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1. One core with 2 cache levels
2. Multiple cores with private caches
3. Multiple cores with private caches and one shared cache

The sequential has an unfair advantage. Can we still get linear speedup?
Schedule the computation so that shared cache misses do not increase.

- with a **work stealing** scheduler allowing efficient dynamic load balancing
- for **parallel loops**: no dependencies between tasks

```
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Core 0         | Core 1         | Core 2         | Core 3         |
| Xeon Nehalem E5530 (2.4Ghz) |

8MB
```

8MB 256KB 256KB 256KB 256KB
32KB 32KB 32KB 32KB
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Overview

Cache Efficient Work Stealing Scheduling for Parallel Loops

1. Standard Schedulers for Parallel Loops
2. New Scheduler Optimized for Shared Cache
3. Efficient Implementation of the Scheduler
4. Experiments
Parallel Loops

Examples of parallel loops

- OpenMP #pragma omp parallel for
- TBB parallel_for
- Cilk parallel_for
- Parallel STL for_each or transform

Problem characteristics

- Schedule $n$ iterations on $p$ cores
- Iterations can be processed independently
- Time to process one iteration can vary
Static Scheduling of Parallel Loops

Static Scheduling

- Allocate \( \frac{n}{p} \) iterations to each core
- ex: OpenMP static scheduling

Characteristics

- low overhead mechanism
- bad load balancing if workload is irregular
Dynamic Scheduling of Parallel Loops

OpenMP dynamic scheduling

- Allocate iterations in chunks of size $g$
- All chunks are stored in a centralized list
- Each thread remove a chunk from the list and process it

Characteristics

- Good load balancing
- Contention on the list
- Chunk creation overhead
Scheduling Parallel Loops with Work Stealing

Work Stealing

- Each thread has its own list of tasks (= chunks)
- If list is empty, steal tasks in a randomly selected list
- Binary tree of tasks to minimize number of steals:
  one steal $\Leftrightarrow$ half of the iterations

Characteristics

- Good load balancing
- Contention is reduced
- Task creation overhead
Scheduling Parallel Loops with Work Stealing
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Scheduling Parallel Loops with Work Stealing

- terminated tasks
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Parallel Loops with Xkaapi

Xkaapi

- Work stealing library
- Tasks are created on a steal: reduce task creation overhead
- Cooperative stealing: The victim stops working to answer work requests
- The victim can answer to multiple requests at a time

Characteristics

- Good load balancing
- Low overhead mechanism

```
typedef struct {
    InputIterator ibeg;
    InputIterator iend;
} Work_t ; // Task

void parallel_for (...) {
    while (iend != ibeg)
        do_work ( ibeg++ ) ;
} // no more work -> become a thief

void splitter ( num_req ) {
    i = 0 ;
    size = victim.iend - victim.ibeg ;
    bloc = size / ( num_req + 1 ) ;
    local_end = victim.iend ;
    while ( num_req > 0 ) {
        thief->iend = local_end ;
        thief->ibeg = local_end - bloc ;
        local_end -= bloc ;
        --num_req ;
    }
} // victim + thieves -> parallel_for
```
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Reuse Distances [Beyls and D’Hollander 01]

- Number of distinct elements accessed between two accesses to the same element.
- If first access, reuse distance is infinity.
- On a fully associative LRU cache of size $C$:
  - reuse distance $\leq C \Rightarrow$ hit
  - reuse distance $> C \Rightarrow$ miss
- $h_d$: number of accesses with a reuse distance $d$
- Number of cache misses $M(C) = \sum_{d=C+1}^{\infty} h_d$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>element access</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reuse distance</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cache content</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>A,B</td>
<td>B,C</td>
<td>B,C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Shared Cache Misses with the Classic Schedule

- Cores work on elements far away
- Good temporal locality of the sequential algorithm
  \[ \Rightarrow \] Cores work on distinct data

- To 1 access by a core corresponds \( p - 1 \) accesses to distinct data by the other cores
- Reuse distance is multiplied by \( p \):
  \[ h_d^{\text{seq}} = h_{p \cdot d}^{\text{par}} \]
- Number of cache misses

\[
M_{\text{par}}(C) = \sum_{d=C+1}^{\infty} h_d^{\text{par}} = \sum_{d=C+1}^{\infty} h_d^{\text{seq} / p} = \sum_{d=C/p+1}^{\infty} h_d^{\text{seq}} = M_{\text{seq}}(C / p)
\]
A Shared Cache Aware Schedule

- Cores work at distance at most $m$
- $r(m)$ accesses to distinct elements in a window of size $m$
- The reuse distance is increased by at most $r(m)$: $h_d^{seq} = h_d^{win} + r(m)$
- Number of cache misses

$$M_{win}(C) \leq \sum_{d=C+1-r(m)}^{\infty} h_d^{seq} = M_{seq}(C) + \sum_{d=C+1-r(m)}^{C} h_d^{seq}$$

Small Overhead over Sequential

- good sequential locality
  - $r(m)$ small
  - $h_d$ small for large $d$
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Implementing the Shared Cache Aware Schedule

Using a standard parallel for loop: StaticWindow

- Divide the iterations in $n/m$ chunks of size $m$
- Each chunk is processed in parallel with a standard parallel for
- Two versions: pthread and XKAAPI

Pthread version

- each thread processes $1/p$ of a chunk
- wait on a barrier after each chunk

XKAAPI version

- each chunk is processed in parallel with a parallel for
Implementing the Shared Cache Aware Schedule

Optimized implementation using XKA-API: SlidingWindow

- Processing iteration $i$ enables iteration $i + m$
- Master thread is at the beginning of the sequence
- On a steal, the master can give work
  - In the interval $[ibeg, iend]$ like the other workers
  - In the interval $[ilast, ibeg + m]$ enabled since the last steal

```
typedef struct {
    InputIterator ibeg;
    InputIterator iend;
} Work_t ; // Task
```

```
typedef struct {
    InputIterator ibeg;
    InputIterator iend;
    InputIterator ilast;
} Master_Work_t ; // Master Task
```
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Application: Isosurface Extraction

Isosurface extraction
▶ Common scientific visualization filter
▶ Memory bounded

Algorithm
▶ Iterate through all cells in the mesh
▶ Interpolate surface inside each cell
▶ **Cells close in the mesh share points**
Experiments

2 processors

- **Opteron**: 2 Dualcores with private $L_1$ and $L_2$ caches
- **Nehalem**: Quadcore with private $L_1$, $L_2$ caches and shared $L_3$

2 schedules

- **NoWindow**: classic schedule
- (Static or Sliding) **Window**: shared cache aware schedule

7 implementations

- **NoWindow**: Pthread, TBB and **XKAAPI**
- **StaticWindow**: Pthread, TBB and **XKAAPI**
- **SlidingWindow**: **XKAAPI**
Pthread < TBB < XKAAPI

On Opteron: no shared cache ⇒ Window < NoWindow
more synchronizations without gain in cache misses
Window Size $m$

- On 4 cores of Nehalem
- Shared 8MB $L_3$ cache
- For small $m$: $M_{\text{window}} \approx M_{\text{seq}}(C)$
- $M_{\text{no-window}} \approx M_{\text{seq}}\left(\frac{C}{p}\right)$
- $M_{\text{no-window}} = 6.15 \cdot 10^7$
- $M_{\text{seq}}\left(\frac{C}{p}\right) = 7.13 \cdot 10^7$
**Speedup and Cache Misses on Nehalem**

- **Speedup $T_{seq}/T_{par}$**
  - Pthread:
    - No Static: 2.44
    - Static: 3.12
    - Static Sliding: 2.96
  - XKAAPI:
    - No Static: 3.25
    - Static: 3.37

- **$L_3$ misses ratio $M_{par}/M_{seq}$**
  - Pthread:
    - No Static: 1.48
    - Static: 1.09
  - XKAAPI:
    - No Static: 1.51
    - Static Sliding: 1.16
    - Static: 1.15

- 4 cores of Nehalem with 8MB of shared cache $L_3$
- Best performance: SlidingWindow
Conclusion

Shared Cache Aware Scheduler

- Shared cache aware scheduler for parallel loops
- Efficient implementation using work stealing
- *For application with good sequential locality the window strategy is as good as if each core had its own copy of the L3 cache*

Future work

- Experiment with other applications
- Automatically find window size with reuse distance histogram
- Cache-oblivious version (cache size unknown)?