

# Assignment 3

路橙 Lu Cheng 2015010137

## Problem 1:

SCORES :		
grid1000x1000.graph		1.00000 / 1
soc-livejournal1_68m.graph		1.00000 / 1
com-orkut_117m.graph		6.00000 / 6
random_500m.graph		6.00000 / 6
rmat_200m.graph		6.00000 / 6
TOTAL		20.00000 / 20

## Problem 2:

SCORES :		Top-Down		Bott-Up		Hybrid	
grid1000x1000.graph		3.00000 / 3		3.00000 / 3		3.00000 / 3	
soc-livejournal1_68m.graph		3.00000 / 3		2.09279 / 3		3.00000 / 3	
com-orkut_117m.graph		0.88358 / 3		3.00000 / 3		3.00000 / 3	
random_500m.graph		6.00000 / 6		4.44705 / 6		6.00000 / 6	
rmat_200m.graph		6.00000 / 6		4.15887 / 6		6.00000 / 6	
TOTAL		56.58230 / 63					

### 1. (1)Top\_down:

Synchronization:

```
#pragma omp critical
{
    memcpy(new_frontier->vertices + new_frontier->count, local_frontier, local_count * sizeof(int));
    new_frontier->count += local_count;
}
```

Ensure the local\_frontier to be able to be added in new\_frontier.

Limit overhead:

```
#pragma omp parallel private(local_count)
{
    local_count = 0;
    Vertex* local_frontier = new Vertex [g->num_nodes];
#pragma omp for
```

Let the thread compute a number of vertexes, rather than compute one vertex, because adding vertex into new\_frontier is a kind of overhead.

(2)bottom\_up:

Synchronization:

No synchronization because neither of 2 threads write into the same memory.

Limit overhead:

Didn't do that.

2. Yes.

The sparse graph uses  $\text{top\_down}(|V| / |E| < 30)$ , the opposite uses bottom\_up.

Besides, if the graph is too sparse that  $|V| / |E| < 5$ , I simply use top\_down that computes every node in frontier in parallel rather than compute a group of nodes. It works very well in grid1000x1000.graph.

3. I think it is because of the memory bandwidth.