Shuffling: A Lock Contention Aware Thread Scheduling Technique

Kishore Pusukuri

Multicores are Ubiquitous

- Deliver computing power via parallelism
- Potential for delivering high performance for multithreaded applications

Oracle SPARC M7-8

Mobile phones





Complexity of Achieving High Performance

Application Characteristics

- Degree of Parallelism
- Lock Contention
- Memory Requirements

Architecture

- Cache Hierarchy
- Cross-chip Interconnect Protocols

Operating System Policies

- Thread Scheduling
- Memory Management

Modern Operating Systems

Improve System Utilization and Provide Fairness

- Thread Scheduling: Time Share \rightarrow Fairness
- Memory Allocation: Next → Data Locality

Do not consider relationships between threads of a multithreaded application

Application characteristics should be considered

OS Load Balancing vs Lock Contention

- OS load balancing is oblivious of lock contention
- Performance of multithreaded program with high lock contention is sensitive to the distribution of threads across sockets
- Inappropriate distribution of threads → increases frequency of lock transfers
- Increases lock acquisition latencies
- Increases LLC misses in the critical path

Outline

- Introduction
- Motivation
- Shuffling Framework
- Experimental Results

Lock Contention Study

Lock contention is an important performance limiting factor



Lock Contention on Performance



Lock time: the percentage of elapsed time a process spends on waiting for lock operations in user space

Lock Transfers

Acquire Lock Execute Critical Section Release Lock Overhead of Lock Transfer:

• **T_low** \rightarrow Lock transfers between threads located on the same Socket

• **T_high** \rightarrow Lock transfers between threads located on different Sockets

e.g.: bodytrack (BT) with 64 threads

Lock Transfer	Solaris
T_low	31%
T_high	69%

High Frequency of LLC misses & Its Cause



BT with 64 threads

- Lock arrival times spread across a wide interval
- The likelihood of lock acquired by a thread on a different socket is very high

Lock arrival times of threads per socket at the entry of a lock within a 100 ms time interval

Outline

- Introduction
- Motivation
- Shuffling Framework
- Experimental Results

Thread Shuffling [PACT 2014]

Minimize variation in lock arrival times of threads

Schedule threads whose lock arrival times are clustered in a small time interval

Once a thread releases the lock it is highly likely that another thread on the same Socket will successfully acquire the lock

Thread Shuffling (algorithm)

Input: N \rightarrow Number of Threads; S \rightarrow Number of Sockets

repeat

- **1. Monitor Threads** sample lock times of N threads **if** lock times exceed threshold then
 - **2. Form Thread Groups** sort threads according to lock times and divide them into S groups
 - **3. Perform Shuffling** shuffle threads to establish newly computed groups

until (application terminates)

Shuffling Interval

Impacts Lock transfers between sockets \rightarrow LLC misses



BT: LLC miss rate vs Shuffling interval

Shuffling Overhead Negligible

Frequency of monitoring and shuffling



Overhead is negligible (< 1% of system time)

Lock Transfers: Solaris vs Shuffling



LLC miss rate

Lock time

1.9

72%

Lock Transfer	Shuffling	Solaris	
T_low	46%	31%	
T_high	54%	69%	

3.3

86%

Thread Lock Arrival-time Ranges

Solaris Shuffling



Lock contention & LLC miss rate



Reduces Lock contention & LLC misses

Evaluating Thread Shuffling (cont.)

Up to 54% Avg. 13% Memcached: 17% TATP: 28%



DINO: only considers LLC misses

PSets: binding a pool of threads to a pool of cores

Conclusions

Problem:

OS thread scheduling is oblivious to lock contention and fails to maximize performance of multithreaded applications on multicore multiprocessor systems

Idea:

Minimize variation in lock arrival times of threads

Advantages:

- Improves performance on average 13% (max of 54%)
- No need to modify application source code