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Background

- Our group develops techniques for understanding Java application behavior
  - performance and memory diagnosis tools
    - e.g. Jinsight (mature tool), LeakBot, JaVinci (ongoing research)
    - characterizing complexity

- Focus is on large framework-based systems
  - high-volume web-based (e-Business) applications
  - client-side applications (e.g. Eclipse-based)

- We maintain a consulting practice, solving problems for IBM customers and products
Observations

- Things are getting worse
  - Performance errors are easy to make
  - Performance errors are difficult to localize
    - and to understand, communicate, assess
  - Costs of design choices are difficult to predict
  - Tools are at the wrong level
  - Automated optimizations are not keeping up

- Even well-tuned programs seem bloated
  - They seem to be doing a lot of work to accomplish very little
Goals for this talk

- Scare you ... with how bad things are
Goals for this talk

- Share our experiences from the real world
  What types of problems occur in these applications?
  Explore some of the reasons they occur
  Show some requirements for analysis
  - Illustrate LiveJinsight approach, including its limitations
  Gain insights on where optimizations are failing
Road Map

- Background: large-scale object-oriented systems

- Case studies in Java performance analysis
  - Part I: Performance errors from the real world
  - Part II: A “well-tuned” benchmark

- Ongoing research
  - Automating performance understanding
  - Characterizing complexity
Object-oriented Design and Java

- Modern O-O design techniques and the Java language aim to ease programming and maintenance, improve correctness, and enable reusability
  - e.g. implementations are hidden behind well-defined interfaces
  - e.g. design patterns distribute functional responsibility
  - e.g. Java provides high-level features like automatic garbage collection, multithreading, and object serialization

- In general, the programmer is free not to worry about what's happening behind the scenes

- These techniques have been very successful, and they have enabled the construction of larger, more complex systems. However ...
Object-oriented Design, Java and Performance

- ... many of these same properties can make performance difficult to predict, performance errors easy to make, and runtime behavior complex to analyze

- Some properties of well-designed Java programs:
  - implementation choices are hidden
  - implementation is functionally distributed across many classes for a single user-level feature
  - many interacting parts; many small methods
  - APIs that return new objects
  - reusable libraries/frameworks from vendors or other teams
e-Business Applications: Java part

- Extensive use of libraries and frameworks
  - Application server frameworks provide commonly needed services: security, availability, session management, resource pooling, etc.
    - Incredible number of different standards: servlets, JSPs, JDBC, EJBs, JNDI, XML, XSLT, RMI/IIOP, etc.
    - Many are different in kind
    - Most were designed separately, for general-purpose usage
    - Each has its own type system, conventions, etc.
    - Customers have their own frameworks which are reused across applications
    - Many authors, many vendors

- Application itself is usually relatively small
  - and the actual business and presentation logic is relatively simple!

- On the client side we are seeing a similar story (Eclipse, Hyades, eMF, etc.)
Part I: case studies
Jinsight: Understanding Java Application Behavior

- Visual approach
  For performance and memory analysis

- Traces details of an execution
  Shows how and when problems occur
  Allows ad hoc computation of highly focused measures

- Scalable to very large applications
  Selective and conditional tracing

- Flexibility in navigating and exploring

- Traces using a JVMPI profiling agent
  Analyze during or after the run
  Windows, AIX, z/OS, z/Linux, etc.
A word of warning about the case studies

- It’s easy to think of each case as just another example of bad programming
  - But many of the errors were made by very good programmers!
  - Instead, we would like to encourage questioning of why these problems are so prevalent
Case study #1: Banking application

- Large European bank

- Client-server architecture
  - Server: z/OS (IBM 390), WebSphere, additional higher-level frameworks
  - Java client

- Problem: CPU utilization was too high on the server

- Cause: 6-7 independent problems
Anatomy of a transaction

- Get client request
- Parse client request
- Build IMS request
- Send to IMS
- Parse IMS response
- Build client response
- Send client response
Transaction detail: part I

Get client request

Parse client request

Build IMS request

Send to IMS
Transaction detail: part II

- Parse IMS response
- Build client response
- Send response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Execution</th>
<th>Coloring by type</th>
<th>Workspace CMWAS4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>Threads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sendString</th>
<th>sendString</th>
<th>write</th>
<th>write</th>
<th>check</th>
<th>check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Send response (partial)**

Indications in green = Live content
Indications in white  = Edit in master
Indications in blue    = Locked elements
Indications in black   = Optional elements
Send response: detail

- View shows writing just the header of one String!
- Protocol implemented by layering DataOutputStream over SRTOutputStream
- Solution: buffering
Sending response: summary

- Problem: sending response is expensive

- Solution: introduce a buffering layer

- Comments
  - Performance is not automatically composable!
  - The problem occurred within a framework, and was discovered during application deployment
    - Lesson: performance testing with real-world use cases is especially important for frameworks
  - There actually was a buffering layer, but at the wrong level
Case study #2: Brokerage application

- Web-based client
  Customer can look up account information, stock holdings

- Server:
  WebSphere
  Application uses JSPs, EJBs
  Customer wrote a general framework to support many applications

- Problem: slow response time

- Cause: at least 3 different problems
Problem: database requests?

- actual query to database
- processing 3 records
- all the rest: customer
- LittleInstrumenter class
  - uses Java serialization to wrap up database results, just to measure & log their size
Database request example: summary

- **Problem**: customer reported that database requests were slow
  - the actual problem was expensive logging, using object serialization

- **What went wrong?**
  - costs are hidden
    - just one little call to writeObject!
  - *LittleInstrumenter*? the code was put in to prevent a performance problem!
  - later, the customer erroneously told us they had fixed the code, yet the problem remained
    - lesson: validation is essential

- **Diagnosis techniques**
  - Visualization and focused summarization of information in context were key to discovering and measuring the impact of the problem
  - Used data flow (by hand!) to understand the purpose of the serialization
Problem: converting dates

- 63 dates converted to Java format in this one phase of one servlet hit

- cost of converting one date:
  - 1520 method calls
  - 120 temporary objects created
Converting dates

Creating a new SimpleDateFormat each time
- yet the format is always the same!

- also, substantial setup cost to call SimpleDateFormat constructor

Solution: cache the converter
- even once per transaction would help
Date conversion example: summary

- Problem: creating the same object over and over
  - plus an additional setup cost

- Illustrates three common phenomena:
  - recomputation is one of the most common problems
    - the cost of calls is not obvious
  - creation of temporary objects
    - allocation and GC cost are just part of the problem
    - the real expense is initializing temporary data structures
  - note that the remaining part of the conversion is still expensive
    - conversion is a major expense even in “correctly-written” applications

- Diagnosis techniques
  - understanding and focused summarization of activity in a particular context were essential to discovery and accurate measurement of the impact
  - data flow and escape information (guessed at, by hand) were valuable for understanding
Case study #3: Credit card application

- Problem: slow response time
- Causes: many different problems (only 2 shown here)
Database requests

- View shows getting the field values out of *one* row

- Called in a loop (e.g. 25 records for one query)

- One row costs:
  - 728 method calls
  - 106 new short-lived objects
  - after JIT!
Database requests

- Calls these ResultSet methods: `getString (String columnName)` `getLong (String columnName)` etc.

- Causes `findColumn(columnName)` to be called for each field
  - but the column structure is fixed for every record!

- Solution: use different calls: `getString (int columnIndex)` `getLong (int columnIndex)` etc.
Database requests

- Part 2: `getDate` and `getTimestamp` cause new `GregorianCalendar` to get created each time

- Solution: use different calls:
  - `getDate` (columnIndex, Calendar)
  - `getTimestamp` (columnIndex, Calendar)

- But these calls were not implemented in the DB2 driver!

- What went wrong?
  - Knowledge of correct API required
  - Causing unnecessary recomputation & object recreation
  - Part 2: driver implementation not suited for common use case
private static KeyFactory instance = new KeyFactory();

// Create a unique credit card transaction key
public synchronized long getSIDKey() {
    try {
        Thread.sleep(1);
        long key =
                    // expression based on current time and server name
        return key;
    }
    catch(Exception e) {
        return getSIDKey();
    }
}

in a loop within each servlet hit:
instance.getSIDKey();

Create transaction key

Sleep in a synchronized method

- Contention problem
- Response time problem

Called 17 times in one hit!
private static KeyFactory instance = new KeyFactory();

// Create a unique credit card transaction key
public synchronized long getSIDKey() {
    try {
        Thread.sleep(1);
        long key =
          expression based on current time and server name
        return key;
    }
    catch(Exception e) {
      return getSIDKey();
    }
}

in one servlet hit, in a loop:
…
instance.getSIDKey();

Create transaction key

Want went wrong?
  • Just “coding crazy”?
  • Rather, it was insufficient awareness of scalable multithreading issues

Recursion in exception handler?
Part II: The Diary of a Datum
Ongoing Research
JaVinci: Automated Performance Explanation

- Problem: current tools place too much burden on the user
  Too much expertise is required to interpret the data
  Too much work is required to dig through details, even for experts

- Goal: simplify performance diagnosis and understanding
  Challenge: can we turn a 500K method call trace into a manager’s summary?

- Approach:
  Build collective expertise into the tools
  - Knowledge about how problems are analyzed
  - Domain knowledge (e.g. about J2EE, WCS)
  - Knowledge of what is worth tracing
  Let the system do the hard work: automate much of analysis and trace collection
  Raise the level of explanation
  Integrate many layers of explanation
  Combine static and dynamic analyses
Characterizing Complexity

- **Goal:** Understand the nature and causes of run-time complexity

- **Enables:**
  - Performance understanding and assessment of individual applications
  - Comparisons across various implementations
  - Characterization of classes of applications
    - Identify good API design practice
    - Identify classes of optimizations to target

- **FSE 2005 submission**
People

- Customer examples; Descriptive characterization
  - Nick Mitchell, Gary Sevitsky, Harini Srinivasan

- Jinsight (past)
  - Wim De Pauw, Herb Derby, Olivier Gruber, Erik Jensen, Ravi Konuru, Martin Robillard, Gary Sevitsky, Harini Srinivasan, John Vlissides, Jeaha Yang

- JaVinci: automation of performance understanding
  - Gary Sevitsky, Nick Mitchell
  - Barbara Ryder