Lecture 25

- Parallelism
Pipelining vs. Parallel processing

- In both cases, multiple “things” processed by multiple “functional units”

  **Pipelining**: each thing is broken into a sequence of pieces, where each piece is handled by a different (specialized) functional unit

  **Parallel processing**: each thing is processed entirely by a single functional unit

- We will briefly introduce the key ideas behind parallel processing
  - instruction level parallelism
  - data-level parallelism
  - thread-level parallelism
Exploiting Parallelism

- Of the computing problems for which performance is important, many have inherent parallelism

- Best example: computer games
  - Graphics, physics, sound, AI etc. can be done separately
  - Furthermore, there is often parallelism within each of these:
    - Each pixel on the screen’s color can be computed independently
    - Non-contacting objects can be updated/simulated independently
    - Artificial intelligence of non-human entities done independently

- Another example: Google queries
  - Every query is independent
  - Google is read-only!!
Parallelism at the Instruction Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Dependences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>$2 \leftarrow $3, $4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>$2 \leftarrow $2, $4</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lw</td>
<td>$6 \leftarrow 0($4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>WAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addi</td>
<td>$7 \leftarrow $6, 0x5</td>
<td></td>
<td>WAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub</td>
<td>$8 \leftarrow $8, $4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When can we reorder instructions?

When should we reorder instructions?

Surperscalar Processors:
Multiple instructions executing in parallel at *same* stage
OoO Execution Hardware
Consider adding together two arrays:

```c
void array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0 ; i < length ; ++ i) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
}
```

Operating on one element at a time
Exploiting Parallelism at the Data Level

- Consider adding together two arrays:

```c
void array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0 ; i < length ; ++ i) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
}
```

Operating on one element at a time
Consider adding together two arrays:

```c
void array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0 ; i < length ; ++ i) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
}
```

Operate on *MULTIPLE* elements.
Intel SSE/SSE2 as an example of SIMD

- Added new 128 bit registers (XMM0 - XMM7), each can store
  - 4 single precision FP values (SSE) \(4 \times 32\)b
  - 2 double precision FP values (SSE2) \(2 \times 64\)b
  - 16 byte values (SSE2) \(16 \times 8\)b
  - 8 word values (SSE2) \(8 \times 16\)b
  - 4 double word values (SSE2) \(4 \times 32\)b
  - 1 128-bit integer value (SSE2) \(1 \times 128\)b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4.0 (32 bits)</th>
<th>4.0 (32 bits)</th>
<th>3.5 (32 bits)</th>
<th>-2.0 (32 bits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-1.5 (32 bits)</td>
<td>2.0 (32 bits)</td>
<td>1.7 (32 bits)</td>
<td>2.3 (32 bits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 (32 bits)</td>
<td>6.0 (32 bits)</td>
<td>5.2 (32 bits)</td>
<td>0.3 (32 bits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it always that easy?

- Not always... a more challenging example:

```c
unsigned sum_array(unsigned *array, int length) {
    int total = 0;
    for (int i = 0 ; i < length ; ++ i) {
        total += array[i];
    }
    return total;
}
```

- Is there parallelism here?
We first need to restructure the code

```c
unsigned
sum_array2(unsigned *array, int length) {
    unsigned total, i;
    unsigned temp[4] = {0, 0, 0, 0};
    for (i = 0 ; i < length & ~0x3 ; i += 4) {
        temp[0] += array[i];
        temp[1] += array[i+1];
        temp[2] += array[i+2];
        temp[3] += array[i+3];
    }
    for ( ; i < length ; ++ i) {
        total += array[i];
    }
    return total;
}
```
Then we can write SIMD code for the hot part

```c
unsigned
sum_array2(unsigned *array, int length) {
    unsigned total, i;
    unsigned temp[4] = {0, 0, 0, 0};
    for (i = 0 ; i < length & ~0x3 ; i += 4) {
        temp[0] += array[i];
        temp[1] += array[i+1];
        temp[2] += array[i+2];
        temp[3] += array[i+3];
    }
    for (; i < length ; ++ i) {
        total += array[i];
    }
    return total;
}
```
Thread level parallelism: Multi-Core Processors

- Two (or more) complete processors, fabricated on the same silicon chip
- Execute instructions from two (or more) programs/threads at the same time
Multi-Cores are Everywhere

Intel Core Duo in Macs, etc.: 2 x86 processors on same chip

XBox360: 3 PowerPC cores

Sony Playstation 3: Cell processor, an asymmetric multi-core with 9 cores (1 general-purpose, 8 special purpose SIMD processors)
Why Multi-cores Now?

- Number of transistors we can put on a chip growing exponentially...
But power is growing even faster!!
  - Power has become limiting factor in current chips
As programmers, do we care?

- What happens if we run a program on a multi-core?

```c
void
array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    int i;
    for (i = 0 ; i < length ; ++i) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
}
```
What if we want a program to run on both processors?

- We have to explicitly tell the machine exactly how to do this
  - This is called parallel programming or concurrent programming

- There are many parallel/concurrent programming models
  - We will look at a relatively simple one: fork-join parallelism
  - In CSE 303, you saw a little about threads and explicit synchronization
Fork/Join Logical Example

1. Fork N-1 threads
2. Break work into N pieces (and do it)
3. Join (N-1) threads

```c
void array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    cpu_num = fork(N-1);
    int i;
    for (i = cpu_num; i < length; i += N) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
    join();
}
```

How good is this with caches?
Parallel speedup measures improvement from parallelization:

\[
\text{speedup}(p) = \frac{\text{time for best serial version}}{\text{time for version with } p \text{ processors}}
\]

What can we realistically expect?
In general, the whole computation is not (easily) parallelizable

Reason #1: Amdahl’s Law
Suppose a program takes 1 unit of time to execute serially.

A fraction of the program, $s$, is inherently serial (unparallelizable).

For example, consider a program that, when executing on one processor, spends 10% of its time in a non-parallelizable region. How much faster will this program run on a 3-processor system?

\[
\text{New Execution Time} = \frac{1-s}{p} + s
\]

What is the maximum speedup from parallelization?
Reason #2: Overhead

void
array_add(int A[], int B[], int C[], int length) {
    
    cpu_num = fork(N-1);
    
    int i;
    for (i = cpu_num ; i < length ; i += N) {
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];
    }
    
    join();
}

— Forking and joining is not instantaneous
  • Involves communicating between processors
  • May involve calls into the operating system
    — Depends on the implementation

\[
\text{New Execution Time} = \frac{1-s}{P} + s + \text{overhead}(P)
\]
Programming Explicit Thread-level Parallelism

- As noted previously, the programmer must specify how to parallelize
- But, want path of least effort

- Division of labor between the Human and the Compiler
  - Humans: good at expressing parallelism, bad at bookkeeping
  - Compilers: bad at finding parallelism, good at bookkeeping

- Want a way to take serial code and say “Do this in parallel!” without:
  - Having to manage the synchronization between processors
  - Having to know a priori how many processors the system has
  - Deciding exactly which processor does what
  - Replicate the private state of each thread

- OpenMP: an industry standard set of compiler extensions
  - Works very well for programs with structured parallelism.
Performance Optimization

- Until you are an expert, first write a working version of the program
- Then, and only then, begin tuning, first collecting data, and iterate
  - Otherwise, you will likely optimize what doesn’t matter

“We should forget about small efficiencies, say about 97% of the time: premature optimization is the root of all evil.” -- Sir Tony Hoare
Using tools to do instrumentation

- Two GNU tools integrated into the GCC C compiler

- Gprof: The GNU profiler
  - Compile with the `-pg` flag
    - This flag causes gcc to keep track of which pieces of source code correspond to which chunks of object code and links in a profiling signal handler.
  - Run as normal; program requests the operating system to periodically send it signals; the signal handler records what instruction was executing when the signal was received in a file called `gmon.out`
  - Display results using `gprof` command
    - Shows how much time is being spent in each function.
    - Shows the calling context (the path of function calls) to the hot spot.
## Example gprof output

Each sample counts as 0.01 seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% cumulative</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>cumulative</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>seconds</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>calls</td>
<td>s/call</td>
<td>s/call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 81.89 | 4.16 | 4.16 | 37913758 | 0.00 | 0.00 | cache_access |
| 16.14 | 4.98 | 0.82 | 1        | 0.82 | 5.08 | sim_main |
| 1.38  | 5.05 | 0.07 | 6254582  | 0.00 | 0.00 | update_way_list |
| 0.59  | 5.08 | 0.03 | 1428644  | 0.00 | 0.00 | dl1_access_fn |
| 0.00  | 5.08 | 0.00 | 711226   | 0.00 | 0.00 | dl2_access_fn |
| 0.00  | 5.08 | 0.00 | 256830   | 0.00 | 0.00 | yylex |

Over 80% of time spent in one function

Provides calling context (main calls sim_main calls cache_access) of hot spot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>index</th>
<th>% time</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>children</th>
<th>called</th>
<th>name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>main [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sim_main [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>36418454/36484188</td>
<td>cache_access &lt;cycle 1&gt; [4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>sys_syscall [9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2935/2967</td>
<td>mem_translate [16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2794/2824</td>
<td>mem_newpage [18]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gprof didn’t give us information on where in the function we were spending time. (cache_access is a big function; still needle in haystack)

Gcov: the GNU coverage tool
- Compile/link with the -fprofile-arcs -ftest-coverage options
  - Adds code during compilation to add counters to every control flow edge (much like our by hand instrumentation) to compute how frequently each block of code gets executed.
  - Run as normal
- For each xyz.c file an xyz.gdna and xyz.gcno file are generated
- Post-process with gcov xyz.c
  - Computes execution frequency of each line of code
  - Marks with ##### any lines not executed
    - Useful for making sure that you tested your whole program
Example gcov output

Code never executed

Loop executed over 50 iterations on average (751950759/14282656)
Summary

- Multi-core is having more than one processor on the same chip.
  - Soon most PCs/servers and game consoles will be multi-core
  - Results from Moore’s law and power constraint

- Exploiting multi-core requires parallel programming
  - Automatically extracting parallelism too hard for compiler, in general.
  - But, can have compiler do much of the bookkeeping for us
  - OpenMP

- Fork-Join model of parallelism
  - At parallel region, fork a bunch of threads, do the work in parallel, and then join, continuing with just one thread
  - Expect a speedup of less than P on P processors
    - Amdahl’s Law: speedup limited by serial portion of program
    - Overhead: forking and joining are not free