: How do we walk the iteration space? The next step after specifying an Einsum is to specify a *mapping*: how to walk the iteration space in both logical space and time. A common approach is to lower the Einsum to an abstract loop nest program such as HiFiber [2, 68], then explore various ways to transform that loop nest. For example, both TACO [54] and Timeloop [77] represent the mapping space as a series of nested loop nests, either using the polyhedral model [54] or with a custom specification language [77]. However, the loop nest approach does not adequately capture the space-time aspects of computation, such as uneven distributions of computation across space or time. Works like Maestro [57] adopt a *data-centric* approach to representing the mapping space, which enables a description of mapping aspects such as multicasting data and pipelining computations [57]. Our current approach derives from TeAAL [2, 68], which adopts a loop nest paradigm; however, future work will explore adopting a more data-centric mapping approach to better accommodate graph algorithms on architectures like GPUs.

Prior Work: Defining the Mapping Space. One aspect of work in this area is defining the mapping space and the types of eligible transformations to go from one mapping to another. There are two aspects to mapping: transformations on the *data* and transformations on the *iteration space*. Transformations on data take the input tensor(s) and rearrange their layout in memory or at runtime in some way. For example, swapping the ranks of a tensor (rank-swizzling), reordering values, or partitioning the data into chunks all constitute data transformations. Nayak et al. separate out transformations on data as *content-preserving transformations* [68]. Transformations on the iteration space describe how to walk the iteration space, such as processing particular points in parallel or sequentially, walking in a particular order, or dividing the iteration space into parallel chunks that are then each processed sequentially.

The mapping space for *dense* tensor algebra is well-supported due to compilation support for dense loop nests [10, 54, 105], including dependency analysis [16] and polyhedral analysis [5, 16, 58, 80]. On the other hand, *sparse* tensor algebra presents new challenges, all stemming from the idea that an efficient implementation should not need to touch every point in the iteration space but instead only those points in the iteration space that map to non-empty tensor values [54]. Additionally, there is the added complexity of accessing various sparse storage formats, each of which has different access costs.

```

1 for m1 in range(0, M1):
2   for n1 in range(0, N1):
3     for k1 in range(0, K1):
4       for m0 in range(0, M0):
5         for n0 in range(0, N0):
6           for k0 in range(0, K0):
7             Z[M0 * m1 + m0, N0 * n1 + n0] +=
8               A[M0 * m1 + m0, K0 * k1 + k0] *
9               B[K0 * k1 + k0, N0 * n1 + n0]
```

Fig. 8. An example mapping for tiled dense matrix-matrix multiplication.

accessed N times and M times, respectively. To improve reuse across the input tensors, an implementation may choose to tile the tensors [42, 73]. Figure 8 shows an example tiled GEMM loop nest. By adding a level of tiling, we increase the shape of the iteration space to $M1 \times N1 \times K1 \times M0 \times N0 \times K0$. This also increases the number of possible mappings (based on loop order alone) to ninety! We calculate this number by counting the number of possible tiled GEMM loop nests, each with a different ordering. This does not account for the possible choices for tile sizes, or the possible choices on which loop levels should be parallel or sequential.

Thus, a huge space of tensor algebra work focuses on how to explore the enumerable mapping space based on a cost model. Techniques include manually searching the space [68], and automated searches such as random search [77], integer linear programming [48], genetic algorithms [50], neural networks [43], and asymptotic cost analysis [4]. Note that several of these require some concept of the underlying architecture, including the number of memory levels and compute levels in the memory and compute hierarchies.

3.1.3 Concern: How is data stored? Performance is closely tied to the data format of tensors. Since the operands in an Einsum are simply an algebraic abstraction of a tensor, they do not themselves indicate *how* the tensors are stored in memory. Choosing a data format requires considering the costs for iterative access, random access, and insertion or deletion of values. Chou et al. provide a format abstraction that describes each rank of a tensor as a level-based format [21], and integrate this into the TACO compiler as a format specification language. In this model, each rank level has encoding choices, including dense, compressed, singleton, range, and hashed [21, 99], among others. For example, a format specification for the A tensor may indicate that m is uncompressed, and k is compressed. This, in turn, maps to a CSR data format [21]. These abstractions have been adapted in subsequent tensor algebra work [42, 68, 73, 77, 99].

Prior Work: Searching the Mapping Space. Different mappings have different implications on temporal and spatial locality, reuse, and overall performance. For example, suppose we have a three-deep sequential loop nest for dense matrix-matrix multiplication (GEMM), without any tiling. Equation 2 represents the Einsum for this computation. There are six different possible mappings. The mappings with m and n in the outer loop nests are output-stationary, i.e., they enable perfect reuse on the output tensor. However, they have poor reuse and temporal locality on the input tensors, where values in A and B are

3.1.4 Concern: What is the architecture? To allow an implementation to execute on different architectures, the tensor algebra accelerator community defines separate *architecture specifications*. First introduced with Timeloop [77], an architecture specification indicates the available accelerator compute units, on-chip network information, and memory hierarchy.

3.1.5 Concern: How do we bind computation? Software frameworks take the first three concerns (Einsum, Mapping, and Format) and compile them into platform-specific code [55]. The accelerator community, however, has an additional concern, called *binding*, where mapping and data choices are bound to physical hardware units like memory modules or compute units [34, 68, 77, 99]. A binding specification describes which data components reside at each storage level, how data is accessed (eagerly or lazily [68]), and how long data can reside there [68, 79]. For computation units, binding specifies the computation allowed on each compute component in the architecture specification.

3.2 A Complex Optimization Space

Figure 5 shows the intertwined design space of tensor algebra, where, ideally, an optimizer can look at the combinatorial space of concerns and select the best design point. As mentioned earlier, this is too complex, hence tensor algebra tools have instead focused on separating concerns and exploring the optimization space within those concerns (Figure 6). Given a problem, the standard process is to provide a specification for each of the concerns and interfacing logic that understands each of the concerns, then combine them to generate a (hopefully) performant implementation. The accelerator community focuses on modeling performance in hardware. A designer can then go on to synthesize a domain-specific accelerator, but now, iterating on the design involves simply changing one of the concerns. Meanwhile, the software community focuses on compiling to platform-specific code, but now, iterating on an implementation involves changing the specifications of one of the concerns. More recently, tools are trying to now search over multiple concerns to generate better design points. The co-optimizer WACO [98] searches the design space by taking into account both mapping *and* data format, while DoSA [45] co-optimizes by searching both the mapping space and the architecture space. Table 2 shows prior work and the concerns on which they focus.

3.3 Graph Algorithms to Tensor Algebra

Our work, EDGE, seeks to extend Einsum notation to support graph algorithms. The matrix-graph duality is a well-known concept in the graph algorithm community. *Graph theory* focuses on transforming graph problems into linear algebra problems by leveraging this duality, where linear algebra concepts like matrix decomposition, matrix inverses, and eigenvectors become relevant [22]. Our work does not focus on this aspect.

Our work is closer to GraphBLAS, which provides a framework for implementations built using high-performance building blocks based on linear algebra primitives [52, 53]. However, GraphBLAS does not separate concerns to the extent of tensor algebra tools: instead, in GraphBLAS, imperative variables are combined with linear algebra expressions and computations do not operate on tensors beyond 2D matrices. Additionally, unlike our EDGE notation, GraphBLAS intertwines computation on vertex and edge entities with computations on their features (see § 5.4). GSTACO [28] is similar to EDGE in spirit, but still entangles concerns of mapping, format, and binding with the problem representation itself.

In our case, Einsum notation is strictly used as a *language* or specification for graph algorithms, with certain rules (see § 3.1) on how the language can be manipulated. By using Einsums, we can leverage the separation of concerns found in tensor algebra, and the corresponding space of work in that area. If such a systematic approach can be used for graph algorithms, it will unlock a new space

of principled design exploration and analysis of this problem domain. To enable this, we *extend* Einsums so that we can fully express various graph algorithms as tensor algebra computations. We hope that future graph systems using our advances will leverage existing tensor algebra systems, whose tools will need to support searching a problem space that allows general user-defined data types and computations (§ 5.2), exploring algebraic variants of the Einsum (§ 9), and incorporating optimizations based on computations occurring on coordinates (§ 5.4).

4 Why Extend Einsums Further?

While current Einsum notation is expressive, graph algorithms introduce new challenges that are not fully addressed by current notation. Current Einsums do not fully denote, among other aspects, (1) user-defined computations beyond semirings, (2) user-defined data values, (3) partial updates of tensors, or (4) recursive and iterative computations. We extend the language of Einsums with the following goals in mind:

- (1) The language should enable a separation of concerns.
- (2) Every extension to Einsums must adhere to the operational definition of an Einsum (see § 3.1.1).
- (3) As a direct consequence of design goal 2, the extensions should still support traditional tensor algebra computations enabled by existing tools (e.g., TACO [54], TeAAL [68] and Timeloop [77]). In this way, we hope to leverage prior work in the tensor algebra space.
- (4) Where possible, the language should expose key optimization opportunities to an underlying compiler or modeling tool. Moreover, there should be as few restrictions as possible on a compiler processing the EDGE language.
- (5) At the same time, the language should be as simple and elegant as possible, while precisely describing the computation.
- (6) The language should be expressive and powerful enough to capture *as many as possible* graph algorithms (and other domains!) of interest.
- (7) The language should enable transformations between equivalent expressions in clear, distinct steps.

In addition to these main design goals, we also have the following lower-priority goals that we pursue only if they do not conflict with our primary goals:

- (8) The language should “look” like mathematics as much as possible.
- (9) Where possible, one should be able to apply traditional mathematical rules when manipulating EDGE expressions (see **design goal 7**).
- (10) While aiming for expressivity, our goal is *not* to be a general-purpose programming language. However, we hope to better express other traditionally irregular applications using EDGE, for example (but not limited to) sparse LU factorization (a step commonly used to reorder graphs [32]), various sorting algorithms, and common parallel primitives such as prefix-sum.

The EDGE language is our answer to these design goals. Graph algorithms contain computational patterns found in many other non-tensor applications; thus, while EDGE initially targeted graph algorithms, we find that EDGE also expresses a large range of algorithms beyond both tensor algebra and graph algorithms. These include: matrix decomposition, multi-head attention, GraphSAGE, robotics motion planning, general neural network applications, and Cholesky, among others. In fact, researchers have already begun using EDGE to express their own workloads [33, 36, 49, 70, 72, 89, 96, 102].

In the following sections, we describe the EDGE language and when possible, indicate where we factor in specific design goals.

5 EDGE Features

BFS is one of the simplest graph algorithms to understand and analyze, and it serves as the basis for many more complex algorithms [25]. We walk through different aspects of the EDGE language, building the notation and extensions to Einsums step by step. BFS serves as our primary running example (see § 2), demonstrating how EDGE expresses full graph algorithms. Additionally, when introducing individual language features, we sometimes use simpler tensor algebra expressions (such as GEMM) to isolate and motivate each extension before applying it to BFS. Note that EDGE expressions remain valid regardless of the density or sparsity of the involved tensors. We present the final, complete BFS EDGE specification near the end of this section (BFS Example 11). Overall, EDGE consists of the following features:

- Specifications for user-defined data values and types, as well as empty values (see § 5.1, **design goal 6**)
- Specifications that indicate how a user initializes tensor values (§ 5.1.2, **design goal 6**)
- Specifications for generic user-defined operators (§ 5.2, **design goal 6**), enabled through map and reduce actions, together with a default populate action (§ 5.3, **design goals 2, 5, 6**)
- A separation of merge operations (operations on entities) from compute operations (operations on attributes) (§ 5.4, **design goals 2, 5, 6**)
- Support for iteration and recursion (§ 5.7, **design goals 1, 2, 5, 6**)
- An extended *populate* action for more complex output updates, such as filtering or fiber-level writes (§ 5.8, **design goal 6**)
- Rank variable expressions that enable conditionals and constraints on the iteration space (§ 5.9, **design goal 6**)

5.1 What problem are we solving?

Before specifying the algorithm, we need to understand the problem: what are the inputs and outputs? What do they mean? This concern corresponds to the “data properties” portion of the “workload specifications” in Figures 6 and 7.

BFS Example Part 1: BFS Problem Description

The problem specification (in English) for BFS is:

- Input: An unweighted graph with $|V|$ vertices and $|E|$ edges.
- Input: An initial set of starting vertices, which we call the input *frontier*, along with their starting depths.
- Output: The set of vertices reachable from the input frontier, along with the corresponding depth for each vertex.

5.1.1 Tensor Declarations. We begin by defining the tensors used in a computation. The EDGE language provides a separate specification for the properties of the involved tensors, indicating:

- (1) The input and output tensor names.
- (2) For each tensor, its corresponding *rank names* and *rank shapes*. To distinguish between the *rank names* of a tensor and *accessing* these ranks, we refer to the lower-case subscripts (rank accesses) as *rank variables*. Rank names are indicated by superscripts. In any subsequent Einsum expression, the rank variables refer to accesses to these ranks, which must be listed in the same order as the rank names, regardless of the rank variable names. Since rank names and rank variables can be multi-letter identifiers, we use commas to delineate them in a list of rank names or variables; for example, $G_{sm, dm}$ contains two rank variables, *sm* and *dm*.

- (3) For each tensor, its *data type* and *empty value*. While tensor algebra data is nearly always numerical, graph algorithms use a wider range of data types, including tuple data types and key-value labels used in property graphs [7, 82]. Thus, in EDGE, we allow any user-defined data type beyond the traditional integer, floating-point, and Boolean types used by tensor algebra [54, 77]. EDGE also allows any value (not just zero) to indicate “empty”. Identifying the empty value exposes an optimization opportunity (**design goal 4**), where a sparse tensor can compress away *empty* values instead of only zero values (§ 2.2). This extension is also supported by prior work [18, 27, 44].

We write tensor declarations as $\text{TensorName}^{\text{shape}} \rightarrow \text{datatype}, \text{empty} = \text{value}$, where the arrow ($\rightarrow$) separates the shape specification from the data type and empty-value specification. BFS Example 2 provides an example for BFS.

BFS Example Part 2: BFS Declaration Specification in EDGE

► Tensors

$$G^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer}, \text{empty} = 0 \quad (6a)$$

$$F^{S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer}, \text{empty} = \infty \quad (6b)$$

$$P^{D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean}, \text{empty} = \text{False} \quad (6c)$$

Equation (6) defines three tensors: G (the graph), F (the frontier), and P (the set of visited nodes). Rank S in G has shape $|V|$, meaning it has a coordinate for every vertex in the graph. Likewise, rank D has shape $|V|$. Each possible coordinate in S refers to a source vertex, and each possible coordinate in D refers to a destination vertex. The frontier F and the set of visited nodes P are both 1D tensors, with shapes equal to the number of vertices in the graph.

Although G has *rank names* S and D (indicated by superscripts), we may use different symbols to indicate *rank accesses* (indicated by subscripts in expressions). In the expression $G_{q,r}$ (or equivalently $G_{sm,dm}$, using multi-letter names as described above), the rank variable q accesses G ’s S rank, and the rank variable r accesses its D rank.

Turning to data types and empty values: we assume that $G_{s,d}$ contains a value of 1 whenever an edge exists between vertices s and d , and 0 otherwise. Here, the subscripts s and d indicate *rank accesses*, that is, projections into the G data space to retrieve the value at data point (s, d) .

Tensor F_s represents the active set of source vertices (the “frontier”). The integer value of F at each coordinate s indicates the depth at which BFS discovers the corresponding vertex. At a given coordinate s in F , its *value* is either empty if s is not in the active set, or the corresponding integer depth otherwise. F has an empty value of ∞ for vertices not yet discovered.

Tensor P_d is a Boolean tensor that indicates whether a vertex d has been visited (True) or not (False), with an empty value of False (6c).

The declaration section provides guidance to an underlying compiler on how to cast data types during computation when operands have different data types (**design goal 4**). For example, suppose we declare the output tensor Z in a GEMM computation (Equation (4)) to have a Boolean data type, while the input tensors A and B have integer data types. An underlying compiler can either (1) cast the GEMM computation to Boolean values or (2) optimize the multiplication and reduction steps to use Boolean checks instead. Additionally, EDGE’s explicit declaration section removes ambiguity from the main Einsum expressions with respect to tensor data types, shapes, and empty values (**design goal 5**).

5.1.2 Tensor Initializations. The EDGE language also provides a specification for *initializations*, as shown in BFS Example 3. By default, all tensors are initialized with their empty values. The initialization section indicates which tensors are user-specified, as well as any algorithm-based initializations that must occur. Algorithm-based initializations are themselves expressed as Einsum expressions (see § 7.2).

BFS Example Part 3: BFS Initialization Specification in EDGE

In our BFS example, the initialization specification is:

► Initialization

$$G = \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (7a)$$

$$F_{s:s \in id} = 0 \quad (7b)$$

$$P_{d:d \in id} = \text{True}, \quad (7c)$$

where we assume that *id* is a user-specified list of starting vertices.

In this case, *G* is user-specified. A program based on the EDGE language may allow a user to load a file (such as a Matrix Market file [15]) or construct a graph data structure programmatically.

Expressions (7b) and (7c) are Einsums indicating that only coordinates *s* in *F* and *d* in *P* that are in the *id* list are initialized to non-empty values (initial depth 0 and True for the visited starting nodes, respectively). These Einsum expressions use our extended notation for *conditionals*, which we describe in § 5.9.

5.2 Enabling General Computations

We extend Einsum expressions to support graph algorithms and to expose common graph optimizations to tools in the optimization space (**design goal 4**).

Graph algorithms typically involve mathematical or logical operations beyond traditional multiplication and addition computations; thus, EDGE allows user-defined computation (**design goal 6**), specifically:

- (1) any user-defined Compute between two tensors,
- (2) any user-defined Compute that gathers results into a single value, and
- (3) any user-defined Compute that takes an input expression and places it into an output tensor.

Additionally, tensors can contain any data type and can use any value to indicate emptiness.

Alternative Notes 1: Design Alternatives for Expressing User-Defined Computations

Enforcing Semiring Constraints: One design alternative is to enforce specific algebraic properties on computations. GraphBLAS maps computations to overloaded linear algebra operations described as semirings. A semiring consists of a *monoid* with an associated *identity* value and a *multiply operator* [27, 52].

Scalar addition in matrix multiplication becomes a monoid: a binary operator with an identity value such that applying the operator to any value and the identity returns the value, and that is associative and commutative. Any user-defined Compute overloading addition must satisfy these constraints.

The multiply operator is also binary, taking two input values to produce an output value. The data type of the output value must match the data type of the monoid's identity.

With this approach, users can only express computations that can be cast as semirings. Other computations—e.g., having one tensor be the exponent of another—are not expressible (**design**

goal 10). In EDGE, we allow general user-defined computations, while still preserving the ability to recognize and exploit semiring structure when it is present. Our separation of Merge operations from Compute operations (§ 5.4) also admits expressions beyond semirings. Semiring computations are therefore a *subset* of the computations that our future algebra engine can exploit.

We now incrementally build the EDGE notation. To isolate each extension, we use simple tensor algebra expressions as minimal working examples, starting with GEMM. We return to BFS once the notation is in place (see BFS Example 4).

- (1) First, starting from Equation (4), which explicitly specifies multiplication, we introduce a general *operation label* “.” in the core expression:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n}. \quad (8)$$

The operation label indicates that values accessed from the operands at a given iteration-space point participate in a user-defined Compute.

- (2) In EDGE, we keep the iteration-space structure and the Compute specification distinct. We therefore use a postfix *modifier* (written after “::”) to define the concrete Compute associated with the operation label:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \times. \quad (9)$$

The expression to the left of “::” emphasizes the iteration space and coordinate accesses, while the modifier specifies the compute performed at each relevant point.

Alternative Notes 2: Design Alternatives for Postfix Notation

Valid alternatives to postfix notation include infix and prefix notation. However, we find that both approaches clutter the core Einsum expression. Infix notation makes the Compute explicit between operands but becomes unwieldy as expressions grow more complex.

Postfix notation separates the expression into two conceptual phases:

- (a) Left of “::”: the iteration space and coordinate access variables.
- (b) Right of “::”: the Compute operations performed, as well as any constraints placed on the iteration space (see § 5.4).

Infix notation visually intertwines these phases, while prefix notation places the modifier before the iteration space has been defined.

- (3) Many computations consist of both (i) *pairwise* work at each iteration-space point and (ii) *aggregation* of multiple contributions that target the same output coordinate. In GEMM, for example, we perform K pairwise multiplications for each (m, n) and then aggregate those products by addition. EDGE makes this structure explicit by introducing three actions:
 - (a) a MAP action (denoted $\wedge$) that specifies the pairwise Compute,
 - (b) a REDUCE action (denoted $\vee$) that specifies how multiple contributions are combined, and
 - (c) a POPULATE action that writes reduced results into the output tensor (§ 5.3).

While in GEMM the POPULATE action is simply assignment, naming it as a distinct action allows EDGE to express computations where writing to the output is more involved, such as filtering results based on coordinates or updating an entire fiber rather than a single point (§ 5.8). Concretely, EDGE uses the MAP and REDUCE actions to produce MAP TEMPORARIES and aggregate them into REDUCE TEMPORARIES, while POPULATE materializes the final

output. With this notation, we can express GEMM in EDGE as:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times \bigvee_k +. \quad (10)$$

The subscript on $\bigwedge_k$ indicates that the MAP action combines values sharing the same k coordinate, while $\bigvee_k$ indicates that the REDUCE action aggregates over the k rank. We often drop these subscripts as they are redundant: at a given (m, n, k) point in the iteration space, a pair of values from A and B will always be accessed, and will always share the same k rank coordinate.

In English, we read Equation (10) as follows: “For each (m, n) coordinate in Z , the MAP action multiplies values from A and B with matching k coordinates, the REDUCE action aggregates the resulting products across all k , and the POPULATE action writes the reduced result into Z (here, a simple assignment).”

- (4) Certain computations benefit from skipping ineffectual work, that is, work that would involve empty values. In such cases, only a subset of the iteration space should be traversed, typically due to sparsity in one or more operands. We therefore separate *merge/coordinate* operations, which operate on operand coordinates, from *compute* operations, which operate on operand values. At each iteration-space point, the Merge operation first inspects only the coordinates of the operands to decide whether the iteration-space point is effectual. If it is, the Compute operation processes the corresponding values (returning a computed value); otherwise the point is skipped entirely and the values are never fetched. Precisely specifying Merge operations therefore enables us to avoid ineffectual Compute operations. For MAP actions, Merge operations determine how operand coordinates are paired. For REDUCE actions, Merge operations determine which coordinates contribute to an aggregation. In GEMM, multiplication uses the Merge operation of *intersection* (denoted by $\cap$) [42], meaning that we only consider multiplications where both operands have non-empty values. Addition uses the Merge operation of *union* (denoted by $\cup$) [44], meaning that we add when at least one operand is non-empty. § 5.4 provides further details on the Merge and Compute operators in EDGE. Adding Merge operators yields the following EDGE expression for GEMM:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge \times (\cap) \bigvee + (\cup). \quad (11)$$

- (5) Many graph algorithms are iterative or recursive. Einsums naturally support iteration by introducing a *generational* (also *iterative*) rank for tensors that evolve over time. § 5.7 provides further details on generational ranks. We can express a computation in which the output of one iteration is used as an input to the next, for some number of iterations, as:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{i+1,m,n} &= A_{k,m} \cdot Z_{i,k,n} \\ &:: \bigwedge \times (\cap) \bigvee + (\cup) \\ \diamond : i &\geq 5 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\diamond$ denotes a stopping condition that halts iteration. BFS uses a more meaningful stopping condition (an empty frontier) rather than a fixed iteration count; we return to this in § 5.7.

- (6) Finally, to express operations such as concatenation and conditionals, EDGE allows arbitrary rank-variable expressions that determine how tensors are accessed. For example, the expression

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,f(n)} \quad (13)$$

applies the user-defined function f to the rank variable n before accessing A , enabling patterns such as index remapping and conditional access (see § 5.9).

The remaining subsections formalize these extensions, beginning with the execution model for map, reduce, and populate in § 5.3.

5.3 Extension: Map, Reduce, and Populate Actions

Every Einsum expression consists of a combination of one or more patterns:

- (1) shared indices that appear in multiple input tensors (e.g., k in Equation (11)),
- (2) indices that appear in one or more input tensors but not the output tensor (e.g., k in Equation (11)),
- (3) indices that appear both in the input and the output (e.g., m and n in Equation (11)), and
- (4) indices that appear in the output tensor but in none of the input tensors (e.g., p in the expression $Z_{m,p} = A_m$ (14)).

In conventional Einstein notation (as commonly used in tensor algebra), these patterns are typically paired with fixed operators: pattern 1 indicates multiplication on the corresponding values (or an overloaded multiplication), pattern 2 indicates reduction (via overloaded addition) over the corresponding values, pattern 3 indicates assignment to the output tensor, and pattern 4 indicates repetition (where each value in A_m is repeated n times for a given m for Equation (14)).

Traditional Einsums conflate the patterns of computation with the actual computation operators. Separating computations into MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE actions allows EDGE to factor a wide range of user-defined behavior into a small number of recurring *patterns*. Each action operates over different kinds of objects: MAP combines pairs of operand values, REDUCE combines a set (or stream) of intermediate values into one value per output coordinate, and POPULATE materializes results by writing, deleting, or leaving unchanged elements within output fibers. This separation exposes optimization opportunities (**design goal 4**), since an implementation can optimize the common *pattern* independently of the user-defined operators. For example, a hardware designer may implement each of these actions as hardware primitives—where reduce is mapped to a reduction tree, map to a merger network, etc.—or even combine all three actions into a single network to reduce area overhead [66].

5.3.1 The MAP Action. MAP operates over operand values accessed at iteration-space points. We denote *map* actions with $\wedge$. Each MAP action is associated with a specific operation label ($\cdot$), and the corresponding Compute operator appears in the modifier following that action. When multiple operation labels appear in an expression, EDGE distinguishes them using superscripts.

Operationally, each application of a MAP action at a given iteration-space point produces a *map temporary* (MAP TEMPORARY). A MAP TEMPORARY represents the result of applying the map compute operator to the operand values accessed at that iteration-space point. These MAP TEMPORARIES are consumed by subsequent REDUCE actions (and, ultimately, by POPULATE), but we defer the formal definition to § 6.

For example, we describe element-wise multiplication across three vectors as:

$$Z_m = (A_m \cdot^1 B_m)_m \cdot^2 C_m :: \bigwedge^1 \times \bigwedge^2 \times, \quad (15)$$

where $\wedge^1$ refers to a MAP action between A and B for operation label 1 (that is, $\cdot^1$), and $\wedge^2$ refers to a MAP action between the result of the first expression and C for operation label 2.

The parenthesized subexpression produces an *anonymous tensor* with rank shape M and rank variable m , as indicated by the subscript on the parentheses. Intuitively, this anonymous tensor

corresponds to the collection of MAP TEMPORARIES produced by $\bigwedge^1$ at each m point, which then serve as the left operand to $\bigwedge^2$.

We require two MAP actions in this example because, for now, EDGE enforces that each MAP action operates on exactly two operands (see Inset 4). Likewise, EDGE expressions will always contain two input tensors and one output tensor, hence the need for *anonymous* tensors.

Programming Model for Map: As an implementation walks the iteration space, the map action indicates which regions of the data spaces of two operands to combine. For each point in the iteration space, the Einsum indicates the data space accesses. The implementation applies the map compute operator to the accessed values and emits the resulting MAP TEMPORARY. For example, given a map action of $\bigwedge^1 \times$, we read the expression as: “for a given point in the iteration space, multiply the corresponding data values for the two operands of operation label 1, producing a MAP TEMPORARY.”

Likewise, for a map action of $\bigwedge^4 +$, we read the expression as: “for a given point in the iteration space, add the corresponding data values for the two operands of operation label 4, producing a MAP TEMPORARY.”

Example 1: Element-Wise Addition

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge +, \quad (16)$$

Following the operational definition of an Einsum, an implementation will walk the $M \times N$ iteration space. For each (m, n) point, the implementation projects into the data space and accesses the corresponding data values in A and B . The data values correspond to the same (m, n) point in both A and B , thus, since the *map* action is also on each (m, n) point, the implementation combines the two accessed values through addition (+).

Example 2: Outer Product

The following Einsum—with EDGE extensions—expresses the outer product of two vectors:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_m \cdot B_n :: \bigwedge \times \quad (17a)$$

$$(17b)$$

Read the expression as: “For each (m, n) point in the iteration space, multiply the corresponding data values and place them in the (m, n) location in Z .”

```

1 for k in range(0, K):
2     for m in range(0, M):
3         Z[m] = min(Z[m], A[m, k])
4
5 # Another mapping option
6 for m in range(0, M):
7     for k in range(0, K):
8         Z[m] = min(Z[m], A[m, k])

```

Fig. 9. Two example loop nests for Equation (18).

5.3.2 The REDUCE Action. In the operational definition of a traditional Einsum, when an output point already contains a value, the Einsum will *reduce* the value there with the computed value on the right-hand side (RHS) of the Einsum. Thus, REDUCE combines values that correspond to the same output point into a single result.

We denote REDUCE actions with $\bigvee$. A Compute operator must follow a reduce action—that is, the computation applies to the REDUCE action. Additionally, each REDUCE action pertains to a tensor on the RHS of the

Einsum: either a single input tensor or the implicit, partial tensor created by an operation label ($\cdot$) expression (the MAP TEMPORARY). The compute operation for REDUCE must be binary.

Programming Model for REDUCE: Conceptually, the REDUCE action consumes the stream of MAP TEMPORARIES produced by MAP and incrementally combines them into a single value per output coordinate. For each MAP TEMPORARY, REDUCE identifies the corresponding output coordinate and merges the incoming value with the current reduction state using the specified Merge and Compute operators.

Operationally, this can be viewed as a fold over the set of MAP TEMPORARIES associated with a given output coordinate. Each MAP TEMPORARY contributes at most one update to the reduction state, and the final reduced value is obtained once all relevant MAP TEMPORARIES have been processed. The final reduction state is a REDUCE TEMPORARY. There are as many reduction states as there are output locations.

Because REDUCE operates over MAP TEMPORARIES rather than directly over tensor operands, all MAP actions that produce MAP TEMPORARIES for a given iteration-space point must logically occur before the corresponding REDUCE update for that point. However, there are no ordering constraints across different iteration-space points (see the two mapping choices in Example 3). As a result, an implementation may freely interleave MAP and REDUCE actions across iteration-space points, enabling pipelined, streaming, or parallel execution.

Example 3: Single Operand Reduction

Suppose we want to reduce the k rank of a tensor by selecting the minimum value across k :

$$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \bigvee \min. \quad (18a)$$

As execution walks the iteration space ($M \times K$), it produces a stream of *map temporaries* (here, the RHS value $A_{m,k}$ at each (m, k) point) and incrementally combines them into a *reduction temporary* (REDUCE TEMPORARY) per output coordinate m .

Concretely, for each (m, k) point, REDUCE updates the current reduction state for m by applying min to the incoming value $A_{m,k}$ and the current reduction state for m . After all relevant k values for a fixed m have been processed, the resulting REDUCE TEMPORARY holds the minimum value for that m coordinate. Finally, POPULATE (§ 5.3.3) materializes Z by writing the REDUCE TEMPORARY value into the corresponding output coordinate Z_m .

An *implementation* may choose different loop orders (mapping choices) for iterating $M \times K$. For example, iterating $m \rightarrow k$ fixes m and streams all k values for that m through the reduction state before moving to the next m . Iterating $k \rightarrow m$ instead fixes k and streams all m coordinates, updating each m reduction state as it goes. Both produce the same final REDUCE TEMPORARY values (and thus the same materialized Z) as long as the implementation processes the same set of iteration-space points and applies min consistently. Figure 9 shows two such loop nests.

Note that these are just two possible implementations for the reduction; if, for instance, a particular compute operator for reduction is associative, then an implementation may choose to use a reduction tree or other parallel methods to execute the reduce action.

Example 4: Reduction on a Compute Label

Suppose we have an expression that performs GEMM on two tensors A and B , then does an element-wise addition with a third tensor, C .

$$Z_{m,n} = (A_{k,m} \cdot^1 B_{k,n})_{m,n} \cdot^2 C_{m,n} :: \bigwedge^1 \times \bigvee^1 + \bigwedge^2 + \quad (19)$$

Here, the REDUCE action applies to the implicit, temporary *anonymous tensor* created by the first operation label ($\cdot^1$). Thus, *for a given point in the iteration space*, an implementation must apply the MAP action first (multiplication between two data values), before applying the REDUCE action. Note that this is the only constraint. The implementation may choose to create an entire $M \times N \times K$ partial tensor resulting from the MAP action on operation label 1, then reduce the k rank before applying the second operation label (element-wise addition with C , $\cdot^2$). Alternatively, an implementation may choose to process the entire Einsum point-by-point, multiplying two data values in A and B and adding the result to the current value in C 's (m, n) location. Note that since the second operation label is addition, the addition with C can only occur once.

In general, for a given tensor (explicit or anonymous), REDUCE actions are applied in order of their appearance in the EDGE expression. Note that algebraic manipulations to the expression (see Figure 5 and § 9) may change the order depending on whether the Compute operators for the REDUCE actions are commutative.

Example 5: Order of Operations with Multiple Reduce Actions

A given operation label ($\cdot$) in an EDGE expression *can only have ONE REDUCE action*. For example, to reduce over two different ranks with different compute operators, the expression must be split into two Einsums (a *cascade* of Einsums [68], which represents a DAG of individual Einsums):

$$T_{p,k} = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee \times \quad (20a)$$

$$Z_p = T_{p,k} :: \bigvee + \quad (20b)$$

At a given (p, j, k) point in the iteration space, the Einsum reduces into $T_{p,k}$ using the Compute operator of multiplication (Equation (20a)). The Einsum can then reduce into Z_p through addition (Z_p , Equation (20b)). Note that an implementation may also choose to fully create the first temporary tensor, T , before Z , instead of processing them point-by-point.

Example 6: Reading a Reduce Action

Suppose we want to reduce a tensor over two ranks, using addition.

We specify the computation by indicating a single reduce action over both j and k :

$$Z_p = A_{p,j,k} :: \bigvee + \quad (21a)$$

We read the reduce action as follows: For a given p region of the iteration space, gather all data values in the data space corresponding to all the possible j and k coordinates. Add the data values together and place in their corresponding p location in the Z tensor. More precisely, at a given point in the iteration space, add the RHS value ($A_{p,j,k}$) to the current value in the REDUCE state.

5.3.3 The Default POPULATE Action. POPULATE is the act of materializing (or *populating*) the output tensor with values. For a given point in the iteration space, the default populate action takes the currently computed value—the REDUCE TEMPORARY, determined by the RHS of the Einsum—and

places it at the corresponding data point of the output element. Note that the Einsum notation separates the LHS and the RHS of the Einsum by an assignment symbol ($=$). Thus, the default POPULATE operation is simply assignment ($=$). *Assignment* assumes the initial state of the output tensor is entirely filled with empty values. After fully computing the Einsum expression, *assignment* (or the default POPULATE action) replaces the output tensor with the computed values. This maps to pattern 3 in § 5.2.

Example 7: Assignment as the Default Populate Action

As an example, suppose we have the following Einsum:

$$Z_m = A_m \cdot B_m \quad (22)$$

The assignment to Z indicates that the computation on the RHS completely fills (“populates”) the corresponding m rank of the output. This assignment exists in every expression: every Einsum consists of an output tensor that the Einsum populates with the computation indicated on the RHS.

Pattern 4 in § 5.2 highlights the situation where an output tensor may have a rank that does not appear in any of the input tensors. Suppose the shape of that rank is N . In such a scenario, the Einsum *broadcasts* or copies the computed value on the RHS to the corresponding output rank N times. Again, a simple assignment symbol ($=$) is enough to represent this pattern.

Example 8: Broadcast and the Default Populate Action

Equation (23) shows an example:

$$Z_{m,p} = A_m \cdot B_m \quad (23)$$

Following the operational definition of an Einsum, each point m, p in the iteration space computes a value on the RHS and places it at the corresponding m, p location in Z . But note that no input on the RHS has a p rank. Recall that the REDUCE action contains as many states (or REDUCE TEMPORARIES) as the shape of the output tensor. This creates $M \times P$ REDUCE TEMPORARIES. An EDGE interpreter may choose to repeat the MAP computation P times, or simply *broadcast* a given MAP to the P reduction states. POPULATE then copies each (m, p) REDUCE TEMPORARY to the corresponding Z location.

Every Einsum has a default POPULATE action, implied by the assignment symbol ($=$), where non-empty coordinates appearing on the right-hand side are copied to the matching rank on the left-hand side. If coordinates on one side do not appear on the other side, then a reduction or broadcast *must* occur (see § 5.3, points 2 and 4). Several problems need more complex populate operators, where the Einsum fills (populates) only the elements in the output tensor that satisfy a user-defined function, leaving the other elements unchanged. We discuss this further in § 5.8.

5.3.4 Combining Actions. Overall, EDGE factors user-defined functions into three classes of actions: MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE. For a given point in the iteration space, the order of actions is as follows: for a given operation label, process (1) map actions, then (2) reduce actions, then (3) populate actions. This order must be maintained for a point in the iteration space.

Alternative Notes 3: Design Alternatives for Expressing Common Computational Patterns: GraphBLAS

GraphBLAS [27, 52]: GraphBLAS provides two categories of primitives. First, a set of *operators* used within expressions:

- (1) overloaded multiplication, denoted $\otimes$,
- (2) overloaded addition, denoted $\oplus$,
- (3) the accumulation operator, denoted $\odot$ (overloaded element-wise “update” operator),
- (4) the mask operator, denoted $\langle M \rangle$, which the GraphBLAS machinery applies to the output as: $Z \langle M \rangle$, and
- (5) any user-defined unary operator.

Second, a set of *operations* applied to tensors:

- (1) *extract*, which assigns an output vector/matrix to a subset of the input vector/matrix,
- (2) *assign*, which assigns a subset of the output vector/matrix to the input vector/matrix, and
- (3) *transpose*, which transposes a vector/matrix.

GraphBLAS further groups some of these operators into a *semiring*, which consists of:

- (1) the monoid: an identity value and the overloaded addition ($\oplus$) operator for reduction, and
- (2) the multiply operator: the overloaded multiplication operator ($\otimes$)

In EDGE, both overloaded multiplication and addition are simply user-defined functions that a specification applies to map or reduce actions. Likewise, the GraphBLAS mask operator, which applies a mask on the RHS computation, is simply a specific instantiation of map, ($\wedge$) in EDGE.

For example, to mask the GEMM output using a mask tensor M , we can write the following EDGE specification:

$$Z_{m,n} = (A_{k,m} \cdot^1 B_{k,n})_{m,n} \cdot^2 M_{m,n} :: \bigwedge^1 \times \bigvee^1 + \bigwedge^2 \times, \quad (24)$$

where the map operation on operation label 2 essentially masks the GEMM computation from operation label 1. EDGE does not need a separate class of computations to specify this!

Likewise, the GraphBLAS semiring is a specific instantiation of a combination of map and reduce actions: specifically, the GraphBLAS semiring ($\oplus, \otimes, I$) will always correspond to the following EDGE specification pattern:

$$Z_{Z_r} = A_{A_r} \cdot B_{B_r} :: \bigwedge \otimes (\cap) \bigvee \oplus (\cup), \quad (25)$$

where Z_r, A_r, B_r correspond to the rank variables of Z, A , and B , respectively.

The GraphBLAS accumulation operator, which updates an output tensor instead of entirely replacing it, maps to a combination of applying an iterative rank to the Einsum expression (see § 5.7) and a compute operation between the old version of the output tensor and the computation that will update the tensor (see § 5.7).

EDGE naturally expresses other GraphBLAS operators—including *extract*, *assign*, and *transpose*—as rank expressions that may constrain the iteration space (see § 5.9).

Alternative Notes 4: Design Alternatives for Expressing Common Computational Patterns: Allow Any Pattern

Sparse Array Programming Model: The sparse array programming model, proposed by Henry et al. [44], allows for generalized functions that must explicitly define the iteration space. There

are no “classes” of operations; instead, in the most general case, a specification will contain user-defined functions that take as input any number of *scalar* inputs and produce a scalar output. The compiler then applies these scalar functions to the tensors indicated by the corresponding Einsum expression. The model implicitly maps compute functions to “element-wise operations, reductions, and broadcasts” [44] through the index notation (see § 5.3). EDGE can represent all of these patterns (see § 5.3).

Additionally, the array programming model goes beyond unary and binary operators to allow for any n -ary operator. For example, an n -ary operator may take in n inputs, and always select the fifth input. In EDGE, every compute operator is a binary operator. We maintain this invariant to make it easier for algebraic manipulation—such as commuting variables, distributing computations, etc.—in a system that uses EDGE to find other algorithmic variants of a problem (see Figure 5 and § 9, and goal 5).

BFS Example Part 4: Gather Neighbors of a Frontier

A key step in BFS, and many other graph algorithms, is gathering the neighbors of a set of query vertices. Assuming the default multiplication/addition compute operators for now, in addition to the tensor declarations in Equations (6) and (7), we can describe this phase in EDGE as:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge \times \bigvee + \quad (26)$$

This Einsum specifies an $S \times D$ iteration space. For each (s, d) point in the iteration space, the execution will project into the data space and retrieve the edge weight of edge (s, d) from G , as well as the current depth of vertex s from F (data value of F). We will call the depth of vertex s the “vertex weight” in future examples. If the current depth of s is non-empty (i.e., it is not ∞ —see BFS Example 2), then each (s, d) edge in G for this given s connects that s vertex to a d vertex. That is, the set of all d coordinates for all (s, d) points in G —where s is fixed—is the set of all neighbors of the s vertex. Execution will multiply the two values from G and F , and place the value in the corresponding d coordinate in the output frontier tensor, $F1$. The result is an integer value indicating the depth at which computation found the d vertex.

If multiple s coordinates in the frontier connect to the same d coordinate in G , then the Einsum in Equation (26) will reduce the values through addition. In this particular example, the reduced values have no meaning, other than indicating the total number of parents/paths to each d vertex. BFS Example 6 replaces this operation with $\min$, which simply indicates there is a path from s to d . In graph terms, if multiple s vertices in the frontier share the same destination vertex (d coordinate in G), execution will reduce the computed values and store the reduced value at the d vertex location for the output frontier ($F1$).

5.4 Extension: Separating Out Merge From Compute

Most algorithms for graphs view edges and vertices as graph *entities* that have associated *attributes* [25, Chapter 22.1]. A graph entity refers to the components that make up a graph: either an edge or a vertex. Each graph entity has an ID (see § 2.1). For example, the graph in Figure 3 contains vertices A to G (or when numerically labeled, vertices 0–6), and ten edges with IDs 0–9. An *attribute* describes a particular property of an entity. For example, each vertex or edge may have an associated weight vector (common in road networks or graph neural networks).

BFS Example Part 5: Entities and Attributes in BFS

In BFS, each vertex has an attribute that changes throughout the course of the algorithm: its discovery depth. Aside from the query node, each vertex begins with a starting depth attribute of ∞ , and ends with a final value of its minimum distance from the query node(s).

The $\times$ computation for the map action in Equation (26) does not make sense in this scenario; for BFS, we need to set the depth of a destination vertex to the depth of its parent plus one (the default edge weight that connects that parent to the destination vertex). We can reformulate the EDGE expression for the gather step as follows:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge + \bigvee \min, \quad (27)$$

where, for a given (s, d) point in the iteration space, the corresponding data values in G and F are *added* together to generate a new depth value for that (s, d) point. When multiple parent vertices (s coordinates) share the same destination (d coordinates), we can reduce over s by selecting the minimum calculated depth for d across all s coordinates ($\min$ operation). In graph terms, given a destination vertex d , and new depth counts between that destination vertex and each of its parent s vertices, we select and store the minimum depth.

Overall, in the EDGE formulation of BFS found in Equation (27), the s and d coordinate values identify a vertex *entity*. Edge entities in this formulation consist of (s, d) tuples in G . If we number each element in the list of all non-empty (s, d) tuples in G , then we can obtain the original edge IDs of 0–9 found in Figure 3.

We revisit this expression with merge operators in BFS Example 6.

The promise of any sparse computation is that it need not touch every point in the iteration space. For example, in element-wise multiplication between two sparse vectors, an efficient implementation will only access data values that exist in *both* vectors. (If we know a value does not exist in either vector, then we know the result of the multiplication will be zero, and thus we need not perform the multiplication.) By *intersecting* the coordinates to determine the pairs that contain non-empty values in both tensors, an implementation can determine the subset of the possible data values that will result in a meaningful product [42], while avoiding ineffectual values. When tensors are tiled or multidimensional, implementations can employ *hierarchical* intersection, which eliminates unnecessary accesses to larger regions of the data space [42].

Additionally, certain operations require only touching the entities and not the data values. For example, simply gathering the neighbors of the set of vertices in F (see BFS Example 5) does not actually require processing their data values. It simply requires access to the shared non-zero s coordinates in both G and F , to determine which d coordinates (neighbors) exist in G for a given s coordinate (parent) in F . In general, we can make our computations more efficient by (1) only accessing entities when necessary, and when accessing entities *is* necessary, by (2) not accessing data values unless that is also necessary.

Let us take a closer look at the execution of Equation (27). It requires two steps: (1) gather neighbors of parent vertices (s coordinates in F) by walking the iteration space and projecting into the data space, then (2) compute on the retrieved data values. In EDGE, we generalize these two steps into two types of operators: (1) the *merge* operator and (2) the *compute* operator. We explain each below.

Earlier, we stated that every map and reduce action must be followed by a compute operator (see Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.2). We now expand this: every map and reduce action consists of a

merge operator (Merge) and a *compute operator* (Compute), denoted by $[\wedge \mid \vee] < \text{Compute} > (< \text{Merge} >)$.

5.4.1 What is compute? **Compute operators** process computations on *data values* after an implementation projects into the data space. For MAP actions, the Compute operator operates on a pair of data values at a given point in the iteration space. For REDUCE actions, at a given point in the iteration space, compute takes as input the current REDUCE state, and the current *computed* value on the RHS of the Einsum (the MAP TEMPORARY) to generate a single value. The user must specify an *identity* value for each Compute operator. EDGE allows any user-defined compute operator that meets these constraints.

5.4.2 What is Merge? **Merge operators** process rank variables, culling which points an implementation needs to touch in the iteration space. Without the merge operator, the EDGE expression becomes a traditional tensor expression, where execution traverses the entire iteration space. However, by separating out merge from compute, EDGE enforces “lazy” computation, where an implementation accesses data values only if the corresponding iteration-space point indicates that the data value is non-empty. This information (empty vs. non-empty points) is usually present in the metadata of a tensor [42, 73].

EDGE applies Merge to a specified operation label. At a given point in the iteration space, merge takes as input whether the corresponding tensor coordinates exist in the left-hand operand and whether the corresponding coordinates exist in the right-hand operand. Given these inputs, Merge determines if the output coordinate will exist, and what the coordinate will be. For example, given a map action over rank k ($\wedge$) at a given point in the iteration space, the merge operator for this map action will check if the corresponding k coordinate is empty or non-empty in both operand tensors, then using that merge operator, decide if the output will contain that k coordinate. If the output contains the k coordinate, then the EDGE machinery will apply Compute to the corresponding data values of the input operands.

An example merge operator is intersection ($\cap$), which need only touch points in the iteration space where a non-empty value exists for *both* operands. Another merge operator, union ($\cup$), need only touch points where *at least one* of the operands is non-empty. Overall, there are sixteen possible merge operators, which correspond to the sixteen truth tables possible given a binary operator that checks whether a given point contains an empty value or not in both operands. Appendix A lists the sixteen possible merge operators.

BFS Example Part 6: Intersection in the Gather Step

Note that if G or F is sparse in Equation (27), there is no need to walk the entire iteration space. For example, if the frontier (F_s) contains a single vertex in its rank s , our operational definition of an Einsum states that evaluating an operation that involves F_s will walk every s point in the iteration space. However, an ideal, optimized implementation would only touch the points in the s rank that are present in both F and G .

Let us expand Equation (27) to include merge operators:

$$F1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup), \quad (28)$$

Now, the map action performs an intersection ($\cap$) on the s indices of G and F , then applies the $+$ compute operator to the values that survive intersection ($\bigwedge_s +(\cap)$). In graph terms, we only compute the sum of vertex weight plus edge weight if the source vertex is in the frontier *and* it is connected to the destination vertex by an edge. If F contains a single vertex, then an intersection

merge operator would allow computation with the single-vertex frontier described above to only visit one point in the s rank (one vertex in the graph G) rather than all points (all vertices).

The reduce action looks at all the non-empty s points ($\cup$), and applies the min operator to their values.

Alternative Notes 5: Design Alternatives for Merge

In EDGE, we explicitly choose to input two Booleans for each point in the iteration space, where the Boolean corresponds to whether a coordinate exists or not (see truth tables in Appendix A). These Booleans come from attributes rather than data values.

A design alternative is to consider more complex inputs to determine how to cull the iteration space. For example, the sparse array programming model [44] allows the equivalent of multi-operand merge operators by allowing the program specifier to indicate specific points at which to cull the iteration space. However, in keeping with **design goal 5**, and noting our earlier constraint that all operation labels are binary (see § 5.2), EDGE maintains that merge operators (at a given data point) are also binary. Additionally, enabling non-binary merge operators would allow EDGE to support non-binary reduce operators (see Inset 3 and 4); however, we find that we have not lost expressivity by constraining our operators to be binary (**design goal 6**). Thus, our merge operators are both simple and effective.

5.4.3 Understanding Merge and Compute Operators. For graph algorithms, merge operators tend to correspond to operations on graph entities, while compute operators correspond to operations on attributes. EDGE *parameterizes* the compute operator by a merge operator.

One can view the merge operator in three ways:

- (1) The merge operator is necessary to fully *define* the desired compute operation. For example, consider the unconventional “take-left” compute operator ($\leftarrow$), which, given two non-empty operands, selects the first, left-hand operand. However, suppose we want this computation to return an empty value if either operand is non-empty. To fully define this operation, a specifier needs to include the intersection ($\cap$) merge operator: $\wedge \leftarrow (\cap)$.
- (2) The merge operator gives additional information about the compute operator. Merge tells one whether there is actual work to be done given particular values that are being given to the compute operator, i.e., is the operation *effectual* (resulting in non-empty values) or *ineffectual*? This information is often clear and implied by the normal use of the compute operation; for example, multiplication has an intersection ($\cap$) merge operator because multiplication by an empty value of zero is ineffectual.
- (3) There are cases where one cannot infer the merge operation from the nominal compute operation. For example, traditional addition uses the union ($\cup$) merge operator, which needs at least one operand to be non-zero. However, suppose a computation requires addition that adds two values *only* when both operands are non-zero. In this scenario, the program specifier will write an addition operation with an intersection merge operator: $\wedge + (\cap)$ (see Equation (28)). Here, specifying only the addition operator does not provide enough information to allow a compiler to generate the most efficient computation.

Now, the operational definition of an Einsum needs the precise definition of the merge operation, the compute operation, and their outputs to fully specify computations on the iteration space and the data space.

5.5 Unary Operators

EDGE allows a programmer to specify any user-defined unary function. A unary operation takes as input a data value and transforms it in some way. When applied to a tensor, the unary function individually transforms each element in the tensor, without consideration of the other elements in the tensor.

Unary functions are *syntactic sugar* for a degenerate MAP: every unary function on some tensor A decomposes into an Einsum with input tensors A and B , where $B = 1$. The MAP action uses a “take-left” ($\leftarrow$) Merge operator to select the A tensor at every point in the iteration space. The Compute operator is simply the unary operator.

Example 9: Applying Unary Functions

A unary function transforms each element of a tensor. For example, if we assume B is a Boolean tensor, the following expression performs an element-wise AND between A and the complement of B ($\neg B$).

$$Z_m = A_m \cdot \neg B_m :: \bigwedge \text{AND} \quad (29)$$

Here, for each m point in the iteration space, an implementation will project into the data space and access the corresponding data values in A and B . For B , the unary function $\neg$ will return the complement of the current value at that m point.

The above EDGE expression is syntactic sugar for the following:

$$Z_m = A_m \cdot^1 (B_m \cdot^2 1)_m :: \bigwedge^1 \text{AND} \bigwedge^2 \neg(\leftarrow) \quad (30)$$

5.6 Execution Model of an EDGE Einsum

We are now ready to specify how to execute an EDGE Einsum that contains MAP/REDUCE actions (which, in turn, contain Merge/Compute operators). § 6 will further define the semantics.

We begin by walking the iteration space specified by the rank variables in the expression.

- (1) At **each point in that space**, process each specified operation label in the expression:
 - (a) **Map:** Apply all MAP actions first, where, for each MAP action:
 - (i) If specified, process the Merge. Only “touch” points in the iteration space that survive Merge. If the current iteration-space point does not survive Merge, immediately exit and move to the next point in the iteration space. Overall, a failed Merge will abort the entire iteration-space point.
 - (ii) If the current iteration-space point survives Merge, then project into the data space and apply Compute to the corresponding data values. Note that a performant implementation may combine the coordinate check in Merge with the data access. The execution model here describes the logical order of operations rather than a prescribed implementation.

Each MAP action for a given point in the iteration space produces a MAP TEMPORARY, consisting of the iteration space tuple and the computed value.

- (b) **Reduce:** Apply REDUCE:
 - (i) Create as many REDUCE states as the shape of the output tensor. At a given point in the iteration space, each state is indexed by a coordinate from the LHS.
 - (ii) If specified, process Merge (see the MAP action).

- (iii) If a point survives Merge, reduce the corresponding data value on the RHS (the MAP TEMPORARY value) with the current, corresponding state. If the current state is *empty*, use the Compute operator's identity value.

The final, reduced state is a REDUCE TEMPORARY, which consists of the output coordinate and the reduced value.

- (2) **Populate:** Populate the corresponding point in the output tensor. By default, this is simple assignment; see § 5.8 for the extended form.

Example 10: Merge and Compute in GEMM

Let us return to the GEMM example:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge \times(\cap) \bigvee +(\cup), \quad (31)$$

We walk each (m, n, k) point in the $M \times N \times K$ iteration space. Note that the *order* in which we walk this space will be determined by the mapping (not discussed in this work, see TeAAL [68]). At each point, we will first apply MAP. The intersection merge operator $(\cap)$ evaluates whether the k coordinate is non-empty in both A and B for the given (m, n, k) point. If the k coordinate is non-empty, we can then apply the compute operator of multiplication $(\times)$ between A at data point (m, k) and B at data point (n, k) . This computation will produce a MAP TEMPORARY at iteration point (m, n, k) .

For all the generated MAP TEMPORARIES, we need to reduce them with the specified REDUCE action. For a given (m, n, k) point in the iteration space, we update the corresponding (m, n) REDUCE state, applying the REDUCE action to the current MAP TEMPORARY value and the current (m, n) REDUCE state.

Note that the Einsum does not actually specify the overall order in which to walk the iteration space; it only specifies the order of operations when looking at a specific *point* in the iteration space. Thus, an implementation may first apply the MAP action to *all* points in the iteration space, producing a MAP TEMPORARY tensor of shape $M \times N \times K$, before reducing over the K rank of that tensor. An implementation may also choose to instead incrementally multiply and reduce data values at each point in the iteration space.

Additionally, although we described Merge and Compute as point-by-point steps, an implementation may even choose to apply a Merge operation to all iteration-space points first, before applying the Compute operator. For example, an implementation of the GEMM expression above may first intersect the *entire* k rank of A and B by gathering all non-empty coordinates of A and B , performing a set intersection between them, and producing an output stream of k coordinates that are shared by both A and B . Now, execution need only access regions of the $M \times N \times K$ space that contain k coordinates that survived intersection.

Example 11: Merge in Multi-Rank Map Actions

Let us add an intersection merge operator to the outer product example:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_m \cdot B_n :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times(\cap) \quad (32)$$

At any given point in the iteration space, computation will proceed only if the corresponding m and n coordinates in A and B , respectively, both contain non-empty values. The addition of this merge operator allows an implementation to decide whether to perform the computation or not based only on information from graph entities, potentially reducing references into their attributes.

BFS Example Part 7: Describing One Iteration of BFS in EDGE

We now have all the notational tools to fully express the *first iteration* of BFS in EDGE:

► Extended Einsum

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (33a)$$

$$F1_d = T_d \cdot \neg P_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (33b)$$

$$P1_d = P_d \cdot F1_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (33c)$$

We can describe each step from the “graph world” perspective and from the Einsum perspective:

- (1) **Graph View:** Equation (33a) gathers the neighbors of vertices in the frontier (F), updates the depth of each discovered neighbor by one, and removes any duplicate depths for the same neighbor by selecting the minimum depth.

Einsum View: Equation (33a) creates an $S \times D$ iteration space. We intersect F and G on s . That is, we only project into the data space when F and G both contain non-empty s coordinates (i.e., F has one or more query vertices and those vertices exist as parent vertices in G). After projecting into the data space, we add the current depth in F at coordinate s to the edge weight in G at point (s, d) . We place the resulting value at coordinate d in the output tensor, reducing using the min operator when multiple depth values for d exist (due to multiple non-empty s coordinates in F connecting to the same d coordinate in G). T_d contains the temporary results of this step, where each non-empty d vertex/coordinate has a data value equal to one more than the data value of its parent in F .

- (2) **Graph View:** Equation (33b) takes the gathered neighbors and filters out neighbors that have already been visited, i.e., neighbors that appear in P . This produces a new output frontier, $F1_d$.

Einsum View: In Einsum terms, we apply the unary complement operator ($\neg$) to P , such that accessing the Boolean data value of P at point d returns the complement of that value. In fact, we can interpret the entire expression of $\neg P_d$ as a tensor whose values are the complement of P . For this Einsum, we only project into the data space when both T and $\neg P$ contain non-empty values (intersection merge operator). Once in the data space, we apply the special, “take-left” compute operator, which selects the data value of the first operand as the output value.

- (3) **Graph View:** Finally, Equation (33c) updates the set of visited nodes and places this update in a new tensor $P1_d$.

Einsum View: At each d point in the iteration space, if either P or the new frontier, $F1$, is non-empty (union merge operator— $\cup$), project into the data space. The compute operator is the Boolean OR function; since the output is Boolean, the Einsum machinery enforces that the integer value at $F1_d$ (see BFS Example 2) will be cast to a Boolean value of True when a non-empty value exists, and False, otherwise. Thus, the final output tensor, $P1$, will contain non-empty values (i.e., no False values) at d locations where P was non-empty as well as where $F1$ is non-empty. That is, $P1$ is an updated copy of P , with new values from the new frontier.

Alternative Notes 6: Design Alternatives for Merge vs. Compute

Linear algebra tools that support graph algorithms tend to conflate computations on graph entities with computations on graph attributes. For example, GraphBLAS represents the “gather” step of BFS—which gathers the neighbors of vertices in a frontier—as a single, bulk step of matrix-vector multiplication between the adjacency matrix of the graph G and the vector frontier, F . EDGE essentially factors this into two components: first gather the neighboring vertices of parents in the frontier (operating on *entities*), then update the *values* or attributes of those neighbors.

We now present three more cases where the design alternative of conflating merge with compute does not suffice.

Case 1: Matrix-vector multiplication is simply a series of dot-products between the columns of G and the vector frontier. In GraphBLAS, the semiring for BFS uses min for reduction, $+$ (addition) for multiplication, and a “zero value”—which is GraphBLAS’ equivalent of EDGE’s empty value—of ∞ [52]. In EDGE, merge operators simply take as input whether the coordinates of a rank are empty or not in either tensor operand. This enables an EDGE implementation to potentially optimize computation by removing ineffectual computations, looking only at the coordinates before processing data values. However, in GraphBLAS, this optimization is not as obvious. Optimizations are fully at the mercy of the underlying data format: an uncompressed format for G and F would result in a GraphBLAS implementation accessing each element of a given column in G and each element of F , regardless of whether or not the computation will be effectual. Meanwhile, a CSR data format for G that uses s as the rows enables a GraphBLAS implementation to skip any d vertices (column coordinates in CSR) that are not present in the CSR representation. In EDGE, we are explicitly telling the compiler “find a way to track when coordinates exist, and leverage the existence of coordinates to cull the iteration space”. A compiler can then choose to select the appropriate data format and optimization strategy based on the optimization opportunity the EDGE expression exposes (**design goal 4**).

Case 2: Additionally, note that G ’s empty value is 0, while F ’s empty value is infinity (∞) (see BFS Example 2). Consider the expression for the “gather” step, which intersects the s coordinates of G and F for the map action, repeated here:

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (34)$$

Suppose we replace the intersection with union:

$$T_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (35)$$

In the first example, the intersection operator enforces that projection into the data space occurs only when an s coordinate is present both in F (with non-infinity values) and in G (with non-zero values). For the second example, the *union* ($\cup$) operator now enforces that projection into the data space occurs when at least one of the operands is non-empty at a given s coordinate. In many instances of BFS, the s rank of G will be dense—that is, nearly every vertex in the graph has neighbors (and thus is a parent). Now, an implementation walking the iteration space will project into the data space for nearly every s coordinate—regardless of the sparsity of F . Thus, the EDGE specification can clearly indicate the optimization opportunities available to an underlying compiler or implementation (**design goal 4**). Meanwhile, GraphBLAS cannot differentiate between the two scenarios.

Case 3: Finally, suppose we want to perform GEMM, but with addition replacing the multiplication step:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k +(\cup) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (36)$$

Here, the map action uses a union operator ($\cup$), since that is the natural merge operator for addition.

Now, suppose we want the addition (for the map action) to only apply when both operands are non-empty. If one of the operands contains an empty value, the output should be zero. That is, if A has a non-empty value at (k, m) but B is empty at (k, n) , the output at (m, n) should be zero instead of the A value alone. This is simple to represent in EDGE (**design goal 5**):

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{k,m} \cdot B_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k +(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (37)$$

Here, we replace the “natural” union operator for addition with an intersection operator. Equations (36) and (37) will produce different results.

5.7 Extension: Expressing Iteration

Many graph algorithms, including BFS, are iterative or recursive. These algorithms also tend to update data structures on each iteration. Additionally, this computation pattern is not typical for traditional tensor algebra.

In BFS Example 7 (Equation (33)), note the use of $F1$ and $P1$, instead of directly updating the frontier tensors F and P . Compilers often benefit from static single-assignment form (SSA) [24] (**design goals: 4, 5**). Thus, EDGE requires that Einsums also be SSA.

BFS Example Part 8: Specifying Multiple Iterations of BFS

Equation (33) is only one iteration of BFS. A full BFS computation repeats until the frontier is empty. However, as previously mentioned, Einsums must be in static single-assignment form. One way to express this is as a cascade of Einsums (§ 3.1.1), where each iteration is a sequence of gather, filter, and update steps:

► Extended Einsum

$$T1_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (38a)$$

$$F1_d = T1_d \cdot \neg P_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (38b)$$

$$P1_d = P_d \cdot F1_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (38c)$$

$$T2_d = G_{s,d} \cdot F1_s :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (38d)$$

$$F2_d = T2_d \cdot \neg P1_d :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (38e)$$

$$P2_d = P1_d \cdot F2_d :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (38f)$$

...

However, Equation (38) is unwieldy. How do we indicate the number of times to repeat the cascade? How do we codify the pattern of gather, filter, and update in a way that is easy to read?

Traditional matrix algebra and GraphBLAS are limited to at most two dimensions. Einsums impose no limits on the number of dimensions of a tensor. EDGE leverages this: to represent iteration, EDGE adds a special *generational* (or iterative) rank, I , to the iteration space. Any tensor that changes from iteration to iteration will also include this dimension. Thus, simply by adding a rank, we are able to naturally represent a key component of many graph algorithms while maintaining the operational definition of an Einsum (**design goals 2, 5**).

When a generational rank is present in an EDGE Einsum, we assume the expressions repeat until a stopping condition, indicated by $\diamond : < \text{Boolean Expression} >$, where the stopping condition can be any expression that returns True or False. When walking the iteration space, the stopping condition simply indicates the shape of I , which may not be known until runtime.

BFS Example Part 9: Specifying All the Iterations of BFS

In the case of BFS, both the F tensor and the set of visited nodes (P) change on each iteration, and therefore include the i rank.

The new EDGE expression, with the generational rank, is:

► Extended Einsum

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (39a)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (39b)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (39c)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (39d)$$

In our BFS example, several tensors have a generational rank (every use of i). Einsums (39a), (39b), and (39c) repeat until a stopping condition (indicated by $\diamond$) is satisfied. Equation (39d) indicates the *occupancy* or number of non-zeros in the current active vertex set. Computation stops once that occupancy is zero. One can view adding a generational rank to F , for example, as a form of collapsing the $F_1, F_2, \dots$ tensors in the unrolled cascade of Einsums (Equation (38)) into a single, 2D tensor, whose generational rank, I , is unbounded.

Note that a compiler can perform liveness analysis on generational tensors, such as those in Equation (39) (see **design goal 4**). In this case, such an analysis would reveal that only two copies of the frontier are needed at any given time, leading to software optimizations like using two copies of the frontier and alternating between them (“ping-ponging”) [87, 95].

For a given point in the iteration space (e.g., one containing $i + 1$), determining the corresponding value for the output requires a value from a different point in the iteration space (e.g., one containing i). This point-by-point dependency is the only constraint the EDGE machinery places on computation. An actual implementation may choose to take a bulk-synchronous approach, which processes all points for a given i region in the iteration space, before incrementing i . Other implementations may instead choose an asynchronous, or fine-grained synchronicity approach, such as skipping ahead and buffering computation at a particular point until dependencies are resolved, or having certain points of the iteration space computed before others, etc.

Overall, our choice to represent iteration and dependencies using generational ranks does not limit an underlying implementation to a particular approach (**design goal 4**). We desire this flexibility for EDGE; it enables a separation of concerns between expressing *what* computation to perform at each point in the iteration space and *how* to actually walk the iteration space and map the points both in time and in space (to hardware/software units like threads or processing engines) (**design goals 1, 4, and 6**).

Finally, we note that at Einsum granularity, a cascade of Einsums is SSA. However, during execution of a single Einsum, the process is not SSA due to reduction or rank-granularity populate (see § 5.8). This introduces an implementation constraint on dependent operations since the dependent operation must wait for the final update (from reduction or populate) or operate speculatively.

BFS Example Part 10: Replacing Minimum with ANY

In Equation (39), notice that we filter vertices that have already been visited (Equation (39b)). Thus, the output frontier for the current iteration, $F_{i+1,d}$, will always contain either the empty value (∞) or depth values equal to $i + 1$. Likewise, the input frontier for the current iteration, $F_{i,d}$, will always contain either the empty value or depth values equal to i . When performing the gather step (Equation (39a)), since the depth values will always increase by one (G 's values are all 1 or 0), we can replace the min compute operator for the reduce action with ANY:

► Extended Einsum

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (40a)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (40b)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (40c)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (40d)$$

The compute operator ANY selects any of the non-zero values in rank s when reducing over s . This is a powerful manipulation of the original Einsum that used min (Equation (39)): rather than walking every s coordinate to ensure computation is selecting the minimum for a given d coordinate, an implementation can optimize reduction by exiting early once *any* of the s coordinates return a non-empty value. This “early-exit” optimization is common in high-performance BFS implementations [100, Section 5.3] (**design goals 4 and 7**). By representing BFS as an Einsum, it becomes easier for an Einsum writer to notice the possibility of replacing min with ANY. This manipulation is a *manual* manipulation, as it goes beyond the capabilities of a compiler.

Alternative Notes 7: Design Alternatives for Expressing Iteration

An alternative approach to expressing iteration is to place the Einsum expression for one step of computation inside a for loop. In fact, GraphBLAS does exactly this: it places computation within a loop nest, and steps out of the matrix abstraction to encode depth (or “level” information) as a separate, scalar variable [27, Figure 2]. Implicitly, this imposes a bulk-synchronous implementation and compute order, where all computations for all query nodes and neighbors must occur for this iteration first, before moving to the next iteration. This approach entangles the concerns of *what* the computation is with *how* computation maps in space and time (**design goal 1**).

BFS Example Part 11: Full EDGE Specification for BFS

Finally, we can express the full EDGE specification for BFS:

► Tensors

$$G^{I,S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=0 \quad (41a)$$

$$F^{I,S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=\infty \quad (41b)$$

$$T^{I,D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty}=\infty \quad (41c)$$

$$P^{I,D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty}=\text{False} \quad (41d)$$

► Initialization

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (41e)$$

$$F_{0,s:s \in id} = 0 \quad (41f)$$

$$P_{0,d:d \in id} = \text{True} \quad (41g)$$

► Extended Einsum

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s +(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{ANY}(\cup) \quad (41h)$$

$$F_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (41i)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (41j)$$

$$\diamond : ||F_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (41k)$$

Now, tensor $F_{i,s}$ represents the active set of source vertices for the i 'th iteration (i.e., at depth i). $P_{i,d}$ indicates if a vertex d has been visited by the start of iteration i . The output $F_{i+1,d}$ denotes the resulting set of discovered vertices at depth $i+1$ (and their corresponding depths). The output $P_{i+1,d}$ denotes the total set of visited vertices after i iterations. The initialization section (Equations (41f)–(41g)) now specifies the state of F and P on the first iteration ($i = 0$).

Equation (41h) gathers the neighbor list of the frontier (F), then adds the current depth of each source in the frontier to the edge weight of each neighbor (recall that the adjacency graph G stores a 1 for each pair of connected vertices). Equation (41i) removes any neighbors that have already been visited, thus generating the new frontier. Once we gather neighbors, we apply the compute $+$ operator to the current depth of active vertices (values in F) and the resulting (s, d) points in G . Since neighbors (d vertices) may belong to multiple sources, we need to select which source updates a neighbor. We do this using the reduce action, which merges the neighbor lists into a new active vertex set by reducing over the s rank. In this particular expression, the ANY operator selects any one of the duplicate sources. We intersect the resulting temporary tensor— $T_{i,d}$ —with the complement of the P tensor ($\neg P$). Since P is a boolean tensor, and the output needs to contain the new active vertex set with their depths, the compute operator is a “take-left” operation ($\leftarrow$), which selects the value in the first operand. This corresponds to filtering out neighbors that have already been visited. Finally, Equation (41j) updates the visited tensor with the results of the new active set of vertices, in a similar manner as the single-step Equation (33c) in BFS Example 7.

5.8 Extension: Expanding the Populate Action

Up to this point, we have assumed that when we compute something, we copy the result directly into the corresponding output location. This “default populate action” (defined earlier in § 5.3.3)




Fig. 10. (Top Left) A directed graph, G , with edge weights in red. (Top Right) A fibertree representation of the graph, $G_{s,d}$. The leaf values contain the edge weight. (Bottom Left) Resulting tensor, W , that records the minimum outgoing edge weight for each vertex in the graph (see Equation (42)). (Bottom Right) Resulting tensor, N , that records the *destination vertex ID* of the outgoing edge with the minimum edge weight.

is sufficient for many graph algorithms, including BFS. As it turns out, different algorithms may require more flexible ways to write into the output; for example, selectively updating an output location based on the current values at other output locations, or maintaining an output fiber that adheres to some property (e.g., keep only the lowest 3 values). We characterize these as variations on populate. EDGE extends Einsums to support these variations, while still maintaining the operational definition of an Einsum (**design goal 2**).

Thus far, we have expanded on two EDGE actions:

- (1) MAP, which, at a given iteration-space point, retrieves data space points on the RHS, computes on them, and places them at an output data space point on the LHS; and,
- (2) REDUCE, which, at a given iteration-space point, retrieves the current REDUCE state and the computed data space point on the RHS and merges the two, updating the REDUCE state with the new value.

Both actions only retain information related to *the current iteration-space point*. Several algorithms use computations that require information on data related to other iteration-space points. POPULATE addresses this limitation. For example, what if we want the output rank to store only the result of the minimum three non-empty coordinates? Or, what if we want the output rank to contain the maximum three computed values? These questions cannot be computed through map or reduce actions alone, both of which, by definition, apply their merge and compute operators point-by-point in the iteration space and read/update the corresponding *points* of the data space.

To enable this new class of computation, EDGE introduces the specialized *POPULATE* action (in contrast to the default populate, i.e., simple assignment, described in § 5.3.3). Populate goes beyond standard assignment. In EDGE, populate is denoted by $\lll$, and the specialized populate is written




Fig. 11. The two input graphs, W and G , involved in the Einsum expression that finds the neighbors of the minimum-weighted vertex (see Equation (44)). Red circles indicate the intersection of the d rank, when $s = 0$, between W and G . The result is in output tensor Z . Z does not contain vertex $s = 5$ as its minimum-weighted neighbor, vertex 6, has no neighbors. The values in Z indicate the cost of going from vertex s to vertex p through the minimum-weighted neighbor of s .

as follows:

$$\lll_{mutable_rank_list} < \text{Compute} > (\text{Coordinate}).$$

The subscript on $\lll$ indicates the mutable rank variable(s) on which it operates. The rank variables will always be an output rank, with an asterisk superscript, “*”, to indicate the Einsum will modify the rank or ranks indicated by the mutable rank list.

At a given iteration-space point, POPULATE retrieves the computed data space point on the RHS, and the entire, current output *fiber* (not point) corresponding to the mutable rank on the LHS.

POPULATE uses two user-defined operators, each with different roles:

- (1) **Coordinate operator:** this is a user-defined operator that takes as input both the rank variables and their corresponding data values (*coordinate_operator*). Since populate handles a *fiber*, this operator goes beyond the merge operator used by MAP and REDUCE to enable it to process the set of coordinates and values in both the fiber and the data space point on the RHS. This allows the populate action to update the output based on a user-defined operation on the *coordinates* in addition to the values.
- (2) **The compute operator:** As with MAP and REDUCE, POPULATE allows any user-defined compute operator, which specifies how to process the *value* being placed in the output.

5.8.1 An Example: Using REDUCE versus POPULATE.




Fig. 12. Top half: An EDGE expression using populate, where Y is a filtered version of A that contains only A 's maximum three values (Equation (46)). We show example input tensors A and Y , and a specific mapping specification on how execution should walk the D iteration space. Bottom half: The state of Y and its mutable d rank after execution has processed certain points in the iteration space.

Example 12: Finding the Minimum Edge Weight For Each Vertex

Suppose we want to express the computation where, for each source in a graph, we want to select the minimum outgoing edge weight (see Figure 10, Bottom Left). Given the input graph G , we can return a weight vector W that stores the minimum edge weight for each source vertex, s . If the edge weights represent the capacity along that link (edge) in a network, such a computation is useful in graph problems like the minimum-cut problem or single-source shortest paths (SSSP) in weighted graphs. The EDGE computation for this expression is:

$$W_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \min(\cup) \quad (42)$$

Equation (42) reduces over d for each s coordinate, selecting the (s, d) value that is the smallest (min compute operator) across all the d coordinates ($\cup$ merge operator). The output, W_s , contains the minimum edge weight for each source in the graph. Figure 10 (bottom left) shows an example graph and the corresponding weight tensor.

This operation tells us the minimum outgoing edge weight at each vertex. However, it does not tell us *to which* neighbor the edge weight corresponds.

Suppose we want to record *to which* neighbor the minimum edge weight corresponds (see Example 12). The classic operator for this type of query, where we want to know where the solution occurs as opposed to what the solution is, is the argmin compute operator:




Fig. 13. Execution steps after processing iteration-space point $d = 1$ from the problem in Figure 12. Dots are points in the iteration space (dots). Black points indicate execution has already occurred, dots with red x's indicate the Einsum culled that point (due to sparsity), and green indicates the current point execution is processing ($d=4$). We first skip all culled points in the iteration space. This leads us to touch iteration-space point $d = 4$ (Step 1.). At this point, we can project into the Einsum expression data space and perform compute on the RHS (Step 2.). To process populate, we first retrieve the fiber corresponding to the mutable rank of the output tensor—in this case d^* (3a.), then retrieve the current iteration-space point—in this case $d = 4$ (3b.), then retrieve the computed RHS value at the current point—in this case, the value at A_4 (3c.), and finally, we apply the coordinate operator of selecting the maximum three values of the current partial output fiber Y_d and the current data point on the RHS (A_4) (3d). This process updates the output tensor (4.)

Example 13: Why not use argmin?

Example 12 does not tell us *to which* neighbor the edge weight corresponds. The compute min operator returns the minimum value, while argmin returns the coordinate to which the minimum value belongs. Note that using argmin instead of min as the compute operator would return the coordinate as a *value*:

$$N_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \text{argmin}(\cup) \quad (43)$$

Here, for a given s coordinate, the compute operator finds the minimum value across the d rank and returns—as a *data value*—the corresponding d coordinate that gave that minimum value. That is, the corresponding s location in W now contains, as a data value, the d vertex that had the minimum edge weight. Figure 10 (bottom right) shows an example graph and the corresponding weight tensor.

Oftentimes, however, we need the d vertex as a *coordinate* in the output.

For example, we may want to find the neighbors of the minimum d vertex in the next sub-Einsum expression that uses W as an input, using this “gather” expression:

$$Z_{s,p} = G_{d,p} \cdot W_{s,d} :: \bigwedge +(\cap) \bigvee \min(\cup). \quad (44)$$

Here, $W_{s,d}$ contains a single non-zero value for each s fiber, where the corresponding non-zero d coordinate is the neighbor with the minimum-weighted edge of s . Intersecting the graph, G , with W retrieves the neighbors (p coordinates) of each d vertex in W . The final result, Z , contains the neighbors of the minimum-weighted neighbor of each vertex s in the graph. Figure 11 shows an example graph (G), the desired W tensor, and the corresponding Z output that records the path cost from an s vertex to p vertex through s 's minimum-weighted neighbor.

This computation requires d to appear in W as a coordinate and not a value. The tensor output, W , must have a shape of $S \times D$, where each point in $W_{s,d}$ contains a data value of the edge weight if d is the minimum-weighted neighbor of s . Notice we cannot write the following, which uses the reduce action, as it breaks the operational definition of an Einsum (ODE) (**design goal 2**):

$$W_{s,d} = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \min(\cup) \quad \text{this violates the ODE} \quad (45)$$

The ODE mandates that in this Einsum, the reduction rank variable *cannot* appear in the output. Why is this? Ignoring the `EDGE-modifier`, the expression indicates an $S \times D$ iteration space. As we walk the iteration space and project into the data space, values in G at each point in the space directly populate the corresponding point in W . Now let us consider the reduce action after the `EDGE-modifier`: for each (s, d) point, reduce the corresponding RHS value into the corresponding LHS location. However, in this expression, every (s, d) point on the RHS corresponds to exactly one (s, d) point on the LHS (due to the operational definition of an Einsum). There is no reduction!

Another way to view this expression is as follows: for each s , the reduce action says we must look at the d rank and select the minimum *value* across all non-empty values of d . The d rank will disappear. Yet this expression indicates the d rank is present in the output. At which location in the output tensor should we place the computed minimum values? We will return to how we address this problem in a little while, but begin by discussing the mechanism by which we will solve it: the populate action.

For a given point in the iteration space, the default populate action (i.e., assignment) modifies the corresponding point in the data space of the output tensor. Now we introduce a more general populate action: for a given point in the iteration space, the general populate action *may modify other points* (within a specific fiber) in the output. We must now look at an entire fiber of the output tensor to determine how to update it based on computation at a point on the RHS of the expression. In EDGE, we call the rank of the fiber that may be modified the “mutable rank”, demarcated by an asterisk (*) on the rank in the output tensor. For example, if populate can alter the d fiber of an output tensor, Y , the LHS of the Einsum will look as follows:

$$Y_{d^*} = A_d :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-val-3}) \quad (46)$$

Here, populate ($\lll$) will modify the d fiber, hence we subscript Y by d^* . We read Equation (46) as “for each d^* point in Y , check if it contains one of the maximum three values of all values seen thus far. Remove any values that are not in the maximum three values.” This particular expression returns a vector, Y , that only contains values at d locations that correspond to the maximum three values in A . The compute operator, $\mathbb{1}$, is a “pass-through” computation; it copies the values that survive the coordinate operation to the output. Figure 12 shows an example input tensor A , the corresponding desired final output Y , and the state of Y after touching specific points in the iteration space.

Example 14: Finding the maximum three values in a tensor.

Using Equation (46) as an example (see Figure 13), at a specific d point in the iteration space (e.g., $d = 4$), `populate` takes as input the corresponding computed *point* of the corresponding RHS expression. In this example, the computed point is simply a projection into the data space of A . `Populate` also takes as input the corresponding current fiber of the *output* data space on the LHS—or the “partial” fiber (Y_{d^*} in this example) at the current point in execution. We call this fiber “partial” as it is not the final state of the output fiber. The fiber is finalized when execution touches all points in the iteration space.

`Populate` outputs a modified partial fiber, consisting of a set of non-empty coordinate locations and their corresponding values (output Y fiber after each d point in Figure 12). Overall, at a given point in the iteration space, `populate` results in an output fiber with updated values at locations both at the current data space point and optionally at other data space points. In this example, from one iteration point to the next, `populate` will result in an output fiber that contains the maximum three values seen *thus far*. By the time execution has touched all points in the iteration space, the output fiber will contain the maximum three values of the input.

Note that certain computations may require both the `Einsum` and a mapping specification (such as iteration order) to fully specify the computation. An example is when the coordinate operator outputs different results depending on the order of traversal.

5.8.2 Programming and Execution Model for `Populate`.

Programming Model: From the programming model perspective, `populate` processes a region of the iteration space, and outputs an updated region. The coordinate operator considers the coordinates and values of the LHS fiber, and the coordinate and value of the corresponding RHS point. The coordinate operator then outputs a set of coordinates to delete and a set of coordinates to write to for the updated LHS fiber. For each “write” coordinate, the `compute` operator then accepts the RHS value (`REDUCE TEMPORARY`) as input and computes a value to place at the output location.

Execution Model for `Populate`: Given an `EDGE` expression, for a given point in the iteration space, an implementation must first process all map and reduce actions (see § 5.4.3). This generates an implicit, “shadow tensor” (set of `REDUCE TEMPORARY`s) with data coordinates corresponding to each point in the output, and data values corresponding to the computation at the processed points in the iteration space. This shadow tensor will contain empty values at data points that execution has not processed yet in the iteration space (e.g., after $d = 0$ in bottom half of Figure 12, every other d point in Y contains empty values of 0).

The default `populate` action will simply walk the iteration space created by this shadow tensor and copy the corresponding data values to the output locations. If a more complex `populate` action is present, the following will occur:

- (1) The coordinate operator of the `populate` action takes as input the current point in the iteration space, the corresponding data value for this point on the RHS (i.e., the `REDUCE TEMPORARY`), all the non-empty *coordinates* of the mutable rank(s) (indicated by the mutable rank variable list), and the corresponding data values for those coordinates in the current partial output fiber.
- (2) The coordinate operator will then use the input coordinates and/or the input data values to process which coordinates will now be present in the mutable rank `populate` is processing. That is, the coordinate operator will return a new list of valid coordinates for that fiber. It will also return a list of coordinates to *delete* from the fiber.

- (3) The compute operator, for each valid coordinate, computes on the REDUCE TEMPORARY value and returns a value.
- (4) The final output fiber contains non-empty locations corresponding to the coordinate list produced by the coordinate operator, with values corresponding to the computed values.

Overall, for a given point in the iteration space, map and reduce only modify the given data space points corresponding to the iteration-space point. On the other hand, populate may modify other data space points that are not related to the current iteration-space point.

For example, in Figure 12 (bottom half), touching iteration-space point $d = 5$ results in an update of output locations $d = 4$ and $d = 5$, even though $d = 4$ has no direct relationship (through rank variable expressions in the subscripts) to the current iteration point.

Note that although we describe populate in a point-by-point manner, execution can parallelize populate, by processing iteration-space points in parallel. An underlying implementation will need to resolve simultaneous updates to the output fiber in a way that is consistent with the computation specified by the Einsum.

5.8.3 More Populate Examples.

Example 15: Finding the Neighbor Vertex With Minimum Edge Weight

We can now properly express the intent of the (incorrect) Equation (45) as:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} ::\lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{min-val-1}) \quad (47)$$

Here, we assume the coordinate operator—“min-val-1”—is a user-defined function that returns the d coordinate corresponding to the minimum value of the current state of W (at a specific s) and $G_{s,d}$ for the current iteration-space point. If multiple values have the same minimum value, we assume the function has a way of selecting one (such as randomly picking one of the values).

What is this Einsum saying? At each (s, d) point in the iteration space, retrieve the corresponding data space value of G , and the current d fiber (both non-empty coordinates and values) in W for the given s . Then process populate, by first applying the coordinate operator, which returns a valid set of d coordinates that corresponds to the minimum value seen across the data value for $G_{s,d}$ and the current d fiber of W (at s).

Now, execution applies the compute operator—“pass-through”—which simply keeps the data value corresponding to the valid coordinate outputted from the coordinate operator.

To actually read Equation (47), one can follow the following recipe:

- (1) Starting from *the tensor on the left of the* EDGE-modifier, look at all the non-empty points in the *mutable_rank_list* of the output.
- (2) For each non-empty s input region of the iteration space, consider each d point.
- (3) For the corresponding *values* of the partial output, and the corresponding value in the input d point, select the minimum value. Place this minimum value in its matching d location in the output.
- (4) Set the output value of all other d locations to empty values.

Example 16: Path Through a Minimum-Weighted Neighbor

With the populate operator in Example 15, we can now fully express the cost of going from each vertex s , to every neighbor 2 hops away (p) if there exists a 2-hop path that passes through the

minimum-weighted neighbor of s :

▷ Tensors

$$G^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (48a)$$

$$W^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (48b)$$

$$Z^{S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0 \quad (48c)$$

▷ Extended Einsum

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{min-val-1}) \quad (48d)$$

$$Z_{s,p} = G_{n,p} \cdot W_{s,n} :: \bigwedge_n +(\cap) \bigvee_n \min(\cup) \quad (48e)$$

In Equation (48d), we find the neighbor with the minimum edge weight for each source vertex in G . Tensor W represents the subgraph of G that only contains sources and their corresponding neighbors with the minimum edge weight (of all their original neighbors).

Equation (48e) then finds the neighbors of those neighbors, where the d rank in W of the previous sub-Einsum (Equation (48d)) is now renamed to the n rank. The p rank represents the neighbors of these neighbors. The output tensor, Z , now contains the original source vertices in the graph (s), and the neighbors of each s 's minimum-weighted neighbor. Each $Z_{s,p}$ value contains the distance from s to p . Note that the min compute operator on the reduce action does not have an effect, since the n rank has an occupancy of one from the populate action in the previous sub-Einsum. This expression precisely describes the example in Figure 11.

Example 17: Find the Top Three Edge Weights

We can extend the computation in Equation (46) (Example 14) to express selecting the top three edge weights and their corresponding neighbors:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-val-3}) \quad (49)$$

Now, for a given s coordinate in W , the d fiber will contain the maximum three values.

Example 18: Finding the Maximum Neighbor ID

Suppose we want to select the ID of the maximum neighbor for each source vertex in a graph. The corresponding EDGE Einsum is as follows:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{max-coord-1}) \quad (50)$$

Equation (49) takes advantage of the flexible *coordinate operator*. For each (s, d) point in the iteration space, the populate action will check if the current d coordinate for that point is greater than the d^* coordinate(s) present in the incomplete output tensor W (where s is fixed to the s portion of the iteration point.) If it is, populate fills the old d^* coordinate in W with an empty value, and updates the corresponding d^* coordinate (that matches d) with the value at $G_{s,d}$. The compute operator $\mathbb{1}$ simply means “pass-through”, that is, it copies the value whose coordinate(s) survived the coordinate operation into the output.

Example 19: The Default Populate Action

Finally, note that we can express the default populate operator—or assignment (=)—explicitly as:

$$W_{s,d^*} = G_{s,d} :: \lll_{d^*} \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{1}), \quad (51)$$

where all d coordinates and values are directly passed-through (the $\mathbb{1}$ function) to the output.

Example 20: A Common Transformation Pattern for Populate

Some populate expressions modify a single output point based on a set of input values. We can recast such expressions in terms of a cascade of two Einsums that use map and reduce actions. For example, we can transform Equation (48d) (the populate form from Example 16), which uses populate to get the vertex with the minimum-weighted incoming edge, as follows:

$$T_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d \min(\cup) \quad (52a)$$

$$W_{s,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot T_s :: \bigwedge_s \text{return-if-equal}(\cap). \quad (52b)$$

Here, Equation (52a) finds the value of the minimum-weighted outgoing edge for each s vertex, using a reduce action on d ($\bigvee_d \min(\cup)$). Equation (52b) then uses a map action between G and T to filter out edges (or (s, d) pairs) whose value is not equal to the minimum-weighted edge for the corresponding s vertex. The compute operation of “return-if-equal” checks if two values are equal and returns that value if they are, otherwise it returns the empty value.

Note, however, that this transformation only works if each s vertex has only one neighbor (d) with the minimum-weighted edge. If multiple neighbors have the same minimum-weighted edge, Equation (52b) will return all of those neighbors. Populate, on the other hand, can specify in its coordinate operator how to resolve which neighbor to select.

This is a transformation pattern to go from specific instances of populate to a combination of reduce and map. We can also transform an Einsum in the opposite direction if an expression contains the pattern in Equations (52a)–(52b). Such patterns are useful in algebraic manipulations of Einsums, when generating one Einsum from another (**design goal 7**). § 8.1.2 shows an example of such a manipulation, deriving a single-source shortest path algorithm from another algorithm.

The concept of populate is new and potentially powerful, and previous work in tensor algebra does not support this. However, as shown in the previous examples, graph algorithms *need* populate. Another relevant application for populate is in graph sampling—a common step in graph neural networks and database applications—which selects vertices and edges from a given graph [60]. In this case, the coordinate operator of populate is now a general user-defined sampling function (rather than just max-val, etc.) that determines which vertices/edges to include in the final, sampled graph.

5.8.4 Map/Reduce vs. Populate. Both map and reduce actions use a merge operator, which, for a given iteration point, checks if a given coordinate exists or not in the involved input tensor operands. If the coordinate exists, it passes both that coordinate (for all involved tensors) and the corresponding data values to the compute operand. Populate uses a coordinate operator, which, for a given iteration point, looks at the coordinate and value corresponding to the computed RHS point and the list of coordinates and values corresponding to the partial output region. The operator returns a list of valid coordinates, which it passes on to the compute operator for processing of the

data values. We consider merge to be a special type of coordinate operator: it checks if a data value is an empty value to determine if the coordinate exists or not.

Overall, populate allows us to do two new things not possible with map/reduce: (1) operate on coordinates themselves, and (2) modify a partial output fiber. One should consider populate if a graph computation is performing complex operations on the vertex IDs of a graph or the *coordinates* of a tensor. Examples include sampling vertices or filtering out which vertices to use based on the vertex IDs themselves. Additionally, any computation that scatters updates, where multiple inputs may update the same output, may benefit from populate.

Note that because populate takes a list of coordinates as one of its inputs (from the partial output fiber), simple binary merge operators no longer suffice for specifying populate’s behavior. Hence, the coordinate operator allows any user-defined function that operates on coordinates as though they are values.

5.9 Extension: Enabling Rank Variable Expressions

In EDGE, tensor subscripts can contain expressions, termed *rank variable expressions*. These expressions enable features such as incorporating conditional computations into the Einsum (common in graph algorithms, see § 8), selecting a subregion of a tensor, strided accesses, and enabling “windowing” operations—such as those found in convolution. The previous examples in this section use only rank variables to access the tensors. There are two types of rank variable expressions:

- (1) Expressions on *how* to project into the data space given a point in the iteration space. This involves any expression that maps the rank variable, which walks the iteration space, to a point in the data space. For example, A_s maps the s variable in the iteration space to the corresponding s point in data space (accessing A). The expression A_{s+5} maps the s variable in the iteration space to the $s + 5$ point in the data space. EDGE places no restrictions on the types of expressions allowed, as long as the expression is a function that maps the rank variable from one point to another. Convolution (see Equation (5)) is an example of such an expression.
- (2) Expressions that filter which regions of the iteration space an Einsum touches (i.e., *conditional rank variable expressions*), essentially creating a subspace of the iteration space. Einsums contain this type of expression when the problem explicitly requires filtering of points in the iteration space. For example, suppose we want to create the upper triangle of a given 2D tensor. The corresponding EDGE Einsum is:

$$L_{s:s < d, d} = G_{s, d}, \quad (53)$$

where one can read the rank expression $s : s < d$ as “ s , such that s is less than d ”. The Einsum machinery enforces that **a constraint applied to the rank variable of one tensor** (e.g., L in this case), **applies to all tensors containing that rank variable**. This is because the constraint is modifying the *iteration space*, which impacts which regions of the data space to access. By convention, we will generally write constraints on the rank variables of the output tensor.

Equation (53) places a constraint on which points are valid in the iteration space. Without the constraint, the valid region of the iteration space is $S \times D$, or more precisely:

$$s \in [0, S) \quad (54a)$$

$$d \in [0, D) \quad (54b)$$

With the constraint, the valid region of the iteration space is now:

$$s \in [0, d) \quad (55a)$$

$$d \in [0, D) \quad (55b)$$

Note that manipulations are possible on the given iteration space expressions (**design goal 7**). In Equation (55), when d is 4, s can only take on coordinate values from 0 to 3 (inclusive). When d is 5, s can only take on coordinate values from 0 to 4. From the perspective of the operational definition of an Einsum, the constraints in Equation (55) state the following: for a given (s, d) point, we consider this point valid if and only if $s < d$. Thus, the constraint can be rewritten as:

$$0 \leq s < d < D. \quad (56)$$

Note the default constraints on any rank variable are 0 to its shape (see Equation (54)). Since $S \equiv D \equiv |V|$, we can update the constraint in Equation (56) to:

$$0 \leq s < d < S. \quad (57)$$

Using the transitive property, we rewrite the above constraint to express the valid domain of s and d separately:

$$s \in [0, S) \quad (58a)$$

$$d \in (s, D), \quad (58b)$$

and its corresponding Einsum:

$$L_{s,d:d>s} = G_{s,d}. \quad (59)$$

5.9.1 Selective Computations. By definition, **if an Einsum does not touch a point in the iteration space due to rank variable expressions, the corresponding output data space point is by default empty**. For example, the following expression results in empty values along Z 's diagonal:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n:n \neq m} \quad (60)$$

EDGE supports the assignment of different expressions in different regions of the iteration space, using case statements:

$$Z_{m,n} = \begin{cases} A_{m,n} & n \neq m \\ B_{k,m} \cdot C_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

Each branch of a case statement is itself a valid EDGE expression, with its own modifier if needed. At each point in the iteration space, Equation (61) selects the appropriate sub-Einsum expression. Here, the diagonal of Z now contains the dot product of fibers in B and C when $m = n$. Refer to Equation (155) for an alternate way to express this computation using map, reduce and rank variable expressions.

5.10 Rank Variables as Tensors

EDGE allows rank variables to appear as tensors within an expression. Suppose we have the following expression:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot m :: \bigwedge \times(\cap). \quad (62)$$

Here, each m scales each n -fiber of A (at fixed m). For example, when $m = 2$, this expression multiplies all the values in the n -fiber of A at $m = 2$ by 2. In the execution model, at each point in the iteration space, we project into the data space of A , and cast the m coordinate as a value for use

in the map action. At a higher level, one can consider the m term in the expression to simply be a scalar whose value changes at each point in the iteration space.

5.11 Concluding Thoughts

Although both the specialized populate extension (§ 5.8) and conditional expressions (§ 5.9) are entirely new to the Einsum world (to the best of our knowledge), *they still adhere to the ODE (design goal 2)*. These two extensions are extremely powerful in expressing graph computations that filter certain vertex or edge IDs or perform certain operations only when certain conditions are met (**design goal 6**). Graph computations, unlike tensor computations, require filter operations and conditional expressions. To support these needs, we refine and expand the operational definition of an Einsum to separate computation into three phases: map, reduce, and populate. The next section delves into the precise semantics. § 8 then describes more complex algorithms that use these extensions.

6 Semantics using Set Theory

In this section, we define the semantics of EDGE using set theory. For clarity, we present the definitions for a single Extended Einsum with two input tensors, aliased to A and B , and one output tensor, Z . Cascades are interpreted as sequences of such Einsums.

Motivation. Prior work presented an operational definition of an Einsum [68, 72], and earlier sections of this paper have shown how to reason about EDGE expressions. However, these descriptions do not fully specify the mathematical meaning of an EDGE expression.²

We therefore give a set-theoretic semantics for Extended Einsums (EDGE). We use set theory because it is widely accessible and provides a common mathematical language for the application domains where EDGE is already in use, including robotics, RTL simulation [107], graph algorithms, machine learning [6, 68, 70, 72], and iterative linear algebra [35]. Set theory provides the minimal common mathematical machinery needed to describe EDGE’s semantics across this range of users. Our target audience is readers with a college-level foundation in discrete mathematics, as well as programming-language experts.

6.1 Sets

Extended Einsums operate over several sets, and making these sets explicit is the first step toward defining the semantics of EDGE. The following discussion introduces the sets used to describe the iteration space, tensor coordinates, and corresponding data values. Table 3 provides a summary and Figure 14 (in § 6.2.5) visualizes how points in the iteration space, rank coordinate spaces, and data values relate to each other.

Notation convention. Set names in this section follow a consistent scheme. The **base** identifies the kind of set (CS for coordinate space, RCS for rank coordinate space, DS for data space, IS for iteration space, ECS for Einsum coordinate space). A **superscript** names the tensor the set belongs to (e.g., CS^Z is “the coordinate space of tensor Z ”). A **subscript** names a restriction, either to a particular rank (e.g., RCS_R^T is “the rank coordinate space of rank R of tensor T ”) or to a refinement of the set itself (e.g., DS_{ne}^T is “the non-empty data space of tensor T ”). Scalars (such as the rank shape RS) are not sets and are written without decoration. When defining sets, we use the notation $\{x \mid P(x)\}$, read as “the set of all x such that $P(x)$ is true”. In this section, a *point* may refer either to a point in the iteration space or to a point in a tensor coordinate space; we qualify the phrase when the distinction matters.

²When in doubt about the meaning of an EDGE expression, the set-theoretic definitions in this section are authoritative.

Table 3. Key Set Definitions for EDGE.

Term	Notation	Category	Definition
Rank variable	$r_d \in R_d$	Iteration	A variable that determines the iteration space; by default $R_d = \mathbb{W}$, but may be user-defined (e.g., $r \in \mathbb{R}$).
Rank variable set	R_d	Iteration	The set from which a rank variable is drawn.
Iteration space	IS	Iteration	The Cartesian product $R_0 \times R_1 \times \dots \times R_{D-1}$; defines the region over which an Einsum computes.
Rank coordinate	—	Coordinate	A variable that indexes into a specific rank of a tensor.
Rank coordinate set	RCS_R^T	Coordinate	The set of all valid coordinates for rank R of tensor T . May be dense, sparse, or user-defined.
Rank shape	RS	Coordinate	The cardinality $ RCS_R^T $ of a rank coordinate set.
Dense rank coord. set	$DenseCS_R$	Coordinate	The default coordinate set $\{r \mid r \in [0, RS)\}$ for dense tensors.
Tensor coordinate space	CS^T	Tensor	Cartesian product of all rank coordinate sets of T ; the set of all valid index tuples into T .
Point	—	Tensor	An N -tuple element of CS^T ; uniquely addresses one position in an N -dimensional tensor.
Rank name	e.g., P, Q, M	Tensor	A unique identifier for a rank within a specific tensor. Distinct from rank variables even when the same letter is used.
Einsum coord. space	ECS	Tensor	Set of ordered points for each tensor in an Einsum: (CS^Z, CS^A, CS^B)
Data space set	DS^T	Data	The set of data values tensor T can contain; user-defined (e.g., integers, reals, strings).
Empty value set	E^T	Data	A singleton subset of DS^T identifying the “empty” value of T (e.g., $\{0\}$ for integers); $E^T \subseteq DS^T$.

6.1.1 Iteration Space and the Rank Variable Set. Rank variables determine the iteration space over which an Einsum iterates, equivalently the region over which computations can occur.

Given an iteration space with D ranks, we define the iteration space, IS , as the Cartesian product of D different rank variable sets:

$$IS = R_0 \times R_1 \times R_2 \times \dots \times R_{D-1}. \quad (63)$$

A rank variable, r_d , is an element in a rank variable set. A rank variable set may be user-defined, but by default, its elements are whole numbers:

$$r_d \in R_d, \quad R_d = \mathbb{W}. \quad (64)$$

This does not mean an implementation must enumerate all of $\mathbb{W}$. Rather, the rank variable set defines the space a rank variable may be drawn from, while rank variable expressions, tensor coordinates, and Merge guards determine which points are actually evaluated.

For example, a user-defined rank variable set may allow $r \in \mathbb{R}$ or some other space. Indeed, work in the extended Einsum area already allows continuous indices [97].

Suppose we have the following Einsum:

$$Z_{m,n}^{P,Q} = A_{m,k}^{R,S} \times B_{k,n}^{T,U}. \quad (65)$$

Readers should recognize this as a matrix-matrix multiplication (GEMM).

This expression has three rank variables: $m \in M$, $n \in N$, and $k \in K$. Thus, its iteration space, IS_{GEMM} , is $M \times N \times K$, where $m \in M \subset \mathbb{W}$ (with similar definitions for K and N).

6.1.2 Rank Coordinate Sets. A rank coordinate is a variable that indexes into a specific rank of a tensor. An n -dimensional tensor contains n ranks, each with a unique name. A coordinate uniquely identifies a location within a specific rank of a specific tensor. We call the set of possible coordinates for a given rank the **rank coordinate set**. The *rank shape* is the cardinality of the coordinate set.

In Equation 65, each tensor has two ranks, whose unique names we indicate in the superscript. Here, Z has two ranks, with the first rank named P and the second rank named Q .

Example 21: Dense Rank Coordinate Sets

Oftentimes, in dense cases, we implicitly define the coordinate set of a rank through the shape. Given a rank R with shape RS , we can define the following dense rank coordinate:

$$\text{DenseCS}_R := \{r \mid r \in [0, RS)\}$$

In the *tensor declaration* region of a fully-specified EDGE expression, we often write the following:

► Tensors

$$A^{K=3, M=5} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty}=0 \quad (66)$$

This indicates two rank names, K and M , and refers to the following rank coordinate sets:

$$\text{RCS}_K^A = \{k \mid k \in [0, K)\} \quad (67)$$

$$\text{RCS}_M^A = \{m \mid m \in [0, M)\} \quad (68)$$

Example 22: Sparse Rank Coordinate Sets

In the sparse case, not every coordinate within the $[0, RS)$ range exists. Suppose we have a rank, R , where only four coordinates exist (i.e., will contain non-empty fibers):

$$\text{RCS}_M^A := \{0, 1, 5, 7\}$$

In EDGE expressions, we often do not explicitly specify the coordinate space for sparse tensors and only indicate that $\text{RCS}_R^A \subseteq \text{DenseCS}_R$. Syntactically, the notation is similar to the dense case (Example 21), but we can also explicitly specify it:

► Tensors

$$A^{K=3, M=8} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty}=0 \quad (69)$$

$$\text{RCS}_M^A = \{0, 1, 5, 7\} \quad (70)$$

Since rank coordinate sets can be user-defined, all sorts of interesting custom coordinate sets can exist (see Example 23).

Example 23: User-Defined Rank Coordinate Sets

In graph algorithms, vertices may be given non-integer ids, such as vertex ‘a’, ‘b’, ‘c’, etc. To specify this coordinate space, one can explicitly state the set of the corresponding rank in the tensor

declaration:

$$\triangleright \text{ Tensors} \quad (71)$$

$$G^{S=|V|, D=|V|} \rightarrow \dots \quad (72)$$

$$RCS_S^G = \{a, b, c, d, e\}, \quad RCS_D^G = RCS_S^G \quad (73)$$

Here, the S rank of G is indexed by character coordinates (as is the D rank of G).

6.1.3 Tensor Coordinate Space Sets. A tensor coordinate space, always associated with a specific tensor, is the set of all rank coordinate tuples for that tensor. It is the Cartesian product of all rank coordinate sets associated with a given tensor. Given an N -tensor, an element in the coordinate space set *of that tensor* is an ordered tuple of N coordinates, where each coordinate corresponds to a specific rank in the tensor, ordered according to the order in which the ranks are declared in the tensor. For instance, in Equation 65, Z 's tensor coordinate space is P followed by Q . Each coordinate in the tuple is drawn from the rank coordinate set for the corresponding tensor rank.

The coordinate space set for a tensor $T^{M,N,P,Q,\dots}$ with ranks $M, N, P, Q, \dots$, is the Cartesian product of the rank coordinate sets for those ranks:

$$CS^T = RCS_M^T \times RCS_N^T \times RCS_P^T \times RCS_Q^T \times \dots \quad (74)$$

Explicitly enumerating its elements, CS^T is the set of all tuples $(m, n, p, q, \dots)$ where each coordinate is drawn from the rank coordinate set of the corresponding rank:

$$CS^T := \left\{ (m, n, p, q, \dots) \mid m \in RCS_M^T \wedge n \in RCS_N^T \wedge p \in RCS_P^T \wedge q \in RCS_Q^T \wedge \dots \right\}.$$

We call each such N -tuple in CS^T a *point*; when needed, we distinguish this from a point in the iteration space.

6.1.4 Data Space Set. A tensor potentially contains a data value of a specific user-defined data type at every point in the coordinate space of the tensor. The *data space set* consists of all data values a tensor *can* contain (that is, the *codomain* of a tensor, see § 6.2.5). Let DS^T be the data space of tensor T . Then,

$$DS^T := \{ \text{user-defined set of data values} \} \quad (75)$$

Additionally, we distinguish the *empty value set*, E^T , which is a singleton subset of DS^T containing the user-specified value considered “empty” or “null” for the tensor. Let P_T be a user-defined predicate over DS^T with exactly one satisfying value. Then:

$$E^T := \{ x \in DS^T \mid P_T(x) \}, \quad |E^T| = 1. \quad (76)$$

Moreover, $E^T \subseteq DS^T$.

Future work may expand on this by allowing multiple “sentinel” values in place of the empty set.

Example 24: Data Types and Empty Values

A common empty value in traditional tensor algebra is 0 (for integer data types). Then, we can write the following EDGE tensor declaration:

▷ Tensors

$$A^{K=3, M=8} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty}=0 \quad (77)$$

$$(78)$$

This corresponds to the following sets:

$$DS^A = \{ v \mid v \in \mathbb{W} \} \quad (79)$$

$$E^A = \{ x \mid x \equiv 0 \} \quad (80)$$

We can read these as follows: “the data space of A is every v in the space of whole numbers”, and “the empty value set of A is a single value x equivalent to 0”.

6.2 Functions and Transformations

A function associates elements in an input set (the *domain*) with elements in an output set (the *codomain*) [86]. More precisely, each element in the domain of a function is associated with exactly one output element; for partial functions, the domain is a subset of the input set. Throughout this section, partial functions appear often enough that we use the arrow $\rightarrow$ as a visual reminder that the function is partial (“defined for some, but not necessarily all, elements of its input set”), reserving $\mapsto$ for total functions (defined for all elements in the input set).

The *graph* of a function is a set of ordered pairs, where the first element in the pair is the input element, and the second element is the associated output element.

The following uses functions to describe the semantic behavior of different components in an EDGE expression.

6.2.1 Rank Variable Expression. A *rank variable expression* (RVE) is an expression that, when evaluated at a point in the iteration space (IS), produces a rank coordinate value for a single, specific rank of a single, specific tensor. It is many-to-one: given a point in the iteration space, it produces exactly one rank coordinate value, but multiple points in the iteration space may produce the same rank coordinate value. Each tensor rank has its own RVE.

For a tensor T with rank R , we write the corresponding RVE as Γ_R^T . For a point in the iteration space,

$$(rv_0, rv_1, \dots, rv_{D-1}) \in IS, \quad (81)$$

we have

$$\Gamma_R^T(rv_0, rv_1, \dots, rv_{D-1}) = r. \quad (82)$$

If $r \in RCS_R^T$, then r is a valid coordinate for rank R of tensor T . If $r \notin RCS_R^T$, then the value produced by the RVE lies outside the rank coordinate set for that tensor rank.

That is, a rank variable expression takes as input a point in the iteration space and returns a rank coordinate value. For brevity, we will write is to denote a generic point in the iteration space:

$$is = (rv_0, rv_1, \dots, rv_{D-1}) \in IS.$$

Example 25: RVEs in GEMM

The GEMM expression in Equation 65 has six ranks (two for each tensor). Each rank is associated with a rank variable expression (RVE) that sends a point in the iteration space to a rank coordinate value.

The iteration space for GEMM is:

$$IS = M \times N \times K.$$

- (1) Tensor Z has two ranks, P and Q . The RVEs select the corresponding rank variables:

$$\Gamma_P^Z(m, n, k) = m, \quad \Gamma_Q^Z(m, n, k) = n.$$

- (2) Tensor A has ranks R and S , accessed via:

$$\Gamma_R^A(m, n, k) = m, \quad \Gamma_S^A(m, n, k) = k.$$

- (3) Tensor B has ranks T and U , accessed via:

$$\Gamma_T^B(m, n, k) = k, \quad \Gamma_U^B(m, n, k) = n.$$

Overall, in GEMM, every RVE is a trivial projection. Each RVE simply picks one component out of the tuple (m, n, k) in the iteration space.

Example 26: RVEs in Convolution

Suppose we want to express a 2D convolution of an 8×6 output from a 10×12 input and a 4×4 filter, with no padding and unit stride. The corresponding EDGE expression is:

$$\triangleright \text{Tensors} \tag{83}$$

$$Z^{M=8, N=6} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0 \tag{84}$$

$$A^{U=10, V=12} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0 \tag{85}$$

$$B^{H=4, J=4} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0 \tag{86}$$

$\triangleright$ Extended Einsum

$$Z_{p,q} = A_{p+s, q+r} \cdot B_{s,r} :: \bigwedge \times \tag{87}$$

Semantically, this EDGE Einsum defines the iteration space as:

$$IS = S \times R \times P \times Q. \tag{88}$$

It has six RVEs, one for each rank in the Einsum:

- (1) For the M rank of tensor Z :

$$\Gamma_M^Z(s, r, p, q) = p.$$

- (2) For the N rank of tensor Z :

$$\Gamma_N^Z(s, r, p, q) = q.$$

- (3) For the U rank of tensor A :

$$\Gamma_U^A(s, r, p, q) = p + s.$$

- (4) For the V rank of tensor A :

$$\Gamma_V^A(s, r, p, q) = q + r.$$

- (5) For the H rank of tensor B :

$$\Gamma_H^B(s, r, p, q) = s.$$

- (6) For the J rank of tensor B :

$$\Gamma_J^B(s, r, p, q) = r.$$

Unlike GEMM, two of the RVEs here (Γ_U^A and Γ_V^A) combine multiple variables in the iteration space through addition. This is how EDGE expresses the sliding-window access pattern of convolution: each rank coordinate value for A is a separate function of the iteration space (Γ_U^A produces $p + s$, Γ_V^A produces $q + r$), and not just a projection of a single variable in the iteration space.

An RVE may produce a coordinate value that lies outside the rank coordinate set of the tensor rank it indexes. The consequence depends on whether the RVE belongs to an input tensor or the output tensor.

For an input tensor, an out-of-range coordinate value means that the tensor access is undefined at that coordinate. The corresponding existence predicate evaluates to `False`, and the Merge operator determines whether the action produces no value or proceeds using the tensor's empty value. This is useful for boundary, halo, and padding-like behavior.

For the output tensor, the output RVEs must produce a valid coordinate in CS^Z . If the output coordinate is outside CS^Z , then there is no output location for that point in the iteration space, and that point produces no `MAP TEMPORARY`.

Thus, in Example 26, if $q + r \geq 12$ (since V has a shape of 12), the access to $A_{p+s, q+r}$ is outside the coordinate space of A . This does not by itself invalidate the output coordinate (p, q) . Instead, $\text{Exists}_A(p + s, q + r)$ evaluates to `False`; the Merge operator then determines whether `MAP` produces no value or proceeds using the empty value of A .

6.2.2 Einsum Coordinate Set. Given RVEs, we can define the *Einsum Coordinate Space (ECS)* for a particular Einsum. An element of *ECS* is an ordered tuple of tensor coordinate tuples:

$$(cs^Z, cs^A, cs^B).$$

The tuple is ordered as follows: the output tensor coordinate, followed by the first input tensor coordinate, and then the second input tensor coordinate.

For convenience, we write $\Gamma^T(is)$ for the tuple of RVE outputs for all ranks of tensor T at a point is in the iteration space. For example, if tensor T has ranks $R_0, \dots, R_{N-1}$, then:

$$\Gamma^T(is) = (\Gamma_{R_0}^T(is), \dots, \Gamma_{R_{N-1}}^T(is)).$$

For an Einsum with output tensor Z and input tensors A and B , *ECS* is the set of coordinate tuples produced by the RVEs at points in the iteration space whose output coordinate is valid:

$$ECS := \left\{ (cs^Z, cs^A, cs^B) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists is \in IS \text{ such that } cs^Z = \Gamma^Z(is) \wedge cs^Z \in CS^Z \\ \wedge cs^A = \Gamma^A(is) \wedge cs^B = \Gamma^B(is) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (89)$$

The output coordinate cs^Z must be a valid point in CS^Z . However, the input coordinates cs^A and cs^B may lie outside CS^A or CS^B . When this happens, the corresponding tensor existence predicate evaluates to `False`.

Example 27: ECS for GEMM

For the GEMM expression in Equation (65), the RVEs produce:

$$cs^Z = (m, n), \quad cs^A = (m, k), \quad cs^B = (k, n).$$

Thus, the Einsum Coordinate Space for this expression is:

$$ECS_{\text{GEMM}} = \left\{ ((m, n), (m, k), (k, n)) \mid \begin{array}{l} (m, n, k) \in IS_{\text{GEMM}} \\ \wedge (m, n) \in CS^Z \end{array} \right\}. \quad (90)$$

Example 28: Rank Names vs. Rank Variables

In the examples thus far, we have taken care to provide distinct rank names and rank variables within each Einsum. Oftentimes, however, an Einsum expression may use the same variable to represent both the rank *name* and a rank *variable*. Regardless, *rank names are unique to each tensor* and are *distinct from rank variables*.

For example, the GEMM expression in Equation 65 may be rewritten as:

$$Z_{m,n}^{M,N} = A_{m,k}^{M,K} \times B_{k,n}^{K,N}.$$

Here, rank variable m is distinct from the M rank of Z , which is also distinct from the M rank of A .

6.2.3 Einsum Projection. Given RVEs, the *Einsum Projection (EP)* evaluates those RVEs at a point in the iteration space and produces the corresponding output and input tensor coordinate tuples. The output coordinate tuple must lie in CS^Z for EP to be defined at that point. Input tensor coordinate tuples may lie outside their tensor coordinate spaces; when they do, the corresponding tensor existence predicate evaluates to False.

Thus, EP is a partial function:

$$EP : IS \rightarrow ECS. \quad (91)$$

For a point $is \in IS$, the projection is:

$$EP(is) = (\Gamma^Z(is), \Gamma^A(is), \Gamma^B(is)), \quad (92)$$

when $\Gamma^Z(is) \in CS^Z$. If $\Gamma^Z(is) \notin CS^Z$, then EP is undefined at is .

To capture how a particular Einsum's RVEs associate points in the iteration space with tensor coordinates, we use the graph of EP . In set theory, this graph is the set of input/output pairs realized by EP for that Einsum.

Example 29: Einsum Coordinate Space with RVEs

For 2D convolution (Example 26), the Einsum projection produces tuples of the form:

$$((p, q), (p + s, q + r), (s, r)).$$

The input coordinates $(p + s, q + r)$ and (s, r) may lie outside their tensor coordinate spaces; if they do, the corresponding existence predicate evaluates to False.

Replacing each coordinate with its RVE and expanding, the Einsum projection creates the following graph:

$$\text{graph}(EP) = \left\{ \left(is, ((p, q), (p + s, q + r), (s, r)) \right) \left| \begin{array}{l} is = (s, r, p, q) \in IS \\ \wedge p \in RCS_M^Z \wedge q \in RCS_N^Z \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (93)$$

Each rank variable expression is local to the rank it accesses. Einsum projections provide a global view of rank accesses, and thus enable algebraic manipulations of rank variable expressions that impact other rank variable expressions within the Einsum.

Example 30: Eingebraic Manipulation of RVEs

Let us introduce two new variables, $c = p + s$ and $d = q + r$, drawn from new rank variable sets C and D , respectively. Given these expressions, then $p = c - s$ and $q = d - r$. Substituting these terms

into the Einsum projection produces the following:

$$\text{graph}(EP) = \left\{ \left(is, ((c-s, d-r), (c, d), (s, r)) \right) \mid \begin{array}{l} is = (s, r, c, d) \in IS \\ \wedge c-s \in RCS_M^Z \wedge d-r \in RCS_N^Z \end{array} \right\}, \quad (94)$$

where the iteration space is now $S \times R \times C \times D$. The corresponding, transformed Einsum is:

$$Z_{c-s, d-r} = A_{c, d} \cdot B_{s, r}. \quad (95)$$

6.2.4 Specifying Iteration Space Constraints. EDGE allows us to specify constraints on the shape of the iteration space. For example, triangular iterations (such as traversing the lower triangle of a matrix) require the iteration space to exclude certain points that the Cartesian product of rank variable sets would otherwise admit.

Output RVEs and explicit predicates narrow down the set of points in the iteration space that participate in an Einsum. If an output RVE produces an out-of-bounds coordinate at a given point in the iteration space, that point produces no `MAP TEMPORARY`. If an input RVE produces an out-of-bounds coordinate, the corresponding tensor access is undefined and its existence predicate evaluates to `False`.

We also allow a user to constrain the space explicitly: the user states a condition over variables in the iteration space, and points failing the condition are excluded.

EDGE captures this by letting users attach predicates to rank variables, using the notation “ $rv : \langle \text{predicate} \rangle$ ”, where “ $:$ ” denotes a predicate over the iteration space (see § 5.9). While such constraints may appear locally within tensor subscripts, they globally restrict the set of valid points in the iteration space. Semantically, the predicate restricts the set of points in the iteration space in the graph of the Einsum projection (see Example 31).

Example 31: Predicates in Rank Variable Expressions

The following Einsum only accesses the lower triangular region of the B tensor:

$$Z_{m, n} = A_{m, k} \cdot B_{n, k: k < n} \quad (96)$$

Here, the second rank of B is accessed via rank variable k such that $k < n$. The predicate $k < n$ restricts which points in the iteration space participate in the Einsum. Points (m, n, k) with $k \geq n$ are excluded from the graph of EP ; they do not produce `MAP TEMPORARY` elements and are not observed by `REDUCE`. This does not make the output coordinate (m, n) invalid. Rather, for each output coordinate (m, n) , `REDUCE` combines only the contributions from points (m, n, k) where $k < n$.

The corresponding Einsum projection is then:

$$\text{graph}(EP) = \left\{ \left(is, ((m, n), (m, k), (n, k)) \right) \mid \begin{array}{l} is = (m, n, k) \in IS \\ \wedge k < n \end{array} \right\}. \quad (97)$$

This indicates that only (m, n, k) points in the iteration space where $k < n$ participate in the Einsum.

6.2.5 Tensor. Let the non-empty data space be the data space without the empty value set:

$$DS_{ne}^T \subseteq DS^T \quad (98)$$

$$DS_{ne}^T = DS^T \setminus E^T. \quad (99)$$




Fig. 14. Two rank variable expressions transform points in the $I \times J$ iteration space to points in the $M \times N$ coordinate space of tensor *Tensor*. The tensor itself takes a point in the coordinate space to a value in the data space.

A tensor, T , is a *partial* function that goes from its tensor coordinate space to its *non-empty* data space:

$$T : CS^T \rightarrow DS_{ne}^T. \quad (100)$$

For a given point:

$$T(p, q, r, \dots) = dv, \quad dv \in DS_{ne}^T. \quad (101)$$

Note how this is a general enough abstraction to admit any underlying implementation, whether fibertrees [68], a hash table that represents a tensor with many ranks but repeated values, sparse structures, and so on. Figure 14 visualizes an example tensor as a function.

Example 32: Semantics of the EDGE Tensor Declaration Region

We can now state the semantic meaning of EDGE's tensor declaration section. Suppose we have the following declarations:

►Tensors

$$Z^{M=5, N=6} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0 \quad (102a)$$

$$A^{K=10, M=5} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0 \quad (102b)$$

$$B^{K=10, N=6} \rightarrow \text{Integer, empty} = 0. \quad (102c)$$

These declarations induce the following sets and functions:

- (1) There is a tensor Z , defined as a function

$$Z : CS^Z \rightarrow DS_{ne}^Z.$$

- (2) The coordinate space of Z is the Cartesian product of its rank coordinate spaces:

$$CS^Z = RCS_M^Z \times RCS_N^Z.$$

- (3) The declaration $M = 5$ is syntactic sugar for a rank name paired with its rank coordinate space. That is,

$$RCS_M^Z = \{ m \mid m \in [0, 5) \}, \quad RCS_N^Z = \{ n \mid n \in [0, 6) \}.$$

- (4) The data space of Z is the set of integers:

$$DS^Z = \{ v \mid v \in \mathbb{Z} \}.$$

- (5) The declared empty value set of Z is the singleton containing 0:

$$E^Z = \{0\}.$$

- (6) Z is only defined where coordinates map to non-empty values.

We can similarly derive the semantics for lines (102b)–(102c).

6.2.6 Fibers and Subtensors. At times, we may wish to refer to a subtensor (or *fiber* [68]) of a tensor. Within our functional view of tensors, this notion is naturally expressed via partial application (currying).

Given an N -dimensional tensor, specifying $L < N$ rank coordinates partially evaluates the tensor function and yields a subtensor over the remaining ranks.

For example, consider a five-dimensional tensor $Z^{P,Q,R,S,U}$:

- (1) The fully applied expression

$$Z(p, q, r, s, u)$$

evaluates to a single data value, $dv \in DS_{ne}^Z$.

- (2) We can partially apply the tensor by fixing specific rank coordinates:

$$Z(p, q, r, s)$$

For a fixed input (p_i, q_i, r_i, s_i) , it evaluates to a one-dimensional subtensor indexed by the rank coordinate space RCS_U^Z :

$$Z(p_i, q_i, r_i, s_i) = \{ (u, dv_u) \mid u \in RCS_U^Z \wedge dv_u \in DS_{ne}^Z \}.$$

Equivalently, we may write this as a unary function:

$$Z_{p_i, q_i, r_i, s_i}(u) = dv_u, \quad u \in RCS_U^Z.$$

In tensor algebra terminology, this corresponds to fixing the P, Q, R, S ranks and extracting a one-dimensional fiber along the U rank (a U -fiber).

- (3) The partially applied expression

$$Z(p, q, s)$$

fixes only the P, Q, S ranks. For a given (p_i, q_i, s_i) , it evaluates to a two-dimensional subtensor indexed by the Cartesian product of rank coordinate spaces $RCS_R^Z \times RCS_U^Z$:

$$Z(p_i, q_i, s_i) = \{ ((r, u), dv_{r,u}) \mid (r, u) \in RCS_R^Z \times RCS_U^Z \wedge dv_{r,u} \in DS_{ne}^Z \}. \quad (103)$$

Equivalently, this subtensor may be viewed as a function

$$Z_{p_i, q_i, s_i}(r, u) = dv_{r,u}, \quad (r, u) \in RCS_R^Z \times RCS_U^Z.$$

In tensor algebra terms, this operation fixes the P, Q, S ranks and returns a two-dimensional subtensor spanning the remaining $R \times U$ rank coordinate spaces.

6.2.7 Existence Check. Tensors are *partial* functions: not all coordinates produce non-empty values. To determine whether a particular coordinate yields a non-empty value, we define the *existence predicate* for a given tensor, *Exists*.

Semantically, $\text{Exists}_T(c)$ evaluates to True iff T is defined at coordinate c , and to False otherwise:

$$\text{Exists}_T(c) := (c \in \text{dom}(T)). \quad (104)$$

Since $\text{dom}(T) \subseteq CS^T$, if c is outside CS^T , then $\text{Exists}_T(c)$ evaluates to False. Since the codomain of T is DS_{ne}^T , if $c \in \text{dom}(T)$, then evaluating $T(c)$ yields a non-empty value.

The graph of Exists over a set C of coordinate tuples queried for tensor T is given by:

$$\text{graph}_C(\text{Exists}_T) = \{ (c, b) \mid c \in C \wedge b \equiv (c \in \text{dom}(T)) \}. \quad (105)$$

Inset 1 Total vs. Partial Tensor Semantics

There are two mathematically equivalent ways to model tensors with empty values:

Total-function approach. A tensor may be viewed as a total function

$$T : CS^T \rightarrow DS^T,$$

where the data space includes a distinguished empty value e^T with $E^T = \{e^T\}$. Under this model, every tensor coordinate is defined, and sparsity is represented implicitly by mapping many coordinates to e^T . This interpretation aligns naturally with dense array semantics.

Partial-function approach. Alternatively, a tensor may be viewed as a partial function

$$T : CS^T \rightharpoonup DS_{ne}^T,$$

whose domain consists only of coordinates associated with non-empty values. Here, sparsity is represented explicitly by the absence of a mapping.

We choose the partial-function approach as it enables existence checks (for Merge operators) without implying an implementation (**design goal: 4**). That is, an implementation may choose to realize the domain check ($c \in \text{dom}(T)$) in any way it chooses.

Specifically, in the total-function approach, an implementation must touch the coordinate space *and* the data space of a given tensor to determine if a particular location in a tensor is empty. In the partial-function approach, an implementation can implement existence by similarly checking the tensor values, or by encoding it in the metadata (e.g., the COO tensor format simply does not include coordinates for empty tensor locations).

6.3 MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE Actions

In the following subsections, we fix an EDGE Einsum with two input tensors, A and B , an output tensor, Z , and present the semantics of each action as operating over this Einsum.

The following sections step through the semantics of MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE. Figures 15–16 provide a high-level view of how MAP feeds into REDUCE and finally POPULATE. Although we present the steps sequentially, an implementation of EDGE is free to use any strategy as long as dependency constraints (represented by the arrows) are maintained. Thus, one implementation may choose to execute MAP for *all* points in the iteration space (potentially in parallel), before executing the remaining actions; another may choose to generate a MAP TEMPORARY for a single point in the iteration space, then immediately have REDUCE consume it; and still another may choose an asynchronous and pipelined approach where all actions are in flight for different regions of the iteration space. The following semantics simply specify the *meaning* and behavior of these actions (**design goal: 1**).

6.4 MAP

Given a single point in the iteration space, MAP determines whether a computation occurs at that point and, if so, applies the Compute operator to the corresponding tensor values of A and B . The result is an intermediate value consumed by subsequent actions (e.g., REDUCE). The *execution model* applies MAP independently to every point in the iteration space.

Before diving in, we introduce two operators that appear throughout MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE: Merge. The Merge operator takes two Booleans (the existence of the left operand and the right operand at the current point in the iteration space) and returns a single Boolean. In MAP,




Fig. 15. Execution flow of an EDGE Einsum with input tensors A , B and output tensor Z , evaluated at a single point in the iteration space. The figure highlights how a single point in the iteration space passes through rank variable expressions to produce coordinates in the tensor coordinate space, and how those coordinates produce a value in the data space.

this Boolean acts as a guard: if Merge returns True, MAP proceeds to Compute; if Merge returns False, MAP produces no value at this point. In later actions, such as REDUCE, the same Boolean output is interpreted according to that action’s semantics. Merge may be any of the 16 Boolean functions of two variables (see Appendix A); common choices include intersection ($\cap$) and union ($\cup$).

Compute. The Compute operator is a user-defined function that combines operand values into a single output value.

Inputs and Outputs. MAP is a function that takes as input (1) a point in the iteration space, (2) the rank variable expressions (RVEs) for each tensor in the Einsum, (3) the input tensors A and B , (4) a Merge operator, and (5) a user-defined Compute operator, with optional user-defined constants.

EDGE inputs and execution flow across all points




Fig. 16. Execution flow of an EDGE Einsum evaluated over the entire iteration space. The diagram illustrates how points in the iteration space are projected through rank variable expressions into tensor coordinate spaces, and how values are produced and propagated across all points.

The output, when MAP is defined at this point in the iteration space, is the computed value for that point. When paired with the point in the iteration space as a MAP “coordinate”, the (point, value) tuple forms a MAP TEMPORARY element.

We first describe the operational steps performed by MAP, then present a precise semantic definition using set-theoretic notation.




Fig. 17. MAP: Operand values accessed at a point in the iteration space are combined to produce a MAP TEMPORARY, which is then forwarded to the subsequent REDUCE action.

6.4.1 MAP Steps.

- (1) MAP first applies the Einsum projection to the point in the iteration space, producing a tuple of tensor coordinates in the Einsum coordinate space:

$$EP(rv_0, rv_1, \dots, rv_{D-1}) = (cs^Z, cs^A, cs^B),$$

$$\text{where } cs^Z \in CS^Z, cs^A \in CS^A, cs^B \in CS^B. \quad (106)$$

- (2) Given the tensor coordinates, MAP applies the existence predicate (Exists) to the input tensors A and B, producing two Boolean values.
- (3) The Merge operator consumes these two Booleans and produces a single Boolean value that determines whether this point in the iteration space contributes a computation at

all. Isolating this decision in a two-input Boolean operator lets us express all 16 possible combinations uniformly (see Appendix A).

$$\text{Merge} : \mathbb{B} \times \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}. \quad (107)$$

- (4) If Merge evaluates to True, MAP activates the Compute operator. If Merge evaluates to False, MAP produces no value at this point in the iteration space; the MAP function is *undefined* there. We define the following guard predicate:

$$\text{Guard}(is) := \text{Merge}(\text{Exists}_A(cs^A), \text{Exists}_B(cs^B)). \quad (108)$$

- (5) The Compute operator consumes (1) the evaluated tensor values of A and B at the current point in the iteration space, (2) their corresponding coordinate tuples, (3) the point in the iteration space, and (4) any user-defined constants. The Compute operator is user-defined and returns a value in the data space of Z .

$$\text{Compute} : DS^A \times DS^B \times CS^A \times CS^B \times IS \rightarrow DS^Z. \quad (109)$$

If the evaluated value of either A or B is undefined (that is, the Merge operator evaluated to True even though one operand was empty), Compute substitutes the corresponding empty value as the operand. If the computed value lies in the empty space of the output ($dv \in E^Z$), the MAP TEMPORARY element is simply omitted at this point: the partial function MAP is left undefined here.

- (6) Finally, the MAP TEMPORARY element consists of an ordered pair: the point in the iteration space and the computed value. That is, the MAP TEMPORARY element is a tuple of the point in the iteration space passed as an input to MAP, and the corresponding computed output value for that point.

6.4.2 Set Theory Notation for MAP. MAP is a partial function over the iteration space that produces a value. When parameterized on Compute, Merge, the set of RVEs, and tensors, its domain/codomain mapping is:

$$\text{MAP}_{A,B,\Gamma^A,\Gamma^B,\text{Merge},\text{Compute}} : IS \rightarrow DS_{ne}^Z. \quad (110)$$

The MAP TEMPORARY set is a set of ordered pairs, where each pair consists of a point in the iteration space and the corresponding computed value. Note that MAP is itself a tensor, whose graph we name the MAP TEMPORARY. Specifically, when indexed by a point in the iteration space, the MAP TEMPORARY will return the corresponding computed value generated by MAP.

Definition 6.1 (Map Semantics). Fix an Einsum with input tensors A and B , output tensor Z , rank variable expressions Γ^A and Γ^B , a merge operator (Merge), and a compute operator (Compute).

The MAP action is defined as a function

$$\text{MAP} : IS \rightarrow DS_{ne}^Z. \quad (111)$$

Let $e^A \in E^A$ and $e^B \in E^B$ denote the empty values of A and B . For each point $is \in IS$, let

$$(cs^Z, cs^A, cs^B) = EP(is), \quad (112)$$

and define:

$$dv_A(is) := \begin{cases} A(cs^A), & \text{if } \text{Exists}_A(cs^A), \\ e^A, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (113)$$

$$dv_B(is) := \begin{cases} B(cs^B), & \text{if } \text{Exists}_B(cs^B), \\ e^B, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (114)$$

The graph of MAP is then:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{graph}(\text{MAP}) = \{ (cs^{\text{MAP}}, dv) \mid is \in IS, cs^{\text{MAP}} = is, \\ (cs^Z, cs^A, cs^B) = EP(is), \\ \text{Merge}(\text{Exists}_A(cs^A), \text{Exists}_B(cs^B)) = \text{True}, \\ dv = \text{Compute}(dv_A(is), dv_B(is), cs^A, cs^B, is), \\ dv \notin E^Z \}, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

$$\text{MAP TEMPORARY} = \text{graph}(\text{MAP}). \quad (116)$$

6.5 Reduce

The output tensor's rank variable expressions determine when multiple right-hand side computed values (i.e., MAP TEMPORARY values) correspond to the same output location. REDUCE gathers results from MAP based on the *output* location. These values need to be *combined* in some manner: REDUCE specifies how to combine results.

In EDGE, REDUCE does not directly place results in the output tensor (see POPULATE). Instead, REDUCE iterates over the same iteration space as MAP, queries whether MAP produced a non-empty value at each point in the iteration space, and aggregates the resulting intermediate values according to the coordinate space of the output tensor.

Inputs and Outputs. REDUCE takes as input: (1) a point in the iteration space; (2) the MAP TEMPORARY tensor, which may be queried at each point in the iteration space; (3) a Merge operator; (4) the rank variable expressions for Z (Γ^Z); and (5) a user-defined Compute operator, which additionally takes as input an identity element for REDUCE and any user-defined constants.

REDUCE maintains internal state indexed by the coordinate space of the output tensor (Z). Conceptually, there is one reduction state per output tensor coordinate. The output of REDUCE is a reduction temporary (REDUCE TEMPORARY) element, an ordered pair consisting of an output tensor coordinate and the final computed, reduced value. The REDUCE TEMPORARY is a “shadow” of the final output tensor, Z (see Inset 2).

Inset 2 Shadow Tensors and the EDGE Execution Model

In our original *operational definition of an Einsum*, computed values are placed directly into the output tensor location, “reducing” if another value is already present.

In EDGE, the “output tensor” is instead realized as a *shadow tensor*, where computed values (MAP TEMPORARY values) are placed into a location in the shadow (i.e., the reduction state *RState*, which eventually becomes the REDUCE TEMPORARY), reducing with whatever value is already there.

The POPULATE action then either copies this shadow tensor (in the default assignment case) or applies a final transformation to its contents before materializing the output tensor.

This execution model remains consistent with the operational definition of an Einsum, while cleanly separating the responsibilities of computation, aggregation, and placement.




Fig. 18. REDUCE: for each output tensor coordinate cs^Z , REDUCE combines the current reduction state $RState(cs^Z)$ with the incoming MAP TEMPORARY value using the user-specified Merge and Compute operators. The result updates $RState(cs^Z)$. When no further MAP TEMPORARY elements remain for that coordinate, $RState(cs^Z)$ contributes a final reduced value to REDUCE TEMPORARY.

6.5.1 *REDUCE Steps.* For each output tensor coordinate $cs^Z \in CS^Z$, REDUCE maintains a corresponding reduction state, denoted $RState_{cs^Z}$.

- (1) For a given point in the iteration space, REDUCE applies the RVEs for Z to retrieve the corresponding coordinate ($cs^Z = \Gamma^Z(is)$).
- (2) REDUCE checks whether the current value of the reduction state is non-empty. If this is the first time REDUCE is processing this output coordinate, the current value of the reduction state is initialized to the identity element for the given Compute operator.
- (3) Likewise, for that same point in the iteration space, REDUCE applies an existence predicate to the MAP TEMPORARY. That is, REDUCE checks whether MAP TEMPORARY(is) returns a defined (non-empty) value. Note that MAP *must* have executed at this point in the iteration space for REDUCE to process the MAP TEMPORARY:

$$\text{Exists}_{\text{MAP TEMPORARY}}(is) := (is \in \text{dom}(\text{MAP TEMPORARY})).$$

- (4) The resulting Booleans are passed as input to the Merge operator. As with MAP, Merge is user-specified and is one of 16 operators (see Appendix A). The first/left-hand operand to Merge originates from the current value of $RState$, and the second/right-hand operand to Merge originates from the MAP TEMPORARY.
- (5) If Merge evaluates to True, REDUCE activates the Compute operator and updates the reduction state. If Merge evaluates to False, the reduction state for this output coordinate is set to the empty value of Z . This is because, in REDUCE, the Merge operator determines not only whether the incoming MAP TEMPORARY value is used, but also whether the current reduction state remains valid after observing this point in the iteration space. For example, with an intersect Merge operator, a missing MAP TEMPORARY value (i.e., empty) invalidates the accumulated reduction state for that output coordinate.

As with MAP, we treat Merge as a guard:

$$\text{Guard}_{\text{REDUCE}}(is) := \text{Merge}(b_s, b_m), \quad (117)$$

where b_s indicates whether the current value of the reduction state is non-empty, and b_m indicates whether MAP TEMPORARY is defined at this point in the iteration space.

- (6) The Compute operator consumes the current value of the reduction state and the evaluated MAP TEMPORARY value at this point in the iteration space.
If MAP TEMPORARY(is) is defined, then the evaluated MAP TEMPORARY value is MAP TEMPORARY(is). If MAP TEMPORARY(is) is undefined but Merge evaluates to True, then Compute receives the empty value of Z for the MAP TEMPORARY operand. This mirrors the behavior of MAP: when a Merge operator permits computation despite a missing operand, the missing operand is represented by the corresponding empty value.
The Compute operator combines these values using a user-specified operation that takes as input (1) the current value of the reduction state, (2) the evaluated MAP TEMPORARY value, (3) the coordinate tuple for Z , (4) the point in the iteration space, (5) the identity value for the reduction occurring (e.g., 0 for addition), and (6) any user-defined constants.
- (7) The $RState_{cs^Z}$ is updated with the result of Compute.
- (8) This process repeats incrementally for each MAP TEMPORARY associated with the same output coordinate. When no further MAP TEMPORARY elements remain for a given output coordinate, REDUCE considers the corresponding reduction state as final.
- (9) The resulting REDUCE TEMPORARY is an ordered pair consisting of the output coordinate cs^Z and the final value stored in $RState_{cs^Z}$. If that value is empty, REDUCE does not return a value for the given cs^Z .

When the reduction operator is associative and commutative, REDUCE is equivalent to a fold over the MAP TEMPORARY elements corresponding to each output coordinate. In this case, the final reduced value is independent of the order in which MAP TEMPORARY elements are processed.

If the reduction operator is not associative and commutative, then the result may depend on the order in which the corresponding MAP TEMPORARY elements are processed. In that case, EDGE guarantees only that the result is equivalent to applying the reduction operator to some valid ordering of those elements. If a particular ordering is required for correctness or reproducibility, the user must specify that ordering explicitly at the mapping level of the separation of concerns.

6.5.2 Set Theory Notation for REDUCE. At a high level, REDUCE iterates over the iteration space, queries MAP TEMPORARY, and uses the rank variable expressions for Z to identify the corresponding output coordinate. For each output coordinate, REDUCE maintains a reduction state and updates that state according to the user-specified Merge and Compute operators. After all points in the iteration space have been processed, the non-empty final states form the REDUCE TEMPORARY.

Definition 6.2 (Reduce Semantics). Fix an Einsum with output tensor Z , a reduction merge operator Merge, and a reduction compute operator Compute.

Let $\text{graph}(\text{MAP}) \subseteq IS \times DS^Z$ denote the graph of MAP, and let

$$\Gamma^Z : IS \rightarrow CS^Z \quad (118)$$

be the group of RVEs that extract the output tensor coordinate associated with a point in the iteration space.

The REDUCE action maintains a state function

$$\text{RState} : CS^Z \rightarrow DS^Z. \quad (119)$$

The state is created lazily for an output coordinate when that coordinate is first processed. When created, its initial value is the identity for the given Compute operator. After that point, RState may store either a non-empty reduced value or the empty value $e^Z \in E^Z$.

Let RState^{old} denote the reduction state before processing the current point in the iteration space, and let RState^{new} denote the reduction state after processing it.

Let $e^Z \in E^Z$ denote the empty value of Z , and let $\mathbb{I}_{\text{REDUCE}}$ denote the identity value for the reduction.

At a point in the iteration space, the output coordinate is:

$$cs^Z = \Gamma^Z(is). \quad (120)$$

The current value of the reduction state is:

$$dv_s := \begin{cases} \text{RState}^{old}(cs^Z), & \text{if } cs^Z \in \text{dom}(\text{RState}^{old}), \\ \mathbb{I}_{\text{REDUCE}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (121)$$

The Boolean inputs to the Merge operator are:

$$b_s := (dv_s \notin E^Z), \quad (122)$$

$$b_m := \text{Exists}_{\text{MAP TEMPORARY}}(is). \quad (123)$$

The value consumed from MAP TEMPORARY at this point in the iteration space is:

$$dv := \begin{cases} dv', & \text{if } (is, dv') \in \text{graph}(\text{MAP}), \\ e^Z, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (124)$$

The reduction state is updated incrementally according to:

$$\text{RState}^{new}(cs^Z) := \begin{cases} \text{Compute}(dv_s, dv), & \text{Merge}(b_s, b_m) = \text{True}, \\ e^Z, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (125)$$

All other reduction states are left unchanged during this update step.

After this point in the iteration space is processed, $RState^{new}$ becomes the current reduction state for subsequent points in the iteration space.

Let $RState^{final}$ denote the reduction state after all points in the iteration space have been processed. Then REDUCE returns:

$$REDUCE\ TEMPORARY = \{ (cs^Z, dv) \mid cs^Z \in \text{dom}(RState^{final}) \wedge dv = RState^{final}(cs^Z) \wedge dv \notin E^Z \}. \quad (126)$$

6.6 Populate

The presence of “*” annotations in the left-hand side of an expression determines which fibers are mutable with the tensor. A “*” annotation on a given rank indicates that POPULATE may update multiple coordinates within the corresponding fiber, rather than writing to a single output coordinate. This fiber-level update is necessary for computations where the fate of one coordinate depends on the other coordinates in the same fiber, such as selecting the top- k values, keeping only the minimum-weighted neighbor, sampling a subset of vertices, or deleting old entries while inserting new ones.

Suppose we have the following three output tensors on the left-hand side of three different Einsums:

$$Z_{m,n,q} = \dots \quad (127a)$$

$$Z_{m,n,q^*} = \dots \quad (127b)$$

$$Z_{m,n^*,q^*} = \dots \quad (127c)$$

We will use these three EDGE expressions to walk through the semantics of POPULATE. The first scenario (Equation 127a, no “*”) is assignment, or “default” POPULATE (see Inset 5).

Inputs and Outputs. POPULATE takes as input (1) a point in the iteration space; (2) the REDUCE TEMPORARY tensor; (3) the rank variable expressions for Z ; (4) a user-defined Coordinate operator, which additionally takes as input the iteration-space point (is) and any user-defined constants; (5) a user-defined Compute operator, which additionally takes as input any user-defined constants and the iteration-space point (is); and (6) the current output tensor Z .

Z is a tensor that the EDGE expression *creates*. We define Z by iteratively updating its graph through successive applications of POPULATE. POPULATE outputs an updated Z (as Z') replacing either a single tuple (cs^Z, dv) in the “default” assignment mode, or *fiber* of such tuples.

6.6.1 POPULATE Steps.

Fiber-key extraction.

- (1) Given a coordinate tuple of Z , POPULATE computes a *fiber key* (fk) by removing any rank coordinate marked with “*” in the EDGE expression. Intuitively, the fiber key is the part of the output coordinate that stays fixed while POPULATE updates the mutable fiber. Equivalently, it names which fiber of the output tensor is being updated in this round of POPULATE. We denote this operation by the function FILTER-COORDS.

Example 33: Fiber Key Examples

For the default-assignment expression $Z_{m,n,q}$ in Equation 127a, no ranks are marked with “*”. Thus, the tuple (m, n, q) remains unchanged, yielding $fk = (m, n, q)$.

For the Q -fiber expression Z_{m,n,q^*} in Equation 127b, the mutable rank is q . Thus, the tuple (m, n, q) yields $fk = (m, n)$.

Populate Internals




Fig. 19. POPULATE: given the current state of the output tensor Z and an incoming REDUCE TEMPORARY element, POPULATE selects the corresponding fiber (using the fiber key derived from “*”-marked ranks), applies a user-defined Coordinate operator to produce a WRITE/DELETE/NONE action label for each coordinate in the fiber, and then applies the Compute operator to produce the new values at WRITE locations. The updated fiber replaces the original in Z .

For the NQ -fiber expression Z_{m,n^*,q^*} in Equation 127c, the mutable ranks are n and q . Thus, the tuple (m, n, q) yields $fk = (m)$.

Fiber selection.

- (2) Given the filtered coordinate tuple (fiber key), POPULATE indexes the current output tensor Z to retrieve the corresponding fiber (subtensor). However, instead of fibers, POPULATE uses the set of $((m_i, n, q), dv)$ tuple pairs. That is, POPULATE uses the *subset* of the Z tensor that matches the subtensor. We term this subset the *enumerated subtensor/fiber* (EnumFiber_Z).

Example 34: Fiber Keys to Fibers

For Equation 127a, this yields a single value: $Z(m, n, q)$. For Equation 127b, this yields a Q -fiber: $Z(m_i, n_i) = Z_{m_i, n_i}(q)$. For Equation 127c, this yields an $N \times Q$ subtensor (an NQ -fiber): $Z(m_i) = Z_{m_i}(n, q)$. In the case of the NQ -fiber, the subtensor is a set of $((n, q), dv)$ pairs.

Inset 3 The ENUMFIBER Function

ENUMFIBER is useful because POPULATE must know not only which values are in a mutable fiber, but also their full coordinates in the output tensor. The full coordinates are needed to decide which existing entries to delete, which empty coordinates to write, and how to splice the updated fiber back into the graph of Z .

Suppose we have the expression

$$Z_{m,n,q^*} = A_{m,n,q} :: \lll \dots$$

Here, the fiber key is $fk = (m, n)$. Fixing a point (m_i, n_i) , the corresponding fiber consists of all values of Z whose full coordinate tuples match (m_i, n_i) on the non- $*$ ranks:

$$Z(m_i, n_i) = \{(q, dv)\},$$

where m and n are fixed and q varies.

The formal enumerated fiber representation used by POPULATE preserves the full coordinate tuple for each element:

$$\text{EnumFiber}_Z(m_i, n_i) = \left\{ ((m_i, n_i, q), dv) \mid q \in RCS_Q^Z \right\}.$$

Coordinate operator.

- (3) POPULATE applies a user-defined Coordinate operator to the retrieved enumerated fiber of Z and the incoming REDUCE TEMPORARY. The Coordinate operator takes as input (1) the current enumerated fiber, (2) the coordinate tuple and value contained in the REDUCE TEMPORARY for this iteration-space point, and optionally (3) the iteration-space point (is) and (4) any user-defined constants.

It returns a WRITE-DEL set, whose elements are pairs of coordinate tuples and actions drawn from {Write, Delete, None}. The cardinality of this set matches that of the input fiber.

We impose the following semantic constraint on the Coordinate operator: **a coordinate tuple may be marked as Write only if, at this iteration-space point (is), the coordinate maps to the empty value of $Z(E^Z)$ in Z** . In other words, at this point in the iteration space, one cannot put a value at a coordinate location in Z that already contains a value. This prevents overwriting existing values within a single round of POPULATE. The user is responsible for defining Coordinate so that this constraint holds; an implementation of EDGE should raise an error (at compile or runtime) if a violation is detected. The invariants that justify this constraint are detailed in Inset 4.

Inset 4 Constraints on Each Round of Populate

We enforce the following constraint during a single round of fiber updates. We want:

- (a) Writes only target locations empty at the start of the round
- (b) A location deleted in this round cannot also be written in this round

(c) Future rounds may write to locations deleted in this round

Let:

- S be the current state
- Let Loc be the set of all locations (occupied and unoccupied) in the output fiber
- A round is the current point in the iteration space for which populate is occurring
- A “pre-state” is the state of the mutable fiber before a round of writes/deletions occur for this round of populate
- $\text{dom}(S) \subseteq \text{Loc}$ be the set of occupied locations
- $D \subseteq \text{Loc}$ be the delete set
- $W \subseteq \text{Loc}$ be the write set

The key idea is that writes are only checked against the pre-state. So the invariant for (a) is:

$$W \cap \text{dom}(S) = \emptyset$$

and the invariant for (b) is:

$$D \cap W = \emptyset$$

Together:

$$W \cap \text{dom}(S) = \emptyset \wedge D \cap W = \emptyset$$

We can simplify further. If writes must be empty in the pre-state, then deletions do not matter for that check. Therefore, the constraints are logically independent:

- W must avoid currently occupied locations
- W must avoid deletions in the same round

Because deleted locations are occupied in the pre-state, we can express our temporal condition equivalently as:

$$W \cap (\text{dom}(S) \cup D) = \emptyset$$

Writes must avoid modifying anything that either already exists or is being deleted this round.

Fiber update.

- (4) For each element in WRITE-DEL marked Delete, POPULATE removes the corresponding coordinate and value from the current enumerated Z fiber. The resulting enumerated Z fiber, now with zero or more elements removed, is the *post-delete fiber*, denoted $\text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{sans_del}}$. Here, sans_del denotes the state of the fiber after the Delete actions have been applied.
- (5) Elements marked None leave the enumerated Z subtensor unchanged.
- (6) For each element in WRITE-DEL marked Write:
 - (a) POPULATE invokes the user-defined Compute operator to produce a value. The Compute operator takes as input (1) the target coordinate, (2) the value from the REDUCE TEMPORARY, (3) the iteration-space point (*is*), and (4) any user-defined constants, and returns a single data value. The target coordinate is passed explicitly because a single iteration space point may produce multiple Write actions (one per coordinate in the output fiber); Compute may produce a different value at each target coordinate. The Compute operator is invoked once for each coordinate marked as Write in the previous step.
 - (b) The value returned by Compute will be written at the corresponding target coordinate (that was marked Write).
- (7) We refer to the set of values produced by Compute, together with their associated target coordinates, as the *write fiber*, denoted $\text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{write}}$.

Updated output tensor.

- (8) POPULATE produces an updated subtensor for Z by applying the delete and write fibers. The updated tensor Z' may subsequently be used as input to later POPULATE invocations.

Overall, the POPULATE action preserves the semantics of REDUCE by ensuring that every value written to the output tensor originates from a corresponding REDUCE TEMPORARY. This follows from the structure of POPULATE: the Coordinate operator may choose where to write, but it does not create data values. The only data value available to the Compute operator is the value carried by the incoming REDUCE TEMPORARY element, together with the target coordinate, the iteration-space point, and any user-defined constants. Thus, for every value written into Z , there exists a corresponding REDUCE TEMPORARY element whose value was used to produce that write.

6.6.2 Set Theory Notation for POPULATE. At a high level, POPULATE updates the graph of the output tensor (Z) by selecting a fiber, determining how that fiber should be modified, and producing an updated tensor that reflects those changes. Each invocation of POPULATE processes a single reduction temporary (REDUCE TEMPORARY).

Preliminaries. Let the current output tensor be

$$Z : CS^Z \rightarrow DS_{ne}^Z.$$

Let (cs^R, dv_r) denote the REDUCE TEMPORARY element produced by REDUCE and accessed by POPULATE at iteration-space point is .

Fiber-key extraction. Some ranks of Z may be marked with “*” in the EDGE expression. This indicates that POPULATE should operate over a fiber (i.e., a subtensor over the remaining non-“*” coordinates) rather than a single coordinate. To select the fiber key, we define the *filter-coords* function:

Let Z have ranks $(cs_0, cs_1, \dots, cs_{k-1})$, and let

$$\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0, \dots, k-1\}$$

denote the indices of ranks *not* marked with “*”. The fiber-key function is defined as:

$$\text{FILTER-COORDS} : CS^Z \rightarrow CS_{\mathcal{F}}^Z, \quad (128)$$

$$\text{FILTER-COORDS}(cs^Z) := (cs_i)_{i \in \mathcal{F}}. \quad (129)$$

Fiber selection. Given a fiber key $fk \in CS_{\mathcal{F}}^Z$, we define a *fiber-selection* function that returns the set of *enumerated* coordinate-value pairs associated with that fiber:

$$\text{EnumFiber}_Z(fk) = \{ (cs^Z, dv) \mid cs^Z \in CS^Z \wedge \text{FILTER-COORDS}(cs^Z) = fk \wedge Z(cs^Z) = dv \}. \quad (130)$$

This representation retains full coordinate tuples for each element in the fiber, rather than partial coordinate tuples that include only the rank coordinate of the varying rank.

Coordinate operator. The Coordinate operator determines how the selected fiber should be modified in response to the incoming REDUCE TEMPORARY. The operator has the following mapping:

$$\text{Coordinate} : \text{EnumFiber}_Z(fk) \times (CS^Z \times DS^Z) \times IS \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(CS^Z \times \{\text{Write, Delete, None}\}), \quad (131)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ is the power set. That is, the output of Coordinate is a set, the WRITE-DEL set. Note that the WRITE-DEL set is a set of (coordinate, action) pairs, where an action may be Write, Delete, or None; in other words, it includes None entries in addition to Writes and Deletes.

$$\text{WriteDel}_{fk} = \text{Coordinate}(\text{EnumFiber}_Z(fk), (cs^R, dv_r), is) \quad (132)$$

$$\text{List}_{\text{Del}} = \{ cs^Z \mid (cs^Z, \text{Delete}) \in \text{WriteDel}_{fk} \} \quad (133)$$

$$\text{List}_{\text{Write}} = \{ cs^Z \mid (cs^Z, \text{Write}) \in \text{WriteDel}_{fk} \} \quad (134)$$

Each element of WriteDel_{fk} specifies an action (Write, Delete, None) for a coordinate in the enumerated fiber. List_{Del} and $\text{List}_{\text{Write}}$ are sets containing the corresponding coordinate tuples.

Fiber update. First, all coordinates marked for deletion are removed:

$$\text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{sans_del}}(fk) = \text{EnumFiber}_Z(fk) \setminus \{ (cs^Z, dv) \mid cs^Z \in \text{List}_{\text{Del}} \}. \quad (135)$$

The superscript sans_del denotes the state of the fiber after the Delete actions have been applied.

Next, coordinates marked Write produce new values using a user-defined Compute operator:

$$\text{Compute} : CS^Z \times DS^Z \times IS \rightarrow DS^Z. \quad (136)$$

The resulting enumerated write fiber is:

$$\text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{write}}(fk) = \{ (cs^Z, \text{Compute}(cs^Z, dv_r, is)) \mid cs^Z \in \text{List}_{\text{Write}} \}. \quad (137)$$

The updated fiber is then:

$$\text{EnumFiber}_{Z'}(fk) = \text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{sans_del}}(fk) \cup \text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{write}}(fk). \quad (138)$$

Updated output tensor. At a given iteration-space point is , POPULATE operates on exactly one fiber. Let

$$cs^Z = \Gamma^Z(is), \quad fk = \text{FILTER-COORDS}(cs^Z)$$

be the output coordinate and corresponding fiber key induced by is .

The updated output tensor Z' is defined by replacing only this fiber and leaving all other fibers unchanged:

$$\text{graph}(Z') = (\text{graph}(Z) \setminus \text{EnumFiber}_Z(fk)) \cup \text{EnumFiber}_{Z'}(fk). \quad (139)$$

Inset 5 Assignment (“Default” Populate)

Assignment is a specific instance of populate. Suppose we have the following expression:

$$Z_{m,n} = \mathcal{R}_{m,n}$$

where each element in $\mathcal{R}$, representing the REDUCE TEMPORARY, is copied to the corresponding (m, n) location in Z .

For a given (m_i, n_i) point in the iteration space (where i represents this instance of (m, n)), POPULATE does the following:

- (1) Apply FILTER-COORDS, yielding a fiber key of (m_i, n_i) .
- (2) Access the current output tensor (Z) at (m_i, n_i) and form the *enumerated fiber*. Since there is only a single point, $\text{EnumFiber}_Z(m_i, n_i)$ is a set with the following, single element: $((m_i, n_i), Z(m_i, n_i))$.
- (3) Apply the Coordinate operator to (1) $\text{EnumFiber}_Z(m_i, n_i)$ along with (2) the (m_i, n_i) point and corresponding data value (R at (m_i, n_i)) for the RHS REDUCE TEMPORARY. The iteration-space point (is) and user-defined constants are unused for assignment operations. The Coordinate operator returns a WRITE-DEL set that contains a single element: $((m_i, n_i), \text{WRITE})$. This indicates that POPULATE will write to point (m_i, n_i) in Z .

- (4) Apply the Compute operator. For assignment, this is simply the “pass-through” operator, which returns the value from the REDUCE TEMPORARY (R at (m_i, n_i)). This forms an $\text{EnumFiber}_Z^{\text{write}}(m_i, n_i)$.
- (5) Update Z with the $\text{EnumFiber}^{\text{write}}$.

Overall, the steps above correspond to placing the computed value on the RHS (REDUCE TEMPORARY) into the corresponding point on the LHS (Z).

Example 35: Using Populate for Data-Dependent Selection

Suppose an input fiber I_m contains several candidate values, and we want to select one value from that fiber. For example, the selected value could be the minimum, the maximum, or the first value satisfying a user-defined predicate. This selection is data-dependent: the coordinate operator must examine the fiber before deciding which coordinate should remain live. We can express this pattern of computation using POPULATE:

$$Z_{m^*} = I_m :: \lll_m \mathbb{I}(\text{DEPENDENT_SELECT}) \quad (140a)$$

$$Y = Z_m :: \bigvee \text{ANY}(\mathbb{I}) \quad (140b)$$

The coordinate operator `dependent_select` is one possible implementation of this pattern. It is not a fixed primitive of EDGE; rather, it stands for a user-defined coordinate operator whose internal selection policy may be chosen by the programmer. For example, the selection policy could keep the minimum value, keep the maximum value, or keep all values satisfying a predicate. The following pseudo-code shows the common structure of such an operator:

```

1 def dependent_select( lhs_enum_fiber = (z_m), rhs_tuple = (m, I_m.val)):
2   # Form a new enumerated fiber that combines the
3   # lhs_enum_fiber with the rhs_tuple
4   combined_enum_fiber = combine(lhs_enum_fiber, rhs_tuple)
5
6   # Look at all the elements in the combined fiber and select which
7   # coordinates will be included in the new output fiber.
8   # This select can be any function
9   live_coords = select(combined_enum_fiber)
10
11  # Retrieve coordinates that existed before this update
12  z_coords = coords(z_m)
13
14  # Which coordinates are we deleting?
15  delete_list = list(set(z_coords) - set(live_coords))
16
17  # Did we introduce any new coordinates compared to the previous coords?
18  edit_list = list(set(live_coords) - set(z_coords))
19
20  # What is unchanged?
21  none_list = list(set(live_coords)) - edit_list
22
23  return (none_list, delete_list, edit_list)

```

Example 36: Filter Even Values

Using populate, we can filter a fiber to include only even values:

$$Z_{m^*} = I_m :: \lll_m \mathbb{1}(\text{FILTER_EVEN}) \quad (141a)$$

$$(141b)$$

filter_even follows the same pattern as dependent_select (Example 35), with the following select function:^a

```

1 def even_select(combined_enum_fiber):
2   coords = []
3   for coord_tuple, val in combined_enum_fiber:
4     if is_even(val):
5       coords.append(coord_tuple)
6   return coords

```

^aThese are meant to be *example implementations*; optimizations are possible. For example, instead of filtering even values from the combined fiber, one can simply check the incoming value (`I_m.val`) and create a combined fiber if that value is even, otherwise keep the old, Z fiber as the combined fiber.

7 EDGE Syntax

In this section, we summarize the syntax of the EDGE language. This includes the concrete grammar, required components, and default specifications introduced throughout § 5. Figure 20 shows the grammar for the EDGE language, including tensor declaration, initialization, and Extended Einsums. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the default operators and actions when the corresponding symbols are omitted.

Table 4. Default specifications for each operator. An action cannot appear in an expression without an accompanying Compute operator (see Table 9), so there is no entry for Compute operators here.

When this is not present:	Then the default operator is:	Shorthand Example	Fully Specified Version
Merge Operator (in MAP)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \wedge \times$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \wedge \times (\mathbb{1})$
Merge Operator (in REDUCE)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \vee +$	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \vee + (\mathbb{1})$
Coordinate Operator (in POPULATE)	pass-through ($\mathbb{1}$)	$Z_{m^*} = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} \mathbb{1}$	$Z_{m^*} = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{1})$

7.1 Tensor Declaration

The tensor declaration region of an EDGE specification (§ 5.1) declares the rank names, shapes or the rank coordinate set (see § 6.1.2), data types, and empty values of all tensors used in the Extended Einsum region (see BFS Example 11 and Equation (41a)–(41d)). If a tensor rank is unbounded, such as a generational rank, no shape is specified. These declarations remove ambiguity about the size of the iteration space, the meaning of tensor coordinates, and the behavior of operators on empty values.


```

    <EDGE> → <declarations> <initializations> <main-edge>
    <declarations> → "»Tensors:" <declaration-list>
    <declaration-list> → <declaration-list> <tensor-declaration>
    | <tensor-declaration>
    <tensor-declaration> → <tensor-name> <shape-definition> → <data-type> " , " "empty=" <empty-value>
    | <tensor-name> <shape-definition> → <data-type> " , " "empty=" <empty-value> <rank-cs-override-list>
    <rank-cs-override-list> → <rank-cs-override-list> " , " <rank-cs-override>
    | <rank-cs-override>
    <rank-cs-override> → <rank-name> " ( <tensor-name> ) " = " <coordinate-set>
    <coordinate-set> → "{ " <coord-list> " } "
    | <interval>
    | <rank-name> " ( <tensor-name> ) "
    <interval> → "[ " <expression> " , " <expression> " ) "
    <coord-list> → <coord-list> " , " <coordinate> | <coordinate>
    <coordinate> → /[A-Za-z0-9]+/
    <tensor-name> → /[A-Z]+/[A-Za-z0-9]*/
    <shape-definition> → <shape-definition> " , " <shape-declaration> | <shape-declaration>
    <shape-declaration> → <rank-name> " ≡ " <rank-shape>
    | <rank-name>
    <rank-name> → /[A-Z]+/
    <rank-shape> → /[A-Z]+/[0-9]+/
    <initializations> → "»Initialization:" <initialization-list>
    <initialization-list> → <initialization-list> <einsum> | <einsum>
    <main-edge> → "»Extended Einsum:" <nested-cascade>
    <nested-cascade> → <einsum-cascade>
    | <nested-cascade> <stopping-condition>
    <stopping-condition> → "◊rank-variable:" <boolean-function>
    <boolean-function> → <user-defined-function>
    <einsum-cascade> → <einsum-cascade> <einsum> | <einsum>
    <einsum> → <iteration-spec> | <iteration-spec> ":" <computation-spec-list>
    <iteration-spec> → <output-tensor> " = " <expression>
    <expression> → <input-tensor>
    | <unary-operator> <input-tensor>
    | <expression> " , " <binary-label> <expression>
    | <anonymous-tensor>
    <anonymous-tensor> → " ( <expression> " ) " <rank-expression-list>
    <computation-spec-list> → <computation-spec-list> <computation-spec>
    | <computation-spec>
    <computation-spec> → <map-reduce> <binary-label> <compute-operator> " ( " <merge-operator> " ) "
    | <map-reduce> <binary-label> <compute-operator> " ( " <merge-operator> " ) "
    | <populate> <binary-label> <compute-operator> " ( " <coordinate-operator> " ) "
    <map-reduce> → " ∧ " | " ∨ "
    <populate> → " ≡≡ "
    <binary-label> → /[0-9]+/
    <merge-operator> → " 1 " | " F " | " ∩ " | " ⊖ " | " ← " | " ⊖ " | " → " | " ⊕ "
    | " ∪ " | " ∪ " | " ≡ " | " ⇝ " | " ⇝ " | " ⇝ " | " ⇝ " | " ⇝ " | " ⇝ "
    <unary-operator> → " − "
    | <user-defined-function>
    <compute-operator> → " + " | " − " | " × " | " ÷ "
    | <user-defined-function>
    <user-defined-function> → /[A-Za-z][A-Za-z0-9_]*/
    <coordinate-operator> → <user-defined-function>
    <output-tensor> → <tensor-projection>
    <input-tensor> → <tensor-projection>
    <tensor-projection> → <tensor-name> <rank-expression-list>
    <rank-expression-list> → <rank-expression-list> " , " <rank-expression> | <rank-expression>
    <rank-expression> → <rank-variable>
    | <rank-mapping-function> " ( " <rank-variable-list> " ) "
    <rank-variable-list> → <rank-variable-list> " , " <rank-variable> | <rank-variable>
    <rank-mapping-function> → <user-defined-function>
    <rank-variable> → /[a-z]+/[A-Za-z0-9]*/

```

Fig. 20. Grammar for the EDGE language.

7.2 Initialization

The initialization region specifies the values of input tensors. Any input tensor not initialized in this section is assumed user-specified. All *output* tensors are initially empty. Any valid extended Einsum expression may appear in this section as the right-hand side of an input-tensor assignment (see Inset 11, Equation (41f)).

7.3 Extended Einsum

A fully specified extended Einsum is a cascade of Einsum expressions. EDGE also supports nested cascades, extending the cascade model we introduced in Nayak et al. [68]. This is useful for expressing modular computations that feed into a larger computation, such as in Louvain’s method [14] and simple concurrent connected components [61].

7.3.1 Cascade of Einsums. A cascade consists of a sequence of Einsum expressions. If a cascade is iterative, we additionally specify (a) a generational rank variable, (b) its initial value, and (c) its rank variable set (§ 6.1.1). If these are omitted, the default generational rank variable is i , the default initial value is 0, and the default rank variable set is

$$RV_i = \{ i \mid i \in [0, I) \wedge \neg(\diamond : \langle \text{Boolean Expression} \rangle(i)) \}. \quad (142)$$

The diamond predicate excludes generations for which the predicate evaluates to true. The full EDGE BFS expression in Equation (41) uses these default specifications.

7.3.2 An Einsum Expression. Each expression contains the iteration space specifications (iteration-spec), followed by the corresponding specifications for MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE actions (in the EDGE-modifier). In Equation (41h), the iteration-spec is the portion containing the input and output tensors, their corresponding rank variable expressions, and the operation label $(\cdot)$: $(T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s})$.

Anonymous Tensors. An EDGE Einsum normally has two input operands and one output tensor. Expressions with more than two input operands are written using *anonymous tensors*. In such cases, precedence must be explicit. Thus, every binary operation is enclosed in parentheses. Each parenthesized subexpression denotes a partial tensor that may be used by an enclosing expression.

For example, using algebraic manipulation (see § 9), we can express both neighbor gathering (Equation (41h), and $\cdot^1$ in Equation (143)) and neighbor filtering (Equation (41i), and $\cdot^2$ in Equation (143)) as a single Einsum step:

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 F_{i,s})_{i,d} \cdot^2 \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge^1 + (\cap) \bigvee^1 \text{ANY}(\cup) \bigwedge^2 \leftarrow (\cap), \quad (143)$$

Table 5. Default specifications for each action. When an action is omitted, EDGE applies the default action shown here. Required accompanying operators are summarized in Table 9.

When this is not present:	Then the default action is:	Shorthand Example	Fully Specified Version
MAP Action (between 2 operands)	$\wedge \times (\mathbb{1})$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n}$	$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \times (\mathbb{1})$
REDUCE Action	$\vee + (\mathbb{1})$	$Z_m = A_{m,k}$	$Z_m = A_{m,k} :: \bigvee_k + (\mathbb{1})$
POPULATE Action	$\lll \mathbb{1} (\mathbb{1})$	$Z_m = A_m$	$Z_m^* = A_m :: \lll_{m^*} \mathbb{1} (\mathbb{1})$

7.3.3 Actions in an Einsum Expression. Every MAP and REDUCE action *must* correspond to an operation label ($\langle \text{binary_label} \rangle$) in the iteration-specs. Recall that a single-operand Einsum (or “unary” Einsum) is syntactic sugar for a degenerate MAP (see § 5.5). Thus, in a single-operand Einsum containing no operation labels, REDUCE by default refers to operation label 1.

Meanwhile, a two-operand Einsum may contain a REDUCE action on an operation label:

$$\text{MaskedDegree}_s = G_{s,d} \cdot \text{Mask}_s :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_d +(\cup). \quad (144)$$

This expression first filters out the vertices in the graph that are in a mask tensor ($\bigwedge$) before gathering the degrees of the filtered graph ($\bigvee$).

If we wanted to gather the degrees of all s vertices first, and then mask the result, we would need to specify a cascade of Einsums:

$$\text{Degree}_s = G_{s,d} :: \bigvee_d +(\cup) \quad (145a)$$

$$\text{MaskedDegree} = \text{Degree}_s \cdot \text{Mask}_s :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (145b)$$

Equation (145a) finds the degree of every source vertex in G by reducing over the d rank (where REDUCE, by default, refers to operation label 1). The next Einsum (Equation (145b)) selects from which sources (s rank variable) to extract the degree.

Note that in the first expression (Equation (144)) we perform less than or equal to the number of additions in the second expression (Equation (145)) since the first cascade only reduces over masked s elements rather than over all s elements. Future work will explore how to automate the algebraic manipulations necessary to go from one form to the other (**design goal 7**, see § 9).

7.3.4 Merge and Coordinate Operators. Table 7 summarizes the inputs and outputs of Merge, Coordinate, and Compute operators.

When an Einsum expression uses multiplication and addition operators in the traditional sense (as in GEMM, Equation (2)), we can drop the MAP, REDUCE, and POPULATE actions (**design goal 3**). Note that the default Merge operator for such an Einsum is the “pass-through” operator ($\mathbb{1}$), which touches all coordinates regardless of whether they contain empty values or not (see Appendix A, item 1). Merge/Coordinate operators are optional, while Compute operators must be specified (Table 9). If a particular operation label does not contain a Merge operator, the EDGE machinery applies the Compute operator to every point in the iteration space (default pass-through Merge operator).

For example, the gather step in BFS (BFS Example 11, Equation (41h)) *needs* the intersection ($\cap$) operator on the MAP action to execute efficiently. Intersection will ignore all s points in the iteration space where F_s contains an empty value of ∞ . EDGE guarantees that points that survive intersection will be non-empty (i.e., non-infinite) values. If we remove the Merge operator such that the expression becomes:

$$T_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot {}^1 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge^1 + \bigvee \text{ANY}(\cup), \quad (146)$$

then the $+$ Compute operator will add infinity from empty values in F to the edge weights in G . Note that the above expression assumes the default Merge operator of $\mathbb{1}$ (pass-through). While this will still produce a valid result in this particular scenario, the implementation cannot take advantage of the optimization opportunity to only process effectual computations (**design goal: 4**).

7.3.5 Rank Variable Expressions. Rank variable expressions are functions that map iteration-space variables to specific points in the rank of a tensor (see § 5.9, **design goal 6**).

For example, ternary expressions are possible:

$$Z_{f \equiv (w < a ? w : a)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (147)$$

In Equation (147), the RVE in the output is labeled (f), read as “ f such that f is equivalent ($\equiv$) to the result of the expression in parentheses”, where the Boolean expression essentially returns the minimum of w and a as execution walks the iteration space. This expression requires a REDUCE action on the output rank, as multiple points in the iteration space may correspond to the same point in Z ’s data space. For example, $(w, a) = (0, 1)$ will update $f = 0$ ($0 < 1$ so select $w = 0$), and $(w, a) = (1, 0)$ will also update $f = 0$ ($1 \geq 0$, so select $w = 0$). If the P tensor is one-hot, that is, its a rank has at most an occupancy of 1, then this expression returns the set of coordinates in G less than the occupied a coordinate in P , as well as the coordinate in P if any coordinate in G is equal to or greater than that a coordinate. This type of computation is common in algorithms like connected components, which often includes a step where computation replaces an ancestor vertex (a) with a smaller-valued connected vertex (w) (see Figure 21).

In general, we can summarize a rank variable expression on the rank of a tensor, Z , as:

$$Z_{f(\text{iteration space variables})}, \quad (148)$$

where f can be any user-defined function that takes as input points in the iteration space and outputs a single coordinate.

We could rewrite Equation (147) as:

$$Z_{f(a, w)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (149)$$

Function definitions :

$$f(a, w) \rightarrow \text{if } w < a \text{ then return } w \text{ else return } a, \quad (150)$$

or as:

$$Z_{\min(a, w)} = G_w \cdot P_a :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee \text{OR}(\cup), \quad (151)$$

where f is also a *named RVE*.

A named RVE can be referenced in multiple tensor subscripts within the same Einsum. For example:

$$Z_{f(a, w)} = A_w \cdot B_{a, f} :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap), \bigvee \text{OR}(\cup), \quad (152)$$


$$f(a, w) = \max(a, w). \quad (153)$$

Here, the second rank of B is also accessed via f . The name f is not itself a rank variable; it is an alias for the corresponding rank variable expression.

Equivalently, this can be written inline as:

$$Z_{f \equiv \max(a, w)} = A_w \cdot B_{a, f} :: \bigwedge \text{AND}(\cap), \bigvee \text{OR}(\cup). \quad (154)$$

Figure 21 illustrates Equation (147) with a one-hot P_a , non-empty at $a=2$ and G_w non-empty at $w=0, 1, 3$.



Z = updated representative candidates: parents $w < a$ keep their own id parents $w > a$ are absorbed into ancestor a

Legend: active, $w < a$ active, $w \geq a$ non-empty input empty / culled

Fig. 21. Rank variable expression $f \equiv \min(w, a)$ with ancestor P_a one-hot at $a=2$ and current parents G_w non-empty at $w=0, 1, 3$. Z_f gives the updated representative candidates after one step: parents smaller than the ancestor (vertices 0 and 1) keep their own coordinate in Z ; parents larger than the ancestor (vertex 3) are absorbed into the ancestor coordinate $Z[2]$, and vertex 3 disappears from the output ($Z[3]=\emptyset$). This is the ancestor replacement step common in connected-components algorithms.

7.3.6 User-Defined Functions in MAP and REDUCE. EDGE allows Compute operators in both MAP and REDUCE to be user-defined functions. For a MAP action, the Compute operator takes as input the current iteration-space point and the operand values at that point, and returns a single data value. For a REDUCE action, the Compute operator takes as input the current iteration-space point, the current reduce state, and the current value being reduced, and returns an updated data value. These functions may be defined in a host language such as C or Python. Table 8 summarizes the inputs and outputs of Compute and Merge operators in MAP and REDUCE.

7.3.7 User-Defined Functions in POPULATE. EDGE allows Compute and Coordinate operators to be any general, user-defined function in POPULATE. The Compute operator takes as input the iteration-space point, and a single data value corresponding to the computed value on the RHS of the Einsum at that point. The output must be a single data value, thus, Compute within POPULATE acts as a unary operator.

The Coordinate operator takes as input the current iteration-space point, the Compute data value at that point, and the current entire partial output fiber on the LHS (which consists of the coordinates and their values) for the mutable rank on which POPULATE is operating. This allows a user-defined function to use both the current coordinates and values of the LHS to determine which coordinates will exist in the output fiber. The Coordinate operator returns a set of (a) edited and (b) empty coordinates for the output fiber (§ 6.6.1). Table 8 summarizes the inputs and outputs of the Coordinate operator.

7.3.8 Case Statements. The case statement introduced in § 5.9 is syntactic sugar. It enables the expression of different Einsums for different regions of the iteration space for the same output tensor. One can express all case statements using MAP/REDUCE/POPULATE actions with the update

operator and rank variable expressions. For example, we can express Equation (61) as:

$$T1_{m,n} = B_{k,m} \cdot C_{k,n} :: \bigwedge_k \times(\cap) \bigvee_k +(\cup) \quad (155a)$$

$$T2_{m,n:n \neq m} = A_{m,n} \quad (155b)$$

$$Z_{m,n} = T1_{m,n} << T2_{m,n} \quad (155c)$$

EDGE allows any Boolean predicate as conditions for each case.

7.3.9 Shorthand Notation. EDGE supports several shorthand notations for informal communication; see Appendix B.6 for a full description and examples.

8 Case Studies: Graph Algorithms (and Beyond!) in EDGE

Having defined the EDGE language in Sections 5 through 7, we now present case studies of algorithms written in EDGE. First, we show that different algorithms for the same problem are often algebraically related in EDGE, and that we can derive one from another through a sequence of principled manipulations (§ 8.1). Second, we show that EDGE expresses complex, nested iterative algorithms entirely within the tensor machinery, without resorting to a host language (§ 8.2). Third, we show that EDGE naturally expresses computations that arise outside traditional graph traversal, including element-wise numerical operations and randomized algorithms (§ 8.3). Taken together, these examples exercise **design goals 1, 6, 7, and 10**.

We introduce the term *eingebraic manipulation* to refer to the exploration of the algebraic space that EDGE enables. An eingebraic manipulation is an algebraic rewrite, substitution, reassociation, commutation, or mapping choice applied to an EDGE expression to derive another expression that either preserves the value at each iteration or preserves the final value after convergence.

8.1 Deriving Algorithmic Variants Through Manipulation

One of the central promises of EDGE is that algorithmic variants of a problem are not just isolated choices but algebraically related expressions. Given one EDGE expression for a problem, we can often derive other well-known variants by applying substitution, commutation, reassociation, and various mapping choices to the original expression (**design goal 7**). This reframes what “inventing a new algorithm” means: rather than thinking hard about a problem from scratch, a developer can start from a known expression and explore the space of algebraically equivalent alternatives. We demonstrate this twice in this subsection, once for breadth-first search and once for single-source shortest paths. In both cases, the derived variants correspond to algorithms that the literature historically treated as distinct contributions.

8.1.1 Reachability BFS Variants. Reachability BFS is a variant of graph traversal that determines which nodes are reachable from a set of query nodes. This algorithm may be used in more complex algorithms such as connected components [46], maximum flow [31], and finding the diameter of a graph [26]. Cascade 1 provides an EDGE expression for this problem. Assuming all involved tensors contain Boolean values, this expression gathers the neighbors of vertices in F ($G \cdot F$), filtering out those that have already been visited (intersection with $\neg P$). It then updates the set of visited nodes by combining the newly created frontier (F_{i+1}) with the current set of visited nodes (P_i).

Green introduces a variant of BFS that *updates the graph* on each iteration, deleting edges as they are visited [37, 101]. By performing a series of inductive steps on the EDGE expression followed by substitution, we derive the EDGE expression in Cascade 2 for Green’s BFS variant.

► *Extended Einsum*

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 F_{i,s})_{i,d} \cdot^2 \neg P_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_s^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_d^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (156a)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (156b)$$

Cascade 1. Push-BFS (Reachability BFS).

► *Initialization*

$$GG_{0,s,d} = G_{s,d} \quad (157a)$$

► *Extended Einsum*

$$F_{i+1,d} = GG_{i,s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (157b)$$

$$GG_{i+1,s,d} = GG_{i,s,d} \cdot \neg F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (157c)$$

Cascade 2. Green's BFS variant (inverse-delete BFS).

In this expression, GG_0 contains the original, unmodified graph. On each iteration, we first gather the neighbors of vertices in F_i to produce a new output frontier, F_{i+1} . We then update the graph (GG) by deleting all edges whose destinations are in the newly created frontier ($GG_i \cdot \neg F_{i+1}$).

In a similar vein, through commutation, reassociation, and applying a specific mapping choice, we derive pull-BFS (Cascade 3) from push-BFS (Cascade 1) [13]. In this cascade, we begin with push-BFS (Cascade 1) and specify a loop order mapping choice where s is in the outer loop nest and d is in the inner loop nest. The derivable pull-BFS (Cascade 3) can be combined with a loop order mapping choice where d is in the outer loop nest and s is in the inner loop nest. This corresponds to an implementation that iterates through each unvisited vertex ($\neg P$), determines if it has parents in the frontier, and adds itself to the output frontier (F_{i+1}) if so.

► *Extended Einsum*

$$F_{i+1,d} = (G_{s,d} \cdot^1 \neg P_{i,d}) \cdot^2 F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_d^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_s^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_s^2 \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (158a)$$

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (158b)$$

Cascade 3. Pull-BFS (derived from push-BFS via commutation, associativity, and a mapping choice).

8.1.2 Single Source Shortest Paths. Single-source shortest paths (SSSP) operates on weighted graphs. It takes as input a starting source vertex, then determines the shortest path to all vertices reachable from that source. Each vertex has a corresponding value in a *Distances* array, which stores the accumulated distance of the path to that vertex. If a vertex is not reachable, the algorithm sets its distance to infinity. Cascade 4 shows the corresponding EDGE expression for Bellman-Ford.

Table 10 in Appendix C.1 summarizes the tensors used throughout this derivation and marks which cascade each one appears in.

▷ <i>Tensors</i>	
$G^{S \equiv V , D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0$	(159a)
$C^{I, S \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty} = \text{False}$	(159b)
$N^{I, D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty$	(159c)
$\text{NewlyRelaxed}^{I, D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty$	(159d)
$D^{I, S \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = \infty$	(159e)
▷ <i>Initialization</i>	
$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle$	(159f)
$D_{0, s \in \text{root_id}} = 0$	(159g)
▷ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
[For each vertex in D , gather its neighbors.]	
[Add the edge weight (s, d) to update the neighbor's distance.]	
[For each updated neighbor (d) , select the minimum distance from all sources (s) .]	
$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup)$	(159h)
[Check which new neighbor distances are less than current distances.]	
$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d < (\cup)$	(159i)
[Record the relaxed distances.]	
$\text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} = C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \rightarrow (\cap)$	(159j)
[Update distances $(<<)$ with the newly found shorter paths.]	
$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d << (\cup)$	(159k)
$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$	(159l)

Cascade 4. Bellman-Ford SSSP.

Bellman-Ford requires $|V|-1$ iterations to guarantee that all reachable vertices have their correct distances, and it can detect negative cycles if any distance is updated on the $|V|$ th iteration [25]. The Shortest Paths Faster Algorithm [65] is a variant of Bellman-Ford that introduces a queue to reduce the number of total edge relaxation rounds in the average case. EDGE can express this variant, shown in Cascade 5. We later show how SPFA can be derived from Bellman-Ford through a sequence of eingebraic manipulations.

We can *eingebraically manipulate* the Bellman-Ford expression (Cascade 4) to derive SPFA. Each step in the derivation is either a rewrite rule that preserves the value of D_{i+1} for each i or a transformation that preserves the value of D after convergence. The latter may change per-iteration values but not the final answer. We highlight the key transformations in the main text and defer the full eingebraic manipulation steps to Appendix C.

Step 1: Promote s to an Explicit Rank. First, we will defer the min reduction over sources until after we compute the relaxed distances for each source. This exposes each source's contribution

$$Q^{I, S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty} = \text{False} \quad (160a)$$

▷ *Initialization*

$$Q_{0,s \in \text{root_id}} = \text{True} \quad (160b)$$

▷ *Extended Einsum*

[Get the distances of vertices in the queue.]

$$DQ_{i,s} = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (160c)$$

[Select ANY vertex that is in the queue and has a non-infinity distance.]

[This determines which vertex is the source for this iteration.]

[Thus F is a one-hot vector (contains only one non-empty s).]

$$F_{i,s^*} = DQ_{i,s} :: \lll_{s^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{select-any-}s) \quad (160d)$$

[Get neighbors of selected vertex and update neighbor distances
by adding (s, d) edge weight.]

$$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (160e)$$

[Compare neighbor distances to current distances and mark
which nodes have been updated.]

$$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d < (\cup) \quad (160f)$$

[Record updated distances for neighbors.]

$$\text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} = C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (160g)$$

[Update distances with newly relaxed vertices. This keeps the value
in D unless the vertex was relaxed, in which case it updates to the
new distance.]

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d << (\cup) \quad (160h)$$

[Remove selected vertex from queue, store remaining vertices
in temp tensor T .]

$$T_{i,d} = Q_{i,d} \cdot \neg F_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (160i)$$

[Update queue: old queue minus processed vertex (T),
plus newly updated vertices.]

$$Q_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot C_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (160j)$$

$$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i \quad (160k)$$

Cascade 5. Shortest Paths Faster Algorithm (SPFA) in EDGE.

to the distances tensor as a distinct slice of the intermediate tensors, which we can then manipulate independently. Cascade 6 shows the resulting expression; Appendix C walks through each manipulation in the cascade chain in more detail.

Step 2: Collapse the Boolean-Check Update Into a min Einsum. Cascade 6 defers the min reduction that occurs over sources from the gather Einsum (161a) to the reconciliation Einsum (161d). This separation exposes each source’s contribution to the distances tensor as a distinct slice of PerSourceRelaxed, allowing us to manipulate each source’s contribution independently.

► Extended Einsum	
[For each source, gather its neighbors and add the edge weight. Keep s as an explicit rank instead of reducing immediately.]	
$N_{i,s,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$	(161a)
[For each (source, neighbor) pair, check whether the new neighbor distance is less than the current distance.]	
$C_{i,s,d} = N_{i,s,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge < (\cup)$	(161b)
[For each source, record the relaxed distances to its neighbors.]	
PerSourceRelaxed $_{i,s,d} = C_{i,s,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \rightarrow (\cap)$	(161c)
[Across all sources, select the best relaxed distance for each destination.]	
NewlyRelaxed $_{i,d} = \text{PerSourceRelaxed}_{i,s,d} :: \bigvee_s \min(\cup)$	(161d)
[Update distances with the best relaxed distances.]	
$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} :: \bigwedge << (\cup)$	(161e)
$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$	(161f)

Cascade 6. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 1. Promote s to an explicit rank and defer the min-over-sources reduction until after relaxation.

Additionally, notice that C marks where $N < D$ ((161b)), PerSourceRelaxed keeps N 's value at exactly those points ((161c)), and $<<(\cup)$ then writes those values into D ((161e)). Then, D_{i+1} takes N where $N < D$ and keeps D otherwise. This is exactly a minimum between D and N ($\min(D, N)$). Thus, Einsums (161b) through (161e) collapse into a single Einsum that takes the min of D and N . Appendix C.2 provides a more detailed explanation of this transformation. Cascade 7 shows the resulting expression.

► Extended Einsum	
[For each source, gather its neighbors and add the edge weight.]	
$N_{i,s,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$	(162a)
[Take min of D and each source's neighbor candidates, then reduce over s to pick the best per destination.]	
$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup)$	(162b)
$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$	(162c)

Cascade 7. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 2. Einsums (161b) through (161e) of Cascade 6 collapse into a single Einsum that takes the min of D and N , with reduction over s .

Step 3: Replace the s -Reduction With Iterative Accumulation. Now, rather than deferring the update of D until after we compute the relaxed distances for all sources, we can update D iteratively after processing each source. Cascade 8 shows the resulting expression. The gather step still gathers from the original distance array ($\tilde{D}_{i,0,k} = D_{i,k}$) rather than the iteratively updated distance array. To update the running distance array $\tilde{D}$ for this k th source, we take the min of the current running

distance and the relaxed distances from this source ($N_{i,k,d}$). This is possible due to the algebraic properties of min (idempotence and associativity, see Appendix C.3).

$\triangleright$ <i>Extended Einsum</i> [Initialize the running distance.]	
$\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d}$	(163a)
[For each source k , gather neighbors using the <i>original</i> distance $\tilde{D}_{i,0,k}$ and add the edge weight.]	
$N_{i,k,d} = G_{k,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,0,k} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$	(163b)
[Add source k 's candidates into the running distance via min.]	
$\tilde{D}_{i,k+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,k,d} \cdot N_{i,k,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup)$	(163c)
[Stop after processing all sources.]	
$\diamond_k : k \equiv V $	(163d)
[Commit the final running distance as the next iteration's D .]	
$D_{i+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i, V ,d}$	(163e)
$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$	(163f)

Cascade 8. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 3. Replace the reduction over s with accumulation along a new iterative rank k . $\tilde{D}_{i,k,d}$ iteratively accumulates each source's candidate distances via min. All sources still gather from the original distance array ($\tilde{D}_{i,0,k} = D_{i,k}$).

Step 4: Sequentialize the Gather Step. The transformations so far have all been rewrite rules: each cascade computes the same D_{i+1} for each i as previous cascades. We now make a transformation that changes per-iteration values but preserves the value of D after convergence.

Specifically, we change source k 's gather to read from the running distance $\tilde{D}_{i,k,k}$ rather than the original $\tilde{D}_{i,0,k} = D_{i,k}$. Each source now sees the improvements made by earlier sources within the same outer (i) iteration. Cascade 9 shows the resulting expression.

To see why this is sound, unroll $\tilde{D}_{i,k:k=2,d}$ for source $k = 2$ in a 3-vertex graph at a given i . Applying the running distance recurrence twice (Equation (163c)), we have:

$$\tilde{D}_{i,k:k=2,d} = (\tilde{D}_{i,k:k=0,d} \cdot^1 N_{i,k:k=0,d})_{i,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,k:k=1,d} :: \bigwedge^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup). \quad (164)$$

Source 2's gather intersects $\tilde{D}$'s third rank with G 's first rank s , pinning that rank to 2:

$$N_{i,k:k=2,d} = G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,k:k=2,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge + (\cap). \quad (165)$$

Substituting in the unrolled $\tilde{D}_{i,k:k=2,s:s=2}$:

$$N_{i,k:k=2,d} = G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot^1 ((\tilde{D}_{i,k:k=0,s:s=2} \cdot^2 N_{i,k:k=0,s:s=2})_{i,s:s=2} \cdot^3 N_{i,k:k=1,s:s=2})_{i,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge^1 + (\cap) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^3 \min(\cup). \quad (166)$$

Now, $+$ distributes over min, so we can distribute $G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot^1$ over the min reductions in the above expression:

- (1) $G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,k:k=0,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$: this is the same gather computed by the original Bellman-Ford cascades (Cascades 4 through 8) for source 2.
- (2) $G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot N_{i,k:k=0,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$: a path through source 0 first, then source 2 to d .
- (3) $G_{s:s=2,d} \cdot N_{i,k:k=1,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$: a path through source 1 first, then source 2 to d .

The new $N_{i,k:k=2,d}$ is a min over the above three terms, thus, a gather on the running distance is pointwise less than or equal to a gather on the original distances array, D .

Per-iteration values can differ, but the value of D after convergence does not. Both cascades terminate at $D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$, at which point no source can improve any distance. Appendix C.4 gives the formal inductive proof. This new cascade typically converges in fewer outer iterations (i).

$\triangleright$ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
$\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d}$	(167a)
[Gather neighbors using the <i>running</i> distance $\tilde{D}_{i,k,k}$ rather than the original $\tilde{D}_{i,0,k}$.]	
$N_{i,k,d} = G_{k,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,k,k} :: \bigwedge + (\cap)$	(167b)
$\tilde{D}_{i,k+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,k,d} \cdot N_{i,k,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup)$	(167c)
$\diamond_k : k \equiv V $	(167d)
$D_{i+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i, V ,d}$	(167e)
$\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$	(167f)

Cascade 9. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 4. Each source k now reads from the running distance $\tilde{D}_{i,k,k}$ rather than the original $\tilde{D}_{i,0,k}$. Per-iteration values change, but the value of D after convergence does not.

Step 5: Collapse the Inner Enumeration Into the Outer Iteration (SPFA). We now collapse the inner k enumeration into the outer iterative rank i . Instead of processing all $|V|$ sources within each outer iteration, we let each outer iteration i process exactly one source. This requires a selection step that determines which source to process on a given iteration.

To make this efficient, we want to skip sources whose distances have not changed since their last processing as such sources would contribute no improvement. This requires tracking which destinations were actually relaxed during each iteration: we re-introduce the mask $C_{i,d}$ that was collapsed into the min Einsum in Cascade 7. We then track the sources that may still produce improvements in a queue Q , updated each iteration based on C : a destination d is added to Q exactly when it was relaxed. On each outer iteration, we select any source from Q that has a non-infinity distance in D ; the selected source becomes the sole non-empty entry of a frontier tensor F for that iteration.

Note that a single outer iteration of the new cascade processes one source rather than all $|V|$ sources, so per-iteration values differ. The value of D after convergence is preserved by the same $(\min, +)$ argument as Cascade 9. Cascade 10 shows the resulting expression. This is exactly the Shortest Paths Faster Algorithm. The closing paragraph of Appendix C.4 shows that the same convergence argument used for Cascade 9 extends to this queue-based variant.

Step 6: Restrict the Selector to Get Dijkstra. Now, in Cascade 10 we used select-any-s to select which source to explore on a given iteration. If we replace selecting any vertex with selecting the min vertex, and constrain the graph to have no negative-weight edges, we obtain Dijkstra's sequential algorithm. This is shown in Cascade 11. By selecting the minimum-distance vertex on each iteration, Dijkstra's algorithm ensures that each vertex is processed at most once, avoiding the $|V| - 1$ iterations that Bellman-Ford requires for worst-case correctness. The same value-at-convergence argument given in Appendix C.4 applies here, since restricting the selector and forbidding negative-weight edges preserves the $(\min, +)$ algebraic structure.

$$Q^{I, S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty} = \text{False} \quad (168a)$$

► *Initialization*

$$Q_{0, s \in \text{root_id}} = \text{True} \quad (168b)$$

► *Extended Einsum*

[Select a vertex to process.]

[Filter distances that have entries in Q .]

$$DQ_{i,s} = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (168c)$$

[Select ANY vertex that is in the queue and has a non-infinity distance (determines which vertex is $D_0, D_1, \dots$). Thus F is a one-hot vector (contains only one non-empty s).]

$$F_{i,s^*} = DQ_{i,s} :: \lll_{s^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{select-any-}s) \quad (168d)$$

[Update distances of relaxed edges.]

[Gather neighbors of selected vertex.]

$$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (168e)$$

[Compare neighbor distances to current distances and mark which nodes will be updated.]

$$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d < (\cup) \quad (168f)$$

[Record updated distances for neighbors.]

$$\text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} = C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (168g)$$

[Update the distances array.]

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d << (\cup) \quad (168h)$$

[Update the Queue.]

[Remove processed vertex from queue.]

$$T_{i,d} = Q_{i,d} \cdot \neg F_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap) \quad (168i)$$

[Add the neighbors that were just relaxed to the queue.]

$$Q_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot C_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (168j)$$

[Stop when the queue is empty.]

$$\diamond : ||Q_{i+1}|| \equiv 0 \quad (168k)$$

Cascade 10. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 5. Collapse the source enumeration into the iterative rank and introduce a queue-based selector, yielding SPFA.

Efficiently implementing Dijkstra requires a priority queue. At the *format* level of the separation of concerns, this means storing DQ and Q in formats that support efficient minimum selection, such as a binary heap.

8.2 Expressing Complex Algorithms

We now turn to concurrent connected-components algorithms, which require nested iteration, conditional updates, and bookkeeping over multiple tensors. In this subsection we show that

$\triangleright$ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
[Select a vertex to process.]	
[Filter distances that have entries in Q .]	
$DQ_{i,s} = Q_{i,s} \cdot D_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \rightarrow (\cap)$	(169a)
[Select the vertex in Q with minimum current distance.]	
$F_{i,s^*} = DQ_{i,s} :: \lll_{s^*} \mathbb{1}(\text{select-min-s})$	(169b)
$N_{i,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s + (\cap) \bigvee_s \min(\cup)$	(169c)
$C_{i,d} = N_{i,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d < (\cup)$	(169d)
$\text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} = C_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \rightarrow (\cap)$	(169e)
$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{NewlyRelaxed}_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d << (\cup)$	(169f)
$T_{i,d} = Q_{i,d} \cdot \neg F_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \leftarrow (\cap)$	(169g)
$Q_{i+1,d} = T_{i,d} \cdot C_{i,d} :: \bigwedge_d \text{OR}(\cup)$	(169h)
[Stop when the queue is empty.]	
$\diamond : Q_{i+1} \equiv 0$	(169i)

Cascade 11. Algebraically Manipulating Bellman-Ford, Step 6. Dijkstra’s SSSP, derived from SPFA by replacing select-any-s with select-min-s.

EDGE expresses these algorithms entirely within the tensor machinery, using nested cascades and rank variable expressions rather than stepping into the concerns of mapping, format, and binding (**design goals 1 and 6**, see Nayak et al. [68]). We present two variants: Liu and Tarjan’s simple concurrent “Algorithm S” [61], and the Awerbuch-Shiloach variant [8, 9].

8.2.1 Algorithm S: Simple Concurrent Connected Components. Cascade 12 presents the Einsum for simple concurrent connected components, specifically “Algorithm S” from Liu and Tarjan [61]. Connected-components algorithms group all vertices in an undirected graph into *components*, where a component consists of all vertices reachable from every other vertex within the component. Algorithm S tracks the “parents” of each vertex, altering parents until all vertices within a component share the same parent. It consists of three steps: initialization (each vertex is its own parent), parent-connect (for each edge, assign the minimum parent of the two endpoints to the vertex with the lower vertex ID), and shortcut (assign each vertex’s parent to its grandparent). Algorithm S repeats parent-connect followed by rounds of shortcut until no components change.

On the i ’th iteration, the P tensor contains the set of vertices (M rank) that belong to a component (C rank). We express this algorithm as a cascade of cascades, with two generational ranks i and j . Cascade 12 also contains rank variable expressions that select which ancestor should appear in the P tensor. The “Shortcut” step “replaces the parent (av) of every vertex v by its grandparent (gv)” [61]. It repeats until no more parents are changing (Equation (170l)). There is no need to fully understand this Einsum: the key takeaway is that with the few extensions EDGE adds to traditional Einsum notation, *a complex algorithm is now expressible in a succinct and precise manner*.

‣ <i>Tensors</i>	
$G^{I,S \equiv V , D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False}$	(170a)
$P^{I,C \equiv V , M \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False}$	(170b)
‣ <i>Initialization</i>	
$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle$	(170c)
$P_{0,v,v} = \text{True}$	(170d)
‣ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
<i>Begin Outer Cascade</i>	
$i = 0$	(170e)
<i>Parent Connect</i>	
$VAV_{i,v,w,av} = G_{v,w} \cdot P_{i,v,av} \quad :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap)$	(170f)
$WAW_{i,av,aw} = VAV_{i,v,w,av} \cdot P_{i,w,aw} \quad :: \bigwedge_w \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w} \text{OR}(\cup)$	(170g)
$P_{i+1,gs,d:(gs < ad ? gs:(ad:av > aw ? aw:av))} = WAW_{i,av,aw} \cdot P_{i,as:(av > aw ? av:aw),gs}$	(170h)
$:: \bigwedge_{av,aw} \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_d \min_1(\cup)$	
<i>Begin Inner Cascade</i>	
<i>Shortcut</i>	
$j = i + 1$	(170i)
$P_{j+1,v,gv} = P_{j,v,av} \cdot P_{j,av,gv} \quad :: \bigwedge_{av} \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av} \text{ANY}(\cup)$	(170j)
$j = j + 1$	(170k)
$\diamond_j : P_{j+1} \equiv P_j$	(170l)
$i = j$	(170m)
$\diamond_i : P_{i+1} \equiv P_i$	(170n)

Cascade 12. Simple concurrent connected components (Algorithm S, Liu and Tarjan [61]).

8.2.2 Awerbuch-Shiloach and the GraphBLAS Contrast. GraphBLAS can express the Awerbuch-Shiloach variant of connected components [8, 9]. We can also express this variant in EDGE:

The “STARCHECK” sub-cascade is expressible as follows:

Again, note how EDGE stays within the tensor machinery to express iteration while the GraphBLAS formulation steps out of linear algebra primitives to encode iteration as loop nests [9, Algorithms 3–5]. This variant, like Algorithm S, is expressed entirely within the tensor machinery without stepping into a host language.

8.3 Expressing Computations Beyond Graph Traversal

Although we have motivated EDGE through graph algorithms, the extensions we introduced in § 5 are general: user-defined compute operators, rank variable expressions, and the map/reduce/populate decomposition apply equally well to computations that have nothing to do with vertices and edges. This subsection collects three short examples that illustrate this reach. Each is deliberately small, because the point is not algorithmic depth but rather that a single, consistent notation covers element-wise numerical computation, randomized algorithms, and classical sorting, in addition to

► *Tensors*

$$G^{I, S \equiv |V|, D \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (171a)$$

$$F^{I, C \equiv |V|, M \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (171b)$$

$$GF^{I, C \equiv |V|, M \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (171c)$$

$$S^{I, S \equiv |V|} \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty=False} \quad (171d)$$

► *Initialization*

$$G \rightarrow \langle \text{user-specified} \rangle \quad (171e)$$

$$F_{0,v,v} = \text{True} \quad (171f)$$

► *Extended Einsum*

$$i = 0 \quad (171g)$$

Conditional Star Hooking

$$S_{i,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (171h)$$

[Get v 's parent (av) only if v is in a star; (v, w) is an edge]

$$VAV_{i,v,w,av} = (G_{v,w} \cdot^1 F_{i,v,av}) \cdot^2 S_{i,v} :: \bigwedge_v^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (171i)$$

[Get w 's parent (aw), v 's grandparent (gv), store new parents of av]

$$TF0_{i,av,aw} = (VAV_{i,v,w,av} \cdot^1 F_{i,w,aw}) \cdot^2 F_{i,av:av>aw,gv} \\ :: \bigwedge_w^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w}^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_{av}^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_{aw} \min_1(\cup) \quad (171j)$$

$$F_{i+1,av,d} = F_{i,av,d} << TF0_{i,av,d} \quad (171k)$$

Unconditional Star Hooking

$$S_{i+1,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (171l)$$

[Get v if in a star]

$$VAV2_{i+1,v,w,av} = (G_{v,w} \cdot^1 F_{i+1,v,av}) \cdot^2 S_{i+1,v} :: \bigwedge_v^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (171m)$$

[Update v 's parents iff $av \neq aw$]

$$TF1_{i+2,av,aw} = (VAV2_{i+1,v,w,av:av \neq aw} \cdot^1 F_{i+1,w,aw}) \cdot^2 F_{i+1,av,gv} \\ :: \bigwedge_w^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,w}^1 \text{OR}(\cup) \bigwedge_{av}^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \lll_{aw} \min_1(\cup) \quad (171n)$$

$$F_{i+2,av,d} = F_{i+1,av,d} << TF1_{i,av,d} \quad (171o)$$

Shortcut

$$S_{i+2,v} = \langle \text{STARCHECK} \rangle \quad (171p)$$

[Update v 's parent to grandparent iff v is not in a star]

$$TF2_{i+3,v,gv} = (F_{i+2,v,av} \cdot^1 F_{i+2,av,gv}) \cdot^2 \neg S_{i+2,v} \\ :: \bigwedge_{av}^1 \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av}^1 \text{ANY}(\cup) \bigwedge_v^2 \text{AND}(\cap) \quad (171q)$$

$$i = i + 3 \quad (171r)$$

$$F_{i+3,v,d} = F_{i+2,v,d} << TF2_{i+3,v,d} \quad (171s)$$

$$\diamond_i : F_{i+3} \equiv F_i \quad (171t)$$

Cascade 13. Awerbuch-Shiloach connected components variant (expressible in EDGE).

▷ <i>Tensors</i>	
$F^{S \equiv V , D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty}=\text{False}$	(172a)
$GF^{S \equiv V , D \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty}=\text{False}$	(172b)
$S^{S \equiv V } \rightarrow \text{Boolean, empty}=\text{False}$	(172c)
▷ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
$T1_v = \text{True}$	(172d)
$GF_{v,gv} = F_{v,av} \cdot F_{av,gv} :: \bigwedge_{av} \text{AND}(\cap)$	(172e)
$T1_v = T_v << \neg(F_{v,av} \cdot GF_{v,gv:gv \neq av}) :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{gv,av} \text{OR}(\cup)$	(172f)
$T2_{gv} = T1_v << \neg(F_{v,av} \cdot GF_{v,gv:gv \neq av}) :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{v,av} \text{OR}(\cup)$	(172g)
$S_v = F_{v,av} \cdot T2_{av} :: \bigwedge_v \text{AND}(\cap) \bigvee_{av} \text{OR}(\cup)$	(172h)

Cascade 14. STARCHECK sub-cascade.

the graph algorithms of the previous subsections (**design goals 6 and 10**). These examples also foreshadow the broader set of domains in which EDGE has already been applied, including neural networks, robotics, and iterative linear algebra [68, 70, 74, 102, 107].

8.3.1 Element-Wise Exponentiation. Suppose we want to combine two tensors through element-wise exponentiation, common in neural networks such as the sigmoid function used in GraphSAGE [39].

▷ <i>Extended Einsum</i>	
$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} \cdot B_{m,n} :: \bigwedge_{m,n} \exp(\mathbb{1})$	(173a)

Cascade 15. Element-wise exponentiation (A^B).

where $\exp$ is a user-defined function that computes $A_{m,n}^{B_{m,n}}$. In shorthand notation:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n}^{B_{m,n}} \quad (174)$$

To express e^B as a unary operation:

$$Z_{m,n} = \exp(B_{m,n}), \quad (175)$$

where $\exp$ applies $e^{(\cdot)}$ to every element in B . We can also write this as $Z_{m,n} = e^{(B_{m,n})}$, viewing e as a scalar that the Einsum automatically broadcasts to a tensor of shape $M \times N$.

8.3.2 Randomized Vertex Exploration. Suppose we want to randomly determine whether to explore a vertex, common in randomized algorithms such as random-mate connected components [84].

If all tensors are Boolean, then user-rand-func is a user-defined function that, given the vertices that successfully intersected ($\cap$), randomly decides whether to include the corresponding s vertex (True) or skip exploring that vertex's neighbors (False). To make the expression deterministic

► *Extended Einsum*

$$F_{i+1,d} = G_{s,d} \cdot F_{i,s} :: \bigwedge_s \text{user-rand-func}(\cap) \bigvee_s \text{OR}(\cup) \quad (176a)$$

Cascade 16. Randomized vertex exploration.

under repeated evaluation, the random function may be parameterized by a seed and the current iteration-space coordinates.

9 What Next?

We have described the EDGE language, which is the gateway to an algebraic framework for thinking about graph algorithms (see Figure 7). Since EDGE describes graph algorithms in an algebraic manner, one avenue of future work is exploring various algebraic manipulations both manually (see BFS Example 10) and within an automated system. From our preliminary explorations, algebraic manipulations enable transformations from one variant of a graph algorithm to another, potentially enabling the discovery of new graph algorithms (see § 8.1.1). Manual exploration enables users to see optimizations such as replacing compute operators with more efficient operators (e.g., using *ANY* instead of *OR*). We hope manual exploration will enable a more systematic approach for graph algorithm developers to invent new algorithms. Automated exploration will enable the generation of different Einsum variations. Note that this is also useful for tensor algebra applications (**design goal 3**).

In building this ecosystem, our current work focuses on a programmatic implementation of EDGE with a corresponding compiler, such that a user can write graph algorithms and tensor algebra applications as EDGE code. Ideally, such a programmatic implementation will interface with prior work in the tensor algebra space (see Table 2) (**design goal 3**). Additionally, future work in this space will focus on expanding these prior tools to support general user-defined operations and to recognize constraints on computations. There is a rich space of work in discovering new ways to implement algorithms; designing cost models to determine which Einsums and their corresponding mappings are more efficient than others given the properties of input data and backend; and refining both the mapping space and data format space to adequately express the mapping choices present in software (e.g., CUDA dynamic parallelism [3] or dynamic load-balancing approaches such as work-stealing [19]).

Overall, we envision an ecosystem that allows one to succinctly describe and compare different graph algorithms for the same problem in a similar notation; enables an exploration of the possible implementation space (in both hardware and software); and enables algorithm developers to approach inventing new algorithms systematically, rather than “thinking hard” about new ways to solve a problem.

Beyond graph algorithms, we have been able to use extended Einsums to express various machine learning models, variations of the Cholesky computation, and various parallel primitives such as the prefix-sum. Our hope is that the community will take this notation and apply it to their own applications to better understand the algorithmic and implementation space in their domains.

10 Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Chris Fletcher, Yan Zhu, Sanjana Mali, Khai Vu, Mingun Cho, and Angshuman Parashar for acting as test users, in-depth discussions on Einsums, tensor algebra, fibertrees, and accelerator modeling. We thank Charles E. Leiserson, Conal Elliott, Aydın Buluç, Caleb Stanford,

Jason Lowe-Power, Muhammad Osama, Matthew Drescher, Sean Treichler, Jonathan Wapman, and Aamer Jaleel for feedback and technical discussions on graph algorithms and their mapping to tensor algebra.

We thank Saman Amarasinghe, Ajay Brahmakshatriya, Willow Ahrens, Teo Collins, Fredrik Kjolstad, Olivia Hsu, Jaeyoon Lee, Pravi Samaratunga, Sabrina Neuman, Courtney Golden, and Yan Gu, for discussions and feedback on EDGE and related systems. Finally, this work was supported in part by a Microsoft Research Fellowship, an NVIDIA Graduate Fellowship, and NSF Grant 2403389.

References

- [1] 2013. The Graph 500 List. <http://www.graph500.org/>.
- [2] 2023. Fibertree Project. <https://github.com/Fibertree-Project/fibertree>.
- [3] Andy Adinets. 2017. Adaptive Parallel Computation with CUDA Dynamic Parallelism. NVIDIA Developer Blog. <https://developer.nvidia.com/blog/introduction-cuda-dynamic-parallelism/>
- [4] Willow Ahrens, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2022. Autoscheduling for Sparse Tensor Algebra with an Asymptotic Cost Model. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '22)*. ACM, 269–285. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3519939.3523442>
- [5] Corinne Ancourt and François Irigoin. 1991. Scanning Polyhedra with DO Loops. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles & Practice of Parallel Programming (Williamsburg, Virginia, USA) (PPOPP 1991)*, David S. Wise (Ed.). ACM, 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1145/109625.109631>
- [6] Tanner Andrusis, Michael Gilbert, Vivienne Sze, and Joel S. Emer. 2026. Fast and Fusiest: An Optimal Fusion-Aware Mapper for Accelerator Modeling and Evaluation. *CoRR* (Feb. 2026). arXiv:2602.15166 [cs.AR]
- [7] Renzo Angles. 2018. The Property Graph Database Model. In *Proceedings of the 12th Alberto Mendelzon International Workshop on Foundations of Data Management (Cali, Colombia) (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 2100)*, Dan Olteanu and Barbara Poblete (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2100/paper26.pdf>
- [8] Baruch Awerbuch and Yossi Shiloach. 1987. New Connectivity and MSF Algorithms for Shuffle-Exchange Network and PRAM. *IEEE Trans. Computers* 36, 10 (1987), 1258–1263. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1987.1676869>
- [9] Ariful Azad and Aydin Buluç. 2019. LACC: A Linear-Algebraic Algorithm for Finding Connected Components in Distributed Memory. In *IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (IPDPS 2019)*. IEEE, 2–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2019.00012>
- [10] John W. Backus, Robert J. Beeber, Sheldon Best, Richard Goldberg, Lois M. Haibt, Harlan L. Herrick, Robert A. Nelson, David Sayre, Peter B. Sheridan, H. Stern, Irving Ziller, Robert A. Hughes, and R. Nutt. 1957. The FORTRAN automatic coding system. In *Papers presented at the 1957 Western Joint Computer Conference: Techniques for Reliability (Los Angeles, California, USA) (IRE-AIEE-ACM 1957 (Western))*, Morton M. Astrahan (Ed.). ACM, 188–198. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1455567.1455599>
- [11] Albert László Barabási, Natali Gulbahce, and Joseph Loscalzo. 2011. Network medicine: A network-based approach to human disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 12 (1 2011), 56–68. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2918>
- [12] Muthu Baskaran, Benoît Meister, Nicolas Vasilache, and Richard Lethin. 2012. Efficient and scalable computations with sparse tensors. In *2012 IEEE Conference on High Performance Extreme Computing (Waltham, MA, USA) (HPEC '12)*, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC.2012.6408676>
- [13] Scott Beamer, Krste Asanović, and David Patterson. 2012. Direction-Optimizing Breadth-First Search. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '12)*. Article 12, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SC.2012.50>
- [14] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. 2008. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2008, 10 (Oct. 2008), P10008. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/2008/10/p10008>
- [15] Ronald F. Boisvert, Roldan Pozo, Karin Remington, Richard F. Barrett, and Jack J. Dongarra. 1997. Matrix Market: a web resource for test matrix collections. In *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*. Springer US, 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-5041-2940-4_9
- [16] Pierre Boulet and Paul Feautrier. 1998. Scanning Polyhedra without Do-loops. In *Proceedings of the 1998 International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (Paris, France)*. IEEE Computer Society, 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PACT.1998.727127>
- [17] Ajay Brahmakshatriya, Yunming Zhang, Changwan Hong, Shoaib Kamil, Julian Shun, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2021. Compiling Graph Applications for GPUs with GraphIt. In *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO 2021)*. 248–261. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CGO51591.2021.9370321>

- [18] Aydın Buluç, Timothy Mattson, Scott McMillan, Jose Moreira, and Carl Yang. 2017. *The GraphBLAS C API Specification*. http://graphblas.org/index.php/C_language_API Rev. 1.1..
- [19] Daniel Cederman and Philippas Tsigas. 2012. Dynamic Load Balancing Using Work-Stealing. In *GPU Computing Gems Jade Edition*, Wen mei W. Hwu (Ed.). Morgan Kaufmann, Boston, MA, USA, Chapter 35, 485–499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385963-1.00035-6>
- [20] Shuai Che, Michael Boyer, Jiayuan Meng, David Tarjan, Jeremy W. Sheaffer, Sang-Ha Lee, and Kevin Skadron. 2009. Rodinia: A Benchmark Suite for Heterogeneous Computing. In *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC 2009)*, 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IISWC.2009.5306797>
- [21] Stephen Chou, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2018. Format Abstraction for Sparse Tensor Algebra Compilers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (Oct. 2018), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3276493>
- [22] Fan R. K. Chung. 1997. *Spectral Graph Theory*. Vol. 92. American Mathematical Society. <https://doi.org/10.1090/cbms/092>
- [23] Miguel E. Coimbra, Alexandre P. Francisco, and Luís Veiga. 2021. An analysis of the graph processing landscape. *Journal of Big Data* 8, 1 (2021), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-021-00443-9>
- [24] Keith D. Cooper and Linda Torczon. 2023. Chapter 4 - Intermediate Representations. In *Engineering a Compiler (Third Edition)* (third edition ed.), Keith D. Cooper and Linda Torczon (Eds.). Morgan Kaufmann, Philadelphia, 159–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815412-0.00010-3>
- [25] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. 2022. *Introduction to Algorithms, 4th Edition*. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262637509>
- [26] Derek G. Corneil, Feodor F. Dragan, and Ekkehard Köhler. 2003. On the power of BFS to determine a graph’s diameter. *Networks* 42, 4 (2003), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/net.10098>
- [27] Timothy A. Davis. 2019. Algorithm 1000: SuiteSparse: GraphBLAS: Graph Algorithms in the Language of Sparse Linear Algebra. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 45, 4 (Dec. 2019), 44:1–44:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3322125>
- [28] Alexandra Dima. 2023. *GSTACO: A Generalized Sparse Tensor Algebra Compiler*. M.Eng. Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA. <https://commit.csail.mit.edu/papers/2023/alexandra-meng-thesis.pdf>
- [29] Xiaojun Dong, Yan Gu, Yihan Sun, and Yunming Zhang. 2021. Efficient Stepping Algorithms and Implementations for Parallel Shortest Paths. In *33rd ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures* (Virtual Event, USA) (SPAA ’21), Kunal Agrawal and Yossi Azar (Eds.). ACM, 184–197. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3409964.3461782>
- [30] Zhihui Du, Oliver Alvarado Rodriguez, Fuhuan Li, Mohammad Dindoost, and David Bader. 2023. Minimum-Mapping based Connected Components Algorithm. The 10th Annual Chapel Implementers and Users Workshop (CHI UW). <https://chapel-lang.org/CHI UW/2023/Du.pdf>
- [31] Jack Edmonds and Richard M. Karp. 1972. Theoretical Improvements in Algorithmic Efficiency for Network Flow Problems. *Journal of the ACM* 19, 2 (1972), 248–264. <https://doi.org/10.1145/321694.321699>
- [32] Anil Gaihre, Xiaoye Sherry Li, and Hang Liu. 2022. gSoFa: Scalable Sparse Symbolic LU Factorization on GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 33, 4 (2022), 1015–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2021.3090316>
- [33] Michael Gilbert, Yinnan Nellie Wu, Joel S. Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2024. LoopTree: Exploring the Fused-Layer Dataflow Accelerator Design Space. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Artificial Intelligence* 1, 1 (Sept. 2024), 97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tcasai.2024.3461716>
- [34] Michael Gilbert, Yinnan Nellie Wu, Angshuman Parashar, Vivienne Sze, and Joel S. Emer. 2023. LoopTree: Enabling Exploration of Fused-layer Dataflow Accelerators. *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 316–318. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ispass57527.2023.00038>
- [35] Courtney Golden, Axel Feldmann, Joel Emer, and Daniel Sanchez. 2025. Quartz: A Reconfigurable, Distributed-Memory Accelerator for Sparse Applications. In *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture* (Seoul, South Korea) (MICRO ’25). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 929–943. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3725843.3756035>
- [36] Courtney K Golden. 2025. *A Reconfigurable, Distributed-Memory Accelerator for Sparse Applications*. Master’s thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [37] Oded Green. 2021. Inverse-Deletion BFS - Revisiting Static Graph BFS Traversals with Dynamic Graph Operations. In *IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference* (Waltham, MA) (HPEC 2021). IEEE, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC49654.2021.9622864>
- [38] Wei Guo and Jing-Mei Qiu. 2022. A low rank tensor representation of linear transport and nonlinear Vlasov solutions and their associated flow maps. *J. Comput. Phys.* 458 (2022), 111089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2022.111089>
- [39] William L. Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Long Beach, CA, USA) (NIPS 2017, Vol. 30), Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.). 1024–1034. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/5dd9db5e033da9c6fb5ba83c7a7e9ea9-Paper.pdf

- [40] F. Harary and G. Gupta. 1997. Dynamic Graph Models. *Math. Comput. Model.* 25, 7 (April 1997), 79–87. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177\(97\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(97)00050-2)
- [41] Charles R. Harris, K. Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J. Smith, Robert Kern, Matti Picus, Stephan Hoyer, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Matthew Brett, Allan Haldane, Jaime Fernández del Río, Mark Wiebe, Pearu Peterson, Pierre Gérard-Marchant, Kevin Sheppard, Tyler Reddy, Warren Weckesser, Hameer Abbasi, Christoph Gohlke, and Travis E. Oliphant. 2020. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 585, 7825 (Sept. 2020), 357–362. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2>
- [42] Kartik Hegde, Hadi Asghari Moghaddam, Michael Pellauer, Neal Clayton Crago, Aamer Jaleel, Edgar Solomonik, Joel S. Emer, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2019. ExTensor: An Accelerator for Sparse Tensor Algebra. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO-52)*. 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358275>
- [43] Kartik Hegde, Po-An Tsai, Sitao Huang, Vikas Chandra, Angshuman Parashar, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2021. Mind mappings: enabling efficient algorithm-accelerator mapping space search. In *26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Virtual Event, USA) (ASPLOS 2021)*, Tim Sherwood, Emery D. Berger, and Christos Kozyrakis (Eds.). ACM, 943–958. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446762>
- [44] Rawn Henry, Olivia Hsu, Rohan Yadav, Stephen Chou, Kunle Olukotun, Saman P. Amarasinghe, and Fredrik Kjolstad. 2021. Compilation of sparse array programming models. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 5, OOPSLA (2021), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485505>
- [45] Charles Hong, Qijing Huang, Grace Dinh, Mahesh Subedar, and Yakun Sophia Shao. 2023. DOSA: Differentiable Model-Based One-Loop Search for DNN Accelerators. In *56th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Toronto, ON) (MICRO '23)*. IEEE, 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623797>
- [46] John E. Hopcroft and Robert Endre Tarjan. 1973. Algorithm 447: efficient algorithms for graph manipulation. *Commun. ACM* 16, 6 (1973), 372–378. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362248.362272>
- [47] Olivia Hsu, Maxwell Strange, Ritvik Sharma, Jaeyeon Won, Kunle Olukotun, Joel S. Emer, Mark A. Horowitz, and Fredrik Kjolstad. 2023. The Sparse Abstract Machine. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS '23, Vol. 3)*. 710–726. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582051>
- [48] Qijing Huang, Aravind Kalaiah, Minwoo Kang, James Demmel, Grace Dinh, John Wawrzynek, Thomas Norell, and Yakun Sophia Shao. 2021. CoSA: Scheduling by Constrained Optimization for Spatial Accelerators. In *48th ACM/IEEE Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Valencia, Spain) (ISCA 2021)*. IEEE, 554–566. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA52012.2021.00050>
- [49] Qijing Huang, Po-An Tsai, Joel S. Emer, and Angshuman Parashar. 2024. Mind the Gap: Attainable Data Movement and Operational Intensity Bounds for Tensor Algorithms. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 51st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA) (Buenos Aires, Argentina) (ISCA'24)*. 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA59077.2024.00021>
- [50] Sheng-Chun Kao and Tushar Krishna. 2020. GAMMA: Automating the HW Mapping of DNN Models on Accelerators via Genetic Algorithm. In *IEEE/ACM International Conference On Computer Aided Design (San Diego, CA, USA) (ICCAD 2020)*. IEEE, 44:1–44:9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3400302.3415639>
- [51] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. 2003. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (Washington, D.C.) (KDD '03)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/956750.956769>
- [52] Jeremy Kepner, Peter Aaltonen, David Bader, Aydın Buluç, Franz Franchetti, John Gilbert, Dylan Hutchison, Manoj Kumar, Andrew Lumsdaine, Henning Meyerhenke, Scott McMillan, Jose Moreira, John D. Owens, Carl Yang, Marcin Zalewski, and Timothy Mattson. 2016. Mathematical Foundations of the GraphBLAS. In *Proceedings of the IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC.2016.7761646>
- [53] Jeremy Kepner and John R. Gilbert (Eds.). 2011. *Graph Algorithms in the Language of Linear Algebra*. Software, environments, tools, Vol. 22. SIAM. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898719918>
- [54] Fredrik Kjolstad, Shoaib Kamil, Stephen Chou, David Lugato, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2017. The tensor algebra compiler. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 1, OOPSLA (Oct. 2017), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133901>
- [55] Fredrik Berg Kjolstad. 2020. *Sparse Tensor Algebra Compilation*. PhD thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA. Available at <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/128314>.
- [56] Haewoon Kwak, Changhyun Lee, Hosung Park, and Sue B. Moon. 2010. What is Twitter, a social network or a news media?. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2010, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, April 26-30, 2010*. ACM, 591–600. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772751>

- [57] Hyoukjun Kwon, Prasanth Chatarasi, Michael Pellauer, Angshuman Parashar, Vivek Sarkar, and Tushar Krishna. 2019. Understanding Reuse, Performance, and Hardware Cost of DNN Dataflow: A Data-Centric Approach. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture* (Columbus, OH, USA) (*MICRO* 2019). ACM, 754–768. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3352460.3358252>
- [58] Leslie Lamport. 1974. The Parallel Execution of DO Loops. *Commun. ACM* 17, 2 (Feb. 1974), 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1145/360827.360844>
- [59] Sören Laue, Matthias Mitterreiter, and Joachim Giesen. 2020. A Simple and Efficient Tensor Calculus. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 34, 04 (April 2020), 4527–4534. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i04.5881>
- [60] Jure Leskovec and Christos Faloutsos. 2006. Sampling from large graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (*KDD'06*), Tina Eliassi-Rad, Lyle H. Ungar, Mark Craven, and Dimitrios Gunopulos (Eds.). ACM, 631–636. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1150402.1150479>
- [61] Sixue Cliff Liu and Robert Endre Tarjan. 2022. Simple Concurrent Connected Components Algorithms. *ACM Trans. Parallel Comput.* 9, 2 (2022), 9:1–9:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543546>
- [62] Grzegorz Malewicz, Matthew H. Austern, Aart J. C. Bik, James C. Dehnert, Ilan Horn, Naty Leiser, and Grzegorz Czajkowski. 2010. Pregel: A System for Large-scale Graph Processing. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (Indianapolis, Indiana, USA) (*SIGMOD '10*). 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1807167.1807184>
- [63] Robert Ryan McCune, Tim Weninger, and Greg Madey. 2015. Thinking Like a Vertex: A Survey of Vertex-Centric Frameworks for Large-Scale Distributed Graph Processing. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 48, 2, Article 25 (Oct. 2015), 39 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2818185>
- [64] Duane Merrill, Michael Garland, and Andrew Grimshaw. 2012. Scalable GPU Graph Traversal. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming* (New Orleans, Louisiana, USA) (*PPoPP '12*). 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2145816.2145832>
- [65] Edward F Moore. 1959. The shortest path through a maze. In *Proc. of the International Symposium on the Theory of Switching*. Harvard University Press, 285–292.
- [66] Francisco Muñoz-Martínez, Raveesh Garg, Michael Pellauer, José L. Abellán, Manuel E. Acacio, and Tushar Krishna. 2023. Flexagon: A Multi-dataflow Sparse-Sparse Matrix Multiplication Accelerator for Efficient DNN Processing. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (*ASPLOS* 2023), Tor M. Aamodt, Natalie D. Enright Jerger, and Michael M. Swift (Eds.). ACM, 252–265. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582069>
- [67] Lifeng Nai, Yinglong Xia, Ilie G. Tanase, Hyesoon Kim, and Ching-Yung Lin. 2015. GraphBIG: understanding graph computing in the context of industrial solutions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC'15)*. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2807591.2807626>
- [68] Nandeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Shubham Ugare, Christopher Fletcher, Michael Pellauer, and Joel Emer. 2023. TeAAL: A Declarative Framework for Modeling Sparse Tensor Accelerators. In *56th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO '23)*. ACM, 1255–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623791>
- [69] Nandeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Yingchen Wang, Joel S. Emer, Michael Pellauer, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2024. TeAAL Tutorial at MICRO 2024. <https://teaal.csail.mit.edu/tutorials/2024.micro-teaal/index.html>.
- [70] Nandeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Xinrui Wu, Michael Pellauer, Joel S. Emer, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2025. From TeAAL to FuseMax: Separation of Concerns for Attention Accelerator Design. *IEEE Micro* 45, 4 (2025), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MM.2025.3589955>
- [71] Nandeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Yan Zhu, Michael Pellauer, Christopher W. Fletcher, and Joel S. Emer. 2025. TeAAL Tutorial at MICRO 2025. <https://teaal.csail.mit.edu/tutorials/2025.micro-teaal/index.html>.
- [72] Nandeeka Nayak, Xinrui Wu, Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Michael Pellauer, Joel Emer, and Christopher W. Fletcher. 2024. FuseMax: Leveraging Extended Einsums to Optimize Attention Accelerator Design. *IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture* (Nov. 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623791>
- [73] Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, Hadi Asghari-Moghaddam, Michael Pellauer, Kartik Hegde, Po-An Tsai, Neal Crago, Aamer Jaleel, John D. Owens, Edgar Solomonik, Joel Emer, and Christopher Fletcher. 2023. Accelerating Sparse Data Orchestration via Dynamic Reflexive Tiling. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (*ASPLOS '23*, Vol. 3). 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582064>
- [74] Toluwanimi O. Odemuyiwa, John D. Owens, Joel S. Emer, and Michael Pellauer. 2026. Mambalaya: Einsum-Based Fusion Optimizations on State-Space Models. (*Under Review*) (2026).
- [75] Muhammad Osama, Serban D. Porumbescu, and John D. Owens. 2022. Essentials of Parallel Graph Analytics. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Graphs, Architectures, Programming, and Learning (GrAPL 2022)*. 314–317. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPSW55747.2022.00061>

- [76] Muhammad Osama, Serban D. Porumbescu, and John D. Owens. 2023. A Programming Model for GPU Load Balancing. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP 2023)*. 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3572848.3577434>
- [77] Angshuman Parashar, Priyanka Raina, Yakun Sophia Shao, Yu-Hsin Chen, Victor A. Ying, Anurag Mukkara, Rangharajan Venkatesan, Bruce Khailany, Stephen W. Keckler, and Joel Emer. 2019. Timeloop: A Systematic Approach to DNN Accelerator Evaluation. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPASS.2019.00042>
- [78] Adam Paszke, S. Gross, Francisco Massa, A. Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimeshein, L. Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (NeurIPS 2019)*. 8026–8037. <https://doi.org/10.5555/3454287.3455008>
- [79] Michael Pellauer, Yakun Sophia Shao, Jason Clemons, Neal Crago, Kartik Hegde, Rangharajan Venkatesan, Stephen W. Keckler, Christopher W. Fletcher, and Joel Emer. 2019. Buffets: An Efficient and Composable Storage Idiom for Explicit Decoupled Data Orchestration. In *International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. ACM, 137–151. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304025>
- [80] Louis-Noël Pouchet, Uday Bondhugula, Cédric Bastoul, Albert Cohen, J. Ramanujam, P. Sadayappan, and Nicolas Vasilache. 2011. Loop transformations: convexity, pruning and optimization. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (Austin, TX, USA) (POPL 2011)*, Thomas Ball and Mooly Sagiv (Eds.). ACM, 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926449>
- [81] Tahereh Pourhabibi, Kok-Leong Ong, Booi Kam, and Yee Ling Boo. 2020. Fraud detection: A systematic literature review of graph-based anomaly detection approaches. *Decision Support Systems* 133 (2020), 113303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2020.113303>
- [82] Sumit Purohit, Nhuy Van, and George Chin. 2021. Semantic Property Graph for Scalable Knowledge Graph Analytics. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Orlando, FL, USA) (Big Data)*, Yixin Chen, Heiko Ludwig, Yicheng Tu, Usama M. Fayyad, Xingquan Zhu, Xiaohua Hu, Suren Byna, Xiong Liu, Jianping Zhang, Shirui Pan, Vagelis Papalexakis, Jianwu Wang, Alfredo Cuzzocrea, and Carlos Ordóñez (Eds.). IEEE, 2672–2677. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671547>
- [83] Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Connelly Barnes, Andrew Adams, Sylvain Paris, Frédo Durand, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2013. Halide: A Language and Compiler for Optimizing Parallelism, Locality, and Recomputation in Image Processing Pipelines. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Seattle, Washington, USA) (PLDI '13)*. 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491956.2462176>
- [84] John H. Reif. 1985. *Optimal parallel algorithms for integer sorting and graph connectivity*. Technical Report TR-08-85. Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- [85] Amitabha Roy, Ivo Mihailovic, and Willy Zwaenepoel. 2013. X-Stream: Edge-centric Graph Processing using Streaming Partitions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (Farmington, PA, USA) (SOSP '13)*, Michael Kaminsky and Mike Dahlin (Eds.). ACM, 472–488. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2517349.2522740>
- [86] David A. Schmidt. 1997. *Denotational Semantics: A Methodology for Language Development*. Kansas State University. <https://people.cs.ksu.edu/~schmidt/text/DenSem-full-book.pdf> Available as a full book PDF.
- [87] Mo Sha, Yuchen Li, and Kian-Lee Tan. 2019. GPU-based Graph Traversal on Compressed Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) (SIGMOD Conference 2019)*, Peter A. Boncz, Stefan Manegold, Anastasia Ailamaki, Amol Deshpande, and Tim Kraska (Eds.). ACM, 775–792. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3319871>
- [88] Julian Shun and Guy E. Blelloch. 2013. Ligra: a lightweight graph processing framework for shared memory. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (Shenzhen, China) (PPoPP '13)*. 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2442516.2442530>
- [89] Nathan A. Shwatal. 2024. *Improving the Programmability of A Distributed Hardware Accelerator*. Master's thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [90] Shaden Smith and George Karypis. 2015. Tensor-matrix products with a compressed sparse tensor. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Irregular Applications - Architectures and Algorithms (Austin, Texas, USA) (IA3 2015)*, Antonino Tumeo, John Feo, and Oreste Villa (Eds.). ACM, 5:1–5:7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2833179.2833183>
- [91] Edgar Solomonik, Devin Matthews, Jeff R. Hammond, and James Demmel. 2013. Cyclops Tensor Framework: Reducing Communication and Eliminating Load Imbalance in Massively Parallel Contractions. In *27th IEEE International Symposium on Parallel and Distributed Processing (Cambridge, MA, USA) (IPDPS 2013)*. IEEE Computer Society, 813–824. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2013.112>
- [92] Nitish Srivastava, Hanchen Jin, Jie Liu, David Albonese, and Zhiru Zhang. 2020. MatRaptor: A Sparse-Sparse Matrix Multiplication Accelerator Based on Row-Wise Product. In *International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*.

- 766–780. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO50266.2020.00068>
- [93] Sakshi Srivastava and Anil Kumar Singh. 2023. Fraud detection in the distributed graph database. *Cluster Computing* 26, 1 (2023), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10586-022-03540-3>
 - [94] Vivienne Sze, Yu-Hsin Chen, Tien-Ju Yang, and Joel S. Emer. 2020. *Efficient Processing of Deep Neural Networks*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-01766-7>
 - [95] Yangzihao Wang, Yuechao Pan, Andrew Davidson, Yuduo Wu, Carl Yang, Leyuan Wang, Muhammad Osama, Chenshan Yuan, Weitang Liu, Andy T. Riffel, and John D. Owens. 2017. Gunrock: GPU Graph Analytics. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing* 4, 1 (Aug. 2017), 3:1–3:49. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3108140>
 - [96] Jaeyeon Won, Willow Ahrens, Saman Amarasinghe, and Joel S. Emer. 2026. Insum: Sparse GPU Kernels Simplified and Optimized with Indirect Einsums. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2 (USA) (ASPLOS '26)*. 993–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3779212.3790176>
 - [97] Jaeyeon Won, Willow Ahrens, Teodoro Fields Collin, Joel S. Emer, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2025. The Continuous Tensor Abstraction: Where Indices Are Real. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 9, OOPSLA2, Article 368 (Oct. 2025), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3763146>
 - [98] Jaeyeon Won, Charith Mendis, Joel S. Emer, and Saman P. Amarasinghe. 2023. WACO: Learning Workload-Aware Co-optimization of the Format and Schedule of a Sparse Tensor Program. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS 2023, Vol. 2)*, Tor M. Aamodt, Natalie D. Enright Jerger, and Michael M. Swift (Eds.). ACM, 920–934. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3575693.3575742>
 - [99] Yannan Nellie Wu, Po-An Tsai, Angshuman Parashar, Vivienne Sze, and Joel S. Emer. 2022. Sparseloop: An Analytical Approach To Sparse Tensor Accelerator Modeling. In *55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 1377–1395. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO56248.2022.00096>
 - [100] Carl Yang, Aydın Buluç, and John D. Owens. 2018. Implementing Push-Pull Efficiently in GraphBLAS. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Processing (ICPP 2018)*. 89:1–89:11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3225058.3225122>
 - [101] Guangyan Zhang, Shuhan Cheng, Jiwu Shu, Qingda Hu, and Weimin Zheng. 2018. Accelerating breadth-first graph search on a single server by dynamic edge trimming. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 120 (Oct. 2018), 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpdc.2017.09.007>
 - [102] Linxuan Zhang, J. Nelson Amaral, and Di Niu. 2025. TransFusion: End-to-End Transformer Acceleration via Graph Fusion and Pipelining. In *Proceedings of the 58th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Seoul, South Korea) (MICRO '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1491–1504. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3725843.3756105>
 - [103] Yunming Zhang, Mengjiao Yang, Riyadh Baghdadi, Shoaib Kamil, Julian Shun, and Saman Amarasinghe. 2018. GraphIt: A High-Performance Graph DSL. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, OOPSLA (Oct. 2018), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3276491>
 - [104] Shijie Zhou, Rajgopal Kannan, Hanqing Zeng, and Viktor K. Prasanna. 2018. An FPGA framework for edge-centric graph processing. *Proceedings of the 15th ACM International Conference on Computing Frontiers*, 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3203217.3203233>
 - [105] Tong Zhou, Ruiqin Tian, Rizwan A. Ashraf, Roberto Gioiosa, Gokcen Kestor, and Vivek Sarkar. 2022. ReACT: Redundancy-Aware Code Generation for Tensor Expressions. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (Chicago, Illinois) (PACT 2022)*, Andreas Klöckner and José Moreira (Eds.). ACM, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3559009.3569685>
 - [106] Huanzhou Zhu, Ligang He, Matthew Leeke, and Rui Mao. 2020. WolfGraph: The edge-centric graph processing on GPU. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 111 (Oct. 2020), 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2019.09.052>
 - [107] Yan Zhu, Boru Chen, Christopher W. Fletcher, and Nandeeeka Nayak. 2026. RTeAAL Sim: Using Tensor Algebra to Represent and Accelerate RTL Simulation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (ASPLOS '26)*. ACM, 1660–1676. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3779212.3790214>
 - [108] Joseph Zund. 1994. The Ricci Calculus. In *Foundations of Differential Geodesy*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 45–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-79187-1_2

A Appendix: Merge Operators

Merge determines which points in the iteration space participate in a MAP or REDUCE action, indicating which points are effectual. It is a binary operator on two Boolean inputs. For MAP, these two inputs indicate whether the relevant coordinates exist in the left operand (A) and the right operand (B) (§ 6.4). For REDUCE, these two inputs indicate whether the current output point already contains a non-empty reduce state, and whether the current value being reduced is non-empty (§ 6.5). Thus, the same 16 Boolean merge operators—one for each possible truth table on two Boolean inputs—apply to both MAP and REDUCE; only the interpretation of the two inputs changes. We can describe the possible combinations of these Boolean inputs set-theoretically (§ 6) [44].

These merge operators describe effectual points, not implementation strategy. For example, for some merge operators in specific Einsums, leader-follower accesses work best (e.g., in sparse-dense matrix-matrix multiplication), while for others, two-finger merge works best (e.g., in sparse-sparse matrix multiplication, see TeAAL [68]).

Once a point survives merge, the compute operator determines how the corresponding values contribute to the action temporary (MAP TEMPORARY or REDUCE TEMPORARY).

Given two Boolean inputs and a Merge operation on a single rank K , there are 16 possible Merge operators. For merge operators that admit a point even when both Boolean inputs are false, the compute operator is still invoked at that point, with the empty values of A and B substituted as its operands (§ 6.4).

In the example equations below, the compute operator is shown uniformly to emphasize the merge operator. The truth table is determined by Merge.

- (1) The pass-through operator ($\mathbb{I}$, or $\mathbb{T}$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\mathbb{I}) \quad (177)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

- (2) The no-pass operator ($\mathbb{F}$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\mathbb{F}) \quad (178)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

- (3) Intersection ($\cap$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\cap), \quad (179)$$

where compute (+) will only occur when both values are non-empty in A and B at a given k point.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

- (4) Take left (
- $\leftarrow$
-).

In

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\leftarrow), \quad (180)$$

elementwise addition will only occur where A is non-empty.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

- (5) Take left only (
- $\ominus_l$
-).

In the following expression,

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\ominus_l), \quad (181)$$

addition will only occur when A is non-empty and B is empty. In that case, the compute operator $+$ is invoked with A 's value and the empty value of B as its operands (§ 6.4); for a compute operator with additive identity 0, this simply returns the value in A . All other entries of Z will be empty. This differs from take left ($\leftarrow$) above, which also admits points where both A and B are non-empty; $\ominus_l$ excludes that case.

Note that this can also be expressed using a unary operator ($\neg$) and intersection:

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot \neg B_k :: \bigwedge + (\cap) \quad (182)$$

More generally, all 16 merge operators can be expressed using unary operators together with simpler merge patterns such as intersection or union. However, it is still useful to name these operators explicitly, since doing so avoids extra transformations and makes optimization opportunities easier to expose.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

- (6) Take right (
- $\rightarrow$
-).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\rightarrow), \quad (183)$$

where addition only occurs when B is non-empty.

In REDUCE, we can write the following expression:

$$Z = A_k :: \bigvee + (\rightarrow). \quad (184)$$

This indicates that reduction into the current reduce state occurs only when the current value from A at rank variable k is non-empty.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(7) Take right only ($\ominus_r$). In

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\ominus_r), \quad (185)$$

elementwise addition will only occur when B is non-empty and A is empty. In that case, the compute operator $+$ is invoked with the empty value of A and B 's value as its operands (§ 6.4); for a compute operator with additive identity 0, this simply returns the value in B . All other entries of Z will be empty. This differs from take right ($\rightarrow$) above, which also admits points where both A and B are non-empty; $\ominus_r$ excludes that case.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(8) Exclusive OR ($\oplus$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\oplus), \quad (186)$$

where addition only occurs when only one operand is non-empty.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

(9) Union ($\cup$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\cup), \quad (187)$$

where addition only occurs when either operand is non-empty.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	No
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

(10) NOR ($\bar{\cup}$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\bar{\cup}) \quad (188)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(11) Equivalence ($\equiv$, or $\leftrightarrow$). Here, $\equiv$ denotes Boolean equivalence.

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\equiv) \quad (189)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(12) Not take right ($\nrightarrow$). This keeps points for which the right operand is absent—the complement of take right ($\rightarrow$), with each row of the truth table negated.

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\nrightarrow) \quad (190)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

(13) Right implies left ($\Leftarrow$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\Leftarrow) \quad (191)$$

This is equivalent to

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot \neg B_k :: \bigwedge + (\cup) \quad (192)$$

since right-implies-left is the Boolean identity $B \rightarrow A \equiv A \vee \neg B$.

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	No
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	Yes

(14) Not take left ($\nleftarrow$). This keeps points for which the left operand is absent—the complement of take left ($\leftarrow$), with each row of the truth table negated.

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\nleftarrow) \quad (193)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	No

(15) Left implies right ($\Rightarrow$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\Rightarrow) \quad (194)$$

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes

(16) NAND ($\bar{\cap}$).

$$Z_k = A_k \cdot B_k :: \bigwedge + (\bar{\cap})$$

(195)

Point exists in A	Point exists in B	Point exists in Z
No	No	Yes
No	Yes	Yes
Yes	No	Yes
Yes	Yes	No

B Appendix: Additional Notes on EDGE Syntax

The goal of the main syntax section (§ 7) is to state the grammar, defaults, and required components of the language as directly as possible. The material here provides additional intuition, implementation notes, and reference tables.

B.1 Tensor Declarations Matter

The tensor declaration region does more than record metadata about each tensor. It also removes several sources of ambiguity that would otherwise remain when reading an Extended Einsum in isolation. In particular, declarations determine the shapes and rank names that bound the iteration space, identify which tensor ranks are being accessed by each rank variable expression, and specify the empty value associated with each tensor.

These empty values matter as Merge operators interact with them directly. For example, an intersection Merge operator may be used to skip points whose input values are empty, while a pass-through Merge operator will still expose those points to the corresponding Compute operator. As a result, the declaration region is part of what makes an EDGE specification precise.

B.2 Anonymous Tensors and Evaluation Flexibility

An EDGE expression normally has two input operands and one output tensor. When an expression contains more than two input operands, we write it using anonymous tensors so that the order of binary operations is explicit. Parentheses therefore serve two roles: they disambiguate precedence, and they identify intermediate partial tensors that may be consumed by an enclosing expression.

Although the syntax fixes the grouping of operations, it does not require a particular evaluation strategy for those intermediate tensors. An implementation may choose to materialize a single point in a partial tensor and immediately use that point in the enclosing expression. It may also choose to materialize a larger set of points, up to and including the entire partial tensor, before continuing with the outer computation. We treat this as part of *fusion*, which is explored in the *mapping* and *binding* levels of abstraction in our separation of concerns [68].

This flexibility is useful because different implementations may make different trade-offs depending on the target system. One implementation may prefer fine-grained pointwise evaluation to reduce temporary storage, while another may prefer to compute and reuse larger intermediate tiles of a given tensor.

B.3 Why Nested Cascades Are Useful

A fully specified extended Einsum consists of a cascade of Einsum expressions, and EDGE extends this model to support nested cascades. This is useful when a computation is naturally modular, with one group of expressions feeding into another larger computation. Graph algorithms often have this structure. For example, an inner computation may gather, filter, or relabel a set of vertices, while an outer computation uses the result as one step of a broader iterative procedure.

Supporting nested cascades lets the language represent that structure directly rather than forcing every computation into a flat sequence of top-level expressions. See § 8.2 for example algorithms that benefit from nested cascades.

B.4 Additional Intuition for Rank Variable Expressions

A rank variable expression maps iteration-space variables to a coordinate in a tensor rank. Because this mapping may be an arbitrary function of the iteration-space variables, rank variable expressions can express coordinate transformations that go beyond simple renaming or projection.

For example, a conditional expression such as

$$f(a, w) \rightarrow \text{if } w < a \text{ then return } w \text{ else return } a \quad (196)$$

can be used to map multiple iteration-space points to the same output coordinate. In such cases, the output rank requires a REDUCE action, since distinct iteration-space points may contribute to the same point in the output tensor.

This kind of behavior appears in graph algorithms such as connected components, where a computation may replace an ancestor vertex with a smaller-valued connected vertex. A parallel implementation may require *atomic* operations to reduce correctly. The key point is that the syntax of rank variable expressions is general enough to describe these coordinate mappings directly.

B.5 User-Defined Functions

EDGE allows Compute, Merge, and Coordinate operators to be user-defined functions, with constraints on their inputs and outputs. In practice, such functions may be written in a host language such as C or Python and then associated with the corresponding operator in the EDGE specification.

The Coordinate operator in POPULATE is more expressive than the standard Merge because it can inspect not only the current iteration-space point and computed value, but also the current partial output fiber on the mutable rank. This makes it possible to define output coordinates using both coordinate information and data values.

B.6 Shorthand Notation

In practice, the authors have found several shorthand notations convenient for presenting and discussing algorithms. These shorthands are not part of the EDGE language itself, but they make informal presentations easier to read. Whenever a shorthand expression appears, the intended interpretation is obtained by expanding it into a valid EDGE expression and applying the operational and semantic definitions in the main text.

- (1) Dropping the tensor declaration and initialization sections when they are already understood from context.
- (2) Using infix notation to specify simple computations. For example, we may write element-wise addition as $Z_{m,n} = A_{m,n} + B_{m,n}$ instead of spelling out the fully specified MAP action.
- (3) Using “<<” (update) instead of “=” (assignment) to express the assignment of a generational tensor with both the previous iteration’s values and the newly computed values. This is a common computation pattern. For example, we can rewrite the update to the set of visited nodes in Equation (41j) as:

$$P_{i+1,d} << F_{i+1,d} \quad (197)$$

The fully specified EDGE expression corresponds to a MAP action:

$$P_{i+1,d} = P_{i,d} \cdot F_{i+1,d} :: \bigwedge_d << (\cup), \quad (198)$$

where the Compute operator of << (“update”), combined with the union Merge operator, has the following properties:

- if both operands are empty, return an empty value;
- if the left operand (P) is empty or both operands contain values, return the value on the right; and
- if the right operand (F) is empty, return the value on the left.

Table 6. Summary of what each action does.

Action	What it does at each point in the iteration space
MAP	Retrieve the data-space values for each operand on the right-hand side and apply the Compute operator to them.
REDUCE	Given a computed value on the right-hand side, combine it with the current left-hand side state at the corresponding output point.
POPULATE	Given a computed value on the right-hand side, update the mutable fiber on the left-hand side.

Table 7. Syntax summary of the three actions in EDGE.

Action	Symbol	Operators Supported
MAP	$\wedge$	Compute operator (Merge operator)
REDUCE	$\vee$	Compute operator (Merge operator)
POPULATE	$\lll_{mutable_rank_list}$	Compute operator (Coordinate operator)

We use shorthand notation for informal communication only; we do not expect an underlying compiler to support it. Regardless, whenever reading an EDGE expression, the guiding principle is always: apply the operational definition of an Einsum to the expression.

B.7 High-Level Summary Tables

The following tables provide compact summaries of the actions, operators, and required symbols used in EDGE.

Table 8. Operators in an EDGE expression, along with their inputs and outputs at a given point in the iteration space. In addition to the inputs shown here, each operator also takes the current iteration-space point as input. *The unary operator is an instance of MAP; see § 5.5.

	Input 1	Input 2	Output	Computation Type
Merge Operator	On the RHS: existence of a non-empty data-space point in the left operand	On the RHS: existence of a non-empty data-space point in the right operand	Valid or empty coordinate for that point in the iteration space	One of 16 Merge operators (see Appendix A)
Compute Operator	Depends on the action. For MAP: left operand value. For REDUCE: current reduce state. For POPULATE: computed RHS value.	Depends on the action. For MAP: right operand value. For REDUCE: value being reduced. For POPULATE: none.	A value	User-defined
Coordinate Operator	On the RHS: computed data value at that point	On the LHS: current partial output fiber, including both coordinates and values, for the mutable rank	Set of valid or empty coordinates	User-defined
Unary* Operator (on a tensor)	On the RHS: value at the data-space point of the tensor		New value at that data-space point	User-defined unary function

B.8 Macros

A MACRO is a named, parameterized Einsum template. Invoking a MACRO expands it into one or more Einsums via lexical substitution of its tensor and rank variable expression parameters.

Table 9. Summary of required symbols in an Einsum expression. When a given action or operator appears in an expression, it must accompany the required symbols listed here and may accompany the optional symbols. When a given action or operator is omitted, the defaults in the main syntax section apply.

When this action/operator is present:	Then EDGE also requires:	Optional:
MAP Action	Operation label and rank variable list	
REDUCE Action	Rank variable list	Operation label
POPULATE Action	Modifiable rank	
Merge Operator	MAP action or REDUCE action and Compute operator	
Coordinate Operator	POPULATE action and Compute operator	
Compute Operator	MAP action, REDUCE action, or POPULATE action	

A MACRO definition has the form:

▷MACRO

NAME($TA_{a,\dots}, TB_{b,\dots}, \dots$) $\mapsto T_{c,\dots}, T_{2d,\dots}, \dots$

(body: cascade of Einsums using the parameters)

The left-hand side of $\mapsto$ lists the input tensor parameters; the right-hand side declares the output tensors produced by the expansion.

Inline invocation. When a MACRO has a single output tensor, it can be invoked *inline* as an anonymous tensor within a surrounding Einsum expression. The subscript on the call site binds the output tensor’s rank variables and names the anonymous tensor.

Motivating example. Consider three back-to-back GEMMs:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n} \quad (199)$$

$$Y_{n,q} = C_{n,p} \times D_{p,q} \quad (200)$$

$$X_{m,q} = Z_{m,n} \times Y_{n,q} \quad (201)$$

Using MACROS, we can write this cascade as:

$$X_{m,q} = \text{GEMM}(A_{m,k}, B_{k,n})_{m,n} \times \text{GEMM}(C_{n,p}, D_{p,q})_{n,q} \quad (202)$$

where GEMM is defined by the following template:

▷MACRO

$\text{GEMM}(TA_{a,c}, TB_{c,b}) \mapsto T_{a,b}$

$T_{a,b} = TA_{a,c} \times TB_{c,b}.$

MACROS are simply lexical substitutions. For example, we can write $\text{GEMM}(A_{m+1,k}, B_{k,n})_{m,n}$, which expands as follows:

- TA becomes A ; rank variables a, c become $m + 1, k$.

- TB becomes B ; rank variable b becomes n .
- T becomes the anonymous tensor $\text{GEMM}_{m,n}$.

Since the arguments are rank variable *expressions* (not just variables), substitutions such as $a \mapsto m+1$ are permitted.

Equivalently, we can invoke GEMM in assignment form:

$$Z_{m,n} = \text{GEMM}(A_{m,k}, B_{k,n})$$

Here, the subscripts on Z bind the output rank variables ($a \mapsto m, b \mapsto n$), and T becomes Z rather than an anonymous tensor. Both invocation forms produce identical expansions.

Cascade invocation. At times, for readability, we may want to express a cascade of Einsums as a single MACRO. In this case, the MACRO may have multiple output tensors, and we invoke it in *cascade form*, binding output names explicitly on the left-hand side:

$$Z_{m,n}, Y_{n,q}, X_{m,q} = 3\text{-GEMM}(A_{m,k}, B_{k,n}, C_{n,p}, D_{p,q})$$

where 3-GEMM is defined as:

▷MACRO

$$\begin{aligned} 3\text{-GEMM}(TA_{a,b}, TB_{b,c}, TC_{c,d}, TD_{d,e}) &\mapsto TZ_{a,c}, TY_{c,e}, TX_{a,e} \\ TZ_{a,c} &= \text{GEMM}(TA_{a,b}, TB_{b,c}) \\ TY_{c,e} &= \text{GEMM}(TC_{c,d}, TD_{d,e}) \\ TX_{a,e} &= \text{GEMM}(TZ_{a,c}, TY_{c,e}) \end{aligned}$$

The output names on the left-hand side of the invocation (Z, Y, X) bind positionally to the declared outputs (TZ, TY, TX), and the subscripts bind the corresponding rank variables. If a rank variable appears in more than one output, the caller is responsible for providing consistent subscripts across those outputs, following the same convention as rank variable sharing across Einsums in a cascade.

After expansion, all three output tensors are live as named tensors in the enclosing cascade. A downstream Einsum may reference any subset of them; unreferenced tensors are simply dead temporaries, and whether to eliminate them is a concern for the implementation, not the notation.

B.9 Parameterized Rank Groups

A MACRO substitutes symbols one-for-one at instantiation time. Sometimes, however, we want to write a single Einsum expression that is generic over an unknown number of ranks, where that count R is only determined at runtime. We call such a group of ranks a *parameterized rank group*.

Motivating example. Consider the standard GEMM:

$$Z_{m,n} = A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n}. \quad (203)$$

Suppose we want this to be generic, where m can stand for any number of uncontracted ranks whose count R is only known at runtime. We need a way to write the expression once without committing to a specific value of R .

Notation. We declare a parameterized rank group $M.R$ in the tensor declaration, where M is the rank group name and R is its rank-count parameter. Like the generational rank I , R is not assigned a fixed shape at declaration time; its value is determined at runtime. In the Einsum body, we write $m.r$ to refer to the r -th rank variable in the M group, where r is an index ranging over $[0, R)$.

The generalized GEMM is written:

► Tensors

$$Z^{M,R,N}, \quad A^{M,R,K}, \quad B^{K,N} \rightarrow \text{integer, empty} = 0$$

► Extended Einsum

$$Z_{m,r,n} = A_{m,r,k} \times B_{k,n}.$$

At runtime, if $R = 4$, the rank group M expands to four individual ranks, and the Einsum becomes:

$$Z_{m.3, m.2, m.1, m.0, n} = A_{m.3, m.2, m.1, m.0, k} \times B_{k, n}.$$

The iteration space consists of the rank variables ranged by those individual ranks, together with k and n .

Contraction within a rank group. After expansion, each member of the rank group participates in the standard Einsum contraction semantics independently. If a particular expanded rank variable appears only on the right-hand side, that rank contracts. For example, if $R = 4$ and $m.2$ appears only on the right-hand side, then the Einsum reduces over $m.2$. If multiple expanded rank variables appear only on the right-hand side, then the Einsum reduces over each of those ranks. Thus, a full rank group contracts only when every member of that group appears only on the right-hand side.

For example:

$$Z_{m.3, m.1, m.0, n} = A_{m.3, m.2, m.1, m.0, k} \times B_{k, n}$$

contracts over $m.2$ and k , but preserves $m.3$, $m.1$, $m.0$, and n in the output.

Likewise, if the entire expanded group appears only on the right-hand side:

$$Z_n = A_{m.r, k} \times B_{k, n},$$

then all members of the M rank group contract, along with k . At runtime with $R = 2$, this is equivalent to:

$$Z_n = A_{m.1, m.0, k} \times B_{k, n}.$$

Multiple parameterized rank groups. More than one rank group can appear in the same expression. For example, generalizing GEMM so that both sets of uncontracted ranks are parameterized:

$$Z_{m.r, n.s} = A_{m.r, k} \times B_{k, n.s},$$

where $r \in [0, R)$ and $s \in [0, S)$ are independent rank-count parameters, each determined at runtime.

Relationship to MACROS. A parameterized rank group is resolved by expansion at runtime, in the same spirit as a `MACRO` (§ B.8). The distinction is one of arity: a `MACRO` substitutes symbols one-for-one, while a rank group expands a single symbol $m.r$ into an ordered list of rank variables. Both are instances of the same underlying idea of lexical expansion, operating at different granularities.

C Appendix: Bellman-Ford Eingebric Manipulations

This appendix provides a more detailed algebraic justification for each transformation in § 8.1.2.

C.1 Tensor Glossary

Table 10 summarizes the tensors used in the SSSP derivation and marks which cascade each one appears in.

Table 10. Tensors used in the SSSP derivation. Columns mark which cascade each tensor appears in: BF (Cascade 4), Steps 1–4 (Cascades 6–9), SPFA (Cascade 10), and Dijkstra (Cascade 11).

Tensor	Description	BF	S1	S2	S3	S4	SPFA	Dij.
$G^{S,D}$	Edge-weight graph; (s, d) indexes the edge from source s to destination d	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$D^{I,S}$	Per-vertex distances from source; i outer iteration, s vertex	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
$\tilde{D}^{I,K,D}$	Running distance within outer iteration i ; inner step k tracks progress through sources, d is the destination vertex				✓	✓		
N	Candidate neighbor distances after one relaxation; indexed as $N_{i,d}$ in BF/SPFA/Dijkstra and as $N_{i,s,d}$ or $N_{i,k,d}$ in the manipulation steps	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C	Mask where $N < D$; indexed as $C_{i,d}$ in BF/SPFA/Dijkstra and as $C_{i,s,d}$ in Step 1	✓	✓				✓	✓
$\text{PerSourceRelaxed}^{I,S,D}$	N where it improves D , indexed per source s and destination d		✓					
$\text{NewlyRelaxed}^{I,D}$	Best improvement per destination d , after reducing over sources	✓	✓				✓	✓
$Q^{I,S}$	Marks at (i, s) which sources may still produce improvements						✓	✓
$DQ^{I,S}$	D restricted to entries where Q is true						✓	✓
$F^{I,S}$	One-hot at (i, s) for the single-source vertex selected to process this iteration						✓	✓
$T^{I,D}$	Queue Q with the just-processed source removed						✓	✓

C.2 Equivalence of the Boolean-Check Update and a min Einsum

Claim. The three-Einsum chain

$$C_{i,s,d} = N_{i,s,d} \cdot D_{i,d} :: \bigwedge < (\cup) \quad (204a)$$

$$\text{PerSourceRelaxed}_{i,s,d} = C_{i,s,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \rightarrow (\cap) \quad (204b)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot \text{PerSourceRelaxed}_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge << (\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (204c)$$

is equivalent to the single Einsum

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup). \quad (205)$$

Eingebraic Manipulations. We proceed by substitution.

Substituting C 's definition into PerSourceRelaxed :

$$\text{PerSourceRelaxed}_{i,s,d} = (N_{i,s,d} \cdot^1 D_{i,d})_{i,s,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge^1 < (\cup) \bigwedge^2 \rightarrow (\cap). \quad (206)$$

The inner $< (\cup)$ produces a Boolean tensor whose value at (i, s, d) is True exactly when $N_{i,s,d} < D_{i,d}$. The outer $\rightarrow (\cap)$ takes the right operand's value where both operands are non-empty, so $\text{PerSourceRelaxed}_{i,s,d}$ is non-empty exactly where $N_{i,s,d} < D_{i,d}$, and its value at those points is $N_{i,s,d}$. Thus PerSourceRelaxed is N where it improves D .

Substituting this into the D_{i+1} Einsum, the right operand of $<< (\cup)$ is non-empty exactly where $N_{i,s,d} < D_{i,d}$, with value $N_{i,s,d}$. By the definition of $<< (\cup)$, $D_{i+1,d}$ takes the right operand's value where it is non-empty, and the left operand's value otherwise. Therefore at every (i, s, d) :

- If $N_{i,s,d} < D_{i,d}$, then $D_{i+1,d} = N_{i,s,d} = \min(D_{i,d}, N_{i,s,d})$.
- Otherwise: $D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} = \min(D_{i,d}, N_{i,s,d})$.

Either way, the per-source operation yields $\min(D_{i,d}, N_{i,s,d})$, which is exactly the operation specified by $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ between $D_{i,d}$ and $N_{i,s,d}$. The outer reduction over s is unchanged.

Intuition. $<< (\cup)$ is “take right where right exists, else take left.” When right is gated to only exist where it is strictly less than left, the operation reduces to “take whichever is smaller,” which is min.

C.3 Equivalence Between s -Reduction and Iterative Accumulation Over Inner Rank k

Claim. The Einsum

$$D_{i+1,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) \bigvee_s \min(\cup) \quad (207)$$

is equivalent to the cascade

$$\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d} \quad (208a)$$

$$\tilde{D}_{i,k+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,k,d} \cdot N_{i,k,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) \quad (208b)$$

$$\diamond_k : k \equiv |V| \quad (208c)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,|V|,d} \quad (208d)$$

where $N_{i,k,d}$ is $N_{i,s,d}$ with the s rank renamed to k .

Eingebraic Manipulations. Pin the source rank s at each value $0, 1, \dots, |V| - 1$. The original Einsum's reduction over s unrolls into a chain of binary min operations:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i+1,d} &= (\dots ((D_{i,d} \cdot^1 N_{i,s:s=0,d})_{i,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,s:s=1,d})_{i,d} \dots)_{i,d} \cdot^{|V|} N_{i,s:s=|V|-1,d} \\ &:: \bigwedge^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup) \dots \bigwedge^{|V|} \min(\cup). \end{aligned} \quad (209)$$

min is associative and commutative. Thus, this chain equals the original Einsum regardless of the order in which the $\wedge$ operations are applied.

Define $\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d}$ and $\tilde{D}_{i,k+1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,k,d} \cdot N_{i,k,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup)$. By induction on k :

- Base case ($k = 0$): $\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d}$ by definition.
- Inductive step: assume $\tilde{D}_{i,k,d}$ equals the prefix of the chain up through $\bigwedge^k$. Then $\tilde{D}_{i,k+1,d}$ extends by one more min with $N_{i,s:s=k,d}$ (renamed to $N_{i,k,d}$), which is exactly $\bigwedge^{k+1}$.

After at most $|V|$ steps, $\tilde{D}_{i,|V|,d}$ equals the full chain, which equals $D_{i+1,d}$.

Role of idempotence. Suppose we instead do the elementwise min (Equation (207)) first, before reducing over the s rank:

$$\text{PerSourceDist}_{i,s,d} = D_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,s,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) \quad (210a)$$

$$D_{i+1,d} = \text{PerSourceDist}_{i,s,d} :: \bigvee_s \min(\cup). \quad (210b)$$

Substituting the PerSourceDist values and pinning s , this expands to:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i+1,d} = & \left(\dots \left((D_{i,d} \cdot^1 N_{i,s:s=0,d})_{i,d} \cdot^{|V|+1} (D_{i,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,s:s=1,d})_{i,d} \right)_{i,d} \cdot^{|V|+2} \dots \right)_{i,d} \\ & \cdot^{2|V|-1} (D_{i,d} \cdot^{|V|} N_{i,s:s=|V|-1,d})_{i,d} \\ & :: \bigwedge^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup) \dots \bigwedge^{2|V|-1} \min(\cup). \end{aligned} \quad (211)$$

Notice that $D_{i,d}$ appears $|V|$ times as an operand in the expanded form. Idempotence of min ($\min(D, D) = D$) collapses these duplicates, so the result agrees with the rolled form.

Note on the two iterative ranks. The cascade introduces an inner iterative rank k within each outer iteration i . This is a nested cascade: $\tilde{D}$'s k rank drives an inner cascade that processes one source per step, while the outer cascade's stopping condition $\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$ continues to govern overall convergence. At a given i , the inner cascade always runs for exactly $|V|$ steps because all sources still read from the original $D_{i,d}$.

C.4 Sequentializing the Gather step

Step 3 is synchronous. Notice that in Cascade 8, each source k within an outer iteration i gathers from the same original distance tensor: $\tilde{D}_{i,0,k} = D_{i,k}$. So source k 's gather has the form:

$$N_{i,k,d} = G_{k,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,0,k} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (212)$$

No source sees the running distance updates contributed by sources $0, 1, \dots, k-1$. We term this a *synchronous* cascade: every source operates on a frozen snapshot of D taken at the start of outer iteration i .

Step 4 (Cascade 9) breaks this synchrony by routing source k 's gather to $\tilde{D}_{i,k,k}$, the running distance after sources $0, 1, \dots, k-1$ have added contributions:

$$N_{i,k,d} = G_{k,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,k,k} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (213)$$

We now show constructively that this change preserves the value of D at convergence.

At $k = 0$. By definition, $\tilde{D}_{i,0,d} = D_{i,d}$. Source 0's gather is:

$$N_{i,0,d} = G_{0,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,0,0} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (214)$$

Since $\tilde{D}_{i,0,0} = D_{i,0}$, this matches source 0's gather in the synchronous cascade. The running distance update is then:

$$\tilde{D}_{i,1,d} = \tilde{D}_{i,0,d} \cdot N_{i,0,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup) = D_{i,d} \cdot N_{i,0,d} :: \bigwedge \min(\cup). \quad (215)$$

At $k = 1$. Source 1's gather now reads $\tilde{D}_{i,1,1}$ rather than $D_{i,1}$:

$$N_{i,1,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,1,1} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (216)$$

Substituting the unrolled $\tilde{D}_{i,1,1}$:

$$N_{i,1,d} = G_{1,d} \cdot^1 (D_{i,s:s=1} \cdot^2 N_{i,0,s:s=1})_{i,s:s=1} :: \bigwedge^1 +(\cap) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup). \quad (217)$$

Distributing $G_{1,d} \cdot^1$ over the inner $\bigwedge^2 \min(\cup)$ via the $(\min, +)$ semiring:

$$N_{i,1,d} = (G_{1,d} \cdot^1 D_{i,s:s=1})_{i,d} \cdot^3 (G_{1,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,0,s:s=1})_{i,d} :: \bigwedge^1 +(\cap) \bigwedge^2 +(\cap) \bigwedge^3 \min(\cup). \quad (218)$$

The first term matches source k 's gather in the synchronous cascade. By the inductive hypothesis, each remaining term $G_{k,d} \cdot N_{i,k',k}$ appends one edge (from k to d) to a candidate ending at k . The final N term is the minimum across all candidate options.

The first term matches source 1's gather in the synchronous cascade (reading the original $D_{i,1}$). The second term is a new candidate: a two-edge path from vertex 0 through vertex 1 to d , expressed as the gather $G_{1,d} \cdot N_{i,0,1}$.

The new $N_{i,1,d}$ is therefore the min of the synchronous $N_{i,1,d}$ (Equation (212)) and one additional candidate. Since $\min(a, b) \leq a$ pointwise, the new N is pointwise less than or equal to the synchronous N .

Generalizing at $k = 2$. Source 2's gather:

$$N_{i,2,d} = G_{2,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,2,2} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (219)$$

Unrolling $\tilde{D}_{i,2,2}$ via the running-distance recurrence applied twice:

$$\tilde{D}_{i,2,s:s=2} = (D_{i,s:s=2} \cdot^1 N_{i,0,s:s=2})_{i,s:s=2} \cdot^2 N_{i,1,s:s=2} :: \bigwedge^1 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^2 \min(\cup). \quad (220)$$

Substituting and distributing $G_{2,d} \cdot$ over the min Einsums:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{i,2,d} &= (G_{2,d} \cdot^1 D_{i,s:s=2})_{i,d} \\ &\quad \cdot^4 (G_{2,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,0,s:s=2})_{i,d} \cdot^5 (G_{2,d} \cdot^3 N_{i,1,s:s=2})_{i,d} \\ &:: \bigwedge^1 +(\cap) \bigwedge^2 +(\cap) \bigwedge^3 +(\cap) \bigwedge^4 \min(\cup) \bigwedge^5 \min(\cup). \end{aligned} \quad (221)$$

Each of these three terms is itself an EDGE expression in $\bigwedge +(\cap)$ and $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ over $D_{i,\cdot}$ and $G_{\cdot,\cdot}$. The first matches source 2's gather in the synchronous cascade; the second and third are new candidates that chain through sources 0 and 1 within this i iteration.

Inductive generalization. For arbitrary k , $\tilde{D}_{i,k,k}$ unrolls into a chain of $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ Einsums combining $D_{i,k}$ with $N_{i,k',k}$ for each $k' < k$. Source k 's gather is:

$$N_{i,k,d} = G_{k,d} \cdot \tilde{D}_{i,k,k} :: \bigwedge +(\cap). \quad (222)$$

Distributing $G_{k,d}$ over the $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ chain via the $(\min, +)$ semiring at the EDGE level:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_{i,k,d} &= (G_{k,d} \cdot^1 D_{i,s:s=k})_{i,d} \\
 &\quad \cdot^{k+2} (G_{k,d} \cdot^2 N_{i,0,s:s=k})_{i,d} \cdot^{k+3} \dots \cdot^{2k+1} (G_{k,d} \cdot^{k+1} N_{i,k-1,s:s=k})_{i,d} \\
 &\quad :: \bigwedge^1 +(\cap) \bigwedge^2 +(\cap) \dots \bigwedge^{k+1} +(\cap) \bigwedge^{k+2} \min(\cup) \dots \bigwedge^{2k+1} \min(\cup). \quad (223)
 \end{aligned}$$

The first term matches source k 's gather in the synchronous cascade. By the inductive hypothesis, each remaining term $G_{k,d} \cdot N_{i,k',k}$ appends one edge (from k to d) to a candidate ending at k . The final N term is the minimum across all candidate options.

Same result at convergence. Every value Step 4's cascade computes is expressible as an EDGE expression in $\bigwedge +(\cap)$ and $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ over D_i and G . So is every value the synchronous cascade computes. Step 4 simply discovers more such expressions per i iteration. The stopping condition $\diamond : D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$ holds when no candidate improves any distance. For the synchronous and sequentialized cascades in Steps 3 and 4, this stopping condition is identical. On graphs without negative cycles, the smallest reachable distance from any combination of $\bigwedge +(\cap)$ and $\bigwedge \min(\cup)$ Einsums over D and G is unique, so both cascades reach the same value of D at convergence. The sequentialized cascade typically converges in fewer i iterations because each i explores additional candidates of the form $G_{k,d} \cdot N_{i,k',k}$ for $k' < k$ that the synchronous cascade defers to subsequent outer i iterations.

Negative cycles. On graphs with negative cycles, neither cascade converges: distances along the cycle keep decreasing each iteration, so $D_{i+1} \equiv D_i$ never holds and the stopping condition is never met. Both the synchronous and sequentialized cascades inherit this behavior from the underlying Bellman-Ford relaxation.

From the sequentialized cascade to SPFA and Dijkstra. The SPFA algorithm collapses k into i such that on each i , one source from the queue Q is selected and processed. The queue tracks exactly those sources whose outgoing edges may still produce improvements. Thus, SPFA terminates when Q is empty rather than when a single iteration leaves D unchanged. Dijkstra further restricts this selector: it selects the vertex in Q with minimum current distance, and it is correct under the constraint that all edge weights are non-negative.