

Title: Performance Comparison of Tiled vs. Non-Tiled Matrix Multiplication

1. Aim

The objective of this assignment is to compare the performance of tiled and non-tiled approaches in matrix multiplication. Specifically, we analyse how different tiling sizes (e.g., row-wise, column-wise, row16, row32, row64, etc.) impact computation time while multiplying a 1024 x 1024 matrix.

2. System Configuration

- **Processor:** Intel Core i5-12450H
- **Operating System:** Ubuntu 24.02

3. Definition

Non-Tiled Approach

In the non-tiled approach, the entire matrix is processed sequentially without breaking it into smaller blocks. This method is simple but often inefficient due to memory access latency and lack of cache optimization.

Tiled Approach

Tiled matrix multiplication divides the matrices into smaller sub-matrices (tiles). These tiles are processed independently, reducing cache misses and improving memory access efficiency.

4. Performance Comparison Table

Non-tiled Column method

```
Performance counter stats for './col':

 3,90,04,82,921    cpu_atom/cycles/          #    1.395 GHz              (0.17%)
12,25,87,16,594    cpu_core/cycles/          #    4.383 GHz              (99.83%)
 6,00,67,49,209    cpu_atom/instructions/    #    1.54   insn per cycle  (0.17%)
52,94,67,59,951    cpu_core/instructions/    #    4.32   insn per cycle  (99.83%)
 7,44,62,402       cpu_atom/cache-misses/    # 79.15% of all cache refs  (0.17%)
20,36,430          cpu_core/cache-misses/    # 2.67% of all cache refs   (99.83%)
 3,145            page-faults              #    1.124 K/sec            (0.17%)
 2,796.82 msec    task-clock                #    1.000 CPUs utilized    (0.17%)
 63,22,18,871     cpu_atom/branches/        # 226.049 M/sec             (99.83%)
1,12,06,14,911    cpu_core/branches/        # 400.675 M/sec             (99.83%)
 50,14,448        cpu_atom/branch-misses/    # 0.79% of all branches     (0.17%)
11,38,227        cpu_core/branch-misses/    # 0.10% of all branches     (99.83%)
 6,93,59,92,188   cpu_atom/bus-cycles/       #    2.480 G/sec            (0.17%)
 6,98,06,50,743   cpu_core/bus-cycles/       #    2.496 G/sec            (99.83%)
 9,40,74,147      cpu_atom/cache-references/  # 33.636 M/sec              (0.17%)
 7,63,56,686      cpu_core/cache-references/  # 27.301 M/sec              (99.83%)
 6,93,59,92,188   cpu_atom/ref-cycles/       #    2.480 G/sec            (0.17%)
 6,98,06,50,743   cpu_core/ref-cycles/       #    2.496 G/sec            (99.83%)

 2.797816447 seconds time elapsed

 2.787916000 seconds user
 0.009999000 seconds sys
```

Non tiled Row method

```
Performance counter stats for './row':

 9,30,32,08,642      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      3.214 GHz          (0.43%)
12,69,01,99,118      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.384 GHz          (99.57%)
30,52,67,22,522      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      3.28   insn per cycle (0.43%)
52,96,11,12,204      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.17   insn per cycle (99.57%)
 4,57,60,044         cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #    50.11% of all cache refs (0.43%)
 6,06,917            cpu_core/cache-misses/    #    0.86% of all cache refs (99.57%)
    3,144            page-faults          #      1.086 K/sec          #
    2,894.50 msec    task-clock           #      1.000 CPUs utilized
93,88,46,927         cpu_atom/branches/      #    324.355 M/sec          (0.43%)
1,12,05,90,018       cpu_core/branches/      #    387.144 M/sec          (99.57%)
28,68,577            cpu_atom/branch-misses/  #    0.31% of all branches (0.43%)
11,36,040            cpu_core/branch-misses/  #    0.10% of all branches (99.57%)
7,21,41,08,636       cpu_atom/bus-cycles/     #      2.492 G/sec          (0.43%)
7,22,44,98,760       cpu_core/bus-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.57%)
 9,13,24,371         cpu_atom/cache-references/ #    31.551 M/sec          (0.43%)
7,05,59,716         cpu_core/cache-references/ #    24.377 M/sec          (99.57%)
7,21,41,08,636       cpu_atom/ref-cycles/     #      2.492 G/sec          (0.43%)
7,22,44,98,760       cpu_core/ref-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.57%)

    2.894996767 seconds time elapsed

    2.889047000 seconds user
    0.006000000 seconds sys
```

Tiled Approach (Row Method 16x16)

```
Performance counter stats for './row16':

 9,65,60,59,608      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      3.266 GHz          (0.13%)
12,88,63,38,580      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.359 GHz          (99.87%)
30,40,08,98,947      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      3.15   insn per cycle (0.13%)
59,17,71,67,441      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.59   insn per cycle (99.87%)
35,51,314           cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #    17.14% of all cache refs (0.13%)
10,96,170           cpu_core/cache-misses/    #    17.83% of all cache refs (99.87%)
    3,153            page-faults          #      1.067 K/sec          #
    2,956.28 msec    task-clock           #      0.933 CPUs utilized
7,26,56,81,960       cpu_atom/branches/      #      2.458 G/sec          (0.13%)
2,71,16,27,346       cpu_core/branches/      #    917.243 M/sec          (99.87%)
29,78,649           cpu_atom/branch-misses/  #    0.04% of all branches (0.13%)
50,06,653           cpu_core/branch-misses/  #    0.18% of all branches (99.87%)
7,35,75,20,887       cpu_atom/bus-cycles/     #      2.489 G/sec          (0.13%)
7,37,85,14,057       cpu_core/bus-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.87%)
 2,07,22,585         cpu_atom/cache-references/ #    7.010 M/sec          (0.13%)
61,48,308           cpu_core/cache-references/ #    2.080 M/sec          (99.87%)
7,35,75,20,887       cpu_atom/ref-cycles/     #      2.489 G/sec          (0.13%)
7,37,85,14,122       cpu_core/ref-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.87%)

    3.168572391 seconds time elapsed

    2.927336000 seconds user
    0.030003000 seconds sys
```

Tiled Approach (Column Method 16x16)

```
Performance counter stats for './col16':

 3,83,59,64,509      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      1.268 GHz          (0.17%)
13,19,29,48,117      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.361 GHz          (99.83%)
 3,80,72,99,685      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      0.99   insn per cycle (0.17%)
59,33,21,39,784      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.50   insn per cycle (99.83%)
 8,35,95,398         cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #    83.45% of all cache refs (0.17%)
12,25,904           cpu_core/cache-misses/    #    15.66% of all cache refs (99.83%)
    3,148            page-faults          #      1.041 K/sec          #
    3,025.14 msec    task-clock           #      0.924 CPUs utilized
67,31,28,110         cpu_atom/branches/      #    222.512 M/sec          (0.17%)
2,74,02,93,316       cpu_core/branches/      #    905.841 M/sec          (99.83%)
50,82,522           cpu_atom/branch-misses/  #    0.76% of all branches (0.17%)
51,57,158           cpu_core/branch-misses/  #    0.19% of all branches (99.83%)
7,50,48,07,802       cpu_atom/bus-cycles/     #      2.481 G/sec          (0.17%)
7,55,04,25,473       cpu_core/bus-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.83%)
10,01,75,314         cpu_atom/cache-references/ #    33.114 M/sec          (0.17%)
78,30,065           cpu_core/cache-references/ #    2.588 M/sec          (99.83%)
7,50,48,07,802       cpu_atom/ref-cycles/     #      2.481 G/sec          (0.17%)
7,55,04,25,473       cpu_core/ref-cycles/     #      2.496 G/sec          (99.83%)

    3.273441779 seconds time elapsed

    3.004565000 seconds user
    0.021003000 seconds sys
```


Tiled Approach (Row method 32 x 32)

```
Performance counter stats for './row32':

 4,46,02,26,514      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      1.562 GHz          (0.21%)
12,44,40,67,433      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.359 GHz          (99.79%)
 4,43,82,99,726      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      1.00  insn per cycle (0.21%)
58,73,60,46,416      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.72  insn per cycle (99.79%)
 10,34,55,099        cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #      85.51% of all cache refs (0.21%)
  6,56,092           cpu_core/cache-misses/    #     11.64% of all cache refs (99.79%)
    3,152            page-faults          #      1.104 K/sec          (0.21%)
    2,854.98 msec    task-clock           #      0.921 CPUs utilized          (0.21%)
 78,54,58,514        cpu_atom/branches/        #     275.118 M/sec          (99.79%)
 2,57,35,46,196      cpu_core/branches/        #     901.422 M/sec          (0.21%)
 46,02,879           cpu_atom/branch-misses/    #      0.59% of all branches (99.79%)
 43,62,994           cpu_core/branch-misses/    #      0.17% of all branches (0.21%)
 7,10,88,80,272      cpu_atom/bus-cycles/        #      2.490 G/sec          (99.79%)
 7,12,56,40,281      cpu_core/bus-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.21%)
 12,09,83,299        cpu_atom/cache-references/    #     42.376 M/sec          (99.79%)
 56,38,939           cpu_core/cache-references/    #      1.975 M/sec          (0.21%)
 7,10,88,80,272      cpu_atom/ref-cycles/        #      2.490 G/sec          (99.79%)
 7,12,56,40,216      cpu_core/ref-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.21%)

 3.099262782 seconds time elapsed

 2.832793000 seconds user
 0.023014000 seconds sys
```

Tiled Approach (Row method 32 x 32)

```
Performance counter stats for './col32':

 6,14,72,86,572      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      2.084 GHz          (0.28%)
12,86,87,98,296      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.363 GHz          (99.72%)
 6,91,50,59,033      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      1.12  insn per cycle (0.28%)
58,86,20,77,641      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.57  insn per cycle (99.72%)
 12,22,22,515        cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #     84.77% of all cache refs (0.28%)
 10,52,017           cpu_core/cache-misses/    #     21.41% of all cache refs (99.72%)
    3,147            page-faults          #      1.067 K/sec          (0.28%)
    2,949.60 msec    task-clock           #      0.924 CPUs utilized          (0.28%)
 98,56,47,088        cpu_atom/branches/        #     334.163 M/sec          (99.72%)
 2,59,21,61,108      cpu_core/branches/        #     878.819 M/sec          (0.28%)
 49,73,128           cpu_atom/branch-misses/    #      0.50% of all branches (99.72%)
 39,16,812           cpu_core/branch-misses/    #      0.15% of all branches (0.28%)
 7,33,11,56,196      cpu_atom/bus-cycles/        #      2.485 G/sec          (99.72%)
 7,36,17,51,356      cpu_core/bus-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.28%)
 14,41,79,539        cpu_atom/cache-references/    #     48.881 M/sec          (99.72%)
 49,12,629           cpu_core/cache-references/    #      1.666 M/sec          (0.28%)
 7,33,11,56,196      cpu_atom/ref-cycles/        #      2.485 G/sec          (99.72%)
 7,36,17,51,356      cpu_core/ref-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.28%)

 3.193328966 seconds time elapsed

 2.926064000 seconds user
 0.025000000 seconds sys
```

Tiled Approach (Row method 64 x 64)

```
Performance counter stats for './row64':

 7,82,14,98,418      cpu_atom/cycles/          #      2.884 GHz          (0.77%)
11,86,40,78,288      cpu_core/cycles/          #      4.375 GHz          (99.23%)
21,95,32,94,348      cpu_atom/instructions/    #      2.81  insn per cycle (0.77%)
58,66,08,06,898      cpu_core/instructions/    #      4.94  insn per cycle (99.23%)
  3,28,09,749        cpu_atom/cache-misses/    #     70.69% of all cache refs (0.77%)
  8,80,744           cpu_core/cache-misses/    #     10.81% of all cache refs (99.23%)
    3,153            page-faults          #      1.163 K/sec          (0.77%)
    2,712.01 msec    task-clock           #      0.922 CPUs utilized          (0.77%)
 5,16,49,05,456      cpu_atom/branches/        #      1.904 G/sec          (99.23%)
 2,47,83,82,136      cpu_core/branches/        #     913.854 M/sec          (0.77%)
 32,26,524           cpu_atom/branch-misses/    #      0.06% of all branches (99.23%)
 23,73,030           cpu_core/branch-misses/    #      0.10% of all branches (0.77%)
 6,75,35,67,978      cpu_atom/bus-cycles/        #      2.490 G/sec          (99.23%)
 6,76,89,02,329      cpu_core/bus-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.77%)
 4,64,13,678         cpu_atom/cache-references/    #     17.114 M/sec          (99.23%)
 81,47,616           cpu_core/cache-references/    #      3.004 M/sec          (0.77%)
 6,75,35,67,978      cpu_atom/ref-cycles/        #      2.490 G/sec          (99.23%)
 6,76,89,02,460      cpu_core/ref-cycles/        #      2.496 G/sec          (0.77%)

 2.941359718 seconds time elapsed

 2.688385000 seconds user
 0.025003000 seconds sys
```

Tiled Approach (Column method 64 x 64)

```
Performance counter stats for './col64':
```

4,96,47,04,506	cpu_atom/cycles/	#	1.814 GHz	(0.23%)
11,96,60,87,118	cpu_core/cycles/	#	4.372 GHz	(99.77%)
4,74,70,00,557	cpu_atom/instructions/	#	0.96 insn per cycle	(0.23%)
58,58,76,16,849	cpu_core/instructions/	#	4.90 insn per cycle	(99.77%)
10,54,67,553	cpu_atom/cache-misses/	#	84.95% of all cache refs	(0.23%)
9,82,562	cpu_core/cache-misses/	#	23.40% of all cache refs	(99.77%)
3,148	page-faults	#	1.150 K/sec	
2,736.91 msec	task-clock	#	0.919 CPUs utilized	
84,05,39,072	cpu_atom/branches/	#	307.112 M/sec	(0.23%)
2,52,07,08,186	cpu_core/branches/	#	921.005 M/sec	(99.77%)
44,73,015	cpu_atom/branch-misses/	#	0.53% of all branches	(0.23%)
22,72,663	cpu_core/branch-misses/	#	0.09% of all branches	(99.77%)
6,80,88,63,555	cpu_atom/bus-cycles/	#	2.488 G/sec	(0.23%)
6,83,10,31,190	cpu_core/bus-cycles/	#	2.496 G/sec	(99.77%)
12,41,55,846	cpu_atom/cache-references/	#	45.364 M/sec	(0.23%)
41,98,883	cpu_core/cache-references/	#	1.534 M/sec	(99.77%)
6,80,88,63,555	cpu_atom/ref-cycles/	#	2.488 G/sec	(0.23%)
6,83,10,31,190	cpu_core/ref-cycles/	#	2.496 G/sec	(99.77%)

2.978044280 seconds time elapsed

2.710188000 seconds user

0.028012000 seconds sys

5. Advantages & Disadvantages

Non-Tiled Approach

Advantages:

- Simpler to implement
- No additional overhead for managing tiles

Disadvantages:

- Poor cache utilization
- Higher memory access latency
- Slower execution for large matrices

Tiled Approach

Advantages:

- Better cache performance
- Reduced memory access overhead
- Faster execution times for large matrices

Disadvantages:

- Requires careful tile size selection
- Additional implementation complexity

Comparison Table:

Test Case	CPU GHz	IPC	Cache Miss %	Execution Time (s)
col	1.395	4.32	79.15%	2.797
row	3.214	4.17	50.11%	2.899
row16	3.266	4.59	17.14%	3.168
col16	1.814	4.90	84.95%	2.978
row32	1.562	4.72	85.51%	3.099
col32	1.814	4.90	84.95%	2.978
row64	2.884	4.94	70.69%	2.941
col64	1.814	4.90	84.95%	2.978

From this analysis we can consider row64 has the best IPC which makes it most suitable but at the same time row16 is favourable for smaller cache memory as it has the least cache miss.

Column wise methods are slower and inefficient on intel core processors.

6. Conclusion

From the experiment, the tiled approach significantly improves performance over the non-tiled method due to efficient memory access. However, the optimal tile size varies based on system architecture, and excessively large or small tile sizes may degrade performance.

7. Case Study: Intel Core i5 vs. AMD Ryzen for Matrix Computation

Intel i5-12450H

- Strong single-thread performance
- Moderate cache size
- Decent power efficiency
- Row method is favoured.

AMD Ryzen (e.g., Ryzen 5 5600H)

- Better multi-thread performance
- Higher L3 cache size, which benefits tiled approaches
- Power efficiency varies based on workload
- Column method is favoured.

Conclusion:

For general matrix multiplication, AMD Ryzen processors tend to perform better in tiled approaches due to larger cache sizes and superior multi-threading capabilities. However, Intel i5 CPUs perform competitively in workloads favouring single-thread performance.