

# CS 557 — Programming Assignment 2

Xinchen Shen

February 21, 2026

## 1 System Configuration

Component	Specification
CPU	AMD Ryzen 9 9900X (12 cores / 24 threads, Zen 5)
Memory	1×64 GB DDR5-5600 (single-channel)
OS	Windows 11 x64
Compiler	Clang++ 21.1.8 (LLVM)

### Compilation and reproducibility.

The project uses CMake (Ninja generator) to build four executables from the same source files, differentiated by compile definitions: `lap_baseline` (unmerged, 12 threads), `lap_merged` (`-DUSE_MERGED`, 12 threads), `lap_baseline_serial` (unmerged, 1 thread), and `lap_merged_serial` (`-DUSE_MERGED`, 1 thread). All targets are compiled with `-O3 -march=native -std=c++23 -fopenmp=libomp` and linked against `libomp.lib`. Image output is disabled during timing runs by passing `writeIterations = false`.

```
cmake -DCMAKE_BUILD_TYPE=Release -DCMAKE_CXX_COMPILER=clang++ -G Ninja -S
. -B build
cmake --build build
ctest --test-dir build -V
```

### OpenMP settings.

CTest sets `OMP_DYNAMIC=FALSE`, `OMP_PROC_BIND=close`, `OMP_PLACES=cores`, and `OMP_NUM_THREADS=12` (or 1 for serial runs). As observed in Programming Assignment 1, enabling SMT (24 threads) provides no benefit for memory-bandwidth-bound workloads and can degrade performance due to contention on shared resources within each core. Therefore, all parallel experiments use exactly 12 threads pinned one-per-core, effectively utilizing all physical cores while avoiding SMT interference.

## 2 Task 1: Instrumented Kernel Timing

Each kernel invocation in the Conjugate Gradients loop is wrapped with a dedicated `Timer` object that accumulates time across all 256 iterations using the `Restart()/Pause()` interface from `LaplaceSolver_0_3`. Timers are declared as globals in `main.cpp` and referenced via `extern` declarations in `ConjugateGradients.cpp`. Kernels inside the loop (lines 6–16) are each called 256 times; lines 2 and 4 are one-time setup.

Line	Kernel	12 Threads			1 Thread		
		Time (ms)	Avg/call (ms)	% CG	Time (ms)	Avg/call (ms)	% CG
2	ComputeLaplacian(x, z)	11.7	11.7	0.1	15.5	15.5	0.1
2	Saxpy(z, f, r, -1)	23.3	23.3	0.1	22.8	22.8	0.1
2	Norm(r)	3.3	3.3	0.0	7.8	7.8	0.0
4	Copy(r, p)	7.6	7.6	0.0	16.2	16.2	0.1
4	InnerProduct(p, r)	6.8	6.8	0.0	13.8	13.8	0.1
6	ComputeLaplacian(p, z)	2491.6	9.7	14.9	2835.7	11.1	13.0
6	InnerProduct(p, z)	1433.8	5.6	8.6	3673.2	14.3	16.8
8	Saxpy(z, r, r, - $\alpha$ )	2769.2	10.8	16.6	2360.4	9.2	10.8
8	Norm(r)	830.0	3.2	5.0	1927.2	7.5	8.8
13	Copy(r, z)	1812.5	7.1	10.9	2373.8	9.3	10.8
13	InnerProduct(z, r)	1443.1	5.6	8.7	3696.7	14.4	16.9
16	Saxpy(p, x, x, $\alpha$ )	2956.5	11.5	17.7	2402.1	9.4	11.0
16	Saxpy(p, r, p, $\beta$ )	2846.3	11.1	17.1	2507.3	9.8	11.5
Sum of kernels		16635.8		99.8	21852.2		99.9
Total CG		16667.3			21876.5		

Table 1: Kernel timing breakdown for the unmerged baseline. Lines 2 and 4 execute once; lines 6–16 execute 256 times each.

### Observations.

In the parallel case, the four **Saxpy** calls dominate ( $\sim 51\%$ ), followed by **ComputeLaplacian** (15%) and the two **InnerProduct** calls (17%). The **Copy** at line 13 is surprisingly expensive (10.9%) for a pure memory copy — this is entirely memory bandwidth cost.

In the serial case, the relative cost of **InnerProduct** increases significantly (from 17% to 34%) because it uses `omp parallel for reduction` and scales well with threads, whereas the **Saxpy** calls lack OpenMP pragmas in the original code.

**ComputeLaplacian** is only  $\sim 14\%$  faster in parallel (2492 ms) than in serial (2836 ms), confirming that the stencil computation is memory-bandwidth-bound: adding more threads does not proportionally increase available bandwidth with a single memory channel.

## 3 Task 2: Kernel Merging

### 3.1 Merged Kernels Implemented

Four merged kernels were implemented in `MergedKernels.cpp`, consolidating five opportunities identified in the lecture notes:

#### 1. LaplacianSaxpyAndNorm (Line 2).

Merges **ComputeLaplacian**(x, z), **Saxpy**(z, f, r, -1), and **Norm**(r) into a single pass. The intermediate array **z** is never written to memory; the Laplacian is computed, subtracted from **f**, and the infinity norm is accumulated — all in one loop nest. This eliminates two full array traversals.

#### 2. LaplacianAndDot (Line 6).

Merges **ComputeLaplacian**(p, z) and **InnerProduct**(p, z). The Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}p$  is computed and stored into **z**, while simultaneously accumulating  $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{z}$ . This saves one full read of both **p** and **z**.

### 3. SaxpyAndNorm (Line 8).

Merges `Saxpy(z, r, r, - $\alpha$ )` and `Norm(r)` so that the updated residual and its norm are computed in a single pass over the `r` and `z` arrays.

### 4. DoubleSaxpy (Line 16).

Merges `Saxpy(p, x, x,  $\alpha$ )` and `Saxpy(p, r, p,  $\beta$ )`. Both operations read `p`, so by caching `p[i][j][k]` in a register and computing both updates, we halve the reads of `p`. Since `p` is both input and output, the old value must be read before writing the new one; the merged kernel handles this by saving `p_val` before updating.

### 5. Elimination of Copy(r, z) (Line 13).

In the merged version, `Copy(r, z)` is eliminated entirely. Since  $\mathcal{M} = I$  (no preconditioner), line 13 reduces to  $\mathbf{z} \leftarrow \mathbf{r}$ , so `InnerProduct(z, r)` becomes `InnerProduct(r, r)`. This removes one full array copy per iteration.

## 3.2 Merged Timing Results

Algorithm Line	Merged Kernel	12 Threads		1 Thread	
		Time (ms)	Avg/call (ms)	Time (ms)	Avg/call (ms)
Line 2	LaplacianSaxpyAndNorm	13.8	13.8	20.4	20.4
Line 4	Copy(r, p)	8.2	8.2	12.1	12.1
Line 4	InnerProduct(p, r)	6.8	6.8	14.2	14.2
Line 6	LaplacianAndDot	3023.5	11.8	4851.3	19.0
Line 8	SaxpyAndNorm	2319.4	9.1	2638.2	10.3
Line 13	InnerProduct(r, r)	1140.8	4.5	3548.4	13.9
Line 16	DoubleSaxpy	3550.5	13.9	4456.0	17.4
Sum of kernels		<b>10062.9</b>	–	<b>15540.6</b>	–
Total CG		<b>10105.4</b>	–	<b>15567.6</b>	–

Table 2: Merged kernel timing for both parallel and serial runs.

### 3.3 Comparison: Unmerged vs. Merged

Threads	Kernel Group	Unmerged (ms)	Merged (ms)	Speedup
12	Line 2 (Lap+Saxpy+Norm)	38.3	13.8	2.78×
12	Line 6 (Lap+Dot)	3925.4	3023.5	1.30×
12	Line 8 (Saxpy+Norm)	3599.2	2319.4	1.55×
12	Line 13 (Copy+Dot)	3255.6	1140.8	2.85×
12	Line 16 (2×Saxpy)	5802.8	3550.5	1.63×
12	<b>Total CG</b>	<b>16667.3</b>	<b>10105.4</b>	<b>1.65×</b>
1	Line 2 (Lap+Saxpy+Norm)	46.1	20.4	2.26×
1	Line 6 (Lap+Dot)	6508.9	4851.3	1.34×
1	Line 8 (Saxpy+Norm)	4287.6	2638.2	1.63×
1	Line 13 (Copy+Dot)	6070.5	3548.4	1.71×
1	Line 16 (2×Saxpy)	4909.4	4456.0	1.10×
1	<b>Total CG</b>	<b>21876.5</b>	<b>15567.6</b>	<b>1.41×</b>

Table 3: Comparison of unmerged kernel groups and their merged replacements.

## 4 Discussion

### Overall speedup.

Kernel merging delivers a **1.65×** speedup with 12 threads and **1.41×** in the serial case. The larger parallel benefit is expected: with multiple threads saturating memory bandwidth, each unnecessary array traversal becomes more costly, so eliminating them has a proportionally larger impact.

### Biggest winners.

The most dramatic improvement comes from eliminating `Copy(r, z)` at line 13. Each array is  $256^3$  floats = 64 MiB. The baseline performs a full copy (128 MiB read+write) followed by an inner product re-reading both arrays (another 128 MiB). The merged `InnerProduct(r, r)` reads only `r` once (64 MiB), saving  $\sim 192$  MiB per iteration, or  $\sim 48$  GiB over 256 iterations — explaining the 2.85× parallel speedup.

### LaplacianAndDot (line 6).

This merge shows a modest 1.30× improvement in parallel. The 7-point stencil has higher arithmetic intensity than the other kernels, partially masking the bandwidth savings from eliminating a second pass over `p` and `z`.

### DoubleSaxpy (line 16).

The 1.63× parallel speedup comes from reading `p` once instead of twice. The serial improvement is smaller (1.10×), likely because the single thread is not bandwidth-limited and the compiler may keep `p` in cache across the two sequential loops.

### Correctness verification.

All four configurations produce identical results (Table 4).

Configuration	Iterations	Final Residual Norm ( $\nu$ )
Unmerged, 12 threads	256	0.000975891
Merged, 12 threads	256	0.000975891
Unmerged, 1 thread	256	0.000975891
Merged, 1 thread	256	0.000975891

Table 4: Correctness verification: all configurations converge identically.

## 5 Selected Code Snippets

### Timer instrumentation with compile-time dispatch.

The `USE_MERGED` flag (set via CMake) selects between baseline and merged paths:

```

// Algorithm : Line 6
#ifdef USE_MERGED
    timerLaplacianAndDot_line6.Restart();
    float sigma = LaplacianAndDot(p, z);
    timerLaplacianAndDot_line6.Pause();
#else
    timerLaplacian_line6.Restart();
    ComputeLaplacian(p, z);
    timerLaplacian_line6.Pause();

    timerInnerProduct_line6.Restart();
    float sigma = InnerProduct(p, z);
    timerInnerProduct_line6.Pause();
#endif

```

LaplacianAndDot — fusing stencil with inner product.

```

float LaplacianAndDot(const float (&p)[XDIM][YDIM][ZDIM],
                     float (&z)[XDIM][YDIM][ZDIM]) {
    double result = 0.0;
#pragma omp parallel for reduction(+:result)
    for (int i = 1; i < XDIM-1; i++)
    for (int j = 1; j < YDIM-1; j++)
    for (int k = 1; k < ZDIM-1; k++) {
        const float lp = -6*p[i][j][k]
            + p[i+1][j][k] + p[i-1][j][k]
            + p[i][j+1][k] + p[i][j-1][k]
            + p[i][j][k+1] + p[i][j][k-1];
        z[i][j][k] = lp;
        result += (double)p[i][j][k] * (double)lp;
    }
    return (float)result;
}

```