Rectangles All The Way Down
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"The most amazing achievement of the computer software industry is its continuing cancellation of the steady and staggering gains made by the computer hardware industry."

- Henry Peteroski


## Fundamental Laws

## CPU Performance - Memory Lane

"Transistor density doubles every year"

- Gordon Moore
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## Concurrency \& Parallelism



## Universal Scalability Law (USL)

$$
C(N)=N /(1+\alpha(N-1)+((\beta * N) *(N-1)))
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
C=\text { capacity or throughput } \\
\mathbf{N}=\text { number of processors } \\
\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\text { contention penalty } \\
\boldsymbol{\beta}=\text { coherence penalty }
\end{gathered}
$$

## Universal Scalability Law (USL)


—Amdahl —USL

# If concurrency is so difficult then what else can we do? 



## Queueing Theory



## Queueing Theory

$$
r=s(2-\rho) / 2(1-\rho)
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{r}=\text { mean response time } \\
\mathbf{s}=\text { service time } \\
\boldsymbol{\rho}=\text { utilisation }
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\text { Note: } \rho=\lambda * s
$$



## $L=\lambda W$ <br> WIP $=$ Throughput * Cycle Time

## Little's Law

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{L}=\lambda W \\
\mathrm{WIP}=\text { Throughput } * \text { Cycle Time }
\end{gathered}
$$
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$$
\begin{gathered}
L=\lambda W \\
\text { WIP }=\text { Throughput } * \text { Cycle Time }
\end{gathered}
$$

Bandwidth Delay Product:
Bytes in flight = Bandwidth * Latency

80 bytes / 100ns $=800 \mathrm{MB} / \mathrm{s}: 10 \mathrm{LFBs}$

## Memory

## Are all memory operations equal?

## Sequential Access

Average time in ns/op to sum all longs in a 1GB array?

## Access Pattern Benchmark

| Benchmark | Score | Error | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sequential | 0.832 | 0.006 | /op |

## ~1 ns/op

## Really???

## Less than 1ns per operation?

## Instruction Level Parallelism

## Haswell Execution Unit Overview
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## ~90 ns/op



# A 100ns cache-miss is a lost opportunity to execute ~1000 instructions on CPU 

## Algorithms \& Data Structures

## Little's Law

## $\mathrm{L}=\lambda \mathrm{W}$

## Bandwidth Delay Product:

Bytes in flight = Bandwidth * Latency

80 bytes / 100ns $=800 \mathrm{MB} / \mathrm{s}: 10$ LFBs

## Little's Law

$$
\mathrm{L}=\lambda \mathrm{W}
$$

## Bandwidth Delay Product:

Bytes in flight = Bandwidth * Latency

80 bytes / 100ns $=800 \mathrm{MB} / \mathrm{s}: 10$ LFBs 80 bytes / 15ns $=5.3 \mathrm{~GB} / \mathrm{s}$ :prefectch

## Little's Law

## $\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{\lambda W}$

## Bandwidth Delay Product:

Bytes in flight = Bandwidth * Latency

80 bytes / 100ns $=800 \mathrm{MB} / \mathrm{s}: 10$ LFBs 80 bytes / 15ns $=5.3 \mathrm{~GB} / \mathrm{s}$ :prefectch 640 bytes / 15ns $=42.6 \mathrm{~GB} / \mathrm{s}$ :cachelines

Arrays are the most efficient data structure to traverse


## Functional data structures

 are like sausages, the more you see them being made, the less well you will sleepBranches

## Haswell Execution Unit Overview



## Branch Benchmark

| Benchmark | Score | Error | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| baseline | 5.600 | 4.469 | us |
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## Branch Benchmark

| Benchmark | Score | Error | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| baseline | 585.600 | 4.469 | us/op |
| predictable | 578.364 | $\pm 10.906$ | us/op |
| unPredictable | 2234.414 | $\pm 564.472$ | us/op |

## What can we do?

## Count bits as Booleans

## Wide Registers

# Math, Data Dependencies, and Instruction Level Parallelism 

## Haswell Execution Unit Overview



## Consider Sorting Arrays

https://lamport.azurewebsites.net/pubs/multiple-byte.pdf

| Programming | G. Manacher |
| :--- | :--- |
| Techniques | Editor |

Techniques Editor
Multiple Byte Processing with FullWord Instructions

Leslie Lamport<br>Massachusetts Computer Associates, Inc.

[^0]
# "It's a neat hack, and it's more useful now than it was then for two reasons." 

- Leslie Lamport (2011)
"The obvious reason is that word size is larger now, with many computers having 64-bit words."
- Leslie Lamport (2011)
"The less obvious reason is that conditional operations are implemented with masking rather than branching."
- Leslie Lamport (2011)
"Branching is more costly on modern multi-issue computers than it was on the computers of the 70s."
- Leslie Lamport (2011)


## Robert Morris

Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, N.J.


#### Abstract

It is possible to use a small counter to keep approximate counts of large numbers. The resulting expected error can be rather precisely controlled. An example is given in which 8-bit counters (bytes) are used to keep track of as many as 130,000 events with a relative error which is substantially independent of the number $n$ of events. This relative error can be expected to be $\mathbf{2 4}$ percent or less 95 percent of the time (i.e. $\sigma=$ $n / 8$ ). The techniques could be used to advantage in multichannel counting hardware or software used for the monitoring of experiments or processes.


Key Words and Phrases: counting
CR Categories: 5.11
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## Work with your CPU caches

## Memory Access Considerations

## 1. Temporal: group accesses in time
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1. Temporal: group accesses in time
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## Memory Access Considerations

1. Temporal: group accesses in time
2. Spatial: group access in space
3. Pattern: create predictable patterns

Batching

## Batching - Amortising Costs



## Batching - Amortising Costs



In closing...

Profile, profile, profile...

Eliminate Waste Batch to Amortise
Access Memory in Patterns Favour Math over Branches Favour Predictable Branches

## Consider Parallelism - <br> ILP \& Task

Is it really "Turtles all the way down"?


## Rectangles all the way down...

Is it really "Turtles all the way down"?

- Networks: Frames
- Operating Systems: Pages
- File systems and storage: Blocks
- DRAM memory: Banks and Row Buffers
- CPU cache subsystems: Cache Lines

- Applications use Arrays plus and interesting data structures are made up of small Arrays


# "I don't care what data structure you use, nothing beats an array" 

- a HFT Programmer


## Questions?

## Twitter: @mjpt777

"Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry, and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely on these accounts. Broad, wholesome, charitable views of men and things cannot be acquired by vegetating in one little corner of the earth all one's lifetime."

- Mark Twain


[^0]:    A method is described which allows parallel processing of packed data items using only ordinary fullword computer instructions, even though the processing requires operations whose execution is contingent upon the value of a datum. It provides a useful technique for processing small data items such as alphanumeric characters.
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