# Fighting Acts build bloatHadrien Grasland2020-07-20

# We have a build problem

- Like all « modern C++ » projects, Acts builds slowly
  - On 2020-05-20, a full build\* took 1h30 of seq. CPU time
  - Some tests take *minutes* to build  $\rightarrow$  bad for dev. iterations
- More importantly, however, the build uses a lot of RAM
  - On 2020-05-20, the record was CKF tests @ 7,4 GB RSS
  - Ergo, can't use all cores on a typical dev machine
- Some work was done in the past, but more is needed

## Setting a goal

- « Acts should build with all cores on Moritz' laptop »
  - 4 threads, 8 GB of RAM, assume 1-2GB used by system
  - Actually a fairly typical mid-end development machine
  - By that metric, Acts should stay below **1.5 GB/process**

# **Identifying the culprits**

- Offenders are easy to spot with a system monitor\*
  - ...but good to cross-check with GNU time for extra precision
  - Error on the peak with ~2s polling can be 200-300 MB
- On 2020-05-20, those processes were >4GB :
  - CKF tests (7.4 G) FitAlgFitFunc (6.4 G)
  - TrkFdAlgTrkFdFunc (6.9 G)
    AMVFinder tests (4.1 G)
  - KF tests (6.8 G)

- GainMatrixUpd tests (4.1 G)

# Telling what's going on

- Compiler profiling is sadly a bit of a pain
  - Most give you a per-pass breakdown, which is useless
  - External profilers like perf won't help you either
    - Require debug symbols, compiler impl knowledge
    - No tracing information about method parameters
  - Templight requires a custom clang build + is hard to use
  - Thankfully, clang 9+ has -ftime-trace...

### -ftime-trace

- Clang 9+ feature contributed by a Unity3D developer\*
- Gives fine-grained, hierarchical compiler time profiles
  - Source pass (#include other preprocessor) :
    - Which top level headers take a lot of time to process
    - Why they do so (transistive inclusion, eager templates...)
  - PerformPendingTemplateInstantiations pass :
    - Which **templates** take a lot of time to instantiate
    - Which other templates they transitively instantiate

# Wait... time profiles ?

- Unfortunately, nothing like -ftime-trace for memory usage
  - So, must make do with what we have...
- **Assumption :** Using a lot of RAM <=> Taking a lot of time
  - => : Reasonable expectation, data takes time to process
  - <= : Less obvious (think alloc/free cycle), turned out to hold
- Assumption : GCC and clang have similar perf characteristics
  - Again, not obvious but turned out to hold well enough

# **Using -ftime-trace**

- Get the command line used to build the .cpp file
  - Simple way\* : touch cpp file and re-run « make »
- Adjust it
  - « g++ »  $\rightarrow$  « clang++ »
  - « -std=gnu++17 »  $\rightarrow$  « -std=c++17 »
  - Add -ftime-trace flag
- Run it  $\rightarrow$  A JSON file is produced next to the .o file
- Open Chrom(e|ium)\*\*, go to « chrome://tracing », feed it the file

\* Clever way : Have CMake generate a « compilation database » and parse it
 \*\* Could use SpeedScope before, but unfortunately they improved input sanitization...

#### Demo : CKF test build analysis

# (End of may) Conclusions

- Two major contributors to CKF tests build time :
  - Huge std::variant from Acts' Measurement mechanism
  - Lots and lots and lots of **Eigen templates**
- Decided to focus on reducing Eigen bloat because...
  - It was the biggest contributor
  - I have an old axe to grind with that lib anyway

## **Eigen characteristics**

- The good : First-class support for **small matrices** 
  - No heap allocation when size is statically known
  - Methods can be inlined (though codegen isn't great\*)
- The bad : Some features have a large **complexity cost** 
  - Expression templates
  - CRTP-style inheritance
  - Block<MatrixType>

- Dynamic-sized matrices
- Row-major support

\* An intern of ours once wrote a small prototype library which is multiple times faster than Eigen at low-dimensional matrix multiplication and inversion to back up this claim

# A bothersome feature

- Expression templates are a special kind of evil
  - « a\*b + c » isn't just « a\*b » and « a+b »
    - Type is like Sum<Product<M1, M2>, M3>
    - Construct Matrix from this  $\rightarrow$  Expression is evaluated
  - Consequences :
    - Combinatorial explosion of types/constructors
    - Lifetime issues (who got bitten by « auto » in Eigen?)
    - **Bad compiler optimization** (CSE takes a hit)
    - Incomprehensible execution profiles
    - All to avoid temporaries... that compiler optimize out !

# **Blocking the bother**

- I tried to inhibit expression templates by...
  - Building wrappers for Eigen types
  - Replicating most of the Eigen API on the wrappers...
  - ...but returning matrices from operators, not expressions
- Took me about a month of work
  - Net result : -0.3 GB to -1.0 GB per compilation unit :-(
  - Not awful, but not worth adding 6 kLoC to Acts yet...

## Meanwhile, on master...

- At end of June, I rebased the finished wrapper on master...
- ...whose build profile had changed a lot wrt late May !
  - CKF tests : 5.9 G (-1.5)
  - EvDatView test : 5.7 G (NEW)
  - KF test : 5.7 G (-1.1)

- FitAlgFitFunc : 4.8 G (-1.6)
- GainMatUp test : 3.4 G (-0.7)
- AMVFinder test : 3.3 G (-0.8)
- TrkFdAlgTrkFdFunc : 5.6 G (-1.3)
- Exact origin unknown, bisecting would be too expensive...
  - But good surprise was welcome, and motivating !

# Finding more fat

- Without expression templates, the **build profile is clearer** 
  - Complex ops (e.g. matrix inversion, geometry, Cholesky...)
    obviously not helped by wrapping
  - But still surprisingly high contribution of add, mul, etc.
  - Cause turned out to be large-scale use of Block and Map
    - ...which are actually Block<Matrix> and Map<Matrix>
    - ...which, combined with CRTP, re-instantiates all the code
    - So I tried to switch to an extractBlock/setBlock design

#### ...and even more

- Per se, changing block API was not enough
  - Still needed many Matrix constructor instances (1/block)
  - So I accepted the necessity of rewriting the impl too...
  - ...and similarly rewrote the impl of every other simple matrix operation with a big impact on KF test build profile
- Having to go there was unfortunate, but effective :
  - CKF tests : 4.3 G (-1.6)
  - FitAlgFitFunc : 3.9 G (-0.9)
  - TFAlgTFFunc : 3.7 G (-1.9)

- EvDatView test : 3.7 G (-2.0)
- KF test : 3.4 G (-2.3)
- Everyone else <3 GB

### **Current status**

- Can likely gain even more by **replacing more** Eigen impls
  - Geometry, matrix inversion, and Cholesky are quite bad
  - ...but more work to rewrite than addition/multiplication
- Can that alone take us down to <1.5 G ? Not sure...
  - I suspect Measurement variant will need some love too
- Also, will need **better impls** to beat Eigen at runtime
  - Tried auto-vectorizable loops... but that didn't work out
  - I don't expect SIMD impls to cost more... but must prove it



- We still have a build problem (but it got better in June)
- Eigen is a very significant part of it
  - Though Measurement variant should be investigated too
- We can go far with a piecewise rewrite of Eigen...
  - ...but I still need to prove that at equivalent runtime perf
  - Also, the new impls are really specialized for Acts' needs
    - Can't contribute them to Eigen, room for a simpler BLAS

### Thanks for your attention !