

## Foreword

- This presentation contains a collection of best practices for writing highly performant LabVIEW applications as learned by top LabVIEW developers at SpaceX and presented in pure academic form for the benefit of the greater LabVIEW community.
- This presentation does not contain any information specific to SpaceX in order to remain in compliance with ITAR regulations.
- This presentation is not an official marketing outreach of SpaceX, but has received approval from the Marketing and Communication office for use in the 2017 CLA Summit.
- All pictures in this presentation are publically available on the Internet.

SPACEX

3/4/2018



SpaceX regularly challenges LabVIEW in terms of functionality, performance, and scalability. Many of the patches released for LabVIEW 2013 and 2015 have been in direct support of SpaceX. Thank you to LabVIEW R&D for their support.







This presentation will focus on managing the risk associated with LabVIEW performance and touch on issues to help reduce risk of failures through real-time metrics analysis. An entirely separate presentation could be written to discuss managing the risks associated with *some* of the problems listed on the previous slide.



Throughput, latency, jitter



This is probably the most important slide in this presentation! This is where we've had significant struggles and wins.



TagBus is a great way to accommodate preallocation and minimize data copies and coercions

This might be a 2013 bug, or it might be a function of the datatype or dynamic dispatching. The In Place Algorithm will likely recognize that the output can reuse the input array memory space, but semantically this is not expressed or promised by this traditional use of auto indexing inputs and outputs. The diagram on the right, although less concise, does the express the desired behavior semantically.

Note that the size of the output arrays will be different with the shown implementation, which basically assumes that if an error occurs the application will be shutting down, so the change in array size is not significant. You would need to remove the conditional terminal from the loop on the left in order to guarantee the inputs and outputs match length.



Static Dispatch is faster than Dynamic Dispatch by single digit microseconds. If you're writing code to avoid dynamic dispatch, consider the overhead of that code adds to the Static Dispatch time. It's possible that dynamic dispatch is now fast enough that this trick is no longer required, but in LV2015 I do not believe that to be the case.

Dynamic Dispatch defaults to Shared Clone Reentrancy. Non-reentrant is an option for Dynamic Dispatch (excludes recursion), but Preallocate Reentrancy is not. Shared Reentrancy can introduce jitter in an application.

To More Specific can be a potentially expensive operation but in this case it is not because it is known thanks to the case structure that the object *is* of the requested type, and the types are only 1 generation apart from each other. No search down the ancestry required to find the matching type.



Although unused, error terminals are required on this Read Accessor in order to make the accessor callable in a property node.

Consider modifying the Read Accessor template VI in the resource folder in order to change the default construction of this VI.



Available since 2013



We haven't upgraded to LV2016 or 2017 yet, so I haven't experimented with the new IPE nodes yet. Allen Smith suggests this will likely be more beneficial if you're using nested attributes.



Queues amortize their growth by allocating memory in increasing-sized blocks. Therefore the next enqueue operation might require a memory allocation to make room for the new element. Preallocating the queue prevents jitter because no memory allocation will occur during execution.







Make sure all dependencies are reentrant to ensure execution does not synchronize across Execution Systems.



Not all data is created equal. Prioritize your data by keeping it separated from less important data.





Naming convention might include things like <source>.<measurement>\_<value>\_<valueunit>\_<rateunit>





![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

(Animation is covering diagrams here)

Slide 24

NM1 Nate Moehring, 9/17/2017

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

I've experienced too many problems with run-time crashes using Parallel For Loops to make them desirable to you. I've also seen Parallel For Loops run slower than just sequentially running through all of the elements, even if it didn't crash

Color Bloom technique is the idea that when a user is scrolling through a table or a listbox, his eye is probably on ~ the middle of the table. Therefore, when coloring the rows or text of that table/listbox, color bloom is a technique coined by TurboPhil that describes coloring the middle row first, then alternating above and below rows, moving out towards the top and bottom.

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

So is LabVIEW a Tortoise or a Hare?