

Performance (Memory) Optimization

National Tsing Hua University
2020, Fall Semester

Communication vs Computation

■ Peak performance for Kepler

- The peak processing performance is 3935 Gflops.
- The bandwidth is 250GB/s, which equals to 63G floating point data per second.
- The ratio is about 60 times

■ Instruction execution

- Each computation **instruction takes 1~4 cycles**
- Each load/store instruction for **global memory** access takes **400~800 cycles**
- Memory access to **shared memory** can be **1~20 cycles**
- The ratio is about 100 times

Data Pre-fetch and Reuse

- GPU has faster memory spaces (**but smaller**)
 - Shared memory / L1 cache
 - Register file
- Solution:
 - Hardware: prefetch data to shared memory or registers for later computation (hardware)
 - Software/Programmer: **minimize memory usage & reuse the data in shared memory or registers** as many times as possible

Outline

■ Host memory

- Pined memory
- Asynchronous computation & data transfer
- Streams

■ Global/Local memory

- Memory coalescing
- Tiled algorithm

■ Shared memory

- Bank conflicts avoidance
- Memory padding

■ Address linearization

Outline

■ Host memory

- Pined memory
- Asynchronous computation & data transfer
- Streams

■ Global/Local memory

- Memory coalescing
- Tiled algorithm

■ Shared memory

- Bank conflicts avoidance
- Memory padding

■ Address linearization

1. Page-Locked Data Transfers

- `cudaMallocHost()` allows allocation of page-locked (“pinned”) host memory

```
cudaMalloc ( &dev1, size ) ;  
cudaMallocHost( &host1, size ) ;  
...  
cudaMemcpy ( dev1, host1, size, H2D ) ;
```

- Enables highest `cudaMemcpy` performance
- Use with caution!!
 - Allocating too much page-locked memory can reduce overall system (host) performance

2. Overlap CPU & GPU Computations


- To facilitate concurrent execution between **host** and **device**, some function calls are **asynchronous**:
 - Control is returned to the host thread before the device has completed the requested task.
- Asynchronous functions:
 - **Kernel launches**
 - Asynchronous memory copy and set options:
cudaMemcpyAsync, cudaMemcpySetAsync
 - **cudaMemcpy** within the **same device**
 - H2D cudaMemcpy of **64kB or less**

Synchronous Computation

```
cudaMalloc ( &dev1, size ) ;  
double* host1 = (double*) malloc ( &host1, size ) ;  
...  
// cudaMemcpy blocks until copy is completed  
cudaMemcpy ( dev1, host1, size, H2D ) ;  
// two kernels are serialized and executed on device  
kernel2 <<< grid, block>>> ( ..., dev2, ... );  
kernel3 <<< grid, block>>> ( ..., dev3, ... );  
// cudaMemcpy starts after kernels finish  
// and blocks until copy is completed  
cudaMemcpy ( host4, dev4, size, D2H ) ;  
CPU_func() ;  
...
```

} Kernels from a single thread are serialized


- CPU and GPU are synchronized due to cudaMemcpy
- Kernel functions from the same process (default stream) are always serialized, and cannot be overlapped on GPU



Asynchronous Computation

```
cudaMalloc(&dev1, size) ;  
double* host1=(double*) malloc (&host1, size);  
...  
cudaMemcpy (dev1, host1, size, H2D) ;  
kernel2 <<< grid, block >>> ( ..., dev1, ... );  
kernel3 <<< grid, block >>> ( ..., dev1, ... );  
CPU_method ();  
cudaMemcpy ( host1, dev1, size, D2H ) ;  
...
```


CPU & GPU
overlapped



Asynchronous Data Transfers

- Asynchronous host-device memory copy returns control immediately to CPU
 - `cudaMemcpyAsync(dst, src, size, dir, stream);`
 - requires **pinned host memory** (allocated by “`cudaMallocHost`”)
- Overlap CPU computation with data transfer
 - **0 = default stream**

```
cudaMemcpyAsync(a_d, a_h, size,  
                cudaMemcpyHostToDevice, 0);  
kernel<<<grid, block>>>(a_d);  
cudaMemcpyAsync(a_h, a_d, size,  
                cudaMemcpyHostToDevice, 0);  
CPU_method();
```




The diagram illustrates the execution flow of the provided code. A large curly bracket on the right groups the first three lines of code: `cudaMemcpyAsync(a_d, a_h, size, cudaMemcpyHostToDevice, 0);`, `kernel<<<grid, block>>>(a_d);`, and `cudaMemcpyAsync(a_h, a_d, size, cudaMemcpyHostToDevice, 0);`. An arrow points from this bracket to the word "overlapped". Another arrow points from the "overlapped" label to the `CPU_method();` line, indicating that the CPU computation can proceed while the asynchronous memory transfers are in progress.

3. CUDA Streams

- CUDA Stream is a technique to **overlap the execution of a kernel**, and **hide data transfer delay from computations**
 - Operations in **different streams** can be interleaved and, when possible, they can even **run concurrently**
 - **Operations in the same stream are still serialized and executed in order**
- Consider a kernel process a huge dataset
 - Without stream, the kernel computation can only start after the dataset is transferred



- With stream, we can partition the dataset, assign each partition to a stream, and execute them in a **pipeline**



CUDA Streams

- kernel launch

- `kernel<<<grid,block,0,stream-id>>> (/*...*/);`

- Stream-id must be allocated and destroyed

- `cudaStream_t *stream;`

- `cudaStreamCreate(&stream);`

- `cudaStreamDestroy(stream);`

- Memory copy can be either synchronous or asynchronous. **But synchronous memcpy prevents streams from running in parallel**

- **If asynchronous copy is used, host memory must be pinned**

CUDA Streams

```
cudaStream_t stream[2];
cudaStreamCreate(&stream[0]);
cudaStreamCreate(&stream[1]);
cudaMallocHost(&hostPtr, 2 * size);
for (int i = 0; i < 2; ++i) {
    cudaMemcpyAsync( /*...*/ , cudaMemcpyHostToDevice, stream[i] );
    kernel<<<100,512,0,stream[i]>>>( /*...*/ );
    cudaMemcpyAsync( /*...*/ , cudaMemcpyDeviceToHost, stream[i] );
}
cudaStreamDestroy(stream[0]);
cudaStreamDestroy(stream[1]);
```


pined(page locked mem)

Stream based Synchronization

- `cudaStreamSynchronize(stream-id)`
 - Blocks host until **all CUDA calls in stream stream-id** complete
- `cudaEventRecord (event , stream-id)`
 - Insert '**events**' in streams
 - Event is recorded when GPU reaches it in a stream
- `cudaEventSynchronize (event)`
 - Blocks **CPU thread** until event is recorded
- `cudaStreamWaitEvent (steam-id , event , 0)`
 - Block a **GPU stream** until event reports completion

Example: Explicit Sync between Streams

```
cudaEvent_t event;  
cudaEventCreate (&event); // create event  
// 1) H2D copy of new input  
cudaMemcpyAsync ( d_in, in, size, H2D, stream1 );  
cudaEventRecord (event, stream1); // record event  
// 2) D2H copy of previous result  
cudaMemcpyAsync ( out, d_out, size, D2H, stream2 );  
// wait for event in stream1  
cudaStreamWaitEvent ( stream2, event );  
// 3) must wait for 1 and 2  
kernel <<< , , , stream2 >>> ( d_in, d_out );  
asynchronousCPUMethod ( ... ) // Async GPU method
```




Outline

- Host memory
 - Pined memory
 - Asynchronous computation & data transfer
 - Streams
- Global/Local memory
 - Memory coalescing
 - Tiled algorithm
- Shared memory
 - Bank conflicts avoidance
 - Memory padding
- Address linearization

Local Memory Cache

- L1 & L2 are used to cache **local memory** contents
 - L1: On chip memory. Same as **share memory**
 - ◆ Programmers can decide the ratio of shared memory and L1 cache
 - L2: Off chip memory Cache. Same as **global memory**




Coalesced Memory Access


- Accessing data in the global memory is critical to the performance of a CUDA application
 - DRAM is slow comparing to other on-chip memory
- Recall that all threads in a warp execute the same instruction
 - When all threads in a warp execute a load instruction, the hardware detects whether the threads access consecutive memory locations
 - In this favorable case, the hardware coalesces all memory accesses into a consolidated access (single transaction) to consecutive **DRAM** locations (off-chip memory)

Coalesced Memory Access

■ Coalesced access




■ Unaligned sequential addresses that fit into two 128-byte L1-cache lines



Misaligned Access Without Caching

- Misaligned sequential addresses that fall within five **32-byte L2 cache segments**


- No extra data reading



- Sometimes, it will be faster than (L1) cached memory access
 - If data are not reused


Example: Matrix Transpose

- SDK Sample (“transpose”)
- Illustrates coalescing using shared memory
 - Speedups for even small matrices





Uncoalesced Transpose

Reads input from GMEM




Write output to GMEM



Coalesced Transpose

- Coalescing through shared memory
- Make both read & write become continuous for global memory



Outline

- Host memory
 - Pined memory
 - Asynchronous computation & data transfer
 - Streams
- Global/Local memory
 - Memory coalescing
 - Tiled algorithm
- Shared memory
 - Bank conflicts avoidance
 - Memory padding
- Address linearization

Example: Matrix Multiply

- Compute $C = A \times B$, where A, B, C are N by N matrices

For $i = 1:N$

For $j = 1:N$

Let each thread compute one element $C[i][j]$

For $k = 1:N$

$C[i][j] += A[i][k] * B[k][j]$

- Compute to Global Memory Access (CGMA) ratio

➤ Compute = 1 multiplication + 1 addition; Memory access = 2

➔ CGMA = 1

- K20x (Kepler)

➤ Compute = 3950 GFLOPs; Global memory BW = 250GB/s

➤ Compute / Comm. = $3950 \times 4 / 250 \approx 64$

➔ CGMA must increase to 64!

Floating point takes 4 bytes

Load Everything to Shared Memory

- Share memory is 100 times faster than global memory
- If N^2 threads are used:
 - Each thread only needs to load 2 elements, and does $2N$ computations
 - CGMA = N (When $N > 64$, memory access will not be the bottleneck anymore)

```
For i = 1:N
  For j = 1:N
    For k = 1:N
      C[i][j] += A[i][k] * B[k][j]
```

- But shared memory is small
 - The data needs to be stored is $3N^2$ integers or floats
 - If $N=1024$, size = 12MB (i.e., $3 \times 1,024 \times 1,024 \times 4$)


Load Everything to Shared Memory

- `Matrix_Mul<<<1, N, 2*N*N>>>(A, B, C, N);`
 - The third parameter is the size of shared memory.

```
extern __shared__ int S[];
inline int Addr(int matrixIdx, int i, int j, int N) {
    return (N*N*matrixIdx + i*N + j);
}
__global__ void Matrix_Mul(int* A, int* B, int* C, int* N) {
    int i = threadIdx.x;
    int j = threadIdx.y;
    //move data to shared memory
    S[Addr(0, i, j, N)] = A[Addr(0, i, j, N)];
    S[Addr(1, i, j, N)] = B[Addr(0, i, j, N)];
    __syncthreads();
    // do computation
    for(int k=0; k<*N; k++)
        C[Addr(1, i, j, N)] = S[Addr(0, j, k, N)] * S[Addr(0, k, j, N)];
}
```

Block(Tiled) Algorithm

- Break up the execution of the kernel into phases so that the data accesses in each phase is focused on one subset (tile) of data
- Not all problems can be partitioned into independent subsets



Block(Tiled) Algorithm

Total required data accesses

$$= 2 \times (\text{TILE_WIDTH})^2$$

Total computing = $2 \times (\text{TILE_WIDTH})^3$

■ Rewrite for-loop by TILE_WIDTH

```
For i' = 1:N step TILE_WIDTH
  For j' = 1:N step TILE_WIDTH
    For k' = 1:N step TILE_WIDTH
      For i = i' : i' + TILE_WIDTH - 1
        For j = j' : j' + TILE_WIDTH - 1
          For k = k' : k' + TILE_WIDTH - 1
            C[i][j] += A[i][k] * B[k][j]
```

■ We can find a small enough TILE_WIDTH, such that all the values needed by C[i][j] are in shared memory

→ Every data is re-used **TILE_WIDTH** times

■ Given 48KB shared memory: Include output array C[][]

➤ Max tiled size = $(48\text{KB}/4\text{B}/3)^{(1/2)} = 64$

➤ **CGMA = number of data re-use = TILE_WIDTH = 64!**

```

extern __shared__ int S[];
inline int Addr(int matrixIdx, int i, int j, int N) {
    return (N*N*matrixIdx + i*N+ j);
}
__global__ void Matrix_Mul(int* A, int* B, int* C, int* N) {
    int i = threadIdx.x;
    int j = threadIdx.y;
    //move data to shared memory
    S[Addr(0, i, j, N)]=A[Addr(0, i, j, N)];
    S[Addr(1, i, j, N)]=B[Addr(0, i, j, N)];
    __syncthreads();
    // do computation
    for(int k=0; k<N; k++)
        C[Addr(1, i, j, N)]=A[Addr(0, j, k, N)]*B[Addr(0, k, j, N)];
}
void main() {
    for(int i=0; i<N; i+=TILE_WIDTH)
        for(int j=0; j<N; j+=TILE_WIDTH){
            cudaMemcpy(d_A, &A[i,j], sizeof(int)*TILE_WIDTH*TILE_WIDTH, H2D);
            cudaMemcpy(d_B, &B[i,j], sizeof(int)*TILE_WIDTH*TILE_WIDTH, H2D);
            Matrix_Mul<<<1, N, 2*N*N>>>(d_A, d_B, d_C, TILE_WIDTH);
            cudaMemcpy(&C[i,j], d_C, sizeof(int)*TILE_WIDTH*TILE_WIDTH, D2H);
        }
}

```

Tiled Algorithm

- **Block algorithms or tiled algorithms:**

- Split the inputs into blocks to fit into shared (cache) memory
- Increase data reuse, minimize global memory access

- **Larger CGMA ratio does not always guarantee better performance.**

- **CGMA ratio should be large enough to hide the communication cost, not the larger the better**
- Block algorithms cause overhead due to increasing computations or number of thread blocks

Outline

- Host memory
 - Pined memory
 - Asynchronous computation & data transfer
 - Streams
- Global/Local memory
 - Memory coalescing
 - Tiled algorithm
- Shared memory
 - Bank conflicts avoidance
 - Memory padding
- Address linearization


Shared Memory Architecture

- Many threads accessing memory
 - Therefore, memory is divided into **banks**
 - Successive **32-bit (4Bytes) words** assigned to successive banks
- Each bank can service one address per cycle
 - A memory can service as many simultaneous accesses as it has banks
- Multiple simultaneous accesses to a bank result in a **bank conflict**
 - Conflicting accesses are serialized
- Shared memory is as fast as register if no bank conflict




Example: No bank Conflict

■ Linear addressing




■ Random 1:1 Permutation



Example: No bank Conflict

- If all threads of a **half-warps** read the identical address, there is no bank conflict (**using broadcast**)
 - Assume warp size is 8
 - Thread0~3 access the same data & in the same half-warps
 - The rest of threads also have 1:1 permutation and no conflict
 - **But not for write access**




Example: Bank Conflict

■ n-way bank conflict

- Each bank has n different memory access

■ Ex: 2-way bank conflict

```
__shared__ int array[2][32];  
int offset = threadIdx.x*2;  
int temp = array[offset/32][offset%32];
```




Bank Conflict Avoidance

- Change shared memory access pattern
 - Linear addressing access
 - 1:1 permutation
 - Broadcast: half-warp read the identical address
- Memory padding
 - Add addition memory space to avoid bank conflict

Example: 2D array


■ 32x32 SMEM array

- Warp accesses a column:
- 32-way bank conflicts (threads in a warp access the same bank)



Memory Padding

- Add a column for padding:
 - 32x33 SMEM array
- Warp accesses a column:
 - 32 different banks, no bank conflicts




Address linearization (SoA)

- **Address linearization** can avoid **bank conflict** on **shared memory**, and provide **memory coalescing** on **local memory** or **constant memory**


- An **array of structures** behaves like row major accesses

- `struct Point { double x; double y; double z; }
A[N];`
- `A[threadIdx].x = ...`



- A **structure of arrays** behaves like column major

- `struct PointList { double *x; double *y; double *z; }
A;`
- `A.x[threadIdx] = ...`





Slides from Mark Harris, NVIDIA Developer Technology
Performance Optimization

AN EXAMPLE OF CUDA

Parallel Reduction




- Common and important data parallel primitive
- Easy to implement in CUDA
 - Harder to get it right Performance!
- Serves as a great optimization example 30x Speedup!
 - We'll walk step by step through 7 different versions
 - Demonstrates several important optimization strategies

Parallel Reduction



- Tree-based approach used within each thread block



- Need to be able to use multiple thread blocks
 - To process very large arrays
 - To keep all multiprocessors on the GPU busy
 - Each thread block reduces a portion of the array
- But how do we communicate partial results between thread blocks?

Problem: Global Synchronization




- If we could synchronize across all thread blocks, could easily reduce very large arrays, right?
 - Global sync after each block produces its result
 - Once all blocks reach sync, continue recursively
- But CUDA has no global synchronization. Why?
 - Expensive to build in hardware for GPUs with high processor count
 - Would force programmer to run fewer blocks (no more than $\# \text{ multiprocessors} * \# \text{ resident blocks} / \text{multiprocessor}$) to avoid deadlock, which may reduce overall efficiency
- Solution: decompose into multiple kernels
 - Kernel launch serves as a global synchronization point
 - Kernel launch has negligible HW overhead, low SW overhead

Solution: Kernel Decomposition



- Avoid global sync by decomposing computation into multiple kernel invocations

If the maximum threads per block is 8



- In the case of reductions, code for all levels is the same
 - Recursive kernel invocation

Reduction #1: Interleaved Addressing



// input/output data is initiated on global memory

```
__global__ void reduce0(int *g_idata, int *g_odata) {  
    extern __shared__ int sdata[]; // Use shared memory for computations
```

// each thread loads one element from global to shared mem

```
    unsigned int tid = threadIdx.x;
```

```
    unsigned int i = blockIdx.x*blockDim.x + threadIdx.x;
```

```
    sdata[tid] = g_idata[i];
```

```
    __syncthreads(); // Wait for other threads to finish moving
```

// do reduction in shared mem

```
    for(unsigned int s=1; s < blockDim.x; s *= 2) {
```

```
        if (tid % (2*s) == 0) {
```

```
            sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + s];
```

```
        }
```

```
        __syncthreads(); // Sync between threads in the same block
```

```
    }
```

// write result for this block to global mem

```
    if (tid == 0) g_odata[blockIdx.x] = sdata[0];
```

```
}
```

Parallel Reduction: Interleaved Addressing




Values (shared memory)

Step 1
Stride 1

Thread
IDs

10	1	8	-1	0	-2	3	5	-2	-3	2	7	0	11	0	2
----	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	----	---	---




Values

11	1	7	-1	-2	-2	8	5	-5	-3	9	7	11	11	2	2
----	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	----	----	---	---	----	----	---	---

Step 2
Stride 2

Thread
IDs



Values

18	1	7	-1	6	-2	8	5	4	-3	9	7	13	11	2	2
----	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	----	----	---	---

Step 3
Stride 4

Thread
IDs



Values

24	1	7	-1	6	-2	8	5	17	-3	9	7	13	11	2	2
----	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	----	----	---	---	----	----	---	---

Step 4
Stride 8

Thread
IDs



Values

41	1	7	-1	6	-2	8	5	17	-3	9	7	13	11	2	2
----	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	----	----	---	---	----	----	---	---


Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s

Note: Block Size = 128 threads for all tests

Parallel Reduction: Interleaved Addressing



Highly divergent wrap (threadID 0~14)

Reduction #1: Interleaved Addressing



```
__global__ void reduce1(int *g_idata, int *g_odata) {  
    extern __shared__ int sdata[];
```

```
    // each thread loads one element from global to shared mem
```

```
    unsigned int tid = threadIdx.x;
```

```
    unsigned int i = blockIdx.x*blockDim.x + threadIdx.x;
```

```
    sdata[tid] = g_idata[i];
```

```
    __syncthreads();
```

```
    // do reduction in shared mem
```

```
    for (unsigned int s=1; s < blockDim.x; s *= 2) {
```

```
        if (tid % (2*s) == 0) {  
            sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + s];
```

```
        }
```

```
        __syncthreads();
```

```
    }
```


Problem: highly divergent warps are very inefficient, and % operator is very slow

```
    // write result for this block to global mem
```

```
    if (tid == 0) g_odata[blockIdx.x] = sdata[0];
```

```
}
```

Parallel Reduction: Interleaved Addressing



Reduction #2: Interleaved Addressing



Just replace divergent branch in inner loop:

```
for (unsigned int s=1; s < blockDim.x; s *= 2) {  
    if (tid % (2*s) == 0) {  
        sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + s];  
    }  
    __syncthreads();  
}
```

With strided index and non-divergent branch:


```
for (unsigned int s=1; s < blockDim.x; s *= 2) {  
    int index = 2 * s * tid;  
  
    if (index < blockDim.x) {  
        sdata[index] += sdata[index + s];  
    }  
    __syncthreads();  
}
```

Performance for 4M element reduction




	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x

Parallel Reduction: Interleaved Addressing



New Problem: Shared Memory Bank Conflicts

Parallel Reduction: Sequential Addressing



Sequential addressing is conflict free

Reduction #3: Sequential Addressing



Just replace strided indexing in inner loop:

```
for (unsigned int s=1; s < blockDim.x; s *= 2) {  
    int index = 2 * s * tid;  
  
    if (index < blockDim.x) {  
        sdata[index] += sdata[index + s];  
    }  
    __syncthreads();  
}
```

With reversed loop and threadIdx-based indexing:


```
for (unsigned int s=blockDim.x/2; s>0; s>>=1) {  
    if (tid < s) {  
        sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + s];  
    }  
    __syncthreads();  
}
```


Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x
Kernel 3: sequential addressing	1.722 ms	9.741 GB/s	2.01x	4.68x

Parallel Reduction: Sequential Addressing



Half of the threads are idle since 1st iteration!

Reduction #4: First Add During Load



Halve the number of blocks, and replace single load:

```
// each thread loads one element from global to shared mem
unsigned int tid = threadIdx.x;
unsigned int i = blockIdx.x*blockDim.x + threadIdx.x;
sdata[tid] = g_idata[i];
__syncthreads();
```

With two loads and first add of the reduction:

```
// perform first level of reduction,
// reading from global memory, writing to shared memory
unsigned int tid = threadIdx.x;
unsigned int i = blockIdx.x*(blockDim.x*2) + threadIdx.x;
sdata[tid] = g_idata[i] + g_idata[i+blockDim.x];
__syncthreads();
```

Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x
Kernel 3: sequential addressing	1.722 ms	9.741 GB/s	2.01x	4.68x
Kernel 4: first add during global load	0.965 ms	17.377 GB/s	1.78x	8.34x

Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2 ²² ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x
Kernel 3: sequential addressing	1.722 ms	9.741 GB/s	2.01x	4.68x
Kernel 4: first add during global load	0.965 ms	17.377 GB/s	1.78x	8.34x
Kernel 5: unroll last warp	0.536 ms	31.289 GB/s	1.8x	15.01x
Kernel 6: completely unrolled	0.381 ms	43.996 GB/s	1.41x	21.16x
Kernel 7: multiple elements per thread	0.268 ms	62.671 GB/s	1.42x	30.04x

Details in backup slides

Kernel 7 on 32M elements: 73 GB/s!

Final Optimized Kernel

```
template <unsigned int blockSize>
__device__ void warpReduce(volatile int *sdata, unsigned int tid) {
    if (blockSize >= 64) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 32];
    if (blockSize >= 32) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 16];
    if (blockSize >= 16) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 8];
    if (blockSize >= 8) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 4];
    if (blockSize >= 4) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 2];
    if (blockSize >= 2) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 1];
}
```

```
template <unsigned int blockSize>
__global__ void reduce6(int *g_idata, int *g_odata, unsigned int n) {
    extern __shared__ int sdata[];
    unsigned int tid = threadIdx.x;
    unsigned int i = blockIdx.x*(blockSize*2) + tid;
    unsigned int gridSize = blockSize*2*gridDim.x;
    sdata[tid] = 0;
```

```
    while (i < n) { sdata[tid] += g_idata[i] + g_idata[i+blockSize]; i += gridSize; }
    __syncthreads();
```

```
    if (blockSize >= 512) { if (tid < 256) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 256]; } __syncthreads(); }
    if (blockSize >= 256) { if (tid < 128) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 128]; } __syncthreads(); }
    if (blockSize >= 128) { if (tid < 64) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 64]; } __syncthreads(); }
```

```
    if (tid < 32) warpReduce(sdata, tid);
    if (tid == 0) g_odata[blockIdx.x] = sdata[0];
```

```
}
```



Backup

Instruction Bottleneck



- At 17 GB/s, we're far from bandwidth bound
 - And we know reduction has low arithmetic intensity
- Therefore a likely bottleneck is instruction overhead
 - Ancillary instructions that are not loads, stores, or arithmetic for the core computation
 - In other words: address arithmetic and loop overhead
- Strategy: unroll loops

Unrolling the Last Warp



- As reduction proceeds, # “active” threads decreases
 - When $s \leq 32$, we have only one warp left
- Instructions are **SIMD** synchronous within a warp
- That means when $s \leq 32$:
 - We don't need to `__syncthreads()`
 - We don't need “if (tid < s)” because it doesn't save any work
- Let's unroll the last 6 iterations of the inner loop

Reduction #5: Unroll the Last Warp

```
__device__ void warpReduce(volatile int* sdata, int tid) {  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 32];  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 16];  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 8];  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 4];  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 2];  
    sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 1];  
}
```

↑

IMPORTANT:
For this to be correct,
we must use the
“volatile” keyword!

```
// later...  
for (unsigned int s=blockDim.x/2; s>32; s>>=1) {  
    if (tid < s)  
        sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + s];  
    __syncthreads();  
}  
  
if (tid < 32) warpReduce(sdata, tid);
```

Note: This saves useless work in *all* warps, not just the last one!

Without unrolling, all warps execute every iteration of the for loop and if statement

Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x
Kernel 3: sequential addressing	1.722 ms	9.741 GB/s	2.01x	4.68x
Kernel 4: first add during global load	0.965 ms	17.377 GB/s	1.78x	8.34x
Kernel 5: unroll last warp	0.536 ms	31.289 GB/s	1.8x	15.01x

Complete Unrolling



- If we knew the number of iterations at compile time, we could completely unroll the reduction
 - Luckily, the block size is limited by the GPU to 512 threads
 - Also, we are sticking to power-of-2 block sizes
- So we can easily unroll for a fixed block size
 - But we need to be generic – how can we unroll for block sizes that we don't know at compile time?
- Templates to the rescue!
 - CUDA supports C++ template parameters on device and host functions

Unrolling with Templates



- Specify block size as a function template parameter:

```
template <unsigned int blockSize>  
__global__ void reduce5(int *g_idata, int *g_odata)
```

Reduction #6: Completely Unrolled



```
Template <unsigned int blockSize>
__device__ void warpReduce(volatile int* sdata, int tid) {
    if (blockSize >= 64) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 32];
    if (blockSize >= 32) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 16];
    if (blockSize >= 16) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 8];
    if (blockSize >= 8) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 4];
    if (blockSize >= 4) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 2];
    if (blockSize >= 2) sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 1];
}
```

```
if (blockSize >= 512) {
    if (tid < 256) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 256]; } __syncthreads(); }
if (blockSize >= 256) {
    if (tid < 128) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 128]; } __syncthreads(); }
if (blockSize >= 128) {
    if (tid < 64) { sdata[tid] += sdata[tid + 64]; } __syncthreads(); }

if (tid < 32) warpReduce<blockSize>(sdata, tid);
```

Note: all code in **RED** will be evaluated at compile time.

Results in a very efficient inner loop!

Invoking Template Kernels



- Don't we still need block size at compile time?
- Nope, just a switch statement for 10 possible block sizes:

```
switch (threads)
{
  case 512:
    reduce5<512><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 256:
    reduce5<256><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 128:
    reduce5<128><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 64:
    reduce5< 64><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 32:
    reduce5< 32><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 16:
    reduce5< 16><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 8:
    reduce5<  8><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 4:
    reduce5<  4><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 2:
    reduce5<  2><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
  case 1:
    reduce5<  1><<< dimGrid, dimBlock, smemSize >>>(d_idata, d_odata); break;
}
```

Performance for 4M element reduction



	Time (2^{22} ints)	Bandwidth	Step Speedup	Cumulative Speedup
Kernel 1: interleaved addressing with divergent branching	8.054 ms	2.083 GB/s		
Kernel 2: interleaved addressing with bank conflicts	3.456 ms	4.854 GB/s	2.33x	2.33x
Kernel 3: sequential addressing	1.722 ms	9.741 GB/s	2.01x	4.68x
Kernel 4: first add during global load	0.965 ms	17.377 GB/s	1.78x	8.34x
Kernel 5: unroll last warp	0.536 ms	31.289 GB/s	1.8x	15.01x
Kernel 6: completely unrolled	0.381 ms	43.996 GB/s	1.41x	21.16x

Reference

- NVIDIA Advanced CUDA Webinar Memory Optimizations
 - http://on-demand.gputechconf.com/gtc-express/2011/presentations/NVIDIA_GPU_Computing_Webinars_CUDA_Memory_Optimization.pdf
- NVIDIA CUDA C/C++ Streams and Concurrency
 - <http://on-demand.gputechconf.com/gtc-express/2011/presentations/StreamsAndConcurrencyWebinar.pdf>
- Mark Harris, NVIDIA Developer Technology
 - http://gpgpu.org/static/sc2007/SC07_CUDA_5_Optimization_Harris.pdf