

Partitioning: The problem obviously lends itself nicely to a domain decomposition as we are performing the same operation at each grid. Additionally, each operation only depends vary local data points.

Agglomeration: The optimal level of communication should be that each processor sends one and only one message to its neighbor at any given iteration. We do this by combining square that are next to each and thus only needing to communicate the edges. The creation of these larger submatrices will make this communication more efficient.

2.

3.

[illegible]

At steps = 20

[illegible]

At steps = 40

[illegible]

At steps = 80

[illegible]

4.

We should get something like $T_{\text{comp}} = t_c N^2$ where N^2 is the grid size. In this case $N = 20$. From ones.f90 I found that a 5 by 5 grid took about 2×10^{-6} seconds therefore t_c should be $2 \times 10^{-6}/25$ or 8×10^{-8} . From this I find that $T_{\text{comp}} = 3.2 \times 10^{-5}$. Next we look at T_{comm} . The scheme that we have should give us $T_{\text{comm}} = 4P(t_s + 2t_w(N/P))$. We know that $N = 20$ and $P = 4$ thus $T_{\text{comm}} = 16(t_s + 10t_w)$. We can now get t_s and t_w from HW6. From P.1 we can conclude that $t_s = 1.5 \times 10^{-6}$ seconds and $t_w = 9.5 \times 10^{-7}$. Thus $T_{\text{comm}} = 16(t_s + 10t_w) = 1.52 \times 10^{-4}$ seconds. Per a processor we get $T_{2D} = 1.52 \times 10^{-4}/4 + 3.2 \times 10^{-5}/4 = 3.8 \times 10^{-5} + 8 \times 10^{-6} = 4.6 \times 10^{-5}$ seconds per an iteration. When ran in a 10^6 do loop the time clocked was about 17.8 seconds or about 1.78×10^{-5} seconds per an iteration. These are within an order of magnitude which is good for me.