Programming Language (9)
Garbage Collection

田浦

Contents

Contents

Evaluating GCs

1. preciseness:
   - garbage that can be collected
2. memory allocation cost:
   - the work (including GC) required to allocate memory
3. pause time:
   - the (worst case) time the mutator has to (temporarily) suspend for GC to function
4. mutator overhead:
   - the overhead imposed on the mutator for GC to function

Criteria #1: preciseness

- *reference counting cannot reclaim cyclic garbage*
- reference count < traversing GC (traversing GC is better)



Criteria #2: memory allocation cost

- difficult to say in a few words (more details ahead)

Criteria #2: memory allocation cost

- difficult to say in a few words (more details ahead)
- traversing GC:
  - *the cost is determined by the ratio "reachable objects" / "unreachable (reclaimed) objects"* (later)
  - totally depending on apps and memory size, it can be anywhere from the minimum to infinity
  - an advanced technique: generational GC

Criteria #2: memory allocation cost

- difficult to say in a few words (more details ahead)
- traversing GC:
  - *the cost is determined by the ratio "reachable objects" / "unreachable (reclaimed) objects"* (later)
  - totally depending on apps and memory size, it can be anywhere from the minimum to infinity
  - an advanced technique: generational GC
- reference counting:
  - the cost of reclaiming an object once its RC drop to zero is small and constant
  - it is constant even if memory is scarce (good)

Criteria #3: pause time

- reference counting $<$ traversing GC (reference counting is better)

Criteria #3: pause time

- reference counting < traversing GC (reference counting is better)
- traversing GC:
  - traverse *all* live objects, *en masse*, and reclaim *all* unreached objects, *en masse*
  - do a whole bunch of work and get a whole bunch of free blocks

Criteria #3: pause time

- reference counting < traversing GC (reference counting is better)
- traversing GC:
  - traverse *all* live objects, *en masse*, and reclaim *all* unreached objects, *en masse*
  - do a whole bunch of work and get a whole bunch of free blocks
  - why so? troubled if the mutator runs (= changes the graph of objects) during traversing
    - a solution: incremental GC
    - generational GCs mitigate it too

Criteria #3: pause time

- reference counting < traversing GC (reference counting is better)
- traversing GC:
  - traverse *all* live objects, *en masse*, and reclaim *all* unreached objects, *en masse*
  - do a whole bunch of work and get a whole bunch of free blocks
  - why so? troubled if the mutator runs (= changes the graph of objects) during traversing
    - a solution: incremental GC
    - generational GCs mitigate it too
- reference counting:
  - when an object's RC drops to zero (as a result of mutator's action), it can be reclaimed immediately
  - reclaim garbage as they arise

Criteria #4: mutator overhead

- traversing < reference counting (traversing GC is better)
- reference counting has a large overhead for updating RCs

```
1 object * p, * q;
2 p = q;
```

will do:

```
1 if (p) p->rc--;
2 if (q) q->rc++;
3 p = q;
```

Moreover,

- what about multithreaded programs?
- what if the counter overflows (how to check it)?

- techniques: deferred reference counting, sticky reference counting, 1 bit reference counting
- remark: some traversing GCs (e.g., generational and incremental) add overhead to pointer updates too

Summary

	traversing	reference counting
preciseness	+	−
allocation cost	? (∗)	+
pause time	− (†)	+
mutator overhead	+ (‡)	−

(∗) depends on size of reachable graph and memory; generational garbage collector helps

(†) incremental garbage collector helps

(‡) both generational and incremental garbage collectors impose some mutator overheads

Contents

mark&sweep GC vs. copying GC

they differ in what to do on reachable objects

- mark&sweep GC: mark them as "visited"

mark&sweep GC vs. copying GC

they differ in what to do on reachable objects

- mark&sweep GC: mark them as "visited"
- copying GC: copy them into a distinct (contiguous) region

Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Mark&sweep GC

1. mark-phase:
   - traverses objects from the root, *marking* objects it encounters
   - maintains *mark stack (not shown in the figure)*, marked objects whose children may have not been marked (= light gray objects)
2. sweep phase:
   - reclaims all memory blocks that were not visited
   - free memory blocks are not contiguous, so must be managed by an appropriate data structure *(free lists)*



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC

- in essence, ≈ copying a graph (≈ serialization)
  - the same pointers must remain the same after the copy
- semi-space GC (copy all objects reachable from the root into another space)



Copying GC: algorithm

```
1  void *free, *scan;
2  copy_gc() {
3    free = scan = to_space;
4    redirect_ptrs(root);
5    while (scan < free) {
6      redirect_ptrs(scan);
7      scan += the size of object scan points to;
8    }
9  }
10 redirect_ptrs(void * o) {
11   for (p ∈ pointers in o) {
12     if (p has been copied) {
13       p = p's forward pointer;
14     } else {
15       copy p to free;
16       p = free;
17       p's forward pointer = free;
18       free += the size of object p points to;
19     }
20   }
21 }
```

invariant

- $p <$ `scan` $\Rightarrow p$ has been reached; so has its direct children
- $p <$ `free` $\Rightarrow p$ has been reached; but its children may not



Copying GC: algorithm

```
1  void *free, *scan;
2  copy_gc() {
3    free = scan = to_space;
4    redirect_ptrs(root);
5    while (scan < free) {
6      redirect_ptrs(scan);
7      scan += the size of object scan points to;
8    }
9  }
10 redirect_ptrs(void * o) {
11   for (p ∈ pointers in o) {
12     if (p has been copied) {
13       p = p's forward pointer;
14     } else {
15       copy p to free;
16       p = free;
17       p's forward pointer = free;
18       free += the size of object p points to;
19     }
20   }
21 }
```

invariant

- $p <$ `scan` $\Rightarrow p$ has been reached; so has its direct children
- $p <$ `free` $\Rightarrow p$ has been reached; but its children may not



Mark&sweep vs. copying GC

- copying GC pros:
  - live objects occupy a contiguous region after a GC
  - $\rightarrow$ the free region becomes contiguous too
  - $\rightarrow$ the overhead for memory allocation is small (no need to "search" the free region)
- copying GC cons:
  - copy is expensive, obviously
  - the free region must be reserved to accommodate objects copied (low memory utilization)
    - must ensure "size of objects that may be copied" $\leq$ "size of the region to copy them into"
    - $\rightarrow$ "from space" = "to space"
  - pointers must be "precisely" distinguished from non-pointers (ambiguous pointers are not allowed)
    - pointers are updated to the destinations of copies
    - a disaster occurs if you update non-pointers

Contents

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

- let's quantify the cost of allocating a byte including GC's work
- assume:
  - heap size (size of a semi-space in case of copying GC) = M
  - reached objects = r
  - assume for the sake of argument it's *always* r



Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

- let's quantify the cost of allocating a byte including GC's work
- assume:
  - heap size (size of a semi-space in case of copying GC) = M
  - reached objects = r
  - assume for the sake of argument it's *always* r



Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

- let's quantify the cost of allocating a byte including GC's work
- assume:
  - heap size (size of a semi-space in case of copying GC) = M
  - reached objects = r
  - assume for the sake of argument it's *always* r
- behavior at equilibrium: the program repeats:
  1. a GC occurs → scan (or copy) r bytes, to make a free space of $(M - r)$ bytes
  2. allocate $(M - r)$ bytes without triggering a GC



Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

- let's quantify the cost of allocating a byte including GC's work
- assume:
  - heap size (size of a semi-space in case of copying GC) = M
  - reached objects = r
  - assume for the sake of argument it's *always* r
- behavior at equilibrium: the program repeats:
  1. a GC occurs → scan (or copy) r bytes, to make a free space of $(M - r)$ bytes
  2. allocate $(M - r)$ bytes without triggering a GC
- a key observation

  the time (cost) of a single GC is roughly proportional to the amount of reached objects (i.e., $\propto r$)



Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs



Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs



$\therefore$ the cost of allocating a byte

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs



$$\therefore \quad \text{the cost of allocating a byte} = \alpha + \frac{\text{the amount of time spent on a GC}}{\text{the amount of space reclaimed by a GC}}$$

- α : a constant cost needed anyway, even if you don't need to reclaim memory at all

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs



$$
\begin{aligned}
\therefore \quad & \text{the cost of allocating a byte} \\
= \quad & \alpha + \frac{\text{the amount of time spent on a GC}}{\text{the amount of space reclaimed by a GC}} \\
= \quad & \alpha + \beta \frac{\text{the amount of space visited by a GC}}{\text{the amount of space reclaimed by a GC}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- α : a constant cost needed anyway, even if you don't need to reclaim memory at all

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs



$$
\begin{aligned}
\therefore \quad & \text{the cost of allocating a byte} \\
= \quad & \alpha + \frac{\text{the amount of time spent on a GC}}{\text{the amount of space reclaimed by a GC}} \\
= \quad & \alpha + \beta \frac{\text{the amount of space visited by a GC}}{\text{the amount of space reclaimed by a GC}} \\
= \quad & \alpha + \beta \frac{r}{M - r}
\end{aligned}
$$

- α : a constant cost needed anyway, even if you don't need to reclaim memory at all
- β : an average cost to examine a single byte
  - copy it (in a copying GC)
  - see if it is a pointer to an unvisited object

Note on copying GC vs mark-sweep GC

- the key observation

  the time (cost) of a single GC is roughly proportional to the amount of reached objects (i.e., $\propto r$)

  ignores the cost of so-called "sweep phase"
- a more accurate quantification will be

$$\text{the time (cost) of a single GC} \approx \beta r + \gamma(M - r),$$

  which adds a constant (γ) to an allocation cost per byte, which any memory allocator will incur anyway
- i.e., the cost will be

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha + \frac{\beta r + \gamma(M - r)}{M - r} \\ = \quad & \alpha + \gamma + \beta \frac{r}{M - r} \end{aligned}$$

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

- important formula:

$$\text{allocation cost per byte} \propto \text{const.} + \frac{r}{M - r}$$

- $r/(M-r)$ is often called *mark-cons ratio*. its origin:
  - mark : the amount of work to *mark* reachable objects
  - cons : the synonym of memory allocation in the ancient Lisp language =`(cons x y)`

Memory allocation cost of traversing GCs

$$\text{cost per byte} \propto \text{const.} + \frac{r}{M - r}$$

- r (primarily) depends only on app (not dependent of GCs)
  - remark: r may fluctuate depending on "when" GCs occur
- M is an adjustable parameter (up to GC's choice)
- M is large $\rightarrow$ the cost is small
- $\rightarrow$ you can reduce the cost by making M (memory usage) larger
- may sound obvious, but remember that what is important is the cost *per allocation (byte)*, not the frequency of GCs

How large do we make M (memory usage)?

- alright, the larger we make M, the smaller the cost becomes
  - $\rightarrow$ why don't we make it arbitrarily large (up to physical memory)?
- we normally set M "modestly", like:

$$M \propto r$$

e.g., choose a constant $k > 1$ and set:

$$M = kr$$

- a GC measures the amount of reachable objects to get r and set M according to the above formula

How large do we make M (memory usage)?

- in this setting,
  - cost

$$\text{mark-cons ratio} = \frac{r}{kr - r} = \frac{1}{k - 1} = \text{const}$$

  - memory usage

    $\propto$ the size of reachable objects at a point during execution

  both are "reasonable"
- most GCs allow you to set k (or M directly)
- normally, $k = 1.5 \sim 2$, but it is worth knowing that you can reduce the cost by setting it large

Contents

Generational GC: introduction

- objective: reduce *mark-cons ratio* in traversing GCs
- how: traverse and reclaim only *recently created objects (young generation)*
  - traverse only young generations often
  - traverse the entire heap occasionally when it does not reclaim enough space
- why does it work?

mark-cons ratio (review)

GC overhead

$\equiv$ GC's work per allocating a byte

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}}
\end{aligned}
$$

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}}
\end{aligned}
$$

(assume a traversing GC; look at a specific GC)

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}} \\
& \text{(assume a traversing GC; look at a specific GC)} \\
\propto\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space reclaimed}}
\end{aligned}
$$

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}} \\
& \text{(assume a traversing GC; look at a specific GC)} \\
\propto\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space reclaimed}} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space unreachable from the root}}
\end{aligned}
$$

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}} \\
& \text{(assume a traversing GC; look at a specific GC)} \\
\propto\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space reclaimed}} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space unreachable from the root}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- *the less reachable space there are, the smaller it becomes*

mark-cons ratio (review)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text{GC overhead} \\
\equiv\ & \text{GC's work per allocating a byte} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{GC's work}}{\text{memory allocated}} \\
& \text{(assume a traversing GC; look at a specific GC)} \\
\propto\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space reclaimed}} \\
=\ & \frac{\text{space reachable from the root}}{\text{space unreachable from the root}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- *the less reachable space there are, the smaller it becomes*
- below, we simply say an object is "alive" when it is "reachable from the root" (strictly, not a correct usage)

Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



- two problems:

Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



- two problems:
  1. where to target: *which region has a lesser live object ratio?*

Generational GC: the basic idea

- basic idea: traverse (collect) only *a region that has a lesser live object ratio*



- two problems:
  1. where to target: *which region has a lesser live object ratio?*
  2. correctness: how to find all live objects in a region, *by traversing "only" that region?*

Problem 1: where generational GC targets

a region holding young (recently created) objects

Problem 1: where generational GC targets

a region holding young (recently created) objects

Q: why (or when) is this effective?

(Weak) generational hypothesis

- *"most objects die young"*
- it seems to hold in most languages (where all memory allocations are served from the heap)



Studies on (weak) generational hypothesis

- studies show *"a (large) fraction d of objects die before a (young) age y"* in various languages
  - note: an "age" of an object o = the total size of memory allocated after o is created (that is, *the time is measured by the amount of memory allocation*)

authors	lang.	mortality rate (d)	age (y)
Zorn	Common Lisp	50-90%	10KB
Sanson and Jones	Haskell	75-95%	10KB
Hayes	Cedar	99%	721KB
Appel	SML/NJ	98%	varies
Barret and Zorn	C	50%	10KB
	C	90%	32KB

source: Richard Jones and Rafael Lins. "Garbage Collection. Algorithms for Automatic Memory Management" Chapter 7.1

“most objects die young” and a rational of generational GCs

- say 90% die younger than 10KB, then

  mark-cons ratio when traversing most recent 10KB ≈ 0.1

- if we use heap 2-3 times larger than the live objects,

  the ratio when traversing the entire heap $\approx 1/3 \sim 1/2 > 0.1$

Problem 2: how to make it correct?

- we need to find all young objects reachable from the root, through "*all pointers, young or old*"
- simply ignoring old objects won't work



Problem 2: how to make it correct?

- we need to find all young objects reachable from the root, through "*all pointers, young or old*"
- simply ignoring old objects won't work



- solution: *record "all" pointers from "old → young"* during the execution and consider them as part of the root

Problem 2: how to make it correct?

- we need to find all young objects reachable from the root, through "*all pointers, young or old*"
- simply ignoring old objects won't work



- solution: *record "all" pointers from "old → young"* during the execution and consider them as part of the root
- note: some may not be reclaimed, despite being unreachable from the root

Write barrier

- an intervention in mutator actions to capture all "old → young" pointers
- mutator actions that need an intervention: assignments:

  (possibly) old object's field ← (possibly) young object

- in OCaml,

expression	description	need intervention?
`o.x <- a`	update a mutable field	yes
`{ x = ...; ...}`	create a record etc.	no
`let b = o.x`	initialize a variable	no

- hopefully they rarely occur in "mostly functional" languages

Implementing Write Barrier (1) Remembered Set

- given

```
1  o.x <- a;
```

  we do

```
1  if (generation(a) < generation(o)) {
2    if (o ∉ R) add(R, o)
3  }
```

- the overhead is large
  - obtain `generation(·)` (address comparison in copying GC)
  - check if `o` $\in$ `R`
  - manage `R`

Implementing Write Barrier (2) Card Marking

- basic idea: unconditionally record addresses pointers are written to
- partition the heap into constant-sized "cards"
  - a card: a region whose addresses share a number of most significant bits
    - e.g., share the highest 57 of 64 bit addresses
    - $\rightarrow$ a single card $2^7 = 128$ bytes



Implementing Write Barrier (2) Card Marking

- basic idea: unconditionally record addresses pointers are written to
- partition the heap into constant-sized "cards"
  - a card: a region whose addresses share a number of most significant bits
    - e.g., share the highest 57 of 64 bit addresses
    - $\rightarrow$ a single card $2^7 = 128$ bytes



Implementing Write Barrier (2) Card Marking

- basic idea: unconditionally record addresses pointers are written to
- partition the heap into constant-sized "cards"
  - a card: a region whose addresses share a number of most significant bits
    - e.g., share the highest 57 of 64 bit addresses
    - $\rightarrow$ a single card $2^7 = 128$ bytes



- record only whether each card receives any pointer write (1 byte/card; card mark)

The overhead of card-marking

- e.g.: given the following pointer update,

```
o->x <- y;
```

unconditionally record “a card containing `&o->x` is written”

```
C[(&o->x) >> 9] = 1;
```

C is the base address to obtain the card address. that is,

```
C[heap >> 9] == card
```



Card-marking : Pros and Cons

- a small write barrier overhead (if you hold C in a register, it takes three RISC instructions)

```
1 C[(&o->x) >> 9] = 1;
```

- memory overhead adjustable by adjusting card size (e.g. a card is 128 bytes $\rightarrow$ 1/128)
- you cannot efficiently list written cards; you must check all cards ($\propto$ heap)
- when any address of a card is written, we must consider all addresses of the card a root

Contents

Incremental GC

- objective: *reduce the "pause time"* of traversing GC
  - good for applications that need real time or interactive responses
- recall that pause time $\approx$ time to traverse all reachable objects

Incremental GC

- objective: *reduce the "pause time"* of traversing GC
  - good for applications that need real time or interactive responses
- recall that pause time ≈ time to traverse all reachable objects
- how: by traversing reachable objects *"a little bit at a time"*
  - instead of traversing 1 GB in one stroke, traverse 10 MB at a time, 100 times



Challenges in incremental GC

- (from GC's view point) *the object graph changes while GC is traversing it*



- how to guarantee it does not miss any reachable object?
- $\Rightarrow$ we'll get back to the basics of graph traversal

Assumptions for later discussions

- only a single mutator (the app is single-threaded)
- the mutator and the collector run *"alternately" (not at the same time)*
  - the collector does a little bit of its work upon a memory allocation
- i.e., we do not consider race conditions that would happen when they are truly concurrent

Graph traversal : basics

- traversing GC ≈ graph traversal
- the principle is the same whether it's mark&sweep or copying

- omitting details, it is:

```
1  F = { root };
2  while (F is not empty) {
3    o = pop(F);
4    for (all pointers p in o)
5      if (!marked(p)) {
6        mark(p);
7        add(F, p);
8      }
9  }
```



Graph traversal : basics

- traversing GC ≈ graph traversal
- the principle is the same whether it's mark&sweep or copying

- omitting details, it is:

```
1  F = { root };
2  while (F is not empty) {
3    o = pop(F);
4    for (all pointers p in o)
5      if (!marked(p)) {
6        mark(p);
7        add(F, p);
8      }
9  }
```



Key data : the frontier

- F : frontier
- the set of objects that have been visited but whose children may have not
- the actual data structure
  - mark&sweep : mark stack
  - copying : a part of the to space



mark&sweep



copying

The issue that an incremental GC must address

```
1  F = { root };
2  while (F is not empty) {
3    o = pop(F);
4    for (all pointers p in o)
5      if (!marked(p)) {
6        mark(p);
7        add(F, p);
8      }
9    if (has iterated a few times)
10     // the graph changes below
11     resume_mutator();
12 }
```

- ordinary GC: the while loop runs until the end keeping the mutator stopped → the object graph does not change during the loop
- incremental GC:
  - *the collector gets interrupted by the mutator every once in a while*
  - . . . and continues after a while
  - that is, the issues is how to do with the fact that *the graph may change between iterations of the while loop*

The tri-color abstraction

- likens a graph traversal to coloring its nodes
- visiting an object ≈ coloring an object
  - black: the object and its children have been visited
  - gray: it has been visited but its children may not
  - white: it has not been visited
- the graph traversal using the tri-color abstraction

```
1  gray the root;
2  while (there is a gray object) {
3    o = pick a gray object and blacken it;
4    for (all pointers in o)
5      if (p points to a white object)
6        gray it;
7    the mutator changes the graph;  }
```



- correctness of the algorithm: *when there are no gray objects, all objects reachable from the root are black (i.e., white objects are unreachable)*

A problematic mutation to the graph

- intuitively, *the issue seems the mutator may create "black → white" pointers*
  - black: GC thinks it has "done" with it
  - white: going to be reclaimed, unless found in other paths
- ⇒ prevent "black → white pointers" from being created



Two approaches to preventing black→white

capture the point where "black→white" is about to be created

1. approach #1: gray the white (make black→gray)
   - pros: the frontier always progresses
   - pros: easier to work with for copying GCs
   - cons: reclaim less objects. if p becomes unreachable due to another update to o, it won't be reclaimed (by the current GC)
2. approach #2: get the black back to gray (make gray→white)
   - pros: reclaim more objects
   - cons: the frontier retreats



Mutator actions that need to be captured

naively all pointer movements must be captured

- write a pointer into an object field (write barrier)

```
1 o->x = p
```

- write a pointer into a root ≡ write a pointer to a variable (read barrier)

```
1 p = o->x
```

the latter is so frequent that some approaches avoid them (example #2: Boehm GC)

Example #1: Appel-Ellis-Li

- copying GC + incremental
- based on the approach # 1. more precisely, maintain the following invariant
  the mutator never sees a pointer to white
- how?
  - intervene in reading a field from gray objects (read barrier)
- read-protect the region of gray objects $\subset$ scan $\sim$ free, by the virtual memory primitive of operating systems



Appel-Ellis-Li : the read barrier in action

- when a field of a gray object is read, blacken objects in the page containing it (= scan those objects → they become gray)

```
1  trap_read_from_grey(a) {
2    page = the page including a;
3    for (all objects o in the page) {
4      scan(o); // copy o's children
5    }
6    unprotect(page);
7  }
```



Appel-Ellis-Li : the read barrier in action

- when a field of a gray object is read, blacken objects in the page containing it (= scan those objects → they become gray)

```
1  trap_read_from_grey(a) {
2    page = the page including a;
3    for (all objects o in the page) {
4      scan(o); // copy o's children
5    }
6    unprotect(page);
7  }
```



Remark : it's easier for copying GC

- during a copying GC, there are two versions of each visited object (one in the from space and the other in the to space)
- immutable objects do not care which one the mutator sees, but mutable ones do
- it will eventually see the one in to space anyways, so it's natural to maintain "it never sees the one in the from space"
- $\rightarrow$ it's natural to let the mutator never see (get a pointer to) a white object



Example #2: Boehm GC

- conservative GC ($\rightarrow$ mark&sweep) + incremental
- invariants:
  - "non-root black $\rightarrow$ white" pointers never exist
- how?
  - capture *"writing to an object field" (write barrier)*
- remark: "root $\rightarrow$ white" pointers *may* exist
  - prevention requires us to capture writing to the root $\rightarrow$ *reading* from an object
  - the overhead is so large that it deserves a separate treatment (covered later)

Write barrier in Boehm GC

- capture writing into objects by virtual memory (the only choice in C/C++)
- gray the "written-to" object
  - push it onto the mark stack
- no read barriers → "root (black) → white" pointers are allowed
- at the end of a mark phase, it traverses from the root again
- during this second traversal, the mutator is stopped → it may cause a long pause time

Appendix: a more rigorous correctness proof

- while it is clear "black→white" pointers cause a problem, it is not trivial that preventing them is sufficient to solve the problem
- the proposition to prove: after the following algorithm finished,

  reachable from the root → *black*

```
1  gray the root;
2  while (there are gray objects) {
3    o = pick and blacken a gray object;
4    for (pointers p in o)
5      if (p points to a white object)
6        gray it;
7    the mutator changes the graph;
8  }
```

The key invariant

- the following "always" holds during the execution (GC or mutator)
  (I): all "white" objects reachable from the root are reachable from some "gray" objects
- if this is true,
  (I) and the termination condition (i.e. there are no grays)
  $\rightarrow$ no white objects are reachable from the root
  $\rightarrow$ white objects can be reclaimed
  and we are done. the only remaining task is to prove (I).

Proof of (I)

- say w is a white object reachable from the root

- since the root is always black or gray and there are no "black $\rightarrow$ white" pointers $(*)$, there must be a gray object on each path P from the root to w (QED).



- $(*)$: you need to show that not only the mutator but also the collector never creates "black $\rightarrow$ white" pointers. it's easy and left as an exercise.

Contents

Contents

Managing and finding free space

- in any method except for copying GC (mark&sweep GC, reference counting, malloc/free), free space are not contiguous
- $\rightarrow$ tracking and managing free blocks is required
- goal:
  - good allocation speed: quickly find a region that fits the request size
  - good memory utilization: do not waste available space
- basic data structure: free list (list of free blocks)



Managing and finding free space

- in any method except for copying GC (mark&sweep GC, reference counting, malloc/free), free space are not contiguous
- $\rightarrow$ tracking and managing free blocks is required
- goal:
  - good allocation speed: quickly find a region that fits the request size
  - good memory utilization: do not waste available space
- basic data structure: free list (list of free blocks)



Free list

- list of free blocks (or cells)

```
1 typedef struct cell {
2   struct cell * next;
3   size_t sz;
4   /* other info as necessary */
5 } cell;
6 cell * free_list;
```

- allocation (malloc) ≈
  1. (linearly) search for a cell large enough for the requested size
  2. if a free space remains in the cell, put it back to the free list
- reclamation (free) ≈
  1. put it back to the free list (issue: how to know its size?)
  2. if the cell just freed is adjacent to another free cell, merge them (coalescing)



Issues in the simple method

- allocation:
  - needs to traverse a fair amount of cells (until you find a cell that fits)
  - → make many free lists, one for a fixed size (*segregated free lists*)
- reclamation:
  - needs to check if coalescing is possible
  - needs to know the size of the freed cell
  - → manage memory in a larger unit (*page*) and dedicate a page to a single size (*Big Bags of Pages; BiBOP*)



Segregated free lists

- for small sizes (e.g., < 2KB), make a free list for various representative sizes
- a single list for large sizes
- ex:
  - 16, 32, 48, 64, . . . , 448, 512, 672, 800, 1024, 1344, 2048
  - 2048 bytes or larger



Allocation sequence

- Colored: a fast path for small objects
- blue: the overhead removable if the size (sz) is a compile-time constant
- red: the essential cost. traverse a list once (6-7 instructions)
- note: in multithreaded programs, we either have to
  - let each thread have its own `free_lists`, or
  - atomically perform the read-modify-write on `free_lists` (this hinders scalability)

```
1  void ** free_lists;
2
3  void * malloc(size_t sz) {
4    if (SMALL(sz)) {
5      size_t idx =
             bytes_to_idx(sz);
6      cell * a =
             free_lists[idx];
7      if (a) {
8        free_lists[idx] =
             a->next;
9        return a;
10     } else {
11       return malloc_slow(sz);
12     }
13   } else {
14     return malloc_slow(sz);
15   }
16 }
```

Big Bags of Pages

- manage the heap by dividing it into constant-sized blocks (page)
  - a page: a set of addresses sharing a number of highest bits
  - e.g. 64 bit addresses, sharing the highest 52 bits $\rightarrow 2^{12} = 4096$ bytes/page
- each page is either
  - completely free or
  - used only for a single size (e.g., only for 48 bytes)



- Coalescing: repurpose a page only when the page becomes completely empty
  - $\rightarrow$ only need to count the number of free cells in the page
- does not require per-object size field either

Contents

Improving performance of mark&sweep GC

- overall structure:
  1. mark phase: traverses pointers from the root, marking reached objects along the way
  2. sweep phase: reclaims unmarked objects → pushes them back to an appropriate free list
- basics:
  - segregated free lists
  - BiBOP
  - mark bits separated from objects
  - lazy sweep

Separated mark bits

- question: where do you put the mark bit of an object?
- Method 1: use a word within an object
- Method 2: use a separate space dedicated for mark-bits outside objects
  - where is the separate space, exactly? → page header; holds mark bits of all the objects in the page together (1 byte/object)

```
1 mark(void * o) {
2   page * page = o & 0xFFF...000; /* page header address */
3   page->header->mark[(o & 0x000...FFF) >> 4] = 1;
4 }
```

  - point: gather spaces that are written

Lazy sweep

- why do we need to sweep: reclaim space that has become free
- naturally, you would put them back to an appropriate free list (cf. BiBOP)
- lazy sweep: defer this operation until you need to allocate them

Overview of the sweep phase

- after a mark phase is finished, a page is either
  - empty: zero objects have been reached
  - partial: > 0 objects have been reached, > 0 objects have not been reached
  - full: zero objects have not been reached
- a naive implementation of a sweep phase:

```
1  for (all pages p) {
2    if (p is empty) {
3      put p in the empty page list;
4      /* can be repurposed for any size */
5    } else if (p is partial) {
6      sz = the size of objects in the page;
7      put free cells in p to the free list fo sz bytes;
8    }
9  }
```

Lazy sweep

- does not rebuild free lists immediately
- instead puts the page into the list of "to-reclaim" pages

```
1  for (all pages p) {
2    if (p is empty) {
3      put p in the empty page list;
4      /* can be repurposed for any size */
5    } else if (p is partial) {
6      sz = the size of objects in the page;
7      put p into the reclaim list for sz bytes;
8    }
9  }
```

Reclaim list

- list of pages that have at least one free cell
- like free lists, there is a list per size
- when an allocation finds the free list empty, look at the reclaim list and if there is any page, move free cells of a page into the free list

What's the point?

- simply deferring the task you need to do anyway? not exactly so
- make more coalescing opportunities:
  - after a few GCs, a page may become empty before it needs to be reused for allocation
- improve temporal locality of references:
  - by touching free cells to put them back to free list, closely before they are used by the mutator
- shorten the pause time due to the sweep phase

Contents

Conservative GC

- *conservative* GC
  - $\approx$ GC for languages designed without assuming GC, such as C/C++

Conservative GC

- *conservative* GC
  - $\approx$ GC for languages designed without assuming GC, such as C/C++
  - $\approx$ GC in the presence of words that may or may not be pointers (conservatively assumed to be pointers)

Conservative GC

- *conservative* GC
  - ≈ GC for languages designed without assuming GC, such as C/C++
  - ≈ GC in the presence of words that may or may not be pointers (conservatively assumed to be pointers)
- antonym: *accurate* GC
  - does not necessarily reclaim all dead (no longer used) objects
  - accurate or conservative refers to whether "pointer identifications" are accurate or not
  - languages that implement an accurate GC normally use a data representation in which looking at a single word can tell you whether it is a pointer or not
    - ex: the last bit = 0 (pointer), = 1 (non-pointer)

A challenge in C/C++: pointer ambiguity

- a pointer and a non-pointers cannot be told apart; a word "7596272344674820427 ($1011010010110101011011\cdots011000010100101_2$)" can be any of the following
  - a pointer to an object at address 7596272344674820427,
  - an integer 7596272344674820427,
  - a part of a string ("Kawasaki"),
  - a double precision floating point number ($6.549545\ldots\times10^{199}$),
  - ...

A challenge in C/C++: pointer ambiguity

- a pointer and a non-pointers cannot be told apart; a word "7596272344674820427 ($101101001011010110110\cdots011000010100101_2$)" can be any of the following
  - a pointer to an object at address 7596272344674820427,
  - an integer 7596272344674820427,
  - a part of a string ("Kawasaki"),
  - a double precision floating point number ($6.549545\ldots \times 10^{199}$),
  - ...
- the basic principle:
  - *if a word is an address of a block being used, it is assumed to be the pointer to it*
  - a non-pointer may be misidentified as a pointer
  - a method to minimize the loss (leak) caused by misidentified pointers → blacklisting

Blacklisting

- during marking, record ("blacklist") words p (suspicious addresses) satisfying:



Blacklisting

- during marking, record ("blacklist") words p (suspicious addresses) satisfying:
  - address p is currently *not* used and
  - p is a subject of future allocation (i.e., an address within the current heap)



Blacklisting

- during marking, record ("blacklist") words p (suspicious addresses) satisfying:
  - address p is currently *not* used and
  - p is a subject of future allocation (i.e., an address within the current heap)
- do not use such p's for *future allocation*



Blacklisting

- during marking, record ("blacklist") words p (suspicious addresses) satisfying:
  - address p is currently *not* used and
  - p is a subject of future allocation (i.e., an address within the current heap)
- do not use such p's for *future allocation*
- note that we already lose (a memory associated with) p, but it would be much worse and devastating to allocate p and make *p and all objects reachable from p* uncollectable *(the domino effect)*



Other tips in conservative GC

1. see `http://hboehm.info/gc/gcinterface.html`
2. `GC_MALLOC_ATOMIC` :
   - same as `GC_MALLOC`, except you indicate (declare) you never put pointers in it (good for strings and numerical arrays)
   - reduce the probability of pointer misidentification
   - reduce the space that must be traversed
3. `GC_MALLOC_IGNORE_OFF_PAGE` : declares "you never put pointers except in the first 512 bytes"
4. clear pointers no longer necessary with NULL
   - pointers within a data structure
   - prevent the domino effect when a single object is mistakenly kept alive
5. tips in how you link data structures
   - data structures less prone to the domino effect due to a pointer misidentification

Data structure (not) prone to the domino effect

- suppose you make link lists, trees and graphs
- (NG): directly link large nodes with payload
- (GOOD): separate the structure linking nodes *(the spine)* and the payloads → misidentifying a payload does not lead to another object





Data structure (not) prone to the domino effect

- suppose you make link lists, trees and graphs
- (NG): directly link large nodes with payload
- (GOOD): separate the structure linking nodes *(the spine)* and the payloads → misidentifying a payload does not lead to another object