

A Greedy Heuristic using Redundancy for Data Layout on Cache Oblivious Mesh Layouts

Zachary DeStefano, Shan Jiang, Gopi Meenakshisundaram
University of California, Irvine

July 7, 2014

Abstract

In Computer Graphics, it is important to figure out how to lay out the data units for a cache oblivious mesh layout in such a way that minimizes seek time required. Finding a deterministic solution to the problem is NP-hard so various heuristics have been proposed. In this paper, we present a solution to the problem based on introducing redundancy to the layout. It will first use the idea to get an optimal layout without adding extra units. It will then try to reduce seek time while using the least amount of redundancy possible. This will prove to be a better heuristic than existing ones proposed both analytically and experimentally. The use of redundancy will provide better seek time in both cases than the optimal solution without redundancy.

Introduction

The Data Layout Problem can be formulated as follows. The input is a linear sequence of data units. Each of the data units is assigned at least one color and many of them have multiple colors assigned. The length of a color is the distance from its first data unit to its last data unit. The data units can be rearranged as desired. The output we would like is the sequence of data units that will minimize the total length of all the colors.

In Yoon's paper ****INSERT CITATION****, the Data Layout Problem is described as well as the metric that is motivating the above definition. We noticed that access patterns described in the paper can be very general and there could easily be data units that are far apart in the sequence but need to be accessed together. This led us to realize that if we copy data units and move them closer to other ones that share the same access pattern then we could save a lot of seek time without adding much storage space. The rest of this paper is about the algorithm developed to optimize seek time while minimizing the redundancy required to accomplish that.

Related Work

****TODO:** Look at related work section of Shan's other papers and incorporate the information in there to talk about related work on this problem******

***TODO:** Make sure they come from this web link:

<http://graphics.ics.uci.edu/Interactive3DRenderingProject/index.htm>

These are the ones to use

<http://graphics.ics.uci.edu/upload/I3D09.pdf>

Page based data structure paper

Gives us the justification to use data units the way we do that are uniform

Each data unit is a page

That is why we are using this algorithm

<http://www.ics.uci.edu/~bsajadi/files/I3D/I3D11.pdf?userRef=PNAW41ZR9R0BCVAVIMQWM0E>

Data Management for SSDs paper

Shows the motivation for the experiment

The point of the paper is that in SSD we don't rely on global optimized layout

From the experiment, we find that if we reduce seek time on HDD, then the performance improves

Only way to reduce seek time is thus to introduce redundancy

This was the motivation for further papers

From this paper, we know that without reducing seek time, HDD performance is not better

However, HDD drives are much cheaper, so we can have more space, therefore we can use more space

In Yoon et al, they tackle the problem of approximating the best data layout. Since it is an NP-hard problem, they suggest a heuristic that computes locally optimal solutions. We liked the idea that it used to get a good data layout and felt that if we take over from there and use redundancy, then we can achieve an even better seek time. ****TODO: Mention the terminology used by this paper. Mention the heuristic they have in more detail. ****

Look at this paper which provides more motivation and uses redundancy:

<http://graphics.ics.uci.edu/drupal/pub/singleseek.pdf>

Idea of this paper is to do a brute force repeat and get a single seek layout, no more seeks

We make sure the seek time is 1

Good first step for exploring redundancy-based approach

Motivation for why in this paper we have a threshold on redundancy

The extreme other end for where we have a lot of redundancy

****Shan to send me the optimization paper that uses redundancy****

****Ask Duy about optimization paper****

****It was the one that Duy presented in Sydney****

It is a serial story:

1. Data Management paper shows that we can put redundancy into an HDD to reduce seek time
2. Single Seek Layout Paper shows the result with a lot of redundancy
3. Optimization paper shows a balance between 1 and 2
4. We do not have a layout though for 3, this paper is meant to show the layout

****TODO: Mention papers in the related work of the Single Seek Data Layout Paper****

Greedy Redundancy-based Cache Oblivious Mesh Layout Algorithm

The main time when this problem arises is when walking through a large 3D environment. Since we cannot put all the geometric data into memory all at once, we want to make sure that as little time as possible is spent seeking out the new data units during walkthrough. Thus, we need to put the data units as close together as they can be. When they are close together, the walkthrough performance will be significantly better.

The algorithm in Yoon et al. computes a locally optimal solution. Our algorithm is meant to take over after a locally optimal solution has been found or approximated. The basic idea of the algorithm is to take data units and copy them to a place that reduces seek time. This way if a data unit should be in more than one place to optimize seek time then it will be. If the old data units end up not being used then we delete them. Because there are cases where we would delete old units, the first loop in the algorithm is to take care of those cases first as it would reduce seek time without adding any redundancy. In order to get this algorithm to work, there are a few important issues to consider. We need to know which data units should be copied, where it should be copied to, which data units should be used by each access requirement, and which how many data units should be copied.

Which data unit

Since we only care about the length of each access requirement, we will only be copying the data units that are on the endpoints of an access requirement. The key to this algorithm is that we are shortening each access requirement at each step, so hopefully we can get to a point where they are all grouped together.

Where to locate data unit

We want to copy the data units to somewhere between the one after the first one and the last one. That way we are guaranteed to reduce the seek time for the access requirement we care about. For our own access requirement, it won't matter where in that interval we place our data unit. However, for the other access requirements, we are adding one unit of seek time since that data unit gets inserted. Therefore, we want to find which place will interrupt the least number of access requirements. We then have to search through each unit to see where the least number of overlaps occurs. We can assume that we have already precomputed the number of overlaps at each unit. We now have a problem of given a dynamic set of intervals (access requirement ranges in our case), and an arbitrary range, what is the least number of overlapping intervals in that range?

This problem is just find the least number in an arbitrary range. For our purposes, we will do a linear

search through each entry in the range in order to find the ideal entry. If k is the size of the access requirement, then this gives us $O(k)$ query time. Updates will also be $O(k)$ and construction will be $O(N)$ with N being the number of data units. There are other approaches, such as a range tree or dynamic programming, that may produce better query times, but their construction and update times will be worse as well as their storage.

With dynamic programming, we would have to maintain a matrix where an entry (i, j) would contain the minimum value in that range. This would give us a $O(1)$ query time but the construction and storage would be $O(N^2)$ where N is the number of data units. The update time would be $O(N)$ when we add a data unit. Since the N for this problem domain is in the hundreds of millions, that is an unacceptable storage bound. The construction run time would also be prohibitive given the magnitude of our input.

We could use a range tree. The initial binary search tree would be sorted by index and at each entry would be a pointer to a binary search tree sorted by value. If we put the min value at each of the nodes of the initial tree, we can speed up our queries. We would get a $O(\log N)$ query time, but our construction time and storage would be $O(N \log N)$. Updating the data structure would take at a minimum $O(k \log(N))$ time if we do careful indexing and only update the nodes that need to be updated. If we have a large access requirement, then this would represent a significant improvement in query time however given our exceptionally large input, the construction, storage, and update bounds are too prohibitive.

Which data unit is used by each access requirement

A given data unit will have a few access requirements attached to it. When you copy the data unit, it will move into a new position and benefit your current access requirement. It may benefit other ones too. For the other access requirements, if they will be shorter if they use this new copy then they should do that. Otherwise, they should stick to the old copy.

Number of data units to be copied

If we want to get the best seek time possible with redundancy, we will copy each data unit as many times as it has access requirements. We will then group all the access requirements into their own blocks as they will now have their own copies of the data that they need. Unfortunately, given memory restrictions, this is not always possible. In practice, the redundancy factor was around 20 when we did this.

For this paper, we tackle the problem of how do we optimize seek time given some limit on our redundancy.

Run-time and Storage Analysis

We now need to analyze the running time and storage requirements of our algorithm. For simplification, we will assume that the number of access requirements is a constant ratio of the number of data units. This is not a bad simplification as in many applications, the number of access requirements can easily be close to the number of data units. Thus, we will denote N as the number of data units and access requirements. We will use k as the average length of a single access requirement. The variable Q will represent the number of runs of the redundancy loop, and R will be the number of runs of the new copy loop. For simplicity, we will also assume that any given data unit has up to a constant number of overlapping access requirements.

*TWO THINGS TO INCORPORATE:

- (1) The number of overall access requirements should be kept as its own parameter.
- (2) The number of overlapping access requirements is proportional to the $(\text{RedundancyFactor}-1) \cdot (\text{Number of Data Units})$ where RedundancyFactor is the factor required for a single seek layout.**

The Initial Construction loop is run on all N access requirements. There are $\log(N)$ operations to insert the data into the heap and a constant number of operations plus $O(k)$ operations for the search of the AR to get the benefit information. Thus it takes a total of $O(N \cdot k \cdot \log(N))$ operations to do the initial construction.

With the redundancy and new copy loop, there are $Q + R$ runs of it. Since we are assuming a constant number of overlapping access requirements, there are a constant number of operations, except for reforming the heap and updating the nodes in the AR. With that, there are $O(\log(N))$ operations done a constant number of times plus $O(k)$ operations for updating the data nodes in the access requirement. Thus the redundancy and new copy loop takes $O((Q + R)k \cdot \log(N))$ operations.

This means that in total, our algorithm takes $O((N + Q + R) \cdot k \cdot \log(N))$ operations.

Theoretical Improvements over existing algorithms

The first part of the algorithm will produce a better solution than proposed by Yoon without adding extra units, thus it is an improved solution to the Data Layout Problem. Here is an example layout produced by Yoon's algorithm:

*INSERT PICTURE OF LAYOUT PRODUCED BY YOON**

With our algorithm we will produce the following layout:

*INSERT PICTURE OF OUR NEW LAYOUT**

Existing algorithms do not consider redundancy. Even if we find a polynomial solution to the data layout problem, we can actually achieve a seek time better than the optimal one without redundancy. Here is a

case where that happens:

INSERT PICTURE OF DATA LAYOUT*

Without redundancy, this is the optimal solution:

INSERT PICTURE OF LAYOUT WITHOUT REDUNDANCY*

With redundancy, this is the result

INSERT PICTURE OF LAYOUT WITH REDUNDANCY*

Experimental Results

****INSERT THE INFO FROM SHAN'S THESIS****

Conclusion and Future Work

We have shown that we have a quadratic time algorithm with quadratic storage space for the Data Layout Problem. It achieves significant results analytically and experimentally. When walking through an extremely detailed 3D model, this algorithm can be used to ensure that the performance will not suffer. If we give the algorithm the proper access requirements with this 3D model, then the performance will be even better.

This leads to a logical extension of this work. Since we have a good algorithm that takes over once we know the access requirements, we should figure out how to ensure there are good access requirements to begin with. One idea on how to ensure this is to check the usage history of an application and group data units together if they are accessed together with high probability. This could even be done dynamically in the sense that after a certain amount of usage and repeating on a regular basis, you recompute the optimal access requirements and then use that to recompute the optimal layout.

Acknowledgments

References

****YOON'S PAPER****

SHAN'S PREVIOUS PAPERS*

PUT ANY PREVIOUS LITERATURE ON THE TOPIC IF IT EXISTS*

Appendix

Algorithm Summary

```
Initialize AR heap and newCopy list
for each accessRequirement P's head node and tail node U:
    Set benefit to distance from U to next or previous node
    Let destination be spot with least number of overlapping access requirements
    For each access requirement T that also uses U
        See if T will be shorter by using new copy. Add T to oldCopyList if not.
        Add that to benefit if so
    Add benefit to heap
    If oldCopyList is empty then add U to newCopy list
while newCopy is not empty:
    take out random element and move the node
    Update AR heap and newCopy list
while there exists more space for redundancy:
    pop best element from heap
    copy the element U to its destination
    update affected access requirements
    update heap
```