

# Interesting results I

---



image blending ...



## Interesting results II




image blending ...



## Interesting results III

---




image blending ...



# Optimize for acceleration

---

## GPU info

```
+-----+  
| NVIDIA-SMI 361.42      Driver Version: 361.42 |  
+-----+  
| GPU  Name      Persistence-M| Bus-Id      Disp.A  |  
| Fan  Temp     Perf  Pwr:Usage/Cap|          Memory-Usage  |  
|=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+=====+|  
| 0   GeForce GTX 950     Off  | 0000:01:00.0    On  |  
| 33%   40C     P8      8W /  90W |      482MiB / 2044MiB |  
+-----+
```

## Executed time via basic method

These are the GPU run time 10 times using Jacobi method.

```
1st time: 1113771us  
2nd time: 1113888us  
3rd time: 1113197us  
4th time: 1113896us  
5th time: 1113891us  
6th time: 1113780us  
7th time: 1113824us  
8th time: 1113931us  
9th time: 1115095us  
10th time: 1115653us
```

Average time: *1.1140926 seconds*

## Using SOR method

- Code can be found in `lab3_accelerate_b.cu` file.

I found the best  $\omega$  is near 1.35 in this case. If  $\omega$  is over 1.35 too much, the converge will fail and get the wrong image blending. If I decreased  $\omega$  value until close 1, the converge speed will be slower than before.

Finally, I got a better result below. From 20,000 iterations to becomes **10,000 iterations** to converge, and the images are very similar via watching by eyes.

```
1st time: 628234us
2nd time: 628267us
3rd time: 628037us
4th time: 628185us
5th time: 628117us
6th time: 627981us
7th time: 628320us
8th time: 628162us
9th time: 627972us
10th time: 628328us
```

Average time: 0.6281603 seconds

## Result images



Fig5. *Jocobi 2,000 iters and SOR 1,000 iters*



Fig6. *Jocobi 6,000 iters and SOR 2,500 iters*



Fig7. *Jocobi 20,000 iters and SOR 10,000 iters*

## Using lower resolution (Less references)

- Code can be found in `lab3_accelerate_a.cu` file.

I used the method from TA in problem 1. I upsample the `{diffX, diffY} = {0, 1}, {1, 0}, {0, -1} and {-1, 0}`. There are the nearest point from center. Then, I replace the points like a triangle, there are `{0, 2}, {1, -1} and {-1, -1}`. Because centroid point of three points is center point **G(0, 0, 0)**, is the same with basic method (4 points).

Finally, I got a better result below. From 20,000 iterations to becomes **6,000 iterations** to converge, and the images are very similar via watching by eyes.

```
1st time: 292607us
2nd time: 288680us
3rd time: 288771us
4th time: 289976us
5th time: 289635us
6th time: 288571us
7th time: 289866us
8th time: 289869us
9th time: 288590us
10th time: 290020us
```

Average time: *0.2896585 seconds*

## Try less reference points




Fig1. Using the new reference points like a triangle

## Result images



Fig2. Jocobi 2,000 iters and low resolution 1,000 iters



Fig3. Jocobi 6,000 iters and low resolution 2,000 iters



Fig4. *Jacobi 20,000 iters and low resolution 6,000 iters*

## Summary

We can see the figure below, the method of low resolution is **faster than** SOR method. Why I said "faster" instead of "better"? Because decrease the resolution means losing the information of image. Maybe is difficult to aware from human, but there's much difference to computers. It just like the **dithering** (Computer Graphics), the target is that making people to satisfy when the compressing image.




Fig8. Algorithm comparison