

Performance Characterization and Optimizations of Traditional ML Applications

Harsh Kumar

*Department of Computer Science & Automation
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore
harshkumar@iisc.ac.in*

R. Govindarajan

*Department of Computer Science & Automation
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore
govind@iisc.ac.in*

Abstract—Even in the era of Deep Learning based methods, traditional machine learning methods with large data sets continue to attract significant attention. However, we find an apparent lack of a detailed performance characterization of these methods in the context of large training datasets.

In this work, we study the systems behavior of a number of traditional ML methods as implemented in popular free software libraries/modules to identify critical performance bottlenecks experienced by these applications. The performance characterization study reveals several interesting insights on the performance of these applications. Then we evaluate the performance benefits of applying some well-known optimizations at the levels of caches and the main memory. More specifically, we test the usefulness of optimizations such as (i) software prefetching to improve cache performance and (ii) data layout and computation reordering optimizations to improve locality in DRAM accesses. These optimizations are implemented as modifications to the well-known `scikit-learn` library, and hence can be easily leveraged by application programmers. We evaluate the impact of the proposed optimizations using a combination of simulation and execution on a real system. The software prefetching optimization results in performance benefits varying from 5.2% - 27.1% on different ML applications while the data layout and computation reordering approaches yield 6.16% - 28.0% performance improvement.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been an ever increasing interest in machine learning and data science research, thanks to the increasing computational capacity and the availability of huge amounts of user data. Machine learning methods can be widely categorized into two categories: Deep Learning models and the traditional Machine Learning methods. Deep learning models are characterized by huge computational models such as Neural Networks, CNNs, Language Models, etc. and are known to be both computationally demanding and have large memory footprint [SSR18]. Traditional Machine Learning models, on the other hand, use regression models, clustering, decision tree or support vector machines to perform the prediction. Another important difference is that traditional machine learning methods are explainable whereas deep learning methods are not [Mol19].

A recent study [Psa+19] noted that Deep Learning methods only account for less than 20% of data-science workload today and that traditional Machine Learning is still the dominant approach — either solely or in some hybrid form, where the

outputs of the traditional machine learning methods are fed to the Deep learning models for further processing.

As a consequence, it becomes important to revisit these traditional Machine Learning methods and their bottlenecks in context of ever increasing datasets. Several research works [SF12], [CLQ11], [Pat+12], [WGS20], [Gen+17], [WS15] have been carried out to adapt these traditional algorithms for massive datasets. Distributed and parallel implementations such as Weka-Parallel [CM02] and Spark MLlib [Men+16] have been developed. However, we find an apparent lack of a detailed performance characterization of these methods, especially in the context of huge datasets.

Several studies perform architectural characterization of data mining algorithms [Ozi+06], [Liu+], [Gho+05], [Mek+10]. A few of the popular traditional machine learning algorithms are a part of their benchmark suite. They measure execution times, cache miss ratios, branch performance, parallelization overheads and speedup with increasing number of threads in their studies. However it does not include any micro-architectural characterization study. Mekkat et al. [Mek+10] find the workloads to be memory intensive with little to no temporal locality. In [Liu+], the authors claim that prefetching can help, but neither proposes any specific approach nor reports any potential benefits of prefetching. The impact of compiler inserted prefetch instructions on a set of data-mining workloads (NU-MineBench [Ozi+06]) is reported in [Mek+10]. However, the machine learning workloads in their study are limited to very small datasets. Studies in [Xie+16] and [Jia+17] have focused on studying the system behaviour of big-data analytics workloads. They perform a top-down analysis to measure various performance metrics. [Xie+16] focuses on vectorization on the Intel Xeon Phi machine whereas [Jia+17] claims the software stack is the problem.

All these earlier work either focus on very small datasets or they are only interested in the scalability with the increasing number of threads. Also their selection of workloads does not represent the true state of data-science applications in present days.

In this paper, we are interested in studying the micro-architectural characteristics of widely-used traditional machine learning algorithms (in present day data-science) in the context

of large datasets.

We focus mainly on single core and low-end servers (with 4 — 8 cores) in this study for two reasons. One, many data science practitioners (beginners, model developers, and users) frequently train and run their models on these on low-end servers. Our performance characterization reveals that the bottlenecks and insights are similar across 1 — 8 cores, although their extent may be different.

Our selection of workloads is quite broad and covers all the modern day use-cases including Classification, Regression, Clustering and Dimensionality-reduction applications. In our setting, the algorithms are free to run on multiple threads, but we focus our study on the bottlenecks encountered in single thread execution. Our performance characterization study reveals several interesting insights to improve the performance of these applications. Based on these insights, we implement some well-known optimizations, such as software prefetching, data and computation reordering and evaluate their benefits on the traditional machine learning applications. The software prefetching optimization results in performance benefits varying from 5.2% - 27.1% on different ML applications while the data layout and computation reordering approaches yield 6.16% - 28.0% performance improvement. Our optimizations are implemented in `scikit-learn` and thus allowing users to easily leverage them.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we describe the workload used and the experimental methodology. In Section III we present the performance characterization results. This will be followed by a discussion on the reasons behind the bottlenecks in Section IV. Next, we discuss on the impacts of hardware and software-based prefetching methods and the impacts of certain data-layout and computation re-ordering algorithms on the overall performance in Sections V and VI. A discussion on related work is presented in Section VII. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section VIII.

II. EXPERIMENT METHODOLOGY

As a first step, we select a set of 13 traditional Machine learning workloads which are popularly used in present-day data science applications, including Lasso [Tib96] and Ridge [HK00] regressions, Principal Components Analysis (PCA) [Pea01], Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [BNJ03], Support Vector Machines (SVM) (both linear kernel and RBF kernel) [Hea+98], KMeans [Llo82], Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM) [SM92], K-Nearest Neighbours (KNN) [FH89], DBSCAN [Est+96], t-SNE [MH08], Decision Trees [Qui86], Random Forests [Bre01] and Adaboost [FS99]. We categorize the workloads into three sets based on the nature of subroutines they spend most of their time on. These categories are Matrix-algebra based methods, Neighbours-based methods and Tree-based methods. The set of workloads in each category is shown in Table I.

To ensure implementation-independent measurements, we perform measurements on two different implementations of

these workloads, one in the `scikit-learn` [Ped+11] v1.0.1 library and another in the `mlpack` [Cur+18] v3.4.2 library. The `scikit-learn` library is the most widely used data science library [Psa+19] whereas the `mlpack` website [Cur+18] claims it to be the fastest library. Also note that the `mlpack` [Cur+18] library does not implement SVM with RBF kernel, LDA and t-SNE algorithms.

TABLE I
BENCHMARKS USED AND THEIR CATEGORIES

Category	Workload
Matrix-based	Lasso, Ridge, PCA, Linear SVM, SVM-RBF, LDA
Neighbour-based	KMeans, GMM, KNN, DBSCAN, t-SNE
Tree-based	Decision Tree, Random Forests, Adaboost

We use Intel VTune profiler [Vtu17] for identifying the performance bottleneck and the `linux perf` tool for measuring various performance monitoring counters. The memory profiling is also done using the `Linux perf mem` tool. Intel’s VTune provides high level bottleneck information in terms of percentage of pipeline slots whereas the `perf` tools gives actual Performance Monitoring Unit (PMU) counter values which are helpful to understand the nature of the bottlenecks.

As we are only interested in performance bottlenecks, we make use of dummy datasets of size 10 million rows and 20 features. These datasets are generated using the `datasets` module in the `scikit-learn` library. The generated datasets are then converted in binary formats – `numpy` format for `scikit-learn` and `bin` format for `mlpack`. This avoids the overhead incurred due to reading input text files (and subsequent string to float conversion).

For each workload, we run the measurements for a minimum of eight hours or five training iterations whichever is earlier. The workloads are run on a single core (with `n_jobs` parameter set to 1) in isolation. No other user process is run in parallel to the workloads during measurements. Average values of three runs is used for comparison and analysis purposes. Finally, the processor and cache configuration of the system used in our evaluation is shown in Table II. We used the Ubuntu 20.04 operating system and the underlying BLAS, ATLAS and LAPACK libraries were the default distribution from Netlib [Bla+01]. We verified the version of these libraries to be v3.9.0.

III. PERFORMANCE CHARACTERIZATION

In this section, we study the performance characterization of traditional ML applications using VTune and `perf` tool. First, we present in detail our study on single core systems. In Section III-B we present the results for multi-core servers.

A. Performance Characterization on Single-core System

Figures 1 and 2 present CPI (Cycles Per Instruction) and retiring ratio (the ratio of instruction slots spent usefully in retiring instructions to the maximum possible instructions that can be retired) expressed as a percentage.

For all our workloads, the CPI is between 0.4 to 1.75. These CPI values are large given that the processor is an aggressive

TABLE II
MACHINE ARCHITECTURE

Parameters	Values
Architecture	x86_64, Intel i7-10700 ice-lake, 2.90 GHz
L1D/I Cache	256KB/256KB
L2 Cache	2MB
L3 Cache	16MB
DRAM	32 GB
FPU	Available




Fig. 1. CPI values for all the workloads across both `scikit-learn` and `mlpack` implementations.

5-way superscalar architecture. We notice that the retiring ratio varies from 15-40% in all workloads (except GMM and KMeans), indicating potential performance bottlenecks in the applications. Further the performance bottlenecks are higher in `scikit-learn` implementations than the one using `mlpack`.

Next to identify the major reasons for the performance bottlenecks, we present the percentage of stalled pipeline slots due to branch mis-speculation in Figure 3. The values are significantly higher in tree-based workloads as seen in Figure 3. Figure 4 shows the corresponding branch misprediction ratios for all the workloads and a positive correlation can be noticed with Figure 3. Further, around 20-25% of instructions in both neighbour-based and tree-based workloads were found to have branch instructions (see Figure 5). Last, as shown in Figure 6, around 80-95% of the branch instruction are conditional branch instructions, implying that the performance of these workloads would be heavily influenced by the quality of the branch-predictor. In neighbour-based workloads, the impact of bad speculation is smaller compared to the tree-




Fig. 2. Retiring ratios for all the workloads across both `scikit-learn` and `mlpack` implementations.




Fig. 3. Bad-Speculation bound (percentage) for all the workloads.




Fig. 4. Branch misprediction values for all the workloads across both `scikit-learn` and `mlpack` implementations.

based workloads, due to lower misprediction rates (refer to Figure 3).

Figures 7 and 8 respectively show the fraction of cycles stalled due to DRAM (called DRAM bound) and the LLC miss ratio for all the workloads. We observe that 31.8%, 37.4% and 31.2% of cycles are stalled due to DRAM latency for the matrix-based, neighbour-based and tree based workloads respectively. The LLC miss rates in these workloads also follow a similar trend. These indicate that DRAM latency is one major performance bottleneck in these applications.

Figure 9 shows the percentage of memory bandwidth utilized by each workload. Matrix-based workloads show very high values (around 80%) of memory bandwidth utilization, whereas other workloads show smaller values (around 40%).

Last we present port utilization – the fraction of cycles the CPU execution was stalled on core non-divider related issues – across all the workloads in Figure 10. This again confirms




Fig. 5. Fraction of branch instructions for all the workloads.




Fig. 6. Percentage of conditional branches across all the workloads.




Fig. 7. DRAM bound for all the workloads.




Fig. 8. LLC miss ratios for all the workloads.




Fig. 9. Percentage of memory bandwidth utilization across all the workloads.




Fig. 10. Percentage of execution stall cycles due to core non-divider related issues.

a significant fraction (15% - 38%) of the execution cycles are wasted due to functional-unit (other than Divider) related stalls.

In summary, (i) most workloads have a considerably high CPI (greater than 0.8) and low retiring ratio; (ii) bad-speculation bound caused by high misprediction rate was observed to be a significant performance bottleneck in tree-based workloads (iii) large LLC miss ratios and large fraction of cycles stalled due to DRAM is another major cause of high CPI; and (iv) roughly 25–30% of the CPU cycles are wasted due to core non-divider related stalls.

B. Multicore Performance Characterization

Next we present our results for the characterization study on 4 and 8 cores. Due to space constraints we present these results in the form of tables, and limit ourselves only to those benchmarks which have parallel multi-core implementation in the respective library. For ease of comparison, we have reproduced the 1-core numbers as well in Tables III and IV.

The key observations that we made for single core continue to hold in 4- and 8-core systems. The CPI's of the applications continue to be higher (0.7 or higher) and bad speculation and DRAM stalls at 4- and 8-cores are comparable to those at single core.

Next we move on to propose a few standard optimizations to address the key performance bottlenecks observed. In studying these optimizations and evaluation their impact on performance, we focus on single core system.

IV. ANALYSIS OF MEMORY ACCESS PATTERNS

We saw in Section III that memory accesses is one of the major sources of performance stalls. To understand this better, we did a code-level hotspots analysis using Intel VTune [Vtu17].

For matrix based workloads, we observed that the memory accesses are regular. We believe the memory access stalls may be due to the inability of the underlying BLAS library to fully reuse the caches. An improvement for these workloads will thus require making changes to the underlying BLAS library.

For neighbour-based workloads, however, we noticed the use of irregular memory accesses of the form $A[B[i]]$ (and

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE NUMBERS FOR `SCIKIT-LEARN` IMPLEMENTATION.

Workloads	CPI			Retiring			Bad Spec.			DRAM Bound			Core Bound			
	Cores	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c
LDA		0.76	1.06	1.10	36.7	30.3	29.8	3.2	4.6	3.8	19.3	31.5	34.9	28.1	29.7	27.6
GMM		1.08	1.14	0.85	23.5	24.2	31.0	8.9	3.6	1.1	29.5	28.7	28.6	12.4	26.0	19.8
KMeans		0.51	1.45	0.845	37.4	24.0	35.1	8.9	6.3	9.8	15.3	16.2	18.1	19.1	16.5	21.0
DBSCAN		1.61	1.64	1.32	18.1	14.6	35.3	1.9	1.4	2.5	48.5	42.7	30.3	27.4	20.6	16.7
kNN		1.42	1.11	0.86	20.6	23.8	21.0	4.8	14.1	10.4	48.4	44.5	60.2	26.4	20.6	13.4
t-SNE		1.73	1.68	1.36	15.5	14.5	10.9	8.4	9.4	10.4	44.6	38.2	60.3	29.2	21.2	13.5
R. Forests		1.01	1.13	0.96	24.4	24.2	27.9	22.3	17.7	27.1	33.4	32.2	35.8	23.8	16.0	16.3
Adaboost		1.13	0.95	0.94	22.6	26.5	25.8	24.8	24.0	31.2	32.8	26.7	27.5	24.3	15.5	14.3

TABLE IV
PERFORMANCE NUMBERS FOR `MLPACK` IMPLEMENTATION.

Workloads	CPI			Retiring			Bad Spec.			DRAM Bound			Core Bound			
	Cores	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c	1c	4c	8c
GMM		0.62	0.56	0.68	50.8	34.5	31.6	2.9	2.7	1.1	12.4	23.8	29.1	14.9	20.4	19.8
KMeans		0.46	0.69	0.64	56.8	41.0	39.4	2.3	1.6	1.8	19.1	16.8	20.1	17.6	14.8	17.0
DBSCAN		0.78	0.98	1.32	28.1	25.8	22.9	13.5	4.5	3.6	48.4	47.5	35.2	34.3	11.5	16.4
kNN		0.82	0.82	0.779	28.1	36.7	34.7	10.6	5.6	14.6	48.6	33.8	34.2	35.4	13.9	13.7
R. Forests		1.25	1.2	0.94	20.2	28.6	30.9	28.4	17.3	16.1	34.7	53.8	38.8	25.8	14.6	13.5
Adaboost		0.81	0.68	0.64	34.6	36.8	38.8	17.6	10.9	11.3	32.4	36.2	22.5	23.2	20.3	19.2




Fig. 11. Geometric partition of data samples. In this example, $M = 2$

in some cases, $A[B[C[i]]]$ to be the main reason behind the bottleneck. It appears that the library implementations use such memory access patterns to prune computations. For example, in workloads like KNN and DBSCAN, the neighbourhood information is stored in a tree-based structure (K-D Tree [Ben75] in `scikit-learn` and Binary Space Tree [Tót05] in `mlpack`). These tree structures store the indices of the dataset rows of the samples lying in a certain geometric partition (in the M -dimensional space, where M is the number of features) as shown in Figure 11. Such an arrangement helps to avoid unnecessary neighbour searches, as the points lying in a specific partition are more likely to be the neighbours.

For tree-based workloads, we also noticed the use of irregular memory accesses of the form $A[B[i]]$. In these workloads, however, the index array $B[i]$ is used to group samples into different nodes of the decision tree. We now set out to study the impact of two well-known optimizations, viz., prefetching and memory access ordering on the performance of traditional ML applications.

V. IMPACTS OF PREFETCHING

Prefetching reduces cache misses by fetching the expected data to the caches before the demand access happens. The accuracy, coverage and timeliness of the prefetched data is

important. Further, care should be taken not to prefetch the data too aggressively or it may lead to cache pollution.

A. Potential Benefits

First we measure the potential benefits of prefetching. For this, we measure the improvements in IPC with perfect LLC or perfect L2 cache. We use the Sniper simulator [CHE11] for this purpose. The configuration of the simulated system is shown in Table V.

TABLE V
SIMULATOR CONFIGURATION

Parameters	Values
Cacheline Size	64B
L1D/I Cache	32KB/32KB (8-way)
L2 Cache	256KB (8-way)
L3 Cache	8MB (16-way)
Cache replacement	LRU
DRAM	32 GB, 8 Chips per DIMM, 4 DIMMs

The results of our simulation study are shown in Figure 12. With perfect LLC, we notice an average improvement of 25.1%, 35.8% and 27.1% for matrix-based, neighbour-based and tree-based workloads respectively. With perfect L2 cache, we notice an improvement of 40.9%, 39.22% and 31.21% for matrix-based, neighbour-based and tree-based workloads.

B. Hardware-based prefetching

We measure the effectiveness of the default hardware in reducing the memory access bottleneck. The fraction of useless hardware prefetches issued is shown in Figure 13.

A major part (nearly 42%) of the hardware prefetches issued are useless for the neighbour-based and tree-based workloads. This is due to the irregular nature of the memory access requests. It may be noted that the performance characterization




Fig. 12. IPC improvements in case of perfect L2 and LLC for each workload.




Fig. 13. Fraction of useless hardware prefetches for each workload.

study reported in Section III did include the benefits of hardware prefetchers, as they are, by default, enabled.

C. Software-based prefetching

The memory bandwidth utilization for the Matrix-based workloads already show a very high memory bandwidth utilization. Software-based prefetching in those workloads would only increase the traffic, possibly leading to congestion. We therefore limit our study of software-based prefetching to neighbour-based and tree-based workloads.

To measure the impacts of the software-based prefetching, we modified the *neighbors* and *tree* modules of the *scikit-learn* library. For this, we used the `_mm_prefetch` intrinsic instruction [Int21]. These modules are written as Cython [Beh+11] files which first get transformed to a C-language file before finally getting compiled. We manually inserted the intrinsics in the generated intermediate C-language file. In some cases, we also had to unroll a couple of loop iterations to expose opportunities for a timely data prefetch. We targeted the L2 cache as the destination of prefetched data since our study in Section V-A shows a perfect L2 cache as more promising than the perfect LLC.

D. Results

We measured the impacts of the software-based prefetching on L2 cache miss rate, DRAM bound, Bad-Speculation bound, port utilization distribution and the resulting performance




Fig. 14. L2 cache miss ratio before and after prefetching




Fig. 15. Percentage of DRAM bound stalls before and after prefetching

speedup. Figures 14 and 15 show the reduced L2 cache miss rate and DRAM bound. Other than KMeans and SVM, the L2 cache miss rate is reduced by 10% to 35%. The DRAM bound stall cycles is reduced by 5% to 26% across different workloads.

Interestingly, bad-speculation bound is also reduced by 8-10% in tree-based workloads as shown in Figure 16. This could be due to reduced times for branch resolution in cases where the branch result depends on a memory-resident operand.

Figure 17 shows an increase of 12.8% (on average) in the fraction of 2+ uops executed each cycle; this is a further evidence that stalls due to dependency on memory-resident operands is reduced by software prefetching. Finally, we show the speedup achieved by including the software prefetch intrinsics in Figure 18. Except in SVM-RBF and KMeans, a speedup of 5% to 27% is observed across workloads.

VI. IMPACTS OF DATA LAYOUT AND COMPUTATION RE-ORDERING

Figures 7 and 9 in Section III show a high percentage of DRAM bound stall cycles but with roughly 40% memory




Fig. 16. Bad-speculation bound stalls before and after prefetching




Fig. 17. Port utilized distribution before (blue) and after (green) prefetching




Fig. 18. Speedup after prefetching

bandwidth utilization for the neighbour-based and tree-based workloads. Given the irregular nature of memory accesses in the neighbour and tree based workloads and the large dataset size, successive memory accesses are more likely to result in poor spatial locality in both cache hierarchy and memory (DRAM).

As shown in Figure 19, neighbour and tree based methods work on the geometric representation of data samples. Each row in the dataset can be visualized as a point in the M-dimensional space where M is the number of features. However, the datasets store the samples as an array of N elements, with the order of samples having no relevance to the proximity in the M-dimensional space. Thus when points which are nearby in the M-dimensional space are accessed in that order, they could be far apart in the dataset rows resulting in poor spatial locality. Further, these accesses are characterized by indirect indexing (e.g., $A[B[i]]$) and hence cause irregular access pattern.

Several research works [HT06], [Die+17], [EKL19], [KZA16], [Kis+17], [Din+14], [Cha+20] have been proposed for improving the performance of irregular workloads. However, most of them deal only with cache optimizations and focus on scientific and other applications. To the best of our knowledge we did not find any study in the context of machine learning applications and memory (DRAM) performance.

A. Potential Improvements

We start with measuring the possible improvements in case of an ideal row-buffer hit ratio. We used the Ramulator [KYM16] DRAM simulator for this purpose. The simulator




Fig. 19. Working of neighbour and tree based workloads

TABLE VI
RAMULATOR CONFIGURATION

Parameters	Values
DRAM Standard	DDR4
Size	4GBx8
Channels	1
Ranks	1
Banks	16 per chip
Rows	32K per bank
Scheduling algorithm	FRFCFS-Cap [MM07]
Address scheme	RoBaRaCoCh

configuration is shown in Table VI. We experimented with two different address mapping schemes: Row-Bank-Rank-Column-Channel and Channel-Rank-Bank-Row-Column, but present results for the former due to space constraints. The memory trace was collected using the Linux perf mem tool. For our task, we considered only those requests which reach the DRAM (i.e those that are not satisfied by L1/L2/L3 caches). In our study the final memory trace consisted of around 148 million to 2 billion memory accesses.

Columns 2 and 3 in Table VII report, respectively, the row buffer hit ratio and the average memory access latency experienced by different applications. We observe that certain workloads (such as KNN, t-SNE, and DBSCAN) experience a very poor row-buffer hit ratio (less than 0.25), while others have only a moderate hit ratio. The table also presents (column 4) the average access latency for an ideal row-buffer hit ratio. The simulation results show a likely improvement of 11.84% to 25.46% across the workloads. This motivates us to explore different data-layout and computation re-ordering methods that help improve the row-buffer locality.

B. Reordering Algorithms

In this work, we evaluate five well-known data-layout reordering and computation reordering algorithms, viz., First Touch Reordering [DK99], Recursive Co-ordinate Bisection (RCB)[BB87], reordering based on Space Filling Curves [MWK99] (Hilbert curve [Sag12] and Z-order curve [Sag12]) and Locality based blocking and Z-order based computation reordering [HT06].

TABLE VII
ORIGINAL AND IDEAL HIT-RATE AVERAGE ACCESS LATENCIES FOR ALL THE WORKLOADS.

Benchmark	Original Hit-Ratio	Original Avg. latency	Avg. latency (Ideal Hit-Ratio)	Improvement (% Memory cycles)
Adaboost	0.64	82.37	72.61	11.84
DBSCAN	0.21	91.58	69.73	23.85
Decision Tree	0.36	83.06	68.14	17.96
GMM	0.47	80.69	69.72	13.59
KMeans	0.48	81.58	70.71	13.33
KNN	0.13	92.13	68.67	25.46
Random Forests	0.34	83.04	70.37	15.25
t-SNE	0.18	93.85	69.78	25.64

TABLE VIII
REORDERING ALGORITHMS

Category	Algorithms	Implementation
First-touch & RCB data-layout reordering	First-touch	Runtime
	RCB	Offline
SFC data-layout reordering	Hilbert and Z-order	Offline
Computation reordering	Locality based blocking	Runtime
	Z-order comp. reordering	Runtime

C. Implementation Details

The First-touch reordering is based on the inspector-executor model. The inspector inspects the order of data accesses in first iterations. The dataset is then rearranged accordingly. Execution in the subsequent stages proceed in the normal way.

The Recursive Co-ordinate Bisection, Hilbert curve and Z-order curve reordering algorithms are based on the geometric representation of the data. Each dataset row is considered as a point in the M dimensional space where M is the number of features. The dataset is thus, a collection of N sample points in the M dimensional space. The data set reordering rearranges the elements such that adjacent points in the SFCs occupy adjacent rows if the feature matrix. The reordered dataset is then provided as the input to the workloads. Other the data ordering part, the approach requires no change in the implementation libraries is required.

The objective of the Locality based reordering] is to improve the row-buffer reuse using blocking or tiling. Since the workloads cannot know the virtual address to physical address a priori, we limit exploiting row-buffer locality within an OS page. Typically the OS page size is 0.5x or 2x of the row-buffer size. Thus any row-buffer locality exposed within a OS page is likely to be utilized well in the DRAM page (or row-buffer). Thus we reorder the memory accesses to ensure that addresses within a virtual page are accessed together.

The Z-order based computation reordering is implemented using the algorithm described in [HT06]. The First-touch




Fig. 20. Row-buffer hit ratios for all the workloads. The subscript (c) represents computation reordering.




Fig. 21. Average access latency for all the workloads. The subscript (c) represents computation reordering.

reordering, Locality based blocking and Z-order computation reordering require modifications to the library. We implement these algorithms as modifications to the `scikit-learn` library.

D. Results

In this section, we present the impacts of the reordering algorithms. We determine, using the Ramulator simulator, the improvements in row-buffer hit ratio and average access latency for our workloads. The results are shown in Figures 20 and 21, respectively.

All reordering methods improves the hit ratio: for some applications the improvement is as high as 3x (e.g., First-touch in DBSCAN) or 4X (Z-order(c) reordering on kNN). Even in applications where the baseline experiences a good row buffer hit ratio (e.g., Adaboost), reordering approaches give 15% – 20% improvement in hit ratio. These improvements in row-buffer hit ratio also result in a reduction in the average latency by 4.4% – 25.14% across different workloads. Only in GMM, the average latency increases with some of the reordering methods.

Significant reductions in bad-speculation stalls for tree-based workloads are observed with maximum reductions for the space filling curves (8 to 12%). As before, we attribute this to early branch resolution. The results are shown in Figure 22.




Fig. 22. Bad-Speculation bound for all workloads after applying the reordering algorithms.




Fig. 23. Speedup after applying various reordering algorithms across all the workloads for 15M rows dataset. No overhead cost considered.

Next, we measured the speedups for each reordering method on actual-runs with 15 million rows dataset. We noticed a consistent speedup of ranging from 4% to 60% across the workloads, when the reordering overheads are not included (refer to Figure 23). When the reordering overheads are accounted, many of the reordering methods have a positive impact on the performance as shown in Figure 24, with speedup improvement up to 35%. Certain reordering methods (such as Hilbert Curve in Adaboost or DBSCAN) incur huge overheads, effectively resulting in a slowdown.

Overall, we observed that the computation reordering algorithms provide relatively better performance improvements for neighbour-based workloads and data-layout reordering algorithms work better for the tree-based workloads, with Random Forest and Adaboost showing best performance improvements after SFC-based data-layout reordering.




Fig. 24. Speedup after applying various reordering algorithms across all the workloads for 15M rows dataset. Overhead costs of reordering considered.

TABLE IX
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT REORDERING ALGORITHMS

Category	Algorithm	Neighbour-based workloads	Tree-based workloads
First-touch & RCB data re-ordering	First-Touch	Small overheads, medium gains	Small overheads, small gains
	RCB	Small overheads, medium gains	Small overheads, small gains
SFC data re-ordering	Hilbert	Large overheads, high gains	Large overheads, large gains
	Z-Order	Medium overheads, large gains	Same as above
Computation reordering	Locality-based Blocking	Medium overheads, medium gains	Medium overheads, small gains
	Z-Order (Index-based)	Small overheads, medium gains	Not applicable

E. Comparison of different Reordering algorithms

In this section, we present a qualitative comparison (refer to Table IX) of different reordering methods in term of the overhead incurred and the performance gains achieved for different set of workloads.

Specifically, Hilbert curve and Z-order reordering methods have the largest overheads, and advocate the use of these methods only in cases where the reordered dataset will be used multiple times, for example ensemble based workloads such as Adaboost and Random Forests. Inspector-executor model based First-Touch reordering has the lowest overheads and can be used in other scenarios. Further computation re-ordering methods provide the best improvements for the neighbour-based workloads in our experiments.

As such, we advise using computation reordering algorithms for neighbour-based workloads and data-layout reordering for tree-based workloads.

VII. RELATED WORK

Prior to the modern day data-science, a number of earlier studies have dealt with data-mining and data-analytics workloads. Both data-science and data-mining fields are related, however, data-mining algorithms mostly deal with finding useful patterns and association rules in a given dataset. A couple of traditional machine learning algorithms studied in our work can also be considered as data-mining workloads. As such, several studies performing data-mining performance characterization such as [Ozi+06], [Liu+], [Gho+05], [BF98] and [Mek+10] among others have a few of the traditional machine learning algorithms as a part of their benchmark suite.

Ozisyilmaz et al. [Ozi+06], Liu et al. [Liu+], Ghoting et al. [Gho+05] and Mekkat et al. [Mek+10] performed architectural characterization of data mining applications. Ozisyilmaz et al. [Ozi+06] also proposed a new data mining benchmark suite called MineBench. As a part of their work, they measured

execution times, cache miss ratios, branch performance, parallelization overheads and speedup with increasing number of threads. Mekkat et al. [Mek+10] find the workloads to be memory intensive with little to no temporal locality. In [Liu+], the authors claim that prefetching can help, but neither propose any specific approach nor report any potential benefits of prefetching. The impact of compiler inserted prefetch instructions on a set of data-mining workloads is reported in [Gho+05]. However, the compiler-inserted prefetch instructions increase the overall running time in all the machine learning methods in their workload. The dataset size in all these studies is quite small, ranging from 30MB to 65MB.

Xie et al. [Xie+16] and Jia et al. [Jia+17] among others have focused on the system behaviour in context of big-data analytics workloads. They perform a top-down analysis to measure various performance metrics including cache misses, branch mispredictions, Front-end, back-end bound stalls, CPI and speedup. [Xie+16] focus mainly on the extent and impacts of vectorization on Intel Xeon Phi machine. [Jia+17] on the other hand find correlations between CPI and other bound stall values. They claim the software stack to be the problem for larger CPI and stall values. We find that KMeans, SVM and PCA appear as a part of their benchmark suite.

Studies in [Awa+15] and [Awa+16] perform top-down analysis using Intel VTune for architectural characterization. [Awa+15] focuses only on measuring stall values corresponding to different bottlenecks (bounds) whereas [Awa+16] measures the impact of the NUMA nodes and next-line hardware prefetchers on execution times. Dimitrov et al. [Dim+13] on the other hand analyze the spatial and temporal reference patterns in physical memory traces at DIMM level. They also study the impacts of caching, prediction and prefetching on these workloads. However, none of our workloads are present in their benchmark suite.

There have been significant research works also on developing parallel and distributed frameworks for machine learning workloads. Meng et al. [Men+16] propose a distributed ML library based on spark. Ye et al. [Ye+12] proposed a similar library based on Hadoop virtual cluster. Low et al. [Low+14] propose a framework based on MapReduce to parallelize common patterns in ML algorithms. Finally, several studies target a reformulation of the algorithms themselves to make them parallel and distributed. Such studies include [SF12], [CLQ11], [You+14] for SVM, [Pat+12], [CGL10], [SL18], [WGS20] for DBSCAN and [Gen+17], [Wan+13], [WS15] for Random Forests among many others.

In our work, we study a broad set of workloads spanning across classification, regression, clustering and dimensionality-reduction with much larger datasets, which seems to be missing from the earlier studies. Our set of workloads represents the true state of modern day data-science applications. We expect our study to be useful to other research works focused on developing faster versions of these workloads.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we carried out a general performance char-

acterization study on a set of traditional machine learning workloads in the context of larger datasets. We found memory access to be a common bottleneck. Tree based workloads also suffer from large bad-speculation stalls. We then evaluated the benefits of two well-known optimizations — prefetching and data-layout and computation reordering — on the given workloads. We demonstrate significant improvements due these optimizations. Our performance characterization study was done on low-end server systems with up to 8-cores. We anticipate the performance characteristics and bottlenecks will continue to hold even in large scale systems, when problem sizes are scaled proportionately. The optimizations applied to address the bottlenecks are independent of the number of processor cores. Hence should work well across multiple cores and high-end servers as well.

REFERENCES

- [Awa+15] Ahsan Javed Awan, Mats Brorsson, Vladimir Vlassov, and Eduard Ayguade. “Performance Characterization of In-Memory Data Analytics on a Modern Cloud Server”. In: *2015 IEEE Fifth International Conference on Big Data and Cloud Computing*. 2015, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/BDCLOUD.2015.37.
- [Awa+16] Ahsan Javed Awan, Vladimir Vlassov, Mats Brorsson, and Eduard Ayguade. “Node Architecture Implications for In-Memory Data Analytics on Scale-in Clusters”. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Big Data Computing, Applications and Technologies*. BDCAT ’16. Shanghai, China: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 237–246. ISBN: 9781450346177. DOI: 10.1145/3006299.3006319. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3006299.3006319>.
- [BB87] Berger and Bokhari. “A Partitioning Strategy for Nonuniform Problems on Multiprocessors”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computers* C-36.5 (1987), pp. 570–580. DOI: 10.1109/TC.1987.1676942.
- [Beh+11] Stefan Behnel, Robert Bradshaw, Craig Citro, Lisandro Dalcin, Dag Sverre Seljebotn, and Kurt Smith. “Cython: The best of both worlds”. In: *Computing in Science & Engineering* 13.2 (2011), pp. 31–39.
- [Ben75] Jon Louis Bentley. “Multidimensional Binary Search Trees Used for Associative Searching”. In: *Commun. ACM* 18.9 (Sept. 1975), pp. 509–517. ISSN: 0001-0782. DOI: 10.1145/361002.361007. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/361002.361007>.
- [BF98] J.P. Bradford and J. Fortes. “Performance and memory-access characterization of data mining applications”. In: *Workload Characterization: Methodology and Case Studies. Based on the First Workshop on Workload Characterization*. 1998, pp. 49–59. DOI: 10.1109/WWC.1998.809358.

- [Bla+01] L. S. Blackford, J. Demmel, J. Dongarra, I. Duff, S. Hammarling, G. Henry, M. Heroux, L. Kaufman, A. Lumsdaine, A. Petitet, R. Pozo, K. Remington, and R. C. Whaley. “An Updated Set of Basic Linear Algebra Subprograms (BLAS)”. In: *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 28 (2001), pp. 135–151.
- [BNJ03] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. “Latent Dirichlet Allocation”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3.null (Mar. 2003), pp. 993–1022. ISSN: 1532-4435.
- [Bre01] Leo Breiman. “Random Forests”. English. In: *Machine Learning* 45.1 (2001), pp. 5–32. ISSN: 0885-6125. DOI: 10.1023/A:1010933404324. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A%3A1010933404324>.
- [CGL10] Min Chen, Xuedong Gao, and HuiFei Li. “Parallel DBSCAN with priority r-tree”. In: *2010 2nd IEEE International Conference on Information Management and Engineering*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 508–511.
- [Cha+20] Nagadastagiri Challapalle, Sahithi Rampalli, Linghao Song, Nandhini Chandramoorthy, Karthik Swaminathan, John Sampson, Yiran Chen, and Vijaykrishnan Narayanan. “GaaS-X: Graph Analytics Accelerator Supporting Sparse Data Representation using Crossbar Architectures”. In: *2020 ACM/IEEE 47th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 2020, pp. 433–445. DOI: 10.1109/ISCA45697.2020.00044.
- [CHE11] Trevor E. Carlson, Wim Heirman, and Lieven Eeckhout. “Sniper: Exploring the Level of Abstraction for Scalable and Accurate Parallel Multi-Core Simulation”. In: *Proceedings of 2011 International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. SC ’11. Seattle, Washington: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011. ISBN: 9781450307710. DOI: 10.1145/2063384.2063454. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2063384.2063454>.
- [CLQ11] Godwin Caruana, Maozhen Li, and Man Qi. “A MapReduce based parallel SVM for large scale spam filtering”. In: *2011 eighth international conference on fuzzy systems and knowledge discovery (fskd)*. Vol. 4. IEEE, 2011, pp. 2659–2662.
- [CM02] Sebastian Celis and David R. Musicant. *Weka-Parallel: Machine Learning in Parallel*. Tech. rep. Carleton College, CS TR, 2002.
- [Cur+18] Ryan R. Curtin, Marcus Edel, Mikhail Lozhnikov, Yannis Mentekidis, Sumedh Ghaisas, and Shang-tong Zhang. “mlpack 3: a fast, flexible machine learning library”. In: *Journal of Open Source Software* 3 (26 2018), p. 726. DOI: 10.21105/joss.00726. URL: <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00726>.
- [Die+17] Matthias Diener, Eduardo H. M. Cruz, Marco A. Z. Alves, Edson Borin, and Philippe O. A. Navaux. “Optimizing Memory Affinity with a Hybrid Compiler/OS Approach”. In: *Proceedings of the Computing Frontiers Conference*. CF’17. Siena, Italy: Association for Computing Machinery, 2017, pp. 221–229. ISBN: 9781450344876. DOI: 10.1145/3075564.3075566. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3075564.3075566>.
- [Dim+13] Martin Dimitrov, Karthik Kumar, Patrick Lu, Vish Viswanathan, and Thomas Willhalm. “Memory system characterization of big data workloads”. In: *2013 IEEE International Conference on Big Data*. 2013, pp. 15–22. DOI: 10.1109/BigData.2013.6691693.
- [Din+14] Wei Ding, Mahmut Kandemir, Diana Guttman, Adwait Jog, Chita R. Das, and Praveen Yedlapalli. “Trading Cache Hit Rate for Memory Performance”. In: *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation*. PACT ’14. Edmonton, AB, Canada: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, pp. 357–368. ISBN: 9781450328098. DOI: 10.1145/2628071.2628082. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2628071.2628082>.
- [DK99] Chen Ding and Ken Kennedy. “Improving Cache Performance in Dynamic Applications through Data and Computation Reorganization at Run Time”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 1999 Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. PLDI ’99. Atlanta, Georgia, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1999, pp. 229–241. ISBN: 1581130945. DOI: 10.1145/301618.301670. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/301618.301670>.
- [EKL19] Jeongyoon Eo, Kang-Wook Kim, and Chang-Gun Lee. “Memory Access Pattern-Aware DRAM Controller Design for Mixed-Criticality Systems”. In: *Cyber Physical Systems. Design, Modeling, and Evaluation*. Ed. by Roger Chamberlain, Walid Taha, and Martin Törngren. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 27–42. ISBN: 978-3-030-17910-6.
- [Est+96] Martin Ester, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Jörg Sander, and Xiaowei Xu. “A Density-Based Algorithm for Discovering Clusters in Large Spatial Databases with Noise”. In: *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. KDD’96. Portland, Oregon: AAAI Press, 1996, pp. 226–231.
- [FH89] Evelyn Fix and J. L. Hodges. “Discriminatory Analysis. Nonparametric Discrimination: Consistency Properties”. In: *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique* 57.3 (1989), pp. 238–247. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1403797>.

- [FS99] Yoav Freund and Robert E. Schapire. “A Short Introduction to Boosting”. In: *In Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1999, pp. 1401–1406.
- [Gen+17] Robin Genuer, Jean-Michel Poggi, Christine Tuleau-Malot, and Nathalie Villa-Vialaneix. “Random forests for big data”. In: *Big Data Research* 9 (2017), pp. 28–46.
- [Gho+05] Amol Ghoting, Gregory Buehrer, Srinivasan Parthasarathy, Daehyun Kim, Anthony Nguyen, Yen-Kuang Chen, and Pradeep Dubey. “A Characterization of Data Mining Algorithms on a Modern Processor”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Data Management on New Hardware*. DaMoN ’05. Baltimore, Maryland: Association for Computing Machinery, 2005, 1–es. ISBN: 9781450378031. DOI: 10.1145/1114252.1114258. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1114252.1114258>.
- [Hea+98] M.A. Hearst, S.T. Dumais, E. Osuna, J. Platt, and B. Scholkopf. “Support vector machines”. In: *IEEE Intelligent Systems and their Applications* 13.4 (1998), pp. 18–28. DOI: 10.1109/5254.708428.
- [HK00] Arthur E. Hoerl and Robert W. Kennard. “Ridge Regression: Biased Estimation for Nonorthogonal Problems”. In: *Technometrics* 42.1 (2000), pp. 80–86. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1271436>.
- [HT06] Hwansoo Han and Chau-Wen Tseng. “Exploiting locality for irregular scientific codes”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 17.7 (2006), pp. 606–618. DOI: 10.1109/TPDS.2006.88.
- [Int21] Intel. *Intel Intrinsic Guide*. 2021. URL: https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/docs/intrinsics-guide/index.html#text=_mm_prefetch&ig_expand=5404%7D.
- [Jia+17] Zhen Jia, Jianfeng Zhan, Lei Wang, Chunjie Luo, Wanling Gao, Yi Jin, Rui Han, and Lixin Zhang. “Understanding Big Data Analytics Workloads on Modern Processors”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 28.6 (2017), pp. 1797–1810. DOI: 10.1109/TPDS.2016.2625244.
- [Kis+17] Orhan Kislal, Jagadish Kotra, Xulong Tang, Mahmut Taylan Kandemir, and Myoungsoo Jung. “POSTER: Location-Aware Computation Mapping for Manycore Processors”. In: *2017 26th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*. 2017, pp. 138–139. DOI: 10.1109/PACT.2017.20.
- [KYM16] Yoongu Kim, Weikun Yang, and Onur Mutlu. “Ramulator: A Fast and Extensible DRAM Simulator”. In: *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters* 15.1 (2016), pp. 45–49. DOI: 10.1109/LCA.2015.2414456.
- [KZA16] Vladimir Kiriansky, Yunming Zhang, and Saman Amarasinghe. “Optimizing Indirect Memory References with Milk”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation*. PACT ’16. Haifa, Israel: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, pp. 299–312. ISBN: 9781450341219. DOI: 10.1145/2967938.2967948. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2967938.2967948>.
- [Liu+] Ying Liu, Jayaprakash Pisharath, Wei-keng Liao, Gokhan Memik, Alok Choudhary, and Pradeep Dubey. *PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF SCALABLE DATA MINING ALGORITHMS*.
- [Llo82] Stuart P. Lloyd. “Least squares quantization in pcm”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 28 (1982), pp. 129–137.
- [Low+14] Yucheng Low, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Aapo Kyrola, Danny Bickson, Carlos E. Guestrin, and Joseph Hellerstein. *GraphLab: A New Framework For Parallel Machine Learning*. 2014. arXiv: 1408.2041 [cs.LG].
- [Mek+10] Vineeth Mekkat, Ragavendra Natarajan, Wei-Chung Hsu, and Antonia Zhai. “Performance Characterization of Data Mining Benchmarks”. In: *Proceedings of the 2010 Workshop on Interaction between Compilers and Computer Architecture*. INTERACT-14. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Association for Computing Machinery, 2010. ISBN: 9781605589213. DOI: 10.1145/1739025.1739040. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1739025.1739040>.
- [Men+16] Xiangrui Meng, Joseph Bradley, Burak Yavuz, Evan Sparks, Shivaram Venkataraman, Davies Liu, Jeremy Freeman, DB Tsai, Manish Amde, Sean Owen, Doris Xin, Reynold Xin, Michael J. Franklin, Reza Zadeh, Matei Zaharia, and Ameet Talwalkar. “MLlib: Machine Learning in Apache Spark”. In: *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 17.1 (Jan. 2016), pp. 1235–1241. ISSN: 1532-4435.
- [MH08] Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. “Visualizing Data using t-SNE”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 9.86 (2008), pp. 2579–2605. URL: <http://jmlr.org/papers/v9/vandermaaten08a.html>.
- [MM07] Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda. “Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling for Chip Multiprocessors”. In: *40th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO 2007)*. 2007, pp. 146–160. DOI: 10.1109/MICRO.2007.21.
- [Mol19] Christoph Molnar. *Interpretable Machine Learning. A Guide for Making Black Box Models Explainable*. 2019.

- [MWK99] John Mellor-Crummey, David Whalley, and Ken Kennedy. “Improving Memory Hierarchy Performance for Irregular Applications”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Supercomputing*. ICS ’99. Rhodes, Greece: Association for Computing Machinery, 1999, pp. 425–433. ISBN: 158113164X. DOI: 10.1145/305138.305228. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/305138.305228>.
- [Ozi+06] Berkin Ozisikyilmaz, Ramanathan Narayanan, Joseph Zambreno, Gokhan Memik, and Alok Choudhary. “An Architectural Characterization Study of Data Mining and Bioinformatics Workloads”. In: *2006 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization*. 2006, pp. 61–70. DOI: 10.1109/IISWC.2006.302730.
- [Pat+12] Md Mostofa Ali Patwary, Diana Palsetia, Ankit Agrawal, Wei-keng Liao, Fredrik Manne, and Alok Choudhary. “A new scalable parallel DBSCAN algorithm using the disjoint-set data structure”. In: *SC’12: Proceedings of the International Conference on High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE. 2012, pp. 1–11.
- [Pea01] Karl Pearson. *LIII. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space*. Nov. 1901. DOI: 10.1080/14786440109462720. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786440109462720>.
- [Ped+11] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. “Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), pp. 2825–2830.
- [Psa+19] Fotis Psallidas, Yiwen Zhu, Bojan Karlas, Matteo Interlandi, Avriila Floratou, Konstantinos Karanasos, Wentao Wu, Ce Zhang, Subru Krishnan, Carlo Curino, and Markus Weimer. “Data Science through the looking glass and what we found there”. In: *CoRR* abs/1912.09536 (2019). arXiv: 1912.09536. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.09536>.
- [Qui86] J. Ross Quinlan. “Induction of decision trees”. In: *Machine Learning* 1 (1986), pp. 81–106.
- [Sag12] Hans Sagan. *Space-filling curves*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [SF12] Zhanquan Sun and Geoffrey Fox. “Study on parallel SVM based on MapReduce”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Processing Techniques and Applications (PDPTA)*. Citeseer. 2012, p. 1.
- [SL18] Hwanjun Song and Jae-Gil Lee. “RP-DBSCAN: A superfast parallel DBSCAN algorithm based on random partitioning”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2018, pp. 1173–1187.
- [SM92] James C. Spall and John L. Maryak. “A Feasible Bayesian Estimator of Quantiles for Projectile Accuracy From Non-iid Data”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87.419 (1992), pp. 676–681. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2290205>.
- [SSR18] Mohit Sewak, Sanjay K. Sahay, and Hemant Rathore. “Comparison of Deep Learning and the Classical Machine Learning Algorithm for the Malware Detection”. In: *2018 19th IEEE/ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking and Parallel/Distributed Computing (SNPD)*. 2018, pp. 293–296. DOI: 10.1109/SNPD.2018.8441123.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani. “Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 58.1 (1996), pp. 267–288. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346178>.
- [Tót05] Csaba D. Tóth. *Binary Space Partitions: Recent Developments*. 2005.
- [Vtu17] Intel Vtune. *Fix Performance Bottlenecks with Intel® VTune™ Profiler*. 2017.
- [Wan+13] Yue Wang, Wilson Goh, Limsoon Wong, and Giovanni Montana. “Random forests on Hadoop for genome-wide association studies of multivariate neuroimaging phenotypes”. In: *BMC bioinformatics* 14.16 (2013), pp. 1–15.
- [WGS20] Yiqiu Wang, Yan Gu, and Julian Shun. “Theoretically-efficient and practical parallel DBSCAN”. In: *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. 2020, pp. 2555–2571.
- [WS15] Dewen Wang and Zhiwei Sun. “Big data analysis and parallel load forecasting of electric power user side”. In: *Proceedings of the CSEE* 35.3 (2015), pp. 527–537.
- [Xie+16] Biwei Xie, Xu Liu, Sally A. McKee, Jianfeng Zhan, Zhen Jia, Lei Wang, and Lixin Zhang. “Understanding Data Analytics Workloads on Intel(R) Xeon Phi(R)”. In: *2016 IEEE 18th International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications; IEEE 14th International Conference on Smart City; IEEE 2nd International Conference on Data Science and Systems (HPCC/SmartCity/DSS)*. 2016, pp. 206–215. DOI: 10.1109/HPCC-SmartCity-DSS.2016.0039.
- [Ye+12] Kejiang Ye, Xiaohong Jiang, Yanzhang He, Xiang Li, Haiming Yan, and Peng Huang. “vHadoop: A Scalable Hadoop Virtual Cluster Platform for MapReduce-Based Parallel Machine Learning with Performance Consideration”. In: *2012 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing*

Workshops. 2012, pp. 152–160. DOI: 10.1109/ClusterW.2012.32.

- [You+14] Zhu-Hong You, Jian-Zhong Yu, Lin Zhu, Shuai Li, and Zhen-Kun Wen. “A MapReduce based parallel SVM for large-scale predicting protein–protein interactions”. In: *Neurocomputing* 145 (2014), pp. 37–43.