

Towards analysis of synchronization and parallelism in multi-threaded programs

> Nina Bohr John Gallagher Morten Rhiger Mads Rosendahl **Roskilde University**











Some inter-related questions relevant to resource analysis of multi-threaded code (1)

- What resources are used by each thread between communications?
- What statements in different threads <u>may</u> run in parallel with each other?
 - → equivalently which statements in different threads <u>definitely do not</u> run in parallel?



Some inter-related questions relevant to resource analysis of multi-threaded code (2)

- How (in)active is each thread? Are thread loads reasonably balanced?
- Are threads located on the appropriate cores?



Behaviour of a single thread



Overview of approach

- Construct an automaton for each thread
 - states are pieces of code that do not communicate
 - transitions are labelled with events
 - get, send, get+send, fork, join
- The automaton for a program is formed as a synchronised product of the automata for individual threads

- synchronous communication (XC)



Automaton for a thread



Notes on the automaton

- 1. Program statements can be in more than one state.
 - e.g. B_1 and B_2 overlap
- 2. There can be multiple paths through a state (possibly an infinite number)
 - e.g. B₃ can (1) re-enter inner for-loop, (2) re-enter outer for-loop, (3) exit both for-loops
- 3. Size of automaton is linear in code size.





Parallel threads



Product automaton



Formal definition of product

AB is reachable if AB is the initial state, or





if AB reachable, c is a shared channel, where



and vice versa



if AB reachable, c is not a shared channel, where

similarly for send(c), and symmetric cases



May-run-in-parallel analysis

- Pair-states that are reachable in the product contain code that <u>may</u> run in parallel
 - i.e. A_1B_1 , A_2B_2 and A_2B_3
 - pairs that do not occur <u>cannot</u> execute in parallel
- Analysing execution times of the elements of the pairs yields information on whether one thread may wait for the other.
 - could be WCET (if bounded) or parametric complexity analysis





Pipeline product





Pipeline sequence diagram





14 /23

Pipeline product states

- Reachable states (out of 12 possible)
 - $-A_1B_1C_1$ $-A_2B_2C_1$ $-A_2B_3C_2$ $-A_2B_2C_2$
- Timing analysis might show that A and C are hardly ever active simultaneously

 should be allocated on the same core?
 or A and C should run on slower cores?



Abstracting paths/states

- Let the variables of a state be X.
- The behaviour of each state S can be abstracted to a relation R_S(X,X')
 - -e.g. abstract interpretation of the code.
 - relation between the values of the variables before (X) and after (X') execution of the state.



Reachability relation

- State S' is reachable with state X' if
 - there is a transition from S to S', and
 - state S is reachable with state X, and
 - $-R_{S}(X,X')$ holds
- Representation as Horn clause

 $reach_{S'}(X') := reach_{S}(X), R_{S}(X,X').$



Horn clause abstraction of automaton



reach1(X) :- init(X).
reach2(X') : reach1(X), R₁(X,X').
reach2(X') : reach2(X), R₂(X,X').
reach2(X') : reach3(X), R₃(X,X').
reach3(X') : reach3(X), R₂(X,X').



18 /23

Horn clause abstraction of product



reach11(X,Y) := initA(X), initB(Y).

reach22(X',Y') : reach11(X,Y), R_{A1}(X,X'), R_{B1}(Y,Y').
reach22(X',Y') : reach22(X,Y), R_{A2}(X,X'), R_{B2}(Y,Y').
reach22(X',Y') : reach23(X,Y), R_{A2}(X,X'), R_{B3}(Y,Y').

reach23(X',Y') :reach22(X,Y), R_{A2}(X,X'), R_{B2}(Y,Y'). reach23(X',Y') :reach23(X,Y), R_{A2}(X,X'), R_{B3}(Y,Y').



Implicit representation of product

- The product is represented implicitly
- The transition relation for each product state is not explicitly computed
 - this would be computationally expensive
- We thus have control over the tradeoff of precision and complexity
 - drawing on methods from Horn clause analysis and verification



Refinement of automaton

- Analysis of the product automaton Horn clauses yields approximation of the values in which each product state is reachable
- This can give more precise analysis of mayrun-in-parallel
- Let Φ_{AB} be an approximation of the state in which product state AB is reachable.
 - Apply forward slicing using Φ_{AB} to states A and B
 - eliminate infeasible path combinations that cannot run in parallel



How far have we got?

Construction of thread automata Prototype shown in Madrid November 2014. current work – extension of the language and semantics v now have AST from the real XC parser (thanks Jamie) construction of product automata Analysis and refinement of state relations $R_{s}(X,X')$ ✓ tools for Horn clause abstract interpretation ✓ tools for slicing Horn clauses Complexity analysis of states integration with CiaoPP resource analysis (and WCET?)

other recent techniques for cost analysis (CAV'2014)



Future

- Integration with timing analysis?
- Estimation of throughput, frequency of communication, idle time, etc.
- Handling master-slave and stream communication in XC.
- Energy analysis of whole program
 single-threaded energy analysis of thread automaton states
 - uses estimates of number of active threads as needed by the Bristol energy model

