




3 4456 0333721 7

ORNL/TM-11768



OAK RIDGE
NATIONAL
LABORATORY

MARTIN MARIETTA

The IBM RISC System/6000 and Linear Algebra Operations

Jack J. Dongarra
Peter Mays
Giuseppe Radicati di Brozolo

OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY
CENTRAL RESEARCH LIBRARY
CIRCULATION SECTION
EMOM ROOM 175
LIBRARY LOAN COPY
DO NOT TRANSFER TO ANOTHER PERSON
If you wish someone else to see this
report, send to same with report and
the library will arrange a loan.
OCT 1990

MANAGED BY
MARTIN MARIETTA ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.
FOR THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from the Office of Scientific and Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831; prices available from (615) 576-8401, FTS 626-8401.

Available to the public from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22161.

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, make any warranty, express 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 any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

ORNL/TM-11768

Engineering Physics and Mathematics Division

Mathematical Sciences Section

**THE IBM RISC SYSTEM/6000 AND LINEAR ALGEBRA
OPERATIONS**

Jack J. Dongarra
Department of Computer Science
University of Tennessee
and
Mathematical Sciences Section
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831-8083

Peter Mays
Numerical Algorithms Group Ltd.
Wilkinson House, Jordan Hill Road
Oxford OX2 8DR, United Kingdom

Giuseppe Radicati di Brozolo
IBM European Center for Sci. & Eng. Comput.
00147 Roma
Giorgione 159, Italy

Date Published: January 1991

This work was supported in part by the Applied Mathematical Sciences subprogram of the Office of Energy Research, U.S. Department of Energy, under Contract DE-AC05-84OR21400, Computer Science Department of the University of Tennessee, IBM, and the National Science Foundation Science and Technology Center Cooperative Agreement No. CCR-8809615.

Prepared by the
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831
managed by
Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc.
for the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
under Contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400



MARTIN MARIETTA ENERGY SYSTEMS LIBRARIES
3 4456 0333721 7

Contents

1	IBM RISC System/6000: System Overview	1
1.1	Central Processing Unit	1
1.2	Memory and Caches	3
1.3	Serial Optical Link	3
2	Fortran Techniques for Performance on Matrix Operations	3
2.1	Level 1 BLAS	4
2.2	Level 2 BLAS	5
2.3	Level 3 BLAS	8
2.4	Summary of BLAS Performance	10
3	Block Algorithms and LAPACK	10
3.1	Performance of Blocked Algorithms on the RISC System/6000	11
4	Summary and Conclusions	11
5	Acknowledgements	12

The IBM RISC System/6000 and Linear Algebra Operations *

Jack J. Dongarra

*Computer Science Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301; and
Mathematical Sciences Section, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831*

Peter Mayes

*NAG Ltd., Wilkinson House, Jordan Hill Road, Oxford, OX2 8DR, UNITED KINGDOM
and*

Giuseppe Radicati di Brozolo

*IBM European Center for Scientific and Engineering Computing, 00147 Roma, via Giorgione 159,
ITALY*

Abstract

This paper discusses the IBM RISC System/6000 workstation and a set of experiments with blocked algorithms commonly used in solving problems in numerical linear algebra. We describe the performance of these algorithms and discuss the techniques used in achieving high performance on such an architecture.

1 IBM RISC System/6000: System Overview

The IBM RISC System/6000 computer is a superscalar second-generation RISC architecture [2]. It is the result of advances in compiler and architecture technology that have evolved since the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Like other RISC processors, the RISC System/6000 implements a register-oriented instruction set, the CPU is hardwired rather than microcoded, and it features a pipelined implementation. The floating-point unit is integrated in the CPU, minimizing the overhead associated with separate floating-point coprocessors.

Unlike other RISC processors, however, the RISC System/6000 has the ability to dispatch

multiple instructions and to overlap the execution of the fixed-point, the floating-point, and the branch functional units. The 184 instructions are divided among the functional units and are designed to minimize interaction among the functional units.

The IBM RISC System/6000 is intended to satisfy the requirements of both commercial and scientific applications. Our focus here is on the performance of the RISC System/6000 for scientific applications, which require very high floating-point performance as well as specialized peripherals, such as high-quality graphics adapters. These, in turn, require very high memory bandwidths to the central processing unit.

In what follows, we give a brief overview of the design of the CPU and memory and of some aspects of the I/O system. In particular, we discuss those architectural features most important for designing and implementing high-performance mathematical software. Note that specific details refer to the Model 530. The specification of other members of the RISC System/6000 family may be different in some aspects. For a more complete discussion of the hardware, we refer the interested reader to the January 1990 issue of the *IBM Journal of Research and Development*.

1.1 Central Processing Unit

The CPU architecture is based on a design that exploits modern compiler technology, and an implementation that exploits VLSI and CMOS technology, to allow as much parallel instruction execution as possible. The RISC System/6000 processor consists of three separate but integrated functional units:

1. The Instruction Cache and Branch Processing Unit feeds a stream of instructions to the fixed-point and floating-point units. The branch processor provides all the branching, interrupt, and condition code functions within the system. An important feature of the branch processing unit is the “zero-cycle branch.” A zero-cycle branch is achieved by

executing branches simultaneously with fixed- or floating-point operations so that the stream of data to these units is not interrupted. In practice, this configuration means that loop boundaries do not interrupt pipelining.

2. The Fixed-Point Unit (FXU) is designed to execute the fixed-point arithmetic, the logic instructions, and the data address computations and to schedule the movement of data between the floating-point unit and the data cache. Read or write transfers between the floating-point unit and the data cache require one cycle to complete.
3. The Floating-Point Unit (FPU) supports the execution of the floating-point instructions. The FPU has a set of thirty-two 64-bit floating-point registers that access the data cache directly. It conforms to the ANSI/IEEE 745-1985 standard for binary floating-point arithmetic. The FPU is organized for double-precision computations. Thus, data held in the floating-point registers are always represented in double-precision format. Therefore, when single-precision data are loaded, they are expanded to double-precision format.

In addition, there are a number of features in the architecture which enhance performance.

- Register renaming is an important feature of the machine. This allows data for the next instruction to be loaded into a floating-point register that is currently being used by an earlier instruction.
- In addition to the usual arithmetic operations, there are compound instructions that multiply two operands and add (or subtract) the product to a third operand. These floating-point multiply-and-add (FMA) instructions take two cycles to complete. However, one FMA instruction may be issued in each clock cycle, provided that the operands are independent. Thus it is possible to complete two floating-point computations in each cycle.
- The FMA instructions actually produce only one rounding error rather than two and are therefore more accurate than required by the IEEE standard. This additional accuracy

has been used, for example, in some of the math intrinsic functions. However, if strict adherence to the IEEE standard is required, a compile-time option can be used to disable the generation of compound instructions.

- The floating-point divide is implemented by a Newton-Raphson approximation algorithm. A division requires 16 to 19 cycles to complete and provides correctly rounded results, but is obviously expensive if computed unnecessarily inside a loop. If division by a constant is taken out of the loop and replaced by a multiplication with the reciprocal, the code is more efficient, but the results are not necessarily identical. If it is important to have exactly equivalent code, the added precision and speed of the multiply-add instruction can be used to implement a reciprocal multiplication plus correction algorithm at the cost of a multiply and two multiply-adds (5 cycles). This algorithm is cheaper than a division and still provides correctly rounded results.

This design has allowed the implementation of a CPU that executes up to four instruction per cycle: one branch instruction, one condition register instruction, one fixed-point instruction, and one floating-point multiply-add instruction. A second pipelined instruction can begin on the next cycle on an independent set of operands. This means that two independent floating-point operations per cycle can be executed.

Of particular interest is the fact that loads and independent floating-point operations can occur in parallel. The compiler takes advantage of this capability in many cases: with a well-designed algorithm, it is possible to execute two floating-point operations on separate data items and “hide” one memory reference all in the same cycle. At a clock cycle of 25 MHz, this translates into a peak performance of 50 million floating-point operations per second (Mflops).

1.2 Memory and Caches

The RISC System/6000 memory banks implement a four-way interleaved design that provides two words (two 64-bit words) of data every machine cycle. A system can have from 16 to

256 Mbytes of total memory.

Separate instruction and data caches provide conflict-free access to data and instructions. The instruction cache is organized as an 8-Kbyte, two-way set-associative cache, which has a 64-byte (16-instruction) line size. The data cache is a four-way set-associative 64-Kbyte cache, which is divided into four identical chips of 16 Kbytes each. The cache is implemented as a store-back cache to minimize the memory bus traffic: data are written back to memory only when an updated line in cache is replaced. The cache-line size is 128 bytes. A synchronous 128-bit memory bus allows 400 Mbytes per second to be transferred to or from memory: it takes eight cycles to load a cache line (16 double-precision words) from memory to cache. A 64-bit data bus connects the floating-point unit and the data cache: it takes one cycle to transfer a double-precision word between the data cache and the floating-point registers.

1.3 Serial Optical Link

The I/O unit contains an I/O channel controller and two serial link adapters, which provide an interface to optics cards that drive fiber-optics links. It is intended for attachment of disks, graphics adapters, and other high-speed peripherals. (Support for this high-speed optical link is planned for future release.) The serial optical link has a bandwidth of 220 Mbits per second, and it allows the attachment of remote devices up to 2000 meters away. The link is also suitable for interprocessor message and data transfers in a multiprocessor configuration, and work is under way to investigate its suitability for closely coupled multiprocessing.

2 Fortran Techniques for Performance on Matrix Operations

As mentioned in the preceding section, the RISC System/6000 can complete a floating-point multiply-and-add (FMA) instruction every cycle, so that a Model 530 running at 25 MHz has a theoretical peak speed of 50 Mflops. Many factors limit the amount of concurrency that can be effectively used, thus limiting the performance that an algorithm can achieve. Most notably,

unnecessary memory references can have a severe impact on the performance attainable. Indeed, the movement of data between memory and registers can be more costly than arithmetic operations on the data. This cost provides considerable motivation to restructure existing algorithms and to devise new algorithms that minimize data movement.

In this section we describe a model to predict the performance of simple Fortran loops and to serve as a guide to writing efficient Fortran code for the RISC System/6000. (We observe that the Fortran compiler usually takes advantage of all the parallelism of which the CPU is capable.) Our model is based on the following rules:

1. Each FMA instruction requires two cycles to complete. Two FMAs that operate on independent data will be scheduled on consecutive cycles, and therefore two floating-point operations will be executed simultaneously.
2. Loads from cache to floating-point registers require one cycle to complete. They will be overlapped with FMAs that were scheduled earlier, even if they operate on registers that the earlier FMA is still using (register renaming).
3. Stores do not overlap with FMAs.
4. Loop boundaries do not interrupt pipelining (zero-cycle branch).
5. When a cache miss occurs, the floating-point unit must wait 11 cycles before the whole cache line is available. The latency from memory to cache accounts for 8 cycles. In our model we add to this an additional latency of 3 cycles, which fits closely the experimental data we collected. The details of the data transfer may be more complicated in reality, but this is the average effect that a Fortran programmer might expect to see.

In the following three subsections we use this model to explain the different levels of performance that can be achieved by using different levels of Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms (BLAS) kernels [8, 5, 4], and we describe some Fortran techniques to implement the BLAS

efficiently. High performance was achieved by constructing the codes in such a way that the compiler can easily generate code that matches the architecture of the machine. The techniques used were blocking (or strip-mining), loop unrolling, and loop jamming—all fairly standard techniques used by compiler writers. We hope that some of these techniques will be incorporated into subsequent versions of the compiler, so that even less work will be required to exploit the machine.

2.1 Level 1 BLAS

The two Level 1 BLAS operations that occur most frequently in linear algebra are the DOT:

```
DO 10 I = 1, N
    TEMP = TEMP + X(I)*Y(I)
10 CONTINUE
```

and the AXPY:

```
DO 10 I = 1, N
    Y(I) = Y(I) + ALPHA*X(I)
10 CONTINUE
```

We begin by examining the performance of these operations when using data stored in cache.

For the DOT operation, each FMA instruction requires two loads, one for $X(I)$ and for $Y(I)$. Loading the data requires two cycles, and performing the FMA also requires two cycles. There is no possibility of re-using data, so the best we can expect is that the loading of the next two operands is overlapped with an FMA. This corresponds to a theoretical speed of 25 Mflops; in practice, we measured 24.5 Mflops (see Table 1).

For the AXPY operation, each FMA instruction requires two loads and one store. Again, there is no possibility of reusing data, so the best we can hope for in this case is one FMA instruction

Table 1: Speed in Mflops of Level 1 BLAS

Type of memory access	DOT		AXPY	
	predicted	measured	predicted	measured
all data in cache	25	24.5	16.67	16.4
all data from memory:				
x and y with unit stride	14.81	14.6	11.43	11.3
x with stride 16	3.65	3.2	3.40	3.2
x and y with stride 16	2.08	1.8	2	1.4

every three cycles. This corresponds to 16.67 Mflops; in practice, we measured 16.4 Mflops (see Table 1).

For data that must be accessed from memory, we must take account of the time taken for data to arrive in the registers. Each time a cache miss occurs (every 16 elements for stride-one access), the processing is interrupted, and the CPU must wait for the cache line to become available. In our model, the CPU must wait for 11 machine cycles. Thus, the cost of moving contiguous data from memory to registers is, on the average, 1.69 cycles per element (i.e., 11 cycles to move a cache line from memory to cache plus 1 cycle to transfer each of the 16 elements from cache to register $((11+16)/16)$ cycles per element). In a DOT operation, on the average 2 floating-point operations (1 FMA) are scheduled every 3.38 machine cycles, giving 14.81 Mflops in theory and 14.6 Mflops in practice. If the vectors are accessed with stride 16 (the length of a cache line), each element will be available after a delay of 12 cycles $(= 11 + 1)$, giving $25/12 = 2.08$ Mflops in theory and 1.8 Mflops in practice. Table 1 shows the measured performance and the prediction using the model for some other memory access patterns.

2.2 Level 2 BLAS

Here we consider the Level 2 BLAS DGEMV operations

$$y \leftarrow y + Ax \quad \text{and} \quad y \leftarrow y + A^T x.$$

The basic operation in Fortran is given in Figure 1, where $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J})$ must be replaced by $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{I})$

```
DO
  DO
    Y(I) = Y(I) + A(I,J)*X(J)
  CONTINUE
CONTINUE
```

Figure 1: Generic matrix-vector multiply code

for the operation with A^T . Depending on the ordering of the DO-loops, the inner loop is either a DOT or an AXPY. We have seen from the discussion of the two Level 1 BLAS operations that, because the RISC System/6000 system can perform an FMA instruction with all its operands in registers, it is better suited to DOT operations than to AXPY operations. (Note that this contrasts with the situation on vector machines such as the CRAY Y-MP, where the two vector loads and one vector store required match the architecture well. Also, by unrolling, it is possible to keep the vector $Y(I)$ in a vector register for longer, thus increasing the ratio of floating-point operations to memory references.) We have also seen from Table 1 that when accessing data from memory, it is very important to access the data with stride one, so that all the elements in a cache line are used when that line is loaded. For these two reasons, we consider the operation

$$y \leftarrow y + A^T x,$$

which can be expressed as a DOT operation with A accessed with unit stride.

For this operation, the peak speed is again 25 Mflops—exactly the same as for the DOT. However, in this case we can unroll the dot product to re-use each $x(J)$ a number of times. As the depth of unrolling increases, the ratio of operations to loads increases from one and tends towards two. For example, for unrolling to depths 2, 3, and 4, the ratio of operations to loads is $4/3$, $6/4$, and $8/5$, with a theoretical peak speed of 33.3, 37.5, and 40 Mflops, respectively. The code for this operation unrolled to depth 4 is shown in Figure 2. In practice, there is little benefit in unrolling to very large depths, as there are only a finite number of floating-point registers, and the performance reaches a plateau. The code in Figure 2 performs at 36.3 Mflops, and a speed of 40.3 Mflops has been measured for unrolling to depth 8.

```

DO 20 I = 1, M, 4
  TEMP1 = ZERO
  TEMP2 = ZERO
  TEMP3 = ZERO
  TEMP4 = ZERO
  DO 10 J = 1, N
    TEMP1 = TEMP1 + A(J,I )*X(J)
    TEMP2 = TEMP2 + A(J,I+1)*X(J)
    TEMP3 = TEMP3 + A(J,I+2)*X(J)
    TEMP4 = TEMP4 + A(J,I+3)*X(J)
10  CONTINUE
  Y(I ) = Y(I ) + TEMP1
  Y(I+1) = Y(I+1) + TEMP2
  Y(I+2) = Y(I+2) + TEMP3
  Y(I+3) = Y(I+3) + TEMP4
20  CONTINUE

```

Figure 2: Model Code for $y \leftarrow y + A^T x$

Table 2: Speed in Mflops of Level 2 BLAS

depth	Data in Cache				Data in Memory			
	$y \leftarrow y + Ax$		$y \leftarrow y + A^T x$		$y \leftarrow y + Ax$		$y \leftarrow y + A^T x$	
	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY
1	22.7	15.6	22.6	15.5	8.7	9.0	11.0	7.7
2	30.4	23.5	30.4	23.4	10.4	10.0	11.2	9.5
3	34.1	24.0	34.2	23.8	10.6	12.3	11.4	9.7
4	36.3	24.0	36.4	23.6	11.3	9.8	11.3	10.3

Table 2 lists the speed of the various DGEMV operations and also includes speeds for data accessed from memory. This table shows that for data accessed from cache, the speed of the operation $y \leftarrow y + Ax$ based on DOT is the same as that for the operation with A^T —there is no penalty for accessing with stride from cache.

First, we notice that for data accessed from memory, for the $y \leftarrow y + Ax$ operation it is slightly better to use the AXPY operation, which accesses the matrix with unit stride, rather than the DOT version, which accesses the matrix with stride equal to its leading dimension. Second, we see that although the speed of the $y \leftarrow y + Ax$ operation based on AXPY (9.0 Mflops) and the

Table 3: Speed of $C \leftarrow C + AB$ on the RISC System 6000-530

<i>Conditions before operation</i>	<i>Speed in Mflops</i>
All arrays initially in cache	47.5
<i>A</i> or <i>B</i> initially in cache	45.4
<i>C</i> initially in cache	42.5
No arrays initially in cache	41.5

$y \leftarrow y + A^T x$ operation based on DOT (11.0 Mflops) are slower than the corresponding Level 1 BLAS speeds based on unit stride (11.3 Mflops and 14.6 Mflops respectively—see Table 1), the speeds for accessing the matrix across a row are much faster for the Level 2 BLAS than for the corresponding Level 1 BLAS. This is because when elements of a row of a matrix are accessed, all the elements in the corresponding cache line are loaded into cache, and some will be immediately available when the next row is accessed.

2.3 Level 3 BLAS

In performing the matrix-matrix multiply operation

$$C \leftarrow C + AB,$$

where we assume that all three arrays are in cache, it is possible to increase the ratio of operations to loads to 2:1 by unrolling the DO-loops in two directions and thereby re-using each loaded element twice. Note that this ratio is optimal, in the sense that it is precisely what the hardware supports. The code fragment in Figure 3 illustrates this technique. In theory, this approach would result in a speed close to the theoretical maximum of 50 Mflops on a 25 MHz machine. In practice, we have measured 47.5 Mflops—see Table 3. Note that a production version would be complicated by the need to include code for the cases when *M* and *N* are not a multiple of two.

In general, the arrays *A*, *B* and *C* will be too large to fit into cache together; in any case, they need to be loaded from memory initially. It is still possible to arrange for the operations

```
DO 30 J = 1, N, 2
  DO 20 I = 1, M, 2
    T11 = ZERO
    T21 = ZERO
    T12 = ZERO
    T22 = ZERO
    DO 10 K = 1, L
      T11 = T11 + A(I, K)*B(K,J )
      T21 = T21 + A(I+1,K)*B(K,J )
      T12 = T12 + A(I, K)*B(K,J+1)
      T22 = T22 + A(I+1,K)*B(K,J+1)
10    CONTINUE
      C(I, J ) = C(I, J ) + T11
      C(I+1,J ) = C(I+1,J ) + T21
      C(I, J+1) = C(I, J+1) + T12
      C(I+1,J+1) = C(I+1,J+1) + T22
20    CONTINUE
30 CONTINUE
```

Figure 3: Code fragment for near-optimal performance of $C \leftarrow C + AB$


to be performed with data largely in cache by dividing the matrix into blocks, as shown in Figure 4. We may then fix the block \tilde{A} of the matrix A and perform every operation involving this block before moving on to another block of A . In other words, we compute the products $C_1 \leftarrow C_1 + \tilde{A}B_1, C_2 \leftarrow C_2 + \tilde{A}B_2, \dots, C_6 \leftarrow C_6 + \tilde{A}B_6$. In this way the block \tilde{A} can be kept in cache and the data reused many times.

In addition, if we assume that the leading dimension of B is such that the block B_i can all be contained in cache, the overhead of loading B_i from memory is not too great. Moreover, each column of B_i is accessed a number of times. Thus we may perform the matrix-matrix product of these blocks at close to the peak speed of the machine.


To illustrate the overhead of cache loading, we show in Table 3 the speed of the operation

$$C \leftarrow C + AB$$


where C is 24 by 24, and A is 24 by 128, and where different arrays are forced to be accessed either from cache or from memory. These dimensions were chosen so that all three arrays can



Partitioning of large matrix-matrix product



Matrix-matrix product of individual blocks
(Block \tilde{A} remains in cache)



Doubly unrolled dot products for
"optimal" performance on sub-blocks

Figure 4: Blocked matrix-matrix multiply (DGEMM)

comfortably fit into cache together, and the length of the dot products is sufficiently long so that they reach their asymptotic speed.

One other important detail of the blocking strategy merits discussion. Suppose that the matrix A is declared with a very unfavorable leading dimension. Then it is possible that only a few columns of the matrix \tilde{A} will fit into cache before new columns begin to flush the old columns. For example, if the leading dimension of A is 512, and \tilde{A} is 32 by 32, it turns out that only 16 columns of \tilde{A} will fit in cache. To overcome this problem, we copy the block \tilde{A} into a work array and then perform all the operations with the work array, rather than addressing a part of the array A . This approach requires us to access A with a bad leading dimension only once, rather than 16 times, for the matrix dimensions mentioned above.

A Fortran version of the Level 3 BLAS routine DGEMM using these techniques is available from *netlib* (send mail to *netlib@ornl.gov*; in the mail message type: send dmr from misc).

2.4 Summary of BLAS Performance

Figure 5 shows a graph of the speed of the three BLAS routines DDOT, DGEMV, and DGEMM for increasing matrix dimensions. The operations performed by DGEMV and DGEMM are chosen so that dot products are performed on contiguous elements, i.e., $y \leftarrow y + A^T x$ for DGEMV and $C \leftarrow C + A^T B$ for DGEMM.

This graph clearly shows the benefit of increasing the ratio of floating-point operations to memory references achieved by using the Level 3 BLAS. For matrix-matrix multiply we are doing $O(n^3)$ operations on $O(n^2)$ data, representing a favorable *surface-to-volume* effect. Hence matrix-matrix multiply offers much greater opportunity for exploiting the memory hierarchy than the lower-level BLAS routines. All the experiments described here were performed on a IBM RISC System/6000 Model 530 running at 25 MHz, using the AIX XL compiler version 01.01.0000.0000 with the -O option. The BLAS shown in Figure 5 were implemented in standard Fortran 77.




Figure 5: Speed of Level 1, 2, and 3 BLAS on the RISC System 6000-530

3 Block Algorithms and LAPACK

Experience with machines having a memory hierarchy [6, 7] indicates that it is often preferable to partition the matrix or matrices into blocks and to perform the computation by matrix-matrix operations on the blocks. By organizing the computation in this fashion, one can provide for full reuse of data while a given block is held in the cache or local memory. This approach avoids excessive movement of data to and from memory, and its benefits on the RISC System/6000 in particular are clear from the previous section.

Many algorithms can be blocked. For example, researchers have used blocking to rewrite codes for the solution of partial differential equations. Such codes make efficient use of supercomputers with small main memory and large solid-state disks [9]. All experience with these techniques has shown them to be enormously effective at squeezing the best possible performance out of advanced architectures.

Recent work by numerical analysts has shown that the most important computations for dense matrices are also blockable. A major software development project dealing with blocked algorithms for linear algebra, called LAPACK (shorthand for Linear Algebra Package), is based

on this idea [1].

The LAPACK library will provide routines for solving systems of simultaneous linear equations, least-squares solutions of overdetermined systems of equations, and eigenvalue problems. The library is intended to be efficient and transportable across a wide range of computing environments, with special emphasis on modern high-performance computers. To achieve high efficiency, LAPACK developers are restructuring most of the algorithms from LINPACK and EISPACK in terms of calls to a small number of extended BLAS, each of which implements a block matrix operation such as matrix multiplication, rank- k matrix updates, and the solution of triangular systems. These block operations can be optimized for each architecture, but the numerical algorithms that call them will be portable.

3.1 Performance of Blocked Algorithms on the RISC System/6000

We used three blocked variants from LAPACK to compare the performance of LU factorization for a general matrix. These blocked variants are shown in Figure 6. The lightly shaded parts indicate the matrix elements accessed in forming a block row or column, and the darker shading indicates the block row or column being computed. The *left-looking* variant computes a block column at a time using previously computed columns. The *right-looking* variant (the familiar recursive algorithm) computes a block row and column at each step and uses them to update the trailing submatrix. The *Crout* variant is a hybrid algorithm in which a block row and column are computed at each step using previously computed rows and previously computed columns.

All of the computational work for the LU variants is contained in three routines: the matrix-matrix multiply DGEMM, the triangular solve with multiple right-hand sides DTRSM, and the unblocked LU factorization for operations within a block column. Figures 7-9 show the distribution of work among these three routines.

Each variant calls its own unblocked variant, and the row interchanges use about 2% of the total time. The average speed of DGEMM is over 40 Mflops for all three variants, but the average




Figure 6: Variants of *LU* factorization on the RISC System 6000-530




Figure 7: Breakdown of work in left-looking *LU*

speed of DTRSM depends on the size of the triangular matrices. For the left-looking variant, the triangular matrices at each step range in size from b to $n - b$, where b is the blocksize and n the order of the original matrix, and the average performance is 38 Mflops. For the right-looking and Crout variants, on the other hand, the triangular matrices are always of order b , and the average speed is only 29 Mflops. Clearly the average performance of the Level 3 BLAS routines in a blocked routine is as important as the percentage of Level 3 BLAS work.

Despite the differences in the performance rates of their components, the block variants of the *LU* factorization tend to show similar overall performance, with a slight advantage to the




Figure 8: Breakdown of work in right-looking LU




Figure 9: Breakdown of work in Crout LU




Figure 10: Speed of *LU* Variants on the RISC System 6000-530

right-looking and Crout variants because more of the operations are in DGEMM. Figure 10 shows the performance rates in Mflops of these three variants for different matrix sizes on a IBM RS/600-530, along with the performance of the LINPACK routine DGEFA. The optimal blocksize on the RISC System/6000 computers is 32 for most matrix sizes, but the performance varies less than 10% over a wide range of blocksizes.

4 Summary and Conclusions

The aim of this work has been to examine the performance of block algorithms on the IBM RISC workstation. Based on our experiments, we draw the following conclusions.

1. Neither the memory bandwidth nor the cycle time for the IBM RISC System/6000 is at the level of current-generation vector supercomputers. There is, however, no technical reason why this situation could not be improved.
2. The IBM RISC processor is close to matching the performance level of vector processors with matched cycle times [10]. Because of the regularity of vector loops and the ability of the RISC architecture to issue floating-point instruction every cycle and complete two

floating-point operations per cycle we expect that the RISC superscalar machines will perform at the same rates as the vector machines for vector operations with similar cycle times. Moreover, the RISC machines will exceed the performance of those vector processors on non-vector problems.

3. The LAPACK software based on blocked operations performs at near-optimal performance with minimal effort. One should note, however, that the workstation does not match the I/O performance and the number of users accommodated on larger computers.
4. Essential to high performance is the use of optimized versions of the Level 1, 2, and 3 BLAS. The techniques and ideas used here to gain performance on the IBM RISC System/6000 should work on all RISC-based machines. To a large extent, the success will depend on the Fortran compiler's ability to generate efficient code. (We believe that this high performance is due, at least in part, to the fact that compiler writers were involved in the early design stages, rather than after the hardware designers had completed much of their work.)

5 Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Ron Bell of IBM (UK) Ltd for giving us access to a draft of his guide to Fortran and C programming on the RISC System/6000 [3].

We would also like to thank Ramesh Agarwal and Fred Gustavson of the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, and Stan Schmidt and Joan McComb of the IBM Kingston Laboratory. The optimized BLAS on which our work is based, were developed jointly by Yorktown and Kingston, and early access to these routines was crucial.

References

- [1] E. Anderson, Z. Bai, C. Bischof, J. Demmel, J. Dongarra, J. DuCroz, A. Greenbaum, S. Hammarling, A. McKenney, and D. Sorensen. LAPACK: A portable linear algebra library for high-performance computers. In *Supercomputer 90*, New York, NY, 1990. IEEE Press.
- [2] H.B. Bakoglu, G.F. Grohoski, and R.K. Montoye. The IBM RISC System/6000 processor: Hardware overview. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 34:12-23, 1990.
- [3] R. Bell. IBM RISC System/6000 performance tuning for numerically intensive Fortran and C programs. ITSC Technical Bulletin GG24-3611-00, IBM Corporation, 1990.
- [4] J. Dongarra, J. Du Croz, I. Duff, and S. Hammarling. A set of level 3 basic linear algebra subprograms. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 16:1-17, 1990.
- [5] J. Dongarra, J. Du Croz, S. Hammarling, and R. Hanson. An extended set of fortran basic linear algebra subroutines. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, 14(1):1-17, March 1988.
- [6] J. J. Dongarra and D. C. Sorensen. Linear algebra on high-performance computers. In U. Schendel, editor, *Proceedings of Parallel Computing '85*, pages 3-32, New York, 1986. North Holland.
- [7] Kyle Gallivan, Robert Plemmons, and Ahmed Sameh. Parallel algorithms for dense linear algebra computations. *SIAM Review*, 32(1):54-135, 1990.
- [8] C. Lawson, R. Hanson, D. Kincaid, and F. Krogh. Basic linear algebra subprograms for Fortran usage. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 5:308-323, 1979.
- [9] H. Lomax and T. H. Pulliam. A three-dimensional implicit code for the ILLIAC IV. In Garry Rodrigue, editor, *Computational Physics on Parallel Computers*, New York, NY, 1982. Academic Press.

- [10] M.L. Simmons and H.J. Wasserman. Los Alamos experiences with the IBM RISC System/6000 workstation. Report LA-11831-MS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, 1990.

Appendix: The Model 550

Since this report was first prepared, IBM has announced a new model in the RISC System/6000 family—the Model 550. This model has exactly the same architecture as the Model 530 used in the experiments reported earlier, but has a faster CPU, running at 41.6 MHz (compared with 25 MHz for the Model 530), and a faster memory. In this appendix we reproduce versions of Tables 1–3, with data gathered from the Model 550. We also reproduce Figure 5, which demonstrates the performance attainable with the three levels of BLAS.

Table 4 (similar to Table 1) shows the speed of various Level 1 BLAS operations. In this case the predictions are based on the clock speed of 41.6 MHz, and a time of 9 cycles to load a cache line from memory to cache. This value fits the observed data better than the 11 cycles used for the Model 530. The other tables correspond exactly to those in the text.

Table 4: Speed in Mflops of Level 1 BLAS on the RISC System 6000-550

Type of memory access	DOT		AXPY	
	predicted	measured	predicted	measured
all data in cache	41.6	41.15	27.72	27.4
all data from memory:				
x and y with unit stride	26.62	26.04	20.17	19.53
x with stride 16	7.20	5.90	6.62	5.29
x and y with stride 16	4.16	3.40	3.96	2.60

Table 5: Speed in Mflops of Level 2 BLAS on the RISC System 6000-550

depth	Data in Cache				Data in Memory			
	$y \leftarrow y + Ax$		$y \leftarrow y + A^T x$		$y \leftarrow y + Ax$		$y \leftarrow y + A^T x$	
	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY	DOT	AXPY
1	38.0	26.2	38.0	26.3	16.1	15.5	18.8	13.4
2	51.0	39.2	51.0	39.2	17.9	17.4	19.2	16.4
3	57.5	40.0	57.8	40.0	19.0	21.2	19.7	17.1
4	61.0	40.0	61.7	40.2	19.6	17.2	19.8	17.2




Figure 11: Speed of Level 1, 2, and 3 BLAS on the RISC System 6000-550

Table 6: Speed of $C \leftarrow C + AB$ on the RISC System 6000-550

<i>Conditions before operation</i>	<i>Speed in Mflops</i>
All arrays initially in cache	79.3
A or B initially in cache	75.6
C initially in cache	70.9
No arrays initially in cache	70.2

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

- | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | B. R. Appleton | 23. | P. H. Worley |
| 2-3. | T. S. Darland | 24. | A. Zucker |
| 4. | E. F. D'Azevedo | 25. | J. J. Dorning (EPMD Advisory Committee) |
| 5-9. | J. J. Dongarra | 26. | R. M. Haralick (EPMD Advisory Committee) |
| 10. | T. H. Dunigan | 27. | J. E. Leiss (EPMD Advisory Committee) |
| 11. | G. A. Geist | 28. | N. Moray (EPMD Advisory Committee) |
| 12. | M. T. Heath | 29. | M. F. Wheeler (EPMD Advisory Committee) |
| 13. | E. R. Jessup | 30. | Central Research Library |
| 14. | E. G. Ng | 31. | ORNL Patent Office |
| 15. | V. W. Ng | 32. | K-25 Plant Library |
| 16. | C. E. Oliver | 33. | Y-12 Technical Library
/Document Reference Station |
| 17. | B. W. Peyton | 34. | Laboratory Records - RC |
| 18-19. | S. A. Raby | 35. | Laboratory Records Dept. |
| 20. | C. H. Romine | | |
| 21-22. | R. C. Ward | | |

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

36. Cleve Ashcraft, Boeing Computer Services, P.O. Box 24346, M/S 7L-21, Seattle, WA 98124-0346
37. Robert G. Babb, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Oregon Graduate Institute, 19600 N.W. Walker Rd., Beaverton, OR 97006
38. David H. Bailey, NASA Ames Research Center, Mail Stop 258-5, Moffett Field, CA 94035
39. Jesse L. Barlow, Dept. of Computer Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802
40. Edward H. Barsis, Computer Science and Mathematics, P. O. Box 5800, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM 87185
41. Eric Barszcz, NASA Ames Research Center, MS T045-1, Moffett Field, CA 94035
42. Robert E. Benner, Parallel Processing Div. 1413, Sandia National Laboratories, P. O. Box 5800, Albuquerque, NM 87185
43. Donna Bergmark, Cornell Theory Center, Engineering and Theory Center Bldg., Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
44. Chris Bischof, Mathematics and Computer Science Div., Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439

45. Ake Bjorck, Dept. of Mathematics, Linkoping University, S-581 83 Linkoping, Sweden
46. Jean R. S. Blair, Dept. of Computer Science, Ayres Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
47. Daniel Boley, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Minnesota, 200 Union St. S.E. Rm.4-192 Minneapolis, MN 55455
48. James C. Browne, Dept. of Computer Sciences, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712
49. Bill L. Buzbee, Scientific Computing Div., National Center for Atmospheric Research, P.O. Box 3000, Boulder, CO 80307
50. Donald A. Calahan, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
51. John Cavallini, Office of Scientific Computing, Office of Energy Research, ER-7, Germantown Building, U.S. Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC 20545
52. Ian Cavers, Dept. of Computer Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1W5, Canada
53. Tony Chan, Dept. of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90024
54. Jagdish Chandra, Army Research Office, P.O. Box 12211, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
55. Eleanor Chu, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
56. Melvyn Ciment, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street N.W., Washington, DC 20550
57. Thomas Coleman, Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
53. Paul Concus, Mathematics and Computing, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720
59. Jane K. Cullum, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598
60. George Cybenko, Center for Supercomputing Research and Development, University of Illinois, 104 S. Wright St., Urbana, IL 61801-2932
61. George J. Davis, Dept. of Mathematics, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303
62. Iain S Duff, Atlas Centre, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Oxon OX11 0QX England
63. Patricia Eberlein, Dept. of Computer Science, SUNY at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260
64. Stanley Eisenstat, Dept. of Computer Science, Yale University, P.O. Box 2158 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520

65. Lars Elden, Dept. of Mathematics, Linkoping University, 581 83 Linkoping, Sweden
66. Howard C. Elman, Computer Science Dept., University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
67. Albert M. Erisman, Boeing Computer Services, P.O. Box 24346, M/S 7L-21, Seattle, WA 98124-0346
68. Ian Foster, Mathematics and Computer Science Div., Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
69. Geoffrey C. Fox, Booth Computing Center 158-79, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125
70. Paul O. Frederickson, NASA Ames Research Center, RIACS, M/S T045-1 Moffett Field, CA 94035
71. Fred N. Fritsch, Computing & Mathematics Research Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P. O. Box 808, L-316 Livermore, CA 94550
72. Robert E. Funderlic, Dept. of Computer Science, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27650
73. Dennis B. Gannon, Computer Science Dept., Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405
74. David M. Gay, Bell Laboratories, 600 Mountain Ave., Murray Hill, NJ 07974
75. C. William Gear, Computer Science Dept., University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801
76. W. Morven Gentleman, Div. of Electrical Engineering, National Research Council, Building M-50, Room 344, Montreal Rd., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0R8
77. J. Alan George, Vice President, Academic and Provost, Needles Hall, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
78. John R. Gilbert, Xerox Palo Alto Research Center, 3333 Coyote Hill Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94304
79. Gene H. Golub, Dept. of Computer Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
80. Joseph F. Grcar, Div. 8331, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA 94550
81. Sven Hammarling, Numerical Algorithms Group Ltd. Wilkinson House, Jordan Hill Road Oxford OX2 8DR, United Kingdom
82. Per Christian Hansen, UNI*C Lyngby, Building 305, Technical University of Denmark, DK-2800 Lyngby, Denmark
83. Richard Hanson, IMSL Inc., 2500 Park West Tower One, 2500 City West Blvd., Houston, TX 77042-3020
84. Don E. Heller, Physics and Computer Science Dept., Shell Development Co., P.O. Box 481, Houston, TX 77001

85. Nicholas J. Higham, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Manchester, Gt Manchester, M13 9PL, England
86. Charles J. Holland, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Building 410, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, DC 20332
87. Robert E. Huddleston, Computation Dept., Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
88. Ilse Ipsen, Dept. of Computer Science, Yale University, P.O. Box 2158 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520
89. Lennart Johnsson, Thinking Machines Inc., 245 First St., Cambridge, MA 02142-1214
90. Harry Jordan, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309
91. Bo Kagstrom, Institute of Information Processing, University of Umea, S-901 87 Umea, Sweden
92. Malvin H. Kalos, Cornell Theory Center, Engineering and Theory Center Bldg., Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-3901
93. Hans Kaper, Mathematics and Computer Science Div., Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
94. Robert J. Kee, Applied Mathematics Div. 8331, Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, CA 94550
95. Kenneth Kennedy, Dept. of Computer Science, Rice University, P.O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77005
96. Thomas Kitchens, Dept. of Energy, Scientific Computing Staff, Office of Energy Research, ER-7, Office G-236 Germantown, Washington, DC 20585
97. Richard Lau, Code 1111MA, 800 N. Quincy Street, Boston Tower, 1 Arlington, VA 22217-5000
98. Alan J. Laub, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106
99. Robert L. Launer, Army Research Office, P.O. Box 12211, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709
100. Charles Lawson, MS 301-490, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, 4800 Oak Grove Dr., Pasadena, CA 91109
101. Peter D. Lax, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer St., New York, NY 10012
102. John G. Lewis, Boeing Computer Services, P.O. Box 24346, M/S 7L-21, Seattle, WA 98124-0346

103. Jing Li, IMSL Inc., 2500 Park West Tower One, 2500 City West Blvd., Houston, TX 77042-3020
104. Joseph Liu, Dept. of Computer Science, York University, 4700 Keele St., North York, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3
105. Franklin Luk, School of Electrical Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
106. Thomas A. Manteuffel, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Colorado - Denver, Denver, CO 80202
- 107-111. Peter Mayes, NAG Ltd., Wilkinson House, Jordan Hill Road, Oxford, OX2 8DR, United Kingdom
112. Paul C. Messina, Mail Code 158-79, California Institute of Technology, 1201 E. California Blvd. Pasadena, CA 91125
113. James McGraw, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, L-306, P.O. Box 808, Livermore, CA 94550
114. Cleve Moler, The Mathworks, 325 Linfield Place, Menlo Park, CA 94025
115. Brent Morris, National Security Agency, Ft. George G. Meade, MD 20755
116. Dianne P. O'Leary, Computer Science Dept., University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
117. James M. Ortega, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, Thornton Hall University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903
118. Chris Paige, Dept. of Computer Science, McGill University, 805 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2K6
119. Roy P. Pargas, Dept. of Computer Science, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-1906
120. Beresford N. Parlett, Dept. of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720
121. Merrell Patrick, Dept. of Computer Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706
122. Robert J. Plemmons, Dept.s of Mathematics and Computer Science, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27650
123. Jesse Poore, Dept. of Computer Science, Ayres Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
124. Alex Pothén, Dept. of Computer Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802
125. Michael J. Quinn, Computer Science Dept., Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331
- 126-130. Giuseppe Radicati di Brozolo, IBM European Center for Scientific and Engineering Computing, 00147 Roma, via Giorgione 159, Italy

131. Noah Rhee, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Kansas City, MO 64110-2499
132. John K. Reid, Numerical Analysis Group, Central Computing Dept., Atlas Centre, Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, England
133. Werner C. Rheinboldt, Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260
134. John R. Rice, Computer Science Dept., Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907
135. Garry Rodrigue, Numerical Mathematics Group, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550
136. Donald J. Rose, Dept. of Computer Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706
137. Ahmed H. Sameh, Computer Science Dept., University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801
138. Michael Saunders, Systems Optimization Laboratory, Operations Research Dept., Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305
139. Robert Schreiber, RIACS, Mail Stop 230-5, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffet Field, CA 94035
140. Martin H. Schultz, Dept. of Computer Science, Yale University, P.O. Box 2158 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520
141. David S. Scott, Intel Scientific Computers, 15201 N.W. Greenbrier Pkwy., Beaverton, OR 97006
142. Lawrence F. Shampine, Mathematics Dept., Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275
143. Kermit Sigmon, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611
144. Horst Simon, Mail Stop 258-5, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035
145. Larry Snyder, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, FR-35, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195
146. Danny C. Sorensen, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, Rice University, P. O. Box 1892, Houston, TX 77251
147. Rick Stevens, Mathematics and Computer Science Div., Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Ave., Argonne, IL 60439
148. G. W. Stewart, Computer Science Dept., University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
149. Quentin F. Stout, Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
150. Daniel B. Szyld, Dept. of Computer Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706-2591

151. W.-P. Tang, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
152. Michael Thomason, Dept. of Computer Science, Ayres Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
153. Bernard Tourancheau, LIP ENS-Lyon 69364 Lyon cedex 07, France
154. Charles Van Loan, Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853
155. James M. Varah, Centre for Integrated Computer Systems Research, University of British Columbia, Office 2053-2324 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1W5, Canada
156. Robert G. Voigt, ICASE, MS 132-C, NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23665
157. Michael Vose, Dept. of Computer Science, Ayres Hall, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1301
158. Phuong Vu, Cray Research Inc., 1408 Northland Dr., Mendota Heights, MN 55120
159. E. L. Wachspress, Dept. of Mathematics, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1300
160. Daniel D. Warner, Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, O-104 Martin Hall, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29631
161. D. S. Watkins, Dept. of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-2930
162. Andrew B. White, Computing Div., Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545
163. Michael Wolfe, Oregon Graduate Institute, 19600 N.W. von Neumann Dr., Beaverton, OR 97006
164. Margaret Wright, Bell Laboratories, 600 Mountain Ave., Murray Hill, NJ 07974
165. David Young, University of Texas, Center for Numerical Analysis, RLM 13.150, Austin, TX 78731
166. Office of Assistant Manager for Energy Research and Development, U.S. Dept. of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office, P.O. Box 2001, Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8600
- 167-176. Office of Scientific Technical Information, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, TN 37831