Logistics and life lessons?

- Some progress on amplxe + MPI – watch Piazza
- Should be working on shortest paths now
- Final projects: be careful with scope!
  - A good small kernel trumps vast ambition without execution
  - Check against a slow, naive, obvious calculation.
Reminder: Conjugate Gradients

What if we only know how to multiply by $A$? About all you can do is keep multiplying!

\[ \mathcal{K}_k(A, b) = \text{span} \left\{ b, Ab, A^2b, \ldots, A^{k-1}b \right\}. \]

Gives surprisingly useful information!

If $A$ is symmetric and positive definite, $x = A^{-1}b$ minimizes

\[ \phi(x) = \frac{1}{2} x^T Ax - x^T b \]
\[ \nabla \phi(x) = Ax - b. \]

Idea: Minimize $\phi(x)$ over $\mathcal{K}_k(A, b)$. Basis for the method of conjugate gradients.
Convergence of CG

- KSPs are *not* stationary (no constant fixed-point iteration)
- Convergence is surprisingly subtle!
- CG convergence upper bound via *condition number*
  - Large condition number iff form $\phi(x)$ has long narrow bowl
  - Usually happens for Poisson and related problems
- *Preconditioned* problem $M^{-1}Ax = M^{-1}b$ converges faster?
- Whence $M$?
  - From a stationary method?
  - From a simpler/coarser discretization?
  - From approximate factorization?
PCG

Compute \( r^{(0)} = b - Ax \)
for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \)
solve \( Mz^{(i-1)} = r^{(i-1)} \)
\( \rho_{i-1} = (r^{(i-1)})^T z^{(i-1)} \)
if \( i == 1 \)
\( p^{(1)} = z^{(0)} \)
else
\( \beta_{i-1} = \rho_{i-1}/\rho_{i-2} \)
\( p^{(i)} = z^{(i-1)} + \beta_{i-1} p^{(i-1)} \)
endif
\( q^{(i)} = Ap^{(i)} \)
\( \alpha_i = \rho_{i-1}/(p^{(i)})^T q^{(i)} \)
\( x^{(i)} = x^{(i-1)} + \alpha_i p^{(i)} \)
\( r^{(i)} = r^{(i-1)} - \alpha_i q^{(i)} \)
end

Parallel work:
- Solve with \( M \)
- Product with \( A \)
- Dot products
- Axpys

Overlap comm/comp.
PCG bottlenecks

Key: fast solve with $M$, product with $A$

- Some preconditioners parallelize better! (Jacobi vs Gauss-Seidel)
- Balance speed with performance.
  - Speed for set up of $M$?
  - Speed to apply $M$ after setup?
- Cheaper to do two multiplies/solves at once...
  - Can’t exploit in obvious way — lose stability
  - Variants allow multiple products — Hoemmen’s thesis
-Lots of fiddling possible with $M$; what about matvec with $A$?
Thinking on (basic) CG convergence

Consider 2D Poisson with 5-point stencil on an $n \times n$ mesh.

- Information moves one grid cell per matvec.
- Cost per matvec is $O(n^2)$.
- At least $O(n^3)$ work to get information across mesh!
CG convergence: a counting approach

- Time to converge $\geq$ time to propagate info across mesh
- For a 2D mesh: $O(n)$ matvecs, $O(n^3) = O(N^{3/2})$ cost
- For a 3D mesh: $O(n)$ matvecs, $O(n^4) = O(N^{4/3})$ cost
- "Long" meshes yield slow convergence
- 3D beats 2D because everything is closer!
  - Advice: sparse direct for 2D, CG for 3D.
  - Better advice: use a preconditioner!
CG convergence: an eigenvalue approach

Define the *condition number* for $\kappa(L)$ s.p.d:

$$\kappa(L) = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}}(L)}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(L)}$$

Describes how elongated the level surfaces of $\phi$ are.

- For Poisson, $\kappa(L) = O(h^{-2})$
- CG steps to reduce error by $1/2 = O(\sqrt{\kappa}) = O(h^{-1})$.

Similar back-of-the-envelope estimates for some other PDEs. But these are not always that useful... can be pessimistic if there are only a few extreme eigenvalues.
CG convergence: a frequency-domain approach

FFT of $e_0$

FFT of $e_{10}$

Error $e_k$ after $k$ steps of CG gets smoother!
Choosing preconditioners for 2D Poisson

- CG already handles high-frequency error
- Want something to deal with lower frequency!
- Jacobi useless
  - Doesn’t even change Krylov subspace!
- Better idea: block Jacobi?
  - Q: How should things split up?
  - A: Minimize blocks across domain.
  - Compatible with minimizing communication!
Restrictive Additive Schwartz (RAS)
Restrictive Additive Schwartz (RAS)

- Get **ghost cell data**
- Solve *everything* local (including neighbor data)
- Update **local values** for next step
- Default strategy in PETSc
Multilevel Ideas

- RAS propagates information by one processor per step
- For scalability, still need to get around this!
- Basic idea: use multiple grids
  - Fine grid gives lots of work, kills high-freq error
  - Coarse grid cheaply gets info across mesh, kills low freq

More on this another time.
Two ways to get better performance from CG:

1. Better preconditioner
   - Improves asymptotic complexity?
   - ... but application dependent

2. Tuned implementation
   - Improves constant in big-O
   - ... but application independent?

Benchmark idea (?): no preconditioner, just tune.
Compute $r^{(0)} = b - Ax$
for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$

solve $Mz^{(i-1)} = r^{(i-1)}$

$\rho_{i-1} = (r^{(i-1)})^T z^{(i-1)}$

if $i == 1$
$p^{(1)} = z^{(0)}$
else
$\beta_{i-1} = \rho_{i-1}/\rho_{i-2}$
$p^{(i)} = z^{(i-1)} + \beta_{i-1}p^{(i-1)}$
endif

$q^{(i)} = Ap^{(i)}$

$\alpha_i = \rho_{i-1}/(p^{(i)})^T q^{(i)}$

$x^{(i)} = x^{(i-1)} + \alpha_i p^{(i)}$

$r^{(i)} = r^{(i-1)} - \alpha_i q^{(i)}$

end
Tuning PCG

Compute \( r^{(0)} = b - Ax \)
\( p_{-1} = 0; \beta_{-1} = 0; \alpha_{-1} = 0 \)
\( s = L^{-1} r^{(0)} \)
\( \rho_0 = s^T s \)
for \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \)
\( w_i = L^{-T} s \)
\( p_i = w_i + \beta_{i-1} p_{i-1} \)
\( q_i = Ap_i \)
\( \gamma = p_i^T q_i \)
\( x_i = x_{i-1} + \alpha_{i-1} p_{i-1} \)
\( \alpha_i = \rho_i / \gamma_i \)
\( r_{i+1} = r_i - \alpha q_i \)
\( s = L^{-1} r_{i+1} \)
\( \rho_{i+1} = s^T s \)
Check convergence (\( \|r_{i+1}\| \))
\( \beta_i = \rho_{i+1} / \rho_i \)
end

Split \( z = M^{-1} r \) into \( s, w_i \)
Overlap
- \( p_i^T q_i \) with \( x \) update
- \( s^T s \) with \( w_i \) eval
- Computing \( p_i, q_i, \gamma \)
- Pipeline \( r_{i+1}, s ? \)
- Pipeline \( p_i, w_i ? \)

Parallel Numerical LA,
Demmel, Heath, van der Vorst
Tuning PCG

Can also tune
- Preconditioner solve (hooray!)
- Matrix multiply
  - Represented implicitly (regular grids)
  - Or explicitly (e.g. compressed sparse column)

Or further rearrange algorithm (Hoemmen, Demmel).
Tuning sparse matvec

- Sparse matrix blocking and reordering (Im, Vuduc, Yelick)
  - Packages: Sparsity (Im), OSKI (Vuduc)
  - Available as PETSc extension
- Optimizing stencil operations (Datta)
for i = 1:n
    y[i] = 0;
    for jj = ptr[i] to ptr[i+1]-1
        y[i] += A[jj]*x[col[j]];
    end
end

Problem: y[i] += A[jj]*x[col[j]];
Memory traffic in CSR multiply

Memory access patterns:

- Elements of $y$ accessed sequentially
- Elements of $A$ accessed sequentially
- Access to $x$ are all over!

Can help by switching to block CSR.
Switching to single precision, short indices can help memory traffic, too!
Parallelizing matvec

- Each processor gets a piece
- Many partitioning strategies
- Idea: re-order so one of these strategies is “good”
Reordering for matvec

SpMV performance goals:
▶ Balance load?
▶ Balance storage?
▶ Minimize communication?
▶ Good cache re-use?

Also reorder for
▶ Stability of Gauss elimination,
▶ Fill reduction in Gaussian elimination,
▶ Improved performance of preconditioners...
Reminder: Sparsity and partitioning

Want to partition sparse graphs so that

- Subgraphs are same size (load balance)
- Cut size is minimal (minimize communication)

Matrices that are “almost” diagonal are good?
Reordering for bandedness

Natural order

RCM reordering

Reverse Cuthill-McKee

- Select “peripheral” vertex $v$
- Order according to breadth first search from $v$
- Reverse ordering
From iterative to direct

- RCM ordering is great for SpMV
- But isn’t narrow banding good for solvers, too?
  - LU takes $O(nb^2)$ where $b$ is bandwidth.
  - Great if there’s an ordering where $b$ is small!
Skylines and profiles

- *Profile* solvers generalize band solvers
- Use skyline storage; if storing lower triangle, for each row $i$:
  - Start and end of storage for nonzeros in row.
  - *Contiguous* nonzero list up to main diagonal.
- In each column, first nonzero defines a profile.
- All fill-in confined to profile.
- RCM is again a good ordering.
Beyond bandedness

- Bandedness only takes us so far
  - Minimum bandwidth for 2D model problem? 3D?
  - Skyline only gets us so much farther
- But more general solvers have similar structure
  - Ordering (minimize fill)
  - Symbolic factorization (where will fill be?)
  - Numerical factorization (pivoting?)
  - ... and triangular solves
Reminder: Matrices to graphs

- $A_{ij} \neq 0$ means there is an edge between $i$ and $j$
- Ignore self-loops and weights for the moment
- Symmetric matrices correspond to undirected graphs
Troublesome Trees

One step of Gaussian elimination *completely* fills this matrix!
Terrific Trees

Full Gaussian elimination generates *no* fill in this matrix!
Graphic Elimination

Eliminate a variable, connect all neighbors.
Consider first steps of GE

\[ A(2:\text{end}, 1) = \frac{A(2:\text{end}, 1)}{A(1, 1)}; \]
\[ A(2:\text{end}, 2:\text{end}) = A(2:\text{end}, 2:\text{end}) - \ldots - A(2:\text{end}, 1) \times A(1, 2:\text{end}); \]

Nonzero in the outer product at \((i, j)\) if \(A(i, 1)\) and \(A(j, 1)\) both nonzero — that is, if \(i\) and \(j\) are both connected to 1.

General: Eliminate variable, connect remaining neighbors.
Order leaves to root $\Rightarrow$
on eliminating $i$, parent of $i$ is only remaining neighbor.
Nested Dissection

- Idea: Think of block tree structures.
- Eliminate block trees from bottom up.
- Can recursively partition at leaves.
- Rough cost estimate: how much just to factor dense Schur complements associated with separators?
- Notice graph partitioning appears again!
  - And again we want small separators!
Nested Dissection

Model problem: Laplacian with 5 point stencil (for 2D)
- ND gives optimal complexity in exact arithmetic (George 73, Hoffman/Martin/Rose)
- 2D: $O(N \log N)$ memory, $O(N^{3/2})$ flops
- 3D: $O(N^{4/3})$ memory, $O(N^2)$ flops
Minimum Degree

- Locally greedy strategy
  - Want to minimize upper bound on fill-in
  - Fill $\leq (\text{degree in remaining graph})^2$

- At each step
  - Eliminate vertex with smallest degree
  - Update degrees of neighbors

- Problem: Expensive to implement!
  - But better variants via *quotient graphs*
  - Variants often used in practice
Elimination Tree

- Variables (columns) are nodes in trees
- \( j \) a descendant of \( k \) if eliminating \( j \) updates \( k \)
- Can eliminate disjoint subtrees in parallel!
Cache locality

Basic idea: exploit “supernodal” (dense) structures in factor

- e.g. arising from elimination of separator Schur complements in ND
- Other alternatives exist (multifrontal solvers)
Pivoting is a tremendous pain, particularly in distributed memory!

- Cholesky — no need to pivot!
- Threshold pivoting — pivot when things look dangerous
- Static pivoting — try to decide up front

What if things go wrong with threshold/static pivoting?
Common theme: Clean up sloppy solves with good residuals
Direct to iterative

Can improve solution by *iterative refinement*:

\[ PAQ \approx LU \]

\[ x_0 \approx QU^{-1}L^{-1}Pb \]

\[ r_0 = b - Ax_0 \]

\[ x_1 \approx x_0 + QU^{-1}L^{-1}Pr_0 \]

Looks like approximate Newton on \( F(x) = Ax - b = 0 \).
This is just a stationary iterative method!
Nonstationary methods work, too.
Variations on a theme

If we’re willing to sacrifice some on factorization,

- Single precision + refinement on double precision residual?
- Sloppy factorizations (marginal stability) + refinement?
- Modify $m$ small pivots as they’re encountered (low rank updates), fix with $m$ steps of a Krylov solver?