

# Language-Agnostic Test Harness (LATH) User's Guide

---

July 28, 2020

## Table of Contents

1	What is LATH? .....	4
2	Purpose .....	4
3	Definitions .....	4
4	Execution Flow .....	5
5	Quick Start .....	6
5.1	Build LATH (and other libraries) .....	6
5.2	Run a benchmark .....	8
6	Benchmark Construction and Design .....	20
6.1	Test Harness Wrapper .....	20
6.2	Form of a LATH/JMH Benchmark (Single threaded) .....	20
6.2.1	The @Benchmark Function .....	21
6.2.2	@State Objects .....	22
6.2.3	Blackhole objects .....	22
6.2.4	@Setup and @Teardown .....	22
6.3	Parallel (multi-threaded) benchmarks .....	23
6.3.1	Homogeneous Parallelism (TLP) .....	23
6.3.2	Heterogeneous (functional/producer-consumer) parallelism: .....	23
6.4	Benchmark guidelines .....	23
6.4.1	Unwanted optimization .....	23
6.4.1.1	Loops .....	24
6.4.1.2	Warmup and inlining .....	24
6.4.1.3	Dead code elimination .....	24
6.4.1.4	Constant folding .....	25
6.4.1.5	Data regularity .....	25
6.4.2	Reproducibility .....	25

6.4.2.1	Random numbers.....	26
6.4.2.2	Memory usage .....	26
6.4.3	Multi-threaded benchmarks .....	26
6.4.3.1	False sharing.....	27
6.4.3.2	Thread start/stop skew .....	27
6.4.4	Porting benchmarks .....	27
6.4.4.1	Target language expertise and code quality .....	27
6.4.4.2	Algorithmic equivalence rule (and when to break it) .....	28
6.5	Support Classes .....	28
6.5.1	BlackHole.....	28
6.6	Annotations.....	28
7	LATH C++ .....	31
7.1	Benchmark file .....	31
7.1.1	Compiling outside of LATH.....	31
7.1.2	Method semantics .....	31
7.2	Classes.....	32
7.3	LATH C++ Annotations .....	32
7.3.1	Alternate Notation Syntax .....	32
7.3.2	Supported annotations .....	32
7.4	Building the benchmark runtime .....	33
7.5	Benchmark runtime options .....	33
8	JMH (for Java benchmarks).....	34
8.1	JMH Setup .....	34
8.2	Getting the JMH source code and building it to create the API JavaDocs... ..	35
8.3	Benchmark file .....	36
8.4	Classes.....	36
8.5	Annotations.....	36
8.6	Building the benchmark jar file .....	36
8.7	Benchmark runtime options .....	36
9	LATH JS.....	36
10	Advanced Topics .....	36
10.1	Controlling the Environment .....	36
10.1.1	Variations in CPU frequency .....	36
10.1.2	Interference from other processes .....	37
10.1.3	Internal interference.....	37

10.1.4	File system.....	37
10.2	Drilling Down - Test Harness Details .....	37
10.2.1	Undesired over-optimization .....	38
10.2.1.1	Dead code elimination .....	38
10.2.1.2	Constant folding.....	38
10.2.2	Memory issues .....	39
10.2.2.1	Memory layout and determinism .....	39
10.2.2.2	False sharing.....	39
10.2.2.3	NUMA hardware .....	40
10.2.3	Warmup .....	40
10.2.4	Measuring time correctly .....	40
10.2.4.1	Accuracy .....	40
10.2.4.2	Thread skew .....	41
10.2.5	Test Harness Loop Structure .....	41
10.3	CPU frequency monitoring.....	43
10.4	Deep performance analysis .....	43
10.5	PORTING BENCHMARKS TO JMH/LATH - A PRIMER .....	43
10.5.1	Walkthrough and tutorial .....	43

## 1 What is LATH?

LATH is

- 1) A language-independent test harness design
- 2) The implementation of that design for different languages.

The LATH design closely follows the design of JMH, the preeminent test harness for Java. Since the Java Micro-benchmark Harness (JMH) already achieves the goals of LATH for the Java language, the benchmark executables generated by LATH for other languages are designed to be directly comparable to JMH benchmarks for Java.

## 2 Purpose

There is often a need to compare the performance of the same benchmark implemented in different languages and/or executed in different frameworks. Successful and accurate performance comparison depends on the elimination of as many confounding variables as possible. One source of confounding variables is the variation in test harness design, capability, and quality for different languages/platforms.

LATH seeks to provide a common test harness that will allow benchmark implementations in different languages to execute in a test environment that is as consistent as possible, and thereby enable a more “apples to apples” comparison.

LATH also provides a test harness environment that will assist benchmark developers and users in avoiding many of the pitfalls associated with micro-benchmarking that can result in inaccurate or unreliable results.

However, note that while a well-designed test harness can take much of the burden off of the shoulders of the micro-benchmark developer, the test harness cannot remove *all* of the potential hazards which can trap the unwary developer. Guidelines and practices to avoid these can be found in Section 6.4, Benchmark guidelines.

*(XXX add references for further reading)*

## 3 Definitions

These are some terms that will be used throughout this document.

- The *target language* is the language in which the benchmark is written.
- The *target platform* indicates the environment in which the benchmark will run (e.g., as a native executable, within a specific virtual machine (VM), within a specific interpreter, etc.)
- An *invocation* is a single call to a benchmark method.
- An *operation* is a unit of work. By default, each invocation is a single operation, although this can be modified through annotations.

- An *iteration* is one set of successive operations. This is the smallest quantity of work for which measurements are reported. The definition of an iteration depends on the benchmark *mode* that is specified.
- *Warmup iterations* are initial iterations that are performed in order to warm up the target platform. Measurement associated with these iterations are not included in the reported statistics.
- *Benchmark iterations* are iterations carried out after warmup. These are the iterations used to generate the performance results.

## 4 Execution Flow

The execution flow is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1 Execution Flow

- 1) A file containing the annotated benchmark code is provided by the user.
- 2) The wrapper generator parses the annotations in the benchmark file to produce the benchmark wrapper code along with a copy of the benchmark code with the annotations stripped (or commented) out.
- 3) The wrapper code, stripped benchmark code, test runner, and utility classes are used to build the test executable.
- 4) The executable is run to produce the test results.

In order to provide the optimal testing environment for accurate benchmark measurement, LATH first scans the benchmark source code and generates the appropriate test harness code for that benchmark. The benchmark developer uses annotations within the benchmark code to provide meta-information that indicates how LATH should run the benchmark (see Section 6.6, Annotations).

## 5 Quick Start

This section outlines the minimal steps that the user needs to follow in order to get started using LATH. They include the steps necessary to:

- Install and build LATH (and other libraries)
- Run one of the included benchmarks

For further information, consult:

- Section 6, Benchmark Construction and Design, for guidance on writing your own benchmarks.
- Section 7, LATH C++, for more details on running C++ benchmarks.
- Section 8, JMH (for Java benchmarks), for more details on running Java benchmarks.

Section 0,

**TBD**

- Advanced, for advanced topics.

### 5.1 Build LATH (and other libraries)

**Step 1:** Clone LATH from the GitHub repository (**XXX add GitHub link here**):

```
git clone <XXX add github specification here>
```

**Step 2:** Install other libraries and utilities, if needed:

In order to build and run Java benchmarks, your environment must have the JavaJDK and Maven installed. To test that these are installed (and in your path), enter the following:

```
java --version  
mvn --version
```

The Java version should be 8.0 or newer, and Maven version 3.6 or newer is recommended.

**Step 3:** Set environment variables:

The easiest way to do this is to source the lath.rc file located in the top-level lath directory:

```
source <path_to_lath_directory>/lath.rc
```

This will:

- Set environment variable LATH\_HOME to the path to the top-level lath directory.
- Add \$LATH\_HOME/scripts to your path.

**Step 4:** Build the LATH-C++ test harness generator and the JMH benchmark project directory used by LATH (for Java benchmarks):

LATH provides a Makefile that will do this for you:

```
cd $LATH_HOME  
make
```

If successful, you should see something like the following:

```

=====
Building lath-cpp:
=====
make[1]: Entering directory `your-path-to-lath/lath-cpp'

Building cpp_parser
make cpp_parser
make[2]: Entering directory `your-path-to-lath/lath-cpp'
flex -L -o cpp_parser.cpp cpp_parser.l
g++ -std=gnu++11 -c cpp_parser.cpp
g++ -std=gnu++11 -o cpp_parser cpp_parser.o
make[2]: Leaving directory `your-path-to-lath/lath-cpp'
make[1]: Leaving directory `your-path-to-lath/lath-cpp'

=====
Building JMH benchmark project directory:
=====
make[1]: Entering directory `your-path-to-lath/jmh'
mvn archetype:generate -DinteractiveMode=false -DarchetypeGroupId=org.openjdk.jmh -DarchetypeArtifactId=jmh-java-benchmark-archetype -DgroupId=lath -DartifactId=lath_bm -Dversion=1.0
[INFO] Scanning for projects...
[INFO]
[INFO] -----< org.apache.maven:standalone-pom >-----
[INFO] Building Maven Stub Project (No POM) 1
[INFO] -----[ pom ]-----
[INFO]
[INFO] >>> maven-archetype-plugin:3.1.2:generate (default-cli) > generate-sources @ standalone-pom >>>
[INFO]
[INFO] <<< maven-archetype-plugin:3.1.2:generate (default-cli) < generate-sources @ standalone-pom <<<
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-archetype-plugin:3.1.2:generate (default-cli) @ standalone-pom ---
[INFO] Generating project in Batch mode
[INFO]
[INFO] Using following parameters for creating project from Archetype: jmh-java-benchmark-archetype:1.0
[INFO]
[INFO] Parameter: groupId, Value: lath
[INFO] Parameter: artifactId, Value: lath_bm
[INFO] Parameter: version, Value: 1.0
[INFO] Parameter: package, Value: lath
[INFO] Parameter: packageInPathFormat, Value: lath
[INFO] Parameter: package, Value: lath
[INFO] Parameter: version, Value: 1.0
[INFO] Parameter: groupId, Value: lath
[INFO] Parameter: artifactId, Value: lath_bm
[INFO] Project created from Archetype in dir: your-path-to-lath/jmh/lath_bm
[INFO]
[INFO] BUILD SUCCESS
[INFO]
[INFO] Total time: elapsed time
[INFO] Finished at: dateTtime
[INFO]
[INFO]
make[1]: Leaving directory `your-path-to-lath/jmh'

```

## 5.2 Run a benchmark

Here, we will build and run the factorial benchmarks as an example.

Step 1: Generate and build the test harness executables

First, navigate to the benchmark directory:

```
cd $LATH_HOME/benchmarks/fac_tests
```

Then generate and build the Java and C++ benchmarks. The easiest way to do this is to use the included scripts.

C++:

```
lath_build_cpp.sh factorial.cpp
```

If successful, you should see the following output:

```
Generating test harness...
Building executable...
Done. run_factorial built.
```

Java:

```
lath_build_java.sh Factorial.java
```

If successful, the output should look something like this:

```
Preparing benchmark project directory...
Building jar file...
[INFO] Scanning for projects...
[INFO]
[INFO] -----< lath:lath_bm >-----
[INFO] Building Auto-generated JMH benchmark 1.0
[INFO] -----[ jar ]-----
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-clean-plugin:2.5:clean (default-clean) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-resources-plugin:2.6:resources (default-resources) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] Using 'UTF-8' encoding to copy filtered resources.
[INFO] skip non existing resourceDirectory your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/src/main/resources
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-compiler-plugin:3.1:compile (default-compile) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] Changes detected - recompiling the module!
[INFO] Compiling 1 source file to your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/target/classes
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-resources-plugin:2.6:testResources (default-testResources) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO]
[INFO] Using 'UTF-8' encoding to copy filtered resources.
[INFO] skip non existing resourceDirectory your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/src/test/resources
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-compiler-plugin:3.1:testCompile (default-testCompile) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] No sources to compile
[INFO]
```



```

[INFO] --- maven-surefire-plugin:2.17:test (default-test) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] No tests to run.
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-jar-plugin:2.4:jar (default-jar) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] Building jar: your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/target/lath_bm-1.0.jar
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-shade-plugin:2.2:shade (default) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] Including org.openjdk.jmh:jmh-core:jar:1.0 in the shaded jar.
[INFO] Including net.sf.jopt-simple:jopt-simple:jar:4.6 in the shaded jar.
[INFO] Including org.apache.commons:commons-math3:jar:3.2 in the shaded jar.
[INFO] Replacing your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/target/benchmarks.jar with your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/target/lath_bm-1.0-shaded.jar
[INFO]
[INFO] --- maven-install-plugin:2.5.1:install (default-install) @ lath_bm ---
[INFO] Installing your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/target/lath_bm-1.0.jar to your-home-dir/.m2/repository/lath/lath_bm/1.0/lath_bm-1.0.jar
[INFO] Installing your-path-to-Lath/jmh/lath_bm/pom.xml to your-home-dir/.m2/repository/lath/lath_bm/1.0/lath_bm-1.0.pom
[INFO]
[INFO] -----
[INFO] BUILD SUCCESS
[INFO] -----
[INFO] Total time: elapsed time
[INFO] Finished at: dateTtime
[INFO] -----
your-path-to-Lath/benchmarks/fac_tests
Done. run_Factorial.jar built.

```

If both have been successful, the scripts should have built the LATH-C++ executable “run\_factorial” and JMH jar file “run\_Factorial.jar”.

## Step 2: Run the benchmarks:

lath/sample\_scripts contains some example scripts that can be used to run benchmarks. You can use them “as is” or use them as a template for building your own scripts.

Here, we’ll use one of the provided scripts, as that is the quickest and easiest method:

**Step 2a:** This script uses environment variables. Set one or more of the following environment variables to the Java VMs on which you want to run the Java benchmark:

- JAVA\_HOME\_GRAAL: the top-level GraalVM directory
- JAVA\_HOME\_HOTSPOT8: the top-level HotSpot 8 directory
- JAVA\_HOME\_HOTSPOT11: the top-level HotSpot 11 directory

(If none are set, the Java benchmark will not be run.)

**Step 2b:** Use the *lath\_exec\_all.sh* script to run the benchmark:

```

$LATH_HOME/sample_scripts/lath_exec_all.sh run_factorial run_Factorial.jar
results/run1 > run1.out

```

This script will run the C++ executable (run\_factorial) and it will execute the Java jar file (run\_Factorial.jar) on each of the specified Java VMs. Once all of these have run once, the script will run each of them a second time (in a different order, just in case of any order-dependent performance behavior).

The main results are written to stdout, which we have redirected here to file "run1.out". Additional supplementary output files will be written to directory "results" with base file name "run1".

Here is an example of what the main results should look like:

```
$LATH_HOME/sample_scripts/lath_exec_all.sh run_factorial run_Factorial.jar results/run1

Running benchmarks:
  C++ benchmark run_factorial
  Java benchmark run_Factorial.jar on platforms:
    GraalVM
    HotSpot 8
    HotSpot 11

Supplementary output files will be written to "results"

Hostname: abcde001
Start: Sun Jun  7 06:37:06 PDT 2020

=====
Environment information:
=====

Processor info:
(from lscpu)
Architecture:          x86_64
CPU op-mode(s):        32-bit, 64-bit
Byte Order:            Little Endian
CPU(s):                56
On-line CPU(s) list:   0-55
Thread(s) per core:    2
Core(s) per socket:    14
Socket(s):             2
NUMA node(s):          2
Vendor ID:             GenuineIntel
CPU family:            6
Model:                79
Model name:            Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2690 v4 @ 2.60GHz
Stepping:              1
CPU MHz:               2600.000
CPU max MHz:           3500.0000
CPU min MHz:           1200.0000
BogoMIPS:              5188.37
Virtualization:        VT-x
Hypervisor vendor:     vertical
Virtualization type:   full
L1d cache:             32K
L1i cache:             32K
L2 cache:              256K
L3 cache:              35840K
NUMA node0 CPU(s):     0-13,28-41
NUMA node1 CPU(s):     14-27,42-55
Flags:                 fpu vme de pse tsc msr pae mce cx8 apic sep mtrr pge mca cmov pat pse36 clf
lsh dts acpi mmx fxsr sse sse2 ss ht tm pbe syscall nx pdpe1gb rdtscp lm constant_tsc arch_perfmo
n pebs bts rep_good nopl xtopology nonstop_tsc aperfmperf eagerfpu pni pclmulqdq dtes64 monitor ds
_cpl vmx smx est tm2 ssse3 fma cx16 xtpr pdcm pcid dca sse4_1 sse4_2 x2apic movbe popcnt tsc_deadl
ine_timer aes xsave avx f16c rdrand lahf_lm abm 3dnowprefetch ida arat epb invpcid_single pln pts
dtherm intel_pt spec_ctrl stibp pti tpr_shadow vnmi flexpriority ept vpid fsgsbase tsc_adjust bmi1
hle avx2 smep bmi2 erms invpcid rtm cqm rdseed adx smap xsaveopt cqm_llc cqm_occup_llc

(from head of /proc/cpuinfo)
processor       : 0
vendor_id     : GenuineIntel
cpu family    : 6
model        : 79
model name    : Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2690 v4 @ 2.60GHz
stepping: 1
microcode    : 0xb00002e
cpu MHz      : 2372.601
```

```

cache size      : 35840 KB
physical id     : 0
siblings: 28
core id        : 0
cpu cores      : 14
apicid         : 0
initial apicid : 0
fpu            : yes
fpu_exception  : yes
cpuid level    : 20
wp             : yes
flags          : fpu vme de pse tsc msr pae mce cx8 apic sep mtrr pge mca cmov pat pse36 clflush
dts acpi mmx fxsr sse sse2 ss ht tm pbe syscall nx pdpe1gb rdtscp lm constant_tsc arch_perfmon peb
s bts rep_good nopl xtopology nonstop_tsc aperfmperf eagerfpu pni pclmulqdq dtes64 monitor ds_cpl
vmx smx est tm2 ssse3 fma cx16 xtpr pdcm pcid dca sse4_1 sse4_2 x2apic movbe popcnt tsc_deadline_t
imer aes xsave avx f16c rdrand lahf_lm abm 3dnowprefetch ida arat epb invpcid_single pln pts dther
m intel_pt spec_ctrl stibp pti tpr_shadow vnmi flexpriority ept vpid fsgsbase tsc_adjust bmi1 hle
avx2 smep bmi2 erms invpcid rtm cqm rdseed adx smap xsaveopt cqm_llc cqm_occup_llc
bugs           : cpu_meltdown spectre_v2
bogomips: 5188.37
clflush size   : 64
cache_alignmen : 64
address sizes  : 46 bits physical, 48 bits virtual
power managemen:

Memory info:
(free -m)
              total        used        free      shared  buff/cache   available
Mem:          773922      227886      163895       24817       382140       638585
Swap:          12287        11186         1101

(vmstat -s)
792496512 K total memory
233356192 K used memory
269553664 K active memory
340865600 K inactive memory
167828848 K free memory
2272 K buffer memory
391309216 K swap cache
12582908 K total swap
11455300 K used swap
1127608 K free swap
3188155721 non-nice user cpu ticks
2768354 nice user cpu ticks
5180587512 system cpu ticks
90500773745 idle cpu ticks
49745836 IO-wait cpu ticks
161083 IRQ cpu ticks
23336507 softirq cpu ticks
0 stolen cpu ticks
83476650 pages paged in
2081287865 pages paged out
14421607 pages swapped in
28402457 pages swapped out
2064556849 interrupts
3929219527 CPU context switches
1573850655 boot time
4222276852 forks

Current activity:
top - 06:37:07 up 205 days, 16:52, 119 users, load average: 11.81, 11.29, 11.67
Tasks: 4828 total, 4 running, 4782 sleeping, 16 stopped, 26 zombie
%Cpu(s): 5.7 us, 13.8 sy, 0.2 ni, 80.3 id, 0.0 wa, 0.0 hi, 0.0 si, 0.0 st
KiB Mem : 79249651+total, 16782336+free, 23336158+used, 39131158+buff/cache
KiB Swap: 12582908 total, 1127608 free, 11455300 used. 65390604+avail Mem

  PID USER      PR  NI   VIRT    RES    SHR S  %CPU  %MEM     TIME+ COMMAND
 2856 root        20   0  223824    4548   3792 R 100.0   0.0   7836:02 abrttd

```

```
11631 ldrobins 25 5 170992 9012 3700 R 29.0 0.0 0:00.24 top
      8 root    20 0 0 0 0 S 1.6 0.0 1686:46 rcu_sched
```

```
=====
Benchmark results:
=====
```

```
=====
Run C++
```

```
LATH version: 0.5.0
```

```
Compiler version: g++ 7.3.0
```

```
./run_factorial -trendfile results/run1_cpp_1.trends -rf json -rff results/run1_cpp_1.json
```

```
CPU speed and warmup trends written to file results/run1_cpp_1.trends
```

```
Results written to JSON file: results/run1_cpp_1.json
```

```
high-resolution clock: estimated precision: 5.07418
```

```
system clock: estimated precision: 7.05569
```

```
steady clock exceeds precision limit
```

```
Using the system clock
```

```
Parameter values:
```

```
  Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 25
```

```
Benchmark: Benchmarks::factorialRecursive
```

```
Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
```

```
Threads: 1 threads
```

```
Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
```

```
Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
```

```
Parameters: (Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 25)
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 1: 44.1196 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 2: 41.1104 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 3: 41.4085 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 4: 46.9684 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 5: 42.216 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 1: 42.1703 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 2: 43.6667 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 3: 43.0568 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 4: 44.1157 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 5: 46.6927 ns/op
```

```
Result for Benchmarks::factorialRecursive:
```

```
  43.9404 ±(99.9%) 5.86354 ns/op
```

```
  (min, avg, max) = (42.1703, 43.9404, 46.6927), stdev = 1.5228
```

```
Parameter values:
```

```
  Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 30
```

```
Benchmark: Benchmarks::factorialRecursive
```

```
Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
```

```
Threads: 1 threads
```

```
Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
```

```
Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
```

```
Parameters: (Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 30)
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 1: 52.5929 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 2: 51.6011 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 3: 49.6298 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 4: 48.8061 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 5: 48.5914 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 1: 49.0048 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 2: 50.6852 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 3: 50.0188 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 4: 49.4021 ns/op
```

```
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 5: 49.5224 ns/op
```

```
Result for Benchmarks::factorialRecursive:
```

```
  49.7267 ±(99.9%) 2.22687 ns/op
```

(min, avg, max) = (49.0048, 49.7267, 50.6852), stdev = 0.578332

```
=====
Run java (GraalVM)
java version "1.8.0_72"
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)
WARNING: Not a HotSpot compiler command compatible VM ("GraalVM 1.0.0-rc9-1.8.0_192"), compilerHints are disabled.
# VM invoker: your_path_to_GraalVM/graalvm-ee-1.0.0-rc9/jre/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 25)

# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 60.755 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 27.567 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 22.327 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 21.321 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 22.419 ns/op
Iteration 1: 21.296 ns/op
Iteration 2: 23.150 ns/op
Iteration 3: 25.137 ns/op
Iteration 4: 21.689 ns/op
Iteration 5: 22.157 ns/op

Result: 22.686 ±(99.9%) 5.911 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (21.296, 22.686, 25.137), stdev = 1.535
Confidence interval (99.9%): [16.774, 28.597]

WARNING: Not a HotSpot compiler command compatible VM ("GraalVM 1.0.0-rc9-1.8.0_192"), compilerHints are disabled.
# VM invoker: your_path_to_GraalVM/graalvm-ee-1.0.0-rc9/jre/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 30)

# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:40
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 64.882 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 26.906 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 26.128 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 26.025 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 25.751 ns/op
Iteration 1: 28.890 ns/op
Iteration 2: 25.962 ns/op
Iteration 3: 27.297 ns/op
Iteration 4: 26.375 ns/op
Iteration 5: 28.118 ns/op

Result: 27.329 ±(99.9%) 4.652 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (25.962, 27.329, 28.890), stdev = 1.208
Confidence interval (99.9%): [22.677, 31.980]

# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:46
```

Benchmark	(number)	Mode	Samples	Score	Score error	Units
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	25	avgt	5	22.686	5.911	ns/op
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	30	avgt	5	27.329	4.652	ns/op
=====						
Run java (Hotspot 11)						
java version "1.8.0_72"						
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)						
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)						
# VM invoker: <i>your_path_to_Java_11/jdk-11.0.1/bin/java</i>						
# VM options: <none>						
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each						
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each						
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations						
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op						
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive						
# Parameters: (number = 25)						
# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25						
# Fork: 1 of 1						
# Warmup Iteration 1: 39.297 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 2: 41.956 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 3: 50.330 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 4: 43.702 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 5: 39.810 ns/op						
Iteration 1: 39.759 ns/op						
Iteration 2: 40.382 ns/op						
Iteration 3: 38.340 ns/op						
Iteration 4: 39.129 ns/op						
Iteration 5: 43.391 ns/op						
Result: 40.200 ±(99.9%) 7.461 ns/op [Average]						
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (38.340, 40.200, 43.391), stdev = 1.937						
Confidence interval (99.9%): [32.740, 47.661]						
# VM invoker: <i>your_path_to_Java_11/jdk-11.0.1/bin/java</i>						
# VM options: <none>						
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each						
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each						
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations						
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op						
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive						
# Parameters: (number = 30)						
# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:38						
# Fork: 1 of 1						
# Warmup Iteration 1: 47.228 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 2: 46.552 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 3: 49.739 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 4: 46.968 ns/op						
# Warmup Iteration 5: 47.937 ns/op						
Iteration 1: 45.372 ns/op						
Iteration 2: 48.738 ns/op						
Iteration 3: 50.462 ns/op						
Iteration 4: 45.152 ns/op						
Iteration 5: 46.771 ns/op						
Result: 47.299 ±(99.9%) 8.755 ns/op [Average]						
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (45.152, 47.299, 50.462), stdev = 2.274						
Confidence interval (99.9%): [38.544, 56.054]						
# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:45						
Benchmark	(number)	Mode	Samples	Score	Score error	Units
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	25	avgt	5	40.200	7.461	ns/op

1.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive 30 avgt 5 47.299 8.755 ns/op

```
=====
Run java (Hotspot 8)
java version "1.8.0_72"
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)
# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_8/jre1.8.0_72/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 25)

# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 37.712 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 41.287 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 40.713 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 38.654 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 38.840 ns/op
Iteration 1: 39.162 ns/op
Iteration 2: 36.829 ns/op
Iteration 3: 37.179 ns/op
Iteration 4: 36.388 ns/op
Iteration 5: 38.337 ns/op

Result: 37.579 ±(99.9%) 4.399 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (36.388, 37.579, 39.162), stdev = 1.142
Confidence interval (99.9%): [33.180, 41.978]
```

```
# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_8/jre1.8.0_72/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 30)

# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:40
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 46.634 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 45.445 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 46.493 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 48.361 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 52.535 ns/op
Iteration 1: 46.035 ns/op
Iteration 2: 44.797 ns/op
Iteration 3: 47.316 ns/op
Iteration 4: 47.143 ns/op
Iteration 5: 46.613 ns/op

Result: 46.381 ±(99.9%) 3.916 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (44.797, 46.381, 47.316), stdev = 1.017
Confidence interval (99.9%): [42.465, 50.297]
```

# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:45

Benchmark	(number)	Mode	Samples	Score	Score error	Units
1.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	25	avgt	5	37.579	4.399	ns/op
1.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	30	avgt	5	46.381	3.916	ns/op

```

=====
Run C++
LATH version: 0.5.0
Compiler version: g++ 7.3.0
./run_factorial -trendfile results/run1_cpp_2.trends -rf json -rff results/run1_cpp_2.json

CPU speed and warmup trends written to file results/run1_cpp_2.trends
Results written to JSON file: results/run1_cpp_2.json
high-resolution clock: estimated precision: 2.8878
system clock: estimated precision: 1.1284
steady clock: estimated precision: 2.67645
Using the system clock

Parameter values:
  Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 25

Benchmark: Benchmarks::factorialRecursive
Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
Threads: 1 threads
Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
Parameters: (Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 25)

Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 1: 43.7513 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 2: 46.7776 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 3: 44.6167 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 4: 46.1669 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 5: 46.6895 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 1: 43.5848 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 2: 44.4213 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 3: 44.8419 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 4: 43.6248 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 5: 44.7507 ns/op

Result for Benchmarks::factorialRecursive:
  44.2447 ±(99.9%) 2.08326 ns/op
  (min, avg, max) = (43.5848, 44.2447, 44.8419), stdev = 0.541035

Parameter values:
  Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 30

Benchmark: Benchmarks::factorialRecursive
Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
Threads: 1 threads
Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
Parameters: (Benchmarks::InputValue::number = 30)

Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 1: 52.4381 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 2: 55.5676 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 3: 52.6055 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 4: 51.8816 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, warmup iteration 5: 61.7279 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 1: 54.9237 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 2: 52.3683 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 3: 50.8935 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 4: 51.0811 ns/op
Benchmark Benchmarks::factorialRecursive, iteration 5: 50.9417 ns/op

Result for Benchmarks::factorialRecursive:
  52.0417 ±(99.9%) 5.93109 ns/op
  (min, avg, max) = (50.8935, 52.0417, 54.9237), stdev = 1.54034

=====
Run java (Hotspot 8)
java version "1.8.0_72"
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)
# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_8/jre1.8.0_72/bin/java

```



```

# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 25)

# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 40.215 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 37.469 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 37.740 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 37.411 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 42.123 ns/op
Iteration 1: 38.740 ns/op
Iteration 2: 39.371 ns/op
Iteration 3: 38.116 ns/op
Iteration 4: 41.222 ns/op
Iteration 5: 42.003 ns/op

Result: 39.891 ±(99.9%) 6.378 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (38.116, 39.891, 42.003), stdev = 1.656
Confidence interval (99.9%): [33.512, 46.269]

# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_8/jre1.8.0_72/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 30)

# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:39
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 46.381 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 50.122 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 49.043 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 43.991 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 44.545 ns/op
Iteration 1: 56.865 ns/op
Iteration 2: 51.053 ns/op
Iteration 3: 57.235 ns/op
Iteration 4: 45.004 ns/op
Iteration 5: 45.355 ns/op

Result: 51.102 ±(99.9%) 22.865 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (45.004, 51.102, 57.235), stdev = 5.938
Confidence interval (99.9%): [28.237, 73.967]

# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:45

Benchmark                                     (number)  Mode  Samples  Score  Score error  Units
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive            25  avgt     5  39.891     6.378 ns/op
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive            30  avgt     5  51.102    22.865 ns/op

=====
Run java (Hotspot 11)
java version "1.8.0_72"
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)
# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_11/jdk-11.0.1/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each

```

```
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 25)
```

```
# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25
```

```
# Fork: 1 of 1
```

```
# Warmup Iteration   1: 44.925 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   2: 43.260 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   3: 43.266 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   4: 40.241 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   5: 40.011 ns/op
Iteration    1: 39.753 ns/op
Iteration    2: 43.597 ns/op
Iteration    3: 37.854 ns/op
Iteration    4: 37.625 ns/op
Iteration    5: 38.937 ns/op
```

```
Result: 39.553 ±(99.9%) 9.308 ns/op [Average]
  Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (37.625, 39.553, 43.597), stdev = 2.417
  Confidence interval (99.9%): [30.245, 48.861]
```

```
# VM invoker: your_path_to_Java_11/jdk-11.0.1/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 30)
```

```
# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:38
```

```
# Fork: 1 of 1
```

```
# Warmup Iteration   1: 47.496 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   2: 50.214 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   3: 70.361 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   4: 46.668 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration   5: 46.593 ns/op
Iteration    1: 44.167 ns/op
Iteration    2: 43.880 ns/op
Iteration    3: 45.575 ns/op
Iteration    4: 49.530 ns/op
Iteration    5: 46.676 ns/op
```

```
Result: 45.966 ±(99.9%) 8.812 ns/op [Average]
  Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (43.880, 45.966, 49.530), stdev = 2.288
  Confidence interval (99.9%): [37.154, 54.777]
```

```
# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:46
```

Benchmark	(number)	Mode	Samples	Score	Score error	Units
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	25	avgt	5	39.553	9.308	ns/op
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive	30	avgt	5	45.966	8.812	ns/op

```
=====
Run java (GraalVM)
java version "1.8.0_72"
Java(TM) SE Runtime Environment (build 1.8.0_72-b15)
Java HotSpot(TM) 64-Bit Server VM (build 25.72-b15, mixed mode)
WARNING: Not a HotSpot compiler command compatible VM ("GraalVM 1.0.0-rc9-1.8.0_192"), compilerHints are disabled.
# VM invoker: your_path_to_GraalVM/graalvm-ee-1.0.0-rc9/jre/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
```

```

# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 25)

# Run progress: 0.00% complete, ETA 00:06:25
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 97.398 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 25.918 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 21.417 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 21.579 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 22.316 ns/op
Iteration 1: 24.391 ns/op
Iteration 2: 22.019 ns/op
Iteration 3: 22.219 ns/op
Iteration 4: 21.145 ns/op
Iteration 5: 22.455 ns/op

Result: 22.446 ±(99.9%) 4.600 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (21.145, 22.446, 24.391), stdev = 1.195
Confidence interval (99.9%): [17.845, 27.046]

WARNING: Not a HotSpot compiler command compatible VM ("GraalVM 1.0.0-rc9-1.8.0_192"), compilerHints are disabled.
# VM invoker: your_path_to_GraalVM/graalvm-ee-1.0.0-rc9/jre/bin/java
# VM options: <none>
# Warmup: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Measurement: 5 iterations, 1 s each
# Threads: 1 thread, will synchronize iterations
# Benchmark mode: Average time, time/op
# Benchmark: lath.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive
# Parameters: (number = 30)

# Run progress: 14.29% complete, ETA 00:06:40
# Fork: 1 of 1
# Warmup Iteration 1: 64.926 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 2: 25.683 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 3: 26.797 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 4: 24.615 ns/op
# Warmup Iteration 5: 28.153 ns/op
Iteration 1: 28.925 ns/op
Iteration 2: 25.966 ns/op
Iteration 3: 25.448 ns/op
Iteration 4: 25.063 ns/op
Iteration 5: 25.938 ns/op

Result: 26.268 ±(99.9%) 5.899 ns/op [Average]
Statistics: (min, avg, max) = (25.063, 26.268, 28.925), stdev = 1.532
Confidence interval (99.9%): [20.369, 32.167]

# Run complete. Total time: 00:07:46

Benchmark                                     (number)  Mode  Samples  Score  Score error  Units
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive            25  avgt     5   22.446    4.600 ns/op
l.Factorial.JavaFactorialRecursive            30  avgt     5   26.268    5.899 ns/op

End: Sun Jun  7 07:50:25 PDT 2020

```

## 6 Benchmark Construction and Design

### 6.1 Test Harness Wrapper

The wrapper generator extracts the annotations from the benchmark code and use them to generate the wrapper code. The wrapper code is designed to facilitate safe, robust, and accurate benchmark measurements.




Figure 2 Test harness wrapper code

The responsibilities of the wrapper code are visually depicted in the figure above.

[Note that the figure does not cover all possible permutations (that would be too cluttered). However, it shows some of the more common cases.]

### 6.2 Form of a LATH/JMH Benchmark (Single threaded)

LATH and JMH are different from other benchmarking frameworks, as it was designed for *micro*-benchmarks which tend to be smaller, faster, and more self-contained than larger benchmarks. As such, instead of defining timing intervals in a program, LATH and JMH are entirely **function based**. Each component of the benchmark is broken into one or more functions. Each function passes key profiling parameters to LATH or JMH using **annotations**.

This is fine for a microbenchmark, but a larger benchmark may need to be refactored into the following five key parts:

1. One or more functions you annotate as `@Setup` - these do all of the initialization and are not timed.
2. One or more functions you annotate as `@Teardown` - these do all necessary cleanup and are not timed.

3. One or more functions you annotate as `@Benchmark` - the core code of your program that *is* timed.
4. One or more classes or structures you annotate as `@State`. These should hold all the data needed by your benchmark, and all the *parameters* to this benchmark.
5. LATH and JMH provide a **BlackHole object** that you use to consume values that are produced by your benchmark (either explicitly or implicitly).

Tip: When writing your own microbenchmark, it's often easiest to take a ready made LATH/JMH class and just replace the parts above with your own.

Note that Multithreaded benchmarks, especially ones with functional parallelism, are even trickier in LATH/JMH. Because parallelism adds complexity to understanding and use of LATH/JMH, we will first describe everything for a single threaded benchmark, and then follow up with a special section on parallelism.

We'll now go over the main options for each of the standard functions that are implemented for JMH/LATH.

### 6.2.1 The `@Benchmark` Function

- Additional Benchmark Annotations
- The `@State` Object
- The Blackhole object...
- The `@Setup` and `@Teardown` Methods...
- Working with parallel benchmarks

This function can (but is not required to) take one or more **@State object** and (optionally) a **Blackhole** object as its inputs, and is the only function that is timed. (If you have more than one benchmark function, they will be considered independent benchmarks that will be run sequentially, EXCEPT in the case of a functionally parallel benchmark, but that will be described in the parallel benchmark section.)

The *benchmark mode* effects how performance is computed:

- Throughput: how many operations per unit of time
- Average time: average time per operation
- Sample time: computes statistics, percentiles, and a histogram of the distribution of operation run times
- Single shot: measures the time for a single operation

The benchmark mode is specified by the `@BenchmarkMode` annotation. (See Section 6.6, Annotations, for more information)

**Warning!** Sample time and Single shot modes attempt to measure the time for a single operation. For many microbenchmarks, a single invocation of the benchmark function may be too small to measure for the available timers. LATH will output a warning in these cases. This can be alleviated by using the *batchSize* argument to redefine an operation to be a specified number of invocations.

### Important note:

Benchmarking issues can occur with the notion of *iteration*. Because microbenchmarks are typically very small, the default assumption of LATH/JMH is to repeatedly invoke a benchmark function repeatedly for a specified amount of *time* (for the *average time*, *throughput*, and *sample time* modes). However, this can lead to a misleading comparison between two platforms if the benchmark function run time changes over repeated invocations, whether because of the benchmark code itself, the state of memory, or in the case of Java, the case of dynamic compilations.

It's also impractical for benchmarks with longer run times, and once again, changes the nature of the work when the number of iterations differ. (XXX ?? – consider removing)

This problem can be avoided by specifying that the test harness run for a specified number of *invocations* rather than a specified amount of time. Currently, however, the only way to do this in LATH/JMH is by using the *single shot* benchmark mode, which measures the time taken by a single *operation*. You can use the *batchSize* argument of the `@Measurement` annotation to specify the number of invocations for each operation.

## 6.2.2 @State Objects

State objects are *defined* in the benchmark (and marked with the `@State` annotation), but they are *instantiated* by the test harness. A State object can be passed to any of the other LATH/JMH functions (benchmark, setup, or teardown) as an argument. The State objects are allocated by LATH/JMH in order to control memory alignment and (for multithreaded benchmarks) false sharing issues.

, but this currently only applies to the static portion of the benchmark's state. (We hope in the future to provide benchmark support for dynamic allocation.) (XXX ?? – ask Jeff)

The values contained within State objects are protected against constant folding.

Note that, in single-threaded benchmarks, for each State object definition, only *one* instance is created by the test harness. So, in essence, the values and fields in a State object are common across all of your benchmark functions. The State object definition should be public.

## 6.2.3 Blackhole objects

Any computed value that you don't want dead-code-eliminated along with the computation that created it must be protected. This can be done implicitly, by returning the value from your Benchmark function and letting the test harness take care of it, or explicitly by using a Blackhole object.

The Blackhole object has a key method called `consume(any variable)`.

## 6.2.4 @Setup and @Teardown

These methods are used to initialize and finalize your benchmark, this is most often used to initialize and clean up your State objects. The methods take as input one or more State objects. The parameter to their annotation defines the Level:

- `@Setup(Level.Trial)`. = called once per Trial, i.e., Setup before any of the warmup and benchmark iterations, and Teardown after all iterations have been completed.
- `@Setup(Level.Iteration)` = called once per iteration.
- `Setup(Level.Invocation)` = called before every call to each Benchmark method. Warning: this can only be used with sufficiently long-running Benchmark functions, since timing will be interrupted

for each invocation. This is commonly used in combination with Single Shot or Sample Time benchmark modes.

## 6.3 Parallel (multi-threaded) benchmarks

**TBD**

State is given the parameter of scope:

```
@State(Scope.benchmark)
```

Where scope can be:

- Thread - each thread has its own instance.
- Benchmark - all threads share this one state object.
- Group - each group of threads running a parallel benchmark will use its own instance. See the parallel benchmark section for details.

Note that Setup will be called once for every state object, to allow all state objects to be initialized correctly. In order to give each thread its own work ID, a static value can be set to zero in the TearDown method and incremented in the Setup Method. This gets trickier with parallel benchmarks. [CHECK THIS IS TRUE]

### 6.3.1 Homogeneous Parallelism (TLP)

### 6.3.2 Heterogeneous (functional/producer-consumer) parallelism:

In this more complex case, different groups of threads work on different functions simultaneously, and each single function might itself be scalar or parallel. This is enabled in JMH in two steps:

6. Declare more than one function a @benchmark function. This indicates the heterogeneous (functional) parallelism. For example, one function might produce data while another might consume it, and a third monitor the entire benchmark process. For each function, you can declare the number of threads and state objects as in the homogeneous case.
7. Set fork to zero. This is a special case value that tells JMH to run all the individual @benchmark functions simultaneously.

## 6.4 Benchmark guidelines

This section contains guidelines for the benchmark developer to help avoid some common benchmarking pitfalls that can result in inaccurate, misleading, or nondeterministic performance results.

Each section generally follows the same format: a problem is introduced and the general guidelines for avoiding it are discussed, which is then followed by the specific assistance provided by LATH/JMH.

### 6.4.1 Unwanted optimization

Many of the pitfalls associated with benchmarking are related to avoiding undesirable compiler optimization that can obscure or skew the performance results of interest.

#### 6.4.1.1 *Loops*

In benchmarking, we are generally attempting to measure the time required for some behavior. However, the timer granularity may often be too coarse to accurately measure this behavior, so it is typically necessary to repeat the behavior many times and then measure the total time required.

However, if a simple loop is employed, an aggressive compiler can combine loop optimizations (such as unrolling, etc.) along with aggressive optimizations across the loop iterations, and, in some cases, lift much of the calculation out of the loop entirely.

[The JMH samples give an example of this problem where naïve loop construction results in a measured result of 1/20th of a nanosecond to execute the benchmark code, which is clearly nonsensical.]

Thus, it is necessary to construct the loop in such a way that it suppresses aggressive optimization across multiple loop iterations, but, at the same time, minimizes any introduced overhead that could skew the results in the other direction.

[Note: When doing this on your own, inspection of the resulting compiled instructions is recommended to ensure that each loop iteration is executed independently.]

- The test harness takes care of this by generating the loop code for you. Each implementation of the test harness will generate code appropriate for the target language that suppresses unwanted loop optimizations. Your code should only provide the method to be executed on each loop iteration.

#### 6.4.1.2 *Warmup and inlining*

There are some cases where aggressive inlining of the benchmark code is undesirable.

For example, if the benchmark code executed during warm-up were to be inlined separately from the benchmark code during timed execution, then the warm-up may not apply to the actual executed code!

The benchmark code should be constructed so that exactly the same code is executed during warmup and during timed execution.

- The test harness takes care of this for you by controlling inlining of the code that invokes the benchmark method during execution. All you need to do is provide the benchmark method, and the generated code will ensure that warm-up is executed correctly.

#### 6.4.1.3 *Dead code elimination*

One common source of inaccuracy in benchmarks is when an optimizing compiler eliminates branches of the code tree that produce results that are never used. While this is often useful in real-world applications, it is typically undesirable in benchmarking, as benchmark code is typically an abstraction that attempts to do a certain quanta of “work” and the results are usually not important.

One common method used to avoid this is to “trick” the compiler into thinking that the results are being used. It is important that this is done correctly for the target language. Some ad hoc methods used to do this (such as returning a computed value) can still fail, particularly when other optimizations come into



play (such as inlining). Assignment to a volatile value can circumvent this, but, if done incorrectly, may skew the results by forcing a cache miss during timed execution.

- Each implementation of the test harness provides a `BlackHole` class which is guaranteed to correctly consume the results in a manner that is as lightweight as possible. The benchmark developer is responsible for assuring that the result of every computation is either returned by the benchmark method (in which case the generated code will ensure that it is consumed correctly) or explicitly consumed by a `Blackhole` object that is passed in as an argument to the benchmark method.

#### 6.4.1.4 *Constant folding*

Smart compilers can introduce optimizations involving hard-coded constants. This is known as *constant folding*.

For example, clever compilers can replace a divide by a constant with a (typically much faster) sequence of operations using multiplies and shifts. However, if the constant is standing in for a value that could be runtime dependent in real-world code that the benchmark is intended to represent, this could result in artificially optimistic performance measurements.

So, it is often necessary to “trick” the compiler into believing that a value might be runtime dependent. However, this must be done very carefully to avoid unwanted timing issues. It is not sufficient to simply create a variable that is later set to the constant value (compilers are smarter than this). Declaring the variable to be volatile can avoid constant folding, but can skew timing by forcing extra memory accesses each time the value is used. This problem can in turn be circumvented, for example, by having the value to which the variable is set dependent on the value of a dummy volatile, thereby leaving the compiler uncertain as to the final value.

- The test harness takes care of most of this for you. You are responsible for ensuring that your benchmark method code does not inappropriately use any hard-coded constants. Instead, any constant values should be specified as an initialized variable in an annotated State object.

#### 6.4.1.5 *Data regularity*

If the data used in your benchmark is overly regular (particularly in comparison to any real-world code that this is intended to represent), then this can optimistically skew your performance results. In particular, dynamic compilation can take advantage of regular patterns of execution that are driven by, say, regularities in a data array.

As the benchmark developer, you should make sure that your data is not overly regular (unless that is explicitly desired).

- The test harness does not provide any assistance here.

### 6.4.2 *Reproducibility*

This section contains guidelines to help ensure that your benchmarks are deterministic and/or reproducible.

#### 6.4.2.1 *Random numbers*

For reproducibility, if your benchmark makes use of a random number generator, it should provide a mechanism to enable a specific benchmark run to be reproduced. This is useful for both debugging as well as deeper analysis to determine the cause of some observed behavior.

- The test harness facilitates doing this through use of the annotated Param feature. For example, your benchmark could output a *seed* value that could be used as input to exactly reproduce the data used in the run. When reproducing an earlier run, an annotated Param can be used to specify the seed on the command line (and where, if a seed is not specified, the default behavior would be to generate a random seed). Note that the value of the generated seed should be output as part of a teardown method so that the outputting of the value does not contribute to the benchmark timing.

#### 6.4.2.2 *Memory usage*

The details of how data is mapped into the address space can affect the measured performance, leading to either an inaccurate estimation of *average* performance or the introduction of non-determinism in the benchmark measurements.

If a benchmark has a sufficiently large data footprint that cache contention comes into play, the performance can depend on where the various data structures are located in the address space, as different arrangements can lead to different patterns of set collision within the cache. This can result in nondeterministic behavior from one run to the next.

There are two main scenarios that need to be accommodated:

- A consistent memory layout from one run to the next will help to eliminate false variability and give more consistent and deterministic benchmark results.
  - For some benchmarks, however, it may be more desirable to produce an accurate representation of the typical *average* behavior (e.g., if the fixed layout happens to hit an unrepresentative resonance or anti-resonance). In this situation, it may be better for the benchmark to be run multiple times with different random memory layouts.  
[Note: when comparing across languages and/or platforms, it may not be possible to ensure that the different implementations provide equivalent layouts in memory. Consequently, a random layout may often be the better option for cross-language comparisons.]
- The benchmark method and/or setup should avoid allocating data on the heap for itself. Instead, it should delegate data allocation to the test harness through annotated State objects. The harness has options to accommodate both of the scenarios detailed above.

#### 6.4.3 *Multi-threaded benchmarks*

This section provides additional guidelines for multi-threaded benchmarks.

#### 6.4.3.1 *False sharing*

One source of performance loss that can artificially reduce your benchmark results is false sharing, where the private data for two or more threads happens to reside in the same cache line (or, equivalently, when private data resides on the same cache line with shared data). This can result in repeated cache line invalidation, and has the potential to severely degrade performance.

It is thus necessary to ensure that thread-private data is not falsely shared with other data.

- Again, when using the test harness, the benchmark should avoid allocating its own data on the heap. Instead, simply use annotated State objects. The test harness is responsible for allocating all of the State objects in memory, and it will ensure that these objects are allocated so as to prevent false sharing.

#### 6.4.3.2 *Thread start/stop skew*

When starting multiple threads, there may be some variation in the thread start time. Threads that begin earlier may exhibit unrealistically good performance (due to the absence of resource contention from the other threads) or bad performance (e.g., while waiting for synchronization with another thread that has not yet started).

It is thus necessary to ensure that timing measurements only take place when all threads are running.

- The test harness takes care of this for you. For multi-threaded benchmarks, the test harness will postpone timing of iterations until all threads have had time to start, and will end timing before the threads terminate.

### 6.4.4 *Porting benchmarks*

This section contains some guidelines for porting benchmarks between languages.

#### 6.4.4.1 *Target language expertise and code quality*

There is rarely benefit to be obtained by benchmarking code that is poorly designed and constructed.

When porting a benchmark, it is necessary to have some level of expertise in the target language so that all implementations represent the best performance and capabilities of each language.

<p>Note: this assumes that the original implementation is likewise of high quality. DO NOT assume that this is true simply because a benchmark is well respected or considered a “standard”. We have found a significant number of widely used benchmarks that are very poorly implemented!</p>
---

#### 6.4.4.2 Algorithmic equivalence rule (and when to break it)

It is important to eliminate as many confounding factors as possible when making comparisons between implementations of the same benchmark in different languages. Care should be taken to ensure that both implementations implement the same algorithm (otherwise, you may be testing algorithmic differences rather than differences in the language capabilities).

However, there may be exceptions to this rule due to specializations in certain languages. (For example, R executes loops very slowly, but performs vector operations well. Therefore, it might make sense to re-implement a loop as a vector operation when porting a benchmark to R.)

Rule of thumb: algorithmic differences are OK if each implementation is using the best algorithmic choice for that language.

## 6.5 Support Classes

### 6.5.1 BlackHole

Each implementation provides a BlackHole class that allows values and results to be safely and robustly consumed with minimal overhead. This allows the benchmark code to avoid pitfalls such as *dead code elimination*.

## 6.6 Annotations

Annotations provide a way for the benchmark to pass meta-information to the test harness that it needs to generate the appropriate wrapper code. Annotations are specified by the “@” symbol followed by the annotation name, with no spaces in between. Some annotations may accept one or more arguments (expressed as is typical as a comma-separated list enclosed by parentheses). These arguments may be optional.

[If the “@” symbol is an operator in a target language, another symbol will be substituted to indicate annotations for benchmarks written in that language. See the specific section for that language.]

@Benchmark	Marks the following function or method as a Benchmark function. These are the functions that are invoked by the test harness and timed. [no arguments]
@BenchmarkMode	Specifies the mode for running and measuring the accompanying Benchmark function. <i>Required</i> argument. Available argument values are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Mode.AverageTime      average time per operation</li><li>- Mode.SampleTime        samples the time for each operation and shows the distribution of the sampled times</li><li>- Mode.SingleShotTime    measures the time for a single operation</li><li>- Mode.Throughput        average operations per unit of time</li></ul>

@Measurement	<p>Provides details of how the measurements will be carried out for the accompanying Benchmark function.</p> <p><i>Optional</i> arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- iterations = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Number of times to repeat measurements with this benchmark</li> <li>- time = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Time to run each iteration (in the specified time units)</li> <li>- timeUnit      The time unit. Available values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TimeUnit.DAYS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.HOURS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MINUTES</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.SECONDS (<i>default</i>)</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MILLISECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MICROSECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.NANOSECONDS</li> </ul> </li> <li>- batchSize = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Number of method calls per operation</li> </ul>
@OperationsPerInvocation	<p>Number of operations per invocation for the accompanying Benchmark function.</p> <p><i>Optional</i> argument:</p> <p>&lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Number of operations per method call.</p>
@OutputTimeUnit	<p>The time units in which to specify the results for the accompanying Benchmark function.</p> <p><i>Required</i> argument. Available values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TimeUnit.DAYS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.HOURS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MINUTES</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.SECONDS (<i>default</i>)</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MILLISECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MICROSECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.NANOSECONDS</li> </ul>
@Param	<p>Defines the values to which the following State data member should be set (in the given order). The benchmarks will be run for each parameter setting (if multiple parameters are specified, it will be run for each combination of parameter values).</p> <p><i>Required</i> argument: a list of quoted values</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>@Param({"25", "30"})</p>
@Setup	<p>Marks the following function or method as a Setup method. These will be invoked by the test harness but are not timed.</p> <p><i>Required</i> argument: specify when this method is to be run. Available values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level.Trial      Before the trial (default)</li> <li>- Level.Iteration      Before each iteration</li> <li>- Level.Invocation      Before each call to the benchmark method (WARNING!!)</li> </ul>

@State	<p>Marks the following class or struct definition as a State object. The test harness will have the responsibility to safely instantiate the State objects and pass them as arguments to the setup, teardown, and benchmark methods (as needed). The data members of the State objects will be protected from constant folding by the test harness.</p> <p><i>Required</i> argument: for multithreaded benchmarks, specify how each State object will be shared (and how many will need to be instantiated). Available values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scope.Benchmark      the most “global” state across the entire benchmark (and all threads) [used for all single-threaded benchmarks]</li> <li>- Scope.Group            shared by all threads within a group</li> <li>- Scope.Thread           private state for one thread</li> </ul>
@Teardown	<p>Marks the following function or method as a Teardown method. These will be invoked by the test harness but are not timed.</p> <p><i>Required</i> argument: specify when this method is to be run. Available values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level.Trial              After the trial (default)</li> <li>- Level.Iteration        After each iteration</li> <li>- Level.Invocation      After each call to the benchmark method (WARNING!!)</li> </ul>
@Warmup	<p>Provides details of how warmup will be carried out for the accompanying Benchmark function.</p> <p><i>Optional</i> arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- iterations = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Number of warmup iterations</li> <li>- time = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)            Time to run each warmup iteration (in the specified time units)</li> <li>- timeUnit                                The time unit. Available values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ TimeUnit.DAYS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.HOURS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MINUTES</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.SECONDS (<i>default</i>)</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MILLISECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.MICROSECONDS</li> <li>○ TimeUnit.NANOSECONDS</li> </ul> </li> <li>- batchSize = &lt;int&gt; (default 1)      Number of method calls per operation</li> </ul>

## 7 LATH C++

### 7.1 Benchmark file

#### 7.1.1 Compiling outside of LATH

LATH C++ provides two features to facilitate compiling benchmark code outside of the LATH environment. [This can be useful, for example, for developing the benchmark code outside of LATH, or to assist in porting existing code to the LATH environment.]

- The generated test harness code will include the following line:  
`#define LATH`  
This enables conditional code to be included within the benchmark code when running either within or outside the LATH environment.
- LATH C++ also provides an alternative notation for annotations ("`//@@`"). See 7.3, LATH C++ Annotations.

Example of the former:

An open question is how you test/develop this outside of the test harness? One way is to add a null definition of a black hole into your project.

Example of a null Blackhole place holder:

```
#ifndef LATH

class Blackhole
{
template < class T >
static void consume(T val) { } // Do nothing, but at least it compiles
};

#endif // LATH
```

#### 7.1.2 Method semantics

Your annotated Benchmark methods, along with any annotated Setup and Teardown methods, are invoked by the generated test harness code. These methods can use any of the test harness-generated state objects or the provided Blackhole object. To indicate that a method needs to use one of these objects, simply specify it as a *reference* or *const-reference* argument to the method.

For example, if your benchmark has a State class named "MyState", and you have a benchmark method Foo() that needs to read (but not modify) this state, and also needs to (explicitly) use the Blackhole object, you could define the method as follows:

```
@Benchmark
// ... other annotations ...
void Foo(const MyState &state, harness_utils::Blackhole &bh) {
    // ... body of method ...
}
```

## 7.2 Classes

LATH C++ defines the Blackhole class that is used to consume results and prevent unwanted dead code elimination. It can safely consume any object in as lightweight a manner as possible.

```
namespace harness_utils {

class Blackhole {
public:
    // Destructor
    // (This sinks all of the local sink targets to the volatile final sinks to
    // prevent a *really* smart compiler from compiling out the local sinks.)
    ~Blackhole();

    // Type-specific consume methods for the built-in types:
    void consume(char val);
    void consume(short val);
    void consume(int val);
    void consume(long val);
    void consume(long long val);
    void consume(signed char val);
    void consume(unsigned char val);
    void consume(unsigned short val);
    void consume(unsigned int val);
    void consume(unsigned long val);
    void consume(unsigned long long val);
    void consume(float val);
    void consume(double val);

    // Generic template consume method for any other types
    // (generally, don't do this - it's slower. Better to only consume
    // the built-in types)
    template <typename T>
    void consume(const T& val);
};

}
```

The Blackhole definition is automatically included by the generated test harness code.

## 7.3 LATH C++ Annotations

### 7.3.1 Alternate Notation Syntax

LATH C++ provides an alternate notation for annotations, where “@” is replaced by “//@@”. This enables benchmark code to compile outside of LATH, which can be useful for code development outside of LATH. See 7.1.1, Compiling outside of LATH.

### 7.3.2 Supported annotations

The following annotations are currently supported by LATH C++:



- Benchmark
- BenchmarkMode
- Measurement
- OperationsPerInvocation
- OutputTimeUnit
- Param
- Setup
- State
- Teardown
- Warmup

See 6.6, Annotations, for general annotation details.

## 7.4 Building the benchmark runtime

In order to build the benchmark runtime, the annotated benchmark file is parsed and used to generate the test harness wrapper code specific to this benchmark (the wrapper code also contains the original benchmark code with the annotations stripped out). This is then compiled to create the test executable.

The vast majority of microbenchmarks are encapsulated within a single file. The easiest way to build these is to use the provided build script, `lath_build_cpp.sh` (located in `$LATH_HOME/scripts`). For example:

```
lath_build_cpp.sh my_benchmark.cpp
```

This will parse `my_benchmark.cpp` and write the generated the test harness wrapper code to `run_my_benchmark.cpp`, which will in turn be compiled to an executable called `run_my_benchmark`.

If you need to modify any of these steps for your specific benchmark (e.g., to include additional libraries), the easiest way to do this is to modify a copy of `lath_build_cpp.sh` specific to your benchmark. [An example of this can be seen in `$LATH_HOME/benchmarks/xml_transform_tests`.]

## 7.5 Benchmark runtime options

The generated test executable has some pre-defined command-line options:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <code>-rf</code>                         | Specifies the report format (currently, the only valid option is “json”)   |
| <code>-rff &lt;filename&gt;</code>       | If specified, names a report file to be created. This will contain all of the generated output data in a convenient machine-readable format for post-processing.   |
| <code>-trendfile &lt;filename&gt;</code> | If specified, the generated file will contain the detailed trend information for warmup and for relative CPU speed measurements at runtime. [Note: this can generate a lot of data, particularly for long-running benchmarks!] See Section 10.3, CPU frequency monitoring, for more details. |

## 8 JMH (for Java benchmarks)

### 8.1 JMH Setup

- STEP 1: Installing the latest public version of the Java JDK on your computer.
- STEP 2: Configuring your shell environment
- STEP 3. Installing maven (mvn)
- STEP 4. Installing jmh and creating your first jmh Java project....
- STEP 5. Building and running your jmh project...

(Building from source is NOT recommended due to dependencies on other projects.) It is easy to download and install a ready made binary package from the Oracle website:

<https://www.oracle.com/technetwork/java/javase/downloads/jdk13-downloads-5672538.html> As of November, 2019, the most recent Java version is 13, with 14 due out in March, 2020

In your bash shell, set JAVA\_HOME and your PATH to point to the latest java. I use a special script to do this, specifically for when I need to do something that needs Java. You'll need to figure out where the install package from Step 1 put the JDK. On Macs, it's installed in the /Library/Java/JavaVirtualMachines directory:

```
# Mac bash Example:
export PATH=/Library/Java/JavaVirtualMachines/jdk-13.0.1.jdk/Contents/Home/bin
:$PATH
export JAVA_HOME=/Library/Java/JavaVirtualMachines/jdk-13.0.1.jdk/Contents/Hom
e
```

You can then verify everything worked: (I called my script profile\_java.bash):

```
. profile_java.bash
which java
java --version
```

### STEP 3. Installing maven (mvn)

Maven is the Make utility for Java. Again, I can't recommend attempting to build it from source - the dependencies spiral out of control. Instead, the easiest way I found was to install it as a package. On a Mac, I used home-brew.

You might have to install/update brew first. Brew is great for telling you how to fix issues...

```
brew update
brew install maven
```

**WARNING** - if you do "brew install mvn", it will install "mvnvm" which stands for "maven version manager". Unfortunately, this is a version of Maven from 2010, and it's incompatible with modern jmh! Instead, make sure you say brew install maven or brew upgrade maven.

Note that if you use brew, you'll probably already have the needed paths in your PATH - brew installs in /user/local/bin

You can then check if the maven worked:

```
which mvn
mvn -version
```

Note that for java 13, we need maven version 3.6.2

(If you do NOT plan on doing a JMH java project, you can focus on just the C/C++ project.)

Maven can be used to install jmh as a project dependency by creating a JMH project, which you'll presumably need anyway.

Here are the inputs you give to maven to generate a new JMH project: Create a directory for the project, execute the bash script to put maven in your path, cd to that directory and type:

```
mvn archetype:generate \
-DinteractiveMode=false \
-DarchetypeGroupId=org.openjdk.jmh \
-DarchetypeArtifactId=jmh-java-benchmark-archetype \
-DgroupId=my.own.jmhpackage \
-DartifactId=bm_directory \
-Dversion=1.0-SNAPSHOT
```

Maven will download what you need.

In the above example, mvn will create a local directory called "bm\_directory". Inside that directory will be a maven .pom file that describes this project, along with a src directory. Under the src directory maven creates a directory

main/java/my/own/jmhpackage

(Where my.own.jmhpackage was the first argument.)

In this folder is a minimum JMH benchmark file, called "MyBenchmark.java". It contains the package name my.own.jmhpackage, creates a class, MyBenchmark, with a benchmark method public void testMethod().

What about the version number you listed above as "1.0-SNAPSHOT" ? We'll see in the next section:

As mentioned, maven (mvn) is the java make utility. cd into the top directory of your new project (bm\_directory above). This has the all important pom.xml file in it which defines your project. Then type:

```
mvn package
```

This will build the entire package, similar to a "make all" or "make clean; make".

Now there is a new top level directory called target. In this directory will be two jar files created:

"benchmarks.jar" and "bm\_directory-1.0-SNAPSHOT.jar"

Now you see how the version argument is used: Maven will automatically save a jar file for each version you specify, so that you can compare different versions (albeit binary versions) across each other.

Assuming you are still in the top level directory (bm\_directory in this case), you can execute it by running:

```
java -jar target/benchmarks.jar
```

The goal of LAFF is to support a subset of the JMH framework for C/C++ benchmarks. This means that if you understand JMH, you will understand most of what you need to know to port benchmarks to both JMH and LAFF. There is a wealth of detailed, yet incomplete explanations of JMH on the web (some links below), but unfortunately, none just come out and define the things you need to know to use JMH. So we will define the key elements of JMH here, and you can learn JMH in more depth online.... You might want to read our summary first. :) Here we assume you know why you want to use JMH for java benchmarking, and we'll give you a solid reference of terms on HOW to use it.

## 8.2 Getting the JMH source code and building it to create the API JavaDocs...

The Java API Docs can be a good reference to the JMH API. But they do not exist online - they instead need to be created from the actual JMH source code during the build process!

Building anything from source is extraordinarily difficult. It is for this reason that we are INCLUDING the JavaDocs for JMH. However, if you're willing to give a shot at building JMH from source, make sure you check all these boxes: - In your Terminal Session, MAKE SURE that BOTH JAVA\_HOME and your path are pointing to the SAME Java JDK, ideally a modern one like Java 13. You can check via:

```
which java
java -v
echo $JAVA_HOME
```

- Make sure you've successfully updated maven to a compatible version (like 3.6.2):

```
which mvn
```

```
mvn -v
```

**ASIDE:** Having an incompatible version of maven will cause the build to act like it has a corrupted maven repository, which it stores in your home directory under `~/.m2`

- Get the actual source code for JMH. One way to do this is with Mercurial (ironically, not on GitHub):  

```
hg clone http://hg.openjdk.java.net/code-tools/jmh/ jmh
```
- Then build jmh. You should skip the tests, because it will not pass all of them. It will also not compile without some errors and a lot of warnings:  

```
cd jmh/  
mvn clean install -DskipTests
```

Note that at this point, maven will download the repo onto your machine in `~/.m2`
- If you wish, you can attempt to also build the standard jmh benchmarks, although this is not needed to get the java docs.  

```
mvn clean install  
java -jar target/benchmarks.jar
```
- **NOW LOOK FOR THE GENERATED JAVADOCS.** They should be in `"jmh/jmh-core/target/apidocs"`. Double click on `"index.html"` and start browsing the docs!

**If this doesn't work for you, we've included a recent version of the java docs with LATH.**

## 8.3 Benchmark file

## 8.4 Classes

## 8.5 Annotations

## 8.6 Building the benchmark jar file

## 8.7 Benchmark runtime options

# 9 LATH JS

**TBD**

# 10 Advanced Topics

## 10.1 Controlling the Environment

Accurate and dependable benchmark measurement can depend on providing a stable, consistent environment that is free from interference that can skew the results.

### 10.1.1 Variations in CPU frequency

Modern CPUs can step their frequency up or down to provide improved performance (e.g., TurboBoost) or for thermal management. Changes in the CPU frequency between runs, or during a run, can result in meaningless measurements.

If possible, the test harness should attempt to stabilize the CPU frequency by disabling these features, if it is possible to do so, and if it can be done safely (you would not want to disable thermal management and damage the chip).

Regardless, the generated test code will periodically monitor the relative speed of the CPU and report the results at the end of the run.

### 10.1.2 Interference from other processes

Other processes running on the same core, the same CPU, or the same compute node can contend with the benchmark code for resources and potentially invalidate the results. As much as possible, the system should be put into a quiescent state with as few system processes running in the background as possible.

Similarly, there may be asynchronous activity that is part of the platform, such as garbage collection. This should also be suspended, if possible. However, this could be problematic for some longer-running benchmarks, so the harness should force the system to run garbage collection during untimed periods if the system allows it.

Of course, any suspension or disabling of features in the environment should be optional to allow for the potential investigation of the impact on performance of those features.

### 10.1.3 Internal interference

It is also possible for different parts of the benchmark to interfere with each other.

If multiple benchmark methods are specified, the test harness must guarantee that they do not interfere with each other; i.e., the measured performance will be independent of the order in which they are run (unless explicitly requested, e.g., with the `@Fork` annotation). If this guarantee cannot be met for a particular target language, running multiple benchmark methods will be disallowed.

For multi-threaded benchmarks, in order to avoid unwanted perturbation due to access by another thread (e.g., cache de-warming), only the “worker” threads should ever touch state values. For example, if there is a setup method that touches state that is thread-private, that thread should be used to call the setup method. Likewise, for state that has group scope, one of the threads in the group should be used to call the setup method.

### 10.1.4 File system

For benchmarks that include file I/O, the framework could optionally run a temporary file system in memory so that the performance is not dominated by the I/O performance (unless that's relevant to what the user is trying to measure - hence optional).

## 10.2 Drilling Down - Test Harness Details

This section expands and explains the motivations behind the design decisions.

The goal of the test harness design is to produce benchmark measurements that are accurate and deterministic, both at runtime and by providing assistance to the benchmark developer.

The following subsections discuss the following potentially problematic areas and how they are addressed by the test harness design:

- Undesired over-optimization
- Memory issues
- Warmup
- Measuring time correctly
- Controlling the environment

The last subsection addresses measurement and some other metrics that may be of interest.

### 10.2.1 Undesired over-optimization

Over-optimization during compilation (either static or dynamic) can result in errors that invalidate performance measurement. Two of the most common pitfalls are dead code elimination and constant folding.

#### 10.2.1.1 Dead code elimination

One common source of inaccuracy in benchmarks is when an optimizing compiler eliminates branches of the code tree that produce results that are never used. While this is often useful in real-world applications, it is typically undesirable in benchmarking, as benchmark code is typically an abstraction that attempts to do a certain quanta of “work” and the results are usually not important.

One common method used to avoid this is to trick the compiler into thinking that the results are being used. However, some ad hoc methods used to do this (such as returning a computed value) can still fail, particularly when other optimizations come into play (such as inlining).

Thus, the test harness provides the BlackHole class which is guaranteed to correctly consume the results in a manner that is as lightweight as possible. This frees the developer from the burden of knowing how to correctly apply one of the ad hoc methods.

#### 10.2.1.2 Constant folding

A related issue occurs when the inputs are too deterministic. As stated previously, benchmark code is typically an abstraction that is intended to be representative of real-world code. Thus, it is important for the benchmark code to avoid operating on constants when the real-world code being represented would not. This includes passing constant arguments to a function that performs a calculation, as compiler optimizations can expose this.

[For example, a divide is typically a relatively expensive operation. However, division by a constant can often be implemented much more quickly by using multiply and shift operations, and some compilers are capable of implementing this optimization. This can result in a significant overestimation of the benchmark performance.]

There are ad hoc ways to avoid this that are language dependent, such as declaring a variable to be volatile in C or Java. However, the test harness provides a way to avoid constant folding, regardless of

language, through use of the @Param annotation. This is guaranteed to do the “right thing” regardless of the target language.

### 10.2.2 Memory issues

The details of how data is mapped into the address space can affect the measured performance, leading to either an inaccurate underestimation of performance or the introduction of non-determinism in the benchmark measurements.

#### 10.2.2.1 Memory layout and determinism

If a benchmark has a sufficiently large data footprint that cache contention comes into play, the performance can depend on where the various data structures are located in the address space, as different arrangements can lead to different patterns of set collision within the cache. This can result in nondeterministic behavior from one run to the next.

There are two main scenarios that need to be accommodated:

- To provide more deterministic and consistent results from run to run and eliminate false variability, the test harness can enforce a consistent memory layout. It will make a single block request of sufficient size to accommodate all of the state data (with padding, as noted above), and then allocate the state data within this block (if the target language allows this). Thus, the relative locations of the state data within the cache remain the same from one run to the next.

[Note: there may still be some nondeterminism due to the relative offsets of the state data and the stack. If this is significant, it may be possible to eliminate this through alignment of the state data during allocation.]

- In other cases, however, this may not produce an accurate representation of the typical *average* behavior (e.g., if the fixed layout happens to hit an unrepresentative resonance or anti-resonance). In this situation, it may be better for the framework to run the benchmark multiple times with different random memory layouts. The folks at Charles University published a paper outlining a method to randomize the memory layout in these cases (<http://d3s.mff.cuni.cz/publications/download/KaliberaBulejTuma-BenchmarkPrecision.pdf>). The test harness should include a seed value in the output, and should have an option for the user to provide this seed value to the random number generator. This facilitates reproducibility when debugging or analyzing performance results.

[Note: this option is typically preferred when making comparisons between different languages and/or different platforms, due to the difficulties of ensuring that the memory layout in one language/platform is identical to the other.]

#### 10.2.2.2 False sharing

For multi-threaded benchmarks, false sharing can occur when two different state objects accessed by different threads share the same cache granule.

The test harness avoids false sharing between state belonging to different threads by sufficiently padding the state objects in memory such that one state object never shares a cache granule with another state object.

### 10.2.2.3 NUMA hardware

For NUMA architectures, the data location in memory can impact the benchmark performance due to differences in access time. In this case, the code can be bound to a specific NUMA node.

### 10.2.3 Warmup

The test harness provides conventional means for the user to explicitly specify how long to warm up the benchmark before starting measurement. However, this relies on the user to specify a warmup interval that is sufficient for warmup to complete.

It would be preferable for the test harness to be able to remove this element of uncertainty by automatically detecting when warmup has completed. Unfortunately, automatic detection of warmup is difficult, for the following reasons:

- There can be differing definitions of warmup, depending on the target language/platform.
- It can be difficult to find a measurement criterion that dependably identifies when warmup is complete.
- There are benchmarks that persist in a quasi-unstable state where the performance can vary significantly from one iteration to the next. This can confound attempts to detect the completion of warmup.

Therefore, a given implementation of the test harness can optionally implement the `@AutoWarmup` capability as appropriate for a given language/platform.

However, all implementations should be capable of measuring the variation in the performance measurements during the run, and print a warning if:

- There is a high degree of variability in the measurements.
- There appears to be a trend from the beginning of the run to the end, particularly if performance appears to be improving over the course of the run. This can indicate a benchmark that was insufficiently warmed up.

### 10.2.4 Measuring time correctly

#### 10.2.4.1 Accuracy

The facilities for time measurement can vary widely from one language/platform to the next. There can be variations in

- Timing granularity
- Timing accuracy
- Timing overhead

Instead of requiring every benchmark developer to be aware of the idiosyncrasies of the timing facilities in each of the target languages, the test harness will generate code appropriate for each target language. It will ensure that calls to the timing facility are frequent enough to make the necessary measurements (for benchmark performance calculations as well as for detecting insufficient warmup



and variations in CPU frequency – see the sections on “Warmup” and “Controlling the Environment” for more information), but not so frequent that it invalidates the results.

The test harness should print a warning if the annotated directives in the benchmark result in timing intervals that are too short for the timing facility to accurately measure, or results in calls to the timing facility are too frequent such that they would skew the performance measurements.

#### 10.2.4.2 Thread skew

When starting multiple threads, there may be some variation in the thread start time. Threads that begin earlier may appear to have unrealistically good performance (due to the absence of resource contention from the other threads) or bad performance (e.g., while waiting for synchronization with another thread that has not yet started).

For multi-threaded benchmarks, the harness should postpone timing of iterations until all threads have had time to start, and should end timing before the threads end.

#### 10.2.5 Test Harness Loop Structure

The outer loop(s) may include the following:

- One or more loops sweeping over the specified parameter values.
- If multiple benchmark methods are specified, all iterations for each benchmark method will be completed before the next is run (unless, for a multi-threaded benchmark, they are in the same thread group, in which case they will be run concurrently).
- Multiple iterations of the same benchmark, if specified. Each iteration will consist of one or more invocations of the benchmark method. The timing results are computed for each iteration, and then the results from the iterations are aggregated.

The inner loop(s) may include the following:

- Multiple invocations of the benchmark method. Start and end time measurements over a number of consecutive invocations delimit an invocation *group*. The size of an invocation group is determined by a number of factors, including the accuracy and granularity of the timing facility, the level specification for setup and teardown methods, and the total measurement interval specified.
- Multiple invocation groups. A number of consecutive invocation groups for the benchmark method will be run until the specified measurement interval for an iteration has been satisfied.

The generated wrapper code will implement code that will do the following:

- Instantiate the state objects used by the benchmark methods. The state objects will be instantiated with sufficient padding between them to avoid false sharing. The wrapper code will either
  - A. Static layout: allocate a block of memory large enough to contain the state objects, with padding, and then allocate the state objects within this block.
  - B. Random layout: allocate the state objects at random locations (see <http://d3s.mff.cuni.cz/publications/download/KaliberaBulejTuma-BenchmarkPrecision.pdf>).[Note: to facilitate reproducibility, a seed should be provided in the output that can be used to reconstruct the memory layout in a subsequent run.]

- Instantiate a BlackHole object that will be used to consume values returned by the benchmark methods. Instantiate any additional BlackHole objects as required to be passed as arguments to benchmark, setup, or teardown methods, if specified.
- Instantiate Control objects as needed.
- Call any specified setup/teardown methods (depending on the specified annotation argument indicating setup/teardown level, these will be called either before/after the entire run, before/after each benchmark run, or before/after each call to the benchmark method).  
Note: for multi-threaded benchmarks, to avoid unwanted factors from skewing the performance results, setup and teardown methods should be called by one of the “worker” threads that are used to call the benchmark method(s).
- If there are one or more fields of state objects that are specified to be parameters with multiple values, it will create one or more outer loops to iterate over the parameter values.  
Note that the test harness guarantees that even single-valued parameters will be instantiated and passed in the correct manner (depending on the target language) to avoid over-optimization due to constant folding.
- Safely run one or more of the identified benchmark methods.
  - A. If the target language/platform allows it, each of the specified benchmark methods can be run, one at a time. This must be done in such a way that the benchmark method runs do not interfere with each other, and the performance result should not depend on the order in which they are run. For some platforms, this may require “resetting” the platform or even forking a fresh copy of a VM or interpreter for each benchmark method.
  - B. Otherwise, only one benchmark method can be run at a time. Either the benchmark code must only specify one benchmark method, or the benchmark method can be chosen by a command-line option.
- If this is a multi-threaded benchmark, it will launch the specified number of benchmark threads (including all benchmark methods that are specified to belong to a common thread group). Threads should be bound to prevent code migration between threads.
- It will create an inner loop (for each thread, if multi-threaded) that will repeatedly call the benchmark method specified in the benchmark code. Care should be taken to minimize unwanted over-optimization between the loop optimizations, depending on the capabilities of the target language.
- If a benchmark method returns a value, that value should be consumed by a BlackHole object.
- Make calls to the appropriate system timing facility to collect timing information, depending on the measurement mode indicated. The placement and frequency of the calls may also depend on the level of any setup or teardown methods. The default settings should provide for sufficient invocations between time measurements to enable accurate measurement of elapsed time. This can be language/platform dependent. For example, the modern JavaScript libraries provide timing facilities with microsecond granularity, while older JavaScript implementations only provide millisecond granularity.  
Note: the test harness should detect and print a warning if the specified timing interval (either by invocation count or by elapsed time) is too short for the available timing facility to accurately measure. Ideally, it could recommend a setting to fix the problem.
- For multi-threaded benchmarks, the start of timing should be delayed, and timing should be ended early, in order to ensure that timing only takes place when all of the threads are running and active.
- Any other specified metrics should be collected.

- If the system employs garbage collection, the system should be forced to run garbage collection during the untimed intervals between benchmarks, parameter values, iterations, or invocation groups.
- If possible, in order to monitor for variations in CPU frequency (e.g., due to thermal management), periodically measure the relative CPU speed (for example, by timing a short sequence of very deterministic compute-bound code). This should be done between timing periods, and should be done frequently enough to capture any CPU speed variation over time, but not so frequently that it significantly perturbs the benchmark results. See [https://wiki.osdev.org/Detecting\\_CPU\\_Speed](https://wiki.osdev.org/Detecting_CPU_Speed) for some examples of how to do this that are minimally intrusive (very fast) and hardware-independent.

## 10.3 CPU frequency monitoring

TBD

## 10.4 Deep performance analysis

TBD

## 10.5 PORTING BENCHMARKS TO JMH/LATH - A PRIMER

### 10.5.1 Walkthrough and tutorial

Here we take you through a tutorial in which you start with a small C benchmark and port it to LATH, run it, and interpret the output. We will later add a tutorial of porting this benchmark to Java and running the Java version of JMH.

We'll start with a greatly reduced version of the Mandelbrot Benchmark, "SampleBrot.cpp", albeit one that still generates a picture for validation and fun. You can compile and run it in a command line, e.g.

```
# Find SampleBrot.cpp in this tutorial directory
# Assuming you have a c++ compiler like g++, then just do:
g++ -O3 -std=c++11 SampleBrot.cpp -o SampleBrot.x
# (It requires C++11 for parallelism)
# Then run it in single thread mode
./SampleBrot.x
# And again in multithreaded mode - use 2x the number of cores
./SampleBrot.x 8
```

This source code is fairly typical of a small benchmark. It sets up the basic parameters in main(), allowing the user to configure things by command line options. The timed part of the benchmark is already a separate function (typically not true of even smaller benchmark), and there is a separate single threaded and multithreaded front end. When you run it, it outputs a ppm picture in the same directory as a check. And it does its own timing, currently set to use best of three. Performance variation is within a few percent on a loaded laptop.

Now we need to transform and test this benchmark until it can be used with LATH. This will further aid us in later porting it to Java and JMH.

In the beginning of this tutorial, we explained that you will need to break your benchmark down into at least 3 different functions: Setup, Benchmark, and Teardown. The problem is that JMH/LATH calls these functions, so there is no way for these functions to directly communicate with each other in any way. They cannot pass parameters to each other, nor can they return values! So the first step is to create a

structure which holds all the variables that need to be used in place of parameters and return values. In this SampleBrot, we can see the following values are important as parameters or return values: Note that for values needed in high performing code segments, OR for values that will be LOCALLY CHANGED, change their names so you can make local copies out of the state struct for use within the program! (There's no pass by value in a structure.) (We will side step this problem by simply wrapping the original functions with functions that unpack the struct.) Items that we can define locally in setup and teardown don't need to be here. Note that for such a tiny benchmark, this is manageable, but a larger program can have dozens to hundreds of parameters that need to be moved to global state.

```
//-----
// STEP 1: Create a struct with all the function arguments and return values
//-----
typedef struct {
    int num_threads, max_iter, image_w, image_h, image_pitch;
    double UL_Cx, UL_Cy, inc_x, inc_y;
    pix_t* image_pixels;
    bool running_multithreaded;
    long total_brots;
    double total_seconds;
    double brots_per_second;
} MyState_t;
```

This will be initialized in Setup, with total\_brots and total\_seconds are set in the benchmark function and used in the teardown method for expressing the computed rate. Currently, JMH does not offer a way to express a data dependent/variable amount of operations per benchmark call, but we are planning to add this to LATH.

However, there's one other issue we must address. We want to have two benchmark functions: Single threaded and multithreaded. BUT, a flaw in the JMH API is that ALL BENCHMARKS have to share the SAME setup and teardown method. What if they need special handling? The problem is, when setup and teardown is called, WE DON'T EVEN KNOW WHICH BENCHMARK FUNCTION has been used! A crude work around for this situation is to define a different state type for each benchmark, call Setup and Teardown with BOTH of them, and then pass just one each to a given benchmark. But there are performance issues with this approach, and we STILL don't know which benchmark was called! In the case of this sample benchmark, we are currently handling all the parallel details internally, so the only time we care is during the performance reporting in teardown. So it's not a significant performance issue to simply remember which benchmark was run by setting a state variable inside the benchmark. So we'll add one boolean value:

```
bool running_multithreaded; // how to tell WHICH benchmark was called
```

In the interest of not breaking working code, we'll initially create wrapper functions that take a State Object as input, then internally call the original functions with parameters from the state object. This eliminates the modification issue, but will slow down the benchmark, and for smaller benchmarks, may completely distort the timing. However, this is the best way to start the port. (In testing, we found for this benchmark the slowdown is around 10%.

Because current JMH/LATH support for parallel benchmarks are incomplete, we'll also wrap the parallel version of our benchmark the same way, and just use the built in parallelism instead of jmh at the moment...

We will also preserve the internal app timing in the wrapper. This will also add overhead, but will provide a valuable check to make sure the timing reported by LATH/JMH matches our expectations. Finally, notice that what was previously a return value of the function is now written into the state object for use in the TearDown function.

The two wrappers look like this:

```

//-----
// STEP 2: Wrap the benchmark functions to use state for I/O
//-----
// Note we also record WHICH benchmark was called and provide timing info
// We gave it a different name to avoid c++ bugs with variadic templates
void ComputeMandelImageState(MyState_t &state)
{
    state.running_multithreaded = false;
    double seconds = get_seconds();
    state.total_brots = ComputeMandelImage(state.UL_Cx, state.UL_Cy, state.inc_x
, state.inc_y,
    state.max_iter,
    state.image_pixels, state.image_w, state.image_h, state.image_pitch);
    state.total_seconds = get_seconds() - seconds;
}

//-----
// STEP 2: Wrap the benchmark functions to use state for I/O
//-----
// Note we also record WHICH benchmark was called and provide timing info
void ComputeMandelImageMTState(MyState_t &state)
{
    state.running_multithreaded = true;

    double seconds = get_seconds();
    state.total_brots = ComputeMandelImageMT(state.num_threads,
    state.UL_Cx, state.UL_Cy, state.inc_x, state.inc_y,
    state.max_iter,
    state.image_pixels, state.image_w, state.image_h, state.image_pitch);
    state.total_seconds = get_seconds() - seconds;
}

```

We will eventually want to make inlined versions of the benchmark for more representative performance results.

Note that at the moment, neither LATH nor JMH support passing command line arguments to a benchmark. So for now, we'll have to hard code the parameters. However, we'll have the parallel and scalar versions of the benchmark as two independent benchmarks, with the first using one thread, and the other using the JMH/LATH construct for MAX\_THREADS, which we'll just define at the moment. Note that we want to keep the heads up information because our benchmark takes a long time, and we'd like to know it's executing. Finally, we'll store the number of threads intended for the multithreaded version of the benchmark, knowing that if the single threaded variant is called, the number of threads is implicitly one.

The Setup function ends up looking like this:

```

//-----
// STEP 3: Create a Setup function to initialize the state
//-----
// Mimic what we did in main() minus the vararg stuff.
void Setup(MyState_t &state)
{
    const int image_w = 1024, image_h = 768;
    const int max_iter = 4096;

    pix_t *image = (pix_t*) calloc(sizeof(pix_t), image_w * image_h);
}

```

```

// Defining the image...
double brot_w = 3.0, brot_h = 2.5; // frame Mandelbrot
double cen_x = -0.74529, cen_y = 0; // 0.113075; // with sweep, good for may
be 112 frames...
double inc_x = brot_w / double(image_w);
double inc_y = -brot_h / double(image_h);

double UL_x = cen_x - inc_x * image_w/2.0;
double UL_y = cen_y - inc_y * image_h/2.0;

// Initialize state:
state.UL_Cx = UL_x;
state.UL_Cy = UL_y;
state.inc_x = inc_x;
state.inc_y = inc_y;
state.num_threads = 8; // need to figure this out
state.max_iter = max_iter;
state.image_w = image_w;
state.image_h = image_h;
state.image_pitch = state.image_w;
state.image_pixels = image;
state.total_brots = 0;
state.total_seconds = 0.0;
}

```

This cleans up the memory allocation and also computes rates we need that currently aren't computable with the standard LATH/JMH interface - namely measure of work/second. Here we will use the boolean state value alerting us as to which benchmark was actually called, so we know the true thread number. Note that there's no way currently to convey to JMH/LATH how much work the benchmark did, so we have to report the meaningful rate ourselves. On this benchmark, it will do the same amount of work each time as long as the configuration is identical, but on the real Mandelbrot benchmark, every frame is different, so direct comparisons cannot be made without it.

```

//-----
// STEP 4: Create a Teardown function to clean up and report performance
//-----
// Mimic what we did in main() minus the vararg stuff.
void Teardown(MyState_t &state)
{
    state.brots_per_second = double(state.total_brots) / state.total_seconds;

    printf("Computed %d x %d mandelbrot, max_iter = %d",
        state.image_w, state.image_h, state.max_iter);
    if (state.running_multithreaded) printf(" using %d threads.\n", state.num_th
reads);
    else printf(".\n");

    printf("\t... Performance was %g megabrots in %g seconds = %g megabrots/seco
nd",
        state.total_brots * 0.000001, state.total_seconds, state.brots_per_second
* 0.000001);
    if (state.running_multithreaded) printf(" = %g MBPS/thread.\n", state.brots_
per_second * 0.000001 / state.num_threads);
    else printf(".\n");

    fflush(stdout);
}

```

```

    // Save image as check:
    save_image("./Mandelbrot.ppm", state.image_pixels, state.image_w, state.image_h);
    free(state.image_pixels); state.image_pixels = NULL; // clean up
}

```

Once we create a driver function, we can then run and debug the now LATH/JMH compatible version of the benchmark... Here we will restore the main "best of 3" approach, so that we can see the performance variation as we call the benchmark multiple times. Note that this driver function won't be used in the final version, but it's useful for debugging now. We also shortcut main() with a call to this benchmark. Note that we have not deleted ANY of the original benchmark code. This is by design.

```

//-----
// STEP 5: Create a driver loop to mimic the test harness.
//-----
void DriveBenchmark()
{
    const int tot_runs = 3; // best time of 3
    MyState_t state;

    for (int run = 0; run < tot_runs; run++)
    {
        Setup(state);
        ComputeMandelImageState(state);
        Teardown(state);
    }

    for (int run = 0; run < tot_runs; run++)
    {
        Setup(state);
        ComputeMandelImageMTState(state);
        Teardown(state);
    }
}

// Timing the benchmark, plus defining it...
//
int main(int argc, char *argv[])
{
    DriveBenchmark();
    return 0;
    [...] // rest as before
}

```

Now we can finally run the refactored benchmark to see if it still works...

```

g++ -O3 -std=c++11 PortedSampleBrot.cpp -o PortedSampleBrot.x
./PortedSampleBrot.x

```

But we get this cryptic compiler error:

```

mac:/Volumes/D/MacCode/LATH> g++ -O3 -std=c++11 PortedSampleBrot.cpp -o PortedSampleBrot.x
PortedSampleBrot.cpp:281:18: error: no matching function for call to 'async'
    threads[tid] = std::async(std::launch::async, ComputeMandelImage,
                        ^~~~~~
/Applications/Xcode.app/Contents/Developer/Toolchains/XcodeDefault.xctoolchain/usr/include/c++/v1/future:2335:1: note:
    candidate template ignored: couldn't infer template argument '_Fp'

```

```

async(launch __policy, _Fp&& __f, _Args&&... __args)
^
/Applications/Xcode.app/Contents/Developer/Toolchains/XcodeDefault.xctoolchain
/usr/include/c++/v1/future:2361:1: note:
    candidate template ignored: substitution failure [with _Fp = std::__1::l
aunch]: deduced incomplete pack <(no value),
    double &, double &, double &, double &, const int &, unsigned char *&, i
nt &, int &, int &> for template parameter
    '_Args'
async(_Fp&& __f, _Args&&... __args)
^
1 error generated.

```

This error has nothing to do with LATH, but it does illustrate how things may go wrong when you wrap functions. In this case, the error was due to the use of the C++ async function call to implement parallelism. The async function leverages the C++ feature of variadic templates. The problem occurred because you tried to use an overloaded function name with a variadic template function (that is, the async call), and so the compiler didn't know which function pointer you meant when you called async. And it picked the wrong one, since it does a one pass compile from left to right, so it can't use your arguments to match the correct version of the function.

To fix this, we will simply make sure our wrapper functions use a different name than the original. To catch these errors earlier, make sure you compile as you go. (This error can also be caused by you actually passing the wrong number of variables when calling the wrapper functions - it can be tricky to get right.)

Now the compiler works, and we can functionally test and debug the State version of the benchmark:

```

g++ -O3 -std=c++11 PortedSampleBrot.cpp -o PortedSampleBrot.x
./PortedSampleBrot.x
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096.
... Performance was 651.38 megabrots in 2.30363 seconds = 282.762 megabrot
s/second.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096.
... Performance was 651.38 megabrots in 2.31032 seconds = 281.943 megabrot
s/second.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096.
... Performance was 651.38 megabrots in 2.30821 seconds = 282.201 megabrot
s/second.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096 using 8 threads.
... Performance was 651.378 megabrots in 0.380596 seconds = 1711.47 megabr
ots/second = 213.934 MBPS/thread.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096 using 8 threads.
... Performance was 651.378 megabrots in 0.369773 seconds = 1761.56 megabr
ots/second = 220.195 MBPS/thread.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm
Computed 1024 x 768 mandelbrot, max_iter = 4096 using 8 threads.
... Performance was 651.378 megabrots in 0.404912 seconds = 1608.69 megabr
ots/second = 201.086 MBPS/thread.
> Wrote image to ./Mandelbrot.ppm

```

It works!

In this example, we clearly use the return value of the benchmark function - to print out performance in the TearDown method. So in principle, we don't need to use a Black Hole object. On fact, both lath and



JMH will automatically use a black hole object for the value returned by a benchmark function.<sup>0</sup> The problem is there is a risk that someone else will see that and say, "we don't need to print out this result - so let's just comment this out." And all of a sudden, the benchmark will run much faster because the entire thing was dead code eliminated. So just to be safe, we'll use a black hole object on the result. Of course, you initially won't want to use a real black hole object until you're ready to port to LATH. SO we've provided a simple compatibility header to fake the availability of lath functionality in your pre-transformed program for testing. At the top of your program, just include "lath.h". Now we can add a few things from lath/jmh:

Let's use the java Threads.Max in our Setup function. (In the future, we will add to lath a C compatible format for the enums.)

```

    //@@Setup(Level.Invocation)
    void Setup(MyState_t &state) {
    [...]
        // Initialize state:
    [...]
        state.num_threads = Threads.MAX; // works like magic!
    [...]

```

Now let's black hole consume our result in the teardown function... The way this works in JMH is you specify a Blackhole as a function argument, and it will be allocated and passed. Unfortunately, for us, this means allocating one and using it with our driver functions...

```

    //@@TearDown(Level.Invocation)
    void Teardown(MyState_t &state, Blackhole &bh)
    {
        // Consume the most important return value - the operation count:
        bh.consume(state.brots_per_second); // STEP 6 - add black hole support
    [...]

```

```

void DriveBenchmark()
{
    const int tot_runs = 3; // best time of 3
    MyState_t state;
    Blackhole bh; // STEP 6 - add black hole support

    for (int run = 0; run < tot_runs; run++)
    {
        Setup(state);
        ComputeMandelImageState(state);
        Teardown(state, bh); // STEP 6 - add black hole support
    }
    for (int run = 0; run < tot_runs; run++)
    {
        Setup(state);
        ComputeMandelImageMTState(state);
        Teardown(state, bh); // STEP 6 - add black hole support
    }
}

```

This is not something we'll be able to test without LATH, but we can put them in initially as comments. This is not a very long running benchmark, but the single threaded version does take several seconds, so let's do a "one shot" approach to timing.

Let's make the minimum amount of annotations we can get away with, accepting defaults for everything else. First, we want to define the state as per benchmark. Then, we want to define both benchmarks as

One Shot. Finally, we want to add the Setup and TearDown methods as once per invocation (compatible with one shot) as shown:

```
//@@State(Scope.Benchmark)
typedef struct {
[...]
```

```
//@@Benchmark
//@@BenchmarkMode(Mode.SingleShotTime)
void ComputeMandelImageState(MyState_t &state)
[...]
```

```
//@@Benchmark
//@@BenchmarkMode(Mode.SingleShotTime)
void ComputeMandelImageMTState(MyState_t &state)
[...]
```

```
//@@Setup(Level.Invocation)
void Setup(MyState_t &state)
[...]
```

```
//@@TearDown(Level.Invocation)
void Teardown(MyState_t &state)
```

So how hard was porting this benchmark? By lines of code, we had to increase the size of the benchmark by 50% to make it LATH/JMH compatible, adding overhead that slowed the runtime by about 10%! And there was a lot of debugging time we needed to get it to compile and run correctly. Prepare yourself for a non-trivial amount of porting time.

This is extremely straightforward, assuming LATH has no parsing issues with converting your source code. Simple do:

```
./lath/lath-cpp/cpp_parser ./PortedSampleBrot.cpp > ./PortedSampleBrot.lath.cpp
```

The source to source translator will create a new version of your file that can be compiled and run, which will INCLUDE the test harness code.

```
g++ -O3 -std=c++11 ./PortedSampleBrot.lath.cpp -o ./PortedSampleBrotWithLath.x
```

Now it's time to see what LATH does...