Chapter 9
Parallel Algorithms

Algorithm Theory
WS 2014/15

Fabian Kuhn

Models

- A large variety of models, e.g.:

- **PRAM** (Parallel Random Access Machine)
  - Classical model for parallel computations
- **Shared Memory**
  - Classical model to study coordination / agreement problems, distributed data structures, …
- **Message Passing** (fully connected topology)
  - Closely related to shared memory models
- Message Passing in **Networks**
  - Decentralized computations, large parallel machines, comes in various flavors…

PRAM

- Parallel version of RAM model
- p processors, shared random access memory

Similar: shared memory



- Basic operations / access to shared memory cost 1
- Processor operations are synchronized
- Focus on parallelizing computation rather than cost of communication, locality, faults, asynchrony, …

Other Parallel Models

- **Message passing:** Fully connected network, local memory and information exchange using messages

- **Dynamic Multithreaded Algorithms:** Simple parallel programming paradigm
  - E.g., used in Cormen, Leiserson, Rivest, Stein (CLRS)

```
FIB(n)
1  if n < 2
2      then return n
3  x ← spawn FIB(n − 1)
4  y ← spawn FIB(n − 2)
5  sync
6  return (x + y)
```



Parallel Computations

Sequential Computation:

- Sequence of operations

Parallel Computation:

- Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)



Parallel Computations

T_p: time to perform comp. with p procs

- T_1: **work** (total # operations)
  - Time when doing the computation sequentially
- T_∞: **critical path / span**
  - Time when parallelizing as much as possible
- **Lower Bounds**:

$$T_p \geq \left\lceil \frac{T_1}{p} \right\rceil \qquad T_p \geq T_\infty$$



Parallel Computations

T_p: time to perform comp. with p procs

- **Lower Bounds**:

$$T_p \geq \frac{T_1}{p}, \qquad T_p \geq T_\infty$$

- **Parallelism**: $\frac{T_1}{T_\infty}$
  - maximum possible speed-up

- **Linear Speed-up**:

$$\frac{T_1}{T_p} = \Theta(p)$$



Scheduling

- How to assign operations to processors?

- Generally an online problem
  - When scheduling some jobs/operations, we do not know how the computation evolves over time

Greedy (offline) scheduling:

- Order jobs/operations as they would be scheduled optimally with ∞ processors (topological sort of DAG)
  - Easy to determine: With ∞ processors, one always schedules all jobs/ops that can be scheduled
- Always schedule as many jobs/ops as possible
- Schedule jobs/ops in the same order as with ∞ processors
  - i.e., jobs that become available earlier have priority

Brent's Theorem

Brent's Theorem: On p processors, a parallel computation can be performed in time

$$T_p \leq \frac{T_1 - T_\infty}{p} + T_\infty.$$

Proof:

- Greedy scheduling achieves this…
- #operations scheduled with ∞ processors in round i: x_i



Brent's Theorem

Brent's Theorem: On p processors, a parallel computation can be performed in time

$$T_p \leq \frac{T_1 - T_\infty}{p} + T_\infty.$$

Proof:

- Greedy scheduling achieves this…
- #operations scheduled with ∞ processors in round i: x_i

$T_1 = \sum_i x_i$

P processors

t_i : time to schedule x_i operations

$$t_i = \lceil \frac{x_i}{p} \rceil \leq \frac{x_i}{p} + \frac{p-1}{p} = \frac{x_i - 1}{p} + 1$$

$$T_p^G \leq \sum_{i=1}^{T_\infty} t_i \leq \underbrace{\sum_i \frac{x_i}{p}}_{T_1/p} - \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{T_\infty} \frac{1}{p}}_{T_\infty/p} + \underbrace{\sum_i 1}_{T_\infty} = \frac{T_1 - T_\infty}{p} + T_\infty \leq \frac{T_1}{p} + T_\infty$$

Brent's Theorem

Brent's Theorem: On p processors, a parallel computation can be performed in time

$$T_p \leq \frac{T_1 - T_\infty}{p} + T_\infty.$$

Corollary: Greedy is a 2-approximation algorithm for scheduling.

$T_p^* \geq T_\infty$

$T_p^* \geq \frac{T_1}{p}$

$T_p^G \leq \frac{T_1}{p} + T_\infty \leq 2T_p^*$

parallelism

Corollary: As long as the number of processors $p = O(T_1/T_\infty)$, it is possible to achieve a linear speed-up.

PRAM

Back to the PRAM:

- Shared random access memory, synchronous computation steps
- The PRAM model comes in variants…

EREW (exclusive read, exclusive write):

- Concurrent memory access (to same memory cell) by multiple processors is not allowed
- If two or more processors try to read from or write to the same memory cell concurrently, the behavior is not specified

CREW (concurrent read, exclusive write):

- Reading the same memory cell concurrently is OK
- Two concurrent writes to the same cell lead to unspecified behavior (also concurrent write & read)
- This is the first variant that was considered (already in the 70s)

PRAM

The PRAM model comes in variants…

CRCW (concurrent read, concurrent write):

- Concurrent reads and writes are both OK
- Behavior of concurrent writes has to specified
  - Weak CRCW: concurrent write only OK if all processors write 0
  - Common-mode CRCW: all processors need to write the same value
  - Arbitrary-winner CRCW: adversary picks one of the values
  - Priority CRCW: value of processor with highest ID is written
  - Strong CRCW: largest (or smallest) value is written

- The given models are ordered in strength:

  weak $\leq$ common-mode $\leq$ arbitrary-winner $\leq$ priority $\leq$ strong

Some Relations Between PRAM Models

Theorem: A parallel computation that can be performed in time t, using p processors on a strong CRCW machine, can also be performed in time $O(t \log p)$ using p processors on an EREW machine.

- Each (parallel) step on the CRCW machine can be simulated by $O(\log p)$ steps on an EREW machine

Theorem: A parallel computation that can be performed in time t, using p probabilistic processors on a strong CRCW machine, can also be performed in expected time $O(t \log p)$ using $O(p/\log p)$ processors on an arbitrary-winner CRCW machine.

- The same simulation turns out more efficient in this case

Some Relations Between PRAM Models

Theorem: A computation that can be performed in time t, using p processors on a strong CRCW machine, can also be performed in time $O(t)$ using $O(p^2)$ processors on a weak CRCW machine

Proof:

- Strong: largest value wins, weak: only concurrently writing 0 is OK

Simulate 1 step of a strong CRCW PRAM on a weak CRCW PRAM

Processors: strong CRCW: $1,\dots,p$

additional proc: q_{ij} for every pair (i,j), $i,j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$

additional mem. cells:

for all $i \in \{1,\dots,p\}$: f_i, V_i, a_i (initialized to 0)

if process i wants to write x to mem. cell c (in strong CRCW alg.)

↳ $f_i := 1$ $V_i := x$ $a_i := c$

Some Relations Between PRAM Models

Theorem: A computation that can be performed in time t, using p processors on a strong CRCW machine, can also be performed in time $O(t)$ using $O(p^2)$ processors on a weak CRCW machine

Proof:

- Strong: largest value wins, weak: only concurrently writing 0 is OK

Proc i wants to write x to cell c $f_i := 1$, $v_i := x$, $a_i := c$

$\forall i,j$: $q_{i,j}$ reads $f_i, f_j, v_i, v_j, a_i, a_j$ (assume $i < j$)

if $f_i = f_j = 1$ and $a_i = a_j$ then

if $v_j \geq v_i$ then $f_i := 0$

else $f_j := 0$

concurrent writes are OK

---

proc. i writes v_i to mem. cell a_i iff $f_i = 1$

Computing the Maximum

Observation: On a strong CRCW machine, the maximum of a n values can be computed in $O(1)$ time using n processors

- Each value is concurrently written to the same memory cell

Lemma: On a weak CRCW machine, the maximum of n integers between 1 and $\sqrt{n}$ can be computed in time $O(1)$ using $O(n)$ proc.

Proof:

- We have $\sqrt{n}$ memory cells $f_1, \dots, f_{\sqrt{n}}$ for the possible values
- Initialize all $f_i := 1$
- For the n values $x_1, \dots, x_n$, processor j sets $f_{x_j} := 0$
  - Since only zeroes are written, concurrent writes are OK
- Now, $f_i = 0$ iff value i occurs at least once
- Strong CRCW machine: max. value in time $O(1)$ w. $O(\sqrt{n})$ proc.
- Weak CRCW machine: time $O(1)$ using $O(n)$ proc. (prev. lemma)

Computing the Maximum

Theorem: If each value can be represented using $O(\log n)$ bits, the maximum of n (integer) values can be computed in time $O(1)$ using $O(n)$ processors on a weak CRCW machine.



Proof:

- First look at $\frac{\log_2 n}{2}$ highest order bits
- The maximum value also has the maximum among those bits
- There are only $\sqrt{n}$ possibilities for these bits
- max. of $\frac{\log_2 n}{2}$ highest order bits can be computed in $O(1)$ time
- For those with largest $\frac{\log_2 n}{2}$ highest order bits, continue with next block of $\frac{\log_2 n}{2}$ bits, …

Prefix Sums

- The following works for any associative binary operator $\oplus$:

  associativity: $(a \oplus b) \oplus c = a \oplus (b \oplus c)$

All-Prefix-Sums: Given a sequence of n values $a_1, \dots, a_n$, the all-prefix-sums operation w.r.t. $\oplus$ returns the sequence of prefix sums:

$$s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n = a_1, a_1 \oplus a_2, a_1 \oplus a_2 \oplus a_3, \dots, a_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_n$$

- Can be computed efficiently in parallel and turns out to be an important building block for designing parallel algorithms

Example: Operator: $+$, input: $a_1, \dots, a_8 = 3, 1, 7, 0, 4, 1, 6, 3$

$s_1, \dots, s_8 = 3, 4, 11, 11, 15, 16, 22, 25$

Computing the Sum

- Let's first look at $s_n = a_1 \oplus a_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus a_n$
- Parallelize using a binary tree:

total # of operations

$T_1 = n-1$

$T_\infty = \Theta(\log n)$

Brent's theorem

$T_p \le \frac{T_1}{p} + T_\infty$

$\le \frac{n}{p} + \log n$

$\Rightarrow p = \Theta(n/\log n)$

$\rightarrow T_p = \Theta(\log n)$



$((a_1 \oplus a_2) \oplus (a_3 \oplus a_4)) \oplus ((a_5 \oplus a_6) \oplus (a_7 \oplus a_8))$