



# Parallel performance measure and embarrassingly Parallel algorithms

Performance measure and load balancing

Xavier JUVIGNY, SN2A, DAAA, ONERA

xavier.juvigny@onera.fr

Course Parallel Programming
- January 8th 2023 -

Ce document est la propriété de l'ONERA. Il ne peut être communiqué à des tiers et/ou reproduit sans l'autorisation préalable écrite de l'ONERA, et son contenu ne peut être divulgué. This document and the information contained herein is proprietary information of ONERA and shall not be disclosed or reproduced without the prior authorization of ONERA.

### **Table of contents**



- 2 Embarrassingly parallel algorithms
- 3 Nearly embarrasingly parallel algorithm





# **Overview**



- 2 Embarrassingly parallel algorithms
- 3 Nearly embarrasingly parallel algorithm





# Speed-up

### Definition

#### Let's

- t<sub>s</sub>: Sequential execution time
- t<sub>P</sub>(n): Execution time on n computing units;

Speed-up is defined as:

$$S(n) = \frac{t_s}{t_p(n)} \tag{1}$$

### Remark

The sequential algorithm is often different as parallel algorithm. In this case, speed-up measure is not obvious. In particular, following questions must be asked among other questions:

- Is the sequential algorithm optimal in complexity?
- Is the sequential algorithm well optimized?
- Is the sequential algorithm exploiting at best the cache memory?





### Amdahl's law

### Give a limit for the speed-up

- Let's t<sub>s</sub> the time running the code in sequential
- Let's f the part (in percent) of ts, relative to a part of the code which can't be parallelized

So

$$S(n) = \frac{t_s}{f.t_s + \frac{(1-f)t_s}{n}} = \frac{n}{1 + (n-1)f} \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{} \frac{1}{f}$$

This law is useful to find the maximal number of computing core to use for an application.

#### Limitation of the law

f may change with the volume of input data and bigger input data improve the speed-up.







### Gustafson's law

# Speed-up behaviour with constant volume input data per process

- Hypotheses :
  - t<sub>s</sub> ≥ 0 the time to execute the sequential part of the code is indenpendant of the volume of input data;
  - $t_p > 0$  the time to execute the parallel part of the code is linear relative of the volume of input data.
  - Let's consider  $t_s + t_p = 1$  (one unit of time).
- Let's  $t_s$  the time token by the execution of the sequential part of the code;
- Let's  $t_p$  the time token by the execution of the parallel part of the code for a fixed amount of data.

$$S(n) = \frac{t_s + n.t_p}{t_s + t_p} = n + \frac{(1 - n)t_s}{t_s + t_p} = n + (1 - n).t_s$$







# **Scalability**

### **Definition**

For a parallel program, the behavious of the speed-up when we raises up the number of processes or/and the amount of input data.

### How evaluate the scalability?

- Evaluate the worst speed-up: For a global fixed amount of data, draw the speed-up curve in function of the number of processes;
- Evaluate the best speed-up: For a fixed amount of data per process, draw the speed-up curve in function of the number of processes;
- In concrete use of the program, the speed-up may be between the worst and best scenario.







# Granularity

### Ratio between computing intensity and quantity of data exchanged between processes

- · Sending and receiving data is prohibitive :
  - Initial cost of a message: each message has an initial cost: set the connection, get the same protocol, and so. This
    cost is constant.
  - Cost of the data transfer: At last, the cost of the data flow is linear with the number of data to exchange
  - These costs are greater the cost of memory operations in RAM
  - Better to copy some sparse data in a buffer and send the buffer than send data with multiple send and receives
- Try to minimize the number of data exchange between processes
- Greater is the ratio between number of computation instructions and messages to exchange, better will be your speed-up!
- Granularity can be improved with non blocking data exchanges.







# Load balancing

### **Definition**

All processes execute a computation section of the code in the same time;

- Great penalities in time occure if some parts of the code are far away from load balancing;
- Example 1: A function in the code take t seconds for the half of the processes, and to for other processes. The maximal speed-up for this function will be:

$$S(n) = \frac{\frac{n}{2}t + \frac{n}{2}\frac{t}{2}}{t} = \frac{3n}{4}$$

Example 2: A function in the code takes <sup>t</sup>/<sub>2</sub> seconds for n - 1 processes, and t for one process. The maximal speed-up for this function will be:

$$S(n) = \frac{(n-1)\frac{t}{2} + t}{t} = \frac{n-1}{2} + 1 = \frac{n+1}{2}$$

**Remark**: Greater is the time token to execute a bad load balancing function, greater is the penality. Don't worry about load balancing for functions taking very small time to execute







# **Overview**



- 2 Embarrassingly parallel algorithms
- 3 Nearly embarrasingly parallel algorithm







### **Definition**

# Embarrassingly parallel algorithm

- Each data used and computed are independent;
- No data race in multithread context:
- No communication between processes in distributed environment

### **Property**

- In distributed parallel context, no data must be exchanged between processes to compute the results;
- In shared parallel environment, parallelization is straightforward, but beware to the memory bound computation;
- In distributed environment, the memory bound limitation is not a trouble;
- If data are contiguous and algorithm vectorizable, can be ideal on GPGPU for performance.







# First example: Vector addition

#### Add two real vectors of dimensions N

$$w = u + v$$
;  $u, v, w \in \mathbb{R}^3$ 

### Ideas

- For load balancing, scatter the vectors in equal parts among the threads or processes
- Each process/thread computes a part of the vector addition
- In distributed memory, the result is scattered among processes!

### Some properties

- Memory access and computing operation have the same complexity: On shared memory, memory bound limits the
  performance
- On distributed memory, each process uses his own physical memory and none data must be exchanged: Speed-up may
  be linear relative to the number of processes (if data intensity is enough)







# **Example : Block diagonal matrices multiplication** C = A.B (1)

Matrix-matrix multiplication C = A.B where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & A_{nn} \end{pmatrix}, B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & B_{22} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & B_{nn} \end{pmatrix}.$$

where  $d_i = \dim(A_{ii}) = \dim(B_{ii})$  (*n* independent matrix-matrix multiplications)

#### **Problematic**

Close to the vector addition multiplication, but :

- Dimensions of diagonal blocks are inhomogeneous & for each diagonal block, computation complexity:  $d_i^3$ .
- How distribute diagonal blocks among processes to obtain nearly optimal load balancing?





# **Example : Block diagonal matrices multiplication** C = A.B (2)

### algorithm to distribute diagonal blocks among processes

### Example of algorithm to distribute the diagonal blocks

- Sort diagonal blocks with dimension decreasing;
- Set "weight" to zero for each process
- Distribute biggest triplet blocks A<sub>ii</sub>, B<sub>ii</sub>, C<sub>ii</sub> among processes and add each d<sub>i</sub> in the weight of each process;
- While some diagonal blocks are not distributed :
  - Add the biggest block which is not distributed to the process having the smallest weight
  - Add the relative d<sub>i</sub> at the weight of the process

**Remark**: All processes compute the distribution of the diagonal blocks. It's better to do same computation for all processes than one computes and sends result to other processes.







# Third example: Syracuse series (1)

#### Definition of syracuse serie

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_0 \text{ choosen} \\[0.2cm] u_{n+1} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{u_n}{2} \text{ if } u_n \text{ is even} \\[0.2cm] 3.u_n + 1 \text{ if } u_n \text{ is odd.} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

#### Property of syracuse serie

- One cycle exists :  $1 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow \cdots$
- A conjecture :  $\forall u_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , the serie reaches the cycle above in a finite number of iterations

#### Some definition

- Length of flight: number of iterations for a serie to reach the value 1;
- Height of the flight: maximal value reached by a serie

The goal of the program: compute the length and the height of flight for lot of odd values for  $u_0$ 







# Third example: Syracuse series (2)

#### **Problematic**

- Each process computes the length and the height for a subset of initial values  $u_0$ ;
- The computation intensity depends of the length of each syracuse serie;
- It's impossible to know a priori the computation complexity to compute the height and the length of a serie
- Use a dynamic algorithm on "root" process (the "master" process) to distribute serie among other processes ("slaves")

#### Master's Algorithm

- Send a small pack of series to each slave processes;
- · While(some pack of series to send) do
- Wait slave asking series and send next pack;
- end While
- Send terminaison id to all slave processes;

### Slave's Algorithm

- While (receive some series to compute in a pack)
- Compute each serie of the pack;
- end While

Remark: A task is composed of a pack of series to have a good granularity.







# **Overview**



- 2 Embarrassingly parallel algorithms
- 3 Nearly embarrasingly parallel algorithm







# **Nearly embarrasingly parallel algorithm**

#### Definition

Independant computation for each processes with a final communication to finalize the computation.

#### Examples

- Dot product of two vector in R<sup>n</sup>;
- Compute an integral;
- Matrix-vector product;

#### Non embarrasingly parallel algorithm examples

- Parallel sort algorithms;
- Matrix-matrix product;
- Algorithms based on domain decomposition methods;







# Integral computation

#### Integral computation

Integral computation based on Gauss quadrature formulae :

$$\int_a^b f(x)dx \approx \sum_{i=1}^{Ng} \omega_i f(g_i)$$

where  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{R}$  the weights and  $g_i \in \mathbb{R}$  integrals points.

- In fact, Gauss quadrature are given on [-1; 1] interval: some variable modification to do in the integral!;
- $\{g_1 = 0, \omega_1 = 2\}$ : Order 1 Legendre Gauss quadrature;
- $\left\{\left(g_1=-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2},\omega_1=\frac{5}{9}\right),\left(g_2=0,\omega_2=\frac{8}{9}\right),\left(g_3=+\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2},\omega_3=\frac{5}{9}\right)\right\}$ : Order 3 Legendre Gauss quadrature
- Remark: Order n means than quadrature compute the exact value of the integral for polynoms of degree lesser or equal
  to n.
- To compute better approximation of the integral, we subdivide the interval in several smaller intervals







# Parallel integral computation

$$I = \int_{a}^{b} f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{a_{i}}^{b_{i}} f(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^{N} I \text{ where } a_{1} = a, b_{N} = b \text{ and } a_{i} < b_{i} < a_{i+1}$$

#### Main ideas

Scatter sub-intervals among the processes P to compute partial sums :

$$S_{P} = \sum_{[a_{i};b_{i}] \in P} \int_{a_{i}}^{b_{i}} f(x) dx$$

• Use reduce to compute the integral value (global sum) :

$$S = \sum_{p=1}^{nbp} S_p$$







# **Matrix-vector product**

Let's a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and a vector  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

The goal of this algorithm is to compute the matrix-vector product :

$$v = A.u \in \mathbb{R}^n$$
 where  $v_i = \sum_{j=1}^m A_{ij}.u_j$ 

Two possibilities to parallize this algorithm:

- Partitionning the matrix per block of rows :
- Partitionning the matrix per block of columns and the vector *u* per block of same size.

The goal is to split the computation between processes and use a global communication operation to get the final result.







# Matrix-vector product per rows splitting

Let's

$$A = egin{pmatrix} \dfrac{A_1}{A_2} \ dots \ \dfrac{\vdots}{A_I} \ \dfrac{\vdots}{A_N} \end{pmatrix} ext{ where } orall I \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$$
 ,  $A_I \in \mathbb{R}^{rac{N}{N} imes m}.$ 

### Algorithm

- Each process computes a part of v. The process I computes  $V_I = A_I.u \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n}{N}}$
- To compute another matrix-vector product with the new vector, we need to gather the vector in all processes (only necessary for distributed parallel algorithm).







# Matrix-vector product per columns splitting

Let's

$$A = (A_1|A_2|\dots|A_I|\dots|A_N) ext{ and } u = egin{pmatrix} \dfrac{U_1}{U_2} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{U_I}{U_I} \\ \vdots \\ \dfrac{U_I}{U_I} \end{pmatrix} ext{ where } orall I \in \{1,2,\dots,N\} \,, A_I \in \mathbb{R}^{n imes rac{m}{N}} ext{ and } U_I \in \mathbb{R}^{rac{m}{N}}$$

### Algorithm

• Each process computes a partial sum for v. Processus I computes

$$V_I = A_I.U_I \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

• Finnaly, a sum reduction is done to get the final result :  $v = \sum_{r=1}^{N} V_I$ 







### Bhudda set

Let's consider the complex recursive mandelbrot serie :

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} z_0=0,\\ z_{n+1}=z_n^2+c \text{ where } c\in\mathbb{C} \text{ chosen.} \end{array}\right.$$





Figure – Mandelbrot (left) and Bhudda's (right) set

#### **Property**

- Serie divergent if  $\exists n > 0; |z_n| > 2;$
- Region of interest : the disk  $\mathcal{D}$  of radius 2;
- In some region of the disk, possible to prove the converger
- But chaotic convergence behaviour in some region of  $\mathcal{D}$ !

#### Mandelbrot and bhudda sets

- Mandelbrot's set: color c with "divergence speed" of relative series
- Bhudda's set : Color orbit of divergent series







# Bhudda's set algorithm

### Algorithm

- Draw N random values of c in the disk  $\mathcal{D}$  where the relative series diverge;
- Compute the orbit of this serie until divergence and increment the intensity of the pixel representing each value of the orbit;

# Parallelization of the algorithm

- Master-slave algorithm to ensure load balancing;
- For granularity, one define a task as a pack of random values c;





