

CUDA Performance

Patrick Cozzi University of Pennsylvania CIS 565 - Fall 2016

Acknowledgements

Some slides from <u>Varun Sampath</u>

Agenda

- Parallel Reduction Revisited
- Warp Partitioning
- Memory Coalescing
- Bank Conflicts
- Dynamic Partitioning of SM Resources
- Data Prefetching
- Instruction Mix
- Loop Unrolling
- Thread Granularity



Optimizations based on GPU Architecture

Maximum Performance

Recall Parallel Reduction (sum)







__shared__ float partialSum[];
// ... load into shared memory
unsigned int t = threadIdx.x;
for (unsigned int stride = 1;
 stride < blockDim.x;
 stride *= 2)</pre>

_____syncthreads(); if (t % (2 * stride) == 0) partialSum[t] += partialSum[t + stride];

shared float partialSum[]; // ... load into shared memory unsigned int t = threadIdx.x;for (unsigned int stride = 1; stride < blockDim.x;</pre> stride *= 2) Computing the sum for the elements in shared memory syncthreads(); if (t % (2 * stride) == 0) partialSum[t] += partialSum[t + stride];



__shared__ float partialSum[];
// ... load into shared memory
unsigned int t = threadIdx.x;
for (unsigned int stride = 1;
 stride < blockDim.x;
 stride *= 2)</pre>

_____syncthreads(); Why? if (t % (2 * stride) == 0) partialSum[t] += partialSum[t + stride];







1st pass: threads 1, 3, 5, and 7 don't do anything
 Really only need n/2 threads for n elements



2nd pass: threads 2 and 6 also don't do anything



3rd pass: thread 4 also doesn't do anything



In general, number of required threads cuts in half after each pass

What if we tweaked the implementation?











```
shared float partialSum[]
// ... load into shared memory
unsigned int t = threadIdx.x;
for(unsigned int stride = blockDim.x / 2;
     stride > 0;
     stride (= 2)
    syncthreads();
  if (t < stride)
   partialSum[t] +=
      partialSum[t + stride];
```





1st pass: threads 4, 5, 6, and 7 don't do anything
 Really only need n/2 threads for n elements



2nd pass: threads 2 and 3 also don't do anything



3rd pass: thread 1 also doesn't do anything

What is the difference?



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...



What is the difference?

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

if (t < stride)</pre>

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

stride = 1, 2, 4, ...

stride = 4, 2, 1, ...

- Warp Partitioning: how threads from a block are divided into warps
- Knowledge of warp partitioning can be used to:
 - Minimize divergent branches
 - □ Retire warps early

Partition based on consecutive increasing threadIdx

1D Block

 $\Box \texttt{threadIdx.x}$ between 0 and 512 (G80/GT200)

- □Warp n
 - Starts with thread 32n
 - Ends with thread 32 (n + 1) 1

Last warp is padded if block size is not a multiple of 32



2D Block

- □Increasing threadIdx means
 - Increasing threadIdx.x
 - Starting with row threadIdx.y == 0

2D Block T_{0,0} T_{1,0} T_{2,0} T_{3,0} T_{0,1} T_{2,1} $T_{1,1}$ T_{3,1} $T_{0,2}$ $T_{1,2}$ $T_{2,2}$ $T_{3,2}$ T_{1,3} T_{2,3} T_{3,3} T_{0.3} T_{0,0} T_{3,3}

linearized order
3D Block

□ Start with threadIdx.z == 0

□ Partition as a 2D block

Increase threadIdx.z and repeat

Divergent branches are within a warp!



38 Image from: http://bps10.idav.ucdavis.edu/talks/03-fatahalian_gpuArchTeraflop_BPS_SIGGRAPH2010.pdf

For warpSize == 32, does any warp have a divergent branch with this code:

```
if (threadIdx.x > 15)
{
    // ...
}
```

For any warpSize > 1, does any warp have a divergent branch with this code:

```
if (threadIdx.x > warpSize - 1)
{
    // ...
}
```

Given knowledge of warp partitioning, which parallel reduction is better?

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

<mark>if (t < stride)</mark>

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

stride = 1, 2, 4, ...

stride = 4, 2, 1, ...

Pretend warpSize == 2



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...



stride = 4, 2, 1, ...

1st Pass



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...













 Good partitioning also allows warps to be retired early.

Better hardware utilization

if (t % (2 * stride) == 0)

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

<mark>if (t < stride)</mark>

partialSum[t] +=

partialSum[t + stride];

stride = 1, 2, 4, ...

stride = 4, 2, 1, ...

Parallel Reduction



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...



1st Pass



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...



1st Pass



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...







2nd Pass



stride = 1, 2, 4, ...



stride = 4, 2, 1, ...

Given a matrix stored row-major in global memory, what is a thread's desirable access pattern?

М _{0,0}	M _{1,0}	M _{2,0}	M _{3,0}
M _{0,1}	M _{1,1}	M _{2,1}	M _{3,1}
M _{0,2}	M _{1,2}	M _{2,2}	M _{3,2}
M _{0,3}	M _{1,3}	M _{2,3}	M _{3,3}

 $\frac{M_{0,0}}{M_{1,0}} \frac{M_{2,0}}{M_{2,0}} \frac{M_{3,0}}{M_{3,0}} \frac{M_{0,1}}{M_{0,1}} \frac{M_{1,1}}{M_{2,1}} \frac{M_{3,1}}{M_{3,1}} \frac{M_{0,2}}{M_{0,2}} \frac{M_{1,2}}{M_{2,2}} \frac{M_{3,2}}{M_{3,2}} \frac{M_{0,3}}{M_{0,3}} \frac{M_{1,3}}{M_{1,3}} \frac{M_{2,3}}{M_{2,3}} \frac{M_{3,3}}{M_{3,3}} \frac{M_{1,2}}{M_{2,3}} \frac{M_{1,3}}{M_{2,3}} \frac{M_{2,3}}{M_{3,3}} \frac{M_{3,3}}{M_{3,3}} \frac{M_$

Μ

53 Image from: http://bps10.idav.ucdavis.edu/talks/03-fatahalian_gpuArchTeraflop_BPS_SIGGRAPH2010.pdf

Given a matrix stored row-major in global memory, what is a thread's desirable access pattern?



Image from: http://courses.engr.illinois.edu/ece498/al/textbook/Chapter5-CudaPerformance.pdf

Thread

Thread

- Given a matrix stored row-major in global memory, what is a thread's desirable access pattern?
 - □a) column after column
 - Individual threads read increasing, consecutive memory address
 - □ b) row after row
 - Adjacent threads read increasing, consecutive memory addresses



a) column after column

56 Image from: http://courses.engr.illinois.edu/ece498/al/textbook/Chapter5-CudaPerformance.pdf



b) row after row

57 Image from: http://courses.engr.illinois.edu/ece498/al/textbook/Chapter5-CudaPerformance.pdf

- Global memory bandwidth (DRAM)
 G80 86.4 GB/s
 GT200 150 GB/s
- Achieve peak bandwidth by requesting large, consecutive locations from DRAM
 Accessing random location results in much lower bandwidth

- Memory coalescing rearrange access patterns to improve performance
- Useful today but will be less useful with large on-chip caches

- The GPU coalesces consecutive reads in a *half-warp* into a single read
- Strategy: read global memory in a coalesce-able fashion into shared memory
 - Then access shared memory randomly at maximum bandwidth
 - Ignoring bank conflicts...

- Shared Memory
 - □ Sometimes called a *parallel data cache*
 - Multiple threads can access shared memory at the same time
 - Memory is divided into banks



Banks

- Each bank can service one address per two cycles
- Per-bank bandwidth: 32-bits per two (shader clock) cycles
- Successive 32-bit words are assigned to successive banks



- Bank Conflict: Two simultaneous accesses to the same bank, but not the same address
 - □ Serialized
- G80-GT200: 16 banks, with 8 SPs concurrently executing
- Fermi: 32 banks, with 16 SPs concurrently executing







Fast Path 1 (G80) All threads in a half-warp access different banks



Fast Path 2 (G80) All threads in a half-warp access the same address



Slow Path (G80) Multiple threads in a half-warp access the same bank Access is serialized What is the cost?



__shared__ float shared[256];
// ...
float f = shared[index + s * threadIdx.x];

For what values of s is this conflict free?

__shared__ float shared[256];
// ...
float f = shared[index + s * threadIdx.x];



- Without using a profiler, how can we tell what kind of speedup we can expect by removing bank conflicts?
- What happens if more than one thread in a warp writes to the same shared memory address (non-atomic instruction)?

SM Resource Partitioning

Recall a SM dynamically partitions resources:

Thread block slots		
Thread slots		
Registers		
Shared memory		
SM		
Recall a SM dynamically partitions resources:

Thread block slots
Thread slots
Registers
Shared memory
SM

G80 Limits

8

768

8K registers / 32K memory

16K

We can have

□ 8 blocks of 96 threads

□ 4 blocks of 192 threads

But not 8 blocks of 192 threads



We can have (assuming 256 thread blocks)
 768 threads (3 blocks) using 10 registers each
 512 threads (2 blocks) using 11 registers each



We can have (assuming 256 thread blocks)
 768 threads (3 blocks) using 10 registers each
 512 threads (2 blocks) using 11 registers each



- Performance Cliff: Increasing resource usage leads to a dramatic reduction in parallelism
 - For example, increasing the number of registers, unless doing so hides latency of global memory access

Independent instructions between a global memory read and its use can hide memory latency

float m = Md[i];
float f = a * b + c * d;
float f2 = m * f;

Independent instructions between a global memory read and its use can hide memory latency

float m = Md[i]; Read global memory
float f = a * b + c * d;
float f2 = m * f;

Independent instructions between a global memory read and its use can hide memory latency

Independent instructions between a global memory read and its use can hide memory latency

memory latency

Prefetching data from global memory can effectively increase the number of independent instructions between global memory read and use

}

Recall tiled matrix multiply:

```
for (/* ... */)
{
    // Load current tile into shared memory
    _____syncthreads();
    // Accumulate dot product
    _____syncthreads();
```

Tiled matrix multiply with prefetch:

// Load first tile into registers

```
for (/* ... */)
{
```

}

Tiled matrix multiply with prefetch:

/ Load first tile into registers

```
for (/* ... */)
{
    // Deposit registers into shared memory
    _____syncthreads();
    // Load next tile into registers
    // Accumulate dot product
    _____syncthreads();
}
```

Tiled matrix multiply with prefetch:

// Load first tile into registers

```
for (/* ... */)
{
    // Deposit registers into shared memory
    _____syncthreads();
    // Load next tile into registers
    // Accumulate dot product
    _____syncthreads();
}
```

Tiled matrix multiply with prefetch:

// Load first tile into registers

```
for (/* ... */)
{
    // Deposit registers into shared memory
    __syncthreads();
    // Load next tile into registers
    // Accumulate dot product
    __syncthreads();
}

These instructions
executed by enough
threads will hide the
memory latency of the
prefetch
```

Instruction Mix

- **Special Function** • Units (SFUs)
 - Use to compute • sinf(), expf()
 - Only 4, each can execute 1 instruction per clock



Image: NVIDIA Fermi Whitepaper

Dispatch Port

FP Unit

for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k)
{
 Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx];
}</pre>

Instructions per iteration
 One floating-point multiply
 One floating-point add
 What else?

for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k)
{
 Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx];
}</pre>

Other instructions per iteration
 Update loop counter

Loop Unrolling for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k) { Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx]; }</pre>

Other instructions per iteration Update loop counter Branch

for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k)
{
 Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx];
}</pre>

Other instructions per iteration
 Update loop counter
 Branch
 Address arithmetic

```
for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k)
{
    Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx];
}</pre>
```

Instruction Mix

- 2 floating-point arithmetic instructions
- □1 loop branch instruction
- 2 address arithmetic instructions
- □ 1 loop counter increment instruction

- Only 1/3 are • floating-point calculations
 - But I want my • full theoretical 1 **TFLOP** (Fermi)
 - Consider loop unrolling



Image: NVIDIA Fermi Whitepaper

FP Unit

Fermi Streaming Multiprocessor (SM)

```
Pvalue +=
   Ms[ty][0] * Ns[0][tx] +
   Ms[ty][1] * Ns[1][tx] +
   ...
   Ms[ty][15] * Ns[15][tx]; // BLOCK_SIZE = 16
```

- No more loop
 - No loop count update
 - No branch
 - Constant indices no address arithmetic instructions

```
■ Automatically:
#pragma unroll BLOCK_SIZE
for (int k = 0; k < BLOCK_SIZE; ++k)
{
    Pvalue += Ms[ty][k] * Ns[k][tx];
}
```

Disadvantages to unrolling?

Thread Granularity

How much work should one thread do?

- □ Parallel Reduction
 - Reduce two elements?
- Matrix multiply
 - Compute one element of Pd?



Image from http://courses.engr.illinois.edu/ece498/al/textbook/Chapter5-CudaPerformance.pdf

Thread Granularity

 Matrix Multiple
 Both elements of Pd require the same row of Md

0

2

ty

TILE WIDTH



© David Kirk/NVIDIA and Wen-mei W. Hwu

by

Image from http://courses.engr.illinois.edu/ece498/al/textbook/Chapter5-CudaPerformance.pdf

Thread Granularity

- Matrix Multiple
 - Compute both Pd elements in the same thread
 - Reduces global memory access by ¼
 - Increases number of independent instructions
 What is the benefit?
 - New kernel uses more registers and shared memory What does that imply?