



## Pre- and post-scheduling memory allocation strategies on MPSoCs

Karol Desnos, Maxime Pelcat, Jean François Nezan, Slaheddine Aridhi

### ► To cite this version:

Karol Desnos, Maxime Pelcat, Jean François Nezan, Slaheddine Aridhi. Pre- and post-scheduling memory allocation strategies on MPSoCs. Electronic System Level Synthesis Conference (ESLSyn13), May 2013, Austin, TX, United States. pp.60-65. hal-00868945

**HAL Id: hal-00868945**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00868945v1>**

Submitted on 2 Oct 2013

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Pre- and Post-Scheduling Memory Allocation Strategies on MPSoCs

Karol Desnos, Maxime Pelcat, Jean-François Nezan  
IETR, INSA Rennes, CNRS UMR 6164, UEB  
20, Av. des Buttes de Coësmes, 35708 Rennes  
email: kdesnos, mpelcat, jnezan@insa-rennes.fr

Slaheddine Aridhi  
Texas Instruments France  
06271 Villeneuve Loubet, France  
email: saridhi@ti.com

**Abstract**—This paper introduces and assesses a new method to allocate memory for applications implemented on a shared memory Multiprocessor System-on-Chip (MPSoC).

This method first consists of deriving, from a Synchronous Dataflow (SDF) algorithm description, a Memory Exclusion Graph (MEG) that models all the memory objects of the application and their allocation constraints. Based on the MEG, memory allocation can be performed at three different stages of the implementation process: prior to the scheduling process, after an untimed multicore schedule is decided, or after a timed multicore schedule is decided. Each of these three alternatives offers a distinct trade-off between the amount of allocated memory and the flexibility of the application multicore execution. Tested use cases are based on descriptions of real applications and a set of random SDF graphs generated with the SDF For Free (SDF3) tool.

Experimental results compare several allocation heuristics at the three implementation stages. They show that allocating memory after an untimed schedule of the application has been decided offers a reduced memory footprint as well as a flexible multicore execution.

## I. INTRODUCTION

During the design of an embedded system, memory issues strongly impact the system quality and performance, as the area occupied by the memory can be as large as 80% of the chip and may be responsible for a major part of its power consumption [1]. Consequently, memory allocation plays a crucial role in the implementation process of an application on a Multiprocessor System-on-Chip (MPSoC) and new allocation techniques are needed to accommodate the increasing complexity of embedded systems where multiple applications are executed concurrently on a single MPSoC.

This paper focuses on memory allocation of applications described by a Synchronous Dataflow (SDF) Model of Computation (MoC) [2]. A SDF MoC models the application as a directed graph of computational entities named actors that exchange data via First In, First Out data queues (FIFOs). Each actor is associated with fixed firing rules specifying its behavior in terms of data token production and consumption. A token is an abstract representation of a data quantum, independent of its size. Actors themselves are “black boxes” of the model and may be implemented in any programming language. Firing an actor consists of starting its preemption-free execution. An example of an SDF graph with 5 actors is given in Figure 1. Edges are labeled with their token production and consumption rates. An edge with a black dot

signifies that initial tokens are present in the FIFO queue when the system starts to execute. The number of initial tokens is specified by the  $xN$  label. Initial tokens are a semantic element of the SDF MoC that makes communication possible between successive iterations of the graph execution; they are often used to pipeline applications described with SDF graphs [2].




Fig. 1. Synchronous Dataflow (SDF) graph

Multicore scheduling is composed of actor mapping, scheduling and timing [3]. Mapping a graph consists of assigning the computation of each actor to a specific processing element of the architecture. Scheduling consists of ordering the firings of the actors assigned to each processing element. In a timed schedule, not only the order of actor firings is fixed but also the time at which each actor starts and ends its execution. Multicore scheduling stages can be performed at compile time or at runtime.

Section II of this paper presents existing memory allocation techniques. Section III explains the preprocessing of the SDF graph to reveal its memory characteristics. Then, Section IV details the different implementation stages and Section V presents a performance evaluation of our method. Finally, Section VI concludes this paper and proposes directions for future work.

## II. RELATED WORK

Memory optimization for multicore systems has generally been studied as a post-scheduling process. As such, the lifetimes of the different memory objects of an application are derived from scheduling and timing information. Minimization is then achieved by allocating memory objects whose lifetimes do not overlap in the same memory space. Common approaches to perform the memory allocation are:

- Running an online allocation algorithm. Online allocators assign memory objects one by one in the order in which they arrive. The most commonly used online allocators are the First-Fit (FF) and the Best-Fit (BF) algorithms [4]. FF algorithm consists of allocating an object to the first available space in memory that is sufficiently large to

store it. The BF algorithm works similarly but allocates each object to the available space in memory whose size is the closest to the size of the allocated object.

- Running an offline allocation algorithm [1], [5]. In contrast to online allocators, offline allocators have a global knowledge of all memory objects requiring allocation, thus making further optimizations possible.
- Coloring an exclusion graph that models the conflicting memory objects [6].
- Using constraint programming [7] where memory constraints are used together with cost, resource usage and execution time constraints.

The novelty of our memory allocation method is that it is applicable at three different stages of the implementation process. Indeed, memory allocation can be performed before scheduling, after the multicore scheduling process but without actor timing information, or with a timed multicore schedule of the graph actors. As shown in Section IV, these three possibilities offer a trade-off between size of memory footprint and flexibility of actor mapping and scheduling.

### III. PREPROCESSING TOWARD MEMORY ALLOCATION

Before allocating an SDF graph in memory, a set of transformations is applied to reveal and model its embedded parallelism and its memory characteristics.

#### A. Transforming the Algorithm

The first transformation applied to the input SDF graph to reveal parallelism is a conversion into a single-rate SDF (srSDF) graph: a SDF graph where the production and consumption rates on each FIFO are equal. Each vertex of the srSDF graph corresponds to a single actor firing from the SDF graph. This conversion is performed by computing the topology matrix [2], by duplicating actors by their number of firings, and by connecting FIFOs properly. For example, in Figure 2, actors  $B$ ,  $C$ , and  $D$  are each split in two instances and new FIFOs are added to ensure the equivalence with the SDF graph of Figure 1. An algorithm to perform this conversion can be found in [8].

The second conversion consists of generating a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) by isolating one iteration of the algorithm. This conversion is achieved simply by ignoring FIFOs with initial tokens in the srSDF. In our example, this approach means that the feedback FIFO  $C_2 \rightarrow C_1$  which stores 75 initial tokens is ignored.




Fig. 2. Single-rate SDF (Directed Acyclic Graph if dotpoint FIFO is ignored) Dotpoint arrows depict new precedence relationships introduced by a schedule of the DAG on an architecture with 2 cores.

In the context of memory analysis and allocation, these transformations are applied to fulfill the following objectives:

- *Expose data parallelism:* Concurrent analysis of data parallelism and data precedence gives information on the lifetime of memory objects prior to any scheduling process. Indeed, two FIFOs belonging to parallel data-paths may contain data tokens simultaneously and are consequently forbidden from sharing a memory space. Conversely, two single-rate FIFOs linked with a precedence constraint can be allocated in the same memory space since they will never store data tokens simultaneously. In Figure 2 for example, FIFO  $A \rightarrow B_1$  is a predecessor to  $C_1 \rightarrow D_1$ . Consequently, these two FIFOs may share a common address range in memory.

- *Break FIFOs into shared buffers:* In the SDF model, channels carrying data tokens between actors behave like FIFO queues. The memory needed to allocate each FIFO corresponds to the maximum number of tokens stored in the FIFO during an iteration of the graph. As this number of tokens depends on the schedule of the actors, methods exist to derive a schedule that minimizes the memory needed to be allocated to the FIFOs [9]. However, in our method, the memory allocation can be independent from scheduling considerations. It is for this reason that FIFOs of undefined size before the scheduling step are replaced with buffers of fixed size during the transformation of the graph into a srSDF. In Figure 2, buffers linking two actors will be written and read only once with a data token of fixed size, which simplifies the memory allocation.

- *Derive an acyclic model:* Cyclic data-paths in an SDF graph are an efficient way to model iterative or recursive calls to a subset of actors. In order to use efficient static scheduling algorithms [10], SDF models are often converted into DAGs before being scheduled. Besides revealing data-parallelism, this transformation makes it easier to schedule an application, as each actor is fired only once per execution of the resulting DAG. Similarly, in the absence of a schedule, deriving a DAG permits the use of memory objects (communication buffers) that will be written and read only once per execution of the DAG. Consequently, before a memory object is written and after it is read, its memory space will be reusable to store other objects.

#### B. Extracting Memory Characteristics from the Algorithm

The DAG resulting from the transformations of an SDF graph contains three types of memory objects

- *Communication buffers:* The first type of memory object, which corresponds to the single-rate FIFOs of the DAG, are the buffers used to transfer data between consecutive actors. In our approach, we consider that the memory allocated to these buffers is reserved from the execution start of the producer actor until the completion of the consumer actor. This choice is made to enable custom token consumption throughout actor firing time. As a consequence, the memory used to store an input buffer of an actor should not be reused to store an output buffer of the same actor. In Figure 2, the 100 units of memory used to carry data between actors  $A$  and  $B_1$  can not be reused, even partially, to transfer data from  $B_1$  to  $C_1$ .

- *Working memory of actors:* The second type of memory object corresponds to the maximum amount of memory allocated by an actor during its execution. This working memory represents the memory needed to store the data used during the computations of the actor but does not include the input

buffer nor the output buffer storage. In our method, we assume that an actor keeps an exclusive access to its working memory during its execution. In Figures 1 and 2, the size of the working memory associated with each actor is given by the number below the actor name. This memory is equivalent to a task stack space in an operating system.

- *Feedback/Pipeline FIFOs*: The last type of memory object corresponds to the memory needed to store edges ignored as a result of the transformation of a srSDF into a DAG. These edges carry data between successive executions of the DAG and must behave like FIFO queues.

### C. Deriving a Memory Exclusion Graph (MEG)

Once an application has been transformed into a DAG and all its memory objects have been identified, the last pre-processing step of our allocation method consists of deriving the MEG [11] used for memory allocation (Section IV).

A Memory Exclusion Graph (MEG) is an undirected weighted graph denoted by  $G = \langle V, E, w \rangle$  where:

- $V$  is the set of vertices. Each vertex represents an indivisible memory object.
- $E$  is the set of edges representing the memory exclusions.
- $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a function with  $w(v)$  the weight of a vertex  $v$ . The weight of a vertex corresponds to the size of the associated memory object.
- $|S|$  the cardinality of a set  $S$ .  $|V|$  and  $|E|$  are respectively the number of vertices and edges of a graph.
- $\delta(G) = \frac{2 \cdot |E|}{|V| \cdot (|V| - 1)}$  the edge density of the graph corresponding to the ratio of existing exclusions to all possible exclusions.

Two memory objects of any type exclude each other (i.e. they can not share the same memory space) if a schedule can be derived from the DAG where both these memory objects store data simultaneously. Some exclusions are directly caused by the properties of the memory objects, such as exclusions between input and output buffers of an actor. Other exclusions result from the parallelism of an application, as is the case with the working memory of actors from parallel data-paths that might be executed concurrently.

The MEG presented in Figure 3 is derived from the SDF graph of Figure 1. The complete MEG contains 18 memory objects and 78 exclusions but, for clarity, only the vertices corresponding to the buffers between actors (1<sup>st</sup> type memory objects) are presented. The values printed below the vertices names represent the weight  $w$  of the memory objects. Methods to build the MEG are given in [11].




Fig. 3. Memory Exclusion Graph (MEG). Crossed out exclusions are removed when considering new precedence edges induced by the schedule of Fig. 2

### D. Generating Memory Bounds from MEG

Memory bounds of an SDF graph are introduced in [11] and used in this paper to assess allocation results. The MEG of an application is built and analyzed in order to derive two values that bound the amount of memory needed for the allocation of all memory objects in memory (Figure 4). For example, the memory required for the MEG allocation of Figure 3 is between 525 and 725 memory units.




Fig. 4. Memory Bounds

This bounding method, independent of timing and architecture constraints, can be used prior to allocation to verify whether a targeted architecture has sufficient memory to run an application. In the next section, we show that a MEG can be updated to incorporate precedence information resulting from a schedule thus allowing the reduction of the amount of allocated memory.

## IV. MEMORY ALLOCATION

Given an initial MEG constructed from a non-scheduled DAG, we propose three possible implementation stages to perform the allocation of this MEG in shared memory: prior to any type scheduling process, after an untimed multicore scheduling of actors, or after a timed multicore scheduling of the application. The current section details the scheduling flexibility resulting from the three alternatives.

### A. Pre-scheduling Memory Allocation

The pre-scheduling memory allocation offers the greatest flexibility of the three alternatives in terms of mapping and scheduling. In this first alternative, the input MEG is allocated in shared memory without being associated with any scheduling or timing information.

As presented in Section III-C, the MEG models all possible exclusions that may prevent memory objects from being allocated in the same memory space. As we will show in Section IV-B, scheduling a DAG on a multicore architecture always results in removing exclusions from its corresponding MEG but never results in adding new exclusions. Hence, a pre-scheduling MEG models all possible exclusions for all possible multicore schedules of an application. Consequently a compile-time allocation based on a pre-scheduling MEG will never violate any exclusion for any valid multicore schedule of this graph on any shared-memory architecture.

Since a compile-time memory allocation based on a pre-scheduling MEG is compatible with any multicore schedule, it is also compatible with any runtime schedule. The great flexibility of this first allocation approach is that it supports any runtime scheduling policy for the DAG and can accommodate any number of cores that can access a shared memory.

A typical scenario where this pre-scheduling compile-time allocation is useful is a multicore architecture implementation



which runs multiple applications concurrently. In such a scenario, the number of cores used for an application may change at runtime to accommodate applications with high priority or those with high processing needs. The compile-time allocation relieves runtime management from the weight of a dynamic allocator while guaranteeing a fixed memory footprint for the application.

The downside of this first approach is that, as shown in the results of Section V, this allocation technique requires substantially more memory than post-scheduling allocators.

### B. Post-scheduling Memory Allocation

Post-scheduling memory allocation offers a trade-off between amount of allocated memory and multicore scheduling flexibility. In this second alternative, the input MEG is updated with information from a schedule of the corresponding DAG before allocating the MEG in shared memory.

Scheduling a DAG on a multicore architecture introduces an order of execution of the graph actors, which can be seen as a new precedence relationship between actors. For example, Figure 2 illustrates the new precedence edges that result from scheduling the DAG on 2 cores. In this example, *Core*<sub>1</sub> executes actors *B*<sub>2</sub>, *C*<sub>1</sub>, *D*<sub>2</sub> and *E*; and *Core*<sub>2</sub> executes actors *A*, *B*<sub>1</sub>, *C*<sub>2</sub> and *D*<sub>1</sub>. Adding new precedence edges to a DAG results in decreasing the embedded parallelism of the application. For example in Figure 2, the schedule of *Core*<sub>1</sub> creates a new precedence relationship between *C*<sub>2</sub> and *D*<sub>1</sub>.

As presented in Section III-C, memory objects belonging to parallel data-paths may have overlapping lifetimes [11]. Reducing the parallelism of an application results in creating new precedence-paths between memory objects, thus preventing them from having overlapping lifetimes and removing exclusions between them. Since all the parallelism embedded in a DAG is explicit, the scheduling process cannot augment the parallelism of an application and cannot create new exclusions between memory objects. Figure 3 illustrates the updated MEG resulting from the multicore schedule of Figure 2.

The advantage of post-scheduling compared to pre-scheduling allocation is that updating the MEG greatly decreases its density which results in using less memory to allocate the MEG (Section V).

Like pre-scheduling memory allocation, the flexibility of post-scheduling memory allocation comes from its compatibility with any schedule obtained by adding new precedence relationships to the scheduled DAG. Indeed, adding new precedence edges will make some exclusions useless but it will never create new exclusions. Consequently, any memory allocation based on the updated MEG of Figure 3 is compatible with a new schedule of the DAG that introduces new precedence edges. For example, we consider a single core schedule derived by combining schedules of *Core*<sub>1</sub> and *Core*<sub>2</sub> as follows *A* *B*<sub>2</sub>, *B*<sub>1</sub>, *C*<sub>1</sub>, *C*<sub>2</sub>, *D*<sub>2</sub>, *D*<sub>1</sub> and *E*. Updating the MEG with this schedule would only result in removing the following exclusions: *AB*<sub>2</sub>–*B*<sub>1</sub> *C*<sub>1</sub> and *C*<sub>2</sub> *B*<sub>2</sub>–*D*<sub>1</sub> *E*.

The scheduling flexibility for post-scheduling allocation is inferior to the flexibility offered by pre-scheduling allocation. Indeed, the number of cores allocated to an application may be only dynamically decreased for post-scheduling allocation

while pre-scheduling allocation allows the number of cores to be both dynamically increased and decreased.

### C. Timed Memory Allocation

Timed memory allocation offers the least scheduling flexibility of the three alternatives. However, this approach is the one that yields the best performance in terms of memory allocation. In this third alternative, the MEG is associated with information from a timed schedule.

A timed schedule is a schedule where not only the execution order of the actors is fixed, but also their absolute starting and ending times. Such a schedule can be derived if the exact, or the worst-case execution times of all actors are known at compile time [12]. Following assumptions made in Section III-B, the lifetime of a memory object begins with the execution start of its producer, and ends with the execution end of its consumer. In the case of working memory, the lifetime of the memory object is equal to the lifetime of its associated actor. Using a timed schedule, it is thus possible to update a MEG so that exclusions remain only between memory objects whose lifetimes overlap.




Fig. 5. Re-scheduling from 3 to 2 cores with no precedence between actors

Rescheduling a DAG with a timed memory allocation consists of adding precedence edges between all actors with non-overlapping lifetimes. As a consequence, the parallelism of the application is greatly decreased, which leads to less efficient rescheduling possibilities. Figure 5(a) illustrates this issue with an example where 6 actors, *A* to *F*, with no dependency between them are scheduled on 3 cores. Figure 5(b) shows the schedule obtained when rescheduling the 6 actors on 2 cores in the case of post-scheduling memory allocation where actor order from the original schedule must be respected. Figure 5(c) shows the schedule obtained when rescheduling the 6 actors on 2 cores in the case of timed memory allocation where time precedence from the original schedule must be respected. Because *E* must end its execution before *B* and *D* are started, this schedule is longer than the schedule obtained with post-scheduling allocation.

Because its MEG has the lightest density, timed allocation has the best results in terms of memory size. However, its reduced parallelism makes it the least flexible scenario in terms of multicore scheduling. The results presented in the next section illustrate the memory allocation efficiency offered by the three implementation stages.

## V. RESULTS

The three implementation stages presented in Section IV were tested within the Preesm MPSoC rapid prototyping

framework [12]. For each case, three allocation algorithms were tested to allocate the MEGs in memory: the First-Fit (FF) and the Best-Fit (BF) algorithms [4], and the Placement Algorithm (PA) algorithm introduced by DeGreef et al. in [1]. Two types of memory object orders were used in online algorithms that allocate memory objects in order in which they are received. In the Largest-First (LF) order, memory objects are allocated in decreasing order of size. For post-scheduling and timed allocations, we also tested the allocation of the memory objects in scheduling order. This is equivalent to using an online allocator at runtime.

srSDF graph			Memory Exclusion Graph (MEG)					
Nr	Application	Actors	FIFOs	$ V $	$\delta_{pre}$	$\delta_{sch}$	$\delta_{tim}$	$B_{max}$
1	MPEG4 Enc.	74	143	143	0.80	0.60	0.50	2534479
2	H263 Enc.*	207	402	603	0.98	0.76	0.50	5238336
3	MP3 Dec.*	33	44	71	0.64	0.55	0.31	363104
4	PRACH	308	897	897	0.94	0.67	0.56	4518961
5	Sample Rate	624	1556	1289	0.50	0.22	0.03	1639

\*: Actors of this graph have working memory

TABLE I. PROPERTIES OF THE TEST GRAPHS

The different algorithms and stages were tested on a set of MEGs derived from SDF graphs of real applications. Table I shows the characteristics of the tested graphs. The first three entries of this table, namely *MPEG4 Enc.*, *H263 Enc.*, and *MP3 Dec.*, model standard multimedia encoding and decoding applications. The *Sample Rate* graph models an audio sample rate converter. The *MPEG4 Enc.*, *H263 Enc.* and *Sample Rate* graphs were taken from the SDF For Free (SDF3) example database<sup>1</sup>. The *PRACH* graph models the preamble detection part of the Long Term Evolution (LTE) telecommunication standard [12]. Information on the working memory of actors was only available for the *MPEG4 Enc.* and the *MP3 Dec.* graphs. In Table I, columns  $\delta_{pre}$ ,  $\delta_{sch}$ , and  $\delta_{tim}$  respectively correspond to the density of the MEG in the pre-scheduling, post-scheduling, and timed stages.  $B_{max}$  gives the upper bound in Bytes for the memory allocation of the applications [11].

In order to complete these results, the different algorithms were also tested on 45 SDF graphs that were randomly generated with SDF3<sup>1</sup> tool. These 45 MEGs cover a wide range of complexities with a number of memory objects  $|V|$  ranging from 47 to 2208, and exclusion densities  $\delta$  ranging from 0.03 to 0.98. For each stage, a table presents the performance of the three allocators for each application. Performance is expressed as a percentage corresponding to the amount of memory allocated by the algorithm compared to the smallest amount of memory allocated by all algorithms. So, 0% means that the algorithm determined the best allocation. A positive percentage value indicates the degree of excess memory allocated by an allocator compared to the value of the *Best Found* column. The  $B_{min}$  column gives the lower memory bound found using the heuristic presented in [11]

For each stage, a box-plot diagram presents performance statistics obtained with all 50 graphs. For each allocator, the following information is given: the leftmost and rightmost marks are the best and worst performance achieved by the allocator, left and right sides of the rectangle respectively are inferior and superior to 75% of the 50 measured performances,

and the middle mark of the rectangle is the median value of the 50 measured performances.

#### A. Pre-scheduling allocation

Nr	Best Found	$B_{min}$	First-Fit (FF)	Best-Fit (BF)	PA [1]
			LF	LF	
1	988470	-3%	+3%	0%	+13%
2	2979776	0%	+1%	+1%	0%
3	144384	-3%	+2%	+2%	0%
4	2097152	0%	0%	+1%	+29%
5	347	-17%	0%	+4%	+18%

$B_{min}$ : Lower bound (Bytes) for the memory allocation of the application [11]  
LF: Algorithm fed in Largest-First Order

TABLE II. PRE-SCHEDULING MEMORY ALLOCATION

Performances obtained for pre-scheduling allocation are displayed in Table II and Figure 6. These results clearly show that the FF-LF algorithm tends to generate a smaller footprint than the other algorithms. Indeed, the FF-LF algorithm finds the best allocation for 29 of the 50 graphs tested. When it fails to find the best solution, it assigns only 1.35% more memory, on average, than the *Best Found* allocation. Moreover, the solution of the FF-LF is 4% superior, on average, to the lower bound  $B_{min}$ .




Fig. 6. Performance of pre-scheduling allocation algorithms for 50 graphs.

Since the pre-scheduling allocation is performed at compile-time, it is possible to execute all allocation algorithms and keep only the best results. Indeed, in our 50 tests, the BF-LF allocator found the best solution for 13 graphs and the PA for 12 graphs.

#### B. Post-scheduling allocation

Nr	Best Found	$B_{min}$	First-Fit (FF)		Best-Fit (BF)		PA [1]
			LF	Sch.	LF	Sch.	
1	861726	-3%	0%	+6%	+3%	+6%	+9%
2	1570240	-37%	+0%	+5%	+2%	+17%	0%
3	117184	-1%	+8%	+34%	+8%	+55%	0%
4	1365906	-16%	0%	+51%	+11%	+51%	+13%
5	185	-2%	+1%	0%	0%	+4%	+5%

Sch.: Algorithm fed in Scheduling Order

TABLE III. POST-SCHEDULING MEMORY ALLOCATION

Table III and Figure 7 present the performance obtained for post-scheduling allocation on a multicore architecture with 3 cores. Because the 50 graphs have very different degrees of parallelism, mapping them on the same number of cores decreases their parallelism differently and enables us to have a wide variety of test cases. On average, updating MEGs with scheduling information reduces their exclusion density by 39% which in turns leads to a diminution of the amount of allocated memory by 32%.

As for pre-scheduling allocation, the FF-LF is the most efficient algorithm, finding the best allocation for 29 of the 50

<sup>1</sup> SDF3 website: <http://www.es.ele.tue.nl/sdf3>




Fig. 7. Performance of post-scheduling allocation algorithms for 50 graphs.

graphs and allocating 1.74% more memory, on average, than the *Best Found* solution for the remaining 21 graphs. Online allocation algorithms fed in scheduling order present the worst performance which was expected since online algorithms do not exploit global knowledge of all memory objects.

### C. Timed allocation

Performances obtained for timed allocation are presented in Table IV and Figure 8. The FF-LF allocator is once again the most efficient algorithm as it finds the best allocation for 31 of the 50 graphs, including all 5 real applications.

Nr	Best Found	$B_{min}$	First-Fit (FF)		Best-Fit (BF)		PA
			LF	Sch.	LF	Sch.	
1	760374	-0%	0%	+13%	+0%	+13%	+13%
2	1243072	-0%	0%	+28%	+10%	+48%	+3%
3	111008	-3%	0%	+3%	0%	+3%	+1%
4	1231968	-8%	0%	+17%	+14%	+22%	+26%
5	41	-10%	0%	+5%	+5%	+2%	+17%

TABLE IV. TIMED MEMORY ALLOCATION

The online allocators fed in scheduling order assign more memory than the FF-LF algorithm for 38 graphs with up to 48% more memory being assigned. In the timed stage, online allocators assign only 7% less memory, on average, than the FF-LF algorithm in the post-scheduling stage. In 5 cases, including the *PRACH* application, online allocators assign even more memory in the timed stage than which was allocated by the FF-LF algorithm in the post-scheduling stage. Considering the  $O(n \log n)$  complexity of these online allocators [4], where  $n$  is the number of allocated objects, using the post-scheduling allocation is an interesting alternative. Indeed, using post-scheduling allocation removes the computation overhead of dynamic online allocation while guaranteeing a fixed memory footprint slightly superior to that which could be achieved dynamically.




Fig. 8. Performance of timed allocation algorithms for 50 graphs.

On average, the *Best Found* timed allocation uses only 11% less memory than the post-scheduling allocations and only

2.7% more memory than the minimum bound  $B_{min}$ . Considering the small gain in footprint and the loss of flexibility induced by this stage (Section IV), timed allocation appears to be a good choice for systems with restricted memory resources where flexibility is not important. However, for systems where the memory footprint is important, but scheduling flexibility is also desired, the post-scheduling allocation offers the best trade-off. Finally for systems where a strong flexibility is essential, the pre-scheduling allocation offers all the required parallelism while ensuring a fixed memory footprint.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we have proposed a new method to perform memory allocation of applications described with SDF graphs. In this method, memory allocation can be performed at three distinct stages of the implementation process, each offering a distinct trade-off between memory footprint and scheduling flexibility. We show that using our method with the First-Fit (FF) allocator fed in the Largest-First (LF) order provides smaller memory footprints that commonly used dynamic online allocators. Furthermore, allocating memory after an untimed schedule of the application has been decided is shown to offer an efficient trade-off between memory footprint and multicore execution flexibility.

Future work on this subject will include a study of the throughput and latency obtained for the different stages of memory allocation. An investigation of a runtime scheduler design that exploits the scheduling flexibility offered by the pre- and post-scheduling allocations is also planned.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. de Greef, F. Catthoor, and H. de Man, "Array placement for storage size reduction in embedded multimedia systems," *ASAP*, 1997.
- [2] E. Lee and D. Messerschmitt, "Synchronous data flow," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 75, no. 9, pp. 1235 – 1245, sept. 1987.
- [3] E. A. Lee and S. Ha, "Scheduling strategies for multiprocessor real-time dsp," in *Global Telecommunications Conference, 1989, and Exhibition. Communications Technology for the 1990s and Beyond. GLOBE-COM'89., IEEE*. IEEE, 1989, pp. 1279–1283.
- [4] D. S. Johnson, "Near-optimal bin packing algorithms," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1973.
- [5] P. Murthy and S. Bhattacharyya, "Shared memory implementations of synchronous dataflow specifications," in *DATE Proceedings*, 2000.
- [6] M. Bouchard, M. Angalović, and A. Hertz, "About equivalent interval colorings of weighted graphs," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 157, pp. 3615–3624, October 2009.
- [7] R. Szymanek and K. Kuchcinski, "A constructive algorithm for memory-aware task assignment and scheduling," in *CODES Proceedings*, ser. CODES '01. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2001, pp. 147–152.
- [8] S. Sriram and S. S. Bhattacharyya, *Embedded Multiprocessors: Scheduling and Synchronization*, 2nd ed. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, Inc., 2009.
- [9] W. Sung and S. Ha, "Memory efficient software synthesis with mixed coding style from dataflow graphs," *VLSI Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, no. 5, oct. 2000.
- [10] Y.-K. Kwok, "High-performance algorithms of compile-time scheduling of parallel processors," Ph.D. dissertation, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, 1997.
- [11] K. Desnos, M. Pelcat, J. Nezan, and S. Aridhi, "Memory bounds for the distributed execution of a hierarchical synchronous data-flow graph," in *SAMOS Proceedings*, 2012.
- [12] M. Pelcat, S. Aridhi, J. Piat, and J.-F. Nezan, *Physical Layer Multi-Core Prototyping: A Dataflow-Based Approach for LTE eNodeB*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2012.