Performance Realities

- ***There's more to performance than asymptotic complexity***

- **Constant factors matter too!**
  - Easily see 10:1 performance range depending on how code is written
  - Must optimize at multiple levels:
    - algorithm, data representations, procedures, and loops
- **Must understand system to optimize performance**
  - How programs are compiled and executed
  - How to measure program performance and identify bottlenecks
  - How to improve performance without destroying code modularity and generality

Optimizing Compilers

- **Provide efficient mapping of program to machine**
  - register allocation
  - code selection and ordering (scheduling)
  - dead code elimination
  - eliminating minor inefficiencies
- **Don't (usually) improve asymptotic efficiency**
  - up to programmer to select best overall algorithm
  - big-O savings are (often) more important than constant factors
    - but constant factors also matter
- **Have difficulty overcoming "optimization blockers"**
  - potential memory aliasing
  - potential procedure side-effects

Limitations of Optimizing Compilers

- **Operate under fundamental constraint**
  - Must not cause any change in program behavior
  - Often prevents it from making optimizations when would only affect behavior under pathological conditions.
- **Behavior that may be obvious to the programmer can be obfuscated by languages and coding styles**
  - e.g., Data ranges may be more limited than variable types suggest
- **Most analysis is performed only within procedures**
  - Whole-program analysis is too expensive in most cases
- **Most analysis is based only on *static* information**
  - Compiler has difficulty anticipating run-time inputs

- **When in doubt, the compiler must be conservative**

Generally Useful Optimizations

- **Optimizations that you or the compiler should do regardless of processor / compiler**

- **Code Motion**
  - Reduce frequency with which computation performed
    - If it will always produce same result
    - Especially moving code out of loop

```
void set_row(double *a, double *b,
   long i, long n)
{
    long j;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        a[n*i+j] = b[j];
}
```

→

```
    long j;
    int ni = n*i;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        a[ni+j] = b[j];
```

Compiler-Generated Code Motion

```
void set_row(double *a, double *b,
   long i, long n)
{
    long j;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        a[n*i+j] = b[j];
}
```

```
    long j;
    long ni = n*i;
    double *rowp = a+ni;
    for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
        *rowp++ = b[j];
```

```
set_row:
        testq   %rcx, %rcx              # Test n
        jle     .L4                     # If 0, goto done
        movq    %rcx, %rax              # rax = n
        imulq   %rdx, %rax              # rax *= i
        leaq    (%rdi,%rax,8), %rdx     # rowp = A + n*i*8
        movl    $0, %r8d                # j = 0
.L3:                                  # loop:
        movq    (%rsi,%r8,8), %rax      # t = b[j]
        movq    %rax, (%rdx)            # *rowp = t
        addq    $1, %r8                 # j++
        addq    $8, %rdx                # rowp++
        cmpq    %r8, %rcx               # Compare n:j
        jg      .L3                     # If >, goto loop
.L4:                                  # done:
        rep ; ret
```

Reduction in Strength

- Replace costly operation with simpler one
- Shift, add instead of multiply or divide

  `16*x  -->  x << 4`

  - Utility machine dependent
  - Depends on cost of multiply or divide instruction
    - On Intel Nehalem, integer multiply requires 3 CPU cycles
- Recognize sequence of products

```
for (i = 0; i < n; i++)
  for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
    a[n*i + j] = b[j];
```

→

```
int ni = 0;
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
  for (j = 0; j < n; j++)
    a[ni + j] = b[j];
  ni += n;
}
```

Share Common Subexpressions

- Reuse portions of expressions
- Compilers often not very sophisticated in exploiting arithmetic properties

```
/* Sum neighbors of i,j */
up =    val[(i-1)*n + j  ];
down =  val[(i+1)*n + j  ];
left =  val[i*n     + j-1];
right = val[i*n     + j+1];
sum = up + down + left + right;
```

```
long inj = i*n + j;
up =    val[inj - n];
down =  val[inj + n];
left =  val[inj - 1];
right = val[inj + 1];
sum = up + down + left + right;
```

3 multiplications: i*n, (i–1)*n, (i+1)*n

1 multiplication: i*n

```
leaq   1(%rsi), %rax  # i+1
leaq   -1(%rsi), %r8  # i-1
imulq  %rcx, %rsi     # i*n
imulq  %rcx, %rax     # (i+1)*n
imulq  %rcx, %r8      # (i-1)*n
addq   %rdx, %rsi     # i*n+j
addq   %rdx, %rax     # (i+1)*n+j
addq   %rdx, %r8      # (i-1)*n+j
```

```
imulq    %rcx, %rsi  # i*n
addq     %rdx, %rsi  # i*n+j
movq     %rsi, %rax  # i*n+j
subq     %rcx, %rax  # i*n+j-n
leaq     (%rsi,%rcx), %rcx # i*n+j+n
```

Optimization Blocker #1: Procedure Calls

- **Procedure to Convert String to Lower Case**

```
void lower(char *s)
{
  int i;
  for (i = 0; i < strlen(s); i++)
    if (s[i] >= 'A' && s[i] <= 'Z')
      s[i] -= ('A' - 'a');
}
```

Lower Case Conversion Performance

- Time quadruples when double string length
- Quadratic performance



Convert Loop To Goto Form

```
void lower(char *s)
{
   int i = 0;
   if (i >= strlen(s))
     goto done;
 loop:
   if (s[i] >= 'A' && s[i] <= 'Z')
       s[i] -= ('A' - 'a');
   i++;
   if (i < strlen(s))
     goto loop;
 done:
}
```

- `strlen` executed every iteration

Calling Strlen

```
/* My version of strlen */
size_t strlen(const char *s)
{
    size_t length = 0;
    while (*s != '\0') {
       s++;
       length++;
    }
    return length;
}
```

- **Strlen performance**
  - Only way to determine length of string is to scan its entire length, looking for null character.
- **Overall performance, string of length N**
  - N calls to strlen
  - Require times N, N-1, N-2, …, 1
  - Overall $O(N^2)$ performance

Improving Performance

```
void lower(char *s)
{
  int i;
  int len = strlen(s);
  for (i = 0; i < len; i++)
    if (s[i] >= 'A' && s[i] <= 'Z')
      s[i] -= ('A' - 'a');
}
```

- Move call to `strlen` outside of loop
- Since result does not change from one iteration to another
- Form of code motion

Lower Case Conversion Performance

- Time doubles when double string length
- Linear performance of lower2



Optimization Blocker: Procedure Calls

- ***Why couldn't compiler move*** `strlen` ***out of inner loop?***
  - Procedure may have side effects
    - Alters global state each time called
  - Function may not return same value for given arguments
    - Depends on other parts of global state
    - Procedure `lower` could interact with `strlen`
- **Warning:**
  - Compiler treats procedure call as a black box
  - Weak optimizations near them
- **Remedies:**
  - Use of `inline` functions
    - GCC does this with –O2
    - See web aside ASM:OPT
  - Do your own code motion

```
int select(int x, int y, int i) {
  int data[2] = { x, y };
  if (i >= 0 && i < 2)
    return data[i];
  else
    return 0;
}
```

```
int test_select() {
  return select(5, 6, 1);
}
```

Function test_select, optimized -O1

```
test_select:
  pushl %ebp
  movl  %esp, %ebp
  subl  $12,  %esp      Allocate 12 bytes on stack
  movl  $1,   8(%esp)   Set 1 as 3rd argument
  movl  $6,   4(%esp)   Set 6 as 2nd argument
  movl  $5,   (%esp)    Set 5 as 1st argument
  call  select          Call select(5,6,1)
  leave
  ret
```

```
int select(int x, int y, int i) {
  int data[2] = { x, y };
  if (i >= 0 && i < 2)
    return data[i];
  else
    return 0;
}
```

```
int test_select() {
  return select(5, 6, 1);
}
```

Function select, optimized -O3
x at %ebp+8, y at %ebp+12, i at %ebp+16

```
test_select:
  pushl %ebp
  movl  $6,   %eax     Set result = 6
  movl  %esp, %ebp
  popl  %ebp
  ret
```

Inlining

- **Good**
  - Can be much faster
- **Bad**
  - Harder to debug
  - Code size can increase
  - Hurts modularity