SIFT Parallelization Report

Parallelization Strategy

This implementation uses a **hybrid MPI+OpenMP approach** with spatial domain decomposition to parallelize the SIFT (Scale-Invariant Feature Transform) algorithm.

Architecture Overview

The parallelization strategy divides the computational workload across multiple MPI ranks using a 2D Cartesian grid topology, with each rank processing a spatial tile of the image. Within each rank, OpenMP threads are used to further parallelize computationally intensive loops.

Phase-by-Phase Strategy

1. Gaussian Pyramid Generation (generate_gaussian_pyramid_parallel)

- Tile-based decomposition: Image divided into tiles across MPI ranks using Cartesian grid topology
- Parallel Gaussian blur (gaussian_blur_parallel):
 - · Each rank blurs its local tile independently
 - Halo exchange operations for boundary pixels between neighboring ranks
 - Separable convolution: vertical pass → halo exchange → horizontal pass → halo exchange
 - OpenMP parallelization within each pass for interior pixels
- Adaptive strategy: Small octaves (when tiles become too small) processed sequentially on rank 0 to avoid communication overhead

2. DoG Pyramid (generate_dog_pyramid_parallel)

- Embarrassingly parallel: Each rank computes pixel-wise differences on its local tiles independently
- No inter-rank communication required
- OpenMP parallelization for difference computation

3. Gradient Pyramid (generate_gradient_pyramid_parallel)

- Distributed computation: Each rank computes gradients on local tiles
- Halo exchange: Required for accurate gradient computation at tile boundaries
- OpenMP parallelization: Interior pixels processed with #pragma omp parallel for

4. Keypoint Detection (find_keypoints_parallel)

- Interior ownership model: Each rank detects keypoints in its tile using a 1-pixel interior boundary rule
- **Halo-aware extrema checking**: Boundary pixels checked using exchanged halo data from neighboring ranks
- Local refinement: Keypoint refinement performed locally on each rank
- Gather operation: All detected keypoints gathered to rank 0

5. Orientation & Descriptor (find_keypoints_and_descriptors_parallel)

- Gather-then-compute approach:
 - o Gradient pyramids and keypoints gathered to rank 0
 - Rank 0 performs orientation assignment and descriptor computation
- OpenMP parallelization: Keypoint processing parallelized with dynamic scheduling across threads
- Trade-off: Centralized computation avoids complex distributed orientation/descriptor logic

Performance Analysis

Sequential Baseline (1 rank, 1 thread)

• Total execution time: 127,817.89 ms (~128 seconds)

• Major hotspots:

• Gaussian pyramid generation: 61,010 ms (47.6%)

Orientation & descriptor computation: 35,798 ms (27.9%)

• Gradient pyramid generation: 18,454 ms (14.4%)

• Keypoint detection: 5,556 ms (4.3%)

DoG pyramid generation: 2,598 ms (2.0%)

Parallel Version (4 ranks, 16 threads)

• Total execution time (max across ranks): 39,241.50 ms (~39 seconds)

• Overall speedup: 3.26×

• Parallel efficiency: 81.5% (3.26/4)

Detailed Phase Breakdown

Phase	Sequential (ms)	Parallel Max (ms)	Speedup	Efficiency
Gaussian pyramid	61,010	19,229	3.17×	79.3%
DoG pyramid	2,598	1,950	1.33×	33.3%
Gradient pyramid	18,454	4,518	4.08×	102.0%
Keypoint detection	5,556	2,298	2.42×	60.5%
Orientation/descriptor	35,798	3,265	10.96×	68.5%*

^{*}Using 16 OpenMP threads on rank 0

Communication Overhead Analysis

Total MPI communication time: 29,238.74 ms (36.4% of parallel runtime)

Key communication costs:

- gather_gradient_pyramid: 8,074 ms per rank
 - o Transfers entire gradient pyramid to rank 0
 - Largest communication bottleneck

- MPI Bcast base dimensions: Up to 9,731 ms
 - o Includes synchronization overhead
 - Broadcasting base image dimensions for each octave
- Halo exchanges: ~441 ms total
 - Relatively efficient for boundary data exchange
 - Small overhead compared to computation
- gather_keypoints: ~14 ms per rank
 - Minimal cost due to small keypoint data size

Load Balancing

Max time: 39,241.50 ms (slowest rank)Min time: 35,955.72 ms (fastest rank)

• Load imbalance: 9.1%

Sources of imbalance:

- 1. Rank 0 handles small octaves exclusively (prepare_octave_bases: 9,703 ms)
- 2. Non-uniform keypoint distribution may cause slight variation in detection time
- 3. Rank 0 performs all orientation/descriptor computation (3,265 ms exclusive work)

Key Findings

Strengths **V**

- 1. Excellent OpenMP scaling: Orientation/descriptor phase achieves 10.96× speedup with 16 threads
- 2. Effective domain decomposition: Gradient pyramid shows 4.08× speedup with 4 ranks
- 3. Efficient halo exchange: Communication overhead for boundary data is minimal (~441 ms)
- 4. Good overall speedup: 3.26× speedup on 4 ranks demonstrates effective parallelization

Bottlenecks △

- 1. Communication-bound: 36.4% of runtime spent in MPI communication
- 2. Gradient pyramid gather: Single largest bottleneck at 8,074 ms per rank
- 3. Limited MPI scalability: DoG pyramid only achieves 1.33× speedup
- 4. Centralized final phase: Gathering all data to rank 0 limits scalability beyond 4 ranks

Scalability Concerns III

- Strong scaling limit: Gather operations become prohibitive as rank count increases
- Weak scaling: Load imbalance from rank-0-only processing increases with problem size
- Memory pressure: Rank 0 must hold entire gradient pyramid (high memory footprint)

Recommendations for Further Optimization

- 1. **Distributed descriptor computation**: Keep gradient data distributed and compute descriptors in parallel across ranks
- 2. Overlap communication with computation: Use asynchronous MPI operations where possible

3. **Optimize gather operations**: Use collective I/O or streaming approaches instead of gathering full pyramids

- 4. Dynamic load balancing: Distribute small octave processing across all ranks
- 5. **Memory optimization**: Avoid duplicating full gradient pyramid on rank 0

Conclusion

The hybrid MPI+OpenMP parallelization achieves a respectable **3.26× speedup** on 4 ranks with 16 threads, demonstrating effective spatial domain decomposition for the SIFT algorithm. The implementation successfully parallelizes the most computationally intensive phases (Gaussian pyramid, gradient computation, and orientation/descriptor extraction) with good efficiency.

However, the centralized gather-then-compute approach for the final phase introduces significant communication overhead (36.4% of runtime) that limits scalability. For larger-scale parallelism (8+ ranks), a fully distributed approach would be necessary to maintain efficiency and avoid the memory and communication bottlenecks associated with centralizing data on rank 0.