CSC D70: Compiler Optimization Prefetching

Prof. Gennady Pekhimenko University of Toronto Winter 2020

The content of this lecture is adapted from the lectures of Todd Mowry and Phillip Gibbons



- ? processor speed >> ? memory speed
- caches are not a panacea

Prefetching for Arrays: Overview

- Tolerating Memory Latency
- Prefetching Compiler Algorithm and Results
- Implications of These Results

Coping with Memory Latency

Reduce Latency:

- Locality Optimizations
 - reorder iterations to improve cache reuse

Tolerate Latency:

- Prefetching
 - move data close to the processor before it is needed

Tolerating Latency Through Prefetching



• overlap memory accesses with computation and other accesses

Types of Prefetching

Cache Blocks:

• (-) limited to unit-stride accesses

Nonblocking Loads:

• (-) limited ability to move back before use

Hardware-Controlled Prefetching:

- (-) limited to constant-strides and by branch prediction
- (+) no instruction overhead

Software-Controlled Prefetching:

- (-) software sophistication and overhead
- (+) minimal hardware support and broader coverage

Prefetching Goals

- Domain of Applicability
- Performance Improvement
 - maximize benefit
 - minimize overhead

Prefetching Concepts

possible only if addresses can be determined ahead of time *coverage factor* = fraction of misses that are prefetched *unnecessary* if data is already in the cache *effective* if data is in the cache when later referenced

Analysis: what to prefetch

- maximize coverage factor
- minimize unnecessary prefetches

<u>Scheduling</u>: when/how to schedule prefetches

- maximize effectiveness
- minimize overhead per prefetch

Reducing Prefetching Overhead

• instructions to issue prefetches

٠

• extra demands on memory system

Hit Rates for Array Accesses



Compiler Algorithm

Analysis: what to prefetch

• Locality Analysis

<u>Scheduling</u>: when/how to issue prefetches

- Loop Splitting
- Software Pipelining

Steps in Locality Analysis

1. Find data reuse

- if caches were infinitely large, we would be finished
- 2. Determine "localized iteration space"
 - set of inner loops where the data accessed by an iteration is expected to fit within the cache
- 3. Find data locality:
 - − reuse \cap localized iteration space \Rightarrow locality

Data Locality Example





Reuse Analysis: Representation

• Map *n* loop indices into *d* array indices via array indexing function:

]

$$\vec{f}(\vec{i}) = H\vec{i} + \vec{c}$$

$$A[i][j] = A\left(\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}i\\j\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}0\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\right)$$

$$B[j][0] = B\left(\begin{bmatrix}0 & 1\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}i\\j\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}0\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\right)$$

$$B[j+1][0] = B\left(\begin{bmatrix}0 & 1\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}i\\j\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}1\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\right)$$

Finding Temporal Reuse

• Temporal reuse occurs between iterations \vec{i}_1 and \vec{i}_2 whenever:

$$H\vec{i_1} + \vec{c} = H\vec{i_2} + \vec{c}$$

 $H(\vec{i_1} - \vec{i_2}) = \vec{0}$

• Rather than worrying about individual values \vec{i}_1 of \vec{i}_2 and, we say that reuse occurs along direction \vec{r} vector when: $H(\vec{r}) = \vec{0}$

Temporal Reuse Example

• Reuse between iterations (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2) whenever:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_1 \\ j_1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_2 \\ j_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i_1 - i_2 \\ j_1 - j_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- True whenever j₁ = j₂, and regardless of the difference between i₁ and i₂.
 i.e. whenever the difference lies along the nullspace of which is span{(1,0)} (i.e. the outer loop).

Prefetch Predicate

Locality Type	Miss Instance	Predicate	
None	Every Iteration	True	
Temporal	First Iteration	i = 0	
Spatial	Every iterations (I = cache line size)	(i mod) = 0	

Reference	Locality	Predicate
A[i][j]	[i] = [none j] = [spatial]	(j mod 2) = 0
B[j+1][0]	[i] = [temporal j] = none	i = 0

Compiler Algorithm

Analysis: what to prefetch

• Locality Analysis

<u>Scheduling</u>: when/how to issue prefetches

- Loop Splitting
- Software Pipelining

Loop Splitting

- Decompose loops to isolate cache miss instances
 - cheaper than inserting IF statements

Locality Type	Predicate	Loop Transformation	
None	True	None	
Temporal	i = 0	Peel loop i	
Spatial	(i mod l) = 0	Unroll loop i by l	

- Apply transformations recursively for nested loops
- Suppress transformations when loops become too large
 - avoid code explosion

Software Pipelining

Iterations Ahead = $\left[\frac{1}{5}\right]$

where *I* = memory latency, *s* = shortest path through loop body

Original Loop

for (i = 0; i<100; i++)
 a[i] = 0;</pre>

Example Revisited

Original Code

```
for (i = 0; i < 3; i++)
for (j = 0; j < 100; j++)
 A[i][j] = B[j][0] + B[j+1][0];
   O Cache Hit
  • • Cache Miss
                    i=0
    A[i][j]
                            }
  j
   B[j+1][0]
                    i>0
                             }
  0000000
  0000000
   000000
               J
```

Code with Prefetching

```
prefetch(&A[0][0]);
for (j = 0; j < 6; j += 2) {
 prefetch(&B[j+1][0]);
  prefetch(\&B[j+2][0]);
  prefetch(&A[0][j+1]);
for (j = 0; j < 94; j += 2) {
  prefetch(&B[j+7][0]);
  prefetch(&B[j+8][0]);
  prefetch(&A[0][j+7]);
 A[0][j] = B[j][0]+B[j+1][0];
 A[0][j+1] = B[j+1][0]+B[j+2][0];
for (j = 94; j < 100; j += 2) {
 A[0][j] = B[j][0]+B[j+1][0];
 A[0][j+1] = B[j+1][0]+B[j+2][0];
for (i = 1; i < 3; i++) {
 prefetch(&A[i][0]);
  for (j = 0; j < 6; j += 2)
    prefetch(&A[i][j+1]);
  for (j = 0; j < 94; j += 2) {
    prefetch(&A[i][j+7]);
    A[i][j] = B[j][0] + B[j+1][0];
    A[i][j+1] = B[j+1][0] + B[j+2][0];
  for (j = 94; j < 100; j += 2) {
    A[i][j] = B[j][0] + B[j+1][0];
    A[i][j+1] = B[j+1][0] + B[j+2][0];
```

Prefetching Indirections

for (i = 0; i<100; i++)
 sum += A[index[i]];</pre>

Analysis: what to prefetch

- both dense and indirect references
- difficult to predict whether indirections hit or miss

<u>Scheduling</u>: when/how to issue prefetches

modification of software pipelining algorithm

Software Pipelining for Indirections

Original Loop

```
for (i = 0; i<100; i++)
    sum += A[index[i]];</pre>
```

```
Software Pipelined Loop
(5 iterations ahead)
```

```
for (i = 0; i<5; i++) /* Prolog 1 */
   prefetch(&index[i]);
for (i = 0; i<5; i++) { /* Prolog 2 */
   prefetch(&index[i+5]);
   prefetch(&A[index[i]]);
}
for (i = 0; i<90; i++) { /* Steady State*/
   prefetch(&index[i+10]);
   prefetch(&A[index[i+5]]);
   sum += A[index[i]];
}
for (i = 90; i<95; i++) { /* Epilog 1 */
   prefetch(&A[index[i+5]]);
   sum += A[index[i]];
}
for (i = 95; i<100; i++) /* Epilog 2 */
   sum += A[index[i]];
```

Summary of Results

Dense Matrix Code:

- eliminated 50% to 90% of memory stall time
- overheads remain low due to prefetching selectively
- significant improvements in overall performance (6 over 45%)

Indirections, Sparse Matrix Code:

expanded coverage to handle some important cases

Prefetching for Arrays: Concluding Remarks

- Demonstrated that software prefetching is effective
 - selective prefetching to eliminate overhead
 - dense matrices and indirections / sparse matrices
 - uniprocessors and multiprocessors

 Hardware should focus on providing sufficient memory bandwidth

Prefetching for Recursive Data Structures

Recursive Data Structures

- Examples:
 - linked lists, trees, graphs, ...
- A common method of building large data structures
 - especially in non-numeric programs
- Cache miss behavior is a concern because:
 - large data set with respect to the cache size
 - temporal locality may be poor
 - little spatial locality among consecutively-accessed nodes

<u>Goal</u>:

 Automatic Compiler-Based Prefetching for Recursive Data Structures

Overview

- Challenges in Prefetching Recursive Data Structures
- Three Prefetching Algorithms
- Experimental Results
- Conclusions

Scheduling Prefetches for Recursive Data Structures



Our Goal: fully hide latency

- thus achieving fastest possible computation rate of 1/W
- e.g., if L = 3W, we must prefetch 3 nodes ahead to achieve this

Performance without Prefetching



computation rate = 1 / (L+W)

Prefetching One Node Ahead



Computation is overlapped with memory accesses

computation rate = 1/L



computation rate does not improve (still = 1/L)!

Pointer-Chasing Problem:

• any scheme which follows the pointer chain is limited to a rate of 1/L

Our Goal: Fully Hide Latency



achieves the fastest possible computation rate of 1/W

Overview

- Challenges in Prefetching Recursive Data Structures
- Three Prefetching Algorithms
 - Greedy Prefetching
 - History-Pointer Prefetching
 - Data-Linearization Prefetching
- Experimental Results
- Conclusions

Pointer-Chasing Problem

<u>Key</u>:

n, needs to know &n, without referencing the d-1 intermediate nodes

Our proposals:

use *existing* pointer(s) in n_i to approximate &n_{i+d}

Greedy Prefetching

- add *new* pointer(s) to n_i to approximate &n_{i+d}
 History-Pointer Prefetching
- compute &n_{i+d} directly from &n_i (no ptr deref)
 - History-Pointer Prefetching

Greedy Prefetching

- Prefetch all neighboring nodes (simplified definition)
 - only one will be followed by the immediate control flow
 - hopefully, we will visit other neighbors later





- Reasonably effective in practice
- However, little control over the prefetching distance

History-Pointer Prefetching

- Add new pointer(s) to each node
 - history-pointers are obtained from some recent traversal



Trade space & time for better control over prefetching distances

oneondei

Data-Linearization Prefetching

- No pointer dereferences are required
- Map nodes close in the traversal to contiguous memory



prefetching distance= 3 nodes

prefetch

····

Summary of Prefetching Algorithms

	Greedy	History-Pointer	Data-Linearization
Control over Prefetching Distance	little	more precise	more precise
Applicability to Recursive Data Structures	any RDS	revisited; changes only slowly	must have a major traversal order; changes only slowly
Overhead in Preparing Prefetch Addresses	none	space + time	none in practice
Ease of Implementation	relatively straightforward	more difficult	more difficulty

Conclusions

- Propose 3 schemes to overcome the pointer-chasing problem:
 - Greedy Prefetching
 - History-Pointer Prefetching
 - Data-Linearization Prefetching
- Automated greedy prefetching in SUIF
 - improves performance significantly for half of Olden
 - memory feedback can further reduce prefetch overhead
- The other 2 schemes can outperform greedy in some situations

CSC D70: Compiler Optimization Prefetching

Prof. Gennady Pekhimenko University of Toronto Winter 2020

The content of this lecture is adapted from the lectures of Todd Mowry and Phillip Gibbons