# Parallelisation of the revised simplex method for general large scale LP problems

Julian Hall

School of Mathematics

University of Edinburgh

21st June 2004

# Overview

- The simplex method for linear programming
  - The standard simplex method
  - The revised simplex method
- Past approaches to parallelising the simplex method
- SYNPLEX
- Results and conclusions

# Solving LP problems

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{minimize} & f = \boldsymbol{c}^T \boldsymbol{x} \\ \text{subject to} & A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b} \\ & \boldsymbol{x} \geq \boldsymbol{0} \\ \text{where} & \boldsymbol{x} \in I\!R^n \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{b} \in I\!R^m. \end{array}$$

- At any vertex the variables may be partitioned into index sets
  - $\mathcal{B}$ of $m$ basic variables $\boldsymbol{x}_B \geq \boldsymbol{0}$:
  - $\mathcal{N}$ of $n - m$ nonbasic variables $\boldsymbol{x}_N = \boldsymbol{0}$.
- Components of $\boldsymbol{c}$ and columns of $A$ are
  - the basic costs $\boldsymbol{c}_B$ and basis matrix $B$;
  - the non-basic costs $\boldsymbol{c}_N$ and matrix $N$.

# Reduced LP problem

At any vertex the original problem is

$$\begin{array}{lrcl} \text{minimize} & f & = & \boldsymbol{c}_N^T \boldsymbol{x}_N + \boldsymbol{c}_B^T \boldsymbol{x}_B \\ \text{subject to} & & & N\,\boldsymbol{x}_N + B\,\boldsymbol{x}_B = \boldsymbol{b} \\ & & & \boldsymbol{x}_N \geq \boldsymbol{0} \quad \boldsymbol{x}_B \geq \boldsymbol{0}. \end{array}$$

Eliminate $\boldsymbol{x}_B$ from the objective to give

$$\begin{array}{lrcl} \text{minimize} & f & = & \hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N^T \boldsymbol{x}_N + \hat{f} \\ \text{subject to} & & & \hat{N}\,\boldsymbol{x}_N + I\,\boldsymbol{x}_B = \hat{\boldsymbol{b}} \\ & & & \boldsymbol{x}_N \geq \boldsymbol{0} \quad \boldsymbol{x}_B \geq \boldsymbol{0}, \end{array}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}} = B^{-1}\boldsymbol{b}$, $\hat{N} = B^{-1}N$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N$ is the vector of **reduced costs** given by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N^T = \boldsymbol{c}_N^T - \boldsymbol{c}_B^T \hat{N}.$$

# The standard simplex method

| | $\mathcal{N}$ | $\mathcal{B}$ | RHS |
|---|---|---|---|
| $1$<br>$\vdots$<br>$m$ | $\hat{N}$ | $I$ | $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}$ |
| $0$ | $\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N^T$ | $\mathbf{0}^T$ | $-\hat{f}$ |

**In each iteration:**

- Select the column $q'$ of a nonbasic variable $q \in \mathcal{N}$ to be increased from zero.
- Find the row $p$ of the first basic variable $p' \in \mathcal{B}$ to be zeroed.
- Exchange indices $p'$ and $q$ between sets $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{N}$.
- Update tableau corresponding to this **basis change**.
  - Scale row $p$ by $\hat{N}_{pq'}$.
  - Eliminate $\hat{N}_{iq'}$, $i = 0, \ldots, m, i \neq p$.

# Revised simplex method

Given $\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}}$ and a representation of $B^{-1}$, repeat

`CHUZC:` Scan the reduced costs $\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N$ for a good candidate $q$ to enter the basis.
`FTRAN:` Form the pivotal column $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_q = B^{-1}\boldsymbol{a}_q$, where $\boldsymbol{a}_q$ is column $q$ of $A$.
`CHUZR:` Scan the ratios $\hat{b}_i/\hat{a}_{iq}$ for the row $p$ of a good candidate to leave the basis. Let $\alpha = \hat{b}_p/\hat{a}_{pq}$.
Update $\hat{\boldsymbol{b}} := \hat{\boldsymbol{b}} - \alpha\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_q$.
`BTRAN:` Form $\boldsymbol{\pi}_p^T = \boldsymbol{e}_p^T B^{-1}$.
`PRICE:` Form the pivotal row $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_p^T = \boldsymbol{\pi}_p^T N$.
Update reduced costs $\hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N^T := \hat{\boldsymbol{c}}_N^T - \hat{c}_q\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_p^T$.
`If` (growth in factors) `then`
  `INVERT:` Form a representation of $B^{-1}$.
`else`
  `UPDATE:` Update the representation of $B^{-1}$ corresponding to the basis change.
`end if`

# Factored representation of $B^{-1}$

When using the product form update

$$B^{-1} = E_U^{-1} B_0^{-1}$$

- $B_0^{-1}$ is represented by the INVERT etas
- $E_U^{-1}$ is represented by the UPDATE etas
- FTRAN is performed as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_q = B_0^{-1} \boldsymbol{a}_q \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{a}}_q = E_U^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{a}}_q.$$

- BTRAN is performed as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_p^{\,T} = \boldsymbol{e}_p^T E_U^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\pi}_p^T = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}_p^{\,T} B_0^{-1}.$$

# Parallelising the simplex method

- Why try to parallelise the simplex method?
  - Want to solve general large sparse LP problems fast
  - Serial revised simplex solvers are very efficient
    CPLEX, OSL, Xpress, SOPLEX, EMSOL
  - Parallel solver must offer (hope of) further performance improvement
- How to parallelise the simplex method
  - Exploit **data parallelism**
    Use several processors simultaneously to perform a single operation
  - Exploit **functional parallelism**
    Perform more than one operation simultaneously using several processors
- Architectures
  - Distributed memory machines
    Communication between processors using message-passing routines (PVM/MPI)
  - Shared memory machines
    Coordination of processes and memory read/write using message-passing routines or compiler directives (OpenMP)

# Standard simplex method

- Tableau update yields simple data parallelism using dense data structure
- Worthwhile exercise in (early days of) parallel computing
  Finkel (1987), Stunkel (1988), Agrawal *et al.* (1989), Luo *et al.* (1988–91)
- Notable implementations due to
  - Eckstein *et al.* (1995): Massively parallel (CM-5)
  - Lentini *et al.* (1995): Parallel *sparse* standard simplex
- Parallel efficiency of 50%–90%
- Totally uncompetitive with serial RSM unless a prohibitively large number of processors are used
- Still being considered
  Yarmish (2001), Elangovan (2004)

# Revised simplex method

- Immediate data parallelism only in PRICE
- Limited data parallelism in FTRAN, BTRAN and INVERT
- Theoretical discussion by
  - Pfefferkorn and Tomlin (1976): for ILLIAC IV
  - Helgason *et al.* (1988): using quadrant interlocking factorization
  - McKinnon and Plab (1997): processing of factored inverse and parallel FTRAN
- Implementation by
  - Ho and Sundarraj (1994)
    Data-parallel PRICE and functionally-parallel INVERT
  - Shu (1995)

Significant speed-up only obtained when $n \gg m$ so PRICE dominates

# Dual (revised) simplex method

- Bixby and Martin (1995–2000)
- Dual simplex can require far fewer iterations than primal simplex
- Requires full PRICE
- Only exploited data parallelism in PRICE
- Good results on shared memory machine relative to serial CPLEX for problems when $n \gg m$

# RSM with steepest edge

- Wunderling (1996)
- Steepest edge pricing requires additional BTRAN and PRICE each iteration
  Number of iterations to solve an LP can be significantly reduced
- Functional parallelism plus parallel PRICE
  - Multiple FTRAN computes a number of attractive tableau columns
  - Two BTRANs performed simultaneously
  - Functionally parallel INVERT?




- Fully parallel for only two processors
- Good results only for problems when $n \gg m$

# ASYNPLEX

- Hall and McKinnon (1995)
- Dantzig pricing with ‘full’ BTRAN and PRICE
- Functional parallelism
- Target platform: Cray T3D (PVM and `shmem`)




- Speed-up of up to 5 on modest Netlib problems
- Performance limited by
  - communication overhead
  - duplicated work
  - limited candidate persistence
- Numerically unstable

# PARSMI

- Hall and McKinnon (1996)
- SSM minor iterations on small subset of tableau columns
- Each processor dedicated to a particular operation
- Devex pricing requires no more operations per iteration
  Number of iterations to solve an LP can be significantly reduced



# SYNPLEX

- Synchronous variant of PARSMI
- Better candidate persistency
- INVERT not overlapped with basis changes so numerically stable
- All tasks distributed over all processors
- Target platform: Sun Fire E15k (52 x 0.9GHz UltraSPARC III)
- Parallelise using OpenMP

# SYNPLEX: parallel scheme

When using $1 + p$ processors

- Functionally parallel multiple FTRAN for INVERT etas
- Rows distributed over $p$ processors for data parallel
  - multiple FTRAN for UPDATE etas
  - CHUZR
  - UPDATE RHS
- BTRAN for UPDATE etas performed on 1 processor
  Overlapped with UPDATE RHS

# SYNPLEX: parallel scheme (cont.)

- Functionally parallel multiple BTRAN for INVERT etas
- Columns distributed over $p$ processors for data parallel
  - PRICE
  - CHUZC
- INVERT overlapped with
  - BTRAN for INVERT etas
  - PRICE
  - CHUZC
  - FTRAN

# SYNPLEX in theory



# Implementation

- SYNPLEX not yet fully implemented
  - Phase 2
  - Dantzig pricing
- SYNPLEX not yet efficient in serial
  - Column-wise PRICE
  - Doesn't exploit 'hypersparsity'
- SYNPLEX not yet fully parallelised
  - INVERT not overlapped
  - Minor iterations still sequential
  - Inefficient parallel UPDATE FTRAN

# Results: 25FV47

| | |
|---|---|
| 16264 | FTRANs |
| 5695 | Iterations |
| 35% | Candidate persistence |

| PE | Solve | FTRAN | BTRAN | PRICE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CPU(s) | | | |
| 1 | 8.12 | 2.76 | 1.09 | 1.53 |
| | Speed-up | | | |
| 2 | 0.96 | 1.89 | 1.53 | 0.99 |
| 3 | 1.05 | 2.65 | 1.95 | 1.18 |
| 4 | 1.08 | 3.41 | 2.27 | 1.26 |




| Description | Elapsed |
|---|---|
| PRICE | 0.01441 |
| FTRAN: Inv Etas | 0.00721 |
| INVERT | 0.00500 |
| BTRAN: Inv Etas | 0.00399 |
| FTRAN: U Etas | 0.00294 |

| Description | Elapsed |
|---|---|
| Update Tableau | 0.00250 |
| Pack pivotal column | 0.00122 |
| Initialise UPDATE eta file | 0.00068 |
| CHUZR | 0.00067 |
| All threads barrier | 0.00043 |

# Results: PDS-06

| | |
|---|---|
| 88685 | FTRANs |
| 28989 | Iterations |
| 32% | Candidate persistence |

| PE | Solve | FTRAN | BTRAN | PRICE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CPU(s) | | | |
| 1 | 187.69 | 49.91 | 31.49 | 66.02 |
| | Speed-up | | | |
| 2 | 1.02 | 1.84 | 1.55 | 1.05 |
| 3 | 1.12 | 2.58 | 2.02 | 1.25 |
| 4 | 1.17 | 3.32 | 2.42 | 1.41 |




| Description | Elapsed |
|---|---|
| PRICE | 0.92479 |
| BTRAN: Inv Etas | 0.12884 |
| FTRAN: Inv Etas | 0.12115 |
| Pack pivotal column | 0.05126 |
| INVERT | 0.01717 |

| Description | Elapsed |
|---|---|
| Initialise UPDATE eta file | 0.01596 |
| Major CHUZC | 0.01151 |
| FTRAN: U Etas | 0.00794 |
| Update Tableau | 0.00762 |
| CHUZR | 0.00455 |

# Conclusions

- Shared memory machines with OpenMP offer prospect of
  - easier implementation
  - reduced parallel overheads
  - worthwhile target platform
- SYNPLEX addresses problems of candidate persistency and numerical stability
- Crude and incomplete implementation already offers some speed-up
- Potential for worthwhile speed-up