GEMM3: Constant-Workspace High-Performance Multiplication of Three Matrices for Matrix Chaining

Krzysztof A. Drewniak

The University of Texas at Austin

April 13, 2018

Matrix chaining problem

- Problem: compute $A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n$ efficiently
- $O(n \log n)$ algorithm, also $O(n^3)$ with dynamic programming
- Fewer flops $\rightarrow$ more performance?

Generalized matrix chaining

- In reality — transposes, inverses, properties
- Ensemble Kalman filter $X_i^b S_i (Y_i^b)^T R_i^{-1}$
  Tridiagonalization $\tau_u \tau_v v v^T A u u^T$
  Two-sided triangular solve $L^{-1} A L^{-H}$ (L lower triangular)
- Performance with BLAS/LAPACK – must be expert
- Less performance with Matlab, numpy, etc. (left-to-right)
- Linnea: expression $\rightarrow$ BLAS calls automagically

GEMM3 — Why bother?

-
  - $\boldsymbol{X}_i^b \boldsymbol{S}_i (\boldsymbol{Y}_i^b)^T R_i^{-1}$
  - $\tau_u \tau_v \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^T \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{u}^T$
  - $\boldsymbol{L}^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}(\boldsymbol{L}^{-1})^H$ (L lower triangular)
- All multiply three matrices as a subproblem
- (Notation: $G \mathrel{+}= DEF$ and GEMM3)
- Not everything divides well this way

GEMM3 — Why a new algorithm?

- Current approach: parentheses, multiply twice, store temporary T
- T often eats memory (& perf)
- We can do better!
- Use how GEMM works to nest computations
- $O(1)$ extra memory, maybe more performance

Section 2

High-Performance GEMM

Memory hierarchy



Important matrix shapes



GEMM: The kernels



GEMM: The kernels



GEMM: The algorithm



Data reuse

- Every loop reads *something* repeatedly

Want:



Section 3

The GEMM3 algorithm

Key concept of the algorithm

- We want $G \mathrel{+}= DEF$, (dimensions: m, k, l, n in order)
- EF first needed in packing step
- Compute a row panel then

Deriving GEMM3: Partitionings

$G \quad += \quad D \quad [(EF) \quad \leftrightarrow \quad E \quad F]$

1. 

2. 

3. 

Deriving GEMM3: Inner algorithm



- Only point to compute EF in constant memory
- GEMM algorithm needs tweaks

Inner algorithm tweaks: Removing the outer loop



Inner alg. tweaks: Microkernel packed writes



Inner alg. tweaks: Halving n_C



Inner algtweaks: Small k_C reduction



Inner algtweaks: Small k_C reduction



Deriving GEMM3: The small drawback

Problem shape:



Reuse problem: m small



The algorithm



$G \mathrel{+}= (DE)F$

Ex: Don't



- Putting parentheses there sometimes better
- Deriving directly doesn't work — bad shape
- However, $G \mathrel{+}= (DE)F \Leftrightarrow G^T \mathrel{+}= F^T(E^T D^T)$

Section 4

Experiments and Results

Implementation details

- Multilevel Optimization of Matrix Multiply Sandbox (MOMMS)
- Extended to support three matrices
- Implement both GEMM3 and BLIS algorithm
- BLIS algorithm port performs like BLIS
- Machine: 3.5 GHz (one core used), 15 GB RAM, 32 KB $L1$ cache, 256 KB $L2$, 8 MB $L3$. Peak perf 56 GFLOPS/s.

	GEMM3	BLIS algorithm
m_R	6	6
n_R	8	8
m_C	72	72
k_C	252	256
l_C	256	
n_C	2040	4080

Table: Parameters for Haswell CPUs

Experiments

1. $G \mathrel{+}= D(EF)$, square matrices
   - Inputs column-major, outputs row-major for fairness
2. $G^T \mathrel{+}= F^T(E^T D^T)$, square matrices
   - After transpose, all row major
3. $G \mathrel{+}= D(EF)$, rectangles (one dimension small)

Workspace usage, square matrices



$G \mathrel{+}= D(EF)$, square matrices



$G \mathrel{+}= D(EF)$, square matrices



$G \mathrel{+}= (DE)F$, square matrices



$G \mathrel{+}= (DE)F$, square matrices



$G \mathrel{+}= D(EF)$, rectangular matrices



Conclusions

- GEMM structure lets us make GEMM3
- Constant memory
- Comprable performance
- Cleaner API

Future Work

- Parallel case
- More architectures

Acknowledgments

- Prof. Robert van de Geijn — advising and providing inspiration
- Dr. Tyler Smith — writing MOMMS and algorithm design
- Prof. Tze Meng Low — performance fixes
- NSF awards CCF-1714091 and ACI-1550493 — funding

Questions?

Picking parameters: m_R, n_R

- Determine microkernel
- Based on microarchitecture — register width, FMA properties
- We're reusing BLIS's work
- Can swap m_R and n_R

Picking parameters: k_C

Placing memory in cache: [tag][set #][offset in line]

$$m_r k_c S_{elem} = C_A C_{L1} N_{L1} \qquad n_r k_C S_{elem} = C_B C_{L1} N_{L1}$$

L1 Cache:



$\ldots$

$$C_A + C_B + 1 \leq W_{L1}$$

Maximizing k_C improves performance

$$C_B = \left\lceil \frac{n_R k_C S_{elem}}{N_{L1} C_{L1}} \right\rceil$$

$$= \left\lceil \frac{n_R}{m_R} C_A \right\rceil$$

$$C_A \leq \left\lfloor \frac{W_{L1} - 1}{1 + \frac{n_R}{m_R}} \right\rfloor$$

Picking parameters: m_C and n_C

- For m_C: reserve ways for B and C
- Then take all you can
- n_C, leave out what architecture requires, then divide
- L3 is very big, tuning is much less needed