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ABSTRACT
Sparse tensors are rapidly becoming critical components of modern deep learning workloads. However, developing high-performance sparse operators can be difficult and tedious, and existing vendor libraries cannot satisfy the escalating demands from new operators. Sparse tensor compilers simplify the development of operators, but efficient sparse compilation for deep learning remains challenging because a single sparse format cannot maximize hardware efficiency, and single-shot compilers cannot keep up with latest hardware and system advances. We show that the key to addressing both challenges is two forms of composability. In this paper, we propose SparseTIR, a sparse tensor compilation abstraction that offers composable formats and composable transformations for deep learning workloads. SparseTIR constructs a search space over these composable components for performance tuning. With these improvements, SparseTIR obtains consistent performance speedups vs vendor libraries on GPUs for single operators: 1.1-3.3x for GNN operators and 1.1-4.4x for sparse transformer operators. SparseTIR also accelerates end-to-end GNNs by 1.1-2.2x for GraphSAGE training and 0.9-26x for RGCN inference.

1 INTRODUCTION
Sparsity is becoming ubiquitous in deep learning due to the application of deep learning to graphs and the need for more efficient backbone models. Graph neural networks (GNNs) [27, 37, 59] have made substantial progress in modeling relations in social networks, proteins, point clouds, etc., using highly sparse matrices. Sparse transformers [4, 10, 13] reduce both the time and space complexity of transformers [58] by making the attention mask sparse using manually designed and moderately sparse matrices.

Existing vendor libraries, such as cuSPARSE [16], dgSPARSE [20] and Intel MKL [61], support only a few sparse operators. As such, they fail to accelerate rapidly evolving workloads such as GNNs on heterogeneous graphs [34, 51, 66] and hypergraphs [23]. Manually optimizing sparse operators can be difficult and tedious. Sparse matrices are stored in compressed formats, and programmers must write manual code to compress or decompress coordinates to access non-zero elements. Furthermore, the compressed sparse formats vary, and operators designed for one format cannot generalize to others. Therefore, we need a more scalable and efficient approach to developing optimized sparse operators.

Sparse tensor compilers, such as MT1 [7] and TACO [39], greatly simplify the development of sparse operators by decoupling format specification and format-agnostic computation descriptions. However, applying sparse compilation to deep learning must overcome two major challenges. First, modern deep learning workloads are quite diverse, making them hard to fit into a single sparse format pattern provided by existing solutions. Second, hardware backend are evolving and becoming heterogeneous, making it hard for single-shot compilers to keep up with the latest hardware and system advances.

Figure 1: Format composability enables us to leverage multiple formats for different parts in sparse pattern we face in deep learning, and maximize the use of underlying hardware resources.

Our key observation is that we can resolve all challenges by introducing two forms of composability:
Single Format

Composable Formats

Format composability. We propose to go beyond the single format option provided by most existing solutions to composable formats (Figure 1) that store different parts of a sparse matrix in the different formats that best fit their local patterns. The compilation process decomposes the original computations into sub-computation routines to enable efficient executions on each local pattern that better match the characteristics of the corresponding deep learning workloads.

Transformation composability. We reconfigure the single-shot sparse tensor program compilation process into a composable set of program transformations. Additionally, we enable a design that incorporates existing loop-level abstractions in dense tensor compilers. This design lets us define our own transformations for sparse data while reusing hardware-specific optimizations (such as tensorization and GPU mapping) from existing solutions, increasing our overall efficiency to incorporate advances in hardware backends.

Combining both forms of compositability, we propose SparseTIR, an abstraction that generates efficient sparse operators for deep learning. Our contributions include the following:

- We propose an intermediate representation (IR) with composable formats and composable transformations to accelerate sparse operators by decomposing formats and specifying schedules.
- We build a performance-tuning system that searches over the parameter space of possible composable formats and composable transformations.
- We evaluate SparseTIR on several important sparse deep learning workloads.

SparseTIR offers consistent speedup for single operators relative to vendor libraries on GPUs: 1.1-3.3x for GNN operators and 1.1-4.4x for sparse transformer operators. SparseTIR also accelerates end-to-end GNNs by 1.1-2.2x for GraphSAGE [27] training and by 0.9-26x for RGCN [51] inference.

2 SYSTEM OVERVIEW

This section provides an overview of SparseTIR. Figure 2 summarizes our overall design and compare it with existing approaches. The figure’s left side shows the design of most existing sparse tensor compilers [53]. Their inputs are (1) tensor expressions, (2) format annotations/specifications that allow only a single format for each matrix, and (3) user-defined schedules. Schedules are tracked in intermediate data structures, such as provenance graphs or schedule trees, and then used to guide code generation. The effects of schedules cannot be materialized immediately; we refer to such compilation flows as single-shot compilation: the complexity of code-generation and scheduling grows significantly as the possible schedule set becomes larger due to the coupling of schedules primitives and intermediate data structures. Though tensor compilers such as Halide [48] and TVM [11] implement schedule primitives and code generation on multiple backends, it is difficult to re-use these infrastructures because code generation is coupled with provenance graph data structure in single-shot sparse compilers.

SparseTIR builds on top of these previous approaches, and introduces a design that enables composable formats and composable transformations. It contains three IR stages. The first stage presents computation in coordinate space, where we describe sparse tensor computations; like previous work, we decouple format specification
and computations. Unlike a single-shot sparse compiler that accepts a single format for each sparse tensor, SparseTIR lets users specify composable formats. The second stage describes computation in non-zero position space. The last stage of SparseTIR is a loop-level IR in existing tensor compilers, such as TVM [11], AKG [70] and the affine dialect in MLIR [57]. We design two passes on the IR, namely, sparse iteration lowering and sparse buffer lowering, to transform code from stage I to stage II and stage II to stage III, respectively.

Instead of single-shot compilation, all schedules in SparseTIR are performed as composable program transformations (which do not change the stage of the IR) on the IR instantly. The composable design lets us transform the IR step-by-step and stage-by-stage. To manipulate the coordinate space computation in stage I IR, we can define new schedules as composable transformations applied to stage I (i.e., stage I schedules). For stages compatible with target loop-level IR, we can apply schedules defined for backend tensor compilers (i.e., stage II schedules). Notably, format decomposition can also be formulated as a program transformation at stage I (see §3.2.1).

SparseTIR constructs a joint search space of composable formats and composable transformations for performance tuning of sparse operators. Users can customize the parameterized search space by specifying format and schedule templates based on their domain-specific knowledge about the operator and sparse tensor characteristics. When the sparse structure is present at compile-time, we can search for the best formats and schedules that achieve optimal runtime performance in advance. Though the compilation might take some time due to the large search space, the overhead can be amortized because the compiled operator will be re-used many times during training or inference for a fixed sparse structure (as is typical in deep learning).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We introduce the SparseTIR design of each stage and compiler passes in Section 3. In Section 4 we evaluate our system in real world sparse deep learning workloads. Section 5 positions SparseTIR relative to related work. Finally, we discuss future work in Section 6 and conclude our work in Section 7.

3 OUR APPROACH
In this section, we introduce the language constructs in SparseTIR, then describe each compilation stage and transformations in the order they appeared in the flow.

3.1 Language Constructs
The SparseTIR has three major components: axes, sparse buffers and sparse iterations.

Axes. An axis is a data structure that defines sparse iteration spaces, which generalize the idea of abstraction levels in previous work [14]. Each axis in SparseTIR has two orthogonal attributes, dense/sparse and fixed/variable, denoting whether the index of non-zero elements in the axis is contiguous or not and whether the number of non-zero elements in the axis is fixed or not. Sparse axes are associated with a `indptr` field that points to the address of the indices pointer array; variable axes are associated with an `indices` field that points to the address of the indices array. Each axis has a parent field that directs to the axis it depends on; a dense-fixed axis has no dependency, and its parent field is always set to none. Axis metadata includes its indices' data type, maximum length, number of accumulated non-zeros in this dimension (if variable), and number of non-zeros per row in this dimension (if fixed).

Sparse buffers. A sparse buffer is SparseTIR's data structure for a sparse matrix. We use defined axes to compose the format specification of sparse matrices. We split sparse structure-related auxiliary data and values: axes store auxiliary data, and sparse buffers store only values. Figure 4 shows the decoupled storage of sparse buffers/axes in the Sampled Dense-Dense Matrix Multiplication (SDDMM) [45] operator. This design lets us re-use auxiliary data if several sparse buffers share the sparse layout (e.g., B and A in SDDMM). The composition of axes is expressive to describe various sparse formats, including CSR, BSR, DIA, ELL, Ragged Tensor [18], etc.

Sparse iterations. Sparse iterations create iterators over a space composed of defined axes. The body of sparse iterations can be any statements (including a sparse iteration itself) that operates on elements in sparse buffers. Notably, we do not pose any restrictions on the indices of sparse buffer access; this means we can write $A[i + j], B[X[i]]$ inside a sparse iteration body, a feature not supported in previous work. A single SparseTIR program could contain multiple sparse iterations, allowing us to describe a decomposed computation.

Figure 3 shows how to define these constructs in SparseTIR for the SDDMM operator. In a SparseTIR program, axes are used to construct both sparse buffers and sparse iterations. This design lets us iterate over a sparse iteration space that is not bound to any sparse buffers.

3.2 Stage I: Coordinate Space Computation
In stage I SparseTIR defines sparse computations inside sparse iterations, where we iterate over non-zero elements and access

---

1SparseTIR has round-trip compatibility with Python, and this paper presents only its Python form.
sparse buffers in the coordinate space. At this stage, we can define program transformations, such as format decomposition and sparse iteration fusion, that manipulate only the three constructs of the SparseTIR.

3.2.1 Format Decomposition. Format decomposition is a transformation that decomposes computations for composable formats (introduced in Section 1). The transformation accepts a list of format descriptions and rewrites the IR according to these formats. Figure 5 shows the generated IR for the Sparse Matrix-Matrix multiplication (SpMM) operation after decomposing the computation in the CSR format to a computation in the BSR format, with block size 2 and an ELLPACK format with 2 non-zero columns per row. In addition to SpMM computations on the new formats, another two sparse iterations that copy data from original to new formats and for computations on these new formats are generated, as well. In practice, we perform data copying at the pre-processing step to avoid the overhead of run-time format conversion.

Unlike work in Chou et al. [15], which automatically generates code that infers indices and indices pointers array of output format at runtime, SparseTIR requires users to pre-compute these values and specify them as input arguments, which simplifies our design. Users need only a dozen lines of Python code to infer these indices in our evaluations.

3.2.2 Stage I Schedules. We define two schedule primitives at stage I, sparse_reorder and sparse_fuse.

Sparse reorder. The order of sparse axes in the sparse iteration influences the order of generated loops in stage II. This primitive enables manipulation of the order of sparse axes.

Sparse fuse. This schedule primitive fuses several iterators in a given sparse iteration into one. It is helpful when we want a single loop rather two nested loops that iterate over all non-zero elements, such as in the SDDMM [45] operator.

Figure 6 shows how stage I schedules transform the IR.

3.3 Stage II: Position Space Computation
Stage II SparseTIR removes the sparse iteration constructs and creates iteration space using nested loops. Unlike stage I, stage II operates on position space instead of coordinate space, with “position” referring to an element’s non-zero index. For example, if the coordinate of the first 4 non-zero elements in a row is {1, 3, 9, 10}, the position of 9 is 2 (assuming the index is 0-based). In stage II we can define program transformations that manipulate loops (e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I IR of SpMM operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I = dense_fixed(n, &quot;int32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J = sparse_variable(I, n, nnz), (indptr, indices), &quot;int32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI = dense_fixed(n, &quot;int32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K = dense_fixed(float_size, &quot;int32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = match_sparse_buffer(I, J, K, &quot;float32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = match_sparse_buffer(I, J, K, &quot;float32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C = match_sparse_buffer(I, J, K, &quot;float32&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with sp_iter([I, J, K], "SSS", "spmm") as [i, j, k]:

with init():

C[i, k] = 0.0


Figure 5: Format decomposition for SpMM. New axes and sparse buffers are created for decomposed formats BSR and ELL. New sparse iterations are generated to copy data from original to new formats and for computations on these new formats.

Figure 4: Internal storage of axes and sparse buffers in an SDDMM: $B_{ij} = X_{ij} A_{ij} Y_{ij}$. Sparse buffers store their axes’ composition and pointers to their value; axes store dense/sparse and fixed/variable attributes, metadata, their dependent axes, and pointers to indices and indptr arrays.
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Sparse iteration in Stage I

with \texttt{sp_iter}([K, I, J], “SSR”, “sddmm”) as \([k, i, j]\):
...

Stage I IR (after iteration fusion)

with \texttt{sp_iter}([K, I, J], “SSR”, “sddmm”) as \([k, i, j]\):
with \texttt{fuse}(I, J) as \([j, i]\):
...

Stage I IR (after reorder)

sparse_reorder([K, I, J])

Stage I IR (after fusion)

Sparse iteration in Stage I

with \texttt{sp_iter}([I, J], “RSS”, “sddmm”) as \([i, j]\):
...

Stage I IR

with \texttt{sp_iter}([I, J, K], “SSR”, “sddmm”) as \([k, i, j]\):

Stage II IR

I = \texttt{dense\_fixed}(m, “int32”)
J = \texttt{sparse\_variable}((nt, nns_1), \{j\_indptr, j\_indices\}, “int32”)

Sparse iteration in Stage II

with \texttt{sp_iter}([K, I, J], “RSS”, “sddmm”) as \([k, i, j]\):

Figure 6: Stage I schedules sequentially applied to stage I IR.

Figure 7: Example of auxiliary buffer materialization. Sparse buffers storing auxiliary information are created.

Stage I IR

\begin{align*}
I &= \texttt{dense\_fixed}(m, “int32”) \\
J &= \texttt{sparse\_variable}((n, nns_1), \{J\_indptr, J\_indices\}, “int32”) 
\end{align*}

Stage II IR

\begin{align*}
I &= \texttt{dense\_fixed}(m, “int32”) \\
J &= \texttt{sparse\_variable}((n, nns_1), \{J\_indptr, J\_indices\}, “int32”) \\
J\_dense &= \texttt{dense\_variable}(I, \{m, nns_1\}, \{J\_indptr, “int32\}) \\
J\_indptr &= \texttt{match\_sparse\_buffer}(J\_indices, \{I, J\_dense\}, “int32”) \\
J\_indices &= \texttt{match\_sparse\_buffer}(J\_indices, \{I, J\_dense\}, “int32”) \\
\texttt{assume\_buffer\_domain}(J\_indptr, \{0, n, 1\}) \\
\texttt{assume\_buffer\_domain}(J\_indices, \{0, n, 1\}) \\
\end{align*}

3.3.1 Sparse Iteration Lowering. This pass transforms stage I IR to stage II IR. It consists of the following 3 steps.

Step 1: Auxiliary buffer materialization. Pointers to the indices pointer array and indices array are specified as arguments when creating axes. In stage II we need to declare these auxiliary buffers explicitly to access their value when determining loop range and translating coordinates. Figure 7 shows how the materialization works. In addition to auxiliary buffers, we also create hints that indicate the domain of buffer values; these are used for integer set analysis in stage II when performing schedules.

Figure 8: Nested loop generation in sparse iteration lowering. One loop is emitted per axis in the sparse iteration.

Step 3: Coordinate translation. This step rewrites the indices used to access sparse buffers from coordinate space to non-zero position space to bridge the semantic gap between stages I and II. Figure 9 shows an example; assume \([I, J, K]\) is a chain of dependent axes. A is a sparse buffer whose axis on second dimension is \(L\), and we have already translated the index of the first dimension from coordinate space (\(coord_1\)) to position space (\(pos_1\)). Suppose the original index on the second dimension is \(g(i, j, k)\), which was defined in coordinate space.

To rewrite it to position space, we must first decompress the coordinates corresponding to positions \(i, j, k\) by function \(f\), which either returns the identity (for dense axes) or looks up the indices array (for sparse axes):

\[
f(K, x) = \begin{cases}
    x & \text{is-dense}(K) \\
    K\_indices[i][j][k] & \text{is-sparse}(K)
\end{cases}
\]

Then, we apply the \(g\) to compute the coordinate on the second dimension. Finally, we compress the coordinate to position space by \(f^{-1}\), which either returns the identity (for dense axes) or looks up the position of a given coordinate in the last dimension of the indices buffer (for sparse axes):

\[
f^{-1}(L, x) = \begin{cases}
    x & \text{is-dense}(L) \\
    \{\text{lookup}(L\_indices[pos_1][:], x) & \text{is-sparse}(L)
\end{cases}
\]

Like previous work [53], the coordinate lookup is computed using a binary search in SparseTIR. We create nested loops and temporary buffers to perform binary search and store results. This design avoids duplicate computation when a lookup query is requested multiple times. The binary search can be computed either at run-time or pre-processed in another kernel, depending on how the user schedules computations in stage II.

\footnote{A special case is a sparse iteration (e.g., \(i, j \in (I, J)\)) that exactly matches the sparse buffer access \([A(i, j), A(i, J)]\); in this case we can directly return \(i\) and \(j\) when translating the first and second index.}

unroll/split/reorder/vectorize), computation bodies (e.g., tensorize, compute-inline), and buffers (e.g., cache-read/write).

Figure 9: Sparse buffer coordinate space.

Step 2: Nested loop generation. This step converts sparse iterations in stage I to nested loops in stage II: we emit one loop per axis in the sparse iteration. The generated loops start from 0, and the extent is determined by whether the axis is fixed or variable. They are separated by block constructs, which set up boundaries to avoid cross-block loop reordering. The body of original sparse iterations is kept in the innermost emitted blocks.

Figure 8 shows the emitted nested loop structures of different sparse iterations. In the first case, the loops \(I\) and \(J\) cannot not be reordered in stage II because they are separated by a block; in the second case, we fuse \(I, J\) and emit only one loop \((ij)\).
3.4 Stage III: Loop-Level IR

Stage III removes all SparseTIR constructs. It keeps only the nested loop structures whose body includes statements that operate on flattened buffers. This stage should be compatible with loop-level IR in existing tensor compilers. In practice, we select the existing loop-level IR in Apache TVM \[11\].

3.4.1 Sparse Buffer Lowering. Sparse buffer lowering removes all axes, flattens all multi-dimensional sparse buffers to 1-dimension, and rewrites memory access to these buffers. Suppose the original sparse buffer $A$ is composed of axes $\{A_i\}_{j=1}^n$. For memory access $A[x_1, ..., x_n]$, the overall offset after flattening is computed by:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \text{is}_\text{leaf}(A_i) \times \text{offset}(i) \times \text{stride}(i + 1),
$$

where $\text{is}_\text{leaf}(A_i)$ means that if axis $A_i$ has no dependence in $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^n$, offset and stride are defined as:

$$
\text{offset}(i) = \begin{cases} 
  x_i & \text{is}_\text{root}(A_i) \\
  A_{i, \text{indptr}[j] + x_i} & A_j \text{ is parent of } A_i
\end{cases}
$$

$$
\text{stride}(i) = \begin{cases} 
  1 & \text{nnz}(\text{Tree}(A_i)) \times \text{stride}(i + 1) \text{ is}_\text{root}(A_i) \\
  \text{stride}(i + 1) & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
$$

where $\text{nnz}(\text{Tree}(A_i))$ refers to the number of non-zero elements of the sparse iteration space composed by the tree with $A_i$ as its root. Figure 10 shows an example of sparse buffer lowering: axes $I$ and $J$ are removed, and sparse buffers $A$, $B$, $C$ are flattened. The buffer access $A[i, j]$ is translated to $A[J_{\text{indptr}}[i] + j]$ by equation 3.

![Figure 10: Sparse buffer lowering: sparse constructs are totally removed, and memory accesses are flattened to 1-dimension.](https://tvm.apache.org/docs/reference/api/python/tir.html#tvm.tir.Schedule)

3.5 Target-Specific Code Generation

SparseTIR re-uses the backend provided by existing tensor compilers for target-specific code generation. The composible format emits multiple kernels, which incur extra kernel-launching overhead on the GPU. We insert a horizontal fusion \[22, 41\] pass to the TVM backend to reduce this overhead.

4 EVALUATION

We now study how composable formats and composable transformations help optimize sparse deep learning workloads in both single operator and end-to-end setting. In summary, compared to vendor libraries, SparseTIR obtains a 1.1-3.3x speedup on GNN operators and a 1.1-4.4x speedup on sparse transformer operators. When used in an end-to-end setting, SparseTIR obtains a 1.1-2.2x speedup on end-to-end GraphSAGE training and a 0.9-26x speedup on end-to-end RGCN inference.

4.1 Experiment Setup

Environment. We evaluate all experiments under two different GPU environments:
We evaluate the performance of most generic operators in GNNs written in PyTorch that integrates a SparseTIR-tuned kernel with Triton [56] is a tiling-based IR for programming neural networks. For end-to-end GNN training, we compare a GraphSAGE model written in PyTorch that integrates a SparseTIR-tuned kernel with Triton [56] is a tiling-based IR for programming neural networks. For SpMM, we select TACO-generated operator, cuSparse [11, 16] as baselines. For SDDMM, we select DGL and PyG implementations because it does not support SDDMM.

4.2 Graph Neural Networks

We evaluate the performance of most generic operators in GNNs on widely used graphs with different sizes. Table 1 describes the graph characteristics; on the table, #types refers to the number of edge types. We use graphs with single types, i.e., homogeneous graphs, to evaluate SpMM, SDDMM and end-to-end training; we use graphs with multiple edge types, i.e., heterogeneous graphs, to evaluate RGCN operators. Homogeneous graphs are represented as a two-dimensional sparse matrix where the first dimension refers to edge types and the last two dimensions refer to source and destination nodes. For transformers, we select Triton’s block-sparse kernel as our baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>#nodes</th>
<th>#edges</th>
<th>#types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cora [52]</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citeseer [52]</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>9,228</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pubmed [52]</td>
<td>19,717</td>
<td>88,651</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppi [27]</td>
<td>44,906</td>
<td>1,271,274</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogbn-ogvia [31]</td>
<td>169,343</td>
<td>1,166,243</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogbn-ogvia [31]</td>
<td>132,534</td>
<td>39,561,252</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reddit [27]</td>
<td>232,965</td>
<td>114,615,892</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIFB [49]</td>
<td>7,626</td>
<td>48,810</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTAG [49]</td>
<td>27,163</td>
<td>148,100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS [49]</td>
<td>94,806</td>
<td>607,800</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogbn-biokg [31]</td>
<td>93,773</td>
<td>4,762,678</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM [40]</td>
<td>1,885,136</td>
<td>5,668,682</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The number of nodes, edges and edge types of graphs we use in GNN experiments.

We design a parametrized composabale format hyb(\(c, k\)) for sparse matrix \(A\) with two parameters \(c\) and \(k\). We partition columns of the sparse matrix by the given factor \(c\), so that each column partition has width \(w\). For each column partition, we collect the rows with length \(l\) that satisfy \(2^{l-1} \leq l \leq 2^{l}\) to bucket \(i\), and we pad the length of these rows to \(2^{l}\); each bucket then forms a sub-matrix with the ELL format. Figure 11 shows a special case, hyb(2, 2).

For bucket \(i\) of each column partition, we group each \(2^{k-1}\) rows and map them to a unique thread block in GPUs. The number of non-zero elements in \(A\) that are processed by each thread block is \(2^{k}\), which is implemented with TVM’s split and bind primitives. We use the schedule proposed in GE-SpMM [35] for each sub-matrix for the remaining dimensions. The column partition in our design is intended to improve cache locality; when processing column partition \(j\), only \(B[jw : (j + 1)w]\) would be accessed for \(B\). Featgraph [33] proposes to apply column partitions for SpMM on CPUs; however, it does not extend the idea to GPUs. Our bucketing technique was designed to achieve compile-time load balancing. In

Figure 11: Example of hyb(2, 2): the original matrix is decomposed to 6 ELLPACK sub-matrices; elements in partion 1 are stored in sub-matrices 1-3, and elements in partion 2 are stored in sub-matrices 4-6.
practice, we fix \( k = \lceil \log_2 \frac{mz}{n} \rceil \), which works well in searching for the best \( c \) over \( \{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\} \).

We evaluate the SpMM written in SparseTIR with and without the proposed hyb format on real world GNN datasets for both V100 and RTX3070.\(^5\) We measure the geometric mean speedup of different SpMM implementations against cuSPARSE for feature size \( d \in \{32, 64, 128, 256, 512\} \). Figure 13 shows our results. The SparseTIR kernel on hyb format obtains a 1.2-3.3x speedup on V100 and a 1.2-2.7x speedup on RTX 3070 compared to cuSPARSE. We also achieve consistently better performance than state-of-the-art open source sparse library dgSPARSE [20], which implements DASpMM [17], and TACO with auto-scheduling enabled [53]. Though TACO also explores compile-time load balancing, it does not support caching the partially aggregated result in registers, which is critical to kernel performance on GPUs, and the irregularity of the CSR format limits the application of loop unrolling. In SparseTIR we can perform these optimizations in stage II schedules.

Importance of composable formats. We evaluate the SparseTIR kernel without format decomposition (see SparseTIR(no-hyb) in the figure). Results suggest that the SparseTIR kernel without format decomposition and per-format scheduling performs generally worse: ogbn-arxiv is a citation network graph whose degrees obey a power-law distribution, and our designed format can perform significantly better because of more efficient load balancing. The degree distribution of the ogbn-proteins graph is centralized, and significantly better because of more efficient load balancing. The performance achieved by using a hybrid format is compensated for the extra overhead introduced by padding. To evaluate the effect of column partitioning, we fix the feature size to 128 and measure several kernel metrics generated by SparseTIR on a Reddit dataset under different column partition settings. Figure 12 shows the results; L1 and L2’s cache hit-rates improve as we increase the number of column partitions. However, more partitions will increase the required memory transactions of the kernel because we will need to update the results matrix \( c \) times if the number of partitions is \( c \). As a result, the benefit of column partitioning saturates as we increase the number of partitions.

### SDDMM

SDDMM can be formulated as the following:

\[
B_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{d} A_{i,k} X_{i,k} Y_{k,j},
\]

where \( A \) and \( B \) are two sparse matrices that share a sparse structure, \( X, Y \) are dense matrices, and \( d \) is the feature size. In SDDMM, the computation per \((i, j)\) is independent, and the workload per position is the same, so we do not worry about load balancing issues if we parallelize the computation by each non-zero \((i, j)\). The sparse\_fuse schedule primitive introduced in Section 3.2.2 helps us iterate over non-zero \((i, j)\) directly instead of first iterating over \( i \) and then iterating over non-zero \( j \) for each \( i \).

PRedS [69] is the state-of-the-art open-source SDDMM implementation, which optimizes SDDMM in two ways. First, it uses vectorized load/store intrinsics in CUDA, such as \texttt{float4/float2}, which improves memory throughput. Second, it performs the reduction in two stages: (1) intra-group reduction, which computes the reduction inside each group independently, and (2) inter-group reduction, which summarizes the reduction result per group. We formulate the optimization in PRedS as composable transformations in SparseTIR with vectorize and \texttt{rfactor} schedule primitives, and we generalize the parameters, such as group size, vector length and number of workloads per threadblock, as tunable parameters. Figure 14 shows the geometric mean speedup of different SDDMM implementations vs our baseline for feature size \( d \in \{32, 64, 128, 256, 512\} \). We do not use composable formats in SDDMM. The baseline we select is DGL 0.8’s SDDMM implementation, which uses the optimization proposed in Featgraph [33]. cuSPARSE’s SDDMM implementation is not optimized for highly sparse matrices such as graphs and thus achieves very low performance. We obtain generally better performance than dgSPARSE [20], which implements the PRedS [69] algorithm, because of the parametrized scheduling space. SparseTIR significantly outperforms the DGL baseline and the TACO scheduled kernel because these implementations do not support two-stage reduction and vectorized load/store.

Relational graph convolution. The relational graph convolutional network (RGCN) [51] is a widely used model for heterogeneous graphs. The core operator in an RGCN is:

\[
Y_{i,r} = \sum_{r=1}^{R} \sum_{j=1}^{d_{in}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} A_{r,i,j} X_{j,k} W_{r,k,i},
\]

where \( R \) refers to the number of relations (edge types) in the heterogeneous graph, \( A \) is a 3D sparse tensor storing a 2D adjacency matrix for each type of graph (edge type is the first dimension), and \( W \) is a 3D dense matrix storing the weight matrix of each type. However, this operator has no corresponding implementations in any vendor libraries. Existing GNN libraries implement the operator in a two-stage approach:

\[
T_{r,i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{d_{in}} X_{j,k} W_{r,k,i},
\]

\[
Y_{i,j} = \sum_{r=1}^{R} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{r,i,j} T_{r,j,i},
\]

\(^5\)We do not include Reddit and ogbn-proteins on RTX3070 due to the out-of-memory issue.
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Figure 13: Normalized speedup against cuSPARSE for SpMM. SparseTIR consistently out-performs vendor libraries and TACO. Comparing SparseTIR(no-hyb) and SparseTIR(hyb) demonstrates the importance of format composability.

Figure 14: Normalized speedup against Featgraph for SDDMM.SparseTIR beats the state-of-the-art vendor library dgSPARSE on average by parametrizing scheduling space.

The first stage is implemented with an irregular batched GEMM operator, while the second stage is implemented via an SpMM operator. Though we could separately optimize both operators with SparseTIR, a more direct way is to implement and optimize the entire operator in a single kernel. We implement this operator in SparseTIR and measure its performance in end-to-end RGCN inference setting, with a feature size fixed at 16. Compared to the state-of-the-art Graphiler compiler, we obtain a 0.9-26x speedup on V100 and a 1.0-13x speedup on RTX 3070; see Figure 15. We also consume much less GPU memory because we do not need to store the intermediate result $T$ in two-stage implementations.

End-to-end GraphSAGE training. We also integrate SparseTIR-generated SpMM operators in a GraphSAGE[27] model written in PyTorch and compare the end-to-end speedup to DGL. Figure 17 shows that we obtain a 1.09-2.16x speedup on V100 and a 1.08-1.23x speedup on RTX 3070.

4.3 Sparse Transformers

Sparse transformers use batched SpMM:

$$Y_{b,i,k} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{b,i,j} X_{b,j,k},$$

and batched SDDMM:

$$B_{b,i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^{d} A_{b,i,j} X_{b,i,k} Y_{b,j,k},$$

where there is batch dimension $b$ in the front of each matrix. The batch dimension is also known as the “head” in the context of multi-head attention in the transformer [58]. The sparse matrices used in sparse transformers are mostly manually designed and have a block-sparse pattern to better utilize tensor cores in modern GPUs. We select two examples: Longformer [4] and Pixelated Butterfly Transformer [10], whose sparse structures are band matrix and butterfly matrix [46], respectively. We implement the batched-SpMM and batched-SDDMM operators for both CSR and BSR formats. For BSR operators, we use the tensorize primitive during stage II IR schedules to use tensorized instructions in CUDA.

---

6We include the datasets that would encounter out-of-memory issues during training.
Figure 15: Normalized speedup against Graphiler on RGCN. The SparseTIR-generated fused kernel is significantly faster than Graphiler and other frameworks.

Figure 16: GPU memory footprint for RGCN inference. SparseTIR saves significantly more memory due to kernel fusion.

Figure 17: Normalized speedup of PyTorch+SparseTIR against DGL on end-to-end GraphSAGE training.

Figure 18 shows different implementations’ speedup against Triton’s [56] block-sparse operator. We fix the matrix size to 4096 × 4096, batch(head) size to 12, band size to 256, and feature size per head to 64. Results show that SparseTIR-BSR obtains a 1.06-1.12x speedup on multi-head SpMM and a 1.72-4.34x speedup on multi-head SDDMM.

Importance of composable transformations. The performance of SparseTIR-CSR is an order of magnitude slower than SparseTIR-BSR. This difference comes from the use of a tensorize schedule on SparseTIR-BSR that is enabled by our composable transformations.

5 RELATED WORK

Deep learning compilers. Halide [48] and TVM [11, 12] are tensor compilers that decouple kernel description and schedules for dense computation. XLA [19] and Relay [50] proposed computational-graph-level abstractions for deep learning, where we can apply optimizations such as kernel fusion and graph substitution [36]. However, these compilers have limited support for representing and optimizing sparse operators, impeding the wider deployment of sparse deep learning workloads such as GNNs.

while Henry et al. [28] extend this idea to sparse array programming. Taichi [32] decouple data structure and kernel description for physics simulation programming; its compiler optimization focuses on spatial sparse data, unsuitable for DL. COMET [55] and MLIR Sparse Dialect [8] are two MLIR dialects that explore composable IR design for sparse tensor algebra. Both treat sparse tensors with format annotation as first-class members in the IR; however, neither considers decomposable formats. CoRA [22] proposes a compiler infrastructure for ragged tensors [18], which can be viewed as a special case of sparse tensors. The operation splitting in CoRA is also a special case of format decomposition SparseTIR. TeSA [72] proposes sparse annotations for optimizing neural networks with weight/activation sparsity; its annotation is still dense and thus not applicable to highly sparse matrices used in GNNs. Tiramisu [3] supports automatic selection of dense/sparse kernels at computational graph-level. However, it lacks tensor-level sparse code generation.

GNN systems and compilers. PyG [24] and DGL [62] propose programming interfaces for the programming message-passing [26] modules in GNN models. Both frameworks accelerate specific message-passing patterns with vendor libraries and handwritten operators. Featgraph [33] optimizes generic GNN operators with TVM. However, it fails to support more operators because TVM lacks sparsity support. Seastar [65] and Graphiler [67] compile user-defined message-passing functions to their intermediate representations (IR) and then optimize the IR and emit template-based, target-specific code: these templates still have limited expressiveness and cannot consider a wide range of the optimization space. SparseTIR could serve as a backend for these GNN compilers. GNN Advisor [64] proposes a CUDA template for GNN computations and uses graph characteristics to guide the performance tuning of GNN training. QGTC [63] introduces a quantized graph neural network (QGNN) model that could benefit from GPU tensor cores. The contribution of these papers is orthogonal to SparseTIR.

Sparse kernel optimizations. Merge-SpMM [68], ASpT [30], GE-SpMM [35], Sputnik [25] and DA-SpMM [17] explore different schedule spaces for SpMM optimization on GPUs. We carefully examined the optimizations suggested in theses papers for use in SparseTIR and propose a composable abstraction to apply these optimizations within our IR. OSKI [60] is a library that provides automatically tuned sparse operators used in sparse solvers. It focuses on optimizing operators on cache-based, super-scalar architectures such as CPUs, and users cannot define their own operators.

Sparse format optimizations. Pichon et al. [47] propose to reorder rows and columns in 2D sparse matrices to increase the block granularity of sparse matrices. Li et al. [42] study the problem of reordering sparse matrices to improve the spatial and temporal cache locality of operators on them. Mehrabi et al. [44] and Wang et al. [64] propose to reorder rows and columns of sparse matrices to accelerate SpMM on GPUs. These reordering algorithms can act as pre-processing steps for SparseTIR to further discover structure information underlying the sparse matrix and thus improve overall performance.

Hardware-efficient algorithms. ES-SpMM [43] compresses the sparse matrix in GNN to more hardware-friendly ELLPACK format to reduce the amount of computation of GNN inference without performance loss. Network pruning also brings sparsity to deep learning by removing redundant weights in the network [29]. Researchers propose pruning algorithms with block-sparsity [40] and bank-sparsity [9, 74] to better utilize tensor cores in GPUs. With the help of format compositability in SparseTIR, researchers can explore more complex sparse patterns with ideal performance on modern hardware.

6 FUTURE WORK

Automatic scheduling. SparseTIR still requires users to specify schedule templates like they do for the first-generation of Halide and TVM. The Halide auto-scheduler [1], FlexTensor [73], An- sor [71] and Meta-scheduler [54] have been proposed to automatically generate schedule templates for dense tensor compilers. We expect these techniques would also prove helpful for sparse compilation. Searching for the optimal configuration is time consuming if we must re-run the compiled kernel each time. Ahrens et al. [2] propose an asymptotic cost model for sparse tensor algebra to narrow the schedule space of sparse kernels, which could also benefit our work.

Automatic format decomposition. In this paper we explore only manually designed format decomposition rules. We leave automatic format decomposition for future work.

Integration with graph-level IR. SparseTIR models only tensor-level sparsity. However, some MoE (Mixture-of-Experts) based models, such as Switch Transformer [21], exhibit sparsity at the computational graph level. Also, though composable formats could improve the performance of a single operator, they may introduce extra format conversion when placed in a computational graph. Finding the optimal format decomposition plan requires global information. Both ends encourage us to extend the constructs in SparseTIR to graph-level IR, like XLA [19] and Relay [50].

7 CONCLUSION

We introduce SparseTIR, a composable abstraction for sparse operators in deep learning. Its key innovation is the use of composable formats and composable transformations, and together they form the parameter search space for performance tuning. Evaluations on generic sparse deep learning show that SparseTIR achieves significant performance improvements over existing vendor libraries and frameworks.
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