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Initial design of ParaSCIP

Two Layered Load Balancing

Goal: run with 10,000 cores
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Solving hc9p

Table 1: Statistics for solving hc9p on supercomputers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Time (sec.)</th>
<th>Idle (%)</th>
<th>Trans.</th>
<th>Primal bound (Upper bound)</th>
<th>Dual bound (Lower bound)</th>
<th>Gap (%)</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Open nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ISM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>604,796</td>
<td>&lt; 0.3</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>29,879,3721</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(317)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,058,9366</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>110,012,624</td>
<td>1,257,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ISM</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>604,794</td>
<td>&lt; 1.5</td>
<td>979,695</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,058,7930</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,102,7556</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3,758,532,600</td>
<td>723,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HLRN III</td>
<td>24,576</td>
<td>86,336</td>
<td>&lt; 1.7</td>
<td>8,811,512</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,102,6645</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,116,3592</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2,402,406,311</td>
<td>575,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HLRN III</td>
<td>12,288</td>
<td>43,199</td>
<td>&lt; 1.5</td>
<td>1,709,027</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,115,3331</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,120,4801</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>664,909,985</td>
<td>602,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HLRN III</td>
<td>12,288</td>
<td>118,259</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9,158,920</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,120,4801</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>30,242,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,677,724,126</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supercomputers used:

- **ISM**: HPE SGI 8600 with 384 compute nodes, each node has two Intel Xeon Gold 6154 3.0GHz CPUs(18 cores×2) sharing 384GB of memory, and an Infiniband (Enhanced Hypercube) interconnect

- **HLRN III**: Cray XC40 with 1872 compute nodes, each node with two 12-core Intel Xeon Ivy-Bridge/Haswell CPUs sharing 64 GiB of RAM, and with an Aries interconnect
How open nodes and active solvers evolved (hc9p)

Figure 1: Evolution of computation for solving hc9p by using 12,288 cores (Run 5)
Solving $h_{11p}$

### Table 2: Statistics for solving $h_{11p}$ on supercomputers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Time (sec.)</th>
<th>Idle (%)</th>
<th>Trans.</th>
<th>Primal bound (Upper bound)</th>
<th>Dual bound (Lower bound)</th>
<th>Gap (%)</th>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Open nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>ISM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>604,799 (2,558)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>119,492.0000</td>
<td>117,388.8528</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119,297.0000</td>
<td>117,496.5470</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>4,314,198</td>
<td>1,109,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>HLRN III</td>
<td>12,288</td>
<td>43,149 (7,164)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
<td>31,304</td>
<td>119,297.0000</td>
<td>117,388.7971</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119,297.0000</td>
<td>117,426.2226</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>28,491,470</td>
<td>5,433,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HLRN III</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>86,354</td>
<td>&lt; 4.9</td>
<td>86,152</td>
<td>119,297.0000</td>
<td>117,426.2226</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supercomputers used:

- **ISM**: HPE SGI 8600 with 384 compute nodes, each node has two Intel Xeon Gold 6154 3.0GHz CPUs (18 cores × 2) sharing 384GB of memory, and an Infiniband (Enhanced Hypercube) interconnect

- **HLRN III**: Cray XC40 with 1872 compute nodes, each node with two 12-core Intel Xeon Ivy- Bridge/Haswell CPUs sharing 64 GiB of RAM, and with an Aries interconnect
How open nodes and active solvers evolved (hc11p)

Figure 2: Evolution of computation for solving hc11p by using 43,000 cores (Run 2)
Runtime behavior: timtab2 – 240 cores
Runtime behavior: timtab2 – 4096 cores
Runtime behavior: timtab2 – 10000 cores

---

![Graph showing runtime behavior](image-url)

**Objective Function Value**

- Incumbents
- Optimal
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**Computing Time (sec.)**

**Number of Nodes**

**Number of Active Solvers + 1**
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16.01.2019 First international UG workshop 2019, Berlin, Germany
Algorithmic improvements
Runtime behavior: timtab2 (improved) – 4096 cores
Runtime behavior: timtab2 (improved) – 10000 cores
Runtime behavior: timtab2 (improved2) – 10000 cores

Graphs showing objective function value and computing time over time, along with measures of the number of nodes and active solvers.
Improvements of transfer methods (with racing ramp-ups)
Runtime behavior: timtab2 (racing) – 4096 cores
Runtime behavior: timtab2 (racing) – 10000 cores
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Solving open instances from MIPLIB2003

6 instances have not been solved 7 Years

- **ds** – 656 constraints, 67,732 binary variables
- **stp3d** – 159,488 constraints, 204,880 binary variables

After applying SCIP presolving 9 times:
88,388 constraints, 123,637 binary variables

**ds, stp3d** were solved by ParaSCIP

Last instances solved. Four instances are still open.
Solving open instances from MIPLIB2003

ds, stp3d were solved by ParaSCIP

Last instances solved. Four instances are still open.

ds: Set partitioning problem originating from public transport service planning.

This instance was solved by a first implementation of ParaSCIP using up to 2048 cores of HLRN-II(http://www.hlrn.de). ParaSCIP, mainly developed by Yuji Shinano, is an extension of SCIP and realizes a parallelization on a distributed memory computing environment. For being able to interrupt and warmstart the computations, ParaSCIP has a checkpoint mechanism. Therefore, selected subproblems are stored as warm start information, which allows to virtually run ParaSCIP, although the HLRN-II environment imposes a time limit of 48 hours per run. It took approximately 86 hours to solve this instance.
Solving open instances from MIPLIB2003

ds, stp3d were solved by ParaSCIP.

Last instances solved. Four instances are still open.

stp3d: 3D Steiner Tree packing problem (VLSI routing problem in a multi-layer grid graph)

This instance was solved by a first implementation of ParaSCIP using up to 2048 cores of HLRN-II (http://www.hlrn.de). ParaSCIP, mainly developed by Yuji Shinano, is an extension of SCIP and realizes a parallelization on a distributed memory computing environment. For being able to interrupt and warmstart the computations, ParaSCIP has a checkpoint mechanism. Therefore, selected subproblems are stored as warm start information, which allows to virtually run ParaSCIP, although the HLRN-II environment imposes a time limit of 48 hours per run. The problem was presolved several times with SCIP presolving techniques. After that, it took approximately 114 hours to solve this instance.
Restarted runs vs. single run

➤ Which run was efficient from a view point of solving ds?

- restarted runs: [STAGE 1(old)]
  - approximated comp. time: 86 [h]
  - real resource requested time: 96 [h]
  - cumulative time: 181,248 [h]

➤ single run: [STAGE 2(new)]
  - comp. time: 76[h]
  - cumulative time: 4096 x 76 = 311,296 [h]

HLRN II supercomputer (SGI Altix ICE 8200EX)
maximum cores for a job: 4096

Answer is “restarted runs”
FiberSCIP and its paper

- Preliminary results were presented in MIPLIB2010 paper (Started working in 2010)
- Computational results had been checked two years
  - 87 instances of many different settings with five repeated runs
  - All numbers in the supplement were checked carefully
- Submitted the paper in 2013
- Publish the paper in 2018
What does scale up do for a hard instance? (dano3mip)

on HLRN III
by using 17,088 cores
starting from 33,332
branch-and-bound nodes

on Titan
by using 35,200 cores
starting from 33,481
branch-and-bound nodes

Large scale can break down problem into solvable sub-MIPs
The biggest and the longest computation

Solving rmine10: 48 restarted runs with 6,144 to 80,000 cores

Titan with 80,000 cores
The others: HLRN III

It took about 75 days and 5,660 years of CPU core hours!

UG can handle up to 80,000 MPI process
ParaXpress: Need to corporate with Xpress developers

Original \[
\min \{c^T x : Ax \leq b, l \leq x \leq u, \text{for all } x_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n, j \in I\}
\]

\[
\min \{c'^T x' : A'x' \leq b', l' \leq x' \leq u', \text{for all } x'_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{n'}, j \in I'\}
\]

LoadCoordinator

waiting: \((l'_i, u'_i)\)

running: \(\)  

Base solver I/O, presolve

First: restricted presolved instance

Current: presolved instance

Presolve again with added bound changes

\[
\min \{c''^T x'' : A''x'' \leq b'', l'' \leq x'' \leq u'', \text{for all } x''_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{n''}, j \in I''\}
\]

Solver 1

Solver 2

Solver 3

Solver 4

Solver n

All transfer data need to be converted back for the presolved instance

All feasible solutions need to be converted back for the original instance
FiberXpress: UG Solver threads with Xpress threads

UG 4 Xpress 4

LoadCoordinator thread

Xpress thread

Xpress thread

Xpress thread

Xpress thread

UG Solver thread

UG Solver thread

UG Solver thread

UG Solver thread

Internal Parallelization Of Xpress


CPU core
ParaXpress: UG Solver processes with Xpress threads

ug[Xpress,MPI] : ParaXpress

- A powerful massively parallel MIP solver
  - Can handle, hopefully efficiently, up to 80,000 (MPI processes) x 24 (threads) = 1,920,000 (cores)
Computational results of FiberXpress

- **Xpress 8.3** and UG-0.8.4 – dev.
- 28 core Intel Xeon CPU E5-2690 v4 CPUs at 2.6 GHz with 35MB cache and 128GB memory
- 52 instances from Tree test set from MIPLIB2010 (6 instances were solved at root by Xpress 16)
- Geometric mean (Time out is counted as 7200 sec.)

Price of externalization is dramatically decreased

Racing settings:
- 25 parameter settings + random seed

- Xpress 16

**Computing Time (sec.)**

- Time limit 7200 sec

**# of solved instances**
Computational results of ParaXpress

- Solving timtab2 from MIPLIB2003
- The experimental implementation
  - Xpress 7.9 and UG-0.8.2
  - HLRN III: Cray XC30 with 24 core Intel E5-2695 v2 CPUs at 2.4GHz, 64GB Memory per computing node
  
- New implementation
  - Xpress 8.3 and UG-0.8.4 – dev.
  - ISM Supercomputer System "I": SGI ICE X with 12 cores Intel Xeon E5-2697v2 at 2.7GHz (2CPUs), 128GB memory per computing node
  
192 cores are used
Solving open instances from MIPLIB2010

http://miplib2010.zib.de

MIPLIB2010 was published

HLRN II -> HLRN III
7,000 cores -> 43,000 cores

New ParaXpress started

Not UG (commercial solvers and SCIP)  UG
Solving open instances from MIPLIB2017

Open instances which could not be generated any feasible solution for all solvers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Solver</th>
<th>#Cores</th>
<th>Time to first sol. (sec.)</th>
<th>Value of first sol.</th>
<th>Time to solve (sec.)</th>
<th>Optimal value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fhnw-sq2</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,883</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neos-4409277-trave</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>181,150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>441,575</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supportcase3</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woodlands09</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>218,528</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>245,205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neos-3214367-sovi</td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40,188</td>
<td>180,025</td>
<td>604,810(cont.)</td>
<td>178,326.9644(LB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>179,985(UB)</td>
<td>604,793(cont.)</td>
<td>178,236.7278(LB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>179,985(UB)</td>
<td>604,788(cont.)</td>
<td>179,186.6611(LB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>179,965(UB)</td>
<td>11,016</td>
<td>179,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neos-3211096-shag</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,484</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>370,983</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neos-3631363-vilnia</td>
<td>ParaSCIP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,632</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ParaXpress</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,335</td>
<td>Infeasible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISM (Institute of Statistical Mathematics) supercomputer, which is a HPE SGI 8600 with 384 compute nodes, each node has two Intel Xeon Gold 6154 3.0GHz CPUs (18 cores × 2) sharing 384GB of memory, by using ParaSCIP and ParaXpress
ParaXpress (= ug[Xpress, MPI]) status

- ParaXpress can be upgraded new version of Xpress without UG code change
- ParaXpress is ready to run on over a million CPU cores!
  - We need an application in which the optimal solution is very important in the research field
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A new feature of SCIP (Added by Stephen J. Maher)

Features

- very fast standalone solver for linear programming (LP), mixed integer programming (MIP), and mixed integer nonlinear programming (MINLP)
- framework for branching, cutting plane separation, propagation, pricing, and Benders' decomposition.
- large C-API, C++ wrapper classes for user plugins

Parallelization of Benders’ decomposition

- Benders’ decomposition is easily parallelisable – however, not embarrassingly parallel
- There are lots of bottlenecks – long running master or subproblems
- Parallelization of Benders’ decomposition can better employ available computational resources
- For stochastic programs, will help increase the scale of scenarios that can be handled and lead to improved solution quality
A new feature of SCIP (Added by Stephen J. Maher)

Three methods of parallelization

1. Tree search parallelization
   - Using the UG Framework – extended to transfer Benders’ cuts between solvers
2. Subproblem parallelization
   - OpenMP used for shared memory parallelization of subproblem solving
3. Hybrid tree search and subproblem parallelization
   - Distributed memory tree search parallelization with shared memory subproblem parallelization
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Overview

Developed by Keiji Kimura

Problems

- AIC-based variable selection
  in linear regression and logistic regression
  \[\implies\text{mixed integer nonlinear programming problems (MINLP)}\]

Algorithm proposed in [1, 2]

- Branch-and-bound (B&B) algorithm using \texttt{SCIP} and \texttt{UG}
- Developed additional plugins:
  - \textbf{Relaxation handler} (to compute lower bounds efficiently)
  - \textbf{Primal heuristics} (to find good solutions early)
  - \textbf{Branching rules} (to reduce branch-and-bound nodes)

---


Variable Selection
- provides a simple statistical model
- finds a subset of relevant variables
- improves prediction performance

Direct Objective Optimization in Variable Selection
- \( f \): the goodness-of-fit (how well a model fits a given dataset)
- \( \lambda \sum z_j (\lambda > 0) \): a penalty for the number of variables

- The problems in [1, 2]
  are of the following form

\[
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\beta, z} & \quad f(\beta) + \lambda \sum_{j \in J} z_j \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad z_j = 0 \Rightarrow \beta_j = 0 \quad \forall j \in J, \\
& \quad \beta_j \in \mathbb{R}, z_j \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall j \in J.
\end{aligned}
\]

Numerical Experiments in [2]

**Problem**: AIC-based variable selection in logistic regression

**Comparison of Approaches**:
- Customized B&B algorithm [2]
  - using SCIP and UG
- Piecewise linear approximation approach [Sato, et al., 2016]
  - using CPLEX to solve MILP problems
  - employing existing heuristics for initial solutions

**Benchmark datasets**: UCI machine learning repository
(https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/)

---

## Numerical Experiments in [2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(16 threads)</th>
<th>Approach 1</th>
<th>Approach 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>AIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bumps</td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1097.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breast-P</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>147.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biodeg</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>653.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stat-G</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>958.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madelon</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2502.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Approach 1**: Customized B&B algorithm [2] (**SCIP** and **UG**)
- **Approach 2**: Piecewise linear approximation approach (**CPLEX**)
- **n**: the number of observations
- **p**: the number of candidates for variables

---
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Instantiated parallel solvers by UG

The following solvers have developed by Yuji Shinano cooperated with each solver developers

- **Single thread base solver**
  - ParaSCIP: ug[SCIP, MPI], FiberSCIP: ug[SCIP, Pthreads/C++11]

- **Multi-threaded base solver**

- **Concorde: TSP solver**
  - ug[Concorde, MPI], ug[Concorde, Pthreads/C++11]
  - ug[Concorde/MPI, MPI]
    - **Concorde/MPI** has developed by Utz-Uwe Haus
Instantiated parallel solvers by UG

The following solvers have developed by each base solver developers.

Skelton code was distributed. Design and coding together with Yuji Shinano about one week in the beginning

- Multi-threaded base solver
  - ParaNUOPT: ug[NUOPT, MPI], FiberNUOPT: ug[NUOPT, Pthreads/C++11]
    - Only tested with single thread NUOPT
- Distributed base solver
  - ug[PIPS-SBB, MPI]
    - PIPS-SBB: a distributed memory solver for Stochastic MIP
## Skelton code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C++ File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommCommPointHdlr.cpp</code></td>
<td>CommPoint is a callback of solver to communicate with LoadCoordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommMpi.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommMpi.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommPointHdlr.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommTh.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaCommTh.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDef.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDeterministicTimer.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDiffSubproblem.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDiffSubproblem.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDiffSubproblemMpi.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDiffSubproblemMpi.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaDiffSubproblemTh.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaInitiator.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParainitiator.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaInstanceMpi.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaInstanceMpi.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaInstanceTh.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaInstanceTh.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolution.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolution.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolutionMpi.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolutionMpi.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolutionTh.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolutionTh.h</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>baseSolverParaSolver.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>fbaseSolver.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>parabaseSolver.cpp</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rename:** baseSolver->your_solver_name, Fill codes for all virtual functions

**baseSolverParaCommPointHdlr.cpp:** CommPoint is a callback of solver to communicate with LoadCoordinator
Built parallel solvers with ug[SCIP,*] libraries

The following solvers have developed by each SCIP plugins developers.

Debugged with Yuji Shinano

- ug[SCIP-Jack,*]
  - Parallel solvers for solving Steiner Tree Problems
- ug[SCIP-SDP,*]
  - Parallel solvers for solving Mixed Integer Semidefinite Programs
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Plan for UG 1.0

- If you have your own state-of-the-art solver, please try to parallelize it with UG
- If you have SCIP application, please try to parallelize it with ug[SCIP,*] libraries

We hope to have feedbacks from user side

- Second UG workshop will be held in two years, since “Sustainable Infrastructures for Archiving and Publishing High-Performance Optimization Software” is three years project
  - Right after the workshop, UG 1.0 would be released
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Concluding remarks

- A research platform for parallel branch-and-bound
  - Users can run all parallel solvers by themselves for fair direct comparison
    - source codes are publically available
    - test data are publically available