

(how to be l33t)

Lecture 5:

~~Performance Optimization~~ Part 1: Work Distribution and Scheduling

Parallel Computing
Stanford CS149, Fall 2021

Programming for high performance

- **Optimizing the performance of parallel programs is an iterative process of refining choices for decomposition, assignment, and orchestration...**
- **Key goals (that are at odds with each other)**
 - **Balance workload onto available execution resources**
 - **Reduce communication (to avoid stalls)**
 - **Reduce extra work (overhead) performed to increase parallelism, manage assignment, reduce communication, etc.**
- **We are going to talk about a rich space of techniques**


Programming for high performance

TIP #1: Always implement the simplest solution first, then measure performance to determine if you need to do better.

(Example: if you anticipate only running low-core count machines, it may be unnecessary to implement a complex approach that creates and hundreds or thousands of pieces of independent work)




Balancing the workload

Ideally: all processors are computing all the time during program execution
(they are computing simultaneously, and they finish their portion of the work at the same time)



Static assignment


- Assignment of work to threads is not dependent on runtime factors (like how long it takes to perform a piece of work)
 - Not necessarily determined at compile-time (assignment algorithm may depend on runtime parameters such as input data size, number of threads, etc.)
- Recall Programming Assignment 1, program 1: assign equal number of grid cells to each thread
 - Students explored different static assignments of work to workers



- Good properties of static assignment: simple, essentially zero runtime overhead to perform assignment (in this example: extra work to implement assignment is a little bit of indexing math)

When is static assignment applicable?

- When the cost (execution time) of work and the amount of work is predictable, allowing the programmer to work out a good assignment in advance
- Simplest example: it is known up front that all work has the same cost




In the example above:

There are 12 tasks, and it is known that each have the same cost.

Static assignment: statically assign three tasks to each of the four processors.


When is static assignment applicable?

- When work is predictable, but not all jobs have same cost (see example below)
- When statistics about execution time are predictable (e.g., same cost on average)



Jobs have unequal, but known cost: assign equal number of tasks to processors to ensure good load balance (on average)


Example from programming assignment 1 (prog 1)



- Why was a static row-interleaved assignment a good solution to this problem?

“Semi-static” assignment

- Cost of work is predictable for near-term future
 - Idea: recent past is a good predictor of near future
- Application periodically profiles its execution and re-adjusts assignment
 - Assignment is “static” for the interval between re-adjustments



Particle simulation:

Redistribute particles as they move over course of simulation
(if motion is slow, redistribution need not occur often)




Image credit: <http://typhon.sourceforge.net/spip/spip.php?article22>

Adaptive mesh:

Mesh is changed as object moves or flow over object changes,
but changes occur slowly (color indicates assignment of parts
of mesh to processors)

Dynamic assignment

Program determines assignment dynamically at runtime to ensure a well distributed load. (The execution time of tasks, or the total number of tasks, is unpredictable.)

Sequential program
(independent loop iterations)

```
int N = 1024;
int* x = new int[N];
bool* prime = new bool[N];

// assume elements of x initialized here

for (int i=0; i<N; i++)
{
    // unknown execution time
    is_prime[i] = test_primality(x[i]);
}
```

Parallel program
(SPMD execution by multiple threads,
shared address space model)

```
int N = 1024;

// assume allocations are only executed by 1 thread
int* x = new int[N];
bool* is_prime = new bool[N];


// assume elements of x are initialized here

LOCK counter_lock;
int counter = 0;    // shared variable


while (1) {
    int i;
    lock(counter_lock);
    i = counter++;
    unlock(counter_lock);
    // atomic_incr(counter);
    if (i >= N)
        break;
    is_prime[i] = test_primality(x[i]);
}
```

Dynamic assignment using a work queue


**Sub-problems
(a.k.a. “tasks”, “work”)**




**Shared work queue: a list of work to do
(for now, let's assume each piece of work is independent)**



Worker threads:
Pull data from shared work queue
Push new work to queue as it is created



Example from programming assignment 1 (prog 3)



- Why did breaking the problem up into many tasks improve performance?

What constitutes a piece of work?

What is a potential performance problem with this implementation?

```
const int N = 1024;

// assume allocations are only executed by 1 thread
float* x = new float[N];
bool* prime = new bool[N];

// assume elements of x are initialized here


LOCK counter_lock;
int counter = 0;

while (1) {
    int i;
    lock(counter_lock);
    i = counter++;
    unlock(counter_lock);
    if (i >= N)
        break;
    is_prime[i] = test_primalty(x[i]);
}
```

Fine granularity partitioning: 1 “task” = 1 element

Likely good workload balance (many small tasks)

Potential for high synchronization cost
(serialization at critical section)



So... IS IT a problem?

Increasing task granularity


```
const int N = 1024;
const int GRANULARITY = 10;

// assume allocations are only executed by 1 thread
float* x = new float[N];
bool* prime = new bool[N];

// assume elements of x are initialized here

LOCK counter_lock;
int counter = 0;

while (1) {
    int i;
    lock(counter_lock);
    i = counter;
    counter += GRANULARITY;
    unlock(counter_lock);
    if (i >= N)
        break;
    int end = min(i + GRANULARITY, N);
    for (int j=i; j<end; j++)
        is_prime[i] = test_primalty(x[i]);
}
```



Coarse granularity partitioning: 1 “task” = 10 elements
Decreased synchronization cost
(Critical section entered 10 times less)

Choosing task size


- **Useful to have many more tasks* than processors**
(many small tasks enables good workload balance via dynamic assignment)
 - Motivates small granularity tasks
- **But want as few tasks as possible to minimize overhead of managing the assignment**
 - Motivates large granularity tasks
- **Ideal granularity depends on many factors**
(Common theme in this course: must know your workload, and your machine)

* I had to pick a term for a piece of work. I'm not specifically referring to ISPC tasks

Smarter task scheduling


Consider dynamic scheduling via a shared work queue

What happens if the system assigns these tasks to workers in left-to-right order?



Smarter task scheduling

What happens if scheduler runs the long task last? Potential for load imbalance!




One possible solution to imbalance problem:

Divide work into a larger number of smaller tasks

- Hopefully this makes the “long pole” shorter relative to overall execution time
- May increase synchronization overhead
- May not be possible (perhaps long task is fundamentally sequential)

Smarter task scheduling

Schedule long task first to reduce “slop” at end of computation



Another solution: smarter scheduling

Schedule long tasks first

- Thread performing long task performs fewer overall tasks, but approximately the same amount of work as the other threads.
- Requires some knowledge of workload (some predictability of cost)

Decreasing synchronization overhead using distributed queues

(avoid need for all workers to synchronize on single work queue)

Subproblems

(a.k.a. "tasks", "work to do")

Set of work queues

(In general, one per worker thread)


Worker threads:

Pull data from OWN work queue

Push new work to OWN work queue


When local work queue is empty...

STEAL work from another work queue



Work in task queues need not be independent


 = application-specified dependency



A task cannot be assigned to worker thread until all its task dependencies are satisfied

Workers can submit new tasks (with optional explicit dependencies) to task system

```
foo_handle = enqueue_task(foo);           // enqueue task foo (independent of all prior tasks)
bar_handle = enqueue_task(bar, foo_handle); // enqueue task bar, cannot run until foo is complete
```



Summary

■ Challenge: achieving good workload balance

- Want all processors working all the time (otherwise, resources are idle!)
- But want low-cost solution for achieving this balance
 - Minimize computational overhead (e.g., scheduling/assignment logic)
 - Minimize synchronization costs

■ Static assignment vs. dynamic assignment

- Really, it is not an either/or decision, there's a continuum of choices
- Use up-front knowledge about workload as much as possible to reduce load imbalance and task management/synchronization costs (in the limit, if the system knows everything, use fully static assignment)

■ Issues discussed today span aspects of task decomposition, assignment, and orchestration

Scheduling fork-join parallelism

Common parallel programming patterns

Data parallelism:

Perform same sequence of operations on many data elements

```
// ISPC foreach
```

```
foreach (i=0 ... N) {  
    B[i] = foo(A[i]);  
}
```

```
// ISPC bulk task launch
```

```
launch[numTasks] myFooTask(A, B);
```

```
// using higher-order function 'map'
```


```
map(foo, A, B);
```

```
// openMP parallel for
```

```
#pragma omp parallel for  
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {  
    B[i] = foo(A[i]);  
}
```

```
// bulk CUDA thread launch (GPU programming)
```

```
foo<<<numBlocks, threadsPerBlock>>>(A, B);
```



Common parallel programming patterns

Explicit management of parallelism with threads:

Create one thread per execution unit (or per amount of desired concurrency)

- Example below: C code with C++ threads

```
float* A;  
float* B;
```

```
// initialize arrays A and B here
```

```
void myFunction(float* A, float* B { ... }
```

```
std::thread thread[NUM_HW_EXEC_CONTEXTS];
```

```
for (int i=0; i<NUM_HW_EXEC_CONTEXTS; i++) {  
    thread[i] = std::thread(myFunction, A, B);  
}
```

```
for (int i=0; i<num_cores; i++) {  
    thread[i].join();  
}
```


Consider divide-and-conquer algorithms

Quick sort:

```
// sort elements from 'begin' up to (but not including) 'end'
```

```
void quick_sort(int* begin, int* end) {
```

```
    if (begin >= end-1)
        return;
```

```
    else {
```

```
        // choose partition key and partition elements
```

```
        // by key, return position of key as 'middle'
```

```
        int* middle = partition(begin, end);
```

```
        quick_sort(begin, middle);
```


```
        quick_sort(middle+1, last);
```

```
    }
```

```
}
```

independent work!

Dependencies



Fork-join pattern

- Natural way to express the independent work that is inherent in divide-and-conquer algorithms
- This lecture's code examples will be in Cilk Plus
 - C++ language extension
 - Originally developed at MIT, now adapted as open standard (in GCC, Intel ICC)

`cilk_spawn foo(args);` ← **“fork” (create new logical thread of control)**

Semantics: invoke `foo`, but unlike standard function call, caller may continue executing asynchronously with execution of `foo`.

`cilk_sync;` ← **“join”**

Semantics: returns when all calls spawned by current function have completed. (“sync up” with the spawned calls)

Note: there is an implicit `cilk_sync` at the end of every function that contains a `cilk_spawn` (implication: when a Cilk function returns, all work associated with that function is complete)


Call-return of a function in C*

```
void my_func() {  
    // calling function (part A)  
  
    foo();  
    bar();  
  
    // calling function (part B)  
  
}
```

Semantics of a function call:

Control moves to the function that is called
(Thread executes instructions for the function)


When function returns, control returns back to caller
(thread resumes executing instructions from the caller)




* And many other languages

Basic Cilk Plus examples


```
// foo() and bar() may run in parallel
cilk_spawn foo();
bar();
cilk_sync;
```



```
// foo() and bar() may run in parallel
cilk_spawn foo();
cilk_spawn bar();
cilk_sync;
```



```
// foo, bar, fizz, buzz, may run in parallel
cilk_spawn foo();
cilk_spawn bar();
cilk_spawn fizz();
buzz();
cilk_sync;
```




Abstraction vs. implementation

- Notice that the `cilk_spawn` abstraction does not specify how or when spawned calls are scheduled to execute
 - Only that they may be run concurrently with caller (and with all other calls spawned by the caller)
 - Question: Is an implementation of Cilk correct if it implements `cilk_spawn foo()` the same way as it implements a normal function call to `foo()`?
- But `cilk_sync` does serve as a constraint on scheduling
 - All spawned calls must complete before `cilk_sync` returns

Parallel quicksort in Cilk Plus

```
void quick_sort(int* begin, int* end) {  
    if (begin >= end - PARALLEL_CUTOFF)  
        std::sort(begin, end);  
    else {  
        int* middle = partition(begin, end);  
        cilk_spawn quick_sort(begin, middle);  
        quick_sort(middle+1, last);  
    }  
}
```

Sort sequentially if problem size is sufficiently small (overhead of spawn trumps benefits of potential parallelization)



Writing fork-join programs

- **Main idea: expose independent work (potential parallelism) to the system using `cilk_spawn`**
- **Recall parallel programming rules of thumb**
 - **Want at least as much work as parallel execution capability (e.g., program should probably spawn at least as much work as needed to fill all the machine's processing resources)**
 - **Want more independent work than execution capability to allow for good workload balance of all the work onto the cores**
 - **"parallel slack" = ratio of independent work to machine's parallel execution capability (in practice: ~8 is a good ratio)**
 - **But not too much independent work so that granularity of work is too small (too much slack incurs overhead of managing fine-grained work)**


Scheduling fork-join programs

- **Consider very simple scheduler:**
 - Launch pthread for each `cilk_spawn` using `pthread_create`
 - Translate `cilk_sync` into appropriate `pthread_join` calls
- **Potential performance problems?**
 - Heavyweight spawn operation
 - Many more concurrently running threads than cores
 - Context switching overhead
 - Larger working set than necessary, less cache locality

Note: now we are going to talk about the implementation of Cilk

Pool of worker threads

- **The Cilk Plus runtime maintains pool of worker threads**
 - **Think: all threads are created at application launch ***
 - **Exactly as many worker threads as execution contexts in the machine**




Example: Eight thread worker pool for my quad-core laptop with Hyper-Threading

```
while (work_exists()) {  
    work = get_new_work();  
    work.run();  
}
```


*** It's perfectly fine to think about it this way, but in reality, runtimes tend to be lazy and initialize worker threads on the first Cilk spawn. (This is a common implementation strategy, ISPC does the same with worker threads that run ISPC tasks.)**

Consider execution of the following code

Specifically, consider execution from the point `foo()` is spawned




Assignment question: what threads should `foo()` and `bar()` be executed by?



First, consider a serial implementation


Run child first... via a regular function call

- Thread runs `foo()`, then returns from `foo()`, then runs `bar()`
- Continuation is implicit in the thread's stack



Traditional thread call stack
(indicates `bar()` will be run next
after return from `foo()`)

Executing `foo()`...




What if, while executing `foo()`,
thread 1 goes idle...

Inefficient: thread 1 could be
performing `bar()` at this time!


Per-thread work queues store “work to do”

Upon reaching `cilk_spawn foo()`, thread places continuation in its work queue, and begins executing `foo()`.




Idle threads “steal” work from busy threads

If thread 1 goes idle (a.k.a. there is no work in its own queue), then it looks in thread 0’s queue for work to do.




Idle threads “steal” work from busy threads

If thread 1 goes idle (a.k.a. there is no work in its own queue), then it looks in thread 0’s queue for work to do.





Idle threads “steal” work from busy threads

If thread 1 goes idle (a.k.a. there is no work in its own queue), then it looks in thread 0’s queue for work to do.



At spawn, should calling thread run the child or the continuation?



Run continuation first: queue child for later execution

- Child is made available for stealing by other threads ("child stealing")


Run child first: enqueue continuation for later execution

- Continuation is made available for stealing by other threads ("continuation stealing")

Which implementation do we choose?

Consider thread executing the following code



```
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync;
```



■ Run continuation first (“child stealing”)


- Caller thread spawns work for all iterations before executing any of it
- Think: breadth-first traversal of call graph. $O(N)$ space for spawned work (maximum space)
- If no stealing, execution order is very different than that of program with `cilk_spawn` removed

Thread 0 work queue



Consider thread executing the following code



```
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync;
```



■ Run child first (“continuation stealing”)

- Caller thread only creates one item to steal (continuation that represents all remaining iterations)
- If no stealing occurs, thread continually pops continuation from work queue, enqueues new continuation (with updated value of `i`)
- Order of execution is the same as for program with `spawn` removed.
- Think: depth-first traversal of call graph


Thread 0 work queue



Executing `foo(0)`...

Consider thread executing the following code


```
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync;
```





■ Run child first (“continuation stealing”)

- Enqueues continuation with `i` advanced by 1
- If continuation is stolen, stealing thread spawns and executes next iteration
- Can prove that work queue storage for system with T threads is no more than T times that of stack storage for single threaded execution


Thread 0 work queue



Thread 1 work queue



Executing `foo(0)`...




Executing `foo(1)`...

Scheduling quicksort: assume 200 elements

```
void quick_sort(int* begin, int* end) {
    if (begin >= end - PARALLEL_CUTOFF)
        std::sort(begin, end);
    else {
        int* middle = partition(begin, end);
        cilk_spawn quick_sort(begin, middle);
        quick_sort(middle+1, last);
    }
}
```

What work in the queue should other threads steal?
(e.g., steal from top or bottom)

Thread 0 work queue






Thread 1 work queue



Thread 2 work queue



...




Working on 0-25...

Implementing work stealing: dequeue per worker

Work queue implemented as a dequeue (double ended queue)

- Local thread pushes/pops from the “tail” (bottom)
- Remote threads steal from “head” (top)




Implementing work stealing: dequeue per worker


Work queue implemented as a dequeue (double ended queue)

- Local thread pushes/pops from the “tail” (bottom)
- Remote threads steal from “head” (top)


Thread 0 work queue




Thread 1 work queue




Thread 2 work queue




...



Working on 0-25...



Working on 101-150...





Working on 51-75...

Implementing work stealing: dequeue per worker

Work queue implemented as a dequeue (double ended queue)



- Local thread pushes/pops from the “tail” (bottom)
- Remote threads steal from “head” (top)

Thread 0 work queue



Working on 0-12...



Thread 1 work queue



Working on 101-113...

...


Thread 2 work queue



Working on 51-63...


Implementing work stealing: choice of victim

- Idle threads randomly choose a thread to attempt to steal from
- Steal work from top of dequeue:
 - Steals largest amount of work (reduce number of steals)
 - Maximum locality in work each thread performs (when combined with run child first scheme)
 - Stealing thread and local thread do not contend for same elements of dequeue (efficient lock-free implementations of dequeue exist)




Child-first work stealing scheduler anticipates divide-and-conquer parallelism

```
for (int i=0; i<N; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync;
```




Code at right generates work in parallel, (code at left does not), so it more quickly fills parallel machine

```
void recursive_for(int start, int end) {  
    while (start <= end - GRANULARITY) {  
        int mid = (end - start) / 2;  
        cilk_spawn recursive_for(start, mid);  
        start = mid;  
    }  
  
    for (int i=start; i<end; i++)  
        foo(i);  
}  
  
recursive_for(0, N);
```




Implementing sync

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync;  
bar();
```



Thread 0 work queue




Thread 1 work queue




Thread 2 work queue




Thread 3 work queue




Working on foo(9)...



Working on foo(7)...




Working on foo(8)...



Working on foo(6)...


State of worker threads
when all work from loop
is nearly complete




Implementing sync: no stealing case

block (id: A)


```
[ for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A  
bar();  
]
```




Thread 0 work queue



Thread 1 work queue



Working on foo(9), id=A...




If no work has been stolen by other threads, then there's nothing to do at the sync point.

cilk_sync is a no-op.


Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)



```
[ for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A  
bar();  
]
```



Thread 0 work queue



Thread 1 work queue



Working on `foo(0)`, id=A...


Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```

cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A

bar();




Idle thread 1 steals from busy thread 0

Note: descriptor for block A created

The descriptor tracks the number of outstanding spawns for the block, and the number of those spawns that have completed.

The 1 spawn tracked by the descriptor corresponds to foo(0) being run by thread 0. (Since the continuation is now owned by thread 1 after the steal.)




Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```


cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A

```
bar();
```



Thread 1 is now running foo(1)

Note: spawn count is now 2





Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```

cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A

bar();





Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```

cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A

```
bar();
```





Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)

```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```

cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A


bar();



Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)


```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A  
bar();
```



Descriptor


id=A
spawn: 10, done: 9

Thread 0 work queue





Idle!

Thread 1 work queue



Idle!

Thread 2 work queue



Working on foo(9), id=A...


Computation nearing end...

Only foo(9) remains to be completed.

Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)


```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}  
cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A  
bar();
```



Descriptor


id=A
spawn: 10, done: 10

Thread 0 work queue





Idle!

Thread 1 work queue



Idle!

Thread 2 work queue



Idle!

Last spawn completes.


Implementing sync: stealing case

block (id: A)


```
for (int i=0; i<10; i++) {  
    cilk_spawn foo(i);  
}
```

cilk_sync; Sync for all calls spawned within block A

```
bar();
```





Thread 0 work queue





Idle!

Thread 1 work queue



Idle!

Thread 2 work queue



Working on bar()...

**Thread 2 now resumes continuation
and executes bar()
Note block A descriptor is now free.**

Cilk uses greedy join scheduling

■ Greedy join scheduling policy

- All threads always attempt to steal if there is nothing to do
- Threads only go idle if there is no work to steal in the system
- Worker thread that initiated spawn may not be thread that executes logic after `cilk_sync`

■ Remember:

- Overhead of bookkeeping steals and managing sync points only occurs when steals occur
- If large pieces of work are stolen, this should occur infrequently
 - Most of the time, threads are pushing/popping local work from their local deque

Cilk summary

- **Fork-join parallelism: a natural way to express divide-and-conquer algorithms**
 - Discussed Cilk Plus, but many other systems also have fork/join primitives (e.g., OpenMP)
- **Cilk Plus runtime implements spawn/sync abstraction with a locality-aware work stealing scheduler**
 - Always run spawned child (continuation stealing)
 - Greedy behavior at join (threads do not wait at join, immediately look for other work to steal)