Can Increasing the Hit Ratio Hurt Cache Throughput?

Ziyue Qiu Juncheng Yang **Mor Harchol-Balter**

Carnegie Mellon University
Computer Science Dept.





What is a Cache?



Hit Ratio:
Fraction of requests found in cache

Cache Eviction Policies

Most Common: LRU

Evict least recently accessed item



access C

access D

Also Common: FIFO

Evict least recently inserted item



Why LRU is most popular

Peter Denning

Data Access patterns show **temporal locality**. Recently accessed data is more likely to be accessed again.

LRU is designed for this!



Common Wisdom

Higher Hit Ratio → Improved Request Latency & Throughput

Beckman, Berg, Berger, Bunt, Carrig, Chen, Cheng, Cho, Cidon, Ciucu, Crooks, Eager, Feng, Gandhi, Ganger, Grosof, Gunasekar, Harchol-Balter, Hellerstein, Henningsen, Kozuch, Lakew, Li, Lu, McAllister, Sabnis, Schmitt, Sitaraman, Stoica, Sunderrajan, Tran, Vinayak, Willick, Yang, Yu, Yue, Zhu …

Ziyue Qiu



But in my caching system:

Higher Hit Ratio → WORSE Latency & Throughput

Hmmm… Super interesting!

Ziyue Qiu



Seems no one has actually studied the relationship between hit ratio and throughput/latency...

Thesis of Talk

For today's LRU-based caching systems,



Caching System Implementation

- Prototype of Meta's HHVM cache
- Run on CloudLab platform
- Requests are for 4KB blocks from Zipfian ($\theta = 0.99$) popularity distribution
- Intel Xeon Platinum CPU for cache with 72 cores.

- **KEY POINTS:**
  - DRAM-based cache
    - Very fast ($0.51\ \mu s$) & Highly concurrent (72 cores)
  - SSD-based disk
    - $100\ \mu s$ but we emulate range from $5\ \mu s - 500\ \mu s$
    - Highly concurrent (72 concurrent requests)
  - Each request is handled by a single core.
    Total # requests in system is limited by #cores ➔ $\mathrm{MPL} = 72$

Queueing model for LRU caching system



Q-theory: “Find the bottleneck”





STEP 1:
Think time

$$E[Z] = E[Z_{cache}] + (1 - p_{hit})E[Z_{disk}]$$



STEP 2: Device demands

$$D_{delink} = p_{hit} \cdot (0.7)$$
$$D_{tail} = (1 - p_{hit}) \cdot (0.59)$$
$$D_{head} = 0.59$$

$$D_{max} = \begin{cases} D_{head} \text{ if } p_{hit} < 0.84 \\ D_{delink} \text{ if } p_{hit} \geq 0.84 \end{cases}$$



$$E[Z] = E[Z_{cache}] + p_{miss}E[Z_{disk}]$$

$$D_{delink} = p_{hit} \cdot (0.7)$$

$$D_{tail} = (1 - p_{hit}) \cdot (0.59)$$

$$D_{head} = 0.59$$

$$D = D_{delink} + D_{tail} + D_{head}$$

$$\text{Throughput} = X \leq min\left(\frac{\text{MPL}}{D + E[Z]}, \frac{1}{D_{max}}\right)$$

$$\frac{72}{101.1 - 99.3p_{hit}} \qquad \frac{1}{\max(0.59, 0.7p_{hit})}$$

$$D_{max} = \begin{cases} D_{head} & \text{if } p_{hit} < 0.84 \\ D_{delink} & \text{if } p_{hit} \geq 0.84 \end{cases}$$



$$\text{Throughput} = X \leq min\left(\frac{\text{MPL}}{D + \boldsymbol{E}[Z]}\ ,\ \frac{1}{D_{max}}\right)$$

$$\frac{72}{101.1 - 99.3p_{hit}} \qquad \frac{1}{\max(0.59, 0.7p_{hit})}$$

3 Regimes

- $p_{hit} < 0.59$
  - ➔ X = Left term
  - ➔ X increases with p_{hit}
- $0.59 < p_{hit} < 0.84$
  - ➔ $X = \frac{1}{D_{head}} = \frac{1}{0.59}$
- $p_{hit} > 0.84$
  - ➔ $X = \frac{1}{D_{delink}} = \frac{1}{0.7p_{hit}}$
  - ➔ X decreases with p_{hit}



3 Regimes

- $p_{hit} < 0.59$
  - ➔ X = Left term
  - ➔ X increases with p_{hit}
- $0.59 < p_{hit} < 0.84$
  - ➔ $X = \frac{1}{D_{head}} = \frac{1}{0.59}$
- $p_{hit} > 0.84$
  - ➔ $X = \frac{1}{D_{delink}} = \frac{1}{0.7 p_{hit}}$
  - ➔ X decreases with p_{hit}

Summary



When p_{hit} is high:

- Delink server becomes bottleneck
- Increasing p_{hit} increases demand on Delink server, making queue even longer
  - ➔ Request latency↑ Throughput ↓

Same story holds for all LRU variants



Segmented LRU (SLRU)
Advanced LRU policy

Future trends

1. Disks will get faster.

2. Concurrency level will increase for both cache and disk.

How do these affect p^*_{hit}?


Faster Disk Speed
500μs
100μs
5μs
Higher Concurrency
MPL 16
MPL 72
MPL 144
Throughput
Hit Ratio

For FIFO-based caches, X-put only rises





Breakdown of Cache Eviction policies

LRU-like behavior

LRU
SLRU
ARC
LIRS
TinyLFU
LFU
LeCaR
CACHEUS



FIFO-like behavior

FIFO
CLOCK
S3-FIFO
SIEVE
QDLP
Hyperbolic
LHD
LRB
Random



Improving future Caching Systems

The problem with LRU:



Q: Why not just forgo LRU altogether & do FIFO?

A: FIFO is less efficient in its use of cache space!

What we really need is some combination of LRU & FIFO!

- Naïve mixture: Probabilistic-LRU
- Better idea:

As p_{hit} gets high, if X-put starts dropping, skip doing Delink step (as in FIFO).

Conclusion


Higher Hit Ratio
can lead to
WORSE Latency & Throughput
How was this missed?


Faster Disk Speed
500μs
100μs
5μs
Higher Concurrency
MPL 16
MPL 72
MPL 144
Throughput
Hit Ratio
In the olden days:
❑ Disks were slower
❑ Cache concurrency was lower ➔ low MPL

Conclusion



- Olden days: Slower disk + lower MPL ➔ "top left corner": higher hit ratio helps
- Also in olden days: lower disk concurrency ➔ Queueing at disk ➔ Disk is bottleneck
- But today with concurrent disks, bottleneck has shifted to cache operations.
- Operations on the hit path (Delink) become bottleneck when p_{hit} is high.
- When this happens, throughput will drop. One solution: mix LRU & FIFO.