Improving Inlining Decisions in the Open Research Compiler

Peng Zhao José Nelson Amaral

University of Alberta Edmonton, AB, Canada

http://www.cs.ualberta.ca/~amaral amaral@cs.ualberta.ca

Yet Another Paper on Inlining?

What is new?

Adapt Decisions to Benchmark Sizes Aggressive for small benchmarks, careful for large ones.

Use Cycle Density to Control Code Bloat A correction to the temperature heuristic in ORC.

What is left to do?

Investigated why remainder procedures not inlined. Next: **Partial Inlining** and **Recursive Procedure Inlining.**

Open Research Compiler

Why inline?

Eliminate function call overhead Building stack frame, passing parameters, ...

Increase scope for code analysis Better identification for loop optimizations

Improve code placement Affine code can be placed nearby

Why not to inline?

Code bloat Negative instruction cache effects

Compiler resources Some analysis may choke on large procedures

$Temperature[E_i(p,q)] = ?$

$$
Temperature[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)]}{size_ratio(q)}
$$

$$
cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_count(q)}{Total_cycle_count} \times \frac{call_freq[E_i(p,q)]}{call_freq(q)}
$$

size_ratio(q) = $\frac{size(q)}{Total_size(q)}$

 $Temperature[E_i(p,q)] =$ cycle_ratio[Ei(p,q)] size_ratio(q)

Edges called often are hot. Good!

 $cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)] =$ call_freq[E_i(p,q)] call_freq(q) cycle_count(q) Total_cycle_count ×

$$
size_ratio(q) = \frac{size(q)}{Total_application_size}
$$

$$
Temperature[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_ratio[Ei(p,q)]}{size_ratio(q)}
$$

Functions that execute longer are hot. Good!

 $cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)] =$ call_freq[E_i(p,q)] call_freq(q) cycle_count(q) Total_cycle_count ×

$$
size_ratio(q) = \frac{size(q)}{Total_application_size}
$$

$$
Temperature[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_ratio[Ei(p,q)]}{size_ratio(q)}
$$

Even if they are not called often. Bad!

 $cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)] =$ call_freq[E_i(p,q)] call_freq(q) cycle_count(q) Total_cycle_count ×

$$
size_ratio(q) = \frac{size(q)}{Total_application_size}
$$

$$
Temperature[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_ratio[Ei(p,q)]}{size_ratio(q)}
$$

Small Code ==> small functions are cold. Bad!

$$
cycle_ratio[E_i(p,q)] = \frac{cycle_count(q)}{Total_cycle_count} \times \frac{call_freq[E_i(p,q)]}{call_freq(q)}
$$

$$
size_ratio(q) = \frac{size(q)}{Total_application_size}
$$

Tempereature Distribution for **gcc**

Temperature distribution of gcc 100000 10000 1000 100 10 1 Compiler-Driven Performance, 0.1 CASCON, Markham, Oct. 2003 16 $1e + 06$ 100000

Temperature Distribution for BZIP2

Adapting the ORC Heuristic to Benchmark Size

Empirical classification of benchmarks (based on SPEC):

Temperature Threshold

1

Small: < 10,000 AST Nodes

Medium: Anything in between 50

Large: > 250,000 AST Nodes 120

" Heavy" Procedures

A procedure call that:

• is hot in the original ORC heuristic

• but that is not called often must have high trip count loops. We call these heavy procedures.

We introduce the cycle density heuristic to fix the ORC inlining decisions for heavy

Cycle Density

 $cycle_density(q) =$ cycle_count(q) frequency(q)

High cycle density indicates a heavy procedure.

Temp. ×Cycle Density (BZIP2)

Experimental Study

SPEC2000 benchmarks, except EON.

Runtime on an Itanium-I (733 MHz, 1 GB mem, RH-Linux 7.1)

Compilation on a dual Pentium III (600 MHz, 512 MB mem, RH-Linux 7.2)

Average Performance Improvement on SPEC2000

Inlining Speedup

Inlining speedup (compared with no inlining)

Inlining Speedup

Inlining speedup (compared with no inlining)

Effect of Cycle Density on Code Size

Compiler-Driven Performance,

CASCON, Markham, Oct. 2003 26

Effect of Cycle Density on Compilation Time

Compiler-Driven Performance,

CASCON, Markham, Oct. 2003 27

Can We Inline Further?

