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Changing a major assumption

So far most or all of your study of computer science has assumed

*One thing happened at a time*

Called *sequential programming* – everything part of one sequence

Removing this assumption creates major challenges & opportunities

- **Programming**: Divide work among *threads of execution* and coordinate (*synchronize*) among them

- **Algorithms**: How can parallel activity provide speed-up
  (more *throughput*: work done per unit time)

- **Data structures**: May need to support *concurrent access*
  (multiple threads operating on data at the same time)
A simplified view of history

Writing correct and efficient multithreaded code is often much more difficult than for single-threaded (i.e., sequential) code
  – Especially in common languages like Java and C
  – So typically stay sequential if possible

From roughly 1980-2005, desktop computers got exponentially faster at running sequential programs
  – About twice as fast every couple years

But nobody knows how to continue this
  – Increasing clock rate generates too much heat
  – Relative cost of memory access is too high
  – But we can keep making “wires exponentially smaller” (Moore’s “Law”), so put multiple processors on the same chip (“ multicore”)
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What to do with multiple processors?

- Next computer you buy will likely have 4 processors
  - Wait a few years and it will be 8, 16, 32, ...
  - The chip companies have decided to do this (not a “law”)

- What can you do with them?
  - Run multiple totally different programs at the same time
    - Already do that? Yes, but with **time-slicing**
  - Do multiple things at once in one program
    - Our focus – more difficult
    - Requires rethinking everything from asymptotic complexity to how to implement data-structure operations
Parallelism vs. Concurrency

Note: Terms not yet standard but the perspective is essential
- Many programmers confuse these concepts

Parallelism:
Use extra resources to solve a problem faster

Concurrency:
Correctly and efficiently manage access to shared resources

There is some connection:
- Common to use threads for both
- If parallel computations need access to shared resources, then the concurrency needs to be managed
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An analogy

CS1 idea: A program is like a recipe for a cook
- One cook who does one thing at a time! (*Sequential*)

**Parallelism:** (*Let's get the job done faster!*)
- Have lots of potatoes to slice?
- Hire helpers, hand out potatoes and knives
- But too many chefs and you spend all your time coordinating

**Concurrency:** (*We need to manage a shared resource*)
- Lots of cooks making different things, but only 4 stove burners
- Want to allow access to all 4 burners, but not cause spills or incorrect burner settings
Parallelism Example

Parallelism: Use extra computational resources to solve a problem faster (increasing throughput via simultaneous execution)

Pseudocode (not Java yet) for array sum:
- No such ‘FORALL’ construct, but we’ll see something similar
- Bad style, but with 4 processors may get roughly 4x speedup

```java
int sum(int[] arr){
    res = new int[4];
    len = arr.length;
    FORALL(i=0; i < 4; i++) {  //parallel iterations
        res[i] = sumRange(arr,i*len/4,(i+1)*len/4);
    }
}
int sumRange(int[] arr, int lo, int hi) {
    result = 0;
    for(j=lo; j < hi; j++)
        result += arr[j];
    return result;
}
```
Concurrent Example

Concurrent: Correctly and efficiently manage access to shared resources (from multiple possibly-simultaneous clients)
   Ex. Multiple threads accessing a hash-table, but not getting in each others' ways

Pseudocode (not Java) for a shared chaining hashtable
   - Essential correctness issue is preventing bad interleavings
   - Essential performance issue not preventing good concurrency
      • One 'solution' to preventing bad inter-leavings is to do it all sequentially

```java
class Hashtable<K,V> {
    ...
    void insert(K key, V value) {
        int bucket = ...;
        prevent-other-inserts/lookups in table[bucket]
        do the insertion
        re-enable access to table[bucket]
    }
    V lookup(K key) {
        (similar to insert, but can allow concurrent lookups to same bucket)
    }
}
```
**Shared memory with Threads**

The model we will assume is shared memory with explicit threads

**Old story:** A running program has
- One *program counter* (current statement executing)
- One *call stack* (with each *stack frame* holding local variables)
- *Objects in the heap* created by memory allocation (i.e., *new*)
  - (nothing to do with data structure called a heap)
- *Static fields*

**New story:**
- A set of *threads*, each with its own program counter & call stack
  - No access to another thread's local variables
- Threads can (implicitly) share static fields / objects
  - To *communicate*, write values to some shared location that another thread reads from
Old Story: one call stack, one pc

- Call stack with local variables
- pc determines current statement
- local variables are numbers/null or heap references

Heap for all objects and static fields
New Story: Shared memory with Threads

Threads, each with own unshared call stack and “program counter”

Heap for all objects and static fields, shared by all threads
Other models

We will focus on shared memory, but you should know several other models exist and have their own advantages

- **Message-passing**: Each thread has its own collection of objects. Communication is via explicitly sending/receiving messages
  - Cooks working in separate kitchens, mail around ingredients

- **Dataflow**: Programmers write programs in terms of a DAG.
  A node executes after all of its predecessors in the graph
  - Cooks wait to be handed results of previous steps

- **Data parallelism**: Have primitives for things like “apply function to every element of an array in parallel”

\[
\text{array } A, B, C
\]
\[
A = B + C
\]
Our Needs

To write a shared-memory parallel program, need new primitives from a programming language or library

- Ways to create and *run multiple things at once*
  - Let’s call these things threads

- Ways for threads to *share memory*
  - Often just have threads with references to the same objects

- Ways for threads to *coordinate (a.k.a. synchronize)*
  - For now, a way for one thread to wait for another to finish
  - Other primitives when we study concurrency
Java basics

First learn some basics built into Java via java.lang.Thread
   – Then a better library for parallel programming

To get a new thread running:
1. Define a subclass C of java.lang.Thread, overriding run
2. Create an object of class C
3. Call that object’s start method
   • start sets off a new thread, using run as its “main”

What if we instead called the run method of C?
   – This would just be a normal method call, in the current thread

Let’s see how to share memory and coordinate via an example…
Parallelism idea

- Example: Sum elements of a large array
- Idea: Have 4 threads simultaneously sum 1/4 of the array
  - Warning: This is an inferior first approach

- Create 4 thread objects, each given a portion of the work
- Call start() on each thread object to actually run it in parallel
- Wait for threads to finish using join()
- Add together their 4 answers for the final result
First attempt, part 1

class SumThread extends java.lang.Thread {
    int lo; // fields, passed to constructor
    int hi; // so threads know what to do.
    int[] arr;
    int ans = 0; // result

    SumThread(int[] a, int l, int h) {
        lo=l; hi=h; arr=a;
    }

    public void run() { // override must have this type
        for(int i=lo; i < hi; i++)
            ans += arr[i];
    }
}

Because we must override a no-arguments/no-result run, we use fields to communicate across threads
First attempt, continued (wrong)

class SumThread extends java.lang.Thread {
    int lo, int hi, int[] arr; // fields to know what to do
    int ans = 0; // result
    SumThread(int[] a, int l, int h) { ... }
    public void run(){ ... } // override
}

int sum(int[] arr){ // can be a static method
    int len = arr.length;
    int ans = 0;
    SumThread[] ts = new SumThread[4];
    for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) // do parallel computations
        ts[i] = new SumThread(arr,i*len/4,(i+1)*len/4);
    for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) // combine results
        ans += ts[i].ans;
    return ans;
}
Second attempt (still wrong)

class SumThread extends java.lang.Thread {
    int lo, int hi, int[] arr; // fields to know what to do
    int ans = 0; // result
    SumThread(int[] a, int l, int h) { ... }
    public void run(){ ... } // override
}

int sum(int[] arr){ // can be a static method
    int len = arr.length;
    int ans = 0;
    SumThread[] ts = new SumThread[4];
    for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) { // do parallel computations
        ts[i] = new SumThread(arr,i*len/4,(i+1)*len/4);
        ts[i].start(); // start not run
    }
    for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) // combine results
        ans += ts[i].ans;
    return ans;
}
Third attempt (correct in spirit)

class SumThread extends java.lang.Thread {
   int lo, int hi, int[] arr; // fields to know what to do
   int ans = 0; // result
   SumThread(int[] a, int l, int h) { ... }
   public void run(){ ... } // override
}

int sum(int[] arr){ // can be a static method
   int len = arr.length;
   int ans = 0;
   SumThread[] ts = new SumThread[4];
   for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) { // do parallel computations
      ts[i] = new SumThread(arr,i*len/4,(i+1)*len/4);
      ts[i].start();
   }
   for(int i=0; i < 4; i++) { // combine results
      ts[i].join(); // wait for helper to finish!
      ans += ts[i].ans;
   }
   return ans;
}
Join: Our “wait” method for Threads

- The **Thread** class defines various methods you could not implement on your own
  - For example: **start**, which calls **run** in a new thread

- The **join** method is valuable for coordinating this kind of computation
  - Caller blocks until/unless the receiver is done executing (meaning the call to **run** finishes)
  - Else we would have a **race condition** on `ts[i].ans`

- This style of parallel programming is called “fork/join”

- **Java detail:** code has 1 compile error because **join** may throw  
  `java.lang.InterruptedIOException`
  - In basic parallel code, should be fine to catch-and-exit
Shared memory?

- Fork-join programs (thankfully) do not require much focus on sharing memory among threads

- But in languages like Java, there is memory being shared. In our example:
  - lo, hi, arr fields written by “main” thread, read by helper thread
  - ans field written by helper thread, read by “main” thread

- When using shared memory, you must avoid race conditions
  - While studying parallelism, we’ll stick with join
  - With concurrency, we will learn other ways to synchronize
A better approach

Several reasons why this is a poor parallel algorithm

1. Want code to be reusable and efficient across platforms
   - "Forward-portable" as core count grows
   - So at the very least, parameterize by the number of threads

```java
int sum(int[] arr, int numTs) {
    int ans = 0;
    SumThread[] ts = new SumThread[numTs];
    for(int i=0; i < numTs; i++) {
        ts[i] = new SumThread(arr, (i*arr.length)/numTs,
                               ((i+1)*arr.length)/numTs);
        ts[i].start();
    }
    for(int i=0; i < numTs; i++) {
        ts[i].join();
        ans += ts[i].ans;
    }
    return ans;
}
```

What if you run your code on a machine with 6 pros?
Too bad you already divided the work into 4 pieces...

□ □ □ □ □ □ 4 pieces of work

□ □ □ □ □ □ — two idle processors
A Better Approach

2. Want to use (only) processors “available to you now”
   - Not used by other programs or threads in your program
     • Maybe caller is also using parallelism
     • Available cores can change even while your threads run
   - If you have 3 processors available and using 3 threads would take time $x$, then creating 4 threads would take time $1.5x$
     • Example: 12 units of work, 3 processors
       - Work divided into 3 parts will take 4 units of time
       - Work divided into 4 parts will take $3*2$ units of time

```cpp
// numThreads == numProcessors is bad
// if some are needed for other things
int sum(int[] arr, int numTs) {
    ...
}
```
If I have 24 units of work and am on a machine with 4 cores, I could create 4 chunks of work:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\] 6 units

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\] 4 processors

What if I am only given 3 of those cores but have already divided into 4 chunks of work?

12 units

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\] Dividing into 3 chunks

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\] vs.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\] 8 units

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

[Think of a unit of work = 1 second]
A Better Approach

3. Though unlikely for sum, in general subproblems may take significantly different amounts of time

- Example: Apply method $f$ to every array element, but maybe $f$ is much slower for some data items
  - Example: Is a large integer prime?

- If we create 4 threads and all the slow data is processed by 1 of them, we won’t get nearly a 4x speedup
  - Example of a load imbalance

Array of vals

- Very small vals
- Very large vals

isPrime() isPrime() isPrime() isPrime()

$10 \text{ sec} \quad 15 \text{ sec} \quad 30 \text{ sec} \quad 50 \text{ sec}$

We will be waiting around for this thread to finish its work!

Load Imbalance
A Better Approach

The counterintuitive (?) solution to all these problems is to cut up our problem into many pieces, far more than the number of processors

- But this will require changing our algorithm
- And for constant-factor reasons, abandoning Java’s threads

1. **Forward-portable**: Lots of helpers each doing a small piece
2. **Processors available**: Hand out “work chunks” as you go
   - If 3 processors available and have 100 threads, then ignoring constant-factor overheads, extra time is < 3%
3. **Load imbalance**: No problem if slow thread scheduled early enough
   - Variation probably small anyway if pieces of work are small
Naïve algorithm is poor

Suppose we create 1 thread to process every 1000 elements

```java
int sum(int[] arr) {
    ...
    int numThreads = arr.length / 1000;
    SumThread[] ts = new SumThread[numThreads];
    ...
}
```

Then the “combining of results” part of the code will have

```
arr.length / 1000  additions
```

- Linear in size of array (with constant factor 1/1000)
- Previous we had only 4 pieces (Θ(1) to combine)

- In the extreme, suppose we create one thread per element – If we use a for loop to combine the results, we have N iterations
- In either case we get a Θ(N) algorithm with the combining of results as the bottleneck....
If loops like on Slide 19 are used to create/start threads and join/combine results, those two phases, which are $O(n)$ could become the bottleneck.

Recursive problem decomposition (as on slide 29 + 37)
A better idea: Divide and Conquer!

1) Divide problem into pieces recursively:
   - Start with full problem at root
   - Halve and make new thread until size is at some cutoff
2) Combine answers in pairs as we return from recursion (see diagram)

This will start small, and ‘grow’ threads to fit the problem
This is straightforward to implement using divide-and-conquer
   - Parallelism for the recursive calls
Remember Mergesort?

8 2 9 4 5 3 1 6

Divide

8 2 9 4

Divide

8 2 9 4

Divide

8 2 9 4

1 element

8 2 9 4

Merge

2 8 4 9

Merge

2 4 8 9

Merge

1 2 3 4 5 6 8 9

5 3 1 6

5 3 1 6

5 3 1 6

5 3 1 6
```java
class SumThread extends java.lang.Thread {
    int lo; int hi; int[] arr; // fields to know what to do
    int ans = 0; // result
    SumThread(int[] a, int l, int h) { ... }
    public void run(){ // override
        if(hi - lo < SEQUENTIAL_CUTOFF)
            for(int i=lo; i < hi; i++)
                ans += arr[i];
        else {
            SumThread left = new SumThread(arr,lo,(hi+lo)/2);
            SumThread right= new SumThread(arr,(hi+lo)/2,hi);
            left.start();
            right.start();
            left.join(); // don't move this up a line - why?
            right.join();
            ans = left.ans + right.ans;
        }
    }
}
int sum(int[] arr){ // just make one thread!
    SumThread t = new SumThread(arr,0,arr.length);
    t.run();
    return t.ans;
}
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```
Divide-and-conquer really works

- The key is divide-and-conquer parallelizes the result-combining
  - If you have enough processors, total time is \textit{height of the tree:} \(O(\log n)\) (optimal, exponentially faster than sequential \(O(n)\))
  - Next lecture: study reality of \(P << n\) processors

- Will write all our parallel algorithms in this style
  - But using a special library engineered for this style
    - Takes care of scheduling the computation well
    - Often relies on operations being associative (like +)
Recursive problem decomposition

Example: summing an array with 10 elements.
(too small to actually want to use parallelism)

The algorithm produces the following tree of recursion, where the range [i,j) includes i and excludes j:

Thread: sum range [0,10)
  Thread: sum range [0,5)
    Thread: sum range [0,2)
      Thread: sum range [0,1) (return arr[0])
      Thread: sum range [1,2) (return arr[1])
      add results from two helper threads
    Thread: sum range [2,5)
      Thread: sum range [2,3) (return arr[2])
      Thread: sum range [3,5)
        Thread: sum range [3,4) (return arr[3])
        Thread: sum range [4,5) (return arr[4])
        add results from two helper threads
      add results from two helper threads
    add results from two helper threads
  Thread: sum range [5,10)
    Thread: sum range [5,7)
      Thread: sum range [5,6) (return arr[5])
      Thread: sum range [6,7) (return arr[6])
      add results from two helper threads
    Thread: sum range [7,10)
      Thread: sum range [7,8) (return arr[7])
      Thread: sum range [8,10)
        Thread: sum range [8,9) (return arr[8])
        Thread: sum range [9,10) (return arr[9])
        add results from two helper threads
      add results from two helper threads
    add results from two helper threads
Being realistic

• In theory, you can divide down to single elements, do all your result-combining in parallel and get optimal speedup
  – Total time $O(n \text{inumProcessors} + \log n)$

• In practice, creating all those threads and communicating swamps the savings, so do two things to help:
  1. Use a *sequential cutoff*, typically around 500-1000
     • Eliminates *almost all* the recursive thread creation (bottom levels of tree)
     • *Exactly* like quicksort switching to insertion sort for small subproblems, but more important here
  2. Do not create two recursive threads; create one thread and do the other piece of work “yourself”
     • Cuts the number of threads created by another 2x
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Half the threads!

```java
// wasteful: don’t
SumThread left = ...
SumThread right = ...
left.start();
right.start();
left.join();
right.join();
an = left.ans + right.ans;
```

```java
// better: do!!
SumThread left = ...
SumThread right = ...
left.start();
right.run();
left.join();
// no right.join needed
ans = left.ans + right.ans;
```

- If a *language* had built-in support for fork-join parallelism, I would expect this hand-optimization to be unnecessary
- But the *library* we are using expects you to do it yourself
  - And the difference is surprisingly substantial
- Again, no difference in theory
Fewer threads pictorially

2 new threads at each step (and only leaf threads do much work)
Total = 15 threads

1 new thread at each step
Total = 8 threads
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That library, finally

- Even with all this care, Java’s threads are too “heavyweight”
  - Constant factors, especially space overhead
  - Creating 20,000 Java threads just a bad idea 😞

- The ForkJoin Framework is designed to meet the needs of divide-and-conquer fork-join parallelism
  - In the Java 7 standard libraries
    - (Also available for Java 6 as a downloaded .jar file)
  - Section will focus on pragmatics/logistics
  - Similar libraries available for other languages
    - C/C++: Cilk (inventors), Intel’s Thread Building Blocks
    - C#: Task Parallel Library
    - …
  - Library’s implementation is a fascinating but advanced topic
Different terms, same basic idea

To use the ForkJoin Framework:
- A little standard set-up code (e.g., create a ForkJoinPool)

Java Threads:  ForkJoin Framework:
Don’t subclass Thread  Do subclass RecursiveTask<V>
Don’t override run  Do override compute
Do not use an ans field  Do return a V from compute
Don’t call start  Do call fork
Don’t just call join  Do call join (which returns answer)
Don’t call run to hand-optimize  Do call compute to hand-optimize
Don’t have a topmost call to run  Do create a pool and call invoke

See the web page for (linked in to project 3 description):
   “A Beginner’s Introduction to the ForkJoin Framework”
class SumTask extends RecursiveTask<Integer> {
    int lo; int hi; int[] arr; // fields to know what to do
    SumTask(int[] arr, int l, int h) { ... }
    protected Integer compute(){// return answer
        if(hi - lo < SEQUENTIAL_CUTOFF) {
            int ans = 0; // local var, not a field
            for(int i=lo; i < hi; i++)
                ans += arr[i];
            return ans;
        } else {
            SumTask left = new SumTask(arr,lo,(hi+lo)/2);
            SumTask right= new SumTask(arr,(hi+lo)/2,hi);
            left.fork(); // fork a thread and calls compute
            int rightAns = right.compute();//call compute directly
            int leftAns = left.join(); // get result from left
            return leftAns + rightAns;
        }
    }
}

static final ForkJoinPool POOL = new ForkJoinPool();
int sum(int[] arr){
    SumTask task = new SumTask(arr,0,arr.length)
    return POOL.invoke(task);
    // invoke returns the value compute returns
}
Getting good results in practice

• Sequential threshold
  – Library documentation recommends doing approximately 100-5000 basic operations in each “piece” of your algorithm

• Library needs to “warm up”
  – May see slow results before the Java virtual machine re-optimizes the library internals
  – Put your computations in a loop to see the “long-term benefit”

• Wait until your computer has more processors 😊
  – Seriously, overhead may dominate at 4 processors, but parallel programming is likely to become much more important

• Beware memory-hierarchy issues
  – Won’t focus on this, but often crucial for parallel performance