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History
• First Java implementations: interpreters
  – compact and portable but slow
• Second Generation: JITs
  – still too slow
  – long startup pauses (compilation)
• Third Generation: Beyond JITs
  – improve both compile & execution time

“HotSpot” Project Goals
Build world’s fastest Java system:
• novel compilation techniques
• high-performance garbage collection
• fast synchronization
• tunable for different environments
  (e.g., low-memory)

Overview
• Why Java is different
• Why Just-In-Time is too early
• How HotSpot works
• Performance evaluation
• Outlook: The future of Java performance

Why Java Is Different
• more frequent calls, smaller methods
  – slower calls (dynamic dispatch overhead)
  – no static call graph
  – standard compiler analysis fails
• sophisticated run-time system
  – allocation, garbage collection
  – threads, synchronization
• distributed in portable bytecode format

Example: javac

Synchronization
Allocation/GC
Native Methods
Byte codes
(execute with JDK interpreter)
Just-In-Time Compilers

- translate portable bytecodes to machine code
- happens at runtime (on the fly)
- standard JITs: compile on method-by-method basis when method is first invoked
- proven technology (used 10 years ago in commercial Smalltalk systems)

Why Just-In-Time Is Too Early

- problem: JITs consume execution time
- dilemma: either good code or fast compiler
  - gains of better optimizer may not justify extra compile time
- root of problem: compilation is too eager
  - need to balance compile & execution time

Solution: HotSpot Compilation

- lazy compilation: only compile/optimize the parts that matter
- combine compiler with interpreter
- seamlessly transition between interpreted and compiled code as necessary

HotSpot Architecture

- fast interpreter
- compiler
- bytecdoded methods
- compiled methods
- dynamic profiler / recompiler

HotSpot Advantages

- shorter compile time
- smaller code space
- better code quality
  - can exploit dynamic run-time information
- more flexibility (speed/space tradeoffs)

HotSpot Optimizing Compiler

- supports full Java language
  - all checks and exceptions, correct FP precision, dynamic loading, ...
- profile-driven inlining
- dispatch elimination
- many dynamic optimizations
- based on 10 years of research (Sun, Stanford, UCSB)
Garbage Collector

- accurate garbage collector
- fast allocation
- scalable to large heaps
  - generational GC
- incremental collection
  - typical GC pauses are less than 10 ms

Fast Synchronization

- software only
- extremely fast
  - up to 50x faster than others
- virtually no per-object space overhead
  - only 2 bits per object
- supports native threads, SMP

Performance Evaluation

- no microbenchmarks
  - but: limited set of benchmarks because HotSpot VM needs modified JDK
- all times are elapsed times
  - 200MHz Pentium Pro™ PC
  - warm file cache, best of three runs
- preliminary data / prerelease software

JVM Implementations

Systems measured:
- Pre-release “HotSpot” with next JDK
- Microsoft SDK 2.0 beta 2 (with MS JDK 1.1)
- Symantec 1.5.3 JIT (JDK 1.1)

Caveats

- pre-release compiler & VM
  - functionally correct but untuned
  - but: implements full Java, no shortcuts for performance
- pre-release JDK libraries
  - VM needs new JDK
- other systems use different libraries
  - some are tuned; no JNI

Performance
Execution Profile (javacup)

- compilation
- class loading
- runtime system / native code
- compiled code
- interpreted code
- GC

CaffeineMarks: Just Say No

- Small, artificial, C-like microbenchmarks
- No correlation to real Java programs
  - No calls, no dispatch, no allocation, no synchronization, no runtime system calls, ...
- Easy target for compiler tricks
- Prediction: we’ll soon see “infinite” CaffeineMarks

Hardware Wish List (Preliminary)

- Standard RISC is just fine, thanks
  - Don’t penalize C code? (runtime system)
- Large caches (esp. I-cache)
  - #1 performance booster
- Reasonably cheap and selective I-cache flushing
- Maybe some others (1-2% each)
- Interpreters could use more support

Future of Java Performance

- Performance will continue to improve
  - Max. “typical” overhead 10-20% over C/C++
  - Object-oriented Java programs will be faster than C++ equivalents
- JITs will be competitive with static compilers for most non-numerical apps
- Next challenge: high-end SMP performance

Conclusions

- Java performance has improved dramatically in the past two years and will continue to improve further
- Even performance-sensitive applications can use Java today
- Java does not need heavy architectural support to run efficiently
  - Except in low-power, low-memory systems
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