

**CS 575 Parallel Processing
Week 3: PRAM**

**Sanjay Rajopadhye
Colorado State University**

Outline

- Discussion 1 recap
- PRAM Algorithms
 - Basic model & variants
 - Basic algorithmic techniques
 - List/pointer based algorithm (from the readings)
 - Array based algorithms

Discussion 1

- Main task: adding n numbers of 8 processors
 - Machine models: distributed/shared memory
- Distributed memory: initial distribution:
 - If one node has all the data it is faster to just add up everything on this processor so assume data is distributed to processors
 - Locally add $n/8$ numbers ($n T_{\text{comp}}/8$ time)
 - ... then the 8 processors add up 8 numbers

Colorado State University ³

Discussion 1 (contd)

- Reduction of 8 numbers on 8 processors (topology dependent)
 - Ring: $4(T_{\text{comp}} + T_{\text{mess}})$
 - Grid: $4(T_{\text{comp}} + T_{\text{mess}})$
 - Fully connected: $3(T_{\text{comp}} + T_{\text{mess}})$
 - Shared memory: $3(T_{\text{comp}} + T_{\text{mess}})$
- Machine parameters
 - $T_{\text{comp}} = 1$ cycle
 - $T_{\text{share}} = 100$ cycles
 - $T_{\text{mess}} = 10^6$ cycles: not (yet) affine model of Ch 2

Colorado State University ⁴

PRAM Algorithms

- Simplest (ideal) model of parallel machines
- Develop a theory of solving problems on such machines
- Two parameter analysis
 - Problem size N
 - Number of processors P
- Why do this analysis
 - Training
 - Lower bounds

Colorado State University ⁵

Machine model

- A machine with P processors
- Accessing a shared memory of (arbitrary size)
- Ideal memory (one unit time to access any word in memory)
 - Ignore issues of locality (orthogonal to PRAMs)
- Conflicts: what if two processors access the same location
 - answer to this question yields sub-models

Colorado State University ⁶

Exclusive/Concurrent access

- Exclusive access:
 - Simultaneous access to the same memory location are forbidden
 - Machine does not allow it
 - Algorithms must respect it (we need to prove it)
- Most “restrictive” PRAM machine = EREW
- Concurrent accesses are allowed
 - For reads
 - What about concurrent writes

Colorado State University ⁷

Concurrent Write Arbitration

How to resolve concurrent writes

- Common: insist that whenever this happens all processors doing so must be writing the same value
- Arbitrary: one of the writers succeeds
 - don't know which one, and algorithm must work regardless of who wins
- Priority: e.g., lowest index processor wins
- Combining: values are combined using an op (usually associative/commutative – reduction)

Colorado State University ⁸

List Ranking (pointer jumping)

```

1  for each processor i in parallel
2    do if next [i] = NIL
3       then d[i] ← 0;
4       else d[i] ← 1;
5  while there exists i such that next[i] != NIL
6    for each processor i in parallel
7      do if next[i] != NIL
8         then d[i] ← d[i] + d[next[i]];
9         next[i] ← next[next[i]];

```

Colorado State University ⁹

Specification & Correctness

- What we desire to compute: at the end we must ensure

$$d[i] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } next[i] = NIL \\ d[next[i]] + 1 & \text{if } next[i] \neq NIL \end{cases}$$

- Invariant for the **while** loop (lines 6-9): adding up the $d[i]$ values in any sub list headed by i , yields the rank of the object i in the original list

Colorado State University ¹⁰

Analysis (Time & Work)

- Execution time of ListRank is $O(\lg N)$
- Work of the parallel algorithm is $O(N \lg N)$
- Work Efficiency
 - Ratio of work of best sequential algorithm to work of parallel algorithm
 - $1/\lg N$ asymptotically approaches zero!

Colorado State University ¹¹

Parallel prefix on lists

```

1  for each processor i in parallel
2    do if  $y[i] = x[i]$ ;
3  while there exists i such that  $\text{next}[i] \neq \text{NIL}$ 
4    for each processor i in parallel
5      do if  $\text{next}[i] \neq \text{NIL}$ 
6        then  $y[\text{next}[i]] \leftarrow y[i] + y[\text{next}[i]]$ ;
7            $\text{next}[i] \leftarrow \text{next}[\text{next}[i]]$ ;

```

Colorado State University ¹²

Parallel Prefix on Arrays

- Instead of lists you have an array $X[1 \dots N]$ and want to produce an Array $Y[1 \dots N]$ (so Quiz 2 was a prefix-max)
- Use divide & conquer: two strategies
 - Split in middle
 - Zip/unzip
- Analysis questions:
 - How many operations (work)
 - How many steps (time)

Colorado State University ¹³

Kogge Stone 1974

- Compute the elements of the recurrence

$$y(i) = a_3y(i-3) + a_2y(i-2) + a_1y(i-1) + a_0$$
- Define: $Y_i = [y_i, y_{i-1}, \dots, y_{i-3}]^T$
- papers (PPoPP 2013 is most recent)
- Another application: IIR filter/linear recurrences

Colorado State University ¹⁴

Depth finding (not Euler tour)

Problem: find depth of all nodes in binary tree

- Sequential algorithm: $\Theta(N)$
- Parallel algorithm:
 - my depth = 1 + parent's depth (// depth first traversal)
 - Steps? Time? Worst case?
- But we have a hammer!!

Colorado State University 15

Brent's Theorem

(real) Problem: dag scheduling, under the guise of simulating a combinational circuit

- Bounded fan-in and CREW
- Basic idea is simple (see figure)

Theorem: a dag with depth = d size = s can be simulated by a CREW PRAM in time =

$$O(n/p + d)$$

- Importance: idea can be used to get work-efficient algorithms for many other problems.

Colorado State University 16

Fast min: power of CW

```
1  for each processor i in parallel do M[i] = 0;
2  for each processor <i,j> in parallel do
3    if (C[i]<C[j]) then M[j] = 1;
4  for each processor <i,j> in parallel do
5    if (M[i] == 0 && i<j) then M[j] = 1;
6  for each processor i in parallel do
7    if (M[i] == 0) then answer = C[i];
```