Caching Issues in Multicore Performance

Problem: The Path Between a CPU and Off-chip Memory is Slow

Solution: Hierarchical Memory Systems, or "Cache"

Cache and Memory are Named by "Distance Level" from the ALU

Storage Level Characteristics

Cache Hits and Misses

Performance programming should strive to avoid as many cache misses as possible. That's why it is very helpful to know the cache structure of your CPU.
Successful use of the cache depends on **Spatial Coherence**:

“If you need one memory address’s contents now, then you will probably also need the contents of some of the memory locations around it soon.”

Successful use of the cache depends on **Temporal Coherence**:

“If you need one memory address’s contents now, then you will probably also need its contents again soon.”

If these assumptions are true, then you will generate a lot of cache hits. If these assumptions are not true, then you will generate a lot of cache misses, and you end up re-loading the cache a lot.

### How Bad Is It? – Demonstrating the Cache-Miss Problem

C and C++ store 2D arrays a row-at-a-time, like this, A[i][j]:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 \\
15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 \\
20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24
\end{array}
\]

For large arrays, would it be better to add the elements by row, or by column? Which will avoid the most cache misses?

```c
float f = A[i][j];
float f = A[j][i];
```

### Demonstrating the Cache-Miss Problem – Across Rows

```c
#define NUM 10000
float A[NUM][NUM];
double MyTimer();

int main(argc, argv[])
{
    float sum = 0.;
    double start = MyTimer();
    for (int i = 0; i < NUM; i++)
    {
        for (int j = 0; j < NUM; j++)
        {
            sum += A[i][j]; // access across a row
        }
    }
    double finish = MyTimer();
    double row_secs = finish - start;
    return 0;
}
```

### Demonstrating the Cache-Miss Problem – Down Columns

```c
float sum = 0.;
double start = MyTimer();
for (int i = 0; i < NUM; i++)
{
    for (int j = 0; j < NUM; j++)
    {
        sum += A[j][i]; // access down a column
    }
}
double finish = MyTimer();
double col_secs = finish - start;
```

### Demonstrating the Cache-Miss Problem

Time, in seconds, to compute the array sums, based on by-row versus by-column order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension (NUM) (Total array size = NUMxNUM)</th>
<th>By-Row</th>
<th>By-Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Array-of-Structures vs. Structure-of-Arrays:

```c
struct xyz
{
    float x, y, z;
} Array[N];
```

```c
float X[N], Y[N], Z[N];
```

1. Which is a better use of the cache if we are going to be using X-Y-Z triples a lot?
2. Which is a better use of the cache if we are going to be looking at all X's, then all Y's, then all Z's?

I've seen some programs use a “Shadow Data Structure” to get the advantages of both AOS and SOA.
Computer Graphics is often a Good Use for Array-of-Structures:

```c
struct xyz
{
    float x, y, z;
} Array[N];
```

```c
glBegin( GL_LINE_STRIP );
for( int i = 0; i < N; i++ )
{
    glVertex3f( Array[i].x, Array[i].y, Array[i].z );
}
glEnd( );
```

A Good Use for Structure-of-Arrays:

```c
float X[N], Y[N], Z[N];
float Dx[N], Dy[N], Dz[N];
```

```c
Dx[0:N] = X[0:N] - Xnow;
Dy[0:N] = Y[0:N] - Ynow;
Dz[0:N] = Z[0:N] - Znow;
```

Good Object-Oriented Programming Style can sometimes be Inconsistent with Good Cache Use:

```c
class xyz
{
    public:
    float x, y, z;
xp = *next;
};
static xyz *Head = NULL;
xyz::xyz( )
{
    xyz * n = new xyz;
n->next = Head;
    Head = n;
}
```

This is good OO style – it encapsulates and isolates the data for this class. Once you have created a linked list whose elements are all over memory, is it the best use of the cache?

But, Here Is a Compromise:

It might be better to create a large array of xyz structures and then have the constructor method pull new ones from that list. That would keep many of the elements close together while preserving the flexibility of the linked list. When you need more, allocate another large array and link to it.

Why Can We Get This Kind of Performance Decrease as Data Sets Get Larger?

![Graph showing performance decrease with data set size]

We are violating Temporal Coherence

We Can Help the Temporal Problem with Pre-Fetching

![Graph showing improved performance with pre-fetching]

We will cover this in further detail when we discuss SIMD
An Example of Where Cache Coherence Really Matters: Matrix Multiply

The usual approach is multiplying the entire A row * entire B column
This is equivalent to computing a single dot product

Matrix Multiply

Row i of A  \*  Column j of B  \rightarrow  Element (i,j) of C

\[ \sum_{k=0}^{\text{SIZE}} A[i][k] \times B[k][j] \rightarrow C[i][j] \]

\[ \text{for( } k = 0; k < \text{SIZE}; k++ ) \]
\[ \text{for( } j = 0; j < \text{SIZE}; j++ ) \]
\[ \text{for( } i = 0; i < \text{SIZE}; i++ ) \]

Problem: Column j of the B matrix is not doing a unit stride

Scalable Universal Matrix Multiply Algorithm (SUMMA)

Entire A row * one element of B row
Equivalent to computing one item in many separate dot products

SUMMA

Row i of A  \*  Row k of B  \rightarrow  Element (i,j) of C

\[ A[i][k] \times B[k][j] \rightarrow C[i][j] \]

\[ \text{for( } k = 0; k < \text{SIZE}; k++ ) \]
\[ \text{for( } j = 0; j < \text{SIZE}; j++ ) \]

Cache Architectures

N-way Set Associative – a cache line from a particular block of memory can appear in a limited number of places in cache. Each "limited place" is called a set of cache lines. A set contains \( N \) cache lines.

The memory block can appear in any cache line in its set.

Most Caches today are N-way Set Associative
\( N \) is typically 4 for L1 and 8 or 16 for L2

Cache line blocks in memory (the numbers) and what cache line set they map to (the colors)

This would be called "3-way"
A Specific Example with Numbers

Memory address = 1234 bytes
Cache Line Block in Memory = 1234 / 64 = 19
Cache Set # = 19 % 4 = 3
Offset in the Cache Line = 1234 – 19*64 = 18

It lives in one of these 2 locations in cache

How Different Cores’ Cache Lines Keep Track of Each Other

Each core has its own separate L2 cache, but a write by one can impact the state of the others.

For example, if one core writes a value into one of its own cache lines, any other core using a copy of that same cache line can no longer count on its values being up-to-date. In order to regain that confidence, the core that wrote must flush that cache line back to memory and the other core must then reload its copy of that cache line.

To maintain this organization, each core’s L2 cache has 4 states (MESI):

1. Modified
2. Exclusive
3. Shared
4. Invalid

A Simplified View of How MESI Works

1. Core A reads a value. Those values are brought into its cache. That cache line is now tagged Exclusive.
2. Core B reads a value from the same area of memory. Those values are brought into its cache, and now both cache lines are re-tagged Shared.
3. If Core B writes into that value. Its cache line is re-tagged Modified and Core A’s cache line is re-tagged Invalid.
4. Core A tries to read a value from that same part of memory. But its cache line is tagged Invalid. So, Core B’s cache line is flushed back to memory and then Core A’s cache line is re-loaded from memory. Both cache lines are now tagged Shared.

Note that False Sharing doesn’t create incorrect results – just a performance hit.

False Sharing – An Example Problem

struct s {
    float value;
    Array[4];
} Array[4];
omp_set_num_threads( 4 );
#pragma omp parallel for
for( int i = 0; i < 4; i++ ) {
    for( int j = 0; j < SomeBigNumber; j++ )
        Array[ i ].value  =  Array[ i ].value  + (float)rand( );
}

Some unpredictable function so the compiler doesn’t try to optimize the for-loop away.

False Sharing – Fix #1

#include <stdlib.h>

struct s {
    float value;
    int pad[NUMPAD];
    Array[4];
} Array[4];
omp_set_num_threads( 4 );
#pragma omp parallel for
for( int i = 0; i < 4; i++ ) {
    for( int j = 0; j < SomeBigNumber; j++ )
        Array[ i ].value = Array[ i ].value + (float)rand( );
}

This works because successive Array elements are forced onto different cache lines, so less (or no) cache line conflicts exist.
Why do these curves look this way?

False Sharing – the Effect of Spreading Your Data to Multiple Cache Lines
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False Sharing – Fix #1
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False Sharing – Fix #1

OK, wasting memory to put your data on different cache lines seems a little silly (even though it works). Can we do something else?

Remember our discussion in the OpenMP section about how stack space is allocated for different threads?

If we use local variables, instead of contiguous array locations, that will spread our writes out in memory, and to different cache lines.

```
#include <stdlib.h>
struct s {
  float value;
} Array[4];
omp_set_num_threads(4);
const int SomeBigNumber = 100000000;
#pragma omp parallel for
for (int i = 0; i < 4; i++) {
  float tmp = Array[i].value;
  for (int j = 0; j < SomeBigNumber; j++)
    tmp = tmp + (float)rand();
  Array[i].value = tmp;
}
```

This works because a localized temporary variable is created in each core’s stack area, so little or no cache line conflict exists.

False Sharing – Fix #2 vs. Fix #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fix #2 -- 4 Threads</th>
<th>Fix #2 -- 2 Threads</th>
<th>Fix #2 -- 1 Thread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of threads</td>
<td>NUMPAD = {0,7,15}</td>
<td>NUMPAD = {0,7,15}</td>
<td>NUMPAD = {0,7,15}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Fix #2 with (1, 2, 4) threads gives the same performance as NUMPAD = {0,7,15}.
malloc'ing on a cache line

What if you are malloc'ing, and want to be sure your data structure starts on a cache line?

Knowing that cache lines start on fixed 64-byte boundaries lets you do this. Consider a memory address. The top N-6 bits tell you what cache line number this address is a part of. The bottom 6 bits tell you what offset that address has within that cache line. So, for example, on a 32-bit memory system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cache line number</th>
<th>Offset in that cache line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 bits</td>
<td>32 - 6 = 26 bits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, if you see a memory address whose bottom 6 bits are 000000, then you know that memory location begins a cache line.

struct xyzw *p = (struct xyzw *) malloc( (ARRAYSIZE)*sizeof(struct xyzw) );
struct xyzw *Array = &p[0];

..  .
Array[ i ].x = 10. ;

If you wanted to make sure that array of structures started on a cache line boundary, you would do this:

unsigned char *p = (unsigned char *) malloc( 64 + (ARRAYSIZE)*sizeof(struct xyzw) );
int offset = (long int)p & 0x3f; // 0x3f = bottom 6 bits are all 1's
struct xyzw *Array = (struct xyzw *) &p[64-offset];

..  .
Array[ i ].x = 10. ;

Remember that when you want to free this malloc'ed space, be sure to say:
free( p );
not:
free( Array );

Now, Consider This Type of Computation

Should you allocate the data as one large global-memory block (i.e., shared)? Or, should you allocate it as separate blocks, each local to its own core (i.e., private)? Does it matter? Yes!

If you allocate the data as one large global-memory block, there is a risk that you will get False Sharing at the individual-block boundaries. Solution: make sure that each individual-block starts and ends on a cache boundary, even if you have to pad it. (Fix #1)

If you allocate the data as separate blocks, then you don't have to worry about False Sharing (Fix #2), but you do have to worry about the logic of your program remembering where to find each Node #i-1 and Node #i+1.