# **Simulations between PRAMs**

### Theorem 1

We can simulate a p-processor priority CRCW PRAM on a p-processor EREW PRAM with slowdown  $\mathcal{O}(\log p)$ .

PA © Harald Räcke

169

171

# **Simulations between PRAMs**

#### Theorem 3

We can simulate a p-processor priority CRCW PRAM on a p-processor common CRCW PRAM with slowdown  $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\log p}{\log\log p})$ .

# **Simulations between PRAMs**

### Theorem 2

We can simulate a p-processor priority CRCW PRAM on a  $p \log p$ -processor common CRCW PRAM with slowdown  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ .

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

170

# **Simulations between PRAMs**

### **Theorem 4**

We can simulate a p-processor priority CRCW PRAM on a p-processor arbitrary CRCW PRAM with slowdown  $\mathcal{O}(\log \log p)$ .

# Lower Bounds for the CREW PRAM

### **Ideal PRAM:**

- every processor has unbounded local memory
- ▶ in each step a processor reads a global variable
- then it does some (unbounded) computation on its local memory
- ► then it writes a global variable

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

173

175

# **Lower Bounds for the CREW PRAM**

#### **Definition 6**

An input index i affects a processor P at time t on some input I if the state of P at time t differs between inputs I and I(i) (i-th bit flipped).

 $K(P, t, I) = \{i \mid i \text{ affects } P \text{ at time } t \text{ on input } I\}$ 

### Lower Bounds for the CREW PRAM

#### **Definition 5**

An input index i affects a memory location M at time t on some input I if the content of M at time t differs between inputs I and I(i) (i-th bit flipped).

 $L(M, t, I) = \{i \mid i \text{ affects } M \text{ at time } t \text{ on input } I\}$ 

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

174

# **Lower Bounds for the CREW PRAM**

#### Lemma 7

If  $i \in K(P, t, I)$  with t > 1 then either

- ▶  $i \in K(P, t 1, I)$ , or
- ▶ P reads a global memory location M on input I at time t, and  $i \in L(M, t-1, I)$ .

# Lower Bounds for the CREW PRAM

### Lemma 8

If  $i \in L(M, t, I)$  with t > 1 then either

- ► A processor writes into M at time t on input I and  $i \in K(P, t, I)$ , or
- ▶ No processor writes into M at time t on input I and
  - either  $i \in L(M, t-1, I)$
  - or a processor P writes into M at time t on input I(i).

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

177

179

# base case (t = 0):

- ▶ No index can influence the local memory/state of a processor before the first step (hence  $|K(P, 0, I)| = k_0 = 0$ ).
- ▶ Initially every index in the input affects exactly one memory location. Hence  $|L(M, 0, I)| = 1 = \ell_0$ .

Let  $k_0 = 0$ ,  $\ell_0 = 1$  and define

$$k_{t+1} = k_t + \ell_t$$
 and  $\ell_{t+1} = 3k_t + 4\ell_t$ 

#### Lemma 9

$$|K(P,t,I)| \le k_t$$
 and  $|L(M,t,I)| \le \ell_t$  for any  $t \ge 0$ 

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

178

# induction step $(t \rightarrow t + 1)$ :

 $K(P, t+1, I) \subseteq K(P, t, I) \cup L(M, t, I)$ , where M is the location read by P in step t + 1.

Hence,

$$|K(P,t+1,I)| \le |K(P,t,I)| + |L(M,t,I)|$$
  
 
$$\le k_t + \ell_t$$

induction step  $(t \rightarrow t + 1)$ :

For the bound on |L(M, t + 1, I)| we have two cases.

Case 1:

A processor P writes into location M at time t+1 on input I.

Then,

$$\begin{split} |L(M,t+1,I)| &\leq |K(P,t+1,I)| \\ &\leq k_t + \ell_t \\ &\leq 3k_t + 4\ell_t = \ell_{t+1} \end{split}$$

PA © Harald Räcke 10 Simulations between PRAMs

181

183

Y(M, t + 1, I) is the set of indices  $u_j$  that cause some processor  $P_{w_j}$  to write into M at time t + 1 on input I.

Fact:

For all pairs  $u_s$ ,  $u_t$  with  $P_{w_s} \neq P_{w_t}$  either  $u_s \in K(P_{w_t}, t+1, I(u_t))$  or  $u_t \in K(P_{w_s}, t+1, I(u_s))$ .

Otherwise,  $P_{w_t}$  and  $P_{w_s}$  would both write into M at the same time on input  $I(u_s)(u_t)$ .

#### Case 2:

No processor P writes into location M at time t+1 on input I.

An index i affects M at time t+1 iff i affects M at time t or some processor P writes into M at t+1 on I(i).

$$L(M, t + 1, I) \subseteq L(M, t, I) \cup Y(M, t + 1, I)$$

Y(M, t+1, I) is the set of indices  $u_j$  that cause some processor  $P_{w_i}$  to write into M at time t+1 on input I.

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

182

Let  $U = \{u_1, ..., u_r\}$  denote all indices that cause some processor to write into M.

Let 
$$V = \{(I(u_1), P_{w_1}), \dots\}.$$

We set up a bipartite graph between U and V, such that  $(u_i,(I(u_j),P_{w_j}))\in E$  if  $u_i$  affects  $P_{w_j}$  at time t+1 on input  $I(u_j)$ .

Each vertex  $(I(u_j), P_{w_j})$  has degree at most  $k_{t+1}$  as this is an upper bound on indices that can influence a processor  $P_{w_j}$ .

Hence,  $|E| \leq r \cdot k_{t+1}$ .

For an index  $u_j$  there can be at most  $k_{t+1}$  indices  $u_i$  with  $P_{w_i} = P_{w_j}$ .

Hence, there must be at least  $\frac{1}{2}r(r-k_{t+1})$  pairs  $u_i, u_j$  with  $P_{w_i} \neq P_{w_j}$ .

Each pair introduces at least one edge.

Hence,

$$|E| \geq \frac{1}{2} r (r - k_{t+1})$$

This gives  $r \leq 3k_{t+1} \leq 3k_t + 3\ell_t$ 

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

185

 $\begin{pmatrix} k_{t+1} \\ \ell_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k_t \\ \ell_t \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} k_0 \\ \ell_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ 

Eigenvalues:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(5 + \sqrt{21}) \text{ and } \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(5 - \sqrt{21})$$

Eigenvectors:

$$v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -(1-\lambda_1) \end{pmatrix}$$
 and  $v_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -(1-\lambda_2) \end{pmatrix}$ 

$$v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{21} \end{pmatrix}$$
 and  $v_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{21} \end{pmatrix}$ 

Recall that  $L(M, t + 1, i) \subseteq L(M, t, i) \cup Y(M, t + 1, I)$ 

$$|L(M,t+1,i)| \le 3k_t + 4\ell_t$$

10 Simulations between PRAMs

186

$$v_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{21} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } v_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{21} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} k_0 \\ \ell_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{21}}(v_1 - v_2)$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} k_t \\ \ell_t \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{21}} \left(\lambda_1^t v_1 - \lambda_2^t v_2\right)$$

Solving the recurrence gives

$$k_t = \frac{\lambda_1^t}{\sqrt{21}} - \frac{\lambda_2^t}{\sqrt{21}}$$

$$\ell_t = \frac{3 + \sqrt{21}}{2\sqrt{21}} \lambda_1^t + \frac{-3 + \sqrt{21}}{2\sqrt{21}} \lambda_2^t$$

with  $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2}(5 + \sqrt{21})$  and  $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(5 - \sqrt{21})$ .

PA © Harald Räcke 10 Simulations between PRAMs

189

191

#### Theorem 10

The following problems require logarithmic time on a CREW PRAM.

- ▶ Sorting a sequence of  $x_1, ..., x_n$  with  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$
- ightharpoonup Computing the maximum of n inputs
- Computing the sum  $x_1 + \cdots + x_n$  with  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

190

# A Lower Bound for the EREW PRAM

# **Definition 11 (Zero Counting Problem)**

Given a monotone binary sequence  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$  determine the index i such that  $x_i = 0$  and  $x_{i+1} = 1$ .

We show that this problem requires  $\Omega(\log n - \log p)$  steps on a p-processor EREW PRAM.

Let  $I_i$  be the input with i zeros folled by n-i ones.

Index i affects processor P at time t if the state in step t is differs between  $I_{i-1}$  and  $I_i$ .

Index i affects location M at time t if the content of M after step t differs between inputs  $I_{i-1}$  and  $I_i$ .

### Lemma 12

If  $i \in K(P, t)$  then either

- $i \in K(P, t-1)$ , or
- $\triangleright$  P reads some location M on input  $I_i$  (and, hence, also on  $I_{i-1}$ ) at step t and  $i \in L(M, t-1)$

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

193

195

### Define

$$C(t) = \sum_{P} |K(P, t)| + \sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M, t)| - 1\}$$

$$C(T) \ge n, C(0) = 0$$

#### Claim:

$$C(t) \le 6C(t-1) + 3|P|$$

This gives  $C(T) \leq \frac{6^T - 1}{5} 3|P|$  and hence  $T = \Omega(\log n - \log |P|)$ .

#### Lemma 13

If  $i \in L(M,t)$  then either

- $i \in L(M, t-1)$ , or
- $\triangleright$  Some processor P writes M at step t on input  $I_i$  and  $i \in K(P,t)$ .
- Some processor P writes M at step t on input  $I_{i-1}$  and  $i \in K(P,t)$ .

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

194

For an index i to newly appear in L(M, t) some processor must write into M on either input  $I_i$  or  $I_{i-1}$ .

Hence, any index in K(P, t) can at most generate two new indices in L(M,t).

This means that the number of new indices in any set L(M, t)(over all *M*) is at most

$$2\sum_{P}|K(P,t)|$$

Hence.

$$\sum_{M} |L(M,t)| \le \sum_{M} |L(M,t-1)| + 2 \sum_{P} |K(P,t)|$$

We can assume wlog, that  $L(M, t - 1) \subseteq L(M, t)$ . Then

$$\sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M, t)| - 1\} \le \sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M, t - 1)| - 1\} + 2\sum_{P} |K(P, t)|$$

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

197

199

Hence,

$$\begin{split} \sum_{P} |K(P,t)| &\leq \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + \sum_{M \in J_t} |L(M,t-1)| \\ &\leq \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + \sum_{M \in J_t} (|L(M,t-1)|-1) + J_t \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + \sum_{M \in J_t} (|L(M,t-1)|-1) + |P| \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + \sum_{M} \max\{0,|L(M,t-1)|-1\} + |P| \end{split}$$

Recall

$$\sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M, t)| - 1\} \le \sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M, t - 1)| - 1\} + 2\sum_{P} |K(P, t)|$$

For an index i to newly appear in K(P, t), P must read a memory location M with  $i \in L(M, t)$  on input  $I_i$  (and also on input  $I_{i-1}$ ).

Since we are in the EREW model at most one processor can do so in every step.

Let J(i,t) be memory locations read in step t on input  $I_i$ , and let  $J_t = \bigcup_i J(i,t).$ 

$$\sum_{P} |K(P,t)| \le \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + \sum_{M \in J_t} |L(M,t-1)|$$

Over all inputs  $I_i$  a processor can read at most |K(P, t-1)| + 1different memory locations (why?).

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

198

This gives

$$\sum_{P} K(P,t) + \sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M,t)| - 1\}$$

$$\leq 4 \sum_{M} \max\{0, |L(M,t-1)| - 1\} + 6 \sum_{P} |K(P,t-1)| + 3|P|$$

Hence,

$$C(t) \leq 6C(t-1) + 3|P|$$

### **Lower Bounds for CRCW PRAMS**

### Theorem 14

Let  $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$  be an arbitrary Boolean function. f can be computed in O(1) time on a common CRCW PRAM with  $\leq n2^n$ processors.

Can we obtain non-constant lower bounds if we restrict the number of processors to be polynomial?



10 Simulations between PRAMs

201

203

### Theorem 15

Let  $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}^m$  be a function with n inputs and  $m \le n$ outputs, and circuit C computes f with depth D(n) and size S(n). Then f can be computed by a common CRCW PRAM in  $\mathcal{O}(D(n))$  time using S(n) processors.

# **Boolean Circuits**

- nodes are either AND, OR, or NOT gates or are special **INPUT/OUTPUT** nodes
- ▶ AND and OR gates have unbounded fan-in (indegree) and ounbounded fan-out (outdegree)
- NOT gates have unbounded fan-out
- ► INPUT nodes have indegree zero; OUTPUT nodes have outdegree zero
- ▶ size is the number of edges
- depth is the longest path from an input to an output

PA © Harald Räcke

10 Simulations between PRAMs

202

Given a family  $\{C_n\}$  of circuits we may not be able to compute the corresponding family of functions on a CRCW PRAM.

#### **Definition 16**

A family  $\{C_n\}$  of circuits is logspace uniform if there exists a deterministic Turing machine M s.t

- M runs in logarithmic space.
- For all n, M outputs  $C_n$  on input  $1^n$ .