

Sensitivity Analysis of Core Specialization Techniques

Prathmesh Kallurkar *

Microarchitecture Research Lab

Intel Corporation

e-mail: prathmesh.kallurkar@intel.com

Smruti R. Sarangi

Department of Computer Science

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

e-mail: srsarangi@cse.iitd.ac.in

Abstract

The instruction footprint of OS-intensive workloads such as web servers, database servers, and file servers typically exceeds the size of the instruction cache (32 KB). Consequently, such workloads incur a lot of i-cache misses, which reduces their performance drastically. Several papers [6, 8, 5, 2, 3] have proposed to improve the performance of such workloads using core specialization. In this scheme, tasks with different instruction footprints are executed on different cores. In this report, we study the performance of five state of the art core specialization techniques: *SelectiveOffload* [6], *FlexSC* [8], *DisAggregateOS* [5], *SLICC* [2], and *SchedTask* [3] for different system parameters. Our studies show that for a suite of 8 popular OS-intensive workloads, *SchedTask* performs best for all evaluated configurations.

1 Multi-programmed Workloads

We compare the impact of all core specialization techniques on a server that is executing multiple OS-intensive applications. Table 1 shows the constituent benchmarks and their workloads for each multi-programmed workload, and Figure 1 shows the impact of different core specialization techniques on the weighted instruction throughput of each multi-programmed workload. We

*The author contributed to this work while at Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

| Bag ID | Constituent benchmarks | Workload of individual benchmark |
|--------|---|----------------------------------|
| MPW-A | <i>DSS, FileSrv</i> | 1X |
| MPW-B | <i>Apache, OLTP</i> | 1X |
| MPW-C | <i>Apache, DSS, FileSrv, Iscp</i> | 0.5X |
| MPW-D | <i>Apache, DSS, Find, OLTP</i> | 0.5X |
| MPW-E | <i>Find, FileSrv, Iscp, Oscp</i> | 0.5X |
| MPW-F | <i>Apache, FileSrv, MailSrvIO, OLTP</i> | 0.5X |

Table 1: Constituent benchmarks of multi-programmed workloads




Figure 1: Impact of different techniques on the instruction throughput of a system executing multi-programmed workloads

start by allocating equal number of cores for each benchmark and then let the scheduling techniques decide the appropriate number of cores to execute the constituent tasks of each multi-programmed workload. The mean improvement in the weighted instruction throughput for these techniques is: *SelectiveOffload* (21.48%), *FlexSC* (-2.26%), *DisAggregateOS* (9.47%), *SLICC* (5.64%), and *SchedTask* (23.94%). The primary point to note from Figure 1 is that the performance of *SLICC* is low for multi-programmed workloads. This is an artifact of *SLICC*'s thread decomposition policy, which does not group common portions of OS execution across different applications. *FlexSC*, *DisAggregateOS*, and *SchedTask* group system calls based on their IDs. Hence, for these techniques, there is a high correlation between their performance of a multi-programmed workload and its constituent benchmarks.

| iSize | Technique | Find | | Iscp | | Oscp | | Apache | | DSS | | FileSrv | | MailSrvIO | | OLTP | | geom. mean | |
|-------|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|---------|------|-----------|------|------|------|------------|------|
| | | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf | iHit | Perf |
| 16 KB | SelectiveOffload | 1 | 10 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 31 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 12 |
| | FlexSC | 7 | -48 | 6 | -40 | 6 | -50 | -1 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 10 | 3 | -14 |
| | DisAggregateOS | 2 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 9 |
| | SLICC | 1 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 8 |
| | SchedTask | 2 | 11 | 1 | 40 | 1 | 23 | 2 | 44 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 34 | 2 | 28 | 3 | 17 | 1 | 25 |
| 32 KB | SelectiveOffload | 2 | 7 | 2 | 21 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 27 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 10 |
| | FlexSC | 10 | -51 | 7 | -44 | 6 | -56 | -1 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 3 | -18 |
| | DisAggregateOS | 3 | -2 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| | SLICC | 4 | 3 | 2 | 28 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 20 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 11 |
| | SchedTask | 4 | 7 | 3 | 39 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 38 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 44 | 4 | 28 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 23 |
| 64 KB | SelectiveOffload | 3 | 6 | 3 | 22 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | -1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 9 |
| | FlexSC | 8 | -52 | 6 | -45 | 4 | -57 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 23 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 3 | -19 |
| | DisAggregateOS | 5 | -1 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| | SLICC | 5 | 4 | 3 | 33 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 21 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 26 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 15 |
| | SchedTask | 5 | 6 | 4 | 39 | 2 | 13 | 8 | 37 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 36 | 3 | 28 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 22 |

iSize is the size of the i-cache. iHit and Perf are the change (%) in i-cache hit rate and the instruction throughput respectively relative to the baseline with the same i-cache size

Table 2: Impact of the size of the instruction cache on the instruction cache hit rate and instruction throughput

2 Instruction Cache Size

Table 2 shows the impact of the i-cache size on the i-cache hit rate and the instruction throughput derived by all core specialization techniques. We evaluate all techniques for the following three i-cache configurations: 4-way 16 KB, 4-way 32 KB, and 4-way 64 KB. A baseline system with a smaller i-cache incurs more cache misses and therefore, the core specialization techniques can improve instruction throughput better. Our proposed technique improves throughput by 25%, 23%, and 22% over the baseline for a 16 KB, 32 KB, and a 64 KB i-cache system, respectively. This results in a performance improvement of 13%, 12%, and 7% respectively over the best state of the art techniques.

3 Cache Configuration

Table 3 describes three cache configurations (Config1, Config2, and Config3) and their impact on the instruction throughput of all techniques. Config1 and Config2 have two levels of cache hierarchy whereas Config3 has three levels of cache hierarchy. Since the performance benefit derived by a core specialization technique is directly proportional to the i-cache miss penalty, the performance of all techniques is the least for Config2 and the most for Config1. Our proposed technique improves throughput by 24%, 21%, and 23% over the baseline for a system with Config1, Config2, and Config3 cache configurations re-

spectively. This results in a 7, 6, and 12 percentage point enhancement in performance (respectively) over the best existing techniques.

4 Number of Cores

Table 4 shows the impact of the number of cores on the instruction throughput of different core specialization techniques. We evaluate all the techniques for the following four systems: system with 8 cores, system with 16 cores, system with 24 cores, and a system with 32 cores. We do not consider a system with less than 8 cores because such a system is not practical for the OS-intensive server-class workloads that we consider. Our proposed technique improves throughput by 18%, 27%, 27%, and 23% over the baseline for a system with 8 cores, 16 cores, 24 cores, and 32 cores respectively. This results in 3, 9, 12, and 12 percentage points enhancements, respectively, over the best existing techniques.

5 Instruction Prefetcher

Figure 2 shows the impact of core specialization techniques on the instruction throughput when the baseline system employs a hardware instruction prefetcher. We use the hardware-only mode (CGHC-2K+32K) of the Call Graph Prefetcher (CGP) [1] as the instruction prefetcher. We use CGP because its hardware overheads are not

| Cache configuration | Technique | Find | Iscp | Oscp | Apache | DSS | FileSrv | MailSrvIO | OLTP | geom. mean |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--|------|------|--------|-----|---------|-----------|------|------------|
| | | Change in the instruction throughput (%) relative to the baseline system with the same cache configuration | | | | | | | | |
| Config1 | SelectiveOffload | -1 | 18 | 14 | 18 | 9 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 12 |
| | FlexSC | -57 | -51 | -60 | 17 | 1 | 11 | 20 | 8 | -21 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -7 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 25 | 9 | 7 |
| | SLICC | 3 | 27 | 16 | 20 | 6 | 18 | 15 | 18 | 15 |
| | SchedTask | 11 | 36 | 21 | 38 | 2 | 30 | 33 | 14 | 23 |
| Config2 | SelectiveOffload | -2 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 11 |
| | FlexSC | -59 | -53 | -61 | 15 | 1 | 12 | 19 | 5 | -23 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -9 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 10 | 21 | 8 | 6 |
| | SLICC | 1 | 25 | 16 | 18 | 5 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 13 |
| | SchedTask | 7 | 33 | 20 | 31 | 2 | 27 | 28 | 10 | 19 |
| Config 3 | SelectiveOffload | 7 | 21 | 8 | 27 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 10 |
| | FlexSC | -51 | -44 | -56 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 12 | 4 | -18 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -2 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 4 | 6 | 9 |
| | SLICC | 3 | 28 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 13 | 11 |
| | SchedTask | 7 | 39 | 15 | 38 | 10 | 44 | 28 | 12 | 23 |
| Config1 → | <i>Private caches</i> | i-cache and d-cache: (4-way 32 KB. latency = 3 cycles) | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Shared cache</i> | L2 cache: (8-way 8 MB. latency = 18 cycles) | | | | | | | | |
| Config2 → | <i>Private caches</i> | i-cache and d-cache: (4-way 32 KB. latency = 3 cycles) | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Shared cache</i> | L2 cache: (8-way 8 MB. latency = 8 cycles) | | | | | | | | |
| Config3 → | <i>Private caches</i> | i-cache and d-cache: (4-way 32 KB. latency = 3 cycles), L2 cache: (4-way 256 KB. latency = 8 cycles) | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Shared cache</i> | L3 cache: (8-way 8 MB. latency = 18 cycles) | | | | | | | | |

Table 3: Impact of the cache configuration on the instruction throughput

| #cores | Technique | Find | Iscp | Oscp | Apache | DSS | FileSrv | MailSrvIO | OLTP | geom. mean |
|----------|------------------|--|------|------|--------|-----|---------|-----------|------|------------|
| | | Change in the instruction throughput (%) relative to the baseline system with the same number of cores | | | | | | | | |
| 8 cores | SelectiveOffload | 14 | 22 | 17 | 48 | 5 | 2 | -1 | 17 | 15 |
| | FlexSC | -24 | -26 | -41 | 13 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 3 | -8 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -17 | -14 | -16 | 0 | -10 | -19 | -28 | -1 | -14 |
| | SLICC | 6 | -5 | -13 | -4 | -3 | -10 | -11 | -5 | -6 |
| | SchedTask | 20 | 24 | 10 | 36 | 9 | 16 | 22 | 12 | 18 |
| 16 cores | SelectiveOffload | 19 | 27 | 26 | 47 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 18 |
| | FlexSC | -24 | -24 | -40 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 13 | -7 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -1 | -10 | -14 | 3 | -5 | -15 | -23 | 4 | -8 |
| | SLICC | 17 | 6 | -2 | 3 | 3 | -3 | -4 | 8 | 3 |
| | SchedTask | 32 | 37 | 22 | 51 | 8 | 17 | 31 | 26 | 27 |
| 24 cores | SelectiveOffload | 15 | 29 | 16 | 40 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| | FlexSC | -45 | -35 | -53 | 11 | 8 | 22 | 13 | 10 | -13 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -4 | 1 | -1 | 6 | 0 | 2 | -12 | 4 | 0 |
| | SLICC | 7 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 9 |
| | SchedTask | 15 | 47 | 23 | 51 | 13 | 27 | 28 | 18 | 27 |
| 32 cores | SelectiveOffload | 7 | 21 | 8 | 27 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 10 |
| | FlexSC | -51 | -44 | -56 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 12 | 4 | -18 |
| | DisAggregateOS | -2 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 6 | 20 | 4 | 6 | 9 |
| | SLICC | 3 | 28 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 13 | 11 |
| | SchedTask | 7 | 39 | 15 | 38 | 10 | 44 | 28 | 12 | 23 |

Table 4: Impact of the number of cores on the instruction throughput




Figure 2: Impact of the instruction prefetcher on the instruction throughput

very high and it is shown to give better performance than the classical instruction prefetchers such as next-line prefetcher and correlation-based prefetcher [7]. We observe that CGP reduces the number of i-cache misses by 20-30% and thus improves the performance of a system without an instruction prefetcher by around 4-5%¹. Since a baseline system with CGP incurs fewer i-cache misses, the scheduling techniques gain lesser by improving the instruction locality. The mean improvements in the instruction throughput of the system after employing CGP are: *SelectiveOffload* (8.37%), *FlexSC* (-20.93%), *DisAggregateOS* (8.57%), *SLICC* (4.28%), and *SchedTask* (19.6%).

6 Trace Cache

Figure 3 shows the impact of core specialization techniques on the instruction throughput when the baseline system employs a trace cache. We use the trace cache implementation that was proposed in [4]. We observe that since the instruction footprints of the considered workloads are very large (>250KB), traces belonging to different *SuperFunctions* keep evicting each other from the shared trace cache. Hence, the performance gains derived by using core specialization techniques do not change

¹The original paper [1] uses a 2-level memory hierarchy only and hence it enhances performance more




Figure 3: Impact of the trace cache on the instruction throughput

much for a system employing a trace cache versus one that does not employ a trace cache. For a system that employs a trace cache, the mean performance gains derived by different techniques are: *SelectiveOffload* (7.2%), *FlexSC* (-20.38%), *DisAggregateOS* (6.67%), *SLICC* (8.04%), and *SchedTask* (20.6%).

7 Conclusion

In this report, we studied the sensitivity of five state of the art core specialization techniques to multi-programmed workloads, cache configurations, instruction prefetchers, and trace-cache. Our studies show that *SchedTask* [3] outperforms other techniques [6, 8, 5, 2] for all evaluated configurations. This is because *SchedTask* employs a fine-grained task scheduler and a superior work stealing algorithm.

Acknowledgment

We thank Omais Pandith and Himani Raina for providing us their Tejas model of “Trace Based Instruction Caching”; it helped us evaluate the impact of Trace Caches on different core specialization techniques.

References

- [1] M. Annavaram, J. M. Patel, and E. S. Davidson. Call graph prefetching for database applications. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 2003.
- [2] I. Atta, P. Tozun, A. Ailamaki, and A. Moshovos. SLICC: Self-Assembly of Instruction Cache Collectives for OLTP Workloads. In *MICRO*, 2012.
- [3] P. Kallurkar and S. R. Sarangi. SchedTask: A Hardware-Assisted Task Scheduler. In *MICRO*, 2017.
- [4] R. F. Krick, G. J. Hinton, M. D. Upton, D. J. Sager, and C. W. Lee. Trace based instruction caching, 2000. US Patent 6,018,786.
- [5] M. Lee. *Memory region: a system abstraction for managing the complex memory structures of multi-core platforms*. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2013.
- [6] D. Nellans, R. Balasubramonian, and E. Brunvand. Interference Aware Cache Designs for Operating System Execution. *University of Utah, Tech. Rep. UUCS-09-002*, 2009.
- [7] K. J. Nesbit and J. E. Smith. Data cache prefetching using a global history buffer. *MICRO*, 2005.
- [8] L. Soares and M. Stumm. FlexSC: Flexible System Call Scheduling with Exception-Less System Calls. In *OSDI*, 2010.