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Abstract

Byte-addressable non-volatile main memory (NVM) demands transactional mechanisms to access and manipulate data on NVM atomically. Those transaction mechanisms often employ a logging mechanism (undo logging or redo logging). However, the logging mechanisms bring large runtime overhead (8%-49% in our evaluation), and 41%-78% of the overhead attributes to the frequent cache-line flushing. Such large overhead significantly diminishes the performance benefits offered by NVM. In this paper, we introduce a new method to remove the overhead of cache-line flushing for logging-based transactions. Different from the traditional method that works at the program level and leverages program semantics to reduce the logging overhead, we introduce architecture awareness. In particular, we do not flush certain cache blocks, as long as they are estimated to be eliminated out of the cache because of the caching mechanism (e.g., the cache replacement algorithm). Furthermore, we coalesce those cache blocks with low dirtiness to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing. We implement an architecture-aware, high performance transaction runtime system for persistent memory, Archapt. Our results show that comparing with the traditional undo logging, Archapt reduces cache flushing by 66% and improves system throughput by 22% on average (42% at most), when running TPC-C and YCSB (A-F) with Redis, and OLTP-bench (TPC-C, LinkBench and YCSB) with SQLite.

1 Introduction

Non-volatile memory (NVM), addressed at a byte granularity directly by CPU and accessed roughly at the latency of main memory, are coming. While NVM as main memory provides an appealing interface that uses simple load/store, it brings new challenges to the designs of persistent data structures, storage systems, and databases. In particular, a store does not immediately make data persistent, because the memory hierarchy (e.g., caches and store buffers) and processor state can remain non-persistent. There is a need to ensure that data is modified atomically when moving from one consistent state to another, in order to provide consistency after a crash (e.g., power loss or hardware failure). In particular, a store does not immediately make data persistent, because the memory hierarchy (e.g., caches and store buffers) and processor state can remain non-persistent. There is a need to ensure that data is modified atomically when moving from one consistent state to another, in order to provide consistency after a crash (e.g., power loss or hardware failure).

The NVM challenges have resulted in investigations of transactional mechanisms to access and manipulate data on persistent memory (NVM) atomically [8, 27, 33–35, 42, 45, 46]. Those transactional mechanisms often employ a logging technique (undo logging or redo logging). However, those transactional mechanisms have a high overhead. Our performance evaluation reveals that running TPC-C [2, 28] and YCSB (A-F) [3, 14] against Redis [7], and OLTP-bench [1] (TPC-C, LinkBench [6] and YCSB) against SQLite [4] based on an implementation of undo logging from Intel PMDK [24]) or a redo logging from [45] to enable transactions, we have overheads of 8%-49%. Such large overhead significantly diminishes the performance benefit NVM promises to provide in many workloads.

Most overhead of logging mechanisms comes from data copy for creating logs and cache-line flushing by special instructions. Cache-line flushing takes a large portion of the total overhead. Use our evaluation with the above workloads as an example again. On average, the cache-line flushing takes 65% and 51% of total overhead for undo logging and redo logging mechanisms respectively. Removing the overhead of cache-line flushing is the key to enable high performance transaction for persistent memory.

The traditional methods reduce the overhead of cache-line flushing using asynchronous cache-line flushing (e.g., blurring persistent boundary [32] and relaxing persistency ordering [32, 45]). Those methods remove the overhead of cache-line flushing off the critical path, by overlapping cache-line flushing with the transaction. However, the effectiveness of asynchronous cache-line flushing depends on the characteris-
tics of the transaction (e.g., how frequent data updates happen), cache-line flushing can still be exposed into the critical path, increasing the latency of the transaction.

In this paper, we introduce a new method to remove the overhead of cache-line flushing. The traditional methods work at the program level and leverage program semantics: as long as the transaction semantics remains correct, we can change the order of persisting data and trigger asynchronous cache-line flushing. Different from the traditional methods, our method introduces architecture awareness. In particular, we do not flush certain cache lines, as long as those cache lines are eliminated out of the cache because of the caching mechanism (e.g., the cache replacement algorithm). In other words, we rely on the existing hardware mechanism to automatically and implicitly flush cache lines. The traditional methods do not have architecture awareness. Ignoring the possible effects of the caching mechanism, the traditional methods flush cache lines by explicitly issuing cache flush instructions, even though those cache lines will be soon or have been eliminated out of the cache by hardware.

Furthermore, we examine the cache line dirtiness to quantify the efficiency of cache-line flushing. The dirtiness of a cache line is defined as the ratio of dirty bytes to total number of bytes in a cache line. Since a cache line is the finest granularity to enforce data persistency, the whole cache line has to be flushed, even though only a few bytes in the cache line are dirty. Use our evaluation with the above workloads as an example again: the average dirtiness of flushed cache lines in Redis and SQLite is 49% and 49% for undo and redo logging mechanisms respectively. Flushing clean data in a cache line wastes memory bandwidth and decreases the efficiency of cache-line flushing.

To leverage the architecture awareness to enable high performance transactions, we must address a couple of challenges. First, we must have a software mechanism to reason and decide the existence of cache blocks in the cache, without the hardware modification. The mechanism must be lightweight and allow us to make a quick decision on whether a cache-line flushing is necessary.

Second, we must provide strong guarantee on data consistency to implement transactions. Skipping cache-line flushing for some persistent objects raises the risk of losing data consistency for committed transactions. The software mechanism to reason the residence of a cache block in the cache is an approximation to the hardware-based caching mechanism. If the software mechanism skips a cache-line flushing, but the corresponding dirty cache block is still in the cache, then there is a chance that the cache block is inconsistent when a crash happens. We must have a mechanism to detect and correct such inconsistency in persistent memory.

To address the above two challenges, we introduce Archapt (Architecture-aware, performant and persistent transaction), an architecture-aware, high performance transaction runtime system. Archapt provides a new way to perform transactional updates on persistent memory with efficient cache-line flushing. To address the first challenge, Archapt uses an LRU queue to reason the residence of cache blocks of a persistent object in the cache and decide whether cache flushing for a persistent object in a transaction is necessary.

To address the second challenge, Archapt introduces a lightweight checksum mechanism. Checksums are built using multiple cache blocks from one or more persistent objects to establish implicit invariant relationships between cache blocks. Leveraging the invariant, Archapt can detect data inconsistency and make best efforts to correct data inconsistency after a crash happens. The checksum mechanism provides a strong guarantee on data consistency, while causes small runtime overhead (less than 5% loss in throughput in our evaluation).

Furthermore, to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing, we examine the implementation of common database systems (Redis and SQLite), and find two problems accounting for the low dirtiness of flushed cache lines. The two problems are unaligned cache-line flushing and uncoordinated cache-line flushing. The two problems come from the fundamental limitation of the existing memory allocation mechanism designed for the traditional DRAM. In particular, the existing memory allocation does not consider the effects of cache-line flushing on persistent memory, and spread data structures with different dirtiness across cache blocks. This causes the low dirtiness of flushed cache lines. Archapt introduces a customized memory allocation mechanism to coalesce cache-line flushing and improve efficiency.

In summary, the paper makes the following contributions:
\begin{itemize}
  \item An architecture-aware new method to achieve high performance transactions on persistent memory;
  \item A mechanism that determines the necessity of cache-line flushing based on the locality of cache blocks; A checksum mechanism to detect and correct data inconsistency to provide strong guarantee on crash consistency;
  \item We reveal the low dirtiness of flushed cache lines in two common databases, and provide a solution to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing;
  \item With Archapt, we reduce cache flushing by 66% and improve system throughput by 22% (42% at most), when running YCSB (A-F) and TPC-C against Redis, and OLTP-bench (TPC-C, LinkBench and YCSB) against SQLite (using the traditional undo logging as baseline). Archapt provides strong crash consistency demonstrated by our crash tests.
\end{itemize}

2 Background and Motivation

Many studies build a atomic and durable transaction [8, 12, 20, 21, 24, 27, 32, 44, 45] to handle the crash consistency
issue on NVM. With such a transaction, each single update must be “all or nothing”, i.e., either successfully completes, or fails completely with the data in NVM intact. With such a transaction, one has to write back the modified data from the volatile cache to NVM that provides the durability. To ensure a cache line is indeed written to NVM in a correct order, one often uses cache-line flushing instructions (e.g., clflush, clflushopt or clwb) and persistent barriers (e.g., sfence and mfence). Cache-line flushing is expensive, because of two reasons: (1) it may need to invalidate cache lines (with clflush and clflushopt instructions) and trigger cache-line sized writes to the memory controller; and (2) it needs persistent barriers to ensure that all flushes are completed and force any updates in the memory controller to be written to NVM.

In the rest of the paper, we use the term persistent object to represent a data object that is modified within the transaction and needs to be persisted. We use the term log record to represent a log (an copy of the old data in an undo logging mechanism or a copy of the new data in a redo logging mechanism). To persist a persistent object, the current common practice is to flush all cache blocks of the persistent object [24]. We use “flushing all cache blocks” for a persistent object and “cache-line flushing” for a persistent object interchangeably in the paper.

### 2.1 Performance Analysis on Log-based Persistent Memory Transactions

Undo and redo logging are two of the most common mechanisms to build persistent transactions on persistent memory. In undo and redo logging, the logging operations (including data copy and log record manipulation) and persistence operations (including cache-line flushing and store barrier) are necessary. Both of them cause performance loss in a transaction. To quantify the impact of the persistent logging on transaction throughput, we run multiple workloads, including YCSB and TPC-C against Redis, and OLTP-bench (TPC-C, LinkBench and YCSB) against SQLite with and without the persistent logging. For each workload, we use eight client threads. More experiment details are available in Section 5.1. Figure 1 shows the results.

The figure reveals that logging decreases throughput by 8%-49%. For a workload with frequent updates (YCSB-A) or large updates (LinkBench), the logging overhead can be very large (33% and 49% for YCSB-A and LinkBench respectively). Furthermore, we measure the delay (latency overhead) caused by logging operations and persistence operations. Figure 2 shows the results. In the undo logging, the persistence operations account for 56%-78% of the latency overhead; in the redo logging, the persistence operations account for 41%-64% of the latency overhead. The overhead of those persistence operations is exposed to the critical path of transactions. The above results show that the persistence operations can significantly impact the transaction performance. Thus, we must avoid frequent cache-line flushing.

Introducing architecture awareness into the design of a transaction, we want to skip cache flushing by leveraging data reuse information in the cache. If data reuse is low, then there is a very good chance that the data is eliminated out of the cache by the hardware-based caching mechanism. We study data reuse in the next section.

### 2.2 Data Reuse and Dirtiness Analysis

Data in a transaction includes log records and persistent objects. Log records, which are used to maintain the transaction atomicity, are seldom reused. We study data reuse at the persistent object level, and explore whether there are persistent objects with few reuse. These persistent objects are candidates for skipping cache-line flushing.

To study data reuse, we count the number of operations (read and write) for each persistent object, and then report what is the percentage of persistent objects with 0, 1, 2 or more operations, which we call the distribution of data reuse. Figure 3 shows the results. The figure reveals that about 89% of persistent objects have data reuse no less than 2. Such high data reuse is because of the following reason: This workload has frequent queries, each of which cover a range of persistent objects. Those ranges of queries overlap with each other, causing high data reuse.

---

2 We have to flush all cache blocks, even though some of them may not be in the cache, because there is no mechanism to faithfully track which cache blocks are in the cache. Flushing cache blocks not resident in the cache has the similar cost as flushing those resident in the cache.
We also explore the efficiency of cache-line flushing. In particular, we quantify the average dirtiness of flushed cache lines. Table 1 shows the results for undo and redo logging (the two logging mechanisms have the same dirtiness). In general, the dirtiness is less than 0.6 in all workloads, which is low.

**Conclusions.** Using the industry standard workloads, our analysis on data reuse and dirtiness shows great opportunities to enable high performance transactions by skipping cache-line flushing and improving its efficiency.

## 3 Design

Motivated by the above performance analysis, we introduce a high performance transaction runtime system, targeting on reducing the overhead of persistence operations. We describe our design in details in this section.

### 3.1 Overview

Archapt avoids cache-line flushing for persistent objects (but not log records) to enable high performance transactions without disturbing transaction atomicity. Archapt uses an LRU-based method to reason if persistent objects are in the cache. With this approach, Archapt does not immediately make a decision on flushing cache blocks for a persistent object, when a cache flushing request is issued from a transaction to persist a persistent object. Archapt delays the decision until it collects more information on read/write of the persistent object and estimates the locality of the persistent object, using the LRU queue. For the persistent object that is estimated not to be resident in the cache, the cache flushing for all of its cache blocks is skipped.

Archapt is also featured with a checksum mechanism. Skipping cache-line flushing for some persistent objects raises the risk of having inconsistent data for committed transactions, when a crash happens. To remove the risk, we introduce a checksum mechanism. This mechanism generates checksums for persistent objects that have cache-line flushing skipped. The checksum mechanism builds an invariant relationship between cache blocks. Upon a crash, the checksums can be used to detect and correct data inconsistency. We design the mechanism with the consideration of avoiding frequently updating checksums for best performance and maximizing the capabilities of correcting data inconsistency.

Furthermore, we identify two reasons that account for the low dirtiness of flushed cache lines: unaligned cache-line flushing and uncoordinated cache line flushing. To address the two problems, Archapt introduces a customized memory allocation mechanism. It clusters persistent objects with the same functionality (i.e., key, field, value, and log) into contiguous cache blocks to coordinate cache-line flushing and align cache-line flushing, based on which Archapt improves the efficiency of cache-line flushing.

**Overall architecture of Archapt.** Archapt has four major components: transaction management unit, memory management unit, persistent management unit, and history management unit. Figure 4 shows the architecture of Archapt.

(1) The transaction management unit includes a set of APIs to establish a transaction (i.e., start and end). Such transaction information is sent to the Archapt runtime to implement transaction semantics. The transaction management unit processes the requested operations of the transaction. It also flushes cache blocks for persistent objects that are estimated to be in the cache. (2) The memory management unit pre-allocates a set of memory pools for coalescing cache blocks and manages the pools to meet memory allocation requests from transactions. (3) The persistent management unit builds checksums for persistent objects for which Archapt skips the cache-line flushing. (4) The history management unit maintains an LRU queue and a hash table, $ObjHT$. The LRU queue is used to estimate the locality of persistent objects (i.e., in the cache or not). $ObjHT$ is used to provide metadata information for each persistent object in the LRU queue, such as the location in the LRU queue and whether there is any pending cache-line flushing.

### 3.2 Architecture-Aware Cache-Line Flushing

The architecture-aware cache-line flushing uses an LRU queue to reason if a persistent object is in the cache or not, and skips cache-line flushing for it, if not. When a persistent
object is updated, its cache blocks are placed into the LRU queue (the queue length is equal to the capacity of last level cache), and the decision for cache flushing for this persistent object is pending until we have enough information to estimate the residence of the persistent object in the cache, based on the LRU queue. We describe our design in details as follows.

First, once Archapt receives a request (i.e., a read or write operation to a persistent object) from the client, the transaction management unit queries $\text{ObjHT}$ to see if the requested persistent object has a record there. If yes, we infer that the persistent object is accessed recently. The hardware cache may have the persistent object resident in the cache because of a previous operation on the persistent object. If the previous operation is a write operation, flushing cache blocks for the persistent object must be pending. We finish the cache flushing for the previous write operation. Furthermore, we update the location of the persistent object in the LRU queue, because of the current request. If the current request is a write operation, we hold the cache flushing for the current request, waiting for the opportunity to skip it in the future.

If the transaction management unit cannot find the requested persistent object information in $\text{ObjHT}$, we conclude that the persistent object has not been accessed recently. The hardware cache may evict the persistent object out of the cache, or never access it at all. The transaction management unit then skips any pending cache flushing request for the persistent object. Afterwards, the transaction management unit asks the history management unit to insert the information for the persistent object into the LRU queue, and suspend the cache flushing for the most recent request if it writes the persistent object. In the future transactions, as other persistent objects are accessed, the target persistent object can be evicted out of the LRU queue according to the LRU policy, and its record will be removed from $\text{ObjHT}$ and the pending cache flushing will be skipped.

We must maintain the commit status of a transaction very well. After the completion of a transaction, we cannot label it as commit as in the traditional transaction, because cache flushing for some persistent objects in the transaction may be pending. For such a transaction, we label it as logical commit. Only after all of cache flushing for persistent objects in the transaction are either finished or skipped (but with checksums added to the persistent objects. See Section 3.3), we label the transaction as physical commit.

A logically committed transaction has completed all read and write operations in the transaction. For such a transaction, the system does not respond to the client to announce the transaction commitment. For a physically committed transaction, the system does so, as in the traditional undo or redo logging mechanisms.

The modern hardware-based cache hierarchy employs sophisticated caching policies. It is possible that a persistent object is resident in the cache while the LRU estimates otherwise. For this case, skipping cache-line flushing can potentially cause data inconsistency for a physically committed transaction, when a crash happens. We introduce a checksum mechanism to detect and correct inconsistent data (see Section 3.3).

**Handling log records.** Log records, once created for a transaction, are seldom accessed (unless a crash happens). We could skip cache flushing for log records and rely on the hardware-based caching mechanism to implicitly persist them. However, by doing so, some log records that are not timely flushed by the hardware are lost when a crash happens; We raise the risk of losing transaction atomicity before the physical commitment of the transaction. Hence, we do not skip cache-line flushing for log records. They are committed and maintained as in the traditional logging mechanisms.

### 3.3 Checksum Design

Skipping cache-line flushing for some persistent objects raises the risk of disturbing transaction atomicity: once a transaction is physically committed, there is no strong guarantee on data consistency, because we estimate data locality and the estimation can be inaccurate. To remove the risk, we introduce a checksum mechanism.

We have multiple requirements for the checksum design. First, the checksum mechanism should have the capability to detect data inconsistency in physically committed persistent objects. Second, the checksum mechanism must provide strong guarantee on data consistency for persistent objects when they are physically committed. Third, the checksum mechanism must be lightweight. Unlike RAID or some ECC that can come with large performance overhead, the overhead of our checksum construction and maintenance should be small, and smaller than the performance benefit of skipping cache flushing for persistent objects. We describe the design of the checksum mechanism in this section.

**General Description.** Our checksums are built with cache blocks of multiple persistent objects from one or more transactions. To build the checksums, cache blocks of multiple persistent objects are logically organized as an $M \times N$ matrix ($M$ and $N$ are the dimension sizes of the matrix, discussed later). Those persistent objects have cache flushing skipped. Each column of the matrix corresponds to cache blocks of a persistent object, where each element of the column is a cache block. Checksums are built as one extra row (the $(M+1)_{th}$ row) and one extra column (the $(N+1)_{th}$ column) of the matrix. The matrix becomes $(M+1) \times (N+1)$. The extra row, named consistency checksums, is used to detect data inconsistency of $N$ columns (i.e., $N$ persistent objects), and each element of the extra row is a consistent checksum for one column. The extra column, named correlation checksums, builds an invariant relationship between cache blocks across the multiple persistent objects. The correlation checksums can correct data inconsistency. We name the matrix, virtual...
matrix in the future discussion.

Consistency checksums to detect data inconsistency. When a persistent object with cache flushing skipped is logically committed, we immediately create a consistency checksum. The checksum is a simple summation of cache blocks of the persistent object. The consistency checksum for a persistent object is implemented as an extra cache block added to the persistent object. The checksum is immediately flushed for consistency once it is created. When a crash happens, for each persistent object with a consistency checksum, we recalculate the checksum and compare it with the existing one in persistent memory. If there is a mismatch, then data inconsistency is detected.

The consistency checksum mechanism is very effective to detect data inconsistency for a persistent object. Any cache block of the persistent object with data inconsistency can easily cause checksum mismatch. In our evaluation with ten workloads with hundreds of millions of transactions and 10,000 crash tests, the consistency checksum mechanism detects all data inconsistency.

Correlation checksums to correct data inconsistency. A correlation checksum, as an element of the \((N + 1)_{th}\) column of the virtual matrix, is a summation of cache blocks of a row in the virtual matrix. The \((N + 1)_{th}\) column is composed of \(M\) correlation checksums, each of which is for one row. Since the cache blocks of a row come from \(N\) persistent objects, a correlation checksum aims to correct data inconsistency for any of the \(N\) persistent objects. Correlation checksums (i.e., the \((N + 1)_{th}\) column) are immediately flushed out of the cache to commit, once they are fully built.

Once a crash happens, we recalculate correlation checksums and compare them with the existing ones in persistent memory. If there is a mismatch in any correlation checksum (say the element \(m_{k(N+1)}\) of the virtual matrix), then the corresponding row (the row \(k\)) must have data inconsistency. Using consistency checksums, we can reason which element of the row \(k\) is inconsistent. Assume that the element \(m_{kj}\) is. This element is corrected by the following:

\[
m_{kj} = m_{k(N+1)} - \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^{N} m_{ki}
\]

where \(m_{k(N+1)}\) is the correlation checksum committed in persistent memory.

\(N\), the column size of the virtual matrix, is the number of persistent objects we use to build the virtual matrix. A smaller \(N\) causes more frequent creation of checksums and hence larger performance overhead, but reduces the possibility of losing updates to persistent objects (because checksums are frequently committed); A larger \(N\) has smaller performance overhead, but increase the possibility. We empirically choose \(N\) as 16 to strike a balance. In other words, we commit \(N\) correlation checksums for \(N\) persistent objects together.

\(M\), the row size of the virtual matrix is determined by the largest persistent object among the \(N\) persistent objects: \(M\) is the number of cache blocks in the largest persistent object. For the shorter persistent objects, their corresponding columns in the virtual matrix can have zero-valued elements to make them as long as the largest persistent object.

An example. Figure 5a shows an example to further explain the idea of checksums. In this example, we have four persistent objects with four, four, three, and four cache blocks respectively. Hence, the virtual matrix is \(4 \times 4\), and each column is for one persistent object. The consistency checksums are in the first-fourth rows, and the correlation checksums are in the fifth rows. The consistency checksums, \(CkSum1-ChkSum4\) can detect data inconsistency for the first-fourth persistent objects respectively. The correlation checksums, \(CkSum5-ChkSum8\), can be used to correct data inconsistency for the cache blocks in the first-fourth rows. Suppose \(CB#32\) has inconsistency detected by the consistency checksum \(CkSum2\). The inconsistency can be corrected by the correlation checksum \(CkSum7\). In particular, \(CB#32 = CkSum7 - CB#31 - CB#33 - CB#34\).

Enabling high performance checksum mechanism. Our checksum mechanism does not cause large performance overhead because of the following reasons. First, creating checksums is not in the critical path of a transaction. A checksum for a persistent object is created, only after the persistent object is estimated to be evicted out of the LRU queue. This indicates that it is highly likely that the persistent object is not accessed in the near future; Also, creating the checksum for the persistent object and committing the checksum later do not block the execution of other transactions. Hence, checksum creation can happen in parallel with other operations,
which removes it from the critical path.

Second, checksums do not need to be updated frequently. Once a persistent object is updated, its checksums must be recalculated and updated to maintain the validity of checksums. Such updates can cause performance overhead. This performance problem is common in other mechanisms, such as ECC or RAID. However, it is not a problem in our design, because we use those persistent objects that are not frequently accessed (according to the LRU queue) to build checksums. Updating checksums do not happen often.

Third, the overhead of flushing cache blocks of checksums can be smaller than that of flushing cache blocks for persistent objects. Hence, the performance benefits of the checksum mechanism provide opportunities to overweight its overhead. Given an $N \times M$ virtual matrix, we need to flush $(N + M)$ cache blocks to make checksums consistent. In contrast, to make consistent $N$ persistent objects in the virtual matrix, we need to flush at least $(M + N - 1)$ cache blocks (assuming that the largest persistent object has $M$ cache blocks while each of other persistent objects has just one cache block), and at most $(M \times N)$ cache blocks (assuming that each of persistent objects has $M$ cache blocks). In fact, when we build a virtual matrix, we try to use persistent objects with similar size, such that in nearly all cases, the number of cache blocks to flush for persistent objects is close to $(M \times N)$. In other words, in nearly all cases, the number of cache blocks to flush for checksums is significantly smaller than that to flush for $N$ persistent objects (i.e., $N + M$ vs. $M \times N$). Although we need to update the checksums and flush again when there is any update to the persistent objects, this does not happen very often because of the above second reason we discuss. In our evaluation, using the checksum mechanism always saves the flushes of cache blocks, hence bringing performance benefits.

Analysis on the capability of correcting data inconsistency. The correlation checksums have a strong capability to correct data inconsistency. If a cache block in a row is inconsistent, we can easily correct it using Equation 1. If more than one cache block in a row are inconsistent, we can use the consistency checksums and the correlation checksums to correct them. Note that the consistency checksum, although mainly used to detect data inconsistency, can be used to correct the inconsistency of cache blocks that fall into the same column, using the similar method as in Equation 1 for the correlation checksum.

Figure 5.b gives an example where we have two inconsistent cache blocks in the first row. Using the correlation checksum $CkSum5$ alone is not able to correct them. However, using the consistency checksums $CkSum2$ or $CkSum4$, we can correct at least one inconsistent data. Afterwards, we can use $CkSum5$ to correct the other.

It is possible that a row has multiple inconsistent cache blocks and the columns where those inconsistent cache blocks are resident have another inconsistent cache blocks. Figure 5.c gives an example. In this example, the first row have two inconsistent cache blocks ($CB#12$ and $CB#14$). They are resident in the columns two and four. These two cache blocks are not correctable by the correlation checksum $CkSum5$. Meanwhile, each of the columns two and four has another inconsistent cache block ($CB#42$ and $CB#24$), making the consistency checksums ($CkSum2$ and $CkSum4$) incapable of correcting the inconsistent cache blocks too.

In this case, any checksum, including the combination of consistency checksum and correlation checksum, cannot correct those cache blocks. However, such a case is extremely rare: Those inconsistent cache blocks must be so “coincident” to fall into the same row and column together. In our evaluation with ten workloads with hundreds of millions of transactions and 100,000 crash tests, our checksums can correct all of data inconsistency for committed transactions.

Post-crash processing. After a crash happens, we examine persistent objects in persistent memory. If they do not have checksums and the transactions are physically committed, then the persistent objects must be consistent without any cache flushing skipped. If they do not have checksum and the transactions are not physically committed, then the transaction updates are cancelled and the persistent objects are restored using traditional logs.

If the persistent objects have checksums and the transactions are physically committed, then we use consistency checksums to detect consistency of each persistent object. If there is any inconsistency, then we use correlation and consistency checksums to correct them. If the data inconsistency is not correctable, which is very rare, then the corresponding transaction is aborted. To avoid incorrectable data inconsistency after physical commitment, we could add another row and column as consistency and correlation checksums. The new and old checksums, each of which is built upon half of rows or columns, can improve correction for those rare cases, but come with larger performance overhead. Study of this tradeoff is out of scope of this paper, because the current checksum mechanism already works very well in our evaluation.

Ensuring transaction atomicity. Before the physical commitment, Archapt relies on logs, as in the traditional undo and redo logging mechanisms, to ensure atomicity. After the physical commitment, the persistent objects are successfully updated with the assists of checksums and the atomicity is enforced. In the extremely rare case where the persistent object is not consistent and the checksum mechanism cannot correct it, we rely on a traditional checkpoint mechanism and go back to the last valid checkpoint to ensure atomicity.

3.4 Coalescing of Cache-Line Flushing

To reduce the overhead of cache-line flushing, we have two methodologies: one is to avoid cache flushing for persistent objects as in Section 3.2; the other is to coalesce cache-line flushing to avoid low dirtiness of flushed cache lines. After
investigating two common databases (Redis and SQLite), we find two reasons that account for low dirtiness of flushed cache lines: unaligned cache-line flushing and uncoordinated cache-line flushing.

The unaligned cache-line flushing happens when a persistent object is not aligned with cache lines. For example, a persistent object is 100 bytes. Ideally, the object should use two cache blocks (assuming that the cache block size is 64 bytes). However, the object could not be aligned well during the memory allocation, and uses three cache blocks. Once the object is modified, we have to flush three cache lines instead of two. This easily increases the number of cache-line flushing by 50%. We find this problem in Redis and SQLite.

The uncoordinated cache-line flushing happens when multiple, associated data objects are allocated into separate cache blocks. The multiple data objects are associated, because they are often updated together. If they are allocated into the same cache blocks, then we can reduce the number of cache-line flushing. This problem happens more often in NoSQL systems, such as a key-value store system. Figure 6 gives an example in Redis where the uncoordinated cache-line flushing happens. The figure shows the basic data structure of Redis. As a key-value store system, Redis enables secondary indexing based on a two-level hash table. In the second level, Redis has a set of field-value pairs. Each field-value pair stores the field ID (F_n) and their data. For each field-value pair, the field and value objects are allocated separately on different cache blocks. This is inefficient on persistent memory, because the field and value have to be persisted by flushing separate cache lines. The size of the field object is small (usually less than one cache block), and the field object is usually updated with the value object together. Therefore, coalescing the field and value objects into a fewer contiguous cache blocks can reduce the number of cache-line flushing.

To address the above two problems, we introduce a new memory allocation mechanism to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing. We use Redis as an example again. The original implementation of Redis uses the traditional memory allocation, without considering the implications of memory allocation on cache flushing. Whenever a key or a complex value is created, Redis allocates the corresponding memory space on demand, without the coordination with other memory allocations.

In our new design for Redis, we pre-allocate three memory pools without allocating memory on demand. The three memory pools, *key_pool*, *field_value_pool* and *log_pool*, meet the memory allocation requests for keys, field and value pairs, and log records, respectively. We use the three memory pools, instead of allocating memory on demand, because the three pools can use separate memory allocation methods to minimize cache-line flushing; The three memory pools can also cluster objects with the same functionality (i.e., key, field, value, and log) into contiguous cache blocks to coordinate cache-line flushing.

### 4 Implementation

**Programming APIs.** Archapt is implemented as a user-level library to provide persistence support and be integrated with the existing log-based transaction implementation, such as Intel PMDK [24], Redis and SQLite. Archapt includes a set of APIs, defined in Table 2.

*Archapt_init()* is used to pre-allocate multiple memory pools for coalescing cache-line flushing (Section 3.4) and initialize critical data structures (e.g., the LRU queue and QbHT). *Archapt_Tx_Start()* and *Archapt_Tx_End()* are used to identify transactions for the Archapt runtime, and can be embedded into the existing transaction start/finalization functions. *Archapt_Tx_LCommit()* is used to replace the traditional transaction commit to implement the logical commit for Archapt. *Archapt_Malloc()* and *Archapt_Free()* are used to replace the traditional memory allocation and free APIs in the transaction implementation. The two APIs are used to allocate and free memory from/to the pre-allocated memory pools for coalescing cache-line flushing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>API Name</th>
<th>Functionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Init()</td>
<td>Pre-allocate memory pools and initialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Tx_Start()</td>
<td>Identify the beginning of a transaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Tx_End()</td>
<td>Identify the end of a transaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Tx_LCommit()</td>
<td>Logical commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Malloc(int type, size_t size)</td>
<td>Memory allocation for coalescing cache-line flushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archapt_Free(int type, size_t size)</td>
<td>Free memory allocation for coalescing cache-line flushing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6: Uncoordinated cache-line flushing in the two-level hash table in Redis.*
free hash table, and a high-performance LRU queue based on circular buffers. In addition, to avoid contention on the LRU queue from multiple transactions (multiple threads), Archapt creates a transaction management unit for each transaction, and the transaction management unit puts information on write/read of persistent objects into a local buffer. By fetching the information from those local buffers, the history management unit collectively updates the LRU queue.

### 5 Evaluation

#### 5.1 Experimental Methodology

The goal of the evaluation is to evaluate the performance of Archapt with a range of workloads with different characteristics. We use both NoSQL and SQL systems (Redis and SQLite). We use four persistent transaction mechanisms for evaluation: undo logging with Archapt, undo logging, the existing rollback journal system in SQLite, and the existing AOF mechanism (logging every write operation) in Redis. We do not show the results of redo logging in our evaluation, because of the space limitation. But the results of redo logging are similar to those of undo logging. Our implementation of the undo logging is based on Intel PMDK [24]. For the rollback journal and AOF, whenever a transaction commitment happens, we commit the transaction updates to memory (not hard drive), in order to enable fair performance comparison.

We run YCSB [14] (A-F) and TPCC-C [2, 28] against Redis, and run OLTP-bench [18] (particularly, TPCC-C, LinkBench [6] and YCSB) against SQLite. These workloads are chosen for Redis and SQLite respectively, because they can easily run on the two database systems without any modification. Table 3 gives some details for these workloads. For YCSB running against Redis, we perform 10M operations; for other workloads, we use the default configurations.

All experiments are performed on a 24-core machine with two 12-core Xeon Gold 6126 processors with 187GB memory and 19.25MB last level cache. We use DRAM to emulate NVM, since NVDIMM is not on the market at the time of preparing this manuscript. For other slower NVMs, the benefits of Archapt would only be larger because of the reduction of cache-line flushing. We use the clflushopt instruction to flush cache lines, which is one of the most recent and efficient cache-line flushing instructions. Other advanced instructions such as clwb are not available in a processor in the market at the time of preparing this manuscript.

#### 5.2 Experimental Results

**Basic Performance.** We use different numbers of threads to evaluate throughput and latency of the four persistent transaction mechanisms. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the results.

Figure 7 reveals that undo with Archapt has the highest throughput among the four transaction mechanisms. On average, undo with Archapt offers 22%, 60% and 35% better throughput than the traditional undo logging, the rollback journal system and AOF respectively. The biggest improvement happens on YCSB-A, YCSB-F and LinkBench, which are write-intensive. For these three workloads, undo with Archapt offers up to 36%, 80% and 58% higher throughput than the other three transaction mechanisms. As we increase the number of client threads, Archapt consistently performs best. With 12 threads, Archapt offers 22%, 34% and 57% better throughput than the traditional undo logging, the rollback journal system and AOF respectively. For the read-only workload (YCSB-C), Archapt cannot offer performance improvement, but the throughput is at most 1% lower than other transaction mechanisms, which is small.

Figure 8 shows the 99th-percentile latency for the four transaction mechanisms. We run eight client threads for each workload. Archapt has the shortest latency among the four transaction mechanisms. On average, Archapt decreases the tail latency by 7%, 9% and 20%, compared with the traditional undo logging, AOF and the rollback journal system respectively. Such performance improvement in tail latency comes from the reduction of unnecessary cache flushing. For the read-only workload (YCSB-C), Archapt cannot offer performance improvement, to reduce cache flushing, Archapt still provides comparable performance to the other three transaction mechanisms.

**Quantifying the effectiveness of reducing cache-line flushing.** We measure the number of cache-line flushing before and after applying Archapt to undo logging. We only show the results for undo logging, because it has less cache-line flushing than the rollback journal and AOF. Hence reducing cache-line flushing for undo-logging is more challenging than doing that for the rollback journal and AOF. Figure 9 shows the number of reduced cache-line flushing after applying Archapt. The numbers in the figure are normalized by the total numbers of cache-line flushing before applying Archapt. The figure does not include YCSB-C, because this workload is read-only and does not need cache flushing. The figure also isolates the contributions of the two techniques (the LRU-based approach and coalesce of cache-line flushing) to compare the effectiveness of the two techniques.

The figure reveals that Archapt greatly reduces the number of cache-line flushing by 66% on average. YCSB-E has less reduction in the number of cache-line flushing than other workloads, because it has more data reuse in persistent objects, which provides less opportunities to skip cache-line flushing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Op</th>
<th>Redis</th>
<th>SQLite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPCC</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This result is consistent with that shown in Figure 3.

We further notice that both techniques effectively reduce cache-line flushing. The contribution of the LRU-based approach to the reduction of cache-line flushing varies between different workloads, because different workloads have different data reuse of persistent objects. Furthermore, comparing with Redis, SQLite gains less benefit from the coalescence of cache-line flushing. This is because of the strict SQL data structures in SQLite that have some existing optimization on cache line alignment.

**Quantify dirtiness of flushed cache lines.** Figure 10 shows the distribution of the dirtiness of flushed cache lines before and after applying Archapt. The figure does not include YCSB-C, because this workload is read-only and does not need cache flushing. In general, our memory allocation optimization works in every workload. The average improvement is 12%. Among all workloads, YCSB-E (Redis) has the largest increase; the average cache line dirtiness increases from 51% to 68%.

**Random crash tests.** We examine data consistency in

\[\text{Figure 9: The numbers of reduced cache-line flushing after applying Archapt to undo logging. The numbers are normalized by the total numbers of cache-line flushing before using Archapt.}\]
vide safe, transactional access to non-volatile memories. Some of those runtime systems employ undo logging mechanisms [8, 12, 20, 21, 24, 27], while others employ redo logging mechanisms [32, 44, 45]. Our work can be applied to those logging-based mechanisms to improve performance of persistent transactions.

Enabling crash consistency on NVM. Enabling crash consistency on NVM can be expensive, because of cache-line flushing and persistent barriers. Strict persistency [37] enforces crash consistency by strictly enforcing write orders in persistent memory and can cause a large performance loss. Some work [13, 25, 26, 37, 39] relaxes the constrains on write orders to improve performance. Different from the above existing work, we do not relax write orders, but optimize performance by skipping and coalescing cache-line flushing.

Detection and correction of data errors. Previous efforts on RAID [9, 23, 36, 41] and ECC [17, 29–31, 43, 49] exploit hardware- and software-based approaches to detect and correct data errors, but the relatively large runtime overhead and possible hardware modifications make them hard to be applied to detect and correct data inconsistency on NVM for a transaction mechanism.

Algorithm-based fault tolerance, as an efficient software mechanism to correct data errors, has been used for fault tolerance in high performance computing (HPC) [10, 11, 15, 16, 19, 22, 47, 48]. However, they are customized for specific numerical algorithms, and can be hard to be applied to transactional workloads in database systems.

The lazy persistency [5] proposed by Alshboul et. al is very relevant to our work. They focus on computation-intensive HPC applications and skip cache-line flushing for all dirty data objects. They rely on periodical cache flushing of all dirty cache blocks. Our work is significantly different from them in two perspectives. First, the lazy persistency does not have a systematic way to decide which cache-line flushing can be skipped. Second, the lazy persistency cannot correct data inconsistency after a crash. The above two limitations cause unpredictable data loss in committed transactions, hence the lazy persistency cannot be reliably applied to transaction systems. Archapt avoids the above limitations by the LRU-based approach and well-design checksums.

7 Conclusions

Enabling high performance transaction is critical to release the power (performance benefit) of persistent memory for many applications. In this paper, we present Archapt, an architecture-aware, high performance transaction runtime system for persistent memory. Archapt reduces the number of cache-line flushing to improve performance of transactions. Archapt estimates if cache blocks of a persistent objects are in the cache to determine the necessity of cache-line flushing. Relying on a checksum mechanism to detect data inconsistency and correct it if possible, Archapt provides strong data consistency. Archapt also coalesces cache blocks with low dirtiness to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing.

6 Related Work

Persistence in NVM has received significant research activities recently. Previous work on the runtime systems for persistent memory transaction [8, 12, 20, 21, 24, 27, 27, 32, 35, 44, 45] exploits software-based approaches at the user level to provide safe, transactional access to non-volatile memories. Some of those runtime systems employ undo logging mechanisms [8, 12, 20, 21, 24, 27], while others employ redo logging mechanisms [32, 44, 45]. Our work can be applied to those logging-based mechanisms to improve performance of persistent transactions.

Enabling crash consistency on NVM. Enabling crash consistency on NVM can be expensive, because of cache-line flushing and persistent barriers. Strict persistency [37] enforces crash consistency by strictly enforcing write orders in persistent memory and can cause a large performance loss. Some work [13, 25, 26, 37, 39] relaxes the constrains on write orders to improve performance. Different from the above existing work, we do not relax write orders, but optimize performance by skipping and coalescing cache-line flushing.

Detection and correction of data errors. Previous efforts on RAID [9, 23, 36, 41] and ECC [17, 29–31, 43, 49] exploit hardware- and software-based approaches to detect and correct data errors, but the relatively large runtime overhead and possible hardware modifications make them hard to be applied to detect and correct data inconsistency on NVM for a transaction mechanism.

Algorithm-based fault tolerance, as an efficient software mechanism to correct data errors, has been used for fault tolerance in high performance computing (HPC) [10, 11, 15, 16, 19, 22, 47, 48]. However, they are customized for specific numerical algorithms, and can be hard to be applied to transactional workloads in database systems.

The lazy persistency [5] proposed by Alshboul et. al is very relevant to our work. They focus on computation-intensive HPC applications and skip cache-line flushing for all dirty data objects. They rely on periodical cache flushing of all dirty cache blocks. Our work is significantly different from them in two perspectives. First, the lazy persistency does not have a systematic way to decide which cache-line flushing can be skipped. Second, the lazy persistency cannot correct data inconsistency after a crash. The above two limitations cause unpredictable data loss in committed transactions, hence the lazy persistency cannot be reliably applied to transaction systems. Archapt avoids the above limitations by the LRU-based approach and well-design checksums.

7 Conclusions

Enabling high performance transaction is critical to release the power (performance benefit) of persistent memory for many applications. In this paper, we present Archapt, an architecture-aware, high performance transaction runtime system for persistent memory. Archapt reduces the number of cache-line flushing to improve performance of transactions. Archapt estimates if cache blocks of a persistent objects are in the cache to determine the necessity of cache-line flushing. Relying on a checksum mechanism to detect data inconsistency and correct it if possible, Archapt provides strong data consistency. Archapt also coalesces cache blocks with low dirtiness to improve the efficiency of cache-line flushing.

6 Related Work

Persistence in NVM has received significant research activities recently. Previous work on the runtime systems for persistent memory transaction [8, 12, 20, 21, 24, 27, 27, 32, 35, 44, 45] exploits software-based approaches at the user level to pro-
results show that Archapt reduces cache flushing by 66% and improve system throughput by 22% (42% at most), when running YCSB (A-F) and TPC-C against Redis, and OLTP-bench (TPC-C, LinkBench and YCSB) against SQLite (using the traditional undo logging as baseline).
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