L11: Sparse Linear Algebra
on GPUs

## Administrative Issues

- Next assignment, triangular solve
- Due 5PM, Tuesday, March 15
- handin cs6963 lab 3 <probfile>"
- Project proposals
- Due 5PM, Wednesday, March 7 (hard deadline)
- handin cs6963 prop 〈pdffile>

Triangular Solve (STRSM)
for ( $\mathrm{j}=0 ; \mathrm{j}<\mathrm{n} ; \mathrm{j}+\mathrm{+}$ )
for ( $k=0 ; k<n ; k++$ )
if ( $B\left[j{ }^{*} n+k\right]!=0.0 f$ ) \{
for ( $i=k+1 ; i<n ; i++$ )
$B\left[j^{\star} n+i\right]=A\left[k^{*} n+i\right]^{*} B\left[j{ }^{*} n+k\right] ;$
\}

Equivalent to
cublasStrsm('I' /* left operator */, 'I' /* lower triangular */, 'N' /* not transposed */, 'u' /* unit triangular */, N, N, alpha, d_A, N, d_B, N);

See: http://www.netlib.org/blas/strsm.f

## A Few Details

- C stores multi-dimensional arrays in row major order
- Fortran (and MATLAB) stores multidimensional arrays in column major order
- Confusion alert: BLAS libraries were designed for FORTRAN codes, so column major order is implicit in CUBLAS!


## Dependences in STRSM

for ( $\mathrm{j}=0 ; \mathrm{j}<\mathrm{n} ; \mathrm{j}+\mathrm{+}$ )
for ( $k=0 ; k<n ; k++$ )
if $(B[j * n+k]!=0.0 f)$ \{
for ( $\mathrm{i}=\mathrm{k}+1$; $\mathrm{i}<\mathrm{n} ; \mathrm{i}++$ )
$B\left[j^{*} n+i\right]=A\left[k^{*} n+i\right] * B[j * n+k]$
\}
Which loop(s) "carry" dependences?
Which loop(s) is(are) safe to execute in parallel?

## Assignment

- Details:
- Integrated with simpleCUBLAS test in SDK
- Reference sequential version provided

1. Rewrite in CUDA
2. Compare performance with CUBLAS library
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## Performance Issues?

-     + Abundant data reuse
-     - Difficult edge cases
-     - Different amounts of work for different <j,k> values
-     - Complex mapping or load imbalance


## Outline

- Next assignment
- For your projects:
- "Debunking the 100X GPU vs. CPU Myth: An Evaluation of Throughput Computing on CPU and GPU", Lee et al., ISCA 2010.
- Sparse Linear Algebra
- Readings:
"Implementing Sparse Matrix-Vector Multiplication on Throughput Oriented Processors," Bell and Garland (Nvidia), SCO9, Nov. 2009.
- "Model-driven Autotuning of Sparse Matrix-Vector Multiply on GPUs", Choi, Singh, Vuduc, PPoPP 10, Jan. 2010
- "Optimizing sparse matrix-vector multiply on emerging multicore platforms," Journal of Parallel Computing, 35(3):178-194, March 2009. (Expanded from SCO7 paper.)


## Overview:

## CPU and GPU Comparisons

- Many projects will compare speedup over a sequential CPU implementation
- Ok for this class, but not for a research contribution
- Is your CPU implementation as "smart" as your GPU implementation?
- Parallel?
- Manages memory hierarchy?
- Minimizes synchronization or accesses to global memory?


## The Comparison

- Architectures
- Intel i7, quad-core, $3.2 \mathrm{GHz}, 2$-way hyperthreading, SSE, 32KB L1, 256KB L2, 8MB L3
- Same i7 with Nvidia GTX 280
- Workload
- 14 benchmarks, some from the GPU literature


Architectural Comparison

|  | Core i7-960 |  | GTX280 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number PEs | 4 | 30 |  |
| Frequency (GHz) | 3.2 | 1.3 |  |
| Number Transistors | 0.7 B | 1.4 B |  |
| BW (GB/sec) | 32 | 141 |  |
| SP SIMD width | 4 | 8 |  |
| DP SIMD width | 2 | 1 |  |
| Peak SP Scalar <br> FLOPS (GFLOPS) | 25.6 | 116.6 |  |
| Peak SP SIMD <br> Flops (GFLOPS) | 102.4 | $311.1 / 933.1$ |  |
| Peak DP SIMD <br> Flops (GFLOPS) | 51.2 | 77.8 |  |
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Workload Summary

| Kernel | Application | SIMD | TLP | Charaterisitics |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SGEMM (SGEMM) [48] | Linear algebra | Regular | Across 2D Tiles | Compute bound after tiling |
| Monte Carlo (MC) [34,9] | Computational Finance | Reglar | Accoss paths | Compute bound |
| Convolution (Conv) [16, 19] | Image Analysis | Reglar | Across pixels | Compute bound; BW bound for small flleers |
| FFT (FFT) [17, 21] | Signal Processing | Regular | Across smaller FFTs | Compute BW b bound depending on size |
| SAXPY ( AAXPY [46] | Dot Product | Regular | Across vector | BW bound for lage vectors |
| LBM (LBM) [32, 45] | lime Migration | Reglar | Across cells | BW bound |
| Constrain Solver (Solv) [14] | Rigid bady physics | CatherIScatter | Across constraints | Synchronization bound |
| SpMV (SpMV) $50,8,471$ | Spance Solver | Gather | Across non-zrio | ${ }_{\text {BW bound for typical large matices }}$ |
|  | Colisision Delection | GatherIScater | Across objects | Compute Bound |
| Sott (Sort) [15, 3, 4, 40] | Database | Gather/Scatter | Across elements | Compute bound |
| Ray Casting (RC) [43] | Volume Rendering | Gather | Across rays | 4-8MB first level working set, over 500 MB last level working set |
| Search (Search) [27] | Database | thersc | Across quenes | Compute bound for small tree, BW |
| Histogram (Ifist) [53] | Image Analysis | $\begin{gathered} \text { Requires } \\ \text { conflict detection } \end{gathered}$ | Across pixcls | Reductionsynctronization bound |
| Bilateral (Bilat) [5] | Image Analysis | Regular | Across pixels | Compute Bound |
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## Sparse Linear Algebra

- Suppose you are applying matrix-vector multiply and the matrix has lots of zero elements
- Computation cost? Space requirements?
- General sparse matrix representation concepts
-Primarily only represent the nonzero data values
- Auxiliary data structures describe placement of nonzeros in "dense matrix"


## CPU optimization

- Tile for cache utilization
- SIMD execution on multimedia extensions
- Multi-threaded, beyond number of cores
- Data reorganization to improve SIMD performance


## GPU Challenges

- Computation partitioning?
- Memory access patterns?
- Parallel reduction

BUT, good news is that sparse linear algebra performs TERRIBLY on conventional architectures, so poor baseline leads to improvements!


| CSR Example ```for (j=0; j<nr; j++) { for (k = ptr[j]; k<ptr[j+1]-1; k++) t[j] = t[j] + data[k] * x[indices[k]];``` |
| :---: |

## Other Representation Examples

- Blocked CSR
- Represent non-zeros as a set of blocks, usually of fixed size
- Within each block, treat as dense and pad block with zeros
- Block looks like standard matvec
- So performs well for blocks of decent size
- Hybrid ELL and COO
- Find a "K" value that works for most of matrix
- Use COO for rows with more nonzeros (or even significantly fewer)
Table 1 from Bell/Garland: Summary of SpMV kernel properties.


## CSR Example
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| Summary of Representation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| and Implementation |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | /Flop |
| Kernel | Granularity | Coalescing | 32-bit | 64-bi |
| DIA | thread: row | full | 4 | 8 |
| ELL | thread: row | full | 6 | 10 |
| CSR(s) | thread: row | rare | 6 | 10 |
| CSR(v) | warp : row | partial | 6 | 10 |
| coo | thread: nonz | full | 8 | 12 |
| HYB | thread: row | full | 6 | 10 |



## Stencil Example

What is a 3-point stencil? 5-point stencil?
7-point? 9-point? 27-point?
Examples:
$a[i]=[b[i-1]+b[i+1]] / 2$;
$a[i][j]=[b[i-1][j]+b[i+1][j]+b[i][j-1]+b[i][j+1]] / 4 ;$
How is this represented by a sparse matrix?

## Unstructured Matrices

See Figures 13 and 14
Note that graphs can also be represented as sparse matrices. What is an adjacency matrix?

## Stencil Result (structured matrices)

See Figures 11 and 12, Bell and Garland

## PPoPP paper

- What if you customize the representation to the problem?
- Additional global data structure modifications (like blocked representation)?
- Strategy
- Apply models and autotuning to identify best solution for each application


## Summary of Results

BELLPACK (blocked ELLPACK) achieves up to 29 Gflop/s in SP and 15.7 Gflop/s in DP

Up to $1.8 x$ and $1.5 x$ improvement over Bell and Garland.
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## This Lecture

- Exposure to the issues in a sparse matrix vector computation on GPUs
- A set of implementations and their expected performance
- A little on how to improve performance through application-specific knowledge and customization of sparse matrix representation
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## What's coming

- Next time: Application case study from Kirk and Hwu (Ch. 8, real-time MRI)
- Wednesday, March 2: two guest speakers from last year's class
- BOTH use sparse matrix representation!
- Shreyas Ramalingam: program analysis on GPUs
- Pascal Grosset: graph coloring on GPUs

