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Abstract—Nowadays, Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) dominate in a wide spectrum of computing realms and multi-task is increasingly applied in various complicated applications. To gain higher performance, multi-task programs require cumbersome programming efforts to take advantage of inter-kernel concurrency at source-code level. Although there exist works automatically scheduling kernels to enable inter-kernel concurrency, they all inevitably introduce new programming frameworks and some even bring significant performance downgrade compared to the expertise-based optimizations. To address this issue, we propose KeSCo, a compiler-based scheduler to expose kernel level concurrency in multi-task programs with trivial code modification. In compilation, KeSCo applies a strategy to schedule kernels in task queues, accounting for both load balance and synchronization cost. Also, KeSCo utilizes a customized algorithm designed for computational flow to remove redundant synchronizations. The design is further extended to support multi-process scenario, where multiple GPU processes are sharing a single context. Evaluations on representative benchmarks show that the proposed approach gains a 1.28× average speedup for multi-task scenario (1.22× for multi-process). Even with lessened programming efforts, our proposed design outperforms two state-of-the-arts GrSched and Taskflow by 1.31× and 1.16× on average, respectively.

Index Terms—GPU, Compiler, Multi-Task, Kernel Scheduling

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) have been widely applied in a myriad of domains, owing to their excessive computation capability and high memory throughput. Advanced GPUs incorporate ample resources than what a typical monolithic GPU task or kernel necessitates and are thus frequently being underutilized, especially when executing single-task programs, which launch just one kernel at a time. To alleviate the under-utilization issue, a plethora of approaches have been proposed, like concurrently executing sliced kernels [1] and resource virtualization [2].
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However, as GPU applications getting more complex, multi-task programs, originally consisting of concurrently executable kernels, show up in diverse domains. Compared to single-task programs with constrained inter-kernel concurrency, multi-task programs can leverage various GPU streams and synchronization events to parallelize serial kernel executions to efficiently shorten run time. Such an optimization requires developers to correctly analyze dependency between kernels and then re-arrange kernels in task queues to strike load balance and minimize synchronization cost. With no doubt, considerable programming efforts should be paid to obtain bug-free and highly performant codes, particularly for increasingly complicated programs. To address the issue, a bunch of designs have been recently presented to automate inter-kernel concurrency of GPU applications, especially for general high performance computing (HPC). RAMMER [3] focuses on inter- and intra-kernel concurrency in Recursive Neural Network (RNN), but lacks scalability to handle general programs. Taskflow [4] proposes a new heterogeneous programming framework for automatic optimization of inter-kernel concurrency. It harnesses cudaGraph [5] to reduce overheads of fragmented kernel launches. Nevertheless, such method requires developers to grasp a new programming model and manually specify kernel dependencies, inevitably raising coding difficulty. A GrCUDA-based [6] runtime approach [7] applies a virtual machine, exempting developers from the need to explicitly claim kernel dependencies. But compared to expertise-based optimizations, it introduces serious performance downgrade due to the overheads of run-time scheduling.

To automatically achieve kernel concurrency in multi-task programs at source-code level with petty programming effort, we propose KeSCo, a compiler-based static kernel scheduler requiring trivial code modification. It automatically identifies data dependencies and then places kernels into different streams concerning load balance and synchronization cost. The transformed code is a highly performant executable with kernels being ready to run concurrently. The design is further extended to schedule a collective of prioritized multi-task
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processes, which is common in today’s GPU space-sharing scenario. The scheduler maintains a stream zone for each sub-program, actively issues kernels of high priority, and meanwhile demotes leftover kernels via adding barriers across zones. This promotes the early completion time of highly prioritized tasks while saturating GPU resources with the low-priority ones, thus effectively reducing the makespan of the whole program.

In summary, the contributions of this paper are:

- We highlight the inadequate performance enhancement and programming weakness of prior arts in automatically achieving inter-kernel concurrency for multi-task programs.
- We propose a static scheduler for inter-kernel concurrency in multi-task programs, well accounting for both load balance and synchronization cost.
- We design a priority-based scheduling strategy for kernels across multi-task programs, with lowered programming burden to enable high kernel concurrency and facilitate prioritized kernels to speed up executions.
- The evaluations show that our design can effectively raise kernel-level parallelism to boost GPU performance, outperforming the state-of-the-arts with obviously less programming efforts.

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

A. Concurrent Kernel Execution (CKE)

Designed for massively parallel computation, modern GPUs are typically equipped with many streaming multiprocessors (SMs), each of which has hundreds of computing cores and can simultaneously execute up to thousands of threads. In most cases, one single kernel cannot fully utilize all resources, thus causing a great waste of computation power and low performance. To alleviate such a problem, CKE parallelizes inter-kernel execution on available hardware components. It issues operations in multiple software task queues (called streams in CUDA [5]), which are mapped onto different hardware queues and processed concurrently if the demanded resources, typically SMs, are sufficient.

The multi-task workloads provide a perfect scenario to implement CKE for acceleration, as they have independent kernels ready to execute concurrently. Developers need to properly scrutinize the complex dependency, schedule kernels in streams, and generate synchronization barriers. Such code re-organization incurs tremendous manual efforts and is thus also error-prone. This laborious process can be automated at different levels of granularity. Many DL compilers like TVM [8] or XLA [9] leverage dedicated collaboration with domain-specific language (DSL) embedded in Python for such task-level parallelization. In HPC where applications are majorly implemented in C++ with GPU programming model, parallelization is exploited at finer sub-task level. Representative techniques include slicing kernels into sub-kernels to saturate GPU resources [10][11], and employing preemption for high-priority tasks [12][13]. They involve coupled compiler-runtime systems for thorough optimizations and have shown great improvement in performance. Nevertheless, these intra-kernel approaches necessitate fine-grained code transformation inside kernels, which becomes infeasible when dealing with hand-tuned kernels or hardware vendors’ highly optimized closed-source libraries having no available codes.

B. CKE Programming in CUDA

Many popular GPU programming models offer a series of concurrency APIs for CKE, here we take CUDA as an example. A data flow graph (DFG) needs to be constructed correctly first to help schedule the executions. The DFG is further divided into multiple levels such that kernels from the same level have no data dependence. Then developers need to create multiple CUDA streams, and issue kernels on different streams to co-execute on GPUs. To ensure the execution order of data dependent kernels across streams, CUDA events are inserted after a kernel’s predecessors as trackers of the completion state, which are awaited by the synchronization barriers before the kernel.

Figure 1 shows an example of three concurrent tasks sharing a GPU. Kernels B and C, are mutually independent, both depend on kernel A. After kernel A finishes, kernels B and C are issued on different streams and executed simultaneously on different SMs. At the same time, an asynchronous copy is proceeding on the copy engine, which is a complementary hardware resource with respect to SMs. Therefore computation of the two kernels and data transfer are overlapped, helping utilize the abundant resources of GPUs.

C. Motivation

1) Programming Efforts: Aiming to automate inter-kernel CKE for GPU programs, approaches like Taskflow [4] and a GrCUDA-based [6] scheduler (aliased as GrSched for ease of reference)[7] have been proposed to craft new programming frameworks by extending CUDA’s API for stream management and synchronization. Taskflow demands explicitly specifying dependencies through its APIs, while GrSched introduces DSL embedded in Python to support automatic analysis and scheduling. In Figure 2a, we evaluate the programming efforts required by implementing CKE at source-code level in three benchmarks elaborated in Section IV-A. Compared with serial execution, manual optimization with CUDA’s streams and events APIs (named Async in figures) costs 6.97× extra tokens to fully expose the kernel concurrency. Taskflow and GrSched yet involve 1.79× and 4.19× additional tokens respectively, to transplanta the serial implementation into their programming frameworks.
models. In contrast with *Async*, they provide straightforward view of dependencies and facilitate maintainability, but yield thorough refactoring of source code.

2) **Scheduling Policy:** Another preliminary study finds that the aforementioned frameworks would bring serious performance penalties compared to the expertise optimization (the *Async* scheme). Figure 2b illustrates the actual overlapped time with respect to the theoretical peak. Figure 2c explores the speedup of each kernel normalized to the serial execution. The static scheduler Taskflow’s overlap ratio is slightly higher than *Async*, but the makespan is 34.1% longer. This performance degradation is caused by prolonged kernel execution time, indicating that the scheduler issues excessive kernels and thus poses resource competition. As a dynamic scheduler, GrSched insufficiency overlaps the computation, with only 39% to the theoretical maximum and 81.1% slower than *Async*. The major reason is the overhead brought by runtime dependency analysis, blocking CPU from launching GPU kernels concurrently. We observe from the above cases that performance gain is two-folded as contributed by both the overlap ratio and the number of issued kernels. A balance between them is demanded to bring an optimal scheduling policy.

3) **Multi-process Scenario:** It is prevalent to serve multiple programs with different priorities on a single GPU since one application might not fully utilize all GPU resources [14]. To improve the performance of multi-program on a shared GPU, Nvidia MPS [15] transparently co-operates multiple CUDA processes at runtime. This code-free tool eliminates manual labor but has no guarantee for priority and suffers from overheads of dynamic scheduling. Other prior arts including GrSched and Taskflow are designed for scheduling one single program and lack prioritized scheduling mechanisms to ensure the early completion of high-priority programs, hindering their extension in the multi-process scenario. Therefore, there remains the urgency for a source code-level approach capable of priority-based scheduling without involving much programming effort in these complicated scenarios.

The aforementioned observations suggest that the schedulers wrapped as new programming frameworks incur inefficient scheduling strategies and strenuous programming efforts. Instead, a compiler-based approach naturally grasps global information about the application and optimizes in-depth without refactoring the source code. To this end, we propose KeSCo to automate the scheduling at compile-time and achieve competent performance compared with manually-optimized approach.

III. **DESIGN**

We introduce KeSCo, a compiler-based static scheduler for concurrent kernel execution in multi-task programs, to automatically enable inter-kernel concurrency. It leverages lightweight code modifications to help construct data flow graph (DFG) of kernels and then schedules kernels to multiple streams as well as generates synchronization barriers to guarantee correct execution order with low cost. In addition to supporting inter-kernel concurrency in a single program, we extend KeSCo to support multi-process scheduling while meeting the requirements of early completion of high-priority sub-programs and saturating hardware resources with low-priority ones.

A. **Overview**

Figure 3 shows the overall workflow of our proposed design. The input is the source code of an application with serial execution and the output is a high-performance executable with concurrent kernel execution. The optimizing procedure consists of three parts: DFG constructor, kernel distributor, and synchronization generator. As the forefront phase, DFG constructor analyzes the input and output of each GPU kernel and builds a data flow graph according to their execution order.

Fig. 3: General workflow of KeSCo to transform serial source code into the executable with efficient parallelism.

1The proposed design is a kernel-level scheduler. Therefore we refer to kernel and task interchangeably, unless otherwise specifically stated.

2We indicate sub-program as a distinct multi-task application, compounded in the multi-process application.
Then the kernel distributor leverages the graph and schedules kernels into different streams. Last, the synchronization generator creates barriers for dependent kernels.

B. DFG Constructor

DFG constructor analyzes dependencies among kernels based on their serial execution order and the relations of Write-After-Read (WAR), Write-After-Write (WAW) and Read-After-Write (RAW). As massive dependencies for variables are ubiquitous in complex HPC programs, it can be expensive to construct the kernels’ dependency graph from the complicated data flow. To reduce repeated search operations, we construct the DFG by finding all predecessors of a kernel. Kernels are iterated by their reversed execution order. For every kernel, breadth-first search is adopted to find its direct predecessors and terminated once all of them are found. Additionally, to distinguish read-only from writable parameters of kernels, which are passed as pointers and potentially have identical memory addresses, hindering compiler-based approach from analyzing them statically, developers are necessitated to add a light wrapper to the kernel. The mechanism is detailed in Section III-F.

C. Kernel Distributor

When the DFG is determined, kernel distributor places the kernels in GPU streams in the order explained below to gain computational overlap. First, it levelizes the DFG so that kernels in the same level have no mutual data dependency. At each level, the kernels are assigned with a unique index value. Then kernels are placed in the first level using their indices modulo to the stream count. For the remaining kernels, the distributor follows a set of rules in consideration of load balance and synchronization cost. ❶ The key idea of the rules is that a kernel issues right after any of its predecessors when possible, to reduce synchronizations among streams. We call these predecessors a preferred predecessor set (PP-Set). ❷ To avoid conflict when multiple kernels’ PP-Set intersects, we sort the kernels by the size of the PP-Set, schedule the kernels with smaller PP-Set first, and then update the PP-Set of unscheduled kernels. ❸ If there still exist conflicts, the kernel is randomly assigned to a stream containing its predecessor.

Here we exemplify the above steps with regard to the given DFG in Figure 4 and the corresponding kernel distribution strategy in Figure 5. Kernels in level 1 are put to the stream by their indices accordingly. In level 2, kernel F is scheduled first by rule ❶ as it has the smallest PP-Set, and is positioned after kernel C by rule ❷. Then kernel E’s updated PP-Set is smaller than that of kernel D, and is thus arranged after kernel A. Finally, kernel D is put after kernel B as accounting for rule ❸ again. In level 3, we repeat the process and schedule them in the order of kernel H, I, and J, which are all placed after their preferred predecessor. Lastly kernel G can choose from stream 1 and 3, where its predecessors are seated, and are randomly inserted in stream 3, as shown in Figure 4.

D. Synchronization Generator

After scheduling kernels in asynchronous streams, synchronization generator comes into play to ensure the correctness of the execution order. A naive approach is to create barriers whenever a data dependence exists. However, a part of the barriers are redundant and may cause performance overhead. To tackle this issue, a pruning algorithm is proposed based on the implicit synchronizations brought by the transitivity of dependency and serial execution of kernels in the same stream. When finish, the barriers are pruned to the minimum.

The synchronization generator traverses the kernels in each stream and works in three steps, suppose it is working on kernel K. In step ❶, it creates barriers for each of K’s predecessors which do not share the stream with K. In step ❷, it checks K’s predecessors in each stream, and reserves only the synchronization issued from the last predecessor in that stream. In step ❸, it enumerates kernels before K in the same stream, say T. If a K and T’s predecessor share the same stream, and K’s predecessor is executed before T’s, K is then implicitly synchronized by T and T’s predecessor. Therefore K’s barrier to that predecessor is safe to be removed. Full analysis of the complete DFG helps eliminate these redundant barriers correctly. In run-time analysis of GrSched, such elimination is infeasible due to the lack of a global view of the graph.

The example of Figure 5 shows the barriers generated in solid lines and the removed barriers in dashed lines. Synchronization generator scans stream 1 and creates kernel E and I’s barriers by step ❶. The same is true for kernel D in stream 2 and kernel J in 3. For kernel G, step ❷ detects its implicit synchronization with kernel A by the execution order of A → E → J, so the barrier is removed.

E. Kernel Scheduling in Prioritized Multi-process

The proposed design above focuses on enabling inter-kernel concurrency in a single program, and it is extensible to schedule independent sub-programs with diverse priorities in conformity to today’s GPU sharing scenario. We introduce
stream zone manager as an orthogonal module with kernel distributor and synchronization generator to coordinate among sub-programs and limit the number of issued kernels in avoidance of resource competition.

In the design extension, developers first manually wrap independent applications as distinct functions, and stream zone manager provides each sub-program a separated set of streams, in which the kernel distributor and synchronization generator schedules the sub-program’s tasks. Policies on scheduling across stream zones are straightforward: ❶ The foremost is creating barriers for low-priority tasks to block them until the high-priority ones are finished; ❷ Then for tasks of the same priority, the number of issued kernels is limited by a hyper-parameter3; ❸ If there is only one kernel left to execute a high-priority task, an additional kernel from a lower-priority task is issued beforehand. This is because a single kernel can rarely saturate all GPU resources. The above steps introduce a significant number of synchronization barriers and are pruned by synchronization generator. Figure 6 shows an example of scheduling two sub-programs. Kernels A, B, and C are issued first as they are of high priorities. By the additional rule ❸, kernel 1 is promoted to launch in interleave with kernel C, and barriers are generated for kernels 2, 3, and 4.

F. Implementation

Figure 7 shows the implementation pipeline of KeSCo, on basis of LLVM Compiler Infrastructure [16]. Although targeting at the CUDA platform, our design can be easily applied to other frameworks that support concurrent task queues (e.g. HIP [17] and SYCL [18]). The GPU kernel code is separated from the host (CPU) code and compiled individually to binary, while host code is compiled to intermediate representation (IR). The binary file of GPU kernels is embedded into host IR file and kernel functions are called by cudaPushCallConfiguration. We pinpoint this pattern to find the serial-issued kernels in host IR and apply our optimizations to their caller functions.

Identifying writable parameters at the compiler level is a challenging task, as computational data is often passed as pointers. These pointers may have identical addresses, making it impossible to discern between read-only and writable memory locations at compile time. As a workaround, developers necessitate adding a lightweight wrapper to the kernel, which specifies the number of writable parameters $N_{out}$ and rearranges them to the first $N_{out}$ parameters. The wrapper additionally takes a parameter specifying the kernel priority, to work with stream zone manager. This technique enables DFG constructor to analyze dependencies automatically, without involving any new programming framework.

Fig. 7: The processing framework of KeSCo implementation. Stream zone manager will be activated if sub-programs with various priorities are contained.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION & RESULTS

A. Experimental Setup

1) Platforms: We conduct experiments on a server equipped with Nvidia A100-PCIe-40GB GPUs, an AMD EPYC 7742 64-Core CPU and 256GB DRAM. The operating system is Debian 5.10.179 and the version of Nvidia driver is 470.182.03. We compile GPU programs using LLVM 14.0.0 and CUDA 11.4.4, with the compiler option –O3 switched on to optimize performance.

2) Benchmarks: We use eight representative workloads listed in Table I. The two in-house micro-benchmark are drawn from the kernels in Nvidia FasterTransformer[19], the rest benchmarks are introduced in [7].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Max DFG Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-2</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vector Square</td>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; Scholes</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Processing</td>
<td>IMG</td>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Learning</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HITS</td>
<td>HITS</td>
<td>HPC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning</td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Evaluated Schemes: We compare KeSCo against the baseline (serial execution, named Serial below), the one with expertise concurrency optimization (using CUDA’s APIs, named Async) and two prior arts including a static scheduler Taskflow [4] and a dynamic scheduler [7] based on GrCUDA [6] (denoted as GrSched).

4) Metrics: To quantify programming efforts, we consider the Line of Code (LoC) and the number of tokens needed in the manual modification. And, for performance, we average the execution time of all GPU kernels in 10 repeated runs.

B. Programming Effort

Table II lists the programming efforts required by different schemes, in terms of the average LoC and token count. Compared with Serial, KeSCo costs only 2.3% LoC and 6.1%
tokens in extra to enable CKE and automates both dependency analysis and concurrency management. The extra code is sourced from the kernels’ light wrapper for writable parameter identification, and our compiler-based approach encompasses the rest of transformation and optimization. In contrast, significant code modification is involved in other schemes. Async necessitates manually managing CUDA’s asynchronous APIs, while Taskflow lessened this burden and still requires explicit dependence specification. GrSched has the merit of automation but is limited to dynamic programming language for runtime analysis. KeSCo covers both automation and adaptation in enabling inter-kernel concurrency, and has the benefit of fulfillment in complex scenarios.

C. Speedup in Multi-task Programs

We conduct the evaluations with input consuming around 5GB of memory for each benchmark. The kernel launch configurations vary in block sizes (the number of threads per block) under a fixed number of grid size (the number of blocks) where Serial achieves the highest performance. For each benchmark using the 1D thread block, we average results for the block sizes from 32 to 1024. For those using the 2D or 3D thread block (e.g. HITS, IMG, and DL), the block sizes range from 8 or 16 to the maximum acceptable size. We report the execution time in Figure 8. KeSCo achieves 1.28× average speedup for all benchmarks, comparable to Async. On the other hand, GrSched and Taskflow achieve 0.98× and 1.10× speedup on average, respectively. For GrSched, the most significant performance penalty comes from the high cost of dynamic scheduling, including dependency analysis as well as runtime capture and issue kernels. Furthermore, such overhead prevents the CPU from launching kernels simultaneously. When the kernels complete shortly (e.g. the input size decreases or launched threads increase), the overhead takes a higher proportion of execution time. This worsens the insufficient overlaps among kernels and thus lowers the performance.

The above evaluation mainly takes into account the scheduling among kernels. But in more general scenarios, data transfer is also a significant factor affecting performance. Thus, we evaluate different schemes except Taskflow for overlapping computation with data transfer, which is not yet supported in Taskflow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>LoC</th>
<th>#Tokens</th>
<th>D.A.</th>
<th>C.M.</th>
<th>N.P.F</th>
<th>P.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Async</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taskflow</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GrSched</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>C++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeSCo</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Python</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Average programming efforts.

- Automatic Dependency Analysis
- Automatic Concurrency Management
- No New Programming Framework
- Programming Language

*The evaluation requires virtual memory mechanism of GPU and asynchronous data prefetch for overlapping computation with data transfer, which is not yet supported in Taskflow.*
acceleration of VEC mostly benefits from this. For M1, M2, and B&S, KeSCo greatly raises the SM occupancy and the throughput of FP32/64 instructions, thus utilizing more computation resources and improving performance.

E. Sensitivity Studies

In this section, we study how KeSCo’s performance is affected by different kernel inputs and stream counts. We evaluate all schemes on each benchmark with input sizes ranging from 1 - 10GB of memory occupancy. Figure 11 illustrates the results. KeSCo achieves an average speedup of 1.28× under all inputs, which is almost identical to Async. However, GrSched’s performance is unstable under varying input sizes. This is because GrSched’s kernel overlap depends on the ratio of dynamic scheduling overhead to the time cost of kernels, which varies greatly with input size.

For the robustness study on CUDA stream counts used in KeSCo, we evaluate three benchmarks whose DFG maximum widths are over five. Figure 12 details the results under the launch setting where KeSCo gains the highest speedup. For B&S, KeSCo achieves the highest speedup 2.76× with six streams and downgrades as the stream increases. We used Nvidia Nsight to profile and observe that up to seven kernels execute simultaneously on GPU, indicating the hardware resource is saturated by seven kernels. Therefore increasing streams aggravates resource competition and reduces performance. For M1 and M2, the max concurrency of kernels is also limited to eight for the same reason.

F. Speedup in Multi-process Scenarios

To evaluate how much KeSCo can deliver acceleration in multi-process scenarios where sub-programs have different priorities, we construct two in-house micro-benchmarks with workloads from Table I. We compare KeSCo with the Baseline scheme where sub-programs will be launched independently on GPU at the same time, and the scheme where Nvidia MPS [15] is enabled to transparently schedule these sub-programs. Figure 13 compares the speedup of each sub-program and the whole application gained by these three schemes. On MP-1, KeSCo outperforms MPS by 23.1% overall and 45.41% for IMG, the sub-program with the highest priority. For VEC1 and VEC2, sub-programs with lower priority, KeSCo achieves a speedup of 1.22×, which is only 4.01% lower than that of MPS. On MP-2, KeSCo achieves a speedup of 1.13× for the whole workload, while MPS’s performance drops by 5.21%. This is because MPS launches B&S, the sub-program with the lowest priority, earlier than KeSCo does, causing resource conflicts and performance penalties. For ML, the sub-program with the highest priority, KeSCo achieves a speedup of 1.14× while MPS causes a 4.95% performance drop. In summary, MPS has the merit of transparent scheduling at runtime but it lacks the ability to prioritize tasks from a global perspective. KeSCo, on the other hand, is a compiler-based approach that enables this global optimization, with the help of user hints.

V. RELATED WORK

A. Concurrent Kernel Execution

CKE has been studied in fine granularity widely. Elastic kernel [1] slices kernels into multiple small ones and deploys them on different SM to speed up. Similarly, OpenMP [21] is leveraged to decompose kernels into multiple tasks in Jungluer [11] and schedule tasks with dependencies via runtime mechanism. Also, Pagoda [22] concurrently executes narrow tasks at warp-level by virtualizing GPU resources and issues kernels when required resources are available. Targeting at real-world applications, RAMMER [3] proposes a DNN compiler for joint optimization of inter- and intra-kernel concurrency. Taskflow [4] wraps GPU programming model APIs and implements a static scheduler in the framework. A GrCUDA [6]-based runtime scheduler [7] eases prototyping of parallel applications. Distinguishing from those prior arts, our proposed KeSCo aims to statically automate kernel scheduling...
in multi-task programs, achieving much better performance with reduced programming burden.

B. Task Scheduling

A bunch of task schedulers have been proposed to optimize multi-task applications. On hardware level, new APIs are introduced in [23] to heterogeneous system architecture (HSA) for applications specifying task priority. Chimera [12] extends SM scheduler to estimate the cost of kernel preemption to minimize the overhead. Similarly, command buffer and status table are further embedded in SM scheduler [13] to minimize the overhead for prioritized tasks. On software level, FELP [24] leverages a compiler-runtime system to control task preemption at kernel level. EffiSha [10] schedules kernels at thread-block level dynamically with an online cost model. Pegasusus [2] proposes a hypervisor that offers a virtualized accelerator’s interface to schedule heterogeneous tasks coordinately in virtual machines. CASE [25] introduces a novel accelerator’s interface to schedule heterogeneous tasks cooperatively. Pegasus [2] proposes a hypervisor that offers a virtualized accelerator’s interface to schedule heterogeneous tasks coherently in virtual machines. CASE [25] introduces a novel accelerator’s interface to schedule heterogeneous tasks cooperatively.

VI. CONCLUSION

The paper proposes KeSCo to automatically enable CKE in multi-task applications at compile-time with trivial programming effort. KeSCo constructs the DFG from source code, distributes kernels across multiple streams, and generates synchronization barriers to achieve load balance and low synchronization cost. Moreover, the design is extended to multi-process scenarios for prioritized sub-program scheduling. Experimental results demonstrate that KeSCo effectively boosts performance and eases programming burden.
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