

## Free-Space Management

In this chapter, we take a small detour from our discussion of virtualizing memory to discuss a fundamental aspect of any memory management system, whether it be a malloc library (managing pages of a process's heap) or the OS itself (managing portions of the address space of a process). Specifically, we will discuss the issues surrounding **free-space management**.

Let us make the problem more specific. Managing free space can certainly be easy, as we will see when we discuss the concept of **paging**. It is easy when the space you are managing is divided into fixed-sized units; in such a case, you just keep a list of these fixed-sized units; when a client requests one of them, return the first entry.

Where free-space management becomes more difficult (and interesting) is when the free space you are managing consists of variable-sized units; this always happens in a user-level memory-allocation library (as in `malloc()` and `free()`) and also in an OS managing physical memory when using **segmentation** to implement virtual memory. In either case, the problem that exists is known as **external fragmentation**: the free space ends up being chopped up into little pieces of different sizes and is thus fragmented; subsequent requests may fail because there is no single contiguous space that can satisfy the request, even though the total amount of free space exceeds the size of the request. The figure below shows an example; a request for 15 bytes will fail even though there are 20 bytes free as the 20 bytes are non-contiguous.

```
[ 0 ... 9 | 10 ... 19 | 20 ... 29 ]  
   free   used   free
```

And thus we arrive at the problem addressed in this chapter:

CRUX: HOW TO MANAGE FREE SPACE

How should free space be managed, when satisfying variable-sized requests? What strategies can be used to minimize fragmentation? What are the time and space overheads of alternate approaches?

## 16.1 Assumptions

Most of this discussion will focus on the great history of allocators found in user-level memory-allocation libraries. We draw on Wilson's excellent survey [W+95] but encourage interested readers to go to the source document itself for more details<sup>1</sup>.

We assume a basic interface such as that provided by `malloc()` and `free()`. Specifically, `void *malloc(size_t size)` takes a single parameter `size`, which is the number of bytes requested by the application; it hands back a pointer (of no particular type, or a **void pointer** in C lingo) to a region of that size (or greater). The complementary routine `void free(void *ptr)` takes a pointer and frees the corresponding chunk. Note the implication of the interface: the user, when freeing the space, does not inform the library of its size; thus, the library must be able to figure out how big a chunk of memory is when handed just a pointer to it (we'll discuss how to do this below).

The space that this library manages is known historically as the heap, and the generic data structure used to manage free space in the heap is some kind of **free list**. This structure contains references to all of the free chunks of space in the managed region of memory. Of course, this data structure need not be a list *per se*, but just some kind of data structure to track free space.

We further assume that primarily we are concerned with **external fragmentation**, as described above. Allocators could of course also have the problem of **internal fragmentation**; if an allocator hands out chunks of memory bigger than that requested, any unasked for

---

<sup>1</sup>It is nearly 80 pages long; thus, you really have to be interested!

(and thus unused) space in such a chunk is considered internal fragmentation and is another example of space waste. However, for the sake of simplicity, we'll mostly focus on external fragmentation.

We'll also assume that once memory is handed out to a client, it cannot be relocated to another location in memory. For example, if a program calls `malloc()` and is given a pointer to some space within the heap, that memory region is essentially "owned" by the program (and cannot be moved by the library) until the program returns it via a corresponding call to `free()`. Thus, no **compaction** of free space is possible, which would be useful to combat fragmentation<sup>2</sup>. Compaction could, however, be used in the OS to deal with fragmentation when implementing **segmentation**; see the chapter on segmentation for details.

Finally, we'll assume that the allocator manages a contiguous region of bytes. In some cases, an allocator could ask for that region to grow; for example, a user-level memory-allocation library might call into the kernel to grow the heap (via a system call such as `sbrk`) when it runs out of space. However, for simplicity, we'll just assume that the region is a single fixed size throughout its life.

## 16.2 Low-level Mechanisms

Before delving into some policy details, we'll first cover some common mechanisms used in most allocators. First, we'll discuss the basics of splitting and coalescing, common techniques in most any allocator. Second, we'll show how one can track the size of allocated regions quickly and with relative ease. Finally, we'll discuss how to build a simple list inside the free space to keep track of what is free and what isn't.

### Splitting and Coalescing

A free list contains a set of elements that describe the free space still remaining in the heap. Thus, assume the following 30-byte heap:

---

<sup>2</sup>Once you hand a pointer to a chunk of memory to a C program, it is generally difficult to determine all references (pointers) to that region, which may be stored in other variables or even in registers at a given point in execution. This may not be the case in more strongly-typed, garbage-collected languages, which would thus enable compaction as a technique to combat fragmentation.

```
[0 ... 9 | 10 ... 19 | 20 ... 29 ]
   free   used     free
```

The free list for this heap would have two elements on it. One entry describes the first 10-byte free segment (bytes 0-9), and one entry describes the other free segment (bytes 20-29):

```
head->[addr:0,len:10]->[addr:20,len:10]->NULL
```

As described above, a request for anything greater than 10 bytes will fail (returning NULL); there just isn't a single contiguous chunk of memory of that size available. A request for exactly that size (10 bytes) could be satisfied easily by either of the free chunks. But what happens if the request is for something *smaller* than 10 bytes?

Assume we have a request for just a single byte of memory. In this case, the allocator will perform an action known as **splitting**: it will find a free chunk of memory that can satisfy the request and split it into two. The first chunk it will return to the caller; the second chunk will remain on the list. Thus, in our example above, if a request for 1 byte were made, and the allocator decided to use the second of the two elements on the list to satisfy the request, the call to `malloc()` would return 20 (the address of the 1-byte allocated region) and the list would end up looking like this:

```
head->[addr:0,len:10]->[addr:21,len:9]->NULL
```

In the picture, you can see the list basically stays intact; the only change is that the free region now starts at 21 instead of 20, and the length of that free region is now just 9<sup>3</sup>. Thus, the split is commonly used in allocators when requests are smaller than the size of any particular free chunk.

A corollary mechanism found in many allocators is known as **coalescing** of free space. Take our example from above once more:

```
[0 ... 9 | 10 ... 19 | 20 ... 29 ]
   free   used     free
```

Given this (tiny) heap, what happens when an application calls `free(10)`, thus returning the space in the middle of the heap? If we

---

<sup>3</sup>This discussion assumes that there are no headers, an unrealistic but simplifying assumption we make for now.

simply add this free space back into our list without too much thinking, we might end up with a list that looks like this:

```
head->[addr:10,len:10]->[addr:0,len:10]->[addr:20,len:10]->NULL
```

Note the problem: while the entire heap is now free, it is seemingly divided into three chunks of 10 bytes each. Thus, if a user requests 20 bytes, a simple list traversal will not find such a free chunk, and return failure.

What allocators do in order to avoid this problem is coalesce free space when a chunk of memory is freed. The idea is simple: when returning a free chunk in memory, look carefully at the addresses of the chunk you are returning as well as the nearby chunks of free space; if the newly-freed space sits right next to one (or two, as in this example) existing free chunks, merge them into a single larger free chunk. Thus, with coalescing, our final list should look like this:

```
head->[addr:0,len:30]->NULL
```

Indeed, this is what the heap list looked like at first, before any allocations were made. With coalescing, an allocator can better ensure that large free extents are available for the application.

### Tracking The Size Of Allocated Regions

You might have noticed that the interface to `free(void *ptr)` does not take a size parameter; thus it is assumed that given a pointer, the malloc library can quickly determine the size of the region of memory being freed and thus incorporate the space back into the free list.




Figure 16.1: An Allocated Region Plus Header

To accomplish this task, most allocators store a little bit of extra information in a **header** block which is kept in memory, usually just before the handed-out chunk of memory. Let's look at an example again (Figure 16.1); in this example, we are examining an allocated block of size 20 bytes, pointed to by `ptr` (imagine the user called `malloc()` and stored the results in `ptr`, e.g., `ptr = malloc(20);`).

The header minimally contains the size of the allocated region (in this case, 20); it may also contain additional pointers to speed up deallocation, a magic number to provide additional integrity checking, and other information. Let's assume a simple header which contains the size of the region and a magic number, like this:

```
typedef struct __header_t {
    int size;
    int magic;
} header_t;
```

The example above would thus look like what you see in Figure 16.2. When the user calls `free(ptr)`, the library then uses simple pointer arithmetic to figure out where the header begins:

```
void free(void *ptr) {
    header_t *hptr = (void *)ptr - sizeof(header_t);
}
```

After obtaining such a pointer to the header, the library can easily determine whether the magic number matches the expected value as a sanity check (`assert(hptr->magic == 1234567)`) and calculate the total size of the newly-freed region via simple math (i.e., adding the size of the header to size of the region). Note the small but critical detail in the last sentence: the size of the free region is the size of the header plus the size of the space allocated to the user.




Figure 16.2: Specific Contents Of The Header

Thus, when a user requests  $N$  bytes of memory, the library does not search for a free chunk of size  $N$ ; rather, it searches for a free chunk of size  $N$  plus the size of the header.

## Embedding A Free List

Thus far we have treated our simple free list as a conceptual entity; it is just a list describing the free chunks of memory in the heap. But how do we build such a list inside the free space itself?

In a more typical list, when allocating a new node, you would just call `malloc()` when you need space for the node. Unfortunately, within the memory-allocation library, you can't do this! Instead, you need to build the list *inside* the free space itself. Don't worry if this sounds a little weird; it is, but not so weird that you can't do it!

Assume we have a 4096-byte chunk of memory to manage (i.e., the heap is 4KB). To manage this as a free list, we first have to initialize said list; initially, the list should have one entry, of size 4096. Here is the description of a node of the list:

```
typedef struct __node_t {
    int         size;
    struct __node_t *next;
} node_t;
```

Now let's look at some code that initializes the heap and puts the first element of the free list inside that space. We are assuming that the heap is built within some free space acquired via a call to the system call `mmap()`; this is not the only way to build such a heap but serves us well in this example. Here is the code:

```
// mmap() returns a pointer to a chunk of free space
node_t *head = mmap(NULL, 4096, PROT_READ|PROT_WRITE,
                    MAP_ANON|MAP_PRIVATE, -1, 0);
head->size    = 4096;
head->next    = NULL;
```

After running this code, the status of the list is that it has a single entry, of size 4096. Yes, this is a tiny heap, but it serves as a fine example for us here. The head pointer contains the beginning address of this range; let's assume it is 16KB (though any virtual address would be fine). Visually, the heap thus looks like this:

```

head -> ----- [virtual address: 16KB]
        |size:   4096| // this is where the 'size' field goes
        -----
        |next:    0| // and 'next': note that NULL is just 0
        -----
        |   ...   | // The rest of the 4096 bytes
        -----

```

Now, let's imagine that a chunk of memory is requested, say of size 100. To service this request, the library will first find a chunk that is large enough to accommodate the request; because there is only one free chunk (4096), this chunk will be chosen. Then, the chunk will be split into two: one chunk big enough to service the request (and header, as described above), and the remaining free chunk. Assuming an 8-byte header (an integer size and an integer magic number), the space in the heap now looks like this:

```

----- [virtual address: 16KB]
|size :   100|
-----
|magic:1234567|
ptr -> |   ...   | \
        |   ...   |  | -- the 100-bytes now allocated
        |   ...   |  |
head -> |   ...   | /
        -----
        |size:   3988|
        -----
        |next:    0|
        -----
        |   ...   | // The rest of the free 3988 bytes
        -----

```

Thus, upon the request for 100 bytes, the library allocated 108 bytes out of the existing one free chunk, returns a pointer (marked `ptr` in the figure above) to it, stashes the header information immediately before the allocated space for later use upon `free()`, and shrinks the one free node in the list to 3988 bytes (4096 minus 108).

Now let's look at the heap when there are three allocated regions, each of 100 bytes (or 108 including the header). The visualization looks like what you see in Figure 16.3.






Figure 16.3: Free Space With Three Chunks Allocated

As you can see, the first 324 bytes of the heap are now allocated, and thus we see three headers in that space as well as three 100-byte regions being used by the calling program. The free list remains uninteresting: just a single node, but now only 3772 bytes in size after the three splits. But what happens when the calling program returns some memory via `free()`?

In this example, the application returns the middle chunk of allocated memory, by calling `free(16500)` (the value 16500 is arrived upon by adding the start of the memory region, 16384, to the 108




Figure 16.4: Free Space With Two Chunks Allocated

of the previous chunk and the 8 bytes of the header for this chunk). This value is shown in the previous diagram by the pointer `sptr`.

The library immediately figures out the size of the free region, and then adds the free chunk back onto the free list. Assuming we insert at the head of the free list, the space now looks like this (Figure 16.4).

And now we have a list that starts with a small free chunk (108 bytes, pointed to by the head of the list) and a large free chunk (3772 bytes). Our list finally has more than one element on it! And yes, the free space is fragmented, an unfortunate but common occurrence.




Figure 16.5: Free Space With Two Chunks Allocated

One last example: let's assume now that the last two in-use chunks are freed. Without coalescing, you might end up with a free list that looks like what you see in Figure 16.5.

As you can see from the figure, we now have a big mess! Why? Simple, we forgot to coalesce the list. Although all of the memory is free, it is chopped up into pieces, thus appearing as a fragmented memory despite not being one. The solution is simple: go through the list and merge neighboring chunks; when finished, we'll be back to one big free space again.

## Growing The Heap

We should discuss one last mechanism found within many allocation libraries. Specifically, what should you do if the heap runs out of space? The simplest approach is just to fail. In some cases this is the only option, and thus returning NULL is an honorable approach. Don't feel bad! You tried, and though you failed, you fought the good fight.

Most traditional allocators start with a small-sized heap and then request more memory from the OS when they run out. Typically, this means they make some kind of system call (e.g., `sbrk` in most UNIX systems) to grow the heap, and then allocate the new chunks from there. To service the `sbrk` request, the OS finds free physical pages, maps them into the address space of the requesting process, and then returns the value of the end of the new heap; at that point, a larger heap is available, and the request can be successfully serviced.

## 16.3 Basic Strategies

Now that we have some machinery under our belt, let's go over some basic strategies for managing free space. These approaches are mostly based on pretty simple policies that you could think up yourself; try it before reading and see if you come up with all of the alternatives (or maybe some new ones!).

The ideal allocator is both fast and minimizes fragmentation. Unfortunately, because the stream of allocation and free requests can be arbitrary (after all, they are determined by the programmer), any particular strategy can do quite badly given the wrong set of inputs. Thus, we will not describe a "best" approach, but rather talk about some basics and discuss their pros and cons.

### Best Fit

The **best fit** strategy is quite simple: first, search through the free list and find chunks of free memory that are as big or bigger than the requested size. Then, return the one that is the smallest in that group of candidates; this is the so called best-fit chunk (it could be called smallest fit too). One pass through the free list is enough to find the correct block to return.

The intuition behind best fit is simple: by returning a block that is close to what the user asks, best fit tries to reduce wasted space. However, there is a cost; naive implementations pay a heavy performance penalty when performing an exhaustive search for the correct free block.

### Worst Fit

The **worst fit** approach is the opposite of best fit; find the largest chunk and return the requested amount; keep the remaining (large) chunk on the free list. Worst fit tries to thus leave big chunks free instead of lots of small chunks that can arise from a best-fit approach. Once again, however, a full search of free space is required, and thus this approach can be costly. Worse, most studies show that it performs badly, leading to excess fragmentation while still having high overheads.

### First Fit

The **first fit** method simply finds the first block that is big enough and returns the requested amount to the user. As before, the remaining free space is kept free for subsequent requests.

First fit has the advantage of speed – no exhaustive search of all the free spaces are necessary – but sometimes this leads to pollution of the beginning of the free list with a number of small objects. Thus, how the allocator manages the free list's order becomes an issue. One approach is to use **address-based ordering**; by keeping the list ordered by the address of the free space, coalescing becomes easier, and fragmentation tends to be reduced.

### Next Fit

Instead of always beginning the first-fit search at the beginning of the list, the **next fit** algorithm keeps an extra pointer to the location within the list where one was looking last. The idea is to spread the searches for free space throughout the list more uniformly, thus avoiding splintering of the beginning of the list. The performance of such an approach is quite similar to first fit, as an exhaustive search is once again avoided.

## Examples

Here are a few examples of the above strategies. Envision a free list with three elements on it, of sizes 10, 30, and 20 (we'll ignore headers and other details here, instead just focusing on how strategies operate):

```
head->[10]->[30]->[20]->NULL
```

Assume an allocation request of size 15. A best-fit approach would search the entire list and find that 20 was the best fit, as it is the smallest free space that can accommodate the request. The resulting free list:

```
head->[10]->[30]->[5]->NULL
```

As happens in this example, and often happens with a best-fit approach, a small free chunk is now left over. A worst-fit approach is similar but instead finds the largest chunk, in this example 30. The resulting list:

```
head->[10]->[15]->[20]->NULL
```

The first-fit strategy, in this example, does the same thing as worst-fit, also finding the first free block that can satisfy the request. The difference is in the search cost; both best-fit and worst-fit look through the entire list; first-fit only examines free chunks until it finds one that fits, thus reducing search cost.

These examples just scratch the surface of allocation policies. More detailed analysis with real workloads and more complex allocator behaviors (e.g., coalescing) are required for a deeper understanding. Perhaps something for a homework section, you say?

## 16.4 Other Approaches

Beyond the basic approaches described above, there have been a host of suggested techniques and algorithms to improve memory allocation in some way. We list a few of them here for your consideration (i.e., to make you think about a little more than just best-fit allocation).

## Segregated Lists

One interesting approach that has been around for some time is the use of **segregated lists**. The basic idea is simple: if a particular application has one (or a few) popular-sized request that it makes, keep a separate list just to manage objects of that size; all other requests are forwarded to a more general memory allocator.

The benefits of such an approach are obvious. By having a chunk of memory dedicated for one particular size of requests, fragmentation is much less of a concern; moreover, allocation and free requests can be served quite quickly when they are of the right size, as no complicated search of a list is required.

Just like any good idea, this approach introduces new complications into a system as well. For example, how much memory should one dedicate to the pool of memory that serves specialized requests of a given size, as opposed to the general pool? One particular allocator, the **slab allocator** by uber-engineer Jeff Bonwick (which was designed for use in the Solaris kernel), handles this issue in a rather nice way [B94].

Specifically, when the kernel boots up, it allocates a number of **object caches** for kernel objects that are likely to be requested frequently (such as locks, file-system inodes, etc.); the object caches thus are each segregated free lists of a given size and serve memory allocation and free requests quickly. When a given cache is running low on free space, it requests some **slabs** of memory from a more general memory allocator (the total amount requested being a multiple of the page size and the object in question). Conversely, when the reference counts of the objects within a given slab all go to zero, the general allocator can reclaim them from the specialized allocator, which is often done when the VM system needs more memory.

The slab allocator also goes beyond most segregated list approaches by keeping free objects on the lists in a pre-initialized state. Bonwick shows that initialization and destruction of data structures is costly [B94]; by keeping freed objects in a particular list in their initialized state, the slab allocator thus avoids frequent initialization and destruction cycles per object and thus lowers overheads noticeably.

ASIDE: GREAT ENGINEERS ARE REALLY GREAT

Engineers like Jeff Bonwick (who not only wrote the slab allocator mentioned herein but also was the lead of an amazing file system, ZFS) are the heart of Silicon Valley. Behind almost any great product or technology is a human (or small group of humans) who are way above average in their talents, abilities, and dedication. As Mark Zuckerberg (of Facebook) says: “Someone who is exceptional in their role is not just a little better than someone who is pretty good. They are 100 times better.” This is why, still today, one or two people can start a company that changes the face of the world forever (think Google, Apple, or Facebook). Work hard and you might become such a “100x” person as well. Failing that, work with such a person; you’ll learn more in day than most learn in a month. Failing that, feel sad.

### Buddy Allocation

Because coalescing is critical for an allocator, some approaches have been designed around making coalescing simple. One good example is found in the **binary buddy allocator** [K65].

In such a system, free memory is first conceptually thought of as one big space of size  $2^N$ . When a request for memory is made, the search for free space recursively divides free space by two until a block that is big enough to accommodate the request is found (and a further split into two would result in a space that is too small). At this point, the requested block is returned to the user. Here is an example of a 64KB free space getting divided in the search for a 7KB block:

```
[           64KB           ]
[      32 KB      ][           ]
[  16 KB  ][  16 KB  ][           ]
[8KB* ][8KB ][  16 KB  ][           ]
```

In the example, the leftmost 8KB block is allocated (as indicated by the asterisk) and returned to the user; note that this scheme can suffer from **internal fragmentation**, as you are only allowed to give out power-of-two-sized blocks.

The beauty of buddy allocation is found in what happens when that block is freed. When returning the 8KB block to the free list,



the allocator checks whether the “buddy” 8KB is free; if so, it coalesces the two blocks into a 16KB block. The allocator then checks if the buddy of the 16KB block is still free; if so, it coalesces those two blocks. This recursive coalescing process continues as high up in the tree of blocks as possible, either restoring the entire free space or stopping when a buddy is found to be in use.

The reason buddy allocation works so well is that it is simple to determine the buddy of a particular block. How, you ask? Think about the addresses of the blocks in the free space above. If you think carefully enough, you’ll see that the address of each buddy pair only differs by a single bit; which bit is determined by the level in the buddy tree. And thus you have a basic idea of how binary buddy allocation schemes work. For more detail, as always, see the Wilson survey [W+95].

### Other Ideas

One major problem with many of the approaches described above is their lack of **scaling**. Specifically, searching lists can be quite slow. Thus, advanced allocators will use more complex data structures to address these costs, trading simplicity for performance. Examples of such structures include balanced binary trees, splay trees, or partially-ordered trees [W+95].

Given that modern systems often have multiple processors and run multi-threaded workloads (something you’ll learn about in great detail in the section of the book on Concurrency), it is not surprising that a lot of effort has been spent making allocators work well on multiprocessor-based systems. Two wonderful examples are found in Berger et al. [B+00] and Evans [E06]; check them out for the details.

These are but two of the many thousands of ideas people have had over time about memory allocators. Read more on your own if you are curious!

## 16.5 Summary

In this chapter, we’ve discussed the most rudimentary forms of memory allocators. Such allocators exist everywhere, linked into every C program you write, as well as in the underlying OS which is managing memory for its own data structures. As with many sys-

tems, there are many trade-offs to be made in building such a system, and the more you know about the exact workload presented to an allocator, the more you could do to tune it to work better for that workload. Making a fast, space-efficient, scalable allocator that works well for a broad range of workloads remains an on-going challenge in modern computer systems.

## 16.6 References

[B+00] “Hoard: A Scalable Memory Allocator for Multithreaded Applications”  
Emery D. Berger, Kathryn S. McKinley, Robert D. Blumofe, and Paul R. Wilson  
ASPLOS-IX, November 2000  
*Berger and company’s excellent allocator for multiprocessor systems. Beyond just being a fun paper, also used in practice!*

[B94] “The Slab Allocator: An Object-Caching Kernel Memory Allocator”  
Jeff Bonwick  
USENIX ’94  
*A cool paper about how to build an allocator for an operating system kernel, and a great example of how to specialize for particular common object sizes.*

[E06] “A Scalable Concurrent malloc(3) Implementation for FreeBSD”  
Jason Evans  
<http://people.freebsd.org/~jasone/jemalloc/bsdcan2006/jemalloc.pdf>  
April 2006  
*A detailed look at how to build a real modern allocator for use in multiprocessors. The “jemalloc” allocator is in widespread use today, within FreeBSD, NetBSD, Mozilla Firefox, and within Facebook.*

[K65] “A Fast Storage Allocator”  
Kenneth C. Knowlton  
Communications of the ACM, 8(10):623–625, Oct 1965  
*The common reference for buddy allocation. Random strange fact: Knuth gives credit for the idea to not to Knowlton but to Harry Markowitz, a Nobel-prize winning economist. Another strange fact: Knuth communicates all of his emails via a secretary; he doesn’t send email himself, rather he tells his secretary what email to send and then the secretary does the work of emailing.*

[W+95] “Dynamic Storage Allocation: A Survey and Critical Review”  
Paul R. Wilson, Mark S. Johnstone, Michael Neely, David Boles  
International Workshop on Memory Management  
Kinross, Scotland, September 1995  
*An excellent and far-reaching survey of many facets of memory allocation. Far too much detail to go into in this tiny chapter!*