CPSC 524: Parallel Programming Techniques Assignment 3

Information on building and running

1. Modules

- a) Loaded Module List
 - 1) StdEnv (S) 2) Langs/Intel/2015_update2
- 3) MPI/OpenMPI/2.1.1-intel15
- b) Intel C/C++ Compiler (ICC Version 15.0.2 20150121) /apps/hpc.rhel7/MPI/OpenMPI/2.1.1-intel15/bin/mpicc

2. Commands

On the Grace cluster, use *sbatch* to run the scripts in *scripts* folder to execute each task separately.

3. Outputs

The output of each script is in /out folder, with the same name of corresponding script.

Task 1: Serial Program

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/serial.sh

2. Result

By execute above command 5 times, we got the following average results:

| | N = 1000 | N = 2000 | N = 4000 | N = 8000 |
|------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1# | 0.1513 | 1.1693 | 13.935 | 120.1668 |
| 2# | 0.1535 | 1.3936 | 14.188 | 124.1491 |
| 3# | 0.1519 | 1.2088 | 14.8568 | 122.3154 |
| 4# | 0.1538 | 1.169 | 14.977 | 123.6939 |
| 5# | 0.1521 | 1.1943 | 14.62 | 120.3718 |
| Avg. | 0.15252 | 1.227 | 14.51536 | 122.1394 |

Task 2A: Blocking MPI Parallel Program (Part A)

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task2a-1.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2a-2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2a-4.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2a-8.sh

| P = 1, N = 1000 | | P=1, N | N = 2000 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.1551 | 0 | 1.4126 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.1551 | Total Runtime | 1.4126 |
| P = 1, N = 4000 | | | |
| P = 1, N | V = 4000 | P=1, N | N = 8000 |
| P = 1 , N Rank | Time | P = 1 , N Rank | Time |
| , | I | , | |
| , | Time | , | Time |

| P = 2, N = 1000 | | P = 2, N = 2000 | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.1103 | 0 | 0.8258 |
| 1 | 0.1103 | 1 | 0.8258 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.1103 | Total Runtime | 0.8258 |
| P = 2, N = 4000 | | | |
| P=2, N | V = 4000 | P = 2, N | V = 8000 |
| P = 2, N Rank | Time | P = 2 , N Rank | Time |
| * | I | , | |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| Rank | Time 10.1511 | Rank | Time 87.7051 |

| P = 4, N = 1000 | | P = 4, N | I=2000 |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.0757 | 0 | 0.5600 |
| 1 | 0.0624 | 1 | 0.4557 |
| 2 | 0.0746 | 2 | 0.5571 |
| 3 | 0.0757 | 3 | 0.5600 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.0757 | Total Runtime | 0.5600 |
| P=4, N | I = 4000 | P = 4, N = 8000 | |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 6.3028 | 0 | 61.8996 |
| 1 | 5.2114 | 1 | 50.1221 |
| 2 | 6.2909 | 2 | 61.8480 |
| 3 | 6.3028 | 3 | 61.8996 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 6.3028 | Total Runtime | 61.8996 |

| P = 8, N = 1000 | | P = 8, N = 2000 | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.0338 | 0 | 0.2251 |
| 1 | 0.0301 | 1 | 0.1968 |
| 2 | 0.0306 | 2 | 0.1985 |
| 3 | 0.0309 | 3 | 0.2040 |
| 4 | 0.0323 | 4 | 0.2133 |
| 5 | 0.0327 | 5 | 0.2191 |
| 6 | 0.0332 | 6 | 0.2236 |
| 7 | 0.0338 | 7 | 0.2251 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000001 |
| Total Runtime | 0.0338 | Total Runtime | 0.2251 |
| P = 8, N = 4000 | | | |
| P = 8, N | V = 4000 | P = 8, N | V = 8000 |
| P = 8 , N Rank | Time | P = 8 , N Rank | Time |
| · · | | | |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| Rank 0 | Time 2.0520 | Rank 0 | Time 30.8198 |
| Rank 0 1 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 | Rank 0 1 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 |
| Rank 0 1 2 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 1.7850 | Rank 0 1 2 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 26.2380 |
| Rank 0 1 2 3 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 1.7850 1.8268 | Rank 0 1 2 3 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 26.2380 27.0624 |
| Rank 0 1 2 3 4 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 1.7850 1.8268 1.9435 | Rank 0 1 2 3 4 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 26.2380 27.0624 30.3688 |
| Rank 0 1 2 3 4 5 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 1.7850 1.8268 1.9435 2.0010 | Rank 0 1 2 3 4 5 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 26.2380 27.0624 30.3688 30.3963 |
| Rank 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Time 2.0520 1.7786 1.7850 1.8268 1.9435 2.0010 2.0457 | Rank 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 | Time 30.8198 26.2124 26.2380 27.0624 30.3688 30.3963 30.7952 |

| | N = 1000 | N = 2000 | N = 4000 | N = 8000 |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| P = 1 | 0.1551 | 1.4126 | 15.5824 | 122.8605 |
| P = 2 | 0.1103 | 0.8258 | 10.1511 | 87.7051 |
| P = 4 | 0.0757 | 0.5600 | 6.3028 | 61.8996 |
| P = 8 | 0.0338 | 0.2251 | 2.0520 | 30.8198 |

4. Analyze

For P = 1, we see the performance is very close to the serial program. It is slightly worse than serial program, which might be some overhead of MPI initialization operation, etc.

For the scalability, as P increasing the scalability will get closer to linear, such for N = 8000, P = 8 cost just half of runtime of P = 4. However, the scalability of initial stage (P is small), the scalability is not quite close to linear, but still it can achieve reasonable speedup.

As for the load balance, it's not that bad, but we do can see node with larger rank generally took more time to finish, since the triangle matrix have more elements with larger row index. Thus, high rank node will have to do much more calculation than those low rank nodes. And such runtime gap between different node increases as N increasing.

Task 2B: Blocking MPI Parallel Program (Part B)

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task2b-p4-n2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2b-p4-n4.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2b-p8-n2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task2b-p8-n4.sh

| P = 4, $Node = 1$, $N = 8000$ | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | | |
| 0 | 11.9916 | 47.5601 | 59.5518 | | |
| 1 | 29.8898 | 18.7373 | 48.6271 | | |
| 2 | 41.3327 | 18.1727 | 59.5053 | | |
| 3 | 47.4922 | 12.0596 | 59.5518 | | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 59.5518 | | | |

| P = 4, Node = 2, N = 8000 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | | |
| 0 | 8.4763 | 50.6959 | 59.1722 | | |
| 1 | 25.9976 | 22.1357 | 48.1332 | | |
| 2 | 37.1569 | 21.9627 | 59.1196 | | |
| 3 | 46.2399 | 12.9464 | 59.1862 | | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 59.1722 | | | |

| P = 4, Node = 4, N = 8000 | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | | |
| 0 | 8.0687 | 47.0753 | 55.1440 | | |
| 1 | 25.8368 | 18.1827 | 44.0196 | | |
| 2 | 37.1669 | 17.9257 | 55.0926 | | |
| 3 | 42.3209 | 12.8349 | 55.1558 | | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 55.1440 | | | |

| P = 8, Node = 1, N = 8000 | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | |
| 0 | 1.2541 | 29.5657 | 30.8198 | |
| 1 | 3.4103 | 22.8021 | 26.2124 | |
| 2 | 10.8652 | 15.3727 | 26.2380 | |
| 3 | 11.5449 | 15.5175 | 27.0624 | |
| 4 | 18.8919 | 11.4769 | 30.3688 | |
| 5 | 16.2301 | 14.1663 | 30.3963 | |

| 6 | 22.3010 | 8.4942 | 30.7952 | |
|---------------|-------------|---------|---------|--|
| 7 | 22.8070 | 8.0128 | 30.8198 | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000014 | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 30.8198 | | |

| P = 8, $Node = 2$, $N = 8000$ | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|--|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | | |
| 0 | 1.7755 | 30.3798 | 32.1553 | | |
| 1 | 6.3072 | 21.0586 | 27.3658 | | |
| 2 | 9.5915 | 17.7958 | 27.3873 | | |
| 3 | 15.2136 | 13.7894 | 29.0030 | | |
| 4 | 19.0850 | 11.5763 | 30.6613 | | |
| 5 | 21.7554 | 9.3781 | 31.1335 | | |
| 6 | 22.4526 | 9.6888 | 32.1414 | | |
| 7 | 23.3918 | 8.7774 | 32.1692 | | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 32.1553 | | | |

| P = 8, $Node = 4$, $N = 8000$ | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | |
| 0 | 1.2585 | 29.3916 | 30.6501 | |
| 1 | 3.2300 | 22.4993 | 25.7293 | |
| 2 | 10.4446 | 15.3055 | 25.7501 | |
| 3 | 14.5771 | 12.2376 | 26.8147 | |
| 4 | 20.9660 | 8.4720 | 29.4380 | |
| 5 | 25.1059 | 5.5226 | 30.6285 | |
| 6 | 20.2531 | 10.3831 | 30.6361 | |
| 7 | 18.2438 | 12.4363 | 30.6801 | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | | |
| Total Runtime | | 30.6501 | | |

| | P = 4 | P = 8 |
|----------|---------|---------|
| Node = 1 | 59.5518 | 30.8198 |
| Node = 2 | 59.1722 | 32.1553 |
| Node = 4 | 55.1440 | 30.6501 |

4. Analyze

From the computation time and communication time listed above, we can see that, node with higher rank generally have longer computation time. This is because of the imbalance split of matrix A. In this part, we split A evenly by row number, but since A is a lower triangular matrix, thus number of

elements grows as row number increases. Higher rank nodes were assigned with higher row number part of matrix, thus cost more computation time.

As for communication time, master node (rank = 0) takes most communication time since it is responsible for assign row and collect final answer from workers.

Generally, as the number of node increasing, we will get better performance. But the difference is quite small. The reason behind such improvement is probably for Part A, communication is handled by only one node, which means that single daemon need to handle all those processes. While for part B, we have more node to handle those processes. From the memory aspect, we also can reach same conclusion that more nodes can leads to less memory required on each node. However, we do see some exception, my guess is that there is still some messaging cost between different node. So, it is possible that the performance actually going down as we have more nodes.

A few suggestions to improve the program will be: (i) using non-blocking operations, so that nodes can do the calculation while sending and receiving column data. (ii) Instead of split A based on row number, we can split it based on element number. That means more rows for lower rank nodes, since those rows generally holds less elements. By doing this, we should be able to reduce the gap of computation time among different nodes.

Task 3A: Non-Blocking MPI Parallel Program (Part A)

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task3a-1.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3a-2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3a-4.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3a-8.sh

| P = 1, N = 1000 | | P = 1, N = 2000 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.1537 | 0 | 1.2289 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.1537 | Total Runtime | 1.2289 |
| P = 1, N = 4000 | | P = 1, N = 8000 | |
| P=1, N | I = 4000 | P=1, N | I = 8000 |
| P = 1 , N Rank | Time | P = 1 , N Rank | Time |
| | | , | |
| | Time | , | Time |

| P = 2, N = 1000 | | P = 2, N = 2000 | |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.1102 | 0 | 0.8276 |
| 1 | 0.1102 | 1 | 0.8276 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.1102 | Total Runtime | 0.8276 |
| P = 2, N = 4000 | | P = 2, N | I = 8000 |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |

| 0 | 10.2163 | 0 | 85.3569 |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1 | 10.2163 | 1 | 85.3569 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 10.2163 | Total Runtime | 85.3569 |

| P=4, N | P = 4, N = 1000 | | I=2000 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.0721 | 0 | 0.4683 |
| 1 | 0.0556 | 1 | 0.3324 |
| 2 | 0.0721 | 2 | 0.4683 |
| 3 | 0.0583 | 3 | 0.4417 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 |
| Total Runtime | 0.0721 | Total Runtime | 0.4683 |
| | | P = 4, N = 8000 | |
| P = 4, N | I = 4000 | P = 4, N | V = 8000 |
| P = 4 , N Rank | Time | P = 4, N Rank | Time |
| | | , | |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| Rank 0 | Time 6.4082 | Rank 0 | Time 51.3995 |
| Rank 0 1 | Time 6.4082 5.0815 | Rank 0 1 | Time 51.3995 43.0789 |
| Rank 0 1 2 | Time 6.4082 5.0815 6.4083 | Rank 0 1 2 | Time 51.3995 43.0789 51.3995 |

| P = 8, N = 1000 | | P = 8, N | N = 2000 |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 0.0236 | 0 | 0.1864 |
| 1 | 0.0197 | 1 | 0.1452 |
| 2 | 0.0198 | 2 | 0.1468 |
| 3 | 0.0205 | 3 | 0.1485 |
| 4 | 0.0217 | 4 | 0.1634 |
| 5 | 0.0235 | 5 | 0.1864 |
| 6 | 0.0236 | 6 | 0.1819 |
| 7 | 0.0215 | 7 | 0.1538 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000001 |
| Total Runtime | 0.0236 | Total Runtime | 0.1864 |
| P=8, N | V = 4000 | P = 8, N = 8000 | |
| Rank | Time | Rank | Time |
| 0 | 1.8613 | 0 | 28.2292 |
| 1 | 1.4568 | 1 | 22.3856 |
| 2 | 1.4628 | 2 | 22.4127 |
| 3 | 1.4699 | 3 | 22.4414 |
| 4 | 1.6438 | 4 | 25.7801 |
| 5 | 1.8613 | 5 | 28.2291 |

| 6 | 1.7993 | 6 | 27.5423 |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 7 | 1.5270 | 7 | 22.9500 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000003 | F-Norm Error | 0.0000000014 |
| Total Runtime | 1.8613 | Total Runtime | 28.2292 |

| | N = 1000 | N = 2000 | N = 4000 | N = 8000 |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| P = 1 | 0.1537 | 1.2289 | 14.7848 | 120.1992 |
| P = 2 | 0.1102 | 0.8276 | 10.2163 | 85.3569 |
| P = 4 | 0.0721 | 0.4683 | 6.4082 | 51.3995 |
| P = 8 | 0.0236 | 0.1864 | 1.8613 | 28.2292 |

4. Analyze

For this part, we achieve non-blocking MPI program by sending and receiving column data while doing calculation. From the summary table above, we can see that the program achieves significant improvement for large N and P, more than 10%.

The conclusion of the scalability of Task2 still holds true. We can even observe some over linear speed up when N and P is large (6.4082s to 1.8613s for N = 4000). And the load balance is still not good, since changing non-blocking won't help that unfair split of A.

In conclusion, using non-blocking MPI operations does help a lot to the overall performance.

Task 3B: Non-Blocking MPI Parallel Program (Part B)

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task3b-p4-n2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3b-p4-n4.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3b-p8-n2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task3b-p8-n4.sh

| P = 4, $Node = 1$, $N = 8000$ | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------|---------|--|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total | |
| 0 | 11.6594 | 39.7401 | 51.3995 | |
| 1 | 30.6377 | 12.4412 | 43.0789 | |
| 2 | 42.1020 | 9.2975 | 51.3995 | |
| 3 | 47.6064 | 0.1868 | 47.7932 | |
| F-Norm Error | 0.0000000000 | | | |
| Total Runtime | 51.3995 | | | |

| P = 4, $Node = 2$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |

| 0 | 9.2218 | 41.4786 | 50.7004 |
|---------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| 1 | 27.5003 | 14.5536 | 42.0538 |
| 2 | 39.2583 | 11.4421 | 50.7004 |
| 3 | 46.2836 | 0.2629 | 46.5465 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | |
| Total Runtime | 50.7004 | | |

| P = 4, $Node = 4$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 8.7496 | 47.1947 | 55.9443 |
| 1 | 25.7966 | 18.5902 | 44.3869 |
| 2 | 37.5733 | 18.3709 | 55.9442 |
| 3 | 43.7433 | 0.2337 | 43.9770 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 55.9443 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 1$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 1.2746 | 26.9546 | 28.2292 |
| 1 | 3.4198 | 18.9657 | 22.3856 |
| 2 | 12.7303 | 9.6824 | 22.4127 |
| 3 | 10.2587 | 12.1827 | 22.4414 |
| 4 | 19.6628 | 6.1173 | 25.7801 |
| 5 | 16.2091 | 12.0200 | 28.2291 |
| 6 | 23.0689 | 4.4735 | 27.5423 |
| 7 | 22.8032 | 0.1469 | 22.9500 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000014 | |
| Total Runtime | | 28.2292 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 2$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 1.8825 | 27.3350 | 29.2175 |
| 1 | 5.6114 | 18.4899 | 24.1014 |
| 2 | 11.6611 | 12.4622 | 24.1233 |
| 3 | 14.1381 | 10.8823 | 25.0204 |
| 4 | 21.3511 | 4.9576 | 26.3087 |
| 5 | 22.9532 | 5.6015 | 28.5547 |
| 6 | 26.0164 | 3.2129 | 29.2293 |
| 7 | 24.8116 | 0.2349 | 25.0465 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 29.2175 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 4$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 1.3103 | 25.9016 | 27.2120 |
| 1 | 3.2310 | 16.5520 | 19.7830 |
| 2 | 12.8985 | 8.6203 | 21.5188 |
| 3 | 15.5608 | 9.7486 | 25.3094 |
| 4 | 14.2588 | 11.4483 | 25.7071 |
| 5 | 17.3967 | 9.7923 | 27.1890 |
| 6 | 24.9794 | 2.2444 | 27.2238 |
| 7 | 20.0448 | 0.3049 | 20.3497 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 27.2120 | |

| | P = 4 | P = 8 |
|----------|---------|---------|
| Node = 1 | 51.3995 | 28.2292 |
| Node = 2 | 50.7004 | 29.2175 |
| Node = 4 | 55.9443 | 27.2120 |

4. Analyze

From the communication and computation time listed above, we can clearly see how non-blocking improve the performance. For those high rank node, we can observe that the communication time is almost close to 0. That's because those nodes are assigned with larger rows, thus they require too much time to do the calculation, so that all those non-blocking sending and receiving operations are actually done during they doing the calculation. That why they seem almost have no communication time. The higher rank one node is, more computation time is required and less communication time it cost (actually more part of communication time will hide under its computation time). This also clearly demonstrate the poor load balance of our current program.

Task 4: Load Balance

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task4b-p4-n1.sh && sbatch /scripts/task4b-p4-n2.sh && sbatch /scripts/task4b-p4-n4.sh && sbatch /scripts/task4b-p8-n1.sh && sbatch /scripts/task4b-p8-n2.sh && sbatch /script s/task4b-p8-n4.sh

| P = 4, $Node = 1$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 41.7374 | 2.9908 | 44.7282 |
| 1 | 36.2997 | 8.4284 | 44.7282 |
| 2 | 31.7077 | 3.1547 | 34.8624 |
| 3 | 27.9382 | 16.7521 | 44.6903 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000000 | | |
| Total Runtime | | 44.7282 | |

| P = 4, $Node = 2$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 37.4317 | 4.2038 | 41.6355 |
| 1 | 30.7952 | 10.8259 | 41.6211 |
| 2 | 28.0463 | 13.5783 | 41.6246 |
| 3 | 25.2460 | 16.4037 | 41.6497 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 41.6355 | |

| P = 4, $Node = 4$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 38.6608 | 4.1558 | 42.8166 |
| 1 | 30.2379 | 12.5905 | 42.8284 |
| 2 | 26.1968 | 16.6029 | 42.7997 |
| 3 | 23.0809 | 19.7306 | 42.8115 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 42.8166 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 1$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 22.7343 | 1.3693 | 24.1036 |
| 1 | 23.0700 | 1.0335 | 24.1035 |
| 2 | 21.5686 | 1.5351 | 23.1037 |
| 3 | 20.1986 | 2.9246 | 23.1232 |
| 4 | 19.0373 | 4.1035 | 23.1408 |
| 5 | 17.7763 | 5.3798 | 23.1562 |
| 6 | 16.4195 | 7.6552 | 24.0747 |
| 7 | 15.8706 | 8.1904 | 24.0610 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000014 | |
| Total Runtime | | 24.1036 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 2$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 23.0210 | 0.4731 | 23.4940 |
| 1 | 18.4578 | 3.5405 | 21.9982 |
| 2 | 20.3005 | 3.1917 | 23.4922 |
| 3 | 16.1925 | 5.8258 | 22.0183 |
| 4 | 16.3997 | 7.0890 | 23.4886 |
| 5 | 14.3814 | 9.1213 | 23.5027 |
| 6 | 14.8266 | 8.6738 | 23.5005 |
| 7 | 12.7674 | 10.7407 | 23.5081 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000000 | |
| Total Runtime | | 23.4940 | |

| P = 8, $Node = 4$, $N = 8000$ | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 10.9195 | 10.2747 | 21.1941 |
| 1 | 11.5961 | 8.0242 | 19.6203 |
| 2 | 18.8660 | 2.3640 | 21.2301 |
| 3 | 14.8797 | 3.4026 | 18.2823 |
| 4 | 15.1271 | 3.9196 | 19.0466 |
| 5 | 12.7071 | 3.4014 | 16.1085 |
| 6 | 12.4450 | 3.6148 | 16.0598 |
| 7 | 10.5215 | 5.5566 | 16.0781 |
| F-Norm Error | | 0.0000000014 | |
| Total Runtime | | 21.1941 | |

| | P = 4 | P = 8 |
|----------|---------|---------|
| Node = 1 | 44.7282 | 24.1036 |
| Node = 2 | 41.6355 | 23.4940 |
| Node = 4 | 42.8166 | 21.1941 |

4. Analyze

In this task, we split A based on the number of elements. We will try to split the original A so that each node will receive generally same number of elements.

From the computation and communication time listed above, we can observe that the load balance of our program has been improved a lot. The gap between different nodes is much less than the previous two version. By doing this, we can see the performance is improved more than 20%.

We also implement generalization in this part. For the row splitting part, due to the split-by-element implementation, we can automatically support any number of rows. As for the column splitting, still

split it evenly by column number. Thus, we have to add additional checking to see if it reaches the last part of B, if so the last part will take all the rest of B. By doing this, out program can support different size of input.

Task 5: Generalization

1. Command

> sbatch /scripts/task5.sh

2. Detailed Results

| P = 7, Node = 4, N = 7633 | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Rank | Comp Time | Comm Time | Total |
| 0 | 10.8057 | 8.6646 | 19.4703 |
| 1 | 11.7493 | 5.8966 | 17.6459 |
| 2 | 17.145 | 2.3108 | 19.4559 |
| 3 | 15.761 | 2.5203 | 18.2813 |
| 4 | 15.3998 | 2.4251 | 17.8249 |
| 5 | 13.9899 | 0.6045 | 14.5944 |
| 6 | 10.563 | 3.1948 | 13.7577 |
| F-Norm Error | 0.000000014 | | |
| Total Runtime | 19.4703 | | |

From the table above, we can see that our program can correctly calculating N=7633 matrix correctly using 7 processes on 4 nodes. The implementation method is described above.