LAWRENCE
LIVERMORE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

HPCS PRODUCTIVITY STUDY – COMPILER ANALYSIS SUMMARY

E. Dube, B. Chan

May 12, 2011

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States government. Neither the United States government nor Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States government or Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

This work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
Compiler Analysis Summary	4
Appendix	6
Compiler Statement of Work - HPCS Phase III Productivity Activity: Productivity Evaluation	6
Compiler Evaluation	6
Background	6
Statement of Work:	6
Tasks, Milestones, Deliverables, Schedules:	6
Telecons Between IBM, DARPA, ORNL, and LLNL.....	7
Telecon Meeting September 16, 2010.....	7
Telecon Meeting October 28, 2010	8
Telecon Meeting November 24, 2010	9
Telecon Meeting December 15, 2010.....	9
Telecon Meeting February 17, 2011	9
Telecon Meeting April 14, 2011.....	9
Results of Tests Run by Bor Chan, LLNL	11

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

Compiler Analysis Summary

As part of the HPCS Phase III Productivity Activity: Productivity Evaluation (D12683), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) evaluated the IBM *PERCS* compilers, focusing on IBM's POWER 7 chip. The goal of this analysis was to evaluate the *PERCS* compilers (C and FORTRAN) coupled to the POWER 7 chip under various scenarios using established benchmarks that Bor Chan, a Computer Scientist from LLNL, had expertise using on multiple platforms.

The Benchmark Codes used were

Benchmark	Explanation
Crystal	Single CPU optimization and SIMD compiler challenge.
IRS	Marquee performance code. Single physics package code. Implicit Radiation Solver for diffusion equation on a block structured mesh.
UMT	Marquee performance code. Single physics package code. Unstructured-Mesh deterministic radiation Transport.
CAM	Kernels from an atmospheric benchmark suite
MF24	Livermore Loops; 24 do-loops; Each loop carries out a different mathematical kernel
EPCC	OpenMP benchmark to evaluate the overhead of OpenMP

Eight tests were run with these benchmark codes comparing the POWER7 (P7) chip to both the POWER5 (P5) chip and the BlueGene (BG) architectures.

Test Name	What was tested	Summary of Results
P5_P7	OpenMP Overhead	For two threads, generally P7 showed good speedup, however for 4 and 8 threads, P7 had poor performance
P5_P7.CRYSTAL	Effectiveness of MASSV on P7	Overall, P7 showed good speedup.
P5_P7.IRS	Effectiveness of the 12 prefetch streams that P7 has	Overall, P7 showed good speedup
P5_P7.UMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none">How well the compiler can unroll the loopGenerate SIMD instruction *without* actually vectorizing the loopsCompare C and FORTRAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Overall, P7 showed good speedup.Note that this benchmark has been tuned for BG machines, and the vector units on those platforms, and even so, with different chips and the associated different overheads, the P7 did well.The P7 without the SIMD speedup was greater than the clock speedup which is extremely good. That implies the compiler is doing a great job especially in C.The unroll did not enhance SIMD as BGQ does.
P7_BG.CAM	Test loop	Some of the tests showed better performance on P7 versus

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	optimization	BG machine, while some tests had slightly worse performance. No large discrepancies were noticed.
P7_BG.MF24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SIMDzation on P7• Compare C and FORTRAN	Some of the tests showed better performance on P7 versus BG machine, while some tests had slightly worse performance. No large discrepancies were noticed.
P5_P7.epcc	Evaluate the overhead of the P7 with OpenMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Most of the timing improvements for P7 is for 2 threads.• Comparing with P5, 2/4/8 threads shows significant slow down for SINGLE, CRITICAL, LOCK/UNLOCK and ATOMIC. (except 2 threads timing for SINGLE)• Among various P7 versions of compiler, the latest version is slightly better.
P5_p7.matrix	Effectiveness of various hardware matrix performances	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hardware matrix performance tests using UMT• P7 is the first compiler to deliver better wall time speedup compare with clock rate speedup of the chip. That translates to excellent compiler work.• Significantly fewer instructions for P7 – half – and 2/3 cycles compared to P5

All parties to this endeavor agree that the evaluation met the original goal stated above. The collaboration proved fruitful in uncovering some shortcomings to the PERSC compiler and in showing its strengths, as stated in the results above. The monthly telecons between the invested parties were instrumental in keeping the project on-task, and in relaying information to IBM in a timely manner.

Appendix

Compiler Statement of Work - HPCS Phase III Productivity Activity: Productivity Evaluation

Compiler Evaluation

Background

This statement of work is to clarify expectations for a compiler evaluation that is part of the HPCS Phase III productivity evaluation outlined in a WFO Proposal between LLNL, ORNL and DARPA. Discussions have occurred between IBM/Toronto's Yaoqing Gao, XL compiler technical lead for PERCS project, and LLNL Bor Chan to narrow the scope of work and understand the features available with the POWER7 FORTRAN/C/C++ compilers.

This PERCS compiler collaboration work will not be tied to any DARPA milestones. Through this effort, PERCS mission partners can benefit from knowing more about how to do performance tuning on POWER7 using IBM XL compilers, and IBM compiler side can benefit from the feedback from PERCS mission partners on compiler performance and productivity enhancement for future consideration.

Statement of Work:

LLNL Plans to evaluate the following compiler features:

1. SIMDzation on POWER7.
2. The effectiveness of MASSV on POWER7.
3. Various compiler optimization flags for code transformations.
4. The effectiveness of the 12 prefetch streams that P7 has.
5. Compare performance between C and Fortran compiler for the same code.

Tasks, Milestones, Deliverables, Schedules:

1. We will use Power5 timing as a base line as long as we have the machine in site.
2. We will use MF24 to test item 1.
3. We will use Crystal to test item 2.
4. All benchmarks will use various compilation flags for item 3.
5. We will use IRS to test item 4.
6. We will use UMT/MF24 to test item 5.
7. We will use UMT to test how well the compiler can unroll the loop and generate SIMD instruction *without* actually vectorize the loop.
8. We will use a optimize UMT kernel used in BG/Q test to compare its performance against Power7.
9. As each part is completed, we will report our findings in a technical report. All sections will be complete by April 30, 2011.

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

Telecons Between IBM, DARPA, ORNL, and LLNL

Telecon Meeting September 16, 2010

Agenda:

1. Round-table introduction;
2. Discuss compiler collaboration with PERCS mission partners:
 - Requirements
 - Expectations for collaboration
 - Provide compiler information to DARPA mission partners: new compiler features to exploit Power7 hardware, options, directives for performance tuning
 - Gather information from DARPA mission partners on benchmark and application code analysis, from possibly manually tuning critical code to compiler auto optimizations;
 - Get feedbacks and address new requirements from DARPA mission partners on compiler performance and productivity for future enhancement
 - How often we gather together, etc.
 - Other items?

Attendees:

PERCS mission partners:

Jeffrey Vetter (ORNL)

Bor Chan (LLNL)

IBM:

Yaoqing Gao (XL compiler technical lead for PERCS project),

Robin Green (XL compiler manager for PERCS project)

Ettore Tiotto (XL UPC compiler technical lead for PERCS project)

Patricia Clark (PERCS project manager)

John Richards, Catalina Danis, Cal Swart (Productivity assessment team)

Discussion:

The initial scope for this compiler collaboration is for C/C++/Fortran. We can discuss extending the scope later if needed.

Jeffrey mentioned that Dolores had been fostering the collaboration. She had ideas about getting compilers in hands of users. Jeffrey also mentioned that Yaoqing Gao had given a nice presentation on some new compiler features at one of the MS meetings and he is interested in getting it out to folks using it. Jeffrey suggested gathering some information from DoD folks.

Bor Chan would like to know:

- How the P7 vector unit works, to help Bor understand BG/Q vs P7 behavior of microkernels.

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

- Compiler Intrinsics
- ESSL and parallel (vector) ESSL
- MASS and MASSV
- New Compiler optimizations (polyhedral, advanced memory, assist threads, XML transformation reports) and other compiler optimizations we added for POWER7 in V11/V13
- POWER 7 Architecture and hardware information and impact of hand-tuning for one architecture on getting good performance on another : Bandwidth, L1/L2/L3 cache characteristics, set associativity , SMT, the overhead to start a thread on POWER5 vs POWER7. SIMDization/short vectorization, long vectorization. prefetch, etc.
- Bor knows the UMT benchmark fairly well (Sequoia benchmark) and would like to see how poly and other optimizations affect performance of that benchmark.

From IBM compiler side,

- We can provide some documents and tutorials in the collaboration meetings to help the mission partners to get familiar with XL compilers and POWER7 hardware features. We just shipped XL C/C++ V11.1 and XL Fortran V13.1 on both AIX and LINUX for POWER7. We will provide the information on what features are new, and on how to use new compiler features to exploit POWER7 hardware.
- We would like to gather information on what application performance challenges PERCS mission partners are facing, and what kernels and benchmarks /applications they are interested in. We would like the mission partners can work with us to conduct code analysis to identify performance opportunities and requirements for future compiler enhancements.
- To improve the productivity, the latest IBM XL compiler release supports compiler transformation reports in XML. Users can view an XML report using a browser, or navigate it using a new tool prototype called Compiler Feedback View in the PTP tool. Users can also use tools such as HPCS toolkit for compiler transformation reports. We would like to get feedbacks on how the compiler transformation reports can help them do application performance tuning, and any new enhancement they would like to see.

Action items:

1. PERCS mission partners: Get access to POWER 7 system. Dolores should be working on getting Bor on M166. Jeffrey will send Joe Cross a message and cc Bor.
2. Bor also suggested Jeff/Evi...etc should start working on SOW (Statement of work) for LLNL.
3. IBM will provide documents on IBM compilers and MS compiler presentations to help bring Bor and DOD folks up to speed on compiler optimization so far.
4. There was no DoD representation in today's meeting due to a meeting conflict. Jeffrey suggested that we gather some feedback from them.

Telecon Meeting October 28, 2010

Agenda:

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

1. PERCS compiler collaboration SOW discussion (all);
2. Performance tuning tips on POWER7 using IBM XL compilers (Yaoqing Gao/IBM);
3. Initial kernel analysis and tuning (Bor Chan/LLNL)

Action items:

1. provide POWER7 hardware information and performance counter information (to be done)
2. provide OpenMP environment variable setting for Bor to tune OpenMP code (done)
3. provide PERCS mission partners the compiler presentation schedule in SC10 (to be finalized)
4. Bor will provide the source of UMT (done), XL compiler team will investigate O3 vs. O5 performance and discuss it in the next meeting;
5. Provide PERCS mission partners with the presentation slides of performance tuning on POWER7 using XL C/C++/Fortran compilers (done, the draft slides sent to Dolores)
6. Schedule the next meeting in the week of before or after SC10 (to be finalized)

Telecon Meeting November 24, 2010

Agenda:

1. brief review of the list of action items and open discussion on compiler collaboration (performance and productivity)
2. benchmark measurement and analysis update (by Bor) (*See attached file: p5_p7.CRSTAL*)(*See attached file: p5_p7.IRS*)(*See attached file: p5_p7.UMT*)
3. compiler optimization investigation update (by IBM) (*See attached file: umtmk.ppt*) by Tommy (*See attached file: IRS performance analysis.ppt*) by Salem

Telecon Meeting December 15, 2010

Agenda:

1. Review of the list of action items from the previous meetings;
2. Summary of productivity discussion from Catalina
3. Benchmark analysis update from Bor (*See attached file: P7_BG.CAM*) (*See attached file: P7_BG.MF24*)
4. Compiler optimization investigation update from IBM (*See attached file: CrystalMk performance analysis.ppt*) (*See attached file: irs_crystal.ppt*)

Telecon Meeting February 17, 2011

Agenda:

1. PERCS compiler collaboration update
2. Benchmark analysis update from Bor (*See attached file: P5_p7.epcc*)
3. PERCS compiler technology deep dive session --- Polyhedral framework by Salem (*See attached file: Polyhedral from user's perspective.ppt*)
4. Upcoming activities

Telecon Meeting April 14, 2011

Agenda:

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

1. Analysis update by Bor;[attachment "p5_p7.matrix" deleted by Yaoqing Gao/Toronto/IBM]
2. Follow-up PERCS compiler technology deep dive session -- Advanced Memory Hierarchy Optimizations, XML compiler transformation reports[attachment "Advanced memory hierarchy optimizations from user's perspective.ppt" deleted by Yaoqing Gao/Toronto/IBM]
3. Technical discussion and actions

Attendances:

Dolores Shaffer
Bor Chan (LLNL)
Evi Dube (LLNL)
Patrica Clark (IBM)
Yaoqing Gao(IBM)
Shimin Cui (IBM)
Wang Chen (IBM)

Summary:

1. Bor presented performance analysis from hardware aspect with the following summary:
 - The project finished on time and within budget. We deliver more than we promised (OMP overhead analysis and detail analysis of the code generated by the compiler for UMT).
 - For the power series chips, P7 is the first compiler deliver better wall time speedup compare with clock rate speedup of the chip. That means excellent compiler work.
 - Many thanks to IBM's compiler group. It provides in depth information for the new compiler technologies and how to take advantage of them.Result of UMT:
 - Wall time speedup better than the clock rate speedup.
 - Compiler generates only half of the instructions and use 2/3 of cycles compare with P5.
 - The cache miss is about the same as P5 but DTLB miss is much less.
 - Branch mispredict-take/not taken is better in P7 compare with P5.
 - Various units stall less on P7 except for stall caused by D cache miss.
2. The compiler collocation has been very productive. Many thanks to Dolores and Evi to promote and support the compiler collaboration, to Pat and Vickie to support this project. In particular, many thanks to Bor for the great job he did. So far, we have covered all line items in SOW. The analysis and feedback will help compiler performance and productivity enhancement. In this project, IBM compiler side arranged a series of compiler technology deep drive sessions.
3. Shimin from IBM compiler side presented Advanced Memory Hierarchy Optimizations

Action items:

1. Evi and Dolores are going to get together to discuss collaboration;
2. IBM compiler side will review the analysis work done by Bor.

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

Results of Tests Run by Bor Chan, LLNL

P5_P7									
	Date : 10/2010								
	Base line:								
	Running on pdev(power5)								
	Compilation line:								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto - qcache=auto -qsmpr=omp -qlanglvl=extc99								
	LDLFLAGS = -blpdata -qsmpr=omp								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	same as above								
	All timings are in microseconds								
	Timing are for *overhead*								
		2ths		4ths		8ths			
		P5	P7	P5	P7	P5	P7		
	PARALLEL	1.901 66	1.219 966	3.2480 97	68.238 533	1.0652 0E+01	244.72 67		
	FOR	2.518 771	1.019 945	3.5270 94	25.629 115	5.4710 9E+00	190.99 17		
	// much higher S.D.								
	PARALLEL FOR	2.401 159	1.418 45	3.8497 22	57.871 151	5.5881 2E+00	231.04 19		
	BARRIER	0.769 088	0.527 98	1.0051 5	28.419 244	1.4621 3E+00	206.54 64		
	SINGLE	0.271 568	0.554 278	0.3349 2	19.568 3	7.4167 7E-01	210.78 51		
	CRITICAL	0.283 421	0.077 162	0.3468 74	0.1452 43	3.6657 4E-01	0.1610 87		
	LOCK/UNLOCK	0.167	0.073	0.2000	0.1329	2.2019	0.1331		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		524	493	47	62	7E-01	19		
	ORDERED	0.399 146	0.307 467	0.4520 43	4.9050 69	5.3513 5E-01	124.52 55		
	ATOMIC	0.117 996	0.078 062	0.2600 21	0.0952 65	3.9990 7E-01	0.0725 27		
	REDUCTION	2.132 506	1.265 74	3.5692 79	32.602 822	5.3849 5E+00	248.41 78		
	Note:								
	1) 2 ths have good speedup vs P5n except SINGEL								
	2) Others show *horrible* overhead except CRITICAL/LOCK/ATOMIC.								
	Assumed clock rate								
	1900 MHz	3360 MHz	2ths		4ths		8ths		
			P5	P7	P5	P7	P5	P7	
	STATIC		2.051 294	1.8783 45	3.3618 21	4.7806 3E+01	7.1359 52	217.0 03	
	STATIC	1	18.91 5832	5.5508 02	32.178 211	7.7453 8E+01	48.786 56	244.6 693	
	STATIC	2	9.740 627	4.2297 12	15.663 6	6.8935 8E+01	25.213 64	225.0 537	
	STATIC	4	5.888 569	3.0339 84	7.7564 95	5.3478 9E+01	13.036 98	201.1 117	
	STATIC	8	3.793 812	2.3912 91	5.2758 93	4.7392 0E+01	7.7228 31	198.8 135	
	STATIC	16	2.809 644	2.0909 31	4.1296 24	5.0923 0E+01	6.5271 26	222.9 76	
	STATIC	32	2.348 399	1.9394 76	3.6057 83	4.0404 3E+01	6.1159 85	206.4 996	
	STATIC	64	2.119 505	1.8571 85	3.5893 32	5.3495 1E+01	5.8159 11	192.6 477	

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	STATIC	128	2.073 944	1.8143 53	3.4169 67	4.9706 9E+01	5.6684 97	210.5 584	
	DYNAMI	C 1	64.79 8427	13.424 659	153.20 1056	9.3522 0E+01	452.10 82	359.5 859	
	DYNAMI	C 2	29.18 8836	7.3803 07	76.419 139	5.8109 0E+01	228.24 17	230.5 835	
	DYNAMI	C 4	14.42 5886	4.6699 88	46.847 069	6.6136 1E+01	131.67 97	168.3 821	
	DYNAMI	C 8	5.480 707	3.1692 62	22.460 532	4.5654 9E+01	72.049 9	172.8 444	
	DYNAMI	C 16	3.054 917	2.3996 95	7.5386 29	4.9528 3E+01	33.948 06	156.7 164	
	DYNAMI	C 32	2.038 908	1.9899 37	3.3178 33	4.4175 0E+01	12.783 35	152.9 06	
	DYNAMI	C 64	1.482 737	1.7735 24	2.8586 98	3.9713 0E+01	5.3635	153.7 034	
	DYNAMI	C 128	1.268 578	1.6644 84	2.8936 15	3.1472 5E+01	5.1708 82	167.3 39	
	GUIDED	1	4.876 28	2.9729 13	12.822 092	4.6797 1E+01	41.135 42	167.9 269	
	GUIDED	2	3.364 742	2.5417 09	9.7500 92	4.7837 3E+01	31.313 35	164.7 702	
	GUIDED	4	2.615 678	2.1998 17	8.4050 89	3.8953 9E+01	25.658 13	169.7 17	
	GUIDED	8	1.757 371	2.2921 44	6.6385 87	4.5957 1E+01	22.791 03	160.8 768	
	GUIDED	16	1.692 593	2.3770 93	4.6825 89	4.7294 2E+01	16.176 11	144.5 67	
	GUIDED	32	1.549 172	2.2653 7	3.2379 63	4.6374 6E+01			

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	GUIDED	64	1.430 082	1.8130 42					
	Note:								
	1) 2ths general show good speedup except DYNAMIC 64+ and GUIDED 8+								
	2) 4ths show *horrible* result for STATIC DYNAMIC 4+ and								
	P5_P7.CRSTAL								
	Date : 10/2010								
	Base line:								
	Running on pdev(power5)								
	Compilation line:								
	// O3								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	LDFlags = -blpdata -lmassv -lm -qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -O5								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	// O3								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	LDFlags = -blpdata -lmassv -lm -qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -O5								
	All timings are in seconds								
		CASE	Crystall_div	Crystal_div_mass	Crystal_pow	Crystal_pow_mass	Crystal_Chole sky		
	P5	O3	2.328	2.1860	2.9835	7.0975	4.8714		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

			506	43	1	2E-01	46		
		O5	2.333 469	2.1860 85	2.9687 83	9.1959 4E-01	4.8747 75		
	P7	O3	1.330 957	1.3417 26	0.6081 34	4.3070 9E-01	2.3601 53		
		O5	1.321 914	1.3266 06	0.6071 7	4.2572 4E-01	2.2944 89		
		SPEED UP P5/P7							
		O3	1.75	1.63	4.91	1.6500 0E+00	2.06		
		O5	1.77	1.65	4.89	2.1600 0E+00	2.12		
		SPEEDUP for _mass							
	P5	O3		1.07		4.2000 0E+00			
		O5		1.07		3.2300 0E+00			
	P7	O3		0.99		1.4100 0E+00			
		O5		1		1.4300 0E+00			
P5_P7.IRS									
	Date : 10/2010								
	Base line:								
	Running on pdev(power5)								
	Compilation line:								
	//***** P5 1.9GHz								
	// O3								
	CFLAGS = -c -qlanglvl=stdc99 -O3 -qhot -qalias=allp -qtune=auto -qarch=auto - qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qmaxmem=16384								
	LDLFLAGS = -blpdata -lm - qsmp=omp								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -								
	O5								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	// O3								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qalias=allp -qarch=auto - qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99 -qmaxmem=16384								
	LDFlags = -blpdata -lm - qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -								
	O5								
	nolter = 5000								
	All timing are in seconds								
	rmatmult3_old	: orig.							
	version								
	rmatmult3_p5_vx	: version target for no. of							
	prefetch streams on P5								
	rmatmult3_p7	: version target for no. of prefetch streams on P7							
			CASE/i	rmatm	rmatm	rmatm	rmatm		
			ter	ult3_ol	ult3_p	ult3_p5	ult3_p		
				d	5_v1	_v2	7		
	P5	O3							
			25	6.1842 63	2.3966 84	2.4069 2E+00			
			50	48.194 554	18.471 385	1.8447 4E+01			
			100	579.15 1223	200.39 8553	1.8636 0E+02			
		O5							
			25	6.1913 28	2.3976 85	2.4041 9E+00			
			50	48.075	18.440	1.8429			

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

				916	049	0E+01			
			100	571.09 6963	204.94 5528	2.0723 7E+02			
	P7	O3							
			25	2.5734 18			2.9330 24		
			50	28.328 686			26.334 07		
			100	188.68 5525			106.26 36		
		O5							
			25	2.6724 09			3.0151 62		
			50	28.751 782			36.296 94		
			100	183.09 343			104.64 09		
		/***** P5/P7 speedup							
		O3							
			25	2.4					
			50	1.7					
			100	3.1					
		O5							
			25	2.3					
			50	1.7					
			100	3.1					
		/***** P7 rmatmult3_old vs rmatmult3_p7 speedup							
		O3							
			25	0.88					
			50	1.08					
			100	1.78					
		O5							
			25	0.89					
			50	0.79					
			100	1.75					

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

P5_P7.UMT									
	1) later version								
	2) automatic control flow								
	3) C version								
	Date : 10/2010								
	Base line:								
	Running on pdev(power5)								
	Compilation line:								
	//***** P5 1.9GHz								
	// O3								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	LDFLAGS = -blpdata -qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -O5								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with -O5								
	All timing are in seconds								
			CASE/iter	1/400000	2/500000	3/250000			
	P5	O3							
			F	6.00E-01	3.15E-01	6.63810E-01			
			C	1.30E+	3.85E-	1.2361			

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

				00	01	8E+00			
		O5							
			F	5.87E-01	3.12E-01	6.53630E-01			
			C	1.29E+00	9.75E-01	1.33851E+00			
	P7	/***** NO - qsimd=auto							
		O3							
			F	3.01E-01	1.68E-01	3.17610E-01			
			C	2.91E-01	1.66E-01	3.23361E-01			
		O5							
			F	4.92E-01	9.22E-01	6.65430E-01			
			C	4.86E-01	9.17E-01	6.73228E-01			
		SPEED UP P5/p7							
		O3							
			F	1.99	1.87	2.09000E+00			
			C	4.45	2.32	3.82000E+00			
		O5							
			F	1.19	0.34	9.80000E-01			
			C	2.65	1.06	1.99000E+00			
	P7	/***** - qsimd=auto							
		bgq bgq restructure // -O3 1.87x -O5 3.39x(with sligth code change) vs scalar							
		v1 scalar optimization							
		v2 vectorization							
			CASE/i ter	1/4000 00	2/5000 00	3/2500 00			
		O3							

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		F							
				2.22E-01	1.51E-01	2.55310E-01			
			bgq	2.23E-01	1.45E-01	2.43010E-01			
			v1	2.14E-01	1.48E-01	2.40600E-01			
			v2	2.17E-01	1.51E-01	2.37150E-01			
		C		2.28E-01	1.45E-01	2.51186E-01			
		O5							
		F							
				2.31E-01	1.49E-01	2.56670E-01			
			bgq	3.68E-01	1.48E-01	3.67380E-01			
			v1	2.15E-01	1.47E-01	2.42550E-01			
			v2	2.18E-01	1.49E-01	2.38180E-01			
		C		2.34E-01	1.46E-01	2.61039E-01			
		SPEEDUP compare without simd							
		O3							
		F		1.36	1.11	1.24000E+00			
		C		1.28	1.15	1.29000E+00			
		O5							
		F		2.13	6.19	2.59000E+00			
		C		2.08	6.26	2.58000E+00			
	P7	/***** !IBM* stream_unroll(n)							
		O3							
		F	!IBM*	stream_unroll(					

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

				2)					
				2.2117 0E-01	1.4764 0E-01	2.5221 0E-01			
			bgq	2.2112 0E-01	1.4513 0E-01	2.4296 0E-01			
			v1	2.1341 0E-01	1.4776 0E-01	2.3757 0E-01			
			v2	2.1419 0E-01	1.4759 0E-01	2.3728 0E-01			
		F	!IBM*	stream _unroll(4)					
				2.2301 0E-01	1.4756 0E-01	2.5227 0E-01			
			bgq	2.2028 0E-01	1.4511 0E-01	2.4304 0E-01			
			v1	2.1434 0E-01	1.4760 0E-01	2.3748 0E-01			
			v2	2.1420 0E-01	1.4785 0E-01	2.3831 0E-01			
		F	!IBM*	stream _unroll(8)					
				2.2126 0E-01	1.4746 0E-01	2.5225 0E-01			
			bgq	2.2034 0E-01	1.4511 0E-01	2.4398 0E-01			
			v1	2.1532 0E-01	1.4758 0E-01	2.3747 0E-01			
			v2	2.1312 0E-01	1.4765 0E-01	2.3741 0E-01			
		O5							
		F	!IBM*	stream _unroll(2)					
				2.3016 0E-01	1.4913 0E-01	2.5664 0E-01			
			bgq	3.6914 0E-01	1.4735 0E-01	3.6442 0E-01			
			v1	2.1379 0E-01	1.4634 0E-01	2.4191 0E-01			
			v2	2.1813 0E-01	1.4929 0E-01	2.3861 0E-01			
		F	!IBM*	stream _unroll(4)					

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

				2.2702 0E-01	1.4881 0E-01	2.5668 0E-01			
			bgq	3.6598 0E-01	1.4756 0E-01	3.6415 0E-01			
			v1	2.1385 0E-01	1.4625 0E-01	2.3873 0E-01			
			v2	2.1493 0E-01	1.4620 0E-01	2.3845 0E-01			
		F	!IBM*	stream _unroll(8)					
				2.2695 0E-01	1.4916 0E-01	2.5608 0E-01			
			bgq	3.6722 0E-01	1.4744 0E-01	3.6437 0E-01			
			v1	2.1387 0E-01	1.4642 0E-01	2.3875 0E-01			
			v2	2.1455 0E-01	1.4657 0E-01	2.3849 0E-01			
	Note:								
	1) P7 without SIMD speedup factor greater than the clock speedup factor which is								
	extremely good. That implies the compiler is doing a very good job especailly in C.								
	It may explains why other restructure has mim. effect.								
	2) unroll did not enhance simd as BGQ does								
	3) For v2								
	-c -O3/O5 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90 -qreport								
	original timing 0.22182E+00								
	//***** call vrec(t_array,t_array,Groups)								
	Both O3/O5								
	3.10E-01								
	//*****								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	do ig=1,Groups								
	t_array(ig) = 1/t_array(ig)								
	enddo								
	Both O3/O5								
	4.28E-01								
	//*****								
	one big loop								
	2.14E-01								
P7_BG.CAM									
	Date : 12/1/2010								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	// O3								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qarch=auto -qtune=auto - qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qalias=allp -qarch=auto - qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	LDFLAGS = -blpdata - qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with - O5								
	All timings are in seconds								
	P7								
	DAWN								
	no simd				simd				
	nosimd/simd								
test case	n/im	0.000 00E+0 0	0	0	0	3	5	nosi md/s imd	
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k1	9/1152	1.50E- 05	1.19E- 05	1.1920 0E-05	1.10E- 05	1.26	1.09	2	*
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k2		6.20E- 06	6.20E- 06	6.1990 0E-06	6.20E- 06	1	1	2	

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k3		3.38E-02	3.41E-02	3.55700E-02	3.48E-02	0.95	0.98	1.5	
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k4		6.55E-02	6.57E-02	4.62300E-02	4.58E-02	1.42	1.43	1.6	*
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k5		5.20E-03	5.22E-03	2.67700E-03	2.69E-03	1.94	1.94	1.6	* <--
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k6		9.06E-06	9.06E-06	8.82100E-06	9.30E-06	1.03	0.97	1.2	
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k7		1.17E-05	1.14E-05	1.14400E-05	1.12E-05	1.02	1.02	1.4	
CAM_dyn_ c_sw_k8		2.95E-02	2.93E-02	2.68600E-02	2.71E-02	1.1	1.08	1.8	*
CAM_dyn_ tp2d_k1		3.45E-02	3.41E-02	3.67000E-02	3.89E-02	0.94	0.88	1.2	
CAM_dyn_ tp2d_k2		3.00E-05	3.15E-05	2.83700E-05	3.17E-05	1.06	0.99	1	* <--
CAM_dyn_ xtpv_k1		7.76E-02	9.29E-02	7.42900E-02	7.40E-02	1.04	1.26	1	* <--
CAM_dyn_ fxppm_k1	1/1152	2.31E-02	2.31E-02	2.28700E-02	2.27E-02	1.01	1.02	1	

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

CAM_dyn_fxppm_k2		6.48E-03	3.91E-03	3.94100E-03	4.00E-03	1.64	0.98	1	* <--
CAM_dyn_lmppm_k1		4.13E-02	4.12E-02	4.12900E-02	4.12E-02	1	1	0.9	
CAM_dyn_d_sw_k1		5.14E-02	5.14E-02	2.38400E-07	2.38E-07	N/A		1	
CAM_rem_ap_map1_ppm_	30/160	2.15E-02	2.15E-02	2.27700E-02	2.28E-02	0.94	0.94	1.1	
CAM_rem_ap_ppm2_m_k1		6.28E-02	6.28E-02	6.98400E-02	7.02E-02	0.9	0.89	1.3	
CAM_rem_ap_ppm2_m_k2		6.70E-05	6.72E-05	6.72300E-05	6.72E-05	1	1	1.2	
CAM_rem_ap_ppm2_m_k3		2.86E-06	1.08E-03	2.86100E-06	1.09E-03	1	0.99	1.1	
CAM_rem_ap_ppm2_m_k4		4.47E-02	4.47E-02	8.64800E-02	8.57E-02	0.52	0.52	1	
CAM_rem_ap_kmppm_k1		9.67E-02	9.66E-02	8.65200E-02	8.66E-02	1.12	1.12	0.9	* <--
	Note:								
	1) * means some speedup								
	2) <-- means perform better than BG among *								
	3) overall BG performs								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	better								
P7_BG.MF24									
	Date : 12/1/2010								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	// O3								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector-qarch=auto -qtune=auto - qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qalias=allp -qarch=auto - qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=stdc99								
	LD_FLAGS = -blpdata - qsmp=omp								
	// O5								
	replace -O3 with - O5								
	vector lenght n = 1024 // other n = 16,64,256 available upon request								
	All timings are in seconds								
	no simd	simd							
	nosimd/simd								
		P7		DAWN					
	test case	-O3 F/c	-O5 F/c	-O3 F/c	-O5 F/c	03	05	nosimd/sim d	
	k1	0.953 67E- 06/	0.119 21E- 05/	0.9536 7E-06/	0.1192 1E-05/	1	1	1.41	
		9.54E- 07	1.19E- 06	1.19E- 06	9.5367 4E-07	0.8	1.25	1.04	* <--
	k2	0.788 43E+0 0/	0.788 57E+0 0/	0.7867 5E+00/	0.7869 9E+00/	1	1	1	
		7.87E- 01	7.88E- 01	7.89E- 01	7.8710 7E-01	1	1	1	
	k3	0.366 39E+0 0/	0.366 37E+0 0/	0.4579 2E+00/	0.4579 8E+00/	0.8	0.8	1.48	
		6.11E-	6.11E-	4.58E-	4.5792	1.33	1.33	0.89	*

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		01	01	01	7E-01				<--
	k4	0.182 86E+0 0/	0.184 34E+0 0/	0.1845 2E+00/	0.1838 5E+00/	0.99	1	1	
		2.89E- 01	2.89E- 01	2.88E- 01	2.8809 6E-01	1	1	0.79	
	k5	0.548 60E+0 0/	0.547 08E+0 0/	0.5468 6E+00/	0.5468 7E+00/	1	1	1	
		5.64E- 01	5.64E- 01	5.64E- 01	5.6450 5E-01	1	1	1	
	k6	0.879 31E+0 0/	0.864 90E+0 0/	0.8711 5E+00/	0.8610 8E+00/	1.01	1	0.69	
		8.81E- 01	8.65E- 01	8.88E- 01	8.7890 5E-01	0.99	0.98	1	
	k7	0.214 58E- 05/	0.238 42E- 05/	0.2145 8E-05/	0.2384 2E-05/	1	1	1.22	
		2.86E- 06	2.38E- 06	2.38E- 06	2.3841 9E-06	1.2	1	1	* <- -
	k8	0.453 62E+0 0/	0.445 03E+0 0/	0.4300 3E+00/	0.4261 7E+00/	1.05	1.05	1.49 *	
		6.41E- 01	6.41E- 01	6.45E- 01	6.4165 8E-01	0.99	1	1	
	k9	0.429 15E- 05/	0.405 31E- 05/	0.2484 0E+00/	0.2483 1E+00/	N/A		0.88	
		4.05E- 06	4.05E- 06	6.45E- 01	6.4477 7E-01				
	k10	0.219 33E+0 0/	0.219 28E+0 0/	0.6542 6E+00/	0.6546 7E+00/	0.34	0.33	1	
		2.44E- 01	2.44E- 01	6.59E- 01	6.5952 3E-01	0.37	0.37	1	
	k11	0.545 02E+0	0.544 85E+0	0.5446 5E+00/	0.5459 3E+00/	1	1	1	

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		0/	0/						
		5.46E-01	5.46E-01	5.46E-01	5.45692E-01	1	1	1	
	k12	0.47684E-06/	0.71526E-06/	0.47684E-06/	0.71526E-06/	1	1	1.49	
		4.77E-07	7.15E-07	4.77E-07	4.76837E-07	1	1.5	1	* <--
	k13	0.56072E+00/	0.56214E+00/	0.54093E+00/	0.54085E+00/	1.04	1.04	1	* <--
		5.88E-01	5.88E-01	5.26E-01	5.25936E-01	1.12	1.12	1	* <--
	k14	0.30958E+00/	0.30949E+00/	0.21499E+00/	0.21462E+00/	1.44	1.44	1	* <--
		2.86E-01	2.80E-01	2.11E-01	2.11358E-01	1.35	1.32	1	* <--
	k15	0.59170E+00/	0.59354E+00/	0.59347E+00/	0.59348E+00/	1	1	1.11	
		5.65E-01	5.68E-01	5.59E-01	5.77648E-01	1.01	0.98	1.06	
	k16	0.53008E+00/	0.53383E+00/	0.56717E+00/	0.56551E+00/	0.93	0.94	0.88	
		4.16E-01	4.60E-01	4.68E-01	4.70562E-01	0.89	0.98	1	
	k17	0.44963E+00/	0.45433E+00/	0.49200E+00/	0.59994E+00/	0.91	0.76	1	
		4.61E-01	4.73E-01	5.97E-01	5.97549E-01	0.77	0.79	0.96	
	k18	0.58000E+00/	0.58317E+00/	0.46779E+00/	0.46024E+00/	1.24	1.27	1.3	*
		5.87E-01	5.86E-01	4.68E-01	4.45589E-01	1.25	1.31	1	* <--

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	k19	0.732 63E+0 0/	0.732 63E+0 0/	0.7325 9E+00/	0.7326 2E+00/	1	1	1	
		7.33E- 01	7.33E- 01	7.33E- 01	7.3261 9E-01	1	1	1	
	k20	0.560 71E+0 0/	0.560 57E+0 0/	0.5635 4E+00/	0.5635 9E+00/	0.99	0.99	1	
		5.40E- 01	5.40E- 01	5.45E- 01	5.4521 9E-01	0.99	0.99	1	
	k21	0.286 81E- 01/	0.128 88E- 01/	0.2840 9E-01/	0.1294 8E-01/	1.01	0.99	1	
		1.35E- 02	1.27E- 02	1.01E- 02	9.1869 8E-03	1.33	1.38	1	* <--
	k22	0.257 49E- 04/	0.252 72E- 04/	0.2598 8E-04/	0.2574 9E-04/	0.99	0.98	1	
		2.43E- 05	2.43E- 05	2.38E- 05	2.4557 1E-05	1.02	0.99	1	
	k23	0.548 91E+0 0/	0.549 03E+0 0/	0.5489 2E+00/	0.5491 2E+00/	1	1	1	
		5.49E- 01	5.49E- 01	5.49E- 01	5.4934 6E-01	1	1	1	
	k24	0.115 29E+0 1/	0.110 01E+0 1/	0.1256 4E+01/	0.1135 7E+01/	0.92	0.97	0.88	
		4.18E- 01	4.24E- 01	4.18E- 01	4.1861 2E-01	1	1.01	1	
	Note:								
	1) * means some speedup								
	2) <-- means perform better than BG among *								
	P5_P7.EPCC								
	Base line:								
	Running on								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	pdev(power5)								
	Compilation line:								
	CFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qalias=allp -qarch=auto -qtune=auto - qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qlanglvl=extc99								
	LDFLAGS = -blpdata -qsmp=omp								
	Env.								
	export XLSMPOPTS=spins=0:yields=0								
	//***** P7 3.36GHz 1.77XP5								
	All timings are in microseconds								
	Timing are for *overhead*								
		2ths		4ths		8ths			
	test case	P5	P7	P5	P7	P5	P7		
	PARALLEL	1.901 66	1.684 711	3.2480 97	3.1270 09	1.0652 0E+01	4.5271 83		
	DD2.0		1.916 038		2.7283 17		4.5456 06		
			1.848 595		2.8485 29		4.3555 62		
	FOR	2.518 771	1.272 08	3.5270 94	3.0787 89	5.4710 9E+00	5.8783 13		
			1.443 325		2.4460 77		6.1643 61		
			1.201 098		3.3918 25		5.5178 64		
	PARALLEL FOR	2.401 159	1.624 451	3.8497 22	3.3305 11	5.5881 2E+00	4.8810 2		
			1.893 984		3.1927 8		4.8128 5		
			1.893 501		3.1760 68		4.6497 11		
	BARRIER	0.769 088	0.442 884	1.0051 5	0.9534 3	1.4621 3E+00	1.2016 61		
			0.514 578		0.7366 04		1.0781 78		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

			0.520 198		0.7697 45		1.1130 69		
	SINGLE	0.271 568	0.148 306	0.3349 2	0.6028 59	7.4167 7E-01	1.3367 13		
			0.194 858		0.5913 83		1.3912 81		
			0.171 177		0.2486 81		1.0203 12		
	CRITICAL	0.283 421	0.472 939	0.3468 74	0.9295 87	3.6657 4E-01	1.6008 26		
			0.735 822		0.9289 99		1.5662 12		
			0.547 886		0.8765 93		1.5203 4		
	LOCK/UNLOCK	0.167 524	0.448 98	0.2000 47	0.9227 38	2.2019 7E-01	1.5708 88		
			0.748 969		0.9374 7		1.5385 56		
			0.527 862		0.8734 74		1.4959 63		
	ORDERED	0.399 146	0.311 694	0.4520 43	0.3631 29	5.3513 5E-01	0.4316 64		
			0.355 374		0.3250 34		0.4074 35		
			0.360 684		0.3317 7		0.3948 09		
	ATOMIC	0.117 996	0.254 076	0.2600 21	0.7640 55	3.9990 7E-01	1.5608 64		
			0.326 86		0.8497 74		1.5518 93		
			0.246 389		0.8283 06		1.5311 53		
	REDUCTION	2.132 506	1.898 651	3.5692 79	3.4700 2	5.3849 5E+00	5.0862		
			1.967 902		2.8633 42		4.8021 02		
			1.933 898		2.9367 32		4.5719 09		
	Assumed clock rate								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	1900 MHz	3360 MHz							
		2ths		4ths		8ths			
	test case	P5	P7	P5	P7	P5	P7		
	STATIC	2.051 294	1.594 567	3.3618 21	3.1413 1E+00	7.1359 52	6.1267 73		
	DD2.0		1.421 01		3.0128 6E+00		6.2783 84		
			1.102 841		3.8057 3E+00		5.6267 98		
	STATIC 1	18.91 5832	12.34 9153	32.178 211	2.8889 1E+01	48.786 557	44.933 63		
			9.893 894		2.9921 6E+01		42.328 64		
			11.55 2799		3.0378 6E+01		41.615 62		
	STATIC 2	9.740 627	8.814 192	15.663 6	1.6261 8E+01	25.213 635	25.602 6		
			7.162 297		1.3378 5E+01		23.040 75		
			7.220 566		1.4423 7E+01		23.430 73		
	STATIC 4	5.888 569	6.784 213	7.7564 95	7.7460 2E+00	13.036 978	15.653 01		
			7.092 237		6.1451 6E+00		13.299 5		
			7.078 683		7.0904 0E+00		14.340 52		
	STATIC 8	3.793 812	3.026 521	5.2758 9	4.8680 5E+00	7.7228 31	9.6791 51		
			2.787 03		4.3511 5E+00		8.7090 85		
			3.121 746		5.0412 5E+00		8.4982 16		
	STATIC 16	2.809 644	2.261 674	4.1296 24	3.8999 6E+00	6.5271 26	7.2129 25		
			2.104 712		3.6342 1E+00		7.1164 01		
			2.419 758		4.2488 9E+00		6.7044 38		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	STATIC 32	2.348 399	1.880 443	3.6057 83	3.4545 5E+00	6.1159 85	6.5491 32		
			1.758 361		3.3204 8E+00		6.6167 59		
			2.058 578		3.9265 5E+00		6.2672 73		
	STATIC 64	2.119 505	1.682 484	3.5893 32	3.2558 2E+00	5.8159 11	6.3943 51		
			1.581 025		3.1322 8E+00		6.7471 03		
			1.915 717		3.7210 8E+00		6.0676 57		
	STATIC 128	2.073 944	1.576 686	3.4169 67	3.1628 3E+00	5.6684 97	6.1917 42		
			1.475 763		3.1204 0E+00		6.3522 1		
			1.816 869		3.6842 0E+00		5.9534 19		
	DYNAMIC 1	64.79 8427	46.71 2875	153.20 1056	4.3445 6E+02	452.10 815	1638.9 98		
			45.95 505		5.1248 3E+02		1715.1 26		
			41.67 4471		4.3826 7E+02		1584.5 85		
	DYNAMIC 2	29.18 8836	35.47 2822	76.419 139	2.1900 6E+02	228.24 173	833.28 16		
			19.55 7691		2.5970 5E+02		874.95 54		
			19.62 2457		2.1743 2E+02		812.02 56		
	DYNAMIC 4	14.42 5886	9.966 505	46.847 069	1.1319 2E+02	131.67 97	420.04 91		
			8.834 016		1.3676 6E+02		442.77 55		
			8.455 575		1.1649 0E+02		413.10 1		
	DYNAMIC 8	5.480 707	4.657 495	22.460 532	5.7596 1E+01	72.049 9	214.52 07		
			3.668		6.8599		225.28		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

			392		0E+01		61		
			3.754 878		5.9022 4E+01		209.76 16		
	DYNAMIC 16	3.054 917	2.333 307	7.5386 29	3.0140 5E+01	33.948 06	112.28 57		
			2.182 221		3.6095 4E+01		118.23 32		
			2.170 157		3.1005 5E+01		109.58 29		
	DYNAMIC 32	2.038 908	1.515 555	3.3178 33	1.5249 8E+01	12.783 34	60.762 35		
			1.453 638		1.7404 2E+01		63.555 88		
			1.503 11		1.5631 5E+01		59.119 99		
	DYNAMIC 64	1.482 737	1.132 643	2.8586 98	6.0722 1E+00	5.3635	32.402 44		
			1.133 525		7.0690 7E+00		33.627 4		
			1.535 022		6.3489 7E+00		31.017 14		
	DYNAMIC 128	1.268 578	0.930 25	2.8936 15	4.1524 1E+00	5.1708 8	15.740 07		
			0.899 029		4.7956 3E+00		16.661 17		
			1.024 401		4.3107 0E+00		14.765 07		
	GUIDED 1	4.876 28	5.929 172	12.822 092	4.2231 2E+01	41.135 41	158.51 6		
			6.960 547		6.3471 8E+01		213.36 03		
			4.586 816		3.6758 5E+01		133.98 01		
	GUIDED 2	3.364 742	4.664 35	9.7500 92	2.9774 5E+01	31.313 34	115.42 42		
			4.772 222		4.1654 5E+01		143.62 07		
			4.001 141		2.7268 4E+01		101.97 59		

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	GUIDED 4	2.615 678	3.080 142	8.4050 89	2.2506 7E+01	25.658 13	85.325 46		
			3.209 567		2.9924 2E+01		101.48 99		
			3.100 812		2.1576 4E+01		79.533 99		
	GUIDED 8	1.757 371	2.525 842	6.6385 87	1.7850 3E+01	22.791 02	69.571 07		
			2.361 774		2.1933 2E+01		76.822 93		
			2.482 569		1.7500 6E+01		65.760 92		
	GUIDED 16	1.692 593	1.931 942	4.6825 89	1.4711 7E+01	16.176 1	56.782 76		
			1.480 556		1.7402 8E+01		61.629 13		
			1.821 554		1.4542 6E+01		54.597 87		
	GUIDED 32	1.549 172	1.175 451	3.2379 63	1.0342 1E+01				
			1.211 512		1.1522 4E+01				
			1.555 967		9.8085 5E+00				
	GUIDED 64	1.430 082	1.090 407						
			1.097 31						
			1.318 3						
P5_P7.Matrix									
	Compilation line:								
	//***** P5								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90								
	//***** P7								
	FFLAGS = -c -O3 -qhot -qsimd=auto -qhot=novector -qarch=auto -qtune=auto -qcache=auto -qsmp=omp -qnosave -qfree=f90 -qsuffix=cpp=F90 -qreport								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		P5	P7	P7/P5					
	clock	1.9GHz	3.36GHz	1.77					
	Execution time (wall clock time) second	2.033502	0.743638609	0.366					
	Processor cycles(PM_CYC)	3307768579	2355144408	0.712					
	Instructions completed(PM_INST_CMPL)	6511536783	3064924701	0.471					
	Instructions per cycle	1.969	1.301	0.661					
	MIPS	3186.215 MIPS	4169.044 MIPS	1.309					
	Instruction mix:								
	Total Load								
	L1 D cache load references(PM_LD_REF_L1)	1868600370	574517880	0.307					
	Total Store								
	L1 D cache store reference(PM_ST_REF_L1)	1198398299							
	PM_ST_FIN (Store Instructions Finished)		351222855	0.293					
	Load+Store done by LSU								
	FOR P5 PM_LD_REF_L1 + PM_ST_REF_L1 - PM_FPU_STF								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

		1868600370 + 1198398299 - 1008102228 2058896441						
	PM_LSU_FIN (LSU Finished an instruction (up to 2 per cycle)):							
			10212 33806	0.496				
	Floating Point load							
	LSU executed Floating Point load instruction			166140 7489				
	(PM_LSU_LDF)							
	PM_LSU_LDF (All Scalar Loads)			239157 79				
	PM_LSU_LDX (All Vector loads (vsx vector + vmx vector))			487806 725				
	FOR P7 Total Floating Point load							
	PM_LSU_LDF + PM_LSU_LDX							
			51172 2504	0.308				
	FXU							
	FXU produced a result(PM_FXU_FIN)							
		10585 01896	82287 6900	0.777				
	Branch							
	Branches issued(PM_BR_ISSUED)			152234 136				
	PM_BRU_FIN (Branch Instruction Finished)							
			64365 871	0.423				
	[] % of BR Miss Prediction			5.67%				
	FPU							
	FPU produced a result(PM_FPU_FIN)			350567 4587				
	PM_VSU_FIN (VSU0 Finished an instruction)							

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

			15742 72625	0.449					
	FPU executed FDIV instruction(PM_FPU_FDIV)			300012 5					
	hardly any FSQRT in UMT								
	PM_VSU_FSQRT_FDIV								
			30000 55	1					
	PM_VSU_FSQRT_FDIV_DOUBLE (DP vector versions of fdiv,fsqrt)								
				352000 38					
	P5 use FMA to do double FDIV?								
	FPU executed multiply-add instruction(PM_FPU_FMA)								
				124800 3526					
	PM_VSU_FMA			702					
	PM_VSU_FMA_DOUBLE								
			27840 0854	0.223					
	FPU executed store instruction(PM_FPU_STF)			100810 2228					
	PM_VSU_STF (FPU store (SP or DP) issued on Pipe0)								
				299363 52					
	PM_VSU1_SQ (Store Vector Issued on Pipe1)								
			28453 2437	0.312					
	PM_FPU_FEST (FPU executed FEST instruction)			175782 76					
	PM_FLOP (Floating Point Operation Finished)			103874 9323					
	PM_VSU_1FLOP			533460 04					
	PM_VSU_2FLOP			668802 421					
	PM_VSU_2FLOP_DOUBLE			668801 722					
	PM_VSU_4FLOP			281400 787					
	PM_VSU_8FLOP			352000 44					
	Cache and TLB:								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	Load								
	L1 D cache load references(PM_LD_REF_L1)								
		18686 00370	57413 8212	0.307					
	L1 D cache load misses(PM_LD_MISS_L1)								
		37752 6	35916 4	0.951					
	Data TLB misses(PM_DTLB_MISS)			136414					
	PM_DTLB_MISS (TLB reload valid)								
			5304	0.039					
	Number of loads per DTLB miss								
		13670 .972	10824 6.269	7.919					
	PM_LD_REF_L1/ PM_DTLB_MISS								
	number of loads per load miss								
		4625. 197	1599	0.346					
	PM_LD_REF_L1/PM_LD_MISS_L1								
	Store								
	L1 D cache store reference(PM_ST_REF_L1)			119839 8299					
	PM_ST_FIN (Store Instructions Finished)								
			34987 9023	2.9200 0E-01					
	L1 D cache store misses(PM_ST_MISS_L1)								
		53075 431	52661 557	9.9200 0E-01					
	number of stores per store miss								
		22.5	6.64	2.9500 0E-01					
	PM_ST_REF_L1/PM_ST_MISS_L1								
	Percentage of L1 store misses per L1 store	ref		17.81%					
	Floating Point:		Group Set						
	Theroretical floating-point peak	1.9GHz * 2(FPU)* 2(FMA) 3.36 * 2(vector) * 2(FMA)							
		7.6GF		1.77					

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

			13.44F GF						
	HW Float point instructions	per Cycle							
		1.969	1.301	0.66					
	Wall Clock Time								
		2.033 502	0.743 63860 9	0.366					
	Flip								
	P5								
	PM_FPU_FIN + PM_FPU_FMA - PM_FPU_STF - PM_FPU_FEST								
	3505674587 + 1248003526 - 1008102228 - 17578276				372799 7609				
	P7								
	PM_FPU_FIN + PM_VSU_FMA_DOUBLE + PM_VSU_FMA - PM_VSU_STF - PM_VSU1_SQ								
	1574272625 + 278400854 + 702 - 29936352 - 284532437				153820 5392				
	P7/P5				4.1300 0E-01				
	flip/sec								
	flip/WCT	1833 M	2069 M	1.13					
	FMA %								
	100 * PM_FPU_FMA * 2 / flip								
		67	36	0.54					
	Branches:								
	Branches issued(PM_BR_ISSUED)			152234 136					
	Branch mispredictions due to CR bit	settin g		123772 44					
	(PM_BR_MPRED_CR)								
	Branch mispredictions due to target	addre ss		8487					
	(PM_BR_MPRED_TA)								

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	PM_BRU_FIN (Branch Instruction Finished)							
			64365 871	0.423				
	PM_BR_PRED (Branch Predictions made)			605009 52				
	PM_BR_MPRED (Number of Branch Mispredicts)							
				342883 2				
	PM_BR_MPRED_CR (Branch mispredict - taken/not taken)							
			11919 46	0.096				
	PM_BR_MPRED_TA (Branch mispredict - target address)							
			4761	0.561				
	PM_BR_MPRED_CCACHE			1139				
	(Branch Mispredict due to Count Cache prediction)							
	PM_BR_MPRED_LSTACK (Branch Mispredict due to Link Stack)							
				3547				
	Stalls:							
	Run cycles(PM_RUN_CYC)							
		33077 68579	23551 44408	0.712				
	Completion stall caused by LSU instruction							
		24284 2766	14884 7113	0.613				
	(PM_CMPLU_STALL_LSU)							
	Completion stall caused by D cache miss							
		56531 92	15089 638	2.67				
	(PM_CMPLU_STALL_DCACHE_MIS S)							
	Completion stall caused by FXU instruction							
		26691 2285	11701 2695	0.438				
	(PM_CMPLU_STALL_FXU)							
	Completion stall caused by FPU							

HPCS Productivity Study – Compiler Analysis Summary

	instruction								
				812246 689					
	(PM_CMPLU_STALL_FPU)								
	PM_CMPLU_STALL_SCALAR			:	130317 948				
	(Completion stall caused by FPU instruction)								
	PM_CMPLU_STALL_VECTOR			:	949474 458				
	(Completion stall caused by Vector instruction)								
	Total for P7			10797 92406	1.33				