

Implementing Combiners

Parallel Programming and Data Analysis

Aleksandar Prokopec

Let's recall combiners from the previous lecture:

```
trait Combiner[T, Repr] extends Builder[T, Repr] {
    def combine(that: Combiner[T, Repr]): Combiner[T, Repr]
}
```

Let's recall combiners from the previous lecture:

```
trait Combiner[T, Repr] extends Builder[T, Repr] {
   def combine(that: Combiner[T, Repr]): Combiner[T, Repr]
}
```

```
trait Builder[T, Repr] {
  def +=(elem: T): this.type
  def result: Repr
}
```

Let's recall combiners from the previous lecture:

```
trait Combiner[T, Repr] extends Builder[T, Repr] {
   def combine(that: Combiner[T, Repr]): Combiner[T, Repr]
}
```

```
trait Builder[T, Repr] {
  def +=(elem: T): this.type
  def result: Repr
}
```

How can we implement the combine method efficiently?

▶ when Repr is a set or a map, combine represents union

- when Repr is a set or a map, combine represents union
- when Repr is a sequence, combine represents concatenation

- when Repr is a set or a map, combine represents union
- when Repr is a sequence, combine represents concatenation

The combine operation must be efficient, i.e. execute in $O(P \cdot \log n)$ time, where *n* is the number of elements, and *P* is the number of processors.

- when Repr is a set or a map, combine represents union
- when Repr is a sequence, combine represents concatenation

The combine operation must be efficient, i.e. execute in $O(P \cdot \log n)$ time, where *n* is the number of elements, and *P* is the number of processors.

Question: Is the method concat *efficient*?

```
def concat(xs: Array[Int], ys: Array[Int]): Array[Int] = {
  val r = new Array[Int](xs.length + ys.length)
  Array.copy(xs, 0, r, 0, xs.length)
  Array.copy(ys, 0, r, xs.length, ys.length)
  r
}
```



```
• hash tables – expected O(1)
```

- hash tables expected O(1)
- balanced trees $O(\log n)$

- hash tables expected O(1)
- balanced trees $O(\log n)$
- ▶ linked lists O(n)

Typically, set data structures have efficient lookup, insertion and deletion.

- hash tables expected O(1)
- balanced trees $O(\log n)$
- ▶ linked lists O(n)

Most set implementations do not have efficient union operation.



Let's see the operation complexity for sequences.

Let's see the operation complexity for sequences.

• mutable linked lists – O(1) prepend and append, O(n) insertion

Let's see the operation complexity for sequences.

- mutable linked lists O(1) prepend and append, O(n) insertion
- ▶ functional (cons) lists O(1) prepend operations, everything else O(n)

Let's see the operation complexity for sequences.

- mutable linked lists O(1) prepend and append, O(n) insertion
- ▶ functional (cons) lists O(1) prepend operations, everything else O(n)
- ► array lists amortized O(1) append, O(1) random accesss, otherwise O(n)

Let's see the operation complexity for sequences.

- mutable linked lists O(1) prepend and append, O(n) insertion
- ▶ functional (cons) lists O(1) prepend operations, everything else O(n)
- ► array lists amortized O(1) append, O(1) random accesss, otherwise O(n)

Mutable linked list can have O(1) concatenation, but for most sequences, concatenation is O(n).

Most data structures can be constructed in parallel with *two-phase construction*, which uses an intermediate data structure.

Most data structures can be constructed in parallel with *two-phase construction*, which uses an intermediate data structure.

The *intermediate data structure* is a data structure that:

▶ has efficient combine method $-O(P \cdot \log n)$ or better

Most data structures can be constructed in parallel with *two-phase construction*, which uses an intermediate data structure.

The *intermediate data structure* is a data structure that:

- ▶ has efficient combine method $-O(P \cdot \log n)$ or better
- has efficient += method

Most data structures can be constructed in parallel with *two-phase construction*, which uses an intermediate data structure.

The *intermediate data structure* is a data structure that:

- ▶ has efficient combine method $-O(P \cdot \log n)$ or better
- has efficient += method
- the result method is allowed to be O(n), but can be parallelized

Let's implement a combiner for arrays.

Two arrays cannot be efficiently concatenated, so we will do a *two-phase construction*.

Let's implement a combiner for arrays.

Two arrays cannot be efficiently concatenated, so we will do a *two-phase construction*.

class ArrayCombiner[T <: AnyRef: ClassTag](val parallelism: Int) {
 private var numElems = 0
 private val buffers = new ArrayBuffer[ArrayBuffer[T]]
 buffers += new ArrayBuffer[T]</pre>

First, we implement the += method:

```
def +=(elem: T) = {
    buffers.last += elem
    numElems += 1
    this
}
```

```
First, we implement the += method:
```

```
def +=(elem: T) = {
   buffers.last += elem
   numElems += 1
   this
}
```

Amortized O(1), low constant factors – as efficient as an array buffer.

Next, we implement the combine method:

```
def combine(that: ArrayCombiner[T]) = {
    buffers ++= that.buffers
    numElems += that.numElems
    this
}
```

Next, we implement the combine method:

```
def combine(that: ArrayCombiner[T]) = {
   buffers ++= that.buffers
   numElems += that.numElems
   this
}
```

 ${\cal O}(P),$ assuming that buffers contains no more than ${\cal O}(P)$ nested array buffers.

Finally, we implement the result method:

```
def result: Array[T] = {
  val step = math.max(1, numElems / parallelism)
  val array = new Array[T](numElems)
  val starts = (0 until numElems by step) :+ numElems
  val chunks = starts.zip(starts.tail)
  val tasks = for ((from. end) <- chunks) vield task {</pre>
    copyTo(array, from, end)
  }
  tasks.foreach(_.join())
  arrav
}
```

Benchmark

Demo – we will test the performance of the aggregate method:

```
xs.par.aggregate(newCombiner)(_ += _, _ combine _).result
```