Global Optimization

	а	{ =	} b;	•
	С	=	b;	•
d	=	a	+	b;
е	=	a	+	b;
	d	=	b;	;
f	=	а	+	b;

		{	}	
	а	=	b;	
{	a	=	b	}
	С	=	b;	
d	=	a	+	b;
е	=	а	+	b;
	d	=	b;	
f	=	а	+	b;

{ } a = b; $\{ a = b \}$ c = b; $\{ a = b, c = b \}$ d = a + b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = a + b \}$ e = a + b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = a + b, e = a + b \}$ d = b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = b, e = a + b \}$ f = a + b;





$$a = b + c$$







$$V_{out} = f_{a=b+c}(V_{in})$$



	a	=	b	•
	С	=	b;	,
d	=	а	+	b;
е	=	a	+	b;
	d	=	b;	•
f	=	а	+	b;

	а	{ =	} b;	•
	С	=	b;	•
d	=	a	+	b;
е	=	a	+	b;
	d	=	b;	;
f	=	а	+	b;

		{	}	
	а	=	b;	
{	a	=	b	}
	С	=	b;	
d	=	a	+	b;
е	=	а	+	b;
	d	=	b;	
f	=	а	+	b;

{ } a = b; $\{ a = b \}$ c = b; $\{ a = b, c = b \}$ d = a + b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = a + b \}$ e = a + b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = a + b, e = a + b \}$ d = b; $\{ a = b, c = b, d = b, e = a + b \}$ f = a + b;

- **Direction**: Forward
- **Domain**: Sets of expressions assigned to variables.
- Transfer functions: Given a set of variable assignments V and statement
 a = b + c:
 - Remove from V any expression containing ${\bf a}$ as a subexpression.
 - Add to V the expression $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}$.

• Initial value: Empty set of expressions.

	a	=	b;
	С	=	a;
d	=	а	+ b;
	е	—	d;
	d	—	a;
	f	=	e;

	[]	с,	d	}
	f	=	e;	
	d	=	a;	
	е	=	d;	
d	=	a	+	b;
	С	=	a;	
	a	=	b;	

	{ 1	с,	d	}	
	f	=	е;	•	•
{	b,	d		e	}
	d	=	a;	•	
	е	=	d;	9	
d		a	+	b	•
	С	=	a;	•	
	a	=	b;	•	

	{	Σ,	d	}	
	f	=	е;		
{	b,	d	7	е	}
	d	=	a;		
{	a,	b	,	е	}
	е	=	d;	•	
d	=	а	+	b	;
	С	—	a;	•	
	a	=	b;	•	

{ b } a = b;{ a, b } c = a;{ a, b } d = a + b;{ a, b, d } e = d;{ a, b, e } d = a;{ b, d, e } f = e;{ b, d }

- **Direction**: Backwards
- **Domain**: Sets of variables.
- Transfer function: Given a set of variables V and statement a = b + c:
 - Remove a from V (any previous value of a is now dead.)
 - Add **b** and **c** to V (any previous value of **b** or **c** is now live.)
 - Formally: $f_{a = b + c}(V) = (V \{a\}) \cup \{b, c\}$
- Initial value: Depends on semantics of language.

Running Local Analyses

- Given an analysis (**D**, **V**, **F**, **I**) for a basic block.
 - Assume that **D** is "forward;" analogous for the reverse case.
- Initially, set OUT[**entry**] to **I**.
- For each statement **s**, in order:
 - Set IN[s] to OUT[prev], where prev is the previous statement.
 - Set OUT[**s**] to $f_s(IN[s])$, where f_s is the transfer function for statement **s**.

Global Optimizations

Global Analysis

- A **global analysis** is an analysis that works on a control-flow graph as a whole.
- Substantially more powerful than a local analysis.
 - (Why?)
- Substantially more complicated than a local analysis.
 - (Why?)

Local vs. Global Analysis

- Many of the optimizations from local analysis can still be applied globally.
 - We'll see how to do this later today.
- Certain optimizations are possible in global analysis that aren't possible locally:
 - e.g. **code motion:** Moving code from one basic block into another to avoid computing values unnecessarily.
- We'll explore three analyses in detail:
 - Global dead code elimination.
 - Global constant propagation.
 - Partial redundancy elimination.

Global Dead Code Elimination

- Local dead code elimination needed to know what variables were live on exit from a basic block.
- This information can only be computed as part of a global analysis.
- How do we modify our liveness analysis to handle a CFG?




































Major Changes, Part One

- In a local analysis, each statement has exactly one predecessor.
- In a global analysis, each statement may have **multiple** predecessors.
- A global analysis must have some means of combining information from all predecessors of a basic block.

























Major Changes, Part II

- In a local analysis, there is only one possible path through a basic block.
- In a global analysis, there may be **many** paths through a CFG.
- May need to recompute values multiple times as more information becomes available.
- Need to be careful when doing this not to loop infinitely!
 - (More on that later)

CFGs with Loops

- Up to this point, we've considered loop-free CFGs, which have only finitely many possible paths.
- When we add loops into the picture, this is no longer true.
- Not all possible loops in a CFG can be realized in the actual program.

CFGs with Loops

- Up to this point, we've considered loop-free CFGs, which have only finitely many possible paths.
- When we add loops into the picture, this is no longer true.
- Not all possible loops in a CFG can be realized in the actual program.



CFGs with Loops

- Up to this point, we've considered loop-free CFGs, which have only finitely many possible paths.
- When we add loops into the picture, this is no longer true.
- Not all possible loops in a CFG can be realized in the actual program.
- **Sound approximation**: Assume that every possible path through the CFG corresponds to a valid execution.
 - Includes all realizable paths, but some additional paths as well.
 - May make our analysis less precise (but still sound).
 - Makes the analysis feasible; we'll see how later.




Major Changes, Part III

- In a local analysis, there is always a welldefined "first" statement to begin processing.
- In a global analysis with loops, every basic block might depend on every other basic block.
- To fix this, we need to assign initial values to all of the blocks in the CFG.













































Summary of Differences

- Need to be able to handle multiple predecessors/successors for a basic block.
- Need to be able to handle multiple paths through the control-flow graph, and may need to iterate multiple times to compute the final value (but the analysis still needs to terminate!)
- Need to be able to assign each basic block a reasonable default value for before we've analyzed it.

Global Liveness Analysis

- Initially, set $IN[s] = \{ \}$ for each statement s.
- Set IN[**exit**] to the set of variables known to be live on exit (language-specific knowledge).
- Repeat until no changes occur:
 - For each statement **s** of the form $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}$, in any order you'd like:
 - Set OUT[s] to set union of IN[p] for each successor p of s.
 - Set IN[s] to $(OUT[s] a) \cup \{b, c\}$.
- Yet another fixed-point iteration!

Why Does This Work?

- To show correctness, we need to show that
 - the algorithm eventually terminates, and
 - when it terminates, it has a sound answer.
- Termination argument:
 - Once a variable is discovered to be live during some point of the analysis, it always stays live.
 - Only finitely many variables and finitely many places where a variable can become live.
- Soundness argument (sketch):
 - Each individual rule, applied to some set, correctly updates liveness in that set.
 - When computing the union of the set of live variables, a variable is only live if it was live on some path leaving the statement.

Theory to the Rescue

- Building up all of the machinery to design this analysis was tricky.
- The key ideas, however, are mostly independent of the analysis:
 - We need to be able to compute functions describing the behavior of each statement.
 - We need to be able to merge several subcomputations together.
 - We need an initial value for all of the basic blocks.
- There is a beautiful formalism that captures many of these properties.

Meet Semilattices

- A **meet semilattice** is a ordering defined on a set of elements.
- Any two elements have some **meet** that is the largest element smaller than both elements.
- There is a unique **top element**, which is larger than all other elements.
- Intuitively:
 - The meet of two elements represents combining information from two elements.
 - The top element element represents "no information yet" or "the least conservative possible answer."










Meet Semilattices for Liveness



Formal Definitions

- A **meet semilattice** is a pair (D, Λ), where
 - D is a domain of elements.
 - A is a **meet operator** that is
 - **idempotent:** $x \land x = x$
 - **commutative:** $x \land y = y \land x$
 - **associative:** $(x \land y) \land z = x \land (y \land z)$
- If x ∧ y = z, we say that z is the meet or
 (greatest lower bound) of x and y.
- Every meet semilattice has a top element denoted ⊤ such that ⊤∧ x = x for all x.

An Example Semilattice

- The set of natural numbers and the **max** function.
- Idempotent
 - **max**{a, a} = a
- Commutative
 - $max{a, b} = max{b, a}$
- Associative
 - $max{a, max{b, c}} = max{max{a, b}, c}$
- Top element is 0:
 - **max**{0, a} = a

A Semilattice for Liveness

- Sets of live variables and the set union operation.
- Idempotent:
 - $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$
- Commutative:
 - $\mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \cup \mathbf{x}$
- Associative:
 - $(x \cup y) \cup z = x \cup (y \cup z)$
- Top element:
 - The empty set: $\emptyset \cup x = x$

Semilattices and Program Analysis

- Semilattices naturally solve many of the problems we encounter in global analysis.
- How do we combine information from multiple basic blocks?
 - Use the meet of all of those blocks.
- What value do we give to basic blocks we haven't seen yet?
 - Use the top element.
- How do we know that the algorithm always terminates?
 - Actually, we still don't! More on that later.

A General Framework

- A global analysis is a tuple (**D**, **V**, \blacktriangle , **F**, **I**), where
 - **D** is a direction (forward or backward)
 - The order to visit statements **within** a basic block, not the order in which to visit the basic blocks.
 - V is a set of values.
 - **A** is a meet operator over those values.
 - **F** is a set of transfer functions $f : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$
 - I is an initial value.
- The only difference from local analysis is the introduction of the meet operator.

Running Global Analyses

- Assume that $(\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{\Lambda}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{I})$ is a forward analysis.
- Set OUT[s] = T for all statements s.
- Set OUT[begin] = I.
- Repeat until no values change:
 - For each statement s with predecessors $p_1,\,p_2,\,\ldots\,,\,p_n$:
 - Set $IN[\mathbf{s}] = OUT[\mathbf{p}_1] \land OUT[\mathbf{p}_2] \land \dots \land OUT[\mathbf{p}_n]$
 - Set OUT[\mathbf{s}] = f_s (IN[\mathbf{s}])
- The order of this iteration does not matter.

For Comparison

- Set IN[s] = ⊤ for all statement s.
- Set IN[exit] = I.
- Repeat until no changes occur:
 - For each statement **s**:
 - Set OUT[**s**] = IN[x_1] $\land ... \land IN[x_n]$ where $x_1, ..., x_n$ are successors of **s**.

 $\overset{\text{Alex Aiken, Stanf}}{-} \overset{\text{Stanf}}{\operatorname{Set}} IN[\mathbf{s}] = f_{s} (OUT[\mathbf{s}])$

- Set IN[s] = { } for each statement s.
- Set IN[**exit**] to the set of variables known to be live on exit.
- Repeat until no changes occur:
 - For each statement s of the form a = b + c:
 - Set OUT[s] to set union of IN[x] for each successor x of s.
 - Set IN[**s**] to (OUT[**s**] - **a**) \cup {**b**, **c**}.

The Dataflow Framework

- This form of analysis is called the dataflow framework.
- Can be used to easily prove an analysis is sound.
- With certain restrictions, can be used to prove that an analysis eventually terminates.
 - Again, more on that later.

- **Constant propagation** is an optimization that replaces each variable that is known to be a constant value with that constant.
- An elegant example of the dataflow framework.







Constant Propagation Analysis

- In order to do a constant propagation, we need to track what values might be assigned to a variable at each program point.
- Every variable will either
 - Never have a value assigned to it,
 - Have a single constant value assigned to it,
 - Have two or more constant values assigned to it, or
 - Have a known non-constant value.
- Our analysis will propagate this information throughout a CFG to identify locations where a value is constant.

Properties of Constant Propagation

- For now, consider just some single variable **x**.
- At each point in the program, we know one of three things about the value of \mathbf{x} :
 - **x** is definitely not a constant, since it's been assigned two values or assigned a value that we know isn't a constant.
 - ${\bf x}$ is definitely a constant and has value ${\bf k}.$
 - We have never seen a value for $\boldsymbol{x}.$
- Note that the first and last of these are **not** the same!
 - The first one means that there may be a way for ${\bf x}$ to have multiple values.
 - The last one means that \mathbf{x} never had a value at all.

Defining a Meet Operator

- The meet of any two different constants is Not a Constant.
 - (If the variable might have two different values on entry to a statement, it cannot be a constant.)
- The meet of **Not a Constant** and any other value is **Not a Constant**.
 - (If on some path the value is known not to be a constant, then on entry to a statement its value can't possibly be a constant.)
- The meet of **Undefined** and any other value is that other value.

• (If x has no value on some path and does have a value on some other path, we can just pretend it always had the assigned value.)

• One possible semilattice for this analysis is shown here:



• One possible semilattice for this analysis is shown here:



This lattice is infinitely wide!

• One possible semilattice for this analysis is shown here:



• One possible semilattice for this analysis is shown here:



- Note:
 - The meet of any two different constants is **Not a Constant**.
 - The meet of **Undefined** and any value is that value.

Alex Aiken, Same meet of Not a Constant and any value is Not a Constant.




































































































Dataflow for Constant Propagation

- Direction: Forward
- Semilattice: **Defined earlier**
- Transfer functions:
 - $f_{x=k}(V) = k$ (assign a constant)
 - $f_{x=a+b}(V) = Not a Constant (assign non-constant)$
 - $f_{y=a+b}(V) = V$ (unrelated assignment)
- Initial value: **x is Undefined**
 - (When might we use some other value?)