## PARALLEL ALGORITHM FOR MATRIX MULTIPLICATION

Presented by: Anuj Shah

Guided by:
Professor Dr. Russ Miller Dr. Matt Jones


## AGENDA

> Problem Definition
> Applications of Matrix Multiplication
$>$ Parallel Implementation
$>$ Results
$>$ Challenges Faced
> Future Work
$>$ Conclusion

## Problem Definition

- Given a matrix $A(n \times m) n$ rows and $m$ columns, where each of its elements is denoted $A_{i j}$ with 1 $\leq \mathrm{i} \leq \mathrm{n}$ and $1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq \mathrm{m}$, and a matrix $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{m} \times \mathrm{p})$ of m rows and p columns, where each of its elements is denoted $B_{i j}$ with $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $1 \leq j \leq p$, the matrix $C$ resulting from the operation of multiplication of matrices $A$ and $B, C=A \times B$, is such that each of its elements is denoted $C_{i j}$ with $1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq \mathrm{n}$ and $1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq \mathrm{p}$, and is calculated follows

$$
C_{r, c}=A B_{r, c}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{r, i} * B_{i, c}
$$



## Matrix Multiplication

$$
+\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 2 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 \\
2 & 3 & 4
\end{array}\right] \times\left[\begin{array}{ll}
2 & 5 \\
6 & 7 \\
1 & 8
\end{array}\right]+
$$

## Sequential Algorithm

for ( $\mathrm{i}=0 ; \mathrm{i}<\mathrm{n} ;++\mathrm{i}$ )
for ( $\mathrm{j}=0 ; \mathrm{j}<\mathrm{n} ;++\mathrm{j}$ )
$c[i][j]=0$;
for (k =0; $k<n ;++k)$
$c[i][j]=a[i][k] * \operatorname{b}[k][j] ;$
end for
end for
end for

## Applications of Matrix Multiplication

A few of them are:
$>$ Recurrence Relations
$>$ Physics
$>$ Video Games
$>$ Robotics
$>$ Graph theory Problems

## Parallel Implementation

1. Partition these square matrices in $p$ square blocks, where $p$ is the number of processes available.
2. Create a matrix of processes of size $P^{1 / 2} \times P^{1 / 2}$ so that each process can maintain a block of $A$ matrix and a block $B$ matrix.
3. Each Process works with it respective sub block.
4. Initial arrangement is done with respect to the PEs such that each sub block of $A$ is shifted to the left by its row number and each sub block of $B$ is shifted up by its column number.
5. Repeat $\sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}$ times
6. Perform Matrix Multiplication in each processor and add the result to the previous one.
7. The sub-blocks of $A$ are shifted one step to the left and the sub-blocks of $B$ are shifted one step up.

| $\mathrm{A}_{00}$ | $A_{01}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{02}$ |  | $\mathrm{A}_{01}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{A}_{10}$ | $A_{11}$ | $A_{12}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{00} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{00} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{11} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{01} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{22} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{02} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathrm{A}_{20}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{21}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{22}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{11}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{12}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{10}$ |
| $\mathrm{B}_{00}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{01}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{02}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{10} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{10} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{21} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{11} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}_{02} \\ & \mathrm{C}_{012} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathrm{B}_{10}$ | $B_{11}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{12}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{22}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{20}$ | $\mathrm{A}_{21}$ |
| B | B |  | $\mathrm{B}_{20}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{01}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{12}$ |
| $\mathrm{B}_{20}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{21}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{22}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{20}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{21}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{22}$ |

Initial Matrices being divided into 4 blocks and given to their processes:


## Initial arrangement \& local multiplication:



## Shift A left by one and B up by 1 \& local Multiplication



## University at Buffalo The State University of New York

## Add the partial answers



## Results

The final testing Parameters were as followed:
$>$ Matrix dimensions ranged from 1000 to 18000 .
$>$ Both matrices were square and had the same dimensions.
$>$ No. of processors used were 1, 4, 9, 25, 49, 81, 100, 144, 225 \& 256.
$>$ Each run was performed on Processors having 16-core nodes and 128GB of memory.

## Sequential run

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1,000 | 0.518 |
| 1,500 | 1.751 |
| 2,000 | 4.878 |
| 3,000 | 19.497 |
| 3,500 | 27.031 |
| 4,000 | 45.462 |
| 4,500 | 65.480 |
| 4,800 | 76.380 |
| 5,000 | 80.716 |
| 5,400 | 115.722 |


| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6,000 | 149.274 |
| 6,400 | 181.407 |
| 6,500 | 198.058 |
| 7,000 | 220.718 |
| 7,500 | 304.095 |
| 8,000 | 365.351 |
| 8,400 | 426.185 |
| 9,000 | 469.025 |
| 9,600 | 612.037 |
| 10,000 | 715.185 |
| 11,000 | 943.285 |



## Parallel run

No of Processors : 4

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1,000 | 0.189 |
| 2,000 | 1.2082 |
| 5,000 | 21.471 |
| 7,000 | 59.600 |

No of Processors : 25

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4,000 | 2.15 |
| 6,000 | 6.31 |
| 8,000 | 13.751 |
| 10,000 | 25.9 |
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No of Processors : 81

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4,500 | 0.942 |
| 6,300 | 2.407 |
| 7,470 | 4.66 |
| 9,000 | 9.103 |

No of Processors : 144

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4,800 | 0.789 |
| 6,000 | 1.362 |
| 8,400 | 3.605 |
| 12,000 | 12.509 |

No of Processors : 100

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4,500 | 0.923 |
| 6,500 | 2.347 |
| 7,500 | 3.559 |
| 11,000 | 13.812 |

No of Processors : 225

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6,000 | 1.129 |
| 9,000 | 3.094 |
| 10,500 | 4.691 |
| 15,000 | 16.655 |

## No of Processors : 256

| DATA | TIME(S) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 6,400 | 1.354 |
| 9,600 | 3.531 |
| 12,800 | 7.721 |
| 18,000 | 27.707 |

PARALLEL APPROACH


## Speed Up Factor



## Challenges Faced

$>$ The number of processors must be a proper square.
$>$ The data should be equally distributed amongst all the processors.
$>$ The results of running time varies with the change of processor specification and their allocation.

## Future Work

$>$ Can use files to read and write data.
$>$ Use of Strassen's algorithm for sequential matrix multiplication.
$>$ Compare the performance results using OpenMP.

## Conclusion

$>$ It is not always worth taking up the additional cost of extra processors vs the speed up achieved.
$>$ The decision highly depends on the task requirements and incoming data

Increasing the number of processors doesn't always speed up the process.
$>$ In my opinion for a matrix of size up to 11 k * 11k one should go for 25 Processors ("sweet point").

## Questions??

## Thank You!



