

Scheduling Languages: A Past, Present, and Future Taxonomy

MARY HALL, University of Utah, USA

COSMIN OANCEA, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

ANNE C. ELSTER, Norwegian Institute of Science and Technology, Norway

ARI RASCH, University of Muenster, Germany

SAMEERAN JOSHI, University of Utah, USA

AMIR MOHAMMAD TAVAKKOLI, University of Utah, USA

RICHARD SCHULZE, University of Muenster, Germany

Scheduling languages express to a compiler a sequence of optimizations to apply. Compilers that support a scheduling language interface allow exploration of compiler optimizations, *i.e.*, *exploratory compilers*. While scheduling languages have become a common feature of tools for expert users, the proliferation of these languages without unifying common features may be confusing to users. Moreover, we recognize a need to organize the compiler developer community around common exploratory compiler infrastructure, and future advances to address, for example, data layout and data movement. To support a broader set of users may require raising the level of abstraction. This paper provides a taxonomy of scheduling languages, first discussing their origins in iterative compilation and autotuning, noting the common features and how they are used in existing frameworks, and then calling for changes to increase their utility and portability.

ACM Reference Format:

Mary Hall, Cosmin Oancea, Anne C. Elster, Ari Rasch, Sameeran Joshi, Amir Mohammad Tavakkoli, and Richard Schulze. 2024. Scheduling Languages: A Past, Present, and Future Taxonomy. 1, 1 (October 2024), 28 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

The main aim and contribution of this paper is to provide a taxonomy of scheduling languages that illustrates how past work motivated and led to the present proliferation of scheduling languages, and how future improvements — aimed at easing the interaction with the domain expert and at supporting more general forms of computations — may cycle back to the past, prompted by the need for higher automation and integration. Table 1 summarizes the key properties of this evolution, which is highlighted in this section and expanded in the rest of the paper.

Until the late 1990s, compilers were essentially black boxes that were controlled via optimization flags and a small set of directives to analysis and optimization. Even today, large open source community compiler projects like LLVM and gcc are organized as a series of passes over a common intermediate representation (IR) that has been lowered from source code, with each pass leaving the code in a consistent state. Therefore, the internals of each pass — including the decision algorithms that apply optimizations — are opaque to compiler users and even most compiler developers. At the end of the compilation process, code is lowered from the IR to architecture-specific machine code.

In the 1990s as compiler research introduced optimizations to achieve locality in caches (and vector and thread-level parallelism), something that is still true today became obvious: *it is difficult to predict the best sequence of code transformations to achieve high performance since it depends heavily on both architecture and input data*. Many sophisticated cache models were developed during this time to predict capacity and conflict

Authors' addresses: Mary Hall, mhall@cs.utah.edu, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA; Cosmin Oancea, cosmin.oancea@di.ku.dk, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark; Anne C. Elster, elster@ntnu.no, Norwegian Institute of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway; Ari Rasch, a.rasch@uni-muenster.de, University of Muenster, Muenster, Germany; Sameeran Joshi, sameeran@cs.utah.edu, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA; Amir Mohammad Tavakkoli, amir.tavakkoli@utah.edu, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, USA; Richard Schulze, r.schulze@uni-muenster.de, University of Muenster, Muenster, Germany.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2024/10-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Table 1. Motivations and resulting technology related to scheduling languages in the past, present, and expected future.

Timeline	Motivation	Focus	Approaches
PAST 1997 - 2012 <i>EXPLORE</i>	HEURISTIC-BASED CODE OPTIMIZATION DECISIONS INEFFECTIVE IMPROVE EFFICIENCY OF EXPERT USERS	PRIMARILY LOOP NEST COMPUTATIONS EMBEDDED & SCIENTIFIC APPLICATIONS & LIBRARIES	AUTOTUNING LIBRARIES EXPLORATORY COMPILERS AND CODE GENERATORS REWRITING RULES & LANG. SUPPORT FOR CODE VARIANTS
PRESENT 2013 - 2023 <i>SPECIALIZE</i>	EFFICIENCY OF EXPERT USERS IN SPECIFIC DOMAINS	DOMAIN SPECIFIC LANGUAGES AND COMPILERS	SEPARATE HIGH-LEVEL SPECIFICATION AND SCHEDULE NARROW THE SEARCH SPACE TO UTILIZE AUTOTUNING AND ML
FUTURE 2024 - <i>POPULARIZE</i>	INCREASE USER ACCESSIBILITY RAISE ABSTRACTION	BROADEN TO MORE GENERAL APPLICATIONS UNIFY AND INCORPORATE INTO COMMON INFRASTRUCTURES	DATA LAYOUT/MOVEMENT INTEGRATION RUNTIME SUPPORT EXPAND SEARCH SPACE WHILE MAINTAINING PRACTICALITY

misses (e.g., interference phenomena [TFJ94] and cache miss equations [GMM99]) to guide architecture-specific optimization. However, as the complexity of these models grew, the alternative idea of simply executing the code to measure its performance on each platform, and adjust the algorithms accordingly, took hold. *Autotuning*, popularized by ATLAS [WD98, CPD01], (Automatically Tuned Linear Algebra) [WD98, CPD01], which focused on BLAS (Basic Linear Algebra) routines and a few LAPACK routines, initially focused on cache and instruction-level parallelism optimizations. Other similar approaches arose in the late 1990s and early 2000s for autotuning computation kernels from specific domains: for linear algebra [BACD97], sparse linear algebra [Vud03, IYV04], Bitreversal [SE98, EM09], and FFTs [Fri99, MJJ⁺01, PMJ⁺05].

This work on autotuning libraries was complemented by programming languages and compilers designed to facilitate exploration of more general computations. Contemporaneously with ATLAS, early work in *iterative compilation* developed compiler technology that enabled exploration of code transformations [BKK⁺98, BKK⁺00, KKO00, TVVA03, PBCC08, PKC11]. Using iterative compilation, the compiler’s internal algorithms were designed to explore alternative sequences of transformations, execute the code on the target hardware, and use that empirical data to decide which version provided the best performance. Iterative compilation led to the reorganization of compilers to support exploration. The search over transformation sequences was part of the compiler’s algorithms, so it was still the compilers’ responsibility to decide *what to explore*.

Subsequent research empowered expert programmers to collaborate with programming languages and compilers by exposing the optimization process to user control. On the programming language side, a number of systems allowed programmers to express alternative *code variants* – functionally equivalent implementations, potentially using different algorithms – and to use autotuning to identify the most performant composition of variants [FKH⁺06, ACW⁺09]. On the compiler and code generation front, a number of systems supported the specification by an expert programmer of a sequence of transformations to apply to a code, expressed within the code using annotations or in a separate transformation recipe [DBR⁺06, GVB⁺06, CCH07, YSY⁺07, HNS09].

In the context of domain-specific languages (DSL), Halide [RKBA⁺13a] popularized the idea of deriving a high-performance implementation by combining: (1) a simple, high-level specification, aimed to increase productivity of domain experts; together with, (2) a transformation recipe written by a compiler expert in a separate language – named a *scheduling* language.

Unlike standard interfaces to compiler optimizations – compile-time flags and pragmas inserted in the code – schedules are *programs* that express a sequence of optimizations to apply to a separate source code. Compilers that support a scheduling language interface allow exploration of compiler optimizations, and are referred to subsequently as *exploratory compilers*. A survey of autotuning compiler approaches going back to the 1990s discusses exploratory compilers in more detail [AKC⁺18].

The scheduling language serves as an expert programmer’s interface to the compiler’s transformations, or as an abstraction that exposes transformations to automated search and prediction. Over the last decade, scheduling languages have been increasingly used to map performance-critical computations within domain-specific commercial applications. In principle, the use of a language to represent a schedule strengthens the optimization description by providing well-defined semantics, composability, and the opportunity for verification. In practice, today’s scheduling languages lack many of these desirable properties of a programming language [HLK⁺20].

In this paper, we consider the suitability of scheduling languages as a key abstraction in current and future compilers for achieving high performance on critical computations. While scheduling languages were originally designed to expose optimizations to experts because automation was too difficult, we envision a future where scheduling languages are unified and part of any architecture-specific optimization workflow. This exploratory compiler structure exposes profitable code transformation sequences at a finer granularity than tuning based on compiler flags, and is externally controllable in contrast to iterative compilation. Moreover, a human-readable language facilitates improving and sharing schedules. Therefore, in the two decades since their origins, through the use of scheduling languages coupled with systematic approaches for exploring schedules, compilers have been restructured to provide the abstractions needed to close the circle and automate high-performance code generation.

The structure of this paper mirrors Table 1. Section 2 surveys past approaches (1997 – 2012) that were essentially aimed at optimizing scientific applications, beyond what the heuristic pipelines of general-purpose compilers could provide. They include autotuning libraries and advanced compilation techniques, such as iterative compilation, which are applied to mainstream languages and are characterized by a high degree of automation and integration. Section 3 surveys present work (2013-2023) using Halide as the starting point. These systems are predominantly domain specific, driven by the observation that *specialization* of the language and compiler repertoire gives rise to performance. Section 4 envisions a future that aims to broaden the specification language and the repertoire of code transformations available to scheduling, while at the same time interacting directly with the domain expert in simple(r) ways. The future likely requires a high degree of automation, reminiscent of the approaches of the past. Section 5 surveys related work, and Section 6 concludes.

2 PAST: OPTIMIZATION EXPLORATION

Early exploratory optimization systems arose from the growing complexity of emerging architectures and the productivity challenge of producing architecture-specific code. These trends demanded that even expert programmers needed tools to accelerate exploration of different implementation strategies. This section reviews the origins of scheduling languages by discussing three distinct bodies of work: domain-specific autotuning libraries and code generators; iterative compilation and early autotuning compilers and code generators; and programming languages that permitted exploration of optimizations and algorithms.

2.1 Early Domain-Specific Autotuning Library Generators

Autotuning libraries are examples of early efforts to improve performance automatically (without programmer interactions) across different architectures. These approaches decompose the given functions into performant subprograms, e.g., customized to the cache hierarchy of a given architecture. The sizes of the subprograms are parameterized and the parameters that offer best performance are determined empirically; thus, *autotuning* for a given architecture. Some of the earliest efforts include PhiPAC, ATLAS and FFTW.

PhiPAC [BACD97] was a multi-level cache-blocked matrix multiply autotuning generator that was a precursor to ATLAS. ATLAS (Automatically Tuned Linear Algebra) [WD98, CPD01], focused on BLAS (Basic Linear Algebra) routines such as matrix-matrix multiplication and a few LAPACK routines. Autotuned compilation approaches combined with a small hand tuned assembly kernel, have also been shown to beat both ATLAS and vendor-optimized libraries [JKE11]. Since BLAS are performance-critical building blocks, the main vendors now offer BLAS implementations that are not only autotuned to their platforms, but also employ empirical based planners and optimizers, e.g. Intel’s MKL (Math Kernel Library) and Nvidia’s CuBLAS.

Other efforts developed domain/algorithm specific libraries: such as for bitreversal [SE98, EM09], sparse linear algebra [Vud03, IYV04] and FFTs. For example, the Fastest Fourier Transform in the West (FFTW) library [Fri99] takes advantage of the recursive nature of the FFT algorithm where smaller FFTs can be used as building blocks for larger FFTs. FFTW thus uses a high-level description execution plan for decomposing larger Fourier

transforms into smaller, specialized kernels named “codelets”, which can be tailored to the cache hierarchy. It then uses a dynamic programming-based search process at runtime, when the input transform size is known, to find the best execution plan. Similiar techniques are used in CuBLAS. The Spiral [MJJ⁺01, PMJ⁺05] system applies to more general signal processing with high-level tensor notations and genetic algorithms-based search.

2.2 Exploratory Compiler and Code Generation Technology

2.2.1 Iterative Compilation. Concurrent with the emergence of domain-specific autotuning libraries, *iterative compilation* was developed as part of the OCEANS compiler project [ABB⁺97]. Early work from this project by Bodin et al. describes the use of an iterative algorithm [BKK⁺98, BKK⁺00] that applied tiling, unrolling and padding to matrix multiply, and then searched among a fixed set of tile and unroll sizes. The portability of the search algorithm is demonstrated on three target architectures (Ultrasparc, Pentium Pro, and embedded VLIW Trimedia TM1000). At that time, the high search cost of iterative compilation limited its use to embedded applications, where the assumption was that the application would be compiled once or infrequently and run repeatedly to amortize the search cost. Kisuki et al. present a variety of search space algorithms and limits on searching tile and unroll sizes to make it practical for general-purpose optimization [KKO00]. The *optimization-space exploration (OSE)* compiler focused on VLIW optimizations for the Itanium processor, including VLIW-specific optimizations, standard loop transformations, and compiler flags [TVVA03]. Pouchet et al. developed an iterative compilation approach that explored different valid multi-dimensional schedules using the polyhedral model, which facilitates correct composition of a sequence of iteration space transformations [PBCC08]. Park et al. developed a prediction modeling technique called *tournament predictor* to discover optimization sequences that outperformed -Ofast and other predictors using the Open64 compiler [PKC11].

A defining feature of iterative compilation research was that the search was part of the compiler’s algorithms and not intended to be accessible to application developers. Triantafyllis et al. refer to the configuration of the iterative optimization algorithm as happening at *compiler construction time* [TVVA03]. The mechanism in these works to configure the compiler was not described in detail, but presumably looked very different from a scheduling language.

2.2.2 Autotuning Compilers and Code Generators. A few years later, motivated by the high performance enabled by autotuning libraries and iterative compilation, compilers and code generators emerged that made it possible for expert users to control the sequence of transformations applied to a computation. The precursors to today’s scheduling languages were focused on more general-purpose computation, typically limited to loop nests, where parallelizing compiler technology could be applied.

Expressing Transformations as an Interface to Compilers. An initial question was how to express the optimizations to be applied. Initially, this approach permitted user access to compiler algorithms, and the scheduling language was primarily used to perform transformations on loop nest computations.

The approach taken in the X Language was to express a sequence of transformations as pragmas in the source code [DBR⁺06], as in Figure 1(a). An advantage of using pragmas is that the source code and optimization strategy are self-contained in a single file. However, a disadvantage is that only a single optimization strategy is supported. The X Language also made it possible to define new transformations in the compiler so as to add capability to the language.

CHiLL [CCH07, TCC⁺09, HCC⁺10] (in 1(b)) and URUK [GVB⁺06] supported a separate script that provided a sequence of transformations, each designating the source code statement to which the transformation should be applied along with parameters to the compiler’s optimization. The separate script has the advantage of supporting different optimization strategies or even architectures.

Figure 1 shows how transformations are expressed in the X language and in CHiLL for matrix multiply. In the X language, the loops are named so that transformations can use the names to designate where transformations are applied. As new loops are created, such as with the *stripmine* transformation, they too are named. In CHiLL’s separate script, the *permute* command reorders the loop nest so that the I loop is outermost and the K loop is innermost, resulting in the dependence on C being carried by the innermost loop. For all but *permute*, the first parameter of each transformation is the statement to which the transformation should be applied. The matrix multiply has a single statement, so it is always 0. The second parameter is the loop, followed by any parameters to the transformation, e.g., the tile size or unroll factor. Note that after the first *tile* command, a

<pre> // code, named loops, xforms #pragma xlang name iloop for (i=0; i<NB; i++) #pragma xlang name jloop for (j=0; j< NB; j++) #pragma xlang name kloop for (k=0; k<NB; k++) { c[i][j] += a[i][k]*b[k][j]; } #pragma xlang transform stripmine iloop NU NUloop #pragma xlang transform stripmine jloop MU MUloop #pragma xlang transform interchange jloop NUloop #pragma xlang transform interchange kloop NUloop #pragma xlang transform fullunroll NUloop #pragma xlang transform fullunroll MUloop #pragma xlang transform scalarize_in b in kloop #pragma xlang transform scalarize_in a in kloop #pragma xlang transform scalarize_in&out c in kloop #pragma xlang transform lift kloop.stores after kloop </pre>	<pre> // code DO J=1,N DO K=1,N DO I=1,N C(I,J)=C(I,J)+ A(I,K)*B(K, J) </pre> <pre> // CHiLL // transformation recipe permute([3,1,2]) tile(0,2,TJ) tile(0,2,TI) tile(0,5,TK) datacopy(0,3,2,[1]) datacopy(0,4,3) unroll(0,4,UJ) unroll(0,5,UJ) </pre>
(a) Xlang	(b) CHiLL

Fig. 1. Examples of expressing locality optimizations for matrix multiply in Xlang[DBR⁺06] and CHiLL[CCH07].

tile controlling loop is added in the outermost position (loop level 1). Thus, in the next tile command, loop level 2 refers to the I loop, which was previously in the outermost position. Both the X Language and the CHiLL versions shown here are tiling i and j loops and unrolling some or all of the inner loop tiles. CHiLL additionally tiles the k loop, and performs a datacopy of tiles of a and b into buffers to eliminate conflict misses in cache.

All three frameworks – X Language, URUK, and CHiLL – exposed interfaces designed for expert users with knowledge about compiler transformations and abstractions.

Expressing Transformations as an Interface to Code Generators. Around the same time, code generators that emit specific code combined with existing templates were developed to apply transformations to code, typically integrated with autotuning. Figure 2 shows early examples of this approach as applied to matrix multiply, ORIO [HNS09] and POET [YSY⁺07]. Both examples apply unroll-and-jam for the loop nest computation. On the right side of Figure 2(a), the inputs to the autotuner are provided, which include a series of problem sizes and unroll factors. In both systems, it is possible to define new transformations by describing how they modify the code. For example, in Figure 2(b) `mm_block_unroll` combines blocking (i.e., tiling) and unrolling.

2.3 Language-Compiler Codesign

Complementary to exploratory compilers, this section provides a brief overview of a related strand of research that refers to enhancing the language with more powerful constructs as a way of lifting the level of abstraction at which the compiler reasons.

2.3.1 Decomposition and Algorithmic Variants. Sequoia [FKH⁺06] was one of the first works that proposed a specification language in which task decomposition is programmed explicitly – but generically in terms of array sizes – and a scheduling language that specializes the task to the particularities of the hardware by mapping the user-defined decomposition at each level of the memory hierarchy. Figure 3 shows the specification and schedule of the running example of the original paper. The specification of a Sequoia task consists of:

- recursive definitions (variant `inner` at lines 1 – 21) that apply blocking primitives to generically-sized, multi-dimensional arrays (lines 9 – 11) together with recursive calls to sub-blocks from inside map-reduce constructs (lines 16 – 18);
- a base-case definition (`leaf` at lines 23 – 30) that expresses a sequentially-efficient implementation;
- algorithmic variants are in principle supported at both levels;
- communication is only possible between parent and child tasks by means of call-by-value-result semantics.

```

/*@ begin Loop (
transform UnrollJam(ufactor=Ui)
for (i=0; i<=M-1; i++)
  transform UnrollJam(ufactor=Uj)
  for (j=0; j<=N-1; j++)
    transform UnrollJam(ufactor=Uk)
    for (k=0; k<=O-1; k++)
      A[i][j] += B[i][k]*C[k][j];
) @*/
for (i=0; i<=M-1; i++)
  for (j=0; j<=N-1; j++)
    for (k=0; k<=O-1; k++)
      A[i][j] += B[i][k]*C[k][j];
/*@ end @*/

```

(a) ORIO

```

<define loopJ Loop#("j",0,"n",1)>
<define loopI Loop#("i",0,"m",1)>
<define loopK Loop#("k",0,"1",1)>
<define mmStmt "c[i+j*m] += alpha*b[k+j*1] * a[i+m*k];">
<define nest1 Nest#(loopK,mmStmt)>
<define nest2 Nest#(loopI,nest1)>
<define nest3 Nest#(loopJ,nest2)>
<define mmHead "void dgemm(int m, int n, int l, double alpha, double *a, double *b, double *c)">
<define dgemm Function#(mmHead, "int i, j, k;", nest3)>
<define mm_block_unroll (Unroll#(mm_block, InnermostLoop#(mm_block)))>
<output mm_block_unroll.c (Block.bsize=(16 16 8);Unroll.ur=8; mm_block_unroll)>

```

(b) POET

Fig. 2. Examples of expressing matrix multiply in ORIO [HNS09] and POET [YSY⁺07].

While the schedule in Figure 3b essentially performs tiling at each level of the memory hierarchy, the work on Sequoia has brought forth (at least) two key ideas:

- (1) A slight strengthening of the language — e.g., mostly side-effect free specification, isolation of communication and delegating the task decomposition to the user — may simplify compiler’s reasoning and may result in simple implementations that offer competitive performance with state-of-the-art HPC libraries. Many of the present DSLs borrow similar ideas from the data flow (or functional) context.
- (2) Scheduling each level of the memory hierarchy allows to make explicit data-layout optimizations — e.g., lines 24 – 25 in figure 3b specify that arguments A and B of `matmul :: leaf` are remapped in contiguous storage so as to ensure stride-1 accesses (and lines 8 – 9 specify the data-distribution policy). This is even more relevant today, e.g., because GPUs offer programmable memories and specialized execution units.

Finally, a significant body of work was aimed at composing algorithmic variants, notably PetaBricks [ACW⁺09] and the already discussed work aimed at FFT. For example, PetaBricks demonstrates that the Poisson solver, symmetric eigenproblem and sorting can be efficiently implemented each from three algorithmic variants.

2.3.2 Rewrite-Rule Systems in Purely-Functional Languages. Purely-functional languages primarily aim to provide a programming environment that allows the implementation to match as closely as possible the algorithmic specification. The support for higher abstraction comes at the cost of (high) runtime overhead, which would be prohibitively expensive unless it is statically optimized. However, the low-level loop optimizations developed in the imperative context are not applicable here because, for example, recurrences are expressed in terms of recursive functions (rather than loops) and type abstraction requires aggressive boxing, which results in heavy use of indirection (pointers). Instead, one of the directions taken has been to exploit the richer semantics of higher-order operators by making their *algorithmic* properties available to the compiler under the form of re-write rules. The key difference between re-write rules and affine transformations is that the former can express identities that cannot be derived by reordering the statements of the original code pattern.

An example of such rewrite is the rule [Ble90] that famously states that a segmented scan [Ble89] (prefix sum) with an arbitrary associative operator—i.e., scanning in parallel each subarray of an irregular array of

<pre> 1 void task matmul::inner(in float A[M][P] 2 , in float B[P][N] 3 , inout float C[M][N]){ 4 // tunable parameters specify the 5 // size of subblocks of A, B, C 6 tunable int U, X, V; 7 8 // Partition matrices into sets of blocks 9 blkset Ablks = rchop(A, U, X); 10 blkset Bblks = rchop(B, X, V); 11 blkset Cblks = rchop(C, U, V); 12 13 // Compute all blocks of C in parallel 14 mappar(int i=0 to M/U, int j = 0 to N/V) { 15 mapreduce (int k=0 to P/X) { 16 matmul(Ablks[i][k] // recursive 17 , Bblks[k][j] // invocation 18 , Cblks[i][j]); // on subblocks 19 } 20 } 21 } 22 23 void task matmul::leaf(in float A[M][P] 24 , in float B[P][N] 25 , inout float C[M][N]){ 26 for (int i=0; i<M; i++) 27 for (int j=0; j<N; j++) 28 for (int k=0; k<P; k++) 29 C[i][j] += A[i][k] * B[k][j]; 30 } </pre>	<pre> 1 instance { 2 name = matmul_cluster_inst 3 task = matmul 4 variant = inner 5 run_at = cluster_level 6 calls = matmul_node_inst 7 tunable U = 1024, X = 1024, V = 1024 8 A distribution = 2D block-block 9 (blocksize 1024x1024) ... } 10 instance { 11 name = matmul_node_inst 12 task = matmul 13 variant = inner 14 run_at = node_level 15 calls = matmul_L2_inst 16 tunable U = 128, X = 128, V = 128 } 17 instance { 18 name = matmul_L2_inst 19 task = matmul 20 variant = inner 21 run_at = L2_cache_level 22 calls = matmul_L1_inst 23 tunable U = 32, X = 32, V = 32 24 subtask arg A = copy 25 subtask arg B = copy } 26 instance { 27 name = matmul_L1_inst 28 task = matmul 29 variant = leaf 30 run_at = L1_cache_level } </pre>
--	---

(a) Algorithmic Specification
(b) Instantiation to a Cluster Hardware.

Fig. 3. Running Example taken from Sequoia paper [FKH⁺06]: specification (left) and schedule (right).

<pre> 1 foldr :: (α → β → β) → β → [α] → β 2 foldr k z [] = z 3 foldr k z (x:xs) = f x (foldr f z xs) 4 5 build :: (forall b. (a → b → b) → b → b) 6 → [a] 7 build g = g (:) [] 8 9 10 {-# RULES 11 "foldr/build" 12 forall (g :: ∀ b. (a → b → b) → b → b) 13 k z. 14 foldr k z (build g) = g k z 15 #-} </pre>	<pre> 1 sum :: [Int] → Int -- sum [5,4,3,2,1] = 15 2 sum xs = foldr (+) 0 xs 3 4 down :: Int → [Int] -- down 5 = [5,4,3,2,1] 5 down v = build (λ n → down' v n) 6 7 down' 0 cons nil = nil 8 down' v cons nil = cons v (down' (v-1) cons nil) 9 10 sum (down 5) 11 ⇒ -- inlining sum and down 12 foldr (+) 0 (build (down' 5)) 13 ⇒ -- applying foldr/build re-write 14 down' 5 (+) 0 15 -- computes 5 + (4 + (3 + (2 + (1 + 0)))) </pre>
--	---

Fig. 4. Example of Haskell Re-Write Rule from [JTH01]: Shortcut deforestation rule (left) and its application (right).

arrays—can be rewritten as a scan with a lifted operator that is applied to the array of tuples obtained by zipping the flattened-data array with a flag array that encodes with 1 the start of each subarray (and 0 otherwise).

A large body of work [LMW89, DFG⁺94, BHW97, VBT98, dMS99] has studied in the functional context how to allow a library writer to extend the compiler by means of re-write rules that encode “domain-specific”




Fig. 5. Evolution of a number of scheduling approaches (arrows indicate citation).

optimizations. The Haskell GHC compiler employs such a mechanism that has passed the test of time and differentiates itself from related approaches by means of its practical simplicity [JTH01]. Re-write rules are written in source-to-source Haskell, that enables simple pattern matching and a simple re-write strategy.

An example of re-write rule (used in [JTH01]) is shown at the bottom left of figure 4: it consists of (1) a name “`foldr/build`”, (2) a `forall` clause that declares which of the variables used in the rule are universally quantified, and (3) a body in which the left hand side must be the application of a function which is not one of the quantified variable (`foldr` in our case). When the rule fires, the left hand side is always replaced with the right-hand side; it is the user’s responsibility to ensure that (1) the rule is correct, (2) the right-hand side is more efficient than the left-hand side, and that (3) the system of re-writes terminates.

The rule uses the higher-order functions `foldr` and `build`. `foldr` is conventionally defined, i.e., it has the semantics $\mathbf{foldr} \circ z [x_1, \dots, x_n] = x_1 \circ (x_2 \circ \dots (x_n \circ z))$. `build` takes as parameter a functional representation of a list `g` — that abstracts over its `cons` and `nil` constructors — and it applies `g` to ordinary list constructors `:` and `[]`. The rule states that the cases when `foldr` consumes the application of `build` to `g` as its third argument, can be re-written by applying `g` directly. The right hand side of figure 4, demonstrates how this rule eliminates the creation of the intermediate list [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

Essentially, the GHC performs the boring transformations — such as beta reduction, inlining, case switching, let floating, case swapping and elimination — and relies heavily on the library writer to directly communicate the smarts to the compiler. Common examples include fusion rules for user-defined ADTs (e.g. rose trees) and specialization rules for (common cases of) overloaded instances, where special attention is dedicated to eliminating the overheads of maintaining a modular programming style. Notably, the compiler also automatically generates and then applies re-write rules, typically pertaining to specializations.

3 PRESENT: WHAT’S IN A SCHEDULE?

Our taxonomy categorizes the present as beginning with Halide [RKBA⁺13b], which coined the phrase “separate schedules from the underlying algorithm” and played an important role in popularizing scheduling languages. The present, which represents a decade of progress, has coincided with the recognition that *specialization gives rise to efficiency*, leading to a proliferation of domain-specific hardware and software tools. Consequently, we organize this section into a set of key domains where scheduling languages were paramount to unlocking high performance. Of note, the systems described here increasingly target mainstream commercial applications, while past approaches of Section 2 were developed in the context of scientific computing or embedded systems.

The evolution of a number of scheduling approaches is depicted in Figure 5, which uses arrows to denote citations in the pointed-to paper and thus represents relationships in a visual manner. Each subsection discusses an application domain, complemented with figures that summarize how the discussed central works have influenced each other, i.e., the evolution that provided more context and exposed more optimizations.

3.1 Image Processing Approaches (summarized in fig. 6)

Halide [RKBA⁺13a] is one of the first works to pragmatically combine the strengths of the functional and imperative approaches in the context of a DSL that is primarily aimed at image-processing pipelines.




Fig. 6. Overview of two of the central works related to DSL scheduling languages targeting image processing.

The key idea in Halide is to separate the algorithm’s expression from the optimization concerns by using:

- a simple and pure data-flow specification that is implicitly parallel and accessible to the domain expert,
- an optimization recipe that is written by the compiler expert or is derived by autotuning.

Figure 7a shows the expression of a 3×3 un-normalized box filter, in which arrays (e.g., `blurx`, `out`)¹ are represented as index functions (i.e., from coordinates to values), hence their elements can be safely computed in parallel. In this context, the optimization of highest impact is *stencil fusion*, which can be realized by a combination of tiling, sliding-window and work replication strategies.² The best combination is however sensitive to the hardware and dataset characteristics. As such, the optimization recipe answers the questions: (1) at which granularity to *compute* and (2) at which granularity to *store* each of the intermediate arrays, and, within those grains, (3) in what order/fashion should the array domain be traversed?³ For example, the optimization recipe in figure 7b declares a schedule that combines the tiling and sliding window optimizations:

- `out` is tiled with tiles of size 4, creating (re-ordered) dimensions of indices y_o, x_o, y_i, x_i , from which y_o, x_o are parallelized, y_i is sequentialized (to implement a sliding window) and x_i is vectorized.
- `blurx` is *stored* at the level of loop y_o in `out` but is *computed* at a finer granularity (y_i) – hence the domain of `blurx` under y_i only has dimension x_i , which is vectorized for performance.

```

1 UniformImage in (Uint(8), 2)
2 Var x, y
3 Func blurx(x, y) = in(x-1, y)
4                   + in(x, y)
5                   + in(x+1, y)
6 Func out(x, y) = blurx(x, y-1)
7                 + blurx(x, y)
8                 + blurx(x, y+1)

```

(a) Data-flow specification of a 3×3 un-normalized box filter

```

1 blurx: split x by 4 → x_o, x_i
2         vectorize: x_i
3         store at out.x_o
4         compute at out.y_i
5 out: split x by 4 → x_o, x_i
6       split y by 4 → y_o, y_i
7       reorder: y_o, x_o, y_i, x_i
8       parallelize: y_o
9       vectorize: x_i

```

(b) Optimization Recipe (i.e., Schedule Specification)

Fig. 7. Halide running example [RKBA⁺13a].

The legality of the transformations is enabled by the pure (and implicitly parallel) semantics of the array computations, e.g., tiling is legal because parallel loops are always safe to be interchanged inwards.

In summary, Halide has demonstrated that high-performance implementations of image-processing pipelines can be derived by means of a simple and clean DSL specification in conjunction with (1) either an optimization recipe written by the compiler expert or with (2) extensive autotuning. Initially, its autotuner used a genetic algorithm, but its slow convergence motivated the switch to the more robust OpenTuner framework [AKV⁺14a]; this, however, still required hours-to-days to find the optimal solution for deep pipelines.

PolyMage’s approach [MVB15] was (partly) motivated by the observation that even though the schedule space is vast,⁴ only a smallish subset of that space matters in practice. As such, PolyMage renounced the

¹`blurx` and `out` compute the horizontal and isotropic blur by averaging over 3×1 and 1×3 windows, respectively.

²These techniques cover a trade-off space along three axes: the degree of locality, of exploited parallelism and of redundant computation.

³For example, dimensions can be strip-mined, reordered, traversed sequentially or in parallel (vectorization included).

⁴The schedule (search) space is exponential in the depth of the pipeline, i.e., the number of pipeline stages.

optimization recipe in favor of a *greedy grouping procedure*, which aggressively fuses computation until a maximal threshold of redundant computation is reached. Since the grouping procedure is parameteric in terms of tile and threshold sizes, the autotuning is simplified to explore a smallish space of (three) threshold values and (seven) tile sizes per tiled dimension. This procedure is reported to find in up to one hour a near-optimal schedule for multi-core execution that offers performance competitive to code written/optimized by experts. Finally, PolyMage demonstrated that polyhedral reasoning can be applied in a DSL context to elegantly model

- overlapped tiling – which, in principle, falls outside polyhedral scheduling since it introduces redundant computation (i.e., does not preserve the statements of the original program), and
- other classical tiling strategies – such as parallelogram, hexagonal or split tiling – which were not feasible to be expressed in Halide.

Since then, a rich body of work has been aimed at improving Halide in various ways, for example (1) by adapting the scheduling strategy of PolyMage to generate competitive Halide schedules [MAS⁺16], (2) by extending Halide to generate code for Specialized Digital Signal Processors (DSPs) compilers [VCJ⁺17], (3) by providing support for automatic computation of gradients [LGA⁺18], (4) by adding new optimization strategies to maximize producer-consumer locality [SSW⁺19], (5) by supporting automatic generation of GPU schedules [SSB⁺20], and (6) by refining the search algorithm to quickly produce high-quality schedules [AMA⁺19b, AAM⁺21]. **ImageCL** [FE16, FE18] also showed improvements over Halide and others.

3.2 Tensor Algebra Approaches (summarized in fig. 8)

Tensor algebra describes an algebra applied to multi-dimensional tensors of any rank, with multiplication used to compute tensor products. Tensor contraction refers to multiplying elements of two tensors to produce a third tensor; a contraction dimension results in a summation of the products of the two tensors along that dimension. In this section, we separate dense and sparse tensor algebra, as the expression and optimization of them varies significantly. While dense tensor algebra exhibits high arithmetic intensity and demands optimizations to manage the memory hierarchy and parallelism, sparse tensor algebra suffers from being memory bound and involves a significantly more complex code generation process.




Fig. 8. Overview of some central works related to scheduling languages for dense (blue) and sparse tensor algebra (green).

Dense Tensor Algebra. Beyond the various strategies for implementing matrix multiply, we focus this section on support for tensor contraction for higher-dimensional tensors. An early domain-specific system for tensor algebra was the **Tensor Contraction Engine (TCE)** [CBL⁺02, BAB⁺05], designed for a class of quantum chemistry computations. These are characterized by contractions over 4-dimensional tensors with hundreds of terms. The computations are both compute-intensive, and access a large volume of data. The order in which the tensor contraction is performed impacts the overall amount of computation. Moreover, with so many terms with different dimension orders, many address streams are touched during the computation. These challenges are addressed using enumeration of feasible solutions that fit in memory, minimization of total computation, and fusion heuristics to limit the set of implementations explored [CBL⁺02, BAB⁺05]. While work on TCE predates the use of scheduling languages in compilers, it employs search and search space pruning to explore a prohibitively large set of feasible implementations.

Barracuda [NRB⁺15] is a more recent work on 4-dimensional tensor contraction, optimizing quantum chemistry kernels and nuclear fusion computations on GPUs. The approach uses exploratory compilation, from mathematical description to optimized CUDA code as output. Starting with a high-level tensor input language, the approach combines tensor-specific mathematical transformations with a GPU decision algorithm, and autotuning of a large parameter space using a random forest search algorithm. Internally, this implementation uses CUDA-CHiLL's scheduling language, and Orio to manage the search algorithm. A key heuristic to limit the search space is to choose loop orders that match memory layout order for at least one of the tensors in the computation, thus limiting data movement.

Fireiron [HEB⁺20] introduces a scheduling language that is fully focused on optimizing dense matrix multiplication on NVIDIA GPUs. For this, Fireiron introduces scheduling primitives to target domain-specific hardware extensions of NVIDIA GPUs, namely Tensor Cores which compute matrix multiplication of small 4×4 matrices immediately in hardware, thereby enabling high performance potentials. However, while Fireiron achieves impressive performance results for its particular target domain - multiplication of dense matrices on NVIDIA GPUs - it cannot be used for other computations and/or architectures, which limits its applicability.

DISTAL represents the state-of-the-art in scheduling languages for tensor algebra, targeting CPU and GPU clusters [YAK22]. The scheduling language in DISTAL includes loop transformations to organize the computation as well as communication specification across distributed nodes. Moreover, a separate format description permits data layout within a node and distributed across nodes. This approach makes it possible to specify common tensor algebra algorithms such as Cannon and COSMA at a high level, and automate their generation to optimized code.

Sparse Tensor Algebra. Sparse tensor algebra performs the same operations as dense tensor algebra, but the underlying data representation is fundamentally different. When many entries of a tensor are zero, sparse tensor representations only store nonzero values, to (1) reduce the size of data; (2) avoid unnecessary computation such as multiplying by zero or adding zero; and, (3) reduce data movement through the memory hierarchy. Auxiliary data structures provide a mapping of nonzero values to their logical indices in a dense matrix. This physical-to-logical mapping makes it possible for sparse tensor code generators to perform the portions of a computation on the nonzero values.

As compared to dense tensor algebra, we observe that scheduling languages for sparse tensor algebra have several unique capabilities. First, they support a variety of sparse data representations - hereafter referred to as *data layouts* - since proper code generation must be customized to a layout. Moreover, loop optimizations must be reformulated whenever loop indices iterate over a sparse dimension of a tensor. They may also require constructs that utilize information only available at runtime into the optimization. These points will be illustrated by examples from sparse tensor algebra systems that employ scheduling languages.

CHiLL-I/E extended CHiLL's transformations and associated scheduling commands to support sparse linear algebra computations [VSHS14, VHS15, KVP⁺16, VMP⁺16, AVH16]. CHiLL was extended to incorporate concepts from the sparse polyhedral framework [SLC⁺16], such as uninterpreted functions representing index arrays. CHiLL-I/E was able to convert sparse matrix representations using an *inspector/executor paradigm*, whereby a one-time inspector at runtime converted the matrix from a standard representation to an optimized one, and the executor was then able to generate optimized GPU or CPU code. The scheduling language constructs added to CHiLL included standard transformations such as *coalesce* (also called collapse and flatten), *parallel* and *reduction* [VSHS14]. In addition, the *make-dense* transformation designated a sparse dimension as

being dense as a way for the compiler to reason about subsequent transformations. These included a sequence of standard transformations such as *tile* and *skew*. Ultimately, any *make-dense* was preceded by *compact*, or *compact-and-pad* transformations, which generate both an inspector for format conversion and an executor for parallel execution on a GPU. This work enabled conversion from CSR format to common formats ELL, DIA and BCSR [VHS15]. Uninterpreted functions were also used to incorporate dynamic parallel wavefronts [VMP⁺16].

While CHILL-I/E transformations were designed to support a single sparse tensor, **TACO** [KKC⁺17] introduced an approach to co-iteration over multiple sparse tensors, where the intersection (for multiply) or the union (for addition) of the nonzero locations must be identified. The user specifies the layout along with the computation in Einstein notation, and the compiler generates the code for the input with the specified layout. Originally, TACO represented data layouts by marking dimensions as being either *dense* or *compressed*, where compressed dimensions only represented nonzero values; a similar approach was integrated into the MLIR compiler [BKS⁺22]. Subsequent extensions incorporated *singleton*, *range*, *offset*, and *hash* to support other common sparse tensor layouts that are the higher-dimensional analogs of sparse matrix representations COO, ELL, and DIA, as well as a hashmap [CKA18]. [ADKA23] extends the layout specification to describe regular and irregular patterns. Code transformations were subsequently enabled in TACO through a scheduling language [SHW⁺20]. Key transformations are *split* (i.e., strip-mine), and *collapse* (also called coalesce or flatten), *reorder* (i.e., permute), *unroll* and *parallelize*. The transformations *pos* and *coord* enable transformations to be applied to the position (or physical) space, and the coordinate (or logical) space. The transformation *precompute* permits subarrays to be computed in scratchpad memories, and *bound* introduces constants used by code generation. The transformations are applied on an iteration graph IR before sparse code generation.

Two systems for sparse tensor computations extend the use of scheduling languages in unique ways. **Mosaic**[BHOK23] extends TACO’s scheduling language to combine code generation and optimization with integration with optimized library kernels. For this purpose, Mosaic introduces two essential scheduling commands, *Bind*, which indicates that a statement should be replaced by a function call, and *Map*, which provides partial automation of schedule generation. The Tensor Algebra Accelerator Language (**TeAAL**) uses a scheduling language to enable precise and concise specification of sparse tensor algebra accelerators, and inspiration comes from dense tensor algebra accelerator design[NOU⁺23]. Examples of scheduling language primitives include rank-order, partitioning, loop-order, and spacetime.

3.3 Data-Parallel Computations (summarized in fig. 9)

Lift [SFLD15], **Tiramisu** [BRR⁺19b], **Locus** [TTAPG19], **DaCe** [BNdFLZ⁺19], and **MDH** [RSS⁺23] address a more general flavor of computations that include image processing and tensor kernels, but also more exotic computations, such as *Probabilistic Record Linkage (PRL)* [RSG⁺19] from the domain of *Data Mining*, different kinds of *Stencil* [HSS⁺18] and climate modeling [BNGD⁺22] applications.




Fig. 9. Overview of some of the central works focusing on data parallel approaches and how they are related.

Lift [SFLD15] (recently also known as *RISE* [SKKP22]) proposes a restricted purely-functional language, together with a repertoire of code transformations that are expressed as rewrite rules (e.g., map, fusion, fission, stripmining). Since the optimization space is huge, the rewrites are either directly specified by the user or are guided by procedures that use stochastic search or equality saturation [KGB⁺24]. More recent work focuses on

the design of a strategy language, named *ELEVATE* [HLK⁺20], that aims to allow programmers to define new optimization strategies in a composable and reusable way (and is inspired by the work discussed in section 2.3.2). Lift mainly targets performance portability across GPU hardware. For example, extending Lift with `slide` and `pad` primitives (and associated re-writes) allows efficient computation of individual stencils [HSS⁺18] (e.g., by overlapped tiling), and extension with *macro rules* targets matrix multiplication [RLSD16].

Tiramisu [BRR⁺19a] is a scheduling framework for a C++ embedded domain-specific language (DSL). In contrast to Lift’s functional rewrite rules, Tiramisu uses polyhedral transformations, rooted in dependence analysis on arrays. Similar to Halide, the algorithm specification is separated by the implementation details (hardware, iteration space, and other optimizations). Unlike Halide, which uses an interval-based representation of iteration spaces, Tiramisu opts for a more mathematically powerful polyhedral representation that supports composition of a complex sequence of affine transformations on dense multi-dimensional spaces (i.e., loop nests). Notably, Tiramisu uses a four-level intermediate representation (IR) that addresses separation of concerns without unnecessarily barring optimizations: The first level refers to the algorithmic specification, the second to the ordering of computations, the third to the management of data (i.e., storage location on device and layout), and the fourth to the communication between execution nodes.

Tiramisu supports multiple backends, including multicore X86 CPUs, Nvidia GPUs (both leveraging LLVM infrastructure), Xilinx FPGAs (Vivado HLS) and distributed machines (MPI), and reports performance results for image stencils, recurrent neural network (dense and sparse), and other non-rectangular iterations spaces that rival those of cuBLAS, cuDNN, Intel OneAPI, and other specialized libraries. Recent work [BML⁺21] reports a learning-based cost model for automatic code optimization that was implemented in the Tiramisu compiler.

Locus [TTAPG19] is a scheduling framework that is aimed at orchestrating the optimization of legacy code written directly in mainstream languages, such as C, C++, Fortran, instead of a (restricted) DSL. The work addresses the challenges of manipulating large programs written in complex languages, in particular related to expressing clearly and concisely complex collections of transformations—rooted in dependence analysis on arrays—that are applied to (different) code regions, as selected by the programmer. Locus supports a number of optimization modules off the shelf, as well as procedures for automatically searching the space of code variants.

DaCe [BNdFLZ⁺19] is a framework that supports a collection of APIs for implementing optimization workflows. *The key idea is that the performance engineer uses the APIs to write their own DSLs and optimization pipelines, tailored to the target application*, albeit DaCe comes already equipped with a collection of transformations and optimization passes. The most important API is the Stateful DataFlow multiGraph (SDFG), which implements the IR and facilitates the *construction* of SDFGs by means of frontends for several language subsets. Other APIs refer to transformations on SDFG graphs (e.g., to develop optimization passes and tuners) and code generation APIs, which handle the mapping to different architectures, such as multicore, GPU and FPGA.

Scheduling optimizations are expressed either on (1) the structural representation, e.g., tiling is represented as nested Map scopes; or, (2) the attributed representation, e.g., “schedule” attributes are attached to scope nodes to indicate OpenMP scheduling, GPU thread blocks, etc., and “storage” attributes are attached to data nodes to indicate the memory type (CPU heap, GPU global, shared or register memory). For code transformation, DaCe uses a combination of polyhedral and re-write rules on graphs. Recent work [TBNS⁺23, BNGD⁺22] has reported an autotuning framework that automatically explores the space of some common polyhedral transformations by combining machine learning and performance profiling techniques.

MDH [RSS⁺23] is a recent approach that has a particular focus on a structured-language design. It is grounded in the algebraic formalism of *Multi-Dimensional Homomorphisms (MDH)* [Ras24], and it is aimed to systematically express (de/re)-compositions of computations at each level of the memory and core hierarchies of parallel architectures. The claimed advantages are twofold: *First*, MDH catches a multitude of user errors⁵ and it issues precise error messages for the invalid schedules. *Second*, MDH allows leaving any arbitrary optimization decision optionally to its internal autotuning engine (including automatic generation of entire device- and data-optimized schedules), thereby promoting user productivity and performance portability. Similar to Lift and Tiramisu, MDH allows autotuning of straightforward optimization parameters such as tile sizes, but also supports more advanced exploration, e.g., related to layout transformations and memory placement (register/private/shared/global). The automatically generated schedules have often been found to

⁵In addition to the errors caught by polyhedral approaches, such as specification of invalid tiling, MDH detects more sophisticated errors, e.g., when the user tries to combine the results of *CUDA Thread Blocks* across invalid memory regions, as per CUDA specification [NVI22].

offer performance competitive with vendor libraries [RSS⁺23] and can also be used as a starting point for manual fine tuning by a performance expert. In terms of limitations, MDH’s scheduling language is designed to express optimizations at a high abstraction level and is thus unable to express low-level code optimizations (such as loop unrolling, which is handled in MDH internally by heuristics).

3.4 Deep Learning Approaches (summarized in fig. 10)




Fig. 10. Overview of some of the central works related to scheduling languages targeting Deep Learning.

Scheduling languages are a common feature in systems focused on code generation for deep learning workloads, supporting computations such as linear algebra, convolutions, and computations for reshaping and splitting data. Given the large body of recent work in this area, we focus our discussion here on **TVM**, which represents the current state-of-the-art in CPU and GPU mapping of deep learning workloads [CMJ⁺18]. TVM achieves performance close to hand-optimized vendor libraries. TVM’s scheduling language augments Halide schedule constructs with architecture-specific optimizations, e.g., applying to TPUs, NVIDIA Tensor Cores, and memory hierarchies. Extensions to TVM’s scheduling language were added for **CoRA** [FCGM22], which supports ragged tiles resulting from problem sizes that are not divisible by the tile size. These include iteration space splitting, padding, horizontal fusion across operators, and thread remapping for load balance. **Cortex** provides additional extensions in a dynamic scheduling language to address how recursion is lowered [FCGM21]. Only a limited set of optimizations can be tuned in TVM’s scheduling language, and more advanced optimizations require the code generation to be tunable (e.g., based on *Ansor* [ZJS⁺20] discussed in Section 5.2). TVM supports *graph-level optimizations* across deep learning operators, particularly fusion of adjacent operators that do not exhibit data dependences. Graph-level optimizations are not accessible from the scheduling language, but are instead performed upon the intermediate representation. In contrast, operator fusion is implemented within a scheduling language as a loop transformation, as in the SWIRL system for wide SIMD CPUs [VRB⁺19]. **Triton** [TKC19] also targets DNNs. It focuses on block tiling, but does not provide a scheduling language.

3.5 Graphs (main frameworks summarized below)

Graph algorithms require a unique set of transformations that reflect structural changes and how to parallelize the execution of graphs. **Galois** [KPW⁺07, LP15] takes a data-centric view of parallelism where the Parallel program is viewed as Operator + Schedule + Parallel Data Structures. For Galois, the schedule refers to constructs that relax the order in which graph vertices are processed, later extended with data placement annotations for scalability. Galois [NLP13] demonstrated that it could serve as a backend for other vertex-centric graph DSLs PowerGraph [GLG⁺12], GraphChi [KBG12] and Ligra [SB13], improving their performance and scalability.

More recently, **GraphIt** [ZYB⁺18] exposes a scheduling language and a separate algorithm language describing operators on vertices and edges. The scheduling language has representations for edge traversal, vertex data layout, and structure optimizations. The schedules provides various functions to configure edge traversal direction, parallelization, data layout, and data placement optimizations. It also offers the unique opportunity for structural changes to the graph, such as fusing adjacent vertices into a single vertex.

4 FUTURE: CALL TO ACTION

The story portrayed so far shows a past in which performance critical applications were predominantly optimized with general-compiler infrastructure operating on mainstream languages and a present in which we

have amassed significant expertise in extracting near-optimal performance for specific computational kernels from various domains — e.g., image processing, tensor algebra — by using scheduling languages in conjunction with very restricted programming models (languages) and specialized compiler infrastructure.

However, at its core, the compiler pipeline employed by these systems consists of a combination of well-known code transformations along with architecture-specific optimizations. A natural next step might be to cycle back to the past by gradually lifting the language restrictions, unifying scheduling languages, and extending their repertoire with more dynamic analyses and support for specifying data layout and movement. Since writing schedules is challenging, we envision that solutions might: raise the level of abstraction of the scheduling language such that it becomes accessible to domain experts; and/or rely on exploratory compilers that automate schedule generation and selection, while still allowing the user to provide key optimization insights. This section predicts several emerging technologies that would benefit scheduling languages in the quest of advancing the holy grail of automating high-performance code generation.

4.1 Unifying scheduling languages

We have discussed a number of systems, each with its own scheduling language. In several cases, the same code transformation is named differently across systems, e.g., *permute/interchange* and *flatten/coalesce/collapse*. Conversely, in other cases, very different transformations share the same generic name—see the various kinds of *tiling* or the various instances of *flattening* irregular nested parallelism [Ble90, BR12, ZM12, CLJ⁺07].

These ambiguities lead to the question: *is standardization of scheduling languages possible, and how can it be achieved?* We consider here the alternative strategies for standardization. First, annotation systems such as OpenMP [Cla98] expose a pragma interface that permits programmers to express thread-level parallelism at a high level, while relying on the underlying compiler to implement the details of the parallelization. In recent years, OpenMP pragmas describe loop transformations (currently *tile*, and *unroll*). The strength of standardization is that a committee reviews the language extensions. However, a weakness is that many of the users of scheduling languages are not part of the high-performance computing community, from which OpenMP arises, and that it takes a long time to add support for a new transformation.

An approach with a potentially broader reach is to integrate the scheduling language into a widely-used open source compiler infrastructure, particularly one designed to support domain-specific systems. The MLIR compiler [LAB⁺21] provides this capability in the form of the *transform dialect* [LZM⁺24]. The transform dialect approach is distinguished from other systems in this paper where a schedule is customized to a particular computation. Instead, the use of the *pdl dialect* to identify applicability of transforms makes the schedules independent of the computation, more like an optional compiler pass, and facilitates “building libraries of composed compiled transforms” [LZM⁺24]. Therefore, it is not a direct replacement for schedules in other systems, but additional layers on top of transform dialect, such as in PEAK [TJS⁺23], could potentially improve this. Such an approach is still limited in that it relies on a specific compiler infrastructure that cannot be reused outside that environment. Additional transformations may require significant changes to the intermediate representation; e.g., for data layout and data movement optimizations in Section 4.2.

Alternatively, we can design high-level languages aimed at specifying *a (source/target) language together with the code transformations operating on it (them)*. For example, in the context of functional languages, the essence of a code transformation can often be concisely and elegantly expressed in the form of inference rules, declared for each syntactic category of the source language. We hypothesize that the verbose, complex and error-prone code that implements the code transformation—i.e., that traverses the abstract-syntax tree, matches the pre-conditions and applies the inference rules—can be automatically generated. Rather than requiring all compiler experts to work on the same code base, such an approach would democratize the implementation of a new language and its optimizing compiler by allowing to reuse, adjust and compose available components from the specification of the code transformations belonging to other languages. Such solutions can build on the findings of strategy languages, such as *ELEVATE* [HLK⁺20] and *MDH* [RSS⁺23], which are aimed to improve the language aspects of schedules: clearly-defined semantics, composibility and opportunity for (automatic) verification. For example, it is arguably easier to reason about and verify a high-level specification rather than its low-level implementation.

Standardization of scheduling languages could make all of these approaches viable. A commitment by the community towards standardization is the first step.

4.2 Data layout and data movement as part of the schedule

Since data movement is the key cost in terms of time and energy, incorporating specifications of data layout and data movement into scheduling languages should be a universal part of future exploratory compilers. Organizing data according to its access pattern then requires modifying the computation accordingly. We discussed the role of data layout in terms of sparse tensor computations, but other computations also benefit from data layout and data movement specifications.

Historically, data copy was applied to reorganize submatrices, especially to avoid conflict misses in cache or stage data in explicitly managed storage [TGJ93, BBK⁺08]. CHiLL incorporated datacopy into its scheduling language [CCH07], which was later adapted in CUDA-CHiLL to copy data to/from global memory, shared memory, and texture memory in GPUs [KBR⁺13]. More recently, Fireiron and MDH enrich these data movement specifications for GPUs [HEB⁺20, RSS⁺23]. Follow-on work, for example in Graphene, optimizes data layout and thread mapping, particularly to prepare data and computation for tensor cores [HFC⁺23].

Other layouts beyond strided rectangular regions and sparse tensor representations have been shown to reduce data movement. For example, fine-grain data blocking, where logically adjacent three-dimensional subdomains are stored in contiguous memory, have been shown to significantly reduce data movement in structured grid computations [ZBW⁺19]. A two-dimensional *tile*, also a fine-grain data block, has been used in Triton to accelerate deep learning computations [TKC19].

Looking forward, data layout specifications in scheduling languages should support these and other future layouts. To generalize this approach, the scheduling language should be integrated into a compiler supporting high-level abstraction such as MLIR. To generate code, the compiler must map between *logical* and *physical* data layouts, so that address calculations can map logical indices to their physical locations. In sparse tensor computations, where logical indices may not have corresponding physical entries, the inverse mapping from physical to logical indices can be used to find corresponding elements in other tensors during co-iteration, as is done in `dlcomp` [ZPH⁺22]. The mapping from a variety of layouts to hierarchical sublayouts could be supported with additional logical dimensions, generalizing the approach in Graphene [HFC⁺23].

4.3 Architecture-specific scheduling primitives

Related to data layout is the need to support architecture-specific hardware features, which was discussed above for Graphene [HFC⁺23] and Fireiron [HEB⁺20] in the context of matrix processing units for NVIDIA GPUs. How might architecture-specific constructs be integrated into a scheduling language?


One mechanism is to layer scheduling languages, providing an extensible programming language approach to build new scheduling constructs either from existing ones, or by describing how to rewrite code based on scheduling constructs. More recently, Exocompilation [IBR⁺22] addresses this challenge with a user-level scheduling language – a Python-embedded DSL called `Exo` – that permits a performance expert to describe architecture details that impact performance. In `Exo`, users may define specialized memories including lower precision data types; semantics of hardware instructions, e.g., fused multiply-add; and, hardware state so as to avoid redundant computation or data movement in composing operations.

The above approaches address the extensibility of scheduling languages, but not the widespread adoption of these extensions; i.e., unification and raising the level of abstraction. As new classes of architectures arise, extensions permit exploration of how to derive performant schedules. Once the community settles on a solution, these architecture-specific layers can be integrated into the language and compiler mechanisms.

4.4 Integration with runtime

Many optimizations require a combination of static and runtime information to make decisions. For example, inspector-executor strategies, as previously discussed in the context of sparse tensors, may wish to choose data layouts based on the nonzero structure of the sparse tensors – information only available at runtime. Similarly, a runtime data layout transformation, such as ZMorton order, would need to be part of the schedule, especially since it may require costly layout conversion that needs to happen early in the computation.

Furthermore, in computations such as preconditioners for sparse solvers, the resulting loop parallelism is data-dependent [VMP⁺16], hence the computation needs to be reorganized in a sequence of parallel wavefronts, whose structure is determined at runtime. In molecular-dynamics (astrophysics) simulations, the distribution of molecules (particles) is unknown at least until runtime, and it might also dynamically change. Dynamic



(a) Picture schedule for Matrix Multiplication (MM) (b) Picture Schedule for Needleman-Wunsch (NW).

Fig. 11. Picture-like Schedules for MM [KH16] and NW [MHSO22]: they seem isomorphic with a language representing array slices, i.e., describing the result (and input) slices produce (read) at each level of the parallel-hierarchy of the hardware.

analyses [DK99, SH04] proposed in these contexts use a statically-generated inspector to perform data- and (loop-) iteration reordering in order to optimize spatial and temporal locality, respectively. Such runtime-reordering transformations have been later integrated in sparse-polyhedral frameworks [SLC⁺16] and have further inspired the notion of locality hypergraphs [SH04], for example, as a way to model the optimization of communication in distributed computations as graph-partitioning problems [REP⁺12, RB14].

Finally, another facet of runtime integration is the decision process for selecting the appropriate optimized code variant if that choice is data dependent. The selection might involve a lookup into pre-autotuned variants based on data ranges, or use of inference based on problem size or other problem size features.

Current scheduling languages are typically weak at supporting integration with the runtime system, of the kind described above. We hypothesize that future research directions will be aimed at incorporating such dynamic analyses into the repertoire supported by scheduling languages.

4.5 Raising the level of abstraction

Most of the work reviewed so far expresses a schedule as a (precise and detailed) sequencing of compiler transformations. Arguably, such a representation is unfriendly to domain experts, who might be well versed in (or at least willing to learn) “parallel thinking”, but may find that the gap to “thinking like a compiler” is too wide to bridge. Another disadvantage is that it requires (even) the compiler experts to run the optimization recipe in their head and to specify in detail its effects on the entire code base – which might be impractical for large computations. Ideally, the appropriate level of the scheduling language should specify *concepts that are accessible to domain experts*, and from which *a sequence of compiler transformations is automatically inferred*.

A first possible approach could be to pair up the original program with a specification of the high-level (loop) structure of the target (optimized) code. For example, the original program could be annotated with (comment) labels identifying loops and code fragments and the labeled names can be used in the specification to declare the target code structure. The challenge resides in *inferring the sequence of (loop) code transformations whose application conforms with the target code structure* and in designing a clear semantics of the specification language that is intuitive and promotes ease of use. Since code transformations are guaranteed to be correct, the resulted program is guaranteed to be semantically equivalent to the original one, but the question of when the desired structure is met needs to be answered in an unambiguous way that also matches user’s intuition.

The second possible approach is to describe by means of pictures the array slices produced/used at each level of the hardware, respectively. Figure 11 illustrates pictures used in two scientific publications to explain locality optimizations for matrix multiplication [KH16] and for the Needleman-Wunsch problem [MHSO22]. The former requires tiling at each hardware level, and the latter requires tiling and two loop-skewing transformations. While the domain experts might find it difficult to “think like a compiler” – e.g., loop skewing has seldom been called an intuitive transformation – they could arguably reason in terms of wavefront parallelism, both across

the blocks and within a $b \times b$ block depicted in figure 11b.⁶ In a nutshell, the domain expert could possibly draw a picture that describes how the result is produced at each level of the hardware (e.g., grid, block, and thread level for GPUs). A first step in this direction is taken by MDH [RSS⁺23].

Such a picture-representation of schedules is essentially isomorphic with a language of array slices, i.e., which specifies what slice of the result is produced at each hardware level *and* from what input slices. Similar as before, the challenging step refers to automatically inferring the sequence of code transformations from the picture (slice language), and verifying that it actually produces the desired picture.

5 RELATED WORK

This section surveys several strands of related work, as follows: Section 5.1 surveys approaches that refer to the classical, heuristic-based compilation and, as well, to compiler-exploration techniques that produce a multitude of code variants, which are then autotuned to the particularities of hardware and datasets. Section 5.2 surveys approaches that deeply integrate the autotuning in the compiler-exploration process by testing and sampling code variants during compilation. Finally, section 5.3 examines advanced autotuning solutions, in particular the ones based on machine-learning (ML) algorithms.

5.1 Heuristic Compilation and Compiler Exploration

While scheduling-based compilers are becoming increasingly attractive in the HPC community, there is also a wide range of promising compiler approaches that do not expose optimization to the user in the form of scheduling programs, or expose optimizations at all.

5.1.1 Classical Compiler Approaches. Classical compilation approaches automatically generate low-level parallel code according to a set of internal (optimization) heuristics. As such, they do not necessitate user intervention, but may be somewhat customizable by means of pragma annotations or compiler flags. Examples include tensor DSLs such as TC [VZT⁺18, VZT⁺19] and FlexTensor [ZLW⁺20], and polyhedral [PBB⁺11] compilers such as Pluto, PPCG [BHRS08, VCJC⁺13, VJ17]. They have demonstrated that efficient parallelization of (at least) affine programs is possible for multi-core and GPU hardware. In turn, such analyses are facilitated by the development of analytic cost models for locality of reference, capable of deriving, for example, asymptotic lower bounds at the level of misses in a set-associative cache hierarchy [BKPS17]. As well, since the affine domain is too restrictive for many practical applications, various techniques were devised to utilize explicit (user) annotations within polyhedral transformations of otherwise unanalyzable patterns. For example, Pencil allows the user to summarize read-write access sets of unanalyzable functions [BBC⁺15], and other works [RKC16, CSS15] allows to integrate reduction, loop- and task-parallel OpenMP annotations within the polyhedral optimizer. Such heuristic-based approaches can be considered more productive than scheduling-based compilers, because the user is not in charge of making complex optimization decisions. However, they are fundamentally limited by the fact that they essentially produce *one* optimized code version: Even when this code version is parameterized by tile sizes and the like, it still cannot cover the case when different sequences of code transformations are needed to optimize different classes of datasets, i.e., “one size does not fit all”.

5.1.2 Compiler Exploration Followed By Autotuning. More recent approaches provide means to adapt the compilation strategy to the hardware and dataset characteristics. A class of compilers, such as CLBlast [Nug18] and MDH [Ras24]⁷, do not rely on schedules, but instead they expose their optimization spaces in the form of (formally defined) parameter spaces, which further enables automatic exploration of such spaces by means of autotuning frameworks [AKV⁺14b, NC15, van19, PSH⁺20, WBK⁺23, HSL⁺23, RSSG21]. However, a parameter-based space makes it difficult for humans to express optimizations, because parameters lack the language properties that are specifically designed for human interaction.

Another instance of compiler exploration that does not rely on a scheduling language is proposed by Futhark: a purely-functional language that supports nested compositions of the full set of data-parallel operators—such as map, reduce(-by-index), scan, scatter. Here, the (arbitrarily-nested) application parallelism is mapped to the

⁶Figure 11b hints that the computation is organized as a wavefront, where the i^{th} anti-diagonal of $b \times b$ blocks is processed at parallel time i . Each $b \times b$ logical block is processed within a Cuda block of size b : the green box denotes the write set of a Cuda block and the red/purple vertical/horizontal lines denote the read set of a Cuda block; all are being mapped to shared memory. The computation inside a Cuda block is also organized in a wavefront structure that computes at parallel time i the i^{th} anti-diagonal (see the zoomed block).

⁷MDH also exposes optimizations in the form of schedules, as discussed in Section 3.3

hardware by an exploratory procedure, dubbed “incremental flattening” [HTEO19], that utilizes map fission and map-loop interchange to create semantically-equivalent code versions that systematically map more and more levels of application parallelism to the hierarchy supported by the hardware. The code versions are independently optimized and combined together into a program by branching on predicates that compare a dynamic program measure (e.g., the degree of utilized parallelism) with a threshold. The best combination of code versions is derived by autotuning the threshold values: this is implemented by a deterministic procedure that is guaranteed to produce the optimal result in minimal number of runs, as long as the dynamic measure conforms with a monotonic property [MBH⁺21]. However, tile sizes and the like do not conform with this monotonic property and are not autotuned. Of note, the use of a scheduling language is not practical in Futhark, because the language supports reverse-mode automatic differentiation [SRHO22]: this is a complex program-level transformation that produces code that cannot be “predicted”, hence “scheduled”, by the user.

A variety of image processing DSLs, compilation techniques and autotuners have been developed independent of Halide and PolyMage. Modesto [GGH15] (CPU+GPU), Absinthe [GGH19] (CPU) and Stencil-Gen [RVSR⁺18] (GPU) rely on analytical models to determine the optimal schedule among a multitude of variants generated using various tiling strategies (including overlapped tiling with streaming), storage optimizations and (greedy) fusion heuristics. Another body of work refers to applying dynamic analysis to optimize stencils: OPS [RMG18] uses a combination of delayed execution and dependence analysis to resolve at runtime hindrances to static analysis that typically occur in large applications, and ARTEMIS [RVSR⁺19] uses bottleneck analysis via runtime profiling to guide the application of optimizations, and the tuning of various code generation parameters. Other work explores (1) scalable and adaptive autotuning frameworks for stencil computations [SLY⁺21, SLY⁺22, SLY⁺23] and (2) efficient mapping of image-processing pipelines to FPGA hardware [CVPB16, HDH21]

In comparison with approaches based on scheduling languages, the drawbacks of the frameworks surveyed in this section are possibly (1) suboptimal performance, since there is no guarantee that the optimization space is exhaustively explored; and, (2) high compilation time, because code variants need to be explicitly executed on the target system during autotuning. On the plus side, such frameworks may offer more complete languages that can express more general flavors of computations, for example, enabling efficient execution of applications from domains such as finance [PEO21], remote-sensing [GRH⁺20, SOO⁺23] and computer vision [ORG20].

5.2 Integrating Scheduling Languages with Autotuning

Systems that use scheduling languages employ different techniques for deriving the optimized sequence of transformations described by the scheduling language. Here, we use the phrase *defining the optimization search space* to refer to the process of how possible optimization sequences are determined and specified. A *point in the search space* is then an instantiated schedule that can be provided to the system to generate code. These search spaces are typically prohibitively large, and it is impractical to evaluate each point in the search space. Therefore, various techniques are needed to limit the search space and sample a subset of points, which we refer to as *search space pruning*. Instead of the performance models used in compiler heuristics as discussed in the previous subsection, autotuning is frequently used to measure the execution time of an optimized code variant running on a specific hardware platform. As previously discussed, autotuning systems arose because of the increasing challenge of deriving accurate performance models as architectural complexity has exploded.

A very common approach to defining the optimization search space is to use manually-written scheduling templates, written by performance experts, with variables embedded in each template that are placeholders for parameters in the search space; e.g., in frameworks for deep learning such as AutoTVM [CZY⁺18a] and SWIRL [VRB⁺19]. In domain-specific systems, where the set of possible optimizations is well understood, this approach can be effective because the search space can be kept narrow.

In other systems, the search space is generated by an algorithmic procedure, using various techniques to limit the size of the search space. CUDA-CHiLL [KBR⁺13] avoids combinatoric growth in the search space by separating the exploration of data placement in the GPU memory hierarchy (global/shared/texture memories or registers) from tuning optimization parameters (thread, block, tile and unroll factor sizes), treating them as independent variables. Protuner [HAGH⁺20] uses Monte Carlo Tree Search to look ahead when generating and evaluating complete schedules. FlexTensor [ZLW⁺20] generates schedules by enumerating different combinations, based on a specific ordering within the schedule space. AnsoR [ZJS⁺20] uses evolutionary search and learned cost model to find optimized TVM schedules. This approach is superior to the approach of AutoTVM since it extends to optimizing operators not available as templates and captures complex optimization patterns.

For sparse tensor computations, Ahrens et al. [AKA22] co-optimizes the computation and format of a sparse tensor. This system outputs a schedule by ranking and filtering by asymptotic complexities and runtime, which reduces the scheduling space by orders of magnitude and generate kernels which perform asymptotically better than the default TACO schedules. WACO [WMEA23] co-optimization considers both sparse formats and sparse schedules together. A sparse CNN model extracts the feature set from sparse programs, and a superschedule explores the combined search space using the Approximate Nearest Neighbour Search (ANNS).

5.3 Tuning using Machine Learning (ML)

An alternative approach to conventional autotuning is to construct a predictive model using deep learning: a learning phase derives an associated cost with different schedules and inputs, and inference performs a model lookup at runtime. While a search is still needed to build the model, an accurate model can be reused, and leverages the large investment in deep learning systems to make this efficient. Early work by Park et al. developed a predictive model for iterative compilation, called a tournament predictor [PKC11].

ImageCL [FE15, FE18], introduced in 2015, showed how to use Machine Learning (ML) for autotuning CUDA codes targeting stencils for image processing. It was later extended as a more general framework AUMA [FE15, FE17, FE18], for OpenCL. ImageCL and AUMA are DSLs whose schedules are autogenerated based on the model derived by ML training. Branches from AUMA's opensource repository [AUM] include extensions for Julia as well as 3D extensions for Adaptive Mesh Refinement.

Like with conventional autotuning, the challenges with this approach revolve around navigating a prohibitively large search space during the training phase. For instance, [BML⁺21] claims to have spent three weeks on training data collection. This is even after restricting the number of schedules per program to 32. Nonetheless, once trained, ML-based optimization techniques continue to exhibit state-of-the-art performance and some prominent work in this domain are [PKC11, KC12, AMA⁺19a, HAAW⁺20, CPWL17, ZLW⁺20, CZY⁺18b].

Patabandi et al. identify a key challenge in the cost of training to be a *Multiplicative Domain Formulation (MDF)* [PH23]. This term refers to the size of search spaces for multiple transformations through a combinatorial exploration of their schedule domains. For convolutions, they demonstrate an example of *Additive Domain Formulation (ADF)*, querying an existing model for one transformation [PVK⁺21] when building the model for another transformation, demonstrating a 100× reduction in inference time, while maintaining high accuracy.

6 SUMMARY

This paper has provided a taxonomy of scheduling languages that illustrates how the past approaches aimed at optimizing performance-critical applications have motivated the emergence of scheduling languages, and how future improvements may cycle back to the past.

Past work (1997 – 2012) has targeted scientific applications expressed in mainstream languages, e.g., in terms of loop nests, that could not be adequately optimized by the heuristic pipelines of general-purpose compilers. This has led to autotuning libraries and to more advanced compilation techniques that better explore the optimization space. Examples include iterative compilation that, at each step, generates multiple candidates and selects the one that performs best on the target hardware; or, rewrite-rule systems that encode algorithmic properties of high-level language constructs.

Present work (2013 – 2023) is driven by the observation that specialization gives rise to performance, in that restricting (and purifying) the specification language (DSLs) allows it to be effectively optimized by means of a relatively small number of code transformations, which are sequenced either explicitly by the compiler expert, or automatically by tuning strategies.

We envision that future work will broaden the specification language to cover more general computations and the repertoire of code transformations available to scheduling, e.g., with various dynamic analyses and with support for specifying data layout and data movement. On the one hand this will require improvements to the search strategies such as to cover this expanded space in practical time. On the other hand, this will require productivity-oriented improvements that minimize the user interaction with the scheduling language, while still allowing specification of key optimization insight. Ideally, the domain expert can directly interact with scheduling languages, by lifting their level of abstraction. Achieving this requires a level of integration and automation reminiscent of earlier exploratory compilers, thus circling back to the past.

Acknowledgments. We thank the Lorentz Center and its 2022 Workshop on Generic Auto-tuning for GPU Applications, which brought the authors together, and Tor Andre Haugdahl for his contributions re. Tiramisu.

This work was partially funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)* – project *PPP-DL* (470527619), the US National Science Foundation project CCF-2107556, and SFI-CGF through Research Council of Norway Project no. 309960.

REFERENCES

- [AAM⁺21] Luke Anderson, Andrew Adams, Karima Ma, Tzu-Mao Li, Tian Jin, and Jonathan Ragan-Kelley. Efficient automatic scheduling of imaging and vision pipelines for the gpu. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(OOPSLA), oct 2021.
- [ABB⁺97] Bas Aarts, Michel Barreteau, François Bodin, Peter Brinkhaus, Zbigniew Chamski, Henri-Pierre Charles, Christine Eisenbeis, John Gurd, Jan Hoogerbrugge, Ping Hu, William Jalby, Peter M. W. Knijnenburg, Michael F. P. O’Boyle, Erven Rohou, Rizos Sakellariou, Henk Schepers, André Seznec, Elena Stöhr, Marco Verhoeven, and Harry A. G. Wijshofi. Oceans: Optimizing compilers for embedded applications. In Christian Lengauer, Martin Griebel, and Sergei Gorbach, editors, *Euro-Par’97 Parallel Processing*, pages 1351–1356, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [ACW⁺09] Jason Ansel, Cy Chan, Yee Lok Wong, Marek Olszewski, Qin Zhao, Alan Edelman, and Saman Amarasinghe. Petabricks: a language and compiler for algorithmic choice. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI ’09*, page 38–49, New York, NY, USA, 2009. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [ADKA23] Willow Ahrens, Daniel Donenfeld, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. Looplets: A language for structured coiteration. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, pages 41–54, 2023.
- [AKA22] Peter Ahrens, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. 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*, pages 269–285, 2022.
- [AKC⁺18] Amir H. Ashouri, William Killian, John Cavazos, Gianluca Palermo, and Cristina Silvano. A survey on compiler autotuning using machine learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 51(5), sep 2018.
- [AKV⁺14a] Jason Ansel, Shoaib Kamil, Kalyan Veeramachaneni, Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Jeffrey Bosboom, Una-May O’Reilly, and Saman Amarasinghe. Opentuner: An extensible framework for program autotuning. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation, PACT ’14*, page 303–316, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [AKV⁺14b] Jason Ansel, Shoaib Kamil, Kalyan Veeramachaneni, Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Jeffrey Bosboom, Una-May O’Reilly, and Saman Amarasinghe. Opentuner: An extensible framework for program autotuning. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation, PACT ’14*, page 303–316, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [AMA⁺19a] Andrew Adams, Karima Ma, Luke Anderson, Riyadh Baghdadi, Tzu-Mao Li, Michaël Gharbi, Benoit Steiner, Steven Johnson, Kayvon Fatahalian, Frédo Durand, and et al. Learning to optimize halide with tree search and random programs. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 38(4), July 2019.
- [AMA⁺19b] Andrew Adams, Karima Ma, Luke Anderson, Riyadh Baghdadi, Tzu-Mao Li, Michaël Gharbi, Benoit Steiner, Steven Johnson, Kayvon Fatahalian, Frédo Durand, and Jonathan Ragan-Kelley. Learning to optimize halide with tree search and random programs. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 38(4), jul 2019.
- [AUM] AUMA. <https://github.com/ancelster/ML-autotuning>.
- [AVH16] Khalid Ahmad, Anand Venkat, and Mary W. Hall. Optimizing lobpcg: Sparse matrix loop and data transformations in action. In Chen Ding, John Criswell, and Peng Wu 0001, editors, *Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing - 29th International Workshop, LCPC 2016, Rochester, NY, USA, September 28-30, 2016, Revised Papers*, volume 10136 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 218–232. Springer, 2016.
- [BAB⁺05] G. Baumgartner, A. Auer, D.E. Bernholdt, A. Bibireata, V. Choppella, D. Cociorva, Xiaoyang Gao, R.J. Harrison, S. Hirata, S. Krishnamoorthy, S. Krishnan, Chi chung Lam, Qingda Lu, M. Nooijen, R.M. Pitzer, J. Ramanujam, P. Sadayappan, and A. Sibiryakov. Synthesis of high-performance parallel programs for a class of ab initio quantum chemistry models. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 93(2):276–292, 2005.
- [BACD97] Jeff Bilmes, Krste Asanovic, Chee-Whye Chin, and Jim Demmel. Optimizing matrix multiply using phipac: a portable, high-performance, ansi c coding methodology. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Supercomputing, ICS ’97*, page 340–347, New York, NY, USA, 1997. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [BBC⁺15] Riyadh Baghdadi, Ulysse Beaunon, Albert Cohen, Tobias Grosse, Michael Kruse, Chandan Reddy, Sven Verdoolaege, Adam Betts, Alastair F. Donaldson, Jeroen Ketema, Javed Absar, Sven van Haastregt, Alexey Kravets, Anton Lokhmotov, Robert David, and Elnar Hajiyev. Pencil: A platform-neutral compute intermediate language for accelerator programming. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Parallel Architecture and Compilation (PACT)*, PACT ’15, page 138–149, USA, 2015. IEEE Computer Society.
- [BBK⁺08] Muthu Manikandan Baskaran, Uday Bondhugula, Sriram Krishnamoorthy, J. Ramanujam, Atanas Rountev, and P. Sadayappan. Automatic data movement and computation mapping for multi-level parallel architectures with explicitly managed memories. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPOPP ’08*, page 1–10, New York, NY, USA, 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [BHOK23] Manya Bansal, Olivia Hsu, Kunle Olukotun, and Fredrik Kjolstad. Mosaic: An interoperable compiler for tensor algebra. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 7(PLDI):394–419, 2023.

- [BHRS08] Uday Bondhugula, Albert Hartono, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. A practical automatic polyhedral parallelizer and locality optimizer. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '08*, pages 101–113, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
- [BHW97] J. Boyle, T. Harmer, and V. Winter. The tampr program transformation system: Design and applications. In *In Arge, E., Bruaset, A., and Langtangen, H., editors, Modern Software Tools for Scienti Computing. Birkhauser.*, 1997.
- [BKK⁺98] François Bodin, Toru Kisuki, Peter Knijnenburg, Mike O'Boyle, and Erven Rohou. Iterative compilation in a non-linear optimisation space. In *Workshop on profile and feedback-directed compilation*, 1998.
- [BKK⁺00] François Bodin, Toru Kisuki, Peter Knijnenburg, Mike Boyle, and Erven Rohou. Iterative compilation in a non-linear optimisation space. *Workshop on Profile and Feedback-Directed Compilation*, 03 2000.
- [BKPS17] Wenlei Bao, Sriram Krishnamoorthy, Louis-Noel Pouchet, and P. Sadayappan. Analytical modeling of cache behavior for affine programs. *Proc. of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(POPL):32:1–32:26, December 2017.
- [BKS⁺22] Aart Bik, Penporn Koanantakool, Tatiana Shpeisman, Nicolas Vasilache, Bixia Zheng, and Fredrik Kjolstad. Compiler support for sparse tensor computations in mlir. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 19(4), sep 2022.
- [Ble89] Guy E. Blelloch. Scans as Primitive Parallel Operations. *Computers, IEEE Transactions*, 38(11):1526–1538, 1989.
- [Ble90] Guy E Blelloch. *Vector models for data-parallel computing*, volume 75. MIT press Cambridge, 1990.
- [BML⁺21] Riyadh Baghdadi, Massinissa Merouani, Mohamed-Hicham Leghetta, Kamel Abdous, Taha Arbaoui, Karima Benatchba, et al. A deep learning based cost model for automatic code optimization. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 3, 2021.
- [BNdFLZ⁺19] Tal Ben-Nun, Johannes de Fine Licht, Alexandros N. Ziogas, Timo Schneider, and Torsten Hoefler. Stateful dataflow multigraphs: A data-centric model for performance portability on heterogeneous architectures. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, SC '19*, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [BNGD⁺22] Tal Ben-Nun, Linus Groner, Florian Deconinck, Tobias Wicky, Eddie Davis, Johann Dahm, Oliver D. Elbert, Rhea George, Jeremy McGibbon, Lukas Trümper, Elynn Wu, Oliver Fuhrer, Thomas Schulthess, and Torsten Hoefler. Productive performance engineering for weather and climate modeling with python. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, SC '22*. IEEE Press, 2022.
- [BR12] Lars Bergstrom and John Reppy. Nested data-parallelism on the gpu. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP '12*, pages 247–258, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.
- [BRR⁺19a] Riyadh Baghdadi, Jessica Ray, Malek Ben Romdhane, Emanuele Del Sozzo, Abdurrahman Akkas, Yunming Zhang, Patricia Suriana, Shoaib Kamil, and Saman Amarasinghe. Tiramisu: a polyhedral compiler for expressing fast and portable code. In *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization, CGO 2019*, page 193–205. IEEE Press, 2019.
- [BRR⁺19b] Riyadh Baghdadi, Jessica Ray, Malek Ben Romdhane, Emanuele Del Sozzo, Abdurrahman Akkas, Yunming Zhang, Patricia Suriana, Shoaib Kamil, and Saman Amarasinghe. Tiramisu: A polyhedral compiler for expressing fast and portable code. In *2019 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, pages 193–205, 2019.
- [CBL⁺02] Daniel Cociorva, Gerald Baumgartner, Chi-Chung Lam, P. Sadayappan, J. Ramanujam, Marcel Nooijen, David E. Bernholdt, and Robert Harrison. Space-time trade-off optimization for a class of electronic structure calculations. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2002 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '02*, page 177–186, New York, NY, USA, 2002. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [CCH07] Chun Chen, Jacqueline Chame, and Mary W. Hall. Chill : A framework for composing high-level loop transformations. 2007.
- [CKA18] Stephen Chou, Fredrik Kjolstad, and Saman Amarasinghe. Format abstraction for sparse tensor algebra compilers. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(OOPSLA):1–30, 2018.
- [Cla98] D. Clark. Openmp: a parallel standard for the masses. *IEEE Concurrency*, 6(1):10–12, 1998.
- [CLJ⁺07] Manuel M. T. Chakravarty, Roman Leshchinskiy, Simon Peyton Jones, Gabriele Keller, and Simon Marlow. Data Parallel Haskell: A Status Report. In *Int. Work. on Decl. Aspects of Multicore Prog. (DAMP)*, pages 10–18, 2007.
- [CMJ⁺18] Tianqi Chen, Thierry Moreau, Ziheng Jiang, Lianmin Zheng, Eddie Yan, Meghan Cowan, Haichen Shen, Leyuan Wang, Yuwei Hu, Luis Ceze, Carlos Guestrin, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. Tvm: An automated end-to-end optimizing compiler for deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI '18*, page 579–594, USA, 2018. USENIX Association.
- [CPD01] R. Clint Whaley, Antoine Petitet, and Jack J. Dongarra. Automated empirical optimizations of software and the atlas project. *Parallel Computing*, 27(1):3–35, 2001. New Trends in High Performance Computing.
- [CPWL17] Chris Cummins, Pavlos Petoumenos, Zheng Wang, and Hugh Leather. End-to-end deep learning of optimization heuristics. In *2017 26th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, pages 219–232. IEEE, 2017.
- [CSS15] Prasanth Chatarasi, Jun Shirako, and Vivek Sarkar. Polyhedral optimizations of explicitly parallel programs. In *2015 International Conference on Parallel Architecture and Compilation (PACT)*, pages 213–226, 2015.
- [CVPB16] Nitin Chugh, Vinay Vasista, Suresh Purini, and Uday Bondhugula. A dsl compiler for accelerating image processing pipelines on fpgas. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation, PACT '16*, page 327–338, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [CZY⁺18a] Tianqi Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Eddie Yan, Ziheng Jiang, Thierry Moreau, Luis Ceze, Carlos Guestrin, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. Learning to optimize tensor programs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- [CZY⁺18b] Tianqi Chen, Lianmin Zheng, Eddie Yan, Ziheng Jiang, Thierry Moreau, Luis Ceze, Carlos Guestrin, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. Learning to optimize tensor programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.08166*, 2018.

- [DBR⁺06] Sebastien Donadio, James Brodman, Thomas Roeder, Kamen Yotov, Denis Barthou, Albert Cohen, María Jesús Garzarán, David Padua, and Keshav Pingali. A language for the compact representation of multiple program versions. In Eduard Ayguadé, Gerald Baumgartner, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan, editors, *Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*, pages 136–151, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [DFG⁺94] Klaus Didrich, Andreas Fett, Carola Gerke, Wolfgang Grieskamp, and Peter Pepper. Opal: Design and implementation of an algebraic programming language. In Jürg Gutknecht, editor, *Programming Languages and System Architectures*, pages 228–244, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [DK99] Chen Ding and Ken Kennedy. Improving cache performance in dynamic applications through data and computation reorganization at run time. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1999 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '99, page 229–241, New York, NY, USA, 1999. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [dMS99] Oege de Moor and Ganesh Sittampalam. Generic program transformation. In S. Doaitse Swierstra, José N. Oliveira, and Pedro R. Henriques, editors, *Advanced Functional Programming*, pages 116–149, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [EM09] Anne C. Elster and Jan Christian Meyer. A super-efficient adaptable bit-reversal algorithm for multithreaded architectures. In *2009 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing*, pages 1–8, 2009.
- [FCGM21] Pratik Fegade, Tianqi Chen, Phillip Gibbons, and Todd Mowry. Cortex: A compiler for recursive deep learning models. In A. Smola, A. Dimakis, and I. Stoica, editors, *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 3, pages 38–54, 2021.
- [FCGM22] Pratik Fegade, Tianqi Chen, Phillip Gibbons, and Todd Mowry. The cora tensor compiler: Compilation for ragged tensors with minimal padding. In D. Marculescu, Y. Chi, and C. Wu, editors, *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 4, pages 721–747, 2022.
- [FE15] Thomas L. Falch and Anne C. Elster. Machine learning based auto-tuning for enhanced opencl performance portability. In *2015 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshop*, pages 1231–1240, 2015.
- [FE16] Thomas L. Falch and Anne C. Elster. Imagecl: An image processing language for performance portability on heterogeneous systems. In *2016 International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation (HPCS)*, pages 562–569, 2016.
- [FE17] Thomas L. Falch and Anne C. Elster. Machine learning-based auto-tuning for enhanced performance portability of opencl applications. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 29(8):e4029, 2017. e4029 cpe.4029.
- [FE18] Thomas L. Falch and Anne C. Elster. Imagecl: Language and source-to-source compiler for performance portability, load balancing, and scalability prediction on heterogeneous systems. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 30(9):e4384, 2018. e4384 cpe.4384.
- [FKH⁺06] Kayvon Fatahalian, Timothy J. Knight, Mike Houston, Mattan Erez, Daniel Reiter Horn, Larkhoon Leem, Ji Young Park, Manman Ren, Alex Aiken, William J. Dally, and Pat Hanrahan. Sequoia: Programming the memory hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing*, 2006.
- [Fri99] Matteo Frigo. A fast fourier transform compiler. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1999 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '99, page 169–180, New York, NY, USA, 1999. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [GGH15] Tobias Gysi, Tobias Grosser, and Torsten Hoefler. Modesto: Data-centric analytic optimization of complex stencil programs on heterogeneous architectures. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM on International Conference on Supercomputing*, ICS '15, page 177–186, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [GGH19] Tobias Gysi, Tobias Grosser, and Torsten Hoefler. Absinthe: Learning an analytical performance model to fuse and tile stencil codes in one shot. In *2019 28th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, pages 370–382, 2019.
- [GLG⁺12] Joseph E. Gonzalez, Yucheng Low, Haijie Gu, Danny Bickson, and Carlos Guestrin. PowerGraph: Distributed Graph-Parallel computation on natural graphs. In *10th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 12)*, pages 17–30, Hollywood, CA, October 2012. USENIX Association.
- [GMM99] Somnath Ghosh, Margaret Martonosi, and Sharad Malik. Cache miss equations: A compiler framework for analyzing and tuning memory behavior. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 21(4):703–746, jul 1999.
- [GRH⁺20] Fabian Gieseke, Sabina Rosca, Troels Henriksen, Jan Verbesselt, and Cosmin E. Oancea. Massively-parallel change detection for satellite time series data with missing values. In *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 385–396, 2020.
- [GVB⁺06] S. Girbal, N. Vasilache, C. Bastoul, A. Cohen, D. Parello, M. Sigler, and O. Temam. Semi-automatic composition of loop transformations for deep parallelism and memory hierarchies. *International Journal of Parallel Programming*, 34, June 2006.
- [HAAW⁺20] Ameer Haj-Ali, Nesreen K Ahmed, Ted Willke, Yakun Sophia Shao, Krste Asanovic, and Ion Stoica. Neurovectorizer: end-to-end vectorization with deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, pages 242–255, 2020.
- [HAGH⁺20] Ameer Haj-Ali, Hasan Genc, Qijing Huang, William Moses, John Wawrzynek, Krste Asanović, and Ion Stoica. Protuner: tuning programs with monte carlo tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13685*, 2020.
- [HCC⁺10] Mary Hall, Jacqueline Chame, Chun Chen, Jaewook Shin, Gabe Rudy, and Malik Murtaza Khan. Loop transformation recipes for code generation and auto-tuning. In Guang R. Gao, Lori L. Pollock, John Cavazos, and Xiaoming Li, editors, *Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*, pages 50–64, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [HDH21] Dillon Huff, Steve Dai, and Pat Hanrahan. Clockwork: Resource-efficient static scheduling for multi-rate image processing applications on fpgas. In *2021 IEEE 29th Annual International Symposium on Field-Programmable Custom Computing Machines (FCCM)*, pages 186–194, 2021.

- [HEB⁺20] Bastian Hagedorn, Archibald Samuel Elliott, Henrik Barthels, Rastislav Bodik, and Vinod Grover. Fireiron: a data-movement-aware scheduling language for gpus. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*, pages 71–82, 2020.
- [HFC⁺23] Bastian Hagedorn, Bin Fan, Hanfeng Chen, Cris Cecka, Michael Garland, and Vinod Grover. Graphene: An ir for optimized tensor computations on gpus. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3*, ASPLOS 2023, page 302–313, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [HLK⁺20] Bastian Hagedorn, Johannes Lenfers, Thomas Kundefinedhler, Xueying Qin, Sergei Gorlatch, and Michel Steuwer. Achieving high-performance the functional way: A functional pearl on expressing high-performance optimizations as rewrite strategies. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(ICFP), aug 2020.
- [HNS09] Albert Hartono, Boyana Norris, and P. Sadayappan. Annotation-based empirical performance tuning using orio. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel & Distributed Processing*, pages 1–11, 2009.
- [HSL⁺23] Erik Hellsten, Artur Souza, Johannes Lenfers, Rubens Lacouture, Olivia Hsu, Adel Ejeh, Fredrik Kjolstad, Michel Steuwer, Kunle Olukotun, and Luigi Nardi. Baco: A fast and portable bayesian compiler optimization framework, 2023.
- [HSS⁺18] Bastian Hagedorn, Larisa Stoltzfus, Michel Steuwer, Sergei Gorlatch, and Christophe Dubach. High performance stencil code generation with lift. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, CGO 2018, page 100–112, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [HTEO19] Troels Henriksen, Frederik Thorøe, Martin Elsmann, and Cosmin Oancea. Incremental flattening for nested data parallelism. In *Proceedings of the 24th Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, PPOPP '19, pages 53–67, New York, NY, USA, 2019. ACM.
- [IBR⁺22] Yuka Ikarashi, Gilbert Louis Bernstein, Alex Reinking, Hasan Genc, and Jonathan Ragan-Kelley. Exocompilation for productive programming of hardware accelerators. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 703–718, 2022.
- [IYV04] E.J. Im, K. Yelick, and R. Vuduc. Sparsity: Optimization framework for sparse matrix kernels. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 18:135–158, 2004.
- [JKE11] Rune Jensen, Ian Karlin, and Anne C. Elster. Autotuning a matrix routine for high performance. In *NIK 2011*, 2011.
- [JTH01] Simon Peyton Jones, Andrew Tolmach, and Tony Hoare. Playing by the Rules: Rewriting as a Practical Optimisation Technique in GHC. In *Haskell Workshop*, volume 1, pages 203–233, 2001.
- [KBG12] Aapo Kyrola, Guy Blelloch, and Carlos Guestrin. GraphChi: Large-Scale graph computation on just a PC. In *10th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 12)*, pages 31–46, Hollywood, CA, October 2012. USENIX Association.
- [KBR⁺13] Malik Khan, Protonu Basu, Gabe Rudy, Mary Hall, Chun Chen, and Jacqueline Chame. A script-based autotuning compiler system to generate high-performance cuda code. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 9(4), jan 2013.
- [KC12] Sameer Kulkarni and John Cavazos. Mitigating the compiler optimization phase-ordering problem using machine learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM international conference on Object oriented programming systems languages and applications*, pages 147–162, 2012.
- [KGB⁺24] Thomas Koehler, Andrés Goens, Siddharth Bhat, Tobias Grosser, Phil Trinder, and Michel Steuwer. Guided equality saturation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 8(POPL):1727–1758, 2024.
- [KH16] David B. Kirk and Wen-mei W. Hwu. *Programming Massively Parallel Processors, Third Edition: A Hands-on Approach*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 3rd edition, 2016.
- [KKC⁺17] Fredrik Kjolstad, Shoaib Kamil, Stephen Chou, David Lugato, and Saman Amarasinghe. The tensor algebra compiler. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 1(OOPSLA):1–29, 2017.
- [KKO00] T. Kisuki, P. M. W. Knijnenburg, and M. F. P. O’Boyle. Combined selection of tile sizes and unroll factors using iterative compilation. In *Proceedings 2000 International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (Cat. No.PR00622)*, pages 237–246, Oct 2000.
- [KPW⁺07] Milind Kulkarni, Keshav Pingali, Bruce Walter, Ganesh Ramanarayanan, Kavita Bala, and L. Paul Chew. Optimistic parallelism requires abstractions. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 42(6):211–222, jun 2007.
- [KVP⁺16] Rashid Kaleem, Anand Venkat, Sreepathi Pai, Mary Hall, and Keshav Pingali. Synchronization trade-offs in gpu implementations of graph algorithms. In *2016 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 514–523, 2016.
- [LAB⁺21] Chris Lattner, Mehdi Amini, Uday Bondhugula, Albert Cohen, Andy Davis, Jacques Pienaar, River Riddle, Tatiana Shpeisman, Nicolas Vasilache, and Oleksandr Zinenko. MLIR: Scaling compiler infrastructure for domain specific computation. In *2021 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, pages 2–14, 2021.
- [LGA⁺18] Tzu-Mao Li, Michaël Gharbi, Andrew Adams, Frédo Durand, and Jonathan Ragan-Kelley. Differentiable programming for image processing and deep learning in halide. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 37(4), jul 2018.
- [LMW89] Peter Lipps, Ulrich Möncke, and Reinhard Wilhelm. Optran - a language/system for the specification of program transformations: System overview and experiences. In Dieter Hammer, editor, *Compiler Compilers and High Speed Compilation*, pages 52–65, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1989. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [LP15] Andrew Lenharth and Keshav Pingali. Scaling runtimes for irregular algorithms to large-scale numa systems. *Computer*, 48(8):35–44, 2015.
- [LZM⁺24] Martin Paul Lücke, Oleksandr Zinenko, William S. Moses, Michel Steuwer, and Albert Cohen. The mlir transform dialect. your compiler is more powerful than you think, 2024.

- [MAS⁺16] Ravi Teja Mullapudi, Andrew Adams, Dillon Sharlet, Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, and Kayvon Fatahalian. Automatically scheduling halide image processing pipelines. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 35(4), jul 2016.
- [MBH⁺21] Philip Munksgaard, Svend Lund Breddam, Troels Henriksen, Fabian Cristian Gieseke, and Cosmin Oancea. Dataset sensitive autotuning of multi-versioned code based on monotonic properties. In Viktória Zsóok and John Hughes, editors, *Trends in Functional Programming*, pages 3–23, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing.
- [MHSO22] P. Munksgaard, T. Henriksen, P. Sadayappan, and C. Oancea. Memory optimizations in an array language. In *2022 SC22: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC) (SC)*, pages 424–438, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, nov 2022. IEEE Computer Society.
- [MJJ⁺01] José M. F. Moura, Jeremy Johnson, Robert W. Johnson, David Padua, Viktor K. Prasanna, Markus Püschel, Bryan Singer, Manuela Veloso, and Jianxin Xiong. Generating platform-adapted DSP libraries using SPIRAL. In *High Performance Extreme Computing (HPEC)*, 2001.
- [MVB15] Ravi Teja Mullapudi, Vinay Vasista, and Uday Bondhugula. Polymage: Automatic optimization for image processing pipelines. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, ASPLOS '15*, page 429–443, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [NC15] Cedric Nugteren and Valeriu Codreanu. Cltune: A generic auto-tuner for opencl kernels. In *2015 IEEE 9th International Symposium on Embedded Multicore/Many-core Systems-on-Chip*, pages 195–202, 2015.
- [NLP13] Donald Nguyen, Andrew Lenharth, and Keshav Pingali. A lightweight infrastructure for graph analytics. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP '13*, page 456–471, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [NOU⁺23] Nandeeeka Nayak, Toluwanimi O Odemuyiwa, Shubham Ugare, Christopher Fletcher, Michael Pellauer, and Joel Emer. Teaal: A declarative framework for modeling sparse tensor accelerators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07931*, 2023.
- [NRB⁺15] Thomas Nelson, Axel Rivera, Prasanna Balaprakash, Mary Hall, Paul D. Hovland, Elizabeth Jessup, and Boyana Norris. Generating efficient tensor contractions for gpus. In *2015 44th International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 969–978, 2015.
- [Nug18] Cedric Nugteren. Cblast: A tuned opencl blas library. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on OpenCL, IWOCCL '18*, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [NVI22] NVIDIA. CUDA Toolkit Documentation. <https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/>, 2022.
- [ORG20] Cosmin Eugen Oancea, Ties Robroek, and Fabian Gieseke. Approximate nearest-neighbour fields via massively-parallel propagation-assisted k-d trees. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, pages 5172–5181, 2020.
- [PBB⁺11] Louis-Noël Pouchet, Uday Bondhugula, Cédric Bastoul, Albert Cohen, J. Ramanujam, P. Sadayappan, and Nicolas Vasilache. Loop transformations: Convexity, pruning and optimization. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL '11*, pages 549–562, New York, NY, USA, 2011. ACM.
- [PBCC08] Louis-Noël Pouchet, Cédric Bastoul, Albert Cohen, and John Cavazos. Iterative optimization in the polyhedral model: part ii, multidimensional time. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '08*, page 90–100, New York, NY, USA, 2008. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [PEO21] Wojciech Michal Pawlak, Martin Elsmann, and Cosmin Eugen Oancea. A functional approach to accelerating monte carlo based american option pricing. In *Proceedings of the 31st Symposium on Implementation and Application of Functional Languages, IFL '19*, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [PH23] Tharindu R. Patabandi and Mary Hall. Efficiently learning locality optimizations by decomposing transformation domains. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2023*, page 37–49, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [PKC11] Eunjung Park, Sameer Kulkarni, and John Cavazos. An evaluation of different modeling techniques for iterative compilation. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Compilers, Architectures and Synthesis for Embedded Systems, CASES '11*, page 65–74, New York, NY, USA, 2011. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [PMJ⁺05] Markus Püschel, José M. F. Moura, Jeremy Johnson, David Padua, Manuela Veloso, Bryan Singer, Jianxin Xiong, Franz Franchetti, Aca Gacic, Yevgen Voronenko, Kang Chen, Robert W. Johnson, and Nicholas Rizzolo. SPIRAL: Code generation for DSP transforms. *Proceedings of the IEEE, special issue on "Program Generation, Optimization, and Adaptation"*, 93(2):232–275, 2005.
- [PSH⁺20] Filip Petrovič, David Štrělák, Jana Hozzová, Jaroslav Ol'ha, Richard Trembecký, Siegfried Benkner, and Jiří Filipovič. A benchmark set of highly-efficient cuda and opencl kernels and its dynamic autotuning with kernel tuning toolkit. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 108:161–177, 2020.
- [PVK⁺21] Tharindu R. Patabandi, Anand Venkat, Abhishek Kulkarni, Pushkar Ratnalikar, Mary Hall, and Justin Gottschlich. Predictive data locality optimization for higher-order tensor computations. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming, MAPS 2021*, page 43–52, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Ras24] Ari Rasch. (de/re)-composition of data-parallel computations via multi-dimensional homomorphisms. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, may 2024. 73 pages.
- [RB14] Chandan Reddy and Uday Bondhugula. Effective automatic computation placement and data allocation for parallelization of regular programs. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Supercomputing, ICS '14*, page 13–22, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [REP⁺12] Mahesh Ravishankar, John Eisenlohr, Louis-Noël Pouchet, J. Ramanujam, Atanas Rountev, and P. Sadayappan. Code generation for parallel execution of a class of irregular loops on distributed memory systems. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, SC '12*, Washington, DC, USA,

2012. IEEE Computer Society Press.
- [RKBA⁺13a] Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Connelly Barnes, Andrew Adams, Sylvain Paris, Frédo Durand, and Saman Amarasinghe. 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, PLDI '13*, page 519–530, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [RKBA⁺13b] Jonathan Ragan-Kelley, Connelly Barnes, Andrew Adams, Sylvain Paris, Frédo Durand, and Saman Amarasinghe. Halide: a language and compiler for optimizing parallelism, locality, and recomputation in image processing pipelines. *Acm Sigplan Notices*, 48(6):519–530, 2013.
- [RKC16] Chandan Reddy, Michael Kruse, and Albert Cohen. Reduction drawing: Language constructs and polyhedral compilation for reductions on gpus. In *2016 International Conference on Parallel Architecture and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, pages 87–97, 2016.
- [RLSD16] Toomas Rummelg, Thibaut Lutz, Michel Steuwer, and Christophe Dubach. Performance portable gpu code generation for matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Workshop on General Purpose Processing Using Graphics Processing Unit, GPGPU '16*, page 22–31, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [RMG18] István Z. Reguly, Gihan R. Mudalige, and Michael B. Giles. Loop tiling in large-scale stencil codes at run-time with ops. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 29(4):873–886, 2018.
- [RSG⁺19] Ari Rasch, Richard Schulze, Waldemar Gorus, Jan Hiller, Sebastian Bartholomäus, and Sergei Gorlatch. High-performance probabilistic record linkage via multi-dimensional homomorphisms. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing, SAC '19*, page 526–533, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [RSS⁺23] Ari Rasch, Richard Schulze, Denys Shabalín, Anne Elster, Sergei Gorlatch, and Mary Hall. (de/re)-compositions expressed systematically via mdh-based schedules. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Compiler Construction, CC 2023*, page 61–72, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [RSSG21] Ari Rasch, Richard Schulze, Michel Steuwer, and Sergei Gorlatch. Efficient auto-tuning of parallel programs with interdependent tuning parameters via auto-tuning framework (atf). *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 18(1), jan 2021.
- [RVS⁺18] Prashant Singh Rawat, Miheer Vaidya, Aravind Sukumaran-Rajam, Mahesh Ravishankar, Vinod Grover, Atanas Rountev, Louis-Noël Pouchet, and P. Sadayappan. Domain-specific optimization and generation of high-performance gpu code for stencil computations. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 106(11):1902–1920, 2018.
- [RVS⁺19] Prashant Singh Rawat, Miheer Vaidya, Aravind Sukumaran-Rajam, Atanas Rountev, Louis-Noël Pouchet, and P. Sadayappan. On optimizing complex stencils on gpus. In *2019 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 641–652, 2019.
- [SB13] Julian Shun and Guy E. Blelloch. Ligma: a lightweight graph processing framework for shared memory. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming, PPoPP '13*, page 135–146, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [SE98] Robert Strandh and Anne C. Elster. An introduction to computational networks and the computational network toolkit. Technical Report CNA-288, Oct. 1998.
- [SFLD15] Michel Steuwer, Christian Fensch, Sam Lindley, and Christophe Dubach. Generating performance portable code using rewrite rules: From high-level functional expressions to high-performance opencl code. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2015*, page 205–217, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [SH04] Michelle Mills Strout and Paul D. Hovland. Metrics and models for reordering transformations. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Workshop on Memory System Performance, MSP '04*, page 23–34, New York, NY, USA, 2004. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [SHW⁺20] Ryan Senanayake, Changwan Hong, Ziheng Wang, Amalee Wilson, Stephen Chou, Shoaib Kamil, Saman Amarasinghe, and Fredrik Kjolstad. A sparse iteration space transformation framework for sparse tensor algebra. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 4(OOPSLA):1–30, 2020.
- [SKKP22] Michel Steuwer, Thomas Koehler, Bastian Köpcke, and Federico Pizzuti. Rise & shine: Language-oriented compiler design, 2022.
- [SLC⁺16] Michelle Mills Strout, Alan LaMiel, Larry Carter, Jeanne Ferrante, Barbara Kreaseck, and Catherine Olschanowsky. An approach for code generation in the sparse polyhedral framework. *Parallel Computing*, 53:32–57, 2016.
- [SLY⁺21] Qingxiao Sun, Yi Liu, Hailong Yang, Zhonghui Jiang, Xiaoyan Liu, Ming Dun, Zhongzhi Luan, and Depei Qian. cstuner: Scalable auto-tuning framework for complex stencil computation on gpus. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing (CLUSTER)*, pages 192–203, 2021.
- [SLY⁺22] Qingxiao Sun, Yi Liu, Hailong Yang, Zhonghui Jiang, Zhongzhi Luan, and Depei Qian. Stencilmart: Predicting optimization selection for stencil computations across gpus. In *2022 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium (IPDPS)*, pages 875–885, 2022.
- [SLY⁺23] Qingxiao Sun, Yi Liu, Hailong Yang, Zhonghui Jiang, Zhongzhi Luan, and Depei Qian. Adaptive auto-tuning framework for global exploration of stencil optimization on gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, pages 1–15, 2023.
- [SOO⁺23] D. Serykh, S. Oehmcke, C. Oancea, D. Masiliunas, J. Verbesselt, Y. Cheng, S. Horion, F. Gieseke, and N. Hinnerskov. Seasonal-trend time series decomposition on graphics processing units. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 5914–5923, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, dec 2023. IEEE Computer Society.
- [SRHO22] Robert Schenck, Ola Rønning, Troels Henriksen, and Cosmin E. Oancea. Ad for an array language with nested parallelism. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, SC '22*. IEEE Press, 2022.

- [SSB⁺20] Savvas Sioutas, Sander Stuijk, Twan Basten, Henk Corporaal, and Lou Somers. Schedule synthesis for halide pipelines on gpus. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 17(3), aug 2020.
- [SSW⁺19] Savvas Sioutas, Sander Stuijk, Luc Waeijen, Twan Basten, Henk Corporaal, and Lou Somers. Schedule synthesis for halide pipelines through reuse analysis. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 16(2), apr 2019.
- [TBNS⁺23] Lukas Trümper, Tal Ben-Nun, Philipp Schaad, Alexandru Calotoiu, and Torsten Hoefler. Performance embeddings: A similarity-based transfer tuning approach to performance optimization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Supercomputing*, ICS '23, page 50–62, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [TCC⁺09] Ananta Tiwari, Chun Chen, Jacqueline Chame, Mary Hall, and Jeffrey K. Hollingsworth. A scalable auto-tuning framework for compiler optimization. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel & Distributed Processing*, pages 1–12, 2009.
- [TFJ94] O. Temam, C. Fricker, and W. Jalby. Cache interference phenomena. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM SIGMETRICS Conference on Measurement and Modeling of Computer Systems*, SIGMETRICS '94, page 261–271, New York, NY, USA, 1994. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [TGJ93] O. Temam, E. D. Granston, and W. Jalby. To copy or not to copy: a compile-time technique for assessing when data copying should be used to eliminate cache conflicts. In *Proceedings of the 1993 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing*, Supercomputing '93, page 410–419, New York, NY, USA, 1993. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [TJS⁺23] Amir Mohammad Tavakkoli, Sameeran Joshi, Shreya Singh, Yufan Xu, P. Sadayappan, and Mary Hall. Peak: Generating high-performance schedules in mlir. In *International Workshop on Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*. Springer Verlag, 2023.
- [TKC19] Philippe Tillet, H. T. Kung, and David Cox. Triton: an intermediate language and compiler for tiled neural network computations. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Machine Learning and Programming Languages*, MAPL 2019, page 10–19, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [TTAPG19] S. F. X. Thiago Teixeira, Corinne Ancourt, David Padua, and William Gropp. Locus: A system and a language for program optimization. In *2019 IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO)*, pages 217–228, 2019.
- [TVVA03] Spyridon Triantafyllis, Manish Vachharajani, Neil Vachharajani, and David I August. Compiler optimization-space exploration. In *International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization, 2003. CGO 2003.*, pages 204–215. IEEE, 2003.
- [van19] Ben van Werkhoven. Kernel tuner: A search-optimizing gpu code auto-tuner. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 90:347–358, 2019.
- [VBT98] Eelco Visser, Zine-el-Abidine Benaissa, and Andrew Tolmach. Building program optimizers with rewriting strategies. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, ICFP '98, page 13–26, New York, NY, USA, 1998. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [VCJ⁺17] Sander Vocke, Henk Corporaal, Roel Jordans, Rosilde Corvino, and Rick Nas. Extending halide to improve software development for imaging dsp. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 14(3), aug 2017.
- [VCJ⁺13] Sven Verdoolaege, Juan Carlos Juega, Albert Cohen, José Ignacio Gómez, Christian Tenllado, and Francky Catthoor. Polyhedral parallel code generation for cuda. *ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO)*, 9(4):54:1–54:23, January 2013.
- [VHS15] Anand Venkat, Mary Hall, and Michelle Strout. Loop and data transformations for sparse matrix code. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI '15, page 521–532, New York, NY, USA, 2015. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [VJ17] Sven Verdoolaege and Gerda Janssens. Scheduling for ppeg. *Report CW*, 706, 2017.
- [VMP⁺16] Anand Venkat, Mahdi Soltan Mohammadi, Jongsoo Park, Hongbo Rong, Rajkishore Barik, Michelle Mills Strout, and Mary Hall. Automating wavefront parallelization for sparse matrix computations. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, SC '16. IEEE Press, 2016.
- [VRB⁺19] Anand Venkat, Tharindu Rusira, Raj Barik, Mary Hall, and Leonard Truong. Swirl: High-performance many-core cpu code generation for deep neural networks. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 33(6):1275–1289, 2019.
- [VSHS14] Anand Venkat, Manu Shantharam, Mary Hall, and Michelle Mills Strout. Non-affine extensions to polyhedral code generation. In *Proceedings of Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, CGO '14, page 185–194, New York, NY, USA, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Vud03] Richard Vuduc. *Automatic Performance Tuning of Sparse Matrix Kernels*. PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 2003.
- [VZT⁺18] Nicolas Vasilache, Oleksandr Zinenko, Theodoros Theodoridis, Priya Goyal, Zachary DeVito, William S Moses, Sven Verdoolaege, Andrew Adams, and Albert Cohen. Tensor comprehensions: Framework-agnostic high-performance machine learning abstractions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04730*, 2018.
- [VZT⁺19] Nicolas Vasilache, Oleksandr Zinenko, Theodoros Theodoridis, Priya Goyal, Zachary DeVito, William S. Moses, Sven Verdoolaege, Andrew Adams, and Albert Cohen. The next 700 accelerated layers: From mathematical expressions of network computation graphs to accelerated gpu kernels, automatically. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 16(4), oct 2019.
- [WBK⁺23] Xingfu Wu, Prasanna Balaprakash, Michael Kruse, Jaehoon Koo, Brice Videau, Paul Hovland, Valerie Taylor, Brad Geltz, Siddhartha Jana, and Mary Hall. ytopt: Autotuning scientific applications for energy efficiency at large scales, 2023.
- [WD98] R. Clint Whaley and Jack J. Dongarra. Automatically tuned linear algebra software. In *Proceedings of the 1998 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing*, SC '98, page 1–27, USA, 1998. IEEE Computer Society.
- [WMEA23] Jaeyeon Won, Charith Mendis, Joel S Emer, and Saman Amarasinghe. 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, Volume 2*, pages 920–934, 2023.

- [YAK22] Rohan Yadav, Alex Aiken, and Fredrik Kjolstad. Distal: the distributed tensor algebra compiler. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, PLDI 2022, page 286–300, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [YSY⁺07] Qing Yi, Keith Seymour, Haihang You, Richard Vuduc, and Dan Quinlan. Poet: Parameterized optimizations for empirical tuning. In *2007 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*, pages 1–8, 2007.
- [ZBW⁺19] Tuowen Zhao, Protonu Basu, Samuel Williams, Mary Hall, and Hans Johansen. Exploiting reuse and vectorization in blocked stencil computations on cpus and gpus. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, SC '19, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [ZJS⁺20] Lianmin Zheng, Chengfan Jia, Minmin Sun, Zhao Wu, Cody Hao Yu, Ameer Haj-Ali, Yida Wang, Jun Yang, Danyang Zhuo, Koushik Sen, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Anso: Generating high-performance tensor programs for deep learning. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*, pages 863–879. USENIX Association, November 2020.
- [ZLW⁺20] Size Zheng, Yun Liang, Shuo Wang, Renze Chen, and Kaiwen Sheng. Flextensor: An automatic schedule exploration and optimization framework for tensor computation on heterogeneous system. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 859–873, 2020.
- [ZM12] Yongpeng Zhang and Frank Mueller. CuNesl: Compiling nested data-parallel languages for SIMT architectures. In *Proceedings of the 2012 41st International Conference on Parallel Processing*, ICPP'12, pages 340–349, Washington, DC, USA, 2012. IEEE Computer Society.
- [ZPH⁺22] Tuowen Zhao, Tobi Popoola, Mary Hall, Catherine Olschanowsky, and Michelle Strout. Polyhedral specification and code generation of sparse tensor contraction with co-iteration. *ACM Trans. Archit. Code Optim.*, 20(1), dec 2022.
- [ZYB⁺18] Yunming Zhang, Mengjiao Yang, Riyadh Baghdadi, Shoaib Kamil, Julian Shun, and Saman Amarasinghe. Graphit: A high-performance graph dsl. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(OOPSLA):1–30, 2018.