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Abstract

Template metaprograms have become an essential part of today’s C++ programs. Despite their importance there are surprisingly few tools for creating, using and analysing them efficiently. The radically increased compilation time of programs using template-heavy code is one of the phenomena of which root is a serious challenge to trace down. The compilation speed can increase when one starts using even less complex template metaprogram structures. Industrial projects pay a big price for these additional times. Our paper presents intrusive and non-intrusive approaches of getting detailed information on the compilation process of templates and measuring time each specific template instantiations had taken. The results show the pros and cons of the different techniques, comparing them across different compilers. In an example we demonstrate how to identify the bottleneck and how to improve template metaprograms regarding compilation time.
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D.3.2 [Programming Languages]: Language Classification – C++;  
D.2.5 [Testing and Debugging]: Profiling
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1. Introduction

Code efficiency is an all-important aspect of software design. In order to improve the efficiency of a program, a programmer must identify the critical parts. Boehm reports that 20 percent of the routines consumes 80 percent of the execution time [4]. Knuth claims that less than 4 percent of a program usually accounts for more than 50 percent of its runtime [7]. To identify and modify these critical parts may significantly improve the efficiency of the whole program. As static analysis methods fail in many cases to explore the dynamical behavior of the program, execution profiling is a key element to finding bottlenecks in the code. In order to investigate the behavior of a program profilers should collect information during the runtime.

The more complex the language environment we work in, the more sophisticated profiling toolset we need. In object-oriented languages like C++ tools must be able to measure all elements of classes, like constructors and destructors, inline functions, static variables etc. [12]. Most current profilers [30, 31] available for object-oriented languages are capable of handling these problems. Templates are essential part of the C++ language, by enabling data structures and algorithms to be parameterized by types [15, 18]. This abstraction is frequently needed when using general algorithms like finding an element in a data structure, or defining data types like a list or a matrix of elements of same type. The mechanism behind a matrix containing integer or floating point numbers, or even strings is essentially the same, it is only the type of the contained objects that differs. With templates we can express this abstraction, thus this generic language construct aids code reuse, and the introduction of higher abstraction levels. This method of code reuse often called parametric polymorphism, to emphasise that here the variability is supported by compile-time template parameter(s).

The effect of heavy usage of templates in C++ had a significant negative effect on compilation time. As templates have to be presented as source code, they are usually implemented in form of header files. Header files are included into source files as well as other header files in a recursive manner. The parser have to process each of them repeatedly in every compilation unit.

Generic programming [14] is a recently emerged programming paradigm for writing highly reusable components. The Standard Template Library (STL) – the most notable example of generic programming – is now an unavoidable part of most professional C++ programs [8]. The STL as well as the rest of the C++ standard library mostly consist of template classes placed into a number of header files. While the usage of templates provides a great flexibility and reusability for the programmers, compile times grew significantly.

The everyday process of programming consists of compiling, executing (and perhaps profiling) the code. However, the recently emerged programming paradigm, C++ template metaprogramming (TMP) does not follow this pattern. In template metaprogramming the program itself is running during compilation time. A cleverly designed C++ code is able to utilize the type-system of the language and force the compiler to execute a desired algorithm [21]. The output of this process is still checked by the compiler and run as an ordinary program.

Template metaprogramming is proved to be a Turing-complete sublanguage of C++ [5]. We write metaprograms for various reasons, like expression templates [22] replacing runtime computations with compile-time activities to enhance runtime performance, static interface checking, which increases the ability of the compile-time to check the requirements against template parame-
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plates. Thus when templates are instantiated the IP’s may trace the chain of instantiation. As the whole metaprogram is executed by the compiler to detect these events are not trivial.

Another popular profiling method for run-time programs is sampling. These profilers are often called statistical profilers. A sampling profiler probes the analyzed software’s program counter at regular intervals using operating system interrupts. Sampling profilers are typically less accurate and specific, but allow the measured software to run at near full speed.

Implementing sampling profilers for template metaprograms are possible but their usefulness is far behind their run-time counterparts. It is possible to interrupt the compilation process, and compilers could be modified to report which part of code is executed at the moment. However, as the compilation process – in most logical cases – a deterministic process statistical methods have not too much value here.

Since instrumentations are not the part of the analyzed code, profiling has overhead [26]. The number of executed probes, or the probe count causes instrumentation overhead. The probe count for an instrumentation point is the number of the instances of probe. All executed probes incur overhead associated with executing the probe code that intercepts program execution. Because of the condition that controls the payload, every instance of a probe may not incur overhead of the payload. Thus, the total overhead for an instrumentation point is related to the number of done probes, how much each probe costs, how frequently the payload is called and the payload’s cost.

We can avoid this overhead when measuring full programs, rather then their’s structural parts. Such test programs can highlight certain patterns of template metaprograms even they do not revealing internal details.

3. Practical approaches of profiling

3.1 Measuring compilation units

The most available method to measure compile time performance is measuring full compilation of units. Compilation of full source files does not require to modify the code, thus this is a non-intrusive method, and do not add overhead or significant distortion. Although filter out all perturbations are not easy, most of the operating systems provide us fair tools to measure the experienced real-time, user and system times on the run of a compilation session.

In most cases locating, loading, and parsing header files is a non-trivial effort. To filter out this effect we can run the precompiler in a separate session and measure only further compilation stages. Figure 1 shows that separating precompiler tasks changes the compilation times significantly.

![Figure 1. Compilation time with separate precompilation](image)

Compiling full programs or compilation units can reveal significant behavioural patterns of programs or template constructs. Abrahams and Gurtovoy measured template metaprogram constructs in [1] with this method and were able pointing to fundamental differences in strategy and tactics of different compilers. They have shown the effect of certain techniques, like memoisation and have measured structural complexity of metaprograms.

However, measuring compilation time has certain shortages. It is not always trivial to write wrapper programs around certain template constructs without seriously distort measurement results. Full session of compilation includes activities we are not interested in: initializations, outputting, solve non-template related tasks. When we analyse the results we have the compilation times, but no implications on how this gross time splits among different code components. Measuring full compilation is great to prove concepts but hard to use for analysis.

3.2 Measuring with instrumenting

Most compilers generate additional information for profilers. An appropriate compiler support for measuring template metaprogram profiles would be the ideal solution. However, as this support is unavailable as of now, an immediate and portable method is to use external tools cooperating with standard C++ language elements.

Without the modification of the compiler the only way of obtaining any information about our metaprogram during compilation is to generate warning messages [1]. Therefore the task is the instrumentation of the source, i.e. its transformation into a functionally equivalent modified form that triggers the compiler to emit talkative warning messages. The inserted code fragments are designed to generate warnings that contain enough information about the context and details of the actual event. Whenever the compiler instantiates a template, defines an inner type etc. the inserted code fragments generate detailed information on the actual template-related event. A pipeline transmits the information for the profiler which measures the time of the event. As we will see in the results, for large template metaprograms the overhead of the communication between processes is negligible.

The instrumented code fragments, on the other hand, result in big performance overhead, that can significantly distort the measured data.

Our instrumentation method is based on the Templight framework, originally addressed debugging C++ template metaprograms [10]. The framework was intentionally designed to be as portable as possible, for this end we tried to use portable and standard-compliant tools. Almost all components are written in standard C++ using the STL, boost and Xerces libraries. The input of Templight is a C++ source file and the output is a trace file, a list of events like instantiation of template X began, instantiation of template X ended, typedef definition found etc. The overall architecture of the framework is seen on Figure 2.

The procedure begins with the execution of the preprocessor, followed by invoking the boost::wave C++ parser. Our aim is to insert warning-generating code fragments at the instrumentation points. As wave does not semantic analysis we can only recognise these places by searching for specific token patterns. We go through the token sequence and look for patterns like template keyword + arbitrary tokens + class or struct keyword + arbitrary tokens + { to identify template definitions. This pattern matching step is called annotating, its output is an XML file containing annotation entries in a hierarchical structure following the scope.

The instrumentation takes this annotation and the single source and inserts the warning-generating code fragments for each annotation at its corresponding location in the source thus producing a source that emits warnings at each annotation point during its compilation. The next step is the execution of the compiler to have these
warning messages generated. The inserted code fragments are intentionally designed to generate warnings that contain enough information about the context and details of the actual event. Since the compiler may produce output independently of our instrumenter for valuable information from its internals. Here the result is a format that differentiates them. This is the step where we ask the computation, it is important for debugger warnings to have a distinct format as a text file. The warning translator takes special format and generates an event sequence with all the details. The result is an XML file that lists the events that occurred during the compilation in chronological order. For profiling purposes, timestamps are also placed in the XML file for each instantiation. This way we have timestamps whenever a warning occurs. This way we have timestamps for each template-related event, and the processing time of a certain template instance can be easily computed by subtracting the timestamps stored at the corresponding template-begin and template-end event (warning message).

There is an interesting distortion factor in case of instrumenting regarding inheritance hierarchy. Let consider the following code snippet:

```cpp
template <typename T>
class Derived : public Base<T>
{
    // ...
};
```

When Derived is about to be instantiated, the compiler starts to instantiate Base with typename parameter T. This process will be finished before class Derived would start to be instantiated. If we inject the observer code at the beginning and end-point of both classes, we end up with the following sequence of emitted warnings:

- Base starts
- Base ends
- Derived starts
- Derived ends

In other words, inheritance relationship would remain hidden, and instantiation time for Derived (wrongly) will not include the time of instantiation of Base. This is a serious problem, when a metaprogram relies heavily on inheritance, like in the case of boost::mpl or boost::wave. Therefore we have to handle this situation with greater attention.

An other factor of distortion is the way we add timestamps to the emitted warning messages. Compilers do not decorate warnings with timestamp info. In the simplest solution an external program reads compiler output and apply timestamps. In this case the delay between the warning is generated and timestamped can be significant. Better way, if timestamp is generated inside the compiler when constructing the warning message, this delay can be eliminated. But this requires the modification of the compiler.

### 3.3 Modification of the compiler

The most accurate way for evaluating compilation times is by acquiring timing information from the compiler itself. As our metaprogram is executed on a meta-level from the viewpoint of C++, a meta-level profiler is needed, i.e. one measuring the compiler’s action times. The obvious approach – to use a profiler tool (like gprof) and measure the compiler’s runtime – does not work, since we cannot identify those parts of the subject code wich are under compilation. Even though we would be able to measure some kind of compiler method `instantiate_class_template`’s running time in general, we could not disambiguate certain instantiations. In other words, we could acquire the sum of all instantiation times, but would not be able to measure each instantiation separately.

To gain the required detailed data on particular instantiations we have to modify the compiler for the purpose. We instrument the code with templight, but generate warnings with timestamp via the modified compiler. To demonstrate this method we have chosen the widely used GNU g++ compiler (version 3.4.3), as its C source code is freely available, thus rendering it a plausible target for "hacking", and developing possible future compiler features. In the center of our examination is the modification of warning generation procedure, i.e. the `warning` and `cp_warning_at` functions.

The modification consists of generating timestamps when entering and exiting these functions and adding it to the emitted message. We used this approach to eliminate the distortion of generating the warning itself. Experiments showed, however, that most cases the time we spent in these functions is negligible.

### 4. Evaluation of the methods

In this section we present our measurement results with the proposed methods. We analyzed the profiling methods from the following points of view:
1. **Accuracy.** What is the accuracy of the different profiler methods?

2. **Applicability.** Are the profilers applicable to large programs?

3. **Overhead.** What are the overheads of the profiling methods themselves: i.e. to what degree do the different methods distort profiling results?

When constructing the tests we partly followed the examples discussed by Abrahams and Gurtovoy in [1]. In these examples the importance of memoization is emphasized. Memoization is a procedure done by the compiler when instantiating new types from templates. Each instantiation begins with a lookup in the compiler’s repository, searching for the type about to be instantiated. If the compiler does find the type (i.e. it has already been instantiated) it aborts the creation procedure, and uses the already finished type. Memoization speeds up the compilation [1], as this lookup happens much faster than it would take to repeat the instantiation. In order to avoid this phenomenon, we modified our fibonacci metaprogram (computing fibonacci numbers in compile-time) to enforce instantiation.

In the following we describe the four test methods whose results are presented in this section.

The first method follows the test method described by Abrahams and Gurtovoy. Here the program was compiled and the full compilation time was measured with the UNIX time command. Therefore the compilation times of the templated part and the rest of the program were not separated. The curve representing the result data is labelled g++ whole.

The second approach uses the Templight framework to instrument the source code. The instrumentation results in a code that emits a warning message at the begin and end points of each template instantiation. As the warnings appear, the external profiling tool measures the time spent on the instantiation. Thus we are able to separate the compilation of templates from the rest of the activities.

The third and four methods are based on the modification of the g++ compiler. Since there was no significant difference between the results with buffering the output and the immediate printing with redirection to file, we illustrated these results with one curve labelled g++ mod.

Figure 3 shows the results of our experiments with the same non-memoizing example.

![Figure 3. Instantiation time without memoization](image)

The most significate experience based on the results is that the characteristics of all the three curves are similar. Templight has constant overhead. The best results have been produced by the built-in solution that indicates the importance of compiler supported template metaprogram debuggers.

4.1 **Accuracy**

To estimate the accuracy of our methods we compared the total execution time of g++ to the outermost template’s instantiation time, i.e. the running of the whole metaprogram. The difference between fibonacci\langle N \rangle (N = 1, 20, 40,...) and the whole compilation time grew linearly, with N = 200 the difference being about 30 seconds. Even though we have acquired the same O(N^3) complexity for the compilation time as found in [1], there is a significant difference between numeric data of the outermost template’s instantiation and the whole compilation time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>140</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Full compilation time (full) vs. sum time of instantiation (inst)

The cause of the difference is that even in case of high number of template instantiations, all the operations g++ carries out before, after, and between instantiating types (source code analysis, optimization, code generation, etc) have heavy costs. The result shows the importance of precise profiling methods.

4.2 **Applicability**

One of the most frequently used functionalities of a profiler is the determination of critical parts that slow down the compilation process. Both the modified g++, and Templight generate a trace containing the names of the instantiated templates, and the instantiation times. With the help of a script processing this trace file we can easily obtain a list of template instances sorted by their compilation times. A portion of Templight’s output profiling fibonacci is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template instance</th>
<th>Full instantiation time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle118,119\rangle</td>
<td>2.5837152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle121,123\rangle</td>
<td>2.6137584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle113,120\rangle</td>
<td>2.6237728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle124,125\rangle</td>
<td>2.6237728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle118,121\rangle</td>
<td>2.6337872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle55,55\rangle</td>
<td>2.653816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle115,121\rangle</td>
<td>2.6638304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle120,122\rangle</td>
<td>2.6638304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle123,124\rangle</td>
<td>2.6738448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle122,123\rangle</td>
<td>2.703888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle117,122\rangle</td>
<td>2.7139024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle119,123\rangle</td>
<td>2.75396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle121,124\rangle</td>
<td>2.7940176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle123,125\rangle</td>
<td>2.8440896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fibonacci\langle56,56\rangle</td>
<td>2.8440896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Instantiation times

On the other hand, fibonacci is a relatively simple metaprogram. In larger software projects, however, there are many templates referencing each other, and it is not as easy to spot the exact cause of a slow compilation as in the previous example. To see how this profiling technique operates in projects where numerous templates are used we measured the compilation of the Templight framework itself. The measured source combines different template libraries like STL algorithms, Boost::spirit, and Boost::wave. Table 3 shows the 20 most time-consuming instantiations.
If we are not interested in the actual instances, but rather we would like to see what templates need the most time during the compilation process, we can see the table in template level as shown in Table 4. Though none of the instantiations of the STL templates appear in the first table, in the template level view we can see that the std::allocator template is instantiated 64 times and takes the 13th most time to be processed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template instance</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iterator_facade&lt;boost::filesystem::bas...</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail::iterator_facade_types&lt;const st...</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail::facade_iterator_category_impl&lt;...</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wave::context&lt;char *,Templight::FileAn...</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templight::Grammar&lt; wave::pp_iterator&lt;...</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wave::util::functor_input::inner&lt;boost::...</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wave::impl::pp_iterator functor&lt; boost::...</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wave::util::macromap&lt; boost::wave::cont...</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit::tree_match&lt; boost::wave::cpplex...</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpl::if_&lt; boost::detail::is_iterator_ca...</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail::operator_brackets_result&lt; boost::...</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail::is_pod_impl&lt; const std::basic_s...</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpl::if_&lt; boost::detail::use_operator_b...</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail::is_scalar_impl&lt; const std::basic_s...</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpl::if_&lt; boost::is_convertible&lt; std::bi...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mpl::if_&lt; boost::mpl::and_&lt; boost::is_re...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit::unary&lt; boost::spirit::chlit&lt;cha...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit::unary&lt; boost::spirit::chlit&lt;wch...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit::unary&lt; boost::spirit::strlit&lt;co...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit::tree_node&lt; boost::spirit::node...</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Compilation times per template instances

We can easily have a quick overview about the compilation times of the different template library usages in our code if we sum the template processing times by their namespaces. This comparison can be found in Table 5. Table 4 and 5 not only give an overview of the processing times but also present the number of template instantiations per templates and per namespaces respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Namespace</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boost</td>
<td>4663</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>std</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templight</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Compilation times per templates

Table 5. Compilation times per namespaces

4.3 Overhead

The Templight framework inserts code fragments into the user code, resulting in significant compilation time overhead, see Table 6. Compiler modification methods result only in marginal overheads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>memoisation</td>
<td>+646%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templight source</td>
<td>+73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Compilation time overhead caused by the inserted code fragments when the Templight framework is used

5. Limitations

5.1 Modification of the source code

Compiler support The Templight framework works only if the compiler gives enough information when it meets the instrumented erroneous code. Unfortunately not all compilers fulfill this criterion today. Table 7 summarizes our experiences with some compilers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compiler</th>
<th>result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g++ 3.3.5</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g++ 4.1.0</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVC 7.1</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSVC 8.0</td>
<td>ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel 9.0</td>
<td>no instantiation backtrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeau 4.3.3</td>
<td>no instantiation backtrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrowerks</td>
<td>no instantiation backtrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CodeWarrior 9.0</td>
<td>no instantiation backtrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borland 5.6</td>
<td>no warning message at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borland 5.8</td>
<td>no instantiation backtrace, but the warning message is printed for each instantiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Our experiences with different compilers

It is a frequent case when a warning is emitted, but there is no information about its context. The most surprising find was that the Borland 5.6 compiler does not print any warnings to our instrumented statement even with all warnings enabled. A later version of this compiler (version 5.8) prints the desired messages, but similarly to many others it does not generate any context information. In contrast to the others this compiler prints the same warning for each instantiation.

Semantics Since we do not have semantical information we fall back on using mere syntactic patterns. Unfortunately without semantic information there are ambiguous cases where it is impossible to determine the exact role of the tokens. This simply comes from the environment-dependent nature of the language and from the heavily overloaded symbols. The following line for example can have totally different semantics depending on its environment:

```c
enum { a = b < c > :: d };
```
If the preceding line is
\begin{verbatim}
enum { b = 1, c = 2, d = 3 }; 
\end{verbatim}
then the < and > tokens are relational operators, and :: stands for 'global scope', while having the following part instead of the previous line

\begin{verbatim}
template<int>
struct b {
   enum { d = 3 }; 
};
enum { c = 2 }; 
\end{verbatim}

the < and > tokens become template parameter list parentheses and :: the dependent name operator. This renders recognising enum definitions more difficult.

6. Related work and future directions

Template metaprogramming was first investigated in Veldhuizen's articles [21]. Vandevorde and Josuttis introduced the concept of a tracer, which is a specially designed class that emits runtime messages when its operations are called [18]. When this type is passed to a template as an argument, the messages show in what order and how often the operations of that argument class are called. The authors also defined the notion of an archetype for a class whose sole purpose is checking that the template does not set up undesired requirements on its parameters.

To improve the compilation of heavily templated C++ programs Veldhuizen proposed alternative compilation models [20], each with a distinct tradeoff of compile time, code size, and code speed. Abrahams and Coelho compared compilers and compilation strategies in [29]. They pointed to such important parameters, like reinstantiation overhead, and symbol size.

In their book on boost [1] Abrahams and Gurtovoy devoted a whole section to diagnostics, where the authors showed methods of generating textual output in the form of warning messages. They implemented the compile-time equivalent of the aforementioned runtime tracer (mpl::print). Compile-time performance was also investigated via a set of carefully selected test cases. The cost of memoization, memoized lookup, and instantiation was characterized and compared across various compilers.

Accuracy is a fundamental property of profilers. To minimize overhead of instrumentation and measurement we have to step forward to the modification of compilers. While instrumentation is a more portable solution, real industrial solutions we could imagine via compiler modifications only.

In this paper we have concentrated mostly on temporal properties of metaprogram execution. Memory consumption is at least as important as the run-time properties. We want to extend our researches to this area.

Using reliable template metaprogram profilers it is possible to describe the compile time characteristics of metaprogram algorithms. In STL, runtime complexity guarantees are part of the standard. Similar compile time guarantees for template metaprograms can largely improve practicability of template metaprograms.

In C++0x concepts will support constrained generics, i.e. the programmer may define concepts – requirements against template arguments. While this will be a long time desired functionality for C++ community, most notably programmers for the STL library, early tests warn that the new feature may increase compilation time. One of our future research plans involve the examination of this language feature, especially the compile-time consequences the heavy usage of concept maps, and searching for best practices.

7. Conclusion

C++ template metaprogramming is a new, evolving programming paradigm. It extends traditional runtime programming with numerous advantages, like implementing active libraries, optimizing numerical operations, and enhancing compile-time checking possibilities. Since metaprograms typically show bad compile-time performance, identifying the bottlenecks is a crucial task.

In this article we evaluated profiling techniques applicable for C++ template metaprograms. Instrumenting the C++ source, collecting and measuring the emitted messages during compilation is a highly portable but limited possibility. Real profiling information can only be obtained with the help of the compiler. To demonstrate this possibility we modified the g++ compiler to produce profiling information on C++ template metaprograms.
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