

Liberal throughput estimates: to prove GPU isn't worthwhile for FP64 linalg						Lower bound, e-FP64 cycles	Complex cycles	Scheduler* cycle	ILP=4 Cycles	ILP=1 Cycles	
						e11m48 + e11m48	24 + 8+4	16+2	36	36	
	FADD	FMUL	FFMA	FRECIP	FRSQRT	e11m48 x e11m48	40 + 8+4	16+2	52	52	
Single Precision (e8m24) GIPS						e11m48 x e11m48 + e11m48	52 + 12+4	24+2	68	68	
M1 1-CPU	51.65	51.65	51.65	12.91	12.91	e8m48 + e8m48		11	11	22	
M1 8-CPU	388.61	388.61	388.61	97.15	97.15	e8m48 x e8m48		8	8	16	
M1 4-AMX*	0.00	0.00	826.37	0.00	0.00	e8m48 x e8m48 + e8m48		19	19	38	
M1 8-AMX*	0.00	0.00	1652.74	0.00	0.00	*Assuming e11m48 exponent processing takes 8 ops/input (one complex), 2 ops/output (one complex)					
M1 32-GPU	5308.42	5308.42	5308.42	884.74	663.55						
i9-13900K 24-CPU	1792.00	1792.00	1792.00	179.20	179.20	double = e8m48					
RTX 4090 128-GPU	41287.68	41287.68	41287.68	5160.96	5160.96	single + double -> double		10			
CPU/core/GHz	16.00	16.00	16.00	4.00	4.00	single x double -> double		6			
AMX/core/GHz	0.00	0.00	64.00	0.00	0.00	double x double -> single		6			
M1/core/GHz	128.00	128.00	128.00	21.33	16.00	single x single -> double		2			
RTX/core/GHz	128.00	128.00	128.00	16.00	16.00	double + double -> single		9			
1-CPU, 4-AMX, 8-AMX assumed 3.228 GHz. 8-CPU assumed 3.036 GHz						divide(e8m48)	6	70	70	140	
**Assuming all P/E-cores reach turbo boost, 2x AVX-256 per cycle						recip(e8m48)*	6	56	56	112	
						sqrt(e8m48)**	8	50	50	100	
Single-Double (e8m48) GIPS						*Assuming 2 iterations of Newton-Raphson, but probably 3 IRL					
M1 32-GPU	482.73	663.55	279.52	94.97	106.17	**Assuming e-SQRT and e-RSQRT operations have same throughput					
RTX 4090 128-GPU	3548.16	4193.28	1922.46	-	-						
M1/core/GHz	11.64	16.00	6.74	2.29	2.56	double = e11m48					
RTX/core/GHz	11.00	13.00	5.96	-	-	e11m48 + e8m24	20 + 8	16	16	32	
						e11m48 x e8m24	28 + 8	16	16	32	
Double Precision (e11m48) GIPS						divide(e11m48)*	6 + 24 + 8	70 + 6 + 16	92	162	
M1 1-CPU	25.82	25.82	25.82	6.46	6.46	recip(e11m48)*	6 + 16 + 4	56 + 4 + 8	68	124	
M1 8-CPU	194.30	194.30	194.30	48.58	48.58	sqrt(e11m48)*	8 + 16 + 4	50 + 4 + 8	62	112	
M1 4-AMX	0.00	0.00	206.59	0.00	0.00	*Too costly for e11m48 ADD, but here we can separate the exponent above 2^2^8, convert to e8m48, and combine later.					
M1 8-AMX	0.00	0.00	413.18	0.00	0.00	e11 ADD via e8	24 + 8+4	11 + 6 + 16+2	36	47	
M1 32-GPU	147.64	147.64	100.36	77.97	85.43	e11 MUL via e8	24 + 8+4	8 + 6 + 16+2	36	41	
i9-13900K 24-CPU	896.00	896.00	896.00	56.00	56.00	e11 FMA via v8	32 + 16+4	19 + 8 + 24+2	53	73	
RTX 4090 128-GPU	645.12	645.12	645.12	161.28	161.28						
CPU/core/GHz	8.00	8.00	8.00	2.00	2.00						
AMX/core/GHz	0.00	0.00	16.00	0.00	0.00	Sources					
M1/core/GHz	3.56	3.56	2.42	1.88	2.06	https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.22360/SpringSim.2016.HPC.032					
RTX/core/GHz	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.50	0.50	https://stackoverflow.com/questions/4125033/floating-point-division-vs-floating-point-multiplication					
						https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/51150/exact-computational-costs-flop-count-for-algorithms					
						https://github.com/danielchalef/openblas-benchmark-m1					
						https://github.com/danielchalef/openblas-benchmark-m1/blob/main/dgemm/results/VECLIB/dgemm.veclib.100.txt					
Operation	FADD	FMUL	FFMA	FRECIP	FRSQRT						
CADD	2	0	0	0	0						
CMUL	0	2	2	2	0						
CFMA	0	0	4	0	0						
CRECIP	0	3	1	1	0	SGEMM GFLOP/s actual					
CDIV	0	5	3	1	0	Time	OpenBLAS 1C	OpenBLAS 8C	Accelerate 1C	Accelerate 2C	Accelerate 8C
						n=32					GPU e8m24
Linalg operation, num ops						n=64					
DGEMV	0	0	n^2	0	0	n=96					
DGEMM	0	0	n^3	0	0	n=128					
DPOTRF	0	0	(1/6)n^3	(1/2)n^2	n	n=160					

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]