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ParaPhrase

- Parallel Patterns for Heterogeneous Multicore Systems
  - EC-STREP FP7

Concurrency and multi-core, the theoretical background

- a personal perspective

FastFlow

- A programming model (and a library)
- Fast (<10 nS) core-to-core lock-free messaging
- Supporting multi-core and accelerators

Testbed: a novel two-phase image/video denoiser

- clean salt-and-pepper noise up to 90%
- reconstruction quality at 50% close to jpeg compression
- demo
ParaPhrase: Parallel Patterns for Heterogeneous Multicore Systems

- 3 Year targeted research project (FP7 STREP)
  - Runs from 1/10/11 to 30/9/14
  - Funded by objective 3.4, “Computing Systems”
  - Project Number ICT-2011-288570

- 9 partners from five countries
- €3.5M budget, €2.6M EU contribution
- Coordinated by the U. of St Andrews, Scotland, UK
### Project Consortium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project partners</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of St Andrews</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gordon University</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mellanox Technologies Ltd.</strong></td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Competence Center Hagenberg</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erlang Solutions Ltd</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pisa</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Performance Computing Center Stuttgart</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Torino</strong></td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen’s University Belfast</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multi-cores: programming issues

- We can muddle through on 2-16 cores
  - modified sequential code may work
  - we may be able to use multiple programs to soak up cores
  - BUT larger systems are much more challenging

- Fundamentally, programmers must learn to “think parallel”
  - this requires new high-level programming constructs
  - you cannot program effectively while worrying about deadlocks etc
    - they must be eliminated from the design!
  - you cannot program effectively while fiddling with communication etc
    - this needs to be packaged/abstracted!
The need of a *programming model*

- Applications programmers must be systems programmers
  - insufficient assistance with abstraction, too much complexity to manage
- Difficult/impossible to scale, unless the problem is simple
- Future multi/many-core
  - Probably not just scaled versions of today’s multi/many-core
    - Highly heterogeneous: message-passing, shared-memory cc-NUMA, variable cache consistency, specialized cores (XML, crypto, ...), soft-cores (FPGA), ...
- The approaches provide libraries
  - they need to provide abstractions, i.e. *programming models*
The Implications for Programming

- We must program heterogeneous systems in an integrated way.
- It will be impossible to program each kind of core differently.
- It will be impossible to take static decisions about placement etc.
ParaPhrase Aims

Overall, we aim to produce a new pattern-based approach to programming parallel systems.

1. develop high-level design and implementation patterns that are capable of easily exposing useful parallelism on heterogeneous multicore/manycore systems.

2. develop new dynamic mechanisms to support adaptivity for heterogeneous multicore/manycore systems

3. verify that these patterns and adaptivity mechanisms can be used easily and effectively to develop a wide range of real-world applications
Concurrency and multi-core theoretical background: a personal perspective
Nowadays

- E.g. Intel Sandybridge, AMD Opteron
  - cache-coherent
  - 10 core per socket (20 contexts)
  - cc-NUMA (as matter of a fact)

- NVidia/AMD GPGPU/Hybrid
  - SIMD, no global synch
  - performance only with proper and not automatic memory hierarchy management

- Intel MIC CPU/GPGPU
  - ring-based interconnection, variable coherency
  - apparently even more NUMA

- IBM powerEN
  - general purpose cores
  - specialised cores, soft cores?
From programming/tuning viewpoint ... the simplest is already too complex ...

* Exploit cache coherence
* Memory fences are expensive
  ✦ Increasing core count will make it worse
* Fine-grained parallelism is hard to achieve
  ✦ I/O bound problems, High-throughput, Streaming, Irregular DP problems
  ✦ Automatic and assisted parallelisation solves uniform & easy cases
  • OpenMP, Par4all, ...
* From programming model viewpoint, SIMD/GPGPU (maybe) worsen the scenario
  ✦ Well-understood programming model
  ✦ Atomic ops in memory (i.e. fences) are still needed
  ✦ Not everything can be described with do independent (a.k.a. map)
Micro-benchmarks: farm of tasks

Used to implement: parameter sweeping, master-worker, etc.

```c
void Emitter () {
    for ( i =0; i <streamLen;++i){
        task = create_task ();
        queue=SELECT_WORKER_QUEUE();
        queue ->PUSH(task);
    }
}

void Worker() {
    while (!end_of_stream){
        myqueue ->POP(&task);
        do_work(task) ;
    }
}

int main () {
    spawn_thread( Emitter ) ;
    for ( i =0; i <nworkers;++i){
        spawn_thread(Worker);
    }
    wait_end () ;
}
```
Task farm with POSIX lock/unlock

![Diagram showing task farm with POSIX lock/unlock](image-url)

- **E**: Entry
- **W_1**, **W_2**, ..., **W_n**: Work nodes
- **C**: Completion

The graph illustrates the average execution time per task across different number of cores and lock/unlock times. The x-axis represents the number of cores, and the y-axis shows the speedup. The legend includes:

- **Ideal**
- **50 μS**
- **5 μS**
- **0.5 μS**

The ideal speedup is shown as a red line, while the actual speedup for different lock/unlock times is represented by different colors.

The diagram shows how the speedup varies with the number of cores and lock/unlock times, indicating the effects of concurrency and lock/unlock overhead on task execution performance.
Can we avoid locks?

- Under relaxed memory models, using CAS/atomic ops
  - "lock-free" data structures
  - they perform better than lock-based
  - they fence the memory and pay cache coherency reconciliation overhead
  - in GPUs ...
    - CAS/atomic ... you have to go to the global memory
Lock vs CAS at fine grain (0.5 μS)
Re-starting from the basics

✴ Reducing the problem to the bare bones
✦ Producer-Consumer model (streaming)
✦ Directly control thread blocking using non-blocking synchronisations
✦ Directly design the “data channel”
  • Having clear how data move in the whole memory hierarchy

✴ Restarting from the FIFO queue
Interaction models: theoretical background (in a nutshell)

✴ low-level synchronisation in the shared memory model
  ✦ Mutual Exclusion (mutex)
    • typically used as basic building block of synchronisations
  ✦ Producer Consumer

✴ they are not equally demanding
  ✦ Mutual Exclusion is inherently more complex since requires deadlock-freedom
    • require interlocked ops (CAS, ...), that induces memory fences, thus cache invalidation
    • Dekker and Bakery requires Sequential Consistency (++)
  ✦ Producer Consumer is a cooperative (non cyclic) process
Recap: coherence and consistency

✴ Memory/Cache Coherence

✦ Deal with multiple replicas of the same location in different caches

✴ Memory Consistency

✦ Deal with the ordering in which writes and reads at different locations take effect in memory (issued by either the same or different processors/cores)
FastFlow SPSC queues

- Proved to be correct under SC
- Doesn’t work under weaker models
  - TSO, e.g. x86
  - WO, e.g. PPC, ARM

```
push_nonbocking(data) {
    if (NEXT(head) == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[head] = data;
    head = NEXT(head);
    return 0;
}
```

```
pop_nonbocking(data) {
    if (head == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    data = buffer[tail];
    tail = NEXT(tail);
    return 0;
}
```

Lamport FIFO - 1983
FastFlow SPSC queues

Lamport FIFO - 1983

```c
push_nonbocking(data) {
    if (NEXT(head) == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[head] = data;
    head = NEXT(head);
    return 0;
}

pop_nonblocking(data) {
    if (head == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    data = buffer[tail];
    tail = NEXT(tail);
    return 0;
}
```

FastFlow FIFO

```c
push_nonbocking(data) {
    if (NULL != buffer[head]) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[head] = data;
    head = NEXT(head);
    return 0;
}
```

```
For any model weaker than TSO (WMB)
```

```c
pop_nonblocking(data) {
    data = buffer[tail];
    if (NULL == data) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[tail] = NULL;
    tail = NEXT(tail);
    return 0;
}
```

FastFlow FIFO

derived from PICI (Higham and Kavalsh, ISPAN 1997)
FastFlow SPSC queues

Lamport FIFO - 1983

```c
push_nonblocking(data) {
    if (NEXT(head) == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[head] = data;
    head = NEXT(head);
    return 0;
}

pop_nonblocking(data) {
    if (head == tail) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    data = buffer[tail];
    tail = NEXT(tail);
    return 0;
}
```

FastFlow FIFO

```c
push_nonblocking(data) {
    if (NULL != buffer[head]) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[head] = data;
    head = NEXT(head);
    return 0;
}

pop_nonblocking(data) {
    data = buffer[tail];
    if (NULL == data) {
        return EWOULDBLOCK;
    }
    buffer[tail] = NULL;
    tail = NEXT(tail);
    return 0;
}
```

- head and tail are mutually invalidated by producer and consumer
- 1 cache miss every push and pop (at least)
- For any model weaker than TSO
- producer read/write head
- consumer read/write tail
- no misses

FastFlow FIFO

derived from P1C1 (Higham and Kavalsh, ISPN 1997)
Lock vs CAS vs SPSC FastFlow (50 µS)
Lock vs CAS vs SPSC FastFlow (5 μS)
Lock vs CAS vs SPSC FastFlow (0.5 μS)
Medium grain (5 μS workload)
Fine grain (0.5 μS workload)
Producer-Cons with FF queue: latency

4 sockets x 8 core x 2 contexts

Xeon E7-4820 @2.0GHz Sandy Bridge
18MB L3 shared cache, 256K L2

DK Panda said today
MPI is ~190 ns
Wait-free fence-free unbound dynamic queue (uSPSC)

```c
int size = N; //SPSC size
bool push(void* data) {
    if (buf_w->full()) {
        SPSC t = pool.next_w();
        if (!t) return false;
        buf_w = t;
    }
    buf_w->push(data);
    return true;
}

bool pop(void** data) {
    if (buf_r->empty()) {
        if (buf_r == buf_w) return false;
        if (buf_r->empty()) {
            SPSC tmp = pool.next_r();
            if (tmp) {
                pool.release(buf_r);
                buf_r = tmp;
            }
        }
    }
    return buf_r->pop(data);
}

struct Pool {
    dSPSC inuse;
    SPSC cache;
    SPSC* next_w() {
        SPSC* buf;
        return (inuse.pop(&buf) ? buf : NULL);
    }

    SPSC* next_r() {
        SPSC* buf;
        return (inuse.pop(&buf) ? buf : NULL);
    }

    void release(SPSC* buf) {
        buf->reset(); // reset pread and pwrite
        if (!cache.push(buf))
            deallocateSPSC(buf);
    }
}
```

Fig. 3: Unbounded wait-free uSPSC queue implementation.

Bandwidth test (with uSPSC)

http://www.1024cores.net/home/technologies/fastflow

4 sockets x 8 core x 2 contexts

Xeon E7-4820 @2.0GHz Sandy Bridge
18MB L3 shared cache, 256K L2

<35 ns irrespectively of the mapping

Linked list + circular buffer
Opt Michael-Scott queue
(our result)

Speedup

12x faster

Linked list with pooling
Opt Michael-Scott queue
(our result)

20x faster

Linked list w/ dyn alloc
Michael-Scott queue
well-known ~ 400 citations
Related Work: Lock-free, CAS-free, wait-free

* Single-Producer-Single-Consumer FIFO queues
  - Lamport et al. 1983 Trans. PLS (Sequential consistency only - passive)
  - Higham and Kavalsh. 1997 ISPAN (P1C1 - TSO + proof - passive)
  - Giacomoni et al. 2008 PPoPP (TSO + cache slipping - passive)

* Multiple-Producers-Multiple-Consumers FIFO queues
  - with CAS (two of them) - Michael and Scott (PODC96)
    - Also implemented in FastFlow, require deferred reclamation/hazard pointers to avoid ABA problem
  - without CAS - passive ➞ Cannot be done
  - without CAS - active ➞ FastFlow

* Extending the taxonomy with locking algorithms is clearly useless ....
Why elaborating on queues?

**Queues are the base of Producer-Consumer**
- reference paradigm for data-centric and data-flow models
- orthogonal and complementary to Transactional Memories
  - that address competition
- can be used in both shared memory and message passing models

**Queues are the primary (maybe the only) global synchronisation mechanism in current GPGPUs**
- take a look to NVidia/CUDA programming manual
- efficient global synch can pave the way to a broader usage of GPUs
  - is it possible an atomic-free global memory queue on GPUs?
FastFlow
Lock-free and CAS-free?

❖ Mutex cannot be done
  Single-Producer-Single-Consumer (SPSC) can be done
    ✦ Producer-Consumer is inherently weaker with respect to Mutex
    ✦ It does require the cooperation of partners whereas Mutex does not

❖ Expressive enough to build a streaming (or dataflow) programming framework
    ✦ MPMC = SPSC + mediator threads

❖ But what about productivity at large scale?
  ✦ Write a program is defining a graph encoding true dependencies ... not really easy
FastFlow is based on producer-consumer

- Lock-free/fence-free non-blocking synchronisations
- C++ STL-like implementation
- thread-model agnostic (pthreads, QT, windows threads, ...)
- compliant with other synchronisation mechanisms in the business code (e.g. locks and semaphores)
Pattern-based approach: rationale

✴ Abstract parallelism exploitation pattern by parametric code

✦ E.g. higher order function, code factories, C++ templates, ...
✦ Can composed and nested as programming language constructs + offloading
✦ Stream and Data Parallel

✴ Platform independent

✦ Implementations on different multi/many-cores
✦ Support for hybrid architectures thanks to pattern compositionality

✴ Provide state-of-the-art, parametric implementation of each parallelism exploitation pattern

✦ With natural way of extending patterns, i.e. OO
✦ Functional (seq code) and tunable extra-functional (QoS) parameters
Patterns, their implementation, and their purpose

- **farm**
  - on CPU - master-worker - parallelism exploitation
  - on GPU - CUDA streams - automatic exploitation of asynch comm

- **pipeline**
  - on CPU - pipeline
  - on GPU - sequence of kernel calls or global mem synch

- **map**
  - on CPU - master-worker - parallelism exploitation
  - on GPU - CUDA SIMT - parallelism exploitation

- **reduce**
  - on CPU - master-worker - parallelism exploitation
  - on GPU - CUDA SIMT (reduction tree) - parallelism exploitation

- **D&C**
  - on CPU - master-worker with feedback - // exploitation
  - on GPU - working on it, maybe loop+farm
Composition

Composition via C++ template meta-programming

- CPU: Graph composition
- GPU: CUDA streams
- CPU+GPU: offloading

- farm{ pipe }
- pipe(farm, farm)
- pipe(map, reduce)
- ....
On my personal view of MPI ...

* I love it, I’ve using it for 15 years
  ✦ as a target language for building compilers for high-level parallel languages

* MPI collective operations are good
* they are an example of patterns (a.k.a. skeletons)
  ✦ even if not particularly high-level

* the problem are Send/Rcv
  ✦ and the other over hundred (and counting) operations?
    ✦ are they perceived as really useful from anybody?
  ✦ they are on the language as well, and people use them

* one problem of “cars” are drivers (and crashes)
  ✦ how much expertise do you need to write/tune/debug something barely decent?
At the bottom line, it is just abstracting & engineering well-known concepts

Think In Parallel

- The GPU is a data-parallel processor
  - Thousands of parallel threads
  - Thousands of data elements to process
  - All data processed by the same program
  - SPMD computation model
  - Contrast with task parallelism and ILP

- Best results when you “Think Data Parallel”
  - Design your algorithm for data-parallelism
  - Understand parallel algorithmic complexity and efficiency
  - Use data-parallel algorithmic primitives as building blocks

Data-Parallel Algorithms

- Efficient algorithms require efficient building blocks
- This talk: data-parallel building blocks
  - Map
  - Gather & Scatter
  - Reduce
  - Scan

+ farm + pipeline + D&C
at least to manage automatically asynchronous copies
Recap

Patterns at the high-level
- Currently as C++ templates
- Set of patterns can be extended, semantics of patterns can be changed, complexity gracefully increase with semantic distance

Used to generate cyclic streaming networks (of threads, ...)
- Graphs, describing true data dependencies. Can be composed and transformed as graphs
- Cyclic graphs need unbound queue
- Heterogeneous cores, thread affinity, memory affinity, NUMA, can be managed while mapping graph onto the metal
Applications (see [http://di.unito.it/fastflow](http://di.unito.it/fastflow))

- **Smith-Waterman** (based on SWPS3/SSE2, ParCo 10)
  - Recently discovered it is used as baseline for FPGA design at it seems it is among the fastest SW solutions
- **C4.5** (EMCL-PKDD 10, Concurrency prat. exp. submitted)
- **StochKit-ff** (HiBB 11)
- **MonteCarlo sims & Gillespie’s biological sims** (PDP 11, HiBB 11)
- **Cholesky** (PDP 12)
- **nProbe-ff** (part of nTop software, ParCo 11)
- **pbzip-ff** (Wiley book 12)
- **nqueens, k-means, fibonacci, Mandelbrot QT, and many micro-benchmarks**
- **Two-phase edge-preserving denoiser** (IEEE IPTA submitted)
Targeting multi cores by structured programming and data flow

M. Aldinucci, L. Anardu, M. Danelutto, P. Kilpatrick, M. Torquati

Dept. Computer Science, U
Dept. Computer Science, Queen

Abstract

Data flow techniques have been around since were used in compilers for sequential language duction they were also considered as a possible ing, although the impact here was limited. It has been identified as a candidate for efficient programming models on multi-core architectures. The burden of determining data flow “macro” programmer, while the compiler/runtime efficient scheduling of these instructions. We d programming approach supporting automatic micro-distributions have been experimentally tested.

Figure 10: $mdf^3$ vs PLASMA library. Cholesky factorization for a single 1024x1024 complex matrix (Intel Nehalem).
Decision Tree Growing and Pruning on General-Purpose Multicore

Marco Aldinucci, Salvatore Ruggieri, and Massimo Torquati

Abstract—The whole computer hardware industry embraced multicores. The extreme optimisation of sequential algorithms is then no longer sufficient to squeeze the real machine power, which can be only exploited via thread-level parallelism. Decision tree algorithms exhibit natural concurrency that makes them suitable to be parallelised. This paper presents an in-depth study of the parallelisation of an implementation of the C4.5 algorithm for multicore architectures. In addition to the tree growing phase, we cover also the so far unaddressed problem of parallelising the error-based pruning with grafting phase. We characterise elapsed time lower bounds for the forms of parallelisations adopted, and achieve close to optimal performances. Our implementation is based on the FastFlow para...
Smith Waterman vs TBB vs OpenMP vs Cilk
Parallel Computing 2010
From users: Intel or AMD

- We always test on both platforms
  - ....

- Assembler
  - MONITOR/MWAIT instruction appear interesting for non-blocking synchronisations
    - accessible only in Ring 0, why?
    - IBM PowerEN ...

- Memory bandwidth is the key
  - but memory affinity tools appear to be quite primitive in both platforms
    - how data structures are related with access pattern?
    - we are trying to address the problem with patterns ...
A novel two-phase edge preserving parallel de-noising

Maurizio Drocco
University of Torino (MSc. student)
with the support of HPC AC university award
Two-phase denoising + Demo

Original Baboon standard test image 1024x1024

10% impulsive noise

50% impulsive noise

90% impulsive noise

Restored

PNSR 43.29dB MAE 0.35

PNSR 32.75dB MAE 2.67

PNSR 23.4 MAE 11.21
Denoising explained

Adaptive median filter
- different pixels are independent and can be easily processed in parallel
- pixels are read-only

Iterative variational method
- answer to the question: which is the greyscale level that better “integrate” in the surrounding (i.e. keeps edges)
- at each iteration an approximation of restored pixels is available

\[
F_d|_N(u) = \sum_{(i,j)\in N} [ |u_{i,j} - d_{i,j}| + \frac{\beta}{2} (S_1 + S_2) ]
\]

\[
\varphi(t) = |t|^\alpha \text{ with } 1 < \alpha \leq 2
\]

\[
S_1 = \sum_{(m,n)\in V_i,j \cap N} 2 \cdot \varphi(u_{i,j} - d_{m,n})
\]

\[
S_2 = \sum_{(m,n)\in V_i,j \cap N^c} \varphi(u_{i,j} - u_{m,n})
\]
On the algorithm

✳ Adaptive median filters
  ✦ well-known
  ✦ smooth the image if used in rebuilding phase

✳ Variational methods
  ✦ edge-preserving, can be used for any kind of noise
  ✦ the formula is well-known, our algorithm is particularly fast
    ● because we found several loop invariants in the process
  ✦ if used alone can destroy “good” pixels
  ✦ not used up to now because too slow
    ● > 1 h on Matlab to rebuild a 256x256 image with 30% of noise

✳ Coupling them
  ✦ detect: increase the speed by reducing false positives
  ✦ denoise: guarantee a good restoration because “touches” only noisy points
noise 70%

restored

original
Offloading on soft (i.e. not used cores) and HW accelerators
Speedup (multi-core)

4 sockets x 8 core x 2 contexts
Xeon E7-4820 @2.0GHz Sandy Bridge
18MB L3 shared cache, 256K L2
Parallelism exploitation and patterns

✿ Application programmed high-level with FastFlow

✦ using Intel OpenCV
  • be careful, it is not fully thread-safe, all non thread-safe operation should be managed by a single thread (i.e. main)

✦ using offloading support, i.e. wrap a pattern-based code into a soft or HW “accelerator”
  • nice technique to port existing legacy code with very low effort
  • support for “semi-automatic” loop streamization

✿ Let us understand how through an example

✦ Two-phase denoising - video version
#include <opencv/highgui.h>
#include <opencv/cv.h>

int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
    CvCapture *capture;
    IplImage * frame,clean_frame;
    char key;
    vector<noisy_t> noisy;
    cvNamedWindow("Video", CV_WINDOW_AUTOSIZE);
    capture = cvCreateCameraCapture(CV_CAP_ANY);
    //capture = cvCreateFileCapture("/path/to/your/video/test.avi");
    while(true) {
        frame = cvQueryFrame(capture);  // get a frame from device
        noisy = myDetect(frame);        // detect noisy pixels
        clean_frame = myDenoise(frame,noisy);  // denoise the frame
        cvShowImage("Video", clean_frame);  // show the denoised frame
        key = cvWaitKey(100);
    }
    cvReleaseCapture(&capture);
    cvDestroyWindow("Video");
}
Denoising explained

**Adaptive median filter**

- Different pixels are independent and can be easily processed in parallel
- Pixels are read-only

**Iterative variational method**

- Answer to the question: which is the greyscale level that better “integrate” in the surrounding (i.e. keeps edges)
- At each iteration an approximation of restored pixels is available

In the video case the two stages can be pipelined on m-core+m-core m-core+GPGPU GPGPU+GPGPU

and you haven’t to decide it at design time o port the code

---

**pipeline**

```
map p in pixels
while (winsize<MAX)
  if (homogenous(p,winsize))
    winsize++;
  else if isImpluse(p) return NOISY;
return NOT_NOISY;
```

**detect**

```
while !fixpoint
  map u in N (noisy pixels)
    new_u = value_that_minimize F(u);
reduce(u in N,new_u in NEW_N, diff);
```

**denoise**

```
F_u|N(u) = \sum_{(i,j)\in N} [|u_{i,j} - d_{i,j}| + \frac{\beta}{2}(S_1 + S_2)]
\varphi(t) = |t|^\alpha \text{ with } 1 < \alpha \leq 2
S_1 = \sum_{(m,n)\in V_{i,j}\cap N} 2 \cdot \varphi(u_{i,j} - d_{m,n})
S_2 = \sum_{(m,n)\in V_{i,j}\cap N^c} \varphi(u_{i,j} - u_{m,n})
```
Single design - many implementations

Sequential

Parallel - Farm(Pipeline(myDetect, myDenoise))

Changing the structure does not require re-writing business code (gray)
Single design - many implementations

Sequential

Parallel - Pipeline(myDetect, Map(myDenoise))

Changing the structure does not require re-writing business code (gray)
Single design - many implementations

Sequential

Parallel - \texttt{Farm(Pipeline(myDetect, Map(myDenoise)))}

Changing the structure does not require re-writing business code (gray)
## FF multi-core vs FF hybrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>noise</th>
<th>FF 32 cores Intel 4x8x2 2GHz</th>
<th>FF 8 cores (detect) + Tesla C2050 (denoise)</th>
<th>Seq Intel 4x8x2 2GHz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lena 512x512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8 s</td>
<td>1.9 s</td>
<td>32 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5 s</td>
<td>2.3 s</td>
<td>162 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>10.9 s</td>
<td>2.8 s</td>
<td>290 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space 4096x4096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>78 s</td>
<td>12 s</td>
<td>2093 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>373 s</td>
<td>46 s</td>
<td>10400 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>665 s</td>
<td>77 s</td>
<td>18571 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demo
Nondeterministic variants & Convergence speed

❄ flat (used in CUDA version)
  - use block halo, block size = 1
  - do independent
  - deterministic - slow convergence
  - easy CPU and GPU - can be linearized

❄ border
  - use block halo
  - do independent on tiles, do across within tiles
  - nondeterministic - fast convergence
  - easy on CPU and GPU - cannot be linearized

❄ std (used in multicore version)
  - don’t use a block halo
  - do independent on tiles, do across within tiles
  - nondeterministic - fast convergence
  - easy CPU and GPU - cannot be linearized

❄ cluster
  - do independent on tiles, do across within tiles
  - deterministic - fast convergence
  - easy on CPU, difficult on GPU - can be linearized

![Graph showing PSNR vs. n. cycles for different variants.](image: space, size: 2048x2048, noise: 90%)
Conclusions

FastFlow C++ pattern-based framework

- A tiny, lightweight & open research framework
  - 2 years old - 6K downloads - 30K contacts - x86/PPC/ARM(?) + Linux/Mac/Win
  - Adopted as one run-time technology in ParaPhrase
  - Laboratory to experiment new run-time solutions
    - GPGPU integration (working on), Infiniband RDMA integration (working on), HW blocking reads (thinking on), HW transactional mem (thinking on) ...
    - Stream-specific parallel memory allocator: faster than TBB (testing)

- A step forward in parallel programming models
  - Data-centric, focus on messaging and synchronization, thread model agnostic
  - support both message passing and shared memory

- High-level = performance & portability
  - Speedup starting from ~20 clock cycles workload on standard x86_64 (TBB ~ 50K)
  - FF/AVX Smith-Waterman among fastest existing SW solutions
  - Tested on dozen of apps, comparable or faster than TBB/OpenMP
Conclusions

✴ GPGPUs
  ✦ Needs high-level, CUDA/OpenCL too close to the metal
  ✦ Well integrate with functional style and higher order partterns

✴ Two-phase denoising
  ✦ Novel, fast and efficient
    • Works up to 95% or noise, comparable to jpeg on 50% of noise
  ✦ CPU/GPGPUs/Hybrid
  ✦ Edge-preserving restoration works also for other kinds of noise
    • Working on detection and color images
Thank you
FF-allocator (written in FF)

- Faster than posix, often faster than hoard and TBB
  - unpublished, but available on sourceforge
  - needs lot of comparative testing to be published
- Implements deferred deallocation to avoid ABA problem (i.e. garbage collection)

The graph is now cyclic and needs unbound queues to avoid deadlocks
On programming model

- Shared memory or message passing (data)
  + message passing (synchronisations)
  ✦ Graphs exactly describes the (true) data dependency pattern
  ✦ Additional synchronisations can be added (e.g. locks) in the user code

- Queue can pass pointers or data
  ✦ Passing data means copying it. A proper usage of allocator might significantly enhance locality. Copying non strictly needed data is overhead.
  ✦ The balance depends on the application. Should be studied more.
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