Some Computational Science Algorithms

Computational science

• Simulations of physical phenomena
  - fluid flow over aircraft (Boeing 777)
  - fatigue fracture in aircraft bodies
  - evolution of galaxies
  - ...
• Two main approaches
  - continuous models: fields and differential equations (eg. Navier-Stokes equations, Maxwell’s equations,...)
  - discrete models: particles and forces (eg. gravitational forces)
• Paradox
  - most differential equations cannot be solved exactly
  • must use numerical techniques that convert calculus problem to matrix computations: discretization
  - n-body methods are straight-forward
  • but need to use a lot of bodies to get accuracy
  • must find a way to reduce O(N^2) complexity of obvious algorithm
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• Finite-difference methods
  - ordinary and partial differential equations
  - discretization techniques
  • explicit methods: Forward-Euler method
  • implicit methods: Backward-Euler method
• Finite-element methods
  - mesh generation and refinement
  - weighted residuals
• N-body methods
  - Barnes-Hut
• Key algorithms and data structures
  - matrix computations
  • algorithms
    - solution of systems of linear equations
    - direct methods
    - iterative methods
  • data structures
    - dense and sparse matrices
  - graph computations
    - mesh generation and refinement
    - spatial decomposition trees
Ordinary differential equations

- Consider the ode
  \[ u'(t) = -3u(t) + 2 \]
  \[ u(0) = 1 \]
- This is called an initial value problem
  - initial value of \( u \) is given
  - compute how function \( u \) evolves for \( t > 0 \)
- Using elementary calculus, we can solve this ode exactly
  \[ u(t) = \frac{1}{3} (e^{-3t} + 2) \]

Problem

- For general ode’s, we may not be able to express solution in terms of elementary functions
- In most practical situations, we do not need exact solution anyway
  - enough to compute an approximate solution, provided
    - we have some idea of how much error was introduced
    - we can improve the accuracy as needed
- General solution:
  - convert calculus problem into algebra/arithmetic problem
    - discretization: replace continuous variables with discrete variables
    - in finite differences,
      - time will advance in fixed-size steps: \( t=0,h,2h,3h,... \)
      - differential equation is replaced by difference equation

Forward-Euler method

- Intuition:
  - we can compute the derivative at \( t=0 \) from the differential equation
    \[ u'(t) = -3u(t) + 2 \]
  - so compute the derivative at \( t=0 \) and advance along tangent to \( t=0 \) to find an approximation to \( u(h) \)
- Formally, we replace derivative with forward difference to get a difference equation
  \[ \frac{u(t+h) - u(t)}{h} = -3u(t) + 2 \]
- Replacing derivative with difference is essentially the inverse of how derivatives were probably introduced to you in elementary calculus

Back to ode

- Original ode
  \[ u(t) = -3u(t) + 2 \]
- After discretization using Forward-Euler:
  \[ (u(t+h) - u(t))/h = -3u(t) + 2 \]
- After rearrangement, we get difference equation
  \[ u(t+h) = (1-3h)u(t) + 2h \]
- We can now compute values of \( u \):
  \[ u(0) = 1 \]
  \[ u(h) = (1-h) \]
  \[ u(2h) = (1-2h+3h^2) \]
  .......
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Exact solution of difference equation

- In this particular case, we can actually solve difference equation exactly
- It is not hard to show that if difference equation is
  \[ u(t+h) = a \cdot u(t) + b \]
  \[ u(0) = 1 \]
  the solution is
  \[ u(nh) = a^n b (1 - a^n) (1 - a) \]
- For our difference equation,
  \[ u(t+h) = (1 - 3h) u(t) + 2h \]
  the exact solution is
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (1 - 3h)^n + \frac{2}{3} \]

Comparison

- Exact solution
  \[ u(t) = \frac{1}{3} (e^{-3t} + 2) \]
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (e^{-3nh} + 2) \]
- Forward-Euler solution
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (1 - 3h)^n + \frac{2}{3} \]
  - Use series expansion to compare
    \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (1 - 3nh + 9/2 n^2 h^2 + ... + 2) \]
    So error = \( O(nh) \) (provided \( h < 2/3 \))
- Conclusion:
  - Error per time step (local error) = \( O(h^2) \)
  - Error at time \( nh \) = \( O(nh^2) \)
  - In general, Forward-Euler converges only if time step is "small enough"

Choosing time step

- Time-step needs to be small enough to capture highest frequency phenomenon of interest
- Nyquist’s criterion
  - Sampling frequency must be at least twice highest frequency to prevent aliasing
  - For most finite-difference formulas, you need sampling frequencies (much) higher than the Nyquist criterion
- In practice, most functions of interest are not band limited, so use
  - Insight from application or
  - Reduce time-step repeatedly till changes are not significant
- Fixed-size time-step can be inefficient if frequency varies widely over time interval
  - Other methods like finite-elements permit variable time-steps as we will see later

Backward-Euler method

- Replace derivative with backward difference
  \[ u'(t) \rightarrow \frac{u(t) - u(t-h)}{h} \]
- For our ode, we get
  \[ u(t) - u(t-h)/h = -3u(t) + 2 \]
  which after rearrangement
  \[ u(t) = (2h + u(t-h))/(1 + 3h) \]
- As before, this equation is simple enough that we can write down the exact solution:
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} \frac{((1/(1+3h))n + 2)/3}{1+3h} \]
  - Using series expansion, we get
    \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (1 - 3nh + 9/2 n^2 h^2 + 9/2 n^2 h^2 + ... + 2) \]
    So error = \( O(nh^2) \) (for any value of \( h \))
Comparison

- Exact solution
  \[ u(t) = \frac{1}{3} (e^{-3t}+2) \]
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (e^{-3nh}+2) \]
  (at time-steps)
- Forward-Euler solution
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} (1 - 3nh + 2) \]
  error = \( O(h^2) \)
- Backward-Euler solution
  \[ u(nh) = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{1}{1 + 3h} \right) + 2 \]
  error = \( O(h^2) \)
  (h can be any value you want)
- Many other discretization schemes have been studied in the literature
  - Runge-Kutta
  - Crank-Nicolson
  - Upwind differencing
  - ...

Higher-order difference formulas

- First derivatives:
  - Forward-Euler: \( y'(t) \rightarrow \frac{y(t+h)-y(t)}{h} \)
  - Backward-Euler: \( y'(t) \rightarrow \frac{y(t)-y(t-h)}{h} \)
  - Centered: \( y'(t) \rightarrow \frac{y(t+h)-y(t-h)}{2h} \)
- Second derivatives:
  - Forward: \( y''(t) \rightarrow \frac{(y(t+2h)-2y(t+h)+y(t))/h^2}{y(t+2h)-2y(t+h)+y(t)/h^2} \)
  - Backward: \( y''(t) \rightarrow \frac{y(t)-2y(t-h)+y(t-2h)/h^2}{y(t)-2y(t-h)+y(t-2h)/h^2} \)
  - Centered: \( y''(t) \rightarrow \frac{y(t+h)-2y(t)+y(t-h)/h^2}{y(t+h)-2y(t)+y(t-h)/h^2} \)

Systems of ode’s

- Consider a system of coupled ode’s of the form
  \[ u'(t) = a_{11}u(t) + a_{12}v(t) + a_{13}w(t) + c_1(t) \]
  \[ v'(t) = a_{21}u(t) + a_{22}v(t) + a_{23}w(t) + c_2(t) \]
  \[ w'(t) = a_{31}u(t) + a_{32}v(t) + a_{33}w(t) + c_3(t) \]
- If we use Forward-Euler method to discretize this system, we get the following system of simultaneous equations
  \[ u(t+h) - u(t)/h = a_{11}u(t) + a_{12}v(t) + a_{13}w(t) + c_1(t) \]
  \[ v(t+h) - v(t)/h = a_{21}u(t) + a_{22}v(t) + a_{23}w(t) + c_2(t) \]
  \[ w(t+h) - w(t)/h = a_{31}u(t) + a_{32}v(t) + a_{33}w(t) + c_3(t) \]

Forward-Euler (contd.)

- Rearranging, we get
  \[ u(t) = \left[ u(t), v(t), w(t) \right]^T \]
  \[ A = \cdots \]
  \[ U(t) = \left[ c_1(t), c_2(t), c_3(t) \right]^T \]
**Vector notation**

- Our systems of equations was
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  u(t+h) &= (1+ha_11)u(t) + ha_12v(t) + ha_13w(t) + hc_1(t) \\
  v(t+h) &= ha_21u(t) + (1+ha_22)v(t) + ha_23w(t) + hc_2(t) \\
  w(t+h) &= ha_31u(t) + ha_32v(t) + (1+ha_33)w(t) + hc_3(t)
  \end{align*}
  \]

- This system can be written compactly as follows
  
  \[U(t+h) = (I+haA)U(t) + hC(t)\]

- We can use this form to compute values of \(U(h), U(2h), U(3h), \ldots\)

- Forward-Euler is an example of explicit method of discretization
  - key operation: matrix-vector (MVM) multiplication
  - in principle, there is a lot of parallelism
    - \(O(n^2)\) multiplications
    - \(O(n)\) reductions
  - parallelism is independent of runtime values

**Backward-Euler**

- We can also use Backward-Euler method to discretize system of ode’s
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  u(t) - u(t-h) / h &= a_{11}u(t) + a_{12}v(t) + a_{13}w(t) + c_1(t) \\
  v(t) - v(t-h) / h &= a_{21}u(t) + a_{22}v(t) + a_{23}w(t) + c_2(t) \\
  w(t) - w(t-h) / h &= a_{31}u(t) + a_{32}v(t) + a_{33}w(t) + c_3(t)
  \end{align*}
  \]

- We can write this in matrix notation as follows
  
  \[(I-hA)U(t) = U(t-h) + hC(t)\]

- Backward-Euler is example of implicit method of discretization
  - key operation: solving a dense linear system \(Mx = y\)

- How do we solve large systems of linear equations?
  - Matrix \((I-hA)\) is often very sparse
    - Important to exploit sparsity in solving linear systems

**Solving linear systems**

- Linear system: \(Ax = b\)
- Two approaches
  - direct methods: Cholesky, LU with pivoting
    * factorize \(A\) into product of lower and upper triangular matrices \(A = LU\)
    * solve two triangular systems
      - \(Ly = b\)
      - \(Ux = y\)
    * problems:
      - even if \(A\) is sparse, \(L\) and \(U\) can be quite dense (“fill”)
      - no useful information is produced until the end of the procedure
  - iterative methods: Jacobi, Gauss-Seidel, CG, GMRES
    * guess an initial approximation \(x_0\) to solution
    * error is \(Ax_0 - b\) (called residual)
    * repeatedly compute better approximation \(x_i\) from residual \((Ax_i - b)\)
    * terminate when approximation is “good enough”

**Diversion:**

**Solving linear systems**

- Linear system: \(Ax = b\)
- Two approaches
  - direct methods: Cholesky, LU with pivoting
    * factorize \(A\) into product of lower and upper triangular matrices \(A = LU\)
    * solve two triangular systems
      - \(Ly = b\)
      - \(Ux = y\)
    * problems:
      - even if \(A\) is sparse, \(L\) and \(U\) can be quite dense (“fill”)
      - no useful information is produced until the end of the procedure
  - iterative methods: Jacobi, Gauss-Seidel, CG, GMRES
    * guess an initial approximation \(x_0\) to solution
    * error is \(Ax_0 - b\) (called residual)
    * repeatedly compute better approximation \(x_i\) from residual \((Ax_i - b)\)
    * terminate when approximation is “good enough”
Iterative method: Jacobi iteration

- Linear system
  \[ 4x + 2y = 8 \]
  \[ 3x + 4y = 11 \]
- Exact solution is \((x=1, y=2)\)
- Jacobi iteration for finding approximations to solution
  - guess an initial approximation
  - iterate
    - use first component of residual to refine value of \(x\)
    - use second component of residual to refine value of \(y\)
- For our example
  \[ x_{i+1} = x_i - \frac{4x_i + 2y_i - 8}{4} \]
  \[ y_{i+1} = y_i - \frac{3x_i + 4y_i - 11}{4} \]
  - for initial guess \((x_0=0, y_0=0)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>2.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7188</td>
<td>1.7188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1055</td>
<td>2.1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8945</td>
<td>1.8945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0396</td>
<td>2.0396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jacobi iteration: general picture

- Linear system \(Ax = b\)
- Jacobi iteration
  \[ M^*x_{i+1} = (M-A)x_i + b \] (where \(M\) is the diagonal of \(A\))
  This can be written as
  \[ x_{i+1} = x_i - M^{-1}(Ax_i - b) \]
- Key operation:
  - matrix-vector multiplication
- Caveat:
  - Jacobi iteration does not always converge
  - even when it converges, it usually converges slowly
  - there are faster iterative methods available: CG, GMRES, ...
  - what is important from our perspective is that key operation in all
    these iterative methods is matrix-vector multiplication

Sparse matrix representations

MVM with sparse matrices

- Coordinate storage
  for \(P = 1\) to \(NZ\) do
  \[ Y(A.row(P)) = Y(A.row(P)) + A.val(P) \times X(A.column(P)) \]
- CRS storage
  for \(l = 1\) to \(N\) do
  for \(JJ = A.rowPtr(l)\) to \(A.rowPtr(l+1)-1\) do
  \[ Y(l) = Y(l) + A.val(JJ) \times X(A.column(JJ)) \]
Finite-differences: pde’s

Finite-difference methods for solving partial differential equations

- Basic ideas carry over unchanged
- Example: 2-d heat equation
- \( u_t = u_{xx} + u_{yy} = f(x,y) \)
- Assume temperature at boundary is fixed
- Approximate derivatives as centered differences
  - \( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} \rightarrow \frac{(u(i+1,j) - u(i,j))/h - (u(i,j) - u(i-1,j))/h}{h^2} \)
  - \( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} \rightarrow \frac{(u(i,j+1) - u(i,j))/h - (u(i,j) - u(i,j-1))/h}{h^2} \)
- So we get a system of \((N-1)\times(N-1)\) difference equations in terms of the unknowns at the \((N-1)\times(N-1)\) interior points

\[(u(i,j) + u(i,j+1) + u(i,j-1) + u(i+1,j) + u(i-1,j) - 4u(i,j)) = \frac{h^2 f(ih,jh)}{4} \]

- This system can be solved using any of our methods.

Solving partial differential equations contd.

- System of \((N-1)\times(N-1)\) difference equations in terms of the unknowns at the \((N-1)\times(N-1)\) interior points

\[
\begin{align*}
\forall\text{ interior point } (i,j) \\
u_{i,j}^{n+1} = u_{i,j}^{n+1} + u_{i,j+1}^{n+1} + u_{i,j-1}^{n+1} + u_{i+1,j}^{n+1} + u_{i-1,j}^{n+1} - 4u_{i,j}^{n+1} = \frac{h^2 f(ih,jh)}{4}
\end{align*}
\]

- Matrix notation: use row-major (natural) order for u’s

Pentadiagonal sparse matrix

Since matrix is sparse, we should use an iterative method like Jacobi.

Useful to change data structures

- Data structure:
  - Pentadiagonal matrix can be inlined into code
  - Values of u at a given time-step can be stored in a 2D array
  - Use two arrays and use them for odd and even time-steps
- Algorithm:
  - For each interior point
  \[
  u_{i,j}^{n+1} = u_{i,j}^{n+1} + u_{i,j+1}^{n+1} + u_{i,j-1}^{n+1} + u_{i+1,j}^{n+1} + u_{i-1,j}^{n+1} - \frac{h^2 f(ih,jh)}{4}
  \]
- Known as stencil codes
- Example shown is Jacobi iteration with five-point stencil
- Parallelism
  - All interior points can be computed in parallel
  - Parallelism is independent of runtime values
Observations

• Algorithm: Jacobi iteration with 5-point stencil to solve 2-D heat equation
• Two very different programs
  a. pentadiagonal matrix: stored in sparse matrix format, unknowns: 1D vector
  b. pentadiagonal matrix: inlined into code, unknowns: matrix
• Data structures are critical
  – can result in very different programs (implementations) for the same algorithm

Summary

• Finite-difference methods
  – can be used to find approximate solutions to ode’s and pde’s
• Many large-scale computational science simulations use these methods
• Time step or grid step needs to be constant and is determined by highest-frequency phenomenon
  – can be inefficient for when frequency varies widely in domain of interest
  – one solution: structured AMR methods

Big picture

Finite-element methods

• Express approximate solution to pde as a linear combination of certain basis functions
• Similar in spirit to Fourier analysis
  – express periodic functions as linear combinations of sines and cosines
• Questions:
  – what should be the basis functions?
    • mesh generation: discretization step for finite-elements
    • mesh defines basis functions \( \phi_0, \phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots \) which are low-degree piecewise polynomial functions
  – given the basis functions, how do we find the best linear combination of these for approximating solution to pde?
    • \( u = c_0 \phi_0 + c_1 \phi_1 + \ldots \)
    • weighted residual method: similar in spirit to what we do in Fourier analysis, but more complex because basis functions are not necessarily orthogonal
Mesh generation and refinement

- **1-D example:**
  - mesh is a set of points, not necessarily equally spaced
  - basis functions are "hats" which
    - have a value of 1 at a mesh point,
    - decay down to 0 at neighboring mesh points
    - 0 everywhere else
  - linear combinations of these produce piecewise-linear functions in domain, which may change slope only at mesh points
- In 2-D, mesh is a triangulation of domain, while in 3-D, it might be a tetrahedralization
- Mesh refinement: called h-refinement
  - add more points to mesh in regions where discretization error is large
  - irregular nature of mesh makes this easy to do locally
  - finite-differences require global refinement which can be computationally expensive

Finding coefficients

- **Weighted residual technique**
  - similar in spirit to what we do in Fourier analysis, but basis functions are not necessarily orthogonal
- **Key idea:**
  - problem is reduced to solving a system of equations \(Ax = b\)
  - solution gives the coefficients in the weighted sum
  - because basis functions are zero almost everywhere in the domain, matrix \(A\) is usually very sparse
  - number of rows/columns of \(A\) ~ O(number of points in mesh)
  - number of non-zeros per row ~ O(connectivity of mesh point)
- typical numbers:
  - \(A\) is 10^6 x 10^6
  - only about ~100 non-zeros per row

Delaunay Mesh Refinement

- Iterative refinement to remove bad triangles with lots of discretization error:
  - while there are bad triangles do {
    - Pick a bad triangle
    - Find its cavity:
      - triangulate cavity;
    - - may create new bad triangles
  } 
- Don’t care non-determinism:
  - final mesh depends on order in which bad triangles are processed
  - applications do not care which mesh is produced
- Data structure:
  - graph in which nodes represent triangles and edges represent triangle adjacencies
- Parallelism:
  - bad triangles with cavities that do not overlap can be processed in parallel
  - parallelism is dependent on runtime values
  - compilers cannot find this parallelism
  - (Miller et al) at runtime, repeatedly build interference graph and find maximal independent sets for parallel execution

Finding the best choices of the coefficients:

**Analogy with Fourier series:**

\[
A \sin(b) dx = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \cos(b) dx = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left( a_0 + \sum a_i \cos(b_i x) + \sum b_i \sin(b_i x) \right) \cos(b) dx
\]

How do you find 'best' choices for \(a_i\) and \(b_i\)?
Barnes Hut N-body Simulation

**Introduction**

- **Physical system simulation (time evolution)**
  - System consists of **bodies**
  - "n" is the number of bodies
  - Bodies interact via **pair-wise forces**

- **Many systems can be modeled in these terms**
  - Galaxy clusters (gravitational force)
  - Particles (electric force, magnetic force)
Barnes Hut Idea

- Precise force calculation
  - Requires \( O(n^2) \) operations (\( O(n^2) \) body pairs)

- Barnes and Hut (1986)
  - Algorithm to approximately compute forces
    - Bodies’ initial position & velocity are also approximate
    - Requires only \( O(n \log n) \) operations
    - Idea is to “combine” far away bodies
    - Error should be small because \( force \sim 1/r^2 \)

Barnes Hut Algorithm

- Set bodies’ initial position and velocity
- Iterate over time steps
  1. Subdivide space until at most one body per cell
     - Record this spatial hierarchy in an octree
  2. Compute mass and center of mass of each cell
  3. Compute force on bodies by traversing octree
     - Stop traversal path when encountering a leaf (body) or an internal node (cell) that is far enough away
  4. Update each body’s position and velocity

Build Tree (Level 1)

Subdivide space until at most one body per cell

Build Tree (Level 2)

Subdivide space until at most one body per cell
Build Tree (Level 3)

Subdivide space until at most one body per cell

Build Tree (Level 4)

Subdivide space until at most one body per cell

Build Tree (Level 5)

Subdivide space until at most one body per cell

Compute Cells’ Center of Mass

For each internal cell, compute sum of mass and weighted average of position of all bodies in subtree; example shows two cells only
Compute Forces

Compute force, for example, acting upon green body

Compute Force (short distance)

Scan tree depth first from left to right; green portion already completed

Compute Force (down one level)

Red center of mass is too close, need to go down one level

Compute Force (long distance)

Yellow center of mass is far enough away
**Compute Force (skip subtree)**

Therefore, entire subtree rooted in the yellow cell can be skipped.

**Pseudocode**

Set bodySet = 
foreach timestep do {
  Octree octree = new Octree();
  foreach Body b in bodySet {
    octree.Insert(b);
  }
  OrderedList cellList = octree.CellsByLevel();
  foreach Cell c in cellList {
    c.Summarize();
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet {
    b.ComputeForce(octree);
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet {
    b.Advance();
  }
}

**Complexity**

Set bodySet = 
foreach timestep do {
  // O(n log n)
  Octree octree = new Octree();
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // O(n log n)
    octree.Insert(b);
  }
  OrderedList cellList = octree.CellsByLevel();
  foreach Cell c in cellList { // O(n)
    c.Summarize();
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // O(n log n)
    b.ComputeForce(octree);
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // O(n)
    b.Advance();
  }
}

**Parallelism**

Set bodySet = 
foreach timestep do {
  // sequential
  Octree octree = new Octree();
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // tree building
    octree.Insert(b);
  }
  OrderedList cellList = octree.CellsByLevel();
  foreach Cell c in cellList { // tree traversal
    c.Summarize();
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // fully parallel
    b.ComputeForce(octree);
  }
  foreach Body b in bodySet { // fully parallel
    b.Advance();
  }
}
Summary

- Physical Phenomena
  - Continuous Models
  - Discrete Models
- Spectral
- Finite-difference
  - Explicit
  - Implicit
- Finite-element
- Mesh generation and refinement
- Spatial decomposition trees
- FFT

Summary (contd.)

- Some key computational science algorithms and data structures
  - MVM:
    - explicit finite-difference methods for ode’s, iterative linear solvers, finite-element methods
    - both dense and sparse matrices
  - stencil computations:
    - finite-difference methods for pde’s
    - dense matrices
  - A=LU:
    - direct methods for solving linear systems: factorization
    - usually only dense matrices
    - high-performance factorization codes use MMM as a kernel
  - mesh generation and refinement
    - finite-element methods
    - graphs

Summary (contd.)

- Terminology
  - regular algorithms:
    - dense matrix computations like MVM, A=LU, stencil computations
    - parallelism in algorithms is independent of runtime values, so all parallelization decisions can be made at compile-time
  - irregular algorithms:
    - graph computations like mesh generation and refinement
    - parallelism in algorithms is dependent on runtime values
    - most parallelization decisions have to be made at runtime during the execution of the algorithm
  - semi-regular algorithms:
    - sparse matrix computations like MVM, A=LU
    - parallelization decisions can be made at runtime once matrix is available, but before computation is actually performed
    - inspector-executor approach