

|  |
| --- |
| CONCURRENT SYSTEMS ASSIGNMENT REPORT  CS3014 – 2018/19 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Team members: |  |  |
| Prapti Setty  Patrick Jennings |  |  |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Getting Started

Starting the assignment


Setup

Trying Parallelization

#pragma omp parallel for collapse(3)

#pragma omp parallel for collapse(6)

# Getting started



## Starting the assignment


We started the assignment in reading week and our first step was to understand what was happening in the original code given to us. We ran the code a few times with some random values to see what was happening and tried to step through it using the debugger.

We then re-read the spec more carefully to determine exactly what was being asked before beginning out implementation

## Set up

Since we were working in a group, it was quite important to use some kind of version control so we would minimize our conflicts as much as possible. We set up a Github repository shared between the two team members, so we could easily share code. This also proved very useful when we wanted to work on code on our own machines and then clone and pull it to the machine we were going to run the code on (Stoker).

We then decided to add in some lines of code to allow us to track how long the original code was taking and track the speedup we gained with what we implemented.



We wanted to be able to run the sample inputs 50-70 times initially (we reduced this down to 20 as we realized we were hogging Stoker), so having something like an output file that recorded something along the lines of the output below:


“Team conv time: 292653 microseconds, a 9 speedup! 2766819

COMMENT: sum of absolute differences (0.000000) within acceptable range (0.062500)”

We updated the print statement to the following:



We could then write in a new .c file that would take in the inputs and specify the number of times we wanted to run them. We named this concTester.c and it looked as follows:



This program sent our results to an output file that we could specify the name for. This output file we had could then be imported into a C# program and calculate averages very quickly by parsing the values obtained. This saved us a lot of time as we avoided having to do the calculations manually with a calculator, but still gave us the advantage of getting a more accurate answer for our timings, allowing us to eliminate outliers in our outputs by having an average instead of running it just once.

**Trying parallelization**

**#pragma omp parallel for collapse(3)**

We started looking through the notes to look for what we could do to improve the speed of our program and decided to start by adding in

#pragma omp parallel for

Also written as


#pragma omp parallel for collapse(1)

and then tested our code. We ran this 50 times and got the averages. Here are the results for it:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Width** | **Height** | **Kernel\_**  **Order** | **Number\_Of**  **\_Channels** | **Kernel\_**  **Number** |  | **No Improvement** | **Parallelized**  **collapse(1)** | |
| 16 | 16 | 5 | 1024 | 128 |  | 2864872 | 164775 | 17 |
| 32 | 32 | 3 | 512 | 256 |  | 4137490 | 242200 | 17 |
| 64 | 64 | 1 | 256 | 64 |  | 442745 | 28149 | 15 |
| 128 | 128 | 7 | 128 | 128 |  | 32516436 | 1774827 | 18 |
| 256 | 256 | 5 | 64 | 64 |  | 19271368 | 1003890 | 19 |
| 512 | 512 | 7 | 32 | 32 |  | 32403120 | 2352950 | 13 |

We then decided to parallelize it further ( #pragma omp parallel for collapse(2) and #pragma omp parallel for collapse(3))and run it again, but this time we only ran it 20 times as we realized running it 50 times was hogging the machine.

This is what our code looked like:



These were the results we got for the new code:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Width** | **Height** | **Kernel\_**  **Order** | **Number\_Of\_**  **Channels** | **Kernel\_**  **Number** | **No Improvement** | **Parallelized collapse(1)** | | **Parallelized collapse(2)** | | **Parallelized collapse(3)** | |
| 16 | 16 | 5 | 1024 | 128 | 2864872 | 164775 | 17 | 162546 | 16 | 163035 | 15 |
| 32 | 32 | 3 | 512 | 256 | 4137490 | 242200 | 17 | 254254 | 14 | 249677 | 14 |
| 64 | 64 | 1 | 256 | 64 | 442745 | 28149 | 15 | 29390 | 12 | 28495 | 12 |
| 128 | 128 | 7 | 128 | 128 | 32516436 | 1774827 | 18 | 1574541 | 20 | 1582756 | 20 |
| 256 | 256 | 5 | 64 | 64 | 19271368 | 1003890 | 19 | 1019410 | 18 | 971688 | 19 |
| 512 | 512 | 7 | 32 | 32 | 32403120 | 2352950 | 13 | 1585599 | 20 | 1618731 | 20 |

At this point we noticed that by parallelizing it down to collapse(3), for smaller inputs, was actually slowing our improvements down very slightly on average. Initially confused about this, we decided to do some research into it and came to a conclusion that it was possible hat for the smaller values, there was a lot of time involved to get set up with the threads, thus leading to it overall being a little slower.

We wondering if trying to parallelize it all the way down to the inner most for loop would have any improvements or would be worse.

**#pragma omp parallel for collapse(6)**

We couldn’t parallelize it all the way down by simply updating the line to make it from #pragma omp parallel for collapse(3) to #pragma omp parallel for collapse(6). We needed to do some altering of the code to be able to parallelize it down to the inner most for loop and here is the snippet of code we came up with:

