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Abstract

Work stealing is a promising approach to constructing multi-threaded program runtimes of parallel programming languages. This paper presents HERMES, an energy-efficient work-stealing language runtime. The key insight is that threads in a work-stealing environment – thieves and victims – have varying impacts on the overall program running time, and a coordination of their execution “tempo” can lead to energy efficiency with minimal performance loss. The centerpiece of HERMES is two complementary algorithms to coordinate thread tempo: the workpath-sensitive algorithm determines tempo for each thread based on thief-victim relationships on the execution path, whereas the workload-sensitive algorithm selects appropriate tempo based on the size of work-stealing deques. We construct HERMES on top of Intel Cilk Plus’s runtime, and implement tempo adjustment through standard Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS). Benchmarks running on HERMES demonstrate an average of 11-12% energy savings with an average of 3-4% performance loss through meter-based measurements over commercial CPUs.
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D.3.4 [Programming Languages]: processors—Run-Time Environments; D.3.3 [Programming Languages]: Language Constructs and Features
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1. Introduction

Work stealing is a thread management strategy effective for maintaining multi-threaded language runtimes, with parallel architectures as specific target and with a primary goal of load balancing. In the multi-core era, work stealing received considerable interest in language runtime design. With its root in Cilk [6, 16], work stealing is widely available in industry-strength C/C++/C#-based language frameworks such as Intel TBB [20], Intel Cilk Plus [21], and Microsoft .NET framework [25]. The core idea of work stealing has also made its way into mainstream languages such as Java [24], X10 [10, 23, 30], Haskell [28], and Scala [32]. There is an active interest in research improving its performance-critical properties, such as adaptiveness [2, 18], scalability [13], and fairness [14].

In comparison, energy efficiency in work-stealing systems has received little attention. At a time where power-hungry data centers and cloud computing servers are the norm of computing infrastructure, energy efficiency is a first-class design goal with direct consequences on operational cost, reliability, usability, maintainability, and environmental sustainability. The lack of energy-efficient solutions for work-stealing systems is particularly unfortunate, because the platforms on which work stealing is most promising to make impact – systems with a large number of parallel units – happen to be large power consumers and require more sophisticated techniques to achieve energy efficiency [8, 12, 17, 22, 27, 33, 38].

HERMES is a first step toward energy efficiency for work-stealing runtimes. Program execution under HERMES is tempo-enabled\(^1\): different threads may execute at different speeds (tempo), achieved by adjusting the frequencies of host CPU cores through standard DVFS. The effect of DVFS on energy management is widely known. The real challenge lies upon balancing the trade-off between energy and performance, as lower frequencies may also slow down program execution. The primary design goal of HERMES is to tap inherent and unique features of the work-stealing runtime to help make judicious DVFS decisions, ultimately maximizing energy savings while minimizing performance loss. Specifically, HERMES is endowed with two algorithms:

\(^1\)The term is inspired by music composition, where each movement of a musical piece is often marked with a different tempo – e.g., allegro (“fast”) and lento (“slow”) – to indicate the speed of execution.
• workpath-sensitive tempo control: thread tempo is set based on control flow, with threads tackling “immediate work” \[7\] executing at a faster tempo. This design approach corresponds to a key design principle in work-stealing algorithms: the work-first principle.

• workload-sensitive tempo control: thread tempo is set based on the number of work items a thread needs to tackle, as indicated by the size of the deque in work-stealing runtimes. Threads with a longer deque execute at a faster tempo.

HERMES unifies the two tempo control strategies in one. Our experiments show that the two strategies are highly complementary. For instance, on a 32-core machine, each strategy can contribute to 6% and 7% energy savings respectively, whereas the unified algorithm can yield 11% energy savings. In the same setting, each strategy incurs 6% and 5% performance loss respectively, whereas the unified algorithm incurs 3% loss.

This paper makes the following contributions:

1. The first framework, to the best of our knowledge, addressing energy efficiency in work-stealing systems. The framework achieves energy efficiency through thread tempo control.

2. Two novel, complementary tempo control strategies: one workpath-sensitive and one workload-sensitive.

3. A prototyped implementation and experimental evaluation demonstrating an average of 11-12% energy savings with 3-4% performance loss over work-stealing benchmarks. The results are stable throughout comprehensive design space exploration.

2. Background: Work Stealing

Work stealing was originally developed in Cilk \[6, 16\], a C-like language designed for parallel programming. The main appeal of work stealing is its synergetic solution spanning the compute stack, bridging the gap between abstraction layers such as architectures, operating systems, compilers, program runtimes, and programming models.

Work stealing is a load balancing scheduler for multi-threaded programs over parallel architectures. The program runtime consists of multiple threads called workers, each executing on a host CPU core (or hardware parallel unit in general). Each worker maintains a queue-like data structure – called a double-ended queue or deque – each item of which is a task to be processed by the worker. When a worker finishes processing a task, it picks up next one from its deque and continues the execution of that task. When the deque is empty (we say the worker or its host core is idle), the worker steals a task from the deque of another worker. In this case we call the stealing worker a thief whereas the worker whose task was stolen a victim. The selection of victims follows the principles observed by load balancing and may vary in different implementations of work stealing.

What sets work stealing apart from standard load balancing techniques is how the runtime structure described above corresponds to program structures and compilation units. Each task on the deque is a block of executable code – or more strictly, a program counter pointing to the executable code – demarcated by the programmer and optimized by the compiler. In that sense, to have a worker “pick up a task” is indeed to have the worker continue its execution over the executable code embodied in the task. To describe the process in more detail, let us use the following Cilk example:

```cilk
L1 cilk int f()
L2 { int n1 = spawn f1();
L3 ... // other statements
L4 }
L5 cilk int f1() {
L6 int n2 = spawn f2();
L7 ... // other statements
L8 }
L9 cilk int f2() {
L10 ... // other statements
L11 }
```

Logically, each spawn can be viewed as a thread creation. On the implementation level however, a work-stealing runtime adopts Lazy Task Creation \[31\], where for each spawn, the executing worker simply puts a task onto its own deque, either to pick it up later or to be stolen by some other worker. This strategy aligns thread management with the underlying parallel architecture: a program that invokes f above 20 times but runs on a dual-core CPU can operate only with 2 threads (workers) instead of 40.

Work-First Principle The question here is what the item placed on the deque should embody. For instance, when L2 is executed, one tempting design would be to consider f1 as the task placed on the deque. The Cilk-like work-stealing algorithm takes the opposite approach: it places the continuation of the current spawn statement onto the deque. In the example above, it is the program counter pointing to L3. The current worker continues to invoke f1 as if spawn were elided.

This design reflects a fundamental principle well articulated in Cilk: the work-first principle. The principle concerns the relationship between the parallel execution of a program and its corresponding serial execution. (A logically equivalent view for the latter would be to have the parallel program execute on a single-core machine.) Let us revisit the example above. If it is executed on a single-core machine, f1 is the “immediate” work when L2 is reached, and hence carries more urgency. For that reason, f1 should be immediately executed by the current worker, whereas the continuation is not as urgent and is hence placed on the deque.

Work-first principle plays a pivotal role in the design of work-stealing systems. In Cilk, it further leads to a compila-
Deque Management  One natural consequence of placing continuations onto the deque is that the order of tasks on the deque reflects the immediacy of processing these items as defined by the work-first principle: the earlier the item is placed, the less immediate it is. For example, if the control flow of a worker reaches L10, two tasks are placed on the deque, the program counter for L3 (when the spawn in L2 is executed) and the program counter for L7 (when the spawn in L6 is executed). In a serial execution, L3 will only be encountered after L7.

With this observation, deque is designed as a data structure that can be manipulated on both ends. Let us call the head of the deque as the earliest item placed on the deque by the worker, whereas the tail of the deque as the latest. When a worker becomes idle, it always retrieves from the tail of its own deque, i.e., the most immediate task. On the other hand, when a thief attempts to steal from a worker, it always retrieves from the head of that worker’s deque, i.e., the least immediate task. From now on, we call the worker placing a task to its own deque a push, while removing a task from its own deque a pop. We continue to use term steal to refer to a worker removing a task from another worker’s deque.

Figure 1. Work Stealing: An Illustration

Figure 2. Work Stealing Algorithm
Figure 1 illustrates the time sequence of a typical program execution on a 4-core CPU (numbered as 1-4 at the bottom of each sub-figure). For each pair of adjacent figures, the elapsed time is one time unit. The rectangle below the dotted line is the currently executed task, and the rectangles above form the deque for the worker on that core, with the top rectangle representing the “head” task (H) and the bottom representing the “tail” task (T). The number inside the rectangle represents the number of time units needed to complete that task if the task were to run serially. In the first elapsed time unit – from Figure 1(a) to Figure 1(b) – core 2 spawns another task with 2 time units. Its continuation, with 12-1-4 = 7 time units left, is pushed onto the tail of its deque. In the same elapsed time, core 4 completes its executing task. Since its deque is empty, core 4 steals from the head of the deque of core 2, as shown in Figure 1(c). Another stealing happens in Figure 1(e), after core 3 becomes idle in Figure 1(d). In Figure 1(f), core 2 completes its current task, but since its deque is not empty, it pops a task from the tail of its deque.

**Work-Stealing Scheduler**  
Figure 2 provides a simplified specification of the classic work-stealing algorithm. The state of each worker thread is maintained by data structure Worker, which consists of a deque DQ and two indices for its head (H) and (T) respectively. As shown in Algorithm 2.1, a worker either attempts to POP a task from its deque – or if not available – SELECT a victim and STEAL a task from it. Once a task is obtained, the worker WORK’s on it, during which (we elide the WORK specification here) it may spawn new tasks and PUSH them onto its deque. If no task is available either through POP or STEAL, the worker thread YIELD’s its host core. We leave out the definition of SELECT: a typical implementation (such as Cilk) is a randomized algorithm.

The definitions of PUSH, POP, and STEAL are predictable. PUSH increments the tail index. POP decrements the tail index, and STEAL increments the head index. The scheduler maintains one invariant to check if the head index is less than or equal to the tail index. When head index and tail index are equal, possibility exists that a thief and a victim attempt to work on the same task. To resolve potential contention, LOCK and UNLOCK are introduced. The locking strategy adopted by most work-stealing runtimes are reminiscent of optimistic locking. This somewhat stylistic protocol is known as THE [16], orthogonal to the rest of the paper.

### 3. Energy-Efficient Work Stealing

In this section, we describe how HERMES improves energy efficiency of work-stealing runtimes. The overall technique of HERMES is DVFS-guided tempo control: different workers execute at different speeds – workers tackling more urgent tasks run at the faster tempos to retain high performance, whereas others run at the slower tempos to save energy. The main design challenges were the determination of the appropriate tempo for each worker thread and the timing for tempo adjustment. To achieve these goals, we developed two novel algorithms.

#### 3.1 Workpath-Sensitive Tempo Control

Our workpath-sensitive tempo control strategy is fundamentally aligned with the work-first principle of classic work-stealing algorithms: tasks encountered earlier – if the program were to be executed serially – carry more immediacy and will be executed at the faster tempos. Recall that in work-stealing systems, the order of tasks on the deque reflects the immediacy, with the head being the least immediate. Further, recall that a thief always steals from the head of a victim’s deque. Hence, every worker executing a stolen task carries less immediacy than its victim worker.

The workpath-sensitive tempo control strategy says that the victim worker takes precedence over the thief worker in a thief-victim relationship, or in other words, the thief should be executing at a slower tempo than the victim worker. It is important to realize that the thief-victim relationship between workers has a dynamic lifespan: it is formed at steal time, and terminates when either the thief or the victim completes its current set of tasks and becomes idle again.

Specifically, workpath-sensitive tempo control entails two important design ideas:

- **Thief Procrastination:** At the begin of the thief-victim relationship, the tempo of the thief worker should be set to be slower than the victim worker.

- **Immediacy Relay:** If the thief-victim relationship terminates because the victim runs out of work, the tempo of the thief should be raised. In this case, the previous victim simply becomes an idle thread, and the immediacy should be “relayed” to the thief.

Intuitively, the design of **Immediacy Relay** can be analogously viewed as a relay race. When a worker finishes the tasks that carry immediacy, it needs to pass on the immediacy “baton” to the next worker.

Figure 3 demonstrates the key ideas of workpath sensitivity, with the 6 subfigures representing (not necessarily consecutive) “snapshots” of a program execution sequence. We use different gray-scales to represent different tempos. The darker the shade of the circle is, the slower tempo the hosted worker is executed at. Worker 1 starts in Figure 3(a) with a task of 100 time units. In Figure 3(b), a task with 94 time units is pushed to the deque and subsequently stolen by worker 2. According to Thief Procrastination, worker 2 executes at a tempo one level slower than worker 1. In Figure 3(c), worker 3 steals from worker 2 (i.e., “a thief’s thief”) executing at a tempo further slower than worker 2. At Figure 3(d), worker 1 finishes all its tasks. According to Immediacy Relay, its thief (worker 2 in this case) needs to
raise its tempo. Intuitively, what worker 2 currently works on is the “unfinished business” when the 100 time units started on worker 1. When worker 2 raises its tempo by one level, HERMES transitively raises the tempo of worker 2’s thief. This is demonstrated in Figure 3(e). In Figure 3(f), worker 1 steals again, starting a new thief-victim relationship with worker 2, except that worker 1 this time is the thief.

### 3.2 Workload-Sensitive Tempo Control

HERMES is further equipped with a *workload-sensitive* strategy for tempo control. The intuition is simple: a worker needs to work faster when there are more tasks to handle. In the case of work stealing, a natural indicator of the workload is the deque size: the number of tasks waiting to be processed by a worker.

We demonstrate the ideas of workload-sensitivity through Figure 4. Let us assume we have three tempo levels, set based on the deque size with two thresholds: 1 and 3. As a convention, HERMES always bootstraps the program execution with the fastest tempo, as in Figure 4(a). At snapshot Figure 4(b), core 2 steals one task. Since its deque is of size 0, lower than the first threshold, the tempo for worker 2 is set at the lowest one. As worker 2 progresses such as PUSH more tasks to its deque, its tempo rises to the medium level in Figure 4(c), and then fastest level in Figure 4(d). The tempo is slow downed again when worker 2 is stolen, dropping its deque size below the second threshold in Figure 4(e), and even slower when it pops more items from its own deque in Figure 4(f).

HERMES determines the thresholds through a lightweight form of online profiling. Our runtime periodically samples deque sizes, and computes the average of the last fixed number of samples. Let that average be $L$. In an execution with $K$ thresholds, the thresholds for the next period are set at

$$
\text{thld}_i = \left( \frac{2 \times L}{K + 1} \right) \times i
$$

where $1 \leq i \leq K$. For example, if the average deque size is 15 and there are 2 thresholds, we apply the fastest tempo if the deque size is no less than 20, the medium tempo for a deque size between 10 and 20, and the slowest tempo otherwise.
Algorithm 3.1 Worker
1: w : WORKER
2: procedure SCHEDULE(w)
3: loop
4: t ← POP(w)
5: if t == null then
6: w0 = w.next
7: for w0 != null do
8: UP(w0)
9: w0 ← w0.next
10: end for
11: w.prev.next ← w.next
12: w.next.prev ← w.prev
13: w.next ← null
14: w.prev ← null
15: v = SELECT()
16: t ← STEAL(v)
17: if t == null then
18: YIELD(w)
19: else
20: DOWN(w, v)
21: if v.next != null then
22: w.next ← v.next
23: v.prev ← w.prev
24: end if
25: v.next ← w
26: w.prev ← v
27: WORK(w, t)
28: end if
29: else
30: WORK(w, t)
31: end if
32: end loop
33: end procedure

Algorithm 3.2 Tempo Adjustment
procedure DOWN(w, v)
// set w to one tempo lower than v
procedure DOWN(w)
// set w to one tempo lower
procedure UP(w)
// set w to one tempo higher

Algorithm 3.3 Push
1: w : WORKER
2: procedure PUSH(w, t)
3: w.T++
4: w.DQ[w.T] ← t
5: if w.T - w.H > w.thld[w.S] then
6: if w.S < K-1 then
7: w.S++
8: UP(w)
9: end if
10: end if

Algorithm 3.4 Pop
1: w : WORKER
2: procedure POP(w)
3: w.T−−
4: if w.H > w.T then
5: LOCK(w)
6: w.T−−
7: if w.H > w.T then
8: w.T++
9: UNLOCK(w)
10: return null
11: end if
12: UNLOCK(w)
13: if w.T - w.H < w.thld[w.S] then
14: if w.S > 0 then
15: if w.prev != null then
16: w.S−−
17: DOWN(w)
18: end if
19: end if
20: return w.DQ[w.T]
21: end procedure

Algorithm 3.5 Steal
1: v : WORKER // victim
2: procedure STEAL(v)
3: LOCK(v)
4: v.H++
5: if v.H > v.T then
6: v.H−−
7: UNLOCK(v)
8: return null
9: end if
10: UNLOCK(v)
12: if v.S > 0 then
13: if v.prev != null then
14: v.S−−
15: DOWN(v)
16: end if
17: end if
18: return v.DQ[v.H]
19: end procedure

Structures
structure WORKER
DQ // deque (array)
H // head index
T // tail index
next // next immediate work
prev // prev immediate work
thld // size thresholds (array)
S // size threshold index
end structure

3.3 Unified Algorithm Specification
The two tempo control strategies are designed to comple-
ment each other. In workpath-alone executions, a major
“anti-pattern” is that a non-immediate worker may have
many deque items to work on. With a slower tempo, the
worker may be left with a large number of work items when
it becomes immediate. In other words, a slower tempo in-
creases the workpath length. A second opinion based on
workload-sensitive control helps speed up such workers
early on. Similarly, in workload-alone executions, an im-

Figure 5. Core HERMES Algorithm (X for Workpath Sensitivity and X for Workload Sensitivity)
mediate worker with fewer deque items is set to a lower tempo, increasing the workpath length. A second opinion based on workload-sensitive control can differentiate such workers from others. In both cases, an increased workpath length means increased execution time, which potentially leads to additional energy consumption. In this section, we specify the unified algorithm.

Figure 5 presents the pseudocode of the core HERMES algorithm. The modifications on top of the classic work-stealing algorithm are highlighted, with two colors indicating workpath-sensitive and workload-sensitive support respectively.

The key data structure to support workpath sensitivity is a double-linked list across workers, connected by the next and prev pointers. The list maintains the order of immediacy: when worker w1’s next worker is w2, it means w2 is processing a task immediately following the tasks processed by worker w1, where immediacy is defined according to the work-first principle.

When stealing succeeds (lines 20-27), the thief worker becomes the immediate next worker of the victim. The tempo of the thief is set to be one level slower than the victim (line 20), and the prev and next references are properly set (lines 25-26). We will detail the implementation of tempo adjustment in the next subsection. One issue to address is that the victim might already be stolen by another thief before. In that case, the algorithm inserts the current thief ahead of the previous thief on the linked list (lines 21-24).

In other words, the current thief is more immediate than the previous thief. This corresponds to how the order of tasks on the victim’s deque reflects immediacy: the tasks stolen earlier are not as immediate as the tasks stolen later (recall Section 2).

When a worker becomes idle again and out of work (line 6), it effectively terminates the thief-victim relationship previously developed since it became out of work last time. If the current worker is a victim, then according to the design of Immediacy Relay, the temps of its thieves are raised, passing on the immediacy (lines 7-10). Note that Up(w) is defined to raise the tempo of w one level up from its current level, so in a scenario where a thief worker w1 is further stolen by another thief w2, both workers will have their tempo raised by one level, and w2 can still maintain a slower tempo than w1. Finally, the current worker is removed from the linked list (lines 11-14).

Workload sensitivity is relatively simple to support. Each worker maintains an array thld to record its thresholds, with the number of thresholds defined by constant K. The computation of the thld was described in Section 3.2. The algorithm increases the tempo when PUSH makes the deque size reach the next threshold up, or decreases the tempo when either POP or STEAL reduces the deque size to the next threshold down.

One interesting aspect of our algorithm is that workpath sensitivity and workload sensitivity largely independently - workpath-sensitive tempo control is applied when the deque is empty whereas workload-sensitive tempo control is applied when the deque is not - so the unification of the two is a simple matter. The only intersection of the two lies in one fact: when a worker is at the beginning of the immediacy list, we choose not to reduce its tempo even if workload sensitivity advises so. This can be seen in the w.prev!=null condition in Pop and the similar v.prev!=null condition in Steal. In other words, if the task a worker processes is immediate, we still execute it with a fast tempo regardless of deque size.

3.4 Lower-Level Design Considerations

**Tempo-Frequency Mapping** HERMES achieves tempo adjustment through DVFS and modern CPUs usually support a limited, discrete number of frequencies. We now define tempo adjustment in the presence of a fixed number of frequencies. Let \( \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_n\} \) be frequencies supported by a CPU core, where \( f_i > f_{i+1} \) for any \( 1 <= i <= n - 1 \). For simplicity, let us assume all cores of a CPU support the same frequencies. The algorithm in the previous section stays the same, except Up and Down procedures should be refined. For instance,

```
procedure DOWN(w, v)
  f ← frequency of core hosting v
  if f == f_i and i < N then
    ...// scale core hosting w to f_{i+1}
  end if
end procedure
```

where \( N <= n \) is a constant to further restrict the range of frequencies used for the runtime. In other words, a CPU may support \( n \) frequencies, but a runtime may only choose to use the highest \( N \)-number. In practice, a subset of frequencies often strikes a better trade-off between energy and performance: they are sufficient to yield energy savings, yet without incurring significant performance penalties due to low operating CPU frequencies. We call this design \( N \)-frequency tempo control.

**Worker-Core Mapping** HERMES relies on the knowledge of the relationship between workers (threads) and their hosting CPU cores, information readily available in work-stealing runtimes. To maintain this mapping, we allow for two scheduling strategies in our experiments: (a) static scheduling: each worker thread is pre-assigned to a CPU core; (b) dynamic scheduling: each worker thread may migrate from one core to another during program execution. The only requirement for dynamic scheduling is that during the processing of a task (i.e., an invocation of the WORK procedure), a worker stays on its host core. With this, OS cannot re-assign a worker to a different core if preempted, invalidating frequency settings at context switch time. We think
this is a reasonable design because (1) work stealing by design is a load balancing strategy, overlapping with the goal of OS-level load balancing; (2) work-stealing tasks usually take a short amount of time to complete.

We achieve the goal of binding workers to cores through affinity setting. For dynamic scheduling, affinity is set right before each WORK invocation (line 27 and line 30) and reset at the completion of each invocation.

One scenario common in standard multi-threaded program runtimes is the support of multiple threads executing concurrently on the same core. This is a non-issue for work-stealing runtimes. Lazy task creation fundamental in work stealing entails that the number of workers can be statically bound by CPU resources, not program logic.

**Tempo Setting of Idle Workers/Cores** HERMES does not adjust CPU frequencies when a worker becomes idle but fails to steal. This corresponds to lines 17-18 in the algorithm where YIELD happens. In work-stealing systems, there are usually more tasks to keep all workers busy, either through POP or STEAL, with YIELD relatively uncommon. When a YIELD does happen, the core is often reallocated to another worker, which sets its CPU frequency based on its own workpath-sensitive and workload-sensitive rules.

**Overhead** The overhead of our approach comes in 3 aspects: (1) DVFS switching cost. DVFS switching time is usually in the tens of microseconds, magnitudes smaller than the execution time of tasks. Our use of DVFS is relatively coarse-grained: tempo control is not applied during the execution of a task; (2) online profiling of workload threshold; (3) affinity setting in dynamic scheduling.

### 4. Implementation and Evaluation

HERMES is implemented on top of Intel Cilk Plus (build 2546). In this section, we present the experimental results.

#### 4.1 Experiment Setup

We selected benchmarks from the Problem-Based Benchmark Suite (PBBS) [5]. The benchmarks support parallel programming, and our selection of the benchmarks support Cilk-like syntax such as spawn.

K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) uses pattern recognition methods to classify objects based on closest training examples in the feature space. Sparse-Triangle Intersection (Ray) benchmark calculates for each ray the first triangle it intersects given a set of triangles contained inside a 3D bounding box and a set of rays that penetrate the box. Integer Sort (Sort) is an implementation of parallel radix sort. Comparison Sort (Compare) is similar to Sort but uses sample sort. Convex Hull (full) is a computational geometry benchmark.

To measure the effectiveness of our approach across platforms, we constructed our experiments on two systems:

- **System A**: a machine with 2×16-core AMD Opteron 6378 processors (Piledriver microarchitecture) running Debian 3.2.46-1 x86-64 Linux (kernel 3.2.0-4-amd64) and 64GB of DDR3 1600 memory. Each processor supports 5 frequencies: 1.4GHz, 1.6GHz, 1.9GHz, 2.2GHz and 2.4GHz.

- **System B**: a machine with an 8-core AMD FX-8150 processor (Bulldozer microarchitecture) running Debian 3.2.46-1 Linux (kernel 3.2.0-4-amd64) and 16GB of DDR3 1600 memory. The processor supports 5 frequencies: 1.4GHz, 2.1GHz, 2.7GHz, 3.3GHz and 3.6GHz.

Piledriver/Bulldozer microarchitectures are among the latest commercial CPUs that support multiple clock-domains, i.e., CPUs whose individual cores can have their frequencies adjusted independently. Specifically, in both architectures, every two cores share one clock domain. In other words, System A has 16 independent clock domains, whereas System B has 4. To avoid the undesirable DVFS interference, all our experiments are performed over cores with distinct clock domains. For example, our experiments on System A consider as many as 16 workers, and no two workers may share the same clock domain.

Energy consumption is measured through current meters over power supply lines to the CPU module. Data is converted through an NI DAQ and collected by NI LabVIEW SignalExpress with 100 samples per second. Since the supply voltage is stable at 12V, energy consumption is computed as the sum of current samples multiplied by 12 × 0.01. We executed each benchmark using our HERMES scheduler. The results reported below are often normalized to a control, defined as executing the same benchmark with the unmodified Intel Cilk Plus scheduler running at the maximum CPU frequency. For each benchmark, we run 20 trials and calculate the average of the trials, disregarding the first 2 trials.

#### 4.2 Experimental Results

**Overall Results** Figure 6 and Figure 7 summarize the energy/performance results of HERMES on System A and System B respectively. All data are normalized against the baseline execution over unmodified Intel Cilk Plus. The blue columns are the percentage of energy savings of HERMES, while the red columns are the percentages of performance (time) loss. The results are grouped by benchmarks, and within each group, the columns show different numbers of workers. On System A, we conducted experiments using 2, 4, 8, and 16 workers (hence each group in Figure 6 has 4 columns, in that order). On System B, we conducted experiments using with 2, 3, and 4 workers (hence each group in Figure 7 has 3 columns, in that order). The last columns in both Figures show the average.

In both systems, HERMES averages 11-12% energy savings over 3-4% performance loss. We have further computed the Energy-Delay Product (EDP) of the benchmarking results, and the normalized results are shown in Figure 8 and
Figure 6. Normalized Energy Savings (Blue) and Time Loss (Red) of HERMES w.r.t. Intel Cilk Plus on System A

Figure 7. Normalized Energy Savings (Blue) and Time Loss (Red) of HERMES w.r.t. Intel Cilk Plus on System B

Figure 8. Normalized EDP for System A

Figure 9. Normalized EDP for System B

Figure 9 respectively. Often used as an indicator for demonstrating the energy/performance trade-off, EDP is the product of energy consumption and execution time. A smaller value in EDP is aligned with our intuition of improved energy efficiency. In both System A and System B, the average normalized EDP is about 0.92. HERMES shows remarkable stability across benchmarks, worker counts, and underlying systems. EDP is improved without exception. This is an unexpected feature while experimenting in a highly dynamic setting.

Relative Effectiveness of Workpath vs. Workload Sensitivity

To determine how much workpath sensitivity and workload sensitivity contribute to HERMES, we also run benchmarks with only one of the two strategies enabled. Figure 10 and Figure 11 shows the energy/time effects on System A, while Figure 12 and Figure 13 shows the energy/time ef-
Figure 10. Energy: Workpath vs. Workload on System A

Figure 11. Time: Workpath vs. Workload on System A

Figure 12. Energy: Workpath vs. Workload on System B

Figure 13. Time: Workpath vs. Workload on System B

Figure 14. The Effect of Frequency Selections on System A
(For each benchmark, the 4 groups are for 2, 4, 8, 16 workers respectively. Within each group, columns 1 and 4 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 2.4/1.6GHz; columns 2 and 5 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 2.4/1.4Ghz; columns 3 and 6 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 2.4/1.9Ghz)

Figure 15. The Effect of Frequency Selection on System B
(For each benchmark, the 3 groups are for 2, 3, 4 workers respectively. Within each group, columns 1 and 4 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 3.6/2.7GHz; columns 2 and 5 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 3.6/2.1Ghz; columns 3 and 6 are energy saving and time loss for frequency pair 3.6/3.3Ghz)

To highlight the individual contributions of the two tempo control strategies to the unified HERMES algorithm, we normalize the percentage of savings/loss. For instance, if a tempo control strategy alone can lead to 6% energy savings whereas the HERMES algorithm (unified with both strategies) can lead to 12% energy savings, we record $\frac{6}{12} = 0.5$ in Figure 10 and Figure 12. For another instance, if a tempo control strategy alone can lead to 6% performance loss whereas the HERMES algorithm (unified with both strategies) can lead to 3% performance loss, we record $\frac{6}{3} = 2$ in Figure 11 and Figure 13. In all figures, the blue columns are the workpath-only results and the red columns are the workload-only results.

This set of figures show the complementary nature of workpath sensitivity and workload sensitivity. Take the 8-core execution of Compare on System A for example. In Figure 10, workpath sensitivity alone leads to around 60%...
energy savings relative to the unified HERMES algorithm, and workload sensitivity alone leads to around 55% energy savings relative to the unified HERMES algorithm. The overall energy saving is nearly the sum of saving from the two strategies alone. In Figure 11, again for the 8-core execution of Compare, the time loss of workpath-alone strategy is about 1.6 time of the time loss of the unified algorithm, and the time loss of workload-alone strategy is about 1.7 time of the time loss of the unified algorithm. In other words, the unified algorithm obtains the best of the two worlds: the unified strategy leads to more energy savings (almost the sum of the strategies alone), but incurs less performance loss (almost half of the strategies alone).

The Effect of Frequency Selection

We conceptually explored the design space of tempo-frequency mapping in Section 3.4, and now experimentally evaluate the effects of different frequency mapping strategies. Figure 14 and Figure 15 are results for mapping tempos to different CPU frequencies. For simplicity, we only consider 2-frequency tempo control, where the fastest tempo is mapped to the first frequency, and all other tempos are mapped to the second frequency. In all experiments, we fix the frequency for the fast tempo – 2.4GHz for System A and 3.6GHz for System B – and experiment with different settings for the slow tempo.

As predicted, selecting a higher frequency for the slow tempo is likely to yield less performance loss, but also fewer energy savings. This is demonstrated by columns 3 and 6 in each benchmark for both Figures, and the effect is particularly evident in System B. Selecting a very low frequency for the slow tempo (columns 2 and 5 in each benchmark for both Figures) will lead to significant performance loss. In fact, such a selection is not wise for energy savings either: significant increase in the execution time may increase energy consumption, because the latter also holds a linear relationship with time. Heuristically, our experiments seem to suggest the optimal combination often comes with the golden ratio: the frequency for the slow tempo is about 60% percent of the one for the fast tempo.

N-Frequency Tempo Control

In the next set of experiments, we study how the number of frequencies impact the results, demonstrated in Figure 16 and Figure 17. Overall, the results between 2-frequency tempo control and 3-frequency tempo control are similar. A 3-frequency tempo control can sometimes incur less loss on performance, as demonstrated by column 6 for each group in Figure 16 and column 4 for each group in Figure 17, but the 2-frequency tempo control has a slight edge on energy savings. We surmise the small advantage of 2-frequency tempo control on energy savings might be due to its lesser overhead on DVFS. In this context, tempo adjustment occurs less frequently.

Static Scheduling vs. Dynamic Scheduling

In Section 3.4, we discussed the design choices between static scheduling and dynamic scheduling of workers. Figure 18 demonstrates...
the effectiveness of HERMES under static scheduling and dynamic scheduling respectively. Figures 19-22 are a more detailed analysis, demonstrating the time series of power consumption. The “shape” of the time series are clearly dependent on the nature of the benchmarks and their settings (such as worker numbers). For each benchmark with the same number of workers, the executions of static scheduling vs. dynamic scheduling display similar patterns. Note that in each figure, the two time series are from different executions. For parallel programs with significant non-determinism, it should come as no surprise that two executions of the same program do not “spike” at the same time.

As demonstrated in the figures, dynamic scheduling in- curs a slightly higher level of energy consumption. We be- lieve this is due to the overhead needed for setting/resetting affinity to workers for each WORK invocation, a topic dis- cussed in Sec. 3.4. We investigated into a large number of time series, but found no evidence static scheduling led to significant imbalance (e.g. times series with drastically dif- ferent patterns from their dynamic scheduling counterparts).

**Naive Frequency Scaling** Finally, we investigate the im- pact of naively applying frequency scaling, i.e., without the tempo control algorithm of HERMES. Figures 23-24 show the impact of performance and energy if CPU frequencies are naively scaled down at a fixed frequency throughout the program execution. We select two benchmarks, KNN and Ray. For System A, the CPU frequencies of all cores are fixed at 1.9GHz and 1.4GHz respectively (Figures 23). For
System B, the CPU frequencies are fixed at 2.7GHz and 1.4GHz respectively (Figures 24). In both figures, a negative value on the Y-axis indicates performance loss or energy over-consumption, normalized against the same control defined in Section 4.1. The figures show that the naive approach not only yields performance loss, but also energy waste.

5. Related Work

Energy efficiency in work-stealing run-times is an emerging problem that has received little attention. The only prior work we know of is a short essay [26] that called for the coordination between the thief and the victim to improve energy efficiency. We now summarize related work in two more established areas: optimization of work-stealing run-times and energy efficiency of multi-threaded programs.

Improving various aspects of work-stealing system efficiency has been a central issue throughout the development of work-stealing systems. Indeed, the original work-stealing algorithm [16] was designed for load balancing, with direct impact on the performance of multi-threaded systems. A-Steal [2] is an adaptive thread scheduler to take parallelism feedback into account at scheduling time. Dinan et al. [13] improved the scalability of work-stealing runtimes through optimizations ranging from lock reduction to work splitting. SLAW [18] is a work-stealing scheduler with adaptive scheduling policies based on locality information. AdaptiveTC [36] improves system performance through adaptive thread management at thread creation time. BWS [14] improves system throughput and fairness in time-sharing multicore systems. Kumar et al. [23] applies run-time techniques such as dynamic compilation and speculative optimization to further reduce the overhead in the context of managed X10. Acar et al. [1] designed a non-shared-memory model to replace the locking model based on shared memory. Performance characterization of Intel TBB with work stealing was systematically conducted by Wu et al. [11]. Bender and Rabin [4] formally analyzed the performance of work-stealing systems on top of a heterogeneous platform, where parallel units may operate on different, yet fixed, frequencies.

There is a large body of work studying the energy efficiency of multi-threaded programs on parallel architectures. On the architecture level, Iyer and Marinescu [22] studied the impact of DVFS on multi-clock-domain architectures. Wu et al. [38] designed a DVFS-based strategy where the interval of DVFS use is adaptive to recent instance issue queue occupancy. Magklis et al. [27] designed a profiling-based DVFS algorithm on CPUs with multiple clock domains. On the OS level, numerous efforts exist to apply DVFS for energy management, starting with the seminal work by Weiser et al. [37]. Recent examples include CPU Miser [17] (DVFS based on job workload in clusters) and Dhiman et al. [12] (DVFS based on online learning). Beyond DVFS, approaches for energy management of multi-threaded programs include thread migration [33], a combination of thread migration and DVFS [8], and software/hardware approximation [15, 34]. The boundary between architecture and OS for energy efficiency is often blurred. For example, Merkel et al. [29] designed an energy-aware scheduling policy for thermal management, with inputs from hardware performance counters. Further afield, energy efficiency can be achieved via compiler optimization (e.g., [19, 39]) and language designs (e.g., [3, 9, 34, 35]).

6. Conclusion

This paper introduced HERMES, a novel and practical solution for improving energy efficiency of work-stealing applications. HERMES addresses the problem through judicious tempo control over workers, guided by a unified workpath-sensitive and workload-sensitive algorithm. HERMES only requires minor changes to the work-stealing runtime. With no changes necessary for the underlying architectures, OS, or higher-level programming models, this minimalistic approach can still yield significant energy savings with little performance overhead. HERMES illustrates the mutually beneficial relationship between architecture features and language runtime features, and offers a “sweet spot” unifying the strength of the two. With DVFS, the language runtime becomes tempo-enabled, leading to improved energy efficiency. With unique features of the work-stealing language runtime design — specifically, the relationship between tasks as defined by the work-first principle, and the meta-level structure of deques — HERMES is able to answer challenging questions every DVFS-based energy management system must answer: “when to scale frequencies?” and “what frequency to scale to?” The latter point is particularly relevant in the context of multi-threaded language design: compared with more established programming/runtime models (such as Pthreads), work-stealing language runtimes are intrinsically endowed with features friendly for energy management, which HERMES takes advantage of. As a result, HERMES is a language-level solution without the need of characterizing program executions on a per-application basis.

The workpath-sensitive and workload-sensitive tempo control strategies of HERMES are experimentally effective. In the future, we plan to theoretically analyze the two heuristics through work-span analysis [16], formally establishing their impact on the performance/energy trade-off.
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