


Why Events Are A Bad Idea (for high-concurrency servers)

Rob von Behren, Jeremy Condit and Eric Brewer
University of California at Berkeley
{jrvb,jcondit,brewer}@cs.berkeley.edu
<http://capriccio.cs.berkeley.edu>

A Talk HotOS 2003


The Stage

- Highly concurrent applications
 - Internet servers (Flash, Ninja, SEDA)
 - Transaction processing databases
- Workload
 - Operate "near the knee"
 - Avoid thrashing!
- What makes concurrency hard?
 - Race conditions
 - Scalability (no $O(n)$ operations)
 - Scheduling & resource sensitivity
 - Inevitable overload
 - Code complexity



The Debate

- Performance vs. Programmability
 - Current threads pick one
 - Events somewhat better
- Questions
 - Threads vs. Events?
 - How do we performance and programmability?



Our Position


- Thread-event duality still holds
- But threads are better anyway
 - More natural to program
 - Better fit with tools and hardware
- Compiler-runtime integration is key

The Duality Argument

- General assumption: follow "good practices"
- Observations
 - Major concepts are analogous
 - Program structure is similar
 - Performance should be similar
 - Given good implementations!

Threads	Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitors Exported functions Call/return and fork/join Wait on condition variable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Event handler & queue Events accepted Send message / await reply Wait for new messages

Web Server




The Duality Argument

- General assumption: follow "good practices"
- Observations
 - Major concepts are analogous
 - Program structure is similar
 - Performance should be similar
 - Given good implementations!

Threads	Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitors Exported functions Call/return and fork/join Wait on condition variable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Event handler & queue Events accepted Send message / await reply Wait for new messages

Web Server




The Duality Argument

- General assumption: follow "good practices"
- Observations
 - Major concepts are analogous
 - Program structure is similar
 - Performance should be similar
 - Given good implementations!


Threads	Events
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitors Exported functions Call/return and fork/join Wait on condition variable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Event handler & queue Events accepted Send message / await reply Wait for new messages

Web Server




"But Events Are Better!"

- Recent arguments for events
 - Lower runtime overhead
 - Better live state management
 - Inexpensive synchronization
 - More flexible control flow
 - Better scheduling and locality
- All true but...
 - No *inherent* problem with threads!
 - Thread implementations can be improved




Runtime Overhead

- Criticism: Threads don't perform well for high concurrency*
- Response
 - Avoid $O(n)$ operations
 - Minimize context switch overhead
- Simple scalability test
 - Slightly modified GNU Pth
 - Thread-per-task vs. single thread
 - Same performance!



Live State Management

- Criticism: Stacks are bad for live state*
- Response
 - Fix with compiler help
 - Stack overflow vs. wasted space
 - Dynamically link stack frames
 - Retain dead state
 - Static lifetime analysis
 - Plan arrangement of stack
 - Put some data on heap
 - Pop stack before tail calls
 - Encourage inefficiency
 - Warn about inefficiency




Synchronization

- Criticism: Thread synchronization is heavyweight*
- Response
 - Cooperative multitasking works for threads, too!
 - Also presents same problems
 - Starvation & fairness
 - Multiprocessors
 - Unexpected blocking (page faults, etc.)
 - Compiler support helps

Control Flow

- Criticism: Threads have restricted control flow*
- Response
 - Programmers use simple patterns
 - Call / return
 - Parallel calls
 - Pipelines
 - Complicated patterns are unnatural
 - Hard to understand
 - Likely to cause bugs




Scheduling

- **Criticism: Thread schedulers are too generic**

- Can't use application-specific information

- **Response**

- 2D scheduling: task & program location
 - Threads schedule based on task only
 - Events schedule by location (e.g. SEDA)
 - Allows batching
 - Allows prediction for SRCT
- Threads can use 2D, too!
 - Runtime system tracks current location
 - Call graph allows prediction




Scheduling

- **Criticism: Thread schedulers are too generic**

- Can't use application-specific information

- **Response**

- 2D scheduling: task & program location
 - Threads schedule based on task only
 - Events schedule by location (e.g. SEDA)
 - Allows batching
 - Allows prediction for SRCT
- Threads can use 2D, too!
 - Runtime system tracks current location
 - Call graph allows prediction




Scheduling

- **Criticism: Thread schedulers are too generic**

- Can't use application-specific information

- **Response**

- 2D scheduling: task & program location
 - Threads schedule based on task only
 - Events schedule by location (e.g. SEDA)
 - Allows batching
 - Allows prediction for SRCT
- Threads can use 2D, too!
 - Runtime system tracks current location
 - Call graph allows prediction



The Proof's in the Pudding

- **User-level threads package**


- Subset of pthreads
- Intercept blocking system calls
- No $O(n)$ operations
- Support > 100K threads
- 5000 lines of C code

- **Simple web server: Knot**

- 700 lines of C code

- **Similar performance**

- Linear increase, then steady
- Drop-off due to `poll()` overhead



Our Big But...

- **More natural programming model**

- Control flow is more apparent
- Exception handling is easier
- State management is automatic

- **Better fit with current tools & hardware**

- Better existing infrastructure
- Allows better performance?


Control Flow

- **Events obscure control flow**

- For programmers *and* tools

Threads	Events
<pre> thread_main(int sock) { struct session s; accept_conn(sock, &s); read_request(&s); pin_cache(&s); write_response(&s); unpin(&s); } pin_cache(struct session *s) { pin(&s); if(!in_cache(&s)) read_file(&s); } </pre>	<pre> AcceptHandler(event e) { struct session *s = new_session(e); RequestHandler.enqueue(s); } RequestHandler(struct session *s) { ...; CacheHandler.enqueue(s); } CacheHandler(struct session *s) { pin(s); if(!in_cache(s)) ReadFileHandler.enqueue(s); else ResponseHandler.enqueue(s); ... } ExitHandler(struct session *s) { ...; unpin(&s); free_session(s); } </pre>

Web Server




Control Flow

- Events obscure control flow
 - For programmers *and* tools

Threads	Events
<pre> thread_main(int sock) { struct session s; accept_conn(sock, &s); read_request(&s); pin_cache(&s); write_response(&s); unpin(&s); } pin_cache(struct session *s) { pin(&s); if (!in_cache(&s)) read_file(&s); } </pre>	<pre> CacheHandler(struct session *s) { pin(s); if (!in_cache(s)) ReadFileHandler.enqueue(s); else ResponseHandler.enqueue(s); } RequestHandler(struct session *s) { ...; CacheHandler.enqueue(s); } ... ExitHandler(struct session *s) { ...; unpin(&s); free_session(s); } AcceptHandler(event e) { struct session *s = new_session(e); RequestHandler.enqueue(s); } </pre>

Web Server




Exceptions

- Exceptions complicate control flow
 - Harder to understand program flow
 - Cause bugs in cleanup code

Threads	Events
<pre> thread_main(int sock) { struct session s; accept_conn(sock, &s); if (!read_request(&s)) return; pin_cache(&s); write_response(&s); unpin(&s); } pin_cache(struct session *s) { pin(&s); if (!in_cache(&s)) read_file(&s); } </pre>	<pre> CacheHandler(struct session *s) { pin(s); if (!in_cache(s)) ReadFileHandler.enqueue(s); else ResponseHandler.enqueue(s); } RequestHandler(struct session *s) { ...; if (error) return; CacheHandler.enqueue(s); } ... ExitHandler(struct session *s) { ...; unpin(&s); free_session(s); } AcceptHandler(event e) { struct session *s = new_session(e); RequestHandler.enqueue(s); } </pre>

Web Server




State Management

- Events require manual state management
- Hard to know when to free
 - Use GC or risk bugs

Threads	Events
<pre> thread_main(int sock) { struct session s; accept_conn(sock, &s); if (!read_request(&s)) return; pin_cache(&s); write_response(&s); unpin(&s); } pin_cache(struct session *s) { pin(&s); if (!in_cache(&s)) read_file(&s); } </pre>	<pre> CacheHandler(struct session *s) { pin(s); if (!in_cache(s)) ReadFileHandler.enqueue(s); else ResponseHandler.enqueue(s); } RequestHandler(struct session *s) { ...; if (error) return; CacheHandler.enqueue(s); } ... ExitHandler(struct session *s) { ...; unpin(&s); free_session(s); } AcceptHandler(event e) { struct session *s = new_session(e); RequestHandler.enqueue(s); } </pre>

Web Server



Existing Infrastructure

- Lots of infrastructure for threads
 - Debuggers
 - Languages & compilers
- Consequences
 - More amenable to analysis
 - Less effort to get working systems

Better Performance?

- Function pointers & dynamic dispatch
 - Limit compiler optimizations
 - Hurt branch prediction & I-cache locality
- More context switches with events?
 - Example: Haboob does 6x more than Knot
 - Natural result of queues
- More investigation needed!

The Future: Compiler-Runtime Integration

- Insight
 - Automate things event programmers do by hand
 - Additional analysis for other things
- Specific targets
 - Dynamic stack growth*
 - Live state management
 - Synchronization
 - Scheduling*
- Improve performance *and* decrease complexity

* Working prototype in threads package

Conclusion

- Threads \approx Events
 - Performance
 - Expressiveness
- Threads $>$ Events
 - Complexity / Manageability
- Performance *and* Ease of use?
 - Compiler-runtime integration is key

