# Toward Ractor local GC

Koichi Sasada STORES, Inc.



# Summary

- Introducing Ractor local GC is promising but challenging
  Cross-Ractor references make this difficult
- We propose a conservative approach to enable Ractor local GC by keeping shareable objects as root objects
  - Since the number of sharable objects is small enough, it is feasible
  - At least, the behavior is equivalent to the current implementation (Global GC every time)
- We can observe significant improvements in microbenchmarks

# Acknowledgement

- This work is a collaboration with Rohit Menon
  - He is a Google Summer of Code developer in 2022
  - I mentored him on the project "Optimizing Garbage Collection for Ruby Ractors"
- Contributions
  - I provided basic idea and discuss him
  - Rohit continued developing his own implementation extending my idea over 3 years
  - I learned from his experience and developed my implementation (this talk)

# Koichi Sasada

- Ruby interpreter developer employed by **STORES, Inc.** (2023~) with @mametter
  - YARV (Ruby 1.9~)
  - Generational/Incremental GC (Ruby 2.1~)
  - Ractor (Ruby 3.0~)
  - debug.gem (Ruby 3.1~)
  - M:N Thread scheduler (Ruby 3.3~)
  - • •
- Ruby Association Director (2012~)
- An owner of @.bookstore at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor



Off-topic: Ractor::Port proposal <a href="https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/21262">https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/21262</a>

- Proposal to change the Ractor API
  - Introduce: Ractor::Port for communication
  - Deprecate: Ractor.yield and Ractor#takd pair
- Ractor::Port is a small enhancement of the mailbox concept in the Actor model

# Background

### "Ractor" is

- Introduced in Ruby 3.0
- Designed to enable
  - Computing on Ruby for more performance on multi-core CPUs
    - Enables faster applications
  - 😂 robust concurrent programming
    - Prevents bugs caused by shared mutable state

### What is parallel?

- Threads of different Ractors can run in **parallel** 
  - They can utilize CPU cores on your machine



Time

# Ractor as an Isolated Object Space

Each Ractor has its own isolated object space (objspace)
Every object (obj) belongs to exactly one Ractor





## Ractor as an Isolated Object Space

Cannot access objects in other Ractors



## "Ractor local GC" It seems natural to run GC simultaneously

- Run Ractors in parallel
- Run GC independently in parallel in each Ractor objspace





## Ractors can share "Shareable objects"

- Shareable objects (shobj):
  - Classes and Modules
  - Immutable objects (frozen and only reference shareable objects)
  - Special objects (Ractor objects and so on)
- Ractors can hold to shareable objects



Question: How should Ractor-Local GC handle sharable objects?

- 1. Ractor R1 has a shareable object (sh1)
- 2. Ractor R2 holds a reference to **sh1**
- R1 run GC and sh1 is collected because no referrece to sh1 (even though R2 does)
- 4. R2 tries to use **sh1**, but it has already been freed  $\rightarrow$  CRASH!



# Challenges

# Solution (1) Tracking references to shareable objects

If R1 knows that sh1 is referenced by another Ractor, its GC can take this into account and avoid collecting sh1



# Problem with Solution (1) Tracking shareable references is Difficult

- References can be updated at any time
- All Ractors execute in parallel
- → Difficult to keep reference states accurate across Ractors incorrect information can introduce marking miss
- Performance concerns
  - Additional overhead from tracking inter-Ractor references
  - Additional memory usage

### Sample scenario

- 1. sh1 is sent from R1 to R2 and R2 holds a reference to sh1
- 2. The runtime detects "sh1 is referenced"



### Sample scenario

info

3. R2 references **sh3** (because it's reachable from **sh1**)

- <u>The reference information becomes stale</u>, but cannot be updated immediately because no mechanism to that (or too slow)
- sh3 is marked due to outdated information ("sh1 is referenced")



### Sample scenario

4. sh2 removes the references to sh3, making sh3 <u>unreachable</u>
5. As a result, sh3 is collected by R1's local GC



# Solution (2) Global Object Space

- The current implementation uses a single "global object space"
- No per-Ractor heap: objects are managed in one shared space
- GC stop all Ractors and marks objects correctly





# The Goal and the Challenge

- Goal: Introduce Local GC to improve performance
  - Track only Ractor local objects
  - Run Local GC in parallel, independently (like Erlang/Elixir)
- Difficult to implement with shareable objects
  - Tracking shareable objects across Ractors is hard
  - (This is why Ractor local GC hasn't been introduced for years)
- Challenge: Design a safe algorithm for Ractor local GC

# Proposal

# Proposal: Do not collect Shareable objects

- The problem is "hard to detect liveness of shareable objects"
- $\rightarrow$  Give up detecting liveness; assume they are alive
  - The number of shareable objects is limited
  - A conservative but safe approach
- On Local GC, Mark local shareable objects as root objects
- Use <u>Global GC</u> to reclaim shareable objects correctly
  - Stop all Ractors and check cross-Ractor references
  - Run less frequently than the current Global GC

# Shareable objects as Root objects

- 🍐 Accurate
- ? Shareable objects that no longer reachable are never reclaimed until Global GC



# Lifetime of Shareable objects

- Classes, Modules, methods and bytecode (ISeqs)
  - Typically, long-lived objects
- Ractors
  - Depends on applications, but most are not short-lived now
- Immutable objects (marked as shareable)
  - Depends on the application
  - Immutable objects assigned to constants tend to be long-lived

Few shareable objects are short-lived

 $\rightarrow$  Conservative approach is acceptable

# GC timeline (proposed approach)



Only Ractor's objects on local GC
 Runs in Parallel
 Easy to implement

## Key insight: Done is better than Perfect

- Solution (1) is ideal, but difficult to implement
  - We've discussed this for 3 years but haven't completed yet
  - And we couldn't deliver any improvements
- Proposed conservative approach may not be perfect, but it's likely better than the current implementation (solution (2))
- Let's adopt a practical and effective compromise
  - As long as the number of shareable objects remains small, this approach should work well
  - It can serve as a baseline for future algorithm improvements

## Implementation

- 1. Introduce a verifier
  - Shareable objects should only refer to shareable objects
    - There are some exceptions though
  - Implement in GC.verify\_internal\_consistency
  - With this verifier, sharable states become correct
- 2. Separate Object Space per Ractor
  - All Ractor has own heap
  - Introduce Global Object Space as well
- 3. Track a set of sharable objects as roots
  - A sharable object is appeared, add it to the shareable set
  - Note: Sharable objects never become unshareable
- 4. Make a Local GC that uses the set as roots
- 5. Make a Global GC that rebuilds a set of sharable objects
- 6. Implement logic to choose between Local GC or Global GC

# Techniques

- A set is implemented using arrays
  - GenGC reduces the marking time, so managing with an array is efficient (and allows marking exceptional reference (e.g. sh → unsh))
  - However, if one sharable object is added, all sharable objects in the array is marked by the write-barrier and remember-set
  - To mitigate the overhead, use array list ([prev\_set, sh1, sh2, ...]) and only the last array is marked at write-barrier
- Rebuilding an array during Global GC
  - Creating new arrays during GC is not allowed
  - So, collect sharable object references across Ractors with st\_table, and rebuild the set (as arrays) at the end of global GC
- Objects belong to the creating Ractor
  - When a Ractor is created, the Ractor object belongs to the Ractor that created it.
    - Marking functions should be separated into "Ractor-local" and "from outer Ractor"
  - At the same time, a Thread object is also created and belongs to the creating Ractor.
    - Replace the newly created Thread object in created Ractor during Ractor bootstrap

# Evaluation

# Benchmark setup

- Environment
  - CPU
    - 13th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-13700H
    - 14 Cores (6 performance cores with HT), 8 efficient cores)
  - Ubuntu 22.04.5 LTS
  - gcc version 11.4.0 (Ubuntu 11.4.0-1ubuntu1~22.04)
  - Ruby versions
    - master: ruby 3.5.0dev (2025-03-17T17:19:43Z master 52f6563422) +PRISM [x86\_64-linux]
    - modified: this proposal is patched on top of the above version
- Microbenchmarks
  - Repeats simple tasks N times
    - Each Ractor perform TN tasks
    - TN = N / RN, where RN is the number of Ractors
    - <u>https://gist.github.com/ko1/5e8cb732a8d8ecfe49605674c5a01193</u>







-master -modified







# Wrap-up

## Future work

- Complete implementation for Ruby 3.5 (Dec 2025)
  - Hopefully, only minor issues remain
  - Need to introduce a lightweight way to send an object
  - Need to reduce sharable objects like callcache
  - And more details  $chages\cdots$
- Parallel marking on the Global GC
  - Enables per-Ractor heap marking in parallel, improving global GC efficiency
- Try the ideal but difficult solution (1) for more performance
  - Rohit said he might have found a good algorithm
  - Let's look forward to his future report

# Summary

- Introducing Ractor local GC is promising but challenging
  - Cross-Ractor references make this difficult
- We propose a conservative approach to enable Ractor local GC by keeping shareable objects as root objects
  - Since the number of sharable objects is small enough, it is feasible
  - At least, the behavior is equivalent to the current implementation (Global GC every time)
- We can observe significant improvements in micro-benchmarks
- NOTE: This work is a collaboration with **Rohit Menon**

Questions and feedbacks are very welcome! Thank you for listening!

