Are Your Incoming Aliases Really Necessary? Counting the Cost of Object Ownership

<u>Alex Potanin, Monique Damitio, James Noble</u> Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Are Your Incoming Aliases Really Necessary? Remembering the Cost of Object Ownership

<u>Alex Potanin</u>, Monique Damitio, James Noble Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Aliasing

"The big lie of object-oriented programming is that objects provide encapsulation."

> John Hogg Islands: Aliasing Protection in Object-Oriented Languages <u>OOPSLA 1991</u>

Object-Oriented Programming

C

http://openclipart.org/





Aliasing (The Good)



Aliasing (The Bad)

Point p = new Point(100, 50); Rectangle r = new Rectangle(p, 300, 200);

p.setX(400);

}

...

...

Aliasing (The Ugly)

- Bugs due to unintentional aliasing are hard to track down (e.g. applets breaking out of JDK v1.1.1 sandbox)
- Typically enforced by coding style only (e.g. CMU SEI CERT OBJ05-J advises to "defensively copy private mutable class members before returning their references")
- Still no mainstream language support for enforcing per-object encapsulation after 20+ years... (Rust?)





Ownership Tree

D

B

E

A

С

F

G

H

Ownership Tree: HelloWorld



Ownership Tree: LinkedList



Back to LinkedList



Encapsulated LinkedList



LinkedList with Iterator



Our Questions

How must designs change to respect encapsulation?

What performance cost do these changes impose?

How does this impact programs' performance?

More on Ownership



Owners as Accessors (IWACO 2014)



Owner-as-Accessor Example

class Internal { String s = "abc"; } class Owner { Internal i = new Internal(); void modifyI() { i.s = "def"; } } class External { Internal i; Owner o = new Owner(); void doIt() { this.i = o.i; // OK. Stores external ref. o.modifyI(); // OK. Modifies Internal. // this.i.s = "ghi"; // WRONG. Not owner!

Java Collections Framework v1.5.0

		Implementations									
		Hash Table	Resizable Array	Balanced Tree	Linked List	Hash Table + Linked List					
	Set	<u>HashSet</u>		<u>TreeSet</u>		LinkedHashSet					
Interfaces	List		ArrayList		LinkedList						
	Мар	<u>HashMap</u>		<u>TreeMap</u>		LinkedHashMap					

Seffectively: Lists and Maps (implemented using Hash, Array, List or Tree).

Our Implementations Available Online:

http://homepages.ecs.vuw.ac.nz/~alex/software/



ArrayList (and Vector)



What About LinkedList?



Owner-as-Dominator

Naive implementation that uses just the interface gives O(N²) iteration of the whole list (duh!)

Single Place Cache (caching last accessed item and its index) improves it back to O(N) for <u>non-random</u> iteration – complies with specification

Owner-as-Accessor (Proxy Iterator)



Owner-as-Accessor (Indirection Iterator)



Other Possible Iterators

Magic Cookie" that uses a unique ID for each Iterator and stores its internal state inside a list in a hash map

See: "Iterators and Encapsulation" by James Noble in TOOLS2000



Map Interfaces



[Linked]HashMap and Hashtable



Extended Map Interface

Summary of Map Changes

HashMap's HashIterator was changed to utilise the extended Map interface

LinkedHashMap was easier as the "getNextKey" could make use of linked list woven through the map's entries

Hashtable (like Vector) was fundamentally the same but used different interfaces and was fully synchronised

Finally, we provided 4 more owner-as-accessor refactorings following the ones described in LinkedList

TreeMap

Originally planned to refactor separately...

- Turns out we could re-use all the iterator, view, and entry objects from HashMap as they were just using Map's public interface!
- Calling getNextKey(currentKey) results in tracing down from the root of Red-Black tree (more costly and complex operation), but improvements with caching are possible

Measurements

Three Microbenchmarks

Doug Lea's IteratorLoops from JSR166

- LinkedList Iteration: forward/backward/ disruptive
- Doug Lea's MapMicroBenchmark from JSR166

NB! We ensured that GC and JIT did not interfere with our tests and ran each 25 times (see Georges et al OOPSLA2007)

IteratorLoops



LinkedList Iteration



MapMicroBenchmark



Three Macrobenchmarks

DaCapo (Typical Usage, Improves on SPEC)
SPECjbb2005
SPECjvm2008

TABLE I FULL RESULTS TABLE (FORMAT: MEAN|SD; STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT VALUES SHOWN IN BOLD)

Benchmark	Original		OasD Proxy		ху	Proxy D. Indire		tion Indirection D.		ion D.	Number	Percent		
DaCapo (Time in ms; lower is better)														
avrora	23003	300	22781	415	22816	236	22867	179	22948	389	22873	323	219049309	78.08%
batik	2516	34	2517	19	2520	25	2519	19	2519	25	2528	30	26507124	31.37%
eclipse	53793	1031	53480	936	53716	1010	53812	1329	53554	1406	53608	738	355465429	33.63%
fop	393	27	397	29	394	20	397	23	396	23	399	20	1874892	18.07%
h2	24133	580	24238	593	24141	517	24188	380	23967	320	23934	375	90175446	8.04%
jython	15041	215	15476	100	15725	107	15719	53	15837	110	17050	145	159700109	7.49%
luindex	705	18	687	23	714	22	713	19	710	40	718	51	327466	36.66%
lusearch	7251	184	7334	105	7181	189	7120	198	7226	299	7325	78	11979688	5.45%
pmd	3944	47	3992	39	4046	59	4065	72	4005	64	4054	67	10712544	36.55%
sunflow	22656	518	22560	365	23365	126	22970	711	22851	523	22331	207	171198077	<0.01%
tomcat	7576	108	7641	135	7687	134	7736	111	7733	88	7661	118	16726923	13.95%
tradebeans	27952	409	27556	494	28258	506	28142	275	27998	328	28020	340	1621619	33.00%
tradesoap	64476	1251	65193	1549	65042	1712	65119	1463	64390	1378	65111	1499	1631193	32.82%
xalan	26604	384	26692	318	26383	247	26173	258	26125	251	26310	291	61153799	13.23%
SPECjbb2005 (Throughput; higher is better)														
SPECjbb2005	29598	405	14062	181	28825	860	28540	619	28959	764	28394	641	35542855	4.87%
				SPE	Cjvm200)8 (Tin	ne in ms;	lower	is better)				
compress	46.56	0.81	46.77	0.59	46.71	0.59	46.82	0.42	46.83	0.42	46.84	0.57	199478	20.21%
crypto.aes	18.49	0.18	18.40	0.13	18.46	0.10	18.48	0.18	18.42	0.10	18.48	0.19	254853	22.00%
crypto.rsa	35.04	0.25	34.89	0.28	34.92	0.31	34.95	0.36	34.94	0.25	34.95	0.27	6535358	11.18%
crypto.signverify	53.06	0.27	52.97	0.31	53.11	0.29	53.16	0.36	53.09	0.38	53.12	0.29	3290783	2.13%
derby	21.55	0.48	21.63	0.40	21.56	0.50	21.73	0.43	21.59	0.38	21.61	0.33	89061937	3.04%
mpegaudio	15.08	0.05	15.10	0.05	15.08	0.06	15.11	0.05	15.10	0.06	15.07	0.06	209089	20.32%
fft.large	23.61	0.27	23.53	0.30	23.49	0.27	23.43	0.28	23.55	0.24	23.51	0.38	168290	23.78%
fft.small	82.75	4.49	84.24	5.21	84.98	3.94	83.35	4.01	84.46	4.70	83.57	4.26	439646	9.22%
lu.large	6.98	1.44	6.69	1.24	6.72	1.22	7.05	1.39	6.34	0.96	7.02	1.42	166728	23.92%
lu.small	107.98	0.87	107.61	0.92	107.48	0.75	107.58	0.84	107.94	0.70	107.82	0.85	642713	6.39%
monte_carlo	15.33	1.49	15.33	1.48	15.65	0.10	15.67	0.11	15.63	0.03	15.29	1.47	179253	22.58%
sor.large	13.01	0.02	13.01	0.02	13.01	0.01	13.02	0.02	12.99	0.05	13.01	0.01	167449	23.92%
sor.small	57.47	0.11	57.47	0.10	57.49	0.10	57.47	0.12	57.43	0.07	57.44	0.10	193425	21.16%
sparse.large	11.51	0.23	11.97	1.22	11.70	0.28	11.82	0.80	11.71	0.34	11.77	0.36	166691	23.98%
sparse.small	43.87	0.11	43.79	0.12	43.80	0.18	43.83	0.11	43.85	0.18	43.80	0.15	182676	22.17%
serial	33.22	0.98	32.46	0.96	33.27	0.81	33.04	0.92	32.88	1.31	33.31	0.89	51123977	5.68%
sunflow	20.51	0.50	20.48	0.50	20.55	0.32	20.42	0.52	20.22	0.63	20.51	0.47	42506559	0.12%
xml.validation	63.38	1.09	63.01	0.96	63.36	1.03	63.19	1.42	63.75	1.39	63.23	1.03	10318760	3.33%

Macrobenchmarks

Full table available in our ICSE2013 paper and an accompanying Technical Report ECSTR12-22:

http://ecs.victoria.ac.nz/Main/TechnicalReportSeries

In only 40 out of 165 refactored benchmarks have we detected a statistically significant slow down!

SPECjbb2005 is the heaviest user of collections (around 8% of its running time spent in java.util.* methods according to option -Xrunhprof:cpu-times) and as a result slowed down the most

Conclusions

Encapsulation reduces performance by factors of 2 to 8 (in particular on microbenchmarks)

Owner-as-dominator is the worst (as expected)

Owner-as-accessor (even with dynamic checking) only produces less than 3% slowdown on macrobenchmarks

We hope these results may encourage object-oriented designers to consider object encapsulation more carefully when designing their programs – especially their use of incoming aliases to circumvent encapsulation – and to ask themselves: are their incoming aliases really necessary?

Since 2013...

State of the macro benchmarks is still "to be improved": some recent 2019 developments on DeCapo update *as well as* a competing performance corpora by Oracle Labs just released at PLDI 2019 (Renaissance – controversial)

New common data structure libraries but still not necessarily treating aliasing more than an algorithmic side effect. Are Your Incoming Aliases Really Necessary?



KEEP CALM AND CARRY ON

Are your Incoming Aliases Really Necessary?

> Counting the Cost of Object Ownership Alex Potanin, Monique Damitio, James Noble

Fri 24 May Session 2.3