

# CS610: Assignment 2 Report

Name : Nishant  
Roll No: 251110053

Semester 2025–2026-I

## Problem 1: Naive and Blocked 3D Convolution

### Implementation

Implemented both **naive 3D convolution** and **blocked convolution**. The blocked version improves cache locality by operating on sub-blocks of the input.

### How to Run

```
g++ 251110053-prob1.cpp -o prob1 -lpapi
```

```
# or simply  
make
```

```
# Execution:  
./prob1
```

### Experimental Setup

- Setup used for every problem is CSEWS 4.
- Input size:  $64 \times 64 \times 64$ .
- Each configuration was run 5 times and average was reported.

### Results

1. The least time taken was found for block size = 32. However, this minimum is not stable and changes across different runs.
2. Naive convolution average time = 61.9812 ms  
Blocked convolution average time = 55.5378 ms (for block size = 32).
3. Papi library counters are tested, as L1 cache misses are less for blocked convolution than for naive convolution.

```

-----
nishantk25@csews4:~/Downloads/251110053_assign2$ ./1
=== Naive convolution ===
Execution time (us): 59563
L1 Data Accesses: 64502  L1 Misses: 62171
L2 Data Accesses: 83406  L2 Misses: 83406
LLC Data Accesses: 0    LLC Misses: 0
-----

===== Block size = 32 =====
=== Blocked convolution ===
Execution time (us): 55685
L1 Data Accesses: 76452  L1 Misses: 63751
L2 Data Accesses: 148884 L2 Misses: 148884
LLC Data Accesses: 0    LLC Misses: 0
-----

```

Figure 1: PAPI counters for naive vs blocked convolution.(time in microseconds)

## Observations

Blocking reduced cache misses and gave lower execution time compared to the naive version. Best performance was observed at block size 32, although the results were not strictly consistent across all runs. In some cases, the naive version appeared faster than the blocked version, which can happen due to increased load/store operations and variability in cache behavior.

## Problem 2: Multithreaded Word and Line Count

### Performance Bugs Identified

#### False Sharing

The `word_count` array in `struct tracker` caused false sharing since consecutive threads updated adjacent elements. To fix this, we padded the array to place each thread's counter on a separate cache line (`thread_id*8`). This eliminated false sharing. (Implemented in `prob2_padded.cpp`).

#### True Sharing

Locks were taken for every word/line update, causing high contention and HITMs. We reduced this by using thread-local counters and merging them only once, removing redundant locks. This nearly eliminated HITMs. (Implemented in `prob2_final.cpp`).

### Fixes Implemented

- `prob2_padded.cpp`: Added padding/alignment to remove **false sharing**.
- `prob2_final.cpp`: Instead of updating the shared counter for every word or line (causing contention), each thread maintained its own local count and only updated the global counter once at the end. This approach effectively removed **true sharing**.

Each thread was executed with **15 MB text files** as input for obtaining the results.

### How to Run

```

g++ -std=c++17 original.cpp -o original -pthread
g++ -std=c++17 prob2_padded.cpp -o prob2_padded -pthread
g++ -std=c++17 prob2_final.cpp -o prob2_final -pthread

```

```
# or simply

make

# Execution:
./original <num_of_threads> <path_to_file>
./prob2_padded <num_of_threads> <path_to_file>
./prob2_final <num_of_threads> <path_to_file>

# With performance counters:
perf c2c record ./prob2_padded 5 input.txt
perf c2c report
```

Terminal														
Shared Data Cache Line Table (32 entries, sorted on Total HITMs)														
Index	CacheLine Address	Node	PA	cnt	Tot Hitm	Total	LclHitm	RmtHitm	records	Total Loads	Total Stores	L1Hit	L1Miss	N/A
0	0x5a9bfa395280	0	6848	42.78%	1167	1167	0	0	9354	7388	1966	1556	410	0
1	0xfffff923d418a9100	0	2173	37.28%	1017	1017	0	0	3838	3191	647	632	15	0
2	0x5a9bfa395280	0	1	10.34%	282	282	0	0	354	354	0	0	0	0
3	0x5a9bfa395380	0	503	0.77%	21	21	0	0	698	646	52	52	0	0
4	0xfffff923f25398000	0	80	0.51%	14	14	0	0	131	38	93	93	0	0
5	0xfffff923f2539d280	0	73	0.44%	12	12	0	0	115	32	83	83	0	0
6	0xfffff923d478d8000	0	64	0.40%	11	11	0	0	108	36	72	72	0	0
7	0xfffff923f26335280	0	60	0.33%	9	9	0	0	105	29	76	76	0	0
8	0xfffff923e522a8000	0	69	0.29%	8	8	0	0	96	34	62	61	1	0
9	0xfffff923d418aa640	0	6	0.26%	7	7	0	0	15	12	3	3	0	0
10	0xfffff923d40de5280	0	4	0.22%	6	6	0	0	12	7	5	5	0	0
11	0xfffff923f2539dbc0	0	3	0.22%	6	6	0	0	9	8	1	0	1	0
12	0xfffff92408c135e80	0	1	0.22%	6	6	0	0	12	10	0	0	0	0
13	0xfffff92408c0b4c00	0	7	0.18%	5	5	0	0	12	9	3	3	0	0
14	0xfffff923d40de2940	0	1	0.15%	4	4	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0
15	0xfffff923d478d8800	0	4	0.15%	4	4	0	0	8	4	4	4	0	0
16	0xfffff92408c021800	0	6	0.15%	4	4	0	0	10	8	2	1	1	0
17	0xfffff92408c035600	0	3	0.15%	4	4	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0
18	0xfffff92408c035e80	0	1	0.15%	4	4	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0
19	0xfffff92408c134c00	0	8	0.15%	4	4	0	0	11	9	2	2	0	0
20	0xfffff92408c135600	0	5	0.15%	4	4	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0
21	0xfffff92408c535a00	0	2	0.15%	4	4	0	0	5	4	1	1	0	0
22	0xfffff923e522a8940	0	1	0.11%	3	3	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
23	0xfffff923f25398800	0	3	0.11%	3	3	0	0	8	3	5	5	0	0
24	0xfffff923f2539da80	0	4	0.11%	3	3	0	0	6	4	2	2	0	0
25	0xfffff92408c0a1800	0	2	0.11%	3	3	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0
26	0xfffff92408c134c00	0	3	0.11%	3	3	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
27	0xfffff92408c135a00	0	6	0.11%	3	3	0	0	9	5	4	4	0	0
28	0xfffff92408c1b4c00	0	6	0.11%	3	3	0	0	9	9	0	0	0	0
29	0xfffff92408c234c00	0	2	0.11%	3	3	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0
30	0xfffff92408c5b4c00	0	4	0.11%	3	3	0	0	6	5	1	1	0	0
31	0xfffffaa7e526eb980	N/A	0	0.11%	3	3	0	0	23	5	18	18	0	0

Figure 2: Perf c2c report for original implementation showing high HITM counts.

Terminal													
Shared Data Cache Line Table (32 entries, sorted on Total HITMs)													
Index	CacheLine	Address	Node	PA cnt	Tot	Hitm	Total	LclHitm	RmtHitm	Total	Total	Total	Stores
										records	Loads	Stores	L1Hit
													L1Miss
													N/A
0	0x591829a003c0	0	8118	44.44%	1102	1102	0	11228	10027	1201	1183	18	0
1	0xffff923d4189adc0	0	1863	34.27%	850	850	0	3333	2777	556	545	11	0
2	0x591829a003c0	0	1	11.37%	282	282	0	366	366	0	0	0	0
3	0x591829a00480	0	450	0.97%	24	24	0	642	595	47	47	0	0
4	0xffff923db2bca940	0	84	0.69%	17	17	0	123	40	83	83	0	0
5	0xffff923e27e8d280	0	68	0.48%	12	12	0	106	38	68	68	0	0
6	0xffff923db2bcd280	0	51	0.32%	8	8	0	80	24	56	56	0	0
7	0xffff923f2dbd0000	0	60	0.24%	6	6	0	102	25	77	77	0	0
8	0xffff92408c035e80	0	1	0.24%	6	6	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
9	0xffff92408c2b5600	0	8	0.24%	6	6	0	14	14	0	0	0	0
10	0xffff92408c4a1800	0	4	0.24%	6	6	0	10	8	2	1	1	0
11	0xffff923db2bca980	0	3	0.20%	5	5	0	6	6	0	0	0	0
12	0xffff92408c2b5e80	0	1	0.20%	5	5	0	8	8	0	0	0	0
13	0xffff92408c3a1800	0	3	0.20%	5	5	0	7	5	2	1	1	0
14	0xffff923d8b37a940	0	43	0.16%	4	4	0	88	15	73	73	0	0
15	0xffff923f2dbd0800	0	3	0.16%	4	4	0	6	5	1	1	0	0
16	0xffff92408c035a00	0	5	0.16%	4	4	0	7	4	3	3	0	0
17	0xffff92408c2a1800	0	9	0.16%	4	4	0	11	8	3	1	2	0
18	0xffff92408c2b4c00	0	11	0.16%	4	4	0	17	14	3	3	0	0
19	0xffff92408c3b5a00	0	4	0.16%	4	4	0	5	4	1	1	0	0
20	0xffff92408c434c00	0	3	0.16%	4	4	0	6	6	0	0	0	0
21	0xffff92408c4b4c00	0	7	0.16%	4	4	0	13	10	3	3	0	0
22	0xffff92408c4b5a00	0	7	0.16%	4	4	0	11	6	5	4	1	0
23	0xffff92408c535600	0	2	0.16%	4	4	0	6	6	0	0	0	0
24	0xffff923d40faa940	0	3	0.12%	3	3	0	6	5	1	1	0	0
25	0xffff923d40fad280	0	3	0.12%	3	3	0	8	5	3	3	0	0
26	0xffff923db2bcd0c0	0	1	0.12%	3	3	0	4	4	0	0	0	0
27	0xffff92408c2b5a00	0	5	0.12%	3	3	0	8	5	3	3	0	0
28	0xffff92408c3b4c40	0	2	0.12%	3	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
29	0xffff92408c435a00	0	4	0.12%	3	3	0	5	4	1	1	0	0
30	0xffff92408c4b4c40	0	1	0.12%	3	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
31	0xffff92408c534c40	0	1	0.12%	3	3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0

Figure 3: Perf c2c report for padded implementation, HITMs decreased.

Terminal													
Shared Data Cache Line Table (0 entries, sorted on Total HITMs)													
Index	CacheLine	Address	Node	PA cnt	Tot	Hitm	Total	LclHitm	RmtHitm	Total	Total	Total	Stores
										records	Loads	Stores	L1Hit
													L1Miss
													N/A

Figure 4: Perf c2c report for final implementation, removing both false and true sharing.

## Results

Version	Runtime (s)	HITMs
Original	1.781	2633
Padded version	1.213	2398
Final version	0.090	0

Table 1: Performance comparison of different versions for Problem 2

## Observations

Padding reduced false sharing, while batching updates in the final version eliminated true sharing. This gave the best scalability and lowest runtime.

## Problem 3: Lock Implementations

### Implementation

We implemented:

- **Filter Lock:** Uses a filter hierarchy to avoid simultaneous entry, ensures fairness but overhead grows with threads.

- **Bakery Lock:** Assigns tickets to threads, guaranteeing fairness, but can be slow under contention.
- **Spin Lock:** Simple busy-waiting lock, very fast in low contention but wastes CPU cycles when many threads compete.
- **Ticket Lock:** Each thread gets a ticket, ensures FIFO fairness, but suffers from cache-line bouncing at scale.
- **Array Queue Lock:** Threads enqueue themselves in an array-based queue; provides fairness but higher overhead.

## How to Run

```
g++ -std=c++17 251110053-prob3.cpp -o prob3 -pthread
```

```
# or simply
make
```

```
# Execution:
./prob3
```

## Results

Taken N=1000 to obtain results

Threads	1	2	4	8	16	32	64
Pthread Mutex	0	0	0	15	42	157	632
Filter Lock	0	2	16	56	460	10057	4645660
Bakery Lock	0	2	0	8	74184	2853862	35306462
Spin Lock	0	0	0	32	35	65	233
Ticket Lock	0	0	0	0	155780	2076062	25444157
Array Q Lock	0	2	0	0	90	2567431	20191492

Table 2: Performance of different lock implementations (measured in microseconds)

## Observations

- Spin locks were fastest in most cases.
- Bakery locks were observed to be the slowest in most cases.
- Bakery and Ticket locks ensure fairness but perform poorly with many threads.
- Array Queue Lock is fair but suffers at scale.
- Pthread mutex is stable and well-balanced.