# Sparse parallel multichannel multikernel convolution

Can ZHOU 19324118 zhouc@tcd.ie

## Part One:

The efforts made to make the code efficient

- 1. Loop Unrolling
- 2. SIMD SSE -x86

3. OpenMP

## 1. Loop Unrolling

- Loop unrolling is a technique for loop transformation which helps to optimise a program's execution time.
- It can remove or reduce iterations.
- I used this method with four iterations unrolling on the second for loop in both initialization and convolution parts.
- By using this, the convolution part can calculate four sum values in one w (width)'s iteration.

## 2. SIMD SSE -x86 [Overall]

- \_m128 (4 32-bit precision floats) in SSE could load,
  calculate, and store four float numbers at same time.
- By using this I am able to operate four calculations in one operation time.
- But I I have to change some code structures.

## 2. SIMD SSE -x86 [Code Structures]

#### The matrix is divided into three blocks:

- The yellow part will use SSE to speed up.
- The size of yellow part is (width width%4) \* (high height%4)
- The size of green part is height \* (width%4)
- Blue part is (height%4) \* (width width%4).

#### Change nested for loops order:

- I got some ideas when I read multichannel\_conv\_dense(), so I put m's for loop as the outermost loop in convolution part. In this order, I can implement the SSE on h (height).
- In the initialization part, when calculate green and blue part, I put m (nkernels) as the innermost loop to avoid unnecessary for loop when the width or height is exactly divided by 4.

## 3. OpenMP [Overall]

- OpenMP can let the program run in multiple threads automatically.
- At first, I added the "#pragma omp parallel for" for the outermost loop (nkernels) in convolution part, but I found some issues:

## 3. OpenMP [Issues]

#### Issue one: Result mistakes

- OpenMP thread are sharing loop variables.
- I added the private() and shared() clause to make sure OpenMP was working properly.

#### Issue two: The threshold to use OpenMP

- When input is small, OpenMP actually slows down the Program.
- Because it takes more time to generate and handle more threads (which don't really do anything).
- I found threshold to use OpenMP from multiple tests.
- If input (width \* nchannels \* nkernels \* kernel\_order) > 270 \* 32 \* 64 \* 3, then use OpenMP

## Part Two:

# Timings

#### Machine I used:

Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8750H CPU @ 2.20GHz

Sockets: 1

Cores: 6

**Logical processors: 12** 

Input 256 256 3 256 256 200
 Input 512 512 3 1024 1024 1000
 Original code 2298194.1 Microseconds Original code 102089133.8 Microseconds
 My Code 100624.7 Microseconds My Code 4417874.1 Microseconds
 Speedup 22.84 times Speedup 23.108 times

• Input 256 256 1 256 256 20

• Input 128 128 5 64 64 20

Original code 864744.3 Microseconds

Original code 197486.3 Microseconds

12345.5 Microseconds

My Code

95502.9 Microseconds

Speedup

My Code

15.997 times

Speedup

9.05

times

Input 128 128 3 32 32 20

Input 32 32 3 32 64 200

18900.4 Microseconds Original code

My Code

Original code 881.3 Microseconds

My Code

5208.1 Microseconds

286.3 Microseconds

**Speedup** 

3.63

times

Speedup

3.08 times

• Input 16 16 1 32 32 20

Original code 45 Microseconds

My Code 28.9 Microseconds

Speedup 1.56 times

Input 16 16 7 32 32 20

Original code 221.1 Microseconds

My Code 42.2 Microseconds

Speedup 5.24 times

#### Part Two:

# Timings

From the results above, we can see that no matter the input is small or large, my code is faster than the original code and this feature is especially obvious when inputting large data, and sometimes my code can even be 23 times faster than the original program.

# Thank you!

Can ZHOU 19324118 zhouc@tcd.ie