

Elimination Techniques for Algorithmic Differentiation Revisited

Uwe Naumann* Erik Schneidereit Simon Märtens
 Markus Towara[†]

Abstract

All known elimination techniques for (first-order) algorithmic differentiation (AD) rely on Jacobians to be given for a set of relevant elemental functions. Realistically, elemental tangents and adjoints are given instead. They can be obtained by applying software tools for AD to the parts of a given modular numerical simulation. The novel generalized face elimination rule proposed in this article facilitates the rigorous exploitation of associativity of the chain rule of differentiation at arbitrary levels of granularity ranging from elemental scalar (state of the art) to multivariate vector functions with given elemental tangents and adjoints. The implied combinatorial GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION problem asks for a face elimination sequence of minimal computational cost. Simple branch and bound and greedy heuristic methods are employed as a baseline for further research into more powerful algorithms motivated by promising first test results. The latter can be reproduced with the help of an open-source reference implementation.

1 Introduction

Research in elimination methods for algorithmic differentiation (AD) [16, 26] has been targeting decompositions of differentiable numerical programs into simple scalar elemental functions (mainly the built-in numerical operators and intrinsic functions provided by modern programming languages) for more than three decades. Elimination methods aim to exploit associativity of the chain rule of differentiation in order to minimize the computational cost of accumulating Jacobians, Hessians, or possibly even higher derivative tensors. Applicability is typically restricted to static code fragments¹ of limited complexity (e.g. basic blocks). Theoretical benefits due to lower operations counts require careful

*corresponding author: naumann@stce.rwth-aachen.de

[†]all: Informatik 12: Software and Tools for Computational Engineering, RWTH Aachen University, 52056 Aachen, Germany.

¹Data dependences are defined uniquely at compile time.




Figure 1: (a): G ; (b): \tilde{G} ; (c) $\tilde{G} - (0, 2, 3)$

implementation in order to translate into actual run time savings. The application of available optimization methods for elimination methods to real-world large-scale AD missions is hindered substantially by the present restrictions.

This paper aims to address these issues by lowering the level of granularity to multivariate vector elements of potentially significant computational cost. Additionally, all known elimination methods are generalized to the practically relevant scenario, where elemental tangent and adjoint models are available instead of elemental Jacobians. Illustration is provided by the following example to be referred to repeatedly throughout this article.

Example 1 *Newton's method for the iterative approximation of a solution for parameterized systems of nonlinear equations $R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = 0$ with twice continuously differentiable residual $R : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ evolves for fixed \mathbf{p} as $\mathbf{x}^{i+1} = \mathbf{x}^i - R'(\mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{p})^{-1} \cdot R(\mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{p})$ starting from a given \mathbf{x}^0 and where R' denotes the invertible Jacobian of R with respect to the state \mathbf{x} . Termination after k steps may be due to the requirement to reach a given accuracy, e.g. $|R(\mathbf{x}^k, \mathbf{p})| \leq \epsilon$, or k may have to be fixed in order to meet constraints on the overall computational cost.*

Think of an inexact Newton method [7], where the three elemental functions $F_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $F_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $F_3 : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ represent the approximation of the Jacobian of the residual ($F_1 = R'$) by finite differences, the evaluation of the residual ($F_2 = R$) and the iterative approximation of the solution of the linear Newton system including incrementation of the state ($F_3 = \mathbf{x}^i + F_1^{-1} \cdot F_2$). An implicit function $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{p})$ is defined by $R(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = 0$. We are interested in tangents and/or adjoints of \mathbf{x} with respect to \mathbf{p} .² Both

²Without loss of generality, elimination techniques are discussed in the context of the accumulation of full Jacobians. The generalization to tangents and adjoints beyond products of the Jacobian with identities follows seamlessly.

can (and should) be derived symbolically at the (exact) solution [10]. AD is to be preferred in the inexact case as this method provides exact (with machine accuracy) tangents and adjoints of the actually computed \mathbf{x}^k .

AD mission planning refers to the task of determining for a given decomposition of a modular numerical simulation program into elemental subprograms an order of evaluations of the elemental tangent and adjoint subprograms such that the desired derivative is obtained at minimal computational cost. It relies on realistic cost estimates for all elemental tangents and adjoints. The resulting optimized derivative code amounts to the evaluation of a generalized face elimination sequence. E.g., in [8] it was shown that theoretical savings in computational cost due to the exploitation of associativity of the chain rule translate into corresponding improvements in terms of run time. Similar observations were made in [28] in the context of computing Hessians.

2 State of the Art

We consider implementations of multivariate vector functions

$$F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{y} := F(\mathbf{x}) \quad (1)$$

over the real (floating-point) numbers \mathbb{R} as differentiable computer programs with Jacobian matrices (also: Jacobians)

$$F' = F'(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} . \quad (2)$$

Figure 1 will provide graphical illustration for the concepts to be discussed in the following. We use lower case boldface letters to distinguish vectors from (non-bold) scalars. Matrices as well as multivariate vector functions are denoted by upper case letters. AD yields *scalar tangents*

$$\mathbb{R}^m \ni \dot{\mathbf{y}} := F'(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (3)$$

and *scalar adjoints*

$$\mathbb{R}^{1 \times n} \ni \bar{\mathbf{x}} := \bar{\mathbf{y}} \cdot F'(\mathbf{x}) . \quad (4)$$

The full Jacobian can be obtained (also: harvested) by setting $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ or $\bar{\mathbf{y}}^T$ equal to (also: seeding) the Cartesian basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{R}^m , respectively, implying cheap gradients ($m = 1$) [13]. Reapplication results in second- and higher-order tangents and adjoints. Derivatives of F can be evaluated efficiently and with machine accuracy. We use $=$ to denote mathematical equality, \equiv in the sense of “is defined as” and $:=$ to represent assignment according to imperative programming.

F is referred to as the *primal program*. It evaluates a partially ordered sequence of continuously differentiable *elemental functions* (also: *elementals*)

$$F_j = F_j(\mathbf{v}_i)_{i \prec j} : \mathbb{R}^{\sum_{i \prec j} n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$$

as a *single assignment code*

$$\mathbb{R}^{n_j} \ni \mathbf{v}_j := F_j(\mathbf{v}_i)_{i \prec j} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, q \quad (5)$$

and where, adopting the notation from [16], $i \prec j$ if and only if \mathbf{v}_i is an argument of F_j . Hence, $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{v}_i)_{i \in X}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{v}_i)_{i \in Y}$, where $X = \{1 - n, \dots, 0\}$ and $Y = \{p + 1, \dots, q\}$ for $p \equiv q - m$. In the following we distinguish between scalar ($n_j = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, q$) and vector ($n_j \geq 1$) scenarios. Without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.), we assume the results \mathbf{y} of F to be represented by the last m entries of \mathbf{v} .

Elementals represent differentiable subprograms of the primal program with given *elemental Jacobians*

$$F'(i, j) \equiv \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial \mathbf{v}_i}(\mathbf{v}_k)_{k \prec j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_i} . \quad (6)$$

Augmentation of Equation (5) with the computation of all elemental Jacobians as in Equation (6) yields the *augmented single assignment code*.

The state of the art in elimination methods for AD has been targeting the scalar scenario. The corresponding augmented single assignment code induces an edge-labeled directed acyclic graph (dag) $G = (V, E)$ with integer vertices $V = \{1 - n, \dots, q\}$ representing the (scalar) v_j and edges $E \subseteq V \times V = \{(i, j) : i \prec j\}$. Minimal (without predecessors) vertices representing the scalar entries of \mathbf{x} are collected in $X \subseteq V$. The maximal vertices (without successors) $Y \subseteq V$ represent the scalar entries of \mathbf{y} . Scalar first derivatives $F'(i, j)$ are associated with all edges $(i, j) \in E$.

Example 2 *The dag of the primal C-program*

```
void F(float *x, float *y) {
  a=sin(x[0]); b=cos(x[1]); c=a/b;
  y[0]=a*c; y[1]=exp(c); y[2]=c+b;
}
```

is depicted in Figure 1 (a).

The chain rule of differentiation becomes

$$\frac{dv_t}{dv_s} = \sum_{\pi=(s,*,t)} \prod_{(i,j) \in \pi} F'(i, j) \quad (7)$$

[2] where the wildcard $*$ represents the possibly empty remainder of (vertex) paths connecting $s \in X$ and $t \in Y$ in G ; e.g. $(2, 3) \in *$ for $(0, *, 6)$ in Figure 1 (a). Associativity of the chain rule implies that Equation (7) holds for any subgraph of G .

Vector dags follow naturally for $n_j \geq 1$. The $F'(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_i}$ become elemental Jacobian matrices. A vector version of the dag in Figure 1 (a) is used for illustration throughout this article. Vertices are hence annotated with vector sizes (in parentheses). Edges (i, j) are annotated with elapsed run times for evaluating a scalar tangent ($\text{Cost}(F(i, j)$, bottom number) and a scalar adjoint ($\text{Cost}(\bar{F}(i, j)$, top number); see Section 3 for further details.




Figure 2: Annotated dag of a single Newton step

Example 3 *Building on EXAMPLE 1, the dag of a single Newton step is shown in Figure 2 for $\mathbf{v}_{-1} = \mathbf{x}^i$ and $\mathbf{v}_0 = \mathbf{p}$. Elemental Jacobians*

$$F'(-1, 1) \equiv \frac{\partial R'}{\partial \mathbf{x}^i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n}, \quad F'(-1, 2) \equiv \frac{\partial R}{\partial \mathbf{x}^i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

$$F'(0, 1) \equiv \frac{\partial R'}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times m}, \quad F'(0, 2) \equiv \frac{\partial R}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$$

$$F'(-1, 3) \equiv \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i+1}}{\partial \mathbf{x}^i} = I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

$$F'(1, 3) \equiv \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i+1}}{\partial R'} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^2}, \quad F'(2, 3) \equiv \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}^{i+1}}{\partial R} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$$

are associated with the respective edges. Equation (7) yields the Jacobian $\frac{d\mathbf{x}^{i+1}}{d(\mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{p})}$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} F'(-1, 3) + F'(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1) + F'(2, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 2) \\ F'(1, 3) \cdot F'(0, 1) + F'(2, 3) \cdot F'(0, 2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

(Cost-)Optimal interpretations of the chain rule along single paths amount to the solution of the NP-complete MATRIX CHAIN PRODUCT problem [27]. The proof presented therein exploits potential algebraic dependences (more specifically, equality) between the elemental partial derivatives. Even in the *structural* scenario, where partials are assumed to be algebraically independent, the scope for optimization can be quadratic in the problem size. Simply compare the operation counts induced by the best ($\mathcal{O}(n \cdot q)$) versus the worst ($\mathcal{O}(n^3 \cdot q)$) bracketings for $F = F_q \circ F_{q-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1$ with $F_{2,i-1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F_{2,i} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ while $i = 1, \dots, q/2$. Optimal bracketings for Jacobian chain products can be obtained efficiently by dynamic programming [11].

We aim to restrict the amount of material reproduced from [22] to a minimum. Nevertheless, some essential results about state-of-the-art elimination techniques need to be restated explicitly in order to make this article as self-contained as possible.

Face elimination follows immediately from the application of Equation (7) to paths (i, j, k) , $i, j, k \in V$, of (vertex-)length three. The resulting modifications in data dependence between intermediate variables cannot be represented

structurally in G in general. For example, elimination of $(1, 3, 4)$ in Figure 1 (a) must not result in the removal of $(1, 3)$ (equivalent to setting $F'(1, 3) := 0$) as $(1, 3) \in (1, 3, 5)$ and $(1, 3) \in (1, 3, 6)$. Similarly, $(3, 4) \in (2, 3, 4)$ must remain in G . To resolve this conflict, face elimination is defined on the following variant of the line graph of G .

Definition 1 ([22]) *The line dag $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ of G consists of vertices $\tilde{V} = \tilde{X} \cup \tilde{Z} \cup \tilde{Y}$, such that $\tilde{X} \cap \tilde{Z} = \tilde{X} \cap \tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y} \cap \tilde{Z} = \emptyset$, and edges $\tilde{E} = \tilde{E}_X \cup \tilde{E}_Z \cup \tilde{E}_Y$, with $\tilde{E}_X \cap \tilde{E}_Z = \tilde{E}_X \cap \tilde{E}_Y = \tilde{E}_Y \cap \tilde{E}_Z = \emptyset$. It is defined by the following construction:*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X} &= X; \quad \tilde{Z} = E; \quad \tilde{Y} = Y \\ \forall (i, j), (j, k) \in E & : ((i, j), (j, k)) \in \tilde{E}_Z; \\ (i, (i, j)) &\in \tilde{E}_X \text{ for } i \in X \text{ and } (i, j) \text{ in } E; \\ ((i, j), j) &\in \tilde{E}_Y \text{ for } (i, j) \in E \text{ and } j \in Y. \end{aligned}$$

The line dag for EXAMPLE 2 is depicted in Figure 1 (b). Initially, it consists of vertices labeled with index pairs exclusively. This is due to all vertices in \tilde{Z} representing edges (paths of vertex length two) from G . New vertices (fill) are added according to the chain rule to represent paths of (vertex) length three and more. The corresponding labels become triplets, quadruples etc. For example, for the dag in EXAMPLE 2 $F'(-1, 1, 3, 6) \equiv F'(3, 6) \cdot F'(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1)$ is computed. In the following, we write $(i, *, j)$ to denote a vertex due to the chain rule applied to some path connecting a vertex (i, i') with a vertex (j', j) . The wildcard $*$ represents elements from the set of all feasible sub-paths; e.g., $1, 3$ for $F'(-1, *, 6)$ as $(i, i') = (-1, 1)$ and $(j', j) = (3, 6)$. The set of predecessors [successors] of $(i, *, j) \in \tilde{V}$ is denoted as $P(i, *, j) \subset \tilde{V}$ [$S(i, *, j) \subset \tilde{V}$]. We write $(i, *)$ [$(*, j)$] if explicit specification of the sink [source] is not required in the current context.

Rule 1 ([22]) *Face elimination is defined for all $((i, *, j), (j, *, k)) \in \tilde{E}_Z$ as follows:*

1. If $\nexists (i, *, k) \in \tilde{V}$:

$$P(i, *, k) = P(i, *, j) \text{ and } S(i, *, k) = S(j, *, k)$$

then (fill)

$$\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \cup (i, *, j, *, k)$$

$$\tilde{E} := \tilde{E}$$

$$\cup (P(i, *, j) \times (i, *, j, *, k)) \text{ (up-link)}$$

$$\cup ((i, *, j, *, k) \times S(j, *, k)) \text{ (down-link)}$$

$$F'(i, *, j, *, k) := 0.$$

2. $F'(i, *, j, *, k) += F'(j, *, k) \cdot F'(i, *, j)$ (absorb)

3. $\tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus ((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ (remove edge)
4. If $S(i, *, j) = \emptyset$ then (remove isolated vertex)

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V} &:= \tilde{V} \setminus (i, *, j) \\ \tilde{E} &:= \tilde{E} \setminus (P(i, *, j) \times (i, *, j))\end{aligned}$$
 else if $\exists(i, *) \neq (i, *, j) \in \tilde{V} : S(i, *) = S(i, *, j)$ then (merge)

$$\begin{aligned}F'(i, *, j) &+= F'(i, *) \\ \tilde{V} &:= \tilde{V} \setminus (i, *) \\ \tilde{E} &:= \tilde{E} \setminus ((i, *) \times S(i, *) \cup P(i, *) \times (i, *)).\end{aligned}$$
5. If $P(j, *, k) = \emptyset$ then (remove isolated vertex)

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V} &:= \tilde{V} \setminus (j, *, k) \\ \tilde{E} &:= \tilde{E} \setminus ((j, *, k) \times S(j, *, k))\end{aligned}$$
 else if $\exists(*, k) \neq (j, *, k) \in \tilde{V} : P(*, k) = P(j, *, k)$ then (merge)

$$\begin{aligned}F'(j, *, k) &+= F'(*, k) \\ \tilde{V} &:= \tilde{V} \setminus (*, k). \\ \tilde{E} &:= \tilde{E} \setminus ((*, k) \times S(*, k) \cup P(*, k) \times (*, k)).\end{aligned}$$

Fill-in is generated with vanishing derivative $F'(i, *, j, *, k)$ (see 1) followed by the fused multiply-add (**fma**) operation due to the chain rule (see 2). The edge $((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ is removed from \tilde{G} (see 3) which might make vertex $(i, *, j)$ isolated due to missing successors (see 4). Alternatively, vertex $(i, *, j)$ could become mergeable if removal of $((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ makes its neighborhood identical with that of another vertex $(i, *)$. The two derivatives are added and one of the vertices is removed from \tilde{G} together with all incident edges. Similarly, vertex $(j, *, k)$ can become isolated or mergeable (see 5). Figure 1 (c) shows the result of eliminating (0, 2, 3) from Figure 1 (b).

A face elimination sequence is *complete* if the resulting line dag is tripartite corresponding to a bipartite dag and representing the Jacobian of the underlying program. Both termination and numerical correctness are shown in [22] as immediate consequences of the chain rule as stated in Equation (7). Special cases can be derived including rules for *edge* [22] and *vertex elimination* [14] in G . For example, any complete face, edge or vertex elimination sequence transforms the dag in Figure 1 (a) into a bipartite dag $G' = (V'_1 \cup V'_2, E')$, where $V'_1 = \{-1, 0\}$, $V'_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}$ and $E' = V'_1 \times V'_2$.

Assignment of a unit cost to single face eliminations yields the following combinatorial optimization problem.

Problem 1 (FACE ELIMINATION) *Find the shortest complete face elimination sequence.*

Obviously, computational cost should not be reduced to simple operations count in general. Temporal and spatial locality properties of numerical programs have a substantial effect. This fact will be accounted for in Section 3.

The restriction of the chain rule of differentiation to a structural formulation eliminates consideration of potential algebraic dependences (e.g., equality) amongst entries of elemental Jacobians. Numerical values of the latter are not considered. The main argument of the proof of NP-hardness of JACOBIAN ACCUMULATION is hence no longer applicable; see [24]. In fact, the computational complexity of FACE ELIMINATION remains an open problem.

Similar statements hold for the corresponding EDGE and VERTEX ELIMINATION problems. The subgraph of Figure 1 (a) induced by all vertices reachable from -1 followed by re-indexing as $-1 \rightarrow 0$, $3 \rightarrow 2$, $4 \rightarrow 3$, $5 \rightarrow 4$, and $6 \rightarrow 5$ was shown in [21] (and therein referred to as the *Lion* dag) to yield a lower computational cost (11 fma) than the best vertex elimination sequence (12 fma). Edge elimination was proposed together with corresponding greedy heuristics to solve this problem. Similar reasoning led to the definition of face elimination driven by the observation that the cost of the best edge elimination sequence (23 fma) can be improved for the *Bat* dag in Figure 1 (a).

Example 4 *The following face elimination sequence for the Bat dag induces a computational cost of 22 fma:*

$$\begin{aligned}
F'(1, 3, 4) &:= F'(3, 4) \cdot F'(1, 3) && (1 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(2, 3, 6) &:= F'(3, 6) \cdot F'(2, 3) && (1 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(-1, 1, 3, 4) &:= F'(1, 3, 4) \cdot F'(-1, 1) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(-1, 1, 3) &:= F'(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(-1, 1, 3, 5) &:= F'(3, 5) \cdot F'(-1, 1, 3) && (4 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(-1, 1, 3, 6) &:= F'(3, 6) \cdot F'(-1, 1, 3) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(0, 2, 3, 6) &:= F'(2, 3, 6) \cdot F'(0, 2) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(0, 2, 3) &:= F'(2, 3) \cdot F'(0, 2) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(0, 2, 3, 4) &:= F'(3, 4) \cdot F'(0, 2, 3) && (2 \text{ fma}) \\
F'(0, 2, 3, 5) &:= F'(3, 5) \cdot F'(0, 2, 3) && (4 \text{ fma}) .
\end{aligned}$$

The scalar scenario has been studied for more than three decades. Application of Equation. (7) to graphs induced by single vertices (together with their neighborhoods) yielded vertex elimination which was suggested in [14] alongside Markowitz-type greedy heuristics for determining a near-optimal elimination sequence. Motivated by the *Lion* and *Bat* dags edge [21] and face [22] elimination methods were developed. NP-hardness of the combinatorial JACOBIAN ACCUMULATION problem is shown in [24]. Successful implementations of elimination techniques are described in [8, 31, 33]. Generalizations for higher derivatives were proposed [34]. Contributions to the development of combinatorial optimization methods include [5, 18, 30].

3 Generalized Face Elimination

In real-world simulation scenarios the Jacobians of nontrivial vector-valued multivariate elemental functions are typically not available. *Elemental tangents*

$$\mathbb{R}^{n_j \times \dot{n}_j} \ni \dot{V}_j := \dot{F}(i, j) \cdot \dot{V}_i \equiv \dot{V}_j + F'(i, j) \cdot \dot{V}_i \quad (8)$$

and *elemental adjoints*

$$\mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}_i \times n_i} \ni \bar{V}_i := \bar{V}_j \cdot \bar{F}(i, j) \equiv \bar{V}_i + \bar{V}_j \cdot F'(i, j) \quad (9)$$

are assumed to be given instead, for example, as the result of the application of an AD tool. W.l.o.g., we use vector mode (see Chapter 3 in [16]) and incremental notation for both tangents and adjoints allowing for a more compact typesetting in the formulation of RULES 2 and 3. Vector tangent mode yields $F'(i, j)$ at the expense of $\mathcal{O}(n_i)$ evaluations of F_j by setting $\bar{V}_i := I_{n_i}$ for $\dot{V}_j := 0$. Vector adjoint mode yields $F'(i, j)$ at the expense of $\mathcal{O}(n_j)$ evaluations of F_j by setting $\bar{V}_j := I_{n_j}$ for $\bar{V}_i := 0$.

Most AD tools generate scalar tangents $\dot{F}(i, j) \cdot \dot{v}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ and adjoints $\bar{v}_i \cdot \bar{F}(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_i}$. Hence and w.l.o.g., we expect realistic cost estimates for all scalar elemental tangents and adjoints to be provided by the user of the new method, e.g., obtained by profiling.

Moreover, tangents $\dot{F}_j \equiv F'_j \cdot (\dot{V}_i)_{i \prec j}$ and adjoints $\bar{F}_j \equiv \bar{V}_j \cdot F'_j$ associated with vertices are typically given instead of $\dot{F}(i, j)$ and $\bar{F}(i, j)$ associated with individual edges in the dag. The latter can be obtained by specialization of the former. Further technical details of this source code transformation are omitted in favor of focusing on the combinatorial issues of AD mission planning. For example, the AD tool Tapenade [17] supports custom activity patterns for tangent and adjoint subprograms. Similar functionality is provided by AD tools based on operator and function overloading. See www.autodiff.org for a collection of AD tools and a comprehensive bibliography on the general subject.

In this article, all complete face elimination sequences are assumed to have feasible memory requirements. Conservatively, sufficient memory should be available for storage of the inputs to all elemental functions in addition to the maximum memory required for evaluating any single elemental adjoint. This naive checkpointing [12] scheme is likely to be feasible in practice given the limited size of the dags under consideration. The additional evaluation of the primal should be accounted for when defining the computational costs associated with the vertices in the line dag. A more general problem formulation combining FACE ELIMINATION and the computationally intractable DAG REVERSAL [25] or CALL TREE REVERSAL [23] problems is the subject of ongoing research.

The search space of the combinatorial GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION problem to be formulated in the following is induced by two elemental operations on the line dag: *Edge elimination* can be applied to edges connecting any two intermediate vertices, where at least one of them has an elemental Jacobian;

see RULE 2. *Preaccumulation* is applicable to all intermediate vertices without elemental Jacobians; see RULE 3.

Rule 2 Edge elimination is defined for all $((i, *, j), (j, *, k)) \in \tilde{E}_Z$ with $F'(i, *, j) \neq \emptyset$ or $F'(j, *, k) \neq \emptyset$ as follows:

1. If $\nexists (i, *, k) \in \tilde{V}$:

$$P(i, *, k) = P(i, *, j) \text{ and } S(i, *, k) = S(j, *, k) \\ \text{or } F'(i, *, k) = \emptyset$$

then (fill)

$$\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \cup (i, *, j, *, k) \\ \tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \cup (P(i, *, j) \times (i, *, j, *, k)) \\ \cup ((i, *, j, *, k) \times S(j, *, k)) \\ F'(i, *, j, *, k) := 0 \text{ and } \dot{F}(i, *, j, *, k) := \emptyset \text{ and } \bar{F}(i, *, j, *, k) := \emptyset.$$

$$2. F'(i, *, j, *, k) += \begin{cases} \dot{F}(j, *, k) F'(i, *, j) \dots \\ \text{if } \dot{F}(j, *, k), F'(i, *, j) \neq \emptyset \\ F'(j, *, k) \bar{F}(i, *, j) \dots \\ \text{if } F'(j, *, k), \bar{F}(i, *, j) \neq \emptyset \\ F'(j, *, k) \cdot F'(i, *, j) \dots \\ \text{if } F'(j, *, k), F'(i, *, j) \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

3. $\tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus ((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ (remove edge).

4. If $S(i, *, j) = \emptyset$ then (remove vertex)

$$\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \setminus (i, *, j) \\ \tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus (P(i, *, j) \times (i, *, j))$$

else

if $\exists (i, *) \neq (i, *, j) \in \tilde{V}$:

$$S(i, *) = S(i, *, j) \text{ and } F'(i, *) \neq \emptyset$$

then (merge)

$$F'(i, *, j) += F'(i, *) \\ \tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \setminus (i, *) \\ \tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus ((i, *) \times S(i, *) \cup P(i, *) \times (i, *)).$$

5. If $P(j, *, k) = \emptyset$ then (remove vertex)

$$\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \setminus (j, *, k) \\ \tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus ((j, *, k) \times S(j, *, k))$$

else

if $\exists (*, k) \neq (j, *, k) \in \tilde{V}$:

$P(*, k) = P(j, *, k)$ and $F'(*, k) \neq \emptyset$

then (merge)

$F'(j, *, k) += F'(*, k)$

$\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \setminus (*, k)$

$\tilde{E} := \tilde{E} \setminus ((*, k) \times S(*, k) \cup P(*, k) \times (*, k))$.

RULE 2 extends RULE 1 with logic due to the elemental tangent-/adjoint-based formulation of the chain rule. Fill-in yields new vertices with zero Jacobians $F'(i, *, j, *, k)$ and without tangents nor adjoints (see 1). The latter are available for elemental functions represented by vertices in the original line dag, exclusively.

The **fma** operation comes in three flavors (see 2). If both $F'(i, *, j)$ and $F'(j, *, k)$ are given, then their product³ is added to $F'(i, *, j, *, k)$. Otherwise, either the tangent of $(j, *, k)$ is seeded with $F'(i, *, j)$ or the adjoint of $(i, *, j)$ with $F'(j, *, k)$. At least one of the two elemental Jacobians is required to be given for $((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ to qualify as eliminatable, which results in its removal from \tilde{G} (see 3). Merging (see 4 and 5) is similar to RULE 1 with the additional requirement that the elemental Jacobian of the vertex to be merged needs to be available.

The cost of eliminating an eliminatable edge $((i, *, j), (j, *, k))$ according to the three alternatives in 2 is equal to $n_i \cdot \text{COST}(\bar{F}(j, *, k))$, or $n_k \cdot \text{COST}(\bar{F}(i, *, j))$ or $n_i n_j n_k$, respectively. The cost of matrix multiplication is assumed to be equal to the number of **fma** performed. The costs of matrix additions due to merging are neglected as it is dominated by the cost of 2.

Rule 3 Preaccumulation is defined for all $(i, j) \in \tilde{V}_Z$ with $F'(i, j) = \emptyset$ as follows:

$$1. F'(i, j) := \begin{cases} \dot{F}(i, j) I_{n_i} \\ I_{n_j} \bar{F}(i, j) \end{cases}$$

2. If $\exists (i, *, j) \in \tilde{V}$:

$P(i, *, j) = P(i, j)$ and $S(i, *, j) = S(i, j)$ and $F'(i, *, j) \neq \emptyset$

then (merge)

$F'(i, j) += F'(i, *, j)$; $\tilde{V} := \tilde{V} \setminus (i, *, j)$.

Preaccumulation is performed by seeding either the tangent or the adjoint with the corresponding identities (see 1). The less costly alternative will be selected

³We use \cdot to distinguish the matrix product from the Jacobian-free propagation of tangents or adjoints.

in the context of the combinatorial GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION problem to be formulated further below. Mergeability of $(i, *, j)$ might follow under the same conditions as in RULE 2 (see 2).

Termination follows from an argument similar to that in [22]. Correctness of 1 follows from the definition of tangents and adjoints. The merge rule in 2 preserves invariance under the chain rule.

The cost of preaccumulating $F'(i, j)$ is equal to $\min\{n_i \cdot \text{COST}(\dot{F}(i, j)), n_j \cdot \text{COST}(\bar{F}(i, j))\}$; the costs of matrix additions due to merging are neglected due to dominance of the cost of 1. In summary, the cost of a generalized face elimination amounts to the cost of the corresponding edge elimination added to the cost of potentially required preaccumulations; see also EXAMPLE 5.

A generalized version of FACE ELIMINATION can be formulated for given costs of all elemental tangents and adjoints.

Problem 2 (GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION) *Find a complete generalized face elimination sequence of minimal cost.*

W.l.o.g., we assume unit **fma** cost in matrix products.

Example 5 *The illustration of all aspects of RULES 2 and 3 with the help of examples turns out to be infeasible under the given space restrictions due to combinatorial explosion. Instead, we consider the simplest possible scenario $F = F_2 \circ F_1$ with $n = n_1 = 10$, $m_1 = n_2 = 2$, $m = m_2 = 5$, $\text{COST}(\dot{F}(0, 1)) = \text{COST}(\dot{F}(1, 2)) = 1000$ and, optimistically,⁴ $\text{COST}(\bar{F}(0, 1)) = \text{COST}(\bar{F}(1, 2)) = 2000$.*

$$\begin{aligned}
F' &= \dot{F}(1, 2) \cdot (\dot{F}(0, 1) \cdot I_{n_1}) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 20.000 \\
F' &= \dot{F}(1, 2) \cdot (I_{m_1} \cdot \bar{F}(0, 1)) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 14.000 \\
F' &= (I_{m_2} \cdot \bar{F}(1, 2)) \cdot \bar{F}(0, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 20.000 \\
F' &= (\dot{F}(1, 2) \cdot I_{n_2}) \cdot \bar{F}(0, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 12.000 \\
F' &= (\dot{F}(1, 2) \cdot I_{n_2}) \cdot (I_{m_1} \cdot \bar{F}(0, 1)) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 6.100 \\
F' &= (I_{m_2} \cdot \bar{F}(1, 2)) \cdot (I_{m_1} \cdot \bar{F}(0, 1)) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 14.100 \\
F' &= (I_{m_2} \cdot \bar{F}(1, 2)) \cdot (\dot{F}(0, 1) \cdot I_{n_1}) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 20.100 \\
F' &= (\dot{F}(1, 2) \cdot I_{n_2}) \cdot (\dot{F}(0, 1) \cdot I_{n_1}) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 12.100
\end{aligned}$$

The optimal cost of 6.100 is reached when preaccumulating $F'(0, 1)$ in adjoint mode followed by preaccumulation of $F'(1, 2)$ in tangent mode and evaluation of the matrix product $F'(1, 2) \cdot F'(0, 1)$. It undercuts the costs of the standard tangent (first line) and adjoint (third line) modes of AD by a factor of more than three.

GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION can be solved efficiently by dynamic programming for single-path dags resulting from simple chains of elemental function evaluations [20]. Neither sparsity [1] nor scarcity [15] of elemental Jacobians

⁴The run time of the evaluation of an adjoint often exceeds that of a tangent by factors of more than two. The relative run time varies significantly for different AD tools.

are taken into account by RULES 2 and 3. Integration of both aspects will require additional annotation of the dag as well as modification of the elimination rules to detect and keep track of sparsity and scarcity. Face elimination over sparse elemental Jacobians inherits its computational intractability from Jacobian Compression through GRAPH COLORING [9].

GENERALIZED EDGE ELIMINATION (GEE) and GENERALIZED VERTEX ELIMINATION (GVE) in dags follow naturally from GENERALIZED FACE ELIMINATION (GFE). A hierarchy of search spaces is spanned such that $GVE \subseteq GEE \subseteq GFE$.

4 Combinatorial Optimization

The GFE problem yields a combinatorial search space of exponential size in the number of edges $|\tilde{E}|$ in the line dag \tilde{G} . Computational intractability can be proven for the practically relevant scenario allowing for algebraic dependences amongst entries of elemental Jacobians [24]. The computational complexities of the structural variants of GFE, GEE and GVE remain open. Ongoing research puts focus on proving likely hardness and, hence, the development of appropriate methods including branch and bound and (greedy) heuristics. Reference implementations of all methods described in the following can be found on github.com/STCE-at-RWTH/ADmission/tree/ACDA23. All our numerical results can thus be reproduced.

4.1 Heuristics

The two obvious choices for generalized face elimination sequences correspond to sparse tangent [4] and sparse adjoint [16] modes of AD. In sparse tangent mode, all elemental Jacobians associated with minimal vertices are preaccumulated followed by the evaluation of the remaining elemental tangents in topological order. Sparse adjoint mode preaccumulates elemental Jacobians of maximal vertices followed by the evaluation of the remaining elemental adjoints in reverse topological order. For example, for the line dag in Figure 1 (b) sparse tangent mode would proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F'(-1, 1) &+= \dot{F}(-1, 1) \cdot I_{n-1}; \quad F'(0, 2) += \dot{F}(0, 2) \cdot I_{n_0} \\ F'(-1, 3) &+= \dot{F}(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1); \quad \dots \end{aligned}$$

starting from $F'(i, j) = 0$ for $i = -1, \dots, 3$ and $j = 1, \dots, 6$. Sparse adjoint mode operates correspondingly:

$$\begin{aligned} F'(3, 6) &+= I_{m_6} \cdot \bar{F}(3, 6); \quad F'(2, 6) += I_{m_6} \cdot \bar{F}(2, 6) \dots \\ F'(2, 6) &+= F'(3, 6) \cdot \bar{F}(2, 3); \quad \dots \end{aligned}$$

Variants include locally optimal sparse tangent (similarly, adjoint) mode, where $F'(i, j) = F'(i, k) \cdot F'(k, j)$ allows preaccumulation of $F'(i, k)$ (in either tangent

or adjoint mode) followed by the explicit matrix product in case the cumulative local cost undercuts that of $F'(i, j) = \hat{F}(i, k) \cdot F'(k, j)$.

Additionally, we have been experimenting with a range of heuristics. Results will be presented for a simple greedy heuristic based on the local minimization of fill and accounting for negative fill due to merging. Ties are broken by either sparse tangent or adjoint modes.

4.2 Branch and Bound

A branch and bound algorithm was implemented as a deterministic method for solving GFE. Its computational cost is proportional to the size of the branch and bound search tree which grows exponentially with the size of the given (line) dag. Applicability is limited to small dags. For example, the solution of GFE for the single Newton step in Figure 2 takes less than a second on a standard workstation. Two consecutive Newton steps yield a GFE instance whose branch and bound solution can take several weeks. Partial exploration of infeasible search spaces becomes possible by letting the method run for a fixed time period, possibly combined with random multi-start.

We build on [19], where lower bounds for optimal Jacobian accumulation by vertex and edge elimination are derived. An upper bound on the cost of an optimal generalized face elimination sequence is continuously updated by applying one of the greedy heuristics proposed above to the remainder graph. The resulting value is added to the cost of the current partial generalized face elimination sequence corresponding to the current position in the search tree.

A lower bound on the cost of subtrees of the search tree is obtained by adding lower bounds on the respective costs at which each of the remaining vertices can be eliminated from the line dag to the cost of the current partial generalized face elimination sequence. Highly conservative lower bounds are obtained by considering vertices of minimum dimensions which are connected to the current vertex by a directed path. If the lower bound exceeds the current upper bound, then the current subtree can be disregarded from further search.

Optimality-preserving compression of the search tree results from the exploitation of commutativity of mutually independent faces with respect to computational cost. The elimination of one face has no impact on the cost of elimination of the other in this case. The same line dag results from the consecutive elimination of both faces in either order. Further compression results from preaccumulation considered only in the context of enabling the elimination of an incident edge in the line dag. Preservation of optimality follows immediately from the fact that the overall cost of a generalized face elimination sequence is invariant with respect to postponing preaccumulation until just prior to the elimination of the first incident edge.

The branch and bound method may have practical relevance in the context of AD mission planning, where a coarse-grain view of a numerical simulation code is likely to yield relatively small dags over expensive elemental functions. While previously introduced heuristics can be expected to deliver satisfactory

elimination sequences in most cases, certain high-end applications may benefit from additional savings in run time due to a deterministically optimal solution.

Example 6 We continue EXAMPLE 3. Tangents and adjoints are given for F_1, F_2 , and F_3 . Elapsed run times of their scalar evaluation are attached to the respective edges in Figure 2. Adjoints are twice as expensive as tangents. The cost vanishes for $(-1, 3)$ as $F'(-1, 3) = I_n$ is known. All elemental Jacobians are assumed to be dense except $F'(-1, 3)$. For $n = m = 10$ both (dense) tangent and adjoint modes yield a cost of $124,000 = 20 \cdot (200 + 2,000 + 200 + 2,000 + 800 + 1,000) = 10 \cdot (400 + 4,000 + 400 + 4,000 + 1,600 + 2,000)$. The greedy heuristic yields

$$\begin{aligned}
F'(-1, 2) &:= \dot{F}(-1, 2) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 2,000 \\
F'(-1, 2, 3) &:= \dot{F}(2, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 2) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 8,000 \\
F'(0, 2) &:= \dot{F}(0, 2) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 2,000 \\
F'(0, 2, 3) &:= \dot{F}(2, 3) \cdot F'(0, 2) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 8,000 \\
F'(-1, 1) &:= \dot{F}(-1, 1) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 20,000 \\
F'(-1, 1, 3) &:= \dot{F}(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 10,000 \\
F'(0, 1) &:= \dot{F}(0, 1) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 20,000 \\
F'(0, 1, 3) &:= \dot{F}(1, 3) \cdot F'(0, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 10,000 \\
F'(-1, 3) &+= F'(-1, 1, 3) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 0
\end{aligned}$$

with a total cost of 80,000, which represents an improvement over dense AD by more than 35%. Sparse adjoint mode turns out to be equivalent to dense adjoint mode due to the single output.

A global optimum of 74,000 computed by branch and bound results in another minor improvement. The corresponding elimination sequence proceeds as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
F'(0, 2) &:= \dot{F}(0, 2) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} = 2,000 \\
F'(2, 3) &:= \dot{F}(2, 3) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 8,000 \\
F'(0, 2, 3) &:= F'(2, 3) \cdot F'(0, 2) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 1,000 \\
F'(-1, 2) &:= \dot{F}(-1, 2) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 2,000 \\
F'(-1, 2, 3) &:= F'(2, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 2) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 1,000 \\
F'(-1, 1) &:= \dot{F}(-1, 1) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 20,000 \\
F'(-1, 1, 3) &:= \dot{F}(1, 3) \cdot F'(-1, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 10,000 \\
F'(0, 1) &:= \dot{F}(0, 1) \cdot I_{10} && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 20,000 \\
F'(0, 1, 3) &:= \dot{F}(1, 3) \cdot F'(0, 1) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 10,000 \\
F'(-1, 3) &+= F'(-1, 1, 3) && \Rightarrow \text{COST} += 0
\end{aligned}$$

The total savings in cost add up to more than 40% in comparison with dense tangent and adjoint modes.

4.3 Validation

An optimal bracketing of a generalized elemental Jacobian chain product can be computed by dynamic programming; see [20] for details. We use the implementation described in this article for validation of the generalized face elimination rule on the resulting single-path dags. Optimal elimination sequences computed by branch and bound reproduce the results of dynamic programming for all of a substantial number of randomly generated test instances.

Full numerical validation requires the (automated) implementation of the solutions of AD mission planning as actual derivative code. Subsequent evaluation of Jacobians yields numerical values that can be validated, e.g., against finite difference approximations. The development of the full AD mission pipeline is a major effort and the subject of ongoing activities; see also Section 7.

5 Implementation

A sample standard session of version 1.0 of the `admission` software is presented. More comprehensive information about building and using the AD mission planner can be found in the public repository. The software is currently developed with C++ for the Linux operating system running on Intel-x86-based computers. Porting to other compute platforms is left as an option for future development.

The following three files play roles in AD mission planning sessions:

- `admission`: the binary executable (name due to standard build process),
- `config.in`: the configuration file in text format (names may vary),
- `dag.xml`: the target dag in GraphML file format⁵ (names may vary).

Here we assume all three of them to be stored in the current directory. A session is run by typing

```
admission config.in
```

on the command line.

We take a closer look at the application of the branch and bound algorithm to the Lion dag. Its vertices and edges are defined in `dag.xml`. For example, vertex 0 becomes

```
<node id="0">
  <data key="index">0</data>
  <data key="vector_size">2</data>
</node> .
```

Edge (0, 1) is described as

⁵<http://graphml.graphdrawing.org/>


```

<edge id="0" source="0" target="1">
  <data key="tangent_cost">2</data>
  <data key="adjoint_cost">4</data>
  <data key="has_jacobian">0</data> ,
</edge>

```

where the Boolean attribute `has_jacobian` indicates whether the elemental Jacobian is available in addition to the elemental tangent and adjoint.

The contents of the configuration file

```

dag dag.xml
method BranchAndBound

```

turn out to be self-explanatory. The following output is generated:

```

elapsed time: 0.00701579s                                     1
                                                                2
elimination sequence                                         3
  (operation mode target cost):                               4
  ACC TAN (0 1) 4                                             5
  ELI TAN (0 1 2) 2                                           6
  ELI TAN (0 1 4) 2                                           7
  ELI TAN (0 2 3) 6                                           8
  ELI TAN (0 2 4) 2                                           9
                                                                10
dense tangent cost: 16                                        11
dense adjoint cost: 64                                        12
optimized cost: 16                                           13
                                                                14
branch and bound statistics:                                  15
  number of nodes in search space: 416                        16
  number of nodes visited: 190                                17

```

An optimal elimination sequence preaccumulates the elemental Jacobian of edge (0,1) in tangent mode (line 5) followed by tangent propagation through the remaining edges (lines 6-9). Both dense tangent and adjoint costs as well as the optimum obtained by branch and bound (which happens to be equal to the cost of sparse tangent mode in this case) are displayed (lines 11-13). Additional statistics include the total number of nodes in the branch and bound tree (line 16) and the number of nodes actually visited (line 17). Visits of the remaining nodes were avoided due to bounding.

Further methods to be selected from are sparse tangent (`SparseTangent`), sparse adjoint (`SparseAdjoint`) and the greedy minimum fill (`GreedyMinFill`) heuristic. Variants of the AD missions to be planned can be obtained by editing the dag input file. For example, an instance with all elemental Jacobians available can be generated by setting the `has_jacobian` attribute of all edges to 1. Results for both classical (not generalized) versions of the Lion and Bat dags reported in Section 2 were obtained this way.

6 Results

We list results of all modes ordered as `DenseTangent`, `DenseAdjoint`, `SparseTangent`, `SparseAdjoint`, `GreedyMinFill`, `BranchAndBound` for three case studies.

6.1 Lion and Bat

The following results are obtained for the generalized versions of the Lion and Bat dags with respective edge costs as in Figure 1 (a): Lion: (16,64,16,46,20,16), Bat: (48,96,32,64,36,32). In both cases, sparse tangent mode turns out to be optimal. Except in the case of branch and bound these results can easily be reproduced by inspection of Figure 1 (a).

6.2 OpenFOAM

One of our main target applications is OpenFOAM, an open-source computational fluid dynamics solver suite, based on the finite volume method. We build on an algorithmic adjoint version of OpenFOAM described in [32]. The dag is obtained by instrumenting one step of the incompressible, steady state SIMPLE algorithm assuming laminar flow. It is part of the public repository. Velocities, face fluxes, and pressures are both in- and outputs to and from the i -th iteration step of the SIMPLE algorithm. The intermediate vertices correspond to objects allocated by OpenFOAM in order to solve the linearized Navier-Stokes equations. Conceptually, the main tasks are the assembly and solution of the linearized momentum equations and the pressure correction equation. A variety of dependencies exist between these two equations. An in-depth description is beyond the scope of this article. Refer to the OpenFOAM documentation⁶ for further details.

Elemental tangent and adjoint costs were derived from the (very large) sizes (numbers of entries) of the *tapes* generated by the AD tool `dco/c++` [29]. Elemental adjoints are approximately five times as expensive as elemental tangents. The following results are obtained (rounded to the respective power of ten): ($8 \cdot 10^9$, $41 \cdot 10^9$, $5 \cdot 10^9$, $27 \cdot 10^9$, $109 \cdot 10^{12}$, $4.9 \cdot 10^9$) The greedy heuristic performs particularly poorly in this case. An improvement of 35% over dense tangent mode was achieved by sparse tangent mode. This solution was not improved significantly by branch and bound during ten days using 24 threads on a local shared-memory computer. Only a very small fraction of the total search space ($\approx 10^{-36}$) was explored at that point.

6.3 Several Newton Steps

Finally, we present the results for two additional variants of the Newton case study from EXAMPLE 1. The evaluation of several Newton steps yields dags as concatenations of the dag of a single Newton step from Figure 2. For two steps we obtain ($248 \cdot 10^3$, $248 \cdot 10^3$, $200 \cdot 10^3$, $248 \cdot 10^3$, $162 \cdot 10^3$, $152 \cdot 10^3$).

⁶www.openfoam.com/documentation

An improvement over dense AD by nearly 40% can be achieved by branch and bound running for 24 hours and using 48 threads on another local computer. Less than one percent of the search space was explored at that point. The cost of an additional matrix product of $2 \cdot 10^3 = 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 20$ needs to be added to the cost of preaccumulation of two single Newton steps separately yielding a lower total cost of $150 \cdot 10^3 = (2 \cdot 74 + 2) \cdot 10^3$. Similarly, ten steps yield $(1,240 \cdot 10^3, 1,240 \cdot 10^3, 2,600 \cdot 10^3, 1,240 \cdot 10^3, 828 \cdot 10^3, 812 \cdot 10^3)$ and hence an improvement of 35% over standard AD. A tiny fraction of the total search space ($\approx 10^{-127}$) was explored by branch and bound within 24 hours. Again, separate optimal preaccumulation of single Newton steps yields a lower cost of $(10 \cdot 74 + 9 \cdot 2) \cdot 10^3 = 758 \cdot 10^3$. Ongoing investigations consider integration of this improved bound as part of a divide and conquer strategy within the branch and bound algorithm.

7 Conclusion

Generalized face elimination is the basis of AD mission planning. Its formal definition and illustration represents the main contribution of this article. Less emphasis was put on the development of corresponding combinatorial optimization methods. Promising first results obtained with relatively basic variants of branch and bound and greedy heuristics motivate further ongoing and future activities in this area.

More generally, we envision a workflow combining (a) decomposition of a given numerical simulation into multivariate vector elementals, e.g. through annotation or instrumentation, (b) automatic derivation of the corresponding dag, (c) AD mission planning and (d) automatic generation of the optimized derivative code. This article provides fundamental algorithmic techniques for the rigorous treatment of (c). Substantial further effort is required to address full integration with (a), (b) and (d).

References

- [1] B. Averick, J. Moré, C. Bischof, A. Carle, and A. Griewank. Computing large sparse Jacobian matrices using automatic differentiation. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 15(2):285–294, 1994.
- [2] W. Baur and V. Strassen. The complexity of partial derivatives. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 22:317–330, 1983.
- [3] C. Bischof, M. Bücker, P. Hovland, U. Naumann, and J. Utke, editors. *Advances in Automatic Differentiation*, volume 64 of *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*. Springer, Berlin, 2008.
- [4] C. Bischof, A. Carle, G. Corliss, A. Griewank, and P. Hovland. ADIFOR: Generating derivative codes from Fortran programs. *Scientific Programming*, 1(1):11–29, 1992.

- [5] J. Chen, P. Hovland, T. Munson, and J. Utke. An integer programming approach to optimal derivative accumulation. In S. Forth, P. Hovland, E. Phipps, J. Utke, and A. Walther, editors, *Recent Advances in Algorithmic Differentiation*, volume 87 of *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, pages 221–231, Berlin, 2012. Springer.
- [6] G. Corliss, C. Faure, A. Griewank, L. Hascoët, and U. Naumann, editors. *Automatic Differentiation of Algorithms: From Simulation to Optimization*, Computer and Information Science. Springer, 2002.
- [7] R. Dembo, S. Eisenstat, and T. Steihaug. Inexact Newton methods. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 19(2):400–408, 1982.
- [8] S. Forth, M. Tadjouddine, J. Pryce, and J. Reid. Jacobian code generated by source transformation and vertex elimination can be as efficient as hand-coding. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 30(3):266–299, 2004.
- [9] A. Gebremedhin, F. Manne, and A. Pothen. What color is your Jacobian? Graph coloring for computing derivatives. *SIAM Review*, 47(4):629–705, 2005.
- [10] J.-C. Gilbert. Automatic differentiation and iterative processes. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 1:13–21, 1992.
- [11] S. Godbole. On efficient computation of matrix chain products. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-22(9):864–866, Sep. 1973.
- [12] A. Griewank. Achieving logarithmic growth of temporal and spatial complexity in reverse automatic differentiation. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 1:35–54, 1992.
- [13] A. Griewank. Who invented the reverse mode of differentiation? *Documenta Mathematica*, Extra Volume ISMP:398–400, 2012.
- [14] A. Griewank and S. Reese. On the calculation of Jacobian matrices by the Markowitz rule. In A. Griewank and G. Corliss, editors, *Automatic Differentiation of Algorithms: Theory, Implementation, and Application*, pages 126–135, Philadelphia, PA, 1991. SIAM.
- [15] A. Griewank and O. Vogel. Analysis and exploitation of Jacobian scarcity. In H. Bock, E. Kostina, H. Phu, and R. Rannacher, editors, *Modeling, Simulation and Optimization of Complex Processes*, pages 149–164, Berlin, 2005. Springer.
- [16] A. Griewank and A. Walther. *Evaluating Derivatives: Principles and Techniques of Algorithmic Differentiation*. Number 105 in Other Titles in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2nd edition, 2008.
- [17] L. Hascoët and V. Pascual. The Tapenade automatic differentiation tool: Principles, model, and specification. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 39(3):20:1–20:43, 2013.

- [18] A. Lyons, I. Safro, and J. Utke. Randomized heuristics for exploiting Jacobian scarcity. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 27(2):311–322, 2012.
- [19] V. Mosenkis and U. Naumann. On lower bounds for optimal Jacobian accumulation. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 33(4-6):1264–1287, 2018.
- [20] U. Naumann. Optimization of generalized Jacobian chain products without memory constraints. arXiv:2003.05755 [math.NA]; Under review.
- [21] U. Naumann. Elimination techniques for cheap Jacobians. In [6], pages 247–253. Springer, 2002.
- [22] U. Naumann. Optimal accumulation of Jacobian matrices by elimination methods on the dual computational graph. *Mathematical Programming, Ser. A*, 99(3):399–421, 2004.
- [23] U. Naumann. Call tree reversal is NP-complete. In [3], pages 13–22, 2008.
- [24] U. Naumann. Optimal Jacobian accumulation is NP-complete. *Mathematical Programming, Ser. A*, 112(2):427–441, 2008.
- [25] U. Naumann. DAG reversal is NP-complete. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 7:402–410, 2009.
- [26] U. Naumann. *The Art of Differentiating Computer Programs: An Introduction to Algorithmic Differentiation*. Number 24 in Software, Environments, and Tools. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2012.
- [27] U. Naumann. On sparse matrix chain products. In *2020 Proceedings of the Ninth SIAM Workshop on Combinatorial Scientific Computing*, pages 118–127, 2020.
- [28] U. Naumann and S. Burela. Hessian chain bracketing. arXiv:2103.09480 [cs.MS]; To appear in *Journal of Combinatorics*.
- [29] U. Naumann, K. Leppkes, and J. Lotz. dco/c++: Derivative code by overloading in C++. Introduction and summary of features, 2016. Technical Report AIB-2016-08.
- [30] J. Pryce and M. Tadjouddine. Fast automatic differentiation Jacobians by compact LU factorization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 30(4):1659–1677, 2008.
- [31] M. Tadjouddine, S. Forth, and J. Pryce. Hierarchical automatic differentiation by vertex elimination and source transformation. In V. Kumar, M. Gavrilova, C. Tan, and P. L’Ecuyer, editors, *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2003, Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Science and its Applications, Montreal, Canada, May 18–21, 2003. Part II*, volume 2668 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 115–124, Berlin, 2003. Springer.

- [32] M. Towara and U. Naumann. Simple adjoint message passing. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 33(4-6):1232–1249, 2018.
- [33] J. Utke, U. Naumann, M. Fagan, N. Tallent, M. Strout, P. Heimbach, C. Hill, and C. Wunsch. OpenAD/F: A modular open-source tool for automatic differentiation of Fortran codes. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 34(4):18:1–18:36, July 2008.
- [34] M. Wang, A. Pothen, and P. Hovland. Edge pushing is equivalent to vertex elimination for computing Hessians. In *2016 Proceedings of the Seventh SIAM Workshop on Combinatorial Scientific Computing*, pages 102–111, 2016.