Link-Time Analysis to Optimize Library Usage

Mark Chapman and David He

CS 706 Final Project

December 8, 2010



Outline



- 1 Introduction Motivation Solution
- 2 Techniques
 Implementation
 Optimization
- 3 Conclusion
 Current Status
 Possible Future Work

Problem



Inefficient Library Usage

- Authors: experts in field supply a module
- Users: application developers use modules
- Problem: optimal usage requires expertise by both parties

Problem



Inefficient Library Usage

- Authors: experts in field supply a module
- Users: application developers use modules
- Problem: optimal usage requires expertise by both parties

Separate the Concerns

- Authors: supply insight to accomplish task efficiently
- Users: supply logic to use library correctly
- Solution: enable libraries to optimize themselves across method calls, not just in separate calls

Examples



Rectangle

- Need 4 values
 - upper left x, upper left y, width, height
- Remainder can be computed
 - other corners x and y, center, height/width ratio

Examples



Rectangle

- Need 4 values
 - upper left x, upper left y, width, height
- Remainder can be computed
 - other corners x and y, center, height/width ratio
- Look ahead and store only values that are requested later

Examples



Rectangle

- Need 4 values
 - upper left x, upper left y, width, height
- Remainder can be computed
 - other corners x and y, center, height/width ratio
- Look ahead and store only values that are requested later

Data Structures

- Map → HashMap or TreeMap
- List → LinkedList or ArrayList
- Only once use is known can the correct subtype be chosen

Matrix Problem



```
public static void main(String[] args) {
 Matrix mA = MatrixFactory.create(
      new double[] {{1.0, 2.0}, {3.0, 4.0}});
  System.out.println(proc01(mA, 4));
public static double[] proc01(Matrix mA, int k) {
 mA = MatrixOperations.power(mA, k);
 double[] vL = new double[mA.getNumRows()];
 MatrixOperations.eigenvalues(mA, vL);
 return vL;
```

Matrix Problem



```
public static void main(String[] args) {
 Matrix mA = MatrixFactory.create(
      new double[] {{1.0, 2.0}, {3.0, 4.0}});
  System.out.println(proc01(mA, 4));
public static double[] proc01(Matrix mA, int k) {
 mA = new EigenDecompMatrix(mA);
 mA = MatrixOperations.power(mA, k);
 double[] vL = new double[mA.getNumRows()];
 MatrixOperations.eigenvalues(mA, vL);
 return vL;
```

Overview



Enforce Separation of Concerns

- Library addresses performance internally
- Only abstract base types are visible to user

Overview



Enforce Separation of Concerns

- Library addresses performance internally
- Only abstract base types are visible to user

Optimize at Link-Time

- Static analysis: flow sensitive, context insensitive
- Type flow: finds best types for list of method calls
- Insert transforms: convert between concrete types

Implementation



Link-Time Optimization (LTO)

- Uses java.lang.instrument and BCEL
- Reads in annotations from self-optimizing library
- Transforms application bytecode when loaded

Implementation



Link-Time Optimization (LTO)

- Uses java.lang.instrument and BCEL
- Reads in annotations from self-optimizing library
- Transforms application bytecode when loaded

Library Information

- Manifest: lists base types, methods, and transforms
- @Equivalents: annotations point base types to concrete subtypes and base methods (acting on base types) to called methods (acting on concrete types)
- @Cost annotations give relative times for methods and transforms

Problem formulation



Variables
$$X = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|X|}$$

Types $T = t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{|T|}$
Method calls $M = m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{|M|}$

A configuration is a type assignment of variables

$$a: X \rightarrow T$$

The set of all configurations is

$$A = T^{|X|}$$

Problem formulation



Cost of method calls

$$\textit{CM}:\textit{M}\times\textit{A}\to\mathbb{Z}$$

Cost of type transforms

$$CT: A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

Goal: Select $\mathcal{A} = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|M|}$ to minimize

$$C(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{|M|} CM(m_i, a_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{|M|} CT(a_{i-1}, a_i).$$

LP formulation



directed graph
$$G = (V, E)$$
 cost $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ source s sink t capacity $c : E \to \mathbb{Z}$

Minimize $\sum_{e \in E} w_e x_e$ subject to

$$\sum_{v:(v,u)\in E} x_{vu} - \sum_{v:(u,v)\in E} x_{uv} = d(u) \qquad \forall u \in V$$

$$x_{e} \leq c_{e} \qquad \forall e \in E$$

$$x_{e} \geq 0 \qquad \forall e \in E$$

LP formulation



directed graph
$$G = (V, E)$$
 cost $w : E \to \mathbb{Z}$ source s sink t capacity $c : E \to \mathbb{Z}$

$$S_m = \{(v_{0ma}, v_{1ma}) \forall a \in A_m\}$$

Minimize $\sum_{e \in E} w_e x_e$ subject to

$$\sum_{v:(v,u)\in E} x_{vu} - \sum_{v:(u,v)\in E} x_{uv} = d(u) \qquad \forall u \in V$$

$$x_e \leq c_e \qquad \forall e \in E$$

$$x_e \geq 0 \qquad \forall e \in E$$

$$x_e \in \{0,f\} \qquad \forall m, \forall e \in S_m$$

Current Status



Link-Time Analysis

- Working pieces:
 - reads manifest and annotations (from library)
 - finds method calls (from application)
 - optimizes over types
- Remaining step: connect to optimizer to instrument application methods

Current Status



Link-Time Analysis

- Working pieces:
 - reads manifest and annotations (from library)
 - finds method calls (from application)
 - optimizes over types
- Remaining step: connect to optimizer to instrument application methods

Matrix Library

- Limiting visibility to abstract base types makes some decisions difficult, e.g. user might want a sparse matrix
- Allow user to choose some type seeds or leave all decision to optimizer alone

Possible Future Work



Meaning of Cost

- Annotate memory usage instead of execution time
- How could we annotate both and choose a balance?

Possible Future Work



Meaning of Cost

- Annotate memory usage instead of execution time
- How could we annotate both and choose a balance?

Analysis

- Static: add checkpoints where types may change
- Dynamic: change types depending on actual state
- Gains sensitivity to path and context

Possible Future Work



Meaning of Cost

- Annotate memory usage instead of execution time
- How could we annotate both and choose a balance?

Analysis

- Static: add checkpoints where types may change
- Dynamic: change types depending on actual state
- Gains sensitivity to path and context

Type System

- Qualifiers: finer control with lattice rather than hierarchy
- Multiple interfaces: alternative to positive qualifiers