Faster closures in Scala via Stack-allocation

Miguel Garcia http://lamp.epfl.ch/~magarcia LAMP,EPFL

2012-11-04

Outline

Background

How uncurry goes about closure conversion Some inescapable performance laws Terminology

Candidate approaches

Early Inlining

Closures as method-handles, scala.FunctionX compatible

<ロト</th>
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●
●

Which approach results in faster code?

- Background

How uncurry goes about closure conversion

What we get for "(i => i < args.length)" where "args" is a formal param of the enclosing method.

```
@SerialVersionUTD(0)
final <synthetic>
class $anonfun$main$1
extends scala.runtime.AbstractFunction1$mcZI$sp
with Serializable {
  final
 def apply(i: Int): Boolean = apply$mcZI$sp(i);
  <specialized>
 def apply$mcZI$sp(v1: Int): Boolean = v1.<(args$1.length());
 final <bridge>
 def apply(v1: Object): Object = scala.Boolean.box(apply(scala.Int.unbox(v1)));
  <synthetic> <paramaccessor>
 private[this]
 val args$1: Array[String] = ;
 def <init>($outer: Test, args$1: Array[String]): anonymous class $anonfun$main$1 = {
    $anonfun$main$1.this.args$1 = args$1;
    $anonfun$main$1.super.<init>();
    ()
```

<ロト < 聞 > < 臣 > < 臣 > 臣 ?????

- Background

- Some inescapable performance laws

A few steadfast performance characteristics:

- 1. Nothing beats stack-allocation
- 2. Stack-traffic always cheaper than pointer-chasing over heap-allocated data
- 3. Passing IntRef and friends on the stack not really a problem: the VM's Escape Analysis (usually) stack-allocates them.

4. Corollary: lifting local methods is OK, lifting closures is bad

Open question: Relative performance of

- calling a partially-applied method handle vs.
- virtual invocation providing all arguments

- Background

Terminology

Terminology

- Hi-O method: the "higher-order" method taking one or more closure instances as argument. Example, Range.foreach()
- closure-state: the values of fields of an anonymous-closure-class, all of them final. Usually including an \$outer field to access external locations other than local-captures.
- closure-methods: besides apply() and its specialized siblings, lambdalift turns apply()'s local methods into closure-methods.
- closure-constructor: initializes the closure-state with
 - THIS of the invoker, ie the closure's souter reference

- captured-locals
- the rest if accessed via \$outer (one or more hops)

- Candidate approaches

Candidate approaches:

- 1. Inlining at Hi-O callsite (assumes known method to dispatch):
 - 1.1 before uncurry (aka "early inlining")
 - 1.2 in the experimental optimizer.

2. Closure ${\tt apply}$ () delegating to partially-applied method-handle

(1.1) and (1.2) result in stack-allocated closure-state, guaranteed. The next few slides showcase (1.1) and (2.) **Extensive** details about (1.2) at:

https://groups.google.com/d/topic/scala-internals/HnftkoOMzDM/discussion

- Candidate approaches

Early Inlining

rvc.hiO(<M-args> , closure , <N-args>).etc

can be converted (right before uncurry) into:

```
val rcv = ...
val m 1 = \dots // and so on for the M-args and the N-args
val n 1 = ...
    def closureApply( <as-in-original> ) : ....
    def inlinedHiO( rcv, <M-fmls> , <N-fmls> ) : ... {
      // body of Hi-O adapted to use corresponding formal
      11
      // LOAD closure-arg followed by INVOKEVIRTUAL apply()
      // becomes
      // closureApply() callsite, initially with original args
      // (lambdalift will stack all needed closure state)
```

inlinedHiO(rcv, m_1, ... /* closure skipped */ , n_1, ...)

}.etc

- Candidate approaches

Closures as method-handles

A transformation in two phases. First step, on entry to uncurry:

<code>rcv.hiO(</code> ... , <code>Function(vparams, body)</code> , ...).etc

can be transformed into:

```
def closureApply( <Function.vparams> ) = <Function.body>
closureApply( <zero-at-each-arg> )
// fake call to be removed after lambdalift stacks closure-state
val mhApply: MethodHandle = null
// rhs will become (in the 2nd step) a partially-applied MH
rcv.hiO( ... , InvokeExactFunction , ...).etc
```

where InvokeExactFunction is a Function node with body:

- mhApply.invokeExact(<Function-vparams>)
- encoding Function.body's type as return type of that callsite.

- Candidate approaches

- Closures as method-handles

Second step, on exit from lambdalift:

```
def closureApply( <Function.vparams> ,
                    outer.
                    captured-locals ) =
    <Function.bodv>
// lambdalift appended arguments (outer and captured-locals)
// to the fake call that used to be here.
// Note down those arguments and remove the call.
val mhApply: MethodHandle =
  <constant MH targeting 'closureApply',
   partial-binding the extra args
   borrowed from the removed callsite>
rcv.hiO( ... , InvokeExactFunction , ...).etc
```

< 中 < 母 > < 臣 > < 臣 > < 臣 > < 臣 < ○

- Which approach results in faster code?

To recap, candidate approaches:

- 1. Inlining at Hi-O callsite (assumes known method to dispatch):
 - 1.1 before uncurry (aka "early inlining")
 - 1.2 in the experimental optimizer.
- 2. Closure ${\tt apply}$ () delegating to partially-applied method-handle

Some factors influencing resulting speed:

stack-allocation (of closure-state) always faster than alternatives

<ロト</th>
 ・< 目 > < 目 > 目 2000

- code duplication (of the Hi-O method) taxes the JIT compiler
- relative performance of MH partial-binding wrt direct call