

- CSE 5441 Lab 1 Report -
Rajarshi Biswas
biswas.91@osu.edu

Table of Contents

Test cases	2
Test Case # 1	2
Test Case # 2	2
Test Case # 3	3
Test Case # 4	3
Test Case # 5	4
Test Case # 6	4
Test Case # 7	5
Run test case longer	5
Observation on using different time methods for serial programs:	6
Hypothesis on best suited timing methods for parallel programs:	6

Test cases

All the test cases were run on stdlinux.

Test Case # 1

Running the test case testgrid_1 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_1
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 52 iterations.  
With max DSV = 118.918 and min DSV = 107.279.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 0  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 0.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 0.009.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 0m0.004s  
user 0m0.000s  
sys  0m0.001s
```

Test Case # 2

Running the test case testgrid_2 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_2
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 245 iterations.  
With max DSV = 55.8359 and min DSV = 50.2669.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 0  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 0.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 0.247.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 0m0.004s  
user 0m0.001s  
sys  0m0.001s
```

Test Case # 3

Running the test case testgrid_50_78 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_50_78
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 1508 iterations.  
With max DSV = 23.3695 and min DSV = 21.0358.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 0  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 0.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 2.582.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 0m0.023s  
user 0m0.004s  
sys  0m0.000s
```

Test Case # 4

Running the test case testgrid_50_201 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_50_201
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 2286 iterations.  
With max DSV = 4.78875 and min DSV = 4.30989.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 10000  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 0.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 10.533.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 0m0.025s  
user 0m0.012s  
sys  0m0.001s
```

Test Case # 5

Running the test case testgrid_200_1166 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_200_1166
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 14461 iterations.  
With max DSV = 0.812727 and min DSV = 0.731455.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 420000  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 859.088.
```

```
*****
```

```
real0m0.930s  
user0m0.428s  
sys 0m0.000s
```

Test Case # 6

Running the test case testgrid_400_1636 with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_400_1636
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 22283 iterations.  
With max DSV = 1.18174 and min DSV = 1.06357.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 950000  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 1274.66.
```

```
*****
```

```
real0m1.323s  
user0m0.954s  
sys 0m0.007s
```

Test Case # 7

Running the test case `testgrid_400_12206` with affect rate 0.1 and epsilon 0.1.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .1 .1 < testcase/testgrid_400_12206
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 75269 iterations.  
With max DSV = 0.0866714 and min DSV = 0.0780043.  
Affect rate = 0.1;   Epsilon: 0.1.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 29690000  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 34.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 33832.3.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 0m33.896s  
user 0m29.680s  
sys  0m0.076s
```

Run test case longer

Running the test case # 7 with Affect rate = 0.03 and Epsilon = 0.03. The dissipation converges in more number of iterations, and the time takes a little over 3 minutes.

```
[biswas.91@sl4 5441]$ time ./amr_csr_serial .03 .03 <  
testcase/testgrid_400_12206
```

```
*****
```

```
Dissipation converged in 460838 iterations.  
With max DSV = 0.0850069 and min DSV = 0.0824567.  
Affect rate = 0.03;   Epsilon: 0.03.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (clock)   : 182560000  
Elapsed coverage loop time (time)    : 212.  
Elapsed coverage loop time (chrono)  : 211993.
```

```
*****
```

```
real 3m32.059s  
user 3m2.037s  
sys  0m0.588s
```

Observation on using different time methods for serial programs:

- **Clock** ticks returns the number of clock ticks elapsed since the program was launched.
 - The clock timing method might be useful when we just need to measure the processor time consumed by a program.
 - Clock gives output analogous to the 'user' time output of 'time' UNIX utility.
 - Not a very useful measure in the case of profiling programs that may incur latencies due to the bus or network communication, that is not it is an ideal way to measure the real time spent by the program.
- **Time** returns the number of seconds since 00:00 hours, Jan 1, 1970 UTC.
 - The output of only seconds does not provide enough granularity to profile fast programs.
 - Outputs similar to the 'real' time output of 'time' UNIX utility, only with less accuracy.
- **Chrono** namespace has the element 'clocks' and 'duration'. In the program I used 'system_clock' to get the time stamp, and 'duration' to find the duration of two consecutive time stamps.
 - The output is analogous to the 'real' time output of 'time' UNIX utility.
 - The 'system_clock' and 'duration' gives sufficient accuracy of elapsed time.
- **UNIX 'time'** utility reports how long it took to execute a program in terms of user CPU time, system CPU time, and real time.
 - Provide good profiling in terms of real time spent and granularity.

Based on the above observation, in my opinion, using the elements in Chrono or using UNIX 'time' utility give the best result for serial programs. In one hand these give the real time consumed by a program, on the other hand these provide enough accuracy to compare program run times.

Hypothesis on best suited timing methods for parallel programs:

In my opinion, for parallel programming Chrono and UNIX time will work best as these provide finer level of granularity and provide way to measure the real time spent in the computation including for example - any communication delay incurred during multi-processor communication.