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XML Defined

- Text based (usually UTF-8 encoded)
- Tree structured
- Language independent
- Generalized data format
Motivation from SOAP

- Generalized RPC mechanism (supports other models, too)
- Broad industrial support
- Web Services on the Grid
  - OGSA: Open Grid Services Architecture
  - WSRF: Web Services Resource Framework
- At bottom, SOAP depends on XML
XML Exclusive of SOAP

- General structured data format
- Becoming standard for many scientific datasets
  - HapMap - mapping genes
  - Protein Sequencing
  - NASA astronomical data
  - Many more instances
Explosion of Data

- Enormous increase in data from sensors, satellites, experiments, and simulations* 
- Use of XML to store these data is also on the rise
- XML is in use in ways it was never really intended (GB and large size files)
Benchmark Motivation

- Grid applications place a wide range of requirements on the communication substrate and data formats.
- Simple and straightforward implementations can have a severe performance impact.
XML Performance Limitations

- Compared to “legacy” formats
  - Text-based
    - Lacks any “header blocks” (ex. TCP headers), so must scan every character to tokenize
    - Numeric types take more space and conversion time
  - Lacks indexing
    - Unable to quickly skip over fixed-length records
Limitations of XML

- Poor CPU and space efficiency when processing scientific data with mostly numeric data [Chiu et al 2002]
- Features such as nested namespace shortcuts don’t scale well with deep hierarchies
  - May be found in documents aggregating and nesting data from disparate sources
- Character stream oriented (not record oriented): initial parse inherently serial
- Still ultimately useful for sharing data divorced of its application
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All new high end and mid range CPUs for desktop- and laptop-class computers have at least two cores.

The future of AMD and Intel performance lies in increases in the number of cores.

Despite extant SMP machines, many classes of software applications remain single threaded:
- Multi-threaded programming considered “hard”
- Reinforced in the current curricula and by existing languages and tools.
XML and Multi-Core

- Most string parsing techniques rely on a serial scanning process

- **Challenge:** Existing (singly-threaded) XML parsers are already very efficient [Zhang et al 2006]
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Contributions

- We present the design and implementation of a comprehensive benchmark suite for XML and SOAP implementations with standard mechanisms to quantify, compare, and evaluate the performance of each toolkit and study the strengths and weaknesses for a wide range of representative use case scenarios.

- We present an analysis of pre-fetching and piped implementation techniques that aim to offset disk I/O costs while processing large-scale XML datasets on multi-core CPU architectures.
Contributions Continued

- We propose techniques to modify the lexical analysis phase for processing large-scale XML datasets to leverage opportunities for parallelism. (PIXIMAL)
- We present an analysis of the scalability that can be achieved with our proposed parallelization approach as the number of processing threads and size of XML-data is increased.
- We present an analysis on the usage of various states in the processing automaton to provide insights on why the performance varies for differently shaped input data files.
In this thesis we present a comprehensive benchmark suite that facilitates the study of the strengths and weaknesses of XML and SOAP toolkits for a wide range of representative use case scenarios.

We propose a parallel processing model for some application-based large-scale XML datasets that can effectively leverage opportunities for parallelism in emerging multi-core CPU architectures.
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High Performance XML Processing Approaches

- Look-aside buffers/String caching [gsoap, XPP]
- Trie data structure with schema-specific parser [Chiu et al 02, Engelen 04]
- One pass table-driven recursive descent parser [Zhang et al 2006]
- Pre-scan and schedule parser [Lu et al 2006]
- Parallelized scanner, scheduled post-parser [Pan et al 2007]
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XML Benchmark Suite

1. A chosen set of XML documents
   - Low level probes
   - Application-based benchmarks

2. A driver application for each XML processor
   - Runs the parser on the input, but does not act on the data
     - Eliminates application-level performance differences
     - One for each interface style (SAX/DOM)

3. Published in Proceedings of SC’06 [Head et al 2006]
Benchmark Probes

- **Overhead test**
  - Minimal XML document
    - (header plus one self-closing element)

- **Buffering**
  - Repeated use of `xsi:type` attributes

- **Namespace management**
  - Gratuitous use of `xmlns` attributes

- **SOAP payloads**
  - “Interop” test: arrays of integer, string, double, MIO, event objects
Application Benchmarks

- Ptolemy Workflow documents (which Kepler uses)
- Genetic data files
  - (Large) files from the International HapMap Project
- Molecular data
- Mesh interface objects, event streams (WSMG)
- WS-Security documents
Overhead of Each Parser

All Parsers, Overhead Test

Parse time over 20 runs (ms)

Parser
expat
gsoap
libxml2-dom
libxml2-sax
mono-dom
mono-reader
piccolo
qt4-sax
xerces-c-dom
xerces-c-sax
xerces-j-dom
xerces-j-sax
xpp3
Performance of C and C++-based Parsers

C/C++ Parsers, Application-level Inputs

Parser

- expat
- gsoap
- libxml2-dom
- libxml2-sax
- xerces-c-dom
- xerces-c-sax

Parse time over 20 runs (ms)

- hapmap_1797SNPs.xml
- molecule_1kzk.pretty.xml
- workflow_Atype.xml
- workflow_PIW.xml
C Parser Performance Over SOAP Payloads

Parsing Performance for SOAP Payloads of int Arrays

Number of Elements in the Array vs. Parse Time for 20 runs (ms)

- expat
- gsoap
- libxml2-dom
- libxml2-sax
- qt4-sax
- xerces-c-dom
- xerces-c-sax

The graph shows the parsing performance of various XML parsers over SOAP payloads of int arrays, with the number of elements in the array on the x-axis and the parse time in milliseconds on the y-axis. The parsers are compared across different numbers of elements to assess their performance in processing XML payloads.
Performance of Java-based Parsers

Java Parsers, Application-level Inputs

Parse time over 20 runs (ms)

Parser

- piccolo
- xerces-j-dom
- xerces-j-sax
- xpp3

XML files:
- hapmap_1797SNPs.xml
- molecule_1kzk.pretty.xml
- workflow_Atype.xml
- workflow_PIW.xml
XMLBench Conclusions

- Low overhead $\implies$ gSOAP and Expat, XPP3
- gSOAP performs well with namespaces due to look-aside buffers
- Piccolo and XPP3 have comparable performance in Java
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Readahead/Runahead

- Explore OS level caching effects
- Offload disk input to another thread/core
- Published in SOCP Workshop at HPDC [Head et al 2007]
Introduce two parsers which extend the existing, high performance Piccolo parser [Head et al 2006]

- **Runahead**: opens two file descriptors for the input file
  - Start a thread that repeatedly calls `read()` on one of the file descriptors
  - Pass the other file descriptor to the existing Piccolo parser in the main thread

- **Readahead**: opens one file descriptor for the input file, and one pipe
  - Start a thread that reads from the file descriptor and writes to the pipe
  - Pass the pipe to the existing Piccolo parser in the main thread
Test run

- Run each parser (Piccolo, Runahead, and Readahead) on a large (GB-scale) XML file
  - Specifically, a protein sequence database file, `psd7003.xml`
- No user code is run for any SAX event – just the parser itself is tested
- File cache is cleared between each run running a separate process that reads multiple gigabyte files
- Each test is run 50 times for each parser
- Hotspot is warmed by running the parser on another input file with identical content before timing begins
Two Environmental Conditions Tested

- **Architectures**
  - **UP**: Classic Uniprocessor P4-based machine (Dell workstation)
  - **SMP**: Classic Symmetrical MultiProcessing P4-based machine (has server-class I/O system) (IBM e-server)
  - **CMP**: Modern Chip MultiProcessing Core 2 Duo-based machine (Dell workstation)

- **System conditions**
  - **Cached**: The input file is read (hence loaded into the system file cache) before timing begins
  - **Uncached**: The input file is not read before timing begins (and flushed between each run)
Data Analysis

- Speedup for both of the proposed parsers is computed to compare across architectures.

- Baseline value is computing by averaging the times for each run of the unmodified Piccolo parser.

- Speedup for each run is computed by dividing the baseline by the time at each test point.
Speedup for the Readahead Parser Relative to Architecture

- CMP
- UP
- SMP

Run Number
(Input Resides in Filesystem Cache)
Speedup for the Runahead Parser Relative to Architecture

- CMP
- SMP
- UP

Run Number
(Input Resides in Filesystem Cache)
**Speedup for the Runahead Parser Relative to Architecture**

[Graph showing speedup for the Runahead Parser Relative to Architecture with data points for SMP, CMP, and UP.]
**Speedup for the CMP Architecture Relative to Parser Type**

![Graph showing speedup for the CMP architecture relative to parser type. The graph compares Runahead and Readahead methods with run numbers and relative speedup values.]
On systems with available memory and an available processing core with fresh inputs, this approach can provide some performance wins.
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Token-Scanning With a DFA

- DFA-based table-driven scanning is both popular and fast
  - (or at least performance-competitive with other techniques)
- Input is read *sequentially* from start to finish
  - Each character is used to transition over states in a DFA
  - Transition may have associated actions
    - Supports languages that are not “regular”

- Commonly used in high performance XML parsers, such as TDX (C) and Piccolo (Java)
  - Amenable to SAX parsing
  - PIXIMAL-DFA uses this approach
DFA Used in PIXIMAL-DFA
Parallel Scanning With a DFA?

- DFA-based scanning $\rightarrow$ sequential operation

- Desire: run multiple, concurrent DFAs throughout the input
  - Generally not possible because the start state would be unknown
Overcoming Sequentiality With an NFA

- Problem: start state is unknown

- Solution: assume every possible state is a start state
  - Construct an NFA from the DFA used in PIXIMAL-DFA
  - Such an NFA can be applied on any substring of the input

- PIXIMAL-NFA is the parser that does all of this:
  - Partition input into segments
  - Run PIXIMAL-DFA on the initial segment
  - Run NFA-based parsers on subsequent partition elements
  - Fix up transitions at partition boundaries and run queued actions
**PIXIMAL-NFA’s Parameters**

- **split_percent**: The portion of input to be dedicated to the first element of the partition, expressed as a percentage of the total input length.

- **number_of_threads**: The number of threads to use on a run.
Preliminary Questions

- Is there enough memory bandwidth to allow multiple automata to concurrently feed each thread its input?

- Processing each character along several paths through the NFA is costly: how does this work scale with the size of the initial DFA?

- Does the overhead of queuing the NFA actions cost a reasonable amount compared with the cost of DFA-parsing the first partition element?
Memory Bandwidth Test

- Models the work of partitioning the input the way PIXELM-NFA does
  - File I/O is via `mmap(2)`
- A thread is created for each partition element which accumulates each character
- A variety of `split_percent` and `number_of_thread` are chosen
  - Total time to read a large input a fixed number of times is measured
  - Input file is `SwissProt.xml`, which is 109 MB in size
Run several machines, each from a homogeneous class running 64-bit versions of Linux

- 2× uniprocessor: 3.2 Ghz Intel Xeon (uniprocessor), 4 GB RAM, Linux kernel 2.6.15, GNU Lib C 2.3.6, GCC 4.0.3
- 2× dual core: 2.66 Ghz Intel Xeon 5150 (dual core) CPUs, 8 GB RAM, Linux kernel 2.6.18, GNU Lib C 2.3.6, GCC 4.1.2
- 2× quad core: 2.33 Ghz Intel Xeon E5354 (quad-core) CPUs, 8 GB RAM, Linux kernel 2.6.18, GNU Lib C 2.3.6, GCC 4.1.2

4 nodes used from the 2× UP cluster, 10 from each of the other two

Results for each class are averaged across all runs
2× UP Overall Results

[3D graph showing the relationship between Number of Threads, Split Percent, and Time (s)]

- Number of Threads: 5, 10, 15
- Split Percent: 20, 40, 60, 80
- Time (s): 12, 14, 16, 18, 20
2× DC Overall Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Threads</th>
<th>Split Percent</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2x QC Overall Results
Conclusions From Overall Results

- Even when doing very little per-character processing, performance gains possible by adding threads
- Returns do diminish rapidly
- More cores lead to smoother results
- Adding “too many” threads does not hurt performance in this test

- How much gain in terms of speedup?
  - Calculated by $\frac{T_1}{T_P}$
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\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{speedup_graph.png}
\caption{2\times DC Speedup For Best $\text{split\_percent}$}
\end{figure}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split Percent</th>
<th>Speedup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Number of threads & 2.0 & 2.5 & 3.0 & 3.5 & 4.0 \\
\hline
Speedup           & 1.4 & 1.6 & 1.8 & 2.0 & 2.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
2× QC Speedup For Best split_percent
Conclusions From Speedup Cross Sections

- Reaffirmation that speedup is possible
- Returns diminish for these machines at around 6 threads
- Overall, access to main memory is not an immediate bottleneck
- Putting the results from the best `split_percent` for each architecture...
Comparison of Best split_percent Per Class

![Graph showing comparison of best split_percent per class]

- # cores (split %)
  - 2 (52 %)
  - 4 (28 %)
  - 8 (12 %)

- Number of threads: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
- Speedup: 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5
State Scalability Test

- Models the additional work done by the NFA threads by following multiple execution paths through the table.
- Each NFA thread now must remember the state and calculate the next state for each character and for each start state.
  - The DFA need only remember and calculate one state per input character.
- Does not model the memory used, actions stored, or garbage state elimination.
2× DC Overall Results – Best Times

Number of DFA states

Number of threads

Time (s)
2× QC Overall Results – Best Times

- Time (s)
- Number of DFA states
- Number of threads

- 10
- 20
- 30
- 40
- 15
- 15
- 10
- 5
Conclusions From State Scalability Overall Results

Two major conclusions:

- The speedup on the 2× quad-core machines appears stable as the number of threads increases.
- There is a significant steepening when the DFA has 6-7 states.

- Performance reaches its max when the number of threads match the number of processing cores available.
  - Each new thread adds substantial extra work compared with the memory bandwidth test.

- Plotting speedup for certain *split_percent*.
2× DC – Best Speedup for DFA Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFA state size (w/split %)</th>
<th>Speedup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 states, 28 %</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 states, 32 %</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 states, 36 %</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 states, 56 %</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 states, 60 %</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 states, 64 %</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2× QC – Best Speedup for DFA Sizes

Number of Threads

DFA state size (w/split %)
- 2 states, 12 %
- 4 states, 16 %
- 6 states, 20 %
- 8 states, 36 %
- 10 states, 40 %
- 12 states, 40 %

Speedup
Conclusions From State Scalability Test

- The extra work of pushing characters through the multiple execution paths of the NFA is not in itself a limiting factor.
- There is a “sweet spot” for DFA size: around 6-7 states which allows for the greatest language complexity and the best scalability.
  - This is a crossover point where the O(N) extra NFA work overcomes the O(1) work of simply reading the input.
Serial NFA Tests

- Test hypothesis: the extra work required by using an NFA is offset by dividing processing work across multiple threads.
- Run each automaton-parser sequentially and independently.
- Divide the work as usual, with a range of *split_percent* and *number_of_threads*.
- Time each component independently.
- Completely parses the input, generating the correct sequence of SAX events.
- The maximum time for all components to complete (plus fix up time) represents an upper bound on the time *PIXIMAL*-NFA would take with components running concurrently.
Differences From Previous Tests

- Entirely sequential (no concurrency)
- Full XML parsing takes place
- Input file is different
  - “Interop” test from SOAPBench and XMLBench
  - SOAP-encoded arrays of various data types: integers, strings, and MIOs
  - Array size is scaled between 10 and 50,000 elements for each type
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Integers By Thread Count

- **Max Speedup**
- **Mean Speedup**
- **Min Speedup**
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Integers By Split Percent

![Graph showing potential speedup for different split percentages. The graph displays three lines: Max Speedup (red), Mean Speedup (blue dashed), and Min Speedup (green). The x-axis represents the split percent ranging from 0 to 100, and the y-axis represents the potential speedup ranging from 0 to 3.5. The graph shows variations in speedup across different split percentages.]
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Integers State Histogram
Conclusions From Integer Results

- Speedup is possible in this case
- Choice of split point is critical for achieving any speedup at all
- Characters in content sections account for roughly 60% of the input characters
- Input is 117 KB in length
- Consists mainly of 
  
  ...<i>1234</i><i>1235</i><i>1236</i>...
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Strings By Thread Count

- Max Speedup
- Mean Speedup
- Min Speedup

Potential Speedup vs. Thread Count
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Strings By Split Percent

![Graph showing Potential Speedup vs Split Percent]

- **Max Speedup**
- **Mean Speedup**
- **Min Speedup**
Serial NFA Test: 10,000 Strings State Histogram
Conclusions from String Results

- This sort of input is much more amenable to this approach
  - In maximum potential speedup achieved
  - In number of cases where speedup is $> 1$

- Split point is much less important here

- Characters in content sections account for roughly 99% of the input characters

- Input is 1.4 MB in size (though similar results are seen in inputs that are 117 KB)

- Consists mainly of ...<i>String content for the array element number 0. This is long to test the hypothesis that longer content sections are better for the NFA.</i>...
Conclusions from Serial NFA Test

- Shape of the input strongly determines the efficacy of the \textsc{Piximal} approach
  - MIO has similar state usage and mix of content and tags as the integer and \textsc{Piximal} has a similar performance profile there
  - \textsc{Piximal} works well on inputs with longer content sections punctuated by short tags
- Starting in a content section helps because the ‘<’ character eliminates a large number of execution paths through the NFA
  - If ‘>’ could be treated similarly by the parser, starting in a tag would be less harmful
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Proposed Work

Re-run benchmarks, normalize analysis and plotting

SOAPBench and XMLBench results should be re-run. Plots should be rebuilt to match the rest of the figures.

Investigate memory allocation issues

Heap contention is a well known problem for applications with concurrent memory allocations. We plan to investigate the effect of a variety of allocators on PIXIMAL.
Examine “pthread penalty” associated with glibc

During PIXIMAL development, we encountered some issues involving the the performance of malloc once a thread (even a thread with an empty \textit{start\_routine}) was created. We plan to investigate and report on this in detail.

Analyze a broader range of data from the serial NFA test

The serial NFA tests show a small portion of the data collected in that test. There is a wealth of information to uncover about the efficacy of this approach in the data.
Define characteristics of a restricted subset of XML documents: “PXML”

Based on the above results, we can design a language which works best with PNFA. Potential targets include eliminating ‘>’ from content sections, removing CDATA sections, disallowing extra whitespace in tags, and perhaps eliminating attributes altogether.
Thank you for your time.
Questions?
The following slides are additional and not part of the presentation.
Overcoming Sequentiality With an NFA

Problem: start state is unknown

Solution: assume every possible state is a start state

- Construct an NFA from the DFA used in \textsc{PIXIMAL-DFA}
  - Mark every state as a start state
  - Remove all the garbage state and all transitions to it
  - Create an queue for each start state to store actions that should be performed

Such an NFA can be applied on any substring of the input

\textsc{PIXIMAL-NFA} is the parser that does all of this:

- Partition input into segments
- Run \textsc{PIXIMAL-DFA} on the initial segment
- Run NFA-based parsers on subsequent partition elements
- Fix up transitions at partition boundaries and run queued actions
PIXIMAL-DFA Implementation Details

- `mmap(2)` s input file to save memory
- Uses `{length, pointer}` string representation
  - Strings (for tag names, attribute values) point into the mapped memory
  - All the way through the SAX-style event interface
- DFA is encoded as two tables
  - Table of “next” state numbers indexed by state number and input character
  - Table of boolean “action required” indicators indexed by “current” state and “next” state
    - Action required $\implies$ a function is called to decode and execute the required action
- DFA table is generated at compile time using a separate generator program