

State access patterns in embarrassingly parallel computations

Marco Danelutto & Massimo Torquati

Dept. of Computer Science – Univ. of Pisa
{marcod,torquati}@di.unipi.it

Peter Kilpatrick

Dept. of Computer Science – Queen’s Univ. Belfast
p.kilpatrick@qub.ac.uk

Abstract

We introduce a set of state access patterns suitable for managing state in embarrassingly parallel computations on streams. The state access patterns are useful to model typical stream parallel applications. We present a classification of the patterns according to the extent and way in which the state is modified. We define precisely the state access patterns and discuss possible implementation schemas, performances and possibilities to manage adaptivity (parallelism degree) in the patterns. We present experimental results relative to an implementations on top of the structured parallel programming framework FastFlow that demonstrate the feasibility and efficiency of the proposed access patterns.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.3.3 [Programming Languages]: Language Constructs and Features—Control structures

Keywords structured parallel programming, algorithmic skeletons, parallel design patterns, stateful computations

1. Introduction

Structured parallel programming models have been developed to support the design and implementation of parallel applications. These programming models provide the parallel application programmer with a set of pre-defined, ready to use parallel pattern abstractions that may be directly instantiated, alone or in composition, to model the complete parallel behaviour of the application at hand. This raises the level of abstraction by ensuring that the application programmer need not be concerned with architectural and parallelism exploitation issues during application development. Rather, these issues are dealt efficiently, using the state-of-art techniques, by the framework programmer. Algorithmic skeletons, first introduced in the early '90s in the field of High Performance Computing [2] led to the development of several structured parallel programming frameworks including Muesli [7], SKEPU [6] and FastFlow [5]. Meanwhile, the software engineering community extended the classic design pattern concept [10] into the *parallel design pattern* concept [13]. Although not directly providing the programmer with ready-to-use programming abstractions (e.g. via library calls, objects, high order functions) modelling the parallel design patterns, this approach enforced the idea that parallelism may be expressed through composition of well-known, efficient and para-

metric parallelism exploitation patterns rather than through *ad-hoc* compositions of lower level mechanisms. The advantages deriving from structured parallel programming approaches have been clearly identified as a viable solution to the development of efficient parallel application in the well-known Berkeley report [1].

In the framework of parallel design patterns/algorithmic skeletons, stream parallel computations have been widely employed. Various patterns have been provided as algorithmic skeletons working on data streams, and two of them have been demonstrated particularly useful and efficient, namely the *pipeline* and the *task farm* patterns. In pipelines, parallel computations are structured as a set of stages transforming input tasks to output results. In task farms, the same “monolithic” computation is performed over all the input stream items to produce the output result items [14].

However, despite the clear utility of such patterns, they have traditionally been studied, designed and implemented as *stateless* patterns, i.e. as patterns where the stages (in a pipeline) or the worker (in farm) processes/thread do not support any kind of internal state nor support accesses to some more generalized notion of “pattern” global state. This despite the fact there are several well know applications requiring the maintenance of either a “per pattern” or a “per component” state.

In this work we focus on task farm computation and discuss *stateful* pattern variations of the most general embarrassingly parallel pattern provided by the task farm. In particular we identify a range of cases from read-only state to the case where every computation requires access to the complete global state and in turn updates the global state, which is essentially a sequential pattern. We highlight as a key point the fact that there exist intermediate cases where there are clearly defined state updates and yet parallelism may be exploited because of the restricted nature of the update in terms of state.

The specific contribution of this paper consists therefore in

- the introduction of a classification scheme for stateful embarrassingly parallel computations and identification of the conditions under which meaningful speedup may be obtained for each of the classes identified; and
- experimental results on synthetic cases that illustrate the utility of our scheme for identifying conditions under which speedup may be obtained.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Sec. 2 presents the task farm, a pattern modelling embarrassingly parallel computations over streams. Sec. 3 briefly discusses FastFlow, the structured parallel programming framework adopted for our experiments. Sec. 4 introduces the proposed state access pattern classification, and Sec. 5 presents preliminary experimental results achieved using a FastFlow implementation targeting state-of-the-art multicore architectures. Finally, Sec. 6 discusses related work and Sec. 7 draws conclusions.

2. Embarrassingly parallel computations on stream

Embarrassingly parallel computations over streams are defined by providing a function f mapping input data stream items to output data stream items. We assume that a stream of data items of type α is to be transformed into a stream of data items of type β . Thus the function f will have type $f : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ and the result of the computation over an input stream

$$\dots x_3, x_2, x_1, x_0$$

will be

$$\dots f(x_3), f(x_2), f(x_1), f(x_0)$$

The ordering of the output items w.r.t. the input ones is not necessarily preserved. Input data items are available at different times: if item x_i is available at time t_i , item x_{i+k} will be available at time $t_i + \Delta$, $\Delta > 0$.

Ideally, if input stream item x_i turns out to be available for computation at time t_i , then the output stream item $f(x_i)$ will be delivered to the output stream at time $t_i + t_f$, t_f being the time to compute function f . Suppose input items appear on the input stream every t_a , and assuming use of n_w parallel activities (threads, processes) to compute f over different input stream items, the service time of the embarrassingly parallel computation may be approximated as

$$T_s(n_w) = \max\{t_a, \frac{t_f}{n_w}\}$$

and the time spent to compute m input tasks as

$$T_c(n_w, m) = mT_s$$

Implementation Embarrassingly parallel computations are usually implemented according to well-know parallel design patterns:

- using a **master/worker** pattern (see Fig. 1 left), where a *master* concurrent activity distributes input tasks and collects output results to/from a set of concurrent activities called *workers*. Each worker executes a loop waiting for a task to be computed, computing f and returning the result.
- using a **farm pattern** (see Fig. 1 right), where an *emitter* concurrent activity schedules input tasks so a set of *workers* computing f . Workers in turn direct the output to a *collector* concurrent activity, which in turn delivers the results onto the output stream. In this case the emitter and collector activities are called “helper” activities. If the embarrassingly parallel stream computation is not required to enforce input/output ordering of tasks and results (i.e. if $f(x_i)$ may be delivered onto the output stream in any order w.r.t. $f(x_{i-1})$), the collector activity may be suppressed and worker activities may deliver directly to the output stream.

In both cases, the master (emitter) concurrent activity may be programmed to implement different scheduling strategies and the master (collector) concurrent activity may be programmed to post-process the $f(x_i)$ items computed by the workers.

3. FastFlow

In the remainder of the paper, we will discuss possible implementations, while highlighting advantages and issues, of state access patterns in embarrassingly parallel stream computations on top of FastFlow [8].

FastFlow is a structured parallel programming framework available as an open source, header only library on SourceForge. It has been demonstrated to be very efficient on shared memory multi-core machines (possibly with accelerators) and natively provides a




Figure 1. Master worker (left) and farm pattern (right)

```

...
#include <ff/farm.hpp>
...
typeOut *worker(typeIn *task, ff_node *const) {
    return ( f(*task) );
}
...
int main(int argc, char * argv[]) {
    ...
    ff_Farm<typeIn, typeOut> myFarm(worker, nw);
    ...

    myFarm.run\_and\_wait\_end();
    ...
}

```

Figure 2. FastFlow task farm code snippet

number of different stream and data parallel algorithmic skeletons implementing a number of different parallel design patterns [5].

FastFlow natively provides a `ff_farm` class providing the implementation of embarrassingly parallel stream computations, according to the *farm pattern* implementation schema outlined in Sec. 2 above. A mandatory emitter thread and an optional collector thread serve as helper threads to schedule tasks to a set of worker threads and to gather, from the workers, results which are eventually dispatched to the `ff_farm` output stream. All inter-thread communications are implemented using the FastFlow lock-free, fast communication mechanisms guaranteeing communication latencies in the order of few (10-40) clock cycles on state-of-the-art multicore systems. Emitter scheduling and collector by default implement fair scheduling and gathering policies, while the programmer has the possibility to provide tailored implementations with alternative policies. Finally, FastFlow farms may be equipped with a feedback channel supporting routing back of (partial) results from the collector to the emitter, to implement iterative computations.

FastFlow provides the farm pattern to the application programmer as a class that may be directly instantiated to get a parallel application. Fig. 2 shows a typical fragment of code which is all that is needed to run a farm pattern in FastFlow. A farm object may be instantiated providing the input type, the output type, the function computing outputs from inputs and the farm parallelism degree. The execution of the farm is started by calling a `run_and_wait_end()` method on the farm object. The call is synchronous returning when the farm computation is terminated. Farm objects may be used as components of other patterns. For example the `myFarm` object in the snippet could have been used as a pipeline stage. In that case the pipeline should have been declared as a pipeline object `myPipe` and the stage added simply with a `myPipe.addStage(&myFarm)`;

The interested reader may find documentation and tutorials on FastFlow at the FastFlow web site [8].

4. State patterns

When state is taken into account in a task farm pattern, different situations may be identified depending on the kind of *state access pattern* used. In the most general and simple case, the computation of the result produced for input item x_i depends on both the value of x_i and on the value of the state at the moment x_i is received. This means that the presence of state serializes the entire computation (see Sec.4.1). However, there are several variations of this computation schema, that turn out to be:

- useful to model common parallel applications (parallel application schemes)
- supporting a non serial implementation of the state concept or at least providing upper/lower bounds on the speedups eventually achieved in the computations.

In the following sections, we will first present “standard” state pattern in task farm (Sec. 4.1) as a reference point and then introduce different state patterns of interest in embarrassingly parallel stream computations. Each of the state access patterns will be described by providing precise functional semantics, sample motivating applications, implementation and adaptivity related issues.

4.1 Serial state access pattern

Motivating example A large number of computations require maintenance of a global state to process items from an input stream. For example, transactions issued from different bank operators on the same bank account must be processed such that the bank account details are accessed under mutual exclusive access.

Definition A task farm computation computing the result relative to input task $x_i : \alpha$ as a function of the value of the task and of the value of a state $s : \gamma$ can be formalized by providing two functions f and s such that:

- $f : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ computes the result to be delivered to the output stream
- $s : \alpha \times \gamma \rightarrow \gamma$ computes the new state out of the current task and current state

Then the computation of task x_i requires computing the value to be delivered to the output stream as $f(x_i, s_{i-1})$ and the new state, to be used to compute x_{i+1} as $s(x_i, s_{i-1})$.

Therefore, given an initial state

$$s_0 : \gamma$$

and an input stream

$$\dots, x_2, x_1, x_0$$

the result of the computation of the task farm may defined as

$$\dots, f(x_2, ns(x_1, ns(x_0, s_0))), f(x_1, ns(x_0, s_0)), f(x_0, s_0)$$

which obviously implies sequential computation of the items appearing on the output stream.

Implementation The serial state access pattern may be implemented using FastFlow by:

- declaring a global state variable and suitable mutex access mechanisms
- accessing the global state variable within the worker code (i.e. the code computing f) while employing the mutex access mechanisms to guarantee exclusive access to the global state variable.

Performance Serial state access pattern, if correctly implemented, obviously implies serial execution of the worker code and, as a consequence, any speedup will be achieved using more than a single worker. In Sec. 4.5 we will discuss a slightly different state access pattern which actually provides some possibility for parallelism, while keeping the notion of unique, shared and mutually exclusively accessed global state.

4.2 Fully partitioned state access pattern

Motivating example Deep packet inspection applications need to maintain state relative to each individual connection analyzed. The global state of the deep packet inspection is represented by a vector of states of the single connections. State relative to connection i is only updated when receiving and processing a packet of connection i . Incoming packets are processed by different task farm workers, but packets relative to a given connection should be processed by the same worker, the one maintaining the state data structure for that connection.

Definition In the fully partitioned state access pattern the state type is a vector of values of type γ of length N ($vs : \gamma$ vector) and a function

$$h : \alpha \rightarrow [0, N - 1]$$

exists mapping each of the input items to a state vector position. The state vector is initialized before starting the computation with some initial value $s_{init} : \gamma$. Functions f and s are defined as stated in Sec. 4.1 and the computation of the farm is defined such that for each item of the input stream x_i , the item output on the output stream is

$$f(x_i, v[h(x_i)])$$

and the state is updated such that

$$v[h(x_i)] = s(x_i, v[h(x_i)])$$

State items other than $h(x_i)$ are not needed to compute stream item x_i .

Implementation Given a task farm skeleton with n_w workers, the N state items will be partitioned among the workers by giving item v_i to worker $\lceil i/n_w \rceil$. The farm emitter will therefore schedule task x_k to worker $\lceil h(x_k)/n_w \rceil$ and the worker will be the one hosting the current, updated value of the state item necessary to compute both the output result $f(x_i, v[h(x_i)])$ and the state update $v[h(x_i)] = s(x_i, v[h(x_i)])$.

Finally, the value of the global state may be fetched from the farm collector provided the workers direct to the collector their local state items before terminating¹. Overall, in this implementation, worker j will never be enabled to access state items hosted by the other workers.

Performance Load balancing, and therefore scalability, depends on the efficiency of the hash function to spread incoming tasks (more or less) equally across the full range of workers. In the case of a fair implementation of function h , close to ideal speedups may be achieved. If the function h directs more items to a subset of the available workers, the speedup achieved will be impaired by a proportional factor.

Adaptivity Increasing the number of workers from n_w to $n_w + 1$ requires that worker i directs to worker w_{i+1} its last $i + 1$ state items: worker w_0 directs one state item to w_1 , w_1 directs to w_2 2 items, w_2 to w_3 3 items, etc. When decreasing the number of workers from n_w to $n_w - 1$, worker w_i directs to worker w_{i-1} exactly i state items.

¹ or after a timeout, or after having performed a given number of state updates

4.3 Accumulator state access pattern

Motivating example Searching for the number of occurrences of a string in a text (or of DNA sequences in a genome) is a typical application implementing this state access pattern.

Definition In the accumulator state pattern the state is a “scalar” value $s : \gamma$. Functions f and s are defined that compute the result item and the state update out of the current state and of the current input item. Function s is restricted to be of the form

$$s(x_i, s_{i-1}) = g(x_i) \oplus s_{i-1}$$

where \oplus is an associative and commutative operator and g is any function $g : \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$.

Implementation A local state value s_w is used by each of the farm workers, initialized to the identity value w.r.t. function \oplus (s_{zero}). The worker processing item x_i computes $y_i = f(x_i, s_w)$. Then it:

- either sends y_i immediately to the farm collector, and then computes the new state value $s'_w = g(x_i) \oplus s_w$ and periodically sends the value s_w to the collector, re-initializing s_w to s_{zero} ; or
- delivers y_i and $g(x_i)$ to the collector, which will update the global state value accordingly, task by task.

Performance Load balancing is not affected by the state updates, apart from an increased load on the collector. Depending on the computational weight of \oplus , the implementation with periodical updates to the collector will be preferred to the one continuously sending the updates to the collector.

Adaptivity When increasing the number of workers the new workers should be instantiated with a local state value initialized with s_{zero} . When decreasing the number of workers, before stopping any worker thread, the locally stored state values should be directed to the collector. If workers have to be “merged” (e.g. to reduce the worker number but not imposing unexpected update messages on the collector) the resulting worker should be given the “sum” of the merged workers local state values ($s_i \oplus s_j$ where workers i and j are merged).

4.4 Successive approximation state access pattern

Motivating example An application searching a dynamically generated space of solutions for the solution with the best “fitness” exemplifies this state access pattern. The global state is represented by the best solution candidate. Both solution and fitness value is stored in the state. Local approximations of the currently available “best” solution may be maintained and updated to fasten convergence of the overall computation. Solutions “worse” than current “best” solution are simply discarded.

Definition The pattern manages a state which is a scalar value $s : \gamma$. For an input stream with items x_i , a stream of successive approximations of the global state s_j is output by the pattern. Each computation relative to the task x_i updates state if and only if a given condition $c : \alpha \times \gamma \rightarrow \text{bool}$ holds true. In that case the new state value will be computed as $s'(x_i, s_{i-1})$. Therefore in this state access pattern we have

$$s(x_i, s_{i-1}) = \begin{cases} s_{i-1} & \text{iff } c(x_i, s_{i-1}) = \text{false} \\ s'(x_i, s_{i-1}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The state access pattern is defined if and only if s' is monotone in the s_x parameter, that is $s'(x_i, s_{i-1}) \leq s_{i-1}$, and the computation converges even in the case of inexact state updates, that is, where different updates read a state value and decide to update the state with distinct values at the same time (global state updates are anyway executed in mutual exclusion).

Implementation The pattern is implemented with a task farm, where global state value is maintained by the collector. Any update to the state is broadcast to the workers via a feedback channel to the emitter. Workers maintain a properly initialized² local copy of the global state $ls : \gamma$. Workers processing an input stream item x_i send update messages ($s(x_i, ls)$) to the collector. Updates are computed on the local value of the state, and so this may turn out to be misaligned with respect to the global state value maintained by the collector and to the local copies maintained by the other workers. The collector only accepts state updates satisfying the monotonic property of s , that is if a worker sends an update which would change the state in a non-monotonic way, that update is discarded on the basis that a better update has already been found. At any update of its local “global” state value, the updated value is output over the pattern output stream, and therefore the pattern output stream hosts all the subsequent successive approximations computed for the global state.

Performance There are three distinct additional overhead sources in the pattern, w.r.t. the plain task farm pattern:

- A first performance penalty is paid to update the global state at the farm collector every time a worker decides to send a state update. As this just requires the comparison among the state currently computed as the “best” one in the collector and the update value obtained from the worker, this may be considered negligible.
- A second performance penalty is paid to send back the global state update to the workers, through the farm feedback channel. This requires an additional communication from collector to emitter and a broadcast communication from emitter to workers. FastFlow implements both communications very efficiently and so the associated overhead is negligible (in the range of fewer than some hundred clock cycles on state-of-the-art multicore architectures).
- A third performance penalty is paid for the extra update messages directed by workers not having available (as local state copy) an updated state value. This happens in the case that the collector has already propagated the new state value but the message has not yet reached the worker. This performance penalty comes in two components: a) the worker may compute an extra $s'(x_i, s_{i-1})$ as a consequence of having a wrong s_{i-1} value in the computation of $c(x_i, s_{i-1})$, and b) the worker directs an extra state update message to the collector.

Adaptivity When the number of workers in the farm is increased, the new worker(s) should be given the current value of the global state maintained in the collector. This can also be implemented by allowing the worker(s) to be started with a proper s_{init} and then leaving the new workers to get regular update values from the collector. This obviously slows down the convergence of the overall computation, as the new workers will initially only provide “wrong” approximations of the global state. When the number of workers in the farm is decreased, the candidate workers to be removed may simply be stopped immediately before attempting to get a new task on their input stream from the emitter.

4.5 Separate task/state function state access pattern

Motivating example A matrix multiplication implemented by generating a stream of $\langle \text{row}_i, \text{col}_j \rangle$ reference pairs, applying vector product on each pairs and eventually updating the result matrix (state) in the corresponding i, j position is a representative application of the state access pattern. All isomorphic applications, processing stream of items each contributing to a global state in

²e.g. to some known s_{max} value

a non associative and commutative way are representatives of the pattern as well.

Definition The separate task/state function access pattern implements again a scalar state $s : \gamma$. The computation relative to the input task $x_i : \alpha$ is performed in two steps: first a function $f : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ (not depending on state values) is applied to the input task to obtain $y_i = f(x_i)$. Then, a new global state value s_i is computed out of y_i and of the current value of the global state s_{i-1}

$$s_i = s(y_i, s_{i-1})$$

The computation of a generic task x_i will therefore require some time (t_f) to compute f and then some time to fetch the current state value and to compute and commit the state update(t_s). The pattern outputs all modifications applied to the global state s onto the output stream. A variant worth being considered is the one only outputting the value updates to the global state s_j such that $cond(s_j)$ holds true for some $c : \gamma \rightarrow \text{bool}$.

Overall, this pattern is similar to that discussed in Sec. 4.1 (the “serial state access pattern”), the main difference being the way in which the global state is accessed to compute input task x_i :

- in the serial state access pattern, the state is read at the beginning and written at the end of the task computation.
- in the separate task/state function access pattern the state is accessed only while computing s . For the whole period needed to compute f there is no need to access the global state.

Implementation The access pattern is implemented on top of a FastFlow farm. A global variable is allocated in shared memory before actually starting the farm, along with all the appropriate synchronization mutexes/locks/semaphores needed to ensure mutually exclusive access to the state. Pointers to the shared data and to all the required synchronization mechanism variables are passed to all the parallel components composing the task farm pattern. A generic farm worker therefore computes f relative to the received x_i task and then a) accesses shared global state using the synchronization mechanisms provided along with the shared state pointer; b) computes the state update; c) updates the global state; and d) eventually releases the locks over the global state.

Performance Scalability of the separate task/state function state access pattern is obviously impacted by the ratio of the time spent in a worker to compute f (the t_f) to the time spent to interact with the server to update the state (the t_s), the latter contributing to the “serial fraction” of the farm. The time taken to compute n_w tasks sequentially will be $n_w(t_f + t_s)$. The time spent computing the same tasks in parallel, using n_w workers will be (at best) $n_w t_s + t_f$ and therefore the maximum speedup will be limited by

$$\lim_{n_w \rightarrow \infty} \text{speedup}(n_w) = \lim_{n_w \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_w(t_f + t_s)}{n_w t_s + t_f} = \frac{t_f}{t_s} + 1 \quad (1)$$

Adaptivity Increasing or decreasing the number of workers used does not pose any particular issue. Adding a new worker simply requires addition of the worker to the emitter worker queues. Taking away one worker simply requires to stop it while it is waiting for a new task.

5. Experiments

We describe several experiments relating to the different state access patterns discussed in Sec. 4 aimed at demonstrating that the patterns actually work and that the performance results are those predicted. The first group of experiments have all been performed on an Intel Sandy Bridge architecture with 16 2-way hyperthreading cores on two sockets running under Linux 2.6.32 using FastFlow version 2.1.0. In the last part of this Section (Sec. 5.1), we




Figure 3. Accumulator state pattern: completion time vs. parallelism degree (t_f 100 times longer than t_{\oplus})

will show also results achieved on other architectures, confirming the kind of results which have been achieved on the Sandy Bridge multicore. All the experiments have been run using synthetic applications modelled after the state access pattern under examination. Actual computations are dummy computations only, spending time according to the assumed timings for the different functions (e.g. f , s , c , etc.).

Accumulator state access pattern We measured the time spent while running our prototype synthetic application implementing the accumulator state access pattern while varying the amount of time (t_f) spent in the computation of the task to be output on the output stream ($f(x_i, s_w)$) and the time (t_s) spent in the computation of the new state value/update ($g(x_i) \oplus s_{i-1}$). Fig. 3 shows the typical result achieved on the Sandy Bridge multicore when $t_f \gg t_s$. In this case, the state access pattern implemented was the one sending regular updates to the collector at each task computation. The t_f was more that 100 times larger than t_s and the completion time for the synthetic application (i.e. the time measured from parallel application start to application end via the FastFlow function `fftTime` is almost completely overlapped to the ideal completion time

$$\frac{m(t_f + t_s)}{n_w} \quad (2)$$

Fig. 4 reports the results achieved when varying the state update message frequency, i.e. when varying the number of task computations awaited (and therefore the number of state updates accumulated to the local state value) before sending the update to the collector, i.e. to the thread maintaining the overall, correct global state of the computation. In this case we chose to have t_f close to t_s to stress the effect of collector updates. When sending frequent updates the applications stops scaling at quite small parallelism degrees, while with lower frequency steps scalability comes closer to the ideal. This confirms that, ideally, the frequency update should be chosen to be larger than

$$\frac{t_f n_w}{t_s}$$

such that when a new update comes to the collector the old ones have been already accumulated in the global state.

Successive approximation Fig. 5 shows results achieved with the implementation of the successive approximation state access




Figure 4. Accumulator state pattern: effect of update frequency (considerable state update time (t_f 2 times the t_{\oplus}))




Figure 5. Successive approximation pattern: completion time

pattern on the Sandy bridge architecture. Several curves are plotted against the ideal completion time (the one computing according to (2)), varying the amount of time spent computing the condition $c(x_i, s_{i-1})$ (t_f in the legend) and the time spent computing the state update $s'(x_i, s_{i-1})$ (t_s in the legend). As expected, the larger the time spent in the (worker local) computation of the condition, the better the results achieved.

Separate task/state function state access pattern The third experiment investigates the performance of the separate task/state function state access pattern. In this case we aimed at verifying if the limits given by (1). We therefore run the synthetic application implementing the separate task/state function state access pattern varying the ratio between the time spent computing f and computing s . Clearly scalability behaves as predicted by (1): case A is relative to a situation where the upper bound to the speedup is set to 101 ($t_f = 100t_s$) and in fact the scalability increases up to the number of available cores as the ideal one. Case B and C are relative to situations where the upper bound is instead 11 and 6, respectively.




Figure 6. Separate task/state function state access pattern: measured vs. ideal speedup




Figure 7. Separate task/state function state access pattern: measured vs. ideal speedup (AMD Magny Cours, 24 cores)

Use of state access patterns in actual applications We have no specific scalability/completion time/speedup graphs for non-synthetic applications available at the moment, although we have already some preliminary results achieved with actual application code that will be included in the camera ready of the paper, if accepted. However, this work originated in the activities of our research group and we have already one paper published related to the results achieved with an application *de facto* implementing the partitioned state access pattern [3, 4]. This is an application using a partitioned state access pattern implementing a hash function that directs packets to workers respecting the state partitioning schema. The application also supported dynamic adaptation in that the number of workers is increased or decreased to react to packet bursts on the network. Scalability was demonstrated as well as suitability of the dynamic re-distribution of the partitioned state according to the policy outlined in Sec. 5.




Figure 8. Accumulator state pattern: effect of update frequency (considerable state update time (t_f 2 times the t_{\oplus})) on Power8M, 20 cores, 160 hw contexts.

5.1 Different architectures

The experimental results discussed so far have all been achieved on the same Intel Sandy Bridge multicore architecture. However, similar results may have been achieved also when running our synthetic applications on different types of state-of-the-art architectures. Plots in Fig. 9, Fig. 8 and Fig. 7 show results achieved respectively on a Xeon PHI 5100 architecture (60 cores, 4-way hyper threading), on a IBM Power8E architecture (20 cores, 8 hardware thread contexts per core) and on an AMD Opteron 6176 Magny Cours architecture (24 cores).

6. Related work

A number of authors have considered various aspects of state in the context of stream processing. Typically, they employ less overtly structured approaches than the pattern-based concept presented here. Perhaps the closest to our work is that of Wu et al. [16] who introduce a framework for parallelizing stateful operators in a stream processing system. Their *split-(process*)-merge* assembly is very similar to the task farm presented here. They divide each stateful instance of *process* into non-critical access and critical access segments and present a more comprehensive theoretical model to determine speedup (based on shared lock access times, queue lengths, etc. than is attempted here. However, they do not attempt the sort of classification scheme given in this work.

Verdu et al [15] focus on implementation issues in relation to parallel processing of stateful deep pack inspection. The propose Multilayer Processing as a model to leverage parallelism in stateful applications. They focus on lower level implementation issues, such as caching and do not explicitly employ structured pattern based parallelism of the kind used here.

Gedik [11] examines properties of partitioning functions for distributing streaming data across a number of parallel channels. Thus the author focuses on the equivalent of properties of the hash function in our fully partitioned state access pattern.

De Matteis et al. [12] discuss stateful, window based, stream parallel patterns particularly suited to model financial applications. The techniques used to implement the applications fit the design patterns discussed in this paper, but actually somehow mix accumulator, partitioned and separate task/state state access patterns.




Figure 9. Accumulator state pattern: effect of update frequency (considerable state update time (t_f 2 times the t_{\oplus})) on Xeon PHI (60 cores, 4 hw contexts each).

Fernandez et al. [9] also consider the partitioned state and examine issues related to dynamic scale-out and fault tolerance. As with the others, they do not use a pattern-based approach nor do they attempt a classification scheme of the kind presented here.

7. Conclusions

Stream processing has become increasingly prevalent as a means to address the needs of applications in domains such as network processing, image processing and social media analysis. Such applications, when targeted at multicore systems, may be implemented using task farm and pipeline parallel patterns. We observe that typically such applications employ task farms in stateless fashion as it is here that the implementation is easiest and the return in terms of parallel speedup is greatest. However, we note that, while embracing state can lead to a de facto sequential computation, there are variations which can provide scope for parallel speedup. We have classified these variations, indicating for each the issues that arise in relation to implementation detail, performance and how the pattern may be adapted to vary performance. We have presented experimental evidence that the performance properties the various classes of stateful task farms behave as predicted. We consider that a greater understanding of the extent to which (streaming) parallel patterns may incorporate state will broaden the possibilities for development of multicore applications using parallel pattern based approaches. To this end, our next step is to investigate other traditionally stateless patterns for stateful variants.

Acknowledgments

This work has been partially supported by EU FP7-ICT-2013-10 project REPARA (No. 609666) “Reengineering and Enabling Performance And powerR of Applications” and EU H2020-ICT-2014-1 project RePhrase (No. 644235) “REfactoring Parallel Heterogeneous Resource-Aware Applications - a Software Engineering Approach”.

References

- [1] K. Asanovic, R. Bodik, J. Demmel, T. Keaveny, K. Keutzer, J. Kubiatowicz, N. Morgan, D. Patterson, K. Sen, J. Wawrzyniec, D. Wessel,

- and K. Yelick. A view of the parallel computing landscape. *Commun. ACM*, 52(10):56–67, Oct. 2009.
- [2] M. Cole. Bringing skeletons out of the closet: A pragmatic manifesto for skeletal parallel programming. *Parallel Comput.*, 30(3):389–406, Mar. 2004.
- [3] M. Danelutto, L. Deri, and D. D. Sensi. Network monitoring on multicores with algorithmic skeletons. In K. D. Bosschere, E. H. D’Hollander, G. R. Joubert, D. A. Padua, F. J. Peters, and M. Sawyer, editors, *Applications, Tools and Techniques on the Road to Exascale Computing, Proceedings of the conference ParCo 2011, 31 August - 3 September 2011, Ghent, Belgium*, volume 22 of *Advances in Parallel Computing*, pages 519–526. IOS Press, 2011.
- [4] M. Danelutto, D. D. Sensi, and M. Torquati. Energy driven adaptivity in stream parallel computations. In M. Daneshmand, M. Aldinucci, V. Leppänen, J. Lilius, and M. Brorsson, editors, *23rd Euromicro International Conference on Parallel, Distributed, and Network-Based Processing, PDP 2015, Turku, Finland, March 4-6, 2015*, pages 103–110. IEEE, 2015.
- [5] M. Danelutto and M. Torquati. Structured parallel programming with “core” fastflow. In V. Zsóka, Z. Horváth, and L. Csató, editors, *Central European Functional Programming School*, volume 8606 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 29–75. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [6] J. Enmyren and C. W. Kessler. Skepu: A multi-backend skeleton programming library for multi-gpu systems. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on High-level Parallel Programming and Applications*, HLPP ’10, pages 5–14, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [7] S. Ernsting and H. Kuchen. Algorithmic skeletons for multi-core, multi-gpu systems and clusters. *Int. J. High Perform. Comput. Netw.*, 7(2):129–138, Apr. 2012.
- [8] FastFlow home page, 2015. <http://calvados.di.unipi.it>.
- [9] R. C. Fernandez, M. Migliavacca, E. Kalyvianaki, and P. Pietzuch. Scalable and Fault-tolerant Stateful Stream Processing. In A. V. Jones and N. Ng, editors, *2013 Imperial College Computing Student Workshop*, volume 35 of *OpenAccess Series in Informatics (OASISs)*, pages 11–18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2013. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik.
- [10] E. Gamma, R. Helm, R. Johnson, and J. Vlissides. *Design Patterns: Elements of Reusable Object-oriented Software*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 1995.
- [11] B. Gedik. Partitioning functions for stateful data parallelism in stream processing. *The VLDB Journal*, 23(4):517–539, 2014.
- [12] T. D. Matteis and G. Mencagli. Keep Calm and React with Foresight: Strategies for Low-Latency and Energy-Efficient Elastic Data Stream Processing. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP ’16)*, 2016. Barcelona, Spain, to appear.
- [13] T. Mattson, B. Sanders, and B. Massingill. *Patterns for Parallel Programming*. Addison-Wesley Professional, first edition, 2004.
- [14] M. Poldner and H. Kuchen. On implementing the farm skeleton. *Parallel Processing Letters*, 18(1):117–131, 2008.
- [15] J. Verdtó, M. Nemirovsky, and M. Valero. Multilayer processing - an execution model for parallel stateful packet processing. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE Symposium on Architectures for Networking and Communications Systems*, ANCS ’08, pages 79–88, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.
- [16] S. Wu, V. Kumar, K.-L. Wu, and B. C. Ooi. Parallelizing stateful operators in a distributed stream processing system: How, should you and how much? In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM International Conference on Distributed Event-Based Systems*, DEBS ’12, pages 278–289, New York, NY, USA, 2012. ACM.