What is smallpt anyway?

-What is smallpt anyway?

- 1. S
- 2. 99 LoC C++: small path tracer.
- 3. Ported to many languages, including Haskell!4. Haskell port was by Vo Minh Thu. Thanks a ton!
- Start from noteed's original source; SHA the output image from the Haskell source for baseline.
- 6. Perfect for an optimization case study.
- 7. Plan: Quick walk through Haskell code, end up at C++ (clang++) performance.

-What is smallpt anyway?



- 1. S
- 2. 99 LoC C++: small path tracer.
- 3. Ported to many languages, including Haskell!
- 4. Haskell port was by Vo Minh Thu. Thanks a ton!
- Start from noteed's original source; SHA the output image from the Haskell source for baseline.
- 6. Perfect for an optimization case study.
- 7. Plan: Quick walk through Haskell code, end up at C++ (clang++) performance.



- 1. S
- 2. Brief spiritually correct description of how a path tracer works
- 3. Main problem: what light ray hits the eye?4. Idea: trace backwards; start from the eye, hypothesize light came from a direction
- 5. Follow the direction, and see if light did indeed come from this direction
- 6. Hypothesize light came from direction r1. Follow and see what happens
- 7. Similarly for r2, r3



- 1. Let's say our ray hits a light source
- 2. Then we know that the ray came from the light source
- 3. Set color to color of light source

- 1. Let's say our ray hits nothing
- 2. Then we know that nothing could have produced this ray.
- 3. Set color to zero



- 1. Let's say our ray hit a metallic object. This is neither a light source, nor nothing
- 2. We want to find light rays, which on striking the metal, produce our black right ray
- 3. Use reflection: angle of incidence equals angle of reflection
- 4. Perform math, find light ray that lead to black right ray
- 5. candidate blue ray is shown
- 6. recurse



- 1. Let's say our ray hit a glass object. This is different from all the previous cases
- 2. Here, refraction comes into play
- 3. Perform math, find light ray that lead to black right ray
- 4. candidate blue ray is shown
- 5. recurse



- 1. Consider a difficult scene like this one, where light can only enter from the top
- 2. Light may need to bounce many times before it enters the eye
- 3. How many bounces do we consider?
- 4. Make longer bounces more unlikely
- 5. Setup a russian roulette system, where the longer a ray has bounced, the more likely it is to die (stop recursing)
- 6. increase number of bullets in the gun as number of bounces increase

2020-11-0

—What is smallpt anyway?

What is smallpt anyway?

- 1. S
- 2. Has geometric primitives: vectors, spheres, materials
- 3. Entirely numeric-based, no real "data structures" to speak of

What is smallpt anyway?

What is smallpt anyway?

- 1. **S**
- 2. Most of the compute cost is spent in the function that traces rays.
- 3. is called radiance



What is smallest anyway?

The management like in its again, magas alone start

minimum

minim

- 1. S
- 2. radiance is the function that performs this path tracing
- 3. Recursively calls itself a bunch of times

-What is smallpt anyway?

2020-11-0



- 1. **S**
- 2. Recursion is guarded by a lot of control flow

0 11 0



- 1. S
- 2. The control flow and computation is very numeric in nature

2020 11 0

What is smallpt anyway?

What is consider anyway?

The interest of the part of

- 1. S
- 2. uses the function erand48 for randomness

2020-11-0

—What is smallpt anyway?

- 1. **S**
- 2. The full code continues to be more of the same

What is smallpt anyway?

The second section of the control of



- 1. **S**
- $2. \ \,$ The same computation, this time in haskell

Initial Haskell Code: Data structures $(1 \times)$

And the . In . (of 2000 a) banks (a 2000 a) thinks (a 2000 a

- 1. S
- 2. We implement the same geometric data structures in Haskell
- 3. Code here has an inconsistency
- 4. while Vec has unpack, Ray, Sphere not having unpack

- 1. S
- 2. this list will be walked many times, as it contains our scene information.

Initial Haskell code: Sphere intersection

intersect :: Ray -> Sphere -> Maybe Double intersect (bay s d) (Sphere r p .e _c_ref) if deto them Suthing sales f (b-adet) (b-adet)

Initial Haskell code: Sphere intersection

there up - p - a - Fameric eps - 1 - d b - det up b - det up - det up - p - p - p - Fameric and t - appt det f a n - 1 f Armen then Just a size if areas then Just a size Noti

and - syst that that a shift reput then that a size fixthing interests: - by - (depth books, places) interests: - by - (depth books, places) interests: - by - (depth books, places) interests: - places (i.e., - books, - bo

- 1. S
- $2. \ \mbox{Responsible}$ for figuring out what the ray hits.
- 3. We iterate over the list of spheres.
- 4. Once again, numeric heavy.
- 5. Use a Maybe to indicate whether we've found an answer or not.

2020-11-05

—Initial Haskell Code: radiance $(1 \times)$



- 1. S
- 2. Branch heavy
- 3. Recursive
- 4. Uses an RNG

```
Optimizing smallpt
```

Initial Haskell Code: Entry point $(1\times)$

Small related Code Cony point (1×) $\begin{aligned} & \text{single} & \text$

ci + Yec (class yw) (class yw) (class wh) .* 0.25 -- Frite

- 1. S
- 2. Use mutability to store the pixels of the image in c
- 3. Loops over all pixels in an image and shoots rays
- 4. Shoots samps number of rays per pixel and adds up the results
- 5. Finally, writes resulting color out by mutating the array \boldsymbol{c}

- 1. **S**
- 2. As mentioned previously, we use the RNG to decide randomly in which direction to send rays $\ \$
- 3. erand48 is imported as a foreign ccall for parity with the C code

- 1. S
- 2. The very first thing to do is to let the compiler actually optimize.
- 3. If a function is public, then compiler doesn't know all call sites
- 4. Export only the one function that's called from the outside: main
- 5. Allows compiler to know that other functions in module are not called from outside
- 6. compiler has "perfect knowledge" about these functions now

Restrict export list to main $(1 \times \mapsto 1.13 \times)$

module Main (main) where

Exported functions could be used by something unknown

Oxioland versions must be available.

- 1. S
- 2. The very first thing to do is to let the compiler actually optimize.
- 3. If a function is public, then compiler doesn't know all call sites
- 4. Export only the one function that's called from the outside: main
- 5. Allows compiler to know that other functions in module are not called from outside
- 6. compiler has "perfect knowledge" about these functions now

Mark entries of Ray and Sphere as UNPACK and Strict $(1.13 imes \mapsto 1.07 imes)$

- 1. D
- 2. Strictness in the arguments means that they're evaluated when instantiated, not when demanded.
- 3. Where as Unpacking removes indirection from doing a memory lookup for components.
- 4. Means we have to copy everything into the data structure that it is unpacked into.
- 5. We don't unpack ray (Lots of calculations on its components, want those to fuse)
- 6. Unpack Sphere its static from compile time
- 7. Don't unpack Ray, because each Vec undergoes a lot of computation.

```
Use a pattern synonym to unpack Refl in Sphere (1.07 \times \mapsto 1.07 \times)
```

"(* A LEMENT Protection property of the Control of

- 1. D
- 2. Was unable to unpack Refl
- 3. UnboxedSums are recent
- 4. UnboxedSums are very unpleasant
- 5. We're using an older trick to fake the unboxing here instead.
- 6. In this case it isn't much of a win, but it illustrates the technique.

```
—Change from maximum on a list to max (1.07	imes \mapsto 1.08	imes)
```

```
where (the a half) - maximum (ph.h.)

let a " - "habb" (d 'mine")

let a " - "habb" (d 'mine")

d ' | d 'mine" (d 'mine")

d | d ' mine" (d 'mine")

d | d ' mine" (d 'mine a size a 'mine" (-1)

d | d ' mine a 'mine a size a 'mine a size a 'mine" (-1)

d | d ' mine a 'mine a size a 'mine a size a 'mine a 'mine
```

- 1. D
- 2. Prebuild comparison
- 3. Don't go via list
- 4. GHC does not evaluate at compile time, only has RULES
- 5. Doesn't really help much in this case

Convert erand48 to pure Haskell $(1.08 imes \mapsto 1.10 imes)$

- 1. **S**
- 2. The entire premise of this talk is that Haskell can be as fast as C.
- 3. We're opening the black box of what erand48 does to GHC
- 4. Further any impedance mismatch, such as FFI almost universally has to have, carries some bookkeeping overhead.
- If our Haskell code was as fast as the C code moving the code into Haskell would be a win, if it was slightly slower it could still be a win.
- 6. Often considering your Haskell code's performance is a better option and easier than reimplementing something in C.
- 7. As is the way with optimizations, this is not universally true.

```
Remove mutability: Erand48 Monad (1.10 \times \mapsto 1.15 \times)
```

```
Remote mutability: Emailed Mennel (110 m = 115 m)

served 1 is the band of the band

served 1 is the band of the band

served 1 is the band of the band

served 1 is the band of the band
```

- 1. D
- 2. All these mutability locations throw in extra RTS code, extra sequencing that blocks the compiler's optimization, and dependency chains.
- 3. Sometimes we need mutability for performance.
- 4. SSA is normal to compilers though.
- 5. We almost start at SSA as a functional language.
- 6. don't break it when you don't have a good reason.

2020-11-05

Remove mutability: eliminate IORef and Data. Vector . Mutable (1.10 imes + 1.15 imes)

1. D

Set everything in smallpt to be strict (1.10 imes + 1.15 imes)

Among a simple of the control of th

Don't senselessly bang everything in sight.

- 1. D
- 2. This is not a recommendation, this is a warning.
- 3. We get a speedup here but it can also regress performance. Some of these bangs are regressions that are hidden.

Why strictness may be bad

- 1. S
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that x is not used allows us to eliminiate computing x4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have x, because it doesn't produce ERR 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

Why strictness may be bad

- 1. S
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that x is not used allows us to eliminiate computing x
- 4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have x, because it doesn't produce ERR 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

- 1. S
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that \boldsymbol{x} is not used allows us to eliminiate computing \boldsymbol{x}
- 4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have x, because it doesn't produce ERR
- 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

Let fine - Let $x = x error ^{-1}(200^{\circ})$ in |y| > y. Probabile Let fine - Let $x = x error ^{-1}(200^{\circ})$ in |y| > y. Probabile fine 12. Let finely x = |y| > y. Let finely x = |y| > y.

- 1. S
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that \boldsymbol{x} is not used allows us to eliminiate computing \boldsymbol{x}
- 4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have x, because it doesn't produce ERR
- 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

Let for - for $x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $y \to y$. Probable for $10 = 10 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable for 12 = 10. Let $1 = 0 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable for $10 = 10 = \cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable for $1 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable $1 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable $1 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1y \to y$. Probable $1 = x = -\cos x = 2000$ for $1 = x = \cos x = 2000$ for 1 = x = 2000 for 1 = x = 20

Why strictness may be bad

- 1. **S**
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that \boldsymbol{x} is not used allows us to eliminiate computing \boldsymbol{x}
- 4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have $\boldsymbol{x},$ because it doesn't produce ERR
- 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

Why strictness may be bad

Producted but for " let a " sever "SSS" to be 2 v let deat - let be - seem "BB" to by it y Products let for' = let in = error "SSS" in $\backslash y > y$ Products for' 12 ++* Exception: SSS account (now Enclassis): nover, called at Conteractive Scil in interactive Choi? Les desfines - Ne collection de CARCERTETT formant font-fonthet should som 1999

Why strictness may be bad

- 1. S
- 2. Consider the function foo and fooOpt. These are equivalent
- 3. The fact that x is not used allows us to eliminiate computing x
- 4. Consider the next version
- 5. Illegal, we need to have x, because it doesn't produce ERR 6. we can't equationally reason about the program anymore.
- 7. Makes it harder for GHC. GHC is conservative about bangs
- 8. Inhibits compiler from optimizing

emailpt :: Int > Int > Int > Int > ID ()
smallpt w h mamps 'die' (:: ET LESSEE LESSEE

```
Reduce to only useful strictnesses in smallpt (1.10 	imes \mapsto 1.15 	imes)
```

The images of the second of t

- 1. D
- 2. Thus the compiler can no longer move the computation around or simplify it.
- 3. Force useless work.
- 4. A little thinking about how the variables are used or looking at core allows us to select which ones we bang selectively.

```
Strategic application of strictness in entire project (1.15 \times \mapsto 1.23 \times)
```

```
of smooth them because of our of (broades) (broades)

dense of a first of a first of the smooth of t
```

- 1. D
- 2. Sometimes (point out 'intersect') we have to rearrange the code though when we use bangs.
- 3. Bangs tell the compiler to make more efficient code, but take away the compiler's options in how to do so.
- 4. Only take away the compiler's liberties when it's using them poorly.
- 5. Becomes intuitive.

Remove Maybe from intersect(s) $(1.23 \times \mapsto 1.40 \times)$

Remove Maybe from intersect(s) (1.23× > 1.40×)

1000 The Rejet Double to represent (burshift) found, bit-distance: Double)

1000 The var (1/0) to represent and technicity

intersects of by 3 figure 3 Rejet Double

to the result of the second of the rejet of the rej

interests : Bay > Obyte Builde, Sphere) interests are $B_0 > B_0 > B_0$

• many (a,b) = limit x : (1,c)-quantum in parts with a first ≥ b thus (a, a') size (b', a') size

- 1. **S**
- 2. This is a far more performance critical version of what we saw with 'maximum' vs. 'max'.
- 3. innermost functions are of critical importance. remove Maybe which significantly reduces the boxing
- 4. Since a Ray that fails to intersect something can be said to intersect at infinity, Double already actually covers the structure at play
- 5. This also reduces allocation.

Hand unroll the fold in intersects $(1.40 \times \mapsto 1.43 \times)$

- 1. D
- 2. 'intersects' is very hot
- 3. Loop unrolling
- 4. Many compilers do this for us, and there are special versions of it like Duff's Device.
- 5. Sadly GHC doesn't
- 6. Can do variants by hand.
- 7. RULE could handle each one specificly (only exactly that one)?

Optimizing smallpt

2020-11-0

Custom datatype for intersects parameter passing $(1.43 \times \mapsto 1.46 \times)$

Content distings for intersecting parinting parinting [1,43 × 1,460]. The highest is productionable to bins a stiple of the production of the stiple of the production of the

ta = norm # x - p tal = if dot n d < 0 them n else megate m

- 1. D
- 2. We can optimize data passing.
- 3. Want: Data strict, but not unpacked.
- 4. Compiler knows its evaluated but no copying
- 5. A normal tuple lacks strictness information.
- 6. An unboxed tuple forces copying
- 7. Strict Tuple.
- 8. This exists in libraries of course, but we wanted to illustrate it.

Optimizing smallpt

Optimize file writing: $(1.46 \times \mapsto 1.46 \times)$

Data deposits

- (1974 - 1974

Optimize file writing: $(1.46 \times \mapsto 1.46 \times)$

- 1. **D**
- 2. Strings are inefficient
- 3. 'bytestring' has some efficient writing code, so we just convert to that for a modest gain.

- 1. **S**
- Finally, this particular code is quite numeric heavy.
 There are optimizations for numeric heavy code we're missing in GHC.
- 4. LLVM has an extensive library of laws to optimize low level numeric ops.
- 5. LLVM is too low-level to understand haskell as haskell.
- LLVM makes decisions with the tacit assumption that the assembly came from a C-like language, which is often to the detriment of a Haskell-like language.
- 7. In this case, as the code is "fortran-like", LLVM wins.



The view from the mountaintop $(1.46 \times \mapsto 2.04 \times)$



1. **D**

```
Avoid CPU ieee754 slow paths (2.04 \times \mapsto 2.12 \times)
```

Acod CPU LearNet has paths (206+ = 2.2 x). Comme units and instruction) { ... intervals (into value) from view to produce the comment of the

- 1. D
- 2. We used +Inf to match the Maybeness
- 3. C++ code set 1e20 s the horizon
- 4. Mechanical sympathy is important.
- 5. Know how the CPU (abstractly) executes slow path / fast path.

Fix differences with C++ version $(2.12 \times \mapsto 2.32 \times)$

- 1. S
- 2. Since the sha1 of the output didn't match the C++ version we started investigating.
- 3. clang++, g++ actually produce different sha1s
- 4. unincremented depth was being used in one branch, causing us to do more work
- 5. now confident to say we're doing the same computation as C++

Fix differences with C++ version $(2.12 \times \mapsto 2.32 \times)$

Fix differences with C++ version (2.12× -2.32×)

1015 large size, at court Indetti Des ELF backman.

1015 large size, at court Indetti Des ELF backman.

1015 large size, at court Indettion (large-paper)

1016 large size at court Indettion (large-paper)

1016 large size at court Indeticution (large-paper)

11 (-algebis)

12 (-algebis)

13 (-algebis)

- 1. S
- 2. Since the sha1 of the output didn't match the C++ version we started investigating.
- 3. clang++, g++ actually produce different sha1s
- 4. unincremented depth was being used in one branch, causing us to do more work
- 5. now confident to say we're doing the same computation as C++

```
Fix differences with C++ version (2.12 \times \mapsto 2.32 \times)
```

Find differences with C++ wroning (2.12 ~ - 2.28)

Into those parts, a many finding to but Newson and State Parts and State Pa

- 1. S
- 2. Since the sha1 of the output didn't match the C++ version we started investigating.
- 3. clang++, g++ actually produce different sha1s
- 4. unincremented depth was being used in one branch, causing us to do more work
- 5. now confident to say we're doing the same computation as C++

```
Fix differences with C++ version (2.12 \times \mapsto 2.32 \times)
```

```
Find differences with C++ working (122+-222x)

That they go to a, we can idded the little basis.

**March 1996 and a second trained and the second trained and tra
```

- 1. S
- 2. Since the sha1 of the output didn't match the C++ version we started investigating.
- 3. clang++, g++ actually produce different sha1s
- 4. unincremented depth was being used in one branch, causing us to do more work
- 5. now confident to say we're doing the same computation as C++

Optimizing smallpt

-Takeaways

Takeaways

► The unrolling in 'intersects' is ugly.

➤ (We feel) the maintainability of this code hasn't been significantly harmed.

► We're faster than clasg++ and g++ ► Haven't exhausted the optimization opportunities.

▶ GRC could learn to do several of these optimizations for us.

Clean Haskell is often performant Haskell.

 Repository stepping through each optimization is available at github.com/bellu/mailpt-opt ► Slides at github.com/bolis/elides-hackell-exchange-2020-smallpt

1. D