Cross-Translation Unit Optimization via Annotated Headers "Header Time Optimization"



William S. Moses wmoses@mit.edu





Johannes Doerfert

jdoerfert@anl.gov



• How do we ensure that norm is hoisted outside the loop and normalize gets vectorized?

```
// Defined inside an external library
double norm(double *A, int n);
void normalize(double *out, double *in, int n) {
  for (int i = 0; i < n; ++i)
     out[i] = in[i] / norm(in, n);
}</pre>
```

• Let's add restrict (if in and out alias, calls to norm would be different)

```
// Defined inside an external library
double norm(double *A, int n);
void normalize(double *restrict out, double *restrict in, int n) {
  for (int i = 0; i < n; ++i)
     out[i] = in[i] / norm(in, n);
}</pre>
```

• Let's make sure the compiler knows that the input is constant

• Let's really make sure the compiler knows norm is pure

• Maybe marking it as vectorizable will work?

• If we mark norm as having the LLVM attributes "readonly" and "argmemonly" this finally happens!

```
__attribute__((fn_attr("readonly"), fn_attr("argmemonly")))
double norm(double *A, int n);
```

```
void normalize(double *restrict out, double *restrict in, int n) {
  for (int i = 0; i < n; ++i)
    out[i] = in[i] / norm(in, n);
}</pre>
```

^Note this specific syntax doesn't exist in mainline Clang

This is a problem in real programs

 In the DOE RSBench benchmark adding "readnone" to fast_cexp gives a 7% improvement to the entire program (with another 1% for "unwind")

```
complex double fast_cexp(double complex z);
...
Z = ...;
for (int i = w.start; i < w.end; ++i) {
    sigT += data.poles[nuc][i] * fast_cexp(Z);
    ...
```

How do we automatically make code optimizable?



LLVM automatically derives these attributes as part of the compilation process, then throws it away when it's done

Let's ensure this information is accessible across translation units

Why not always use LTO?

- Running LTO (even ThinLTO [1]) is a burden on compile times
- LTO may not be available in your build / operating system
- It's often impossible to run LTO on your entire program (e.g. using an external library)

Also, it's interesting to see how much of LTO's speedups come from "easily fixable" mechanisms and provide user's the agency to fix them in source code (making the speedups available to everyone independent from compiler/linker used)

[1] Teresa Johnson, Mehdi Amini, and Xinliang David Li. Thinlto: scalable and incremental Ito. In 2017 IEEE/ACM Interna onal Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization (CGO), pages 111–121. IEEE, 2017

Introducing "Header Time Optimization"

- At the end of the compilation process, denote what derived attributes can be added to functions using LLVM's existing analyses and Attributor [2]
- Modes of operation:
 - Remark Mode: print out optimization remarks specifying attributes that should be added to functions
 - Pipeline Mode: automatically generate a new header file with this new information
 - Diff Mode (in progress): create a diff for original source tree
- Annotated headers account for half of speedups found by LTO alone!

Header Time Optimization - Remarks



Header Time Optimization – Pipeline



Header Time Optimization – Pipeline (Library)



Header files

- HTO creates new files in a given directory that can be included in any C/C++ program (design chosen for easiest experimentation)
- Leverage forward declarations of functions and structs in C/C++

```
struct Vector;
struct Matrix;
__attribute__((fn_attr("readonly")))
Vector* matvec(Matrix *M, Vector *B);
```

New attributes for Clang

Not all LLVM attributes are representable with existing Clang attributes

Created a generic way to represent LLVM attributes in Clang

```
_attribute__((fn_attr("readonly")))
__attribute__((arg_attr(1, "readonly")))
__attribute__((arg_attr(B, "readonly")))
__attribute__((ret_attr("noalias")))
double* vector_add(double *A, double *B, int len);
```

Experiments

- Multi-source benchmarks in LLVM test suite
 - DOE C/C++ Proxy Apps, Bit Stream benchmark Suite, TSVC test suite, NIST SciMark suite, RNA alignment application, & more
 - Selected tests with runtime > 0.5 seconds
 - 84 tests
- Run min of 10 on quiesced AWS c4.8xlarge
 - Disabled turboboost, hyperthreading
- Compared normal run (with -O3) vs HTO vs ThinLTO

Percentage speedup of HTO over Normal













HTO vs ThinLTO Where Speedup Exists



25% HTO HTO ≥ LTO ±2% HTO < LTO $\pm 2\%$ LTO 20% More than half of LTO speedups can be found by HTO alone 15% Speedup 10% 5%-2%-0% -2% Benchmark

HTO vs ThinLTO Where Speedup Exists

HTO vs ThinLTO Compile and Link Times



HTO vs ThinLTO Compile and Link Times



Optimization Statistics with HTO



 \sim

Takeaways

- HTO (and LTO) can have meaningful performance gains for programs
 - In practice programs don't have the attributes they should
 - Lack of attributes hinders optimizations
- HTO provides tools to automatically integrate these attributes into your programs / libraries with an additional compiler flag
- Simply propagating attributes (via HTO) accounts for ~50% of the speedups seen by LTO
 - Other 50% likely need IPO/inlining

Present Limitations & Future Work

- No anonymous structs (have a script to automatically generate random names)
- No attributes generated for C++ member functions (since can't forward declare)
- No attributes generated for array type (not pointer type) of struct/classes (type mystruct[3] is incomplete ahead of time)
- Allow outputting a diff (resolves above and allows for more performance gains)
- Should generate standard C/C++ attributes when they exist

Conclusions

- Properly annotating programs can make real performance difference
- Writing annotations manually can be difficult
- We provide three mechanisms to remedy:
 - Support for writing LLVM annotations in C/C++
 - Optimization remark to point out missing annotations
 - Pipeline to automatically inject missing annotations into programs
- Code is available on Github (github.com/wsmoses/LLVM-HTO), plans to upstream once cleaned up (and submitted for publication)
- Thanks to DOE CSGF/Exascale project and Google Summer of Code for funding the project

Appendix



HTO vs ThinLTO



Optimized HTO vs ThinLTO Compile and Link Times (Estimated)



Headers Aren't Optimized Yet



Compiler, not Programmer should Optimize Code

- Easier to maintain
- Costly (time or financially) to manually optimize
 - Legacy code base
- Insufficient expertise
- Can't modify source code
 - Calling external library
 - Called by a user program

HTO vs ThinLTO



• What do we need to do to ensure norm is hoisted outside the loop?