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Variable Sharing in OpenMP
OpenMP synchronization issues
OpenMP performance issues

November 4, 2015
Lecture 22
Quote of the Day

“You have power over your mind - not outside events. Realize this, and you will find strength.”

-- Marcus Aurelius, Roman Emperor
121 AD -- 180 AD
Before We Get Started

● Issues covered last time:
  ● Work sharing in OpenMP
    ● Parallel for
    ● Parallel sections
    ● Parallel tasks
  ● Data sharing OpenMP

● Today’s topics
  ● Data sharing in OpenMP, wrap up
  ● OpenMP, caveats

● Other issues:
  ● Assignment: HW07 - due today at 11:59 PM
  ● HW08 assigned today, posted on the class website
  ● Final project proposal: 2 pages, due on 11/13 at 11:59 pm (Learn@UW dropbox)
Functional Level Parallelism Using omp sections

```c
#pragma omp parallel sections
{
    #pragma omp section
        double a = alice();
    #pragma omp section
        double b = bob();
    #pragma omp section
        double k = kate();
}

double s = boss(a, b);
printf ("%6.2f\n", bigboss(s,k));
```
Left: not good. “a” value garbage outside scope of the section
Right: good.

```c
#pragma omp parallel sections
{
    #pragma omp section
    {
        double a = alice();
    }
    #pragma omp section
    {
        double b = bob();
    }
    #pragma omp section
    {
        double k = kate();
    }
}

double s = boss(a, b);
printf ("%6.2f\n", bigboss(s,k));
```
using namespace std;
typedef list<double> LISTDBL;

void doSomething(LISTDBL::iterator& itrtr) {
    *itrtr *= 2.;
}

int main() {
    LISTDBL test; // default constructor
    LISTDBL::iterator it;

    for( int i=0; i<4; ++i)
        for( int j=0; j<8; ++j) test.insert(test.end(), pow(10.0, i+1)+j);
    for( it = test.begin(); it!= test.end(); it++)
        cout << *it << endl;

    it = test.begin();
    #pragma omp parallel num_threads(8)
    {
        #pragma omp single
        {
            while( it != test.end() ) {
                #pragma omp task firstprivate(it)
                {
                    doSomething(it);
                }
                it++;
            }
        }
    }
    for( it = test.begin(); it != test.end(); it++)
        cout << *it << endl;
    return 0;
}
Data Scoping, Words of Wisdom

- When in doubt, explicitly indicate who’s what

- Data scoping: common sources of errors in OpenMP
  - It takes some practice before you understand default behavior
  - Scoping: Not always intuitive
```c
#pragma omp parallel shared(a,b,c,d,nthreads) private(i,tid)
{
    tid = omp_get_thread_num();
    if (tid == 0) {
        nthreads = omp_get_num_threads();
        printf("Number of threads = %d\n", nthreads);
    }

    printf("Thread %d starting...\n",tid);

#pragma omp sections nowait
{
    #pragma omp section
    {
        printf("Thread %d doing section 1\n",tid);
        for (i=0; i<N; i++)
        {
            c[i] = a[i] + b[i];
            printf("Thread %d: c[%d]= %f\n",tid,i,c[i]);
        }
    }

    #pragma omp section
    {
        printf("Thread %d doing section 2\n",tid);
        for (i=0; i<N; i++)
        {
            d[i] = a[i] * b[i];
            printf("Thread %d: d[%d]= %f\n",tid,i,d[i]);
        }
    }
} /* end of sections */

printf("Thread %d done.\n",tid);
} /* end of parallel section */
```

When in doubt, explicitly indicate who’s what

Q: Do you see any problem with this piece of code?
Example: Shared & Private Vars.

A, index, and count are shared by all threads, but temp is local to each thread.
More on Variable Scoping: Fibonacci Sequence

- Start with
  - $F_0 = 0$
  - $F_1 = 1$

- Recursion formula
  - $F_N = F_{N-1} + F_{N-2}$
    - $N \geq 2$
Example: Data Scoping Issue - fib

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <omp.h>

int fib(int);

int main()
{
    int n = 10;
    omp_set_num_threads(4);

    #pragma omp parallel
    {
        #pragma omp single
        printf("fib(%d) = %d\n", n, fib(n));
    }
}
```
Example: Data Scoping Issue - `fib`

Assume that the parallel region exists outside of `fib` and that `fib` and the tasks inside it are in the dynamic extent of a parallel region.

```c
int fib (int n) {
    int x, y;
    if (n < 2) return n;
#pragma omp task
    x = fib(n-1);
#pragma omp task
    y = fib(n-2);
#pragma omp taskwait
    return x+y;
}
```

What's wrong here?

- Values of the private variables not available outside of tasks
- `n` is private in both tasks
- `x` is a private variable
- `y` is a private variable
- This is important - wait here on the completion of the child tasks spawned (two of them)
Example: Data Scoping Issue - \texttt{fib}

```c
int fib ( int n ) {
    int x, y;
    if ( n < 2 ) return n;
    #pragma omp task
    {
        x = fib(n-1);
    }
    #pragma omp task
    {
        y = fib(n-2);
    }
    #pragma omp taskwait

    return x+y
}
```

Values of the private variables not available outside of task definition

- \texttt{x} is a private variable
- \texttt{y} is a private variable

Example: Data Scoping Issue - fib

```
Values of the private variables not available outside of task definition
```

[IOMPP] →
Example: Data Scoping Issue - fib

```c
int fib ( int n ) {
    int x, y;
    if ( n < 2 ) return n;
#pragma omp task shared(x)
    x = fib(n-1);
#pragma omp task shared(y)
    y = fib(n-2);
#pragma omp taskwait

    return x+y;
}
```

- `n` is private in both tasks.
- `x` & `y` are now shared.
- We need both values to compute the sum.

The values of the `x` & `y` variables will be available outside each task construct – after the taskwait.
#include <stdio.h>
#include <omp.h>

int main(void) {
    const int N = 3;
    int a[3] = { 2, 4, 6 };  
    int b[3] = { 1, 3, 5 }; 
    int c[3], d[3]; 
    int i, tid, nthreads;

    #pragma omp parallel private(i,tid) shared(a,b) 
    {
        tid = omp_get_thread_num();
        if (tid == 0) {
            nthreads = omp_get_num_threads();
            printf("Number of threads = %d\n", nthreads);
        }
        printf("Thread %d starting...\n", tid);

        #pragma omp sections
        {
            #pragma omp section
            {
                printf("Thread %d doing section 1\n", tid);
                for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
                    c[i] = a[i] + b[i];
                    printf("Thread %d: c[%d]= %d\n", tid, i, c[i]);
                }
            }
            #pragma omp section
            {
                printf("Thread %d doing section 2\n", tid);
                for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
                    d[i] = a[i] * b[i];
                    printf("Thread %d: d[%d]= %d\n", tid, i, d[i]);
                }
            }
            /* end of sections */
            printf("Thread %d done.\n", tid);
        } /* end of parallel section */
    }
    for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
        printf("c[%d] = %d AND d[%d]= %d\n", i, c[i], i, d[i]);
    }
    return 0;
}
```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <omp.h>

int main(void) {
    const int N = 3;
    int a[3] = { 2, 4, 6 };
    int b[3] = { 1, 3, 5 };
    int c[3], d[3];
    int i, tid, nthreads;

    #pragma omp parallel private(i, tid, c, d) shared(a, b)
    {
        tid = omp_get_thread_num();
        if (tid == 0) {
            nthreads = omp_get_num_threads();
            printf("Number of threads = %d\n", nthreads);
        }
        printf("Thread %d starting...\n", tid);

        #pragma omp sections
        {
            #pragma omp section
            {
                printf("Thread %d doing section 1\n", tid);
                for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
                    c[i] = a[i] + b[i];
                    printf("Thread %d: c[%d]= %d\n", tid, i, c[i]);
                }
            }
            #pragma omp section
            {
                printf("Thread %d doing section 2\n", tid);
                for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
                    d[i] = a[i] * b[i];
                    printf("Thread %d: d[%d]= %d\n", tid, i, d[i]);
                }
            }
            /* end of sections */
        }
        printf("Thread %d done.\n", tid);
    } /* end of parallel section */
    for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
        printf("c[%d] = %d AND d[%d]= %d\n", i, c[i], i, d[i]);
    }
    return 0;
}
```

Work Plan

What is OpenMP?
- Parallel regions
- Work sharing
- Data environment

Synchronization

● Advanced topics
Implicit Barriers

- Several OpenMP constructs have *implicit* barriers
  - parallel – necessary barrier – cannot be removed
  - for
  - single

- Unnecessary barriers hurt performance and can be removed with the *nowait* clause
  - The *nowait* clause is applicable to:
    - for clause
    - single clause
Nowait Clause

- Use when threads unnecessarily wait between independent computations

```c
#pragma omp for nowait
for(...) 
{...};

#pragma omp single nowait
{ [...] }
```

```c
#pragma omp for schedule(dynamic,1) nowait
for(int i=0; i<n; i++)
    a[i] = bigFunc1(i);

#pragma omp for schedule(dynamic,1)
for(int j=0; j<m; j++)
    b[j] = bigFunc2(j);
```

Credit: IOMPP
Barrier Construct

- Explicit barrier synchronization
- Each thread waits until all threads arrive

```c
#pragma omp parallel shared(A, B, C)
{
    DoSomeWork(A, B); // input is A, output is B
    #pragma omp barrier
    DoMoreWork(B, C); // input is B, output is C
}
```

Credit: IOMPP
Atomic Construct

- Code runs ok sequentially (left)
- OpenMP code doesn’t run ok (right)

```c
for (i = 0; i < 8; i++) {
    x[index[i]] += work1(i);
    y[i] += work2(i);
}
```

```c
#pragma omp parallel for
for (i = 0; i < 8; i++) {
    x[index[i]] += work1(i);
    y[i] += work2(i);
}
```

index[0] = 5;
index[1] = 3;
index[2] = 4;
index[3] = 0;
index[4] = 5;
index[5] = 5;
index[6] = 2;
index[7] = 1;
Atomic Construct

- Applies only to simple update of memory location
- Special case of a `critical` section, discussed shortly
  - Atomic introduces less overhead than `critical`

```c
#pragma omp parallel for shared(x, y, index)
  for (i = 0; i < 8; i++) {
#pragma omp atomic
    x[index[i]] += work1(i);
    y[i] += work2(i);
  }
```
Synchronisation, Words of Wisdom

- Barriers can be very expensive
  - Typically 1000s cycles to synchronise

- Avoid barriers via:
  - *Careful* use of the NOWAIT clause
  - Parallelize at the outermost level possible
    - May require re-ordering of loops +/- indexes
  - Choice of CRITICAL / ATOMIC / lock routines may impact performance

Credit: Alan Real
Example: Dot Product

```c
float dot_prod(float* a, float* b, int N)
{
    float sum = 0.0;
    #pragma omp parallel for
    for(int i=0; i<N; i++) {
        sum += a[i] * b[i];
    }
    return sum;
}
```

This is not good.
Race Condition

- Definition, *race condition*: two or more threads access a shared variable at the same time.
  - Leads to nondeterministic behavior

- For example, suppose that *area* is shared and both Thread A and Thread B are executing the statement
  
  `area += 4.0 / (1.0 + x*x);`
Two Possible Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of area</th>
<th>Thread A</th>
<th>Thread B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Order of thread execution causes non-determinant behavior in a data race

Credit: IOMPP
Protect Shared Data

- The **critical** construct: protects access to shared, modifiable data
- The critical section allows only one thread to enter it at a given time

```c
float dot_prod(float* a, float* b, int N) {
    float sum = 0.0;
    #pragma omp parallel for shared(sum)
    for(int i=0; i<N; i++) {
        #pragma omp critical
        sum += a[i] * b[i];
    }
    return sum;
}
```

Credit: IOMPP
OpenMP Critical Construct

```
#pragma omp critical [(lock_name)]
```

- Defines a critical region on a structured block

 Threads wait their turn – only one at a time calls consum() thereby preventing race conditions

Naming the critical construct RES_lock is optional but highly recommended

```
float RES;
#pragma omp parallel
{
#pragma omp critical (RES_lock)
  float B = big_job(i);
  consum(B, RES);
}
```
reduction Example

```
#pragma omp parallel for reduction(+:sum)
    for(i=0; i<N; i++) {
        sum += a[i] * b[i];
    }
```

- Local copy of `sum` for each thread engaged in the reduction is private
  - Each local sum initialized to the identity operand associated with the operator that comes into play
    - Here we have “+”, so it’s a zero (0)

- All local copies of `sum` added together and stored in “global” variable
OpenMP **reduction** Clause

- **reduction (op:list)**

- The variables in `list` will be shared in the enclosing parallel region.

- Here’s what happens inside the parallel or work-sharing construct:
  - A private copy of each list variable is created and initialized depending on the “op”.
  - These copies are updated locally by threads.

- At end of construct, local copies are combined through “op” into a single value.
OpenMP Reduction Example: Numerical Integration

\[ \int_{0}^{1} \frac{4.0}{1+x^2} \, dx = \pi \]

```c
static long num_steps=100000;
double step, pi;

void main() {
    int i;
    double x, sum = 0.0;

    step = 1.0/(double) num_steps;
    for (i=0; i< num_steps; i++){
        x = (i+0.5)*step;
        sum = sum + 4.0/(1.0 + x*x);
    }
    pi = step * sum;
    printf("Pi = %f\n",pi);
}
```
OpenMP Reduction Example: Numerical Integration

```c
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include "omp.h"

int main(int argc, char* argv[]) {
    int num_steps = atoi(argv[1]);
    double step = 1./(double(num_steps));
    double sum;

    #pragma omp parallel for reduction(+:sum)
    {
        for(int i=0; i<num_steps; i++) {
            double x = (i + .5)*step;
            sum += 4.0/(1.0 + x*x);
        }
    }

    double my_pi = sum*step;
    printf("Value of integral is: %f\n", my_pi);
    return 0;
}
```
A range of associative operands can be used with reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operand</th>
<th>Initial Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operand</th>
<th>Initial Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td>~0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;&amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credit: IOMPP
OpenMP Performance Issues
Performance

- Easy to write OpenMP yet hard to write an efficient program

- Five main causes of poor performance:
  - Sequential code
  - Communication
  - Load imbalance
  - Synchronisation
  - Compiler (non-)optimisation.
Sequential Code

- Corollary to Amdahl’s law: A code that has been parallelized will never run faster than the sum of the parts executed sequentially
  - If most of the code continues to run sequentially, parallelization not going to make a difference

- Solution: Go back and understand whether you can approach the solution from a different perspective that exposes more parallelism

- Thinking within the context of OpenMP
  - All code outside of parallel regions and inside MASTER, SINGLE and CRITICAL directives is sequential
  - This code should be as small as possible.
Communication

- On shared memory machines, which is where OpenMP operates, communication is “disguised” as increased memory access costs.
  - It takes longer to access data in main memory or another processor’s cache than it does from local cache.

- Memory accesses are expensive
  - ~100 cycles for a main memory access compared to 1-3 cycles for a flop.

- Unlike message passing, communication is spread throughout the program
  - Hard to analyse and monitor
  - NOTE: Message passing discussed next week. Programmer manages the movement of data through messages

Credit: Alan Real
Caches and Coherency

- Shared memory programming assumes that a shared variable has a unique value at a given time

- Speeding up sequential computation: done through use of large caches

- Caching consequence: multiple copies of a physical memory location may exist at different hardware locations

- For program correctness, caches must be kept coherent

- Coherency operations are usually performed on the cache lines in the level of cache closest to memory
  - LLC last level cache: high end systems these days: LLC is level 3 cache
    - Can have 45 MB of L3 cache on a high end Intel CPU

- There is much overhead that goes into cache coherence

Credit: Alan Real
What Does MESI Mean to You?
MESI: Invalidation-Based Coherence Protocol

- Cache lines have state bits.
- Data migrates between processor caches, state transitions maintain coherence.

- **MESI** Protocol has four states: M: Modified, E: Exclusive, S: Shared, I: Invalid

1. Read “x”

   Processor A’s Cache
   
   ![X]
   
   **I → E**
   
   “exclusive”
   
   ![X]
   
   **E → S**
   
   “shared”
   
   ![X]
   
   **S → M**
   
   “modified/ dirty”

   Processor B’s Cache
   
   ![X]
   
   **I → S**
   
   “shared”

2. Read “x”

   ![X]
   
   **I → S**
   
   “shared”

3. Write “x”

   ![X]
   
   **S → M**
   
   “modified/ dirty”

   ![X]
   
   **S → I**
   
   “invalid”

   Cache line was invalidated

[J. Marathe]→
Further simplify MESI for sake of simple discussion on next slide

- Assume now that each cache line can exist in one of 3 states:
  - Exclusive: the only valid copy in any cache
  - Read-only: a valid copy but other caches may contain it
  - Invalid: out of date and cannot be used

In this simplified coherency model

- A READ on an invalid or absent cache line will be cached as read-only or exclusive
- A WRITE on a line not in an exclusive state will cause all other copies to be marked invalid and the written line to be marked exclusive
Coherency example

Credit: Alan Real