LOCK ELISION FOR PROTECTED OBJECTS USING INTEL TRANSACTIONAL SYNCHRONIZATION EXTENSIONS

Seongho Jeong, Shinhyung Yang and Bernd Burgstaller Department of Computer Science Yonsei University, Korea



Motivation

- Locks are commonly used to protect shared data from data races
- A coarse-grained lock protects a large amount of shared data
 - Advantage: easy to implement, hardly any bugs
 - Disadvantage: scalability bottleneck
- Ada protected objects (POs) are a monitor construct for mutual exclusion
 - Same scalability problem if used for coarse-grained locking
- Example: concurrent hash table
 - Protect the entire hash table by a coarse-grained lock
 - $\square \rightarrow$ tasks serialize even if accessing different keys \otimes

Motivation (cont.)



Time

With locks, tasks serialize, even if they access different portions of the shared data.

Motivation (cont.)

Observation: not all tasks using a PO access the same part of the shared data

- Fine-grained locking of individual data-items can be a fix (but an error-prone one).
- Goal: provide fine-grained parallelism for coarse-grained locks.





Hash table

Our contributions

- Adapt GNU Ada run-time library (GNARL) to elide locks from protected functions and procedures.
- 2. Investigate opportunities and difficulties with lock elision of protected entries.
- **3**. Evaluate the approach for multiple benchmarks in terms of scalability.
- Provide programming- and language-design directions for more parallelism obtainable from lock elision with POs in Ada.

Transactions enable parallelism

Transaction

- Indivisible process
- Composed by multiple operations inside transactional region
- Accesses multiple memory locations atomically
- Speculative execution
 - Tentative and invisible to other tasks
 - Either commits or aborts
 - Keeps read-set and write-set of a transaction
- Possible to run in parallel because changes are tentative
 - Transaction commits in the absence of data-conflict.
 - **Start over** in case of transaction abort.

Data conflict in transaction

- Assume task T is inside a transaction:
- A data conflict occurs iff another task
 - reads a location in task T's write-set, Or
 - writes a location in task T's read-set or write-set.
- Transaction aborts if data conflict is detected.
 Changes in write-set will be discarded.

Intel TSX

- xbegin, xend to delimit transactional region
- Transaction aborts if
 - a data conflict occurs
 - In units of cache-lines

xbegin L1
<Transactional operations>
xend ;commit changes
<Operations after commit>
...
L1: <Operations on abort>

- a task exceeds the read/write set capacity limit,
- an illegal instruction is executed
 - interrupt, system call, ..., or
- an explicit abort by software is called (xabort instruction).
- Abort state is reported in EAX register.
- Fall-back path is always required.
 - Transaction can fail endlessly.
 - Need to ensure progress by falling back on conventional lock.

Lock elision with Intel TSX

Run critical section inside transaction.

- Elide lock acquisition to enter critical section.
- Commit upon exit of critical section.
- Multiple tasks in critical section at the same time.
 - As long as tasks access different cache lines.



Protected objects in GNAT

GNARL wraps protected function and procedure calls by a lock/unlock pair to achieve mutual exclusion:

protected type HashTable is
 procedure Insert (key, val);
private
 Slots : ...; --- Shared data
end HashTable;



Hash table

Protected objects in GNAT

GNARL wraps protected function and procedure calls by a lock/unlock pair to achieve mutual exclusion:

protected type HashTable is
 procedure Insert (key, val);
private
 Slots : ...; --- Shared data
end HashTable;



Hash table



Protected objects in GNAT

GNARL wraps protected function and procedure calls by a lock/unlock pair to achieve mutual exclusion:



GNARL lock elision

 $\mathbf{2}$

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

 $\mathbf{20}$

 $\mathbf{21}$

 $\mathbf{22}$

```
procedure Write_Lock
  result := Try_Elision
  if result = fail then
    acquire PO.lock
  end if
  return
end Write_Lock
```

Adapted Write_Lock:

- Attempt lock elision
 - Call Try_Elision
- Else acquire lock
 - Fall-back path
 - to prevent infinite abort

```
1 Max_Retry : constant Natural...
3 procedure Try_Elision
    retry := 0
4
    while retry < Max_Retry loop
      state := xbegin
      if state = STARTED then
        if PO.lock = free then
          return success
        else
          xabort
        end if
      else if state = CAPACITY or
               state /= RETRY then
        return fail
      else
        Backoff Exponentially
        wait until PO.lock = free
        retry := retry + 1
      end if
    end loop
    return fail
23 end Try_Elision
```



Successful elision	1	Max_Retry : constant Natural
Ouccessful clision	2	
nrocoduro Write Lock	3	procedure Try_Elision
		retry := 0 while wetwy < Max Betwy lean
result := Iry_Elision	5	while retry < Max_Ketry loop
if result = fail then	6	state := $x \text{ Degin}$
acquire PO.lock	7	If state = STARIED then
end if 👩	8	If $PO.lock = free then$
return 🗸 🔽	9	return success
end Write_Lock	10	else
	11	xabort
	12	end if
Call Iry_Elision	13	else if state = CAPACITY or
hefore acquiring lock	14	state /= RETRY then
Delote acquiring lock	15	return fail
Start transaction via	16	else
xbogin	17	Backoff Exponentially
xbegtii	18	wait until PO.lock = free
\square On success:	19	retry := retry + 1
	20	end if
Return and proceed in	21	end loop
transactional mode	22	return fail
แล้าเรลงแบบสา 11000	23	end Try_Elision
		-

Transaction aborts

- If a transaction aborts, the CPU transfers control back to statement xbegin
 - State = STARTED is false at this moment
- Two causes for transaction abort:
 - A. Non-retryable
 - Capacity overflow
 - Illegal instructions
 - B. Retryable
 - Data conflict
 - Software-induced abort

```
1 Max_Retry
                  Transfer here on
\mathbf{2}
                  transaction abort
3 procedure
     retry :=
4
     while retry < Max_Retry loop
5
       state := xbegin
6
       if state = STARTED then
7
          if PO.lock = free then
8
            return success
9
          else
10
            xabort
11
         end if
12
    A else if state = CAPACITY or
13
                 state /= RETRY then
\mathbf{14}
          return fail
15
    🚯 else
16
          Backoff Exponentially
17
          wait until PO.lock = free
18
          retry := retry + 1
19
       end if
20
    end loop
\mathbf{21}
     return fail
\mathbf{22}
23 end Try_Elision
```



Retryable aborts

```
procedure Write_Lock
  result := Try_Elision
  if result = fail then
    acquire PO.lock
  end if
  return
end Write_Lock
```

Retry may succeed if:

11

- A. A lock is held by a competing task dwelling on the fall-back path
 - Once task detects this, it 19will abort explicitly (**xabort**) $\mathbf{20}$
- B. A data conflict occurred.

1 Max_Retry : constant Natural ... $\mathbf{2}$ Data 3 procedure Try_Elis≮ Conflict retry := 04 while retry < Max_Retry loop 5 state := xbegin 朞 6 if state = **STARTED** then 7 if PO.lock = free then 8 return success 9 else 10xabort end 12else if state = CAPACITY or 13 state /= RETRY then $\mathbf{14}$ return fail 15else 16**Backoff** Exponentially 17wait until PO.lock = free 18 retry := retry + 1end if end loop $\mathbf{21}$ return fail $\mathbf{22}$ 23 end Try_Elision





Lock elision for protected entries

- Variables occurring in entry_barrier constitute shared data.
 - POs update such state variables inside protected operations.
 - **Examples**: growable hash table, queue, semaphore, ...
- State variable updates drastically increase data conflicts.
 - Annihilate performance gain from elision. (Observed ~50% abort rate)



Manual code transformations

- □ To leverage parallelism, programmer may transform entry into two halves:
 - 1) Entry_1 (original barrier, not elided): update state variables, requeue on Entry_2.
 - Entry_2 (true barrier, elided): update remaining shared data.
- Limitations:
 - a) Not applicable if state variables need to be updated at end of entry-code.
 - b) Only profitable if parallelizing Entry_2 is profitable.
 - c) Manual code-transformation may introduce concurrency bugs.
- Observed up to 5x speedup over non-split entry from this example.



Restrictions of the Eggshell model

- □ Ada 2012 RM Chapter 9.5.3(16):
 - Queued entry calls with an open barrier **must** precede all other protected operations (eggshell model).
 - The RM does not state the reason for Clause 9.5.3(16), but probably to avoid starvation.
 - Clause 9.5.3(16) restricts the parallelism obtainable from lock elision.
- We considered two possible implementation scenarios:
- 1. Permissive lock elision
 - Waive Clause 9.5.3(16) by PO type annotation.
 - Reason: for many parallel workloads, starvation is not an issue, throughput is.
- 2. Restrictive lock elision
 - Switch the PO's mode from elided to non-elided when an entry call is enqueued at a closed barrier.
 - Switch back to elided mode after all queued entries have been processed.

Experimental evaluation

- Three synthetic and one real-world benchmarks
 - Linked lists ☺
 - A counter-example due to capacity aborts from traversal.
 - 2) Dijkstra's Dining Philosophers ③
 - 3) Concurrent hash table ③
 - 4) K-means clustering ③
 - From Stanford STAMP suite
 - Employed protected procedures & functions only.
- Evaluation platform:
 - 44 cores (2 CPU Intel Xeon E5-2699 v4 system)
 - Linux kernel version 4.9.4, GCC/GNAT 6.3.0

Measurement set-up

All synthetic benchmarks ran in a tight loop
 Example: Dining Philosophers

```
for i in 1 .. MaxIterations loop
    acquireFork_1;
    acquireFork_2;
    null; --- eat
    releaseFork_1;
    releaseFork_2;
end loop;
```

Computation-to-communication ratio thereby minimized

Simulates a highly-contended PO

An upper bound for the best-possible performance improvement (Amdahl's Law)

Performance tuning

Max_Retry

- Empirically, Max_Retry should be higher than the number of participating tasks
- Max_Retry = 200 for all our experiments.

Padding & alignment to prevent false sharing Reduces possibility of data conflict Data structure layout may need to be revised.

Dining philosophers



Concurrent hash table



Normalized time for insert Normalized time for lookup

- Random key generation for operations
- □ 50 million operations in a tight loop

Concurrent hash table (cont.)



Abort rates (%) for insert

Abort rates (%) for lookup

K-means clustering



Conclusion

- Implemented lock elision for protected functions and procedures in the Ada 2012 GNARL.
- Presented possible schemes for lock elision with entries.
- Demonstrated that lock elision can improve performance significantly.
 - Not all types of POs benefit from speculative execution.
 - Programmer intervention may be required to selectively enable elision for certain POs.
- Provided tuning methods to optimize performance.
- Experimental results showed the scalability of lock elision for several benchmarks on up to 44 cores.



Thank you!