



JVM Bytecode Interpretation				
JVM Instruction (examples)	Interpretation (by C code)	Stack top before	Stack top afterwards	
iconst_0	Stack[ sp++ ] = 0; PC++; // code needs 1 byte	() = don't care	(I) = int-value	
istore v	Stack[ fp + $v$ ] = Stack[sp ]; PC += 2; // needs 2 bytes	(I)	0	
iload v	Stack[ sp++ ] = Stack[ fp + v ]; PC += 2;	0	(I)	
iadd	Stack[sp-1] = Stack[sp] + Stack[sp-1]; sp; PC++;	(I, I)	(I)	
goto a	PC = <i>a</i> ;	0	0	
ifeq a	if (Stack[ sp ] == 0) PC = <i>a</i> ; else PC += 3;	(I)	0	
P. Fritzson, C. Kessler, IDA, Linköpings universitet. 5 TDDD55/TDDB44 Compiler Constru			iler Construction, 2011	

Just-In-Time (JIT) Compiling			
	A.k.a. dynamic translation		
	Program execution starts in interpreter as before		
•	Whenever control flow enters a new <b>unit</b> of bytecode (unit could be e.g. a class file, a function, a loop, or a basic block):		
	<ul> <li>Do not interpret it, but call the JIT compiler that translates it to target code and replaces the unit with a branch to the new target code</li> </ul>		
	JIT compiling overhead $\rightarrow$ delay at run-time		
	<ul> <li>paid once per unit (if code can be kept in memory)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>pays often only off if translated code is executed several times (e.g., a loop body)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Can also be done lazily: Interpret the unit when executed for the first time. When re-entering the unit, JIT-compile.</li> </ul>		

- Or pre-compile/pre-JIT to native code ahead of time
- Trade-off:
- JIT-generated code quality vs. JIT compiler speed (run-time delay)

## Just-In-Time (JIT) Compiling (cont.)



- Typically performance boost by at least one order of magnitude
- Typically still somewhat slower, but may even be faster than statically compiled code in some cases
  - Can use on-line information from performance counters (e.g. #cache misses) for dynamic re-optimization and memory re-layout
- Example for Java: Sun JDK HotSpot JVM; for C#: .NET CLR, NGEN