

Hi Mirek,

I worked out the test you suggested. The pipelined set function is not faster anymore. I can understand that this is the case. The SSE2 vectorized set function now is around 30% faster:

```
// Non naive vector test :D
const int VectorBoolOrBitsetTestBitSetVectorizedNonNaive(Bits& buffer, const Vector<unsigned
char>& rand)
{
    unsigned char vec[32];
    const int count = rand.GetCount();
    for (int i = 0; i < count; i += sizeof(vec))
    {
        for (int j = 0; j < sizeof(vec); ++j)
        {
            vec[j] = rand[i + j] > 50 ? 0x80 : 0x0;
        }

        // Use the vectorized set method.
        buffer.VectorSetNonNaive(i, vec);
    }
    int alloc = 0;
    buffer.Raw(alloc);
    return alloc;
}

// The non naive vector set function, that actually implements only the vector
// setting, and not also the comparison of the input!
void Bits::VectorSetNonNaive(int i, const unsigned char vec[32])
{
    // Check whether i is within the bounds of the container.
    ASSERT(i >= 0 && alloc >= 0);

    // Get the DWORD index for the internal buffer.
    int q = i >> 5;

    // Do we need to expand the internal buffer first?
    if(q >= alloc)
        Expand(q);

    // Get the bit index of the next available DWORD.
    i &= 31;
```

```

// Create a bitmask with vector intrinsics.
__m128i boolVecLow = _mm_load_si128((__m128i*)vec);
__m128i boolVecHigh = _mm_load_si128((__m128i*)(vec + 16));
const int bitMaskLow = _mm_movemask_epi8(boolVecLow);
const int bitMaskHigh = _mm_movemask_epi8(boolVecHigh);

// Set the resulting WORD.
LowHighDword w;
w.dw = bp[q];
w.w1 = (short)bitMaskLow;
w.w2 = (short)bitMaskHigh;
bp[q] = w.dw;
}

```

However, I was thinking: if I use vectorized code, I should be allowed to vectorize everything, including the comparison of the input values! I thought about my own use case (where I indeed also have to perform the kind of comparison you suggested), and I realized that this comparison could be vectorized. When I did so, the speeds of the SSE2 and AVX2 vectorized code examples skyrocketed. I understand that you may think of the vectorized comparison as a 'proof-of-concept' rather than a realistic implementation for U++, but I can actually utilize this implementation for my memory scanner. Besides, it was fun to write code like this. I am surprised how easy it can be done and how easily the game is played out. :)

The source code is of the other tests is once again located at my Bitbucket repository:
<https://bitbucket.org/evolution536/cry-performance-test/src/212c3b4f51a29efa0e70841e76cceb11bcaacf06/VectorBoolOrBitsetTest.cpp?at=master&fileviewer=file-view-default>

What do you think about a possible 'multi-set' implementation with an interface like:

```
void Set(int i, const Vector<bool>& vec, const int count);
```

Such function could contain a loop for a vector implementation, and the sequential Set function for the remainder. Maybe also a set function that allows you to manually prepare the dwords and have the set function solely manage the allocation and positioning for you. :)

crydev

File Attachments

1) [Capture.PNG](#), downloaded 659 times
