1 ROOFLINE ANALYSIS

We adopt the roofline model [2] to analyze the effectiveness of stencil computation by Artemis, TCstencil, and TC-w/o tc. Since Nsight profiler do not supprot collect FLOP in half, so we give the theoretical value. Table 1 shows the the maximum operational intensity $I_{max} = \pi/\beta$ (FLOP/Byte) in FP16 precision of A100 and V100, where π (TFLOPS) is the maximum attainable performance the β (GB/s) is maximum memory bandwidth. We are only considering the multiplication-and-add for stencil as FLOP and the access to global memory. For updating the inner points in 16×16 mesh with 9pt stencil, the Arithmetic Intensity (AI, FLOP/Byte) of Artemis/TC-w/o tc/TCstencil is 0.50/2.53/5.33. As for 25pt stencil, the AI of Artemis/TC-w/o tc/TCstencil is 0.50/7.03/6. The computation details are in the appendix. All the above implementations are memory bound since their AI are lower than I_{max} in Table 1.

Table 1: The performance information of A100 and V100 in FP16 precision [1].

Item	A100 FMA	A100 TC	V100 FMA	V100 TC
π	78	312	31.4	125
β	1555		900	
I_{max}	50.1	200.64	34.88	128.8

2 APPENDIX

The computation detail:

- Artemis 9pt: 9 FLOP/(9*2) Byte. update every point, read 9 points in half and perfrom 9 FLOP.
- Artemis 25pt: 25 FLOP/(25*2) Byte.
- TC-w/o tc 9pt: (12*12*9) FLOP / (16*16*2) Byte. update every 12*12 points, load 16*16 points in global memory, perfrom 12*12*9 FLOP.
- TC-w/o tc 25pt: (12*12*25) FLOP / (16*16*2) Byte.
- *TCstencil* 9pt: (16*16*16*2) FLOP/ (3*16*16)*2 Byte. update every 12*12 point, load 16*16 points and 2*16*16 elements in parameter matrices. perform twice Tensor Core MMA, each MMA perform 16*16*16 FLOP.
- $TCstencil\ 25pt:\ (16*16*16*3)\ FLOP/\ (4*16*16)*2\ Byte.$

REFERENCES

- [1] NVIDIA. 2021-1-30. NVIDIA Turing Architecture Whitepaper. online. https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/a100/ Accessed March 30, 2021.
- [2] Samuel Williams, Andrew Waterman, and David Patterson. 2009. Roofline: an insightful visual performance model for multicore architectures. *Commun. ACM* 52, 4 (2009), 65–76.