Slow-Down in Parallel SAT

Paper is inconclusive about the reason for slow-down
- probably more threads work on useless sub-tasks
- sharing clauses caching sub-computation increases pressure on memory system
- maybe search space splitting was not a good idea (guiding path)
Low Speedup in Parallel SAT

- sequential SAT algorithms produce proofs of large depth (\(= \text{span}\))
- so need new algorithms which produce low depth proofs
Memory System is Good Enough


- largest speed-up obtained by portfolio approach
  - run different search strategies in parallel
  - if one terminates stop all
  - in practice share some important learned clauses caching sub-computations

- slow-down due to memory system?
  - since memory system (memory / caches / bus) are shared in multi-core systems
  - slow-down not too bad (particularly for solvers with small working set)
  - even though considered memory-bound (but random access)
  - waiting time for memory to arrive overlaps
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Amdahl's Law with Work and Span

\[ T = \text{work} = \text{sequential time} \quad T_p = \text{wall-clock time} \ p \ \text{CPUs} \quad T_\infty = \text{wall-clock time} \ \infty \ \text{CPUs} \]

**Speedup** \[ S_p = \frac{T}{T_p} \]

*span* critical path (also called “makespan” in the context of scheduling)

\[ f = \text{fraction of sequential work, thus} \quad f = \frac{\text{span}}{\text{work}} \]

**simplified Amdahl’s law in terms of work and span:** \[ S_p \leq \frac{1}{f} = \frac{\text{work}}{\text{span}} \]

Reduce *span* as much as possible:

- keep sequential blocks short! \[ \Rightarrow \text{fine grained locking is evil} \]
- keep sequential dependencies short! \[ \Rightarrow \text{(non-logarithmic) loops are evil} \]
Pebble Games

Given a directed acyclic graph with one sink.

Nodes of the graph have a pebble or not.

One step can either . . .

. . . remove a pebble from a node . . .
. . . or add a new pebble to a node without one, . . .
. . . but only if all its predecessor have a pebble.

Goal is to only have a pebble on the sink node.

What is the smallest maximum number of pebbles needed?

common concept in complexity theory
assuming intermediate results have to be stored
relates to smallest $p$ needed to reach maximum speed-up
this version (black pebble game) actually only gives space bounds
Sum

compute sum $\sum_{1}^{n} x_i$ for $n$ numbers $x_i$ in parallel

- sequential
  - $y_0 = 0$, $y_{i+1} = y_i + x_i$ for $i = 1 \ldots n - 1$
  - work $= T = \mathcal{O}(n)$ $(n - 1)$ additions
  - span $= \mathcal{O}(n)$ too
  - since $y_{i+1}$ depends on all previous $y_j$ with $j \leq i$
  - thus no speed-up $S_p = \mathcal{O}(1)$

- parallel
  - associativity allows to regroup computation
  - work $= \mathcal{O}(n)$ remains the same
  - span $= \mathcal{O}(\log n)$ reduces exponentially
  - speed-up not ideal but $S_n = \mathcal{O}(n/\log n)$
  - note $p > n$ does not make sense
compute all sums \( s_j = \sum_{1}^{j} x_i \) for all \( j = 1 \ldots n \) and again \( n \) numbers \( x_i \) in parallel

sequential version as in previous slide

parallel version needs a second depth \( \mathcal{O}(\log n) \) pass

works even “in place” (first pass overwrites original \( x_i \))

but actual “wiring” complicated

still \( \text{span} = \mathcal{O}(\log n) \)

basic algorithmic idea for many “parallel” algorithms (propagate and generate adders with prefix trees instead of ripple carry adders)
List Ranking / Pointer Jumping

determine distance to head of list:

as long there is \( i \) with \( \text{next}[i] \neq \bot \):

\[
\text{val}[i] += \text{val}[\text{next}[i]]
\]

\[
\text{next}[i] = \text{next}[\text{next}[i]]
\]
Sorting Networks

- circuits for sorting fixed number $n$ of inputs
  - basic “gate” compare-and-swap:
    \[
    \text{cmpswap}(x, y) := (\min(x, y), \max(x, y))
    \]
  - interesting challenge to get smallest sorting network for $n = 11$ size only known to be between 33 and 35 compare-and-swap operations

- zero-one principle
  - correctness of sorting network (it sorts!)
  - only requires sorting 0 and 1 inputs (bits)
  - as long only compare-and-swap is used.

- asymptotic complexity of algorithms
  - examples: Bitonic Sorting, Batcher Odd-Even Mergesort
  - with $\text{span} = \mathcal{O}(\log^2 n)$
  - with $\text{work} = \mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log^2 n) = T_1$
  - but sequential time $T = \mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$
  - maximum absolute speed-up $S_n = \mathcal{O}(n / \log n)$
Bubble Sort Example

- top-most $i$ sorted after $i$ phases
- lowest value only sorted after $n - 1$ compare-and-swaps
- $work = \mathcal{O}(n^2)$
- $span = \mathcal{O}(n)$
- looks like perfect speedup $S_n = \mathcal{O}(n)$ w.r.t. (bad) sequential algorithm
- however, if we compare against Quicksort $T = O(n \cdot \log n)$
  we only get $S_n = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n \cdot \log n}{n}\right) = \mathcal{O}(\log n) < \mathcal{O}(n / \log n)$
Batcher Odd-Even Mergesort

- basically as mergesort
  - split input into two parts . . .
  - . . . sort parts recursively . . .
  - . . . merge sorted sequence.

- example: recursion for \( n = 8 \)
  - outer block takes two sorted sequences of size 4 each
  - each inner block takes two sorted sequences of size 2 each
  - outer input sequences need to be sorted too
NC – Nick’s Class

$f(n)$ polylogarithmic iff exists constant $c$ such that $f(n) = O(\log^c n)$

NC is set of decision problems . . .
. . . which can be decided in polylogarithmic time . . .
. . . on a parallel computer with polynomial many processors, e.g., . . .
. . . exists constant $c$ such that $p = O(n^k)$.

$NC^c$ requires (parallel) computation time ($span$) in $O(\log^c n)$

$NC = \bigcup NC^c$
\textbf{L, NL, AC}

\textit{L} is set of decision problems solvable in logarithmic space deterministically.

\textit{NL} is set of decision problems with logarithmic space non-deterministically.

\textbf{NC = AC} is the set of decision problems with logarithmic circuit complexity, i.e.,

\ldots each input of size \( n \) can be decided by polynomial circuit with logarithmic depth in \( n \),

\ldots made of gates with bounded (NC) or unbounded (AC) number of inputs.

as before define \textbf{NC}^c and \textbf{AC}^c requiring \( \mathcal{O}(\log^c n) \) depth (layers).
P Completeness

\[ NC^1 \subseteq L \subseteq NL \subseteq AC^1 \subseteq NC^2 \subseteq AC^2 \subseteq NC^3 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq NC = AC \subseteq P \]

using “logarithmic” reductions

it is commonly believed that \( NC \neq P \)

accordingly P-hard problems are supposed to be NOT “parallelizable”

similar to the common belief that \( P \neq NP \)
Circuit Evaluation Problem

Given a boolean circuit with one output, and an evaluation to its inputs.

Evaluate the circuit and determine its output value for that input assignment.

This problem (deciding whether output yields one) is P-complete . . . 
. . . and thus considered not to be parallelizable.

Thus evaluating a function can not be done “effectively” in parallel.

One step of simulation or constraint propagation are not parallelizable! (?)