## SOLUTIONS TO INF3380 PROBLEMS, WEEK 3

## Exercise 1

It makes sense to initially distribute $\left\lfloor\frac{n}{P}\right\rfloor$ tasks to each process.
(Here $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ simply means "round down.")
If we are lucky, this accounts for all the tasks, but in general we are left with a remainder term $r$ that is somewhere between 0 and $P-1$. In code, this is simply

```
int init_dist = n / P;
int remainder = n % P;
1
```

If we label the processes by $p_{0}, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{P}$, it is logical to distribute the $r$ remaining tasks among the $r$ first processes, $p_{0}, p_{1}, \ldots, p_{r-1}$. We can easily implement this in code:

```
int my_tasksize, tasksize_total, myrank, numprocs;
// Find out myrank, numprocs, tasksize_total here
// ...
my_tasksize = tasksize_total / numprocs;
if (myrank < tasksize_total % numprocs) my_tasksize ++;
```

Exercise 2
Directly:

|  | Worker 0 | Worker 1 | Worker 2 | Worker 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t=0 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T0 | (idle) | (idle) | (idle) |
| $t=10 \mathrm{~min}$ | T0 complete; begin T1 | Begin T2 | (idle) | (idle) |
| $t=20 \mathrm{~min}$ | T1 complete; begin T3 | (etc.) Begin T4 | Begin T5 | Begin T6 |
| $t=30 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T7 | Begin T8 | Begin T9 | Begin T10 |
| $t=40 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T11 | Begin T12 | Begin T13 | Begin T14 |
| $t=50 \mathrm{~min}$ | T11 complete | T12 complete | T13 complete | T14 complete |

Note that there is nothing to be gained from increasing the number of workers to 5,6 or 7 .

[^0]A similar table for 3 workers:

|  | Worker 0 | Worker 1 | Worker 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t=0 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T0 | (idle) | (idle) |
| $t=10 \mathrm{~min}$ | T0 complete; begin T1 | Begin T2 | (idle) |
| $t=20 \mathrm{~min}$ | T1 complete; begin T3 | (etc.) Begin T4 | Begin T5 |
| $t=30 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T6 | Begin T7 | Begin T8 |
| $t=40 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T9 | Begin T10 | Begin T11 |
| $t=50 \mathrm{~min}$ | Begin T12 | Begin T13 | Begin T14 |
| $t=60 \mathrm{~min}$ | Complete | Complete | Complete |

## Exercise 3

We'll label the processes $p_{i, j}$, where $0 \leq i \leq P-1,0 \leq j \leq Q-1$. We can split the problem into two one-dimensional problems of the exercise 1 variety, that is, we demand that each process will have a workload of size $k_{i} \times l_{j}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k_{i}=\left\lfloor\frac{m}{P}\right\rfloor+e_{i}, \\
& l_{j}=\left\lfloor\frac{n}{Q}\right\rfloor+f_{j},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
1 & \text { if } i<m \bmod P, \\
0 & \text { otherwise } .
\end{array}\right. \\
& f_{j}=\left\{\begin{array}{lc}
1 & \text { if } j<n \bmod Q \\
0 & \text { otherwise } .
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

(This is a nice demonstration of how there's no problem simple enough that you can't make it indecipherable with math.)

Again translated into C code:

```
int k, l, m, n, mycoords[2], numprocs_cartesian[2];
// Find out mycoords, numprocs_cartesian, m, n here
// ...
k = m / numprocs_cartesian[0];
if (mycoords[0] < m % numprocs_cartesian[0]) k ++;
l = n / numprocs_cartesian[1];
if (mycoords[1] < n % numprocs_cartesian[1]) l ++;
```

Remark: Obviously, this distribution will usually be strictly less fair than the 1 d variant, and it is possible to make more fair distributions if you're willing to divide work with crazier shapes.

More stuff: There is a nice structure to this distribution. Specifically, given any process $p_{i, j}$, its workload is of the same height as all its leftright neighbours; similarly it has the same width as all its above-below neighbours. Okay, so this is a rather trite observation, but it does make for easy communication between neighbouring processes.

## ExERCISE 4

Put $t_{i, j}$ to be subtask $j$ of task $i, 0 \leq i \leq n-1,0 \leq j \leq m-1$; for reference, the pipeline has the following structure.

|  | Stage 0 | Stage 1 | $(\ldots)$ | Stage $m-1$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t=0$ | Begin $t_{0,0}$ |  | $(\ldots)$ |  |
| $t=1$ | Begin $t_{0,1}$ | Begin $t_{1,0}$ | $(\ldots)$ |  |
| $(\ldots)$ | $(\ldots)$ |  |  |  |
| $t=m-1$ | Begin $t_{m-1,0}$ | Begin $t_{m-2,1}$ | $(\ldots)$ | Begin $t_{0, m-1}$ |

As the name suggests, the setup is shaped rather like a pipe, where tasks flow continuously through the pipe from left to right. Subtask $t_{i, j}$ can only commence when the preceding subtasks $t_{i, 0}, t_{i, 1}, \cdots, t_{i-j-1}$ have completed; once a subtask has passed through a stage, the stage is ready to commence work on a new subtask of the same type.

Clearly an entire task takes $m$ time units to pass through the entire $m$ stage pipe, and the final tasks enters the pipe (i.e. reaches stage 0) at time $t=n-1$. Summing up, the final task will commence at time $t=n-1$, all tasks have passed the pipeline at time $T_{\text {pipe }}:=m+n-1$.
(This is of course an extremely simple model. It is possible that some subtasks take more time to complete, or you can dedicate multiple cores to some or all stages.)

## ExERCISE 5

Computing the tasks sequentially takes time $T_{\text {seq }}:=m \cdot n$, so we have

$$
p=\frac{T_{\mathrm{seq}}}{T_{\mathrm{pipe}}}=\frac{m \cdot n}{m+n-1} .
$$

Now it's just a matter of solving for $n$,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
m p+n p-p=m n \\
p(m-1)=n(m-p) \\
n=p \frac{m-1}{m-p}
\end{array}
$$

In particular $p=1$ implies $n=1$, (that is, we get no speedup from sending a single task through the pipeline, which makes sense) and $p \rightarrow m$ implies $n \rightarrow \infty$.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ You should be familiar with the remainder operator $\%$. It is frequently referred to as the modulo operator, which is a great name to use if you want to make it really unclear what it does.

