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ABSTRACT

Performance tools for forthcoming heterogeneous exascale platforms must address two principal challenges when analyzing execution measurements. First, measurement of extreme-scale executions generates large volumes of performance data. Second, performance metrics for heterogeneous applications are significantly sparse across code regions. To address these challenges, we developed a novel “streaming aggregation” approach to post-mortem analysis that employs both shared and distributed memory parallelism to aggregate sparse performance measurements from every rank, thread and GPU stream of a large-scale application execution. Analysis results are stored in a pair of sparse formats designed for efficient access to related data elements, supporting responsive interactive presentation and scalable data analytics. Empirical analysis shows that our implementation of this approach in HPCToolkit effectively processes measurement data from thousands of threads using a fraction of the compute resources employed by the application itself. Our approach is able to perform analysis up to 9.4 times faster and store analysis results 23 times smaller than HPCToolkit, providing a key building block for scalable exascale performance tools.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Forthcoming exascale compute platforms pose significant challenges for performance tools. Performance tools must support measurement and analysis of application executions with potential performance problems that may only become apparent at very large scales. For applications running on tens of thousands of compute nodes equipped with multicore processors, gigabytes of measurement data can be generated per second, challenging the scalability of performance tools at all levels. Storage for measurement data and analysis results will be large, especially if wasteful representations are used. Furthermore post-mortem analysis of measurement data becomes more expensive as the data volume grows. To make performance analysis feasible for exascale systems, tools must employ compact and effective storage formats along with efficient parallelism and process-based parallelism, and efficient algorithms to cope with sparsity patterns typical with measurement data for GPU-accelerated applications; and

Exascale supercomputers with heterogeneous GPU-accelerated compute nodes such as the US DOE’s forthcoming Aurora [4], Frontier [19], and El Capitan [15] systems pose an additional challenge. Metrics appropriate for GPU-accelerated code differ vastly from metrics used for CPU code; when CPU and GPU metrics are both collected for an application, there is natural metric sparsity across code regions. For tools to efficiently measure and analyze code performance on heterogeneous exascale systems, metric sparsity must be handled appropriately throughout tool workflows.

Since performance tools typically provide a graphical user interface for browsing performance data, one must consider the needs of such a browser when designing data representations. Interactive browsers for performance data should be responsive, regardless of the size of a measured execution. For very large executions, it will be infeasible for a browser to load all performance data into memory at once; for that reason, browsers must read large data from the file system on demand. However, performing a long sequence of file accesses to gather related data, e.g. metrics for a particular application thread or calling context, will reduce browser responsiveness. For that reason, formats used for storing analysis results should be designed to minimize the number of file accesses necessary to gather related metrics for presentation or data analytics.

In this paper, we present an approach to address the aforementioned challenges: a novel, highly-parallel strategy for post-mortem analysis of performance data that employs sparse storage formats for scalability and efficiency in both time and space. In short, this paper makes the following contributions:

• it describes our sparse formats for measurement data and analysis results, designed to accelerate key access patterns for post-mortem analysis, presentation, and data analytics;
• it outlines our novel, highly-parallel, and efficient approach to post-mortem analysis, which employs thread-based parallelism and process-based parallelism, and efficient algorithms to cope with sparsity patterns typical with measurement data for GPU-accelerated applications; and
• it evaluates the effectiveness of our approach compared to previous work, in terms of storage volume and analysis time.

Overall, our sparse formats often dramatically reduce storage requirements. In our case studies, using sparse formats instead of dense ones yielded up to a 22× reduction in the size of measurement data and a 6000× reduction in the size of analysis results. Our analysis algorithm is capable of processing measurements from tens of thousands of application threads in minutes, using only a small fraction of the resources consumed by the application itself. These results show the promise of our design for analyzing performance data from extreme scale executions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 overviews approaches used by other performance tools in this space, particularly storage formats. Section 3 describes the organization of our sparse formats, with some rationale and case studies for a few representative applications. Section 4 presents our novel analysis algorithm, detailing the methods we used to efficiently exploit parallelism at thread and process levels. Section 5 provides an empirical analysis of our post-mortem analysis workflow compared to the
current state-of-the-art in HPCToolkit [2]. Section 6 summarizes our conclusions.

2 RELATED WORK

Performance tools differ in their scalability, based on their approaches to performance measurement and post-mortem analysis. Linux perf [8] and NVIDIA’s Nsight Systems [18] store all measurements as execution traces. perf collects only CPU measurements while the focus of Nsight Systems is on measurements of GPU performance. Such traces can be huge and very slow to analyze for long executions. Neither perf nor Nsight Systems are designed to analyze data from more than one compute node at a time.

Extrae [7] traces CPU functions and GPU operations of parallel applications within and across multiple compute nodes. It can also use sampling to monitor fine-grain CPU performance. Extrae’s traces will necessarily be very large for extreme-scale executions.

Intel provides several performance tools for parallel programs. Intel Application Performance Snapshot (IAPPS) [11] collects and presents summary statistics for MPI, I/O, GPU utilization, and CPU performance. Intel Trace Analyzer and Collector (ITAC) [10] collects and presents traces and statistics for MPI communication. Intel VTune Profiler [12] can be used to collect detailed measurements of CPU and GPU performance for multiple MPI ranks. However, VTune Profiler’s graphical user interface only supports analysis of code performance for a single GPU-accelerated node at a time.

ARM MAP [6] samples both CPU and GPU activity of a parallel application as it executes. By default, it records only 1000 application-wide samples during an execution. On NVIDIA GPUs, MAP uses NVIDIA’s CUPTI library to measure and attribute instruction samples and stall metrics to source lines in GPU kernels. While MAP’s results provide an overview of application performance, they are not designed for fine-grained analysis or understanding the temporal dynamics of a parallel execution.

Scalasca [27], TAU [23] and Vampir [13] present and analyze data gathered by the Score-P measurement infrastructure [14] stored in the CUBE [24] format. Score-P accumulates per-thread costs to individual calling contexts, which are recorded in CUBE as a series of per-metric dense matrices indexed by application thread and calling context. None of these tools support detailed analysis of costs within functions, e.g. at the loop level, without instrumentation.

Our work builds upon the measurement subsystem provided by HPCToolkit [2], which primarily uses sampling to accumulate per-thread costs to instructions in their full calling contexts. Unlike with Score-P, calling contexts are not unified at application termination; instead, the application writes separate profile and (optional) trace files for each thread and GPU stream in the execution. Profiles and traces are merged in a post-mortem analysis phase so they can be augmented with results of binary analysis to attribute measurements to inlined functions, loops and source lines in addition to dynamic calling contexts. Each profile contains a header that notes the metrics enabled during that thread’s execution and a calling context tree that contains a dense vector of metrics for each node in the tree. When collecting both CPU and GPU metrics, which apply to disjoint code regions, we found that the density of non-zero measurements is lower than 3%. We consider this an unacceptable waste of space for extreme-scale executions.

Many tools, e.g. Nsight Systems and Intel Trace Analyzer, perform post-mortem analysis on a single node, typically in their graphical user interface. Exceptions to this include Extrae, Scalasca, and HPCToolkit. Extrae provides an MPI-based merger that integrates a collection of traces into a single Paraver trace file. Scalasca uses MPI+OpenMP parallelism to assemble profile results as dense metrics in CUBE format. HPCToolkit provides an MPI-based tool for integrating multiple profiles into a fully dense tensor indexed by application thread, calling context and metric identifiers.

Our post-mortem analysis tool differs significantly from all of these, using MPI ranks (typically one per processor) for scalability, multiple threads within a rank to more efficiently exploit multicore hardware, as it assembles sparse tensors with fine-grain metrics for heterogeneous contexts at all levels of granularity (calling contexts, procedures, inlined functions, loops, source lines) using a small fraction of the compute resources used by a measured application.

3 STORAGE FORMATS

For any algorithm, a lower bound on the execution time can be computed by considering data volume to be read and written and the file system bandwidth. To analyze the large volumes of measurements produced by large-scale executions, the formats in which we store these measurements and their analysis results are an important consideration. In Section 3.3, we show that the density of non-zero values in analysis results can be lower than 0.001%. We list a few factors that contribute to such sparsity below:

- Metrics tend to accumulate within expensive leaf functions; distant calling context ancestors may have no metrics.
- Many metrics apply only to code regions executed on a particular compute device, such as stall metrics for GPU instructions or CPU cache misses and branch mispredictions.
- Threads in an application typically begin execution in different locations (e.g. a main thread vs. an OpenMP worker) and often execute different code (e.g. perhaps only the main thread sends messages). After post-mortem analysis, threads will have zeros for contexts only present in other threads.

Retaining empty values in measurement data slows post-mortem analysis; retaining them in analysis results slows interactive exploration of results. To avoid the unnecessary cost of analyzing many zeros, we designed and implemented a series of sparse formats for both measurements data and analysis results. These formats are designed to reduce the total data volume and are optimized for streamlined access to related data entries.

Our sparse formats were inspired by the Compressed Sparse Row (CSR) format for sparse matrices [9]. CSR reduces the data volume for a sparse matrix while providing fast indexing of values. For an \( m \times n \) sparse matrix with \( x \) non-zero values, CSR uses \( O(2x + m + 1) \) space, which saves space whenever \( x < (mn - 1)/2 \). The expected time to access the value of any \((i,j)\) location in a CSR matrix is \( O(\log(x/m)) \).

In the next section, we describe our sparse format for measurement data. Section 3.2 describes two sparse formats we use to store analysis results. Finally, Section 3.3 presents case studies for a few codes that illustrate the benefits of our sparse formats.
Figure 1: The sparse format for our measurement data. There are two parts to the representation: a vector of \((m, v)\) metric/value pairs ordered by context and a vector of \((c, i)\) context/index pairs. The index in a context/index pair indicates the starting index of the context’s metric/value pairs in the metric/value vector.

### 3.1 Sparse Measurement Format
Prior to this work, HPCToolkit’s measurement file included a representation of a calling context tree (CCT) in which each CCT node included a dense vector of metric of values. To better support contexts with sparse metrics, we modified HPCToolkit to use a new sparse format for measurement data.

In each per-thread and per-GPU stream profile, we store metric values using the sparse format shown in Fig. 1. Our sparse representation supports two kinds of sparsity: some contexts may not have any non-zero metrics and any particular context may have only some non-zero metrics. We call contexts with at least one non-zero metric non-empty contexts. We represent sparse metrics with two vectors of pairs. A metric/value vector stores \((m, v)\) pairs, where \(m\) is metric identifier and \(v\) is a non-zero metric value. A context/index vector stores \((c, i)\) pairs, where \(c\) represents a non-empty context and \(i\) represents the index of the first non-zero pair for this context in the metric/value vector. The vector of metric/value pairs for a context ends before the start of the metric/value pairs for the next non-empty context. For example, in Fig. 1, \((1, 1, 1)\) means the starting index of context 1’s data \((0, 2)\) and \((2, 6)\)) in the metric/value vector is 1. The last context/index pair marks the end of the metric/value pairs for the preceding non-empty context.

For \(x\) non-zero values and \(c\) non-empty contexts in a profile, our sparse measurement format uses \(O(2(x + c + 1))\) words to store the data. Locating a value for a particular context and metric involves a binary search in the context/index vector to find the index of the first metric/value pair for the context and a second binary search to locate desired metric/value pair among those for the context. For \(x\) non-zero values per context on average, this format takes \(O(\log(c) + \log(x))\) time to access a value on average.

### 3.2 Analysis Result Formats
A browser interactively exploring performance analysis results requires efficient access to metrics both within a single profile and for selected contexts across multiple profiles. To support these use cases, we designed a Profile Major Sparse (PMS) format and a Context Major Sparse (CMS) format, respectively. Note that both PMS and CMS each include all analysis results, though in a different order and format. We only need to open one file for all accesses of a particular type, e.g. compare complete profiles for two or more threads or compare metric values of all threads for a particular context.

Fig. 2 shows a high-level visualization of PMS and CMS. In PMS and CMS formats, we locate a value with three indices: metric, context, and profile. If we consider the measurement data a sparse plane, then PMS and CMS represent sparse cubes. In PMS, we locate a value indexing by (profile, context, metric); whereas in CMS, we locate a value indexing by (context, metric, profile). For brevity, in the rest of this section, we only discuss the design of CMS.

As Fig. 2 shows, each plane represents the data for one context. We represent data within a context plane using a sparse representation like the one described in Section 3.1. We use a pair of vectors to represent each context plane: a profile/value vector to record pairs of (profile, non-zero metric value) and a metric/index vector composed of pairs consisting of a non-empty metric and an index indicating the position in the profile/value vector for data that this metric is located. To support indexing across context planes, CMS includes an array of context offsets that indicate the start of each plane.

The CMS format provides fast access to non-zero values across all profiles for a particular metric and context. To obtain all non-zero values for a particular metric and context using CMS, we directly index the desired context plane and perform a binary search in the plane’s metric/index vector to get the starting index for the metric’s data in the plane’s profile/value vector. From that point, we can read a contiguous stripe that contains non-zero values of that metric for all profiles. If we want to access only a non-zero value for one profile, we can do a binary search in the profile/value pairs, analogous to the way we locate a particular metric for a context in the measurement data format.

For CMS format, if we have \(x\) non-zeros and \(m\) non-empty metrics per average context, and \(c\) contexts, then CMS uses \(O(2c(x + m + 1))\) space. We can save space when \((2(x + m + 1)) < MP\), where \(M\) is the number of metrics and \(P\) is the number of profiles. \((2(x + m + 1))\) can even be slightly larger than \(MP\) since the dense version uses a fixed number of bytes for each datum; however, CMS can use fewer bytes for some data, such as metric indices. Using CMS, it takes \(O(\log m)\) time to locate the start of the vector of profile values for a specific context and metric. If \(p\) profiles are associated with that context and metric, it takes \(O(\log m + \log p)\) time to locate any specific value.
While this can be mitigated to some extent by pruning insignificant sparse metric values in our PMS and CMS formats, this effect becomes more pronounced. Similarly the density of non-zero values decreases, down to 21% for CPU codes and 3% for GPU codes. Overall, we observed a compression ratio of up to 6000× already, as expected bringing significant sparsity arises in PMS due to the unification of calling contexts across threads along with the addition of lexical contexts.

To illustrate the benefits of our sparse formats, we collected profiles of small executions of several DOE codes: AMG2013 [25]—a parallel algebraic multigrid benchmark, PeleC [1]—a GPU-accelerated adaptive-mesh compressible hydrodynamics code, and Nyx [3]—a GPU-accelerated parallel adaptive mesh refinement code for computational cosmology. Table 1 describes the size of our measurement data for executions of these applications along with some statistics concerning data density, across and within calling contexts. Table 2 lists similar statistics for the PMS format after post-mortem analysis of the measurement data. For this study, AMG2013 was run with 8192 threads across 256 MPI ranks for 30 seconds, PeleC with 480 GPU streams across 96 MPI ranks for 6 minutes, and Nyx with 640 GPU streams across 128 MPI ranks for 20 seconds.

As can be seen from Table 1, we do not need to collect many metrics before the space savings of our sparse formats begin to appear. With 7 CPU metrics (time in addition to cache, TLB and branch operations and misses/mispredictions), the number of non-empty calling contexts in the measurements drops to only 23% on average; with metrics for GPU-accelerated codes, this effect becomes more pronounced. Similarly the density of non-zero values for a calling context drops significantly, down to 21% for CPU codes and 2% for GPU codes. Overall, we observed a compression ratio over dense formats of up to 22× for the measurement data, with only a 1.35× increase in the single-metric case.

Table 2 considers the characteristics of analysis outputs in PMS. Significant sparsity arises in PMS due to the unification of calling contexts across threads along with the addition of lexical contexts to the profiles such as inlined functions and loops. In all of our datasets, each profile on average contains values for less than 1.3% of the unified calling contexts, while each non-empty calling context on average contains less than 0.2% of the total available metrics. While this can be mitigated to some extent by pruning insignificant calling contexts with only tiny metric values, our formats provide a compression ratio of up to 6000× already, as expected bringing them to similar sizes as the original input measurements.

### Table 1: Size and characteristics of measurement data collected by HPCToolkit in our sparse format in small experiments with various codes. The parenthetical notation to the right of each benchmark indicates (# CPU metrics + # GPU metrics) enabled. Density indicates the percentage of non-empty calling contexts and metric values within a profile or context, average and standard deviation across all profiles. Ratio indicates the relative size of an equivalent dense representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App. (# Metrics)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG2013 (1)</td>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>69.1 ± 10.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.74x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG2013 (7)</td>
<td>217.4</td>
<td>22.7 ± 5.9</td>
<td>20.7 ± 2.4</td>
<td>2.11x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeleC (1+82)</td>
<td>193.1</td>
<td>20.6 ± 17.3</td>
<td>1.9 ± 1.1</td>
<td>15.23x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyx [3] (1+62)</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>9.6 ± 2.3</td>
<td>2.8 ± 1.6</td>
<td>22.44x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Size and characteristics of analysis results in our profile-major (PMS) sparse format from the data listed in Table 1. The parenthetical notation to the right of each benchmark indicates (# CPU metrics + # GPU metrics) in analysis results. During analysis, the number of metrics increases as inclusive metrics (for a context and its descendants) are computed for some exclusive metrics (for a context alone). Context density here is over all contexts, including those added during analysis, e.g. contexts for inlined functions and loops. Other columns match those in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App. (# Metrics)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG2013 (2)</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>184.2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG2013 (14)</td>
<td>209.4</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>6002.9x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeleC (2+142)</td>
<td>236.1</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1515.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyx [3] (2+102)</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>3701.1x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 Case Studies

To illustrate the benefits of our sparse formats, we collected profiles of small executions of several DOE codes: AMG2013 [25]—a parallel algebraic multigrid benchmark, PeleC [1]—a GPU-accelerated adaptive-mesh compressible hydrodynamics code, and Nyx [3]—a GPU-accelerated parallel adaptive mesh refinement code for computational cosmology. Table 1 describes the size of our measurement data for executions of these applications along with some statistics concerning data density, across and within calling contexts. Table 2 lists similar statistics for the PMS format after post-mortem analysis of the measurement data. For this study, AMG2013 was run with 8192 threads across 256 MPI ranks for 30 seconds, PeleC with 480 GPU streams across 96 MPI ranks for 6 minutes, and Nyx with 640 GPU streams across 128 MPI ranks for 20 seconds.

As can be seen from Table 1, we do not need to collect many metrics before the space savings of our sparse formats begin to appear. With 7 CPU metrics (time in addition to cache, TLB and branch operations and misses/mispredictions), the number of non-empty calling contexts in the measurements drops to only 23% on average; with metrics for GPU-accelerated codes, this effect becomes more pronounced. Similarly the density of non-zero values for a calling context drops significantly, down to 21% for CPU codes and 2% for GPU codes. Overall, we observed a compression ratio over dense formats of up to 22× for the measurement data, with only a 1.35× increase in the single-metric case.

Table 2 considers the characteristics of analysis outputs in PMS. Significant sparsity arises in PMS due to the unification of calling contexts across threads along with the addition of lexical contexts to the profiles such as inlined functions and loops. In all of our datasets, each profile on average contains values for less than 1.3% of the unified calling contexts, while each non-empty calling context on average contains less than 0.2% of the total available metrics. While this can be mitigated to some extent by pruning insignificant calling contexts with only tiny metric values, our formats provide a compression ratio of up to 6000× already, as expected bringing them to similar sizes as the original input measurements.

#### 4 STREAMING AGGREGATION

As a program executes, our modified version of HPCToolkit’s measurement subsystem records a call path profile annotated with sparse metrics for each CPU thread and GPU stream, and (upon request) sample-based traces of call paths for CPU activity and traces of call paths for each GPU activity stream. Each call path in a profile or trace may span both CPU and GPU code regions.

To integrate profiles and traces of an execution into a cohesive whole for presentation, our new post-mortem analysis tool employs a novel strategy that we call streaming aggregation to integrate measurements from profiles and traces. For scalability, our tool employs distributed-memory parallelism across multiple compute nodes. For performance, our tool employs thread-based parallelism within a compute node, making use of shared-memory algorithms to provide better efficiency than an MPI-everywhere approach. Reading and processing of individual profiles (and associated traces if present)

---

2The integrated trace file format is simple: a segment for each trace and a table of contents that points to the start and end of each trace. The starting location of each trace is computed with a prefix sum over trace lengths. Traces can be written in parallel.
The high-level organization of our streaming aggregation algorithm independently:

into the following six sections, the first four of which can be parsed ing the on-disk database of analysis results. Each profile is broken our dataflow, which after processing flows into a “sink” representa-
societal trace. These become the “sources” of measurement data in

dataflow for our streaming aggregation algorithm. Sections of each profile are read by a Source, aggregated and accumulated, and the final analysis results passed to the Sink for output. Further details are discussed in Section 4.1.

gives us a natural unit of parallelism for distributing work across the available compute resources. Conceptually our tool “streams” measurement data in parallel, “aggregating” our analysis results across the entire application execution.

Section 4.1 describes the thread-based parallelism at the heart of our approach; our tool employs employs one or more threads on each core of an available compute node. Section 4.2 describes communication between threads, which we minimize to avoid unnecessary serialization. Section 4.3 describes how we assemble our analysis results in parallel into several output files. Finally, Section 4.4 describes how our tool employs process-level parallelism across multiple compute nodes.

4.1 Thread-level Parallelism

The high-level organization of our streaming aggregation algorithm is shown as a dataflow diagram in Fig. 3. Each application thread and GPU stream generates a separate measurement profile and associated trace. These become the “sources” of measurement data in our dataflow, which after processing flows into a “sink” representing the on-disk database of analysis results. Each profile is broken into the following six sections, the first four of which can be parsed independently:

- Properties of the experiment’s environment, such as application name, environment variables and enabled metrics,
- Properties of the application thread or GPU stream, such as MPI rank, thread id, GPU context, etc.,
- Paths to files relevant to application code, specifically binaries and source files,
- Calling contexts sampled during the application execution, represented as a calling context tree of instruction offsets within application binaries,
- Trace samples taken during the application execution, each containing a timestamp and the index of a node in the calling context tree that represents the sampled calling context,
- Metric cost accumulations for a single application thread, attributed to sampled calling contexts.

To integrate performance data for multiple application threads, we need to correlate the environment, application files (binaries and sources), and calling context across measurement profiles. As these are parsed from the profiles in parallel we perform a uniquing step to merge corresponding elements, denoted in Fig. 3 by the union (∪) operations. By using concurrent data structures for this step, we reduce any contention between sources and exploit the full parallelism available. We describe the synchronization used for this uniquing step in more detail in Section 4.2.

Many elements require further analysis or are accelerated by preprocessing, for instance loading of source mappings from application binaries (for lexical context, discussed further in Section 4.1.1) or pre-sorting calling contexts for the binary searches required for our analysis result formats (as discussed in Section 3). We perform independent analyses when new elements are added, naturally extending” the elements with the additional data in parallel. Cross-element operations are performed once of the parsing of the input elements is “complete”, and are overlapped with subsequent parsing. By using fine-grained synchronization to overlap these operations with unrelated tasks, we effectively mitigate the insufficient parallelism in these operations, discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.

Execution traces and metric values associated with calling contexts typically make up the majority of a measurement dataset. To process these efficiently, we are careful to control our memory footprint and write analysis results as soon as they are computed directly to an output database. Traces are converted and written directly to the output database as they are parsed, while metric accumulations for a single profile are first propagated to parent calling contexts to generate inclusive costs; this process is discussed in more detail in Section 4.1.2. Once metric propagation for a profile is complete, the profile’s propagated accumulations are written directly to the output database and any memory used to process the profile is freed and available for reuse. Since profiles are processed in parallel this direct output naturally parallelizes our output operations.

Finally, once all profiles have been parsed and completed we “complete” the entire database, writing any remaining metadata (such as the unified context tree) and the final execution-wide summary metrics for every calling context. This serial operation is overlapped with the parallel generation of the context-major portion of the database, discussed in detail in Section 4.3. In this way, the entire streaming aggregation dataflow makes effective use of parallelism to accelerate the generation of a database suitable for performance analysis.
In the following sections, we describe each of the key activities in the streaming aggregation dataflow in more detail.

4.1.1 Lexical Context Expansion. HPCToolkit’s measurement infrastructure represents calling contexts with the addresses of individual instructions encountered during a call stack unwind, recorded as offsets within application binaries. Such raw offsets are of little use to application developers, so we associate each offset with available lexical context information including source line, enclosing loops, inlined function calls, and enclosing function. Such lexical information is extracted from DWARF debugging information in binaries, approximated from ELF symbol tables in binaries, or obtained by ingesting the results of offline binary analysis performed by HPCToolkit’s hpcstruct.

Figure 3 indicates this process by the “edit” operation applied to all incoming contexts prior to unification. If lexical information is available for an application binary, it is read and stored as part of its “extension” when a new application binary is encountered. This information is stored as an interval trie of nested lexical scopes such as the one shown in Fig. 4b. Each node of this trie represents an enclosing function, inlined function or loop construct, with the smallest line-level scopes at the leaves of the trie. When a new calling context is parsed, we “edit” it by inserting the sequence of lexical contexts for the new context’s binary and instruction offset as parent contexts. If the new context is not a call instruction, we additionally replace the calling context with its enclosing line context,\(^3\) which are then merged with any sibling contexts for the same source line by the subsequent unifying operation. An example of this sequence of operations is given in Fig. 4a, with the final augmented context tree presented on the right.

4.1.2 Metric Propagation & Aggregation. HPCToolkit’s measurement infrastructure only records measurements “exclusive” to a calling context, instead of the “inclusive” cost necessary for effective investigation of an application’s performance. We generate these inclusive costs by propagating exclusive values up the context tree, using a recursive walk of the subset of calling contexts observed by an individual profile. By doing this for each profile, we generate a complete analysis result for every application thread or GPU stream, allowing users to diagnose load imbalance and other asymmetric parallel performance bugs. This operation is done once the measurements for a profile have been parsed, as indicated by the “propagate” operation in Fig. 3.

For large-scale executions manually inspecting performance results from every application thread is not feasible. To resolve this we compute an aggregate profile for the entire execution by generating per-context statistics of the non-zero costs measured from different application threads or GPU streams. Some examples include the total and mean cost attributed to a context (to identify expensive contexts regardless of thread) or standard deviation of costs (to identify regions of asymmetric performance). We generate these statistics by accumulating modified costs for a context from every profile, calculating the final values once the entire database is “complete.” For instance mean is calculated as \(\frac{\sum_{\text{profile}} \text{value}}{\sum_{\text{profile}} 1}\) which we implement using two accumulators, one summing costs and the

\(^3\)Call instructions are exempt from this to distinguish between repeated calls to a function on a single source line.

![Figure 4: Lexical expansion of calling context trees.](image-url)
generate separate calling contexts for every possible "route" leading to the instruction. When there is more than one route, we associate metric values with a placeholder context "in superposition" across the leaf contexts generated from each "route." This approach composed with the lexical expansion discussed previously allows us to obtain full calling contexts for GPU code regions.

Once the measurements for a profile have been parsed, we redistribute the metric values attributed to a placeholder context to the generated leaf contexts. The metric values associated with a placeholder context are divided based on the relative observed or approximated\(^4\) call counts for the call sites leading to diverging call paths, applied recursively as the routes diverge. We perform this distribution just before the propagation of metric values for inclusive costs, allowing these resulting values to be propagated up their full calling and lexical contexts.

### 4.2 Thread Coordination

At the heart of our approach is an algorithm which "streams" measurement profiles efficiently and in parallel across multiple threads, which must synchronize in order to make correlations between profiles and generate the "aggregated" analysis results. For performance we minimize the amount of synchronization between threads, allowing unrelated operations to proceed uninhibited and ensuring forward progress for all actively processing profiles.

The following sections describe this synchronization, adding more detail to the high-level description given in Section 4.1.

#### 4.2.1 Concurrent Hash Tables

The uniquing step indicated by the \(\cup\) operations in Fig. 3 is performed in parallel and implemented using a series of concurrent hash tables. In general profiles will overlap significantly in their experiment environment, application files and calling contexts, meaning often the uniquing step will merge rather than create new elements. Taking advantage of this property, our concurrent hash tables are implemented as simple hash tables guarded by a reader-writer lock, using a preliminary check under a read lock to identify duplicates without mutual exclusion. By using hash tables we reduce the time needed to check for duplication down to an amortized constant, ensuring new elements can be added under a write lock without significant waiting. For calling contexts in particular, we further reduce contention by using a per-context concurrent table to store its children, ensuring profiles in different context subtrees are able to operate asynchronously.

#### 4.2.2 Accumulator Storage

To generate the cross-profile statistics discussed in Section 4.1.2, we associate accumulators for various metrics and statistics present with a context. As mentioned previously in Section 3, often contexts will only have values for a subset of the measured metrics. We exploit this sparsity in our in-memory representation by using a concurrent hash table per context to look up metric accumulators. Since this subset of metrics is often a property of the code region for the context, profiles will generally attribute the same metrics and thus rarely create new accumulators. To reduce contention further, synchronization for accumulators is independent of the hash table’s lock, implemented instead using relaxed atomic floating-point operations to accumulate values. These pieces allow the metric values for multiple profiles to be aggregated in parallel with little serialization.

#### 4.2.3 Acquiring Lexical Information

The lexical information used for the expansion discussed in Section 4.1.1 can be acquired in parallel across application binaries; however, our software uses serial parsing of either DWARF or hpcstruct information for a single binary. This acquisition may be an expensive serial operation for large binaries. To mitigate the effect of this serialization, we eagerly acquire lexical information when a new application binary is added. This allows other threads to continue processing of other application files and calling contexts until lexical expansion, where a fine-grained atomic flag is used to synchronize with the lexical acquisition. Since profiles will generally reference the same set of application binaries, this naturally parallelizes the acquisition of lexical information and removes undue serialization for all but the largest binaries.\(^5\)

#### 4.2.4 Custom Task Runtime

In addition to the fine-grained synchronization used to process profiles in parallel, we also use larger cross-profile synchronizations indicated by the completions on the right side of Fig. 3. Since these completions contain preprocessing of only particular classes of elements, they are independent and can be overlapped with only fine-grained synchronization. This encourages the use of task-based programming to parallelize these operations, however we found that the task support provided by the GNU OpenMP runtime had trouble efficiently managing the web of dependencies required by our approach. In our initial experiments, worker threads would often sit idle while tasks were available and plentiful with no clear rationale for why threads did or did not acquire work.

To combat this issue we implemented a custom task runtime specialized for our case. Tasks are managed using multiple non-blocking parallel loops enclosed within a single OpenMP parallel region, the overlapping of these loops aggressively initiates tasks as they become available. Internal parsing state is guarded using a per-profile mutex, held by the task operating on that profile. Completions are handled via atomic "countdown" variables which are triggered when the last appropriate task has completed, and the database completion implemented by the only full OpenMP barrier within the parallel region. The remaining synchronization between tasks, as discussed in previous sections, is implemented using fine-grained synchronization separate from this task runtime. This customized set of synchronization structures provides excellent performance as well as robustness against subtle or unpredictable synchronizations, such as those performed by an MPI implementation (discussed in more detail in Section 4.4).

---

\(^4\)For supported GPU hardware call counts may be approximated via instruction sampling, rather than exact counts obtained by instrumentation. As noted by Zhou et al. [36] using sampling reduces distortion in the performance results without significantly degrading reconstruction accuracy.

\(^5\)Prior to post-mortem processing of execution measurements, detailed lexical information for important binaries can be pre-computed in parallel from a binary’s DWARF information using HPCToolkit’s hpcstruct. It is faster to ingest precomputed lexical context information than to compute it on the fly. For large libraries where detailed lexical attribution of metrics is not of interest, we provide command line arguments to disable DWARF parsing for such binaries.
4.3 Sparse Format Output

At the end of the analysis workflow, we write the analysis results out in both PMS and CMS formats, each as one file. The main idea is to let each thread collect and write data for a group of profiles for PMS and a group of contexts for CMS. The only communication among threads is to coordinate where to put the data in the file. We exploit both thread-level and process-level parallelism to write both PMS and CMS data files. We focus on thread-level parallelism and coordination in this section. We discuss process-level parallelism later in Section 4.4.

4.3.1 Profile Major Sparse. There are two goals for generating the PMS output file: (1) overlapping the I/O time for writing with the CPU time for data collection and (2) avoiding too many small writes. We use a two-buffer system to achieve the two goals. After each profile’s post-processing is complete, we append its output bytes in PMS format to one buffer. When the data size in the buffer hits a threshold, the thread that hits the threshold fetches and adds the current position of the file (atomic variable) to allocate a region for writing and writes the data out to the file. While data is being written, we switch to another buffer and other threads continue appending profile data while the write of the other buffer completes. When the writing of a buffer completes, the buffer becomes empty and available for reuse when the current buffer becomes full. By using buffers, we avoid small writes. Using two buffers enables us to easily overlap buffer writes with the assembly of the profile data to be written.

Support for writing profiles out of order is a pre-requisite for this scheme to work; otherwise, each profile needs to wait for all the profiles with smaller ID to be written first. Fortunately, as discussed in Section 3.2, our PMS storage format uses a profile offset to indicate the location of each profile’s data, which enables profiles to be written in the output file in any order.

4.3.2 Context Major Sparse. We generate the CMS output file after we have a complete PMS output file. As a result, unlike when writing the PMS output file, we already know the size of the data and we can calculate the offset of each context’s data by a simple exclusive scan over context sizes. Of course, this requires the contexts in the file are ordered by their ID. This can be easily achieved by each thread collecting and writing the data for a group of consecutive contexts. Our goal for the rest of the implementation is to let all the threads collect the data and write in parallel, without waiting for each other at all.

We achieve our goal by statically assigning each thread a group of consecutive contexts to work on. To balance the work, we partition groups of contexts among threads based on the size of the data associated with each context. Each thread collects profile, context, and metric data from the PMS output file. Since not all profiles have metrics for each context, each thread uses a heap to keep track of the next non-empty context in each profile. The heap is ordered lexicographically by (context ID, profile ID) pairs. The top of the heap represents the smallest context ID that this thread is responsible for that still has at least one remaining profile with metrics for that context that need to be processed. By using a heap, we avoid scanning profiles over and over to check if they have data for a particular context. Using the pair on the top of the heap to lead the way, we gather metrics for each context to assemble data in CMS format. When we finish with the metrics for a context in a profile, we remove the top pair from the heap, insert a pair for the next non-empty context for this profile, and restore the heap property. We repeat this process until a context ID is no longer in the thread’s heap. At that time, we write data for the context at the pre-calculated offset in the file. This process continues until a thread finishes with all contexts in its group.

4.4 Process-level Parallelism

To process very large-scale executions, we exploit multiple compute nodes using the process-based parallelism provided by MPI. Within each MPI rank we use the thread-based parallelism discussed in Sections 4.1 to 4.3 to efficiently use multicore hardware present on the compute node. The hybrid approach is depicted as a dataflow diagram in Fig. 5, where each block is conceptually an instance of the dataflow in Fig. 3. Input profiles are distributed statically across the ranks and each rank “streams” its allocated profiles as discussed previously, as such communication between the ranks is only needed for “aggregating” analysis results, depicted in Fig. 3 as the union (∪) and accumulation (+) operations.

We take a two-phase approach to our communication, using two reductions to aggregate values across ranks. In the first phase we parse environments, application files (binaries and source files) and calling contexts from measurement profiles in parallel, merging them across ranks using a reduction tree. Once the final merged elements are available on the root rank (rank 0), they are broadcast
to all other ranks along with identifiers used for the analysis results database, to ensure consistency between per-profile results. This starts the second phase, where metric values and traces are parsed from every profile in parallel and each rank writes per-profile outputs into the analysis results database. The statistic accumulators within each rank are accumulated across ranks using a second reduction tree, and the final statistics written out by the root rank along with any remaining metadata for the database. By composing these cross-rank reductions with the thread-level parallelism discussed previously, we obtain an efficient hybrid-parallelism approach to post-mortem analysis.

The reduction trees placed at the ends of the two phases are implemented using custom versions of the “sources” and “sinks” used for the thread-based approach detailed in Section 4.1. By doing this, we are able to naturally use thread-based parallelism for the reductions and overlap with other unrelated operations. If there are \( t \) threads available at every rank, we presume that each rank can process results from up to \( t \) children in parallel. By using a reduction tree with a branching factor of \( t \), we obtain the optimal case of \( \log_t n \) rounds per reduction across \( n \) ranks.\(^6\)

In order to take advantage of process-based parallelism in our sparse output algorithm (see Section 4.3) we require some additional adjustments. The output of our PMS format file uses an atomic to allocate regions, which can be reasonably be replaced with MPI one-sided communication. We have found however that if the MPI implementation does not handle these one-sided requests with an asynchronous helper thread performance will suffer. To provide good communication performance on these suboptimal implementations, we instead manage a “server” thread in rank 0 and replace these atomic operations with a single message and response. Since we use a double-buffered output for the PMS file these requests are infrequent and quick to resolve, as such we have not noticed as significant degradation of our overall performance using this technique.

To exploit process-level parallelism in the output of our CMS format file, we use a dynamic load balancing scheme among processes. We divide all the contexts into small groups with similar sizes of the data associated with the contexts. Each process works on one group at a time and grabs another group to work on when the previous work is complete. The processes only communicate when they want to grab a group, and we use the same idea of having a “server” thread in rank 0 to keep track of the next available group. While groups have similar data sizes, they don’t necessarily involve the same amount of work. This dynamic load balancing scheme enables processes to do similar amounts of work since they can decide if they need more work on the fly. We tried to simply assign the contexts statically to processes based on the data sizes, but it lead to a significant load imbalance among ranks. Section 5.1 compares the overall performance of this approach against the static allocation scheme for two of our experiments.

Finally, some MPI implementations including OpenMPI implement thread support using large internal locks. Since our approach heavily uses fine-grained synchronization, we found it quite easy to accidentally create deadlocks between the two synchronizations, both due to differences in thread interleavings between ranks and due to conflicting lock orders with our locks. To resolve these issues, we added synchronization around all MPI operations to ensure they are called in a single order consistent across all ranks. By limiting this to MPI calls and matching this order with the order of tasks used by our task runtime, we minimize effects on the overall performance and have not observed significant serialization from this addition. By doing this we obtain an efficient and stable hybrid-parallelism approach to post-mortem analysis.

### 5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

To evaluate the performance of our streaming aggregation approach, we implemented our analysis as a hybrid MPI/OpenMP application as discussed in Section 4. The input performance measurements were gathered using a version of HPCToolkit’s measurement infrastructure altered to output our sparse measurement format discussed in Section 3. We collected measurements from short runs of AMG2013\(^7\) [25] and LAMMPS\(^8\) [22] on the Theta\(^5\) and Summit\(^9\), supercomputers managed by Argonne National Laboratory and Oak Ridge National Laboratory respectively\(^10\). These measurements include both execution profiles and traces. The launch parameters used for our experiments are listed in Table 3.

Table 4 compares our approach against the Scalasca parallel trace analysis from Scalasca \([27]\) and the current parallel analysis provided by HPCToolkit \([2]\). As discussed in Section 2, these commonly-used tools make use of parallelism in their post-mortem analysis, making them a reasonable baseline for the performance of our analysis. Scalasca’s Scout is often the most expensive of the approaches due in part to the fact that it processes function enter-exit traces; this differs from HPCToolkit and our analysis, which process profiles and sample-based call path traces. This difference significantly increases its measurement storage size and analysis time in all configurations, and the effect on the latter cannot be mitigated due to its requirement to match the application’s launch parameters.

While Scalasca generated smaller analysis results than HPCToolkit for AMG2013, it is noteworthy that Scalasca’s CUBE output has metrics for AMG2013 and LAMMPS\(^7\) \([25]\) on the Theta\(^5\) and Summit\(^9\), supercomputers managed by Argonne National Laboratory and Oak Ridge National Laboratory respectively\(^10\). These measurements were gathered using a version of HPCToolkit’s measurement infrastructure altered to output our sparse measurement format discussed in Section 3. We collected measurements from short runs of AMG2013\(^7\) [25] and LAMMPS\(^8\) [22] on the Theta\(^5\) and Summit\(^9\), supercomputers managed by Argonne National Laboratory and Oak Ridge National Laboratory respectively\(^10\). These measurements are infrequent and quick to resolve, as such we have not noticed a significant degradation of our overall performance using this technique.

\(^6\)Branching factors that are not multiples of \( t \) will result in idle threads. For some branching factor \( k_t \), a complete reduction tree will require \( (k_t)/(1 + \log_t k_t)) \log_t n \) rounds to complete. This is minimized when \( k_t = 1 \), giving the result in the text.

\(^7\)AMG2013 is a CPU-based parallel algebraic multigrid solver for linear systems implemented using hybrid MPI/OpenMP.

\(^8\)LAMMPS is a CPU and GPU-based parallel molecular dynamics simulation implemented using hybrid MPI/OpenMP/CUDA.

\(^9\)We do not have sufficiently large allocations on these machines for large-scale executions longer than 1-2 minutes.
System Properties:

- Theta[5] Intel Knight’s Landing Architecture
  4 threads/core, 64 cores/node
  Lustre file system, peak 6 GiB/s

- Summit[20] IBM Power9 + NVIDIA Tesla V100
  1-4 threads/core, 21 cores/socket,
  3 GPUs/socket, 2 sockets/node
  Spectrum Scale file system, peak 2.2 TiB/s


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG 8K</td>
<td>Execution Profiles &amp; Traces</td>
<td>1 CPU metric (REALTIME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG 16K</td>
<td>Launch 8192 threads, 256 ranks, 64 nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG 65K</td>
<td>Launch 16384 threads, 512 ranks, 128 nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG 262K</td>
<td>Launch 65536 threads, 2048 ranks, 512 nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAMMPS[22] Measurement & Launch Parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMP 1K</td>
<td>Execution Profiles &amp; Traces</td>
<td>1 CPU metric + 62 GPU metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMP 2K</td>
<td>Launch 510 threads, 510 GPU streams, 510 ranks, 85 nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Tool Launch Parameters:

- Scalasca Theta Same as application
- HPCToolkit Theta 1 thread/rank, 128 ranks/node
- Stream. Agg. Theta 1 thread/rank, 42 ranks/node

Table 3: Properties of the systems and parameters used for the experiments listed in Table 4. Scalasca’s Scout [27] must always use identical launch parameters as the measured application, HPCToolkit [2] must always use a single thread per MPI rank. These are limitations of the respective tools.

The following analyses were performed on Theta:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis Threads (Nodes)</th>
<th>Analysis Time (seconds)</th>
<th>Size (GiB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG 8K</td>
<td>128t (1n) 1024t (8n)</td>
<td>1024t (64n)</td>
<td>8192t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scalasca</td>
<td>0:26</td>
<td>0:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HPCToolkit</td>
<td>3:18</td>
<td>2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stream. Agg.</td>
<td>0:52</td>
<td>0:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMG 16K     | 128t (1n) 1024t (8n)     | 1024t (64n)             | 8192t       |
|             | Scalasca                 | 0:52                    | 0:24       |
|             | HPCToolkit               | 6:02                    | 2:53       |
|             | Stream. Agg.             | 1:16                    | 1:19       |

| AMG 65K     | 128t (1n) 1024t (8n)     | 1024t (64n)             | 8192t       |
|             | HPCToolkit               | 31:53                   | 6:53       |
|             | Stream. Agg.             | 4:21                    | 1:09       |

| AMG 262K    | 128t (1n) 1024t (8n)     | 1024t (64n)             | 8192t       |
|             | HPCToolkit               | >60:00                  | 14:38      |
|             | Stream. Agg.             | 29:26                   | 1:06       |

The following analyses were performed on Summit:

| LMP 1K      | 42t (1n) 420t (10n)      | 420t (25n)              | 1050t       |
|             | HPCToolkit               | 23:26                   | 3:38       |
|             | Stream. Agg.             | 9:33                    | 1:26       |

| LMP 2K      | 42t (1n) 420t (10n)      | 420t (25n)              | 1050t       |
|             | HPCToolkit               | 58:53                   | 9:21       |
|             | Stream. Agg.             | 18:28                   | 2:32       |

Table 4: Comparison of Scalasca’s Scout [27], HPCToolkit [2] and our Streaming Aggregation approach in terms of analysis latency, measurements size and analysis results size. Unlike the case studies in Section 3.3, measurement and analysis data sizes include both profiles and traces of CPU activity and GPU activity streams. System properties and launch parameters are listed in Table 3. Minimum values in each column are marked in bold, valid configurations not attempted are marked NA.

5.1 Discussion

The performance of our streaming aggregation approach is highly dependent on the performance of the underlying filesystem used to store measurements and analysis results. Figure 6 presents an
There is still some idleness present in Fig. 6, most significantly in the regions marked A and B in the figure. The idleness within region A is caused by the worker ranks waiting for rank 0 to compose the global calling context tree, as discussed in Section 4.4. While this idleness could be removed by composing the unified tree on all ranks independently, this would duplicate work and thus not provide any speedup.

The idleness within region B is caused by load imbalance from the largely I/O operations directly preceding. While the profiles are of roughly similar sizes, they are statically assigned to worker ranks which causes imbalance from inconsistent speeds of I/O operations. We intend to explore methods for dynamic assignment in a future revision of our analysis.

The ending region C contains the cross-rank dynamic load balancing algorithm used to output our CMS format, as discussed in Section 4.4. Table 5 compares the overall performance using this algorithm against an equivalent using static allocation. While there is a difference in performance between the two algorithms, the difference is proportionally minor compared to the processing of profiles and traces (regions B and preceding). Since dynamic load balancing provides more robust performance, we consider it the better choice of the two for our purposes.

### Table 5: Comparison of our Streaming Aggregation analysis without and with the global dynamic load balancing described in Section 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Analysis Threads (Nodes)</th>
<th>Analysis Time (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMG 65K</td>
<td>w/o GLB</td>
<td>128t (1n) 1024t (8n) 65536t (512n)</td>
<td>4:21 1:14 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w/ GLB</td>
<td>4:21 1:09 NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMG 262K</td>
<td>w/o GLB</td>
<td>128t (1n) 1024t (8n) 16384t (128n)</td>
<td>29:09 5:52 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w/ GLB</td>
<td>29:26 5:42 NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMP 2K</td>
<td>w/o GLB</td>
<td>42t (1n) 420t (10n) 2016t (480n)</td>
<td>18:28 2:32 1:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w/ GLB</td>
<td>18:16 2:26 1:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The example execution trace of our streaming aggregation approach running on a LAMMPS dataset. In this example, 36.3% of the execution time is spent in I/O operations, while < 11% is spent on actual computation. Many of these I/O operations are part of the critical path, limiting our scalability to the parallel performance of the filesystem.

There is still some idleness present in Fig. 6, most significantly in the regions marked A and B in the figure. The idleness within region A is caused by the worker ranks waiting for rank 0 to compose the global calling context tree, as discussed in Section 4.4. While this idleness could be removed by composing the unified tree on all ranks independently, this would duplicate work and thus not provide any speedup.

The idleness within region B is caused by load imbalance from the largely I/O operations directly preceding. While the profiles are of roughly similar sizes, they are statically assigned to worker ranks which causes imbalance from inconsistent speeds of I/O operations. We intend to explore methods for dynamic assignment in a future revision of our analysis.

The ending region C contains the cross-rank dynamic load balancing algorithm used to output our CMS format, as discussed in Section 4.4. Table 5 compares the overall performance using this algorithm against an equivalent using static allocation. While there is a difference in performance between the two algorithms, the difference is proportionally minor compared to the processing of profiles and traces (regions B and preceding). Since dynamic load balancing provides more robust performance, we consider it the better choice of the two for our purposes.

## 6 Conclusions and Future Work

We have designed and implemented a tool for highly-parallel post-mortem performance analysis of performance measurements on heterogeneous supercomputers. By using sparse formats, we observed space savings up to 22× and 6000× over equivalent dense formats for profiles and their analysis results. Our novel streaming aggregation approach to post-mortem analysis exploits both thread-based and process-based parallelism, achieving results in shorter times and using less total node time than HPCToolkit, we have observed reductions of 9.4× and 7.6× respectively. By taking full advantage of the threads available on a single compute node, we are able to perform analysis using less total node time than the application itself, we have observed as low as 3%. Based on these results, we believe that our approach is suitable for performance analysis of extreme-scale executions, providing a key building block for performance tools supporting forthcoming exascale systems.

As these systems become available we intend to continue to improve our post-mortem analysis to better support these systems. Our modified version of HPCToolkit’s measurement subsystem currently records one file per profile, one potential improvement we will consider is to merge profiles for a single process into a single file. This would significantly reduce the number of files for thread-parallel applications and reduce the overhead of opening many files, which can be significant during both measurement and post-mortem analysis. We also intend to explore the impact of emerging file system abstractions atop non-volatile random-access memory such as DAOS [16] to better understand how they might be used to accelerate performance measurement and analysis workflows.
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