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I. Goals of This Lecture

• Beyond static compilation
• Example of a complete system
• Use of data flow techniques in a new context
• Experimental approach
Static/Dynamic, HL/binary

- Compiler: high-level $\rightarrow$ binary, static
- Interpreter: high-level, emulate, dynamic
- Dynamic compilation: high-level $\rightarrow$ binary, dynamic
  - machine-independent, dynamic loading
  - cross-module optimization
  - Specialize program using runtime information (without profiling)
- Binary translator: mostly dynamic
  - Run “as-is”
  - Software migration (x86 $\rightarrow$ alpha, sun, transmeta; 68000 $\rightarrow$ powerPC $\rightarrow$ x86)
  - Virtualization (make hardware virtualizable)
  - Dynamic optimization (Dynamo Rio)
  - Security (execute out of code in a cache that is “protected”)

Closed-world vs. Open-world

- Closed-world assumption (most static compilers)
  - All code is available a priori for analysis and compilation.
- Open-world assumption (most dynamic compilers)
  - Code is not available; arbitrary code can be loaded at run time.
- Open-world assumption precludes many optimization opportunities.
  - Solution: Optimistically assume the best case, but provide a way out if necessary.
II. Overview in Dynamic Compilation

- Interpretation/Compilation policy decisions
  - Choosing what and how to compile
- Collecting runtime information
  - Instrumentation
  - Sampling
- Exploiting runtime information
  - frequently-executed code paths

Speculative Inlining

- Virtual call sites are deadly.
  - Kill optimization opportunities
  - Virtual dispatch is expensive on modern CPUs
  - Very common in object-oriented code
- Speculatively inline the most likely call target based on class hierarchy or profile information.
  - Many virtual call sites have only one target, so this technique is very effective in practice.
III. Compilation Policy

- \( \Delta T_{\text{total}} = T_{\text{compile}} - (n_{\text{executions}} \times T_{\text{improvement}}) \)
  - If \( \Delta T_{\text{total}} \) is negative, our compilation policy decision was effective.
- We can try to:
  - Reduce \( T_{\text{compile}} \) (faster compile times)
  - Increase \( T_{\text{improvement}} \) (generate better code)
  - Focus on large \( n_{\text{executions}} \) (compile hot spots)
- 80/20 rule: Pareto Principle
  - 20% of the work for 80% of the advantage

Latency vs. Throughput

- Tradeoff: startup speed vs. execution performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Startup speed</th>
<th>Execution performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Quick’ compiler</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimizing compiler</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreter + Compiler Approach

- Interpreter plus optimizing compiler
  - Interpret methods by default.
  - When execution count hits some threshold, dynamically compile the method.
- Problems:
  - Interpreter is 10x to 100x slower than compiled code.
  - How to transition long-running methods?

Compile-Only Approach

- Simple compiler plus optimizing compiler (Jalapeño, JUDO, Microsoft)
  - Initially compile each method using a simple compiler.
  - Recompile frequently-executed methods with optimizing compiler.
- Problems:
  - Code from simple compiler is still too slow. (30% to 100% slower than optimizing)
  - Memory footprint problems.
Multi-Stage Dynamic Compilation System

Stage 1: interpreted code
when execution count = t1 (e.g. 2000)

Stage 2: compiled code
when execution count = t2 (e.g. 25000)

Stage 3: fully optimized code
Execution count is the sum of method invocations & back edges executed.

Granularity of Compilation

- Compilation takes time proportional to the amount of code being compiled.
- Many optimizations are not linear.
- Methods can be large, especially after inlining.
- Cutting inlining too much hurts performance considerably.
- Even “hot” methods typically contain some code that is rarely or never executed.
Example: SpecJVM db

```java
void read_db(String fn) {
    int n = 0, act = 0; byte buffer[] = null;
    try {
        FileInputStream sif = new FileInputStream(fn);
        buffer = new byte[n];
        while ((b = sif.read(buffer, act, n-act))>0) {
            act = act + b;
        }
        sif.close();
        if (act != n) {
            /* lots of error handling code, rare */
        }
    } catch (IOException ioe) {
        /* lots of error handling code, rare */
    }
}
```

Lots of rare code!
Hot “regions”, not methods

- Compile only the most frequently executed segments within a method.
  1. Collect basic block level profile data for hot methods.
  2. Recompile using profile data, replacing rare code entry points with branches into the interpreter.
- Beneficial secondary effect of improving optimization opportunities on the common paths.

Method-at-a-time Strategy

% of basic blocks

execution threshold
Identifying Rare Code

- Simple technique: any basic block executed during Stage 2 is said to be hot.
- Effectively ignores initialization.
- Add instrumentation to the targets of conditional forward branches.
- Enable/disable profiling is implicitly handled by stage transitions.
Dynamic Code Transformations

• Compiling partial methods
• Partial dead code elimination
• Escape analysis

IV. Partial Method Compilation

1. Based on profile data, determine the set of rare blocks.
   – Use code coverage information from the first compiled version
Partial Method Compilation

2. Perform live variable analysis.
   - Determine the set of live variables at rare block entry points.

```
live: x, y, z
```

Partial Method Compilation

3. Redirect the control flow edges that targeted rare blocks, and remove the rare blocks.

```
to interpreter...
```
Partial Method Compilation

4. Perform compilation normally.
   - Analyses treat the interpreter transfer point as an unanalyzable method call.

Partial Method Compilation

5. Record a map for each interpreter transfer point.
   - In code generation, generate a map that specifies the location, in registers or memory, of each of the live variables.
   - Maps are typically < 100 bytes

\[ \text{live: } x, y, z \]

\[ \begin{align*}
  x &: sp - 4 \\
  y &: R1 \\
  z &: sp - 8 
\end{align*} \]
V. Partial Dead Code Elimination

- Move computation that is only live on a rare path into the rare block, saving computation in the common case.

Partial Dead Code Example

```plaintext
x = 0;
if (rare branch 1) {
    ...
    z = x + y;
    ...
}
if (rare branch 2) {
    ...
    a = x + z;
    ...
}
```
VI. Escape Analysis

- Escape analysis finds objects that do not escape a method or a thread.
  - “Captured” by method: can be allocated on the stack or in registers.
  - “Captured” by thread: can avoid synchronization operations.
- All Java objects are normally heap allocated, so this is a big win.

Escape Analysis

- Stack allocate objects that don’t escape in the common blocks.
- Eliminate synchronization on objects that don’t escape the common blocks.
- If a branch to a rare block is taken:
  - Copy stack_allocated objects to the heap and update pointers.
  - Reapply eliminated synchronizations.
Copying from Stack to Heap

VII. Run Time Improvement

First bar: original (Whole method opt)
Second bar: Partial Method Comp (PMC)
Third bar: PMC + opts
Bottom bar: fully optimized
## Summary

- **Dynamic compilation**
  - Runs as is: No accessibility to source program statically
  - Compilation time counted in the program performance
  - Use run-time information

- **Multi-stage Compilation**
  - Pareto Principle: compile where it makes a difference.

- **Partial method compilation:** reduce compile time by reducing granularity of compilation.
  - Partial dead code elimination
  - Escape analysis