System Design and Innovation: A Garbage Collection Case Study

Speaker Collaborators Kathryn S. McKinley, Google Steve Blackburn, Google Wenyu Zhao, ANU

Garbage Collection Design through the lens of

Immix: Hierarchy of Lines and Blocks with judicious copying

✓ Breaking Low Latency & GC Pause Time Tradeoff for Parallel Performance LXR: Reference Counting with even less copying in pauses, concurrent tracing

✓ Abstraction for Innovation

MMTk & Work Packets

Benchmarks, Performance Methodologies & More Methodologies

Not today, but critical

Why should you care about Garbage Collection (GC)?

Programming Languages People Use Rely on Garbage Collection (GC)



Innovation in applications, programming languages & hardware



Innovation is happening at all the layers of the stack

Garbage Collection Helps Glue it All Together



Innovation is happening at all the layers of the stack

Compilers & Runtimes with Garbage Collection glue the layers together, dictating correctness & performance

Parallel Hardware has Deep Memory Systems



History Foundational GC Heap Organizations

Mark-Sweep

Mark-Compact

McCarthy 1960

Styger 1967

Semi-Space Fenichel & Yochelson 1969 Mark-Region Blackburn & McKinley

2008





GC Fundamentals

Allocation

Identification

Reclamation







Mark Sweep



- Allocation produces **poor locality** in multiple size-based free lists.
- Some fragmentation memory overhead
- Low computational overhead due to super fast tracing & non moving reclamation

Mark Compact



- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- No fragmentation
- Tracing is fast
- Multipass algorithm to compacting adds **high computational overhead**





- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- No fragmentation, but doubles the memory overhead because all objects could survive!
- Tracing and evacuation (copying) adds computational overhead to copy objects

Mark-Region



- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- Low fragmentation
- Tracing with occasional copying yields
 low computational and low memory overheads

Mark-Region Immix: Lines and Blocks



Opportunistic Defragmentation



Mark-Region Immix Collection Broke the Space Time Tradeoff

Stop-the-World Collectors Pause all the Threads



Stop-the-world (STW) GC threads

Memory System & Computation Performance Tradeoffs



Performance Tradeoffs







Actual data, taken from geomean of DaCapo, jvm98, and jbb2000 on 2.4GHz Core 2 Duo

Impact of Immix

LXR (PLDI 2022, OOPSLA 2025)

Exploits Immix to avoid expensive copying; a novel approach to achieving high throughput and low latency, significantly outperforming the state-of-the-art (11% throughput advantage over G1).

ISO (PLDI 2025)

Exploits Immix's pinning to solve 30-year old problem of how to do thread-local garbage collection without exploitable immutability (pin public objects, move private).

CRuby, Julia (ISMM 2025)

Exploit Immix's pinning to allow legacy languages with low-overhead C interfaces to have a copying GC for the first time. C-reachable objects are pinned.

Bump Pointer Nursery + Any Heap Organization for the Old Space



Bump Pointer Nursery + Any Heap Organization for the Old Space



Bump Pointer Nursery + Any Heap Organization for the Old Space



Bump Pointer Nursery + Any Heap Organization for the Old Space



Bump Pointer Nursery + Any Heap Organization for the Old Space



 Requires a write barrier to independent collect the nursery If source pointer in old space, and target is in the nursery then store the source pointer in a "cross generation pointer buffer"

G1: Popular Default Open JDK Production GC [2004] Garbage First: Generational GC Stop-the-World, with Free List for the Old Space



On to Concurrent & Parallel GC!

Parallelism

Application threads

Parallelism is imperfect

Application threads

Stop-the-World

Stop-the-world (STW) GC threads

Periodic lengthy pauses, adds latency and queuing delay

Add Concurrency to Make Pauses Short!? Shenandoah [2016], C4 [2011] & ZGC [2017] Short pauses with tracing, but expensive concurrent copying barriers

STW (











DaCapo dev-Chopin (github 202204) using our fork of OpenJDK JDK 11.0.11+6 +35, running on a 16/32 AMD Ryzen 5950X with 64GB DDR4-3200 memory.

LBO Time



Heap Size (relative to min)

DaCapo dev-Chopin (github 202204) using our fork of OpenJDK JDK 11.0.11+6 +35, running on a 16/32 AMD Ryzen 5950X with 64GB DDR4-3200 memory.

LBO Cycles



Heap Size (relative to min)

LXR Design Insights

High throughput with

- ✓ **Immediacy** with reference counting in pauses
- Avoiding copying no concurrent copying

Low latency

- ✓ Short frequent pauses do reference counting & copying
- Snapshot-At-The-Beginning (SATB) fast write barrier (no read barrier)
- ✓ **Concurrent Cycle Tracing** since reference counting cannot reclaim cycles

LXR



STW Pause performs reference counting increments and some decrements defragments heap with small amounts of copying

Not in Pause

Lazy decrements concurrent decrements in application slack

Mature sweeping when lazy decrements & trace completes, reclaim free memory SATB Write Barrier captures reference counts and write during tracing SATB Trace reclaims cycles

Methodology

OpenJDK 11 LTS at time of development

DaCapo Chopin 2022 dev snapshot

4 latency-sensitive workloads All 17 workloads report throughput

Three highly-tuned production collectors G1, Shenandoah, ZGC

Three hardware platforms

AMD Zen 3 5950X 16/32 3.4 GHz 64 MB LLC, 64 GB DDR4 AMD Zen 2 3900X 12/24 3.8 GHz 64 MB LLC, 64 GB DDR4 Intel Coffee Lake i9-9900K 8/16 4.6 GHz 16 MB LLC, 128 GB DDR 4



Latency Lusearch



DaCapo dev-Chopin (github 202204) using our fork of OpenJDK JDK 11.0.11+6 +35, running on a 16/32 AMD Ryzen 5950X with 64GB DDR4-3200 memory.

Latency

H2







YCSB workloads running over Apache cassandra 3.11.10., with a heap 1.3X G1's minimum.



TCP-C-like workload running over Apache derby 10.14.2.0., with a heap 1.3X G1's minimum.



Tomcat's sample web application workload running over Apache tomcat 9.0.37., with a heap 1.3X G1's minimum.

Tomcat

Throughput Normalized to G1 (2X Heap)



Abstraction for Innovation

Industry JVM Collectors 2004-today



low-pause concurrent evacuating collectors

Industry JVM Collectors 2004-today

G1	C4	Shena
🤝 jdk-21+35 👻	jdk / src / hotspot / share / gc / ப	[Flood et a
Name	Last commit date	Tracing ──→ Region-ba
•	Total ~214K LOC	Evacuatio
epsilon	~1K LOC (0.6%) 2 years ago	
b g1	~53K LOC (25.2%) 2 years ago	×L
📄 parallel	$\sim 17 \text{K LOC}$ (8%) 2 years ago	×L
iserial	$\sim 5 \text{K LOC}$ (2.6%) ² years ago	×L
shared	~38K LOC (17.6%) 2 years ago	
Generational	ZGC KLOC (15.1%) 2 years ago	
x	~26K LOC (12.2%) 2 years igo	anda rayaal
z	~40K LOC (18.7%) 2 years igo	code reuse!

Prenandoahbod et al 2016] acing
gion-based
acuation only acuation only Tracing
Region-based
Evacuation only ncurrent evacuation X Low Code Reuse X Low Maintainability

✗ Low Performance

25 Years of Innovation from Modular, Extensible Design

2000 Steve refactored & built new Jikes RVM collectors, producing JMTk

- Pretenuring for Java, S. M. Blackburn, S. Singhai, M. Hertz, K. S. McKinley, and J. E. B. Moss, Proceedings of the ACM 2001 SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages and Applications. (OOPSLA), Tampa Bay FL, October 2001.
- Beltway: Getting Around Garbage Collection Gridlock, S. M. Blackburn, R. Jones, K. S. McKinley, and J. E. B. Moss, Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI), Berlin, Germany, June 2002,.
- In or Out? Putting Write Barriers in Their Place, S. M. Blackburn and K. S. McKinley, International Symposium on Memory Management (ISMM), Berlin, Germany, June 2002.
- Older-first Garbage Collection in Practice: Evaluation in a Java Virtual Machine, D. Stefanovic, M. Hertz, S. M. Blackburn, K. S. McKinley, and J. E. B. Moss, Memory System Performance, Berlin, Germany, June 2002.
- <u>Ulterior Reference Counting: Fast Garbage Collection without the Wait</u>, S. M. Blackburn and K. S. McKinley, Proceedings of the ACM 2003 SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages and Applications (OOPSLA), Anaheim, CA, October 2003.

2004 Steve, Perry, & I publish MMTK v1, 2004-2015, 100+ papers using Jikes + MMTK

- <u>Oil and Water? High Performance Garbage Collection in Java with MMTk</u>, S. M. Blackburn, P. Cheng, and K. S. McKinley, 26th International Conference on Software Engineering, pp. 137-146, Edinburgh, Scotland, May 2004. *Citations from Google Scholar: 333*
- <u>Myths and Realities: The Performance Impact of Garbage Collection</u>, S. M. Blackburn, P. Cheng, and K. S. McKinley, ACM SIGMETRICS Conference on Measurement & Modeling Computer Systems, pp. 25-36, New York, NY, June 2004. **Test of Time Award (June, 2014).** *Citations from Google Scholar: 265*

2017-2025 Steve et al. (not me ;-) design and deliver MMTk in Rust for Jikes & Open JDK

- **Rust as a language for high performance GC implementation**, Lin, Blackburn, Hosking, Norrish, in Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Memory Management, ISMM '16, Santa Barbara, CA, June 13, 2016.
- Reworking Memory Management in CRuby: A Practitioner Report, Wang, Blackburn, Zhu, Valentine-House, in *ISMM*, 2025.
- Reconsidering Garbage Collection in Julia: A Practitioner Report, de Souza Amorim, Lin, Blackburn, Netto, Baraldi, Daly, Hosking, Pamnany, Smith, in ISMM 2025,

Work Packets More Abstraction for More Parallelism & Even Better Software Engineering

Basic GC Phases





(Immix GC with Phases) 48

Work Item: Object obj

}

Work Items and Ke

Work Items

- A smallest unit of work
 - A heap object to trace
 - A mutator stack to scan
- Work item stealing
 - Maximize parallelism

```
void mark_objects(Object objects[]) {
  for (Object obj : objects) {
    if (attempt_mark(obj)) {
       scan_object(obj);
    }
  }
}
```

Kernels

- Small functions to process a list of same-typed work items
- Highly concentrated
 - Captures hot loops only
 - Better Locality
- Highly generic
 - Better code reuse
 - Easy to optimize, understand, & prove correct

Work Packet = < WorkItem[] × Kernel >

Immix with Phases

Immix with Work Packets & Dependencies



Scheduling

Work Packet Dependencies

- e.g. Marking requires a properly initialized mark table
 - Marking cannot start before mark table zeroing is finished

Work Buckets

- A set of packets with same dependencies
- A dependency graph over buckets

Dependency-based scheduling

- A set of algorithm agnostic GC workers
- Workers pull work packets to execute
 - Update bucket status when necessary
- Performs both packet and item stealing



Evaluation

Code Reuse

Most components are reusable (across 10 GCs)

- Algorithm agnostic scheduler
- Common work packets (28 / 49)
 - Root scanning
 - Marking & evacuation
 - Mark table zeroing
 - Sweeping
 - Stop/Resume mutators
 - o ...
- GCs only need to declare their packets and dependencies
- Analysis and instrumentation code (Huang et al. 2023)

S		LOC
0	LXR	3.8K (8.6%)
	Immix	0.5K (1.1%)
	10 GCs Total	45.1K (100%)

GC Pause Time

0.2 0

biojava

batik

LXR_{Phases}

avrora

eclipse

Fop

Braphchi

LXR_{Packets}

cassandra



а. 1.

Pmd -

lusearch

1 -1

. Spring

sunflow tomcat

tradebeans tradesoap talan

zing

min max

mean

Seomean

hzo ime iython

kafka

luindex

Lessons for Parallel Programming

- Programming model transferable to other parallel computation systems
 - A generic abstraction: Work packets and kernels
 - Elegantly handle multiple different types of work with dependencies
 - Two-level scheduling, generalizes work stealing
 - Efficient work stealing with low overhead
 - Reusable and user-friendly analysis and evaluation tools

25 Years of Garbage Collection Innovation

Breaking the **Time & Space Tradeoff** with **Memory Performance** Immix: Hierarchy of Lines and Blocks with judicious copying

Breaking Low Latency & GC Pause Time Tradeoff for **Parallel Performance** LXR: Reference Counting with even less copying in pauses, concurrent tracing

Abstraction for Innovation

MMTk & Work Packets

Benchmarks, Performance Methodologies & More Methodologies

A research journey

Thank you!

GC Algorithms

Mark-Sweep [McCarthy 1960] Free-list + trace + sweep-to-free

- Allocation produces **poor locality** in multiple size-based free lists.
- Some fragmentation
- **Low computational overhead** due to super fast tracing & reclamation, as objects do not move



- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- No fragmentation
- Tracing and evacuation adds computation & **lots of memory overhead** by moving all the objects



- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- No fragmentation
- Tracing and compacting adds **high multipass** computational overhead with low memory overhead

- Super fast allocation with **good locality**
- Low fragmentation
- Tracing with occasional copying yields
 low computational and low memory overheads