
ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Faster Positional-Population Counts for AVX2, AVX-512, and ASIMD

Robert Clausecker¹ | Daniel Lemire² | Florian Schintke¹

¹Distributed Algorithms, Zuse Institute Berlin

²DOT-Lab Research Center, Université du Québec (TÉLUQ)

Correspondence

Robert Clausecker, Zuse Institute Berlin, Takustraße 7, 14195 Berlin, GERMANY
Email: clausecker@zib.de

Funding information

The positional population count operation `popcnt` counts for an array of w -bit words how often each of the w bits was set. Various applications in bioinformatics, database engineering, and digital processing exist.

Building on earlier work by Klarqvist et al., we show how positional population counts can be rapidly computed using SIMD techniques with good performance from the first byte, approaching memory-bound speeds for input arrays of as little as 4 KiB. Improvements include an improved algorithm structure, better handling of unaligned and very short arrays, as well as faster bit-parallel accumulation of intermediate results.

We provide a generic algorithm description as well as implementations for various SIMD instruction set extensions, including Intel AVX2, AVX-512, and ARM ASIMD, and discuss the adaption of our algorithm to other platforms.

KEYWORDS

SIMD, positional population count, AVX2, AVX-512, ASIMD

1 | INTRODUCTION

Low-cardinality categorical variables are often represented using one-hot encoding [1, 2]: each categorical value is associated with a bit within a w -bit word. For example, given the variable `age`, one might have four distinct age categories for the ages between 0–20, 21–35, 36–65, 66–120 years. We may represent each category value using a 4-bit word: `0001`, `0010`, `0100` and `1000`. From these words, we would like to compute as quickly as possible the




FIGURE 1 Positional population count with $w = 3$

```

void pospop_w(int counts[w], uintw_t words[], size_t n) {
    for (size_t i = 0; i < n; i++)
        for (size_t j = 0; j < w; j++)
            counts[j] += words[i] >> j & 1
}

```

FIGURE 2 Pseudo-C function to compute the width- w positional population count

histogram: the number of occurrences of each value.

For such purposes, Klarqvist et al. [3] introduced the *positional population count*. The conventional population count is merely the sum of the bit values (0 and 1) in a stream of bits. It is an important operation in databases and cryptography: most commodity processors (ARM, x64) have dedicated instructions to accelerate the computation of the conventional population count. When we compute the *positional* population count, we view a stream of bits as w interleaved streams for some integer parameter w : we sum the bit values at position 0, w , $2w$, ...; we sum the bit values at 1, $w + 1$, $2w + 1$, ...; ...; we sum the bit values at $w - 1$, $2w - 1$, $3w - 1$, ... So, the positional population count provides w distinct sums. For $w > 1$, positional population count generalizes the conventional population count. See Fig. 1.

Given a database of one-hot encoded values, the positional population count might accelerate group-by queries (e.g. `SELECT COUNT(*)`, `country FROM table GROUP BY country`). Furthermore, the positional population count is not limited to one-hot encoded data: it computes histograms over arbitrary bits which could be useful for various statistical tests. Other uses are found in the construction of *wavelet trees*[4], and in approximate pattern matching of DNA sequences[5], an application where an early form of our implementation is already in use[6].

To compute the positional population count, we might proceed by accessing each bit value in sequence, as in Fig. 2. It is likely that such code requires several processor instructions per input bit. In contrast, our objective is to spend few instructions per input word.

Conventional population count can be seen as a 'horizontal' operation as the set bits across a word or array are counted— independent of their position. In contrast, positional population count has a 'vertical' component as only every w -th bit is to be accumulated in the same counter, which should suit the calculation well for SIMD instructions of modern microprocessors. Modern processors have wide registers, spanning up to 512 bits in recent Intel processors, with accompanying AVX-512 single-instruction-multiple-data (SIMD) instructions [7]. These instructions can execute the same operation on multiple values at once. For sequences of machine words in contiguous memory, SIMD instructions help us compute the conventional population count at gigabytes per second [8]. Using similar techniques, Klarqvist et al. [3] showed that we can achieve gigabytes per second when computing the positional population count by using SIMD instructions as well. Their methods, unfortunately, need inputs exceeding a few kilobytes in size to observe notable speed improvements compared to scalar code.

Our main contribution is a refined algorithm for the positional population count operation, building on Klarqvist et al.'s work [3]. In particular,

- we show how Harley-Seal algorithm scheme can be improved using a simplified CSA network for the initial iteration (see § 4.2),
- we provide effective approaches to deal with inputs that are not aligned to the vector length (see § 4.1) as well as very short inputs (see § 4.6), yielding good performance from the first byte,
- we demonstrate how the CSA-summed bit vectors generated in the main loop of Klarqvist et al.'s algorithm can be transposed and rapidly added to the accumulator vectors in a bit-parallel manner (see § 4.3 and § 4.5),
- we implement our algorithm for different SIMD instruction set extensions including Intel AVX2, AVX-512 and ARM ASIMD and compare its performance with the Klarqvist et al. algorithm for a variety of input sizes, showing that its execution is memory bound with inputs as small as 4 KiB (see § 5).

2 | SIMD INSTRUCTION SET EXTENSIONS

Our algorithms are designed to be implemented using *SIMD instruction set extensions*. SIMD (single instruction multiple data) [9] extensions generally provide additional CPU registers holding *vectors* of data items and instructions that operate on the items of their vector operands in parallel (*vertical instructions*). These include instructions such as vector loads and stores, addition and subtraction, as well as bitwise operations. A number of instructions instead perform arithmetic or data movement between the elements of one vector (*horizontal instructions*). These generally include *reductions* (such as instructions to sum the elements of a vector) and *shuffles* (changing the order of vector elements, either according to a fixed scheme or by a user-defined permutation). In recent SIMD extensions such as AVX-512 and SVE, SIMD registers may be complemented by *predicate mask* registers, allowing the programmer to decide which vector elements an instruction is to affect.

We consider three families of SIMD instruction set extensions. The *AVX* (advanced vector extensions) family comprising AVX and AVX2, extending the Intel 64 instruction-set architecture¹, the *AVX-512* family comprising a variety of extension sets, of which we use the **F** (*foundation*) and **BW** (*byte and word instructions*) sets, also extending Intel 64, and the *ASIMD* (advanced SIMD) extension to AArch64. We also briefly mention other SIMD extensions, but those three are the focus of this publication.

2.1 | AVX2

An upgrade to the earlier SSE family of instruction set extensions, AVX2 provides the programmer with sixteen SIMD registers of 256 bits that can be subdivided into elements of 8, 16, 32, or 64 bits. A comprehensive set of the usual vertical integer and floating point operations is provided, with the notable omission of 8 bit shift instructions. Horizontal reductions and shuffles complement the set, but no full arbitrary 32-byte (or sixteen 16-bit-word) permutation instructions are provided, necessitating careful algorithm design to work around this limitation.

AVX2 registers can be thought of as being divided into two 128-bit (or 16-byte) lanes, with most instructions performing identical and independent operation on both lanes. This simplifies the transition from the earlier 128-bit wide SSE family of instruction set extensions, which can be seen as operating like AVX2, but with only one lane per register. A small number of *cross-lane* instructions break with this pattern and provide means to exchange data across the lanes of an AVX2 register, but at an increased latency. For example, on Intel *Icelake* processors, the in-lane

¹the 64-bit variant of the IA-32 (x86, i386) architecture also known as x86-64, x64, amd64, IA-32e, and EM64T

`vpslufb` (packed shuffle bytes) instruction permutes bytes within 128-bit lanes in one cycle at a throughput of two per cycle. Meanwhile, the cross-lane `vpermd` (packed permute doublewords) instruction permutes 32-bit words within the entire register in three cycles at a throughput of one per cycle. This design feature encourages the programmer to find algorithmic approaches that minimise the number of cross-lane shuffles.

2.2 | AVX-512

AVX-512 extends AVX2 to 512-bit registers while keeping the overall architecture and design of AVX2. The number of SIMD registers is doubled to 32. A number of new instructions are provided, including additional permutation instructions and `vpternlogd` (packed ternary logic doubleword), an instruction to compute any three-input one-output bitwise operation based on a truth table supplied as an immediate operand. For example, the bitwise ternary operator $a = a ? b : c$ can be computed using immediate operand `0xca` as `vpternlogd a, b, c, 0xca`, representing the following truth table:

<i>a</i>	1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0
<i>b</i>	1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0
<i>c</i>	1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0
$0xca \hat{=} a ? b : c$	1 1 0 0 1 0 1 0

As another notable new feature, *mask registers* can be used to decide which vector elements are affected by a SIMD instruction. Other elements remain unchanged (*merge masking*) or may be cleared (*zero masking*), depending on instruction and masking mode. When applied to instructions with memory source operands, no faults occur from masked out elements (*fault suppression*). When applied to stores, merge masking can be used to store possibly discontinuous data without affecting adjacent data.

On the hardware side, Intel implements AVX-512 on the Skylake microarchitecture using the same execution ports 0, 1, and 5 as used for AVX2. For AVX2 instructions, these ports are used at a width of 256 bits, permitting up to three AVX2 instructions to be dispatched per cycle. With AVX-512, port 5 is extended to 512 bits. Instructions operating on 512-bit vectors are either executed on port 5, or the SIMD resources of ports 0 and 1 are bundled to execute one instruction together, for a total of up to two instructions per cycle.² Thus while 256-bit vectors can be processed at up to 6 lanes of 128 bits each per cycle, 512-bit vectors raise this number to only 8 lanes for only a 33% performance increase, despite the doubled vector length. At the same time, on some microarchitectures, CPU frequency is reduced due to *thermal licensing*[10, 11] when executing SIMD instructions at full 512 bits vector length.

Despite these limitations, use of 512-bit vectors poses many advantages in this application: less instruction-level parallelism (ILP) is needed to process the same amount of data, permutations over wider vectors reduce the total number of transposition steps needed, register pressure is reduced, allowing more flexibility with instruction ordering, and the presence of `vpternlogd` significantly reduces the number of steps per full adder (see § 3.1.1).

2.3 | ASIMD

The *Advanced SIMD* (ASIMD) instruction set extension provides SIMD instructions for the AArch64 architecture. The feature set is comparable to that of AVX2, but with 32 registers of only 16 bytes. At the same time, powerful bulk load/store instructions transfer up to 64 bytes at a time. ASIMD is characterised by a more orthogonal set of integer

²Such an instruction formally runs on port 0; port 1 can execute another non-SIMD instruction in the same cycle.

instructions, with almost all instructions being available at all data sizes. Arithmetic instructions often support sign and zero extension as a side effect of their operation, reducing the need for explicit shuffles. A flexible generic 4-input byte permutation instruction `tb1` is provided, allowing the programmer to pick any 16 bytes out of a 64-byte look-up table formed from four consecutive registers.

Performance of ASIMD instructions varies considerably across implementations, with low-end ARM processors some times even seeing a disadvantage over scalar code, while high-end out of order designs provide performance that is on par or even exceeding that of AVX2 on an Intel chip clocked at the same frequency. Another big difference is found in the performance of permutation instructions: while these perform reasonably well on high-end cores, many cores do not cope well with wide permutations and it is often useful to seek other approaches where possible.

This diversity in implementations renders the design of SIMD algorithms with good performance across CPU designs a very challenging task. Nevertheless we believe that we found a good compromise in the ASIMD implementation of our algorithm.

3 | BACKGROUND

The key to the efficient computation of positional population counts as well as regular population count lies in *carry-save adder (CSA) networks* [12]. These are built by combining *bit-parallel full adders* into networks, that can then be used to compute the population of input vectors in chunks.

3.1 | Bit-parallel full adders

A full-adder (FA) circuit takes three one bit inputs and produces a two bit output representing the number of input bits that have been set. The lower output bit Σ is called the *sum*, the upper output bit C is the *carry*. This can be seen as a compression of the population of three input bits weighted $(1, 1, 1)$ into two output bits weighted $(1, 2)$.

Using standard bitwise instructions, we can treat SIMD registers as vectors of bits and simulate a full adder circuit on a whole vector worth of bits in parallel, taking three vectors of input and giving vectors of sum and carry as output. For example, at a vector length of $r = 4$, given the three vectors $a = 1001$, $b = 1001$, and $c = 0101$, we can simulate a full adder to produce $C = 1001$ and $\Sigma = 0101$. We effectively simulate four full adders, one for each element in our 4-bit vectors.

This also highlights the difference to a normal addition routine: while an addition operation $\Sigma = a + b$ is a *horizontal* operation in which a multi-bit number a is added to a multi-bit number b , the bit-parallel full adder routine is a vertical SIMD operation $(C, \Sigma) = FA(a, b, c)$ in which each bit is processed independently.

3.1.1 | Implementation details

The bit-parallel full-adder circuit can be realised in a variety of ways. On all architectures, the classic five gate full adder circuit (Eq. 1), comprising two half adders and an *or* operation to combine their carry-outs can be used. This strategy and its variants require 5 operation steps with a critical path length of 3 steps. It is used to implement the full-adder operation on architectures that only provide basic two-input logic operations such as x86 with MMX, SSE, and AVX2, ARM with SVE, as well as when implementing bit-parallel full adders in high-level languages.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma_1 &= a \oplus b \\
 C_1 &= a \wedge b \\
 \Sigma &= \Sigma_1 \oplus c \\
 C &= C_1 \vee (\Sigma_1 \wedge c)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

```

; AVX2: sum bit vectors ymm0, ymm1, ymm2 into ymm1:ymm0
vpand ymm3, ymm0, ymm1 ; C1 = a & b
vpxor ymm0, ymm0, ymm1 ; S1 = a ^ b
vpand ymm1, ymm0, ymm2 ; tmp = S1 & c
vpxor ymm0, ymm0, ymm2 ; S = S1 ^ c
vpor ymm1, ymm3, ymm1 ; C = C1 | tmp

```

Some SIMD units provide a ‘mux’ instruction implementing the ternary operator $a ? b : c$ for each bit. In this case, a more efficient implementation (Eq. 2) using just 3 operations with a 2 operation critical path length can be used. The sum Σ is again computed by two exclusive-or operations while the carry out C is taken using the mux instruction. This variant is used on SIMD units such as ARM ASIMD (using `bsl`, `bit`, or `bif`) and POWER VMX (using `vse1`).

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma_1 &= a \oplus b \\
 \Sigma &= \Sigma_1 \oplus c \\
 C &= \Sigma_1 ? c : b
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

```

// AArch64 ASIMD: sum bit vectors v0, v1, v2 into v1:v0
eor v3.16b, v0.16b, v1.16b
eor v0.16b, v3.16b, v2.16b // S = v0 = v0 ^ v1 ^ v2
bit v1.16b, v2.16b, v3.16b // C = v1 = v0 ^ v1 ? v2 : v1

```

Finally, AVX-512 provides the `vpternlogd` instruction to perform any three-input single-output bitwise operation based on the given truth table (see [7, Volume 2c, Section 5.1]). This allows us to compute Σ and C directly from the inputs: the sum as the parity, the carry as the majority (i. e. whether more bits are set than not). These two operations are represented by the truth tables `0x96` and `0xe8` for parity and majority respectively.

As `vpternlogd` is destructive (i. e. overwrites one of its operands), we have to use an additional data move to preserve all three input registers through the first of the two `vpternlogd` instructions. All implementations of AVX-512 available on the market as of the writing of this article implement such data moves as zero-latency register renames (i. e. they are effectively free). Hence, even though three instructions are involved in this implementation, we count this as 2 operation steps with a critical path length of 1 step.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma &= a \oplus b \oplus c \\
 C &= \text{maj}(a, b, c)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3}$$

```

; AVX-512: sum bit vectors zmm0, zmm1, zmm2 into zmm1:zmm0
vmovdqa64 zmm3, zmm0 ; zmm3 = zmm0
vpternlogd zmm0, zmm1, zmm2, 0x96 ; S = a ^ b ^ c
vpternlogd zmm1, zmm3, zmm2, 0xe8 ; C = maj(a, b, c)

```


3.2 | Carry-Save Adder (CSA) Networks

Bit-parallel full-adders provide us with a building block to compress, i. e. count, the population of three bits into two. Counting more bits is achieved by repeatedly compressing bits of the same weight with full adders until this is no longer possible. For example, seven input bits weighted $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ can be compressed into three output bits with weights $(1, 2, 4)$. 15 input bits weighted $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ can be compressed into four output bits with weights $(1, 2, 4, 8)$.


To visualise this process, we draw these sequences of full adders as *CSA networks* (see Fig. 3). This visualisation highlights that a great deal of full adders can be evaluated in parallel, improving the *instructions per cycle (IPC)* on out-of-order processors. For example, the CSA_{15} network in Fig. 3(a) performs 11 (vectorised) full-adder operations with a critical path of only 5 FA operations.

3.3 | Counting bits with CSA Networks

The use of CSA networks to count the bits in arrays was first proposed by Harley and Seal in 1996 and later popularised by Warren[13]. By first reducing the 2^k words of an array to $k + 1$ accumulators $a_{2^{k+1}}, \dots, a_2, a_1$ of place-value



(a) CSA₁₅ network for the initial 15 registers



(b) CSA₁₆₊₄ network for the main loop (bit parallelism akin to (a), not shown here)

FIGURE 3 Bit-parallel carry-save adder (CSA) networks

$2^{k+1}, \dots, 2, 1$, costly population count steps can be reduced to comparably cheap bitwise logic and only few final population count steps to sum up the bit-parallel accumulators.

In practice, a fixed block size of 8 or 16 words is chosen and after each chunk of that many words, the population of the most-significant accumulator resulting from the CSA network is taken and added to the population count, while the other accumulators are carried over into the next iteration. This reduces the algorithm to one actual population count per chunk of input; the population of the remaining accumulators resulting from the CSA network needs only be computed once after the final iteration (see Alg. 1).

Algorithm 1 The Harley-Seal algorithm[13]

Require: A is an array of n blocks of 2^k words each

$(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$

$c \leftarrow 0$

for $i \leftarrow 0, 2^k, \dots, (n-1)2^k$ **do**

▷ combine 2^k words of input with accumulators $(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1)$

$a_{2^k}, (a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow \text{CSA}(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1; A[i], A[i+1], \dots, A[i+2^k-1])$

$c \leftarrow c + 2^k \text{popcount}(a_{2^k})$

end for

$c \leftarrow c + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^i \text{popcount}(a_{2^i})$

return c

This idea was combined by Muła et al. with a novel table-based population count routine (see Alg. 2) to yield the currently fastest known algorithm for counting the bits of arrays.[8] Later, the same Harley and Seal algorithm structure was used by Klarqvist et al.[3] to count bits in an array grouped by their places in each word in a vectorised fashion, yielding a fast *positional population count* algorithm for the first time.

Algorithm 2 Sketch of the Klarqvist et al. algorithm without vectorization[3]

Require: A is an array of n blocks of 2^k words of w bits each

$(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0)$

$c[0, 1, \dots, w-1] \leftarrow 0$

for $i \leftarrow 0, 2^k, \dots, (n-1)2^k$ **do**

▷ combine 2^k words of input with accumulators $(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1)$

$a_{2^k}, (a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow \text{CSA}(a_{2^k-1}, \dots, a_2, a_1; A[i], A[i+1], \dots, A[i+2^k-1])$

for $j \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots, w-1$ **do**

$c[j] \leftarrow c[j] + 2^k ((a_{2^k} \gg j) \wedge 1)$

end for

end for

for $j \leftarrow 0, 1, \dots, w-1$ **do**

$c[j] \leftarrow c[j] + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 2^i ((a_{2^i} \gg j) \wedge 1)$

end for

return c

However, while vectorized, the Klarqvist et al. procedure is at its heart still based on a scalar procedure. After the CSA step of the main loop, the accumulators need to be *accumulated* into the counters. Each bit of the most-significant

accumulator a_{2^k} is individually added to the corresponding counter, leading to a number of steps proportional to the word width w by which we want to group bits. The same cumbersome procedure takes place at the end to sum the remaining accumulators into the counter array. While vectorization is employed to process multiple words at the same time, there is clearly room for improvement.

We aim to improve on this result by providing fully bit-parallel accumulation procedures that reduce the amount of steps needed to $O(\log w)$. We also show how the Harley-Seal algorithm scheme can be improved for lower startup cost and provide methods to deal with unaligned input, very short input (i. e. less than one iteration of the main loop), and the tail that remains after no more iterations of the main loop can be executed.

4 | FAST SIMD-VECTORIZED POSITIONAL-POPULATION COUNTS

Like the Klarqvist et al. algorithm (see § 3.3 and Alg. 2), our algorithm takes an array A , computes its positional population count with respect to some word size w , a power of two, and adds the population to an array C of w counters. It is expected that A is aligned to a multiple of w .

The algorithm internally computes the population count with respect to some maximum word size $w_{\max} \geq w$ in vectors of some vector size³ $r \geq w_{\max}$, both of which must be powers of 2, too. For each desired word size w , an accumulation function $f_w(C, c)$ must be provided that reduces the internal counter vector c to w elements and adds the reduced counters to the counter array C . This permits use of the same code for different word sizes. In the code developed for this paper, $w_{\max} = 64$ was chosen for all implementations.

If the input is less than $15r$ bytes in total, we proceed with the special processing from § 4.6. Otherwise:

1. Optionally, clear the counter array C .⁴
2. Align to a multiple of r and perform a load of one vector v_0 from the aligned address. Clear all bytes in v_0 that precede the beginning of the array (§ 4.1).
3. Load 14 more vectors v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{14} from the input array and reduce v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{14} into accumulators (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) using a CSA_{15} network, where each a_i has place value i (§ 4.2).
4. Initialise 16-bit counters vectors $c = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{2w_{\max}/r})$ to zero.
5. Until less than $16r$ bytes of input remain:
 - a. Read 16 vectors v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{15} from the input array. Reduce them with accumulators (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) into $(a_{16}, a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1)$ using another CSA_{16+4} network (§ 4.2). Keep (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) for the next iteration.
 - b. Deinterleave and reduce the bits in a_{16} and add them to the counter vectors (§ 4.3).
 - c. If the counter vectors could overflow in the next iteration or during postprocessing, call $f_w(C, c)$ to flush the counter vectors into the counter array, then reset c to zero (§ 4.4).
6. With less than $16r$ bytes of input remaining, transpose and reduce (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) and add the counts to c (§ 4.5).
7. Process the remaining bytes of input using a special algorithm for short inputs and add their counts to c (§ 4.6).
8. Call $f_w(C, c)$ to add the remaining counts to the counter array.

This algorithm employs a structure similar to the Harley-Seal algorithm, but differs in that instead of initialising the accumulators to zero, we run an initial iteration of only 15 vectors of input with no accumulators carried in (cf. Fig. 4). While processing one vector of input less, this initial CSA network requires only 11 full adders instead of the 15 adders used in the main loop, leading to an overall time save. For comparison, Alg. 3 shows the scheme used for our algorithm

³The vector size r is usually the CPU's native vector size, so $r = 128$ for SSE, ASIMD, and VMX, $r = 256$ for AVX2, and $r = 512$ for AVX-512.

⁴If this is omitted, counts of the current array are added to the counts already in C . This may be desirable for streamed input or non-contiguous memory regions to be counted.




FIGURE 4 Algorithm sketches with carry save adder (CSA) networks

in a manner similar to Alg. 1 and Alg. 2.

Algorithm 3 Simplified algorithm sketch without vectorization, head/tail processing, and $f_w(C, c)$

Require: A is an array of $n \times 2^k - 1$ words of w bits each

$(a_{2^{k-1}}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow \text{CSA}(A[0], A[1], \dots, A[2^k - 2])$ ▷ § 4.2

$c[0, 1, \dots, w_{\max} - 1] \leftarrow 0$

for $i \leftarrow 0, 2^k, \dots, (n - 2)2^k$ **do**

$a_{2^k}, (a_{2^{k-1}}, \dots, a_2, a_1) \leftarrow \text{CSA}(a_{2^{k-1}}, \dots, a_2, a_1; A[2^k + i - 1], A[2^k + i], \dots, A[2 \cdot 2^k + i - 2])$ ▷ § 4.2

Accumulate a_{2^k} into c ▷ § 4.3

end for

Accumulate $(a_{2^{k-1}}, \dots, a_2, a_1)$ into c ▷ § 4.5

return c

4.1 | Head processing

On many microarchitectures, data is processed faster if it is accessed from aligned addresses. On some, this is a hard requirement (unaligned access faults). To address this need, we start out by aligning the input buffer to a multiple of $r/8$ bytes. The address is rounded down to the previous multiple of $r/8$ and an initial vector v_0 is loaded from the aligned address. This load cannot fault as the page size is a multiple of $r/8$ and thus a load from an aligned vector cannot cross a page. All bits in this vector that precede the beginning of the vector are cleared, removing any influence of surrounding data on the result of the algorithm. The 8 to r data bits in v_0 are then complemented by additional 14 vectors of input v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{14} to serve as input for the initial CSA reduction. This approach is an improvement over the Klarqvist et al. method which aligns the input by processing the first up to $r/8$ bytes of input in a scalar manner until sufficient alignment is reached.




FIGURE 5 Intermediate, vectorised accumulation procedure (see § 4.3)

4.2 | Reduction using CSA networks

Like in the Klarqvist et al. algorithm, each chunk of input is initially reduced using a network of carry-save adders. This eliminates the need for any further processing for most input bytes, leaving us with just one vector of data to be processed in the following steps.

We use two CSA networks (cf. Fig. 3): CSA_{15} turns the initial 15 vectors of input v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{14} into vectors (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) forming a 4-bit accumulator, and CSA_{16+4} adds 16 vectors of input v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{15} to the same (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) , yielding a 5-bit accumulator $(a_{16}, a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1)$. The top vector of bits a_{16} is then skimmed off and processed, leaving the other vectors for the next iteration.

The specific CSA networks we use have been designed for good instruction-level parallelism (ILP) and are constrained largely by register pressure. A variety of CSA network designs are possible and there is likely a different optimal design for each ISA. The authors have not exhaustively explored all possible CSA networks, but have instead chosen one empirically.

In contrast to the Klarqvist et al. algorithm, we operate with a fixed accumulator of 4 bits: the final accumulation step involves a sequence of transposition steps that work best on a number of vectors that is a power of two. From the benchmarks of the Klarqvist et al. algorithm, it is clear that using only a 2-bit accumulator (corresponding to their 256 B block size) yields poor performance, while an 8-bit accumulator would only bring benefits for unreasonably large inputs.

Another difference is that the Klarqvist et al. algorithm does not use a separate CSA network for the initial chunk of input. Instead, it initialises the accumulator vectors to zeroes and starts directly with the main loop. This is suboptimal for two reasons: (a) while the main loop CSA network processes one more vector of input bytes, it takes 4 more CSA steps to do so, a disproportionate amount of extra work. (b) with a dedicated initial iteration, no a_{16} vector is produced for the initial $15r$ bytes of input, avoiding the need to reduce that vector into the counters and saving time.

4.3 | Bit accumulation: main loop

After having reduced the input v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{15} with (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) into $(a_{16}, a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1)$, we keep (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) for the next iteration and add the bits in a_{16} to the accumulators c . To do so, each bit of a_{16} needs to be zero-extended into a 16-bit vector element and the vector has to be folded over itself until no more than w_{\max} elements remain. Then, the result is scaled by 16 and added to c . I.e. we want to compute

$$c[i]_{16} \leftarrow c[i]_{16} + 16 \sum_{j=0}^{r/w_{\max}-1} a_{16}[jw_{\max} + i]_{16}. \quad (4)$$

This step is also required in the Klarqvist et al. algorithm, but while they implemented Eq. 4 by looping over $c[i]$, we provide an improved, fully vectorised approach.

The bits of a_{16} are repeatedly split into even and odd bits and folded over themselves, increasing the size of each element from bits to crumbs to nibbles to bytes, possibly up to 16-bit words, while halving the number of elements in each step. This is repeated until w_{\max} elements remain or the element size has reached 16 bits, whatever happens first. The result is then zero-extended to 16-bit elements using the same deinterleaving steps, but without the subsequent reduction, or using dedicated zero-extension instructions, and added to c .

The exact steps and shuffles needed to implement this reduction depend on r and w_{\max} and cannot be given for the general case. A synthetic example for $r = 32$, $w_{\max} = 4$ is given in Fig. 5. As can be seen, each iteration requires a different permutation schedule. This corresponds roughly to the start of our AVX-512 implementation's part that accumulates a_{16} into c , using $r = 512$, $w_{\max} = 64$:

```

; convert zmm4 = a16 to bytes and reduce thrice
; zmm28 = 0x5555..55, zmm27 = 0x3333..33, zmm26 = 0x0f0f..0f
vpandd    zmm5, zmm28, zmm4      ; zmm4 & 0x5555..55 (bits 02468ace x32)
vpandnd   zmm6, zmm28, zmm4      ; zmm4 & ~0x5555..55 (bits 13579bdf x32)
vpsrld    zmm6, zmm6, 1          ; zmm6 shifted to the right by 1
vshufi64x2 zmm10, zmm5, zmm6, 0x44 ; zmm10 = 02468ace x16 13579bdf x16 (low)
vshufi64x2 zmm11, zmm5, zmm6, 0xee ; zmm11 = 02568ace x16 13579bdf x16 (high)
vpaddd    zmm4, zmm10, zmm11     ; zmm4 = zmm10 + zmm11 (first reduction)

vpandd    zmm5, zmm27, zmm4      ; zmm4 & 0x3333..33 (048c x16 159d x16)
vpandnd   zmm6, zmm27, zmm4      ; zmm4 & ~0x3333..33 (26ae x16 37bf x16)
vpsrld    zmm6, zmm6, 2          ; zmm6 shifted to the right by 2
vshufi64x2 zmm10, zmm5, zmm6, 0x88 ; zmm10 = 048c x8 159d x8 26ae x8 37bf x8 (low)
vshufi64x2 zmm11, zmm5, zmm6, 0xdd ; zmm11 = 048c x8 159d x8 26ae x8 37bf x8 (high)
vpaddd    zmm4, zmm10, zmm11     ; zmm4 = zmm10 + zmm11 (second reduction)

vpandd    zmm5, zmm26, zmm4      ; zmm4 & 0x0f0f..0f (08 x8 19 x8 2a x8 3b x8)
vpandnd   zmm6, zmm26, zmm4      ; zmm4 & ~0x0f0f..0f (4c x8 5d x8 6e x8 7f x8)
vpslld    zmm5, zmm5, 4          ; zmm5 shifted to the left by 4 (!)
vshufi64x2 zmm10, zmm5, zmm6, 0x88 ; zmm10 = 08 19 2a 3b 4c 5d 6e 7f (each x4, low)
vshufi64x2 zmm11, zmm5, zmm6, 0xdd ; zmm11 = 08 19 2a 3b 4c 5d 6e 7f (each x4, high)
vpaddd    zmm4, zmm10, zmm11     ; zmm4 = zmm10 + zmm11 (third reduction)

```

The main differences are the different shuffles as well as the use of a left shift in the last step. This pre-scales the reduced counts by 16, removing the need for an explicit multiplication with 16 prior to adding to c .

4.4 | Accumulator overflow handling

In each iteration of the main loop, the elements of c are increased by at most $16r/w_{\max}$. Throughout the algorithm, we keep track of what the highest value h the elements of c could hold. This value is initially $h \leftarrow 0$. After each iteration




FIGURE 6 Vectorised data restructuring (transposition) in the final accumulation procedure (see § 4.5)

of the main loop, we increase h by $16r/w_{\max}$ and check if

$$h \leq 2^{16} - 1 - (15 + 15) \frac{r}{w_{\max}} \tag{5}$$

to ensure that there is enough space left before overflow occurs to fit at least one more iteration of the main loop (up to $16r/w_{\max}$) or the final accumulation ($15r/w_{\max}$) plus the maximum tail size (another $15r/w_{\max}$). If this is the case, we proceed with the next iteration. Otherwise we first call $f_w(C, c)$ to flush the counter vectors c into the counter array C and reset both h and c back to zero.

The function $f_w(C, c)$ is implemented in much the same way as the intermediate accumulation procedure from § 4.3: the counters in c are extended to the size of the counters in C while being folded over until only w counters remain. Then the resulting vectors are added to C .

4.5 | Bit accumulation: final accumulation

Once less than $16r$ bits of input remain, the main loop is terminated and a final accumulation step adds the contents of (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) to c . This is done in a similar way to the main loop accumulation procedure, except we start by turning the four vectors of bits into one group of vectors, each of which holds a set of nibble-sized counters. This first step can be seen as a kind of transposition where (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) form a sequence of 4×4 matrices to be transposed.

The transposition is easily afforded using the classic recursive matrix transposition algorithm[14]. In this algorithm, a square matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ is split into four equally sized block-matrices $A, B, C,$ and D , which are recursively transposed. Finally, the top right and bottom left block matrices are swapped to give the transposed matrix $M^T = \begin{pmatrix} A^T & C^T \\ B^T & D^T \end{pmatrix}$. We implement this transposition in a bit-parallel manner, as depicted in Fig. 6. In the AVX-512 implementation, this

is realised as follows:

```

; transpose zmm3:zmm2:zmm1:zmm0 (a8:a4:a2:a1) into 4 vectors of nibbles
; zmm28 = 0x5555..55, zmm27 = 0x3333..33

vpsrld   zmm4, zmm0, 1           ; zmm4 = a1 >> 1
vpslld   zmm5, zmm1, 1           ; zmm5 = a2 << 1
vpsrld   zmm6, zmm2, 1           ; zmm6 = a4 >> 1
vpslld   zmm7, zmm3, 1           ; zmm7 = a8 << 1
vpternlogd zmm0, zmm5, zmm28, 0xe4 ; a12l = a1 # 0x55..5 | (a2 << 1) # 0xaa..a
vpternlogd zmm1, zmm4, zmm28, 0xd8 ; a12h = a2 # 0xaa..a | (a1 >> 1) # 0x55..5
vpternlogd zmm2, zmm7, zmm28, 0xe4 ; a48l = a4 # 0x55..5 | (a8 << 1) # 0xaa..a
vpternlogd zmm3, zmm6, zmm28, 0xd8 ; a48h = a8 # 0xaa..a | (a4 >> 1) # 0x55..5

// second step
vpsrld   zmm4, zmm0, 2           ; zmm4 = b12a >> 2
vpsrld   zmm6, zmm1, 2           ; zmm6 = b12b >> 2
vpslld   zmm5, zmm2, 2           ; zmm5 = b48a << 2
vpslld   zmm7, zmm3, 2           ; zmm7 = b48b << 2
vpternlogd zmm2, zmm4, zmm27, 0xd8 ; a_c = b48a # 0xcc..c | (b12a >> 2) # 0x33..3
vpternlogd zmm3, zmm6, zmm27, 0xd8 ; a_d = b48b # 0xcc..c | (b12b >> 2) # 0x33..3
vpternlogd zmm0, zmm5, zmm27, 0xe4 ; a_a = b12a # 0x33..3 | (b48a << 2) # 0xcc..c
vpternlogd zmm1, zmm7, zmm27, 0xe4 ; a_b = b12b # 0x33..3 | (b48b << 2) # 0xcc..c

```

This leaves us with four vectors (a_a, a_b, a_c, a_d) holding the counts of (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) transposed into nibbles. Unfortunately, the transposition procedure leaves us with permuted elements. a_a holds counts for bits 0, 4, 8, \dots , $r - 4$, a_b for 1, 5, 9, \dots , $r - 3$, a_c for 2, 6, 10, \dots , $r - 2$, and a_d for 3, 7, 11, \dots , $r - 1$.

Afterwards, the contents of the vectors are zero extended first to bytes, then to 16-bit words. Between zero extensions, we permute the vectors to restore the order of elements and reduce the number of vectors until there is only one element for each of the w_{\max} bit positions using ideas analogous to those in § 4.3.

4.6 | Short Arrays and Scalar Tail

At the end of the main loop, up to $16r - 1$ bits of input may remain to be processed. As these are too few bits to process using the procedure from § 4.3, a special tail handling algorithm is used to process the remaining input, w_{\max} bits⁵ at a time: a vector of w_{\max} byte-sized counters is prepared. For each group of w_{\max} bits of input, those vector elements for which the corresponding bits are set are incremented.

For SIMD extensions with *predicate masks* such as AVX-512 and SVE, this is easily achieved by preparing a vector of ones, loading w_{\max} bits of input into a predicate mask and then performing an addition with merge-masking of the ones to the counter vector.⁶ For SIMD extensions without this feature, the procedure is more involved. First, each byte of input is replicated eight times. These bytes are then masked with 0x8040201008040201 to isolate each bit into its own byte. The bytes are compared with zero to obtain a value of -1 for “bit set” or 0 for “bit clear.” This value is then subtracted from the counter vector, emulating the effect of a masked subtraction:

```

; count 8 bytes from zmm6 into ymm0 and ymm1
; ymm3 and ymm7 hold suitable permutation masks
; ymm2 holds 8040201008040201 x4
vpbroadcastq ymm4, zmm6           ; ymm4 has bytes 7654:3210 x4
vpsrhub   ymm5, ymm4, ymm7         ; ymm5 has bytes 7777:7777:6666:6666:...:4444:4444
vpsrhub   ymm4, ymm4, ymm3         ; ymm4 has bytes 3333:3333:2222:2222:...:0000:0000
vpand     ymm5, ymm5, ymm2         ; mask out one bit in each copy of the bytes
vpand     ymm4, ymm4, ymm2

```

⁵or $r/8$ bits, whichever is larger

⁶Equivalently, a vector of all -1 may be subtracted.

```

vpcmpeqb    ymm5, ymm5, ymm2 ; set bytes to -1 if bits were set
vpcmpeqb    ymm4, ymm4, ymm2 ; or to 0 otherwise
vpsubb      ymm1, ymm1, ymm5 ; add 1/0 (subtract -1/0) to/from counters
vpsubb      ymm0, ymm0, ymm4

```

This is repeated until the entire tail is consumed. If sufficient registers are available, multiple iterations of the loop can be interleaved. Once less than w_{\max} bits of input remain, a final load of w_{\max} bits is performed and the bytes beyond the end of the array are masked out. As we have aligned our input to a multiple of w_{\max} early on in the procedure and as w_{\max} is a fraction of the page size, this load never crosses a page boundary and thus cannot fault, even though it reads past the end of the array. The final bits of input are then processed as above. The byte-sized counter vector is added to c and $f_w(C, c)$ is called one final time to wrap up the procedure.

A similar approach is used for arrays that are shorter than $15r$ bits in total. However, we don't initially align the input to a multiple of w_{\max} bytes to reduce overhead for very short arrays. This causes some extra complications in the final iteration, as loads past the end of the array may indeed cross into unmapped pages if the input array was not aligned. This is dealt with either using fault-suppressing masked loads (AVX-512, SVE) or with an extra case distinction and post processing.

4.7 | Discussion

Through the development of this algorithm, we produced implementations for architectures IA-32 (SSE, AVX2), Intel 64 (SSE, AVX2, AVX-512), as well as AArch64 (ASIMD) with good results. Due to the different constraints provided by each combination of instruction set architecture and SIMD extension, slight variations in the design and implementation of the various implementations are present:

- As shown in § 3.1.1, different full adder circuits are used depending on the bitwise operations provided by the SIMD extension used.
- Due to variations in register pressure between SIMD extensions and architecture, ranging from just 8 registers on IA-32 with SSE and AVX2 to 32 registers on ASIMD and AVX-512, some variation in the order of full adders used in the CSA tree is present.
- Large variations in the specific accumulation schedules exist due to differences in vector size (and hence the number of permutation/reduction steps needed to get down to $w_{\max} = 64$) as well in shuffle instructions available. While SSE, AVX2, and AVX-512 provide very similar shuffles, the set provided by ASIMD is very different, resulting in large variations in the accumulation schedules, though at a similar overall number of instructions per vector of data.
- The variation in available shuffles also affects head processing (see § 4.1) and scalar tail (see § 4.6). Masked operations provided by AVX-512 greatly simplify both the load of data blocks smaller than the length of a vector, and the conditional increment used to count the tail's population.
- The IA-32 implementations are based on an earlier prototype of the algorithm, where instead of processing 16 vectors per iteration and carrying over (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) between iterations, each iteration processes 15 vectors worth of data into four vectors of output, which are then transposed into the counter vectors using what is now called the "final accumulation" procedure from § 4.5, keeping no bit vectors between iterations. Due to declining interest in the IA-32 architecture, the code was not redesigned to integrate a Harley-Seal-like schedule when that was found to yield superior results.

TABLE 1 Benchmarked algorithms

	SIMD extension	vector length r	max. word width w_{\max}	block size $2^k r$
Clausecker et al.	AVX-512	512 bits	64 bits	1024 bytes
Clausecker et al.	AVX2	256 bits	64 bits	512 bytes
Clausecker et al.	ASIMD	128 bits	64 bits	256 bytes
Klarqvist et al.	AVX-512	512 bits	16 bits	1024 bytes
Klarqvist et al.	AVX-512	512 bits	16 bits	512 bytes
Klarqvist et al.	AVX-512	512 bits	16 bits	256 bytes
baseline	—	—	16 bits	2 bytes
roofline	AVX2	256 bits	—	—
roofline	ASIMD	128 bits	—	—

4.7.1 | Variable-length Vectors

Recently, variable-length vector extensions such as AArch64/SVE and RISC-V/RVV have started to emerge. Conceptually similar to SIMD instruction set extensions, variable-length vector extensions are characterised by their vector length being a microarchitectural parameter that varies from one implementation of the architecture to another. For example, while the Fujitsu A64FX processor implements the SVE vector extensions to AArch64 at a length of 2048 bits per register, the ARM Neoverse V1 processor implements SVE with registers of only 128 bits. Programs written for these extensions must be designed to cope with whatever vector length the hardware provides, either by writing code agnostic to vector length, or by providing a family of implementations for the various possible lengths.

There was specific interest in evaluating these extensions for our algorithm. An implementation was attempted for AArch64/SVE, but problems quickly became apparent: while CSA schedule and head processing are very straightforward to implement, it is not clear to the authors how the intermediate and final accumulation steps can be carried out effectively. If fixed w_{\max} and data size for the counters c is used, the number of vectors needed to store these at native vector length and the accumulation schedules to transpose and reduce a_{16} resp. (a_8, a_4, a_2, a_1) into that size data varies depending on the native vector length.

Two approaches obtain: (a) different intermediate and final accumulation procedures as well as implementations of $f_w(C, c)$ for each supported w are provided for each of the 5 possible native vector lengths from 128 to 2048 bits. This is both tedious to program and hard to test, as vector lengths longer than the native vector length cannot effectively be tested without emulation. (b) the transposition/reduction schedule in the accumulation procedures treats the accumulators and counters as if they were 128 bits long, but possibly processes multiple 128-bit chunks per vector at the same time, only reducing to one chunk in $f_w(C, c)$. While less code is required than for approach (a), SVE only provides horizontal reductions reducing directly to scalars, and thus seemingly still requires the programmer to provide a different code path for each vector width.

In addition to this challenge, SVE lacks many important instructions available with ASIMD. Most crucially, the `bsl/bit/bif` family of instructions required for the faster full-adder circuit is absent, leading to a projected overall worse performance than with ASIMD at the same or even double vector length. Other missing instructions include the zero-extending “DSP” arithmetic instructions as well as some of the shuffles used as a part of the accumulation procedures. The authors therefore decided to defer work on an SVE implementation until these problems can be addressed.

5 | BENCHMARKS

For evaluation, we use implementations of our new algorithm in assembly with ASIMD ($r = 128$) for AArch64 and with AVX2 ($r = 256$) and AVX512-F/BW ($r = 512$) for Intel 64. All implementations are based on a common kernel and a set of accumulation functions $f_8(C, c)$, $f_{16}(C, c)$, $f_{32}(C, c)$, and $f_{64}(C, c)$, providing support for accumulation into word widths $w = 8, 16, 32, 64$. We make our code available for free⁷.

For benchmarks on Intel 64, these implementations are complemented by the original code of the Klarqvist et al. algorithm (see § 3.3 and Alg. 2. While the algorithm described in their paper[3] is generic, the authors focus on use of AVX-512 with block sizes of 256, 512, or 1024 bytes, corresponding to 4, 8, or 16 vectors of input to the CSA accumulation step. Counts are then produced for a fixed word size of 16 bits.

We also included a scalar implementation similar to Fig. 2, but manually unrolled for a word size of $w = 16$ and with auto-vectorisation inhibited, as well as a dummy implementation that computes the sum of the input array and adds it to the output array. Auto-vectorisation was enabled, letting the compiler provide vectorised code for ASIMD and AVX2.⁸ This gives us both a baseline for the minimal performance expected as well as a roofline[15] for the maximal performance to be expected given the required memory accesses.

5.1 | Benchmark Design

To analyze the performance of our method, we wrote a benchmark harness patterned after the benchmarking mechanism shipped with the Go programming language. This harness differs from the Klarqvist et al. benchmark [3] as we made different design choices to obtain a more meaningful result. A direct comparison with the Klarqvist et al. algorithm is possible as we have added their code to our new benchmark framework.

The benchmark harness executes a positional population count kernel on an array of n bytes for a number of times k . For faster setup, the arrays are left containing all zeroes, as none of the algorithms benchmarked depend on the specific values being processed. With each round, the number of iterations is repeatedly increased in a geometric progression until the benchmark reaches an execution time of at least two seconds. Even if the first round already exceeds the target execution time, the benchmark is executed for at least two rounds with only the benchmark results of the final run being taken into account for the results, guaranteeing the presence of at least one second of warm up.

Both the input and counter arrays are re-used between iterations, introducing a desired loop-carried dependency between consecutive benchmark iterations. The counter array is finally summed into an accumulator variable qualified as volatile to prevent deletion of the benchmarking code through an overly zealous compiler.

For each benchmark round, we measure the real time elapsed t , the number of cycles elapsed c , and the number of instructions i executed. Neglecting the execution time for the benchmark harness itself and combined with n and k , this permits us to derive the following benchmark results for each kernel and each array size n :

speed: Number of input bytes the kernel processed per second: nk/t

cycles per byte: Number of CPU cycles the kernel takes to process one input byte: c/nk

instructions per byte: Number of instructions that are issued to process one byte of input: i/nk

instructions per cycle: Average number of instructions per cycle through the benchmark: i/c

⁷<https://github.com/clausecker/pospop>, https://github.com/lemire/pospopcnt_avx512

⁸While the vector length is shorter with AVX2 than it is with AVX-512, the same maximum memory bandwidth can be achieved.

TABLE 2 Properties of benchmark systems.

	AVX2	AVX-512	ASIMD
CPU	Intel Xeon W2133	←	AWS Graviton 3, c7g.large
instruction-set architecture	Intel 64	←	AArch64
microarchitecture	Skylake	←	Neoverse V1
number of cores (hyper cores)	6 (12)	←	64
base frequency	3.6 GHz	←	2.6 GHz
turbo boost frequency (vector unit)	3.9 GHz (3.5 GHz)	←	n/a
vector width	32 B	64 B	16 B
number of vector registers / core	16	32	32
L1d size / core	32 KiB	←	64 KiB
L2 size / core	1 MiB	←	1 MiB
L3 size / shared	8.25 MiB	←	32 MiB
RAM model, frequency	DDR4, 3.2 GHz	←	DDR5
RAM size (n×DIMM size)	32 GiB (4×8 GiB)	←	3.72 GiB
operating system	Debian 11 (bullseye)	←	Ubuntu 22.04.4 LTS
kernel version	Linux 5.10.0	←	Linux 6.2.0

A left arrow indicates that the same value as in the next left column applies here as well.

5.2 | Benchmark Parameters

The benchmarks were run on a system with an Intel Xeon W-2133 (Skylake) processor (see Table 2). Turbo Boost was enabled so everything ran with corresponding frequencies. For the duration of the benchmark, the CPU governor was configured to not reduce the CPU speed and the system was idle except for the single benchmark task (single-threaded). The benchmark thread was not pinned to a particular CPU core, as thread-pinning was not found to affect the results.

The performance on arrays sized 2^i bytes for $i = 1$ (2 B) to $i = 30$ (1 GiB) as well as $3 \cdot 2^i$ bytes for $i = 0$ (3 B) to $i = 29$ (1.5 GiB) was measured, showing the impact of L1 cache, L2 cache, L3 cache, and finally main memory bandwidth on the performance while also demonstrating the refinements for small arrays. For comparability with the Klarqvist et al. kernels [3], a word size of $w = 16$ is used, though the word size used is largely irrelevant to the performance of our method as we use the same kernel for each w with just an accumulation function pointer swapped out.

For each array size, the *Clausecker et al.* and *Klarqvist et al.* algorithms (see Tbl. 1) were evaluated and compared with the scalar *baseline* implementation as well as a *roofline* kernel to estimate the maximum throughput to be expected given the available memory bandwidth.

We repeated these measurements on an AArch64 based AWS Graviton 3 c7g.large instance to benchmark the performance of the ASIMD implementation of our algorithm. As the Klarqvist et al. kernels are only available for AVX-512, we excluded them from this benchmark set.

5.3 | Evaluation

The performance of our algorithm can roughly be modeled by three phases, depending on input length: In the first phase, the special “short array” code from § 4.6 is used, processing 8 bytes of input per iteration. Performance is




FIGURE 7 AVX2 and AVX-512 speed of pospopcnt as throughput per second by array length; mean of 10 at least 1 second runs per array size with minimum and maximum error bars (logarithmic scale on both axes).

initially dominated by the fixed cost of calling $f_w(C, c)$ to add the results to the output array, but then converges to the performance ceiling for the short array / scalar tail code. Once the array size reaches $15r$ bits, the algorithm switches to the much faster CSA-based main algorithm, leading to a sudden jump in performance. The performance rises further, approaching the ceiling given by memory bandwidth. In the final stage, our array size exceeds the L2 cache, reducing the maximum possible speed from the bandwidth of the L2 cache to that of main memory.

In contrast to the Klarqvist et al. algorithm, it can clearly be seen how performance matches or exceeds the scalar implementation even for very short inputs. A discontinuity is visible right after the CSA-based main algorithm is used for the first time. This is caused by the next array size being $24r$ bits; large enough to process the initial $15r$ bits using the CSA-based main algorithm, but just small enough to leave $9r$ bits to be processed by the much slower scalar tail code.

5.4 | AVX-512

Our AVX-512 implementation reaches its peak performance of 91.0 GB/s at an input size of 512 KiB, a 53% improvement over the 1024 bit Klarqvist et al. kernel, which clocks in at only 59.4 GB/s on the same input size. This bandwidth is achieved while using only 0.09 instructions per byte of input, whereas the 1024 bit Klarqvist et al. kernel requires 0.13 instructions per byte.

Notably, we actually slightly outperform the roofline reference (88.8 GB/s at the same input size), as it seems limited by a loop-carried dependency in summing the input data due to poor auto-vectorised code generation.




FIGURE 8 AVX2 and AVX-512 cycles per byte of popcnt by array length; mean of 10 at least 1 second runs per array size with minimum and maximum error bars (logarithmic scale on both axes).

5.5 | AVX2

The AVX2 implementation reaches its peak performance of 34.8 GB/s at the same input size as the AVX-512 kernel. Unlike what one might naïvely expect based on the halved vector length, the bandwidth is less than half of the AVX-512 kernel's bandwidth. Various factors affect this difference:

- While 512-bit SIMD instructions can be executed on two ports, three ports are available at a width of 256-bit as used with AVX2, leading to a higher maximum IPC. This makes little difference in our case, as the instruction-level parallelism does not seem to be constrained by a lack of execution units, but rather by inherent limits of the algorithm. The two in fact reach very similar IPC figures, with 2.54 IPC for the AVX-512 kernel versus 2.49 IPC for the AVX2 kernel.
- As explained in § 3.1.1, the bit-parallel full adders used for the AVX2 kernel require 5 gates with a latency of 2/3 gates, whereas the AVX-512 kernel can make do with just a single gate for each of sum and carry, significantly increasing latency while reducing the opportunity for instruction-level parallelism.
- This is slightly compensated by a faster intermediate accumulation procedure, as we need one less transposition step due to the shorter vector length.

5.6 | ASIMD

Moving to AArch64, our ASIMD implementation plateaus at 16 GB/s starting around a kilobyte of input data. This is about 83 % of the 19.3 GB/s roofline observed. While much lower than the AVX-512 performance, it appears fairly comparable when taking into account the shorter vector length and the generally lower single-thread performance of server processors as the Neoverse V1 we benchmarked on.




FIGURE 9 AVX2 and AVX-512 instructions per byte of popcnt by array length; mean of 10 at least 1 second runs per array size with minimum and maximum error bars (logarithmic scale on both axes).




FIGURE 10 AVX2 and AVX-512 instructions per cycle of popcnt by array length; mean of 10 at least 1 second runs per array size with minimum and maximum error bars (logarithmic scale on the x-axis).




FIGURE 11 ASIMD speed of popcnt as throughput per second by array length; mean of 10 at least 1 second runs per array size with minimum and maximum error bars (logarithmic scale on both axes).

6 | CONCLUSION

Using a modified Harley-Seal algorithm scheme coupled with bit-parallel transposition/reduction logic, the positional population count operation can be computed efficiently, with performance being memory bound for arrays larger than a few kilobytes. The algorithm is implemented with a desired maximum word width w_{\max} , allowing the user to select any fraction of that word width as needed by program requirements at runtime. Short arrays can be processed rapidly using a bit-parallel scheme, giving good performance for arrays as small as 2 B.

Our approach is easily ported to new architectures: Implementations for common SIMD instruction set extensions, including AVX2, AVX-512, and ASIMD, are provided as open-source software. Meanwhile, initial users of our improved algorithms are already found in the field of bioinformatics[6].

7 | FUTURE WORK

In a 2024 blog post, Harold Aptroot proposes to use the Galois field affine transform instruction `vgf2p8affineq` available with AVX512-GFNI in conjunction with cross-lane byte permutation instruction `vperm` of AVX512-VBMI to regroup the bits of eight 64-bit words within a 512-bit SIMD register such that each byte holds the 8 bits of the same place value, permitting rapid computation of positional population counts using the population count instruction `vpopcntb` available with AVX512-BITALG[16]. While slower than our algorithm for long inputs, its use for the acceleration of the intermediate accumulation procedure as well as for the handling of short inputs and tail should be investigated.

Acknowledgements

Robert Clausecker would like to thank Université TÉLUQ as well as the NHR-Verein Graduate School programme for their research scholarships.

references

- [1] Lippert C, Listgarten J, Davidson RI, et al. An exhaustive epistatic SNP association analysis on expanded Wellcome Trust data. *Scientific reports*. 2013;3:1099. doi: 10.1038/srep01099
- [2] Mittag F, Römer M, Zell A. Influence of feature encoding and choice of classifier on disease risk prediction in genome-wide association studies. *PLoS one*. 2015;10(8):e0135832.
- [3] Klarqvist MDR, Muła W, Lemire D. Efficient computation of positional population counts using SIMD instructions. *Concurr. Comput. Pract. Exp.*. 2021;33(17). doi: 10.1002/CPE.6304
- [4] Dinklage P, Ellert J, Fischer J, Kurpicz F, Löbel M. Practical Wavelet Tree Construction. *ACM J. Exp. Algorithmics*. 2021;26. doi: 10.1145/3457197
- [5] Bingmann T, Bradley P, Gauger F, Iqbal Z. COBS: a Compact Bit-Sliced Signature Index. In: LNCS. Springer. 2019:285–303. preprint arXiv:1905.09624.
- [6] Shen W, Xiang H, Huang T, et al. KMCP: accurate metagenomic profiling of both prokaryotic and viral populations by pseudo-mapping. *Bioinformatics*. 2022;39(1):btac845. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btac845
- [7] Intel Corporation . *Intel 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer Manuals, Volume 2*. Intel Corporation; Santa Clara, CA: 2023.
- [8] Muła W, Kurz N, Lemire D. Faster population counts using AVX2 instructions. *The Computer Journal*. 2018;61(1):111–120. doi: 10.1093/COMJNL/BXX046
- [9] Flynn MJ. Some Computer Organizations and Their Effectiveness. *Proceedings of the IEEE*. 1972;C-21:948–960. doi: 10.1109/TC.1972.5009071
- [10] Downs T. Gathering Intel on Intel AVX-512 Transitions. <https://travisdowns.github.io/blog/2020/01/17/avxfreq1.html>; 2020. Accessed: 2024-05-27.
- [11] Lemire D. AVX-512: when and how to use these new instructions. <https://lemire.me/blog/2018/09/07/avx-512-when-and-how-to-use-these-new-instructions/>; 2018. Accessed: 2024-05-27.
- [12] Lai HC, Muroga S. Logic Networks of Carry-Save Adders. *IEEE Trans. Computers*. 1982;31(9):870–882. doi: 10.1109/TC.1982.1676102
- [13] Warren Jr. HS. *Hacker's Delight*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education. 2 ed., 2013.
- [14] Frigo M, Leiserson CE, Prokop H, Ramachandran S. Cache-Oblivious Algorithms. In: FOCS '99. IEEE Computer Society. 1999; USA:285–297.
- [15] Williams S, Waterman A, Patterson D. Roofline: an insightful visual performance model for multicore architectures. *Commun. ACM*. 2009;52(4):65–76. doi: 10.1145/1498765.1498785
- [16] Aptroot H. Histogramming bytes with positional popcount (GF2P8AFFINEQB edition). <https://bitmath.blogspot.com/2024/11/histogramming-bytes-with-positional.html>; 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-10.