SPEED LIMIT				
	<b>PER ORDE</b>		172	

6.172 Performance Engineering of Software Systems

### LECTURE 10 Dynamic Storage Allocation

Charles E. Leiserson

October 12, 2010

## **Stack Allocation**



## **Stack Allocation**

### Array and pointer



Allocate **x** bytes

Should check for stack overflow.

## **Stack Deallocation**



## **Stack Deallocation**



# **Stack Storage**



- Allocating and freeing take  $\Theta(1)$  time.
- Must free consistent with stack discipline.
- Limited applicability, but great when it works!
- One can allocate on the call stack using alloca(), but this function is deprecated, and the compiler is more efficient with fixed-size frames.

# **Heap Allocation**

- C provides malloc() and free().
- C++ provides new and delete.

Unlike Java and Python, C and C++ provide no *garbage collector*. Heap storage allocated by the programmer must be freed explicitly. Failure to do so creates a *memory leak*. Also, watch for *dangling pointers* and *double freeing*.

*Memory checkers* can assist in finding these pernicious bugs:

% valgrind --leakcheck=yes ./myprog (*arguments*)

Valgrind is installed on cloud machines. See http://valgrind.org for details.





Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x;



#### Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x;



Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x;

Should check free != NULL.







Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x;



Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x; free object **x** 



Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x; free object **x** 



Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x; free object **x** 



Allocate 1 object

x = free; free = free->next; return x; free object **x** 

## **Free Lists**



- Allocating and freeing take  $\Theta(1)$  time.
- Good temporal locality.
- Poor spatial locality due to *external fragmentation* 
   blocks distributed across virtual memory —
   which can increase the size of the page table and cause disk thrashing.
- The *translation lookaside buffer (TLB)* can also be a problem.

# **Mitigating External Fragmentation**

- Keep a free list per disk page.
- Allocate from the free list for the fullest page.
- Free a block of storage to the free list for the page on which the block resides.
- If a page becomes empty (only free-list items), the virtual-memory system can page it out without affecting program performance.
- 90-10 is better than 50-50:



Probability that 2 random accesses hit the same page  $= .9 \times .9 + .1 \times .1 = .82$  versus  $.5 \times .5 + .5 \times .5 = .5$ 

# Variable-Sized Allocation

### **Binned free lists**

- Leverage the efficiency of free lists.
- Accept some internal fragmentation.



- If bin  $\mathbf{k} = \lceil \lg \mathbf{x} \rceil$  is nonempty, return a block.
- Otherwise, find a block in the next larger nonempty bin k' > k, split it up into blocks of sizes 2<sup>k'-1</sup>, 2<sup>k'-2</sup>, ... 2<sup>k</sup>, 2<sup>k</sup>, and distribute the pieces.



- If bin  $\mathbf{k} = \lceil \lg \mathbf{x} \rceil$  is nonempty, return a block.
- Otherwise, find a block in the next larger nonempty bin k' > k, split it up into blocks of sizes 2<sup>k'-1</sup>, 2<sup>k'-2</sup>, ... 2<sup>k</sup>, 2<sup>k</sup>, and distribute the pieces.



- If bin  $\mathbf{k} = \lceil \lg \mathbf{x} \rceil$  is nonempty, return a block.
- Otherwise, find a block in the next larger nonempty bin k' > k, split it up into blocks of sizes 2<sup>k'-1</sup>, 2<sup>k'-2</sup>, ... 2<sup>k</sup>, 2<sup>k</sup>, and distribute the pieces.



- If bin  $\mathbf{k} = \lceil \lg \mathbf{x} \rceil$  is nonempty, return a block.
- Otherwise, find a block in the next larger nonempty bin k' > k, split it up into blocks of sizes 2<sup>k'-1</sup>, 2<sup>k'-2</sup>, ... 2<sup>k</sup>, 2<sup>k</sup>, and distribute the pieces.\*



## **Storage Layout of a Program**



© 2010 Charles E. Leiserson

# **How Virtual is Virtual Memory?**

- Q. Since a 64-bit address space takes over a century to write at a rate of 4 billion bytes per second, we effectively never run out of virtual memory. Why not just allocate out of virtual memory and never free?
- A. *External fragmentation* would be horrendous! The performance of the page table would degrade tremendously leading to *disk thrashing*, since all nonzero memory must be backed up on disk in page-sized blocks.

### **Goal of storage allocators**

Use as little virtual memory as possible, and try to keep the used portions relatively compact.

# **Analysis of Binned Free Lists**

Theorem. Suppose that the maximum amount of heap memory in use at any time by a program is M. If the heap is managed by a BFL allocator, the amount of virtual memory consumed by heap storage is O(MIg M).

*Proof.* An allocation request for a block of size x consumes  $2^{\lceil lg \times \rceil} \le 2x$  storage. Thus, the amount of virtual memory devoted to blocks of size  $2^k$  is at most 2M. Since there are at most lg M free lists, the theorem holds. ■

⇒ In fact, BFL is  $\Theta(1)$ -competitive with the optimal allocator (assuming no coalescing).

# Coalescing

Binned free lists can sometimes be heuristically improved by splicing together adjacent small blocks into a larger block.

- Clever schemes exist for finding adjacent blocks efficiently, e.g., the "buddy" system, but the overhead is still greater than simple BFL.
- No good theoretical bounds exist that prove the effectiveness of coalescing.
- Coalescing seems to work in practice, because storage tends to be deallocated as a stack (LIFO) or in batches.

# **Garbage Collectors**

### Idea

- Free the programmer from freeing objects.
- A garbage collector identifies and recycles the objects that the program can no longer access.
- GC can be built-in (Java, Python) or do-it-yourself.



# **Garbage Collection**

#### Terminology

*Roots* are objects directly accessible by the program (globals, stack, etc.). *Live* objects are reachable from the roots by following pointers.

*Dead* objects are inaccessible and can be recycled.

### How can the GC identify pointers in objects?

- Strong typing.
- Prohibit pointer arithmetic (which may slow down some programs).












#### Problem

A cycle is never garbage collected!



#### Problem

A cycle is never garbage collected!



#### Problem

A cycle is never garbage collected!



#### Problem

A cycle is never garbage collected!



works well for acyclic structures.

## **Graph Abstraction**

#### Idea

Objects and pointers form a directed graph G = (V, E). Live objects are reachable from the roots. Use breadth-first search to find the live objects.



```
for (\forall v \in V) {
  if (root(v)) {
     v.mark = 1;
     enqueue(Q, v);
  } else v.mark = 0;
while (Q != \emptyset) {
  u = dequeue(Q);
  for (\forall v \in V \text{ such that } (u, v) \in E) {
     if (v.mark == 0) {
       v.mark = 1;
       enqueue(Q, v);
} } }
```









tail

head





























tail

head









tail

head





#### **Observation** All live vertices are placed in contiguous storage in **Q**.















When the FROM space is full, copy live storage using BFS with the TO space as the FIFO queue.



When the FROM space is full, copy live storage using BFS with the TO space as the FIFO queue.



# **Updating Pointers**

Since the FROM address of an object is not generally equal to the TO address of the object, pointers must be updated.

- When an object is copied to the TO space, store a forwarding pointer in the FROM object, which implicitly marks it as moved.
- When an object is removed from the FIFO queue in the TO space, update all its pointers.



#### Remove an item from the queue.



#### Remove an item from the queue.



Enqueue adjacent vertices.



Enqueue adjacent vertices. Place forwarding pointers in FROM vertices.



Update the pointers in the removed item to refer to its adjacent items in the TO space.
## Example



Update the pointers in the removed item to refer to its adjacent items in the TO space.

## Example



Linear time to copy and update all vertices.

## **Managing Virtual Memory**

FROM TO used

After copying, the old TO becomes the new FROM. Allocate new heap space equal to the used space in the new FROM.

FROM heap

When space runs out, the new TO is allocated with the same size as FROM. Allocate TO at start if it fits. Otherwise, allocate TO after FROM.



**Theorem.** VM space used is  $\Theta(1)$  times optimal.

## **Dynamic Storage Allocation**

Lots more is known and unknown about dynamic storage allocation. Strategies include

- buddy system,
- mark-and-sweep garbage collection,
- generational garbage collection,
- real-time garbage collection,
- multithreaded storage allocation,
- parallel garbage collection,
- etc.

6.172 Performance Engineering of Software Systems Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.