

Computing Sparse Jacobians and Hessians Using Algorithmic Differentiation

Bradley M. Bell¹ and Kasper Kristensen²

¹IHME, University of Washington, Seattle, USA,
bradbell@seanet.com

²DTU Aqua, Technical University of Denmark, DK, kaskr@dtu.dk

November 10, 2021

Abstract

Stochastic scientific models and machine learning optimization estimators have a large number of variables; hence computing large sparse Jacobians and Hessians is important. Algorithmic differentiation (AD) greatly reduces the programming effort required to obtain the sparsity patterns and values for these matrices. We present forward, reverse, and subgraph methods for computing sparse Jacobians and Hessians. Special attention is given to the subgraph method because it is new. The coloring and compression steps are not necessary when computing sparse Jacobians and Hessians using subgraphs. Complexity analysis shows that for some problems the subgraph method is expected to be much faster. We compare C++ operator overloading implementations of the methods in the ADOL-C and CppAD software packages using some of the MINPACK-2 test problems. The experiments are set up in a way that makes them easy to run on different hardware, different systems, different compilers, other test problem and other AD packages. The setup time is the time to record the graph, compute sparsity, coloring, compression, and optimization of the graph. If the setup is necessary for each evaluation, the subgraph implementation has similar run times for sparse Jacobians and faster run times for sparse Hessians.

Keywords: automatic differentiation, sparse, minpack-2, cppad, adolc, c++

AMS classifications: 05C15, 65F50, 90C30

ACM classifications: F.2.2, G.2.2

1 Introduction

This paper concerns the computation of sparse Jacobians and Hessians for a function $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$ that can be evaluated using a computer program. We use $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ to denote the inputs and $y \in \mathbf{R}^m$ the outputs of the program.

1.1 The Computational Graph Representation

We use $v \in \mathbf{R}^\ell$ to denote all intermediate values that depend on the inputs

$$v = (v_1, \dots, v_\ell)^T \in \mathbf{R}^\ell$$

The independent variable subvector (input vector) is

$$x = (v_1, \dots, v_n)^T \in \mathbf{R}^n .$$

The dependent variable subvector (output vector) is

$$y = (v_{\ell-m+1}, \dots, v_\ell)^T \in \mathbf{R}^m .$$

We decompose the computations to a sequence of elementary functions $\phi_k : \mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. For $k = n + 1$ to ℓ

$$v_k = \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]})$$

where the positive integer $a[k]$ and $b[k]$ are the variable index of the left and right operands for the k -th elementary function. It follows that $a[k] < k$ and $b[k] < k$, i.e., computation of the k -th variable only depends on the independent variables and variables that have been computed previously. The variables are nodes in the *computation graph*. Each elementary operation corresponds to two arcs, one from variable $v_{a[k]}$ to variable v_k and the other from variable $v_{b[k]}$ to variable v_k . We also write $a[k] \prec k$ and $b[k] \prec k$ which means variable k directly depends on variables $a[k]$ and $b[k]$. This is very similar to the notation in [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Section 2.2]. Some references call nodes $a[k], b[k]$ predecessors of node k and node k a successor of $a[k], b[k]$; for example see [Gower and Mello, 2014], [Wang et al., 2016].

We represent a unary elementary function using $a[k] = b[k]$ together with a binary function $\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]})$ that does not depend on its second argument. One example of a unary representation is $\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) = \sin(v_{a[k]})$. Another example is $\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) = v_{a[k]}$ which can be used to set $y_i = v_{\ell-m+i} = v_{a[\ell-m+i]}$. It is not necessary to have the extra node for $v_{\ell-m+i}$ in the graph for this purpose but it makes this presentation simpler.


Example 1.1 Consider the computer program defined by the following pseudo code:

```
function  $y = f(x)$ 
   $(v_1, v_2, v_3) = x$ 
   $v_4 = v_1 + v_2$ 
   $v_5 = v_3 * v_4$ 
   $y = (v_4, v_5)$ 
```

The corresponding function $f : \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= x_1 + x_2 \\ f_2(x) &= x_3(x_1 + x_2) \end{aligned}$$

The following is a diagram of the corresponding computational graph:



If the last line of the program pseudo code were changed to $y = v_4$, then $f : \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $f(x) = x_3(x_1 + x_2)$ and the diagram above would not change.

The dimension of the range of ϕ_k might be greater than one, and its domain might be greater than two. For example, in some operator overloaded AD tools it is possible to record the operations for one function and make that function an elementary operation in another function. This is closely related to checkpointing; see [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Tables 12.3, 12.4]. We only include binary elementary functions in order to simplify this presentation.

1.2 Dependency Relation

There may be a difference between sparsity patterns and dependency patterns. For example, suppose that

$$\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v_{a[k]} \leq 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

It follows that, where ϕ_k is differentiable, its derivative is zero. Some AD packages might return zero for the derivative everywhere while others might return $(+\infty, 0)$ when $v_{a[k]} = 0$. In any event, $\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]})$ depends on the value of $v_{a[k]}$. Hence, a dependency pattern might include more possibly non-zero elements than a Jacobian sparsity pattern. For the purpose of this presentation, we do not distinguish Jacobian sparsity patterns and dependency patterns. We use the notation $a[k] \prec k$ and $b[k] \prec k$ to denote the fact that v_k directly depends on $v_{a[k]}$ and $v_{b[k]}$. Furthermore, we use \prec^* to denote the transitive closure of this relation; e.g., if $p \prec q$ and $q \prec k$ then $p \prec^* k$; see [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Section 2.2]. Note that the $\phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]})$ defined above does not depend on $v_{b[k]}$; i.e., it represents a unary function. In the text below, unary functions correspond to the case where ϕ_k does not depend on its second argument and $a[k] = b[k]$.

2 Sparse Jacobians

In this section we present a forward algorithm, reverse algorithm, and reverse subgraph algorithm that compute Jacobian sparsity patterns. We also present an algorithm that obtains a sorted subgraph and discuss computing Jacobians and the computational complexity of the subgraph algorithms.

2.1 Forward Mode Sparsity

We use J to denote the subset of independent variable indices that are of interest, $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. For the independent variable indices, $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we define X_k to be the singleton $\{k\}$, if $k \in J$, otherwise the empty set. For $k > n$ we define X_k to be the indices of independent variables in J that the variable v_k depends on; i.e.,

$$X_k = \begin{cases} \{k\} & \text{if } k \leq n \text{ and } k \in J \\ \emptyset & \text{if } k \leq n \text{ and } k \notin J \\ \{j : j \in J \text{ and } j \prec^* k\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

The forward Jacobian sparsity calculation is given by Algorithm 2.1; see [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Eq. (7.4)]. Note that for unary functions, $a[k] = b[k]$ and the union in the algorithm is not necessary. The sparsity pattern for the Jacobian $f^{(1)}(x)$ is given by the observation that for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j \in J$, and $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$[f_i^{(1)}(x)]_j \neq 0 \Rightarrow j \in X_{\ell-m+i} .$$

Algorithm 1 Forward Jacobian Sparsity

```

{  $X_1, \dots, X_\ell$  } = function( $J$ )
  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ 
    if  $k \in J$  set  $X_k = \{k\}$ 
    else set  $X_k = \emptyset$ 
  for  $k = n + 1, \dots, \ell$ 
    set  $X_k = X_{a[k]} \cup X_{b[k]}$ 

```

We note that there are ℓ sets X_k and at most $|J|$ elements in each of these sets where $|J| \leq n$ is the number of elements in set J .

2.2 Reverse Mode Sparsity

We use I to denote the subset of dependent variable indices that are of interest, $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$. For the corresponding variable indices $k \in \{\ell - m + 1, \dots, \ell\}$ we define Y_k to be the singleton $\{k - \ell + m\}$, if $k - \ell + m \in I$, otherwise the empty set. For $k \leq \ell - m$ we define Y_k to be the indices of dependent variables that the variable in I that are affected by v_k ; i.e.,

$$Y_k = \begin{cases} \{k - \ell + m\} & \text{if } k > \ell - m \text{ and } k - \ell + m \in I \\ \emptyset & \text{if } k > \ell - m \text{ and } k - \ell + m \notin I \\ \{i \in I : k \prec^* \ell - m + i\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

We use $\overset{\cup}{=}$ for the operator that sets the left hand side to the right hand side union the previous value of the left hand side. The reverse Jacobian sparsity calculation is given by Algorithm 2.2; see [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Eq. (7.8)]. Note that for unary functions, $a[k] = b[k]$ and the second union in the algorithm is not necessary. The sparsity pattern for the Jacobian $f^{(1)}(x)$ is given by the observation that for $i \in I$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$[f_i^{(1)}(x)]_j \neq 0 \Rightarrow i \in Y_j .$$

We note that there are ℓ sets Y_k and at most $|I|$ elements in each of these sets where $|I| \leq m$ is the number of elements in set I .

2.3 Reverse Subgraph Sparsity

We call this a reverse subgraph method because on each pass through the graph it only visits the nodes that affect a selected dependent variable. (A

Algorithm 2 Reverse Jacobian Sparsity

```

{  $Y_1, \dots, Y_\ell$  } = function( $I$ )
  for  $k = \ell, \dots, \ell - m + 1$ 
    if  $k - \ell + m \in I$  set  $Y_k = \{k - \ell + m\}$ 
    else set  $Y_k = \emptyset$ 
  for  $k = \ell - m, \dots, 1$ 
    set  $Y_k = \emptyset$ 
  for  $k = \ell - m, \dots, 1$ 
    set  $Y_{a[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} Y_k$ 
    set  $Y_{b[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} Y_k$ 

```

forward subgraph method would only visit nodes that are affected by a selected independent variable.) We present two versions of the algorithm. The first is the ‘pattern only’ variant which finds the sparsity pattern of the Jacobian matrix. The second variant is an extension that finds the actual subgraph required to calculate the non-zero values of the Jacobian.

We use $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ to denote the subset of dependent variable indices that are of interest. We use $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ to denote the subset of independent variable indices that are of interest. The set S_i accumulates the independent variables in J that affect the dependent variable $y_i = v_{\ell-m+i}$. The stack K contains the nodes in the subgraph that have not yet been processed for this independent variable index i . Let $\{X_k\}$ be the output corresponding to Algorithm 2.1 with input J . It is not necessary to have the sequence of sets $\{X_k\}$, just the integer sequence $\{c_k\}$ initialized by

if $X_k = \emptyset$ **set** $c_k = m + 1$ **else set** $c_k = 0$.

The value $c_k = i < m + 1$ is used to indicate that node k has already been processed for this independent variable index i . The reverse subgraph Jacobian sparsity calculation is defined by Algorithm 2.3.

The input value for the sequence $\{c_k\}$ can be computed using Algorithm 2.1 with the sets X_k replaced by integer values c_k that are $m + 1$ for empty X_k and 0 for non-empty X_k . The complexity of this calculation is $O(\ell)$, ℓ is the number of nodes in the graph. Note that for unary functions, $a[k] = b[k]$ and the condition for the second if block in the algorithm is false. The sparsity pattern for the Jacobian $f^{(1)}(x)$ is given by the observation that for $i \in I$, $j \in J$, and $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$[f_i^{(1)}(x)]_j \neq 0 \Rightarrow j \in S_i .$$

Algorithm 3 Reverse Subgraph Jacobian: Return Sparsity Pattern

```

{ $S_i : i \in I$ } = function( $I, c_1, \dots, c_\ell$ )
  for  $i \in I$ 
    set done =  $i$ , ignore =  $m + 1$ 
    set  $K = \emptyset$ 
    set  $S_i = \emptyset$ 
    push  $\ell - m + i$  into  $K$ 
    while  $K \neq \emptyset$ 
      pop  $k$  from  $K$ 
      if  $c_{a[k]} \notin \{\text{done}, \text{ignore}\}$ 
        set  $c_{a[k]} = \text{done}$ 
        if  $a[k] \leq n$  set  $S_i \stackrel{\cup}{=} \{a[k]\}$ 
        else push  $a[k]$  into  $K$ 
      if  $c_{b[k]} \notin \{\text{done}, \text{ignore}\}$ 
        set  $c_{b[k]} = \text{done}$ 
        if  $b[k] \leq n$  set  $S_i \stackrel{\cup}{=} \{b[k]\}$ 
        else push  $b[k]$  into  $K$ 

```

We note that there are $|I|$ sets S_i , at most $|J|$ elements in each of these sets, and $|I| \leq m$, $|J| \leq n$. We contrast this with the forward and reverse mode sparsity patterns which have ℓ sets; i.e., a set for each node in the graph.

Remark 2.1 *Algorithm 2.3 is a non-recursive depth-first search in reverse direction from each dependent variable. It uses a mark vector c , of already processed nodes, to avoid multiple placements of the same node in the stack K . The mark vector need not be cleared between consecutive searches because the dependent variable index is used as unique mark for each search. This is important when the subgraph is much smaller than the full graph. The ‘pop k from K ’ in the algorithm could be replaced by extracting any element from K and the algorithm would still work. However, extracting the most recently pushed element (the pop) reduces the worst case space requirement for K from l , the size of the full graph, to the maximum vertex depth of the graph.*

2.4 Reverse Subgraph Sorting

Algorithm 2.3 computes the sparsity patterns $\{S_i : i \in I\}$. For each i , the subgraph corresponding to the node order of the pops from K would have to

be sorted in dependency order to be used for computations. For example, to calculate reverse mode derivatives along the subgraph a dependency order is required. In a worst case scenario, the subgraphs are as big as the full graph and the cost of a reverse sweep is $O(l)$. The cost of sorting the subgraph is $O(l \times \log(l))$. Hence, the sorting could asymptotically become expensive compared to other parts of the algorithm. It is therefore relevant to avoid the sort. With a minor modification of Algorithm 2.3 we can directly obtain a dependency sorted subgraph. If $v_{d[1]}, \dots, v_{d[|G|]}$ is the ordering for a subgraph G , we say that G is *dependency sorted* or *topologically sorted* if

$$v_{d[p]} \prec^* v_{d[q]} \Rightarrow p < q.$$

The main change to the algorithm is as follows: When the top of the stack is a node, for which all the nodes it depends on are already in the subgraph, the top node of the stack is moved to the end of the subgraph. A new mark $-i$ is used to signify that a node has been moved to the subgraph. The result is that the nodes in the subgraph are always dependency sorted.

Remark 2.2 *Algorithm 2.4 can be used to find all the subgraphs, one by one, as needed to perform a full Jacobian calculation. When a G_i has been used for a sweep it is not needed anymore and can be discarded. Note that G_i is only guaranteed to be dependency sorted. In particular, one cannot assume that the independent variable indices (node indices $\leq n$) in the sparsity pattern of the i -th row of the Jacobian are at the beginning of G_i .*

2.5 Computing Jacobians

Once a sparsity pattern for a Jacobian is available, a row (column) compression technique could be used to by reverse mode (forward mode) to multiple rows (columns) of the Jacobian during one pass of the computational graph. This requires an approximate solution of a graph coloring problem; see [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Eq. 8.6 and Section 8.3], [Coleman and Verma, 1998].

The reverse subgraph Jacobian method does not require coloring or a compression step. In this way it is similar to the edge pushing algorithm; see [Petra et al., 2018], [Gower and Mello, 2014]. Reference [Gower and Mello, 2014] defines the apex-induced subgraph corresponding to a fixed node as the nodes that the fixed node depends on (plus the corresponding arcs). The subgraphs in this paper are apex-induced subgraphs corresponding to dependent variables. The subgraph Jacobian calculation method for a selected dependent variable is the same as for normal reverse pass, except that only

Algorithm 4 Reverse Subgraph Jacobian: Return Sorted Subgraph

```

{ $G_i : i \in I$ } = function( $I, c_1, \dots, c_\ell$ )
  for  $i \in I$ 
    set visited =  $i$ , done =  $-i$ , ignore =  $m + 1$ 
    set  $G_i = \emptyset, K = \emptyset$ 
    push  $\ell - m + i$  into  $K$ 
    while  $K \neq \emptyset$ 
      set  $k = \text{top}(K)$ 
      comment If all inputs to node  $k$  are done move  $k$  to  $G_i$ 
      if  $c_{a[k]} \in \{\text{done, ignore}\}$  and  $c_{b[k]} \in \{\text{done, ignore}\}$ 
        pop  $k$  from  $K$ 
        push  $k$  into  $G_i$ 
        set  $c_k = \text{done}$ 
      else
        comment  $v_{\max}$  may depend on  $v_{\min}$ 
        for  $\nu = \max(a[k], b[k]), \min(a[k], b[k])$ 
          if  $c_\nu \notin \{\text{visited, done, ignore}\}$ 
            if  $\nu \leq n$ 
              push  $\nu$  into  $G_i$ 
              set  $c_\nu = \text{done}$ 
            else
              push  $\nu$  into  $K$ 
              set  $c_\nu = \text{visited}$ 

```

the subset of nodes that affect a selected dependent variable y_i are processed. The subgraph and normal reverse mode calculations are so similar that CppAD uses iterators to implement both calculations with the same code; see [Bell, 2020].

2.6 Complexity of the Subgraph Methods

The asymptotic complexity of the subgraph algorithms 2.3 and 2.4 is easy to assess. Both algorithms loop across subgraphs and nodes in each subgraph. For each subgraph, each subgraph node is visited once in Algorithm 2.3 and twice in Algorithm 2.4. The work per node is bounded by a constant independent of the computational graph because there are no more than two arguments (incoming edges) and one result (variable) for each node. It follows that the complexity of both algorithms is

$$O\left(\sum_{i \in I} |G_i|\right) + O(\ell),$$

whether computing patterns only or numerical entries of the Jacobian. The set I is the independent variables of interest and $|I|$ is less than or equal m . The term $O(\ell)$ is for the complexity of initializing the sequence c_1, \dots, c_ℓ . If few independent variables are of interest, the term $\sum_{i \in I} |G_i|$ could be less than ℓ , the number of nodes in the entire graph.

The formula above tells us that, for a given problem, the efficiency of the subgraph method is not directly determined by sparsity of the Jacobian matrix. What really matters is the amount of overlap between the subgraphs. The less overlap (smaller $|G_i \cap G_j|$) the faster are the algorithms. This is in contrast with the graph coloring approach for which the efficiency is determined by the sparsity pattern of the Jacobian. We highlight these differences by two simple examples:

Example 2.1 *The Jacobian $f^{(1)}(x)$ for this example is a dense matrix. Let A be a random n -by- n matrix and consider the matrix vector multiplication function $f(x) = Ax$. The computational graph essentially consists of n^2 multiply-add instructions. The size of the full graph is thus $O(n^2)$. The size of the i -th subgraph is $O(n)$ because y_i is only affected by row i of A . The time to calculate the Jacobian by each of the methods using n reverse sweeps is:*

Method	Bound
n full sweeps	$O(n^3)$
Coloring	$O(n^3)$
Algorithm 2.3	$O(n^2 \log(n))$
Algorithm 2.4	$O(n^2)$

Clearly, no method can be faster than $O(n^2)$ for this problem. Although this example was chosen to show the benefit of the subgraph methods, it demonstrates that there exist non-sparse problems where Algorithm 2.4 is asymptotically optimal.

Example 2.2 The Jacobian $f^{(1)}(x)$ for this example is the identity matrix plus a matrix that is zero except for column n . Suppose that for $k = 1, \dots, n$, ϕ_k is a unary function (in the sense of this paper) and

$$v_{n+k} = \phi_k(v_{n+k-1}, v_{n+k-1}).$$

Recall that $v_n = x_n$ and define $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ by

$$y_k = v_{2n} + x_k,$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n$. The computational graph of f and all its subgraphs are of size $O(n)$. The sparsity pattern of the Jacobian is $\{n\}$ for the n -th row and $\{n, k\}$ for rows $k = 1, \dots, n-1$. This Jacobian can be recovered using a combination of one forward pass and one reverse pass. The asymptotic complexity of the different methods is:

Method	Bound
n full sweeps	$O(n^2)$
Coloring	$O(n)$
Algorithm 2.3	$O(n^2 \log(n))$
Algorithm 2.4	$O(n^2)$

The subgraph method is inefficient for this problem because of the high subgraph overlap. The coloring approach is most efficient for this example because of the special sparsity pattern.

The examples 2.1 and 2.2 are also useful for testing that implementations of a subgraph algorithm scales as expected for various values of n .

3 Sparse Hessians

In this section we consider computing the sparsity pattern for the Hessian of

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i f_i(x), \quad (1)$$

where $w \in \mathbf{R}^m$. We use I to denote the dependent variable indices for which $w_i \neq 0$; i.e.,

$$i \in I \Leftrightarrow i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \text{ and } w_i \neq 0. \quad (2)$$

In addition, we use J to denote the subset of independent variables that are of interest, $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\{X_k\}$ be the output corresponding to Algorithm 2.1 with input J . Let $\{Y_k\}$ be the output corresponding to Algorithm 2.2 with input I . It is not necessary to have the sequence of sets $\{Y_k\}$, just the reverse mode activity analysis Boolean sequence $\{d_k\}$ defined by

$$d_k = (Y_k \neq \emptyset).$$

Here and below $\partial_p h(u)$ is the partial of h with respect to the p -th component of its argument vector evaluated at u . We use $\partial_{p,q}$ to abbreviate $\partial_p \partial_q$. We say that the elementary function ϕ_k is *left nonlinear* if $\partial_{1,1} \phi_k(u)$ is possibly non-zero for some u . It is *right nonlinear* if $\partial_{2,2} \phi_k(u)$ is possibly non-zero for some u . It is *jointly nonlinear* if $\partial_{1,2} \phi_k(u)$ is possibly non-zero for some u . We assume that $\partial_{1,2} \phi_k(u) = \partial_{2,1} \phi_k(u)$.

3.1 Forward Mode Sparsity

Forward mode for function, derivative, and Hessian values starts with the zero, first, and second order values for the independent variables; i.e., x_j , \dot{x}_j , \ddot{x}_j for $j = 1, \dots, n$. It computes the zero, first, and second order values for the other variables using the following equations for $k = n + 1, \dots, \ell$:

$$\begin{aligned} v_k &= \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \\ \dot{v}_k &= \partial_1 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_{a[k]} + \partial_2 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_{b[k]} \\ \ddot{v}_k &= \partial_1 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \ddot{v}_{a[k]} + \partial_2 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \ddot{v}_{b[k]} \\ &\quad + \partial_{1,1} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_{a[k]}^2 + \partial_{2,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_{b[k]}^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \partial_{1,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_{a[k]} \dot{v}_{b[k]}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The forward mode Hessian sparsity calculation is defined by Algorithm 3.1. This is similar to the algorithm [Walther, 2008, Algorithm II]. One difference is using $\{d_k\}$ to avoid the ‘dead end’ nodes mentioned in the reference

and nodes that are not included in the Hessian because the corresponding w_i is zero; see Eq 1 and Eq 2. This is probably the reason that the `adolc` implementation has a larger *nnz* (more possibly non-zero values) than the other implementations in Table 5 and Table 7.

The set N_j , in the algorithm, accumulates the nonlinear interactions between the j -th independent variable and other independent variables. The

Algorithm 5 Forward Hessian Sparsity

$\{ N_1, \dots, N_n \} = \mathbf{function}(X_1, d_1, \dots, X_\ell, d_\ell)$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$ **set** $N_j = \emptyset$

for $k = n + 1, \dots, \ell$ **if** d_k

if ϕ_k is left nonlinear

for $j \in X_{a[k]}$ **set** $N_j \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{a[k]}$

if ϕ_k is right nonlinear

for $j \in X_{b[k]}$ **set** $N_j \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{b[k]}$

if ϕ_k is jointly nonlinear

for $j \in X_{a[k]}$ **set** $N_j \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{b[k]}$

for $j \in X_{b[k]}$ **set** $N_j \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{a[k]}$

nonlinear interactions are initialized as empty. This corresponds to the second order values for the independent variables being zero; i.e., $0 = \ddot{x} \in \mathbf{R}^\ell$. In the case where ϕ_k is jointly nonlinear and left nonlinear, the algorithm [Walther, 2008, Algorithm II] uses the fact that $X_k = X_{a[k]} \cup X_{b[k]}$ to combine two of the unions into one. A similar optimization is done for the case where ϕ_k is jointly nonlinear and right nonlinear,

The sparsity pattern for the Hessian $g^{(2)}(x)$ is given by the observation that for $j \in J$, $p \in J$, and $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$[g^{(2)}(x)]_{j,p} \neq 0 \Rightarrow p \in N_j .$$

Given the second order forward mode equation for \ddot{v}_k in Eq 3, a proof for this assertion would be similar to the proof for Algorithm 3.2. The Boolean vector d has length ℓ . There are ℓ sets X_k and at most $|J|$ elements in each of these sets. There are n sets N_j and at most $|J|$ elements in each of these sets.

3.2 Reverse Mode Sparsity

The reverse mode Hessian sparsity calculation is defined by Algorithm 3.2. This is similar to the table [Griewank and Walther, 2008, Table 7.4], but includes more general nonlinear binary functions; e.g., $\text{pow}(x, y) = x^y$. In addition, the algorithm and proof show how to extend the algorithm to functions with more than two arguments.

Algorithm 6 Reverse Hessian Sparsity

```

{  $M_1, \dots, M_\ell$  } = function( $X_1, d_1, \dots, X_\ell, d_\ell$ )
  for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell$  set  $M_k = \emptyset$ 
  for  $k = \ell, \dots, n + 1$  if  $d_k$ 
    set  $M_{a[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} M_k$ 
    set  $M_{b[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} M_k$ 
    if  $\phi_k$  is left nonlinear
      set  $M_{a[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{a[k]}$ 
      set  $M_{b[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{a[k]}$ 
    if  $\phi_k$  is right nonlinear
      set  $M_{a[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{b[k]}$ 
      set  $M_{b[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{b[k]}$ 
    if  $\phi_k$  is jointly nonlinear
      set  $M_{a[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{b[k]}$ 
      set  $M_{b[k]} \stackrel{\cup}{=} X_{a[k]}$ 
  
```

As with Algorithm 3.1 when ϕ_k is both left nonlinear and jointly nonlinear (or right nonlinear and jointly nonlinear) two of the unions in Algorithm 3.2 can be combined into one. We include a theorem and proof for this algorithm below.

Theorem 3.1 For $j \in J$, $p \in J$, and $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$[g^{(2)}(x)]_{j,p} \neq 0 \Rightarrow p \in M_j .$$

Proof: We define the sequence of scalar valued functions F_ℓ, \dots, F_n by

$$F_\ell(v_1, \dots, v_\ell) = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i v_{\ell-m+i} ,$$

and for $k = \ell, \dots, n + 1$,

$$F_{k-1}(v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}) = F_k[v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]})] .$$

The function $F_n(x)$ is the same as $g(x)$. Reverse mode computes the derivatives F_k with respect to its arguments for $k = \ell - 1, \dots, n$. The derivative of F_n with respect to its arguments is equal to $g^{(1)}(x)$ and is the final value for $\bar{x} = (\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n)$ in the algorithm below. We use $\stackrel{\pm}{=}$ for the operator that sets the left hand side to the right hand side plus the previous value of the left hand side.

```

for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell - m$  set  $\bar{v}_k = 0$ 
for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  set  $\bar{v}_{\ell - m + i} = w_i$ 
for  $k = \ell, \dots, n + 1$ 
  set  $\bar{v}_{a[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_1 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k$ 
  set  $\bar{v}_{b[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_2 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k$ 

```

Differentiating the algorithm above with respect to x , and using the forward mode equation for \dot{v}_k in Eq 3, we obtain

```

for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell$  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_k = 0$ 
for  $k = \ell, \dots, n + 1$ 
  comment differentiate setting of  $\bar{v}_{a[k]}$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{a[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_1 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{\bar{v}}_k$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{a[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_{1,1} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{a[k]}$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{a[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_{1,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{b[k]}$ 
  comment differentiate setting of  $\bar{v}_{b[k]}$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{b[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_2 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{\bar{v}}_k$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{b[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_{1,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{a[k]}$ 
  set  $\dot{\bar{v}}_{b[k]} \stackrel{\pm}{=} \partial_{2,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{b[k]}$ 

```

Suppose that in Eq 3 \dot{x} is the j -th elementary vector. It follows that $\dot{\bar{x}}_p = \partial_{p,j} g(x)$ for $p = 1, \dots, n$. We claim that at the beginning of the iteration k , in the algorithm above and in Algorithm 3.2, for $p = 1, \dots, k$

$$\dot{\bar{v}}_p \neq 0 \Rightarrow j \in M_p .$$

Proving this claim will complement the proof of the theorem. For the first iteration, $k = \ell$ and $\dot{\bar{v}}_p = 0$ for all p . Hence the claim is true for $k = \ell$.

Suppose the claim is true at the beginning of the k -th iteration, it suffices to show it is true at the beginning of iteration $k - 1$. If $p \neq a[k]$ and $p \neq b[k]$ then \dot{v}_p and M_p are the same at the beginning of iteration k and $k - 1$, so we are done. The two cases $p = a[k]$ and $p = b[k]$ are symmetric. It suffices to show the case $p = a[k]$; i.e., at the end of iteration k

$$\dot{v}_{a[k]} \neq 0 \Rightarrow j \in M_{a[k]} .$$

If $\dot{v}_{a[k]} \neq 0$ at the beginning of iteration k then by induction $j \in M_{a[k]}$ at the beginning of iteration k and by Algorithm 3.2 it also true at the end of iteration $k - 1$.

Consider the remaining case where $\dot{v}_{a[k]} = 0$ at the beginning of iteration k and $\dot{v}_{a[k]} \neq 0$ at the end of iteration k . This implies that the right hand side was non-zero in one of the three assignments to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ above. This in turn implies that d_k is true (otherwise \bar{v}_k and \dot{v}_k would be zero). Suppose the first assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero,

$$0 \neq \partial_1 \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \dot{v}_k .$$

This implies that $\dot{v}_k \neq 0$ which, by induction, implies that $j \in M_k$ which, by Algorithm 3.2, implies $j \in M_{a[k]}$ at the end of iteration k . This completes the case where the first assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero.

Suppose the second assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero,

$$0 \neq \partial_{1,1} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{a[k]} .$$

This implies that all three terms in the product on the right hand side are non-zero. Hence $\dot{v}_{a[k]} = \partial_j v_{a[k]}(x)$ is non-zero and $j \in X_{a[k]}$. Furthermore ϕ_k is left nonlinear. Hence, at the end of iteration k , $X_{a[k]} \subset M_{a[k]}$ and $j \in M_{a[k]}$. This completes the case where the second assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero.

Suppose the third assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero,

$$0 \neq \partial_{1,2} \phi_k(v_{a[k]}, v_{b[k]}) \bar{v}_k \dot{v}_{b[k]} .$$

This implies that all three terms in the product on the right hand side are non-zero. Hence $\dot{v}_{b[k]} = \partial_j v_{b[k]}(x)$ is non-zero and $j \in X_{b[k]}$. Hence, at the end of iteration k , $X_{b[k]} \subset M_{a[k]}$ and $j \in M_{a[k]}$. This completes the case where the third assignment to $\dot{v}_{a[k]}$ is non-zero. Q.E.D.

Remark 3.1 *The edge pushing algorithm [Gower and Mello, 2014, Algorithm 3.1] is an alternative reverse mode algorithm for computing Hessian*

sparsity patterns. It is fundamentally different from the reverse mode Hessian sparsity algorithm in this paper because it does not use first order forward mode sparsity patterns to reduce the computed index set sizes to the number of independent variables that are of interest.

3.3 Subgraph Sparsity

We are given a function $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m$ and define $g : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i f_i(x) .$$

Using reverse mode we can compute $g^{(1)}(x)$ in $O(\ell)$ operations. In addition we can obtain the corresponding computational graph; for example see [Kristensen et al., 2016, Tape T2 on pp. 7], [Wang et al., 2016, Section 3.1]. We use this computational graph to define the function $h : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$

$$h(x) = g^{(1)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m w_i f_i^{(1)}(x) .$$

The Jacobian of $h(x)$ is the Hessian of $g(x)$. We can apply the reverse subgraph Jacobian algorithm to the computational graph for $h(x)$ to obtain the sparsity pattern for the Hessian $g^{(2)}(x)$.

3.4 Computing Hessians

Once a sparsity pattern for a Hessian is available, the values in the Hessian are computed in a manner similar to how the Jacobians are calculated; see Section 2.5.

4 Experiments

The speed tests reported below were run using the following hardware and software:

```

processor: i5-3470 3.2GHz 64bit
operating system: fedora 34
Linux kernel: 5.13.6
compiler: clang 12.0.0
memory: 8GB
disk: ST500DM002-1BD14
ADOL-C [Griewank et al., 1999]: git hash 25a69c4
CppAD [Bell, 2020]: git hash 5c86b18
ColPack [Gebremedhin et al., 2013]: version v1.0.10
The ADOL-C git hash corresponds to its master branch on 2020-03-31,
the CppAD git hash corresponds to its master branch on 2020-05-23.

```

4.1 CSV File

Each run of the speed test program adds a row to a csv file with the following columns:

KB: This is the average memory usage, in kilobytes, where each kilobyte is 1000 bytes (not 1024 bytes). A separate run of the speed test program by valgrind's massif tool is used to determine these values.

implement:

adolc A forward or reverse algorithm implemented by the ADOL-C package

cppad A forward or reverse algorithm implemented by the CppAD package

subgraph A CppAD implementation of Algorithm 2.3. Note that the potentially faster Algorithm 2.4 is not implemented in CppAD and therefore not part of the test.

problem: This is the `minpack2` test source code used to compute $f(x)$; see [Averick et al., 1992]. The source code was converted to C using `f2c` and then to C++ so it could be used with ADOL-C and CppAD. The available *problem* values are:

dficfj The flow in a channel Jacobian problem

dierfj The incompressible elastic rod Jacobian problem

deptfg The elastic-plastic torsion Hessian problem

dg11fg One Dimensional Ginzburg-Landau Hessian problem

colpack: If true, the ColPack package was used to solve the coloring sub-problem. Otherwise a greedy distance two coloring algorithm (inspired by the algorithm [Gebremedhin et al., 2005, Algorithm 3.2] and implemented in the CppAD package) is used. In either case, if this is a Hessian problem, a special version of the coloring algorithm that takes advantage of the symmetry, is used. The *colpack* option must be true when *implement* is **adolc**. It must be false when *implement* is **subgraph** because it does not use coloring.

indirect: If this is true, an indirect method was used to get more compression out of the coloring problem. It can only be true when *implement* is **adolc** and *problem* corresponds to computing a Hessian. This must be false when *implement* is **cppad** because it does not support this recovery option. It must also be false when *implement* is **subgraph** because it does not use a compression technique.

optimize: Was the computation graph was optimized. This must be false when *implement* is **adolc** because it does not have this option.

setup: Does the *sec* result include the setup time; e.g., recording the graph, computing sparsity, coloring, compression, and optimization of the graph. If the computational graph (see Section 1.1) corresponding to a function does not depend on the argument to the function, the setup operations can be preformed once and re-used for any argument value. Note that optimization is not included in the setup time when *implement* is **adolc**. Coloring and compression are not included when *implement* is **subgraph**.

reverse: If true (false) reverse mode (forward mode) was used for computing both the sparsity pattern and derivative values. This option must be true when *implement* is **subgraph**.

onepass: If true, the derivative values were computed using one pass of graph with multiple directions at the same time. Otherwise, each directional derivative is computed using a separate pass. This option must be false when *implement* is **subgraph**. The *onepass* option must be true when *implement* is **adolc** and *reverse* is false.

n: This is the size of the domain space for $f(x)$.

m: This is the size of the range space for $f(x)$. If $m = 1$ ($m > 1$), this is a Hessian (Jacobian) problem.

nnz: This is the number of possibly non-zero values in sparse matrix calculated by the implementation. For a Jacobian problem, the matrix is

the entire Jacobian. For a Hessian problem, the matrix is the upper triangle of the Hessian. Note that one implementation may compute a more efficient sparsity pattern than another (have fewer possibly non-zero values).

sec: This is the number of seconds for each calculation of the sparse Jacobian or Hessian.

4.2 Result Tables

There is one table for each *problem* and value for *setup*. For each *implement*, only the combination of options that result in the smallest *sec* (smallest time and fastest execution) is included in the table. Given this selection, options that are the same for all the implementations in a table are reported in the caption at the top of the table. The other options are reported in each row of the table. The rows for each table are sorted so that the *sec* column is monotone non-decreasing.

4.2.1 Jacobian Without Setup

Table 1: *problem=dficfj*, *setup=false*, *indirect=false*, *n=3200*, *m=3200*, *nnz=24787*

KB	implement	colpack	optimize	reverse	onepass	sec
12108	adolc	true	false	false	true	0.00186
13361	cppad	true	true	false	true	0.00233
6480	subgraph	false	true	true	false	0.00586

Table 2: *problem=dierfj*, *setup=false*, *indirect=false*, *n=3003*, *m=3003*, *nnz=31600*

KB	implement	colpack	optimize	reverse	onepass	sec
11561	adolc	true	false	false	true	0.0015
5797	cppad	true	true	false	true	0.00182
4049	subgraph	false	true	true	false	0.00411

Table 1 (Table 2) compares the time, *sec*, and memory, *KB*, required to compute the Jacobian where *problem* is *dficfj* (*dierfj*) and *setup* is false. The *adolc* and *cppad* implementations use the same algorithms, hence their similar run times is not surprising. The *subgraph* implementation takes

about twice as long. (The `subgraph` implementation does not require a sparsity calculation or solving a coloring sub-problem and these tasks are part of the setup for the `adolc` and `cppad` implementations.) The number of possibly non-zeros in the Jacobian sparsity pattern, nnz , depends on the problem but does not depend on the implementation; i.e., the sparsity pattern efficiency is the same for all the implementations. The fastest option choices for the `cppad` implementation are `optimize` true, `reverse` false, and `onepass` true. Using `colpack` true with the `cppad` implementation is faster for one problem and slower for the other. The `indirect` true option is not available for Jacobian problems. The `onepass` true option results in more memory usage but we have not included those details in the result tables. The `subgraph` implementation uses less memory than the other implementations.

4.2.2 Jacobian With Setup

Table 3: `problem=dficfj`, `setup=true`, `indirect=false`, `optimize=false`, `n=3200`, `m=3200`, `nnz=24787`

KB	implement	colpack	reverse	onepass	sec
9807	adolc	true	false	true	0.0109
18430	cppad	true	false	true	0.013
8859	subgraph	false	true	false	0.0141

Table 4: `problem=dierfj`, `setup=true`, `indirect=false`, `optimize=false`, `n=3003`, `m=3003`, `nnz=31600`

KB	implement	colpack	reverse	onepass	sec
9585	adolc	true	false	true	0.00862
5151	subgraph	false	true	false	0.00887
13645	cppad	false	false	true	0.0116

Table 3 (Table 4) is similar to Table 1 (Table 2) with the difference being that `setup` is true instead of false. The time for the `adolc`, `cppad` and `subgraph` implementations are all close. The fastest option choices for the `cppad` implementation are `optimize` false, `reverse` false, and `onepass` true. Using `colpack` true with the `cppad` implementation is faster for one problem and slower for the other. The `subgraph` implementation uses less memory

than the other implementations.

4.2.3 Hessian Without Setup

Table 5: *problem=deptfg, setup=false, onepass=false, n=3600, m=1*

KB	implement	colpack	indirect	optimize	reverse	nnz	sec
5207	subgraph	false	false	true	true	10680	0.00499
4364	cppad	true	false	true	false	10680	0.00523
15115	adolc	true	true	false	false	14161	0.0226

Table 6: *problem=dgl1fg, setup=false, onepass=false, n=5000, m=1, nnz=10000*

KB	implement	colpack	indirect	optimize	reverse	sec
6086	cppad	true	false	true	true	0.00535
9806	subgraph	false	false	true	true	0.00982
16679	adolc	true	true	false	false	0.0243

Table 5 (Table 6) compares the time, *sec*, and memory, *KB*, required to compute the Hessian where *problem* is *deptfg* (*dgl1fg*) and *setup* is false. The *cppad* and *subgraph* implementations have similar times and the *adolc* implementation takes twice as long. The number of possibly non-zeros in the *adolc* implementation for the *deptfg* problem is significantly larger than in the other implementations; i.e., its sparsity pattern is not as efficient as the other implementations. The fastest option choices for the *cppad* implementation are *colpack* true, *optimize* true, and *reverse* true. The *indirect* true option is not available with the *cppad* implementation. No implementation uses less memory for both problems.

4.2.4 Hessian With Setup

Table 7 (Table 8) is similar to Table 5 (Table 6) with the difference being that *setup* is true instead of false. The *subgraph* implementation is the fastest for this case and the *cppad* implementation is significantly slower. The fastest option choices for the *cppad* implementation are *colpack* true, *optimize* false, and *reverse* true. The *adolc* implementation uses less memory than the other implementations.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Table 7: *problem=deptfg, setup=true, onepass=false, n=3600, m=1*

KB	implement	colpack	indirect	optimize	reverse	nnz	sec
7809	subgraph	false	false	true	true	10680	0.0258
15299	adolc	true	true	false	false	14161	0.0453
4921	cppad	true	false	true	false	10680	0.0843

Table 8: *problem=dgl1fg, setup=true, onepass=false, n=5000, m=1, nnz=10000*

KB	implement	colpack	indirect	optimize	reverse	sec
33709	subgraph	false	false	false	true	0.0603
7917	cppad	true	false	true	false	0.111
19144	adolc	true	true	false	false	0.114

4.2.5 Reproducing Results

The source code that produced the results corresponds to the tag 20210803 of the following git repository:

https://github.com/bradb主ell/sparse_ad .

5 Conclusions

If the computational graph (see Section 1.1) corresponding to a function does not depend on the argument to the function, the setup can be done once and reused many times. In the other case, when the setup operations are computed for each argument to a sparse Jacobian, all the implementation have similar timing results. When computing the setup operations for each argument to a sparse Hessian, the **subgraph** implementation is significantly faster and **cppad** is significantly slower.

Further testing is called for. We have provided a GitHub repository with the source code used to obtain the results in this paper. This facilitates reproduction of the results as well as extension of the tests to other cases. Other cases include different computer hardware, operating systems, compilers, and versions of the AD packages. The tests can also be extended to other AD packages as well as other problems and problem sizes. The tests also provide example source code that implements the algorithms presented in this paper.

References

- [Averick et al., 1992] Averick, B. M., Carter, R. G., Moré, J. J., and Xue, G.-L. (1992). The MINPACK-2 test problem collection. Technical Report Preprint MCS-P153-0692, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory.
- [Bell, 2020] Bell, B. M. (2020). *CppAD: a package for C++ algorithmic differentiation*. Computational infrastructure for operations research: coin-or.
- [Coleman and Verma, 1998] Coleman, T. F. and Verma, A. (1998). The efficient computation of sparse jacobian matrices using automatic differentiation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 19(4):1210–1233.
- [Gebremedhin et al., 2013] Gebremedhin, A., Nguyen, D., Patwary, M. M. A., and Pothen, A. (2013). Colpack: Software for graph coloring and related problems in scientific computing. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 40:1–31.
- [Gebremedhin et al., 2005] Gebremedhin, A. H., Manne, F., and Pothen, A. (2005). What color is your jacobian? graph coloring for computing derivatives. *SIAM Review*, 47(4):629–705.
- [Gower and Mello, 2014] Gower, R. M. and Mello, M. P. (2014). Computing the sparsity pattern of Hessians using automatic differentiation. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 40(2):10:1–10:15.
- [Griewank et al., 1999] Griewank, A., Juedes, D., Mitev, H., Utke, J., Vogel, O., and Walther, A. (1999). ADOL-C: A package for the automatic differentiation of algorithms written in C/C++. Technical report, Institute of Scientific Computing, Technical University Dresden. Updated version of the paper published in *ACM Trans. Math. Software* 22, 1996, 131–167.
- [Griewank and Walther, 2008] Griewank, A. and Walther, A. (2008). *Evaluating Derivatives: Principles and Techniques of Algorithmic Differentiation*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2nd edition.
- [Kristensen et al., 2016] Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C. W., Skaug, H., and Bell, B. M. (2016). TMB: Automatic differentiation and Laplace approximation. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 70(5):1–21.

-
- [Petra et al., 2018] Petra, C. G., Qiang, F., Lubin, M., and Huchette, J. (2018). On efficient hessian computation using the edge pushing algorithm in julia. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 33(4–6):1010–1029.
- [Walther, 2008] Walther, A. (2008). Computing sparse Hessians with automatic differentiation. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 34(1).
- [Wang et al., 2016] Wang, M., Pothén, A., and Hovland, P. (2016). Edge pushing is equivalent to vertex elimination for computing Hessians. In Gebremedhin, A., Boman, E., and Ucar, B., editors, *2016 Proceedings of the Seventh SIAM Workshop on Combinatorial Scientific Computing, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA*, pages 102–111, Philadelphia, PA, USA. SIAM.