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## Max Range for an Undersea Glider




## Optimization Parameters \& Evaluating Cost/Constraint Functions

- State variables $V, \gamma, x, z$
- Control variable $C_{L}$
- Parameters $z_{i} \sim C_{L}\left(t_{i}\right)$
- Objective/Contraint $\Longrightarrow$ solve I-V-P



## Code Fragment

\%
[UB, LB, ZO, OPTIONS] = initial_post(DATA); \%
OPTIONS = optimset(OPTIONS, 'LargeScale', 'off',
'Algorithm','active-set', 'UseParallel','always');
end
hndl_obj = @(z) obj2_post(z, DATA);
hndl_con = @(z) con_post(z, DATA);
\%

```
save_time = zeros( 2, 6);
matlabpool open 4
save_time( 1, : ) = clock;
    [Z_star, Val, Exitflag, Output ] = ...
        fmincon(hndl_obj, ZO, [],[],[],[], LB, UB,
                                    hndl_con, OPTIONS);
    save_time( 2, : ) = clock;
    execute=(save_time(2,4:6-save_time(1,4:6))*[3600;60;1];
    disp(['execute = ' num2str(execute)])
    matlabpool close

\section*{Timing Results: Intel Nehalem}

\begin{tabular}{|r|c|c|c|c|}
\hline n_labs & \begin{tabular}{c} 
time \((\mathrm{s})\) \\
8 vars
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
time \((\mathrm{s})\) \\
16 vars
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
time \((\mathrm{s})\) \\
32 vars
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
time \((\mathrm{s})\) \\
64 vars
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 0 & 60 & 123.6 & 246 & 695 \\
4 & 29.7 & 70.9 & 118 & 254 \\
8 & 26.7 & 61.4 & 92 & 173 \\
16 & na & 57 & 82 & 131 \\
31 & na & na & 82 & 115 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Discussion}

A modest number of processors provide some speed-up, but the improvement falls off quickly with the number of processors. This is in large part due to the algorithm. We are using parallel processing only in the calculation of finite-difference estimates for Jacobians. The optimization algorithm requires additional function evaluations as part of its step-size selection strategy. In the problem with 32 variables on 16 processors the code ran a total of 21 iterations using 846 function evaluations. 672 evaluations were for finite-difference estimates, and the remaining 174 were run in the step-size selection procedure (on a single processor). For each gradient calculation, each worker would ideally perform 2 function evaluations for a total of 42 function cycles. Add to this the 174 function cycles required in the step-size selection procedure for a total of 216 function cycles - the ideal speed-up would be \(\frac{846}{216} \approx 3.9\). The achieved speed up was \(\frac{266}{82}=3\).```

