A File is Not a File: Understanding the I/O Behavior of Apple Desktop Applications

Tyler Harter, Chris Dragga, Michael Vaughn,
Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau
Department of Computer Sciences
University of Wisconsin, Madison
{harter, dragga, vaughn, dusseau, remzi}@cs.wisc.edu

ABSTRACT

We analyze the I/O behavior of *iBench*, a new collection of productivity and multimedia application workloads. Our analysis reveals a number of differences between iBench and typical file-system workload studies, including the complex organization of modern files, the lack of pure sequential access, the influence of underlying frameworks on I/O patterns, the widespread use of file synchronization and atomic operations, and the prevalence of threads. Our results have strong ramifications for the design of next generation local and cloud-based storage systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

The design and implementation of file and storage systems has long been at the forefront of computer systems research. Innovations such as namespace-based locality [21], crash consistency via journaling [15, 29] and copy-on-write [7, 34], checksums and redundancy for reliability [5, 7, 26, 30], scalable on-disk structures [37], distributed file systems [16, 35], and scalable cluster-based storage systems [9, 14, 18] have greatly influenced how data is managed and stored within modern computer systems.

Much of this work in file systems over the past three decades has been shaped by *measurement*: the deep and detailed analysis of workloads [4, 10, 11, 16, 19, 25, 33, 36, 39]. One excellent example is found in work on the Andrew File System [16]; detailed analysis of an early AFS prototype led to the next-generation protocol, including the key innovation of callbacks. Measurement helps us understand the systems of today so we can build improved systems for tomorrow.

Whereas most studies of file systems focus on the corporate or academic intranet, most file-system users work in the more mundane environment of the *home*, accessing data via desktop PCs, laptops, and compact devices such as tablet computers and mobile phones. Despite the large number of previous studies, little is known about home-user applications and their I/O patterns.

Home-user applications are important today, and their importance will increase as more users store data not only on local devices but also in the cloud. Users expect to run similar applications across desktops, laptops, and phones; therefore, the behavior of these applications will affect virtually every system with which a user interacts. I/O behavior is especially important to understand since it greatly impacts how users perceive overall system latency and application performance [12].

While a study of how users typically exercise these applications would be interesting, the first step is to perform a detailed study of I/O behavior under typical but controlled workload tasks. This style of *application study*, common in the field of computer architecture [40], is different from the *workload study* found in systems research, and can yield deeper insight into how the applications are constructed and how file and storage systems need to be designed in response.

Home-user applications are fundamentally large and complex, containing millions of lines of code [20]. In contrast, traditional UNIX-based applications are designed to be simple, to perform one task well, and to be strung together to perform more complex tasks [32]. This modular approach of UNIX applications has not prevailed [17]: modern applications are standalone monoliths, providing a rich and continuously evolving set of features to demanding users. Thus, it is beneficial to study each application individually to ascertain its behavior.

In this paper, we present the first in-depth analysis of the I/O behavior of modern home-user applications; we focus on productivity applications (for word processing, spreadsheet manipulation, and presentation creation) and multimedia software (for digital music, movie editing, and photo management). Our analysis centers on two Apple software suites: iWork, consisting of Pages, Numbers, and Keynote; and iLife, which contains iPhoto, iTunes, and iMovie. As Apple's market share grows [38], these applications form the core of an increasingly popular set of workloads; as device convergence continues, similar forms of these applications are likely to access user files from both stationary machines and moving cellular devices. We call our collection the *iBench task suite.*

To investigate the I/O behavior of the iBench suite, we build an instrumentation framework on top of the powerful DTrace tracing system found inside Mac OS X [8]. DTrace allows us not only to monitor system calls made by each traced application, but also to examine stack traces, in-kernel functions such as page-ins and page-outs, and other details required to ensure accuracy and completeness. We also develop an application harness based on AppleScript [3] to drive each application in the repeatable and automated fashion that is key to any study of GUI-based applications [12].

Our careful study of the tasks in the iBench suite has enabled us to make a number of interesting observations about how applications access and manipulate stored data. In addition to confirming standard past findings (*e.g.*, most files are small; most bytes accessed are from large files [4]), we find the following new results.

A file is not a file. Modern applications manage large databases of information organized into complex directory trees. Even simple word-processing documents, which appear to users as a "file", are in actuality small file systems containing many sub-files (*e.g.*, a Microsoft .doc file is actually a FAT file system containing pieces of the document). File systems should be cognizant of such hidden structure in order to lay out and access data in these complex files more effectively.

Sequential access is not sequential. Building on the trend noticed by Vogels for Windows NT [39], we observe that even for streaming media workloads, "pure" sequential access is increasingly rare. Since file formats often include metadata in headers, applications often read and re-read the first portion of a file before streaming through its contents. Prefetching and other optimizations might benefit from a deeper knowledge of these file formats.

Auxiliary files dominate. Applications help users create, modify, and organize content, but user files represent a small fraction of the files touched by modern applications. Most files are helper files that applications use to provide a rich graphical experience, support multiple languages, and record history and other metadata. File-system placement strategies might reduce seeks by grouping the hundreds of helper files used by an individual application.

Writes are often forced. As the importance of home data increases (*e.g.*, family photos), applications are less willing to simply write data and hope it is eventually flushed to disk. We find that most written data is explicitly forced to disk by the application; for example, iPhoto calls `fsync` thousands of times in even the simplest of tasks. For file systems and storage, the days of delayed writes [22] may be over; new ideas are needed to support applications that desire durability.

Renaming is popular. Home-user applications commonly use atomic operations, in particular `rename`, to present a consistent view of files to users. For file systems, this may mean that transactional capabilities [23] are needed. It may also necessitate a rethinking of traditional means of file locality; for example, placing a file on disk based on its parent directory [21] does not work as expected when the file is first created in a temporary location and then renamed.

Multiple threads perform I/O. Virtually all of the applications we study issue I/O requests from a number of threads; a few applications launch I/Os from hundreds of threads. Part of this usage stems from the GUI-based nature of these applications; it is well known that threads are required to perform long-latency operations in the background to keep the GUI responsive [24]. Thus, file and storage systems should be thread-aware so they can better allocate bandwidth.

Frameworks influence I/O. Modern applications are often developed in sophisticated IDEs and leverage powerful libraries, such as Cocoa and Carbon. Whereas UNIX-style applications often directly invoke system calls to read and write files, modern libraries put more code between applications and the underlying file system; for example, including `"cocoa.h"` in a Mac application imports 112,047 lines of code from 689 different files [28]. Thus, the behavior of the framework, and not just the application, determines I/O patterns. We find that the default behavior of some Cocoa APIs induces extra I/O and possibly unnecessary (and costly) synchronizations to disk. In addition, use of different libraries for similar tasks within an application can lead to inconsistent behavior between those tasks. Future storage design should take these libraries and frameworks into account.

This paper contains four major contributions. First, we describe a general tracing framework for creating benchmarks based on interactive tasks that home users may perform (*e.g.*, importing songs, exporting video clips, saving documents). Second, we deconstruct the I/O behavior of the tasks in iBench; we quantify the I/O behavior of each task in numerous ways, including the types of files accessed (*e.g.*, counts and sizes), the access patterns (*e.g.*, read/write, sequentiality, and preallocation), transactional properties (*e.g.*, durability and atomicity), and threading. Third, we describe how these qualitative changes in I/O behavior may impact the design of future systems. Finally, we present the 34 traces from the iBench task suite; by making these traces publicly available and easy to use, we hope to improve the design, implementation, and evaluation of the next generation of local and cloud storage systems:

`http://www.cs.wisc.edu/adsl/Traces/ibench`

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We begin by presenting a detailed timeline of the I/O operations performed by one task in the iBench suite; this motivates the need for a systematic study of home-user applications. We next describe our methodology for creating the iBench task suite. We then spend the majority of the paper quantitatively analyzing the I/O characteristics of the full iBench suite. Finally, we summarize the implications of our findings on file-system design.



Figure 1: **Pages Saving A Word Document.** The top graph shows the 75-second timeline of the entire run, while the bottom graph is a magnified view of seconds 54 to 58. In the top graph, annotations on the left categorize files by type and indicate file count and amount of I/O; annotations on the right show threads. Black bars are file accesses (reads and writes), with thickness logarithmically proportional to bytes of I/O. / is an `fsync`; \ is a `rename`; X is both. In the bottom graph, individual reads and writes to the .doc file are shown. Vertical bar position and bar length represent the offset within the file and number of bytes touched. Thick white bars are reads; thin gray bars are writes. Repeated runs are marked with the number of repetitions. Annotations on the right indicate the name of each file section.

2. CASE STUDY

The I/O characteristics of modern home-user applications are distinct from those of UNIX applications studied in the past. To motivate the need for a new study, we investigate the complex I/O behavior of a single representative task. Specifically, we report in detail the I/O performed over time by the Pages (4.0.3) application, a word processor, running on Mac OS X Snow Leopard (10.6.2) as it creates a blank document, inserts 15 JPEG images each of size 2.5MB, and saves the document as a Microsoft .doc file.

Figure 1 shows the I/O this task performs (see the caption for a description of the symbols used). The top portion of the figure illustrates the accesses performed over the full lifetime of the task: at a high level, it shows that more than 385 files spanning six different categories are accessed by eleven different threads, with many intervening calls to `fsync` and `rename`. The bottom portion of the figure magnifies a short time interval, showing the reads and writes performed by a single thread accessing the primary .doc productivity file. From this one experiment, we illustrate each finding described in the introduction. We first focus on the single access that saves the user's document (bottom), and then consider the broader context surrounding this file save, where we observe a flurry of accesses to hundreds of helper files (top).

A file is not a file. Focusing on the magnified timeline of reads and writes to the productivity .doc file, we see that the file format comprises more than just a simple file. Microsoft .doc files are based on the FAT file system and allow bundling of multiple files in the single .doc file. This .doc file contains a directory (Root), three streams for large data (WordDocument, Data, and 1Table), and a stream for small data (Ministream). Space is allocated in the file with three sections: a file allocation table (FAT), a double-indirect FAT (DIF) region, and a ministream allocation region (Mini).

Sequential access is not sequential. The complex FAT-based file format causes random access patterns in several ways: first, the header is updated at the beginning and end of the magnified access; second, data from individual streams is fragmented throughout the file; and third, the 1Table stream is updated before and after each image is appended to the WordDocument stream.

Auxiliary files dominate. Although saving the single .doc we have been considering is the sole purpose of this task, we now turn our attention to the top timeline and see that 385 different files are accessed. There are several reasons for this multitude of files. First, Pages provides a rich graphical experience involving many images and other forms of multimedia; together with the 15 inserted JPEGs, this requires 118 multimedia files. Second, users want to use Pages in their native language, so application text is not hard-coded into the executable but is instead stored in 25 different .strings files. Third, to save user preferences and other metadata, Pages uses a SQLite database (2 files) and a number of key-value stores (218 .plist files).

Writes are often forced; renaming is popular. Pages uses both of these actions to enforce basic transactional guarantees. It uses `fsync` to flush write data to disk, making it durable; it uses `rename` to atomically replace old files with new files so that a file never contains inconsistent data. The timeline shows these invocations numerous times. First, Pages regularly uses `fsync` and `rename` when updating the key-value store of a .plist file. Second, `fsync` is used on the SQLite database. Third, for each of the 15 image insertions, Pages calls `fsync` on a file named "tempData" (classified as "other") to update its automatic backup.

Multiple threads perform I/O. Pages is a multi-threaded application and issues I/O requests from many different threads during the experiment. Using multiple threads for I/O allows Pages to avoid blocking while I/O requests are outstanding. Examining the I/O behavior across threads, we see that Thread 1 performs the most significant portion of I/O, but ten other threads are also involved. In most cases, a single thread exclusively accesses a file, but it is not uncommon for multiple threads to share a file.

Frameworks influence I/O. Pages was developed in a rich programming environment where frameworks such as Cocoa or Carbon are used for I/O; these libraries impact I/O patterns in ways the developer might not expect. For example, although the application developers did not bother to use `fsync` or `rename` when saving the user's work in the .doc file, the Cocoa library regularly uses these calls to atomically and durably update relatively unimportant metadata, such as "recently opened" lists stored in .plist files. As another example, when Pages tries to read data in 512-byte chunks from the .doc, each read goes through the `STDIO` library, which only reads in 4 KB chunks. Thus, when Pages attempts to read one chunk from the 1Table stream, seven unrequested chunks from the WordDocument stream are also incidentally read (offset 12039 KB). In other cases, regions of the .doc file are repeatedly accessed unnecessarily. For example, around the 3KB offset, read/write pairs occur dozens of times. Pages uses a library to write 2-byte words; each time a word is written, the library reads, updates, and writes back an entire 512-byte chunk. Finally, we see evidence of redundancy between libraries: even though Pages has a backing SQLite database for some of its properties, it also uses .plist files, which function across Apple applications as generic property stores.

This one detailed experiment has shed light on a number of interesting I/O behaviors that indicate that home-user applications are indeed different than traditional workloads. A new workload suite is needed that more accurately reflects these applications.

3. IBENCH TASK SUITE

Our goal in constructing the iBench task suite is two-fold. First, we would like iBench to be *representative* of the tasks performed by home users. For this reason, iBench contains popular applications from the iLife and iWork suites for entertainment and productivity. Second, we would like iBench to be relatively *simple* for others to use for file and storage system analysis. For this reason, we automate the interactions of a home user and collect the resulting traces of I/O system calls. The traces are available online at this site: `http://www.cs.wisc.edu/adsl/Traces/ibench`. We now describe in more detail how we met these two goals.

3.1 Representative

To capture the I/O behavior of home users, iBench models the actions of a "reasonable" user interacting with iPhoto, iTunes, iMovie, Pages, Numbers, and Keynote. Since the research community does not yet have data on the exact distribution of tasks that home users perform, iBench contains tasks that we believe are common and uses files with sizes that can be justified for a reasonable user. iBench contains 34 different tasks, each representing a home user performing one distinct operation. If desired, these tasks could be combined to create more complex workflows and I/O workloads. The six applications and corresponding tasks are as follows.

iLife iPhoto 8.1.1 (419): digital photo album and photo manipulation software. iPhoto stores photos in a library that contains the data for the photos (which can be in a variety of formats, including JPG, TIFF, and PNG), a directory of modified files, a directory of scaled down images, and two files of thumbnail images. The library stores metadata in a SQLite database. iBench contains six tasks exercising user actions typical for iPhoto: starting the application and importing, duplicating, editing, viewing, and deleting photos in the library. These tasks modify both the image files and the underlying database. Each of the iPhoto tasks operates on 400 2.5 MB photos, representing a user who has imported 12 megapixel photos (2.5 MB each) from a full 1 GB flash card on his or her camera.

iLife iTunes 9.0.3 (15): a media player capable of both audio and video playback. iTunes organizes its files in a private library and supports most common music formats (*e.g.*, MP3, AIFF, WAVE, AAC, and MPEG-4). iTunes does not employ a database, keeping media metadata and playlists in both a binary and an XML file. iBench contains five tasks for iTunes: starting iTunes, importing and playing an album of MP3 songs, and importing and playing an MPEG-4 movie. Importing requires copying files into the library directory and, for music, analyzing each song file for gapless playback. The music tasks operate over an album (or playlist) of ten songs while the movie tasks use a single 3-minute movie.

iLife iMovie 8.0.5 (820): video editing software. iMovie stores its data in a library that contains directories for raw footage and projects, and files containing video footage thumbnails. iMovie supports both MPEG-4 and Quicktime files. iBench contains four tasks for iMovie: starting iMovie, importing an MPEG-4 movie, adding a clip from this movie into a project, and exporting a project to MPEG-4. The tasks all use a 3-minute movie because this is a typical length found from home users on video-sharing websites.

iWork Pages 4.0.3 (766): a word processor. Pages uses a ZIP-based file format and can export to DOC, PDF, RTF, and basic text. iBench includes eight tasks for Pages: starting up, creating and saving, opening, and exporting documents with and without images and with different formats. The tasks use 15 page documents.

iWork Numbers 2.0.3 (332): a spreadsheet application. Numbers organizes its files with a ZIP-based format and exports to XLS and PDF. The four iBench tasks for Numbers include starting Numbers, generating a spreadsheet and saving it, opening the spreadsheet, and exporting that spreadsheet to XLS. To model a possible home user working on a budget, the tasks utilize a five page spreadsheet with one column graph per sheet.

iWork Keynote 5.0.3 (791): a presentation and slideshow application. Keynote saves to a .key ZIP-based format and exports to Microsoft's PPT format. The seven iBench tasks for Keynote include starting Keynote, creating slides with and without images, opening and playing presentations, and exporting to PPT. Each Keynote task uses a 20-slide presentation.

		Name	Description	Files	(MB)	Accesses	(MB)	RD%	WR%	Accesses / CPU Sec	I/O MB / CPU Sec
iLife	iPhoto	Start	Open iPhoto with library of 400 photos	779	(336.7)	828	(25.4)	78.8	21.2	**151.1**	4.6
		Imp	Import 400 photos into empty library	5900	(1966.9)	8709	(3940.3)	74.4	25.6	26.7	**12.1**
		Dup	Duplicate 400 photos from library	2928	(1963.9)	5736	(2076.2)	52.4	47.6	**237.9**	**86.1**
		Edit	Sequentially edit 400 photos from library	12119	(4646.7)	18927	(12182.9)	69.8	30.2	19.6	**12.6**
		Del	Sequentially delete 400 photos; empty trash	15246	(23.0)	15247	(25.0)	21.8	78.2	**280.9**	0.5
		View	Sequentially view 400 photos	2929	(1006.4)	3347	(1005.0)	98.1	1.9	24.1	**7.2**
	iTunes	Start	Open iTunes with 10 song album	143	(184.4)	195	(9.3)	54.7	45.3	**72.4**	3.4
		ImpS	Import 10 song album to library	68	(204.9)	139	(264.5)	66.3	33.7	**75.2**	**143.1**
		ImpM	Import 3 minute movie to library	41	(67.4)	57	(42.9)	48.0	52.0	**152.4**	**114.6**
		PlayS	Play album of 10 songs	61	(103.6)	80	(90.9)	96.9	3.1	0.4	0.5
		PlayM	Play 3 minute movie	56	(77.9)	69	(32.0)	92.3	7.7	2.2	1.0
	iMovie	Start	Open iMovie with 3 minute clip in project	433	(223.3)	786	(29.4)	99.9	0.1	**134.8**	**5.0**
		Imp	Import 3 minute .m4v (20MB) to "Events"	184	(440.1)	383	(122.3)	55.6	44.4	29.3	**9.3**
		Add	Paste 3 minute clip from "Events" to project	210	(58.3)	547	(2.2)	47.8	52.2	**357.8**	1.4
		Exp	Export 3 minute video clip	70	(157.9)	546	(229.9)	55.1	44.9	2.3	1.0
iWork	Pages	Start	Open Pages	218	(183.7)	228	(2.3)	99.9	0.1	**97.7**	1.0
		New	Create 15 text page document; save as .pages	135	(1.6)	157	(1.0)	73.3	26.7	**50.8**	0.3
		NewP	Create 15 JPG document; save as .pages	408	(112.0)	997	(180.9)	60.7	39.3	**54.6**	**9.9**
		Open	Open 15 text page document	103	(0.8)	109	(0.6)	99.5	0.5	**57.6**	0.3
		PDF	Export 15 page document as .pdf	107	(1.5)	115	(0.9)	91.0	9.0	**41.3**	0.3
		PDFP	Export 15 JPG document as .pdf	404	(77.4)	965	(110.9)	67.4	32.6	**49.7**	**5.7**
		DOC	Export 15 page document as .doc	112	(1.0)	121	(1.0)	87.9	12.1	**44.4**	0.4
		DOCP	Export 15 JPG document as .doc	385	(111.3)	952	(183.8)	61.1	38.9	**46.3**	**8.9**
	Numbers	Start	Open Numbers	283	(179.9)	360	(2.6)	99.6	0.4	**115.5**	0.8
		New	Save 5 sheets/column graphs as .numbers	269	(4.9)	313	(2.8)	90.7	9.3	9.6	0.1
		Open	Open 5 sheet spreadsheet	119	(1.3)	137	(1.3)	99.8	0.2	**48.7**	0.5
		XLS	Export 5 sheets/column graphs as .xls	236	(4.6)	272	(2.7)	94.9	5.1	8.5	0.1
	Keynote	Start	Open Keynote	517	(183.0)	681	(1.1)	99.8	0.2	**229.8**	0.4
		New	Create 20 text slides; save as .key	637	(12.1)	863	(5.4)	92.4	7.6	**129.1**	0.8
		NewP	Create 20 JPG slides; save as .key	654	(92.9)	901	(103.3)	66.8	33.2	**70.8**	**8.1**
		Play	Open and play presentation of 20 text slides	318	(11.5)	385	(4.9)	99.8	0.2	**95.0**	1.2
		PlayP	Open and play presentation of 20 JPG slides	321	(45.4)	388	(55.7)	69.6	30.4	**72.4**	**10.4**
		PPT	Export 20 text slides as .ppt	685	(12.8)	918	(10.1)	78.8	21.2	**115.2**	1.3
		PPTP	Export 20 JPG slides as .ppt	723	(110.6)	996	(124.6)	57.6	42.4	**61.0**	**7.6**

Table 1: **34 Tasks of the iBench Suite.** The table summarizes the 34 tasks of iBench, specifying the application, a short name for the task, and a longer description of the actions modeled. The I/O is characterized according to the number of files read or written, the sum of the maximum sizes of all accessed files, the number of file accesses that read or write data, the number of bytes read or written, the percentage of I/O bytes that are part of a read (or write), and the rate of I/O per CPU-second in terms of both file accesses and bytes. Each core is counted individually, so at most 2 CPU-seconds can be counted per second on our dual-core test machine. CPU utilization is measured with the UNIX `top` utility, which in rare cases produces anomalous CPU utilization snapshots; those values are ignored.

Table 1 contains a brief description of each of the 34 iBench tasks as well as the basic I/O characteristics of each task when running on Mac OS X Snow Leopard 10.6.2. The table illustrates that the iBench tasks perform a significant amount of I/O. Most tasks access hundreds of files, which in aggregate contain tens or hundreds of megabytes of data. The tasks typically access files hundreds of times. The tasks perform widely differing amounts of I/O, from less than a megabyte to more than a gigabyte. Most of the tasks perform many more reads than writes. Finally, the tasks exhibit high I/O throughput, often transferring tens of megabytes of data for every second of computation.

3.2 Easy to Use

To enable other system evaluators to easily use these tasks, the iBench suite is packaged as a set of 34 system call traces. To ensure reproducible results, the 34 user tasks were first automated with AppleScript, a general-purpose GUI scripting language. AppleScript provides generic commands to emulate mouse clicks through menus and application-specific commands to capture higher-level operations. Application-specific commands bypass a small amount of I/O by skipping dialog boxes; however, we use them whenever possible for expediency.

The system call traces were gathered using DTrace [8], a kernel and user level dynamic instrumentation tool. DTrace is used to instrument the entry and exit points of all system calls dealing with the file system; it also records the current state of the system and the parameters passed to and returned from each call.

While tracing with DTrace was generally straightforward, we addressed four challenges in collecting the iBench traces. First, file sizes are not always available to DTrace; thus, we record every file's initial size and compute subsequent file size changes caused by system calls such as `write` or `ftruncate`. Second, iTunes uses the `ptrace` system call to disable tracing; we circumvent this block by using `gdb` to insert a breakpoint that automatically returns without calling `ptrace`. Third, the `volfs` pseudo-file system in HFS+ (Hierarchical File System) allows files to be opened via their inode number instead of a file name; to include pathnames in the trace, we instrument the `build_path` function to obtain the full path when the task is run. Fourth, tracing system calls misses I/O resulting from memory-mapped files; therefore, we purged memory and instrumented kernel page-in functions to measure the amount of memory-mapped file activity. We found that the amount of memory-mapped I/O is negligible in most tasks; we thus do not include this I/O in the iBench traces or analysis.

To provide reproducible results, the traces must be run on a single file-system image. Therefore, the iBench suite also contains snapshots of the initial directories to be restored before each run; initial state is critical in file-system benchmarking [1].

4. ANALYSIS OF IBENCH TASKS

The iBench task suite enables us to study the I/O behavior of a large set of home-user actions. As shown from the timeline of I/O behavior for one particular task in Section 2, these tasks are likely to access files in complex ways. To characterize this complex behavior in a quantitative manner across the entire suite of 34 tasks, we focus on answering four categories of questions.

- What different types of files are accessed and what are the sizes of these files?
- How are files accessed for reads and writes? Are files accessed sequentially? Is space preallocated?
- What are the transactional properties? Are writes flushed with `fsync` or performed atomically?
- How do multi-threaded applications distribute I/O across different threads?

Answering these questions has two benefits. First, the answers can guide file and storage system developers to target their systems better to home-user applications. Second, the characterization will help users of iBench to select the most appropriate traces for evaluation and to understand their resulting behavior.

All measurements were performed on a Mac Mini running Mac OS X Snow Leopard version 10.6.2 and the HFS+ file system. The machine has 2 GB of memory and a 2.26 GHz Intel Core Duo processor.

4.1 Nature of Files

Our analysis begins by characterizing the high-level behavior of the iBench tasks. In particular, we study the different types of files opened by each iBench task as well as the sizes of those files.

4.1.1 File Types

The iLife and iWork applications store data across a variety of files in a number of different formats; for example, iLife applications tend to store their data in libraries (or data directories) unique to each user, while iWork applications organize their documents in proprietary ZIP-based files. The extent to which tasks access different types of files greatly influences their I/O behavior.

To understand accesses to different file types, we place each file into one of six categories, based on file name extensions and usage. *Multimedia* files contain images (*e.g.*, JPEG), songs (*e.g.*, MP3, AIFF), and movies (*e.g.*, MPEG-4). *Productivity* files are documents (*e.g.*, .pages, DOC, PDF), spreadsheets (*e.g.*, .numbers, XLS), and presentations (*e.g.*, .key, PPT). *SQLite* files are database files. *Plist* files are property-list files in XML containing key-value pairs for user preferences and application properties. *Strings* files contain strings for localization of application text. Finally, *Other* contains miscellaneous files such as plain text, logs, files without extensions, and binary files.

Figure 2 shows the frequencies with which tasks open and access files of each type; most tasks perform hundreds of these accesses. Multimedia file opens are common in all workloads, though they seldom predominate, even in the multimedia-heavy iLife applications. Conversely, opens of productivity files are rare, even in iWork applications that use them; this is likely because most iWork tasks create or view a single productivity file. Because .plist files act as generic helper files, they are relatively common. SQLite files only have a noticeable presence in iPhoto, where they account for a substantial portion of the observed opens. Strings files occupy a significant minority of most workloads (except iPhoto and iTunes). Finally, between 5% and 20% of files are of type "Other" (except for iTunes, where they are more prevalent).

Figure 3 displays the percentage of I/O bytes accessed for each file type. In bytes, multimedia I/O dominates most of the iLife tasks, while productivity I/O has a significant presence in the iWork tasks; file descriptors on multimedia and productivity files tend to receive large amounts of I/O. SQLite, Plist, and Strings files have a smaller share of the total I/O in bytes relative to the number of opened files; this implies that tasks access only a small quantity of data for each of these files opened (*e.g.*, several key-value pairs in a .plist). In most tasks, files classified as "Other" receive a more significant portion of the I/O (the exception is iTunes).

Summary: Home applications access a wide variety of file types, generally opening multimedia files the most frequently. iLife tasks tend to access bytes primarily from multimedia or files classified as "Other"; iWork tasks access bytes from a broader range of file types, with some emphasis on productivity files.



Figure 2: **Types of Files Accessed By Number of Opens.** This plot shows the relative frequency with which file descriptors are opened upon different file types. The number at the end of each bar indicates the total number of unique file descriptors opened on files.



Figure 3: **Types of Files Opened By I/O Size.** This plot shows the relative frequency with which each task performs I/O upon different file types. The number at the end of each bar indicates the total bytes of I/O accessed.



Figure 4: **File Sizes, Weighted by Number of Accesses.** This graph shows the number of accessed files in each file size range upon access ends. The total number of file accesses appears at the end of the bars. Note that repeatedly-accessed files are counted multiple times, and entire file sizes are counted even upon partial file accesses.



Figure 5: **File Sizes, Weighted by the Bytes in Accessed Files.** This graph shows the portion of bytes in accessed files of each size range upon access ends. The sum of the file sizes appears at the end of the bars. This number differs from total file footprint since files change size over time and repeatedly accessed file are counted multiple times.

4.1.2 File Sizes

Large and small files present distinct challenges to the file system. For large files, finding contiguous space can be difficult, while for small files, minimizing initial seek time is more important. We investigate two different questions regarding file size. First, what is the distribution of file sizes accessed by each task? Second, what portion of accessed bytes resides in files of various sizes?

To answer these questions, we record file sizes when each unique file descriptor is closed. We categorize sizes as very small ($<$ 4KB), small ($<$ 64KB), medium ($<$ 1MB), large ($<$ 10MB), or very large ($\geq$ 10MB). We track how many accesses are to files in each category and how many of the bytes belong to files in each category.

Figure 4 shows the number of accesses to files of each size. Accesses to very small files are extremely common, especially for iWork, accounting for over half of all the accesses in every iWork task. Small file accesses have a significant presence in the iLife tasks. The large quantity of very small and small files is due to frequent use of .plist files that store preferences, settings, and other application data; these files often fill just one or two 4 KB pages.

Figure 5 shows the proportion of the files in which the bytes of accessed files reside. Large and very large files dominate every startup workload and nearly every task that processes multimedia files. Small files account for few bytes and very small files are essentially negligible.

Summary: Agreeing with many previous studies (e.g., [4]), we find that while applications tend to open many very small files ($<$ 4 KB), most of the bytes accessed are in large files ($>$ 1 MB).

4.2 Access Patterns

We next examine how the nature of file accesses has changed, studying the read and write patterns of home applications. These patterns include whether files are used for reading, writing, or both; whether files are accessed sequentially or randomly; and finally, whether or not blocks are preallocated via hints to the file system.

4.2.1 File Accesses

One basic characteristic of our workloads is the division between reading and writing on open file descriptors. If an application uses an open file only for reading (or only for writing) or performs more activity on file descriptors of a certain type, then the file system may be able to make more intelligent memory and disk allocations.

To determine these characteristics, we classify each opened file descriptor based on the types of accesses–read, write, or both read and write–performed during its lifetime. We also ignore the actual flags used when opening the file since we found they do not accurately reflect behavior; in all workloads, almost all write-only file descriptors were opened with `O_RDWR`. We measure both the proportional usage of each type of file descriptor and the relative amount of I/O performed on each.

Figure 6 shows how many file descriptors are used for each type of access. The overwhelming majority of file descriptors are used exclusively for reading or writing; read-write file descriptors are quite uncommon. Overall, read-only file descriptors are the most common across a majority of workloads; write-only file descriptors are popular in some iLife tasks, but are rarely used in iWork.

We observe different patterns when analyzing the amount of I/O performed on each type of file descriptor, as shown in Figure 7. First, even though iWork tasks have very few write-only file descriptors, they often write significant amounts of I/O to those descriptors. Second, even though read-write file descriptors are rare, when present, they account for relatively large portions of total I/O (particularly when exporting to .doc, .xls, and .ppt).

Summary: While many files are opened with the `O_RDWR` flag, most of them are subsequently accessed write-only; thus, file open flags cannot be used to predict how a file will be accessed. However, when an open file is both read and written by a task, the amount of traffic to that file occupies a significant portion of the total I/O. Finally, the rarity of read-write file descriptors may derive in part from the tendency of applications to write to a temporary file which they then rename as the target file, instead of overwriting the target file; we explore this tendency more in §4.3.2.



Figure 6: **Read/Write Distribution By File Descriptor.** File descriptors can be used only for reads, only for writes, or for both operations. This plot shows the percentage of file descriptors in each category. This is based on usage, not `open` flags. Any duplicate file descriptors (*e.g.*, created by `dup`) are treated as one and file descriptors on which the program does not perform any subsequent action are ignored.



Figure 7: **Read/Write Distribution By Bytes.** The graph shows how I/O bytes are distributed among the three access categories. The unshaded dark gray indicates bytes read as a part of read-only accesses. Similarly, unshaded light gray indicates bytes written in write-only accesses. The shaded regions represent bytes touched in read-write accesses, and are divided between bytes read and bytes written.



Figure 8: **Read Sequentiality.** This plot shows the portion of file read accesses (weighted by bytes) that are sequentially accessed.



Figure 9: **Write Sequentiality.** This plot shows the portion of file write accesses (weighted by bytes) that are sequentially accessed.

4.2.2 Sequentiality

Historically, files have usually been read or written entirely sequentially [4]. We next determine whether sequential accesses are dominant in iBench. We measure this by examining all reads and writes performed on each file descriptor and noting the percentage of files accessed in strict sequential order (weighted by bytes).

We display our measurements for read and write sequentiality in Figures 8 and 9, respectively. The portions of the bars in black indicate the percent of file accesses that exhibit pure sequentiality. We observe high read sequentiality in iWork, but little in iLife (with the exception of the Start tasks and iTunes Import). The inverse is true for writes: most iLife tasks exhibit high sequentiality; iWork accesses are largely non-sequential.

Investigating the access patterns to multimedia files more closely, we note that many iLife applications first touch a small header before accessing the entire file sequentially. To better reflect this behavior, we define an access to a file as "nearly sequential" when at least 95% of the bytes read or written to a file form a sequential run. We found that a large number of accesses fall into the "nearly sequential" category given a 95% threshold; the results do not change much with lower thresholds.

The slashed portions of the bars in Figures 8 and 9 show observed sequentiality with a 95% threshold. Tasks with heavy use of multimedia files exhibit greater sequentiality with the 95% threshold for both reading and writing. In several workloads (mainly iPhoto and iTunes), the I/O classified almost entirely as non-sequential with a 100% threshold is classified as nearly sequential. The difference for iWork applications is much less striking, indicating that accesses are more random.

Summary: A substantial number of tasks contain purely sequential accesses. When the definition of a sequential access is loosened such that only 95% of bytes must be consecutive, then even more tasks contain primarily sequential accesses. These "nearly sequential" accesses result from metadata stored at the beginning of complex multimedia files: tasks frequently touch bytes near the beginning of multimedia files before sequentially reading or writing the bulk of the file.

4.2.3 Preallocation

One of the difficulties file systems face when allocating contiguous space for files is not knowing how much data will be written to those files. Applications can communicate this information by providing hints [27] to the file system to preallocate an appropriate amount of space. In this section, we quantify how often applications use preallocation hints and how often these hints are useful.

We instrument two calls usable for preallocation: `pwrite` and `ftruncate`. `pwrite` writes a single byte at an offset beyond the end of the file to indicate the future end of the file; `ftruncate` directly sets the file size. Sometimes a preallocation does not communicate anything useful to the file system because it is immediately followed by a single write call with all the data; we flag these preallocations as unnecessary.

Figure 10 shows the portion of file growth that is the result of preallocation. In all cases, preallocation was due to calls to `pwrite`; we never observed `ftruncate` preallocation. Overall, applications rarely preallocate space and preallocations are often useless.

The three tasks with significant preallocation are iPhoto Dup, iPhoto Edit, and iMovie Exp. iPhoto Dup and Edit both call a `copyPath` function in the Cocoa library that preallocates a large amount of space and then copies data by reading and writing it in 1 MB chunks. iPhoto Dup sometimes uses `copyPath` to copy scaled-down images of size 50-100 KB; since these smaller files are copied with a single write, the preallocation does not communicate anything useful. iMovie Exp calls a Quicktime append function that preallocates space before writing the actual data; however, the data is appended in small 128 KB increments. Thus, the append is not split into multiple `write` calls; the preallocation is useless.



Figure 10: **Preallocation Hints..** The sizes of the bars indicate which portion of file extensions are preallocations; unnecessary preallocations are diagonally striped. The number atop each bar indicates the absolute amount preallocated.

Summary: Although preallocation has the potential to be useful, few tasks use it to provide hints, and a significant number of the hints that are provided are useless. The hints are provided inconsistently: although iPhoto and iMovie both use preallocation for some tasks, neither application uses preallocation during import.

4.3 Transactional Properties

In this section, we explore the degree to which the iBench tasks require transactional properties from the underlying file and storage system. In particular, we investigate the extent to which applications require writes to be durable; that is, how frequently they invoke calls to `fsync` and which APIs perform these calls. We also investigate the atomicity requirements of the applications, whether from renaming files or exchanging inodes.

4.3.1 Durability

Writes typically involve a trade-off between performance and durability. Applications that require write operations to complete quickly can write data to the file system's main memory buffers, which are lazily copied to the underlying storage system at a subsequent convenient time. Buffering writes in main memory has a wide range of performance advantages: writes to the same block may be coalesced, writes to files that are later deleted need not be performed, and random writes can be more efficiently scheduled.

On the other hand, applications that rely on durable writes can flush written data to the underlying storage layer with the `fsync` system call. The frequency of `fsync` calls and the number of bytes they synchronize directly affect performance: if `fsync` appears often and flushes only several bytes, then performance will suffer. Therefore, we investigate how modern applications use `fsync`.



Figure 11: **Percentage of Fsync Bytes.** The percentage of `fsync`'d bytes written to file descriptors is shown, broken down by cause. The value atop each bar shows total bytes synchronized.



Figure 12: **Fsync Sizes.** This plot shows a distribution of `fsync` sizes. The total number of `fsync` calls appears at the end of the bars.

Figure 11 shows the percentage of written data each task synchronizes with `fsync`. The graph further subdivides the source of the `fsync` activity into six categories. *SQLite* indicates that the SQLite database engine is responsible for calling `fsync`; *Archiving* indicates an archiving library frequently used when accessing ZIP formats; *Pref Sync* is the `PreferencesSynchronize` function call from the Cocoa library; *writeToFile* is the Cocoa call `writeToFile` with the `atomically` flag set; and finally, *FlushFork* is the Carbon `FSFlushFork` routine.

At the highest level, the figure indicates that half the tasks synchronize close to 100% of their written data while approximately two-thirds synchronize more than 60%. iLife tasks tend to synchronize many megabytes of data, while iWork tasks usually only synchronize tens of kilobytes (excluding tasks that handle images).

To delve into the APIs responsible for the `fsync` calls, we examine how each bar is subdivided. In iLife, the sources of `fsync` calls are quite varied: every category of API except for Archiving is represented in one of the tasks, and many of the tasks call multiple APIs which invoke `fsync`. In iWork, the sources are more consistent; the only sources are Pref Sync, SQLite, and Archiving (for manipulating compressed data).

Given that these tasks require durability for a significant percentage of their write traffic, we next investigate the frequency of `fsync` calls and how much data each individual call pushes to disk. Figure 12 groups `fsync` calls based on the amount of I/O performed on each file descriptor when `fsync` is called, and displays the relative percentage each category comprises of the total I/O.

These results show that iLife tasks call `fsync` frequently (from tens to thousands of times), while iWork tasks call `fsync` infrequently except when dealing with images. From these observations, we infer that calls to `fsync` are mostly associated with media. The majority of calls to `fsync` synchronize small amounts of data; only a few iLife tasks synchronize more than a megabyte of data in a single `fsync` call.

Summary: Developers want to ensure that data enters stable storage durably, and thus, these tasks synchronize a significant fraction of their data. Based on our analysis of the source of `fsync` calls, some calls may be incidental and an unintentional side-effect of the API (*e.g.*, those from SQLite or Pref Sync), but most are performed intentionally by the programmer. Furthermore, some of the tasks synchronize small amounts of data frequently, presenting a challenge for file systems.

4.3.2 Atomic Writes

Applications often require file changes to be atomic. In this section, we quantify how frequently applications use different techniques to achieve atomicity. We also identify cases where performing writes atomically can interfere with directory locality optimizations by moving files from their original directories. Finally, we identify the causes of atomic writes.

Applications can atomically update a file by first writing the desired contents to a temporary file and then using either the `rename` or `exchangedata` call to atomically replace the old file with the new file. With `rename`, the new file is given the same name as the old, deleting the original and replacing it. With `exchangedata`, the inode numbers assigned to the old file and the temporary file are swapped, causing the old path to point to the new data; this allows the file path to remain associated with the original inode number, which is necessary for some applications.

Figure 13 shows how much write I/O is performed atomically with `rename` or `exchangedata`; `rename` calls are further subdivided into those which keep the file in the same directory and those which do not. The results show that atomic writes are quite popular and that, in many workloads, all the writes are atomic. The breakdown of each bar shows that `rename` is frequent; a significant minority of the `rename` calls move files between directories. `exchangedata` is rare and used only by iTunes for a small fraction of file updates.



Figure 13: **Atomic Writes.** The portion of written bytes written atomically is shown, divided into groups: (1) `rename` leaving a file in the same directory; (2) `rename` causing a file to change directories; (3) `exchangedata` which never causes a directory change. The atomic file-write count appears atop each bar.



Figure 14: **Rename Causes.** This plot shows the portion of `rename` calls caused by each of the top four higher level functions used for atomic writes. The number of `rename` calls appears at the end of the bars.

We find that most of the `rename` calls causing directory changes occur when a file (*e.g.*, a document or spreadsheet) is saved at the user's request. We suspect different directories are used so that users are not confused by seeing temporary files in their personal directories. Interestingly, atomic writes are performed when files are saved to Apple formats, but not when exporting to Microsoft formats. We suspect that the interface between applications and the Microsoft libraries does not specify atomic operations well.

Figure 14 identifies the APIs responsible for atomic writes via `rename`. *Pref Sync*, from the Cocoa library, allows applications to save user and system wide settings in .plist files. *WriteToFile* and *movePath* are Cocoa routines and *FSRenameUnicode* is a Carbon routine. A solid majority of the atomic writes are caused by Pref Sync; this is an example of I/O behavior caused by the API rather than explicit programmer intention. The second most common atomic writer is writeToFile; in this case, the programmer is requesting atomicity but leaving the technique up to the library. Finally, in a small minority of cases, programmers perform atomic writes themselves by calling movePath or FSRenameUnicode, both of which are essentially `rename` wrappers.

Summary: Many of our tasks write data atomically, generally doing so by calling `rename`. The bulk of atomic writes result from API calls; while some of these hide the underlying nature of the write, others make it clear that they act atomically. Thus, developers desire atomicity for many operations, and file systems will need to either address the ensuing renames that accompany it or provide an alternative mechanism for it. In addition, the absence of atomic writes when writing to Microsoft formats highlights the inconsistencies that can result from the use of high level libraries.

4.4 Threads and Asynchronicity

Home-user applications are interactive and need to avoid blocking when I/O is performed. Asynchronous I/O and threads are often used to hide the latency of slow operations from users. For our final experiments, we investigate how often applications use asynchronous I/O libraries or multiple threads to avoid blocking.

Figure 15 shows the portion of read operations performed asynchronously with `aio_read`; none of the tasks use `aio_write`. We find that asynchronous I/O is used rarely and only by iLife applications. However, in those cases where asynchronous I/O is performed, it is used quite heavily.

Figure 16 investigates how threads are used by these tasks: specifically, the portion of I/O performed by each of the threads. The numbers at the tops of the bars report the number of threads performing I/O. iPhoto and iTunes leverage a significant number of threads for I/O, since many of their tasks are readily subdivided (*e.g.*, importing 400 different photos). Only a handful of tasks perform all their I/O from a single thread. For most tasks, a small number of threads are responsible for the majority of I/O.

Figure 17 shows the responsibilities of each thread that performs I/O, where a thread can be responsible for reading, writing, or both. The measurements show that significantly more threads are devoted to reading than to writing, with a fair number of threads responsible for both. These results indicate that threads are the preferred technique to avoiding blocking and that applications may be particularly concerned with avoiding blocking due to reads.

Summary: Our results indicate that iBench tasks are concerned with hiding long-latency operations from interactive users and that threads are the preferred method for doing so. Virtually all of the applications we study issue I/O requests from multiple threads, and some launch I/Os from hundreds of different threads.



Figure 15: **Asynchronous Reads..** This plot shows the percentage of read bytes read asynchronously via `aio_read`. The total amount of asynchronous I/O is provided at the end of the bars.



Figure 16: **I/O Distribution Among Threads..** The stacked bars indicate the percentage of total I/O performed by each thread. The I/O from the threads that do the most and second most I/O are dark and medium gray respectively, and the other threads are light gray. Black lines divide the I/O across the latter group; black areas appear when numerous threads do small amounts of I/O. The total number of threads that perform I/O is indicated next to the bars.



Figure 17: **Thread Type Distribution..** The plot categorizes threads that do I/O into three groups: threads that read, threads that write, or threads that both read and write. The total number of threads that perform I/O is indicated next to the bars.

5. RELATED WORK

Although our study is unique in its focus on the I/O behavior of individual applications, a body of similar work exists both in the field of file systems and in application studies. As mentioned earlier, our work builds upon that of Baker [4], Ousterhout [25], Vogels [39], and others who have conducted similar studies, providing an updated perspective on many of their findings. However, the majority of these focus on academic and engineering environments, which are likely to have noticeably different application profiles from the home environment. Some studies, like those by Ramakrishnan [31] and by Vogels, have included office workloads on personal computers; these are likely to feature applications similar to those in iWork, but are still unlikely to contain analogues to iLife products. None of these studies, however, look at the characteristics of individual application behaviors; instead, they analyze trends seen in prolonged usage. Thus, our study complements the breadth of this research with a more focused examination, providing specific information on the causes of the behaviors we observe, and is one of the first to address the interaction of multimedia applications with the file system.

In addition to these studies of dynamic workloads, a variety of papers have examined the static characteristics of file systems, starting with Satyanarayanan's analysis of files at Carnegie-Mellon University [36]. One of the most recent of these examined metadata characteristics on desktops at Microsoft over a five year time span, providing insight into file-system usage characteristics in a setting similar to the home [2]. This type of analysis provides insight into long term characteristics of files that ours cannot; a similar study for home systems would, in conjunction with our paper, provide a more complete image of how home applications interact with the file system.

While most file-system studies deal with aggregate workloads, our examination of application-specific behaviors has precedent in a number of hardware studies. In particular, Flautner *et al.*'s [13] and Blake *et al.*'s [6] studies of parallelism in desktop applications bear strong similarities to ours in the variety of applications they examine. In general, they use a broader set of applications, a difference that derives from the subjects studied. In particular, we select applications likely to produce interesting I/O behavior; many of the programs they use, like the video game Quake, are more likely to exercise threading than the file system. Finally it is worth noting that Blake *et al.* analyze Windows software using event tracing, which may prove a useful tool to conduct a similar application file-system study to ours in Windows.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a detailed study of the I/O behavior of complex, modern applications. Through our measurements, we have discovered distinct differences between the tasks in the iBench suite and traditional workload studies. To conclude, we consider the possible effects of our findings on future file and storage systems.

We observed that many of the tasks in the iBench suite frequently force data to disk by invoking `fsync`, which has strong implications for file systems. Delayed writing has long been the basis of increasing file-system performance [34], but it is of greatly decreased utility given small synchronous writes. Thus, more study is required to understand why the developers of these applications and frameworks are calling these routines so frequently. For example, is data being flushed to disk to ensure ordering between writes, safety in the face of power loss, or safety in the face of application crashes? Finding appropriate solutions depends upon the answers to these questions. One possibility is for file systems to expose new interfaces to enable applications to better express their exact needs and desires for durability, consistency, and atomicity. Another possibility is that new technologies, such as flash and other solid-state devices, will be a key solution, allowing writes to be buffered quickly, perhaps before being staged to disk or even the cloud.

The iBench tasks also illustrate that file systems are now being treated as repositories of highly-structured "databases" managed by the applications themselves. In some cases, data is stored in a literal database (*e.g.*, iPhoto uses SQLite), but in most cases, data is organized in complex directory hierarchies or within a single file (*e.g.*, a .doc file is basically a mini-FAT file system). One option is that the file system could become more application-aware, tuned to understand important structures and to better allocate and access these structures on disk. For example, a smarter file system could improve its allocation and prefetching of "files" within a .doc file: seemingly non-sequential patterns in a complex file are easily deconstructed into accesses to metadata followed by streaming sequential access to data.

Our analysis also revealed the strong impact that frameworks and libraries have on I/O behavior. Traditionally, file systems have been designed at the level of the VFS interface, not breaking into the libraries themselves. However, it appears that file systems now need to take a more "vertical" approach and incorporate some of the functionality of modern libraries. This vertical approach hearkens back to the earliest days of file-system development when the developers of FFS modified standard libraries to buffer writes in block-sized chunks to avoid costly sub-block overheads [21]. Future storage systems should further integrate with higher-level interfaces to gain deeper understanding of application desires.

Finally, modern applications are highly complex, containing millions of lines of code, divided over hundreds of source files and libraries, and written by many different programmers. As a result, their own behavior is increasingly inconsistent: along similar, but distinct code paths, different libraries are invoked with different transactional semantics. To simplify these applications, file systems could add higher-level interfaces, easing construction and unifying data representations. While the systems community has developed influential file-system concepts, little has been done to transition this class of improvements into the applications themselves. Database technology does support a certain class of applications quite well but is generally too heavyweight. Future storage systems should consider how to bridge the gap between the needs of current applications and the features low-level systems provide.

Our evaluation may raise more questions than it answers. To build better systems for the future, we believe that the research community must study applications that are important to real users. We believe the iBench task suite takes a first step in this direction and hope others in the community will continue along this path.

Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers and Rebecca Isaacs (our shepherd) for their tremendous feedback, as well as members of our research group for their thoughts and comments on this work at various stages.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under CSR-1017518 as well as by generous donations from Network Appliance and Google. Tyler Harter and Chris Dragga are supported by the Guri Sohi Fellowship and the David DeWitt Fellowship, respectively.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF or other institutions.

7. REFERENCES

[1] N. Agrawal, A. C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and R. H. Arpaci-Dusseau. Generating Realistic Impressions for File-System Benchmarking. In *FAST '09*, San Jose, CA, February 2009.

[2] N. Agrawal, W. J. Bolosky, J. R. Douceur, and J. R. Lorch. A Five-Year Study of File-System Metadata. In *FAST '07*, San Jose, CA, February 2007.

[3] Apple Computer, Inc. AppleScript Language Guide, March 2011.

[4] M. Baker, J. Hartman, M. Kupfer, K. Shirriff, and J. Ousterhout. Measurements of a Distributed File System. In *SOSP '91*, pages 198–212, Pacific Grove, CA, October 1991.

[5] W. Bartlett and L. Spainhower. Commercial Fault Tolerance: A Tale of Two Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 1(1):87–96, January 2004.

[6] G. Blake, R. G. Dreslinski, T. Mudge, and K. Flautner. Evolution of Thread-level Parallelism in Desktop Applications. *SIGARCH Comput. Archit. News*, 38:302–313, June 2010.

[7] J. Bonwick and B. Moore. ZFS: The Last Word in File Systems. http://opensolaris.org/os/community/ zfs/docs/zfs_last.pdf, 2007.

[8] B. Cantrill, M. W. Shapiro, and A. H. Leventhal. Dynamic Instrumentation of Production Systems. In *USENIX '04*, pages 15–28, Boston, MA, June 2004.

[9] G. DeCandia, D. Hastorun, M. Jampani, G. Kakulapati, A. Lakshman, A. Pilchin, S. Sivasubramanian, P. Vosshall, and W. Vogels. Dynamo: Amazon's Highly Available Key-Value Store. In *SOSP '07*, Stevenson, WA, October 2007.

[10] J. R. Douceur and W. J. Bolosky. A Large-Scale Study of File-System Contents. In *SIGMETRICS '99*, pages 59–69, Atlanta, GA, May 1999.

[11] D. Ellard and M. I. Seltzer. New NFS Tracing Tools and Techniques for System Analysis. In *LISA '03*, pages 73–85, San Diego, CA, October 2003.

[12] Y. Endo, Z. Wang, J. B. Chen, and M. Seltzer. Using Latency to Evaluate Interactive System Performance. In *OSDI '96*, Seattle, WA, October 1994.

[13] K. Flautner, R. Uhlig, S. Reinhardt, and T. Mudge. Thread-level Parallelism and Interactive Performance of Desktop Applications. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 35:129–138, November 2000.

[14] S. Ghemawat, H. Gobioff, and S.-T. Leung. The Google File System. In *SOSP '03*, pages 29–43, Bolton Landing, NY, October 2003.

[15] R. Hagmann. Reimplementing the Cedar File System Using Logging and Group Commit. In *SOSP '87*, Austin, TX, November 1987.

[16] J. Howard, M. Kazar, S. Menees, D. Nichols, M. Satyanarayanan, R. Sidebotham, and M. West. Scale and Performance in a Distributed File System. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 6(1), February 1988.

[17] B. Lampson. Computer Systems Research – Past and Present. SOSP 17 Keynote Lecture, December 1999.

[18] E. K. Lee and C. A. Thekkath. Petal: Distributed Virtual Disks. In *ASPLOS VII*, Cambridge, MA, October 1996.

[19] A. W. Leung, S. Pasupathy, G. R. Goodson, and E. L. Miller. Measurement and Analysis of Large-Scale Network File System Workloads. In *USENIX '08*, pages 213–226, Boston, MA, June 2008.

[20] Macintosh Business Unit (Microsoft). It's all in the numbers... blogs.msdn.com/b/macmojo/archive/2006/11/03/it-s-all-in-the-numbers.aspx, November 2006.

[21] M. K. McKusick, W. N. Joy, S. J. Leffler, and R. S. Fabry. A Fast File System for UNIX. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 2(3):181–197, August 1984.

[22] J. C. Mogul. A Better Update Policy. In *USENIX Summer '94*, Boston, MA, June 1994.

[23] J. Olson. Enhance Your Apps With File System Transactions. http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/cc163388.aspx, July 2007.

[24] J. Ousterhout. Why Threads Are A Bad Idea (for most purposes), September 1995.

[25] J. K. Ousterhout, H. D. Costa, D. Harrison, J. A. Kunze, M. Kupfer, and J. G. Thompson. A Trace-Driven Analysis of the UNIX 4.2 BSD File System. In *SOSP '85*, pages 15–24, Orcas Island, WA, December 1985.

[26] D. Patterson, G. Gibson, and R. Katz. A Case for Redundant Arrays of Inexpensive Disks (RAID). In *SIGMOD '88*, pages 109–116, Chicago, IL, June 1988.

[27] R. H. Patterson, G. A. Gibson, E. Ginting, D. Stodolsky, and J. Zelenka. Informed Prefetching and Caching. In *SOSP '95*, pages 79–95, Copper Mountain, CO, December 1995.

[28] R. Pike. Another Go at Language Design. http://www.stanford.edu/class/ee380/Abstracts/100428.html, April 2010.

[29] V. Prabhakaran, A. C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and R. H. Arpaci-Dusseau. Analysis and Evolution of Journaling File Systems. In *USENIX '05*, pages 105–120, Anaheim, CA, April 2005.

[30] V. Prabhakaran, L. N. Bairavasundaram, N. Agrawal, H. S. Gunawi, A. C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and R. H. Arpaci-Dusseau. IRON File Systems. In *SOSP '05*, pages 206–220, Brighton, UK, October 2005.

[31] K. K. Ramakrishnan, P. Biswas, and R. Karedla. Analysis of File I/O Traces in Commercial Computing Environments. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.*, 20:78–90, June 1992.

[32] D. M. Ritchie and K. Thompson. The UNIX Time-Sharing System. In *SOSP '73*, Yorktown Heights, NY, October 1973.

[33] D. Roselli, J. R. Lorch, and T. E. Anderson. A Comparison of File System Workloads. In *USENIX '00*, pages 41–54, San Diego, CA, June 2000.

[34] M. Rosenblum and J. Ousterhout. The Design and Implementation of a Log-Structured File System. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, 10(1):26–52, February 1992.

[35] R. Sandberg. The Design and Implementation of the Sun Network File System. In *Proceedings of the 1985 USENIX Summer Technical Conference*, pages 119–130, Berkeley, CA, June 1985.

[36] M. Satyanarayanan. A Study of File Sizes and Functional Lifetimes. In *SOSP '81*, pages 96–

108, Pacific Grove, CA, December 1981.

[37] A. Sweeney, D. Doucette, W. Hu, C. Anderson, M. Nishimoto, and G. Peck. Scalability in the XFS File System. In *USENIX 1996*, San Diego, CA, January 1996.

[38] M. Tilmann. Apple's Market Share In The PC World Continues To Surge. maclife.com, April 2010.

[39] W. Vogels. File system usage in Windows NT 4.0. In *SOSP '99*, pages 93–109, Kiawah Island Resort, SC, December 1999.

[40] S. C. Woo, M. Ohara, E. Torrie, J. P. Shingh, and A. Gupta. The SPLASH-2 Programs: Characterization and Methodological Considerations. In *ISCA '95*, pages 24–36, Santa Margherita Ligure, Italy, June 1995.