

## But what is INSIDE a Processor?




## Parallelism again? What's different this time?

"This shift toward increasing parallelism is not a triumphant stride forward based on breakthroughs in novel software and architectures for parallelism; instead, this plunge into parallelism is actually a retreat from even greater challenges that thwart efficient silicon implementation of traditional uniprocessor architectures."

- Berkeley View, December 2006
- HW/SW Industry bet its future that breakthroughs will appear before it's too late
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## Background: Threads

- A Thread stands for "thread of execution", is a single stream of instructions
- A program / process can split, or fork itself into separate threads, which can (in theory) execute simultaneously.
- An easy way to describe/think about parallelism
- A single CPU can execute many threads by Time Division Multipexing

- Multithreading is running multiple threads through the same hardware



## Speedup Issues: Amdahl's Law

- Applications can almost never be completely parallelized; some serial code remains

- s is serial fraction of program, P is \# of cores (was processors)
- Amdahl's law:

Speedup(P) = Time (1) / Time (P)
$\leq 1 /(s+[(1-s) / P)]$, and as $P \rightarrow \infty$
$\leq 1 / s$

- Even if the parallel portion of your application speeds up perfectly your performance may be limited by the sequential portion
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## Life in a multi-core world...

- This "sea change" to multicore parallelism means that the computing community has to rethink:
a) Languages
b) Architectures
c) Algorithms
d) Data Structures
e) All of the above
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## Speedup Issues: Overhead

- Even assuming no sequential portion, there's...
- Time to think how to divide the problem up
- Time to hand out small "work units" to workers
- All workers may not work equally fast
- Some workers may fail
- There may be contention for shared resources
- Workers could overwriting each others' answers
- You may have to wait until the last worker returns to proceed (the slowest / weakest link problem)
- There's time to put the data back together in a way that looks as if it were done by one

But Concurrent programming is hard!

- What if two people were calling withdraw
at the same time?
- E.g., balance=100 and two withdraw 75 each
- Can anyone see what the problem could be?
- This is a race condition
- In most languages,
 this is a problem.
- In Scratch, the system doesn't let two of these run at once.


