Communication-Avoiding Parallel Algorithms for Dense Linear Algebra and Tensor Computations

Edgar Solomonik

Department of EECS, UC Berkeley

February, 2013

Outline

Communication costs more than computation

Communication happens off-chip and on-chip and incurs two costs

- latency - time per message
- bandwidth - amount of data per unit time

These costs are becoming more expensive relative to flops

Table: Annual improvements

time per flop		bandwidth	latency
59%	network	26%	15%
	DRAM	23%	5%

Source: James Demmel [FOSC]

Communication takes more energy than computation



Source: John Shalf (LBNL)

Model assumptions

A variant of a p-processor BSP communication model (BSPRAM)

- Count bandwidth as the number of words moved between global memory and local memory of some process along a data-dependency path
- Count latency as the number of synchronizations between global memory and local memory
- Assume inputs start in global memory
- Assume computation is load-balanced and no values are computed redundantly

A lower bound on sequential communication volume

Definition

Let $G = (V, E)$ be any dependency graph corresponding to an algorithm execution, where each edge represents a dependency. Let $I \subset V$, be the set of initial inputs to G (vertices with in-degree zero).

Conjecture (Neighborhood Theorem)

Let some process p_i compute $S \subset V - I$, where $|S| = \Theta(|(V - I)|/p)$ by load balance. Consider the neighborhood $N(S)$ of S, $\{v \in N(S) : (v, w) \in E \wedge ((v \in V - S \wedge w \in S) \vee (v \in S \wedge w \in V - S))\}$. The bandwidth cost incurred by p_i is $W = \Omega(|N(S)|)$.

Dependency bubble

Definition (Dependency bubble)

We consider the expansion of dependencies associated with a path $R = \{v_1, \ldots v_n\}$, where each v_i, for $i \in [2, n]$ has a dependency path from v_{i-1}. We define the dependency bubble around P as a set of vertices in $B(R) \subset V$ to be the set of vertices $u_i \in B(R)$ which lay on a dependency path, $\{w, \ldots u_i \ldots z\}$ in G where $w, z \in R$. This bubble corresponds to vertices which must be computed between the computations of v_1 and v_n (the start and end of the path).

Dependency bubbles



Latency lower bound based on bubble size

Conjecture (Bubble Neighborhood Theorem)

Consider a computation G which has a dependency path R, and any consecutive subsequence $R \subset P$ has a dependency bubble $B(R)$. Given a lower bound on the size of the bubble $|N(B(R))| = \Omega(\eta(|R|))$, where $\eta(n) = n^k$ for some k, for any $b \in [1, |P|]$, the following bandwidth W and latency cost S must be incurred by some processor to compute G,

$$S = \Omega(|P|/b), \qquad W = \Omega(\eta(b)).$$

Proof of Bubble Neighborhood Theorem

Sketch of Proof

Let the length of the longest consecutive subsequence of R computed by a single processor be b. That process must communicate the neighborhood around R, therefore

$$W = \Omega(\eta(b)).$$

Further, there must be $S = \Omega(|P|/b)$ synchronizations in the computation of R, since no chunk of size more than b is computed sequentially.

Example: solution to system of linear equations

Consider solving for $\mathbf{x}$ where L is lower-triangular in

$$y_i = \sum_{j \leq i}^{n} l_{ij} \cdot x_j.$$

Define vertices corresponding to computations as $v_{ij} = (l_{ij}, y_i)$ in addition to input vertices corresponding to elements of L and y. We can use the concept of the dependency bubble to prove the following conjecture

Conjecture (Latency-bandwidth Trade-off in TRSM)

The parallel computation of $x = L \backslash y$ where L is a lower-triangular n-by-n matrix, must incur latency cost S and bandwidth cost W, such that

$$W \cdot S^2 = \Omega(n^2)$$

TRSM latency lower bound

Sketch of Proof

We consider the dependency bubble formed along any dependency path $R = \{v_{jj}, \ldots v_{kk}\}$, *which corresponds to the divide operations which compute* x_j *through* x_k . *The dependency bubble* $B(R)$ *formed by this path includes vertices* v_{ac} *for* $\{a, c \in [j, k], a \geq c\}$. *Each* v_{ac} *has a unique neighbor of the input graph* l_{ac}, *therefore the neighborhood growth around* $B(R)$, *is lower bound by* $|N(B(R))| = \Omega(\eta(|R|)$ *where*

$$\eta(b) = \Omega(b^2)$$

By the Bubble Neighborhood Theorem we have $S = \Omega(n/b)$, $W = \Omega(b^2)$

$$W \cdot S^2 = \Omega(n^2).$$

Dependency bubble expansion

Recall that a balanced vertex separator Q of a graph $G = (V, E)$, splits $V - Q = W_1 + W_2$ so that $min(|W_1|, |W_2|) \geq \frac{1}{4}|V|$ and $E = W_1 \times (Q + W_1) + W_2 \times (Q + W_2)$.

Definition (Dependency bubble cross-section expansion)

If $B(R)$ is the dependency bubble formed around path R, the **bubble cross-section expansion**, $E(R)$ is the minimum size of a balanced vertex separator of $B(R)$.

General latency lower-bound based on bubble expansion

Conjecture (Bubble Expansion Theorem)

Let P be a dependency path in G, such that any subsequence $R \subset P$, has bubble cross-section expansion $E(R) = \Omega(\epsilon(|R|))$ and bubble size $|B(R)| = \Omega(\sigma(|R|))$, where $\epsilon(b) = b_1^d$,and $\sigma(b) = b_2^d$ for positive integers d_1, d_2 The bandwidth and latency costs of any parallelization of G must obey the relations

$$F = \Omega(\sigma(b) \cdot |P|/b), \qquad W = \Omega(\epsilon(b) \cdot |P|/b), \qquad S = \Omega(|P|/b)$$

for all $b \in [1, |P|]$.

Rough proof-idea and example



Proof of general latency lower bound

Definition

A parallelization corresponds to a coloring of the vertices, Let $V = \cup V_i$ be a disjoint union of sets V_i where process i computes vertices V_i. Define R_i inductively as the smallest consecutive subsequence of $R_i = P - \cup_{j=1}^{i-1} R_j$, so that

- some process $p_i \in \{1, \ldots p\}$ computes the first entry of R_i
- process p_i computes $|V_{p_i} \cap B(R_i)| \geq \frac{1}{4}|B(R_i)|$ elements and does not compute $|B(R_i) - V_{p_i}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B(R_i)|$ elements

Due to load balance $|\sum_i R_j| = \Omega(|P|)$.

Dependency bubbles



Proof of general latency lower bound

Sketch of Proof

To compute each $B(R_i)$ at least one synchronization is required. Further, any communication schedule for $V_{p_i} \cap B(R_i)$ must correspond to a set Q of vertices ("communicated values") which separate $V_{p_i} \cap B(R_i)$ from $V_{p_i} - B(R_i)$. Therefore, Q corresponds to a balanced vertex separator on B_i,

$$F = \Omega\left(\sum_i \sigma(|R_i|)\right), \qquad W = \Omega\left(\sum_i \epsilon(|R_i|)\right).$$

These costs are minimized when each subsequence R_i is of the same length b, therefore

$$F = \Omega(\sigma(b) \cdot |P|/b), \quad W = \Omega(\epsilon(b) \cdot |P|/b), \quad S = \Omega(|P|/b).$$

Example: LU factorization

We can use bubble expansion to prove better latency lower bounds for LU, as well as Cholesky, and QR factorizations. LU factorization of square matrices gives a cubic DAG $v_{ijk} = (l_{ik}, u_{kj})$, where

$$a_{ij} = \sum_{k \leq \min(i,j)} l_{ik} \cdot u_{kj}.$$

Conjecture (Latency-bandwidth Trade-off in LU Factorization)

The parallel computation of lower-triangular L and upper-triangular U such that $A = LU$ where all matrices are n-by-n, must incur flops cost F, latency cost S, and bandwidth cost W, such that

$$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2) \quad \textit{and} \quad F \cdot S^2 = \Omega(n^3)$$

LU latency lower bound

Sketch of Proof

We consider the dependency bubble $B(R)$ formed around any path $R = \{v_{jjj}, \ldots v_{kkk}\}$, where each entry v_{iii} corresponds to the divide operation used to compute l_{ii}. We see that $|B(R)| = \Omega(|R|)$ vertices, for $\eta(b) = b^3$, which are v_{acd} for $a, c, d \in [j, k]$. Each such bubble has a smallest separator size of $E(R) = \Omega(\epsilon(|R|))$ where $\epsilon(b) = b^2$. By application of the Bubble Expansion Theorem, we then get that for any b

$$F = \Omega(b^2 \cdot n), \quad W = \Omega(b \cdot n), \quad S = \Omega(n/b)$$

therefore

$$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2) \quad \text{and} \quad F \cdot S^2 = \Omega(n^3)$$

Krylov subspace methods

Definition (Krylov subspace methods)

Compute $A^k x$, where A typically corresponds to a sparse graph.

Conjecture

To compute $A^k x$, where A corresponds to a 3^d-point stencil, the bandwidth W and latency S costs are lower-bounded by

$$F = \Omega(k \cdot b^d), \quad W = \Omega(k \cdot b^{d-1}), \quad S = \Omega(k/b),$$

for any b. We can rewrite these relations as

$$W \cdot S^{d-1} = \Omega(k^d),$$

$$F \cdot S^d = \Omega(k^{d+1}).$$

Latency lower bound for s-step methods

Sketch of Proof

For n-by-n A based on a d dimensional mesh, we consider the path $P = \{x_{n/2}, (Ax)_{n/2}, \ldots (A^k x)_{n/2}\}$. *The bubble* $B(R)$ *formed along a subsequence of length* $|R|$ *of this path is of size* $|B(R)| = \Omega(\sigma(|R|))$, *where* $\sigma(b) = b^{d+1}$ *(it is all vertices within* $b/2$ *hops in the mesh) and has bubble expansion* $E(R) = \Omega(\epsilon(|R|))$, *where* $\epsilon(b) = \Omega(b^d)$ *(corresponding to a vertex separator cut plane). Using the Bubble Expansion Theorem, we attain,*

$$F = \Omega(k \cdot b^d), \quad W = \Omega(k \cdot b^{d-1}), \quad S = \Omega(k/b),$$

for any b.

Parallel matrix multiplication algorithms

Standard '2D' algorithms ([Cannon 69], [GW 97], [ABGJP 95]) assume $M = 3n^2/p$ and block **A**, **B**, and **C**. on a $\sqrt{p}$-by-$\sqrt{p}$ processor grid. They have a cost of

$$W_{2D} = O\left(\frac{n^2}{\sqrt{p}}\right)$$

'3D' algorithms ([Bernsten 89], [ACS 1990], [ABGJP 95], [MT 99]) assume $M = 3n^2/p^{2/3}$ and block the computation yielding on a $p^{1/3}$-by-$p^{1/3}$-$p^{1/3}$ processor grid, yielding

$$W_{3D} = O\left(\frac{n^2}{p^{2/3}}\right)$$

'2.5D' algorithms ([MT 99], [SD 2011]) generalize this and, for any $c \in [1, p^{1/3}]$ attain the lower bound with memory usage $M = cn^2/p$,

$$W_{2.5D} = O\left(\frac{n^2}{\sqrt{cp}}\right)$$

Strong scaling matrix multiplication



2.5D algorithms on BG/Q



Summary of theoretical results for 2.5D algorithms

A comparison between asymptotic communication cost in ScaLAPACK (SCL) and in 2.5D algorithms ($\log(p)$ factors suppressed). All matrices are n-by-n. For 2.5D algorithms, $c \in [1, p^{1/3}]$

problem	lower bound	2.5D lat	2.5D bw	SCL lat	SCL bw
MM	$W = \Omega(n^2/p^{2/3})$	$\sqrt{p/c^3}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	$\sqrt{p}$	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$
TRSM	$W \cdot S^2 = \Omega(n^2)$	$\sqrt{p/\sqrt{c}}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	$\sqrt{p}$	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$
Cholesky	$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2)$	$\sqrt{pc}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	$\sqrt{p}$	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$
LU	$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2)$	$\sqrt{pc}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	n	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$
QR	$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2)$	$\sqrt{pc}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	n	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$
sym eig	$W \cdot S = \Omega(n^2)$	$\sqrt{pc}$	$n^2/\sqrt{pc}$	n	$n^2/\sqrt{p}$

2.5D LU with pivoting

$A = P \cdot L \cdot U$, where P is a permutation matrix

- 2.5D generic pairwise elimination (neighbor/pairwise pivoting or Givens rotations (QR)) [A. Tiskin 2007]
  - pairwise pivoting does not produce an explicit L
  - pairwise pivoting may have stability issues for large matrices
- Our approach uses tournament pivoting, which is more stable than pairwise pivoting and gives L explicitly
  - pass up rows of A instead of U to avoid error accumulation

Tournament pivoting

Partial pivoting is not communication-optimal on a blocked matrix

- requires message/synchronization for each column
- $O(n)$ messages needed

Tournament pivoting is communication-optimal

- performs a tournament to determine best pivot row candidates
- passes up 'best rows' of A

2.5D LU on 65,536 cores



2.5D QR factorization

- The orthogonalization updates $(I - 2yy^T)$ do not commute so aggregate them into $(I - YTY)^T$.
- To minimize latency perform recursive TSQR on the panel
- Must reconstruct Householder Y from TSQR Q, R

Householder reconstruction

Yamamoto's algorithm

- Given $A = QR$ for tall-skinny A,
- perform LU on $(Q_1 - I)$ to get $LU([Q_1 - I, Q_2]) = Y \cdot (TY^T)$.
- as stable as QR in practice
- stability proof is almost complete

Symmetric eigensolve via QR

Need to apply two sided updates to reduce to tridiagonal T

$$T = (I - YTY^T)A(I - YT^TY^T)$$

$$V = AYT^T - \frac{1}{2}YTY^TAYT^T$$

$$T = A - YV^T - VY^T$$

In order to use TSQR to compute Y by panel must reduce to banded form first.

2.5D symmetric eigensolve

Algorithm outline

- Compute TSQR on each subpanel $A_i = Q_i \cdot R_i$ to reduce A to band size $n/\sqrt{pc}$
- Recover Y_i from Q_i and A_i via Yamamoto's method
- Accumulate $Y = [Y_1, Y_2 \ldots Y_i]$ on processor layers and apply in parallel to next panel A_{i+1}
- Reduce from banded to tridiagonal using symmetric band reduction with $\sqrt{pc}$ processors
- Use MRRR to compute eigenvalues of the tridiagonal matrix

Tensor contractions

We define a tensor contraction between $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{\otimes k}$, $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{\otimes l}$ into $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{\otimes m}$ as

$$c_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_m} = \sum_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m}} a_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{m-l} j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m}} \cdot b_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m} i_{m-l+1} i_{m-l+2} \ldots i_m}$$

Tensor contractions reduce to matrix multiplication via index folding (let $[ijk]$ denote a group of 3 indices folded into one),

$$c_{[i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{m-l}],[i_{m-l+1} i_{m-l+2} \ldots i_m]} = \sum_{[j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m}]} a_{[i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{m-l}],[j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m}]} \cdot b_{[j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{k+l-m}],[i_{m-l+1} i_{m-l+2} \ldots i_m]}$$

so here $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ can be treated simply as matrices.

Tensor symmetry

Tensors can have symmetry e.g.

$$a_{(ij)k} = a_{(ji)k} \quad \text{or} \quad a_{(ij)k} = -a_{(ji)k}$$

I am introducing more dubious notation, by denoting symmetric groups of indices as $(ab...)$. We now might face contractions like

$$c_{(ij)kl} = \sum_{pqr} a_{(ij)(pq)} \cdot b_{(pqk)(rl)}$$

where the computational graph G can be thought of as a 7D tensor with entries $g_{(ij)kl(pq)r} = (c_{(ij)kl}, a_{(ij)(pq)}, b_{(pqk)(rl)})$. There are two things that can happen to symmetries during a contraction:

- preserved, e.g. $g_{(ij)kl(pq)r} = g_{(ji)kl(pq)r}$
- broken, e.g. $b_{(pqk)(rl)} = b_{(pqk)(lr)}$ but $g_{(ij)kl(pq)r} \neq g_{(ij)kr(pq)l}$

Preserved symmetries in contractions

When a d-dimensional symmetry is preserved, a factor of $d!$ can be saved in memory and flops. This is simple to achieve, since the d-dimensional index group can be folded into one index in a packed layout, for instance

$$c_{kl} = 2 \cdot \sum_{[i<j]} a_{k[(i<j)]} \cdot b_{[(i<j)]l}$$

Since we are folding the packed index, the iteration space of this contraction is in effect equivalent to matrix multiplication, and therefore easy to handle.

Broken symmetries in contractions

When a symmetry is broken, no flops can be saved with respect to unpacking. However, memory can be saved as the tensors can remain stored in packed format. Matrix multiplication of two symmetric tensors features a broken symmetry, which can be computed in packed layout as

$$c_{kl} = \sum_i a_{(k<i)} \cdot b_{(i<l)} + a_{(i<k)} \cdot b_{(i<l)} + a_{(k<i)} \cdot b_{(l<i)} + a_{(i<k)} \cdot b_{(l<i)}$$

This requires four matrix multiplications, but each accesses only the lower triangle of the matrices, so only that portion need be stored.
If data replication is correctly utilized in the parallel algorithm unpacking and doing permutations of contractions have equivalent bandwidth costs.

NWChem approach to contractions

A high-level description of NWChem's algorithm for tensor contractions:

- data layout is abstracted away by the Global Arrays framework
- Global Arrays uses one-sided communication for data movement
- packed tensors are stored in blocks
- for each contraction, each process does a subset of the block contractions
- each block is transposed and unpacked prior to contraction
- automatic load balancing is employed among processors

Cyclops Tensor Framework (CTF) approach to contractions

A high-level description of CTF's algorithm for tensor contractions:

- tensor layout is cyclic and dynamically orchestrated
- MPI collectives are used for all communication
- packed tensors are decomposed cyclically among processors
- for each contraction, a distributed layout is selected based on internal performance models
- before contraction, tensors are redistributed to a new layout
- if there is enough memory, the tensors are (partially) unpacked
- all preserved symmetries and non-symmetric indices are folded in preparation for GEMM
- nested distributed matrix multiply algorithms are used to perform the contraction in a load-balanced manner

3D tensor mapping



2.5D algorithms for tensors

We incorporate data replication for communication minimization into CTF

- Replicate only one tensor/matrix (minimize bandwidth but not latency)
- In parallel, autotune over mappings to all possible physical topologies
- Select mapping with least amount of communication that fits in memory
- Achieve minimal communication for tensors of widely different sizes

Coupled Cluster definition

Coupled Cluster (CC) is a method for computing an approximate solution to the time-independent Schrödinger equation of the form

$$\mathbf{H}|\Psi\rangle = E|\Psi\rangle,$$

CC rewrites the wave-function $|\Psi\rangle$ as an excitation operator $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ applied to the Slater determinant $|\Phi_0\rangle$

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{\hat{\mathbf{T}}}|\Phi_0\rangle$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ is as a sum of $\hat{\mathbf{T}}_n$ (the n'th excitation operators)

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathrm{CCSD}} = \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathrm{CCSDT}} = \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_3$$
$$\hat{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathrm{CCSDTQ}} = \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_3 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_4$$

Coupled Cluster derivation

To derive CC equations, a normal-ordered Hamiltonian is defined as the sum of one-particle and two-particle interaction terms

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_N = \hat{\mathbf{F}}_N + \hat{\mathbf{V}}_N$$

Solving the CC energy contribution can be done by computing eigenvectors of the similarity-transformed Hamiltonian

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}} = e^{-\hat{\mathbf{T}}} \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N e^{\hat{\mathbf{T}}}$$

Performing the CCSD truncation $\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2$ and applying the Hadamard lemma of the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula,

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N + [\hat{\mathbf{H}}_N, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1] + [\hat{\mathbf{H}}_N, \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2] + \frac{1}{2}[[\hat{\mathbf{H}}_N \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1], \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1] \ldots$$

which simplifies to

$$\bar{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N \hat{\mathbf{T}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N \hat{\mathbf{T}}_1^2 + \ldots$$

Coupled Cluster equations

Left projecting the eigenvector equation, we can obtain an explicit formula for the CC energy via Wick contraction

$$E_{\text{CCSD}} - E_0 = \langle \Phi_0 | \bar{\mathbf{H}} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \sum_{ia} f_{ia} t_i^a + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{abij} \langle ij||ab \rangle t_{ij}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{aibj} \langle ij||ab \rangle t_i^a t_j^b$$

The tensor amplitude equations are derived in a similar fashion but involve many more terms

$$0 = \langle \Phi_i^a | \bar{\mathbf{H}} | \Phi_0 \rangle = f_{ai} - \sum_{kc} f_{kc} t_i^c t_k^a + \dots$$

$$0 = \langle \Phi_{ij}^{ab} | \bar{\mathbf{H}} | \Phi_0 \rangle = \langle ab||ij \rangle + \sum_{bj} \langle ja||bi \rangle t_j^b + \dots$$

These equations then need to be factorized into two-tensor contractions.

Actual CCSD code

```
FVO["me"] = VABIJ["efmn"]*T1["fn"];
FVV["ae"] = -0.5*VABIJ["femn"]*T2["famn"];
FVV["ae"] -= FVO["me"]*T1["am"];
FVV["ae"] += VABCI["efan"]*T1["fn"];
FOO["mi"] = 0.5*VABIJ["efnm"]*T2["efni"];
FOO["mi"] += FVO["me"]*T1["ei"];
FOO["mi"] += VIJKA["mnif"]*T1["fn"];
WMNIJ["mnij"] = VIJKL["mnij"];
WMNIJ["mnij"] += 0.5*VABIJ["efmn"]*Tau["efij"];
WMNIJ["mnij"] += VIJKA["mnie"]*T1["ej"];
WMNIE["mnie"] = VIJKA["mnie"];
WMNIE["mnie"] += VABIJ["femn"]*T1["fi"];
WAMIJ["amij"] = VIJKA["jima"];
WAMIJ["amij"] += 0.5*VABCI["efam"]*Tau["efij"];
WAMIJ["amij"] += VAIBJ["amej"]*T1["ei"];
WMAEI["maei"] = -VAIBJ["amei"];
WMAEI["maei"] += 0.5*VABIJ["efmn"]*T2["afin"];
WMAEI["maei"] += VABCI["feam"]*T1["fi"];
WMAEI["maei"] -= WMNIE["nmie"]*T1["an"];
Z1["ai"] = 0.5*VABCI["efam"]*Tau["efim"];
Z1["ai"] -= 0.5*WMNIE["mnie"]*T2["aemn"];
Z1["ai"] += T2["aeim"]*FVO["me"];
Z1["ai"] -= T1["em"]*VAIBJ["amei"];
Z1["ai"] -= T1["am"]*FOO["mi"];
Z2["abij"] = VABIJ["abij"];
Z2["abij"] += FVV["af"]*T2["fbij"];
Z2["abij"] -= FOO["ni"]*T2["abnj"];
Z2["abij"] += VABCI["abej"]*T1["ei"];
Z2["abij"] -= WAMIJ["mbij"]*T1["am"];
Z2["abij"] += 0.5*VABCD["abef"]*Tau["efij"];
Z2["abij"] += 0.5*WMNIJ["mnij"]*Tau["abmn"];
Z2["abij"] += WMAEI["maei"]*T2["ebmj"];
E1["ai"]    = Z1["ai"]  *D1["ai"];
E2["abij"]  = Z2["abij"]*D2["abij"];
E1["ai"]   -= T1["ai"];
E2["abij"] -= T2["abij"];
T1["ai"]   += E1["ai"];
T2["abij"] += E2["abij"];

Tau["abij"]  = T2["abij"];
Tau["abij"] += 0.5*T1["ai"]*T1["bj"];
```

Comparison with NWChem on Cray XE6

CCSD iteration time on 64 nodes of Hopper:

system	# electrons	# orbitals	CTF	NWChem
w5	25	205	14 sec	36 sec
w7	35	287	90 sec	178 sec
w9	45	369	127 sec	-
w12	60	492	336 sec	-

On 128 nodes, NWChem completed w9 in 223 sec, CTF in 73 sec.

Blue Gene/Q up to 1250 orbitals, 250 electrons



Coupled Cluster efficiency on Blue Gene/Q



Summary and conclusion

- Communication cost and load balance matter, especially in parallel
- We can lower bound bandwidth based on projections and latency based on dependencies and graph expansion
- 2.5D algorithms present a communication-optimal algorithm family for dense linear algebra
- CTF is a parallel framework for symmetric tensor contractions
- Coupled Cluster and Density Functional Theory are electronic structure calculation methods implemented on top of CTF

Backup slides

Solutions to linear systems of equations

We want to solve some matrix equation

$$A \cdot X = B$$

where A and B are known. Can solve by factorizing $A = LU$ (L lower triangular and U upper triangular) via Gaussian elimination, then computing TRSMs

$$X = U^{-1}L^{-1}B$$

via triangular solves. If A is symmetric positive definite, we can use Cholesky factorization. Cholesky and TRSM are no harder than LU.

2D blocked LU factorization



2D blocked LU factorization



2D blocked LU factorization



2D blocked LU factorization



2D block-cyclic decomposition



2D block-cyclic LU factorization



2D block-cyclic LU factorization



2D block-cyclic LU factorization



3D recursive non-pivoted LU and Cholesky

A 3D recursive algorithm with no pivoting [A. Tiskin 2002]

- Tiskin gives algorithm under the BSP model
  - Bulk Synchronous Parallel
  - considers communication and synchronization
- We give an alternative distributed-memory adaptation and implementation
- Also, we have a new lower-bound for the latency cost

2.5D LU factorization



2.5D LU factorization



2.5D LU factorization



2.5D LU strong scaling (without pivoting)



2.5D LU factorization with tournament pivoting



2.5D LU factorization with tournament pivoting



2.5D LU factorization with tournament pivoting



2.5D LU factorization with tournament pivoting



3D QR factorization

$A = Q \cdot R$ where Q is orthogonal R is upper-triangular

- 3D QR using Givens rotations (generic pairwise elimination) is given by [A. Tiskin 2007]
- Tiskin minimizes latency and bandwidth by working on slanted panels
- 3D QR cannot be done with right-looking updates as 2.5D LU due to non-commutativity of orthogonalization updates

3D QR factorization using the YT representation

The YT representation of Householder QR factorization is more work efficient when computing only R

- We give an algorithm that performs 2.5D QR using the YT representation
- The algorithm performs left-looking updates on Y
- Householder with YT needs fewer computation (roughly 2x) than Givens rotations

3D QR using YT representation



Latency-optimal 2.5D QR

To reduce latency, we can employ the TSQR algorithm

1. Given n-by-b panel partition into $2b$-by-b blocks
2. Perform QR on each $2b$-by-b block
3. Stack computed Rs into $n/2$-by-b panel and recursive
4. Q given in hierarchical representation

Need YT representation from hierarchical Q...

YT reconstruction

Yamamoto et al.

- Take Y to be the first b columns of Q minus the identity
- Define $T = (I - Q_1)^{-1}$
- Sacrifices triangular structure of T and Y.

Our first attempt

$$LU(R-A) = LU(R-(I-YTY^T)R) = LU(YTY^TR) = (Y)\cdot(TY^TR)$$

was unstable due to being dependent on the condition number of R. However, performing LU on Yamamoto's T seems to be stable,

$$LU(I-Q_1) = LU(I-(I-Y_1TY_1^T)) = LU(Y_1TY_1^T) = (Y_1)\cdot(TY_1^T)$$

and should yield triangular Y and T.

Communication lower bound for tensor contractions

The computational graph corresponding to a tensor contraction can be higher dimensional, but there are still only three projections corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$. So, if the contraction necessitates F floating point operations, the bandwidth lower bound is still just

$$W_p = \Omega\left(\frac{F}{p \cdot \sqrt{M}}\right).$$

Therefore. folding contractions into matrix multiplication and running a good multiplication algorithm is communication-optimal.

Cyclic decomposition in CTF

Cyclical distribution is fundamental to CTF, hence the name Cyclops (cyclic-operations).
Given a vector **v** of length n on p processors

- in a blocked distribution process p_i owns $\{v_{i\cdot n/p+1}, \ldots v_{(i+1)\cdot n/p}\}$
- in a cyclic distribution process p_i owns $\{v_i, v_{2i}, \ldots v_{(n/p)i}\}$

A cyclic distribution is associated with a phase along each dimension (for the vector above this was p). The main advantage from this distribution is that each subtensor can retain packed structure with only minimal padding.
CTF assumes all subtensor symmetries have index relations of the form $\leq$ and not $<$, so in effect, diagonals are stored for skew-symmetric tensors.

Blocked vs block-cyclic vs cyclic decompositions



Sequential tensor contractions

A cyclic distribution provides a vital level of abstraction, because each subtensor contraction becomes a packed contraction of the same sort as the global tensor contraction but of smaller size. Given a sequential packed contraction kernel, CTF can parallelize it automatically. Further, because each subcontraction is the same, the workload of each processor is the same. The actual sequential kernel used by CTF employs the following steps

1. if there is enough memory, unpack broken symmetries
2. perform a nonsymmetric transpose, to make all indices of non-broken symmetry be the leading dimensions
3. use a naive kernel to iterate though indices with broken symmetry and call BLAS GEMM for the leading dimensions

Multidimensional processor grids

CTF supports tensors and processor grids of any dimension because mapping a symmetric tensor to a processor grid of the same dimension preserves symmetric structure with minimal virtualization and padding. Processor grids are defined by

- a base grid, obtained from the physical topology or from factorizing the number of processors
- folding all possible combinations of adjacent processor grid dimensions

Tensors are contracted on higher dimensional processor grids by

- mapping an index shared by two tensors in the contraction to different processor grid dimensions
- running a distributed matrix multiplication algorithm for each such 'mismatched' index
- replicating data along some processor dimensions 'a la 2.5D'

Density Function Theory (DFT)

DFT uses the fact that the ground-state wave-function Ψ_0 is a unique functional of the particle density $n(\vec{r})$

$$\Psi_0 = \Psi[n_0]$$

Since $\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{V} + \hat{U}$, where $\hat{T}$, $\hat{V}$, and $\hat{U}$, are the kinetic, potential, and interaction contributions respectively,

$$E[n_0] = \langle \Psi[n_0] | \hat{T}[n_0] + \hat{V}[n_0] + \hat{U}[n_0] | \Psi[n_0] \rangle$$

DFT assumes $\hat{U} = 0$, and solves the Kohn-Sham equations

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \nabla^2 + V_s(\vec{r}) \right] \phi_i(\vec{r}) = \epsilon_i \phi_i(\vec{r})$$

where V_s has a exchange-correlation potential correction,

$$V_s(\vec{r}) = V(\vec{r}) + \int \frac{e^2 n_s(\vec{r'})}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r'}|} d^3 r' + V_{XC}[n_s(\vec{r})]$$

Density Function Theory (DFT), contd.

The exchange-correlation potential V_{XC} is approximated by DFT, by a functional which is often system-dependent. This allows the following iterative scheme

1. Given an (initial guess) $n(\vec{r})$ calculate V_s via Hartree-Fock and functional
2. Solve (diagonalize) the Kohn-Sham equation to obtain each ϕ_i
3. Compute a new guess at $n(\vec{r})$ based on ϕ_i

Due to the rough approximation of correlation and exchange DFT is good for weakly-correlated systems (which appear in solid-state physics), but suboptimal for strongly-correlated systems.

Linear algebra in DFT

DFT requires a few core numerical linear algebra kernels

- Matrix multiplication (of rectangular matrices)
- Linear equations solver
- Symmetric eigensolver (diagonalization)

We proceed to study schemes for optimization of these algorithms.

2.5D algorithms for DFT

2.5D matrix multiplication is integrated into QBox.

- QBox is a DFT code developed by Erik Draeger et al.
- Depending on system/functional can spend as much as 80% time in MM
- Running on most of Sequoia and getting significant speed up from 3D
- 1.75X speed-up on 8192 nodes 1792 gold atoms, 31 electrons/atom
- Eventually hope to build and integrate a 3D eigensolver into QBox

Our CCSD factorization

Credit to John F. Stanton and Jurgen Gauss

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tau_{ij}^{ab} &= t_{ij}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2} P_b^a P_j^i t_i^a t_j^b, \\
\tilde{F}_e^m &= f_e^m + \sum_{fn} v_{ef}^{mn} t_n^f, \\
\tilde{F}_e^a &= (1-\delta_{ae}) f_e^a - \sum_m \tilde{F}_e^m t_m^a - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{mnf} v_{ef}^{mn} t_{mn}^{af} + \sum_{fn} v_{ef}^{an} t_n^f, \\
\tilde{F}_i^m &= (1-\delta_{mi}) f_i^m + \sum_e \tilde{F}_e^m t_i^e + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nef} v_{ef}^{mn} t_{in}^{ef} + \sum_{fn} v_{if}^{mn} t_n^f,
\end{aligned}
$$

Our CCSD factorization

$$\tilde{W}_{ei}^{mn} = v_{ei}^{mn} + \sum_f v_{ef}^{mn} t_i^f,$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ij}^{mn} = v_{ij}^{mn} + P_j^i \sum_e v_{ie}^{mn} t_j^e + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ef} v_{ef}^{mn} \tau_{ij}^{ef},$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ie}^{am} = v_{ie}^{am} - \sum_n \tilde{W}_{ei}^{mn} t_n^a + \sum_f v_{ef}^{ma} t_i^f + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nf} v_{ef}^{mn} t_{in}^{af},$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ij}^{am} = v_{ij}^{am} + P_j^i \sum_e v_{ie}^{am} t_j^e + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ef} v_{ef}^{am} \tau_{ij}^{ef},$$

$$z_i^a = f_i^a - \sum_m \tilde{F}_i^m t_m^a + \sum_e f_e^a t_i^e + \sum_{em} v_{ei}^{ma} t_m^e + \sum_{em} v_{im}^{ae} \tilde{F}_e^m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{efm}$$

$$z_{ij}^{ab} = v_{ij}^{ab} + P_j^i \sum_e v_{ie}^{ab} t_j^e + P_b^a P_j^i \sum_{me} \tilde{W}_{ie}^{am} t_{mj}^{eb} - P_b^a \sum_m \tilde{W}_{ij}^{am} t_m^b + P_b^a$$

Performance breakdown on BG/Q

Performance data for a CCSD iteration with 200 electrons and 1000 orbitals on 4096 nodes of Mira
4 processes per node, 16 threads per process
Total time: 18 mins
v-orbitals, o-electrons

kernel	% of time	complexity	architectural bounds
DGEMM	45%	$O(v^4o^2/p)$	flops/mem bandwidth
broadcasts	20%	$O(v^4o^2/p\sqrt{M})$	multicast bandwidth
prefix sum	10%	$O(p)$	allreduce bandwidth
data packing	7%	$O(v^2o^2/p)$	integer ops
all-to-all-v	7%	$O(v^2o^2/p)$	bisection bandwidth
tensor folding	4%	$O(v^2o^2/p)$	memory bandwidth