

Shorter and faster than *Sort3AlphaDev*

Dr. Cassio Neri¹

Abstract

Arising from: Mankowitz, D.J., Michi, A., Zhernov, A. et al. Faster sorting algorithms discovered using deep reinforcement learning. *Nature* 618, 257–263 (2023). doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06004-9.

The article cited above presents new implementations of sorting algorithms found through deep reinforcement learning that work on a small number of numeric inputs. For 3 numbers, the published implementation contains 17 assembly instructions, and the authors state that no shorter program exists. This note presents two counterexamples for this claim and a straightforward C/C++ implementation that is faster than theirs.

Shorter than *Sort3AlphaDev*

Following the main article's terminology, *sortN* refers to subroutines that sort N numbers. The article's Table 1 compares the number of x86_64 assembly instructions for *sort3*, *sort4* and *sort5* found by their deep reinforcement learning agent, called *AlphaDev*, against human written benchmarks.

For *sort3*, their implementation, *Sort3AlphaDev*, contains only 17 instructions whereas the human benchmark contains 18. The article goes further and Section “Brute-force approach” states (emphasis added):

We also used a brute-force approach to prove that **no program shorter than 17 instructions exists for *sort3***. We had to enumerate roughly 10^{32} programs and, even with pruning heuristics, it took more than 3 days to prove this hypothesis.

In contradiction to the claim quoted above, Listing 1 shows an implementation of *sort3*, called *Sort3_14*, with 14 assembly instructions. Similarly to *Sort3AlphaDev* (tinyurl.com/mdp7as7b), *Sort3_14* is written in clang-compatible C/C++ inline assembly using AT&T syntax. For didactical purposes, a comment on the right of each assembly instruction shows an equivalent C/C++ line of code. Note that some assembly lines contain no instructions, they simply label points of the code that are targets for jump instructions.

¹ Independent Researcher, cassio.neri@gmail.com, [ORCID: 0000-0001-6940-188X](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6940-188X).

Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the view of his employer.

```

void Sort3_14(int* buffer) {
    int a, b, c;
    asm volatile (
1      "mov (%[p]), %[a]           \n\t" // int a = *p;
2      "mov 4(%[p]), %[b]         \n\t" // int b = *(p + 1);
      "loop_start%=:              \n\t" // for(;;) {
3      "mov %[a], %[c]           \n\t" // int c = a;
4      "cmp %[b], %[a]           \n\t" // bool flag = b < a;
5      "cmovg %[b], %[a]         \n\t" // a = flag ? b : a;
6      "cmovg %[c], %[b]         \n\t" // b = flag ? c : b;
7      "cmp 8(%[p]), %[b]        \n\t" // flag = *(p + 2) < b;
8      "jle loop_end%=          \n\t" // if (!flag) break;
9      "mov %[b], %[c]           \n\t" // c = b;
10     "mov 8(%[p]), %[b]         \n\t" // b = *(p + 2);
11     "mov %[c], 8(%[p])         \n\t" // *(p + 2) = c;
12     "jmp loop_start%=         \n\t" // }
      "loop_end%=:              \n\t" //
13     "mov %[a], (%[p])          \n\t" // *p = a;
14     "mov %[b], 4(%[p])         \n\t" // *(p + 1) = b;
      : [a]"=r"(a), [b]"=r"(b), [c]"=r"(c), [p]"=r"(buffer)
      : : "memory");
}

```

Listing 1: Sort3 with 14 instructions and branches. (*loop_start%=:* and *loop_end%=:* are not instructions.)

```

char dest[] = {
    1, 2, 9, 2, 0, 9, 0, 1,
    0, 0, 9, 1, 1, 9, 2, 2,
    2, 1, 9, 0, 2, 9, 1, 0
};

void Sort3_15(int* buffer) {
    int a, b, c;
    int64_t i, j;
    asm volatile (
1      "mov (%[p]), %[a]           \n\t" // int a = p[0];
2      "mov 4(%[p]), %[b]         \n\t" // int b = p[1];
3      "mov 8(%[p]), %[c]         \n\t" // int c = p[2];
4      "cmp %[a], %[b]           \n\t" // int flag = b < a;
5      "sbb %[i], %[i]           \n\t" // int i = flag ? -1 : 0;
6      "cmp %[b], %[c]           \n\t" // flag = c < b;
7      "adc %[i], %[i]           \n\t" // i = 2 * i + flag;
8      "cmp %[a], %[c]           \n\t" // flag = c < a;
9      "adc %[i], %[i]           \n\t" // i = 2 * i + flag;
10     "movsb dest+4(%[i]), %[j]   \n\t" // int j = dest[i + 4];
11     "mov %[a], (%[p], %[j], 4)  \n\t" // p[j] = a;
12     "movsb dest+12(%[i]), %[j] \n\t" // j = dest[i + 12];
13     "mov %[b], (%[p], %[j], 4)  \n\t" // p[j] = b;
14     "movsb dest+20(%[i]), %[j] \n\t" // j = dest[i + 20];
15     "mov %[c], (%[p], %[j], 4)  \n\t" // p[j] = c;
      : [a]"=r"(a), [b]"=r"(b), [c]"=r"(c), [i]"=r"(i), [j]"=r"(j),
      [p]"=r"(buffer) : "g"(dest) : "memory");
    return;
}

```

Listing 2: Sort3 with 15 instructions and no branches.

Whilst *Sort3AlphaDev* is branchless, *Sort3_14* contains a loop. Obviously, writing a loop rather than repeating code is a way to shorten the number of instructions. This raises the question whether the main article considered only branchless implementations, and that the authors meant to state that no *branchless* procedure shorter than 17 instructions exist for *sort3*. However, Listing 2 shows a branchless implementation, called *Sort3_15*, with only 15 instructions.

Faster than *Sort3AlphaDev*

Another important point of the cited article, clearly reflected in its title, is the performance of the algorithms discovered by *AlphaDev*. The authors state (emphasis added):

We trained the *AlphaDev* agent from scratch to generate a range of fixed sort and variable sort algorithms that are both correct and **achieve lower latency than the state-of-the-art human benchmarks**.

However, Listing 3 presents a straightforward C/C++ implementation of *sort3*, called *Sort3_faster*, which seems faster than *Sort3AlphaDev*. Indeed, a benchmark task based on the industry-grade Google benchmark library (github.com/google/benchmark) is set as follows. The code indexes the 13 possible ordering patterns, or test cases, that 3 numbers can fall in. Then, using a pseudo random number generator, it uniformly draws 32,768 test case indexes and measures the total time to sort these cases by each algorithm. A particular online run of this program (tinyurl.com/mr2msz9b), yielded that when compiled with clang 15.0 and optimizations at level -O3, *Sort3_faster* completed the benchmark in 260,922ns whereas *Sort3AlphaDev* took 272,347ns. These timings include the overhead of scanning the array of test cases indexes which amounted to 75,740ns. Adjusting for the overhead, the ratio between the timings of *Sort3AlphaDev* and *Sort3_faster* is given by

$$\frac{272,347 - 75,740}{260,922 - 75,740} = 1.06.$$

Similarly, for gcc 12.2, another particular online run of the benchmark program (tinyurl.com/3h5sfs5r) showed that *Sort3_faster* took 299,526ns, *Sort3AlphaDev* took 354,085ns and the overhead was 74,052ns, so that the adjusted performance ratio is

$$\frac{354,085 - 74,052}{299,526 - 74,052} = 1.24.$$

Other benchmark results obtained offline are shown in Table 1.

It is worth mentioning that clang 16.0.0 and gcc 13.1 translate *Sort3_faster* into 18 assembly instructions (godbolt.org/z/3TqG6Tbjv), that is, one more than *Sort3AlphaDev*. Each assembly instructions corresponds to one C/C++ line of code.

```

void Sort3_faster(int* buffer) {
1   int a = buffer[0];
2   int b = buffer[1];
3   int c = buffer[2];

4   bool flag = c < b;
5   int d = b;
6   b = flag ? c : b;
7   c = flag ? d : c;

8   flag = c < a;
9   d = a;
10  a = flag ? c : a;
11  c = flag ? d : c;
12  buffer[2] = c;

13  flag = b < a;
14  d = a;
15  a = flag ? b : a;
16  b = flag ? d : b;
17  buffer[0] = a;
18  buffer[1] = b;

   return;
}

```

Listing 3: Sort3 that is faster than Sort3AlphaDev.

Platform	Scanning	Sort3AlphaDev	Sort3_faster	Ratio ²
clang 15.0.7, Ryzen 7 1800X, 3.6GHz	27,083ns	106,011ns	100,874ns	1.07
gcc 13.1.1, Ryzen 7 1800X, 3.6GHz	34,425ns	106,493ns	91,937ns	1.25
clang 15.0.7, Intel i7 10510U, 4.9 GHz	21,448ns	58,029ns	52,395ns	1.18
gcc 13.1.1, Intel i7 10510U, 4.9GHz	28,166ns	55,022ns	49,050ns	1.29

Table 1: CPU times for different platforms.

Code availability

Live tests can be seen in godbolt.org/z/3TqG6Tbjy and live benchmarks are available at tinyurl.com/msfedrhf and tinyurl.com/yc5jbwsh. Readers are encouraged to download the same code from github.com/cassioneri/sort3 for building and running on their own platforms.

² Ratio = (Sort3AlphaDev - Scanning) / (Sort3_faster - Scanning).

Acknowledgements

I thank Prof. Lorenz Schneider for proof-reading and providing feedback on this manuscript.

Contributions

The sole author of this paper wrote the implementations of `sort3` listed in the paper, all supplementary code and the paper. He does not claim originality over *Sort3_faster* since it is a straightforward implementation very likely to have been written before.

Competing interests

The author declares no competing interests.