



Instagram Engineering
Jan 18, 2017 · 8 min read

Follow

Dismissing Python Garbage Collection at Instagram

By dismissing the Python garbage collection (GC) mechanism, which reclaims memory by collecting and freeing unused data, Instagram can run 10% more efficiently. Yes, you heard it right! By disabling GC, we can reduce the memory footprint and improve the CPU LLC cache hit ratio. If you're interested in knowing why, buckle up!

How We Run Our Web Server

Instagram's web server runs on Django in a multi-process mode with a master process that forks itself to create dozens of worker processes that take incoming user requests. For the application server, we use uWSGI with pre-fork mode to leverage memory sharing between master and worker processes.

In order to prevent the Django server from running into OOM, the uWSGI master process provides a mechanism to restart the worker processes when its RSS memory exceeds the predefined limits.

Understanding Memory

We started by looking into why worker RSS memory grows so fast right after it is spawned by the master process. One observation is that even though the RSS memory starts with 250MB, its shared memory drops very quickly—from 250MB to about 140MB within a few seconds (shared memory size can be read from `/proc/PID/smmaps`). The numbers here are uninteresting because they change all the time, but the scale of shared memory dropping is very interesting—about 1/3 of the total memory. Next we wanted to understand why this shared memory becomes private memory per process at the beginning of the worker spawning.

Our theory: Copy-on-Read

Linux kernel has a mechanism called Copy-on-Write (CoW) that serves as an optimization for forked processes. A child process starts by sharing every memory page with its parent. A page copied to the child's memory space only when the page is written to (for more details refer

to the wiki <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copy-on-write>).

But in Python land, because of reference counting, things get interesting. Every time we read a Python object, the interpreter will increase its refcount, which is essentially a write to its underlying data structure. This causes CoW. So with Python, we're doing Copy-on-Read (CoR)!

```
#define PyObject_HEAD          \
    _PyObject_HEAD_EXTRA      \
    Py_ssize_t ob_refcnt;      \
    struct _typeobject *ob_type;

...

typedef struct _object {
    PyObject_HEAD
} PyObject;
```

So the question is: are we copy-on-writing immutable objects such as the code objects? Given `PyCodeObject` is indeed a “sub-class” of `PyObject`, apparently yes. Our first thought was to disable the reference counting on `PyCodeObject`.

Attempt 1: Disable reference count on code objects

At Instagram, we do the simple thing first. Given that this was an experiment, we made some small but hacky changes to CPython interpreter, verified the reference count number didn't change on code object, and then shipped that CPython to one of our production servers.

The result was disappointing because there was no change on shared memory. When we tried to figure out why, we realized we couldn't find any reliable metrics to prove our hack worked, nor could we prove the connection between the shared memory and the copy of code objects. Apparently, something was missing here. Lesson learned: prove your theory before going for it.

Profiling page faults

After some googling on Copy-on-Write, we learned Copy-on-Write is associated with page faults in the system. Each CoW triggers a page

fault in the process. Perf tools that come with Linux allow recording hardware/software system events, including page faults, and can even provide stack trace when possible!

So we went to a prod server, restarted the server, waited for it to fork, got a worker process PID, and then ran the following command.

```
perf record -e page-faults -g -p <PID>
```

Then, we got an idea about when page faults happen in the process with stack trace.

Samples: 2K of event 'page-faults', Event count (approx.): 91453					
Overhead	Samples	Command	Shared Object	Symbol	
- 17.08%	198	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] collect.part.7	
- collect.part.7					
- _PyObject_GC_New					
+ 98.54% PyDict_New					
+ 1.46% list_iter					
+ 13.43%	356	uwsgi	_crypt.so	[.] crypto_script	
+ 11.99%	444	uwsgi	libc-2.20.so	[.] _int_malloc	
+ 7.11%	291	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyObject_Malloc	
+ 5.91%	218	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyObject_GenericGetAttr	
+ 4.68%	176	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyEval_EvalFrameEx	
+ 4.61%	167	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyFrame_New	
+ 2.37%	27	mc-eccc-pool	libc-2.20.so	[.] _int_malloc	
+ 2.29%	96	uwsgi	libc-2.20.so	[.] __memcpy_sse2_unaligned	
+ 2.25%	48	cfgator-sub	libc-2.20.so	[.] _int_malloc	

The results were different than our expectations. Rather than copying the code object, the top suspect is `collect`, which belongs to `gcmodule.c`, and is called when a garbage collection is triggered. After reading how GC works in CPython, we have the following theory:

CPython's GC is triggered deterministically based on the threshold. The default threshold is very low, so it kicks in at a very early stage. It maintains linked lists of generations of objects, and during GC, the linked lists are shuffled. Because the linked list structure lives with the object itself (just like `ob_refcount`), shuffling these objects in the linked lists will cause the pages to be CoWed, which is an unfortunate side effect.

```
/* GC information is stored BEFORE the object
structure. */
typedef union _gc_head {
    struct {
        union _gc_head *gc_next;
        union _gc_head *gc_prev;
        Py_ssize_t gc_refs;
    };
};
```

```
    } gc;  
    long double dummy; /* force worst-case alignment  
*/  
} PyGC_Head;
```

Attempt 2: Let's try disabling GC

Well, since GC is backstabbing us, let's disable it!

We added a `gc.disable()` call to our bootstrapping script. We restarted the server, but again, no luck! If we look at `perf` again, we'll see `gc.collect` is still called, and the memory is still copied. With some debugging with GDB, we found that apparently one of the third-party libraries we used (`msgpack`) calls `gc.enable()` to bring it back, so `gc.disable()` at bootstrapping was washed.

Patching `msgpack` is the last thing we would do because it leaves the door for other libraries to do the same thing in the future without us noticing. First, we need to prove disabling GC actually helps. The answer again lives in `gcmodule.c`. As an alternative to `gc.disable`, we did `gc.set_threshold(0)`, and this time, no libraries brought it back.

With that, we successfully raised the shared memory of each worker process from 140MB to 225MB, and the total memory usage on the host dropped by 8GB per machine. This saved 25% RAM for the whole Django fleet. With such big head room, we're capable of running a lot more processes or running with a much higher RSS memory threshold. In effect, this improves the throughput of Django tier by more than 10%.

Attempt 3: Completely shutdown GC takes churns

After we experimented with a bunch of settings, we decided to try it on a larger scale: a cluster. The feedback was pretty quick, and our continuous deployment broke because restarting our web server became much slower with GC disabled. Usually restarting takes less than 10 seconds, but with GC disabled, it sometimes took more than 60 seconds.

```
2016-05-02_21:46:05.57499 WSGI app 0 (mountpoint='')  
ready in 115 seconds on interpreter 0x92f480 pid:  
4024654 (default app)
```

It was very painful to re-produce this bug because it's not deterministic. After a lot of experiments, a real re-pro shows in atop. When this happened, the free memory on that host dropped to nearly zero and jumped back, forcing out all of the cached memory. Then came the moment where all the code/data needed to be read from disk (DSK 100%), and everything was slow.

This rung a bell that Python would do a final GC before the interpreter shut down, which would cause a huge jump in memory usage in a very short period of time. Again, I wanted to prove it first, then figure out how to deal with it properly. So, I commented out the call to `Py_Finalize` in uWSGI's python plugin, and the problem disappeared.

But apparently we couldn't just disable `Py_Finalize` as it was. We had a bunch of important cleanups using atexit hooks that relied on it. What we ended up doing is adding a runtime flag to CPython that would disable GC completely.

Finally, we got to roll it out to a larger scale. We tried our entire fleet after this, but the continuous deployment broke again. However, this time it only broke on machines with old CPU models (Sandybridge), and was even harder to re-pro. Lesson learned: always test the old clients/models because they're often the easiest ones to break.

Because our continuous deployment is a fairly fast procedure, to really catch what happened, I added a separate `atop` to our rollout command. We're able to catch a moment where cache memory goes really low, and all of uWSGI processes trigger a lot of MINFLT (minor page faults).

PRC	sys	41.17s	user	1m48s	#proc	451	#trun	22	#tslpi	395	#tslpu	3	#zombie	31	clones	190	#exit	77
CPU	sys	58%	user	850%	irq	28%	idle	1722%	wait	18%	steal	0%	guest	0%	curf	2.60GHz	curscal	100%
CPL	avg1	5.77	avg5	6.21	avg15	6.43			csw	704450			intr	672928		numcpu	32	
MEM	tot	15.5G	free	1.6G	cache	358.9M	buff	46.0M	slab	350.2M	shmem	85.1M	vmbal	0.0M	hptot	0.0M	hpuse	0.0M
SWP	tot	0.2M	free	0.0M											vmcom	66.8G	vmlln	7.8G
PAG	scan	435956	steal	433140	stall	4854									swin	0	swout	0
DSK		sda	busy	24%	read	279	write	150	KiB/r	71	KiB/w	8	MBr/s	3.92	MBr/s	0.24	avio	2.79 ms
NET	transport	tcp	109255	tcpo	135770	udpi	173	udpo	176	tcpao	899	tcppe	848		tcpr	0	udpi	0
NET	network	lpi	109444	lpo	134727	ipfrw	0	deliv	109444						icmpi	16	icppo	6
NET	lo	----	pcki	61062	pcko	61062	si	80 Mbps	so	80 Mbps	erri	0	erro	0	drpi	0	drpo	0
NET	eth0	----	pcki	52671	pcko	77363	si	39 Mbps	so	26 Mbps	erri	0	erro	0	drpi	0	drpo	0

PID	TID	MINFLT	MAJFLT	VSTEXT	VSLIBS	VDATA	VSTACK	VSIZE	RSIZE	PSIZE	VGROW	RGRW	SWAPSZ	RUID	EUID	MEM	CHD	1/2%
1355149	-	401	8	2748K	130.7M	4.4G	164K	5.1G	372.5M	OK	512K	-26.7M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1356405	-	13216	0	2748K	130.9M	4.2G	164K	4.8G	360.8M	OK	-0.2G	-36.3M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1358066	-	29566	0	2748K	130.7M	4.2G	164K	4.7G	357.7M	OK	-0.3G	-39.1M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1359057	-	22645	0	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	164K	4.7G	352.4M	OK	-0.1G	-41.5M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1359520	-	28992	0	2748K	130.7M	4.2G	164K	4.8G	352.0M	OK	-0.3G	-37.9M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1359057	-	22645	0	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	164K	4.7G	352.4M	OK	-0.1G	-41.5M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1359520	-	28992	0	2748K	130.7M	4.2G	164K	4.8G	352.0M	OK	-0.3G	-37.9M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1357586	-	30114	0	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	168K	4.6G	347.0M	OK	-0.2G	-41.0M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1362457	-	25190	0	2748K	130.7M	3.9G	164K	4.4G	346.6M	OK	-0.3G	-37.3M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1358067	-	27515	0	2748K	130.7M	3.9G	164K	4.5G	343.2M	OK	-0.3G	-39.4M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1358352	-	31036	0	2748K	130.7M	4.0G	168K	4.6G	342.5M	OK	-0.3G	-41.4M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1354801	-	23617	0	2748K	130.7M	4.0G	164K	4.6G	342.1M	OK	-0.3G	-42.4M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1363967	-	16144	0	2748K	130.7M	4.2G	168K	4.8G	340.8M	OK	-0.2G	-35.6M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1362194	-	13460	1	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	164K	4.6G	340.8M	OK	-0.2G	-37.7M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1366301	-	8848	0	2748K	130.7M	4.0G	164K	4.6G	332.4M	OK	77044K	-20.2M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1363964	-	20480	0	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	164K	4.7G	320.1M	OK	-0.3G	-33.0M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	
1365054	-	23372	0	2748K	130.7M	4.1G	164K	4.7G	309.9M	OK	-0.3G	-36.6M	OK	root	root	2%	uwsgi	

Again, by perf profiling, we saw `Py_Finalize` again. Upon shutdown, other than the final GC, Python did a bunch of cleanup operations, like destroying type objects and unloading modules. Again, this hurt shared memory.

Overhead	Samples	Command	Shared Object	Symbol
+ 14.12%	168	uwsgi	libc-2.20.so	[.] _int_free
+ 14.03%	227	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] insertdict
- 13.74%	151	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyType_Modified.part.29
-		PyType_Modified.part.29		
-		PyType_ClearCache		
-		Py_Finalize.part.3		
-		uwsgi_plugins_atexit		
-		0		
+ 2.18%		PyType_Modified.part.29		
- 11.65%	182	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyObject_GC_UnTrack
+ PyObject_GC_UnTrack				
+ 6.58%	87	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] dict_dealloc
- 6.04%	81	uwsgi	uwsgi	[.] PyObject_Free
- PyObject_Free				
- 93.29%		dict_dealloc		
- 93.45%		dict_dealloc		
- 98.36%		instance_dealloc		
-		dict_dealloc		
-		insertdict		
-		PyDict_SetItem		
-		_PyModule_Clear		
-		PyImport_Cleanup		
-		Py_Finalize.part.3		
-		uwsgi_plugins_atexit		
-		0		

Attempt 4: Final step for shutting down GC: No cleanup

Why do we need to clean up at all? The process is going to die, and we're going to get another replacement for it. What we really care about is our atexit hooks that do cleanup for our apps. As to Python's cleanup, we don't have to do it. This is what we ended up with in our bootstrapping script:

```
# gc.disable() doesn't work, because some random 3rd-  
party library will  
# enable it back implicitly.  
gc.set_threshold(0)  
# Suicide immediately after other atexit functions  
finishes.  
# CPython will do a bunch of cleanups in Py_Finalize  
which  
# will again cause Copy-on-Write, including a final GC  
atexit.register(os._exit, 0)
```

This is based on that fact atexit functions run in the reverse order of registry. The atexit function finishes the other cleanups, then calls `os._exit(0)` to exit the current process in the last step.

With this two-line change, we finally finished rolling it out to our entire fleet. After carefully adjusting the memory threshold, we got a 10% global capacity win!

Looking back

In reviewing this performance win, we had two questions:

First, without garbage collection, wasn't the Python memory going to blow up, as all memory allocation wouldn't be freed ever? (Remember, there is no real stack in Python memory because all objects are allocated on heap.)

Fortunately, this was not true. The primary mechanism in Python to free objects is still reference count. When an object is de-referenced (calling `Py_DECREF`), Python runtime always checks if its reference count drops to zero. In such cases, the deallocator of the objects will be called. The main purpose of garbage collection is to break the reference cycles where reference count does not work.

```
#define Py_DECREF(op)  
\  
    do {  
\  
        if ( _Py_DEC_REFTOTAL  _Py_REF_DEBUG_COMMA  
\  
            --((PyObject*)(op))->ob_refcnt != 0)  
\  
            _Py_CHECK_REFCNT(op)  
\  
    } while (0)
```

```

\
    _Py_Dealloc((PyObject *) (op));
\
} while (0)

```

Breaking down the gains

Second question: where did the gain come from?

The gain of disabling GC was two fold:

- We freed up about 8GB RAM for each server we used to create more worker processes for memory-bound server generation, or lower the worker respawn rate for CPU-bound server generation;
- CPU throughput also improved as CPU instructions per cycle (IPC) increased by about 10%.

```
# perf stat -a -e cache-misses,cache-references --
sleep 10
```

Performance counter stats for 'system wide':

268,195,790	cache-misses	#
12.240 % of all cache refs	[100.00%]	
2,191,115,722	cache-references	

10.019172636 seconds time elapsed

With GC disabled, there was a 2–3% of cache-miss rate drop, which was the main reason behind the 10% IPC improvement. CPU cache miss is expensive because it stalls CPU pipeline. Small improvements on the CPU cache hit rate can usually improve IPC significantly. With less CoW, more CPU cache lines with different virtual addresses (in different worker processes) point to the same physical memory address, leading to better cache hit rate.

As we can see, not every component worked as expected, and sometimes, the results can be very surprising. So keep digging and sniffing around, and you'll be amazed how things really work!

Chenyang Wu is a software engineer and Min Ni is an engineering manager at Instagram .

