

# svds-C: A Multi-Thread C Code for Computing Truncated Singular Value Decomposition

Xu Feng, Wenjian Yu\*, Yuyang Xie

*Dept. Computer Science and Technology, BNRist, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China*

---

## Abstract

This article presents **svds-C**, an open-source and high-performance C program for accurately and robustly computing truncated SVD, e.g. computing several largest singular values and corresponding singular vectors. We have re-implemented the algorithm of `svds` in Matlab in C based on MKL or OpenBLAS and multi-thread computing to obtain the parallel program named **svds-C**. **svds-C** running on shared-memory computer consumes less time and memory than `svds` thanks to careful implementation of multi-thread parallelization and memory management. Numerical experiments on different test cases which are synthetically generated or directly from real-world datasets show that, **svds-C** runs remarkably faster than `svds` with averagely 4.7X and at most 12X speedup for 16-thread parallel computing on a computer with Intel CPU, while preserving same accuracy and consuming about half memory space. Experimental results also demonstrate that **svds-C** has similar advantages over `svds` on the computer with AMD CPU, and outperforms other state-of-the-art algorithms for truncated SVD on computing time and robustness.

*Keywords:* truncated singular value decomposition (SVD), Lanczos bidiagonalization process, large-scale matrix

---

## 1. Introduction

Singular value decomposition (SVD) plays a crucial role in data analysis and scientific computing, which is mainly used for principal component analysis (PCA) and low-rank approximation [1]. Using truncated SVD, we can preserve the most important information of matrix data [2]. With

---

\*Corresponding author. This work was supported by NSFC (No. 61872206).  
*E-mail address:* yu-wj@tsinghua.edu.cn (Wenjian Yu)

the development of large-scale data analytics and physical simulation, high-performance program for accurate truncated SVD are largely demanded.

Lanczos bidiagonalization process is a traditional method for computing truncated SVD [3]. It is derived from the Lanczos process for computing eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the symmetric matrix [1, 4]. The Lanczos process belongs to Krylov subspace method and constitutes an iterative algorithm, with rapid convergence, calculating a few of largest and smallest eigenvalues and corresponding eigenvectors. Similarly, the Lanczos bidiagonalization process derives an algorithm which computes a few of the largest and smallest singular values and corresponding singular vectors [3]. However, the vectors computed in Lanczos process and Lanczos bidiagonalization process often suffer from the issue of losing orthogonality in floating-point arithmetic [1]. Therefore, proper re-orthogonalization scheme should be applied in practice. `svds` in Matlab is based on the Lanczos bidiagonalization process with full re-orthogonalization scheme [5], and is regarded as the standard tool for computing truncated SVD, especially for large sparse matrix. An augmented restarting scheme is also used in `svds` to reduce the memory cost while ensuring accuracy [5]. `lansvd` in PROPACK [6] is based on the Lanczos bidiagonalization process with partial re-orthogonalization scheme and augmented restarting, which computes truncated SVD with less amount of computation while sacrificing numerical stability. Besides, there are recent studies on improving the performance of complete or partial SVD computation on dense matrices in high performance computing circumstance [7, 8, 9].

Some widely-used or recently-developed algorithms for truncated SVD of sparse matrix are summarized in Table 1. `lansvd` is implemented in Fortran. `PRIMME_SVDS` and `Armadillo` are two packages implemented in C/C++. For matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , `PRIMME_SVDS` first uses the state-of-the-art truncated eigenvalue decomposition (EVD) library `PRIMME` (PREconditioned Iterative MultiMethod Eigensolver [10]) to compute EVD of  $\mathbf{A}^T\mathbf{A}$  or  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T$ . Then, the obtained results are used as input vectors to solve the truncated EVD of  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}^T \\ \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$  using `PRIMME`. `svds` in `Armadillo` computes the truncated SVD of the sparse matrix according to the EVD of  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ . All the programs can run parallelly with multiple threads. It should be pointed out, the most efficient and stable algorithm of truncated singular value decomposition for large matrices has only an implementation in Matlab (i.e. `svds`). However, the parallel efficiency of Matlab program is not good. The performance of the same algorithm implemented in C or Fortran could be much better on a multi-core computer.

In this paper we present the functionalities of **`svds-C`**, a C program for computing truncated SVD accurately and robustly. **`svds-C`** is an open-source program to provide efficient tool for truncated SVD in a easy-to-use

Table 1: State-of-the-art truncated SVD algorithms.

Algorithm	Method classification	Matrix type
svds in Matlab	Lanczos bidiagonalization process	general
lansvd [6]	Lanczos bidiagonalization process	general
PRIMME_SVDS [11]	Two stage SVD using PRIMME in [10]	general
svds in Armadillo [12]	general EVD of $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{A}^T & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$	sparse
<b>svds-C</b>	Re-implementation of svds	general

way. It contains the function for both sparse matrices and dense matrices, while allows default parameters or parameters defined by users as input. These features are introduced briefly in Section 2. A complete description of **svds-C** is provided in the package documentation, linked in the metadata.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the algorithm and the efficient implementation of **svds-C**, and how to use it. In Section 3, numerical experiments are presented, which not only compare **svds-C** with svds on computers with different CPUs, but also compare **svds-C** with the other algorithms for truncated SVD. Finally, the impact of this packaged is addressed in Section 4, and this paper is concluded in Section 5.

## 2. Functionalities of svds-C

The purpose of **svds-C** is to provide an efficient program for rank- $k$  truncated SVD, i.e.

$$\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{\Sigma}_k \mathbf{V}_k^T, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_k$  is a diagonal matrix with the largest  $k$  singular values in descending order, while  $\mathbf{U}_k$  and  $\mathbf{V}_k$  are orthonormal matrices containing left and right singular vectors corresponding to the largest  $k$  singular values. Besides,  $\mathbf{A}_k$  is the best rank- $k$  approximation of  $\mathbf{A}$  in both spectral and Frobenius norm [13]. We re-implement the lanczos bidiagonalization process and augmented restarting scheme in svds [5], which is a widely-used tool for truncated SVD but with poor paralleling efficiency.

In this section, we first briefly introduce the truncated SVD algorithm in svds. Then, we review the MKL [14] and OpenBLAS [15], which are two efficient libraries of matrix and vector computation, and present the details of **svds-C** which is derived from re-implementing svds. Finally, we present the interface of the **svds-C** program.

### 2.1. The Truncated SVD Algorithm in svds

The traditional algorithm for computing truncated SVD involves the Lanczos bidiagonalization process [3], which is described as Algorithm 1. According to the theory of matrix computation [3], the singular values of  $\mathbf{T}$  can well approximate the largest and smallest singular values of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

---

#### Algorithm 1 Lanczos bidiagonalization process (LBP)

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , iteration parameter  $t$  ( $t \leq n$ )

**Output:** Orthonormal matrices  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times t}$ ,  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times t}$ , bidiagonalization matrix  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times t}$ , such that  $\mathbf{A} \approx \mathbf{U}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{V}^T$

- 1:  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \text{randn}(n, 1)$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 / \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2$ ,  $\mathbf{T} = \text{zeros}(t)$
  - 2:  $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_1$
  - 3:  $\mathbf{T}(1, 1) = \alpha_1 = \|\mathbf{u}_1\|_2$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_1 / \alpha_1$
  - 4: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, t - 1$  **do**
  - 5:    $\mathbf{v}_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{u}_i - \alpha_i \mathbf{v}_i$
  - 6:    $\mathbf{T}(i, i+1) = \beta_i = \|\mathbf{v}_{i+1}\|_2$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1} = \mathbf{v}_{i+1} / \beta_i$
  - 7:    $\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_{i+1} - \beta_i \mathbf{u}_i$
  - 8:    $\mathbf{T}(i+1, i+1) = \alpha_{i+1} = \|\mathbf{u}_{i+1}\|_2$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i+1} / \alpha_{i+1}$
  - 9: **end for**
  - 10:  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_t]$ ,  $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_t]$
- 

In floating-point arithmetic,  $\mathbf{u}_{i+1}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}$  computed in Alg. 1 suffer from losing orthogonality when index  $i$  increases. Therefore, a proper scheme of re-orthogonalization is required, e.g. full re-orthogonalization. In every iteration with full re-orthogonalization scheme,  $\mathbf{u}_{i+1}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1}$  are re-orthogonalized through executing  $\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{U}^{(i)}\mathbf{U}^{(i)T})\mathbf{u}_{i+1}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{i+1} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{V}^{(i)}\mathbf{V}^{(i)T})\mathbf{v}_{i+1}$ , respectively, where  $\mathbf{U}^{(i)} = [\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_i]$  and  $\mathbf{V}^{(i)} = [\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_i]$ .

Now, we introduce the details of truncated SVD algorithm in svds [5]. In svds, the extreme singular values and corresponding singular vectors of  $\mathbf{T}$  in the Lanczos bidiagonalization process are used to approximate those of  $\mathbf{A}$ . And, an accuracy control scheme and an augmented restarting scheme are employed to ensure the accuracy. The accuracy control is based on the following Proposition [5].

**Proposition 1** Suppose  $\{\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j, \hat{\mathbf{v}}_j, \hat{\sigma}_j\}$  denotes the  $j$ -th largest singular triplet of the bidiagonal matrix  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times t}$  obtained with Alg. 1, and  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j, \tilde{\sigma}_j\}$ , ( $1 \leq j \leq t$ ), is the  $j$ -th largest singular triplet of  $\mathbf{A}$  obtained through

$$\tilde{\sigma}_j = \hat{\sigma}_j, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j = \mathbf{U}\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j = \mathbf{V}\hat{\mathbf{v}}_j, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$  are the orthonormal matrices outputted by Alg. 1. Then, the

computed singular triplet of  $\mathbf{A}$  fulfills:

$$\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j = \tilde{\sigma}_j\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j, \quad \mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j = \tilde{\sigma}_j\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j + \beta_t\mathbf{v}_{t+1}\mathbf{e}_t^T\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j, \quad (1 \leq j \leq t) \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta_t$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}$  can be computed by executing one more iteration of the loop in Alg. 1.  $\mathbf{e}_t$  stands for a  $t$ -dimensional unit column vector in which the  $t$ -th element is 1.

Proposition 1 means the approximation caused by truncating the Lanczos bidiagonalization process makes the difference between  $\mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_j\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j$ , which is a residual of the  $j$ -th singular triplet of  $\mathbf{A}$ . This residual is used in svds to evaluate the accuracy of the computed singular triplets and to enable accuracy control. Proposition 1 facilitates the computation. Specifically, the relative residual is used in svds and computed as:

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j - \tilde{\sigma}_j\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j\|_2}{\tilde{\sigma}_j} = \frac{\|\beta_t\mathbf{v}_{t+1}\mathbf{e}_t^T\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j\|_2}{\tilde{\sigma}_j} = \frac{|\beta_t\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j(t)|}{\hat{\sigma}_j}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_j = \tilde{\sigma}_j$  is the computed  $j$ -th largest singular value of  $\mathbf{A}$ . In this computation, only the singular value/vector of bidiagonal matrix  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\beta_t$  in the Lanczos bidiagonalization process are used.

In svds, once the relative residual for any singular value is greater than a preset tolerance  $\text{tol}$  (e.g.,  $10^{-10}$ ), the augmented restarting scheme [5] is applied to restart the Lanczos bidiagonalization process while preserving the first  $k$  computed singular vectors  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j\}$ , ( $j \leq k$ ) as the orthogonal basis vectors. According to Proposition 1,

$$\mathbf{A}[\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k] = [\tilde{\sigma}_1\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_k\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k]. \quad (5)$$

While calculating the  $(k+1)$ -th right orthogonal basis vector,  $\mathbf{v}_{t+1}$  can be used because it is naturally orthogonal to  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j$ , ( $j \leq k$ ). To continue the Lanczos bidiagonalization process, the projection of  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_{t+1}$  on the  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j$  ( $j \leq k$ ) should be evaluated. The projection coefficient can be calculated with

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j^T \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_{t+1} = \mathbf{v}_{t+1}^T \mathbf{A}^T \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j = \mathbf{v}_{t+1}^T (\tilde{\sigma}_j\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_j + \beta_t\mathbf{v}_{t+1}\mathbf{e}_t^T\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j) = \beta_t\mathbf{e}_t^T\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j = \beta_t\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j(t), \quad (6)$$

according to Proposition 1. So, the  $(k+1)$ -th left orthogonal basis vector is computed by

$$\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_{t+1} - \sum_{j=1}^k \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_j\beta_t\hat{\mathbf{u}}_j(t). \quad (7)$$

Then, the Lanczos bidiagonalization process continues to generate the subsequent orthogonal basis vectors and the updated matrix  $\mathbf{T}$ . The truncated

SVD algorithm in svds is described as Algorithm 2 in details.

---

**Algorithm 2** Truncated SVD in svds

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , rank parameter  $k$ , relative residual tolerance  $\text{tol}$ , restarting parameter  $r$

**Output:**  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$

```

1:  $t = \max(15, 3k)$ 
2:  $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{V}] = \text{LBP}(\mathbf{A}, t+1)$  {Alg. 1}
3: for  $i = 1, \dots, r-1$  do
4:    $[\hat{\mathbf{U}}, \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}, \hat{\mathbf{V}}] = \text{svd}(\mathbf{T}(1:t, 1:t))$ 
5:   if  $\forall j \leq k, |\mathbf{T}(t, t+1)\hat{\mathbf{U}}(t, j)|/\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}(j, j) < \text{tol}$  then
6:     break
7:   else
8:      $[\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k] = \mathbf{U}(:, 1:t)\hat{\mathbf{U}}(:, 1:k)$ ,  $[\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k] = \mathbf{V}(:, 1:t)\hat{\mathbf{V}}(:, 1:k)$ 
9:      $\beta_t = \mathbf{T}(t, t+1)$ ,  $\mathbf{T} = \text{zeros}(t+1)$ ,  $\mathbf{T}(1:k, 1:k+1) = [\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}(1:k, 1:k)$ ,
       $(\beta_t \hat{\mathbf{U}}(t, 1:k))^T]$ 
10:     $\mathbf{v}_{k+1} = \mathbf{v}_{t+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{v}_{k+1} - [\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k](\beta_t \hat{\mathbf{U}}(t, 1:k))^T$ 
11:     $\mathbf{T}(k+1, k+1) = \alpha_{k+1} = \|\mathbf{u}_{k+1}\|_2$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_{k+1} = \mathbf{u}_{k+1}/\alpha_{k+1}$ 
12:    Start the iterative loop in  $\text{LBP}(\mathbf{A}, t+1)$  from iteration  $i = k+1$  with
       $\{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k, \mathbf{u}_{k+1}\}$ ,  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_k, \mathbf{v}_{k+1}\}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  to compute  $\mathbf{U}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$ 
13:   end if
14: end for
15:  $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}(1:k, 1:k))$ 
16:  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{U}(:, 1:t)\hat{\mathbf{U}}(:, 1:k)$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{V}(:, 1:t)\hat{\mathbf{V}}(:, 1:k)$ 

```

---

In Alg. 2, the augmented restarting scheme [5] is used in Step 8-12 which limits peak memory usage. In Step 10,  $\mathbf{u}_{k+1}$  is computed based on (7). Step 12 means the iterative Lanczos bidiagonalization process is restarted at the  $(k+1)$ -th iteration inheriting parts of obtained  $\mathbf{U}$ ,  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  results. Besides, the re-orthogonalization scheme should be used in LBP (Alg. 1) and Step 10 to ensure the numerical stability. The parameter  $r$  limits the maximum times of restarting in Alg. 2. With a suitable setting of  $r$ , Alg. 2 can output the singular values/vectors with good accuracy in most time.

According to the process of Alg. 2, truncated SVD in svds is compute-bound when  $\mathbf{A}$  is dense for computing the matrix-vector multiplication on  $\mathbf{A}$ . When  $\mathbf{A}$  is sparse with little nonzero elements, truncated SVD in svds is memory-bound for the memory-cost of  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathbf{V}$ .

## 2.2. Implementation Details of *svds-C*

### 2.2.1. Overview of MKL and OpenBLAS

MKL (Math kernel library) is supported by Intel for high-performance implementations of linear algebras [14]. MKL not only provides high-performance parallel implementations of functions in BLAS [16] and LAPACK [17], but also supports several different computations such as sparse matrix-vector multiplication with CSR format. Therefore, according to those functions in MKL, we can re-implement *svds* to obtain a C program with better parallelizing efficiency.

Because MKL is designed specifically for Intel cores, we use OpenBLAS [15] as a optional library for other CPU cores such as the AMD core. OpenBLAS also provides high-performance parallel implementations of functions in BLAS and LAPACK. Because OpenMP can be used in program with OpenBLAS, the sparse matrix-vector multiplication is implemented with OpenMP to achieve sufficient acceleration.

### 2.2.2. Efficient Implementations of *svds-C*

To improve the performance of truncated SVD in *svds*, we re-implement it in C with MKL (or OpenBLAS) and multi-thread computing, which is called *svds-C* as the following pseudo code (with MKL/BLAS calls in comments). Several careful treatments are imposed in the implementation for better performance on time and parallel efficiency with less memory usage.

```
1 function [U, S, V] = svds_C(A, k)
2   t = max(15, 3*k);
3   [U, T, V] = LBP(A, t+1); % Alg. 1, which calls routines
4     of cblas_dgemv and MKL_dcslmv
5   for i = 1:r-1
6     [Uh, Sh, Vh] = svd(T(1:t, 1:t)); %LAPACKE_dgesvd
7     tarr = abs(T(t,t+1)*Uh(t,1:k))/diag(Sh(1:k,1:k))<tol;
8     if sum(tarr) == k
9       break;
10    else
11      Uk = U(:,1:t)*Uh(:,1:k); %cblas_dgemm
12      Vk = V(:,1:t)*Vh(:,1:k); %cblas_dgemm
13      bt = T(t, t+1), T = zeros(t+1);
14      T(1:k,1:k+1)=[Sh(1:k,1:k), (bt*Uh(t,1:k))'];
15      uk = A*V(:,k+1)-Uk*(bt*Uh(t,1:k))'; %MKL_dcslmv,
16        cblas_dgemv
17      ak = norm(uk,2), uk = uk/ak, T(k+1,k+1)=ak;
18      Vk = [Vk,V(:,t+1)], Uk = [Uk,uk];
19      Compute [U,T,V]=LBP(A,t+1) from i=k+1 with Uk, T, Vk;
```

```

18     end if
19 end for
20 S = diag(Sh(1:k, 1:k));
21 U=U(:, 1:t)*Uh(:, 1:k), V=V(:, 1:t)*Vh(:, 1:k); %cbblas_dgemm
22 return U, S, V;

```

Firstly, we apply the following skills to reduce the peak memory usage.

- We allocate the space of matrices and vectors at the beginning of **svds-C**, to avoid repeatedly allocating and freeing space.
- We free the space of matrices and vectors immediately when they are useless.

Secondly, the following treatments are applied to improve the efficiency or make better parallelization.

- We use high-performance parallel implementations in MKL or OpenBLAS library as much as possible. Therefore, the matrix-matrix, matrix-vector and vector-vector operations are naturally parallelized. We use the following functions of MKL/BLAS to do the main computations in **svds-C**.
  - `MKL_dcsrmmv` : Compute the sparse matrix-vector multiplication with the matrix stored in CSR format. For the version implemented with OpenBLAS, we implement sparse matrix-vector multiplication with OpenMP to gain sufficient acceleration.
  - `cbblas_dgemv` : Compute the matrix-vector multiplication of the dense matrix, which is used for computing the re-orthogonalization in **svds-C**.
  - `LAPACKE_dgesvd` : Compute the singular value decomposition of a matrix, which is used to compute the SVD of the small matrix in **svds-C**.
  - `cbblas_dgemm` : Compute the matrix-matrix multiplication of two dense matrices in **svds-C**.
- We parallelize the copy operations of matrix and vectors with OpenMP. Therefore, all copy operations in **svds-C** are well parallelized with less runtime.



When Alg. 2 performs with  $R$  times augmented restarting, the *flop* (floating-point operation) count of Alg. 2 for the sparse matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FC}_2 \approx & (2t + 1)C_{mul}\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + (t^2 + 3t + 1)C_{mul}(m + n) + \\ & (R + 1)C_{mul}(m + n)tk + (R + 1)C_{svdt^3} + \\ & R\{C_{mul}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + mk) + (t - k)[2C_{mul}\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + (t + k + 4)C_{mul}(m + n)]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $(2t + 1)C_{mul}\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $(t^2 + 3t + 1)C_{mul}(m + n)$  reflects the matrix-vector multiplication and re-orthogonalization (`cblas_dgemv`) in LBP in Line 3,  $(R+1)C_{mul}(m+n)tk$  reflects the matrix-matrix multiplication (`cblas_dgemm`) in Line 11, 12 and 21, and  $(R+1)C_{svdt^3}$  reflects the SVD (`LAPACKE_dgesvd`) in Line 5. In the braces of the right hand side of (8),  $C_{mul}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + mk)$  reflects the matrix-vector multiplication in Line 14, and  $(t - k)[2C_{mul}\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + (t + k + 4)C_{mul}(m + n)]$  reflects the LBP with computed variables in Line 17. According to the analysis of *flop* count, we can see that `cblas_dgemm` and `LAPACKE_dgesvd` are called for computing small matrices. So, the time cost on these two functions is small. In contrast, `MKL_dcscrmv` and `cblas_dgemv` are called in every iteration of LBP for matrix-vector multiplication and re-orthogonalization, which lead to large portion of time cost.

### 2.3. Interface of *svds-C*

In this subsection, we describe the most important functionality and features of *svds-C* using the C interface. Firstly, the sparse matrix should be read in as `mat_csr` structure, and the parameters are the following.

- `nnz`, `nrows` and `ncols`: the number of nonzeros, rows and columns of the input matrix.
- `values`: the array storing the value of each nonzero element in length `nnz`.
- `cols`: the array storing the column index of each nonzero element in length `nnz`. The column index is from 1 to `ncols`.
- `pointerB` and `pointerE`: the arrays in length `nrows` storing the indexes of each row in `cols`. For example, `cols[pointerB[i]-1]` to `cols[pointerE[i]-1]` store the column indexes of nonzero elements in  $i$ -th row.

Parameters `cols`, `pointerB` and `pointerE` are designed following the requirement of the CSR matrix in MKL. Besides, to store the matrices of the results of *svds-C*, the structure `mat` is used, and the parameters are the following.

- `nrows` and `ncols`: the number of rows and columns of the input matrix.
- `d`: the array storing the value of matrix in size `nrows`  $\times$  `ncols` in column-major format.

After specifying the input CSR matrix, we can call the main functions:

```
svds_C(A, U, S, V, k)
svds_C_opt(A, U, S, V, k, tol, t, r)
```

The `A` is the input matrix with structure `mat_csr`. Matrices `U`, `S` and `V` are the matrices with structure `mat` in size `nrows`  $\times$  `k`, `k`  $\times$  1 and `ncols`  $\times$  `k`, and the space of them are allocated automatically in `svds_C`. `k` is the target rank of truncated SVD. In `svds_C_opt`, `tol` represents the error tolerance of results, `t` represents the dimension of subspace in Laczos bidiagonalization process, while `r` represents the maximum of the augmented restarting. And, the three parameters can be defined by users in `svds_C_opt`. Besides, we also give two functions for the dense input matrix:

```
svds_C_dense(A, U, S, V, k)
svds_C_dense_opt(A, U, S, V, k, tol, t, r)
```

The only difference is the input matrix `A` is with the structure `mat`.

### 3. Performance Analysis

In this section, experiments are carried out for the validation of **svds-C**. We compare **svds-C** with `svds` [5], `lansvd` [6], `PRIMME_SVDS` [11] and `svds` in Armadillo [12]. We use the codes of `lansvd`<sup>1</sup> in the latest version of PROPACK in Fortran with OpenMP, the codes of `PRIMME_SVDS`<sup>2</sup> in C compiled with MKL and PETSc [18] in OpenMPI for the best performance of `PRIMME_SVDS`, and the codes of `svds` in Armadillo<sup>3</sup> in C compiled with OpenBLAS and OpenMP for testing. We set the relative residual tolerance  $\text{tol} = 10^{-10}$  for these algorithms. The iteration parameter `t` in `lansvd` is set  $\max(15, 3k)$ , the same as that in `svds` and **svds-C**. And, the restarting parameter `r` in **svds-C** and `svds` is set 10. The maximum of basis in `PRIMME_SVDS` is  $2k$  for convergence.

Firstly, experiments are carried out on a Ubuntu server with two 8-core Intel Xeon CPU (at 2.10 GHz), and 512 GB RAM. The Matlab 2020b is used for `svds` in Matlab. All the programs are parallelized and we compare the runtime with single thread and 16 threads, and the peak memory usage of

<sup>1</sup><http://sun.stanford.edu/~rmunk/PROPACK/>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/primme/primme>

<sup>3</sup><http://arma.sourceforge.net>

them. Then, we compare `svds` and `svds-C` with OpenBLAS on a Ubuntu server with two 64-core AMD EPYC 7V12 CPUs (at 3.30 GHZ), and 528 GB RAM.

### 3.1. Test Cases

The test cases include matrices which are synthetically generated or directly from real-world datasets.

Firstly, three types of decay patterns of the singular value are introduced in (16) to generate synthetic data, which are selected following [19, 20]. Decay1 is from [21] and Decay3 is from [22]. The singular values of Decay1 and Decay2 matrices decay asymptotically slowly, although they attenuate fast at the start, and the singular values of Decay 3 decay faster than them. Then, three  $40,000 \times 40,000$  synthetic matrices named Sparse1, Sparse2 and Sparse3 are randomly generated according to the Decay1, Decay2 and Decay3, respectively. In each matrix, there are 5 nonzero elements per row on average.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Decay1 : its singular values are set to be } & \begin{cases} \sigma_i = 10^{-\frac{4}{19}(i-1)}, i = 1, \dots, 20 \\ \sigma_i = 10^{-4}/(i-20)^{0.1}, i > 20 \end{cases} \\
 \text{Decay2 : its singular values are set to be } & \sigma_i = i^{-2}, 1 \leq i \leq \min(m, n) \\
 \text{Decay3 : its singular values are set to be } & \sigma_i = i^{-3}, 1 \leq i \leq \min(m, n)
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

As for the test cases directly from real-world data, the first three matrices are the same as those in [23]. The first one is a large matrix from Movielens in size  $270,896 \times 45,115$  with 97 nonzero elements per row on average. The Aminer person-keyword matrix in size of  $12,869,521 \times 323,896$  is the second one, with 16 nonzero elements per row on average. The third one is a social network matrix from SNAP [24], in size  $82,168 \times 82,168$  with 12 nonzero elements per row on average. We also consider two classical real-world multi-label matrix, i.e. Bibtex and Eurlex. Bibtex is a  $7,395 \times 1,836$  matrix with 69 nonzero elements per row on average, while Eurlex is a  $15,539 \times 5,000$  matrix with 237 nonzero elements per row on average. The Bibtex dataset is from a social bookmarking system while the Eurlex dataset is from documents about European Union Law. Then, we consider the two sparse matrices from the experiments of PRIMME\_SVDS [11]. LargeRegFile is in size  $2,111,154 \times 801,374$  with 2 nonzero elements per row on average, while Rucci1 is in size  $1,977,885 \times 109,900$  with 4 nonzero elements per row on average [11].

Table 2: Comparison of `svds` and `svds-C` with single thread and 16 threads on computer with Intel CPU. Time is in unit of second and memory is in unit of GB.

Matrix	<code>svds</code>			<code>svds-C</code> (MKL)			<code>svds-C</code> (OpenBLAS)			SP <sub>1</sub>	SP <sub>16</sub>
	time <sub>1</sub>	time <sub>16</sub>	Mem	time <sub>1</sub>	time <sub>16</sub>	Mem	time <sub>1</sub>	time <sub>16</sub>	Mem		
Sparse1	16.7	6.13	0.43	11.5	<b>2.14</b>	0.28	10.7	3.41	0.26	1.5	2.9
Sparse2	11.5	4.62	0.41	6.52	<b>1.24</b>	0.26	6.74	1.94	0.26	1.8	3.7
Sparse3	11.5	3.76	0.43	6.49	<b>1.33</b>	0.26	6.58	1.93	0.26	1.8	2.8
Movielens ( $k=50$ )	59.1	38.4	1.49	22.1	<b>3.31</b>	0.79	20.1	4.53	0.79	2.7	12
Movielens ( $k=100$ )	156	87.4	1.99	52.9	<b>8.67</b>	1.26	53.4	11.6	1.26	2.9	10
Aminer ( $k=50$ )	2866	1745	37.7	1014	<b>208</b>	22.6	913	234	22.3	2.8	8.4
Aminer ( $k=100$ )	9708	4045	72.0	3080	<b>739</b>	42.3	2593	745	42.0	3.2	5.5
SNAP ( $k=50$ )	11.3	3.76	0.43	7.24	<b>1.62</b>	0.28	6.65	2.39	0.28	1.6	2.3
SNAP ( $k=100$ )	41.2	14.8	0.85	24.9	<b>5.88</b>	0.55	22.9	6.45	0.53	1.7	2.5
Bibtex ( $k=50$ )	1.09	1.85	0.05	0.56	<b>0.24</b>	0.03	0.53	0.38	0.03	1.9	7.7
Bibtex ( $k=100$ )	2.57	1.68	0.08	1.00	<b>0.31</b>	0.05	0.88	0.56	0.05	2.6	5.4
Eurlex ( $k=50$ )	4.08	3.86	0.21	2.19	<b>0.53</b>	0.10	1.65	0.60	0.10	1.9	7.3
Eurlex ( $k=100$ )	12.1	8.55	0.21	4.52	<b>1.05</b>	0.12	3.94	1.13	0.12	2.7	8.1
LargeRegFile ( $k=50$ )	302	102	7.53	222	<b>43.5</b>	4.57	187	53.4	4.57	1.4	2.3
LargeRegFile ( $k=100$ )	714	217	14.8	440	<b>120</b>	8.91	399	135	8.91	1.6	1.8
Rucci1 ( $k=50$ )	353	145	5.70	202	<b>44.4</b>	3.32	167	53.5	3.27	1.7	3.3
Rucci1 ( $k=100$ )	1192	360	11.1	609	<b>161</b>	6.45	520	172	6.39	2.0	2.2
Dense1	102	25.2	0.88	71.1	<b>16.5</b>	0.84	69.7	18.0	0.82	1.4	1.5
Dense2	71.5	17.9	0.88	46.0	<b>10.7</b>	0.82	40.4	11.7	0.82	1.6	1.7
Dense3	71.6	18.0	0.87	43.9	<b>10.2</b>	0.82	40.6	12.0	0.82	1.6	1.8
Average	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	2.0	4.7

time<sub>1</sub>, time<sub>16</sub> and Mem denote the runtime with single thread, the runtime with 16 threads and the memory cost, respectively.

SP<sub>1</sub> and SP<sub>16</sub> mean the speed-up ratios of `svds-C` with MKL to `svds` on time<sub>1</sub> and time<sub>16</sub>, respectively.

They are two sparse matrices obtained from SuiteSparse matrix collection<sup>4</sup>. Notice that LargeRegFile is a matrix with many repeated singular values, and Rucci1 has singular values decaying very slowly.

Finally, we generate three  $10,000 \times 10,000$  dense matrices named Dense1, Dense2 and Dense3 following the singular value decay patterns Decay1, Decay2 and Decay3, respectively. The three matrices are used to validate the performance of `svds-C` compared with `svds` on the dense matrix.

In the following experiments, the rank parameter  $k$  is fixed to 100 for the synthetically generated test cases. For the real-world cases, we test the algorithms with both  $k = 50$  and  $k = 100$ .

### 3.2. Validation of `svds-C` on Computer with Intel CPU

In this subsection, we compare our `svds-C` with `svds` on computer with Intel CPU. Because the Matlab routines only take usage of the physical cores

<sup>4</sup><https://people.engr.tamu.edu/davis/matrices.html>

of CPU, i.e. 16 cores in our server, we test all these programs using 16-thread parallel computing for fair comparison. The results with single thread and 16 threads for the total 20 test cases are listed in Table 2. The smallest runtime for each case is indicated in bold.

Based on our efficient implementation, **svds-C** exhibits the average speedups of 2.0X and 4.7X over `svds` on runtime with single thread and 16 threads, respectively (see Table 2). Experiments also show that **svds-C** runs up to 3.2X and 12X faster than `svds` with single thread and 16 threads respectively. Although **svds-C** with OpenBLAS costs less runtime with single thread, **svds-C** with MKL performs better with 16 threads due to the better implementation for parallelization. Because `svds` is paralleled well when dealing with the dense matrix on computer with Intel CPU, the speed-up ratio of `svds` to **svds-C** with 16 threads is nearly the same with that with single thread.

Table 2 also shows that the peak memory of **svds-C** is less than that of `svds` for all test cases. The reduction of memory on sparse matrices is nearly 50% for all cases and up to 52.4% for Eurlex ( $k = 50$ ). This is attributed to the memory management approach used in **svds-C**. The reduction of memory on the dense matrix is less than that on the sparse matrix, because the peak memory usage is mainly constituted of the memory of the input dense matrix.

### 3.3. Validation of **svds-C** on Computer with AMD CPU

In this subsection, we compare our **svds-C** with `svds` on a computer with AMD CPU. Their results with single thread and 16 threads for the total 23 test cases of the sparse matrix are listed in Table 3. Because on dense matrices **svds-C** costs less runtime with 8 threads, we record the runtime with single thread and 8 threads for the three dense matrices in Table 3. The smallest runtime for each case is indicated in bold.

Because Matlab internally uses MKL for computation, the runtime of `svds` with multiple threads on computer with AMD CPU is more than that with single thread. The results in Table 3 show that, our **svds-C** runs up to 3.8X and 8.5X faster than `svds` with single thread and 16 threads respectively, and the average speedup ratios of **svds-C** to `svds` are 2.2X and 5.5X for the computing with single and 16 threads, respectively. When setting more threads on the computer with AMD CPU, we find out that the runtime of **svds-C** decreases little or even increases for some cases. This suggests that setting 16 threads in the experiment is appropriate.

From Table 3 we also see that the peak memory usage of **svds-C** is less than that of `svds` for all test cases except the smallest case Bibtex ( $k = 50$ ). The reduction of memory is nearly 50% for most cases and up to 68.9% (see the case Ruccil ( $k = 100$ )).

Table 3: Comparison of `svds` and `svds-C` (OpenBLAS) with single thread and multiple threads on computer AMD CPU. Time is in unit of second and memory is in unit of GB.

Matrix	svds			svds-C (OpenBLAS)			SP <sub>1</sub>	SP <sub>16</sub>
	time <sub>1</sub>	time <sub>16</sub>	Mem	time <sub>1</sub>	time <sub>16</sub>	Mem		
Sparse1	9.18	10.2	0.54	5.46	<b>2.41</b>	0.27	1.7	4.2
Sparse2	6.37	8.07	0.51	2.86	<b>1.29</b>	0.26	2.2	6.3
Sparse3	6.36	6.94	0.51	2.98	<b>1.35</b>	0.26	2.1	5.1
MovieLens ( $k=50$ )	26.5	27.7	1.53	12.6	<b>3.28</b>	0.78	2.1	8.4
MovieLens ( $k=100$ )	62.2	61.9	2.62	31.3	<b>7.27</b>	1.26	2.0	8.5
Aminer ( $k=50$ )	1331	974	52.1	456	<b>120</b>	22.3	2.9	8.1
Aminer ( $k=100$ )	3419	2412	101	1182	<b>348</b>	42.0	2.9	6.9
SNAP ( $k=50$ )	6.68	6.39	0.54	3.79	<b>2.40</b>	0.28	1.8	2.7
SNAP ( $k=100$ )	18.8	17.0	1.05	12.6	<b>6.32</b>	0.53	1.5	2.7
Bibtex ( $k=50$ )	1.14	1.05	0.03	0.35	<b>0.24</b>	0.04	3.3	4.4
Bibtex ( $k=100$ )	2.23	1.81	0.07	0.58	<b>0.32</b>	0.05	3.8	5.7
Eurlex ( $k=50$ )	3.12	2.21	0.19	1.32	<b>0.31</b>	0.10	2.4	7.1
Eurlex ( $k=100$ )	6.51	4.38	0.19	2.96	<b>0.54</b>	0.12	2.2	8.1
LargeRegFile ( $k=50$ )	147	156	9.84	111	<b>32.5</b>	4.57	1.3	4.8
LargeRegFile ( $k=100$ )	323	323	21.3	184	<b>76.4</b>	8.92	1.8	4.2
Rucci1 ( $k=50$ )	169	187	10.1	92.2	<b>36.2</b>	3.28	1.8	5.2
Rucci1 ( $k=100$ )	471	466	19.9	266	<b>94.0</b>	6.39	3.8	5.7
Dense1	45.6	50.0*	0.87	35.1	<b>14.2*</b>	0.82	1.3	3.5
Dense2	34.5	35.3*	0.87	21.3	<b>8.86*</b>	0.82	1.6	4.0
Dense3	36.1	35.8*	0.87	21.0	<b>8.73*</b>	0.82	1.7	4.1
Average	/	/	/	/	/	/	2.2	5.5

time<sub>1</sub>, time<sub>16</sub> and Mem denote the runtime with single thread, the runtime with 16 threads and the memory cost, respectively. \* represents the runtime with 8 threads.

SP<sub>1</sub> and SP<sub>16</sub> mean the speed-up ratios of `svds-C` with OpenBLAS to `svds` on time<sub>1</sub> and time<sub>16</sub>, respectively.

### 3.4. More Results and Comparisons

In this subsection, we compare our `svds-C` program with other programs for truncated SVD, i.e. `lansvd`, `PRIMME_SVDS` and `svds` in Armadillo. We test all these programs using 16-thread parallel computing for fair comparison on the computer with Intel CPU. The runtime for the total 23 test cases of sparse matrices is listed in Table 4. The smallest runtime for each case is indicated in bold. The computed singular values are plotted in Fig. 1.

From Table 4 we see that the runtime with 16 threads of `svds-C` is the smallest or close to the smallest for most cases. For the cases with  $m \gg n$  (Aminer, LargeRegFile and Rucci1), `PRIMME_SVDS` costs less runtime than `svds-C` because it computes the eigenvalue decomposition of  $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$  at the first stage. From Fig. 1, we see that the results of `svds-C` completely matches `svds` which validates the accuracy of `svds-C`. However, `lansvd`,

Table 4: Runtimes of **svds-C** (MKL), lansvd [6], PRIMME\_SVDS [11] and svds in Armadillo [12] with 16-thread parallel computing, on the computer with Intel CPU. Time is in unit of second.

Matrix	Size ( $m \times n$ )	<b>svds-C</b>	lansvd	PRIMME_SVDS	Armadillo
Sparse1	40,000×40,000	<b>2.14</b>	6.87	6.62	40.2
Sparse2		1.24	4.56	<b>1.05</b>	13.9
Sparse3		1.33	6.50	<b>0.79</b>	36.5
Movielens ( $k=50$ )	270,896×45,115	<b>3.31</b>	32.9	10.0	121
Movielens ( $k=100$ )		<b>8.67</b>	59.0	22.6	257
Aminer ( $k=50$ )	12,869,521×323,896	208	551	<b>177</b>	3888
Aminer ( $k=100$ )		739	1497	<b>316</b>	6700
SNAP ( $k=50$ )	82,168×82,168	<b>1.62</b>	4.04	3.15	11.3
SNAP ( $k=100$ )		<b>5.88</b>	9.85	11.5	30.2
Bibtex ( $k=50$ )	7,395×1,836	<b>0.24</b>	0.55	0.78	1.90
Bibtex ( $k=100$ )		<b>0.31</b>	0.75	2.73	4.05
Eurlex ( $k=50$ )	15,539×5,000	<b>0.53</b>	3.26	1.33	14.0
Eurlex ( $k=100$ )		<b>1.05</b>	6.70	3.53	23.1
LargeRegFile ( $k=50$ )	2,111,154 × 801,374	43.5	53.4	<b>6.00</b>	170
LargeRegFile ( $k=100$ )		120	320	<b>18.7</b>	431
Rucci1 ( $k=50$ )	1,977,885×109,900	44.4	65.7	<b>19.6</b>	253
Rucci1 ( $k=100$ )		161	158	<b>50.0</b>	637

PRIMME\_SVDS and svds in Armadillo all induce accuracy issue on the case LargeRegFile which has many multiple singular values. As shown in Fig. 1, their results are not correct, largely different from those of svds. Therefore, **svds-C** is an efficient choice for calculating accurate truncated SVD robustly.

#### 4. Impact

Truncated SVD, e.g. computing several largest singular values and corresponding singular vectors, is a very important factorization in matrix computations, which has been used in the area of machine learning and data mining for solving problems of dimension reduction, information retrieval and feature selection, etc. For example, it is used in NetMF to compute the network embedding [25], and is repeatedly applied in the singular value thresholding (SVT) algorithm for matrix completion [26]. Among the algorithms for truncated SVD, svds is the most widely-used and most robust tool. However, svds does not perform well on multi-thread computing because it is implemented in Matlab. And, there is an incredible shortcoming that there




Figure 1: The computed singular values of test cases from `svds`, `svds-C`, `lansvd` [6], `PRIMME_SVDS` [11] and `svds in Armadillo` [12] (setting  $k = 100$ ).

is no `svds` algorithm implemented in C/C++. Our work (`svds-C`) fills this gap. The experimental results in this paper show the poor paralleling efficiency of `svds`, and that `svds-C` runs remarkably faster than `svds` under the setting of parallel computing on a computer with no matter Intel CPU or



AMD CPU. Besides, we provide the source code and building instructions of the **svds-C** to the research community through a public release on GitHub, which enables researchers from various areas to efficiently compute truncated SVD in their customized and real applications.

## 5. Conclusion

This article presents the open-source program **svds-C**, a high-performance C program that provides functionalities to compute truncated SVD accurately and robustly. We re-implement the truncated SVD algorithm `svdsin` Matlab to obtain a parallel C program named **svds-C** based on the MKL [14] and OpenBLAS [15]. Numerical experiments on synthetically generated or real-world test matrices show that **svds-C** runs up to 3.2X and 12X faster than `svds` on the machine with Intel CPU for single-thread and 16-thread computing respectively, while remarkably reducing the memory cost. On the computer with AMD CPU, **svds-C** runs up to 3.8X and 8.5X faster than `svds` for single-thread and 16-thread computing, respectively. Our experiments also validates that **svds-C** outperforms the other algorithms for truncated SVD on computing time and robustness. As the result, **svds-C** can be regarded as a good replacer of `svds` for computing truncated SVD of large-scale matrices.

## References

- [1] G. H. Golub, C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, JHU Press, 2012.
- [2] X. Ge, H. Wang, Y. Fan, Y. Cao, H. Chen, R. Huang, Joint inversion of  $t_1$ - $t_2$  spectrum combining the iterative truncated singular value decomposition and the parallel particle swarm optimization algorithms, *Computer Physics Communications* 198 (2016) 59–70. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpc.2015.09.003>.  
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010465515003410>
- [3] G. Golub, W. Kahan, Calculating the singular values and pseudo-inverse of a matrix, *Journal of The Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Series B: Numerical Analysis* 2 (2) (1965) 205–224.
- [4] R. Lehoucq, D. Sorensen, C. Yang, *ARPACK User’s Guide: Solution of Large-Scale Eigenvalue Problems with Implicitly Restarted Arnoldi Methods*, SIAM Press, 1998.

- [5] J. Baglama, L. Reichel, Augmented implicitly restarted Lanczos bidiagonalization methods, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 27 (1) (2005) 19–42.
- [6] R. M. Larsen, PROPACK-software for large and sparse SVD calculations, Available online. <http://sun.stanford.edu/~rmunk/PROPACK> (2004).
- [7] D. Keyes, H. Ltaief, Y. Nakatsukasa, D. Sukkari, High-performance svd partial spectrum computation, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, 2023*, pp. 1–12.
- [8] D. Sukkari, H. Ltaief, A. Esposito, D. Keyes, A qdwh-based svd software framework on distributed-memory manycore systems, *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)* 45 (2) (2019) 1–21.
- [9] D. Sukkari, H. Ltaief, D. Keyes, A high performance qdwh-svd solver using hardware accelerators, *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)* 43 (1) (2016) 1–25.
- [10] A. Stathopoulos, J. R. McCombs, PRIMME: PReconditioned Iterative MultiMethod Eigensolver—methods and software description, *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)* 37 (2) (2010) 1–30.
- [11] L. Wu, E. Romero, A. Stathopoulos, PRIMME\_SVDS: A high-performance preconditioned svd solver for accurate large-scale computations, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 39 (5) (2017) S248–S271.
- [12] C. Sanderson, R. Curtin, Armadillo: a template-based C++ library for linear algebra, *Journal of Open Source Software* 1 (2) (2016) 26.
- [13] C. Eckart, G. Young, The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank, *Psychometrika* 1 (3) (1936) 211–218.
- [14] Intel oneAPI Math Kernel Library, <https://software.intel.com/content/www/us/en/develop/tools/oneapi/components/onemkl.html> (2021).
- [15] X. Zhang, OpenBLAS: An optimized BLAS library, <http://www.openblas.net/> (2022).
- [16] Netlib, Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms, <http://www.netlib.org/blas/> (2022).

- [17] Netlib, Linear Algebra PACKage, <http://www.netlib.org/lapack/index.html> (2022).
- [18] S. Balay, S. Abhyankar, M. F. Adams, S. Benson, J. Brown, P. Brune, K. Buschelman, E. M. Constantinescu, L. Dalcin, A. Dener, V. Eijkhout, W. D. Gropp, V. Hapla, T. Isaac, P. Jolivet, D. Karpeev, D. Kaushik, M. G. Knepley, F. Kong, S. Kruger, D. A. May, L. C. McInnes, R. T. Mills, L. Mitchell, T. Munson, J. E. Roman, K. Rupp, P. Sanan, J. Sarich, B. F. Smith, S. Zampini, H. Zhang, H. Zhang, J. Zhang, PETSc Web page, <https://petsc.org/> (2022).
- [19] W. Yu, Y. Gu, J. Li, S. Liu, Y. Li, Single-pass PCA of large high-dimensional data, in: Proc. International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI), 2017, pp. 3350–3356.
- [20] W. Yu, Y. Gu, Y. Li, Efficient randomized algorithms for the fixed-precision low-rank matrix approximation, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 39 (3) (2018) 1339–1359.
- [21] N. Halko, P. G. Martinsson, Y. Shkolnisky, M. Tygert, An algorithm for the principal component analysis of large data sets, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 33 (5) (2011) 2580–2594.
- [22] T. Mary, I. Yamazaki, J. Kurzak, P. Luszczek, S. Tomov, J. Dongarra, Performance of random sampling for computing low-rank approximations of a dense matrix on GPUs, in: Proc. the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis, no. 60, 2015, pp. 1–11.
- [23] X. Feng, Y. Xie, M. Song, W. Yu, J. Tang, Fast randomized PCA for sparse data, in: Proc. the 10th Asian Conference on Machine Learning (ACML), 2018, pp. 710–725.
- [24] J. Leskovec, A. Krevl, SNAP datasets: Stanford large network dataset collection, <http://snap.stanford.edu/data> (Jun. 2014).
- [25] J. Qiu, Y. Dong, H. Ma, J. Li, K. Wang, J. Tang, Network embedding as matrix factorization: Unifying deepwalk, line, pte, and node2vec, in: Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international conference on web search and data mining, 2018, pp. 459–467.
- [26] J. F. Cai, E. J. Candès, Z. Shen, A singular value thresholding algorithm for matrix completion, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20 (4) (2010) 1956–1982.

### Current code version

Nr.	Code metadata description	Please fill in this column
C1	Current code version	v1
C2	Permanent link to code/repository used for this code version	<a href="https://github.com/THU-numbda/svds-C">https://github.com/THU-numbda/svds-C</a>
C3	Permanent link to Reproducible Capsule	
C4	Legal Code License	MIT
C5	Code versioning system used	git
C6	Software code languages, tools, and services used	C
C7	Compilation requirements, operating environments & dependencies	MKL in oneAPI [14] or OpenBLAS [15]
C8	If available Link to developer documentation/manual	<a href="https://github.com/THU-numbda/svds-C">https://github.com/THU-numbda/svds-C</a>
C9	Support email for questions	

Table 5: Code metadata (mandatory)