

Exercise 3: Task Parallelism

test environment:

Used PC had 12 Cores

SpeedUP:

Test Data: We used the same array in every test. The array has a size of 10 million integers to ensure a meaningful result, and the integers are evenly (randomly) distributed to create a fair sample. We used for the **Threshold the length of the current array**.

The runtime of both the Quicksort and the Mergesort are drawn in the diagram below

Tested Algorithms:

1. Quicksort Single threaded
2. Quicksort Parallel with Thresholds between 0 and 5.000.000

The **best speedup was 4,66** with a threshold of 540.000.

Like we can see the **optimised number of threshold** is **between: 360.000 and 610.000**

When the array size was reduced to **5%** of the original array, sequential Sorting seems to outperform further parallel subdividing.

The naive algorithm is much slower than the single threaded approach, because of the huge overhead, which is why it makes sense to resort back to the single threaded algorithm for smaller array sizes. The exact data will be appended to the submission as an excel sheet.

3. Mergesort Single threaded
4. Mergesort Parallel with Threshold between 0 and 5.000.000

The **best speedup was 3,26** with a threshold of 1.57 million.

The **optimised number of threshold** lies between: **1.000.000 and 2.000.000**

For the mergesort, the best threshold for us is between 10% and 20% of the original array size.

As a side note: with the naive parallel approach we had a speedup of 0.004 (Quicksort) and 0.002 (Mergesort), which means that the naive approach takes 200 - 400 times as long as the sequential algorithm.

