Lazy and Parallel Evaluation

Stephen A. Edwards

Columbia University

Fall 2023



Laziness

Forcing Evaluation with seq Weak Head Normal Form

Parallelism

ThreadScope Sparking Parallelism with par Sparks Limiting Granularity



O'REILLY*

Simon Marlow

This material adapted from

Simon Marlow's book

https://simonmar.github.io/pages/pcph.html

Mary Sheeran and John Hughes's class

http://www.cse.chalmers.se/edu/year/2018/ course/DAT280_Parallel_Functional_ Programming/lectures.html

Laziness in Haskell

Haskell follows a *call-by-need*[†] evaluation strategy in which expressions are evaluated only when their values are needed and at most once.

```
Prelude> let x = 1 + 2 :: Int
Prelude> :t x
x :: Int
Prelude> :sprint x
x = _
Prelude> x + 1
4
Prelude> :sprint x
x = 3
```

_ denotes an unevaluated "thunk"





[Marlow, Figure 2–1]

[†]C, Java, etc. are *call-by-value*: arguments are evaluated before a function call; Algol-68 is *call-by-name*: arguments are (re)evaluated at each reference

Thunks all the way down: seq also forces evaluation

seq :: a -> b -> b

seq x y = evaluate x and y; return y

```
Prelude> let x = 1 + 2 :: Int
Prelude> let y = x + 1
Prelude> :sprint x
x =
Prelude> :sprint v
\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}
Prelude> seq v ()
()
Prelude> :sprint x
\mathbf{x} = 3
Prelude> :sprint y
v = 4
```





Weak Head Normal Form: Lazy Data Structrures

```
Prelude> let x = 1 + 2 :: Int
Prelude> let y = (x, x)
Prelude> let swap(a, b) = (b, a)
Prelude> let z = swap(x,x+1)
Prelude> :sprint z
z =
Prelude> sea z ()
()
Prelude> :sprint z
z = (...)
Prelude> seq x ()
()
Prelude> :sprint z
z = (...,3)
```



[Marlow, Figure 2–3]

Weak head normal form: top is data constructor or lambda, not application

Functions Build Thunks

```
Prelude> let xs =
  map (+1) [1..10] :: [Int]
Prelude> :sprint xs
xs =
Prelude> seq xs ()
()
Prelude> :sprint xs
xs = :
Prelude> seq (tail xs) ()
()
Prelude> :sprint xs
xs = _ : _ : _
Prelude> length xs
10
Prelude> :sprint xs
xs = [_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_
```



[Marlow, Figure 2–4]

Let's Speed Up a Dumb[†] Program

nfib1 :: Integer -> Integer							
nfibl n n < 2 = 1							
nfibl n = nfibl (n-1) + nfibl (n-2) + 1							
main :: IO () main = print (nfib1 40)							

n	nfib n				
10	177				
20	21891				
25	242785				
30	2692537				
35	29860703				
40	331160281				

\$ stack ghc02 \	# Optimize
-threaded \setminus	# Enable parallel execution
-rtsopts \setminus	# Enable run-time system flags +RTS
-eventlog \	# Enable parallel profiling
nfib1.hs	

[†]This should be iterative, not recursive

Running the Program

```
$ TIMEFORMAT="real %Rs"
                              # for bash time builtin
$ time ./nfib1
331160281
real 9,984s
                              \# +RTS = Run Time System, -N1 = 1 core
$ time ./nfib1 +RTS -N1
331160281
real 9 994s
$ time ./nfib1 +RTS -N4  # -N4 = use 4 cores
331160281
real 10,214s
 time ./nfib1 + RTS - N4 - ls # - ls = Record events in nfib1.eventlog 
331160281
real 10.378s
```

ThreadScope

ThreadScope: the Haskell parallel execution event log viewer

Under Ubuntu, I was able to install it using Aptitude:

\$ sudo apt install threadscope

The Haskell stack may also be able to install it (stack install threadscope), but it didn't work automatically on my machine

A Haskell executable compiled with -rtsopts enables the +RTS ... -RTS syntax for passing arguments to the Haskell runtime system

The -1 option enables event logging (in a binary file *executable*.eventlog); s includes scheduler events

Google "Haskell Runtime Control" or look in the GHC User Guide

/home/sedwards/svn/classes/2019/4995-fall/lectures/nfib1.eventlog - ThreadScope 65 Timeline Key Traces Bookmarks runnina 0s **1**s 25 3s 4s 5s **6**5 7s **8**s **9**s GC create thread Activity seg GC reg par GC req migrate thread thread wakeup shutdown HEC 0 user message perf counter perf tracepoint HEC 1 create spark dud spark HEC 2 overflowed spark run spark fizzled spark HEC 3 GCed spark Time Heap GC Spark stats Spark sizes Process info Raw events Total time: 10.37s Mutator time: 10.21s 0.165 GC time: Productivity: 98.4% of mutator vs total

/home/sedwards/svn/classes/2019/4995-fall/lectures/nfib1.eventlog (365037 events, 10.374s)

/home/sedwards/svn/classes/2019/4995-fall/lectures/nfib1.eventlog - ThreadScope 69 Timeline Traces Bookmarks Key runnina 0s **1**s 25 3s 4s 5s **6**5 7s **8**s **9**s GC create thread Activity seg GC reg par GC req migrate thread thread wakeup shutdown HEC 0 user message perf counter perf tracepoint HEC 1 create spark dud spark Only One Thread: Pretty Boring HEC 2 overflowed spark run spark fizzled spark HEC 3 GCed spark Time Heap GC Spark stats Spark sizes Process info Raw events Total time: 10.375 Mutator time: 10.21s GC time: 0.165 Productivity: 98.4% of mutator vs total

/home/sedwards/svn/classes/2019/4995-fall/lectures/nfib1.eventlog (365037 events, 10.374s)

Asking for Parallelism

In Control.Parallel, (stack install parallel)

par : a -> b -> b

par x y "sparks" the evaluation of x in parallel with y; returns y.

The run-time system may convert a spark into work for a thread

```
import Control.Parallel(par)
```

```
nfib2 :: Integer -> Integer
nfib2 n | n < 2 = 1
nfib2 n = par nf (nf + nfib2 (n-2) + 1)
where nf = nfib2 (n-1)</pre>
```

Performance of nfib2 (using par)



A speedup of 7.44: Pretty good for a first try

Sparks



From https://wiki.haskell.org/ThreadScope_Tour

\$./nfib2 +RTS -N8 -s
331160281
SPARKS:
166651588 total
 1210 converted,
47083668 overflowed,
 0 dud,
117359879 GC'd,
 2206831 fizzled

Conclusion: Far too many sparks created; majority were garbage collected; 25% didn't even fit in the spark pool. Only 1210 (0.0007%) did useful work.



Asking more precisely for parallelism

Also in Control.Parallel,

pseq : a -> b -> b

Like seq, but only strict in its first argument. pseq x y means "make sure x is evaluated before starting on y"

```
import Control.Parallel(par, pseq)
```

No visible change in performance; the compiler may have automatically done this for us



Controlling Granularity

We are creating a lot of sparks, most of which are pointless:

It doesn't make sense to be creating 168 million pieces of work when we only have 8 cores on which to do work; only 2351 ever did useful work.

Idea: let's go parallel only to a certain depth

Running Parallel to a Certain Depth





Computing nfib4 40 on an 8-thread i7

Depth	Sparks				Time (s)		Speedup
	total	converted	GC'ed	fizzled	total	elapsed	-
1	1	1	0	0	8.00	3.80	2.10
2	3	3	0	0	6.80	2.34	2.91
3	7	7	0	0	8.83	1.98	4.45
4	15	12	0	2	7.89	1.51	5.21
5	31	19	0	11	7.58	1.24	6.13
6	63	30	0	32	8.14	1.27	6.40
7	127	39	0	87	8.62	1.26	6.82
8	256	48	1	206	7.51	1.07	7.02
9	511	78	0	432	7.57	1.05	7.24
10	1026	98	4	923	7.53	1.03	7.32
11	2052	162	49	1840	7.33	0.98	7.51
12	4106	160	436	3509	7.04	0.93	7.58
13	8226	249	2109	5867	7.62	1.04	7.32
25	30833310	2855	28605093	398402	10.17	1.50	6.77

3.6 GHz 4-core, 8-thread i7-3820, +RTS -N8 -s, 4-run averages, -02 -threaded -rtsopts

Depth = 1: Only two-way parallelism



Depth = 4: 16-way parallelism but unbalanced



Depth = 7: 32 sparks, better balancing



Depth = 12: 4000+ sparks, excellent balancing

