Shady Boukhary

Radix-2 FFT: Sequential vs Parallel with OpenACC and CUDA

Research Week 5 Dr. Colmenares March 25th, 2018

Size/System	Intel Core i3-7100 Dual Core @ 3.90GHz (CPU)		
	Nvidia Geforce GTX 1050 TI (GPU)		
	Method	Speed(seconds)	Speedup(Ts/Tp)
4,096	Sequential	1.907368	
	OpenACC	0.1283052	14.865 (1456.5 %)
	CUDA Global Memory	0.04443002	42.929 (4292.9 %)
	CUDA Shared Memory	0.04316807	44.184 (4418.6 %)
16,384	Sequential	24.24149	
	OpenACC	0.456187	53.139 (5313.9 %)
	CUDA Global Memory	0.477581	50.758 (5075.8 %)
	CUDA Shared Memory	0.3654189	66.338 (6633.8 %)
65,536	Sequential	355.5284	
	OpenACC	3.937445	90.294 (9029.4 %)
	CUDA Global Memory	5.696616	62.41 (6241 %)
	CUDA Shared Memory	5.450865	65.224 (6522.4 %)
262,144	Sequential	5617.434	
	OpenACC	61.06935	91.984 (9198.4 %)
	CUDA Global Memory	88.55316	63.435 (6343.5 %)
	CUDA Shared Memory	83.92049	66.936 (6393.7 %)
1,048,576	Sequential	89563.81	
	OpenACC	979.6323	91.425 (9142.5 %)
	CUDA Global Memory	1415.992	63.251 (6325.1 %)
	CUDA Shared Memory	1343.394	66.669 (6666.9 %)

There is a very significant speedup with the massively parallel approach (up to 91.9x) when using CUDA and shared memory in the GPU as recorded in the table above. The openACC approach exceeded expectations by being very competitive to the CUDA approaches. Sometimes, openACC was significantly faster.

Additionally, using shared memory to solve the problem did not provide a significant performance boost. However, it did provide a minor boost (1.3x faster than the global memory code).



