

PCOT: Cache Oblivious Tiling of Polyhedral Programs

Waruna Ranasinghe
Nirmal Prajapati
Colorado State University
Department of Computer Science
Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

Tomofumi Yuki
INRIA
Rennes, France

Sanjay Rajopadhye
Colorado State University
Department of Computer Science
Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper studies two variants of tiling: iteration space tiling (or loop blocking) and cache oblivious methods that recursively split the iteration space with divide-and-conquer. The key question to answer is when we should be using one over the other. The answer to this question is complicated for modern architecture due to a number of reasons.

In this paper, we present a detailed empirical study to answer this question for a range of kernels that fit the polyhedral model. Our study is based on a generalized cache oblivious code generator that support this class, which is a superset of those supported by existing tools. The conclusion is that cache oblivious code is most useful when the aim is to have reduced off-chip memory accesses, e.g., lower energy, albeit certain situations that diminish its effectiveness exist.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → **Shared memory algorithms**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Shared memory algorithms**;

KEYWORDS

Tiling, Cache Oblivious, Polyhedral Model

ACM Reference format:

Waruna Ranasinghe, Nirmal Prajapati, Tomofumi Yuki, and Sanjay Rajopadhye. 2018. PCOT: Cache Oblivious Tiling of Polyhedral Programs. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference, Washington, DC, USA, July 2017 (Conference'17)*, 14 pages.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Modern multicore processors are complicated, and programming them is a challenge, especially when seeking the best performance. Many different, and often conflicting factors need to be optimized, notably, parallelism and data locality, and that too, at multiple levels of the memory/processor hierarchy (vectors-registers-cores-caches). Indeed, in the exascale era, the very notion of “performance” may refer to execution time (i.e., speed) or to energy (product of the average power and time), or even the energy-delay product.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA
© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

Iteration space tiling [35, 67, 68] (variously called loop blocking [56] or partitioning [8, 15, 61]) is a critical transformation, used for multiple objectives: balancing granularity of communication to computation across nodes in a distributed machine, improving data locality on a single node, controlling locality and parallelism among multiple cores on a node, and, at the finest grain, exploiting vectorization while avoiding register pressure on a single core. It is an essential strategy used by compilers and automatic parallelizers.

Another approach to optimizing memory transfers is provided by cache oblivious algorithms [25, 51]. They come with elegant theoretical bounds on the number of cache misses, and are claimed to require less tuning than iteration space tiling. When applied to specific computation patterns like “stencils,” cache-oblivious the strategy may also be viewed as tiling, where a tile is recursively split into smaller ones through the divide-and-conquer strategy [26].

The fundamental difference between the two approaches is the *schedule*, or temporal order in which tiles are executed. A program transformed with (single-level) iteration space tiling visits the tiles in the lexicographic order. Cache oblivious methods visit (leaf) tiles in a different order, yielding better locality—this can also be viewed as hierarchical tiling [9] where the number of levels depends on the problem size.

The practical impact of this difference is not fully understood due to many complicating factors. The theoretical results for cache oblivious methods assume fully associative caches, and therefore do not fully account for conflict misses. Hardware prefetching plays an important role in modern architecture, and it also has significant impact on the choice of tile sizes [48]. Most importantly, existing tools for cache oblivious code generation are domain specific: Pochoir targets Jacobi-style stencils [59] and AutoGen specializes on dynamic programming [11]. This makes an “apples-to-apples” comparison of the two techniques difficult because of the mismatch between the classes of programs where the application of the two techniques are automated.

Our objective is to understand the difference between iteration space tiling and cache oblivious strategy on modern architecture. Our study emphasizes the influence of tile sizes (or base case thresholds) that strongly impact the performance of both approaches. To do this we generalized cache oblivious code generation to all computations that fit the polyhedral model, i.e., (imperfect) loop nests with affine bounds and array accesses [21–24, 46, 53, 54]. This class of programs include, as a *proper* subset, all the inputs handled by Pochoir and Autogen, and many others such as dense linear algebra algorithms and Gauss-Seidel style stencils. Our study reveals the following:

- The absolute number of cache misses, as well as the variability of this number as a function of tile sizes, are both

significantly lower with cache oblivious codes. This is consistent with theory.

- Both approaches show similar variability in speed, implying that the tuning effort for both methods is similar. The main reason is that speed does not depend on cache behavior alone. The leaf tile sizes influence other aspects such as recursion overhead, register allocation, vectorization, and prefetcher effectiveness.
- The additional levels of tiling in cache oblivious codes do not contribute to speed, especially for polyhedral programs. Once there the code is compute-bound at a certain level of cache, additional locality in slower caches does not improve speed.
- The benefit of cache oblivious approaches diminish on architectures with low set-associativity of caches, and with prefetching. The tile execution order of cache oblivious codes can increase conflict misses with high dimensional data. Hardware prefetching may favor large tile sizes in the innermost dimension, if speed is the primary objective, where the leaf tile sizes are already targeting the LLC (Last Level Cache).

These results are, in part, confirmation of the work by Yotov et al. [70], who focused on sequential executions of matrix computations. We extended the study to a broader range of kernels, and to parallel execution. The main takeaway is that if the main interest is in speed, then cache oblivious codes are unlikely to help. However, if the goal is to reduce off-chip memory traffic, e.g., for better energy efficiency, then cache oblivious codes give this for “free:” no additional tuning is required beyond that required for speed. Even then, its effectiveness is constrained by various aspects of the code and the platform, and care must be taken to select the appropriate strategy. We provide a generalized cache oblivious code generator to offer this option to any polyhedral program, and give insights on when it will be effective.

2 MOTIVATIONS FOR EMPIRICAL STUDY

The key question that we try to answer is when and why we should use standard iteration space tiling over cache oblivious tiling. The two approaches perform similar partitioning of the iteration space, but the schedules given to the partitions are different. Theoretically, cache oblivious code seems to have advantages over iteration space tiling. However, many factors complicate the actual performance, which made our initial experiments difficult to interpret. In this section, we describe the obstacles between the theory and practice we have identified.

We use Single-Level Tiling (SLT) for iteration space tiling, and Cache Oblivious Tiling (COT) for cache oblivious techniques in this paper, which are further described in Section 3.

Recursion Overhead. This is a well-known overhead of COT [70]. The recursion introduces overheads, such as function call overhead, and increased register pressure. Furthermore, the functions force inter-procedural analysis/optimization, known to be more difficult for compilers well. Thus, the leaf tiles must be “sufficiently large” to avoid excessive overhead due to the recursion.

Recursive Split Constraints the Tile Sizes. In typical cache oblivious algorithms, the problem is recursively split into halves in each dimension. This is in fact a rather coarse-grained exploration of the hierarchical partitioning of the iteration space. For instance, if the current problem size is B^3 , then the next sub-problem would be $(\frac{B}{2})^3$. If the best problem size for utilizing a level of cache is $(B-x)^3$ where $x \ll \frac{B}{2}$ then the subproblems due to divide-and-conquer will not match the best. This is another factor that necessitates fine tuning of leaf tile sizes even for COT, since the utilization rate of L1 cache has strong impact on performance.

COT has more Conflict Misses. The divide-and-conquer execution order may negatively affect cache interference, especially with high dimensional data. This happens when the memory is allocated such that the accesses are contiguous along some direction in the iteration space (typically along innermost canonical axis). With lexicographic order of execution, this contiguity is largely preserved in the tiled execution. However, divide-and-conquer executes neighboring tiles in all dimensions, and many of those tiles access some distant location in memory. In contrast to accessing contiguous regions of memory, accessing various segments of the memory increases the chances of conflicts.

Hardware Prefetching. Modern architectures are equipped with hardware prefetchers that can bring data to the L1 cache. When having sufficient locality at L2 or LLC makes the program compute-bound, then the latency to L2/LLC can be hidden by the prefetcher. For such programs, it is unnecessary to tile for the fastest cache, and larger tiles targeting slower caches improve performance by maximizing prefetcher effectiveness [48]. When the primary objective is speed, the leaf tiles for COT should also be large, which negates the benefit of divide-and-conquer, as the leafs are already targeting slower caches. Prefetching have little impact on parallel executions, since prefetching is bandwidth limited. When multiple cores try to prefetch at the same time, the bandwidth limit is quickly reached, and the latency hiding effect is lost. Furthermore, smaller tile sizes are better for parallel execution for load balancing reasons.

These factors limit the effectiveness of COT in various ways and are also closely tied to the characteristics of the computation. Our empirical study illustrate the impact of these factors on polyhedral computations.

3 BACKGROUND

In this section, we present necessary background on tiling, cache oblivious divide-and-conquer execution, and define the terminology used in this paper.

3.1 Tiling

Tiling is a well-known loop transformation for partitioning computations into smaller, atomic (all inputs to a tile can be computed before its execution), units called tiles [35, 67]. The partitioning into tiles improves data locality by altering the execution order of the operations. Tiling also exposes coarse-grained parallelism making it the core transformation for polyhedral automatic parallelizers such as Pluto [7].

The natural legality condition of tiling is that the dependences across tiles do not create a cycle. In compilers, this condition is




Figure 1: Execution order of the smallest tiles under single- and two-level tiling. Two-level tiling may be viewed as Cache Oblivious Tiling where the recursion reached the base case after one recursive step. With hierarchical tiling, neighboring tiles form a larger tile that increase intra-tile reuse.

typically expressed as fully permutability (i.e., dependences are non-negative direction vectors), which is a sufficient condition. In the rest of this paper, we assume that the programs have been transformed to expose loop nests that satisfy this condition. For polyhedral programs, scheduling techniques to expose such loop nests are available [7].

3.2 Cache Oblivious Tiling

Cache oblivious algorithms [25, 51] are based on recursive formulation into smaller subproblems (divide-and-conquer). The main argument is that as the problem sizes are recursively made smaller, a subproblem is going to fit on some level of the memory hierarchy that may be caches, main memory, etc. This class of algorithms is expected to take advantage of all memory hierarchies through this strategy.

Cache Oblivious Tiling is a specialization of such algorithms based on tiling. Tiles after a level of tiling can be tiled again with smaller tile sizes to realize the divide-and-conquer execution pattern. COT may be viewed as hierarchical tiling, except that the number of tiling levels are determined at run-time through divide-and-conquer [9].

The key effect of multi-level tiling is to change the execution order of the tiles. As illustrated in Figure 1, the grouping of smaller tiles; forming larger tiles increasing intra-tile reuse; is what accounts for better cache utilization.

3.3 Terminology

We introduce a few terms, in addition to COT in the above.

Single-Level Tiling. SLT is when loop tiling is applied once to improve data locality with respect to a level of cache. The reason we restrict to SLT is because SLT and COT expose the same number of tuning parameters. It is known that even cache oblivious algorithms require the performance of the leaf subproblems to be tuned to have good performance. The tuning effort required is similar to SLT with the same number of tuning parameters, which would not be the case if you apply multi-level tiling that multiplies the number of tuning parameters.

Tile Size. We use tile size interchangeably with the base case threshold (and leaf tile size) in COT. Whenever tile sizes are discussed for COT, it refers to the size of the leaf tile sizes, which is its tuning parameter.

Off-Chip Accesses. OCA are all load accesses that read from the main memory. This includes the accesses due to Last-Level Cache misses due to load operations, as well as those arising from prefetching instructions.

4 CODE GENERATION OF PCOT

In this section, we describe our generalization of the cache oblivious code generation to polyhedral programs: Polyhedral Cache Oblivious Tiling (PCOT).

4.1 Approach Overview

The input is any polyhedral loop nest that is fully permutable and hence tiling it with hyper-rectangular tiles is a legal transformation. We first (in Section 4.2) describe the case for tiling all dimensions of a perfect loop nest. Other cases can be handled with additional pre-processing, which we describe in Section 4.4.

Figure 2 illustrates the structure of our generated code. The input loop nest is replaced by a call to start the recursion as shown in Figure 2a. The computation of the bounding box from loop nests are discussed in Section 4.5.

4.2 Codegen for Perfect Loop Nests

Given a perfectly nested loop with all d dimensions tilable, we seek to generate, (i) a call to recursive function to start the recursion, (ii) a recursive function, and (iii) a base function. The recursive function takes origin and the size of the orthant as inputs, which are d dimensional vectors. For the initial call to the recursive function, the origin and the orthant size correspond to the bounding box of the input loop nest. Bounding box of a domain is the smallest hyper-rectangular shaped domain which encloses the given domain.

The recursive function visits the iteration domain in divide-and-conquer order. It recursively divides iteration domain into orthants until they are smaller than an input parameter. The call to the base function is wrapped by a condition to check whether the size of the current orthant is less than or equal to the base case threshold.

The orthants are visited sequentially in the lexicographic order. For parallel execution the tasks are executed with wave-front parallelism. We use the OpenMP tasks for parallel execution, where each recursive function call is annotated with `omp task pragma`, and the wave-front time boundaries are synchronized with `omp taskwait`.

The base function visits all points in the intersection of leaf orthant and the input loop nest iteratively in lexicographical order. The loop nest in the base function is identical to the loop nest for a tile in SLT with parametric tile sizes we use. One can use any one of the available parametrically tiled code generators [3, 34, 40, 41] to generate parametrically tiled loops and then extract the point loops.




Figure 2: The structure of generated code for Heat2D stencils, which has loop depth $d = 3$. (a) The tileable loop nest is replaced by a call to start the recursion. The input is the bounding box of the loop nest. (b) Structure of the recursive function. The input bounding box is split into 2^d new orthants by dividing each dimension in half, and the same function is recursively called for each new orthant. When the orthant reaches the input tile size, the recursion is terminated by a call to the base function. (c) Code for the base function that performs the computation of a tile in lexicographic order.

4.3 Optimizations

We implement a number of optimizations to improve the speed of code. In this section we explain two important optimizations to exit the recursion early.

4.3.1 Early Exit for Zero Orthants. The zero orthants surface when we have tile sizes that are cubic bounding box with hyper-rectangular tiles and vice versa. In this case, orthant size along all the dimensions reaches the leaf size in different levels of the recursion. But still our code generator generates 2^d sequence of recursive calls where size some of the new orthants may be zero along dimensions where the input orthant size is already smaller than the leaf threshold. This is a simple optimization where we check whether a width along anyone of the dimensions of the orthant is zero. If it is zero then exit the recursion.

4.3.2 Early Exit for Empty Orthants. Second optimization is due to the fact we visit the bounding box of the input loop nest instead of the actual domain. Some kernels operate on non-hyper-rectangular domains (i.e., Cholesky operates on triangular domains) and some kernels need iteration space skewing to enable hyper-rectangular tiling (i.e., Heat2D). If the actual domain is not a hyper-rectangle then the bounding box will have points where no computations are defined. This may lead to orthants outside of the original iteration space, analogous to empty tiles in iteration space tiling.

For example, a loop nest whose iteration space is triangular, the bounding box is a rectangle where the half of the points has no computation defined. When we visit this rectangular box in divide-and-conquer order, we will end up visiting empty orthants and we want to identify these orthants. We generate conditions to check whether all vertices of the orthant remain outside of the original iteration space using *isl* library [65].

The `checkEmpty` method at the top of the Figure 2c implements both optimizations. Without them, the code produces correct answers but visits many base cases which are empty. The recursion ends either when `checkEmpty` method returns true or when the orthant reaches its input tile size.

4.4 Handling Imperfect Loop Nests

The discussion so far assumed perfectly nested loops as inputs. We now extend this to imperfect loop nests, and loop nests where subset of the d dimensions are marked as tilable.

The input imperfect loop nests are converted to perfect loop nests with a pre-processing. This is called the embedding transformation that are used to handle imperfectly nested loops in parametric tiled code generation [41]. It involves, bringing all the statements into the same loop depth by adding loops with one iteration as necessary. Then affine guards are added to eliminate sequence of inner loops, which lead to “perfect loop nest with affine guards”.

When a subset of the loops are marked as tilable, we first extract the marked band of loops parameterized by both program input parameters as well as untilted outer loop iterators. We apply the techniques we have discussed so far to generate code for the extracted loop nest. In this case, the function call to start the recursion is added as the body of outer untilted loop nest. The inner untilted loop nests are added as the body of the point loop in the base function.

4.5 Computing the Bounding Box

The bounding box is a hyper-rectangle containing the iteration space of the loop nest. It is computed by eliminating the outer loop indices from the loop bound expressions. There can be infinitely many bounding boxes for a given loop nest, but we start with the tightest (smallest) bounding box among all the possibilities.

Table 1: Machine Configuration

Architecture Parameters	Haswell	Broadwell
Processor	E3-1231 v3	E5-1650v4
Base Frequency	3.4 GHz	3.6 GHz
Turbo Boost Frequency	3.8 GHz	4 GHz
Number of Cores	4	6
RAM	32 GB	16 GB
L3 Cache	8 MB 16-way	15 MB 20-way
L2 Cache	256 KB per core 8-way	
L1 Cache	32 KB per core 8-way	
Max Mem.Bandwidth	25.6 GB/s	76.8GB/s
Compiler	icc 16.0.2	

The bounding box also plays an important role in deciding the leaf tile size. We want the leaf tile size to have the exact value as the input tile size parameter to the generated code. Therefore, we pad the size of bounding box along each dimension to the minimum value of $b_i \times 2^{k_i} \geq N_i$ where b_i input leaf size parameter, N_i the size along the i^{th} dimension of bounding box and $k_i \geq 0$ is an integer. Now, at k_i th level of recursion the orthant size along the i th dimension will be b_i . The padding of the bounding box introduces iteration points outside of original iteration space. These empty points get optimized away by the optimizations described in Section 4.3

5 EMPIRICAL STUDY

In this section, we empirically study different tiling strategies. The goal of the experiments is to characterize SLT and COT, and to show the influence of the factors discussed in Section 2.

5.1 Experimentation Setup

For our experiments, we use two CPU architectures: Haswell and Broadwell. The configuration of these machines are shown in Table 1. The benchmarks are compiled with ICC 16.0.2 using the following flags: `-O3 -xHost -ipo`. We use perf tool to count off-chip memory accesses (OCA), which is the total number of LLC misses. The tool counts the number of OCA for the entire program that consists of kernel, timing functions and reading program inputs. The number of OCA is dominant in the kernel, therefore we can safely use perf to measure OCA for the kernels.

5.1.1 Code Generators. We experiment with multiple state-of-the-art code generators. We use D-Tiling [40, 41] implemented in AlphaZ [71] to generate SLT code with parametric tile sizes. We compare the performance of parametric SLT and PCOT, which are main subject of our study. In addition, we compare speed of PCOT with Pluto [7] for fixed size SLT code, Pochoir [59] for cache oblivious Jacobi-style stencils, and Autogen [11] for cache oblivious dynamic programming.

5.1.2 Benchmark Suite. We use kernels from stencils, linear algebra, and dynamic programming for our experiments. Specifically, we include FDTD-2D, GaussSeidel-2D (GS-2D), Heat-2D and Heat-3D for stencils; Cholesky decomposition and LU decomposition (LUD) for linear algebra, and Optimal String Parenthesizing (OSP)

from the dynamic programming. These kernels are selected to cover the types of kernels handled by existing tools, as well as additional polyhedral kernels that can now be supported with the PCOT generator. All the benchmarks are from PolyBench/C ¹ version 4.2 except for OSP. We include OSP, since it was used to evaluate Autogen [11] and we obtained OSP code from authors of Autogen. All benchmarks are scheduled using the Pluto algorithm, and use the same memory allocation as PolyBench kernels.

Pluto algorithm is unable to find tiling hyperplanes for all three dimensions for OSP. However, there is a well-known transformation that reorders the summation described by Guibas et al. [29] to transform the dependences to be tileable. We apply this transformation as a pre-processing to tile all three dimensions of OSP. Autogen is able to tile all three dimensions automatically, making this necessary to make a fair comparison of the tile execution order.

5.1.3 Problem Size Selection. We select the problem size of each benchmark such that the memory footprint of a wavefront of tiles, i.e., the set of tiles that may be executed in parallel with single-level tiling code, does not fit in LLC. Therefore, during the execution there will be off-chip memory accesses. We do not use problem sizes that are powers of 2 since they exacerbate the occurrences of conflict misses unless padded. Table 2 shows the chosen problem sizes for all the benchmarks.

5.1.4 Consistent Optimization Level Across Codegen Techniques. We want to ensure that the performance of each tile is similar across all techniques to focus on the difference due to tile execution order. Autogen and Pochoir apply some low-level optimizations not supported by the PCOT generator and Pluto. These optimizations were applied manually to SLT, PCOT, and Pluto generated code. These optimizations are:

- Copy optimization: copying transpose of a column-major input matrix inside a base function to a local array, so that it can be accessed in unit stride, and
- Write optimization: if there is an accumulation in the innermost loop, first perform the accumulation on a local variable and then update the array at the end.
- Indexing Simplification: array accesses are simplified by use of pointer arithmetic instead of accesses to multi-dimensional arrays.

In addition we used the restrict keyword and additional compiler options to ensure that parallel innermost loops are vectorized by ICC.

5.1.5 Tile Size Exploration. In our study, we explore the difference between SLT and COT. An important aspect of this study is the influence of tile sizes, which have large impact on both approaches. We are not interested in the “best” tile size in this paper, but in the characterization of the effect of tile sizes. Therefore, our main focus is in the statistical property over a same set of tile sizes for both tiling schemes.

We explore a set of tile sizes ranges from 10 to 50 in steps of 10, 100 to 500 in steps of 100 in all the dimensions, and 1000 to problem-size in steps of 1000 along innermost dimension of a tile. For Heat-3D, tile sizes 10, 30, 50, 100 and 300 were explored along

¹ Available online at <https://sourceforge.net/projects/polybench/>

² OSP performance numbers are in GUpdateS

Table 2: Benchmarks, problem sizes and achieved performance in GFLOPs per second for the sequential single-level tiling code on both architectures.

Benchmark	Problem size	SLT-seq GFLOPS	
		Haswell	Broadwell
Cholesky	4000^2	12.3	11.7
LUD	3000^2	4.1	4.1
FDTD-2D	500×2000^2	6.4	5.6
GS-2D	500×2000^2	1.9	2.7
Heat-2D	500×3000^2	20.5	20.4
Heat-3D	50×350^3	16.5	17.6
OSP ²	4000^2	21.0	22.8

all the dimensions. These ranges of tile sizes give a relatively coarse-grained sampling of possible tile sizes that fits in different levels of cache. Exhaustively searching the entire space of legal tile sizes is impractical due to time limitations. For each tile size, we use the mean over three runs, which had low variance across runs.

We do not explore tile sizes on both Pluto and Pochoir. It is impossible to automatically explore tile sizes for Pluto since it performs fixed sized tiling, and we had to manually modify the output to make the performance of tiles consistent with others. The tile sizes in Pochoir are hardwired into the code generator, and we could not find an easy way to explore the tile sizes.

5.2 Characterization of SLT and COT

Figures 3, and 4 summarize the result of our study in the two platforms.

We first discuss the variability of OCA with respect to tile size. COT has much smaller number of OCA and variability compared to SLT when we restrict to smaller tile sizes (Figures 3a and 3c). This confirms the benefits of COT as it automatically takes advantage of the multiple levels of memory hierarchy, owing to the recursive structure of COT.

Heat-3D does not exhibit the expected behavior since COT introduces more conflict misses for higher dimensional data as explained below. The theoretical results of COT were derived with the assumption of fully associative caches where a cache line can be stored at any location in the cache. Therefore, there will not be any occurrences of conflict misses but capacity misses. In reality, caches are n-way ($n=16$ and 20 for the cpus used in our experiments) associative where there are n candidate locations in the cache to store a cache line. This leads to conflict misses. Let us consider sequential execution of a d-dimensional stencil where all $d+1$ (including time dimension) dimensions are tiled. A tile uses d of the faces as inputs and generates d faces of outputs. Let us assume that the tile sizes are such that data correspond to all d output faces fit in LLC. SLT executes tiles in lexicographic order. Therefore, lexicographically next tile will read one of the input faces through LLC. But all other $d-1$ input faces were produced long time ago, therefore data is no longer in LLC due to potential capacity misses. Hence, conflict misses can potentially occur when the input face is read through LLC and when accessing data while computing values within the tile. COT visits the neighbouring tiles first. Therefore, a tile reads

more than one (ideally d) input faces through LLC. Hence, conflict misses can occur when all the input faces are read and when compute values within the tile. Since COT reads more input faces through LLC, there is a higher chance of occurring conflict misses compared to SLT. When the number of dimensions are increased, the dimensions of the memory footprint of a tile increase as well as the number of input faces COT read through LLC. The higher number of dimensions, the larger the distance between memory footprints of neighbouring tiles. Therefore, the chance of occurring conflict misses is further increased. Hence for Heat-3D, the number of conflict misses for COT is as high as the number of capacity misses for SLT. This behaviour diminish the benefits of COT for higher dimensional stencils.

When data points correspond to all the tile sizes are considered (Figures 3b and 3d), the absolute number of OCA remains similar for COT since all the tile sizes fits in LLC. For SLT, the mean of OCA is slightly decreased compared to smaller tile sizes since the larger tiles fit in LLC reducing the number of LLC misses. Heat3D remains an outlier due to the conflict misses as described in previous paragraph. The behavior of OCA we discussed so far similar for both sequential and parallel codes except that parallel codes have more OCA due to the increased number of conflict misses.

The variability of execution time is high for both COT and SLT on both platforms. It is related to the recursion overhead and restrictive tile sizes due to recursive split of COT as described in Section 2. This shows that speed of COT is sensitive to tile sizes, therefore, both COT and SLT need tile size exploration/tuning for speed. For sequential runs, large tile sizes make more effective use of prefetcher with increased bandwidth requirement as described under *hardware prefetching* in Section 2. We verified this behavior of prefetcher by counting the L2 prefetcher activities. We noticed that for large tile sizes the number of prefetcher activities are 3 order of magnitude higher compared to small tile sizes. But for parallel runs, the bandwidth limit is reached faster, therefore, benefits of prefetching diminish.

5.3 Comparison of Speed Against State of the Art

In the following we compare the performance of SLT and PCOT with state-of-the-art code generators. The performance is normalized to the GFLOPS (giga flops per second) achieved by sequential parametric single-level tiling (SLT-seq) code. We use the best tile size found in the tile size exploration described above. For Pluto, we used the best tile size for SLT. The absolute performance numbers are shown on top each bar in Figure 5

The parallel variants are executed with the number of threads equal to the number of physical cores (i.e., hyper-threading is not considered) on each machine. Figure 5 shows the normalized performance (GFLOPS) on both Haswell and Broadwell. The speed of SLT and PCOT closely matches the speed of state-of-the-art.

PCOT out performs Pochoir on Heat-2D. For this benchmark, Pochoir does not vectorize the iterations at the boundaries. Pochoir scales better (20%) with 6 threads for Heat-3D due to the concurrent start of tiles. For OSP, PCOT is 10-15% faster than Autogen. This difference is attributed to the tile shapes. The Autogen generated code is restricted to cubic tile sizes where as the PCOT generated




Figure 3: Mean and standard deviation of number of OCA across the tile sizes that fits in LLC for both Haswell and Broadwell. The figures in the left (a,c) show the OCA behavior when restricted to tile sizes within 50 in all dimensions and the figures in the right (b,d) show the behavior when all the tile sizes are used. We have to focus on both relative standard deviation and mean number of OCA. When the tile sizes are restricted to 50, we see the expected behavior where the variability is much lower with COT. This confirms the benefits of the recursive structure of COT as it automatically takes advantage of multiple levels of memory hierarchy. When the tile sizes are not restricted, the number of OCA remains similar for COT. The mean number of OCA for SLT decreases compared to smaller tiles since the larger tiles fits in LLC reducing the number of OCA. The behavior of OCA on both cpu platforms is similar except that Haswell has relatively more OCA since its LLC size is smaller compared to Broadwell.

code have more degrees of freedom, and we found that using large tile sizes in the innermost dimension is better for performance in many cases. When we try cubic tile sizes in PCOT, the speed is similar to Autogen. Performance of SLT, Pluto and PCOT are similar with each other.

Despite the significant reduction in off-chip memory accesses of benchmarks in PCOT, the absolute speeds of codes from PCOT and other techniques remain similar. For compute-bound kernels (i.e., after applying SLT), the latency of OCA are already hidden. Therefore, further reducing OCA does not translate into savings in execution time.

Finally we compare the speed (GFLOPS) of the benchmarks to the peak performance per benchmark. The compiler does clever optimizations for both Haswell and Broadwell architectures. For example, 5-point Heat-2D stencil has 4 muls, 2 subs and 4 adds and the throughput of vector (4 doubles wide) instructions is 2, 1 and 1 per cycle respectively³. The compiler replace some of the operations with fused multiply-add/sub (FMA) operations where the throughput is 2 per cycle. The resulting assembly code has only 2 subs, and 4 FMAs. Hence, it takes only 4 cycles to execute 6 vector instructions which corresponds to 40 scalar operations. Therefore, achievable peak (ceiling) is 36 GFLOPS on Broadwell. The achieved

³Data available at <http://software.intel.com/sites/landingpage/IntrinsicsGuide/>




Figure 4: Mean and standard deviation of execution time on (a) Haswell and (b) Broadwell across all explored tile sizes. Variance is high for both COT and SLT on both machines. Therefore, tile size exploration/tuning is needed for speed.




Figure 5: Performance of SLT and PCOT on (a) Haswell and (b) Broadwell, normalized to sequential parametric SLT SLT-seq (higher the better). The absolute performance numbers are shown on top of each bar in GFLOPS. Both the sequential and the parallel performance of SLT and PCOT closely matches the performance of other code generators. Other represents Pluto for the first 4 benchmarks, Pochoir for Heat-2D and 3D, and Autogen for OSP.

performance is 20.5 GFLOPS which is 57% of the peak. If we account for the cycles for the non-arithmetic operations in the loop body of the assembly code, then the achievable ceiling will be further lowered making the achieved performance much closer to the peak.

6 RELATED WORK

We put our work into context and discuss other approaches to cache-oblivious methods. We also discuss previous works on tiling and code generation.

6.1 Empirical Study of Cache-Oblivious Methods

The most closely related work is by Yotov et al. [70] that explored answers to the question “what is the cost of cache obliviousness?” Their study is primarily on matrix multiplication and is only about sequential execution. Our work extends the study to a broader range of programs and to parallel executions. We also provide variability of both speed and cache behavior with respect to tile size.

Some prior work on code generators for various types of tiling have empirically compared iteration space tiling and cache-oblivious

methods [2, 11, 44, 58, 73]. The objective of these experiments are slightly different from ours; the main target of evaluation is the code generation tools. Our interest is in understanding the difference due to the tile execution order. The reported performance difference in these experiments mostly come from differences in other aspects that influence the performance (e.g., copy optimization and other low-level optimizations), which we carefully checked that codes from all tools have similar behavior in our work. This explains the apparent inconsistency with earlier results.

6.2 Cache Oblivious Code Generation

Prokop [25, 51] introduced the cache-oblivious algorithms. Later, Frigo and Strumpen proposed the serial [26] and the parallel [27] divide and conquer implementations of stencil programs. Strzodka et al. [58] proposed cache oblivious parallelograms method (CORALS) which is similar to the time-skewed wavefront parallelization of iterative stencil computations. CORALS takes advantage of the regular dependence patterns of stencil computations and applies oblique cuts in both space and time dimensions simultaneously. They use a load-balancing scheme to evenly distribute all the threads amongst the tiles. Their technique benefits from data locality, parallelism and vectorization simultaneously.

Pochoir [59] is a domain specific compiler for stencil programs. It generates a divide and conquer implementation of the program based on trapezoidal decompositions using hyperspace cuts. Pochoir generates efficient code, but the code generated for the hyper-trapezoidal tile shape is very complex and that the base case sizes are fixed at compile time. Pochoir, also, cannot handle dependences along the time dimension. The dependence should be always from a previous time step. Therefore, Gauss-Seidel-like dependences cannot be handled. Pochoir can generate the divide and conquer code for periodic stencils. Periodic stencils can be handled by our COT code generator after the smashing transformation [6, 49]. Pochoir is capable of applying oblique cuts whereas we make canonic cuts.

Serial and parallel implementations of recursive divide and conquer algorithms with optimal cache complexity have been developed and evaluated for a specific dynamic programming algorithm such as Longest Common Subsequence [10, 13], global pairwise sequence alignment problem in bioinformatics [12], Gaussian Elimination Paradigm [14], etc. Tithi et al. [63] described a way to obtain divide and conquer algorithms manually for a class of dynamic programming problems. The base cases of these programs are similar to matrix multiplication computations. The code is hand optimized with the non-trivial Z-Morton matrix conversions. Unlike the work of [63], Autogen does not use Z-Morton matrices. The derived cache-oblivious implementation is parameterized by a single base value for all the dimensions which limits the tile shape to a hypercube. Autogen is mostly applicable to dynamic programming problems where the fractal property is often available.

Tang et al. [60] proposed the Cache-Oblivious-Wavefront (COW) technique, that improves the parallelism of the cache-oblivious algorithms, which also preserves locality. They use classic divide and conquer strategy to partition the iteration space and schedule the execution of tasks across different levels of the recursion as soon as the data dependency constraints are satisfied. The execution pattern of the COW algorithm is conceptually similar to classic wavefront

schedules. However, the implementation is done by hand and their technique can handle only dynamic programming algorithms.

Autogen [11] executes an iterative implementation of the input program using very small problem sizes to determine the access patterns (dependences). It then determines a recursive decomposition (called fractal property) that can be used to derive a divide and conquer implementation. The structure of the recursive function is automatically generated but the body of the base case is hand implemented.

Bellmania [36] is an interactive system, based on solver-aided tactics, that re-writes the rules and generates provably correct divide and conquer implementations of dynamic programs. The dependences are statically analyzed, however, the derivation of the recursive algorithm is not automatic.

The COT code generator presented in this paper takes the base case tile sizes as input, therefore, the tile shape can be hyper-rectangular; and supports more general class of programs, i.e. all polyhedral programs.

6.3 Tiled Code Generation

Tiling [35, 68] is a classic iteration space partitioning technique which combines a set of points into tiles, where each tile can be executed atomically. Tiling comes in handy for exploiting data locality [38, 50, 67], minimizing communication [1, 69] and maximizing parallelism [2].

Time skewing [47] enables time tiling which increases the temporal reuse, especially in stencils. Bondhugula et al. [7] developed PLuTo, a system for tiling imperfectly nested affine loops with fixed sized tiles. The PLuTo algorithm obtains tiling hyperplanes that minimizes communication across fixed size hyper-parallelepiped tiles. Bandishti et al. [2] proposed a diamond tiling technique that enables the concurrent start of tiles and eliminates the pipeline fill and flush cost of classic wavefront tiling. Many other tiling techniques [28, 31–33, 37, 42] also propose ways to eliminate pipeline start-up cost in a similar fashion.

However, in all of the above, the generated code has fixed sized tiles and does not guarantee optimal usage of caches. Parametric tile sizes enable efficient auto-tuning and performance portability. Techniques [3, 16, 30, 39, 41, 55] have been thus developed to allow parametric tiling. More studies on parametric tiling such as D-Tiling [40, 41], P-Tiling [3] and Mono-parametric tiling [34] are conducted where the latter is a polyhedral transformation.

Our COT code generator produces code with parametric base tile sizes and the point loops can be generated using any of the aforementioned parametric tiled code generators.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have presented an empirical study of two approaches for tiling: SLT and COT. We have developed cache oblivious code generator that support any polyhedral computation to widen the scope of study to polyhedral programs. The takeaway is that COT does not save you from tuning effort for speed, but it gives you reduced off-chip memory accesses without tuning. However, when the speed is the primary objective, situations where good utilization of hardware prefetcher is essential negate the benefit of COT.

It is interesting to note that the access pattern of Jacobi-style stencils, which has been one of the main beneficiary of COT, is prefetcher-friendly, and are not fully benefiting from COT in our study. Our code generator now offers the option to use COT instead of other execution strategies implemented in the polyhedral tools for a much wider class of programs than stencils.

Since the speed of PCOT and SLT are similar, the savings off-chip memory accesses may result in saving in energy. It would be interesting to quantify the energy savings as a future work. This work only investigated Single-Level Tiling where multi-level tiling is a known alternative to improve data locality at multiple levels of the memory hierarchy. Further study that also explore the use of multi-level tiling is a natural future work.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Andonov, S. Balev, S. Rajopadhye, and N. Yanev. 2001. Optimal Semi-Oblique Tiling. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth annual ACM symposium on Parallel algorithms and architectures (SPAA '01)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- [2] Vinayaka Bandishti, Irshad Pananilath, and Uday Bondhugula. 2012. Tiling Stencil Computations to Maximize Parallelism. In *the International conference on high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis (SC '12)*. IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 40:1–40:11.
- [3] M. M. Baskaran, A. Hartono, S. Tavarageri, T. Henretty, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. 2010. Parameterized tiling revisited. In *CGO*. 200–209.
- [4] Somashekaracharya G. Bhaskaracharya, Uday Bondhugula, and Albert Cohen. 2016. Automatic Storage Optimization for Arrays. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 38, 3 (April 2016), 11:1–11:23.
- [5] Somashekaracharya G. Bhaskaracharya, Uday Bondhugula, and Albert Cohen. 2016. SMO: An Integrated Approach to Intra-array and Inter-array Storage Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 526–538.
- [6] U. Bondhugula, V. Bandishti, A. Cohen, G. Potron, and N. Vasilache. 2014. Tiling and Optimizing Time-Iterated Computations over Periodic Domains. In *PACT*.
- [7] U. Bondhugula, A. Hartono, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. 2008. PLuTo: A Practical and Fully Automatic Polyhedral Program Optimization System. In *ACM Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. ACM SIGPLAN, Tuscon, AZ, 101–113.
- [8] Jichun Bu and Ed F. Depretere. 1988. Converting Sequential Iterative Algorithms to Recurrent Equations for Automatic Design of Systolic Arrays. In *Proceedings of ICASSP*. 2025–2028.
- [9] L. Carter, J. Ferrante, and S. F. Hummel. 1995. Hierarchical tiling for improved superscalar performance. In *Proceedings of 9th International Parallel Processing Symposium (IPPS '95)*. 239–245.
- [10] Rezaul Chowdhury. 2007. *Cache-efficient Algorithms and Data Structures: Theory and Experimental Evaluation*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Computer Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin.
- [11] Rezaul Chowdhury, Pramod Ganapathi, Jesmin Jahan Tithi, Charles Bachmeier, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, Charles E. Leiserson, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Yuan Tang. 2016. AUTOGEN: Automatic Discovery of Cache-oblivious Parallel Recursive Algorithms for Solving Dynamic Programs. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10:1–10:12.
- [12] Rezaul Alan Chowdhury, Hai-Son Le, and Vijaya Ramachandran. 2010. Cache-Oblivious Dynamic Programming for Bioinformatics. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinformatics* 7, 3 (July 2010), 495–510.
- [13] Rezaul Alan Chowdhury and Vijaya Ramachandran. 2006. Cache-oblivious Dynamic Programming. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '06)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA, 591–600.
- [14] Rezaul Alan Chowdhury and Vijaya Ramachandran. 2010. The Cache-Oblivious Gaussian Elimination Paradigm: Theoretical Framework, Parallelization and Experimental Evaluation. *Theory of Computing Systems* 47, 4 (01 Nov 2010), 878–919.
- [15] Alain Darte. 1991. Regular Partitioning for Synthesizing Fixed-Size Systolic Arrays. *Integration: The VLSI Journal* 12 (December 1991), 293–304.
- [16] Alain Darte, Alexandre Isoard, et al. 2014. Parametric tiling with inter-tile data reuse. In *Proceedings of the 2014 International Working on Polyhedral Compilation Techniques (IMPACT '14)*.
- [17] Alain Darte, Alexandre Isoard, and Tomofumi Yuki. 2016. Extended Lattice-based Memory Allocation. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Compiler Construction (CC '16)*. 218–228.
- [18] A. Darte, Y. Robert, and F. Vivien. 2000. *Scheduling and Automatic Parallelization*. Birkhäuser.
- [19] A. Darte, R. Schreiber, and G. Villard. 2005. Lattice-Based Memory Allocation. *IEEE Trans. Computers* 54, 10 (2005), 1242–1257.
- [20] E. De Greef, F. Catthoor, and H. De Man. 1997. Memory Size Reduction through Storage Order Optimization for Embedded Parallel Multimedia Applications. In *Parallel Processing and Multimedia*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- [21] P. Feautrier. 1991. Dataflow analysis of array and scalar references. *International Journal of Parallel Programming* 20, 1 (Feb 1991), 23–53.
- [22] Paul Feautrier. 1992. Some Efficient Solutions to the Affine Scheduling Problem. Part I. One-dimensional Time. *International Journal of Parallel Programming* 21, 5 (1992), 313–347.
- [23] Paul Feautrier. 1992. Some Efficient Solutions to the Affine Scheduling Problem. Part II. Multidimensional Time. *International Journal of Parallel Programming* 21, 6 (1992), 389–420.
- [24] Paul Feautrier and Christian Lengauer. 2011. The Polyhedral Model. In *Encyclopedia of Parallel Programming*, David Padua (Ed.).
- [25] M. Frigo, C. E. Leiserson, H. Prokop, and S. Ramachandran. 1999. Cache-oblivious Algorithms. In *FOCS: IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, New York, NY, 285–297.
- [26] M. Frigo and V. Strumpfen. 2005. Cache Oblivious Stencil Computations. In *International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS)*, 2005. Cambridge, MA, 361–366.
- [27] Matteo Frigo and Volker Strumpfen. 2006. The cache complexity of multithreaded cache oblivious algorithms. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*. ACM, 271–280.
- [28] Tobias Grosser, Albert Cohen, Justin Holewinski, P. Sadayappan, and Sven Verdoolaege. 2014. Hybrid Hexagonal/Classical Tiling for GPUs. In *Proceedings of 12th International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO '14)*. 66:66–66:75.
- [29] L. Guibas, H. T. Kung, and Clark D. Thompson. 1979. Direct VLSI Implementation of Combinatorial Algorithms. In *Proc. Conference on Very Large Scale Integration: Architecture, Design and Fabrication*. 509–525.
- [30] Albert Hartono, Muthu Manikandan Baskaran, Cédric Bastoul, Albert Cohen, Sriram Krishnamoorthy, Boyana Norris, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. 2009. Parametric Multi-Level Tiling of Imperfectly Nested Loops. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Supercomputing (ICS '09)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- [31] A. Hartono, M. M. Baskaran, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. 2010. DynTile: Parametric tiled loop generation for parallel execution on multicore processors. In *2010 IEEE International Symposium on Parallel Distributed Processing (IPDPS)*. 1–12.
- [32] Tom Henretty, Richard Veras, Franz Franchetti, Louis-Noël Pouchet, J. Ramanujam, and P. Sadayappan. 2013. A Stencil Compiler for Short-vector SIMD Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 27th International ACM Conference on International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13–24.
- [33] Justin Holewinski, Louis-Noël Pouchet, and P. Sadayappan. 2012. High-performance Code Generation for Stencil Computations on GPU Architectures. In *Proc. of the 26th ACM Int. Conf. on Supercomputing (ICS '12)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 311–320.
- [34] Guillaume Iooss, Sanjay Rajopadhye, Christophe Alias, and Yun Zou. 2015. *Monoparametric Tiling is a Polyhedral Transformation*. Research Report RR-8802. INRIA Grenoble - Rhône-Alpes ; CNRS. 40 pages.
- [35] F. Irigoien and R. Triolet. 1988. Supermode Partitioning. In *15th ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. ACM, 319–328.
- [36] Shachar Itzhaky, Rohit Singh, Armando Solar-Lezama, Kuat Yessenov, Yongquan Lu, Charles Leiserson, and Rezaul Chowdhury. 2016. Deriving Divide-and-conquer Dynamic Programming Algorithms Using Solver-aided Transformations. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Object-Oriented Programming, Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA 2016)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 145–164.
- [37] Tian Jin, Nirmal Prajapati, Waruna Ranasinghe, Guillaume Iooss, Yun Zou, Sanjay Rajopadhye, and David G. Wonnacott. 2016. Hybrid Static/Dynamic Schedules for Tiled Polyhedral Programs. CoRR abs/1610.07236 (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1610.07236>
- [38] S. Kamil, C. Chan, L. Oliker, J. Shalf, and S. Williams. 2010. An auto-tuning framework for parallel multicore stencil computations. In *Parallel Distributed Processing (IPDPS), 2010 IEEE International Symposium on*. 1–12.
- [39] Daegon Kim. 2010. *Parameterized and Multi-Level Tiled Loop Generation*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA. Advisor(s) Rajopadhye, Sanjay V.
- [40] DG. Kim and S. Rajopadhye. 2009. Efficient Tiled Loop Generation: D-tiling. In *LCPC 2009: The 22nd International Workshop on Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing*, Cavazos Gao, Pollock and Li (Eds.). Springer, LNCS, Newark, DE, 293–307.
- [41] DG Kim and S. Rajopadhye. 2010. *On Parameterized Tiled Loop Generation and Its Parallelization*. Technical Report CSU Tech Report CS-10-101. Colorado

- State University, Computer Science Dept. See <http://www.cs.colostate.edu/TechReports/Reports/2010/tr10-101.pdf>.
- [42] Sriram Krishnamoorthy, Muthu Baskaran, Uday Bondhugula, J. Ramanujam, Atanas Rountev, and P Sadayappan. 2007. Effective Automatic Parallelization of Stencil Computations. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '07)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 235–244.
- [43] Vincent Lefebvre and Paul Feautrier. 1998. Automatic storage management for parallel programs. *Parallel Comput.* 24, 3–4 (1998), 649–671.
- [44] Jonathan Lifflander and Sriram Krishnamoorthy. 2017. Cache Locality Optimization for Recursive Programs. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI '17)*. 1–16.
- [45] C. Mauras. 1989. *ALPHA: un langage équationnel pour la conception et la programmation d'Architectures parallèles synchrones*. Ph.D. Dissertation. L'Université de Rennes I, IRISA, Campus de Beaulieu, Rennes, France.
- [46] C. Mauras, P. Quinton, S. Rajopadhye, and Y. Saouter. 1990. Scheduling Affine Parameterized Recurrences by means of Variable Dependent Timing Functions. In *International Conference on Application Specific Array Processing*, S. Y. Kung and E. Swartzlander (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, Princeton, New Jersey, 100–110.
- [47] J. McCalpin and D. Wonnacott. 1999. *Time Skewing: A Value-Based Approach to Optimizing for Memory Locality*. Technical Report TR-379. Rutgers University, Department of Computer Science.
- [48] Sanyam Mehta, Rajat Garg, Nishad Trivedi, and Pen-Chung Yew. 2016. TurboTiling: Leveraging Prefetching to Boost Performance of Tiled Codes. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '16)*. Article 38, 12 pages.
- [49] N. Osheim, M. Strout, D. Rostrom, and S. Rajopadhye. 2008. Smashing: Folding Space to Tile Through Time. In *LCPC 2008: 15th Workshop on Language and Compilers for Parallel Computing*. Alberta, CA, 80–93.
- [50] Liu Peng, Richard Seymour, Ken ichi Nomura, Rajiv K. Kalia, Aiichiro Nakano, Priya Vashishta, Alexander Loddock, Michael Netzband, William R. Volz, and Chap C. Wong. 2009. High-order stencil computations on multicore clusters. In *IPPS*.
- [51] Harald Prokop. 1999. *Cache-Oblivious Algorithms*. Master's thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science.
- [52] F. Quilleré and S. Rajopadhye. 2000. Optimizing Memory Usage in the Polyhedral Model. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 22, 5 (September 2000), 773–815.
- [53] P. Quinton and V. Van Dongen. 1989. The Mapping of Linear Recurrence Equations on Regular Arrays. *Journal of VLSI Signal Processing* 1, 2 (1989), 95–113.
- [54] S. V. Rajopadhye, S. Purushothaman, and R. M. Fujimoto. 1986. On Synthesizing Systolic Arrays from Recurrence Equations with Linear Dependencies. In *Proceedings, Sixth Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*. Springer Verlag, LNCS 241, New Delhi, India, 488–503.
- [55] Lakshminarayanan Renganarayanan. 2008. *Scalable and Efficient Tools for Multi-level Tiling*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Department of Computer Science, Colorado State University.
- [56] R. Schreiber and J. Dongarra. 1990. *Automatic blocking of nested loops*. Technical Report 90.38. RIACS, NASA Ames Research Center.
- [57] M. Strout, L. Carter, J. Ferrante, and B. Simon. 1998. Schedule-Independent Storage Mapping for Loops. In *ASPLOS 1998: Proceedings of the eighth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. ACM/IEEE, San Jose, CS, 24 – 33.
- [58] Robert Strzodka, Mohammed Shaheen, Dawid Pajak, and Hans-Peter Seidel. 2010. Cache Oblivious Parallelograms in Iterative Stencil Computations. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '10)*. 49–59.
- [59] Yuan Tang, Rezaul Alam Chowdhury, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, Chi-Keung Luk, and Charles E. Leiserson. 2011. The Pochoir Stencil Compiler. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures (SPAA '11)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- [60] Yuan Tang, Ronghui You, Haibin Kan, Jesmin Jahan Tithi, Pramod Ganapathi, and Rezaul A. Chowdhury. 2015. Cache-oblivious Wavefront: Improving Parallelism of Recursive Dynamic Programming Algorithms Without Losing Cache-efficiency. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP 2015)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 205–214.
- [61] J. Teich and L. Thiele. 1993. Partitioning of processor arrays: A piecewise regular approach. *INTEGRATION: The VLSI Journal* 14, 3 (Feb 1993), 297–332.
- [62] W. Thies, F. Vivien, J. Sheldon, and S. Amarasinghe. 2001. A unified framework for schedule and storage optimization. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2001 conference on Programming language design and implementation*. ACM Press, 232–242.
- [63] J. J. Tithi, P. Ganapathi, A. Talati, S. Aggarwal, and R. Chowdhury. 2015. High-Performance Energy-Efficient Recursive Dynamic Programming with Matrix-Multiplication-Like Flexible Kernels. In *2015 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*. 303–312.
- [64] Nicolas Vasilache, Benoit Meister, Albert Hartono, Muthu Baskaran, David Wohlford, and Richard Lethin. 2012. Trading Off Memory For Parallelism Quality. In *IMPACT 201: 2nd International Workshop on Polyhedral Compilation Techniques*. Paris, France.
- [65] Sven Verdoolaege. 2010. isl: An Integer Set Library for the Polyhedral Model. In *ICMS*, Vol. 6327. Springer, 299–302.
- [66] D. Wilde and S. Rajopadhye. 1996. Memory Reuse Analysis in the Polyhedral Model. In *EUROPAR 96: Parallel Processing Conference*. Springer Verlag, Lyon, France, 389–397.
- [67] Michael E. Wolf and Monica S. Lam. 1991. A Data Locality Optimizing Algorithm. In *the ACM SIGPLAN 1991 conference on Programming language design and implementation (PLDI '91)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 30–44.
- [68] M. J. Wolfe. 1987. Iteration space tiling for memory hierarchies. *Parallel Processing for Scientific Computing (SIAM)* (1987), 357–361.
- [69] J. Xue. 1997. Communication-Minimal Tiling of Uniform Dependence Loops. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 42, 1 (January 1997), 42–59.
- [70] Kamen Yotov, Tom Roeder, Keshav Pingali, John Gunnels, and Fred Gustavson. 2007. An Experimental Comparison of Cache-oblivious and Cache-conscious Programs. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (SPAA '07)*. 93–104.
- [71] Tomofumi Yuki, Gautam Gupta, DaeGon Kim, Tanveer Pathan, and Sanjay Rajopadhye. 2013. *AlphaZ: A System for Design Space Exploration in the Polyhedral Model*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 17–31.
- [72] T. Yuki and S. Rajopadhye. 2011. *Canonical Multi-Projection: Memory Allocation for Distributed Memory Parallelization*. Technical Report CSU-CS-11-106. Colorado State University, Computer Science Department.
- [73] Yun Zou and Sanjay Rajopadhye. 2015. Automatic Energy Efficient Parallelization of Uniform Dependence Computations. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM on International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS '15)*. 373–382.

A SCHEDULE INDEPENDENT MEMORY ALLOCATION

We also address a memory-based limitation of polyhedral compilation tools. It is well known that in any parallelization (of any program), it is essential to respect (only) the *true* or flow dependences. Other (memory-based) dependences can be ignored if one can re-allocate memory. In practice, this is limited by the fact that the associated memory expansion may be prohibitively expensive, and there has been work on mitigating this expansion [43, 52, 64, 66]. We propose a novel yet simple *schedule-independent* memory allocation strategy. Our work also generalizes polyhedral compilation by enabling polyhedral tools to use alternate, *hybrid* schedules consisting of affine loops for certain parts of the iteration space and cache-oblivious divide-and-conquer schedules for others.

A.1 Background

In this section, we introduce the necessary background of our work. We first give a brief description of the polyhedral representation of programs, and the general flow of a polyhedral compiler. Then, we discuss the legality of tiling, which is related to the input of our code generator.

A.1.1 Polyhedral Compilation and Representation. Figure 6 shows the flow of polyhedral compilation. First, dependence analysis of an input program (or a “polyhedral section” thereof) produces an intermediate representation (IR) in the form of [18] a *Polyhedral Reduced Dependence (hyper) Graph* (PRDG). Various analyses are performed on the PRDG to choose a number of mappings in the form of *Piecewise Quasi-Affine Functions* (PQAFs) that specify the schedule as a set of *multi-dimensional* vectors. The PQAFs come with annotations to indicate whether each dimension is sequential or parallel, and also whether it is part of a *tilable band*, i.e., whether tiling this band of dimensions is legal. The transformations may be applied to the PRDG iteratively, and (eventually) the PRDG and




Figure 6: Polyhedral Compilation: the Polyhedral Reduced Dependence (hyper) Graph (PRDG) serves as the intermediate representation. Piecewise Quasi-Affine Functions (PQAFs) describe transformations.

QLAF are provided to a code-generator that produces code for various targets.

One of the strengths of the polyhedral model is that a parametric program may be concisely represented with a PRDG with finite number of nodes (statements) and edges (dependences). The potentially unbounded sets of instances of a statement are represented in abstract forms of integer sets, called *domains*, and dependences between them as affine functions (or relations, which are viewed as a set-valued function) over these statement domains. Indeed, every edge, e from node v to w , in the PRDG is annotated with two objects: (i) a domain, D_e specifying the (subset of) the domain, D_v of its source node, where the dependence occurs, and (ii) the affine function, f , such that for any point $z \in D_e$, the (set of) point(s) in D_w on which it depends is given by $f(z)$. D_e is called the context of the edge, and f is its dependence function. We also use the notation $f(D_e)$ to denote the set valued image of D_e by f .

An affine function $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^m$ may be expressed as $f(x) = A\vec{x} + \vec{b}$, where \vec{x} , function domain, is an integer vector of size n ; A , linear part, is an $n \times m$ matrix; and \vec{b} , constant part, is an integer vector of size m . A dependence is said to be uniform if the dependence function is only a constant offset, i.e., when the linear part A is the identity.

A.1.2 Legality of Tiling. Tiling is a well-known loop transformation for partitioning computations into smaller, atomic (all inputs to a tile can be computed before its execution), units called tiles [35, 67]. The natural legality condition is that the dependences across tiles do not create a cycle. In compilers, this condition is typically expressed as fully permutability (i.e., dependences are non-negative direction vectors), which is a sufficient condition. Our transformation for cache oblivious tiling takes as inputs a loop nest that is

```

for (i = 0; i < N; i++){
  S0: X[0,i] = A[i]; } // Initialize
for (t = 1; t <= 2*N; t++){ //Note: ub is even
  for (i = 1; i < N-1; i++){
    S1: X[t%2][i] = f(X[(t-1)%2][i-1],
                    X[(t-1)%2][i], X[(t-1)%2][i+1],
                    X[(t-1)%2][0]);
  }
  S2: X[t%2][0] = g(X[(t-1)%2][0]);
  S3: X[t%2][N-1] = g(X[(t-1)%2][N-1]);
}
for (i = 0; i < N; i++){
  S4: Aout[i] = X[0,i]; } // Output copy

```

Figure 7: Neither Pochoir nor Autogen can handle the computation performed by this simple loop. Moreover, it has a memory based dependence that prevents polyhedral compilers like Pluto from tiling both dimensions. However, the true dependences of the program admit a tilable schedule, but at the potential cost of $O(N^2)$ memory. Our scheme reduces this to $O(N)$

fully permutable. For polyhedral programs, scheduling techniques to expose such loop nests are available [7].

A.2 Memory Allocation

In this section, we first describe how memory based dependences prevent tiling, using our motivating example (Fig. 7), and show that simply ignoring these (false) dependences would lead to memory explosion. After formulating our problem, we next propose a simple, schedule independent memory allocation scheme that resolves it.

Consider the statement S_1 , and note that its domain, D_1 is the polyhedral set, $\{t, i \mid 1 \leq t \leq 2N \wedge 1 \leq i \leq N - 1\}$. S_1 has four true dependences (for points sufficiently far from the boundaries), three of which are $S_1[t - 1, i - 1]$, $S_1[t - 1, i]$ and $S_1[t - 1, i + 1]$, the typical, 1D-Jacobi stencil dependences, and the fourth one is $S_2[t - 1, 0]$, which is a truly affine dependence on the most recent writer to the memory location $X[(t - 1)\%2, 0]$ when the statement $\langle S_1, [t, i] \rangle$ is being executed. All these dependences are captured as edges with affine *functions* in the PRDG. In addition, there is a memory based dependence, that we must also respect. Consider statement S_2 , whose domain, $D_2 = \{t \mid 1 \leq t \leq 2N\}$ is just one dimensional. The t -th instance of S_2 (*over*) writes $X[t\%2, 0]$, therefore all computations that read the previous value must be executed before it. In this sense, $S_2[t]$ “depends on” the set $S_1[t, i]$, for all $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$. This dependence (which is a *relation* rather than a function) is captured by another a special edge in the PRDG.

The only schedule that respects all these dependences is the family of lines parallel to the t axis (provided all iterations of S_1 are done first). Although this has maximal parallelism, it has very poor locality. Note that the Pluto scheduler does not seek maximal parallelism, but rather, to maximize the *number of linearly independent tiling hyperplanes*. Unfortunately, the $t = \text{const}$ is the only legal tiling hyperplane for this set of dependences, and the tilable band obtained by Pluto is only 1-dimensional.

What if we did not have the memory-based dependences, i.e., what if we ignored the memory allocation of the original program, and stored each computed value in a distinct memory location? In this case, there would be no memory based dependences, and we can indeed find another family of (actually, infinitely many) legal tiling hyperplanes: say, the lines $i + t = \text{const}$. As a result, if we use the mapping $(t, i) \mapsto (t, i + t)$ as our “schedule,” the new loops in the transformed program would be fully permutable, and could be legally tiled.

Thus, the problem we seek to solve is: *how to avoid memory based dependences, but without the cost of memory expansion that it seems to imply.*

Memory allocation for polyhedral programs is a well studied problem, and there are two main approaches. One either does memory allocation after the schedule is chosen [4, 5, 19, 20, 43, 52, 64, 66] since it often leads to a smaller memory footprint, or else uses a *schedule independent* memory allocation, based on the so called *universal occupancy vectors* (UOV). This problem is solved when the program has *uniform dependences*, i.e., when each dependence can be described by a *constant vector*, and for some simple extensions of this [57, 72].

It is important to note that tiling actually modifies a schedule: the so called, “schedule dimensions” become fully permutable loops, and indeed, these loops *are actually permuted* in the generated tiled code. So, when a *tiling schedule* specified by a family of d tiling hyperplanes is finally implemented by the generated code, the actual time-stamps are not really d -dimensional vectors, but rather $2d$ -dimensional ones obtained as some complicated function of these indices. Furthermore, we will see when we generate cache-oblivious tiled codes, these tilable loops will actually be visited in the divide-and-conquer order of execution, as required by COT. As a result, finding a memory map that takes into account such a

rather complicated final schedule is a tricky problem. We therefore seek and propose schedule-independent memory allocations.

The intuition behind our solution is (deceptively) simple, and we first illustrate it on our motivating example (Fig. 7). Rather than the so-called “single assignment” program for the entire iteration space of the program (i.e., full memory expansion), could we find lower-dimensional subsets, such that a single assignment memory for only these subsets is sufficient? A careful examination of the code reveals that the memory based dependences arise due to statement S_2 , and its domain is only 1-dimensional. So we store the results of this statement into an auxiliary array, Y , and modify the program so that the fourth dependence simply reads $Y[t - 1]$, rather than $X[(t - 1)\%2, 0]$. For the variable, X , we use the old $(t, i) \mapsto (t\%2, i)$ memory allocation that was used in the original code. This results in $4N$ memory, which is a polynomial degree better than quadratic. Of course, the challenge is how to discover this automatically.

We now outline how this is done. At a high level, our algorithm takes a PRDG as input, applies some (piecewise) affine transformations to it, and outputs the transformed PRDG together with a separate memory map for each node in the transformed PRDG. More specifically, it works as follows.

- *Preprocessing.* For each edge, e , in the PRDG, with context D_e , and function, f , we first identify whether f is *uniform in context* in the sense that, for all points, $z \in D_e$, the value of $z - f(z)$ is a constant vector, independent of z . For example, consider a dependence function, $(i, j) \mapsto (i - 1, i - 1)$ which, maps any point $[i, j]$ in the plane to a point on the diagonal, and is clearly not uniform. However, what if $D_e = \{i, j \mid i = j - 1\}$? With this contextual information, the dependence is actually uniform: $(i, j) \mapsto (i - 1, j - 2)$. All edges/dependences that are neither uniform to begin with, not uniform in context, are marked as *truly affine*.
- *Affine Split.* For every node, v , in the PRDG that has at least one truly affine edge e incident on it, we create a new node, v' . Its domain $D_{v'}$ is the union of $f(D_e)$ of all such incident edges. The edges in the PRDG are modified as follows. All the truly affine edges that were incident on v are now made incident on v' ; and v' has a single outgoing edge e' , annotated with $\langle D_{v'}, I \rangle$ (its dependence function is the identity map) and whose destination is v . It is easy to see that we have not changed the program semantics. In effect, we have simply copied the value of every point in D_v that was the target of any truly affine dependence over to a new variable v' , and “diverted” all the truly affine edges that used to be incident on v over to v' . Moreover, since the identity function is uniform by definition, all edges incident on v are now either uniform, or uniform in context.
- We now use existing UOV based methods [57, 72] to choose a schedule-independent memory allocation for all the original nodes in the PRDG, and a *single-assignment* memory allocation for all the newly introduced variables.

The key insight into why this leads to significant memory savings, is the fact that in all polyhedral programs that we encountered, truly affine dependences are almost always *rank deficient*, i.e., are

many-to-one mappings from the consumer index points to the producers. The only exceptions are either pathological programs, or programs that do multi-dimensional data reorganizations via bijections (e.g., matrix transpose, tensor permutations, etc.) where here is no scope nor need to reduce the total memory footprint. As a result, $f(D_e)$ is almost always a lower dimensional polyhedron, and requires significantly less memory, even when stored supposedly inefficiently.

A.3 Related Work

Memory allocation for polyhedral programs is a well studied problem for almost two decades. DeGreef and Cathoor [20] tackled the problem of sharing the memory across multiple arrays in the program, the so called inet-array memory reuse problem, and proposed an ILP based solution. Wilde and Rajopadhye, in dealing with an intrinsically memory-inefficient functional language Alpha [45] (one can think of this as a program after full expansion) first addressed the memory reuse for points of an iteration space [66]. They gave necessary and sufficient conditions for the legality of a memory allocation function, which they allowed to be “in any direction.” but they did not provide any insight into how to choose the mapping. Lefebvre and Feautrier [43] on the other hand, considered only canonic projections, combined with a modulo factor, but showed how to choose the mapping optimally. Later, Quilleré and Rajopadhye [52] revisited multiprojections, extended them to quasi-affine functions, and proved a tight bound on the number of dimensions of reuse. They also showed that canonic projections with modulo factors was sometimes a constant factor better, and sometimes a constant factor worse. Darté et al. [19] took a fresh and elegant approach to the problem, and formulated the conditions for legal memory allocations by defining the *conflict set*. This led to techniques for choosing provably optimal memory allocations, initially for non-parameterized iteration spaces, and recently in the context of FPGA accelerators, for parametrically tiled spaces [16, 17]. Vasilache et al. [64] developed a tool to combine the scheduling and limiting memory expansion using an ILP formulation, implemented in the R-Stream compiler. Recently, Bhaskaracharya et al. [4] developed methods to optimally choose quasi-affine memory allocations, and showed how they are beneficial for tiled codes, especially with live-out data. Furthermore, they also showed [5] how to combine inter- and intra array reuse in a unifying framework.

The other *schedule independent* memory allocation was pioneered by Strout et al. [57]. Here, the memory allocation is chosen based only on the dependences, and is guaranteed to be legal, regardless of the schedule. This problem is solved when the program has *uniform dependences*, i.e., when each dependence can be described by a *constant vector*, and for some simple extensions of this [57, 72].

Thies et al. [62] have also formulated the problem of simultaneously choosing the schedule and memory allocation as a combined optimization problem.