Symmetric dense matrix tridiagonalization on a GPU cluster

Ichitaro Yamazaki, Tim Dong, Stan Tomov, Jack Dongarra

Inovative Computing Lab. University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Accelerators and Hybrid Exascale Systems (AsHES) Workshop Boston, Massachusetts, 05/20/2013

- 4 回 🕨 - 4 回 🕨 - 4 回 🕨

Introduction

Objective: reduces a matrix A into a tridiagonal matrix T,



where A is dense $(a_{ij} \neq 0)$ and symmetric $(A = A^T)$, through

$$Q^T A Q = T$$
,

where Q is orthogonal.

Motivation: often a bottleneck in solving symmetric dense eigenvalue problem:

$$Av = \lambda v$$
 or $Av = \lambda Bv$.

arise in many scientific and engineering simulations: e.g.,

- electronics calculation, quantum physics, image processing, web analysis, etc.

MAGMA (Matrix Algebra on GPU and Multicore Architecture)

multi-GPU SYTRD integrated in > dense and sparse eigensolvers 8GPU results are from R. Solcá of ETH.

> electronic structure calculation

(e.g., Exciting, Elk, Abinit, QuantumEspress).

- multi-GPU dense symmetric generalized solver -

> optimized GPU kernels with 1DBC on multiple GPUs.



- multi-GPU dense symmetric solver -

- distributed sparse Lanczos solver -





Symmetric dense tridiag. on a GPU cluster

3/18

Extension to distributed GPUs

Motivation: solving larger-scale problems

not easy to develop an out-of-GPU-memory version

- whole trailing submatrix accessed to reduce each column
- problem size limitted by GPU memory
- weak-scaling studies on tens of GPUs or nodes.

Our first step: ScaLAPACK with GPUs

 any number of MPIs/GPUs per node, but one MPI dispatch GPU kernels.

- larger GPU kernel and smaller communication

 1DBC and MPI mapped to cores in a round-robing among nodes.

- our GPU-kernels recycled

 same optimization techniques (e.g., static schedule, overlapping CPU with GPU and MPI-comm of vectors).



4/18

"Blocked" tridiagonalization algorithm



for each column in the panel

- generate q_i to reduce the column
- accumurate it into a blocked update Q





- reduce communication by a block update

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

computational kernels in tridiagonalization: total of $\frac{4}{3}n^3 + O(n^2)$ flops

- 1. panel factorization: tridiagonal reduction of a panel
 - SYMV (bandwidth-limited BLAS-2) about 50% of flops multiply with whole trailing submatrix to reduce each column

$$\begin{split} w_j &:= \widehat{A} v_j & \longrightarrow & \frac{2 \widehat{n}^2 \text{ flops}}{(\widehat{n}^2 + \widehat{n})/2 + \widehat{n} \text{ data}} \approx \frac{4 \text{ flops}}{\text{ data}} \text{ (per call)} \\ & \longrightarrow & \text{ total of } \frac{2}{3} n^3 \text{ flops} \end{split}$$



 \longrightarrow exploit greater memory bandwidth of GPUs

- 2. trailing submatrix update: blocked orthogonal update of trailing submatrix:
 - SYR2K (more data-parallel BLAS-3) about 50% of flops symmetric rank-k update with each panel

$$\begin{array}{lll} A := A - VW^T - WV^T & \rightarrow & \frac{2\hat{n}^2 k \ \text{flops}}{(\hat{n}^2 + \hat{n})/2 + \hat{n}k \ \text{data}} \approx \frac{4k \ \text{flops}}{\text{data}} \ (\text{per call}, \ k = 32, 64) \\ & \rightarrow & \text{total of } \frac{2}{3} n^3 \ \text{flops} \end{array}$$

 \longrightarrow exploit larger computational throughput of GPUs

breakdown of reduction time using one GPU

Keeneland: (two 8-core Intel SandyBridge CPUs + three NVIDIA M2090 GPUs)/node



-≣->

< 🗇 🕨

 reduction time dominated by dsymv and dsyr2k (up to 90%), especially BLAS-2 dsymv (up to 80%).

multi-GPU kernel 1: BLAS-3 SYR2K symmetric rank-k updates

a sequence of "small" CUBLAS calls on streams to exploit data parallelism where A is statically distributed among GPUs in 1DBC



イロン イヨン イヨン イヨン

3

- each GPU updates block columns of its local submatrix
 - SYR2K(V_I, W_I) on diagonal block, and GEMM(V_I^T, W_{I:N}) and GEMM(W_I^T, V_{I:N}) on off-diagonal

multiple GPU streams cyclically on block columns

Symmetric dense tridiag. on a GPU cluster 8/18

performance of SYR2K on multiple GPUs (Keeneland: three NVIDIA M2090 GPUs/node).



high data-parallelism

▶ peak double precision performance = $665Gflop/s \rightarrow 40\%$ of the peak

< ≣ >

æ

- ▶ 430 and 380 Gflops by zgemm and dgemm ightarrow 75% of gemm
- only about 15% of the reduction time is spent here

multi-GPU kernel 2: BLAS-2 SYMV symmetric matrix-vector multiplication

a specialized CUDA kernel to minimize data traffic for multiply with local matrix (an extension of our SC'11 paper).



< ≣ >

- each GPU thread processes a block row
- as each block A_{ii} is read, we multiply with A_{ii} and A^T_{ii}
 - each thread writes its partial result to its own workspace
 - another kernels is launched to sum the partial results
 - A is read only once from the GPU memory

performance of SYMV on multiple GPUs (Keeneland: three NVIDIA M2090 GPUs/node).



bandwidth-limited operation:

- ► zhemv performs twice more operations → twice the Gflop/s
- ▶ 120GB/sec with ECC on → peaks are 120 and 60 Gflop/s for zhemv and dsymv → 65% - 75% of this peak → 15% - 20% of gemm

∢ ≣⇒

up to 80% of the reduction time is spent here

putting them together: multi-GPU tridiagonalization

- 1 statically distribute A in 1DBC
- 2 for each panel
 - 2.1 panel factorization

for each column in the panel

- 2.1.1 update a_i with previous v and w on CPUs
- 2.1.2 compute Householder reflector on CPUs
- 2.1.3 broadcast reflector to all GPUs
- 2.1.4 SYMV of local submatrices on GPUs in parallel
- 2.1.5 copy vector v_i back to CPU
- 2.1.6 compute w_j on CPUs
- 2.2 trailing submatrices update
 - 2.2.1 broadcast V and W to GPUs
 - 2.2.2 SYR2K of local submatrix on GPUs in parallel

for each GPU call, communicate:

local matrix $\left(\frac{n^2+n}{2\times \text{gpus}}\right)$ data) from GPU memory

vector(s) (n or nk data) between CPU and GPU (non-blocking MPI + GPU streams)

▲祠 → ▲ 臣 → ▲ 臣 →

æ

hybrid CPU-GPU computing with asynch. MPI and GPU communication

- SYR2K: hide communication of V or W behind panel factorization using asynch MPI send and dedicated GPU stream
- SYMV: overlap CPU and GPU computation (and hide CPU-GPU communication) for multiplying with updated (left-look within panel, right-look between panels),

 $(\widehat{A} - \widehat{V}\widehat{W}^T - \widehat{W}\widehat{V}^T)v_j,$

where \widehat{A} is $\widehat{n} \times \widehat{n}$, while \widehat{V} and \widehat{W} are $\widehat{n} \times (j-1)$.

- $\widehat{A}v_j$ on GPUs, while $(\widehat{V}\widehat{W}^T + \widehat{W}\widehat{V}^T)v_j$ (and updating next column) on CPUs.



Performance on Keeneland: ScaLAPACK

- Keeneland: two 8-core 2.6GHz Intel Xeon processors (SandyBridge) and three NVIDIA Tesla M2090 GPUs.
- weak-scaling studies: matrix size = $11,520 \times (\text{number of nodes})^{\frac{1}{2}}$.



- hybrid-programming performed well
 - 1MPI/socket obtained best computation and communication performance

< ≣ >

$Performance \ on \ Keeneland: \ ScaLAPACK+1GPU/node$



< ≣⇒

< D > < D > <</p>

æ

GPU-extension got reasonable speedups

- significant speedups over 1MPI/core or 1MPI/node.
- similar performance as 1MPI/socket.

Performance on Keeneland: ScaLAPACK+3GPUs/node



GPU-extension got reasonable speedups

- it is difficult to scale to large-scale,
 - non-blocking MPI-GPU comm. to reduce waiting time
 - \rightarrow MPI communication starts fo dominate.
 - GPU kernel to reduce computation time
 - \rightarrow GPU efficiency goes down on many nodes
 - \uparrow both of which may be addressed by 2DBC.

Performance of SYMV in 2DBC vs. 1DBC





<ロ> (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

æ

- local submatrix is closer to square with 2DBC
 GPU-kernel performs better on a square matrix
- it is being integrated into ScaLAPACK.

Final remarks

- ok speedups on a small number of nodes
- challenge to scale to more nodes
 - MPI communication starts to dominate
 - GPU kernel does not scale well



< ∃⇒

Current and future work:

- 2DBC (or any other suggestion?) to obtain higher-performance
 - to reduce communication and to improve GPU utilization
 - larger-scale studies and distributed Kepler?
- runtime system? two-stage on distributed GPUs?