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Function layout, also referred to as function reordering or function placement, is one of the most effective profile-guided compiler optimizations. By reordering functions in a binary, compilers are able to greatly improve the performance of large-scale applications or reduce the compressed size of mobile applications. Although the technique has been studied in the context of large-scale binaries, no recent study has investigated the impact of function layout on mobile applications.

In this paper we develop the first principled solution for optimizing function layouts in the mobile space. To this end, we identify two important optimization goals, the compressed code size and the cold start-up time of a mobile application. Then we propose a formal model for the layout problem, whose objective closely matches the goals. Our novel algorithm to optimize the layout is inspired by the classic balanced graph partitioning problem. We carefully engineer and implement the algorithm in an open source compiler, LLVM. An extensive evaluation of the new method on large commercial mobile applications indicates up to 2% compressed size reduction and up to 3% start-up time improvement on top of the state-of-the-art approach.

CCS Concepts: • Software and its engineering → Compilers; • Theory of computation → Graph algorithms analysis.
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Optimization Goals

- Mobile apps must launch quickly
  - Fewer ___text page faults → faster startup
  - Smaller ___text size → fewer ___text page faults
    - Compile with -0z (optimize for size)

- Mobile apps must be small
  - .ipa size (compressed)
  - .app size (uncompressed)
    - ~80% of size is executables
Profile Guided Optimization (PGO)

- LLVM IRPGO
  - -fprofile-generate
  - -fprofile-use

- Guides inlining decisions → larger binaries
  - -disable-preinline
  - -pgso=false
    - (profile guided size optimization)
Temporal Profiling

- **Goal:** Improve startup performance with an orderfile
- **-pgo-temporal-instrumentation**
- **Profiles** *function timestamps*
- **Available since LLVM 17.x**
  - [https://discourse.llvm.org/t/rfc-temporal-profiling-extension-for-irpgo/68068](https://discourse.llvm.org/t/rfc-temporal-profiling-extension-for-irpgo/68068)
  - [https://reviews.llvm.org/D147287](https://reviews.llvm.org/D147287)
- **Compatible with Lightweight Instrumentation**
  - [https://discourse.llvm.org/t/instrprofiling-lightweight-instrumentation/59113](https://discourse.llvm.org/t/instrprofiling-lightweight-instrumentation/59113)
  - [https://youtu.be/vFWwJrOiVMM](https://youtu.be/vFWwJrOiVMM)
Temporal Profiling

```c
int global_timestamp = 1;

void foo() {
    if (*timestamp == 0)
        *timestamp = global_timestamp++;
    ...
}

Counts: ...
Trace 1: foo, goo, bar
Trace 2: foo, bar

default-1.profraw
foo:
    timestamp: 1
counts: ...
goo:
    timestamp: 2
counts: ...
bar:
    timestamp: 3
counts: ...

default-2.profraw
foo:
    timestamp: 1
counts: ...
goo:
    timestamp: 0
counts: ...
bar:
    timestamp: 3
counts: ...

Trace 1: foo, goo, bar
Trace 2: foo, bar
Compressed Size

- Compressed size depends on # distinct sequences in a 64KB sliding window
  - Co-locating `similar` functions can improve the compression ratio
Balanced Partitioning

- Orders functions to minimize some objective
  - Use function traces to minimize page faults
  - Use function contents to minimize compressed size

- Performant
  - Can order 1M functions in 20 seconds

- LLVM 17.x
  - [https://reviews.llvm.org/D147812](https://reviews.llvm.org/D147812)
Balanced Partitioning

Original Functions

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f1:} & \quad \text{add } x0, x0, 1 \\
 & \quad \text{br } x0 \\
\text{f2:} & \quad \text{mul } x0, x0, 2 \\
 & \quad \text{add } x0, x0, 1 \\
 & \quad \text{ret} \\
\text{f3:} & \quad \text{add } x0, x0, 1 \\
 & \quad \text{mul } x0, x0, 2 \\
 & \quad \text{br } x0 \\
\text{f4:} & \quad \text{mul } x0, x0, 2 \\
 & \quad \text{ret}
\end{align*}
\]

Stable Hash

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f1:} & \quad 0x10101010(u1) \\
 & \quad 0x20202020(u2) \\
\text{f2:} & \quad 0x30303030(u3) \\
 & \quad 0x10101010(u1) \\
 & \quad 0x40404040(u4) \\
\text{f3:} & \quad 0x10101010(u1) \\
 & \quad 0x30303030(u3) \\
 & \quad 0x20202020(u2) \\
\text{f4:} & \quad 0x30303030(u3) \\
 & \quad 0x40404040(u4)
\end{align*}
\]

Utility Vertices

Goal: Place functions sharing utilities nearby!
Recursive Balanced Partitioning

How to bisect?

functions (unordered)

final order
Balanced Partitioning

Objective: Minimize the number of utilities spanning two buckets by swapping functions

\[
\sum_{u \in U} \text{cost}(L(u), R(u)) = \sum_{u \in U} -(x \cdot \log(x+1) + y \cdot \log(y+1))
\]
When to Order Functions?

- **Before building?**
  - $ llvm-profdata order default.profdata -o a.orderfile
  - $ clang -Wl,-order_file,a.orderfile ...
  - ✅ Function traces for startup
  - ❌ No stable hashes for compression

- **Link time**
  - ✅ Function traces for startup
  - ✅ Stable hashes for compression
  - ✅ Safe optimization
Results

- 3 iOS apps
  - ~80% total size is binary
  - ~20% hot functions
- Firefox for iOS
  - [https://github.com/mozilla-mobile/firefox-ios](https://github.com/mozilla-mobile/firefox-ios)
  - Only controlled Client binary
    - 30% total size
Compressed Size Improvement (w/o Traces)

IPA Size

Binary Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App</th>
<th>IPA Size</th>
<th>Binary Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App1</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>4.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App2</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App3</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefox</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compressed Size Improvement (w/ Traces)

IPA Size  Binary Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App</th>
<th>IPA Size</th>
<th>Binary Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App1</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App2</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App3</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Function Order:
  - Default
  - Optimized

- Time (sec) along the x-axis.
- Cumulative Page Faults along the y-axis.
Conclusion

- Temporal Profiling
- Balanced Partitioning
- 40% fewer page faults
- 0.8 - 3% smaller compressed size
- Future work
  - Order data sections
  - Profile guided outlining
  - ???