- CAAM 2nd year graduate student
- B.S. in Math and Applied Math, Zhejiang University, July 2011

Using Time-Skewing Approach to Accelerate Stencil Codes for Acoustic Constant Density Wave Equation

Muhong Zhou

CAAM Rice University

- Finite Difference Formulation for ACD Wave Equation
- Naive Stencil Implementation and Problem Description
- Time-Skewing Approach and Computational Analysis
- Results
- Conclusion

Finite Difference Formulation for ACD Wave Equation

• Acoustic Constant Density(ACD) Wave Equation:

$$\frac{1}{C^2}U_{tt}(t,\vec{X}) - \bigtriangledown_{\vec{X}}^2 U(t,\vec{X}) = 0$$

• Assumption: velocity C is a constant, but in real world it is not!

- $t \in [0, T], \vec{X} \in [0, X] \times [0, Y] \times [0, Z]$
- Initial Condition $\frac{\partial U}{\partial t}(0, \vec{X})$ and $U(0, \vec{X})$.
- Boundary Condition

$$U(0, \vec{X}) = 0$$
 if $x \in \{0, X\}$ or $y \in \{0, Y\}$ or $z \in \{0, Z\}$

Finite Difference Formulation for ACD Wave Equation

- D_i^n : centered difference approximation for second order derivative i: direction, n: error order e.g. $D_t^2 U = \frac{U(t-\delta t, \vec{X})-2U(t, \vec{X})+U(t+\delta t, \vec{X})}{\delta t^2}$
- 2-4 Finite difference formulation for ACD wave equation is:

$$\frac{1}{C^2}D_t^2 U = D_x^4 U + D_y^4 U + D_z^4 U$$

Finite Difference Formulation for ACD Wave Equation

- D_i^n : centered difference approximation for second order derivative i: direction, n: error order e.g. $D_t^2 U = \frac{U(t-\delta t, \vec{X})-2U(t, \vec{X})+U(t+\delta t, \vec{X})}{\delta t^2}$
- 2-4 Finite difference formulation for ACD wave equation is:

$$\frac{1}{C^2}D_t^2 U = D_x^4 U + D_y^4 U + D_z^4 U$$

• $U(t+\delta t, \vec{X}) = -U(t-\delta t, \vec{x}) + 2 * U(t, \vec{x}) + C^2 * \delta t^2 (D_x^4 U + D_y^4 U + D_z^4 U)$

• Data values at three different time steps are involved, and need two data arrays to store these temporary data values

- Grid: $\delta x, \delta y, \delta z$ are unit distances on each direction
- Up[i][j][k] represents $U(t \delta t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$
- Uc[i][j][k] represents $U(t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$

- Grid: $\delta x, \delta y, \delta z$ are unit distances on each direction
- Up[i][j][k] represents $U(t \delta t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$
- Uc[i][j][k] represents $U(t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$
- Using Up and Uc to get $U(t + \delta t, \vec{X})$ and store it into Up

- Grid: $\delta x, \delta y, \delta z$ are unit distances on each direction
- Up[i][j][k] represents $U(t \delta t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$
- Uc[i][j][k] represents $U(t, i * \delta x, j * \delta y, k * \delta z)$
- Using Up and Uc to get $U(t + \delta t, \vec{X})$ and store it into Up

```
• Up[i][j][k] = Stencil(Up[i][j][k], Uc)
```

• Update rule for NAIVE stencil codes:



Figure: Corresponding stencil of order 2, Up[i][]] and Uc[i-2:i+2][][] planes



Figure: Westmere Chip¹ memory size and latency²: L3~12MB(shared)/17cycles, RAM~4GB/198cycles.

¹http://sc.tamu.edu/systems/eos/Westmere-iDP.php

²Performance Tuning for CPU, Marat Dukhan



Figure: Westmere Chip¹ memory size and latency²: L3 \sim 12MB(shared)/17cycles, RAM \sim 4GB/198cycles.

 Drawback of naive implementation Grid size: 260*260*260 (small problem size) Total memory required for storing two arrays: 134.09MB

¹http://sc.tamu.edu/systems/eos/Westmere-iDP.php

²Performance Tuning for CPU, Marat Dukhan

Muhong Zhou (CAAM)



Figure: Cached data points at the start(a) of the iteration and at the end(b) of the iteration. Each array data gets evicted out of cache at each iteration.

All data array elements get loaded into the cache for at least once per iteration.

• To increase data utilization in cache - cache blocking?



Figure: (a) Naive stencil implementation; (b) Stencil implementation by blocking in three dimensions

 $^{^3}$ Optimization and Performance Modeling of Stencil Computations on Modern Microprocessors. K. Datta, K.

Yellick etc. SIAM Review, Dec. 2008

• To increase data utilization in cache - cache blocking?



Figure: (a) Naive stencil implementation; (b) Stencil implementation by blocking in three dimensions

• But this technique is no longer effective for "practical" data sets³ Because: 1. prefetching mechanism, 2. growing on-chip cache size

Muhong Zhou (CAAM)

³Optimization and Performance Modeling of Stencil Computations on Modern Microprocessors. K. Datta, K. Yellick etc. *SIAM Review*, Dec. 2008

• Time-Skewing Approach⁴: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





⁴David G. Wonnacott http://www.haverford.edu/computerscience/faculty//davew/

• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps





• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

) Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps

Up[k][][]



• Time-Skewing Approach: by blocking in time dimension, each array element gets loaded into the cache at least once every TS time steps



Up[k][][]

• Number of cached planes: 2WS+4TS (If WS = 4 then TS<=9)

Results

Figure: Run time results of different approaches⁵.



 $^{5}\,\text{Platform:}$ DAVinCI Westmere processor at Rice University, Compiler: icc with -O2 turned on

TRIP13

Results

Figure: Total number of L3 cache misses counted by PAPI via HPCTookkit⁶.



Muhong Zhou (CAAM)

⁶Platform: DAVinCI Westmere processor at Rice University, Compiler: icc with -O2 turned on, Sample period: 10000000 cycles, Overhead: <1%

- Apply Time-Skewing approach on ACD wave equation.
- Parameter tuning and measure the codes' performances.
- Current:
 - Integrated into IWAVE
 - Develop function to transform naive stencil codes to time-skewing code
 - Extend to higher order stencil
 - Modify the domain decomposition scheme in IWAVE
- Application: Accelerate IWAVE computation kernel

Thanks! Questions?