

# CHALMERS

## EXAMINATION / TENTAMEN

Course code/kurskod		Course name/kursnamn		
DAT 400		High Performance Parallel Programming		
Anonymous code Anonym kod		Examination date Tentamensdatum	Number of pages Antal blad	Grade Betyg
DAT 400-000 2-LDP		03/01/2022	9	5

\* I confirm that I've no mobile or other similar electronic equipment available during the examination.  
Jag intygar att jag inte har mobiltelefon eller annan liknande elektronisk utrustning tillgänglig under examinationen.

Solved task Behandlade uppgifter	Points per task Poäng på uppgiften	Observe: Areas with bold contour are to completed by the teacher. Anmärkning: Rutor inom bred kontur ifylles av lärare.
No/nr		
1	✓ 7	
2	✓ 10	
3	✓ 10	
4	✓ 9	
5	✓ 8	
6	✓ 8	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
Bonus poäng		
Total examination points Summa poäng på tentamen	52	

(a) To achieve minimum execution time, we need to choose optimal scheduling algorithm including how many tasks, how many iteration, how to assign the tasks to each cores (threads) and how to achieve load balancing.

those are all challenges. Also, we should consider the problem size of each iteration, if it's fixed or we can easily estimate, then static scheduling preferred. However, if it varies per iteration then dynamic scheduling is preferred.

choosing algorithm is challenging because we have to consider overhead introduced every time a task is scheduled and for example choosing parameter such as chunk size is also challenging,

(b) one of low overhead scheduling algorithms is, Static scheduling:  $\frac{N}{P}$  iteration,  $P$  tasks

in case of the problem size is vary,

( $N$ : problem size

for example

$P$ : # of processor)

for  $i=0, i < \text{rand}(K), i++$

})

it cannot minimize execution time because of load-imbalance

Also, as we see on Figure 1 and Figure 2, Coarse Grained scheduling has

big idleness, so in general case, it takes more time than minimum execution time.

(c) FG

Without overhead:  $21 \times 1s = 21s$

With overhead

$$: 21 \times (1+1)s = 42s$$

Without overhead,

FG wins

with overhead

CG wins

(d) CG

Without overhead:  $3 \times (9)s = 27s$

With overhead

$$: 3 \times (9+1) = 30s$$

$$2. N=64 \quad p=8$$

(a) 1.  $\frac{64}{8} = 8$  iterations, 8 tasks

2. 1 iteration, 64 tasks

3.  $\lceil \frac{64}{6} \rceil = 11$ , 6 iterations  $\times$  10 tasks, 4 iterations  $\times$  1 task, 11 tasks

4.  $q_3(4) = 13$  tasks, each iterations 8, 7, 7, 6, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4

C0 8

C1 7

C2 7

C3 6 4

C4 5 4

C5 4 4

C6 4 4

C7 4 4

$T_{exe} = 2$

(b)

1.  $8 \times 2 = 16s$

2.  $\frac{64}{8} \times 2 = 16s$

3.  $2 \times 6 \times 2 = 24s$

4.  $2 \times 10 = 20s$  (on C3, 10 iterations)

self-scheduling

(c)  $8 \times (2 + 0.2) = 17.6s$

chunk scheduling

$2 \times (2 \times 6 + 1) = 26s$

Even though there is overhead on self scheduling;

because of load imbalance on chunk scheduling,

Scheduler 2 (self-scheduling) is faster.

DATUCCO-0002-LPP

3  
③

2 cores

Case 1 C0 1 2 13 5 6 15 9 10 11 (19) → 22 → 23  
C1 3 4 14 7 8 16 11 12 18 (20) (21)

Case 2 C0 1 3 5 7 9 11 13 15 17 19 → 21 → 23  
C1 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 → (22) →

→ 12 time units

4 cores 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Case 1 C0 1 5 9 13 17 (21) 23

C1 2 6 10 14 18 (22)

C2 3 7 11 15 19

C3 4 8 12 16 20

→ 7 time units

C0 1 2 3 4

C1 5 6 7 8

C2 9 10 11 12

C3 x x 13 14

C0 1 2 9 10 11 (21) 23

C1 3 4 11 12 18 (22)

C2 5 6 13 14 19

C3 7 8 15 16 20

8 cores 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C0 1 9 17 → 21 → 23

C1 2 10 18 → 22

C2 3 11 19 →

C3 4 12 20

C4 5 13

C5 6 14

C6 7 15

C7 8 16

→ 5 time units

3 (b)  $\text{Cost} = p \times T_{\text{exe}}(n)$ ,  $p = \text{cores}$ ,  $T_{\text{exe}}(n)$  <sup>parallel execution time</sup>

$\text{Efficiency} = \frac{\text{The best sequential exe time}}{\text{Cost}}$

2 cores:  $\text{cost} = 2 \times 12 = 24 \text{ tu}$ .  $\text{Eff} = \frac{16}{24} = 0.667$

4 cores:  $\text{cost} = 4 \times 7 = 28 \text{ tu}$   $\text{Eff} = \frac{16}{28} = 0.571$

8 cores:  $\text{cost} = 8 \times 5 = 40 \text{ tu}$   $\text{Eff} = \frac{16}{40} = 0.4$

the largest number of cores that can accelerate the computation is

(c) 12, because at the first level of graph (task 1 ... 12),  
we can process maximum 12 tasks at the same iteration time.

Critical path is 5.

(d) For each task, we can apply fine grain schedule which divide the task even smaller, in this case we should carefully consider overhead.

the other approach is that we can use caches so that reduce memory access time which leads reduced execute time and better performance.

a)

$$N^2 (1_{\text{sub}} + 1_{\text{sub}} + \text{get\_invDist} 3 + 1_{\text{mul}} + 1_{\text{add}} + 1_{\text{mul}} + 1_{\text{add}}) \\ + N (1_{\text{mul}} + 1_{\text{add}} + 1_{\text{mul}} + 1_{\text{add}})$$

$$= \text{by assuming that sub, mul, add takes 1 FP operation} \\ = N^2 (6 + \text{get\_invDist} 3) + 4N$$

data / loop level parallelism possible. Because there's no data dependency.

b)

```
private private ( j )
shared ( i, Fx, Fy, N )
```

c) there are race condition when update  $F_x, F_y$  (line 13, 14) since multiple threads access this variable.  
To solve this, we should set critical section, atomic or reduction by adding

(above line 9) ~~\*/~~ pragma omp parallel for

(above line 13) ~~\*/~~ pragma omp critical

or (above line 13) ~~\*/~~ pragma omp atomic

or (above line 9) ~~\*/~~ pragma omp parallel for reduction(+:  $F_x$ ),  
reduction(+:  $F_y$ ) ;

OR another approach is that privatization of  $F_x, F_y$  but there might be false sharing problem.

d) I prefer outer loop (target loop) to parallelize since, inner loop, it creates ~~it~~  $N$  threads and join  $N$  threads for the iterations, which occurs ~~big~~ big overhead. If we parallelize



- (a) tree shape Implementation is better. Because when headnode ~~MPI-Send()~~  
<sup>base</sup>  
 MPI-Bcast() then the other node can receive. so it's effective way when it comes to efficiency.

(b) / measure exetime for group 1 broadcast /  
 MPI\_Barrier()  
 measuredtime -= MPI\_Wtime()  
 MPI\_Bcast ( ... , comm\_world1 )  
 MPI\_Barrier()  
 measuredtime += MPI\_Wtime()  
 // Broadcast to group 1

/ measure exetime for group 2 broadcast /  
 MPI\_Barrier()  
 measuredtime -= MPI\_Wtime()  
 MPI\_Bcast ( ... , comm\_world-2 )  
 MPI\_Barrier()  
 measuredtime += MPI\_Wtime()

(c) myrank = MPI\_Rank  
 msize = MPI\_Size  
 MPI\_Scatter ( ... ) }

if ( myrank == 0 )  
 for ( irank = 0 ; irank < msize ; ++irank )  
 MPI\_Send ( buf[ irank \* msize ], 1, 0, irank, tag )  
 size of (flow)

9 MPI\_Recv ( buf[ ], sizeof(float), 0, root, comm, tag )

DAT 400-0002-LDP

c)

MPI\_Scatter ( buf, sizeof(float), rank, tag, , ) 25

myrank = ~~MPI\_Rank~~  
Comm-Rank ( , & )

msize = Comm-Size ( , &amp; )

if ( myrank == 0 ) {

for ( irank = 0 ; irank &lt; msize ; ++irank ) {

MPI\_Send ( buf [ irank + msize \* sizeof(float) ],  
sizeof(float), irank, 0, )

}

MPI\_Recv ( buf [ ],  
sizeof(float), , 0, )

}

{



- (a)
- 1) BLOCK-DIM for example 1024, (in this case, blockDim, x)
  - 2)  $(n-1)/\text{BLOCK\_DIM} + 1$  " 8,  $(n-1)/\text{BLOCK\_SIZE} + 1$
  - 3) \*d\\_input, \*input
  - 4) \*output, \*d\\_output

- (b) line 5, the result overwrites in input.  
we should add ~~sum~~  $\text{sum} += \text{input}[i]$  at line 6.

Also, after ~~at~~ calculation, we should add  
 $\text{Syncthreads}();$  make sure the computation finished.

$$\text{sizeof(float)} \times \text{vector length} \times N$$

32

$$\text{Bytes transferred from host to device} = 4 \times 1 \times 8192 = 32 \text{ KB}$$

(c)

total execution time of the code

∴ exe time of kernel function + <sup>exe time of</sup> sequential code + communication  
from Host to device + communication from device to Host

$$= 10 \text{ s} + 2 \text{ s} + 2 \times \left( \frac{32 \text{ KB}}{256 \text{ MB/s}} \right)$$

$$\approx 142 \text{ s}$$

DAT400-0002-LDP

d) using shared memory with GPU architecture.

as we see in c), BW is big enough.

BLOCK-DIM = 1024;

```
--Global-- void Reduce1(
```

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

```
--shared-- float sum[BLOCK-DIM];
```

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

```
    if (threadIdx.x % (stride * 2) == 0)
```

```
        input
```

```
        input[i] += input[i + stride];
```

```
        sum[threadIdx.x] = input[BLOCK-DIM * i + threadIdx.x];
```

```
    }
```

```
if (threadIdx.x == 0) {
```

```
    ...
```

same with Reduce 0