

# Aggregating Funnels for Faster Fetch&Add and Queues

Younghun Roh

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, USA  
yhunroh@mit.edu

Yuanhao Wei

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, USA  
yuanhao1@mit.edu

Eric Ruppert

York University  
Toronto, Canada  
ruppert@cse.yorku.ca

Panagiota Fatourou

FORTH ICS and University of Crete  
Crete, Greece  
faturu@csd.uoc.gr

Siddhartha Jayanti

Google Research  
Cambridge, USA  
sjayanti@google.com

Julian Shun

Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, USA  
jshun@mit.edu

## Abstract

Many concurrent algorithms require processes to perform fetch-and-add operations on a single memory location, which can be a hot spot of contention. We present a novel algorithm called *Aggregating Funnels* that reduces this contention by spreading the fetch-and-add operations across multiple memory locations. It aggregates fetch-and-add operations into batches so that the batch can be performed by a single hardware fetch-and-add instruction on one location and all operations in the batch can efficiently compute their results by performing a fetch-and-add instruction on a *different* location. We show experimentally that this approach achieves higher throughput than previous combining techniques, such as Combining Funnels, and is substantially more scalable than applying hardware fetch-and-add instructions on a single memory location. We show that replacing the fetch-and-add instructions in the fastest state-of-the-art concurrent queue by our Aggregating Funnels eliminates a bottleneck and greatly improves the queue’s overall throughput.

## 1 Introduction

Many concurrent algorithms use fetch-and-add to coordinate the actions of multiple processes. A *fetch-and-add* on a memory location  $X$  *atomically* adds a given value to  $X$  and returns the value that was stored in  $X$  before the addition. Introduced by Gottlieb and Kruskal [22], fetch-and-add is widely available as a hardware *primitive* [28]. Applications often have hot spots of contention where many processes perform concurrent fetch-and-add primitives on the same location, which degrades performance. To mitigate this problem, we introduce Aggregating Funnels, which provide a software implementation of fetch-and-add that is much more scalable than the hardware primitive, and more efficient than state-of-the-art software implementations. (We use  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  to denote software implementations and  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  for the hardware primitive.) Since our implementation is linearizable [27], our  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  can be used in place of  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  in any application.

Scalable and efficient software replacements for hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  are crucial for the performance of many concurrent algorithms. Applications of  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  include allocating memory addresses for objects of varying size from a block of memory

[9, 50, 56], solving the readers-writers problem [23], and wait-free universal constructions [13].  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  can be used to implement simpler primitives, such as  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$ —which simply amounts to performing  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(1)$ —and *counters*, which support the operations  $\text{ADD}(\text{val})$  and  $\text{READ}$  (via  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(\text{val})$  and  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(0)$ , respectively). These primitives themselves have a plethora of applications. For example,  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$  is used in assigning distinct identifiers to processes [38], reference counting for garbage collection in concurrent systems [37, 52, 54], assigning distinct tickets in a ticket lock [16, 36, 45], assigning distinct timestamps to operations [5], and implementing simple barriers [25, Chapter 18.2–18.3], array-based queue locks [3] (see also [25, Chapter 7.5.1]), highly-efficient concurrent data structures, such as queues [10, 13, 19, 23, 39, 41] and stacks [43], and in many other applications [15, 17, 34, 44].

Previous work [12, 25, 49] has provided implementations of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  that alleviate the bottleneck that arises when multiple processes simultaneously perform  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  on a single memory location. They do this by diffusing the contention through *software combining*. At a high level, active  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations coordinate on low-contention ancillary variables, combine their operations, and choose a delegate, so that only the delegates contend for the main variable. The delegate then reports its return value to the  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations waiting on it and the waiting operations use this to calculate their own return values. This combining process ensures that both the ancillary and main variables have low contention. This line of work culminated in a technique called *Combining Funnels* [49], which filters  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations through several levels of funnels, combining them pair-wise at each funnel by leveraging the swap and compare-and-swap primitives.

While these existing approaches reduce contention on each variable access, they considerably increase the number of variables accessed by a  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$ . The additional cost of these accesses outweighs the benefits when there are few concurrent  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations. Indeed, we see in our experiments that using Combining Funnels is significantly slower than hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  on low thread counts and only slightly outperforms  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  after 100 threads in  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$ -heavy workloads (see Figures 4a and 4d in Section 4).

We present a novel way to implement `FETCH&ADD` that significantly reduces contention while only slightly increasing the number of variables accessed. It is based on a new *Aggregating Funnels* technique which permits  $k$ -way combining of `FETCH&ADD` operations and is efficient for up to  $k = 25$  in our experiments. This lets us combine more at each level, and use far fewer levels compared to Combining Funnels. In fact, using just *one* level of Aggregating Funnels yielded the best performance in our experiments.

A technique for  $k$ -way combining was previously proposed by Tang and Yew [53], but their algorithm is more complex and uses primitives not available on modern machines, such as `FETCH&ADD&STORE` which atomically performs `FETCH&ADD` on one memory location and `STORE` on an adjacent memory location. In contrast, our algorithm uses only the widely available `LOAD`, `STORE`, and `F&A` primitives.

We refer to the mechanism used to achieve  $k$ -way combining in our algorithm as an *aggregator*. Aggregators achieve fast combining by having each thread register itself in a batch using a single `F&A` instruction. This `F&A` contends only with other threads mapped to the same aggregator and it serves multiple purposes. It is used to (1) decide the delegate for each batch, (2) sum all of the operations within the batch, (3) determine when the batch is closed, and (4) help determine the return value of the `FETCH&ADD`. Previous combining techniques [12, 25, 49] use several variables to coordinate these tasks. Accomplishing all these tasks with a single `F&A` per operation is one reason for the increased efficiency of our combining approach. Our experimental evaluation shows that Aggregating Funnels start outperforming hardware `FETCH&ADD` for as few as 30 threads and are up to 4x faster than both Combining Funnels and hardware `FETCH&ADD` at high thread counts.

We prove our `FETCH&ADD` implementation is *strongly linearizable* [20], making it suitable for deployment even in randomized concurrent algorithms. It is *blocking* because combined operations must wait for the delegate to bring back a return value from the main variable, but our experiments show this does not lead to uneven performance of threads. In fact, our implementation provides greater fairness (i.e., it results in more similar throughputs at different threads) than using hardware `F&A` directly. We also provide a `FETCH&ADDIRECT` operation which can be used by higher priority threads to skip the combining step and go directly to the main variable. Our experiments show that this direct option significantly increases the `FETCH&ADD` throughput of the high priority threads without reducing the overall throughput. Our implementation is *RMWable* [31], meaning it also supports any other operation that is provided as an atomic primitive. For example, if the hardware provides compare-and-swap instructions, then a `COMPARE&SWAP` can also be supported by our fetch-and-add object.

**Scaling up concurrent queues.** We believe Aggregating Funnels can be plugged into many applications that use `F&A`

to make them more scalable. As evidence, we use them to implement the highly contended fetch-and-add objects in LCRQ, published in PPOPP 2013 [39] and recently shown to still be the fastest concurrent queue [46]. Using our Aggregating Funnels eliminates the scalability bottleneck in LCRQ and improves LCRQ’s throughput by up to 2.5x for high thread counts. This constitutes a significant leap forward in concurrent queue efficiency. This speed-up also highlights how the significant efficiency gains observed in the microbenchmarks indeed translate into better performing higher-level applications.

**Our Contributions.** We summarize our main contributions.

- We design the *Aggregating Funnels* algorithm, which uses hardware `F&A` instructions to implement `FETCH&ADD` operations with greatly reduced contention on individual memory locations. It also provides greater fairness to threads.
- We implement various versions of our Aggregating Funnels, and empirically show that they provide more scalable `FETCH&ADD` operations than hardware `F&A` and the state-of-the-art Combining Funnel algorithm [49].
- Our experiments show that replacing hardware `F&A` by our Aggregating Funnels makes the fastest available concurrent queue, LCRQ [39], significantly faster and more scalable.
- Our implementation is *strongly linearizable* [20], making it suitable as a replacement for hardware `FETCH&ADD` in both deterministic and randomized algorithms.
- Our implementation supports all hardware primitives.

## 2 Related Work

Many papers have focused on designing practical implementations of `FETCH&ADD`. One approach uses a complete tree of height  $\Theta(\log p)$ , assigning a leaf to each of the  $p$  threads. Each tree node stores some metadata (including a counter). To execute a `FETCH&ADD(diff)`, a thread first increments the counter of its leaf by *diff*. Then, it works its way up the tree to the root, updating all nodes of the path it traverses. Combining trees [25, Section 12.2] (originally proposed in [21, 58]), employ combining at each node of the tree to reduce contention. Every tree node contains a lock. Threads compete for this lock to ascend from a node to its parent, and only the winning thread proceeds to the next level up the tree. The other thread waits for the winner to apply its operation.

Combining trees were criticized as having performance that is sensitive to changes in the arrival rate of operations [24, 48, 49]: whenever only a subset of the threads is concurrently active, little combining occurs, yet threads must still pay the cost of going through all  $\Theta(\log p)$  levels to reach the root. Combining Funnels [49] addressed this by replacing the static tree with a series of combining layers, through which `FETCH&ADD` operations are funnelled. In each layer, threads meet for combining by randomly choosing a location in an array at which to wait for other threads. By using an adaptive scheme, the funnel can change width and depth

to accommodate dynamic access patterns. Combining funnels have been experimentally shown [49] to outperform all schemes discussed in this section that aim to provide low-contention implementations of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$ .

Counting networks [4, 35] can be used to count concurrently and asynchronously. They are constructed from simple two-input, two-output computing elements called *balancers*, connected to one another by wires. Threads traverse different paths through the network and obtain a return value when they reach an output wire of the network. Generalizations of counting networks can be used to implement  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  [11]. A drawback of this approach is that linearizability cannot be supported without paying a significant cost or by sacrificing other desirable properties [11, 26]. Diffracting trees [48] employ some form of tree-like counting networks and attempt to reduce contention using arrays (*prisms*) where threads attempt to meet and combine. They achieve better performance than the counting networks in [4], but are not linearizable. Counting networks and diffracting trees, even when they are used to implement  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$ , are less efficient than combining funnels [49].

More theoretical work aims at efficiently implementing objects (including fetch-and-add) from *other* primitives, such as CAS and LL/SC. Jayanti [30] used a technique known as *double refresh* (originally proposed in [1]), to build  $f$ -arrays, where  $f$  is a fixed function over the elements of an array  $A[1..n]$ ; each thread  $i$  can update  $A[i]$  and query the value of  $f$ . An  $f$ -array can be used to get a wait-free implementation of a concurrent counter (supporting  $\text{ADD}$  and  $\text{READ}$ ), whose step complexity is  $O(\log p)$ . Ellen and Woelfel [8] presented a wait-free, linearizable implementation of a  $\text{Fetch}\&\text{Add}$  object with  $O(\log p)$  worst-case step complexity from  $O(\log m)$ -bit registers and LL/SC objects for up to  $m$   $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations. These papers do not aim at reducing contention and they all use the standard notion of step complexity, which simply counts the maximum number of accesses to shared variables that an operation performs, without taking into account the contention that these accesses may cause.

Jayanti [29] proved an  $\Omega(\log p)$  lower bound on the expected step complexity of any randomized wait-free, linearizable implementation of a single-shot  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$  object from LL/SC objects (for a strong adaptive adversary). This bound also holds for long-lived objects, even with amortization [32, 33]. Randomized implementations of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$  with polylogarithmic step complexity are known [2].

**Concurrent Queues.** State-of-the-art implementations of concurrent queues employ  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  [39, 41, 46]. There is empirical evidence [46] that LCRQ [39] has the best performance. LCRQ is inspired by the simple idea of using an infinite array,  $Q$ , and two indices  $Tail$  and  $Head$  that are updated using  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$ . Initially, all elements of  $Q$  contain  $\perp$ , and  $Head = Tail = 0$ . To enqueue an item, a thread performs a  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$  on  $Tail$  to get an index  $i$  and tries to swap the item into  $Q[i]$  using a  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{STORE}$ . Similarly, a dequeue

executes  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{INC}$  on  $Head$  to get an index  $i$  and tries to remove an item from  $Q[i]$  by swapping in the value  $\top$ . This way, each element of  $Q$  is accessed by at most one enqueueer and one dequeueer. To bound space usage, LCRQ uses a linked list of circular arrays in place of the infinite array  $Q$ .

LCRQ is lock-free but uses double-word CAS. LPRQ [46] is a variant of LCRQ that uses single-word CAS, but it does not outperform LCRQ in empirical tests. Recent work [42, 57] provides wait-free concurrent queues based on  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$ , but they also do not outperform LCRQ in experimental analyses.

### 3 Aggregating Funnels Algorithm

We present a linearizable implementation of a fetch-and-add object  $O$  that stores an integer and supports the operations  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}(df)$ , which adds  $df$  to the value of  $O$  and returns its previous value, and  $\text{READ}$ , which returns the value of  $O$ . The implementation uses atomic  $\text{READ}$ ,  $\text{WRITE}$  and  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  as primitives (i.e., hardware instructions). Any other primitives, such as compare-and-swap, that are supported by hardware are also supported by  $O$ .

Our implementation uses a principal variable  $Main$ , which stores the actual value of  $O$ , and  $2m$  subsidiary objects called Aggregators, which aggregate batches of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations. In the face of contention, one thread from each batch is chosen to apply a single  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(sum)$  on  $Main$ , where  $sum$  is the sum of the batch's arguments. Thus, an Aggregator acts as a funnel to narrow a stream of operations: many operations may arrive at the Aggregator concurrently, but only one at a time proceeds to access  $Main$ . The goal is to limit contention by spreading out  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  primitives across  $2m + 1$  memory locations ( $Main$  and  $2m$  Aggregators) instead of having all operations perform a  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  on the same location.

A  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}(df)$  operation first chooses one of the  $2m$  Aggregators:  $m$  Aggregators are used for  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations with positive arguments, and the other  $m$  are used for negative arguments. It applies a  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(df)$  to the *value* field of its chosen Aggregator. Thus, *value* stores the sum of the arguments of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  operations that have been applied to the Aggregator. Each Aggregator also stores additional information, described below, to help operations on  $O$  compute the results they should return. Our implementation works for any value of  $m$ . Thus, in practice, we choose  $m$  to optimize performance.

#### 3.1 Detailed Description

Algorithm 1 gives pseudocode for our implementation. Shared variable names are capitalized; thread-local variables are not.

We first describe how a thread applies a  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}(df)$  operation with a positive argument  $df$  on  $O$ . The thread chooses an Aggregator  $A$  and applies a  $\text{F}\&\text{A}(df)$  primitive to  $A.value$  (line 16). To reduce contention, several concurrent operations that chose  $A$  may be combined into a batch. Only the *first* operation of the batch to perform its  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  on  $A.value$

---

**Algorithm 1** Aggregating Funnel: a strongly linearizable Fetch&Add implementation.

---

<pre> 1: <b>Class</b> Aggregator 2:     int <i>value</i> 3:     Batch* <i>last</i> 4: <b>Class</b> Batch 5:     int <i>before</i> 6:     int <i>after</i> 7:     int <i>mainBefore</i> 8:     Batch* <i>previous</i> 9: Shared variables: 10: int <i>Main</i> ← 0 11: Aggregator* <i>Positive</i>[0..<i>m</i> - 1] 12: Aggregator* <i>Negative</i>[0..<i>m</i> - 1] 13: FETCH&amp;ADD(int <i>df</i>) : int 14:     <b>if</b> <i>df</i> = 0 <b>then</b> <b>return</b> READ() 15:     Aggregator* <i>a</i> ← CHOOSEAGGREGATOR(<i>df</i>) 16:     int <i>aBefore</i> ← F&amp;A(<i>a.value</i>, <i>df</i>) 17:     <b>wait until</b>  <i>a.last.after</i>  ≥  <i>aBefore</i>  18:     Batch* <i>last</i> ← <i>a.last</i> 19:     <b>if</b> <i>last.after</i> = <i>aBefore</i> <b>then</b> 20:         int <i>aAfter</i> ← <i>a.value</i> 21:         int <i>mainBefore</i> ← F&amp;A(<i>Main</i>, <i>aAfter</i> - <i>aBefore</i>) 22:         <i>a.last</i> ← new Batch(<i>aBefore</i>, <i>aAfter</i>, <i>mainBefore</i>, <i>last</i>) 23:         <b>return</b> <i>mainBefore</i> 24:     <b>else</b> 25:         Batch* <i>batch</i> ← <i>last</i> 26:         <b>while</b>  <i>batch.before</i>  &gt;  <i>aBefore</i>  <b>do</b> 27:             <i>batch</i> ← <i>batch.previous</i> 28:         <b>return</b> <i>batch.mainBefore</i> + <i>aBefore</i> - <i>batch.before</i> 29:     FETCH&amp;ADDDIRECT(int <i>df</i>) : int 30:         <b>return</b> F&amp;A(<i>Main</i>, <i>df</i>) 31:     READ() : int 32:         <b>return</b> <i>Main</i> 33:     COMPARE&amp;SWAP(int <i>old</i>, int <i>new</i>) : int 34:         <b>return</b> CAS(<i>Main</i>, <i>old</i>, <i>new</i>) </pre>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‣ used to aggregate batches of FETCH&amp;ADD operations</li> <li>‣ sum of values added at this Aggregator</li> <li>‣ last Batch in Aggregator's list</li> <li>‣ represents a batch of operations on an Aggregator</li> <li>‣ Aggregator's <i>value</i> before the batch</li> <li>‣ Aggregator's <i>value</i> after the batch</li> <li>‣ value of <i>Main</i> before the batch</li> <li>‣ pointer to previous Batch of operations on the Aggregator</li> <li>‣ initially, for each Aggregator <i>A</i>, <i>A.value</i> = 0 and <i>A.last</i> points to a Batch with <i>before</i> = <i>after</i> = <i>mainBefore</i> = 0 and <i>previous</i> = nil</li> <li>‣ any Aggregator in <i>Positive</i> or <i>Negative</i>, depending on sign of <i>df</i></li> <li>‣ spin until earlier operations on <i>a</i> are done</li> <li>‣ operation is the first in a batch of operations</li> <li>‣ get Aggregator <i>a</i>'s <i>value</i> at the end of the batch of operations</li> <li>‣ apply batch of operations on <i>Main</i></li> <li>‣ add Batch to <i>a</i>'s list</li> <li>‣ this operation is in a Batch already added to <i>a</i>'s list</li> <li>‣ start from <i>a</i>'s last Batch</li> <li>‣ find batch with  <i>batch.before</i>  ≤  <i>aBefore</i>  &lt;  <i>batch.after</i> </li> <li>‣ compute result to return</li> <li>‣ apply FETCH&amp;ADD directly to <i>Main</i></li> <li>‣ read value directly from <i>Main</i></li> <li>‣ any other available primitive can be applied similarly to <i>Main</i></li> <li>‣ use hardware CAS directly on <i>Main</i></li> </ul>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

---



---

**Algorithm 2** One possible implementation of the CHOOSEAGGREGATOR function for  $p$  threads using  $m = \lfloor \sqrt{p} \rfloor$  Aggregators for each sign.

---

```

35: CHOOSEAGGREGATOR(int df) : Aggregator*
36:   | int g ←  $\lfloor \text{threadIdx} / \sqrt{p} \rfloor$ 
37:   | if df > 0 then return Positive[g]
38:   | else return Negative[g]


```

---

is selected to proceed to access *Main*. That selected operation performs an F&A on *Main* that adds the sum of the batch's arguments to it. To provide a linearization for  $O$ , we linearize the entire batch of operations at the batch's F&A on *Main*. Thus, we maintain an invariant that *Main* holds the value that  $O$  would have if all operations linearized so far were performed on it. Operations within the batch are linearized in the order they performed their F&A on *A.value*.

Since only the first operation in each batch at  $A$  gets the result of the F&A on *Main*, that operation must share this information with the rest of the batch's operations, so that each can figure out the result it should return. To facilitate this,  $A$  also stores a singly-linked list of Batch objects, one for each batch of operations from  $A$  that has been applied to *Main*. The list starts with the most recent Batch object, stored in *A.last*, and each Batch object has a pointer to the previous Batch. Each Batch object has several pieces of information: the fields *before* and *after* store  $A$ 's *value* before and after the batch of operations is applied to  $A$ , and *mainBefore* stores the value of *Main* just before the batch of operations is applied to *Main*. Each field of a Batch is immutable.

A FETCH&ADD operation  $op$  on  $O$  computes its result as follows. If  $op$  is the first operation within its batch on Aggregator  $A$ , it returns the result of its F&A on *Main* at line 23. Otherwise, after  $op$  gets the result *aBefore* from its F&A on *A.value*,  $op$  can determine its batch by looking for a



**Figure 1.** Example execution with five  $FETCH\&ADD$  operations and two Aggregator objects  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

Batch object  $B$  in  $A$ 's list with  $B.before \leq aBefore < B.after$  (lines 25–27). Then,  $aBefore - B.before$  is the sum of the arguments of operations within the batch that precede  $op$ . So,  $op$  returns  $B.mainBefore + aBefore - B.before$  at line 28. In our experiments, we see that 97% of operations locate their batch at the head of the list, thus avoiding looping on line 26.

An Aggregator  $A$ 's list of batches is also used to determine which  $FETCH\&ADD$  operation is the first in its batch. After getting the result  $aBefore$  from its  $F\&A$  on  $A.value$ , an operation  $op$  waits at line 17 until  $A$ 's list contains a Batch object whose *after* field is greater than or equal to  $aBefore$ . If equality holds, then  $op$  is the first operation in its batch, and it adds a new Batch object to  $A$ 's list. The *after* value of this new Batch is determined by reading  $A.value$  on line 20. Since only one thread can add the next Batch to  $A$ 's list, this addition can be accomplished by a simple write at line 22.

Figure 1 shows an example of how the data structure evolves when accessed by five  $FETCH\&ADD$  operations. The arguments and results of all hardware  $F\&A$  primitives are shown. The upper diagram shows the data structure after three operations: two as a batch on Aggregator  $A_1$  and a single operation as a batch on Aggregator  $A_2$ . The lower diagram shows the data structure after another batch of two operations is applied via  $A_1$ . The linearization order of the threads' operations is  $P_2, P_1, P_3, P_4, P_5$ . Threads  $P_1, P_2$  and  $P_4$  see that they are the first operations in their respective batches, since the value they receive from their  $F\&A$  on an Aggregator is that Aggregator's *value* after the previous Batch was applied (or 0 if there is no previous Batch). So, they proceed to do a  $F\&A$  on  $Main$ , while  $P_3$  and  $P_5$  wait to compute their results. Thread  $P_3$  gets the result 9 from its  $F\&A(2)$  on  $A_1.value$ . It concludes that it belongs to  $A_1$ 's oldest Batch, which takes  $A_1.value$  from value 0 to 11.  $Main$  had the value 5 before that batch was applied to it. Thus,  $P_3$  returns  $5 + 9 - 0 = 14$ . The Batch that  $P_3$  needs remains accessible in  $A_1$ 's list of Batches, even after other Batches

are added, so  $P_3$  can compute its result even if it is delayed before accessing this list. Similarly,  $P_5$  finds the Batch in  $A_1$ 's list containing 24 and computes its result as  $16 + 24 - 11 = 29$ .

To handle  $FETCH\&ADD$  operations with negative arguments, the Aggregators are partitioned into two types:  $m$  positive and  $m$  negative Aggregators. Each  $FETCH\&ADD$  must choose an Aggregator of the type that matches the sign of its argument. (A  $FETCH\&ADD(0)$  simply reads the  $Main$  variable; see line 14.) Since all  $FETCH\&ADD$  operations on an Aggregator have arguments with the same sign, the absolute value of the Aggregator's *value* can only increase, and this ensures each  $FETCH\&ADD$  can figure out which Batch contains it. Operations with negative arguments are applied to  $Main$  and compute their responses in exactly the same way as operations with positive arguments.

We prove in Section 3.3 that this implementation of  $O$  is linearizable, regardless of the number of Aggregators and the way that operations choose an Aggregator at line 15. Thus, the exact method for making these choices can be tuned to achieve good performance. Algorithm 2 shows one straightforward way to do this. It divides the  $p$  threads that access the  $FETCH\&ADD$  object  $O$  into  $\sqrt{p}$  groups of  $\sqrt{p}$  threads each, and assigns each group to one of the  $m$  Aggregators of each type. This limits contention on any shared variable to  $\sqrt{p}$ , because at most  $\sqrt{p}$  threads access each Aggregator, and at most one thread from each of the  $\sqrt{p}$  groups can access  $Main$  at any one time. Operations could also be assigned to a random Aggregator of the appropriate type. We discuss various possible schemes for assigning operations to Aggregators to achieve good performance in Section 4.2.

Any other operations that can be applied atomically to a memory word can also be applied to our object  $O$ , simply by applying them directly to  $Main$ . In Algorithm 1, we show the code for performing a  $READ$  or  $COMPARE\&SWAP$ , but other operations would work in exactly the same way. Similarly, we also provide a  $FETCH\&ADD\ DIRECT$  that applies a  $F\&A$  directly to  $Main$ , which can be used by high-priority threads to perform their operations with lower latency.

Our experimental implementation uses epoch-based reclamation [18] for Batch objects. Other safe memory reclamation techniques would also work. For a counter, which supports only  $ADD$  and  $READ$  operations, we can save space by not using Batch objects at all—if each Aggregator simply stores the value that would usually be stored in *last.after*,  $ADD$  operations could still detect when to stop waiting for their batch to be applied to  $Main$  (as in line 17 of  $FETCH\&ADD$ ).

### 3.2 Applying the Construction Recursively

As described above, using  $m = \sqrt{p}$  reduces contention on any variable in a  $p$ -thread system to  $O(\sqrt{p})$ . If  $p$  is very large, one can reduce contention even further by applying the construction recursively. We can replace  $Main$  or any of




Figure 2. Example of recursive construction with  $p = 8$ .

the Aggregators' *value* fields by an instance of Algorithm 1. We can repeat this process to any desired depth of recursion.

For example, consider a fetch-and-add object  $O$  for  $p$  threads implemented using Algorithm 1 where we replace *Main* in  $O$  by another instance  $O'$  of Algorithm 1. We use  $m = p^{2/3}$  for  $O$  and  $m' = p^{1/3}$  for  $O'$ . Suppose threads choose Aggregators as shown in Figure 2. (For simplicity, the figure shows only the Aggregators for positive arguments.) Contention on each Aggregator of  $O$  is at most  $p/m = p^{1/3}$ . Contention on each Aggregator of  $O'$  is at most  $m/m' = p^{1/3}$ . Contention on the variable *Main'* of  $O'$  is at most  $m' = p^{1/3}$ . Thus we have reduced contention on all variables to  $O(\sqrt[3]{p})$ .

Repeating this process of replacing *Main* by another instance of Algorithm 1  $k$  times reduces contention on any base object to  $O(p^{1/(k+1)})$ . If  $k = \log p$ , contention is reduced to  $O(1)$  using  $O(p)$  Aggregators in total. A FETCH&ADD operation would access at most  $O(\log p)$  base objects. Alternatively, repeatedly replacing *both Main* and the Aggregators' *value* fields by Algorithm 1  $O(\log \log p)$  times also achieves  $O(1)$  contention using  $O(p)$  Aggregators.

There is a tradeoff: reducing contention on individual locations requires a FETCH&ADD to access more locations (or wait longer for others to do so). Moreover, when a FETCH&ADD operation must access more locations, it spends a smaller fraction of its time at each one, so it is less likely to contribute to contention at that location at any particular time. Thus, the actual contention at a location will typically be smaller than the worst-case upper bound. So, it is impractical to try to reduce the worst-case contention too much: this will cost time (to access more Aggregators) without the payoff of reducing contention in practice. Indeed, our experiments revealed no advantage of using even a single replacement (as shown in Figure 2) for values of  $p$  up to 176. The recursive construction would pay off only for very large thread counts.

### 3.3 Correctness

We prove the Aggregating Funnels algorithm is linearizable. Each operation is linearized when it is applied to *Main*, either as part of a batch in the case of FETCH&ADD, or individually in the case of the other operations (READ, FETCH&ADDDIRECT and COMPARE&SWAP). This ensures *Main* always stores the

true value the implemented fetch-and-add object ought to have. We must show that the effect of each FETCH&ADD operation  $op$  is applied to *Main* exactly once and that  $op$ 's response is consistent with the linearization. We must also show that  $op$ 's linearization point is between its invocation and response. Since our linearization points can be identified as the execution unfolds, without knowledge of later events, the implementation is also strongly linearizable [20].

We first prove the following invariant, which ensures  $A$ 's Batch list is sorted by *before* fields and that the *before* field of one Batch matches the previous Batch's *after* field.

**Invariant 3.1.** *Let  $A$  be an Aggregator object. If the list of Batch objects reachable from  $A.last$  by following previous pointers is  $B_k, B_{k-1}, \dots, B_0$ , then  $|A.value| \geq |B_k.after|$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $|B_j.after| > |B_j.before| = |B_{j-1}.after|$ , and  $B_0.after = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Initially,  $k = 0$  and  $|A.value| = 0 = |B_0.after|$ .

Batch  $B_k$  is written to  $A.last$  at line 22.  $B_k.after$  is the value read from  $A.value$  on line 20. Since all FETCH&ADD operations applied to  $A$  have arguments of the same sign,  $|A.value|$  can only increase, so  $|A.value| \geq |B_k.after|$ .

Consider any Batch  $B_j$  created at line 22.  $B_j.before$  is the value *aBefore* returned by the F&A on  $A.value$  at line 16 and  $B_j.after$  is the value read from  $A.value$  at line 20.  $|A.value|$  only increases, so  $A.value$  at line 20 has a larger absolute value than the result of the F&A at line 16 (since the F&A's argument is not 0, by the test on line 14). Hence,  $|B_j.after| > |B_j.before|$ . Moreover, line 22 sets  $B_j.previous$  to *last*, and by the test on line 19, *last.after* is equal to the value *aBefore* stored in  $B_j.before$ . Thus,  $B_j.before = B_{j-1}.after$ .  $\square$

We now define linearization points more formally. READ, FETCH&ADDDIRECT, COMPARE&SWAP and FETCH&ADD(0) are each linearized when they access *Main*. We linearize the FETCH&ADD operations with non-zero arguments as follows. Whenever a FETCH&ADD operation  $op$  that chooses an Aggregator  $A$  performs a F&A on *Main* at line 21, we linearize all FETCH&ADD operations that performed a F&A on  $A.value$  in between  $op$ 's accesses to  $A.value$  on lines 16 and 20 (including  $op$  itself), in the order of their F&A operations on  $A.value$ . The values stored in  $A.value$  just prior to these two accesses by  $op$  are stored in the *before* and *after* fields of the Batch  $op$  adds to  $A$ 's list. It follows from Invariant 3.1 that the intervals of time between these two accesses for two different operations assigned to  $A$  cannot both contain the same F&A on  $A.value$ . So, each operation is assigned a unique linearization point.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Each operation is linearized between its invocation and its response.*

*Proof.* The claim is trivial if the operation is linearized at its own step. So consider a FETCH&ADD  $op'$  linearized at the F&A on *Main* by different FETCH&ADD  $op$ . Then  $op'$  cannot terminate at line 23, since then  $op$  would be  $op'$ , by definition.

So suppose  $op'$  terminates at line 28. Let  $A$  be the Aggregator chosen by  $op$  and  $op'$ . By definition,  $op'$  performed a  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$  before  $op$ 's  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$ , so the linearization point of  $op'$  is after  $op$  is invoked. Since  $op'$  completed the waiting loop at line 17, some operation added a Batch  $B$  to  $A$ 's list with  $B.after$  strictly greater (in absolute value) than the result of the  $F\hat{\phi}A$   $op'$  performed on  $A.value$ . It follows from Invariant 3.1 that  $op$  is the operation that added the *first* such Batch to  $A$ 's list, which must have happened before  $op'$  completed its waiting loop. Thus,  $op'$  is linearized when  $op$  performs its  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$ , which is before  $op'$  terminates.  $\square$

We prove the following key invariant by induction.

**Invariant 3.3.** *At all times  $t$ ,  $Main$  stores the value that  $O$  would have if all operations linearized before  $t$  were performed sequentially in the order of their linearization points.*

*Proof. Base case.* The invariant holds initially, since  $Main$  holds the initial value of the object, zero.

*Inductive step.* We show that the invariant is preserved by each step that accesses  $Main$ . (Only these steps are linearization points.) This is clear for accesses to  $Main$  by all operations other than  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  operations with non-zero arguments. So, consider a  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  operation  $op$  that chooses an Aggregator  $A$  and performs a  $F\hat{\phi}A(aAfter - aBefore)$  on  $Main$  at line 21 using the value  $aAfter$  obtained by reading  $A.value$  at line 20 and the value  $aBefore$  obtained from its  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$  at line 16. The  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  operations linearized at  $op$ 's  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$  are exactly those that perform their  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$  in between these two steps, so the sum of their arguments is exactly  $aAfter - aBefore$ . Thus, this  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$  preserves the invariant.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Each operation's response is consistent with the linearization.*

*Proof.* Operations other than  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  are linearized when they access  $Main$ , so the claim follows immediately from Invariant 3.3. Consider a  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$  that is the linearization point of a batch of  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  operations  $op_1, \dots, op_k$  with arguments  $df_1, \dots, df_k$  that all chose the same Aggregator  $A$  (in the order they perform their  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$ ). Then,  $op_1$  is the operation that performs the  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$  with argument  $\sum_{i=1}^k df_i$ . Let  $B$  be the Batch  $op_1$  creates at line 22. Then  $B.mainBefore$  is the value returned by  $op_1$ 's  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$  and  $B.before$  is the value returned by  $op_1$ 's  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$ . Then,  $op_j$  gets the result  $bef_j = B.before + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} df_i$  from its  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $A.value$ . By Invariant 3.3,  $op_j$ 's response should be  $B.mainBefore + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} df_i = B.mainBefore + bef_j - B.before$ , which is the value  $op_j$  returns on line 28.  $\square$

Lemmas 3.2 and 3.4 establish the following main result.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Algorithm 1 is a strongly linearizable implementation of a  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  object.*

Since we can always replace an atomic object by a linearizable implementation, it follows that the recursive constructions described in Section 3.2 are also linearizable.

## 4 Experimental Evaluation

The goals of our experiments are to explore different parameter choices for Aggregated Funnels (Section 4.2), compare Aggregated Funnels with hardware  $F\hat{\phi}A$  and the fastest existing software  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  (Section 4.3), explore the effectiveness of using  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADDIRECT$  to speed up high priority threads (Section 4.4), and observe the performance when we deploy Aggregating Funnels in a state-of-the-art concurrent queue (Section 4.5).

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

We used Google Cloud Platform's `c3-standard-176` instance for our experiments. It has an Intel Xeon Platinum 8481C processor with 176 hyperthreads with 2-way hyperthreading throughout 4 sockets at 2.7GHz, and 704GB of main memory. Our  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  and queue benchmarks are in C++, compiled with `g++ 13.2.0` with `-O3` and `-std=c++17` flag. We used `mimalloc` for scalable memory allocation and `numactl -i all` to distribute memory evenly across the sockets. We used the appropriate memory fences for correctness in weak memory models, and memory alignment to avoid false sharing. Our implementation uses epoch-based reclamation [18] to safely free shared memory.

All  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  benchmarks were run for 2 seconds with random arguments between 1 and 100, and with 5 repetitions to average the results. The error bars in each plot show the standard deviation of the 5 runs, which was small in most cases. To model a context where a fetch-and-add object is used in a larger algorithm, we added a geometrically distributed random amount of additional local work between a thread's operations on the object. We varied the ratio between `READ()` and  $FETCH\hat{\phi}ADD$  operations, the number of threads, and the amount of additional work. Unless stated otherwise, experiments reported here used a mean of 512 hardware cycles, or roughly 0.2 microseconds, of additional work between operations on the fetch-and-add object.

We measured the *throughput*, i.e., the total number of operations across all the threads per unit time, of each algorithm to compare their performance. We also collected several auxiliary measurements to further understand their behavior, from which we derived two significant metrics. *Average batch size* is the average number of operations that are aggregated into one  $F\hat{\phi}A$  on  $Main$ . Higher batch sizes imply less contention on  $Main$ . As our *fairness* metric, we use the ratio between the minimum and maximum number of operations completed by a thread. Lower fairness indicates that different threads have highly imbalanced throughput.




Figure 3. FETCH-ADD performance with different numbers of Aggregators.

## 4.2 Choosing Number of Aggregators

The number of Aggregators can change the behavior of Aggregating Funnels in various workloads. Having more Aggregators will increase contention at *Main*, but it will reduce contention at each Aggregator’s *value*. The optimal balancing point may vary depending on ratio of READ and FETCH-ADD operations in workload since READ operations also contend on *Main*, and on the number of threads where hardware F&A reaches its maximum throughput.

In our graphs, AGGFUNNEL- $m$  denotes the Aggregating Funnels with  $m$  Aggregators in *Positive*. (We did not use the  $m$  Aggregators in *Negative* since all arguments were positive.) In this section, we study how varying  $m$  affects performance. We use a simple scheme for assigning operations to Aggregators that is static and symmetric, which means a thread chooses the same Aggregator for all of its operation, and threads are distributed evenly so that the maximum contention at different Aggregators differ by at most one.

To balance the maximum contention at all Aggregators and *Main*, we tested with  $m = \sqrt{p}$ , which yields  $\sqrt{p}$  maximum contention at all locations. We also tested with constant  $m$  for all thread counts  $p$ , which ensures the maximum contention on the *Main* variable is bounded by the constant  $m$ , while Aggregators have maximum contention  $p/m$ .

Figure 3 compares the results for workloads with 90% and 50% FETCH-ADD. Regardless of the number of Aggregators, our algorithm outperformed the hardware F&A from around 20 threads, and had 2–3x speedup for 176 threads.

Figure 3b shows that schemes with fewer Aggregators have larger batches. This matches our intuition, since schemes with fewer Aggregators had more threads contending in each, so more threads apply F&A to the Aggregator’s *value* before the delegate thread creates a batch. While having larger batches means more operations were applied with a single F&A instruction on *Main*, having more threads in each Aggregator slows down the delegate’s read (line 20), which proportionally reduces the rate of batch creation.

In contrast to the similar throughput in Figure 3a for the 90% FETCH-ADD workload, Figure 3c shows that varying  $m$  produced different throughput for the 50% FETCH-ADD workload. Since all READ() operations access *Main*, read-heavy workloads will perform better with less contention on *Main*, so schemes with fewer Aggregators performed better.

We chose  $m = 6$  as a default for the rest of the experiments we present, as it outperforms other choices in update-heavy and queue benchmarks in later sections, while performing sufficiently well in other workloads.


## 4.3 Fetch-and-Add Benchmark

In this section, we compare the performance of our algorithm with Combining Funnels [49] and hardware F&A. We tested the Combining Funnels by varying depth and width of the funnel, and found that the best performing variant uses  $\lceil \log(p) \rceil - 1$  levels, halving the width at every level. For Aggregating Funnels, we used 6 Aggregators and distributed threads evenly as mentioned above. For recursive Aggregating Funnels (described in Section 3.2), we used the best performing variant which uses  $m = \lceil p/6 \rceil$  Aggregators for the fetch-and-add object  $O$ , and replaces the *Main* variable of  $O$  by another instance of our algorithm with  $m' = 6$  Aggregators, with threads distributed evenly.

Figure 4 shows Aggregated Funnels are faster than Combining Funnels in all cases, and outperform hardware F&A after 30 threads. Aggregating Funnels scaled the best in all experiments, and Aggregating Funnels are up to 4x faster than both Combining Funnels and hardware F&A for high thread counts, as shown in Figure 4d.

For low thread counts, Combining Funnels had lower throughput than other algorithms, but they scale better than hardware F&A and slightly outperform hardware F&A with more threads in Figure 4a. Recursive Aggregated Funnels are expected to scale better than single-level Aggregated Funnels as  $p$  gets very large since it reduces contention further, but it did not achieve better throughput when testing it with up to 176 threads. As discussed in Section 4.2, having





**Figure 4.** Comparing throughput and fairness of Aggregated Funnels, Combining Funnels, and hardware F&A

fewer writing threads on the *Main* variable is advantageous in read-heavy workloads. This effect applies to Combining Funnels and recursive Aggregated Funnels, which can be seen by comparing Figure 4e and Figure 4f.

Varying the additional work did not significantly affect the throughput curve. Comparing Figure 4a and Figure 4c, we see that results only with fewer than 8 threads were affected, and differences are negligible for higher thread counts.

Aggregating Funnels have higher fairness compared to hardware F&A for 32 or more threads. Unfairness in hardware primitives has been investigated before. One explanation is that some threads benefit from getting exclusive access to the variable’s cache line for longer [6]. Our results also match this explanation, since fairness of the hardware F&A drops sharply once at 8 threads, and then drops further at 80 threads. Aggregating Funnels, however, mitigates this unfairness with two changes. In both Aggregator’s *value* and *Main* variable, the maximum number of contending threads is smaller. This allows each cache line to be used more fairly across contending threads. Also, even if the *Main* variable is used unfairly, the delegate thread having increased length of visits will benefit the other threads in the same Aggregator. Notably, Combining Funnels have high fairness, due to the wider and deeper funnel configuration, and assigning random locations for each operation and each level.

#### 4.4 FETCH&ADDDIRECT for High Priority Threads

As mentioned in line 30 of Algorithm 1, our implementations support `FETCH&ADDDIRECT`, which performs a F&A directly on *Main* and therefore has less expected latency. This characteristic can be utilized as an asset when different levels of priority are desired. For example, a program may prioritize a specific thread’s progress over different threads by calling `FETCH&ADDDIRECT`, when it is going through a critical section which stalls the other threads. Any thread can decide when to use `FETCH&ADDDIRECT` at runtime.

In this section, we experiment with an asymmetric allocation scheme `AGGFUNNEL(m, d)`, where  $d$  threads are *high priority threads* that call `FETCH&ADDDIRECT`, and the other  $p - d$  low priority threads will start from  $m$  *Positive Aggregators* evenly, as explained in Section 4.2. For Figure 5, we ran schemes with  $m = 2, 6$  and  $d = 0, 1, 2$ , and only 32 cycles of additional work to highlight the findings.

Figure 5a shows throughput for different parameters. With  $m = 6$ , the total throughput was not significantly affected by having high priority threads. However, with  $m = 2$ , the total throughput increased when high priority threads were present. This effect was more visible with less additional work. We believe this is because high priority threads can do consecutive `FETCH&ADD` operations on *Main* variable, which can significantly decrease the number of cache loads.

Figure 5b shows that average throughput of high priority threads is up to 40x higher than that of low priority




Figure 5.  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  performance with high priority threads. 90%  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$ , 32 cycles




Figure 6. Queue performance using different fetch-and-add implementations in LCRQ

threads. This throughput ratio was significantly higher with  $m = 6$ , where total throughput is not affected. Figure 5c confirms that high priority threads dominate the total throughput, since average batch sizes are significantly smaller. (One  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}\text{DIRECT}$  operation counts as one batch.) These results clearly show that a high priority threads can easily be introduced to gain more control on those threads' throughput or latency, without sacrificing the overall throughput.

#### 4.5 Queue Benchmark

Since our  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  algorithm supports all hardware atomic primitives, we can easily replace a hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  object in various applications to mitigate the contention bottleneck. As mentioned in Section 2, one significant application of  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  is in concurrent queues. To confirm usability of Aggregated Funnels, we ran a concurrent queue benchmark, with existing queues (LCRQ [39], LSCQ [41], LPRQ [46]) with hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$ , and LCRQ with Aggregated Funnels and Combining Funnels. Results of LPRQ with Aggregated

Funnels are not shown in Figure 6, since it got nearly identical results to LCRQ with Aggregated Funnels.

We modified the previously published artifact [46] with our implementations of Aggregating Funnels. We ran the benchmark with the given setting, except using `numactl -i all` to distribute memory evenly across the sockets. Similarly to the  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  benchmarks, we added an average of 512 cycles of work between successive enqueues and dequeues by the same thread. Figure 6 shows total throughput, hence double the transfer rate reported in [46].

Figure 6 illustrates that simply replacing hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$  with the more scalable Aggregating Funnels  $\text{FETCH}\&\text{ADD}$  achieved much higher throughput. In all three scenarios shown in the figure, LCRQ with Aggregated Funnels had up to 2.5x higher throughput than LCRQ with hardware  $\text{F}\&\text{A}$ , and more than 3.5x higher than LCRQ with Combining Funnels for high thread counts.

## 5 Future Work

This work opens up many interesting avenues for future exploration. It would be interesting to see whether the assignment of operations to Aggregators can be made more adaptive to workloads or NUMA-aware. Incorporating elimination [47] might speed up Aggregating Funnels, for example in applications where only increments and decrements by 1 are required. Can the implementation be modified to be non-blocking? Can a version of it be implemented in hardware?

We plan to explore which other applications, besides queues, benefit from deploying aggregating funnels in place of their fetch-and-add objects. Our implementation might also be useful in existing schemes for supporting complex read queries on concurrent data structures (e.g., by implementing the sequence number mechanisms in [14, 40, 55]), for improving the performance of timestamping in e.g., state-of-the-art software transactional memory algorithms such as TL-II [7], and more generally, in concurrent timestamping in database transactions and other database applications [51]. Could our technique also be extended make other concurrent primitives more scalable?

## References

- [1] Yehuda Afek, Dalia Dauber, and Dan Touitou. 1995. Wait-free made fast. In *Proc. 27th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 538–547. <https://doi.org/10.1145/225058.225271>
- [2] Dan Alistarh, James Aspnes, Keren Censor-Hillel, Seth Gilbert, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. 2011. Optimal-time adaptive strong renaming, with applications to counting. In *Proc. 30th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993806.1993850>
- [3] T.E. Anderson. 1990. The performance of spin lock alternatives for shared-memory multiprocessors. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 1, 1 (1990), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1109/71.80120>
- [4] James Aspnes, Maurice Herlihy, and Nir Shavit. 1994. Counting networks. *J. ACM* 41, 5 (Sept. 1994), 1020–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1145/185675.185815>
- [5] Benyamin Bashari, Ali Jamadi, and Philipp Woelfel. 2023. Efficient Bounded Timestamping from Standard Synchronization Primitives. In *Proc. ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3583668.3594601>
- [6] Naama Ben-David, Ziv Scully, and Guy E. Blelloch. 2019. Unfair Scheduling Patterns in NUMA Architectures. In *Proc. 28th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*. 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PACT.2019.00024>
- [7] David Dice, Ori Shalev, and Nir Shavit. 2006. Transactional Locking II. In *Proc. 20th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (LNCS, Vol. 4167)*. Springer, 194–208. [https://doi.org/10.1007/11864219\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/11864219_14)
- [8] Faith Ellen and Philipp Woelfel. 2013. An Optimal Implementation of Fetch-and-Increment. In *Proc. 27th International Symposium on Distributed Computing (LNCS, Vol. 8205)*. 284–298. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41527-2\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-41527-2_20)
- [9] Carla Schlatter Ellis and Thomas J. Olson. 1988. Algorithms for parallel memory allocation. *International Journal of Parallel Programming* 17, 4 (1988), 303–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01407909>
- [10] Panagiota Fatourou, Nikos Giachoudis, and George Mallis. 2024. Highly-Efficient Persistent FIFO Queues. In *Proc. 31st International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity (LNCS, Vol. 14662)*. 238–261. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-60603-8\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-60603-8_14)
- [11] Panagiota Fatourou and Maurice Herlihy. 2004. Read-modify-write networks. *Distributed Computing* 17, 1 (2004), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00446-003-0097-5>
- [12] Panagiota Fatourou and Nikolaos D. Kallimanis. 2012. Revisiting the combining synchronization technique. In *Proc. 17th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2145816.2145849>
- [13] Panagiota Fatourou and Nikolaos D. Kallimanis. 2014. Highly-Efficient Wait-Free Synchronization. *Theory of Computing Systems* 55, 3 (2014), 475–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00224-013-9491-Y>
- [14] Panagiota Fatourou, Elias Papavasileiou, and Eric Ruppert. 2019. Persistent Non-Blocking Binary Search Trees Supporting Wait-Free Range Queries. In *Proc. 31st ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures*. 275–286. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3323165.3323197>
- [15] Michael J. Fischer. 1983. The consensus problem in unreliable distributed systems (a brief survey). In *Foundations of Computation Theory*, Marek Karpinski (Ed.). Springer, Berlin, 127–140.
- [16] Michael J. Fischer, Nancy A. Lynch, James E. Burns, and Allan Borodin. 1979. Resource allocation with immunity to limited process failure. In *Proc. 20th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1979.37>
- [17] M. J. Fischer, S. Moran, S. Rudich, and G. Taubenfeld. 1990. The wakeup problem. In *Proc. 22nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 106–116. <https://doi.org/10.1145/100216.100228>
- [18] Keir Fraser. 2003. *Practical lock-freedom*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Cambridge. Technical report based on thesis is available from

- <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/techreports/UCAM-CL-TR-579.pdf>.
- [19] Eric Freudenthal and Allan Gottlieb. 1991. Process coordination with fetch-and-increment. In *Proc. 4th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 260–268. <https://doi.org/10.1145/106972.106998>
- [20] Wojciech M. Golab, Lisa Higham, and Philipp Woelfel. 2011. Linearizable implementations do not suffice for randomized distributed computation. In *Proc. 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. 373–382. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1993636.1993687>
- [21] James R. Goodman, Mary K. Vernon, and Philip J. Woest. 1989. Efficient synchronization primitives for large-scale cache-coherent multiprocessors. In *Proc. 3rd International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 64–75. <https://doi.org/10.1145/70082.68188>
- [22] Allan Gottlieb and Clyde P. Kruskal. 1981. Coordinating parallel processors: a partial unification. *SIGARCH Compute Architecture News* 9, 6 (Oct. 1981), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.1145/859515.859517>
- [23] Allan Gottlieb, Boris D. Lubachevsky, and Larry Rudolph. 1983. Basic Techniques for the Efficient Coordination of Very Large Numbers of Cooperating Sequential Processors. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 5, 2 (April 1983), 164–189. <https://doi.org/10.1145/69624.357206>
- [24] Maurice Herlihy, Beng-Hong Lim, and Nir Shavit. 1995. Scalable concurrent counting. *Theory of Computing Systems (TOCS)* 13, 4 (Nov. 1995), 343–364. <https://doi.org/10.1145/210223.210225>
- [25] Maurice Herlihy, Nir Shavit, Victor Luchangco, and Michael Spear. 2021. *The Art of Multiprocessor Programming* (2nd ed.). Morgan Kaufmann.
- [26] Maurice Herlihy, Nir Shavit, and Orli Waarts. 1996. Linearizable Counting Networks. *Distributed Computing* 9, 4 (1996), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S004460050019>
- [27] Maurice P. Herlihy and Jeannette M. Wing. 1990. Linearizability: a correctness condition for concurrent objects. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 12, 3 (July 1990), 463–492. <https://doi.org/10.1145/78969.78972>
- [28] Intel. 2020. Intel 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer Manuals. <https://software.intel.com/content/www/us/en/develop/articles/intel-sdm.html>
- [29] Prasad Jayanti. 1998. A time complexity lower bound for randomized implementations of some shared objects. In *Proc. 17th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1145/277697.277735>
- [30] Prasad Jayanti. 2002.  $f$ -arrays: implementation and applications. In *Proc. 21st ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 270–279. <https://doi.org/10.1145/571825.571875>
- [31] Prasad Jayanti, Siddhartha Jayanti, and Sucharita Jayanti. 2024. Mem-Snap: A Fast Adaptive Snapshot Algorithm for RMWable Shared-Memory. In *Proc. 43rd ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3662158.3662820>
- [32] Siddhartha Jayanti, Robert E. Tarjan, and Enric Boix-Adserà. 2019. Randomized Concurrent Set Union and Generalized Wake-Up. In *Proc. ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 187–196. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3293611.3331593>
- [33] Siddhartha Visveswara Jayanti. 2022. Generalized Wake-Up: Amortized Shared Memory Lower Bounds for Linearizable Data Structures [in Telugu]. (2022). arXiv:2207.07561 [cs.DS] Manuscript available from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.07561>.
- [34] E. Korach, S. Moran, and S. Zaks. 1984. Tight lower and upper bounds for some distributed algorithms for a complete network of processors. In *Proc. 3rd ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800222.806747>
- [35] Marios Mavronicolas. 2000. Annotated Bibliography on Counting Networks. *Bull. EATCS* 72 (2000), 123–132.
- [36] John M. Mellor-Crummey and Michael L. Scott. 1991. Algorithms for Scalable Synchronization on Shared-Memory Multiprocessors. *Theory of Computing Systems (TOCS)* 9, 1 (Feb. 1991), 21–65. <https://doi.org/10.1145/103727.103729>
- [37] Maged M. Michael and Michael L. Scott. 1995. *Correction of a Memory Management Method for Lock-Free Data Structures*. Technical Report 599. Computer Science Department, University of Rochester.
- [38] Mark Moir and James H. Anderson. 1995. Wait-free algorithms for fast, long-lived renaming. *Science of Computer Programming* 25, 1 (1995), 1–39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423\(95\)00009-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6423(95)00009-H)
- [39] Adam Morrison and Yehuda Afek. 2013. Fast concurrent queues for x86 processors. In *Proc. ACM Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2442516.2442527>
- [40] Jacob Nelson-Slivon, Ahmed Hassan, and Roberto Palmieri. 2022. Bundling linked data structures for linearizable range queries. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 368–384.
- [41] Ruslan Nikolaev. 2019. A Scalable, Portable, and Memory-Efficient Lock-Free FIFO Queue. In *Proc. 33rd International Symposium on Distributed Computing (LIPIcs, Vol. 146)*. 28:1–28:16. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.DISC.2019.28>
- [42] Ruslan Nikolaev and Binoy Ravindran. 2022. wCQ: A Fast Wait-Free Queue with Bounded Memory Usage. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architectures* (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (SPAA '22). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 307–319. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490148.3538572>
- [43] Yaqiong Peng and Zhiyu Hao. 2018. FA-Stack: A Fast Array-Based Stack with Wait-Free Progress Guarantee. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 29, 4 (2018), 843–857. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2017.2770121>
- [44] Gary L. Peterson. 1982. An  $O(n \log n)$  Unidirectional Algorithm for the Circular Extrema Problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 4, 4 (Oct. 1982), 758–762. <https://doi.org/10.1145/69622.357194>
- [45] David P. Reed and Rajendra K. Kanodia. 1979. Synchronization with eventcounts and sequencers. *Commun. ACM* 22, 2 (Feb. 1979), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1145/359060.359076>
- [46] Raed Romanov and Nikita Koval. 2023. The State-of-the-Art LCRQ Concurrent Queue Algorithm Does NOT Require CAS2. In *Proc. 28th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3572848.3577485> Software artifact available from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7337237>.
- [47] Nir Shavit and Dan Touitou. 1997. Elimination Trees and the Construction of Pools and Stacks. *Theory of Computing Systems* 30, 6 (1997), 645–670. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S002240000072>
- [48] Nir Shavit and Asaph Zemach. 1996. Diffracting trees. *Theory of Computing Systems (TOCS)* 14, 4 (Nov. 1996), 385–428. <https://doi.org/10.1145/235543.235546>
- [49] Nir Shavit and Asaph Zemach. 2000. Combining Funnel: A Dynamic Approach to Software Combining. *J. of Parallel and Distributed Computing* 60, 11 (2000), 1355–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1006/JPDC.2000.1621>
- [50] Harold S. Stone. 1982. *Parallel Memory Allocation using the FETCH-AND-ADD Instruction*. Technical Report RC 9674. IBM Research. 14 pages.
- [51] Harold S. Stone. 1984. Database Applications of the FETCH-AND-ADD Instruction. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* C-33, 7 (1984), 604–612. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1984.5009333>
- [52] Håkan Sundell. 2005. Wait-free reference counting and memory management. In *Proc. 19th IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPS.2005.451>
- [53] Peiyi Tang and Pen-Chung Yew. 1990. Software combining algorithms for distributing hot-spot addressing. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 10, 2 (1990), 130–139. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-7315\(90\)90022-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-7315(90)90022-H)

- [54] John D. Valois. 1995. Lock-free linked lists using compare-and-swap. In *Proc. 14th ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. 214–222. <https://doi.org/10.1145/224964.224988>
- [55] Yuanhao Wei, Naama Ben-David, Guy E. Blelloch, Panagiota Fatourou, Eric Ruppert, and Yihan Sun. 2021. Constant-time snapshots with applications to concurrent data structures. In *Proc. 26th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3437801.3441602>
- [56] James M. Wilson. 1988. *Operating System Data Structures for Shared-Memory MIMD Machines with Fetch-and-Add*. Ph. D. Dissertation. New York University. Available from <https://cs.nyu.edu/~gottlieb/family-tree>.
- [57] Chaoran Yang and John Mellor-Crummey. 2016. A wait-free queue as fast as fetch-and-add. In *Proc. 21st ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. Article 16, 13 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2851141.2851168>
- [58] Pen-Chung Yew, Nian-Feng Tzeng, and Lawrie. 1987. Distributing Hot-Spot Addressing in Large-Scale Multiprocessors. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* C-36, 4 (1987), 388–395. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.1987.1676921>