

---

Subject: Parallel Processing

Posted by [stefan.meingast](#) on Thu, 28 Jun 2012 14:05:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi

I have developed a code which takes a couple of hours to run and I am aware of the fact that IDL automatically parallelizes some vector operations and one should prefer those instead of looping through arrays.

I have done all that but still I know I could speed up things by a factor of 2 when I do certain things on 2 cores.

For instance, somewhere in the program I pass some arrays to a function and this function then returns and equally large array with some calculated values. This is all done with one core since the operations in the function are not parallelized.

However, I could split up the input arrays into to equally large parts and perform the calculations for each of those two on one core. In the end, when both are finished I could just concatenate the result-arrays.

Is this possible in some easy way?

thanks for your help :)

---

---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing

Posted by [stefan.meingast](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 14:50:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi

Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:

To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with

```
bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT
```

where bridges is an object-array which holds the different child processes.  
Upon the execution of the last process I do

```
bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'
```

And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.

Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous since upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my program...

Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the bridges?

thanks  
Stefan

---

---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing  
Posted by [stefan.meingast](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 14:52:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi

Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:

To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with

```
bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT
```

where 'bridges' is an object-array which holds the different child processes.  
Upon the execution of the last process I do

```
bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'
```

And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.

Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous processes since upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my program...

Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the bridges?

thanks  
Stefan

---

---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing  
Posted by [Lajos Foldy](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 15:13:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thursday, July 5, 2012 4:52:23 PM UTC+2, Stefan wrote:

> Hi  
>  
> Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:  
>  
> To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with  
>

> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT  
 >  
 > where 'bridges' is an object-array which holds the different child processes.  
 > Upon the execution of the last process I do  
 >  
 > bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'  
 >  
 > And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.  
 >  
 > Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous processes since  
 upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my  
 program...  
 >  
 > Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the  
 bridges?  
 >  
 > thanks  
 > Stefan

Use IDL\_IDLBridge::Status to determine whether the job is finished. Pseudocode:

```
ndone=0
running=replicate(1, njobs)
while ndone lt njobs begin
  for j=0,njobs-1 do begin
    if running[j] then begin
      query status of the j-th job with IDL_IDLBridge::Status
      if finished
        destroy bridge
        running[j]=0
        ndone++
      endif
    endif
  endfor
  wait, 1
endwhile
```

regards,  
 Lajos

---



---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing  
 Posted by [stefan.meingast](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 15:16:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Am Donnerstag, 5. Juli 2012 17:13:02 UTC+2 schrieb fawltl...@gmail.com:  
 > On Thursday, July 5, 2012 4:52:23 PM UTC+2, Stefan wrote:

```

>> Hi
>>
>> Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:
>>
>> To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with
>>
>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT
>>
>> where 'bridges' is an object-array which holds the different child processes.
>> Upon the execution of the last process I do
>>
>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'
>>
>> And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.
>>
>> Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous processes since
>> upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my
>> program...
>>
>> Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the
>> bridges?
>>
>> thanks
>> Stefan
>
> Use IDL_IDLBridge::Status to determine whether the job is finished. Pseudocode:
>
> ndone=0
> running=replicate(1, njobs)
> while ndone lt njobs begin
>   for j=0,njobs-1 do begin
>     if running[j] then begin
>       query status of the j-th job with IDL_IDLBridge::Status
>       if finished
>         destroy bridge
>         running[j]=0
>         ndone++
>       endif
>     endif
>   endfor
>   wait, 1
> endwhile
>
>
> regards,
> Lajos

```

Ah, I see you put WAIT there if its not finished. I thought of using this in a loop but without putting

WAIT you spend too many resources.

Thanks! :)

---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing  
Posted by [Russell Ryan](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 15:29:21 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Thursday, July 5, 2012 11:16:27 AM UTC-4, Stefan wrote:  
> Am Donnerstag, 5. Juli 2012 17:13:02 UTC+2 schrieb fawltl...@gmail.com:  
>> On Thursday, July 5, 2012 4:52:23 PM UTC+2, Stefan wrote:  
>>> Hi  
>>>  
>>> Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:  
>>>  
>>> To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with  
>>>  
>>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT  
>>>  
>>> where 'bridges' is an object-array which holds the different child processes.  
>>> Upon the execution of the last process I do  
>>>  
>>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'  
>>>  
>>> And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.  
>>>  
>>> Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous processes since  
upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my  
program...  
>>>  
>>> Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the  
bridges?  
>>>  
>>> thanks  
>>> Stefan  
>>  
>> Use IDL\_IDLBridge::Status to determine whether the job is finished. Pseudocode:  
>>  
>> ndone=0  
>> running=replicate(1, njobs)  
>> while ndone lt njobs begin  
>> for j=0,njobs-1 do begin  
>> if running[j] then begin  
>> query status of the j-th job with IDL\_IDLBridge::Status  
>> if finished  
>> destroy bridge  
>> running[j]=0

```
>>         ndone++
>>         endif
>>     endif
>> endfor
>>     wait, 1
>> endwhile
>>
>>
>> regards,
>> Lajos
>
> Ah, I see you put WAIT there if its not finished. I thought of using this in a loop but without
putting WAIT you spend too many resources.
>
> Thanks! :)
```

Yeah, I put a wait in there too. I've thought about "calibrating" the wait time. It seems to me that if your process takes (say 30 minutes) then polling the bridges every 1 second seems like overkill. My gut-feeling is that this wait time should be roughly 1/3 or 1/4 the expected time per process, but of course you'd want to ensure that it's always waiting a minimum of ~0.5 s.

Russell

---

---

Subject: Re: Parallel Processing  
Posted by [lecacheux.alain](#) on Thu, 05 Jul 2012 15:53:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 5 juil, 17:16, Stefan <[stefan.meing...@gmail.com](mailto:stefan.meing...@gmail.com)> wrote:  
> Am Donnerstag, 5. Juli 2012 17:13:02 UTC+2 schrieb fawltlyl...@gmail.com:  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>> On Thursday, July 5, 2012 4:52:23 PM UTC+2, Stefan wrote:  
>>> Hi  
>  
>>> Now that I have successfully implemented multi-threading another problem occurred:  
>  
>>> To invoke multiple processes I start in a loop with  
>  
>>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par1,par2', /NOWAIT  
>  
>>> where 'bridges' is an object-array which holds the different child processes.  
>>> Upon the execution of the last process I do  
>  
>>> bridges[i]->EXECUTE, 'program,par3,par4'

```

>
>>> And after that I destroy my bridges in a loop.
>
>>> Now I have a problem if the last process finishes before one of the previous processes since
upon its completion it will directly move to the part where all bridges are destroyed and kills my
program...
>
>>> Is there an easy way to tell IDL to wait for all my processes to finish and then destroy the
bridges?
>
>>> thanks
>>> Stefan
>
>> Use IDL_IDLBridge::Status to determine whether the job is finished. Pseudocode:
>
>> ndone=0
>> running=replicate(1, njobs)
>> while ndone lt njobs begin
>>   for j=0,njobs-1 do begin
>>     if running[j] then begin
>>       query status of the j-th job with IDL_IDLBridge::Status
>>       if finished
>>         destroy bridge
>>         running[j]=0
>>         ndone++
>>     endif
>>   endfor
>>   wait, 1
>> endwhile
>
>> regards,
>> Lajos
>
> Ah, I see you put WAIT there if its not finished. I thought of using this in a loop but without
putting WAIT you spend too many resources.
>
> Thanks! :)
>
>

```

My way to manage that is putting /NOWAIT, but waiting inside the loop, as follows:

```

repeat begin
  wait, 1
  test = 1B
  foreach b,bridges do test AND= (b.Status() ne 1)

```

endrep until test

alain.

---