

# Analysis of Compiler Heuristics via Stochastic Scheduling and Hyper-Heuristics

## A Thesis Proposal

Department of Computing and Software

McMaster University

Curtis D'Alves

December 19, 2019

### THESIS PROPOSAL

Christopher Anand  
Wolfram Kahl

anandc@mcmaster.ca  
kahl@cas.mcmaster.ca

## Abstract

In compiler optimization, **Instruction Scheduling** seeks to optimize the order of a sequence of instructions to maximize throughput while preserving semantics. As modern pipelined multi-core architectures become increasingly more complex, with techniques such as super-scaling, out of order execution, register remapping, VLIW (Very Large Instruction Word) and more scheduling software must itself become more sophisticated to fully utilize this advanced hardware. However as a known NP-Complete problem, finding the optimal schedule for a non-trivial program is too costly. Conventional compilers opt to utilize heuristics that by default yield far from optimal schedules in exchange for compile time performance. Tuning via compiler flags is complex requiring expert insight (often the order of flags causes different heuristics to overwrite one another) and is often ignored by developers. Statically/Dynamically linked libraries present an opportunity to schedule pre-compiled binaries outside of compile time making room to use more costly methods to find better schedules for performance critical blocks.

This proposal explores techniques for scheduling performance critical code on modern out-of-order architectures. Previous/Current techniques and their relevance are detailed, including List Scheduling, Approximation Algorithms, Stochastic Algorithms and (Non)Linear Programming. Of particular interest, the use of stochastic algorithms presents opportunity to examine the space of feasible schedules. We present a constrained non-linear optimization model that relaxes the discrete nature of scheduling problems. By encoding heuristics as penalty functions that can be scaled to assign priority and using stochastically generated scaling parameters we hope to examine the topology of valid schedules in the more flexible space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

As a testing bed, we schedule the IBM<sup>®</sup> MASS<sup>™</sup>(Math Acceleration Subsystem) library functions for the Z<sup>™</sup> and POWER<sup>™</sup> architectures with already successful results, finding schedules that outperform previous iterations of the library for select functions.

—Source: [https://github.com/dalvescb/phd\\_thesis](https://github.com/dalvescb/phd_thesis) —

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction (Background to Instruction Scheduling)</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Types of Instruction Scheduling . . . . .	4
1.2	SuperScalar Architectures . . . . .	5
1.3	Pipeline Stalls . . . . .	6
1.4	Hazards . . . . .	6
1.5	Register Allocation via Graph Coloring . . . . .	7
1.6	Spilling . . . . .	7
1.7	Combining Register Allocation and Instruction Scheduling . . . . .	8
1.8	Modulo Scheduling: Staging . . . . .	8
1.9	Register Pressure In Staged Loops . . . . .	10
1.10	Register Remapping/Renaming . . . . .	10
1.11	Out-of-Order Execution . . . . .	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Current State of the Art and Notable/Relevant Works in Instruction Scheduling</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	List Scheduling (most commonly performed scheduling) . . . . .	13
2.2	Linear/Constraint Programming . . . . .	14
2.3	Stochastic Search . . . . .	15
2.4	Meta-Optimization / Hyper-Heuristics . . . . .	16

<b>3</b>	<b>Proposed Approaches To Stochastic Scheduling and Heuristic Analysis via Hyper-Heuristics</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Optimization Model for Modulo Scheduling . . . . .	18
3.2	IO Penalty . . . . .	19
3.3	Indicator Function . . . . .	20
3.4	Stochastic Scaling . . . . .	21
3.5	Opportunity for Hyper-Heuristic Development . . . . .	21
	 <b>References</b>	 <b>21</b>

# Chapter 1

## Introduction (Background to Instruction Scheduling)

Modern processors are built with pipelined architectures capable of Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP), processors capable of exploiting ILP on one core through pipelining are known as superscalar processors. Superscalar processors present an opportunity to increase execution throughput by a multitude of the longest latency instruction of the architecture. However maximizing throughput is not always achievable, in part due to instruction dependency (i.e the execution of an instruction cannot occur until it's operands are available). A sequence of dependent instructions of sufficient latency may achieve no benefit from a superscalar architecture. That is, unless they can be interleaved with a set of relatively independent instructions. Furthermore, resource constraints such as the number of available registers and functional units can also delay execution. This creates an interesting problem for hardware and/or compilers: selecting a scheduling of instructions.

### Problem: Instruction Scheduling

Given an a dependency graph (DAG) of instructions and resource limitations (number of registers, functional units, etc), designate an ordering (find a **schedule**) maximizing execution throughput

Even simple formulations of optimal instruction scheduling is an NP-Complete search problem [HG83], and problems attempting to integrate resource limitations on modern architectures are NP-Hard [Mot+95]. Thus practical solutions to instruction scheduling problems are given by either:

- ◇ **Heuristics** most commonly used by conventional schedulers
- ◇ **Approximation Algorithms** some experimental use done for near optimal schedules [Cos]

These solutions have been traditionally defined in hardware, however due to increasingly complex hardware constraints certain architectures known as Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW) architectures haven't been constructed that move the burden of scheduling to the compiler [Fis83]. These algorithms are generally more comprehensive than simple permutation based heuristics performed at runtime by hardware and take a model of the program (typically represented as a dependency DAG [GM86]) as input and returns an ordered model to be used by the assembler during compilation.

## 1.1 Types of Instruction Scheduling

There are two broad criteria that have historically influenced scheduling algorithms: the first being the control flow of the dependency graph, the second being the nature/constraints of the architecture being scheduled for [RF93]. The second criteria yields ad-hoc solutions that are difficult to categorize and often forgotten through the evolution of architectures. However an effective scheduling algorithm must consider both criteria.

Within the first criteria (scheduling based on control flow), the following categories are worth noting [RF93]:

- ◇ **Basic Block:** (local acyclic) break code into blocks within branches (most commonly performed scheduling)
- ◇ **Global Scheduling:** (global cyclic) schedule across basic block boundaries
- ◇ **Modulo Scheduling:** (local cyclic) schedules basic blocks inside of a loop, seeking to optimize by interleaving iterations
- ◇ **Trace Scheduling:** (global acyclic/cyclic) tries to optimize control flow by predicting routes taken on branches

Each of the above categories are distinguished by what consideration is given to different types of branching. Initial research into scheduling focused entirely on local scheduling (ignoring branching) [RF93] and culminated in the use of various list scheduling algorithms in most schedulers by the 80s [Fis83]. An intuitive approach to global scheduling is to first schedule basic blocks then attempt to move operations from one block to an empty slot in neighboring blocks. However this approach would need to take into account/possibly reverse too many arbitrary decisions made in local scheduling in every possible neighboring block. To compensate for this, techniques for predicting more frequently occurring branch routes to improve global scheduling were invented known as trace scheduling [Fis81]. Cyclic scheduling deals with branching that conforms to a loop in the control graph, and could be dealt with in the same fashion as global/trace scheduling, however is important/distinct enough to have its own class of algorithm known as modulo scheduling (discussed in a later section).

## 1.2 SuperScalar Architectures




Figure 1.1: Simple Pipelined Architecture

Simple pipelined architectures issue a single instruction per "cycle". Through pipelining, ILP is still exploitable, but limited by only having one of each type of functional unit. Figure 1.1 shows an example simple RISC architecture that exploits ILP while using only a single execution unit. Conversely, figure 1.2 shows a superscalar architecture that utilizes parallel execution units.




Figure 1.2: SuperScalar Architecture

Superscalar architectures are all uniprocessors that can execute two or more scalar operations in parallel, this encompasses a wide variety of architectures, but common to all these architectures are the existence of parallel and pipelined functional units, and the need to manage that parallelism [ZK01]. In particular, superscalar architectures put increased strain on resource management. This poses a more serious challenge for scheduling algorithms, since basic block scheduling is often not sufficient to allow full utilization of machine resources [BR91].

An ideal architecture to schedule for would be a RISC architecture with a collection of functional units of  $m$  types, where the machine has  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_m$  units of each type. One could view optimizing a schedule over such an architecture as maximizing the amount of live functional units per cycle (i.e maximum throughput). This would generally be accomplished

by interleaving different types of instructions, however if you stretch data dependent instructions too far apart doing this you risk running out of available registers (you increase register pressure).

## 1.3 Pipeline Stalls

Both of the previous sections figures 1.1 and 1.2 show an ideal schedule with **NO** stalls. A stall occurs when, because of various architecture **hazards** that can arise, full throughput cannot be achieved and a NOOP (No-Operation) instruction must be inserted. This is also known as inserting a bubble in the pipeline. Figure 1.3 gives an example of inserting a NOOP (bubble), because of a Read After Write (RAW) hazard.




Figure 1.3: Example of a bubble (NOOP) being inserted to fix an unfulfilled data dependency

## 1.4 Hazards

Architecture hazards can be broken up broadly into three categories [PH13]

- ◇ **Data Hazards** occur when a data dependency is broken, there are three situations in which this can occur: read after write (RAW), write after read (WAR) and write after write (WAW)

RAW	WAR	WAW
$R2 \leftarrow R5 + R3$	$R4 \leftarrow R1 + R5$	$R2 \leftarrow R4 + R7$
$R4 \leftarrow R2 + R3$	$R5 \leftarrow R1 + R2$	$R2 \leftarrow R1 + R3$

- ◇ **Structural Hazards** occurs when an aspect of hardware is accessed at the same time (such as a functional unit)
- ◇ **Control Hazards** also known as Branch Hazards, occurs when a bad branch prediction is made causing instructions that were brought into the pipeline needing to be discarded



## 1.5 Register Allocation via Graph Coloring

The theory of graph coloring deals with algorithms that seek to partition a set of objects into classes, given simple rules associating objects that may not belong to the same class [JT11]. These algorithms operate on graphs, where generally the objects are vertices and the edges denote connected vertices that cannot be in the same class. Classes are represented via colors, where a **k-coloring** denotes a partitioning into  $k$  distinct classes. The problem of finding a **k-coloring** is a well known NP-Complete problem [JT11].

Architectures provide a finite set of registers that must be "allocated" after or during instruction scheduling. Finding an allocation for a given schedule (assuming one exists) has been shown to be equivalent to the Graph Coloring problem and hence NP-Complete [Cha+81]. Given a code schedule in Single Static Assignment (SSA) form, a unique interference graph can be constructed that denotes data dependency. On an architecture with  $k$  registers, a register allocation is found via a **k-coloring** of vertices of this interference graph. See Figure 1.4 as an example.




Figure 1.4: Register Allocation via Graph Coloring

## 1.6 Spilling

Finding the existence of a **k-coloring** for a given graph is itself an NP-Complete problem [JT11], and the absence of an existing coloring presents a difficult problem. When a schedule cannot be register allocated, variables must be *spilled* to memory (spilling is the action of storing variables into memory rather than registers [BDR07]). Spilling requires the addition of new instructions to store/load from memory, which changes not only the interference graph (allowing different register allocations) but the dependency graph as well (allowing different schedules). Therefore adding spills alters the space of valid schedules, and merits consideration when searching for a "truly optimal" schedule (although addition of spills unnecessarily is generally detrimental).

Graph coloring heuristics can be bolstered to include the addition of spilling when they

fail to find a proper **k-coloring** [Cha82],[Bri+89]. The choice of which node to spill is a cost/benefit estimation. Each edge in the interference graph can be assigned an estimated live range (sections of code which a value is defined and used but not re-defined). Eliminating longer live ranges alleviates more register pressure and creates a more flexible scheduling space.

## 1.7 Combining Register Allocation and Instruction Scheduling

Register allocation can be performed before, after, or combined with instruction scheduling, but is generally performed after [Bra+95]. Performing allocation before scheduling involves allocating on top of a "default" schedule and then manipulating the schedule while maintaining a fixed allocation. Having a fixed allocation creates new dependencies (known as *anti-dependencies*) that limit the space of valid schedules. Conversely, register allocation done after instruction scheduling is uninhibited by these anti-dependencies and may find more efficient schedules, but they may require post-hoc intervention via spilling.

Attempts to combine register allocation and scheduling are rare in conventional compilers, even a simple instance of the problem (single register, no latency's, single functional unit) is *NP-hard* [Mot+95] [Pin93]. Heuristics developed for combining register allocation and scheduling generally involve estimating a tradeoff between controlling register pressure and instruction parallelism considerations [Mot+95].

## 1.8 Modulo Scheduling: Staging




Figure 1.5: Example 3-Staged for Modulo Scheduling

The objective of modulo scheduling is to engineer a schedule for one iteration of the loop such that when this same schedule (known as the kernel) is repeated at regular intervals, no intra- or inter-iteration dependence is violated, and no resource usage conflicts arise between operations of either the same or distinct iterations [Rau96]. This generally involves a sort of *loop pipelining*, where a basic block of a loop can be broken into stages and the loop can be *unrolled* to interleave stages between iterations (see Figure 1.5). Integral to this is the concept of an **Initiation Interval** or **II**, which is essentially the fixed delay between the start of successive iterations (see Figure 1.6). Each iteration of the loop can be divided into stages consisting of **II** cycles each. A smaller **II** corresponds to shorter execution time.




Figure 1.6: Initiation Interval

Modulo Scheduling algorithms require a candidate **II** be selected before scheduling is attempted. The **Minimum Initiation Interval** or **MII** is a lower bound on the possible value of any **II** for which a modulo schedule exists. The **MII** is constrained by both resource constraints (**resMII**) and recurrence constraints (**recMII**). The resource constraint simply holds that resources (such as functional units) must be sufficiently available and any extra latency created waiting for a resource to become available must be accounted for (the exact calculation of **resMII** is architecture specific and can become very complicated on Out-of-Order execution architectures, covered in a later section). The recurrence constraint lower bound is defined as the maximum, taken over all cycles **C** in the dependence graph, of the sum of latencies along **C** divided by the sum of distance along **C**:

$$MII = \max(recMII, resMII) \quad (1.1)$$

$$recMII = \max_{C \in DepGraph} \frac{\sum_{e \in C} latency(e)}{\sum_{e \in C} distance(e)} \quad (1.2)$$

The task of generating an optimal, resource-constrained schedule for loops with arbitrary recurrences is known to be NP-complete [Lam12]. A heuristic approach via Swing Modulo Scheduling has been implemented in the GNU C Compiler (GCC) [HZ04].

## 1.9 Register Pressure In Staged Loops

Staging can increase throughput by enabling more instructions to be scheduled between high latency operations and subsequent use. However this also increases the number of live instances of loop variables and thus requires more registers to accommodate the schedule. Swing Modulo Scheduling (SMS) is a notable variation of modulo scheduling that utilizes a heuristic approach that aims to reduce register pressure [Gos+00]. Some architectures also provide hardware mechanisms for **Register Queuing** that provide more efficient spilling.

Due to the nature of modulo scheduling, the lifetime of a variable can overlap with a previous definition of itself. To handle this, some form of register renaming needs to be provided. Some hardware provide support for this in the form of **Rotating Register Files** [Rau+89]. When no hardware solution is provided, the problem of overlapping lifetimes can be solved by a technique known as **Modulo Variable Expansion** (MVE), wherein the kernel is unrolled and multiple definitions of a variable are renamed at compile time [VG98].

## 1.10 Register Remapping/Renaming

Not to be confused with renaming of registers at compile time, register renaming in hardware is a technique to remove false data dependencies — write after read (WAR) and write after write (WAW) — between register operands of subsequent instructions at runtime [Sim00]. For example, a WAR hazard could be rewritten like so

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Before} & & \text{After} \\ R2 \leftarrow \mathbf{R4} + R3 & & R2 \leftarrow \mathbf{R4} + R3 \\ \mathbf{R4} \leftarrow R1 + R5 & \implies & \mathbf{R33} \leftarrow R1 + R5 \end{array}$$

A register renaming scheme must not rename to a register that would introduce a new hazard, this would present a difficult problem were it not for the existence of **Logical** and **Physical** Registers. When executing machine code, hardware maps **Logical Registers** to **Physical Registers**

- ◇ **Logical Registers** are a set of registers usable directly when writing/generating assembly code (limited by system architecture)
- ◇ **Physical Registers** are a set of registers actually available in hardware

Having a larger number of Physical registers than Logical registers gives hardware extra flexibility when dispatching instructions for **Out of Order Execution**.

## 1.11 Out-of-Order Execution

The execution flow of an instruction on a CPU can be implemented in one of two paradigms: **in-order** or **out-of-order** (OoO, also known as dynamic) execution. Execution of an instruction cycle in each paradigm comprises of different steps:

### In-Order Execution

1. Instruction fetch
2. Stall until all operands are available
3. Dispatch to appropriate functional unit
4. Execute (on appropriate functional unit)
5. Write back to register file

### Out-Of-Order Execution

1. Instruction fetch
2. Dispatch to a temporary queue known as **Reservation Station**
3. Wait in the reservation station until operands are available
4. Dispatched once operands are available (even if before an older instruction)
5. Execute (on appropriate functional unit)
6. Results are retired to another temporary queue
7. Only after all older instructions have their results written back, then the result is written back to register file

Although a more complicated design, OoO execution presents an opportunity to increase throughput by filling in time that would be wasted stalling in step 2 of in-order execution with instructions that are ready, then re-ordering the instructions back to appear they finished in order (known as retiring). This essentially decouples the fetch and decode stages of the pipeline from the execution stages. As the instruction pipeline deepens, there is therefore increased opportunity to dispatch out of order. When combined with Register Renaming, this is of particular benefit allowing instructions that are data independent but register dependent to be executed in parallel. OoO dispatching also provides benefits over in-order when cache misses (or high latency memory accesses in general) occur [SRP97]. Figure 1.7 illustrates the general control flow in an OoO machine.




Figure 1.7: Out-Of-Order Execution Control Flow

Out of Order execution requires dynamic scheduling (scheduling at runtime by hardware) performed via methods such as **Tomasulo's Algorithm** or a **Register Score-board**. Both methods seek to enable more efficient use of multiple execution units while preventing breaking of data dependencies. A register scoreboard checks resources for an instruction to see if the required resources are available for the instruction to execute, and if so allows dispatch. The scoreboard record (locks) the resources that would be modified by the instruction at issue time, and any subsequent instructions that want to access those resources cannot be issued until the instruction that initially locked them subsequently unlocks them [Pop+97]. Tomasulo's Algorithm innovated upon score-boarding allowing improved parallel execution although requiring new hardware features such as register renaming in hardware, reservation stations for all execution units and a common data bus between all reservation stations [Tom67].

## Chapter 2

# Current State of the Art and Notable/Relevant Works in Instruction Scheduling

### 2.1 List Scheduling (most commonly performed scheduling)

List scheduling is the most widely used technique for instruction scheduling [GM86]. List scheduling encompasses a class of algorithms for basic block scheduling via a chosen heuristic. It takes a list (of instructions), assigns priorities via a heuristic and schedules them in a topological order in decreasing priority [WS18]. The general structure of a list scheduling algorithm can be described as follows

#### BASIC STRUCTURE OF LIST SCHEDULING ALGORITHMS

```
while there are instrs to be scheduled do
    Identify highest priority instr n
    Choose a processor p for n
    Schedule n on p at est(n,p)
end

est(n,p) = earliest start time of n on p
```

Priorities can be static (remain constant for the DAG) or dynamic (change through iteration of the algorithm). The complexity of list scheduling depends on the heuristic, but is generally polynomial [WS18]. List scheduling can also be performed *forward* or *backward*, or performed successively, applying heuristic on top of heuristics. Examples of common

heuristics are given in Table 2.1 [SKK18].

Table 2.1: Example List Scheduling Heuristics

Heuristic	Description
HLFET (Highest level first with estimate time)	priority is chosen by the attributes of static levels
MCP (Modified Critical path)	priority by utilizing ALAP (As late as possible) attribute
ETF (Earliest time first)	finds the earliest start time for each task and later chooses the task having less initial time
DLS (Dynamic level scheduling)	finds the task priority on the tasks priority on dynamic basis
CNPT (Critical node parent tree)	prioritization of task is determined with CN (Critical node) attribute

List scheduling is the chosen method for most conventional compilers because of its flexibility, efficiency and ability to find near-optimal schedules for most basic blocks. Although originally thought to yield near optimal schedules for almost all schedules, analysis of list scheduling techniques have shown that List Scheduling techniques have difficulty finding near-optimal schedules for codes with a moderate amount of available parallelism — the peak difficulty varying with both the number of processing elements and schedule length [CSS98]. Therefore as architectures become more sophisticated and provide more opportunity to exploit parallelism, list scheduling will in turn become increasingly inadequate.

Limitations of list scheduling most likely stem from the use of a single choice heuristic. There are many factors to consider when constructing a schedule, and it is difficult (or more accurately impossible) to condense this to assigning a priority via a polynomial time heuristic. As mentioned before, combinations of heuristics can be applied through successive iterations, but each iteration could undo previous iterations work.

## 2.2 Linear/Constraint Programming

As an inherently discrete problem, a number of works have sought to formulate instruction scheduling as an Integer Linear Programming (ILP) problem ([WLH00], [CCK97], [KW01], [NG07], [KL99]). Solving an ILP problem is an NP-Complete, so formulating scheduling as an ILP only really serves to generalize solutions to heuristics/approximation algorithms used by ILP solvers.

Another approach which has been far less investigated would be to "relax" the problem to a continuous Linear Program with constraints. Notable efforts into this approach are the works of McInnes/Beek in [MMV08],[VW01]. The constraint LP problem in [MMV08] found provably optimal schedules for basic blocks , with the following types of constraints:



◇ **Latency Constraints**, i.e

- Given a labeled dependency DAG  $G = (N, E)$ 
  - ★  $\forall (i, j) \in E \cdot j \geq i + l(i, j)$

◇ **Resource Constraints** that ensured functional units were not exceeded

◇ **Distance Constraints**, i.e

- Given a labeled dependency **DAG**  $G = (N, E)$ 
  - ★  $\forall (i, j) \in E \cdot j \geq i + d(i, j)$

The approach has some limitations on sophisticated enough architectures. The hard constraints on latency would not account for **Register Remapping in Out Of Order Execution** architectures that would be able to find more optimal schedules despite the fact that latencies in normal execution would create **pipeline stalls**.

ASSEMBLY CODE EXAMPLE REQUIRING REGISTER RENAMING FOR OPTIMAL SCHEDULING

```
fma r3,r3,r4
fma r2,r2,r4
fma r4,r0,r3
fma r0,r1,r2
```

On a system with only 5 registers and an instruction fma of large enough latency, the scheduler would need to push these instructions apart to avoid breaking the anti-dependency on register r4. However a machine could use register remapping to execute these instructions efficiently Out-of-Order making that constraint unnecessary.

Despite limitations introduced by using hard constraints, this work is notable as it illustrates how a relaxed LP problem can be used to model the space of schedules. Even with the limitations on OoO architectures cutting of the optimal schedule, it's reasonable to assume the LP would find near-optimal schedules. And by converting hard constraints to soft constraints (penalties) its simple to assert this space would contain the optimal solution.

## 2.3 Stochastic Search

There is a notable work to explore the space of schedules through a stochastic algorithm via Schkufza, Sharma, Aiken at Stanford [SSA16]. The efforts are culminated in a piece of open source software known as STOKe that serves as a "stochastic optimizer and program synthesizer" for x86-64 instruction sets. Stoke is a super-optimizer with the following notable qualities:

- ◇ Suitable for **Short Basic Block** assembly code sequences (no modulo scheduling)
- ◇ Utilizes a multi-pass algorithm, applying possibly overlapping program transformations each pass
- ◇ Encodes constraints as a **Cost Function** and uses a **Model Checker** to ensure valid schedules (undo-ing transformations otherwise)
- ◇ Uses **Markov Chain Monte Carlo Sampler** to add a stochastic element to program transformation

Each pass of the optimization minimizes the cost function

$$cost(R; T) = w_e \times eq(R; T) + w_p \times perf(R; T)$$

$R$	any rewrite of the program
$T$	the input program sequence
$eq(\cdot)$	the equivalence function (0 if $R \equiv T$ )
$perf(\cdot)$	a metric for performance
$w_e$	weight for the equivalence term
$w_p$	weight for the performance term

Limitations with the approach (as outlined in [SSA16]) include

- ◇ Only optimizes basic blocks (no loops)
- ◇ Extremely inefficient (only practical for very short scheduling)
- ◇ Cost function doesn't model the space of valid checking (hence model checking is required per each rewrite)

This approach highlights the ability to use stochastic optimization to find near-optimal schedules and the use of MCMC to explore the space of schedules. Although the cost function doesn't model the space of valid schedules, using it to generate schedules along with a may still prove to be the most practical way to explore a variety of schedules.

## 2.4 Meta-Optimization / Hyper-Heuristics

Meta-optimization deals with the use of one optimization method to tune another one. Hyper-heuristics are an off-spring of meta-optimization, that search within the search space of just heuristics vs the entire problem solution space. Hyper-heuristics are a relatively new

concept (first used in 2000 to describe heuristics to choose heuristics) the definition has more recently been extended to refer to a search method or learning mechanism for selecting or generating heuristics to solve computational search problems [Bur+13]. When speaking of hyper-heuristics, two main categories should be considered: heuristic *selection* and heuristic *generation*.

Previous research into meta-optimization of compilers has been attempted, using machine learning to improve compiler heuristics [Ste+03b]. The use of genetic programming has rarely been used to solve production scheduling instances directly, because of the difficulty of encoding solutions. However it has been found highly suitable for encoding scheduling heuristics [JJB07].

In the work of [JJB07], genetic programming is used to evolve dispatching rules, which are functions that assign a score to a job based on the state of the problem. When a machine becomes idle, the dispatching rule function is evaluated once for each job in the machine's queue, and each result is assigned to the job as its score. The job in the queue with the highest score is the next job to be assigned to the machine. This approach shows genetic programming combining and rearranging heuristic components to create heuristics superior to those which have been created by humans (heuristic generation).

Although more works have investigated usage of heuristic generation for scheduling (particularly through genetic programming [Bea91],[KF04],[Ste+03a],[WKG05]) no works have been found (at the time of writing for this proposal) on using heuristic selection / generation to analysis the effectiveness of existing heuristics on architectures.

## Chapter 3

# Proposed Approaches To Stochastic Scheduling and Heuristic Analysis via Hyper-Heuristics

In this section I will introduce a Stochastic Scheduling Algorithm that utilizes a continuous optimization model with stochastic-ally generated parameters, and propose it's use as a training set generator for ML driven heuristics selection and possibly generation. The full goal of this approach would be to not only find a means to evaluate the effectiveness of scheduling heuristics on a given architecture by observing learned heuristic selection, but to also be able to evaluate the limitations of an architecture by analyzing the space of valid schedules via the continuous model used for optimization.

### 3.1 Optimization Model for Modulo Scheduling

Objective Variables $t_i, b_i, f_i :$	$\mathbb{R}$
Constants $\Pi :$	$\mathbb{R}$
Indicator Function $\mathbb{I}\mathbb{N} :$	$\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
$t_i :$	dispatch time
$b_i :$	completion time
$f_i :$	FIFO use $0 \leq f_i \leq 1$
$\Pi :$	iteration interval = $\frac{\#instructions}{dispatches/cycle}$

$$\text{Hard Constraints} \quad \forall i, j \cdot i \rightarrow j \quad t_i + \epsilon \leq t_j \quad (3.1)$$

$$0 \leq t_i \leq b_i \leq \text{\#stages} \cdot \text{\textit{II}} \quad (3.2)$$

$$b_i + \epsilon \leq t_i + \text{\textit{II}} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\text{Objective Function} \quad \min \sum_i (b_i - t_i + f_i) + \text{Penalties} \quad (3.4)$$

The above model is a continuous optimization problem for scheduling, similar to the work detailed in Linear/Constrained Programming by [MMV08]. The model optimizes over a set of objective variables:  $t_i, b_i, f_i$  for each instruction  $i$  to be scheduled. Each variable  $t_i, b_i$  represents the dispatch and completion times of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  instruction respectively. As we wish to model an Out-of-Order execution architecture, completion times are not necessarily fixed to dispatch times. The third variable,  $f_i$ , which is constrained to be between 0 and 1, is the probability the instruction  $i$  should spill. The constant variable  $\text{\textit{II}}$  is the pre-computed Initiation Interval

Unlike the work of [MMV08], the proposed model makes little use of constraints. In fact the only constraints used are to enforce the resulting schedule is a valid modulo schedule. The notation  $i \rightarrow j$  used in the Hard Constraints equations above denotes instruction  $j$  depends on instruction  $i$ . The first hard constraint enforces any instruction must be dispatched only after it's dependencies. The second constraint sets a limit on the overall execution time that instructions must fall within. And the third constraint enforces an instruction must complete within the same interval it was dispatched.

Without any **Penalties**, the above objective model would squash all dispatch and completion times down, moving dependent instructions apart only by a given  $\epsilon$  (a small constant chosen for the purpose of creating any arbitrary *distance*) and assigning 0 to all  $f_i$ . A **Key Idea** to this work: encode choice heuristics as penalties, and adjust preference between heuristics by scaling. Heuristics, such as the ones detailed for use in List Scheduling, can all be encoded as Penalty Functions (functions that return a large value to push down in the schedule, or a large negative value to push up). By picking a large or small number to scale a penalty function we can prioritize a schedule.

## 3.2 IO Penalty

Since we're not pushing instructions apart through latency constraints like in [MMV08], we need a penalty to compensate. We propose penalizing the dispatch time of instructions based on the quantity and latencies of it's dependencies. **Note:** unlike a hard constraint on latencies,

this won't cut off valid schedules that could be optimal on OoO architectures.

$$\text{Given } t_i, t_j \quad \forall i, j \mid i \rightarrow j \quad (3.5)$$

$$\text{For each } i \quad N_j = \sum_{i \rightarrow j} \text{latency}(j) \quad (3.6)$$

$$(3.7)$$

$$\mathbb{IO}(i) = \sum_j \frac{1}{N_j} \mathbb{IN}(t_i - t_j) \quad (3.8)$$



Figure 3.1: Custom Indicator Function

### 3.3 Indicator Function

The function  $\mathbb{IN}$  specified in the model and used in the IO Penalty above is what's known as an Indicator Function, and is important for implementing heuristics that rely on testing the proximity of two instructions. Essentially, the function can be used to indicate (via a non-zero value) whether two instructions are scheduled within a certain range of each-other. For this purpose, we developed a custom indicator function (an alteration of the famous sigmoid function often used in neural networks) shown in Figure 3.1.

$$S(x) = \frac{1}{(1 + e^{s(-0.5+v)})(1 + e^{s(-0.5-v)})} \quad (3.9)$$

### 3.4 Stochastic Scaling

The scaling  $\frac{1}{N_j}$  may be a good guess, but not necessarily effective in practice

◊ **IDEA** scale the **IO penalty** stochastic-ally by a multiple of the **II**

$$\text{Define a Grouping} \quad \mathbb{C} = \text{Group}(\forall i \mid i \rightarrow j) \quad (3.10)$$

$$\text{For each Group } i \quad c_i \in \text{RAND}(\mathbb{R}) \quad (3.11)$$

$$\text{Stochastic Penalty} \quad \sum_i c_i II \cdot \mathbb{IO}(i) \quad (3.12)$$

As previously mentioned, various other heuristics can be encoded and also scaled stochastically, in basically the same manner as the IO penalty. The nature of many heuristics can be encapsulated by simply choosing the same scaling based on the type of instruction (i.e push all loads up or down).

### 3.5 Opportunity for Hyper-Heuristic Development

By representing the space of schedules in a continuous model (i.e the space of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) and encoding heuristics as penalties, we can evaluate the merits of various heuristics in combination with each other. The continuous nature of the model provides more degrees of freedom when evaluating overlapping heuristics. By scaling these heuristics stochastic-ally, we already have a method to analysis heuristic selection through analyzing which scalings provide better performing schedules.

By generating a variety of schedules for different types of basic blocks using the stochastic method we can also obtain a "training set" which can subsequently be used with various supervised Machine Learning (ML) algorithms, most notably regression. The use of neural nets, ensemble methods or genetic algorithms may also be worth exploring.

Principal Component Analysis is a dimension reduction tool that can be used to reduce a large set of variables to a small set that still contains most of the information in the large set. Principal component analysis can possibly be performed over the scaling parameters in conjunction with the training set results order to judge the influence of penalties on a given architecture.

Clustering methods (unsupervised learning) can possibly be used for heuristic generation, by finding new groupings to scale. Given a clustering with scaling  $c_i$  we can check the following: **Assertion** For each scaling  $c_i \in \text{RAND}(\mathbb{R})$ , there exists an  $\epsilon \in (R)$  such that  $c_i + \epsilon$  produces a distinct schedule from  $c_i$ . If the assertion fails, the clustering is useless (possible to avoid such clustering?)

# Bibliography

- [BDR07] Florent Bouchez, Alain Darte, and Fabrice Rastello. “On the complexity of register coalescing”. In: *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*. IEEE Computer Society. 2007, pp. 102–114.
- [Bea91] Steven J Beaty. “Genetic algorithms and instruction scheduling”. In: *MICRO*. Vol. 24. Citeseer. 1991, pp. 206–211.
- [BR91] David Bernstein and Michael Rodeh. “Global instruction scheduling for superscalar machines”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. Vol. 26. 6. ACM. 1991, pp. 241–255.
- [Bra+95] Thomas S Brasier et al. “CRAIG: a practical framework for combining instruction scheduling and register assignment.” In: *PACT*. Citeseer. 1995, pp. 11–18.
- [Bri+89] Preston Briggs et al. “Coloring heuristics for register allocation”. In: *PLDI*. Vol. 89. Citeseer. 1989, pp. 275–284.
- [Bur+13] Edmund K Burke et al. “Hyper-heuristics: A survey of the state of the art”. In: *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 64.12 (2013), pp. 1695–1724.
- [CCK97] Chia-Ming Chang, Chien-Ming Chen, and Chung-Ta King. “Using integer linear programming for instruction scheduling and register allocation in multi-issue processors”. In: *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* 34.9 (1997), pp. 1–14.
- [Cha+81] Gregory J Chaitin et al. “Register allocation via coloring”. In: *Computer languages* 6.1 (1981), pp. 47–57.
- [Cha82] G. J. Chaitin. “Register Allocation & Spilling via Graph Coloring”. In: *SIGPLAN Not.* 17.6 (June 1982), pp. 98–101.
- [Cos] Kriston Costa. “Approximation Algorithm based Approach Instruction Scheduling”. In: ().
- [CSS98] Keith D Cooper, Philip J Schielke, and Devika Subramanian. “An experimental evaluation of list scheduling”. In: *TR98* 326 (1998).
- [Fis81] Joseph A. Fisher. “Trace scheduling: A technique for global microcode compaction”. In: *IEEE transactions on computers* 7 (1981), pp. 478–490.
- [Fis83] Joseph A Fisher. *Very long instruction word architectures and the ELI-512*. Vol. 11. 3. ACM, 1983.



- [GM86] Philip B Gibbons and Steven S Muchnick. “Efficient instruction scheduling for a pipelined architecture”. In: *Acm sigplan notices*. Vol. 21. 7. ACM. 1986, pp. 11–16.
- [Gos+00] James Gosling et al. *The Java language specification*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2000.
- [HG83] John Hennessy and Thomas Gross. “Postpass code optimization of pipeline constraints”. In: *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.:(United States)* 3 (1983).
- [HZ04] Mostafa Hagog and Ayal Zaks. “Swing modulo scheduling for gcc”. In: *Proceedings of the 2004 GCC Developers’ Summit*. 2004, pp. 55–64.
- [JJB07] Domagoj Jakobović, Leonardo Jelenković, and Leo Budin. “Genetic programming heuristics for multiple machine scheduling”. In: *European Conference on Genetic Programming*. Springer. 2007, pp. 321–330.
- [JT11] Tommy R Jensen and Bjarne Toft. *Graph coloring problems*. Vol. 39. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [KF04] Fernanda Kri and Marc Feeley. “Genetic instruction scheduling and register allocation”. In: *XXIV International Conference of the Chilean Computer Science Society*. IEEE. 2004, pp. 76–83.
- [KL99] Daniel Kästner and Marc Langenbach. “Code optimization by integer linear programming”. In: *International Conference on Compiler Construction*. Springer. 1999, pp. 122–136.
- [KW01] Daniel Kästner and Sebastian Winkel. “ILP-based Instruction Scheduling for IA-64”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. Vol. 36. 8. ACM. 2001, pp. 145–154.
- [Lam12] Monica S Lam. *A systolic array optimizing compiler*. Vol. 64. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [MMV08] Abid M Malik, Jim McInnes, and Peter Van Beek. “Optimal basic block instruction scheduling for multiple-issue processors using constraint programming”. In: *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools* 17.01 (2008), pp. 37–54.
- [Mot+95] Rajeev Motwani et al. “Combining register allocation and instruction scheduling”. In: *Courant Institute, New York University* (1995).
- [NG07] Santosh G Nagarakatte and R Govindarajan. “Register allocation and optimal spill code scheduling in software pipelined loops using 0-1 integer linear programming formulation”. In: *International Conference on Compiler Construction*. Springer. 2007, pp. 126–140.
- [PH13] David A Patterson and John L Hennessy. *Computer organization and design MIPS edition: the hardware/software interface*. Newnes, 2013.
- [Pin93] Shlomit S. Pinter. “Register Allocation with Instruction Scheduling”. In: *SIGPLAN Not.* 28.6 (June 1993), pp. 248–257.
- [Pop+97] Valeri Popescu et al. *Processor architecture providing out-of-order execution*. US Patent 5,627,983. May 1997.

- [Rau+89] B. Ramakrishna Rau et al. “The Cydra 5 departmental supercomputer: Design philosophies, decisions, and trade-offs”. In: *Computer* 22.1 (1989), pp. 12–35.
- [Rau96] B Ramakrishna Rau. “Iterative modulo scheduling”. In: *International Journal of Parallel Programming* 24.1 (1996), pp. 3–64.
- [RF93] B Ramakrishna Rau and Joseph A Fisher. “Instruction-level parallel processing: history, overview, and perspective”. In: *Instruction-Level Parallelism*. Springer, 1993, pp. 9–50.
- [Sim00] Dezso Sima. “The design space of register renaming techniques”. In: *IEEE micro* 20.5 (2000), pp. 70–83.
- [SKK18] Akanksha Sarangal, Nirmal Kaur, and Ravreet Kaur. “LIST SCHEDULING ALGORITHMS CLASSIFICATION: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY”. In: *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science* 9.2 (2018), p. 385.
- [SRP97] Jared Stark, Paul Racunas, and Yale N Patt. “Reducing the performance impact of instruction cache misses by writing instructions into the reservation stations out-of-order”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Microarchitecture*. IEEE Computer Society. 1997, pp. 34–43.
- [SSA16] Eric Schkufza, Rahul Sharma, and Alex Aiken. “Stochastic Program Optimization”. In: *Commun. ACM* 59.2 (Jan. 2016), pp. 114–122.
- [Ste+03a] Mark Stephenson et al. “Genetic programming applied to compiler heuristic optimization”. In: *European conference on genetic programming*. Springer. 2003, pp. 238–253.
- [Ste+03b] Mark Stephenson et al. “Meta optimization: improving compiler heuristics with machine learning”. In: *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*. Vol. 38. 5. ACM. 2003, pp. 77–90.
- [Tom67] Robert M Tomasulo. “An efficient algorithm for exploiting multiple arithmetic units”. In: *IBM Journal of research and Development* 11.1 (1967), pp. 25–33.
- [VG98] Madhavi Gopal Valluri and R Govindarajan. “Modulo-variable expansion sensitive scheduling”. In: *Proceedings. Fifth International Conference on High Performance Computing (Cat. No. 98EX238)*. IEEE. 1998, pp. 334–341.
- [VW01] Peter Van Beek and Kent Wilken. “Fast optimal instruction scheduling for single-issue processors with arbitrary latencies”. In: *International conference on principles and practice of constraint programming*. Springer. 2001, pp. 625–639.
- [WGK05] Gang Wang, Wenrui Gong, and Ryan Kastner. “Instruction scheduling using MAX-MIN ant system optimization”. In: *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Great Lakes symposium on VLSI*. ACM. 2005, pp. 44–49.
- [WLH00] Kent Wilken, Jack Liu, and Mark Heffernan. “Optimal instruction scheduling using integer programming”. In: *Acm sigplan notices*. Vol. 35. 5. ACM. 2000, pp. 121–133.
- [WS18] Huijun Wang and Oliver Sinnen. “List-scheduling versus cluster-scheduling”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 29.8 (2018), pp. 1736–1749.

- [ZK01] Victor V Zyuban and Peter M Kogge. “Inherently lower-power high-performance superscalar architectures”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computers* 50.3 (2001), pp. 268–285.