CSE110A: Compilers

May 18, 2022

Topics:

- Local value numbering 2
- Loop transformations

Announcements

- New grades:
 - HW 2 posted
 - Please let us know within 1 week if there are any issues!
- Pending grades
 - Midterm (expect by Monday)
- HW 3 is released
 - Due on Tuesday
 - Get started if you haven't
 - I have office hours tomorrow
 - Keep your eye on piazza for this assignment!

Announcements

- No class on Friday
 - Take the time to work on Homework 3!

Quiz

Quiz

It's the parser's job to perform local value numbering

True
False

- Local value numbering operates over 3 address code
- The parser produces 3 address code
- In some cases, the parser might use LVN, but it is independent

Quiz

Local value numbering can only work in just one basic block.

⊖ True

⊖ False

• Reminder on a basic block

- Programs can be split into **Basic Blocks**:
 - A sequence of 3 address instructions such that:
 - There is a single entry, single exit

• *Important property*: an instruction in a basic block can assume that all preceding instructions will execute How might they appear in a high-level language?

How many basic blocks?



Two Basic Blocks

Single Basic Block	L_{i}	abel_x:
Label_x: op1; op2;	0] 0] 0]	p1; p2; p3;
op3; br label_z;	L. 0] 0]	abel_y: p4; p5;

Label_0:	optimized to	Label_0:
x = a + b;	>	x = a + b;
y = a + b;		y = x;

<i>Label_0:</i> x = a + b;	CANNOT always optimized to	<i>Label_0:</i> x = a + b;
	│	
Label_1:		Label_1:
y = a + b;		y = x;

Quiz

Local value numbering can only work in just one basic block.

⊖ True

○ False

True!

Although you might imagine algorithms that can work on more basic blocks. This is called *superlocal value numbering*

Quiz

After perform local value numbering on the following program, how many operations can you save?

a = b + c;
d = e * f;
b = b + c;
c = c + b ;
g = f * e;
○ 1
○ 2
○ 3

a = b + c; d = e * f; b = b + c; c = c + b ; g = f * e;
H = {

1



What if we changed this?

Quiz

What is a good order of performing the following optimizations (left to right):

1) Local value numbering

2) Loop unrolling

3) Constant propagation

```
for (int i = 0; i < 10; i++) {
    x = x + 1;
}</pre>
```

loop unrolling

for (int i = 0; i < 10; i++) {
 x = x + 1;
 i++;
 x = x + 1;
}</pre>

how might this influence other optimizations?

loop unrolling

how might this influence other optimizations?

a = 16; b = a + c; d = 16; e = d + c;

How might constant propagation change this program

a = 16; b = a + c; d = 16; e = d + c;

How might constant propagation change this program

a = 16; b = 16 + c; d = 16; e = 16 + c;

a = 16; b = a + c; d = 16; e = d + c;

How might constant propagation change this program

a = 16; b = 16 + c; d = 16; e = 16 + c;

LVN can now replace the bottom one

It's a little more difficult to apply to ClassleR. Do people have any ideas?

Quiz

What is a good order of performing the following optimizations (left to right):

1) Local value numbering

2) Loop unrolling

3) Constant propagation

Loop unrolling -> Constant propagation -> Local value numbering

Next quiz

- Teaching feedback from CITL
- Part of a larger program to help improves classes here

Review

- Basic blocks
 - A piece of 3 address code that has one entry and one exit
 - Any line of code can assume that all lines before it have been executed
 - Allows "local" reasoning
 - pycfg example
- Local value numbering
 - Local optimization
 - Simple algorithm that can be built on:
 - initial version just used string comparison
 - next we added commutativity
 - lastly we extended the algorithm to not add any new registers

Review

- Algorithm for applying LVN:
 - split 3 address code into basic blocks
 - for each basic block
 - number the variables
 - try to remove expensive arithmetic operations

Today

- Adding constant folding to LVN
- Discussing memory and functions in LVN
- How to add optimized code blocks back into the IR

- Colloquially, they are often used interchangeably
- Technically (e.g. according to the books)
 - Constant propagation is replacing variables with constants
 - Constant folding is compile-time evaluation when constants are known

int x = 14; int y = 7 - x / 2; return y * (28 / x + 2);

int x = 14; int y = 7 - x / 2; return y * (28 / x + 2);

constant propagation

int x = 14; int y = 7 - 14 / 2; return y * (28 / 14 + 2);

int x = 14; int y = 7 - x / 2; return y * (28 / x + 2);

constant propagation

int x = 14; int y = 7 - 14 / 2; return y * (28 / 14 + 2);

constant folding int x = 14; int y = 0; return y * (28 / 14 + 2);

int x = 14; int y = 7 - x / 2; return y * (28 / x + 2);

constant propagation

int x = 14; int y = 7 - 14 / 2; return y * (28 / 14 + 2);

constant folding int x = 14; int y = 0; return y * (28 / 14 + 2);

int x = 14; int y = 0; return 0 * (28 / 14 + 2);

constant propagation

int x = 14;int x = 14;int y = 7 - x / 2; int y = 0; **return** y * (28 / x + 2); return 0 * (28 / 14 + 2); constant constant propagation propagation constant folding int x = 14;int x = 14;constant int y = 0;int y = 7 - 14 / 2; int x = 14;folding **return** y * (28 / 14 + 2); **return** y * (28 / 14 + 2); int y = 0; return 0;

Typically performed at the same time

int x = 14; int y = 7 - x / 2; return y * (28 / x + 2);

constant propagation and folding second line

int x = 14; int y = 0; return y * (28 / 14 + 2); int x = 14; int y = 0; return 0;

constant propagation and folding third line

H = { }

Known_values = {

numbering

b0	=	5;		
c1	=	3;		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	-	d3;
c5	=	a2	+	c1;
d6	=	a2	-	d3;

H = { }

Known_values = {

As you are iterating through code, add any constant mappings to Known_values:

b0	=	5;		
c1	=	3;		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	-	d3;
c5	=	a2	+	c1;
d6	=	a2	-	d3;

H = { }

Known_values = {

As you are iterating through code, add any constant mappings to Known_values:

b0	=	5 ;		
<mark>c1</mark>	=	3;		
		_		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	_	d3;
c5	=	a2	+	c1;
d6	=	a2	_	d3;

Known_values = {
 "b0" : 5
 "c1" : 3
When you find an arithmetic operation, first check if operands are known

b0	=	5;		
c1	=	3;		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	-	d3;
c5	=	a2	+	c1;
d6	=	a2	_	d3;

Known_values = {
 "b0" : 5
 "c1" : 3

}

When you find an arithmetic operation, first check if operands are known



H = { 5+3 }

evaluate and add to known values

}

When you find an arithmetic operation, first check if operands are known



H = { 5+3 }

evaluate and add to known values

}

Known_values = {
 "b0" : 5
 "c1" : 3
 "a2" : 8

When you find an arithmetic operation, first check if operands are known

5;
3;
0
8;
<mark>8 – d3;</mark>
a2 + c1;
a2 – d3;

propagate constant (if IR allows it)

}

When you find an arithmetic operation, first check if operands are known



add to H

continue on.



}

why do we want to store 8 here rather than a2?

b0	=	0;		
d3	=	1;		
f7	=	4;		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	*	d3;
d6	=	e5	*	f7;

H = { }

Known_values = {
}

what can we do here?

b0	=	0;		
d3	=	1;		
f7	=	4;		
a2	=	b0	+	c1;
b4	=	a2	*	d3;
d6	=	e5	*	f7;

H = { }

```
Known_values = {
  "b0":0, "d3":1, "f7":4
}
```

b0	=	0;		
d3	=	1;		
f7	=	4;		
a2	=	b0	+	<mark>c1</mark> ;
b4	=	a2	*	d3;
d6	=	e5	*	f7;

what can we do here? add a special rule for + that if any side is 0, you can just drop the 0.

```
Known_values = {
  "b0":0, "d3":1, "f7":4
}
```

b0	=	0;		
d3	=	1;		
f7	=	4;		
a2	=	<mark>c1</mark> ;)	
b4	=	a2	*	d3;
d6	=	e5	*	f7;

what can we do here? add a special rule for + that if any side is 0, you can just drop the 0.

Known_values = {
 "b0":0, "d3":1, "f7":4
}

What other rules could we have?

Other considerations in LVN

• Memory and functions

• Consider a 3 address code that allows memory accesses

a[i] = x[j] +	y[k];
b[i] = x[j] +	y[k];
	is this transformation allowed?
a[i] = x[j]] + y[k];
b[i] = a[i]];

Consider a 3 address code that allows memory accesses



Consider a 3 address code that allows memory accesses

a[i] = x[i] + y[k];	a[i b[i	.] = .] =	x[j] x[j]	+ +	y[k]; y[k];	
a[i] = x[i] + y[k];						
a[i] = x[j] + y[k];						
		a[i]] = x	[j]] + y[k]	;

Example, initially:

i = j a = x y[k] = 1 x[j] = 1

What does b[i] equal at the end of each computation?

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2); (b,6) = (x[j],?) + (y[k],?);

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);(b,6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);

Does this help at all?

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

$$(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);$$

(b,6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);
(c,7) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);

Does this help at all?

If there is no memory writes between an assignment to a variable then we can do a replacement

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

$$(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);$$

(b,6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);
(c,7) = (b,6);

Does this help at all?

If there is no memory writes between an assignment to a variable then we can do a replacement

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

$$(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);$$

 $(b[i],6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);$

A compiler analysis might try to determine that addresses can't alias

```
can we trace a, x, y to
a = malloc(...);
x = malloc(...);
y = malloc(...);
```

// a, x, y are never overwritten

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);(b[i],6) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);

in this case we do not have to update the number

A compiler analysis might try to determine that addresses can't alias

```
can we trace a, x, y to
a = malloc(...);
x = malloc(...);
y = malloc(...);
```

// a, x, y are never overwritten

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

$$(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);$$

 $(b[i],6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);$

programmer annotations can also tell the compiler that no other pointer can access the memory pointed to by a

• How to number:

- Number each pointer/index pair
- Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

$$(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2);$$

 $(b[i],6) = (x[j],4) + (y[k],5);$

in this case we do not have to update the number

restrict a

programmer annotations can also tell the compiler that no other pointer can access the memory pointed to by a

Warning: the compiler does not enforce this!

- How to number:
 - Number each pointer/index pair
 - Any pointer/index pair that might alias must be incremented at each instruction

(a[i],3) = (x[j],1) + (y[k],2); (b[i],6) = (a[i],3);

How to number?

a = foo(x); x = b; c = foo(x);

How to number?

the same way

a = foo(x); x = b; c = foo(x);

What if you had first class functions?

How to number?

the same way

a = foo(x); x = b; c = foo(x); a1 = foo(x0); x3 = b2; c4 = foo(x3);

Can we replace?

How to number?

the same way

a = foo(x); c = foo(x); a1 = foo(x0);c2 = foo(x0);

How about now?

How to number?

the same way

a = foo(x); c = foo(x); a1 = foo(x0);c2 = foo(x0);

How about now?

```
int count = 0;
int foo(int x) {
    count += 1;
    return 0;
};
```

What if foo had this implementation?

How to number?

the same way

a = foo(x); c = foo(x); a1 = foo(x0); c2 = foo(x0);

How about now?

```
side effects!
int count = 0;
int foo(int x) {
    count += 1;
    return 0;
};
```

What if foo had this implementation?

are these two programs the same?

```
int count = 0;
int foo(int x) {
    count += 1;
    return 0;
};
```

- In C/++, functions are assumed to have side effects
- A function that does not have side effects is called "pure"
 - You can annotate a function as pure
 - __attribute__((pure))
 - warning: compiler does not check this and you can introduce subtle bugs
- Functional languages tend to have a pure-by-default design. Allows more compiler optimizations, but less control to the programmer.

a	=	b	+	с;	
d	=	е	+	f;	
g	=	b	+	с;	
1a	abe	el_	_0 :		
la h	abe =	el_ g	_0 : +	a;	

split into basic blocks



a	=	b	+	с;	
d	=	е	+	f;	
g	=	b	+	с;	
18	abe	el_	_0 :	•	
h	=	g	+	a;	

a = b + c;	a = b + c;	a2 = b0 + c1;
d = e + f;	d = e + f;	d5 = e3 + f4;
g = b + c;	g = b + c;	g6 = b0 + c1;
label_0:	label_0:	<pre>label_0:</pre>
h = g + a;	h = g + a;	h2 = g0 + a1;
k = a + g;	k = a + g;	k3 = a1 + g0;

number
move code on slide to make room

a2 = b0 + c1; d5 = e3 + f4; g6 = b0 + c1;

label_0: h2 = g0 + a1; k3 = a1 + g0;

optimize

a2 = b0 + c1;	a2 = b0 + c1;
d5 = e3 + f4;	d5 = e3 + f4;
g6 = b0 + c1;	g6 = a2;
<pre>label_0:</pre>	<pre>label_0:</pre>
h2 = g0 + a1;	h2 = g0 + a1;
k3 = a1 + g0;	k3 = h2;



What are the issues?



undefined!

What are the issues?

	optimize	part 1: assign original variables their latest values
a2 = b0 + c1;	$a^2 = b^2$	0 + c1;
d5 = e3 + f4;	$d5 = e^{2}$	3 + f4;
g6 = b0 + c1;	g6 = a2	2;
label_0:	label_	0:
h2 = g0 + a1;	h2 = g	0 + al;
k3 = a1 + g0;	$ \mathbf{k}3 = \mathbf{h}2$	2;

make room on slide



what else needs to be done?

stitch part 2: drop numbers from first use of variables

a2 = b0 + c1; d5 = o3 + f4;	a2 = b + c;		
$ u_{3} - e_{3} + I_{4} $	$ u = e + \frac{1}{2};$		
g6 = a2;	g6 = a2;		
<mark>g = g6;</mark>	g = g6;		
<mark>d = d5</mark>	d = d5		
<mark>a = a2;</mark>	a = a2;		
	-		
label_0:	label_0:		
h2 = g0 + a1;	h2 = <mark>g</mark> + <mark>a</mark> ;		
k3 = h2;	k3 = h2;		
<mark>h = h2;</mark>	h = h2;		
k = k3;	k = k3;		

a2 = b0 + c1;	a2 = b + c;	a2 = b + c;
d5 = e3 + f4;	d5 = <mark>e</mark> + <mark>f</mark> ;	d5 = e + f;
g6 = a2;	g6 = a2;	g6 = a2;
<mark>g = g6;</mark>	g = g6;	g = g6;
d = d5	d = d5	d = d5
<mark>a = a2;</mark>	a = a2;	a = a2;
		label_0:
label_0:	label_0:	h2 = g + a;
h2 = g0 + a1;	h2 = g + a;	k3 = h2;
k3 = h2;	k3 = h2;	h = h2;
h = h2;	h = h2;	$ \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}3;$
k = k3;	k = k3;	

Now they can be combined

0

orig	ginal						
a	=	b	+	C	•		
d	=	е	+	f	;		
g	=	b	+	C	,		
la	abe	el_	_0:	•			
h	=	g	+	a	;		
k	=	а	+	g	,		

a2 = b + c;
d5 = e + f;
g6 = a2;
g = g6;
d = d5
a = a2;
label_0:
h2 = g + a;
k3 = h2;
h = h2;
k = k3;

new

is it really optimized?

It looks a lot longer...

original

ong	ginai				
a	=	b	+	с;	
d	=	е	+	f;	
g	=	b	+	с;	
la	abe	el_	_0 :	•	
h	=	g	+	a;	
k	=	a	+	g;	

a2 = b + c;
d5 = e + f;
g6 = a2;
g = g6;
d = d5
a = a2;
label_0:
h2 = g + a;
k3 = h2;
h = h2;
k = k3;

new

is it really optimized?

Common pattern for code to get larger, but it will contain patterns that are easier optimize away

later passes will minimize copies

Loop optimizations

For loops

- How do they look in different languages
 - C/C++
 - Python
 - Numpy
- How do Python and Numpy look under the hood?
- The more constrained the for loops are, the more assumptions the compiler can make, but less flexibility for the programmer

For loops

- The compiler can optimize For loops if they fit a certain pattern
- When developing a compiler optimization, we start with strict constraints and then slowly relax them and make the optimization more general.
 - Sometimes it is not worth relaxing the constraints (code gets too complex)
 - If you know the constraints, then often you can write code such that the compiler can recognize the pattern and optimize!

For loops terminology

- Loop body:
 - A series of statements that are executed each loop iteration
- Loop condition:
 - the condition that decides whether the loop body is executed
- Iteration variable:
 - A variable that is updated exactly once during the loop
 - The loop condition depends on the iteration variable

Loop unrolling

• Executing multiple instances of the loop body without checking the loop condition.

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

unrolled by a factor of 2

for (int i = 0; i < 128; i++) {
 // body
}</pre>



could we unroll more?

• Under what conditions can we unroll?

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

```
for (int i = 0; i < 128; i++) {
    // body
}</pre>
```

• Under what conditions can we unroll?

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

Validate that we actually have an iteration variable

- 1. Ihs of assignment statement
- 2. no assignment to variable in body
- 3. Ihs of loop condition
- 4. Ihs of assignment_statement

Do these guarantee we will find an iteration variable? What happens if we don't find one?

Under what conditions can we unroll?

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

How does C-simple help us here?

Validate that we actually have an iteration variable

- 1. Ihs of assignment statement
- 2. no assignment to variable in body
- 3. Ihs of loop condition
- 4. lhs of assignment_statement

Do these guarantee we will find an iteration variable? What happens if we don't find one?

• Under what conditions can we unroll?

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

```
for (int i = 0; i < 128; i++) {
    // body
}</pre>
```

Validate properties of iteration variable 1. ?

• Under what conditions can we unroll?

FOR LPAR assignment_statement expr SEMI assignment_statement RPAR statement

Validate properties of iteration variable1. identify an iteration range (start and end)2. increment by 1

See everyone on Monday

- No class on Friday
- See you on Monday
- Topics: Continue Loop unrolling