PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR GRADUAL TYPING Asumu Takikawa, Daniel Feltey, Ben Greenman, Max S. New, Jan Vitek, Matthias Felleisen

GRADUAL TYPING is for software maintenance

Fact 1: developers use untyped languages

Fact 2: type annotations enable safety checks and serve as documentation

Thesis: stable untyped code + type annotations = happy future maintainers

PROMISES

Freedom to add types **incrementally**

Soundness: type invariants are enforced at runtime . .

PERFORMANCE LATTICE

Example: FSM benchmark

4 modules, 16 configurations

- A. automata.rkt Interface & basic strategies
- M. main.rkt **Runs a simulation**
- **P. population.rkt** Models groups of automata
- U. utilities.rkt Helper functions



Untyped runtime: **182ms**

Is this "good" performance?

Yes

- + Fully typed is 2x faster
- + 50% of all configurations have < 3x overhead
- + Can avoid > 2,000x overhead by typing both main.rkt and population.rkt

No

- Maximum overhead: 8,500x (26 minutes to run)
- Average overhead: 2,700x
- Median overhead: 470x
- No smooth migration paths: Impossible to convert module-by-module and avoid **2,000x** overhead

Open Question

How to help developers avoid performance valleys (without exploring the whole lattice)?

Each call to **step** wraps **pop** with a higher-order contract After **n** calls, each vector operation suffers **n** indirections

What about performance?

Visualizing all possible gradually-typed configurations





EVALUATION METHOD

Report the relative performance of the **untyped** and **fully-typed** configurations Report the **proportion** of typed/untyped configurations:

- with "deliverable" overhead (at most Nx slowdown)
- with "usable" overhead (at most Mx slowdown)
- within L conversion steps from an Nx or Mx configuration

L-N/M FIGURES Summarizing performance lattices





