

HW2

Antony Sunwoo

March 2020

1 Finding memory bugs

See val test01_solved.cpp, val test02_solved.cpp and comments within.

2 Optimizing matrix-matrix multiplication

The machine I used had:

- Processor: Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-6600 CPU @ 3.30GHz 3.30GHz
- g++: gcc version 9.2.0 (MinGW.org GCC Build-20200227-1)

The given order of loops in the reference function is actually the ideal loop order (in order of j,p,i from outer to inner). This is because in 3 of the 4 memory access happening inside the loops, the index is unit incremented by i, and the remaining access' index is unit incremented by p. So by having i in the innermost loop, and p in the next outer loop it decreases the amount of cache misses dramatically.

After testing with different BLOCK_SIZE values, the optimal value I found was 64.

My timings after introducing blocking were:

No OpenMP

```
$ g++ -O3 --std=c++11 -march=native MMult1.cpp && ./a.exe
```

Dimension	Time	Gflop/s	GB/s	Error
64	0.213462	9.370093	149.921483	0.000000e+000
128	0.202429	9.883381	158.134102	0.000000e+000
192	0.195477	10.283154	164.530472	0.000000e+000
256	0.183477	10.972852	175.565628	0.000000e+000
320	0.186530	10.891631	174.266102	0.000000e+000
384	0.184507	11.047991	176.767862	0.000000e+000
448	0.213458	10.109574	161.753181	0.000000e+000
512	0.209440	10.253455	164.055283	0.000000e+000
576	0.230411	9.952805	159.244877	0.000000e+000
640	0.210406	9.967168	159.474692	0.000000e+000
704	0.210441	9.948071	159.169134	0.000000e+000
768	0.275290	9.872894	157.966304	0.000000e+000

832	0.235339	9.788949	156.623184	0.000000e+000
896	0.289227	9.948216	159.171449	0.000000e+000
960	0.358040	9.884214	158.147425	0.000000e+000
1024	0.217395	9.878257	158.052110	0.000000e+000
1088	0.259310	9.933388	158.934214	0.000000e+000
1152	0.309172	9.889795	158.236716	0.000000e+000
1216	0.357045	10.071816	161.149049	0.000000e+000
1280	0.414876	10.109777	161.756438	0.000000e+000
1344	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1408	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1472	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1536	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1600	0.000000	-inf	-inf	0.000000e+000
1664	3.672207	10.037436	160.598980	0.000000e+000
1728	2.106367	9.798445	156.775122	0.000000e+000
1792	1.158893	9.931176	158.898814	0.000000e+000
1856	1.282599	9.969492	159.511867	0.000000e+000
1920	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1984	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000

With OpenMP:

```
$ g++ -O3 -fopenmp --std=c++11 -march=native MMult1.cpp && ./a.exe
```

Dimension	Time	Gflop/s	GB/s	Error
64	0.433808	4.610700	73.771206	0.000000e+000
128	0.152561	13.113987	209.823796	0.000000e+000
192	0.085778	23.433983	374.943728	0.000000e+000
256	0.068787	29.268116	468.289862	0.000000e+000
320	0.079791	25.461719	407.387500	0.000000e+000
384	0.065825	30.967440	495.479041	0.000000e+000
448	0.063830	33.808075	540.929195	0.000000e+000
512	0.066820	32.138337	514.213385	0.000000e+000
576	0.079760	28.751702	460.027224	0.000000e+000
640	0.068816	30.474773	487.596373	0.000000e+000
704	0.061834	33.856486	541.703783	0.000000e+000
768	0.077791	34.938605	559.017674	0.000000e+000
832	0.075800	30.392104	486.273662	0.000000e+000
896	0.083746	34.357373	549.717965	0.000000e+000
960	0.100733	35.131923	562.110768	0.000000e+000
1024	0.057810	37.147269	594.356312	0.000000e+000
1088	0.079758	32.295531	516.728492	0.000000e+000
1152	0.092723	32.976151	527.618410	0.000000e+000
1216	0.097711	36.803342	588.853479	0.000000e+000
1280	0.111673	37.558801	600.940818	0.000000e+000
1344	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1408	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000

1472	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1536	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1600	0.000000	-inf	-inf	0.000000e+000
1664	1.145908	32.166233	514.659726	0.000000e+000
1728	0.616319	33.487725	535.803606	0.000000e+000
1792	0.308175	37.346216	597.539459	0.000000e+000
1856	0.373002	34.280942	548.495076	0.000000e+000
1920	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000
1984	0.000000	nan	nan	0.000000e+000

Comparing the highest FLOP-rate from both runs, I achieved

$$\frac{37.559}{11.048} * 100 = 339.962\%$$

of my peak FLOP-rate by parallelizing the blocked code.

Note: I am not sure why for some matrix dimensions the timing is 0. I just assumed it was an unreasonable bug since it also happened even using the given MMult0 code as substitute for MMult1.

3 Finding OpenMP bugs

See `omp_solved{2,. . .}.c` and comments within.

4 OpenMP version of 2D Jacobi/Gauss-Seidel smoothing

The timings below are compiled with the same computer, for 1000 iterations.

The biggest N I used was 5000, since using 10000 gave segmentation fault probably due to memory limitations.

4.1 Jacobi

```
$ g++ -O3 -fopenmp --std=c++11 -march=native jacobi2D-omp.cpp && a.exe -n (N) -t (number of threads)
```

N\T	2	4	8	16	32
100	0.94	0.97	1.05	1.13	1.39
1000	6.70	4.90	4.93	4.92	5.19
5000	141.58	98.79	105.18	95.23	95.07

4.2 Gauss-Seidel

```
$ g++ -O3 -fopenmp --std=c++11 -march=native gs2D-omp.cpp && a.exe -n (N) -t (number of threads)
```

$N \backslash T$	2	4	8	16	32
100	0.97	1.01	1.09	1.27	1.60
1000	7.04	5.77	5.73	5.82	5.98
5000	151.79	118.77	117.72	116.21	116.10