

Helmut Seidl

# Program Optimization

*TU München*

Winter 2013/14

# Organization

## Dates:

**Lecture:** Monday, 14:00-15:30

Wednesday, 8:30-10:00

**Tutorials:** Tuesday/Wednesday, 10:00-12:00

Stefan Schulze Frieblinghaus: [schulzef@in.tum.de](mailto:schulzef@in.tum.de)

**Material:** slides, [recording](#) :-)

Moodle

[Program Analysis and Transformation](#)

[Springer, 2012](#)

- Grades:**
- Bonus for homeworks
  - written exam

# Proposed Content:

## 1. Avoiding redundant computations

- available expressions
- constant propagation/array-bound checks
- code motion

## 2. Replacing expensive with cheaper computations

- peep hole optimization
- inlining
- reduction of strength

...

### 3. Exploiting Hardware

- Instruction selection
- Register allocation
- Scheduling
- Memory management

# 0 Introduction

Observation 1: Intuitive programs often are inefficient.

Example:

```
void swap (int i, int j) {  
    int t;  
    if (a[i] > a[j]) {  
        t = a[j];  
        a[j] = a[i];  
        a[i] = t;  
    }  
}
```

## Inefficiencies:

- Addresses  $a[i]$ ,  $a[j]$  are computed three times :-)
- Values  $a[i]$ ,  $a[j]$  are loaded twice :-)

## Improvement:

- Use a pointer to traverse the array  $a$ ;
- store the values of  $a[i]$ ,  $a[j]$ !

```
void swap (int *p, int *q) {  
    int t, ai, aj;  
    ai = *p; aj = *q;  
    if (ai > aj) {  
        t = aj;  
        *q = ai;  
        *p = t;    // t can also be  
    }            // eliminated!  
}
```



## Observation 2:

Higher programming languages (even C :-)) abstract from hardware and efficiency.

It is up to the compiler to adapt *intuitively* written program to hardware.

## Examples:

- ... Filling of delay slots;
- ... Utilization of special instructions;
- ... Re-organization of memory accesses for better cache behavior;
- ... Removal of (useless) overflow/range checks.

## Observation 3:

Programm-Improvements need not always be correct :-)

## Example:

$$y = f() + f(); \quad \Longrightarrow \quad y = 2 * f();$$

Idea: Save second evaluation of  $f()$  ...

## Observation 3:

Programm-Improvements need not always be correct :-)

## Example:

$$y = f() + f(); \quad \Longrightarrow \quad y = 2 * f();$$

**Idea:** Save the second evaluation of  $f()$  ???

**Problem:** The second evaluation may return a result different from the first; (e.g., because  $f()$  reads from the input :-)

## Consequences:

- ⇒ Optimizations have **assumptions**.
- ⇒ The **assumption** must be:
  - formalized,
  - checked :-)
- ⇒ It must be proven that the optimization is **correct**, i.e., preserves the **semantics !!!**

## Observation 4:

Optimization techniques depend on the **programming language**:

- which inefficiencies occur;
- how analyzable programs are;
- how difficult/impossible it is to prove correctness ...

**Example:**            **Java**

## Unavoidable Inefficiencies:

- \* Array-bound checks;
- \* Dynamic method invocation;
- \* Bombastic object organization ...

## Analyzability:

- + no pointer arithmetic;
- + no pointer into the stack;
- dynamic class loading;
- reflection, exceptions, threads, ...

## Correctness proofs:

- + more or less well-defined semantics;
- features, features, features;
- libraries with changing behavior ...

... in this course:

a simple **imperative** programming language with:

- variables // registers
- $R = e;$  // assignments
- $R = M[e];$  // loads
- $M[e_1] = e_2;$  // stores
- **if** ( $e$ )  $s_1$  **else**  $s_2$  // conditional branching
- **goto**  $L;$  // no loops :-)



## Note:

- For the beginning, we omit procedures :-)
- External procedures are taken into account through a statement  $f()$  for an unknown procedure  $f$ .
  - ⇒ intra-procedural
  - ⇒ kind of an intermediate language in which (almost) everything can be translated.

Example:          `swap ( )`

```

0 :   A1 = A0 + 1 * i;           //   A0 == &a
1 :   R1 = M[A1];               //   R1 == a[i]
2 :   A2 = A0 + 1 * j;
3 :   R2 = M[A2];               //   R2 == a[j]
4 :   if (R1 > R2) {
5 :       A3 = A0 + 1 * j;
6 :       t = M[A3];
7 :       A4 = A0 + 1 * j;
8 :       A5 = A0 + 1 * i;
9 :       R3 = M[A5];
10 :      M[A4] = R3;
11 :      A6 = A0 + 1 * i;
12 :      M[A6] = t;
      }

```

Optimization 1:

$$1 * R \implies R$$

Optimization 2:

Reuse of subexpressions

$$A_1 == A_5 == A_6$$

$$A_2 == A_3 == A_4$$

$$M[A_1] == M[A_5]$$

$$M[A_2] == M[A_3]$$

$$R_1 == R_3$$

By this, we obtain:

$$A_1 = A_0 + i;$$

$$R_1 = M[A_1];$$

$$A_2 = A_0 + j;$$

$$R_2 = M[A_2];$$

if ( $R_1 > R_2$ ) {

$$t = R_2;$$

$$M[A_2] = R_1;$$

$$M[A_1] = t;$$

}

Optimization 3: Contraction of chains of assignments :-)

Gain:

	before	after
+	6	2
*	6	0
load	4	2
store	2	2
>	1	1
=	6	2

# 1 Removing superfluous computations

## 1.1 Repeated computations

Idea:

If the same value is computed **repeatedly**, then

- **store** it after the first computation;
- replace every further computation through a **look-up!**
  - ⇒ Availability of expressions
  - ⇒ Memoization

**Problem:** Identify repeated computations!

**Example:**

$$\begin{array}{l} z = 1; \\ y = M[17]; \\ A : x_1 = y + z; \\ \quad \dots \\ B : x_2 = y + z; \end{array}$$

## Note:

$B$  is a repeated computation of the value of  $y + z$ , if:

- (1)  $A$  is **always** executed **before**  $B$ ; and
- (2)  $y$  and  $z$  at  $B$  have the same values as at  $A$  :-)

$\implies$  We need:

- $\rightarrow$  an operational semantics :-)
- $\rightarrow$  a method which identifies at least **some** repeated computations ...




# Background 1: An Operational Semantics

we choose a **small-step** operational approach.

Programs are represented as **control-flow graphs**.

In the example:



Thereby, represent:

vertex	program point
start	programm start
stop	program exit
edge	step of computation

Thereby, represent:

vertex	program point
start	programm start
stop	program exit
edge	step of computation

Edge Labelings:

**Test** :            Pos ( $e$ ) or Neg ( $e$ )

**Assignment** :     $R = e$ ;

**Load** :             $R = M[e]$ ;

**Store** :             $M[e_1] = e_2$ ;

**Nop** :              ;

Computations follow **paths**.

Computations transform the current **state**

$$s = (\rho, \mu)$$

where:

$\rho : \text{Vars} \rightarrow \text{int}$	contents of registers
$\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{int}$	contents of storage

Every **edge**  $k = (u, lab, v)$  defines a **partial transformation**

$$\llbracket k \rrbracket = \llbracket lab \rrbracket$$

of the state:

$$\llbracket ; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu)$$

$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho \neq 0$$

$$\llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho = 0$$

$$\llbracket ; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu)$$

$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho \neq 0$$

$$\llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho = 0$$

//  $\llbracket e \rrbracket$  : **evaluation** of the expression  $e$ , e.g.

$$// \llbracket x + y \rrbracket \{x \mapsto 7, y \mapsto -1\} = 6$$

$$// \llbracket !(x == 4) \rrbracket \{x \mapsto 5\} = 1$$

$$\llbracket ; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu)$$

$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho \neq 0$$

$$\llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{if } \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho = 0$$

//  $\llbracket e \rrbracket$  : **evaluation** of the expression  $e$ , e.g.

$$// \llbracket x + y \rrbracket \{x \mapsto 7, y \mapsto -1\} = 6$$

$$// \llbracket !(x == 4) \rrbracket \{x \mapsto 5\} = 1$$

$$\llbracket R = e; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho \oplus \{R \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho\}, \mu)$$

// where “ $\oplus$ ” modifies a mapping at a given argument

$$\llbracket R = M[e]; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho \oplus \{R \mapsto \mu(\llbracket e \rrbracket \rho)\}, \mu)$$

$$\llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho, \mu \oplus \{\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \rho \mapsto \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \rho\})$$

**Example:**

$$\llbracket x = x + 1; \rrbracket (\{x \mapsto 5\}, \mu) = (\rho, \mu) \quad \text{where:}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \{x \mapsto 5\} \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket x + 1 \rrbracket \{x \mapsto 5\}\} \\ &= \{x \mapsto 5\} \oplus \{x \mapsto 6\} \\ &= \{x \mapsto 6\} \end{aligned}$$



A path  $\pi = k_1 k_2 \dots k_m$  is a **computation** for the state  $s$  if:


$$s \in \text{def} (\llbracket k_m \rrbracket \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket)$$

The **result** of the computation is:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket s = (\llbracket k_m \rrbracket \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket) s$$

## Application:

Assume that we have computed the value of  $x + y$  at program point  $u$ :



We perform a computation along path  $\pi$  and reach  $v$  where we evaluate again  $x + y \dots$

## Idea:

If  $x$  and  $y$  have not been modified in  $\pi$ , then evaluation of  $x + y$  at  $v$  must return the same value as evaluation at  $u$  :-)

We can check this property at every edge in  $\pi$  :-}

## Idea:

If  $x$  and  $y$  have not been modified in  $\pi$ , then evaluation of  $x + y$  at  $v$  must return the same value as evaluation at  $u$  :-)

We can check this property at every edge in  $\pi$  :-}

## More generally:

Assume that the values of the expressions  $A = \{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$  are available at  $u$ .

## Idea:

If  $x$  and  $y$  have not been modified in  $\pi$ , then evaluation of  $x + y$  at  $v$  must return the same value as evaluation at  $u$  :-)

We can check this property at every edge in  $\pi$  :-}

## More generally:

Assume that the values of the expressions  $A = \{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$  are available at  $u$ .

Every edge  $k$  transforms this set into a set  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# A$  of expressions whose values are available **after** execution of  $k$  ...

... which transformations can be composed to the **effect** of a path

$\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$ :

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\#$$

... which transformations can be composed to the **effect** of a path

$\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$ :

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\#$$

The effect  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  of an edge  $k = (u, \text{lab}, v)$  only depends on the label  $\text{lab}$ , i.e.,  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket \text{lab} \rrbracket^\#$

... which transformations can be composed to the **effect** of a path

$\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$ :

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\#$$

The effect  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  of an edge  $k = (u, lab, v)$  only depends on the label  $lab$ , i.e.,  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\#$  where:

$$\llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# A = A$$

$$\llbracket Pos(e) \rrbracket^\# A = \llbracket Neg(e) \rrbracket^\# A = A \cup \{e\}$$

$$\llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# A = (A \cup \{e\}) \setminus Expr_x \quad \text{where}$$

$Expr_x$  all expressions which contain  $x$

$$\llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# A = (A \cup \{e\}) \setminus Expr_x$$

$$\llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# A = A \cup \{e_1, e_2\}$$



$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# A &= (A \cup \{e\}) \setminus Expr_x \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# A &= A \cup \{e_1, e_2\} \end{aligned}$$

By that, **every path** can be analyzed :-)

A given program may admit **several paths** :-)

For any given input, another path may be chosen :-((

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# A &= (A \cup \{e\}) \setminus Expr_x \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# A &= A \cup \{e_1, e_2\} \end{aligned}$$

By that, **every path** can be analyzed :-)

A given program may admit **several paths** :-)

For any given input, another path may be chosen :-((

$\implies$  We require the set:

$$\mathcal{A}[v] = \bigcap \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# \emptyset \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* v \}$$

## Concretely:

- We consider **all** paths  $\pi$  which reach  $v$ .
- For every path  $\pi$ , we determine the set of expressions which are available along  $\pi$ .
- Initially at program start, **nothing** is available :-)
- We compute the **intersection**  $\implies$  **safe information**


## Concretely:

- We consider **all** paths  $\pi$  which reach  $v$ .
- For every path  $\pi$ , we determine the set of expressions which are available along  $\pi$ .
- Initially at program start, **nothing** is available :-)
- We compute the **intersection**  $\implies$  **safe information**

How do we exploit this information ???


## Transformation 1.1:

We provide novel registers  $T_e$  as **storage** for the  $e$ :



## Transformation 1.1:


We provide novel registers  $T_e$  as **storage** for the  $e$ :



... analogously for  $R = M[e]$ ; and  $M[e_1] = e_2$ ;

## Transformation 1.2:


If  $e$  is available at program point  $u$ , then  $e$  need not be re-evaluated:



We replace the assignment with *Nop* :-)

Example:

$x = y + 3;$   
 $x = 7;$   
 $z = y + 3;$






Example:

$$x = y + 3;$$


$$x = 7;$$

$$z = y + 3;$$




## Example:

$x = y + 3;$   
 $x = 7;$   
 $z = y + 3;$



## Example:

$x = y + 3;$   
 $x = 7;$   
 $z = y + 3;$




## Correctness: (Idea)

Transformation 1.1 preserves the semantics and  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  for all program points  $u$  :-)

Assume  $\pi : \text{start} \rightarrow^* u$  is the path taken by a computation.

If  $e \in \mathcal{A}[u]$ , then also  $e \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# \emptyset$ .


Therefore,  $\pi$  can be decomposed into:



with the following properties:

- The expression  $e$  is evaluated at the edge  $k$ ;
- The expression  $e$  is not removed from the set of available expressions at any edge in  $\pi_2$ , i.e., no variable of  $e$  receives a new value :-)

- The expression  $e$  is evaluated at the edge  $k$ ;
- The expression  $e$  is not removed from the set of available expressions at any edge in  $\pi_2$ , i.e., no variable of  $e$  receives a new value :-)



The register  $T_e$  contains the value of  $e$  whenever  $u$  is reached :-))

## Warning:

Transformation 1.1 is only meaningful for assignments  $x = e$ ; where:

- $e \notin Vars$ ;
- the evaluation of  $e$  is **non-trivial** :-}

## Warning:

Transformation 1.1 is only meaningful for assignments  $x = e$ ; where:

- $x \notin \text{Vars}(e)$ ;
- $e \notin \text{Vars}$ ;
- the evaluation of  $e$  is non-trivial :- }

Which leaves us with the following question ...



Question:

How do we compute  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  for every program point  $u$  ??

## Question:

How can we compute  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  for every program point  $u$  ??

We collect all restrictions to the values of  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  into a **system of constraints**:


$$\mathcal{A}[start] \subseteq \emptyset$$

$$\mathcal{A}[v] \subseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{A}[u]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge}$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)


## Example:



## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:




$$\mathcal{A}[0] \subseteq \emptyset$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:



$$\mathcal{A}[0] \subseteq \emptyset$$


$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[0] \cup \{1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[4]$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:




$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}[0] &\subseteq \emptyset \\ \mathcal{A}[1] &\subseteq (\mathcal{A}[0] \cup \{1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y \\ \mathcal{A}[1] &\subseteq \mathcal{A}[4] \\ \mathcal{A}[2] &\subseteq \mathcal{A}[1] \cup \{x > 1\}\end{aligned}$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:



$$\mathcal{A}[0] \subseteq \emptyset$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[0] \cup \{1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[4]$$


$$\mathcal{A}[2] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[1] \cup \{x > 1\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}[3] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[2] \cup \{x * y\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:



$$\mathcal{A}[0] \subseteq \emptyset$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[0] \cup \{1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[4]$$

$$\mathcal{A}[2] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[1] \cup \{x > 1\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}[3] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[2] \cup \{x * y\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$


$$\mathcal{A}[4] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[3] \cup \{x - 1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_x$$



## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:



$$\mathcal{A}[0] \subseteq \emptyset$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[0] \cup \{1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$

$$\mathcal{A}[1] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[4]$$

$$\mathcal{A}[2] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[1] \cup \{x > 1\}$$

$$\mathcal{A}[3] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[2] \cup \{x * y\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_y$$


$$\mathcal{A}[4] \subseteq (\mathcal{A}[3] \cup \{x - 1\}) \setminus \text{Expr}_x$$

$$\mathcal{A}[5] \subseteq \mathcal{A}[1] \cup \{x > 1\}$$

## Wanted:

- a maximally **large** solution (??)
- an algorithm which computes this :-)

## Example:



## Solution:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}[0] &= \emptyset \\ \mathcal{A}[1] &= \{1\} \\ \mathcal{A}[2] &= \{1, x > 1\} \\ \mathcal{A}[3] &= \{1, x > 1\} \\ \mathcal{A}[4] &= \{1\} \\ \mathcal{A}[5] &= \{1, x > 1\}\end{aligned}$$

## Observation:

- The possible values for  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  form a **complete lattice**:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{Expr} \quad \text{with} \quad B_1 \sqsubseteq B_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad B_1 \supseteq B_2$$

## Observation:

- The possible values for  $\mathcal{A}[u]$  form a **complete lattice**:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{Expr} \quad \text{with} \quad B_1 \sqsubseteq B_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad B_1 \supseteq B_2$$

- The functions  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are **monotonic**, i.e.,

$$\llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp(B_1) \sqsubseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp(B_2) \quad \text{whenever} \quad B_1 \sqsubseteq B_2$$

# Background 2: Complete Lattices

A set  $\mathbb{D}$  together with a relation  $\sqsubseteq \subseteq \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$  is a **partial order** if for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{D}$ ,

$$a \sqsubseteq a$$

*reflexivity*

$$a \sqsubseteq b \wedge b \sqsubseteq a \implies a = b$$


*anti-symmetry*

$$a \sqsubseteq b \wedge b \sqsubseteq c \implies a \sqsubseteq c$$

*transitivity*

## Examples:


1.  $\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}$  with the relation “ $\subseteq$ ”:




2.  $\mathbb{Z}$  with the relation “=” :



3.  $\mathbb{Z}$  with the relation “ $\leq$ ” :



4.  $\mathbb{Z}_{\perp} = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\perp\}$  with the ordering:



$d \in \mathbb{D}$  is called **upper bound** for  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  if

$$x \leq d \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

$d \in \mathbb{D}$  is called **upper bound** for  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  if

$$x \leq d \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

$d$  is called **least upper bound (lub)** if

1.  $d$  is an upper bound and
2.  $d \leq y$  for every upper bound  $y$  of  $X$ .



$d \in \mathbb{D}$  is called **upper bound** for  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  if

$$x \leq d \quad \text{for all } x \in X$$

$d$  is called **least upper bound (lub)** if

1.  $d$  is an upper bound and
2.  $d \leq y$  for every upper bound  $y$  of  $X$ .

### Caveat:

- $\{0, 2, 4, \dots\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  has **no** upper bound!
- $\{0, 2, 4\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  has the upper bounds **4, 5, 6, ...**

A **complete lattice (cl)**  $\mathbb{D}$  is a partial ordering where **every subset**  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  has a least upper bound  $\bigsqcup X \in \mathbb{D}$  .


**Note:**

Every complete lattice has

- a **least** element  $\perp = \bigsqcup \emptyset \in \mathbb{D}$ ;
- a **greatest** element  $\top = \bigsqcup \mathbb{D} \in \mathbb{D}$ .

## Examples:

1.  $\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}$  is a cl :-)
2.  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{Z}$  with “=” is not.
3.  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{Z}$  with “ $\leq$ ” is neither.
4.  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{Z}_{\perp}$  is also not :-)
5. With an extra element  $\top$ , we obtain the flat lattice  
 $\mathbb{Z}_{\perp}^{\top} = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\perp, \top\}$  :



We have:

**Theorem:**

If  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice, then every subset  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  has a **greatest lower bound**  $\bigsqcap X$ .

We have:

### Theorem:

If  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice, then every subset  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  has a **greatest lower bound**  $\bigsqcap X$ .

### Proof:

**Construct**  $U = \{u \in \mathbb{D} \mid \forall x \in X : u \sqsubseteq x\}$ .

// the set of all lower bounds of  $X$  :-)

We have:

### Theorem:

If  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice, then every subset  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$  has a **greatest lower bound**  $\sqcap X$ .

### Proof:

**Construct**  $U = \{u \in \mathbb{D} \mid \forall x \in X : u \sqsubseteq x\}$ .

// the set of all lower bounds of  $X$  :-)

**Set:**  $g := \sqcup U$

**Claim:**  $g = \sqcap X$

(1)  $g$  is a **lower bound** of  $X$  :

Assume  $x \in X$ . Then:

$u \sqsubseteq x$  for all  $u \in U$

$\implies x$  is an upper bound of  $U$

$\implies g \sqsubseteq x \quad \text{: -)}$

(1)  $g$  is a **lower bound** of  $X$  :

Assume  $x \in X$ . Then:

$$u \sqsubseteq x \text{ for all } u \in U$$

$\implies x$  is an upper bound of  $U$

$\implies g \sqsubseteq x \quad :-)$


(2)  $g$  is the **greatest lower bound** of  $X$  :


Assume  $u$  is a lower bound of  $X$ . Then:


$$u \in U$$

$\implies u \sqsubseteq g \quad :-))$









We are looking for **solutions** for systems of constraints of the form:

$$x_i \quad \sqsupseteq \quad f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (*)$$

We are looking for **solutions** for systems of constraints of the form:

$$x_i \sqsubseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (*)$$

where:

$x_i$	unknown	here:	$\mathcal{A}[u]$
$\mathbb{D}$	values	here:	$2^{Expr}$
$\sqsubseteq \subseteq \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$	ordering relation	here:	$\supseteq$
$f_i: \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$	constraint	here:	...

We are looking for **solutions** for systems of constraints of the form:

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (*)$$

where:

$x_i$	unknown	here:	$\mathcal{A}[u]$
$\mathbb{D}$	values	here:	$2^{Expr}$
$\sqsubseteq \subseteq \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$	ordering relation	here:	$\supseteq$
$f_i: \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$	constraint	here:	...

Constraint for  $\mathcal{A}[v]$  ( $v \neq start$ ):

$$\mathcal{A}[v] \subseteq \bigcap \{ \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{A}[u]) \mid k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge} \}$$

We are looking for **solutions** for systems of constraints of the form:

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (*)$$

where:

$x_i$	unknown	here:	$\mathcal{A}[u]$
$\mathbb{D}$	values	here:	$2^{Expr}$
$\sqsubseteq \subseteq \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$	ordering relation	here:	$\supseteq$
$f_i: \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$	constraint	here:	...

Constraint for  $\mathcal{A}[v]$  ( $v \neq start$ ):

$$\mathcal{A}[v] \subseteq \bigcap \{ \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{A}[u]) \mid k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge} \}$$

**Because:**

$$x \sqsupseteq d_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x \sqsupseteq d_k \quad \text{iff} \quad x \sqsupseteq \bigsqcup \{d_1, \dots, d_k\} \quad :-)$$

A mapping  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called **monotonic**, if  $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$  for all  $a \sqsubseteq b$ .



A mapping  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called **monotonic**, if  $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$  for all  $a \sqsubseteq b$ .

## Examples:

(1)  $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = 2^U$  for a set  $U$  and  $f(x) = (x \cap a) \cup b$ .

Obviously, every such  $f$  is monotonic :-)

A mapping  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called **monotonic**, if  $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$  for all  $a \sqsubseteq b$ .

## Examples:

(1)  $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = 2^U$  for a set  $U$  and  $f x = (x \cap a) \cup b$ .

Obviously, every such  $f$  is monotonic :-)

(2)  $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{Z}$  (with the ordering “ $\leq$ ”). Then:

- $\text{inc } x = x + 1$  is monotonic.
- $\text{dec } x = x - 1$  is monotonic.

A mapping  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called **monotonic**, if  $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$  for all  $a \sqsubseteq b$ .

## Examples:

(1)  $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = 2^U$  for a set  $U$  and  $f(x) = (x \cap a) \cup b$ .

Obviously, every such  $f$  is monotonic :-)

(2)  $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{Z}$  (with the ordering “ $\leq$ ”). Then:

- $\text{inc } x = x + 1$  is monotonic.
- $\text{dec } x = x - 1$  is monotonic.
- $\text{inv } x = -x$  is **not monotonic** :-)

## Theorem:

If  $f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  and  $f_2 : \mathbb{D}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  are monotonic, then also  
 $f_2 \circ f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  :-)

## Theorem:

If  $f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  and  $f_2 : \mathbb{D}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  are monotonic, then also  
 $f_2 \circ f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  :-)

## Theorem:

If  $\mathbb{D}_2$  is a complete lattice, then the set  $[\mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2]$  of monotonic functions  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is also a complete lattice where

$$f \sqsubseteq g \text{ iff } f x \sqsubseteq g x \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{D}_1$$

## Theorem:

If  $f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  and  $f_2 : \mathbb{D}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  are monotonic, then also  
 $f_2 \circ f_1 : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_3$  :-)

## Theorem:

If  $\mathbb{D}_2$  is a complete lattice, then the set  $[\mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2]$  of monotonic functions  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is also a complete lattice where

$$f \sqsubseteq g \quad \text{iff} \quad f x \sqsubseteq g x \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{D}_1$$

In particular for  $F \subseteq [\mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2]$ ,

$$\bigsqcup F = f \quad \text{mit} \quad f x = \bigsqcup \{g x \mid g \in F\}$$

For functions  $f_i x = a_i \cap x \cup b_i$ , the operations “ $\circ$ ”, “ $\sqcup$ ” and “ $\sqcap$ ” can be explicitly defined by:

$$(f_2 \circ f_1) x = a_1 \cap a_2 \cap x \cup a_2 \cap b_1 \cup b_2$$

$$(f_1 \sqcup f_2) x = (a_1 \cup a_2) \cap x \cup b_1 \cup b_2$$

$$(f_1 \sqcap f_2) x = (a_1 \cup b_1) \cap (a_2 \cup b_2) \cap x \cup b_1 \cap b_2$$

**Wanted:** minimally **small** solution for:

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.



**Wanted:** minimally **small** solution for:

$$x_i \supseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.

**Idea:**

- Consider  $F : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^n$  where

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \quad \text{with} \quad y_i = f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

**Wanted:** minimally **small** solution for:

$$x_i \supseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.

**Idea:**

- Consider  $F : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^n$  where

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \quad \text{with} \quad y_i = f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- If all  $f_i$  are monotonic, then also  $F$  :-)

**Wanted:** minimally **small** solution for:

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.

**Idea:**

- Consider  $F : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^n$  where

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \quad \text{with} \quad y_i = f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

- If all  $f_i$  are monotonic, then also  $F$  :-)
- We successively **approximate** a solution. We construct:

$$\underline{\quad}, \quad F \underline{\quad}, \quad F^2 \underline{\quad}, \quad F^3 \underline{\quad}, \quad \dots$$

**Hope:** We eventually reach a solution ... ???

Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

The Iteration:

	0	1	2	3	4
$x_1$	$\emptyset$				
$x_2$	$\emptyset$				
$x_3$	$\emptyset$				

Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

The Iteration:

	0	1	2	3	4
$x_1$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$			
$x_2$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$			
$x_3$	$\emptyset$	$\{c\}$			

Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

The Iteration:

	0	1	2	3	4
$x_1$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$	$\{a, c\}$		
$x_2$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$		
$x_3$	$\emptyset$	$\{c\}$	$\{a, c\}$		

Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

The Iteration:

	0	1	2	3	4
$x_1$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$	$\{a, c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	
$x_2$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$	
$x_3$	$\emptyset$	$\{c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	



Example:

$$\mathbb{D} = 2^{\{a,b,c\}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \subseteq$$

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

The Iteration:

	0	1	2	3	4
$x_1$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$	$\{a, c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	ditto
$x_2$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\{a\}$	
$x_3$	$\emptyset$	$\{c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	$\{a, c\}$	

## Theorem

- $\underline{\perp}, F \underline{\perp}, F^2 \underline{\perp}, \dots$  form an ascending chain :

$$\underline{\perp} \subseteq F \underline{\perp} \subseteq F^2 \underline{\perp} \subseteq \dots$$

- If  $F^k \underline{\perp} = F^{k+1} \underline{\perp}$ , a solution is obtained which is the least one :-)
- If all ascending chains are finite, such a  $k$  always exists.

## Theorem

- $\underline{\perp}, F \underline{\perp}, F^2 \underline{\perp}, \dots$  form an ascending chain :

$$\underline{\perp} \subseteq F \underline{\perp} \subseteq F^2 \underline{\perp} \subseteq \dots$$

- If  $F^k \underline{\perp} = F^{k+1} \underline{\perp}$ , a solution is obtained which is the least one :-)
- If all ascending chains are finite, such a  $k$  always exists.

## Proof

The first claim follows by complete induction:

**Foundation:**  $F^0 \underline{\perp} = \underline{\perp} \subseteq F^1 \underline{\perp}$  :-)

**Step:** Assume  $F^{i-1} \underline{\perp} \sqsubseteq F^i \underline{\perp}$ . Then

$$F^i \underline{\perp} = F(F^{i-1} \underline{\perp}) \sqsubseteq F(F^i \underline{\perp}) = F^{i+1} \underline{\perp}$$

since  $F$  monotonic :-)

**Step:** Assume  $F^{i-1} \underline{\underline{}} \sqsubseteq F^i \underline{\underline{}}$ . Then

$$F^i \underline{\underline{}} = F(F^{i-1} \underline{\underline{}}) \sqsubseteq F(F^i \underline{\underline{}}) = F^{i+1} \underline{\underline{}}$$

since  $F$  monotonic :-)

**Conclusion:**

If  $\mathbb{D}$  is finite, a solution can be found which is definitely the least :-)

**Question:**

What, if  $\mathbb{D}$  is not finite ???

## Theorem

## Knaster – Tarski

Assume  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice. Then every **monotonic** function  $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  has a **least fixpoint**  $d_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ .

Let  $P = \{d \in \mathbb{D} \mid f d \sqsubseteq d\}$ .

Then  $d_0 = \bigsqcap P$  .



*Brunisław Knaster (1893-1980), topology*

## Theorem

## Knaster – Tarski

Assume  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice. Then every **monotonic** function  $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  has a **least fixpoint**  $d_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ .

Let  $P = \{d \in \mathbb{D} \mid f d \sqsubseteq d\}$ .

Then  $d_0 = \bigsqcap P$  .

## Proof:

(1)  $d_0 \in P$  :



## Theorem

## Knaster – Tarski

Assume  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice. Then every **monotonic** function  $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  has a **least fixpoint**  $d_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ .

Let  $P = \{d \in \mathbb{D} \mid f d \sqsubseteq d\}$ .

Then  $d_0 = \bigsqcap P$  .

## Proof:

(1)  $d_0 \in P$  :

$$f d_0 \sqsubseteq f d \sqsubseteq d \quad \text{for all } d \in P$$

$$\implies f d_0 \quad \text{is a lower bound of } P$$

$$\implies f d_0 \sqsubseteq d_0 \quad \text{since } d_0 = \bigsqcap P$$

$$\implies d_0 \in P \quad \text{: -)}$$

$$(2) \quad f d_0 = d_0 :$$

(2)  $f d_0 = d_0$  :

$f d_0 \sqsubseteq d_0$  by (1)

$\implies f(f d_0) \sqsubseteq f d_0$  by monotonicity of  $f$

$\implies f d_0 \in P$

$\implies d_0 \sqsubseteq f d_0$  and the claim follows  $\therefore$ )

(2)  $f d_0 = d_0$  :

$f d_0 \sqsubseteq d_0$  by (1)

$\implies f(f d_0) \sqsubseteq f d_0$  by monotonicity of  $f$

$\implies f d_0 \in P$

$\implies d_0 \sqsubseteq f d_0$  and the claim follows :-)

(3)  $d_0$  is **least** fixpoint:

(2)  $f d_0 = d_0$  :

$f d_0 \sqsubseteq d_0$  by (1)

$\implies f(f d_0) \sqsubseteq f d_0$  by monotonicity of  $f$

$\implies f d_0 \in P$

$\implies d_0 \sqsubseteq f d_0$  and the claim follows :-)

(3)  $d_0$  is **least** fixpoint:

$f d_1 = d_1 \sqsubseteq d_1$  an other fixpoint

$\implies d_1 \in P$

$\implies d_0 \sqsubseteq d_1$  :-))

## Remark:

The least fixpoint  $d_0$  is in  $P$  and a lower bound :-)

$\implies d_0$  is the least value  $x$  with  $x \sqsupseteq f x$

## Remark:

The least fixpoint  $d_0$  is in  $P$  and a **lower bound** :-)

$\implies d_0$  is the least value  $x$  with  $x \sqsupseteq f x$

## Application:

Assume 
$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

is a **system of constraints** where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.

## Remark:

The least fixpoint  $d_0$  is in  $P$  and a **lower bound** :-)

$\implies d_0$  is the least value  $x$  with  $x \sqsupseteq f x$

## Application:

Assume 
$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (*)$$

is a **system of constraints** where all  $f_i : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic.

$\implies$  least solution of  $(*)$   $\equiv$  least fixpoint of  $F$  :-)



Example 1:  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

Example 1:  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

$f$	$f^k \perp$	$f^k \top$
0	$\emptyset$	$U$

Example 1:  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

$f$	$f^k \perp$	$f^k \top$
0	$\emptyset$	$U$
1	$b$	$a \cup b$

Example 1:  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

$f$	$f^k \perp$	$f^k \top$
0	$\emptyset$	$U$
1	$b$	$a \cup b$
2	$b$	$a \cup b$

**Example 1:**  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

$f$	$f^k \perp$	$f^k \top$
0	$\emptyset$	$U$
1	$b$	$a \cup b$
2	$b$	$a \cup b$

**Example 2:**  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

Assume  $f x = x + 1$ . Then

$$f^i \perp = f^i 0 = i \quad \square \quad i + 1 = f^{i+1} \perp$$

**Example 1:**  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f x = x \cap a \cup b$

$f$	$f^k \perp$	$f^k \top$
0	$\emptyset$	$U$
1	$b$	$a \cup b$
2	$b$	$a \cup b$

**Example 2:**  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$

Assume  $f x = x + 1$ . Then

$$f^i \perp = f^i 0 = i \quad \square \quad i + 1 = f^{i+1} \perp$$

$\implies$  Ordinary iteration will never reach a fixpoint :-)

$\implies$  Sometimes, transfinite iteration is needed :-)

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-(




## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:




## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:




	1
0	$\emptyset$
1	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$
2	<i>Expr</i>
3	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$
4	$\{1\}$
5	<i>Expr</i>

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:




	1	2
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1\}$
2	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$
3	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$
4	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
5	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:




	1	2	3
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
2	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$
3	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$
4	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
5	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:




	1	2	3	4
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
2	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$
3	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$
4	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$
5	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$

## Conclusion:

Systems of inequations can be solved through **fixpoint iteration**, i.e., by repeated evaluation of right-hand sides :-)

**Caveat:** Naive fixpoint iteration is rather **inefficient** :-)

## Example:



	1	2	3	4	5
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	
1	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	
2	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	
3	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	ditto
4	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	$\{1\}$	
5	<i>Expr</i>	$\{1, x > 1, x - 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	$\{1, x > 1\}$	


## Idea: Round Robin Iteration

Instead of accessing the values of the last iteration, always use the **current** values of unknowns :-)

## Idea: Round Robin Iteration

Instead of accessing the values of the last iteration, always use the **current** values of unknowns :-)

## Example:






## Idea: Round Robin Iteration

Instead of accessing the values of the last iteration, always use the **current** values of unknowns :-)

## Example:




	1
0	$\emptyset$
1	{1}
2	{1, $x > 1$ }
3	{1, $x > 1$ }
4	{1}
5	{1, $x > 1$ }

## Idea: Round Robin Iteration

Instead of accessing the values of the last iteration, always use the **current** values of unknowns :-)

## Example:



	1	2
0	$\emptyset$	
1	{1}	
2	{1, $x > 1$ }	
3	{1, $x > 1$ }	ditto
4	{1}	
5	{1, $x > 1$ }	

The code for **Round Robin** Iteration in **Java** looks as follows:

```
for (i = 1; i ≤ n; i++)  $x_i = \perp$ ;  
do {  
    finished = true;  
    for (i = 1; i ≤ n; i++) {  
        new =  $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ;  
        if ( $!(x_i \sqsupseteq \text{new})$ ) {  
            finished = false;  
             $x_i = x_i \sqcup \text{new}$ ;  
        }  
    }  
} while (!finished);
```

## Correctness:

Assume  $y_i^{(d)}$  is the  $i$ -th component of  $F^d \underline{\underline{1}}$ .

Assume  $x_i^{(d)}$  is the value of  $x_i$  after the  $d$ -th RR-iteration.

## Correctness:

Assume  $y_i^{(d)}$  is the  $i$ -th component of  $F^d \underline{\underline{1}}$ .

Assume  $x_i^{(d)}$  is the value of  $x_i$  after the  $i$ -th RR-iteration.

One proves:

$$(1) \quad y_i^{(d)} \sqsubseteq x_i^{(d)} \quad :-)$$

## Correctness:

Assume  $y_i^{(d)}$  is the  $i$ -th component of  $F^d \underline{\underline{1}}$ .

Assume  $x_i^{(d)}$  is the value of  $x_i$  after the  $i$ -th RR-iteration.

One proves:

$$(1) \quad y_i^{(d)} \sqsubseteq x_i^{(d)} \quad :-)$$

$$(2) \quad x_i^{(d)} \sqsubseteq z_i \quad \text{for every solution } (z_1, \dots, z_n) \quad :-)$$

## Correctness:

Assume  $y_i^{(d)}$  is the  $i$ -th component of  $F^d \underline{1}$ .

Assume  $x_i^{(d)}$  is the value of  $x_i$  after the  $i$ -th RR-iteration.

One proves:

(1)  $y_i^{(d)} \sqsubseteq x_i^{(d)} \quad :-)$

(2)  $x_i^{(d)} \sqsubseteq z_i$  for every solution  $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \quad :-)$

(3) If RR-iteration terminates after  $d$  rounds, then  
 $(x_1^{(d)}, \dots, x_n^{(d)})$  is a solution  $:-)$

## Caveat:

The efficiency of **RR**-iteration depends on the **ordering** of the unknowns

!!!



## Caveat:

The efficiency of **RR**-iteration depends on the **ordering** of the unknowns

!!!

## Good:

→  $u$  before  $v$ , if  $u \rightarrow^* v$ ;

→ entry condition before loop body :-)

## Caveat:

The efficiency of **RR**-iteration depends on the **ordering** of the unknowns

!!!

## Good:


→  $u$  before  $v$ , if  $u \rightarrow^* v$ ;

→ entry condition before loop body :-)


## Bad:

e.g., post-order DFS of the CFG, starting at **start** :-)


Good:




Bad:



## Inefficient Round Robin Iteration:




## Inefficient Round Robin Iteration:




	1
0	<i>Expr</i>
1	{1}
2	{1, $x - 1$ , $x > 1$ }
3	<i>Expr</i>
4	{1}
5	$\emptyset$

# Inefficient Round Robin Iteration:




	1	2
0	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }
1	{1}	{1}
2	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }
3	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }
4	{1}	{1}
5	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$

# Inefficient Round Robin Iteration:



	1	2	3
0	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }
1	{1}	{1}	{1}
2	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }
3	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }
4	{1}	{1}	{1}
5	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$

# Inefficient Round Robin Iteration:



	1	2	3	4
0	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }	
1	{1}	{1}	{1}	
2	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }	{1, $x - 1, x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }	ditto
3	<i>Expr</i>	{1, $x > 1$ }	{1, $x > 1$ }	
4	{1}	{1}	{1}	
5	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	

⇒ significantly less efficient :-)



... end of background on: **Complete Lattices**

... end of background on: **Complete Lattices**

**Final Question:**

Why is a (or the least) solution of the constraint system useful ???

... end of background on: **Complete Lattices**

**Final Question:**

Why is a (or the least) solution of the constraint system useful ???

For a complete lattice  $\mathbb{D}$ , consider systems:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}[start] &\sqsupseteq d_0 \\ \mathcal{I}[v] &\sqsupseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{I}[u]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge} \end{aligned}$$

where  $d_0 \in \mathbb{D}$  and all  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic ...

... end of background on: **Complete Lattices**

**Final Question:**

Why is a (or the least) solution of the constraint system useful ???

For a complete lattice  $\mathbb{D}$ , consider systems:

$$\mathcal{I}[start] \sqsupseteq d_0$$

$$\mathcal{I}[v] \sqsupseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{I}[u]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge}$$

where  $d_0 \in \mathbb{D}$  and all  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  are monotonic ...



**Monotonic Analysis Framework**

Wanted: **MOP** (Merge Over all Paths)

$$\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ [\pi]^\# d_0 \mid \pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v \}$$

Wanted: MOP (Merge Over all Paths)

$$\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v \}$$

Theorem

Kam, Ullman 1975

Assume  $\mathcal{I}$  is a solution of the constraint system. Then:

$$\mathcal{I}[v] \supseteq \mathcal{I}^*[v] \quad \text{for every } v$$



Jeffrey D. Ullman, Stanford

Wanted: MOP (Merge Over all Paths)

$$\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* v \}$$

Theorem

Kam, Ullman 1975

Assume  $\mathcal{I}$  is a solution of the constraint system. Then:

$$\mathcal{I}[v] \supseteq \mathcal{I}^*[v] \quad \text{for every } v$$

In particular:  $\mathcal{I}[v] \supseteq \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0$  for every  $\pi : start \rightarrow^* v$



**Proof:** Induction on the length of  $\pi$ .

**Proof:** Induction on the length of  $\pi$ .

**Foundation:**  $\pi = \epsilon$  (empty path)

**Proof:** Induction on the length of  $\pi$ .

**Foundation:**  $\pi = \epsilon$  (empty path)

Then:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 = \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket^\# d_0 = d_0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}[\textit{start}]$$

**Proof:** Induction on the length of  $\pi$ .

**Foundation:**  $\pi = \epsilon$  (empty path)

Then:

$$[[\pi]]^\# d_0 = [[\epsilon]]^\# d_0 = d_0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}[start]$$

**Step:**  $\pi = \pi'k$  for  $k = (u, \_, v)$  edge.

**Proof:** Induction on the length of  $\pi$ .

**Foundation:**  $\pi = \epsilon$  (empty path)

Then:

$$[[\pi]]^\# d_0 = [[\epsilon]]^\# d_0 = d_0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}[start]$$

**Step:**  $\pi = \pi'k$  for  $k = (u, \_, v)$  edge.

Then:

$$[[\pi']]^\# d_0 \sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}[u] \quad \text{by I.H. for } \pi$$

$$\begin{aligned} \implies [[\pi]]^\# d_0 &= [[k]]^\# ([[ \pi' ] ]^\# d_0) \\ &\sqsubseteq [[k]]^\# (\mathcal{I}[u]) && \text{since } [[k]]^\# \text{ monotonic} \\ &\sqsubseteq \mathcal{I}[v] && \text{since } \mathcal{I} \text{ solution } :-)) \end{aligned}$$

## Disappointment:

Are solutions of the constraint system **just** upper bounds ???

Disappointment:

Are solutions of the constraint system **just** upper bounds ???

Answer:

In general: **yes** :-)

## Disappointment:

Are solutions of the constraint system **just** upper bounds ???

## Answer:

In general: **yes** :-)

With the notable exception when all functions  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  are **distributive** ...  
:-)



The function  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called

- **distributive**, if  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{f x \mid x \in X\}$  for all  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ ;
- **strict**, if  $f \perp = \perp$ .
- **totally distributive**, if  $f$  is distributive and strict.

The function  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called

- **distributive**, if  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{f x \mid x \in X\}$  for all  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ ;
- **strict**, if  $f \perp = \perp$ .
- **totally distributive**, if  $f$  is distributive and strict.

## Examples:

- $f x = x \cap a \cup b$  for  $a, b \subseteq U$ .

The function  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called

- **distributive**, if  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{f x \mid x \in X\}$  for all  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ ;
- **strict**, if  $f \perp = \perp$ .
- **totally distributive**, if  $f$  is distributive and strict.

## Examples:

- $f x = x \cap a \cup b$  for  $a, b \subseteq U$ .

**Strictness:**  $f \emptyset = a \cap \emptyset \cup b = b = \emptyset$  whenever  $b = \emptyset$  :-)

The function  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is called

- **distributive**, if  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{f x \mid x \in X\}$  for all  $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ ;
- **strict**, if  $f \perp = \perp$ .
- **totally distributive**, if  $f$  is distributive and strict.

## Examples:

- $f x = x \cap a \cup b$  for  $a, b \subseteq U$ .

**Strictness:**  $f \emptyset = a \cap \emptyset \cup b = b = \emptyset$  whenever  $b = \emptyset$  :-)

**Distributivity:**

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1 \cup x_2) &= a \cap (x_1 \cup x_2) \cup b \\ &= a \cap x_1 \cup a \cap x_2 \cup b \\ &= f x_1 \cup f x_2 \quad \text{:-)} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad \text{inc } x = x + 1$

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad \text{inc } x = x + 1$

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = \text{inc } 0 = 1 \neq \perp \text{ :-}(\$

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\text{inc } x = x + 1$

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = \text{inc } 0 = 1 \neq \perp$  :-)

**Distributivity:**  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{x + 1 \mid x \in X\}$  for  $\emptyset \neq X$   
:-)

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\text{inc } x = x + 1$

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = \text{inc } 0 = 1 \neq \perp$  :-)

**Distributivity:**  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{x + 1 \mid x \in X\}$  for  $\emptyset \neq X$   
:-)

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^2$ ,  $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2$



- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\text{inc } x = x + 1$

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = \text{inc } 0 = 1 \neq \perp$  :-)

**Distributivity:**  $f(\bigsqcup X) = \bigsqcup\{x + 1 \mid x \in X\}$  for  $\emptyset \neq X$   
:-)

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^2$ ,  $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2$  :

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = 0 + 0 = 0$  :-)

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = \mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $\text{inc } x = x + 1$

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = \text{inc } 0 = 1 \neq \perp$  :-)

**Distributivity:**  $f(\sqcup X) = \sqcup\{x + 1 \mid x \in X\}$  for  $\emptyset \neq X$   
:-)

- $\mathbb{D}_1 = (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})^2$ ,  $\mathbb{D}_2 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ ,  $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1 + x_2$  :

**Strictness:**  $f \perp = 0 + 0 = 0$  :-)

**Distributivity:**

$$f((1, 4) \sqcup (4, 1)) = f(4, 4) = 8$$

$$\neq 5 = f(1, 4) \sqcup f(4, 1) \quad :-)$$

## Remark:

If  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is distributive, then also monotonic :-)

## Remark:

If  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is distributive, then also monotonic :-)

Obviously:  $a \sqsubseteq b$  iff  $a \sqcup b = b$ .

## Remark:

If  $f : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_2$  is distributive, then also monotonic :-)

Obviously:  $a \sqsubseteq b$  iff  $a \sqcup b = b$ .

From that follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f b &= f (a \sqcup b) \\ &= f a \sqcup f b \\ \implies f a &\sqsubseteq f b \quad \text{:-)} \end{aligned}$$

**Assumption:** all  $v$  are reachable from *start* .

**Assumption:** all  $v$  are reachable from  $start$  .

Then:

**Theorem**

Kildall 1972

If all effects of edges  $[[k]]^\#$  are distributive, then:  $\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \mathcal{I}[v]$   
for all  $v$  .



Gary A. Kildall (1942-1994).

Has developed the operating system CP/M and GUIs for PCs.



**Assumption:** all  $v$  are reachable from  $start$  .

Then:

**Theorem**

Kildall 1972

If all effects of edges  $[[k]]^\#$  are distributive, then:  $\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \mathcal{I}[v]$   
for all  $v$  .

**Assumption:** all  $v$  are reachable from  $start$  .

Then:

**Theorem**

Kildall 1972

If all effects of edges  $[[k]]^\#$  are distributive, then:  $\mathcal{I}^*[v] = \mathcal{I}[v]$   
for all  $v$  .

**Proof:**

It suffices to prove that  $\mathcal{I}^*$  is a solution :-)

For this, we show that  $\mathcal{I}^*$  satisfies all constraints :-))

(1) We prove for *start* :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^*[start] &= \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* start \} \\ &\supseteq \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket^\# d_0 \\ &\supseteq d_0 \quad :-) \end{aligned}$$

(1) We prove for  $start$  :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}^*[start] &= \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* start \} \\
&\supseteq \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket^\# d_0 \\
&\supseteq d_0 \quad :-)
\end{aligned}$$

(2) For every  $k = (u, \_, v)$  we prove:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}^*[v] &= \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* v \} \\
&\supseteq \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi' k \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi' : start \rightarrow^* u \} \\
&= \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\llbracket \pi' \rrbracket^\# d_0) \mid \pi' : start \rightarrow^* u \} \\
&= \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi' \rrbracket^\# d_0 \mid \pi' : start \rightarrow^* u \}) \\
&= \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{I}^*[u])
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\{ \pi' \mid \pi' : start \rightarrow^* u \}$  is non-empty :-)

## Caveat:

- **Reachability** of all program points cannot be abandoned! Consider:



## Caveat:

- **Reachability** of all program points cannot be abandoned! Consider:



Then:

$$\mathcal{I}[2] = \text{inc } 0 = 1$$

$$\mathcal{I}^*[2] = \bigsqcup \emptyset = 0$$

## Caveat:

- **Reachability** of all program points cannot be abandoned! Consider:



Then:

$$\mathcal{I}[2] = \text{inc } 0 = 1$$

$$\mathcal{I}^*[2] = \bigsqcup \emptyset = 0$$

- **Unreachable** program points can always be thrown away :-)

## Summary and Application:

- The effects of edges of the analysis of **availability of expressions** are distributive:

$$\begin{aligned}(a \cup (x_1 \cap x_2)) \setminus b &= ((a \cup x_1) \cap (a \cup x_2)) \setminus b \\ &= ((a \cup x_1) \setminus b) \cap ((a \cup x_2) \setminus b)\end{aligned}$$



## Summary and Application:

- The effects of edges of the analysis of **availability of expressions** are distributive:

$$\begin{aligned}(a \cup (x_1 \cap x_2)) \setminus b &= ((a \cup x_1) \cap (a \cup x_2)) \setminus b \\ &= ((a \cup x_1) \setminus b) \cap ((a \cup x_2) \setminus b)\end{aligned}$$

- If all effects of edges are **distributive**, then the **MOP** can be computed by means of the constraint system and **RR-iteration**. :-)

## Summary and Application:

- The effects of edges of the analysis of **availability of expressions** are distributive:

$$\begin{aligned}(a \cup (x_1 \cap x_2)) \setminus b &= ((a \cup x_1) \cap (a \cup x_2)) \setminus b \\ &= ((a \cup x_1) \setminus b) \cap ((a \cup x_2) \setminus b)\end{aligned}$$

- If all effects of edges are **distributive**, then the **MOP** can be computed by means of the constraint system and **RR-iteration**. :-)
- If **not all** effects of edges are **distributive**, then **RR-iteration** for the constraint system at least returns a **safe** upper bound to the MOP :-)

## 1.2 Removing Assignments to Dead Variables

Example:

1 :  $x = y + 2;$

2 :  $y = 5;$

3 :  $x = y + 3;$

The value of  $x$  at program points 1, 2 is over-written before it can be used.

Therefore, we call the variable  $x$  **dead** at these program points :-)

## Note:

- Assignments to dead variables can be removed ;-)
- Such inefficiencies may originate from other transformations.

## Note:

- Assignments to dead variables can be removed ;-)
- Such inefficiencies may originate from other transformations.


## Formal Definition:

The variable  $x$  is called **live** at  $u$  along the path  $\pi$  starting at  $u$  relative to a set  $X$  of variables either:

if  $x \in X$  and  $\pi$  does not contain a **definition** of  $x$ ; or:

if  $\pi$  can be decomposed into:  $\pi = \pi_1 k \pi_2$  such that:

- $k$  is a **use** of  $x$ ; and
- $\pi_1$  does not contain a **definition** of  $x$ .




Thereby, the set of all defined or used variables at an edge  $k = (\_, lab, \_)$  is defined by:

<i>lab</i>	<i>used</i>	<i>defined</i>
;	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
$Pos(e)$	$Vars(e)$	$\emptyset$
$Neg(e)$	$Vars(e)$	$\emptyset$
$x = e;$	$Vars(e)$	$\{x\}$
$x = M[e];$	$Vars(e)$	$\{x\}$
$M[e_1] = e_2;$	$Vars(e_1) \cup Vars(e_2)$	$\emptyset$

A variable  $x$  which is not live at  $u$  along  $\pi$  (relative to  $X$ ) is called **dead** at  $u$  along  $\pi$  (relative to  $X$ ).

Example:



where  $X = \emptyset$ . Then we observe:

	live	dead
0	{ $y$ }	{ $x$ }
1	$\emptyset$	{ $x, y$ }
2	{ $y$ }	{ $x$ }
3	$\emptyset$	{ $x, y$ }

The variable  $x$  is **live** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ) if  $x$  is live at  $u$  along **some** path to the exit (relative to  $X$ ). Otherwise,  $x$  is called **dead** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ).



The variable  $x$  is **live** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ) if  $x$  is live at  $u$  along **some** path to the exit (relative to  $X$ ). Otherwise,  $x$  is called **dead** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ).

## Question:

How can the sets of all dead/live variables be computed for every  $u$  ???

The variable  $x$  is **live** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ) if  $x$  is live at  $u$  along **some** path to the exit (relative to  $X$ ). Otherwise,  $x$  is called **dead** at  $u$  (relative to  $X$ ).

### Question:

How can the sets of all dead/live variables be computed for every  $u$  ???

### Idea:

For every edge  $k = (u, \_, v)$ , define a function  $[[k]]^\#$  which transforms the set of variables which are live at  $v$  into the set of variables which are live at  $u$  ...

Let  $\mathbb{L} = 2^{Vars}$  .

For  $k = (\_, lab, \_)$  , define  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\#$  by:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \\ \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# L &= \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# L = L \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \cup Vars(e_1) \cup Vars(e_2)\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathbb{L} = 2^{Vars}$ .


For  $k = (\_, lab, \_)$ , define  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\#$  by:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \\ \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# L &= \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# L = L \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup Vars(e) \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \cup Vars(e_1) \cup Vars(e_2)\end{aligned}$$


$\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  can again be composed to the effects of  $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\#$  of paths  $\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$  by:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\#$$


We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)




We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)



We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)




We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)






We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)



We verify that these definitions are **meaningful** :-)




The set of variables which are live at  $u$  then is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}^*[u] = \bigcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# X \mid \pi : u \rightarrow^* \text{stop} \}$$

... literally:

- The paths **start** in  $u$  :-)  
 $\implies$  As partial ordering for  $\mathbb{L}$  we use  $\sqsubseteq = \subseteq$ .
- The set of variables which are live at program exit is given by the set  $X$  :-)

## Transformation 2:



## Correctness Proof:

- **Correctness of the effects of edges:** If  $L$  is the set of variables which are live at the exit of the path  $\pi$ , then  $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# L$  is the set of variables which are live at the beginning of  $\pi$  :-)
- **Correctness of the transformation along a path:** If the value of a variable is accessed, this variable is necessarily live. The value of dead variables thus is **irrelevant** :-)
- **Correctness of the transformation:** In any execution of the transformed programs, the live variables always receive the same values :-))

## Computation of the sets $\mathcal{L}^*[u]$ :

(1) Collecting constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}[\textit{stop}] &\supseteq X \\ \mathcal{L}[u] &\supseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{L}[v]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge}\end{aligned}$$

(2) Solving the constraint system by means of RR iteration.

Since  $\mathbb{L}$  is finite, the iteration will terminate :-)

(3) If the exit is (formally) reachable from every program point, then the smallest solution  $\mathcal{L}$  of the constraint system equals  $\mathcal{L}^*$  since all  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  are distributive :-))

## Computation of the sets $\mathcal{L}^*[u]$ :

(1) Collecting constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}[stop] &\supseteq X \\ \mathcal{L}[u] &\supseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{L}[v]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge}\end{aligned}$$


(2) Solving the constraint system by means of RR iteration.

Since  $\mathbb{L}$  is finite, the iteration will terminate :-)

(3) If the exit is (formally) reachable from every program point, then the smallest solution  $\mathcal{L}$  of the constraint system equals  $\mathcal{L}^*$  since all  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  are distributive :-))

**Caveat:** The information is propagated **backwards** !!!

## Example:



$$\mathcal{L}[0] \supseteq (\mathcal{L}[1] \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{I\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}[1] \supseteq \mathcal{L}[2] \setminus \{y\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}[2] \supseteq (\mathcal{L}[6] \cup \{x\}) \cup (\mathcal{L}[3] \cup \{x\})$$

$$\mathcal{L}[3] \supseteq (\mathcal{L}[4] \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x, y\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}[4] \supseteq (\mathcal{L}[5] \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{x\}$$


$$\mathcal{L}[5] \supseteq \mathcal{L}[2]$$

$$\mathcal{L}[6] \supseteq \mathcal{L}[7] \cup \{y, R\}$$

$$\mathcal{L}[7] \supseteq \emptyset$$



# Example:




	1	2
7	$\emptyset$	
6	$\{y, R\}$	
2	$\{x, y, R\}$	ditto
5	$\{x, y, R\}$	
4	$\{x, y, R\}$	
3	$\{x, y, R\}$	
1	$\{x, R\}$	
0	$\{I, R\}$	

The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

### Caveat:


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

### Caveat:


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

### Caveat:


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

**Caveat:**


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

### Caveat:


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

**Caveat:**


Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:



The left-hand side of no assignment is **dead** :-)

### Caveat:

Removal of assignments to dead variables may kill further variables:





Re-analyzing the program is inconvenient :-)

**Idea:** Analyze **true** liveness!

$x$  is called **truly live** at  $u$  along a path  $\pi$  (relative to  $X$ ), either

if  $x \in X$ ,  $\pi$  does not contain a definition of  $x$ ; or

if  $\pi$  can be decomposed into  $\pi = \pi_1 k \pi_2$  such that:

- $k$  is a **true** use of  $x$  relative to  $\pi_2$ ;
- $\pi_1$  does not contain any **definition** of  $x$ .




The set of truly used variables at an edge  $k = (\_, lab, v)$  is defined as:


<i>lab</i>	truly used
$;$	$\emptyset$
$Pos(e)$	$Vars(e)$
$Neg(e)$	$Vars(e)$
$x = e;$	$Vars(e)$ (*)
$x = M[e];$	$Vars(e)$ (*)
$M[e_1] = e_2;$	$Vars(e_1) \cup Vars(e_2)$

(\*) – given that  $x$  is truly live at  $v$  w.r.t.  $\pi_2$  :-)


Example:




Example:




Example:



Example:



Example:



## The Effects of Edges:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \\ \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# L &= \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# L = L \cup \text{Vars}(e) \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{Vars}(e) \\ \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{Vars}(e) \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \cup \text{Vars}(e_1) \cup \text{Vars}(e_2) \end{aligned}$$



## The Effects of Edges:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \\ \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# L &= \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# L = L \cup \text{Vars}(e) \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup (x \in L) ? \text{Vars}(e) : \emptyset \\ \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# L &= (L \setminus \{x\}) \cup (x \in L) ? \text{Vars}(e) : \emptyset \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# L &= L \cup \text{Vars}(e_1) \cup \text{Vars}(e_2) \end{aligned}$$

## Note:

- The effects of edges for truly live variables are **more complicated** than for live variables :-)
- Nonetheless, they are **distributive !!**

## Note:

- The effects of edges for truly live variables are **more complicated** than for live variables :-)
- Nonetheless, they are **distributive !!**

To see this, consider for  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f y = (u \in y) ? b : \emptyset$  We verify:

$$\begin{aligned} f (y_1 \cup y_2) &= (u \in y_1 \cup y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= (u \in y_1 \vee u \in y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= (u \in y_1) ? b : \emptyset \cup (u \in y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= f y_1 \cup f y_2 \end{aligned}$$

## Note:


- The effects of edges for truly live variables are **more complicated** than for live variables :-)
- Nonetheless, they are **distributive !!**

To see this, consider for  $\mathbb{D} = 2^U$ ,  $f y = (u \in y) ? b : \emptyset$  We verify:

$$\begin{aligned} f (y_1 \cup y_2) &= (u \in y_1 \cup y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= (u \in y_1 \vee u \in y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= (u \in y_1) ? b : \emptyset \cup (u \in y_2) ? b : \emptyset \\ &= f y_1 \cup f y_2 \end{aligned}$$


$\implies$  the constraint system yields the **MOP** :-))

- True liveness detects **more** superfluous assignments than repeated liveness !!!




- True liveness detects **more** superfluous assignments than repeated liveness !!!

Liveness:




- True liveness detects **more** superfluous assignments than repeated liveness !!!

True Liveness:



## 1.3 Removing Superfluous Moves

Example:




This variable-variable assignment is obviously useless :-)



## 1.3 Removing Superfluous Moves

Example:




This variable-variable assignment is obviously useless :-)

Instead of  $y$ , we could also store  $T$  :-)

## 1.3 Removing Superfluous Moves

Example:




This variable-variable assignment is obviously useless :-)

Instead of  $y$ , we could also store  $T$  :-)

## 1.3 Removing Superfluous Moves


Example:



Advantage: Now,  $y$  has become **dead** :-))

## 1.3 Removing Superfluous Moves

Example:



Advantage: Now,  $y$  has become dead :-))

## Idea:

For each expression, we record the variable which currently contains its value :-)

We use:  $\mathbb{V} = (Expr \setminus Vars) \rightarrow 2^{Vars} \dots$

## Idea:

For each expression, we record the variable which currently contains its value :-)

We use:  $\mathbb{V} = \text{Expr} \rightarrow 2^{\text{Vars}}$  and define:

$$\llbracket ; \rrbracket^{\#} V = V$$


$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^{\#} V e' = \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^{\#} V e' = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } e' = e \\ V e' & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

...

$$\begin{aligned}
[[x = c;]]^\# V e' &= \begin{cases} (V c) \cup \{x\} & \text{if } e' = c \\ (V e') \setminus \{x\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
[[x = y;]]^\# V e &= \begin{cases} (V e) \cup \{x\} & \text{if } y \in V e \\ (V e) \setminus \{x\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
[[x = e;]]^\# V e' &= \begin{cases} \{x\} & \text{if } e' = e \\ (V e') \setminus \{x\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
[[x = M[c];]]^\# V e' &= (V e') \setminus \{x\} \\
[[x = M[y];]]^\# V e' &= (V e') \setminus \{x\} \\
[[x = M[e];]]^\# V e' &= \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } e' = e \\ (V e') \setminus \{x\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$


// analogously for the diverse stores

In the Example:





## In the Example:



→ We propagate information in **forward** direction :-)

At *start*,  $V_0 e = \emptyset$  for all  $e$ ;

→  $\sqsubseteq \subseteq \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V}$  is defined by:

$$V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 \text{ iff } V_1 e \supseteq V_2 e \text{ for all } e$$

## Observation:

The new effects of edges are **distributive**:

To show this, we consider the functions:

$$(1) \quad f_1^x V e = (V e) \setminus \{x\}$$

$$(2) \quad f_2^{e,a} V = V \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}$$

$$(3) \quad f_3^{x,y} V e = (y \in V e) ? (V e \cup \{x\}) : ((V e) \setminus \{x\})$$

Obviously, we have:

$$\llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# = f_2^{e,\{x\}} \circ f_1^x$$

$$\llbracket x = y; \rrbracket^\# = f_3^{x,y}$$

$$\llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# = f_2^{e,\emptyset} \circ f_1^x$$

By closure under **composition**, the assertion follows **:-))**

(1) For  $f V e = (V e) \setminus \{x\}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} f (V_1 \sqcup V_2) e &= ((V_1 \sqcup V_2) e) \setminus \{x\} \\ &= ((V_1 e) \cap (V_2 e)) \setminus \{x\} \\ &= ((V_1 e) \setminus \{x\}) \cap ((V_2 e) \setminus \{x\}) \\ &= (f V_1 e) \cap (f V_2 e) \\ &= (f V_1 \sqcup f V_2) e \quad \text{: -)} \end{aligned}$$

(2) For  $f V = V \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(V_1 \sqcup V_2) e' &= ((V_1 \sqcup V_2) \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}) e' \\
 &= (V_1 \sqcup V_2) e' \\
 &= (f V_1 \sqcup f V_2) e' \quad \text{given that } e \neq e'
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(V_1 \sqcup V_2) e &= ((V_1 \sqcup V_2) \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}) e \\
 &= a \\
 &= ((V_1 \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}) e) \cap ((V_2 \oplus \{e \mapsto a\}) e) \\
 &= (f V_1 \sqcup f V_2) e \quad \text{: -) }
 \end{aligned}$$

(3) For  $f V e = (y \in V e) ? (V e \cup \{x\}) : ((V e) \setminus \{x\})$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f (V_1 \sqcup V_2) e &= (((V_1 \sqcup V_2) e) \setminus \{x\}) \cup (y \in (V_1 \sqcup V_2) e) ? \{x\} : \emptyset \\
 &= ((V_1 e \cap V_2 e) \setminus \{x\}) \cup (y \in (V_1 e \cap V_2 e)) ? \{x\} : \emptyset \\
 &= ((V_1 e \cap V_2 e) \setminus \{x\}) \cup \\
 &\quad ((y \in V_1 e) ? \{x\} : \emptyset) \cap ((y \in V_2 e) ? \{x\} : \emptyset) \\
 &= (((V_1 e) \setminus \{x\}) \cup (y \in V_1 e) ? \{x\} : \emptyset) \cap \\
 &\quad (((V_2 e) \setminus \{x\}) \cup (y \in V_2 e) ? \{x\} : \emptyset) \\
 &= (f V_1 \sqcup f V_2) e \quad \quad \quad :-)
 \end{aligned}$$

## We conclude:

→ Solving the constraint system returns the MOP solution :-)

→ Let  $\mathcal{V}$  denote this solution.

If  $x \in \mathcal{V}[u]e$ , then  $x$  at  $u$  contains the value of  $e$  —  
which we have stored in  $T_e$

⇒


the access to  $x$  can be replaced by the access to  $T_e$  :-)

For  $V \in \mathbb{V}$ , let  $V^-$  denote the **variable substitution** with:


$$V^- x = \begin{cases} T_e & \text{if } x \in V e \\ x & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

if  $V e \cap V e' = \emptyset$  for  $e \neq e'$ . Otherwise:  $V^- x = x$  :-)


## Transformation 3:



... analogously for edges with  $\text{Neg}(e)$



## Transformation 3 (cont.):







## Procedure as a whole:

- (1) Availability of expressions: T1
  - + removes arithmetic operations
  - inserts superfluous moves
  
- (2) Values of variables: T3
  - + creates dead variables
  
- (3) (true) liveness of variables: T2
  - + removes assignments to dead variables


Example: `a[7]--;`




Example: `a[7]--;`



Example (cont.): `a[7]--;`



Example (cont.):  $a[7]--i$




## 1.4 Constant Propagation

Idea:

Execute as much of the code at compile-time as possible!

Example:


```
x = 7;  
if (x > 0)  
    M[A] = B;
```



Obviously,  $x$  has always the value 7 :-)

Thus, the memory access is **always** executed :-))


Goal:



Obviously,  $x$  has always the value 7 :-)

Thus, the memory access is **always** executed :-))

Goal:





Generalization:

Partial Evaluation



Neil D. Jones, DIKU, Copenhagen

## Idea:

Design an analysis which for every  $u$ ,

- determines the values which variables **definitely** have;
- tells whether  $u$  can be reached at all :-)

## Idea:


Design an analysis which for every  $u$ ,

- determines the values which variables **definitely** have;
- tells whether  $u$  can be reached at all :-)

The complete lattice is constructed in two steps.

(1) The potential **values of variables**:

$$\mathbb{Z}^\top = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\top\} \quad \text{with } x \sqsubseteq y \text{ iff } y = \top \text{ or } x = y$$



**Caveat:**  $\mathbb{Z}^\top$  is **not** a complete lattice in itself :-)

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{D} = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top)_\perp = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top) \cup \{\perp\}$$

//  $\perp$  denotes: “not reachable” :-))

$$\text{with } D_1 \sqsubseteq D_2 \text{ iff } \perp = D_1 \quad \text{or} \\ D_1 x \sqsubseteq D_2 x \quad (x \in \text{Vars})$$

**Remark:**  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice :-)

**Caveat:**  $\mathbb{Z}^\top$  is **not** a complete lattice in itself :-)

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{D} = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top)_\perp = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top) \cup \{\perp\}$$

//  $\perp$  denotes: “not reachable” :-))

$$\text{with } D_1 \sqsubseteq D_2 \text{ iff } \perp = D_1 \quad \text{or} \\ D_1 x \sqsubseteq D_2 x \quad (x \in \text{Vars})$$

**Remark:**  $\mathbb{D}$  is a complete lattice :-)

Consider  $X \subseteq \mathbb{D}$ . W.l.o.g.,  $\perp \notin X$ .

Then  $X \subseteq \text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top$ .

If  $X = \emptyset$ , then  $\bigsqcup X = \perp \in \mathbb{D}$  :-)

If  $X \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\bigsqcup X = D$  with

$$\begin{aligned} D x &= \bigsqcup \{f x \mid f \in X\} \\ &= \begin{cases} z & \text{if } f x = z \quad (f \in X) \\ \top & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

:-))

If  $X \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\sqcup X = D$  with

$$\begin{aligned} D x &= \sqcup \{f x \mid f \in X\} \\ &= \begin{cases} z & \text{if } f x = z \quad (f \in X) \\ \top & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

:-))

For every edge  $k = (\_, lab, \_)$ , construct an effect function  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp = \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\sharp : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  which simulates the **concrete** computation.

Obviously,  $\llbracket lab \rrbracket^\sharp \perp = \perp$  for all  $lab$  :-)

Now let  $\perp \neq D \in Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top$ .

## Idea:

- We use  $D$  to determine the values of expressions.




## Idea:

- We use  $D$  to determine the values of expressions.
- For some sub-expressions, we obtain  $\top$  :-)

## Idea:

- We use  $D$  to determine the values of expressions.
- For some sub-expressions, we obtain  $\top$  :-)




We must replace the concrete operators  $\square$  by **abstract** operators  $\square^\#$  which can handle  $\top$  :

$$a \square^\# b = \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } a = \top \text{ or } b = \top \\ a \square b & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

## Idea:

- We use  $D$  to determine the values of expressions.
- For some sub-expressions, we obtain  $\top$  :-)



We must replace the concrete operators  $\square$  by **abstract** operators  $\square^\#$  which can handle  $\top$  :

$$a \square^\# b = \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } a = \top \text{ or } b = \top \\ a \square b & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- The abstract operators allow to define an **abstract** evaluation of expressions:

$$\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# : (Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top$$

**Abstract evaluation** of expressions is like the **concrete** evaluation — but with abstract values and operators. Here:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket c \rrbracket^\# D &= c \\ \llbracket e_1 \square e_2 \rrbracket^\# D &= \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D \square^\# \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# D \end{aligned}$$

... analogously for **unary** operators :-)

**Abstract evaluation** of expressions is like the **concrete** evaluation — but with abstract values and operators. Here:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket c \rrbracket^\# D &= c \\ \llbracket e_1 \square e_2 \rrbracket^\# D &= \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D \square^\# \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# D \end{aligned}$$

... analogously for **unary** operators :-)

**Example:**

$$D = \{x \mapsto 2, y \mapsto \top\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x + 7 \rrbracket^\# D &= \llbracket x \rrbracket^\# D +^\# \llbracket 7 \rrbracket^\# D \\ &= 2 +^\# 7 \\ &= 9 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x - y \rrbracket^\# D &= 2 -^\# \top \\ &= \top \end{aligned}$$


Thus, we obtain the following effects of edges  $\llbracket lab \rrbracket^\#$  :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \\
 \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# D &= \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } 0 = \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ D & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# D &= \begin{cases} D & \text{if } 0 \sqsubseteq \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D\} \\
 \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\} \\
 \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# D &= D
 \end{aligned}$$

... whenever  $D \neq \perp$  :-)


At *start*, we have  $D_{\top} = \{x \mapsto \top \mid x \in Vars\}$ .

Example:



At *start*, we have  $D_{\top} = \{x \mapsto \top \mid x \in \text{Vars}\}$ .

Example:



1	$\{x \mapsto \top\}$
2	$\{x \mapsto 7\}$
3	$\{x \mapsto 7\}$
4	$\{x \mapsto 7\}$
5	$\perp \sqcup \{x \mapsto 7\} = \{x \mapsto 7\}$



The abstract effects of edges  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp$  are again composed to the effects of paths  $\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$  by:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\sharp = \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\sharp \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\sharp \quad : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$$

Idea for Correctness:

Abstract Interpretation

Cousot, Cousot 1977



Patrick Cousot, ENS, Paris

The abstract effects of edges  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  are again composed to the effects of paths  $\pi = k_1 \dots k_r$  by:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_r \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\# \quad : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$$

Idea for Correctness:

Abstract Interpretation

Cousot, Cousot 1977

Establish a description relation  $\Delta$  between the **concrete** values and their descriptions with:

$$x \Delta a_1 \quad \wedge \quad a_1 \sqsubseteq a_2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad x \Delta a_2$$

Concretization:

$$\gamma a = \{x \mid x \Delta a\}$$

// returns the set of described values :-)

(1) Values:  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^\top$

$$z \Delta a \quad \text{iff} \quad z = a \vee a = \top$$

Concretization:

$$\gamma a = \begin{cases} \{a\} & \text{if } a \sqsubset \top \\ \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } a = \top \end{cases}$$

(1) **Values:**  $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}^\top$

$$z \Delta a \quad \text{iff} \quad z = a \vee a = \top$$

Concretization:

$$\gamma a = \begin{cases} \{a\} & \text{if } a \sqsubset \top \\ \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } a = \top \end{cases}$$

(2) **Variable Assignments:**  $\Delta \subseteq (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \times (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top)_\perp$

$$\rho \Delta D \quad \text{iff} \quad D \neq \perp \wedge \rho x \sqsubseteq D x \quad (x \in \text{Vars})$$

Concretization:

$$\gamma D = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } D = \perp \\ \{\rho \mid \forall x : (\rho x) \Delta (D x)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example:  $\{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto -7\} \Delta \{x \mapsto \top, y \mapsto -7\}$

(3) States:

$$\Delta \subseteq ((Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})) \times (Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top)_\perp$$
$$(\rho, \mu) \Delta D \quad \text{iff} \quad \rho \Delta D$$


Concretization:

$$\gamma D = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } D = \perp \\ \{(\rho, \mu) \mid \forall x : (\rho x) \Delta (D x)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We show:

(\*) If  $s \Delta D$  and  $[[\pi]] s$  is defined, then:

$$([[ \pi ] s) \Delta ([[ \pi ]^\# D)$$



The abstract semantics simulates the concrete semantics :-)

In particular:

$$[[\pi]] s \in \gamma ([[ \pi ]]^{\#} D)$$



The abstract semantics simulates the concrete semantics :-)


In particular:

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket s \in \gamma (\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# D)$$

In **practice**, this means, **e.g.**, that  $D x = -7$  implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho' x &= -7 \text{ for all } \rho' \in \gamma D \\ \implies \rho_1 x &= -7 \text{ for } (\rho_1, \_) = \llbracket \pi \rrbracket s \end{aligned}$$

To prove  $(*)$ , we show for every edge  $k$  :



Then  $(*)$  follows by induction  $:-)$

To prove  $(**)$ , we show for every expression  $e$ :

$(***)$   $(\llbracket e \rrbracket \rho) \Delta (\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D)$  whenever  $\rho \Delta D$

To prove  $(**)$ , we show for every expression  $e$  :

$$(***) \quad ([e] \rho) \Delta ([e]^\# D) \quad \text{whenever} \quad \rho \Delta D$$

To prove  $(***)$ , we show for every operator  $\square$  :

$$(x \square y) \Delta (x^\# \square^\# y^\#) \quad \text{whenever} \quad x \Delta x^\# \wedge y \Delta y^\#$$

To prove  $(**)$ , we show for every expression  $e$  :

$$(***) \quad ([e] \rho) \Delta ([e]^\# D) \quad \text{whenever} \quad \rho \Delta D$$

To prove  $(***)$ , we show for every operator  $\square$  :

$$(x \square y) \Delta (x^\# \square^\# y^\#) \quad \text{whenever} \quad x \Delta x^\# \wedge y \Delta y^\#$$

This precisely was how we have defined the operators  $\square^\#$  :-)

Now,  $(**)$  is proved by case distinction on the edge labels  $lab$ .

Let  $s = (\rho, \mu) \Delta D$ . In particular,  $\perp \neq D : Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\top$

Case  $x = e$ :

$$\rho_1 = \rho \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho\} \quad \mu_1 = \mu$$

$$D_1 = D \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D\}$$

$$\implies (\rho_1, \mu_1) \Delta D_1$$

Case  $x = M[e];$  :

$$\rho_1 = \rho \oplus \{x \mapsto \mu(\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \rho)\} \quad \mu_1 = \mu$$

$$D_1 = D \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\}$$

$$\implies (\rho_1, \mu_1) \Delta D_1$$

Case  $M[e_1] = e_2;$  :

$$\rho_1 = \rho \quad \mu_1 = \mu \oplus \{\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \mapsto \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho\}$$

$$D_1 = D$$

$$\implies (\rho_1, \mu_1) \Delta D_1$$

Case  $\boxed{\text{Neg}(e)}$  :  $(\rho_1, \mu_1) = s$  where:

$$0 = [e] \rho$$

$$\Delta [e]^\# D$$

$$\implies 0 \sqsubseteq [e]^\# D$$

$$\implies \perp \neq D_1 = D$$

$$\implies (\rho_1, \mu_1) \Delta D_1$$



Case  $\boxed{\text{Pos}(e)}$  :

$(\rho_1, \mu_1) = s$  where:

$$0 \neq [e] \rho$$

$$\Delta [e]^\# D$$

$$\implies 0 \neq [e]^\# D$$

$$\implies \perp \neq D_1 = D$$

$$\implies (\rho_1, \mu_1) \Delta D_1$$

:-)

**We conclude:** The assertion  $(*)$  is true  $(:-))$

The MOP-Solution:

$$\mathcal{D}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ [\pi]^\# D_\top \mid \pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v \}$$

where  $D_\top x = \top$  ( $x \in \textit{Vars}$ ).

**We conclude:** The assertion  $(*)$  is true  $(:-))$

The MOP-Solution:

$$\mathcal{D}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# D_\top \mid \pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v \}$$

where  $D_\top x = \top$  ( $x \in \textit{Vars}$ ).

By  $(*)$ , we have for all initial states  $s$  and all program executions  $\pi$  which reach  $v$ :

$$(\llbracket \pi \rrbracket s) \Delta (\mathcal{D}^*[v])$$

**We conclude:** The assertion  $(*)$  is true  $:-))$

The MOP-Solution

$$\mathcal{D}^*[v] = \bigsqcup \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# D_\top \mid \pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v \}$$


where  $D_\top x = \top$  ( $x \in \textit{Vars}$ ).

By  $(*)$ , we have for all initial states  $s$  and all program executions  $\pi$  which reach  $v$ :


$$(\llbracket \pi \rrbracket s) \Delta (\mathcal{D}^*[v])$$

In order to approximate the MOP, we use our constraint system  $:-))$

Example:




# Example:




	1	
	$x$	$y$
0	⊤	⊤
1	10	⊤
2	10	1
3	10	1
4	10	10
5	9	10
6	⊥	
7	⊥	

Example:



	1		2	
	$x$	$y$	$x$	$y$
0	⊤	⊤	⊤	⊤
1	10	⊤	10	⊤
2	10	1	⊤	⊤
3	10	1	⊤	⊤
4	10	10	⊤	⊤
5	9	10	⊤	⊤
6	⊥		⊤	⊤
7	⊥		⊤	⊤

# Example:



	1		2		3	
	$x$	$y$	$x$	$y$	$x$	$y$
0	⊤	⊤	⊤	⊤		
1	10	⊤	10	⊤		
2	10	1	⊤	⊤		
3	10	1	⊤	⊤		
4	10	10	⊤	⊤	ditto	
5	9	10	⊤	⊤		
6	⊥		⊤	⊤		
7	⊥		⊤	⊤		



## Conclusion:

Although we compute with concrete values, we fail to compute everything :-)

The fixpoint iteration, at least, is guaranteed to terminate:

For  $n$  program points and  $m$  variables, we maximally need:  
 $n \cdot (m + 1)$  rounds :-)

## Caveat:

The effects of edge are not distributive !!!

Counter Example:  $f = \llbracket x = x + y; \rrbracket^\#$

Let  $D_1 = \{x \mapsto 2, y \mapsto 3\}$

$$D_2 = \{x \mapsto 3, y \mapsto 2\}$$

Dann  $f D_1 \sqcup f D_2 = \{x \mapsto 5, y \mapsto 3\} \sqcup \{x \mapsto 5, y \mapsto 2\}$

$$= \{x \mapsto 5, y \mapsto \top\}$$

$$\neq \{x \mapsto \top, y \mapsto \top\}$$

$$= f \{x \mapsto \top, y \mapsto \top\}$$

$$= f (D_1 \sqcup D_2)$$

:-((

We conclude:

The least solution  $\mathcal{D}$  of the constraint system in general yields only an upper approximation of the MOP, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}^*[v] \sqsubseteq \mathcal{D}[v]$$

We conclude:

The least solution  $\mathcal{D}$  of the constraint system in general yields only an upper approximation of the MOP, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}^*[v] \sqsubseteq \mathcal{D}[v]$$


As an upper approximation,  $\mathcal{D}[v]$  nonetheless describes the result of every program execution  $\pi$  which reaches  $v$ :

$$(\llbracket \pi \rrbracket (\rho, \mu)) \Delta (\mathcal{D}[v])$$



whenever  $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket (\rho, \mu)$  is defined ;-))

## Transformation 4:

## Removal of Dead Code




$$\mathcal{D}[u] = \perp$$




$$[[lab]]^\#(\mathcal{D}[u]) = \perp$$



# Transformation 4 (cont.): Removal of Dead Code



## Transformation 4 (cont.): Simplified Expressions



## Extensions:

- Instead of complete right-hand sides, also subexpressions could be simplified:

$$x + (3 * y) \xrightarrow{\{x \mapsto \top, y \mapsto 5\}} x + 15$$

... and further simplifications be applied, e.g.:

$$x * 0 \implies 0$$

$$x * 1 \implies x$$

$$x + 0 \implies x$$

$$x - 0 \implies x$$

...



- So far, the information of **conditions** has not yet be optimally exploited:

```

if (x == 7)
    y = x + 3;

```

Even if the value of  $x$  before the if statement is unknown, we at least know that  $x$  definitely has the value 7 — whenever the then-part is **entered** :-)

Therefore, we can define:


$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(x == e) \rrbracket^\# D = \begin{cases} D & \text{if } \llbracket x == e \rrbracket^\# D = 1 \\ \perp & \text{if } \llbracket x == e \rrbracket^\# D = 0 \\ D_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$D_1 = D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D \ x \ \sqcap \ \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D)\}$$


The effect of an edge labeled  $\text{Neg}(x \neq e)$  is analogous :-)

Our Example:




The effect of an edge labeled  $\text{Neg}(x \neq e)$  is analogous :-)

Our Example:



The effect of an edge labeled  $\text{Neg}(x \neq e)$  is analogous :-)


Our Example:



## 1.5 Interval Analysis

### Observation:

- Programmers often use global constants for switching debugging code on/off.



Constant propagation is useful :-)

- In general, precise values of variables will be unknown — perhaps, however, a tight **interval** !!!

## Example:

```
for ( $i = 0; i < 42; i++$ )  
    if ( $0 \leq i \wedge i < 42$ ) {  
         $A_1 = A + i$ ;  
         $M[A_1] = i$ ;  
    }  
//  $A$  start address of an array  
// if the array-bound check
```

Obviously, the inner check is superfluous :-)


## Idea 1:

Determine for every variable  $x$  an (as tight as possible :-) interval of possible values:

$$\mathbb{I} = \{[l, u] \mid l \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}, u \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}, l \leq u\}$$


## Partial Ordering:

$$[l_1, u_1] \sqsubseteq [l_2, u_2] \quad \text{iff} \quad l_2 \leq l_1 \wedge u_1 \leq u_2$$



Thus:

$$[l_1, u_1] \sqcup [l_2, u_2] = [l_1 \sqcap l_2, u_1 \sqcup u_2]$$






Thus:

$$[l_1, u_1] \sqcup [l_2, u_2] = [l_1 \sqcap l_2, u_1 \sqcup u_2]$$

$$[l_1, u_1] \sqcap [l_2, u_2] = [l_1 \sqcup l_2, u_1 \sqcap u_2] \quad \text{whenever } (l_1 \sqcup l_2) \leq (u_1 \sqcap u_2)$$



## Caveat:

→  $\mathbb{I}$  is not a complete lattice :-)

→  $\mathbb{I}$  has **infinite ascending chains**, e.g.,

$$[0, 0] \sqsubset [0, 1] \sqsubset [-1, 1] \sqsubset [-1, 2] \sqsubset \dots$$

## Caveat:

- $\mathbb{I}$  is not a complete lattice :-)
- $\mathbb{I}$  has infinite ascending chains, e.g.,

$$[0, 0] \sqsubset [0, 1] \sqsubset [-1, 1] \sqsubset [-1, 2] \sqsubset \dots$$

## Description Relation:

$$z \Delta [l, u] \quad \text{iff} \quad l \leq z \leq u$$

## Concretization:

$$\gamma[l, u] = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid l \leq z \leq u\}$$

Example:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma[0, 7] &= \{0, \dots, 7\} \\ \gamma[0, \infty] &= \{0, 1, 2, \dots, \}\end{aligned}$$

Computing with intervals:

Interval Arithmetic :-)

Addition:

$$[l_1, u_1] +^{\#} [l_2, u_2] = [l_1 + l_2, u_1 + u_2] \quad \text{where}$$

$$-\infty + _ = -\infty$$

$$+\infty + _ = +\infty$$

//  $-\infty + \infty$  cannot occur :-)

Negation:

$$-\# [l, u] = [-u, -l]$$

Multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} [l_1, u_1] *^\# [l_2, u_2] &= [a, b] \quad \text{where} \\ a &= l_1 l_2 \sqcap l_1 u_2 \sqcap u_1 l_2 \sqcap u_1 u_2 \\ b &= l_1 l_2 \sqcup l_1 u_2 \sqcup u_1 l_2 \sqcup u_1 u_2 \end{aligned}$$

Example:

$$\begin{aligned} [0, 2] *^\# [3, 4] &= [0, 8] \\ [-1, 2] *^\# [3, 4] &= [-4, 8] \\ [-1, 2] *^\# [-3, 4] &= [-6, 8] \\ [-1, 2] *^\# [-4, -3] &= [-8, 4] \end{aligned}$$

Division:  $[l_1, u_1] /^\# [l_2, u_2] = [a, b]$

- If 0 is **not** contained in the interval of the denominator, then:

$$a = l_1/l_2 \sqcap l_1/u_2 \sqcap u_1/l_2 \sqcap u_1/u_2$$

$$b = l_1/l_2 \sqcup l_1/u_2 \sqcup u_1/l_2 \sqcup u_1/u_2$$

- If:  $l_2 \leq 0 \leq u_2$ , we define:

$$[a, b] = [-\infty, +\infty]$$

Equality:

$$[l_1, u_1] ==^\# [l_2, u_2] = \begin{cases} [1, 1] & \text{if } l_1 = u_1 = l_2 = u_2 \\ [0, 0] & \text{if } u_1 < l_2 \vee u_2 < l_1 \\ [0, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Equality:

$$[l_1, u_1] ==^\# [l_2, u_2] = \begin{cases} [1, 1] & \text{if } l_1 = u_1 = l_2 = u_2 \\ [0, 0] & \text{if } u_1 < l_2 \vee u_2 < l_1 \\ [0, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example:

$$[42, 42] ==^\# [42, 42] = [1, 1]$$

$$[0, 7] ==^\# [0, 7] = [0, 1]$$

$$[1, 2] ==^\# [3, 4] = [0, 0]$$



Less:

$$[l_1, u_1] <^{\#} [l_2, u_2] = \begin{cases} [1, 1] & \text{if } u_1 < l_2 \\ [0, 0] & \text{if } u_2 \leq l_1 \\ [0, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Less:

$$[l_1, u_1] <^\# [l_2, u_2] = \begin{cases} [1, 1] & \text{if } u_1 < l_2 \\ [0, 0] & \text{if } u_2 \leq l_1 \\ [0, 1] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example:

$$[1, 2] <^\# [9, 42] = [1, 1]$$

$$[0, 7] <^\# [0, 7] = [0, 1]$$

$$[3, 4] <^\# [1, 2] = [0, 0]$$

By means of  $\mathbb{I}$  we construct the complete lattice:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{I}} = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{I})_{\perp}$$

Description Relation:

$$\rho \Delta D \quad \text{iff} \quad D \neq \perp \quad \wedge \quad \forall x \in \text{Vars} : (\rho x) \Delta (D x)$$

The **abstract evaluation** of expressions is defined analogously to constant propagation. We have:

$$(\llbracket e \rrbracket \rho) \Delta (\llbracket e \rrbracket^{\#} D) \quad \text{whenever} \quad \rho \Delta D$$

## The Effects of Edges:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \\
 \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \oplus \{x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D\} \\
 \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\} \\
 \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \\
 \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# D &= \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } [0, 0] = \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ D & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# D &= \begin{cases} D & \text{if } [0, 0] \sqsubseteq \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

... given that  $D \neq \perp$  :-)

## Better Exploitation of Conditions:

$$\llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# D = \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } [0, 0] = \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ D_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where :

$$D_1 = \begin{cases} D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D)\} & \text{if } e \equiv x == e_1 \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap [-\infty, u]\} & \text{if } e \equiv x \leq e_1, \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D = [-, u] \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap [l, \infty]\} & \text{if } e \equiv x \geq e_1, \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D = [l, -] \end{cases}$$


## Better Exploitation of Conditions (cont.):

$$\llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# D = \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } [0, 0] \not\subseteq \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D \\ D_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where :

$$D_1 = \begin{cases} D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D)\} & \text{if } e \equiv x \neq e_1 \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap [-\infty, u]\} & \text{if } e \equiv x > e_1, \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D = [-, u] \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D x) \sqcap [l, \infty]\} & \text{if } e \equiv x < e_1, \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D = [l, -] \end{cases}$$

# Example:



	<i>i</i>	
	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	42
2	0	41
3	0	41
4	0	41
5	0	41
6	1	42
7	$\perp$	
8	42	42

## Problem:

- The solution can be computed with RR-iteration — after about 42 rounds :-)
- On some programs, iteration may **never** terminate :-((

## Idea 1: Widening

- Accelerate the iteration — at the **prize of imprecision** :-)
- Allow only a bounded number of modifications of values !!!

... in the Example:

- dis-allow updates of interval bounds in  $\mathbb{Z}$  ...

⇒ a maximal chain:

$$[3, 17] \sqsubset [3, +\infty] \sqsubset [-\infty, +\infty]$$



## Formalization of the Approach:

$$\text{Let } x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

denote a system of constraints over  $\mathbb{D}$  where the  $f_i$  are **not necessarily** monotonic.

Nonetheless, an **accumulating** iteration can be defined. Consider the system of equations:

$$x_i = x_i \sqcup f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

We obviously have:

(a)  $\underline{x}$  is a solution of (1) iff  $\underline{x}$  is a solution of (2).

(b) The function  $G : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^n$  with

$$G(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n), \quad y_i = x_i \sqcup f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

is **increasing**, i.e.,  $\underline{x} \sqsubseteq G \underline{x}$  for all  $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{D}^n$ .

(c) The sequence  $G^k \underline{\perp}$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , is an ascending chain:

$$\underline{\perp} \sqsubseteq G \underline{\perp} \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq G^k \underline{\perp} \sqsubseteq \dots$$

(d) If  $G^k \underline{\perp} = G^{k+1} \underline{\perp} = \underline{y}$ , then  $\underline{y}$  is a solution of (1).

(e) If  $\mathbb{D}$  has infinite strictly ascending chains, then (d) is not yet sufficient ...

**but:** we could consider the modified system of equations:

$$x_i = x_i \sqcup f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (3)$$

for a binary operation **widening**:

$$\sqcup : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \quad \text{with} \quad v_1 \sqcup v_2 \sqsubseteq v_1 \sqcup v_2$$

(RR)-iteration for (3) still will compute a solution of (1) :-)

## ... for Interval Analysis:

- The complete lattice is:  $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{I}} = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{I})_{\perp}$
- the widening  $\sqcup$  is defined by:

$$\perp \sqcup D = D \sqcup \perp = D \quad \text{and for } D_1 \neq \perp \neq D_2:$$

$$(D_1 \sqcup D_2) x = (D_1 x) \sqcup (D_2 x) \quad \text{where}$$

$$[l_1, u_1] \sqcup [l_2, u_2] = [l, u] \quad \text{with}$$

$$l = \begin{cases} l_1 & \text{if } l_1 \leq l_2 \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$u = \begin{cases} u_1 & \text{if } u_1 \geq u_2 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$\implies$   $\sqcup$  is **not commutative** !!!

## Example:

$$[0, 2] \sqcup [1, 2] = [0, 2]$$

$$[1, 2] \sqcup [0, 2] = [-\infty, 2]$$

$$[1, 5] \sqcup [3, 7] = [1, +\infty]$$


- Widening returns larger values **more quickly**.
- It should be constructed in such a way that termination of iteration is guaranteed :-)
- For interval analysis, widening bounds the number of iterations by:

$$\#points \cdot (1 + 2 \cdot \#Vars)$$

## Conclusion:


- In order to determine a solution of (1) over a complete lattice with infinite ascending chains, we define a suitable widening and then solve (3) :-)
- **Caveat:** The construction of suitable widenings is a **dark art !!!**  
Often  $\sqcup$  is chosen **dynamically** during iteration such that
  - the abstract values do not get too **complicated**;
  - the number of updates remains bounded ...

## Our Example:



	1	
	$l$	$u$
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
6	1	1
7	$\perp$	
8	$\perp$	

## Our Example:



	1		2		3	
	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$		
1	0	0	0	$+\infty$		
2	0	0	0	$+\infty$		
3	0	0	0	$+\infty$		
4	0	0	0	$+\infty$	ditto	
5	0	0	0	$+\infty$		
6	1	1	1	$+\infty$		
7	$\perp$		42	$+\infty$		
8	$\perp$		42	$+\infty$		

... obviously, the result is disappointing :-)

## Idea 2:


In fact, acceleration with  $\sqsubseteq$  need only be applied at **sufficiently many** places!

A set  $I$  is a **loop separator**, if every loop contains at least one point from  $I$  :-)

If we apply widening only at program points from such a set  $I$ , then RR-iteration still terminates !!!



In our Example:




$I_1 = \{1\}$  or:

$I_2 = \{2\}$  or:


$I_3 = \{3\}$

The Analysis with  $I = \{1\}$  :



	1		2		3	
	$l$	$u$	$l$	$u$	$l$	$u$
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$		
1	0	0	0	$+\infty$		
2	0	0	0	41		
3	0	0	0	41		
4	0	0	0	41	ditto	
5	0	0	0	41		
6	1	1	1	42		
7	$\perp$			$\perp$		
8	$\perp$		42	$+\infty$		

# The Analysis with $I = \{2\}$ :



	1		2		3		4	
	$l$	$u$	$l$	$u$	$l$	$u$		
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$		
1	0	0	0	1	0	42		
2	0	0	0	$+\infty$	0	$+\infty$		
3	0	0	0	41	0	41		
4	0	0	0	41	0	41	ditto	
5	0	0	0	41	0	41		
6	1	1	1	42	1	42		
7	$\perp$		42	$+\infty$	42	$+\infty$		
8	$\perp$			$\perp$	42	42		

## Discussion:

- Both runs of the analysis determine interesting information :-)
- The run with  $I = \{2\}$  proves that always  $i = 42$  after leaving the loop.
- Only the run with  $I = \{1\}$  finds, however, that the outer check makes the inner check superfluous :-)

How can we find a suitable loop separator  $I$  ???

### Idea 3: Narrowing

Let  $\underline{x}$  denote any solution of (1), i.e.,

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i \underline{x}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

Then for monotonic  $f_i$ ,

$$\underline{x} \sqsupseteq F \underline{x} \sqsupseteq F^2 \underline{x} \sqsupseteq \dots \sqsupseteq F^k \underline{x} \sqsupseteq \dots$$

// Narrowing Iteration

### Idea 3: Narrowing

Let  $\underline{x}$  denote any solution of (1), i.e.,


$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i \underline{x}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

Then for monotonic  $f_i$ ,

$$\underline{x} \sqsupseteq F \underline{x} \sqsupseteq F^2 \underline{x} \sqsupseteq \dots \sqsupseteq F^k \underline{x} \sqsupseteq \dots$$

// Narrowing Iteration

Every tuple  $F^k \underline{x}$  is a solution of (1) :-)




Termination is no problem anymore:

we stop whenever we want :-))


// The same also holds for RR-iteration.

## Narrowing Iteration in the Example:



	0	
	$l$	$u$
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	$+\infty$
2	0	$+\infty$
3	0	$+\infty$
4	0	$+\infty$
5	0	$+\infty$
6	1	$+\infty$
7	42	$+\infty$
8	42	$+\infty$


## Narrowing Iteration in the Example:



	0		1	
	$l$	$u$	$l$	$u$
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	$+\infty$	0	$+\infty$
2	0	$+\infty$	0	41
3	0	$+\infty$	0	41
4	0	$+\infty$	0	41
5	0	$+\infty$	0	41
6	1	$+\infty$	1	42
7	42	$+\infty$		$\perp$
8	42	$+\infty$	42	$+\infty$



## Narrowing Iteration in the Example:



	0		1		2	
	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	$+\infty$	0	$+\infty$	0	42
2	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
3	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
4	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
5	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
6	1	$+\infty$	1	42	1	42
7	42	$+\infty$		$\perp$		$\perp$
8	42	$+\infty$	42	$+\infty$	42	42

## Discussion:

- We start with a safe approximation.
- We find that the inner check is redundant :-)
- We find that at exit from the loop, always  $i = 42$  :-))
- It was not necessary to construct an optimal loop separator :-)))

## Last Question:

Do we have to accept that narrowing may not terminate ???

## 4. Idea: Accelerated Narrowing

Assume that we have a solution  $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of the system of constraints:

$$x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

Then consider the system of equations:

$$x_i = x_i \sqcap f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (4)$$

Obviously, we have for monotonic  $f_i : H^k \underline{x} = F^k \underline{x} \quad :-)$

where  $H(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n), \quad y_i = x_i \sqcap f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

In (4), we replace  $\sqcap$  durch by the novel operator  $\sqbar{\cap}$  where:

$$a_1 \sqcap a_2 \sqsubseteq a_1 \sqbar{\cap} a_2 \sqsubseteq a_1$$

... for Interval Analysis:


We preserve finite interval bounds :-)

Therefore,  $\perp \sqcap D = D \sqcap \perp = \perp$  and for  $D_1 \neq \perp \neq D_2$ :

$$(D_1 \sqcap D_2) x = (D_1 x) \sqcap (D_2 x) \quad \text{where}$$
$$[l_1, u_1] \sqcap [l_2, u_2] = [l, u] \quad \text{with}$$
$$l = \begin{cases} l_2 & \text{if } l_1 = -\infty \\ l_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$u = \begin{cases} u_2 & \text{if } u_1 = \infty \\ u_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$\implies \sqcap$  is not commutative !!!

## Accelerated Narrowing in the Example:



	0		1		2	
	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>u</i>
0	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$	$-\infty$	$+\infty$
1	0	$+\infty$	0	$+\infty$	0	42
2	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
3	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
4	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
5	0	$+\infty$	0	41	0	41
6	1	$+\infty$	1	42	1	42
7	42	$+\infty$		$\perp$		$\perp$
8	42	$+\infty$	42	$+\infty$	42	42

## Discussion:

- **Caveat:** Widening also returns for non-monotonic  $f_i$  a solution. Narrowing is only applicable to monotonic  $f_i$  !!
- In the example, accelerated narrowing already returns the optimal result :-)
- If the operator  $\sqcap$  only allows for finitely many improvements of values, we may execute narrowing until stabilization.
- In case of interval analysis these are at most:

$$\#points \cdot (1 + 2 \cdot \#Vars)$$

## 1.6 Pointer Analysis

### Questions:

- Are two addresses **possibly** equal?
- Are two addresses **definitively** equal?

## 1.6 Pointer Analysis

### Questions:

- Are two addresses **possibly** equal? May Alias
- Are two addresses **definitively** equal? Must Alias

⇒ **Alias** Analysis



## The analyses so far without alias information:

### (1) Available Expressions:

- Extend the set  $Expr$  of expressions by occurring loads  $M[e]$ .
- Extend the Effects of Edges:

$$\llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# A = (A \cup \{e\}) \setminus Expr_x$$

$$\llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# A = (A \cup \{e, M[e]\}) \setminus Expr_x$$

$$\llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# A = (A \cup \{e_1, e_2\}) \setminus Loads$$

(2) Values of Variables:

- Extend the set  $Expr$  of expressions by occurring loads  $M[e]$ .
- Extend the Effects of Edges:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# V e' &= \begin{cases} \{x\} & \text{if } e' = M[e] \\ \emptyset & \text{if } e' = e \\ V e' \setminus \{x\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# V e' &= \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } e' \in \{e_1, e_2\} \\ V e' & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

### (3) Constant Propagation:

- Extend the abstract state by an abstract store  $M$
- Execute accesses to known memory locations!

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# (D, M) &= \begin{cases} (D \oplus \{x \mapsto M a\}, M) & \text{if} \\ & \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# D = a \sqsubset \top \\ (D \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\}, M) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# (D, M) &= \begin{cases} (D, M \oplus \{a \mapsto \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# D\}) & \text{if} \\ & \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# D = a \sqsubset \top \\ (D, \underline{\top}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{where} \\
 \underline{\top} a &= \top \quad (a \in \mathbb{N})
 \end{aligned}$$

## Problems:

- Addresses are from  $\mathbb{N}$  :-(  
There are **no infinite** strictly ascending chains, but ...
- Exact addresses at compile-time are **rarely** known :-(  
At the same program point, typically different addresses are accessed ...
- Storing at an **unknown** address destroys all information  $\mathbb{M}$  :-(  
At the same program point, typically different addresses are accessed ...

⇒ constant propagation fails :-(  
At the same program point, typically different addresses are accessed ...

⇒ memory accesses/pointers **kill precision** :-(  
At the same program point, typically different addresses are accessed ...

## Simplification:

- We consider pointers to the beginning of **blocks**  $A$  which allow indexed accesses  $A[i]$  :-)
- We ignore well-typedness of the blocks.
- New statements:

$x = \text{new}();$  // allocation of a new block

$x = y[e];$  // indexed read access to a block

$y[e_1] = e_2;$  // indexed write access to a block

- Blocks are possibly infinite :-)
- For simplicity, all pointers point to the beginning of a block.


## Simple Example:

$x = \text{new}();$


$y = \text{new}();$

$x[0] = y;$


$y[1] = 7;$



## The Semantics:




## The Semantics:







## The Semantics:



## The Semantics:




## The Semantics:



## More Complex Example:

```
r = Null;  
while (t ≠ Null) {  
    h = t;  
    t = t[0];  
    h[0] = r;  
    r = h;  
}
```



## Concrete Semantics:

A store consists of a **finite** collection of blocks.

After  $h$  new-operations we obtain:

$$Addr_h = \{\text{ref } a \mid 0 \leq a < h\} \quad // \text{ addresses}$$

$$Val_h = Addr_h \cup \mathbb{Z} \quad // \text{ values}$$

$$Store_h = (Addr_h \times \mathbb{N}_0) \rightarrow Val_h \quad // \text{ store}$$

$$State_h = (Vars \rightarrow Val_h) \times Store_h \quad // \text{ states}$$

For simplicity, we set:  $0 = \text{Null}$

Let  $(\rho, \mu) \in State_h$ . Then we obtain for the new edges:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x = \text{new}(); \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) &= (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto \text{ref } h\}, \\ &\quad \mu \oplus \{(\text{ref } h, i) \mapsto 0 \mid i \in \mathbb{N}_0\}) \\ \llbracket x = y[e]; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) &= (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto \mu(\rho y, \llbracket e \rrbracket \rho)\}, \mu) \\ \llbracket y[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) &= (\rho, \mu \oplus \{(\rho y, \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \rho) \mapsto \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \rho\}) \end{aligned}$$

## Caveat:

This semantics is **too** detailed in that it computes with **absolute** Addresses. Accordingly, the two programs:

$x = \text{new}();$	$y = \text{new}();$
$y = \text{new}();$	$x = \text{new}();$

are **not** considered as equivalent **!!?**

## Possible Solution:

Define equivalence only **up to permutation of addresses** :-)

# Alias Analysis

## 1. Idea:

- Distinguish **finitely many** classes of blocks.
- Collect all addresses of a block into one set!
- Use sets of addresses as abstract values!

⇒ **Points-to-Analysis**

$Addr^\# = Edges$  // creation edges

$Val^\# = 2^{Addr^\#}$  // abstract values


$Store^\# = Addr^\# \rightarrow Val^\#$  // abstract store

$State^\# = (Vars \rightarrow Val^\#) \times Store^\#$  // abstract states

// complete lattice !!!



... in the Simple Example:



	$x$	$y$	$(0, 1)$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\{(0, 1)\}$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\{(0, 1)\}$	$\{(1, 2)\}$	$\emptyset$
3	$\{(0, 1)\}$	$\{(1, 2)\}$	$\{(1, 2)\}$
4	$\{(0, 1)\}$	$\{(1, 2)\}$	$\{(1, 2)\}$

## The Effects of Edges:

$$\llbracket (\_, ;, \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D, M)$$

$$\llbracket (\_, \text{Pos}(e), \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D, M)$$

$$\llbracket (\_, x = y; , \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D \oplus \{x \mapsto D y\}, M)$$

$$\llbracket (\_, x = e; , \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D \oplus \{x \mapsto \emptyset\}, M) \quad , \quad e \notin \text{Vars}$$

$$\llbracket (u, x = \text{new}(); , v) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D \oplus \{x \mapsto \{(u, v)\}\}, M)$$

$$\llbracket (\_, x = y[e]; , \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D \oplus \{x \mapsto \bigcup \{M(f) \mid f \in D y\}\}, M)$$

$$\llbracket (\_, y[e_1] = x; , \_) \rrbracket^\# (D, M) = (D, M \oplus \{f \mapsto (M f \cup D x) \mid f \in D y\})$$

## Caveat:

- The value **Null** has been ignored. Dereferencing of **Null** or negative indices are not detected :-(  
• **Destructive updates** are only possible for variables, not for blocks in storage!

⇒ no information, if not all block entries are initialized before use :-((

- The effects now depend on the edge itself.

The analysis cannot be proven correct w.r.t. the reference semantics :-((

In order to prove correctness, we first **instrument** the concrete semantics with extra information which records where a block has been created.

...


- We compute **possible** points-to information.
- From that, we can extract **may-alias** information.
- The analysis can be rather expensive — without finding very much  
:-(
- Separate information for each program point can perhaps be abandoned ??

# Alias Analysis

## 2. Idea:

Compute for each variable and address a value which safely approximates the values at every program point simultaneously !

... in the Simple Example:



$x$	$\{(0, 1)\}$
$y$	$\{(1, 2)\}$
$(0, 1)$	$\{(1, 2)\}$
$(1, 2)$	$\emptyset$


Each edge  $(u, lab, v)$  gives rise to constraints:

<i>lab</i>	<i>Constraint</i>
$x = y;$	$\mathcal{P}[x] \supseteq \mathcal{P}[y]$
$x = \text{new}();$	$\mathcal{P}[x] \supseteq \{(u, v)\}$
$x = y[e];$	$\mathcal{P}[x] \supseteq \bigcup \{\mathcal{P}[f] \mid f \in \mathcal{P}[y]\}$
$y[e_1] = x;$	$\mathcal{P}[f] \supseteq (f \in \mathcal{P}[y]) ? \mathcal{P}[x] : \emptyset$ for all $f \in Addr^\#$

Other edges have no effect :-)

## Discussion:

- The resulting constraint system has size  $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot n)$  for  $k$  abstract addresses and  $n$  edges :-)
- The number of necessary iterations is  $\mathcal{O}(k(k + \#Vars))$  ...
- The computed information is perhaps still too **zu precise !!!**
- In order to prove correctness of a solution  $s^\# \in States^\#$  we show:




# Alias Analysis

## 3. Idea:

Determine **one** equivalence relation  $\equiv$  on variables  $x$  and memory accesses  $y[]$  with  $s_1 \equiv s_2$  whenever  $s_1, s_2$  may contain the same address at **some**  $u_1, u_2$

... in the Simple Example:





## Discussion:

- We compute a **single information** fo the whole program.
- The computation of this information maintains **partitions**  
 $\pi = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$  :-)
- Individual sets  $P_i$  are identified by means of **representatives**  
 $p_i \in P_i$ .
- The operations on a partition  $\pi$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find}(\pi, p) &= p_i && \text{if } p \in P_i \\ & // && \text{returns the representative} \\ \text{union}(\pi, p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}) &= \{P_{i_1} \cup P_{i_2}\} \cup \{P_j \mid i_1 \neq j \neq i_2\} \\ & // && \text{unions the represented classes} \end{aligned}$$

- If  $x_1, x_2 \in Vars$  are equivalent, then also  $x_1[]$  and  $x_2[]$  must be equivalent :-)
- If  $P_i \cap Vars \neq \emptyset$ , then we choose  $p_i \in Vars$ . Then we can apply **union** recursively :

```

union* ( $\pi, q_1, q_2$ ) = let  $p_{i_1} = \text{find}(\pi, q_1)$ 
                            $p_{i_2} = \text{find}(\pi, q_2)$ 
in if  $p_{i_1} == p_{i_2}$  then  $\pi$ 
   else let  $\pi = \text{union}(\pi, p_{i_1}, p_{i_2})$ 
in if  $p_{i_1}, p_{i_2} \in Vars$  then
   union* ( $\pi, p_{i_1}[], p_{i_2}[]$ )
   else  $\pi$ 

```

The analysis iterates over all edges **once**:


$$\pi = \{\{x\}, \{x[\ ]\} \mid x \in Vars\};$$

forall  $k = (\_, lab, \_)$  do  $\pi = \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\# \pi;$

where:


$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x = y; \rrbracket^\# \pi &= \text{union}^* (\pi, x, y) \\ \llbracket x = y[e]; \rrbracket^\# \pi &= \text{union}^* (\pi, x, y[\ ]) \\ \llbracket y[e] = x; \rrbracket^\# \pi &= \text{union}^* (\pi, x, y[\ ]) \\ \llbracket lab \rrbracket^\# \pi &= \pi \quad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

... in the Simple Example:



	$\{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{x[]\}, \{y[]\}\}$
(0, 1)	$\{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{x[]\}, \{y[]\}\}$
(1, 2)	$\{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{x[]\}, \{y[]\}\}$
(2, 3)	$\{\{x\}, \{y, x[]\}, \{y[]\}\}$
(3, 4)	$\{\{x\}, \{y, x[]\}, \{y[]\}\}$

... in the More Complex Example:



	$\{\{h\}, \{r\}, \{t\}, \{h[]\}, \{t[]\}\}$
(2, 3)	$\{\{h, t\}, \{r\}, \{h[], t[]\}\}$
(3, 4)	$\{\{h, t, h[], t[]\}, \{r\}\}$
(4, 5)	$\{\{h, t, r, h[], t[]\}\}$
(5, 6)	$\{\{h, t, r, h[], t[]\}\}$

## Caveat:

In order to find something, we must assume that variables / addresses always receive a value before they are accessed.

## Complexity:

we have:

$O(\# \text{ edges} + \# \text{ Vars})$	calls of <b>union*</b>
$O(\# \text{ edges} + \# \text{ Vars})$	calls of <b>find</b>
$O(\# \text{ Vars})$	calls of <b>union</b>

$\implies$  We require efficient **Union-Find data-structure** :-)


## Idea:

Represent partition of  $U$  as directed forest:

- For  $u \in U$  a reference  $F[u]$  to the father is maintained;
- Roots are elements  $u$  with  $F[u] = u$ .

Single trees represent equivalence classes.

Their roots are their representatives ...





0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1	1	3	1	4	7	5	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



- **find** ( $\pi, u$ ) follows the father references :-)
- **union** ( $\pi, u_1, u_2$ ) re-directs the father reference of one  $u_i \dots$





0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1	1	3	1	4	7	5	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



1	1	3	1	7	7	5	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

## The Costs:

union :  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  :-)  
find :  $\mathcal{O}(\text{depth}(\pi))$  :-)



## Strategy to Avoid Deep Trees:

- Put the **smaller** tree below the **bigger** !
- Use **find** to compress paths ...




0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

1	1	3	1	4	7	5	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---




0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---


1	1	3	1	7	7	5	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---



0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	7	7	5	3




0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	7	7	5	3




0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	7	7	5	3






0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	7	7	5	3



0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	1	7	1	1



Robert Endre Tarjan, Princeton

## Note:

- By this data-structure,  $n$  **union**- und  $m$  **find** operations require time  $\mathcal{O}(n + m \cdot \alpha(n, n))$   
//  $\alpha$  the **inverse Ackermann-function** :-)
- For our application, we only must modify **union** such that roots are from *Vars* whenever possible.
- This modification does not increase the asymptotic run-time. :-)

## Summary:

The analysis is extremely fast — but may not find very much.

## Background 3: Fixpoint Algorithms

Consider:  $x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, n$

Observation:

RR-Iteration is **inefficient**:

- We require a complete round in order to detect termination :-)
- If in some round, the value of just one unknown is changed, then we still re-compute all :-)
- The practical run-time depends on the ordering on the variables :-)

## Idea:

## Worklist Iteration

If an unknown  $x_i$  changes its value, we re-compute all unknowns which depend on  $x_i$ . **Technically**, we require:

→ the lists  $Dep f_i$  of unknowns which are accessed during evaluation of  $f_i$ . From that, we compute the lists:

$$I[x_i] = \{x_j \mid x_i \in Dep f_j\}$$

i.e., a list of all  $x_j$  which depend on the value of  $x_i$ ;

→ the values  $D[x_i]$  of the  $x_i$  where initially  $D[x_i] = \perp$ ;

→ a list  $W$  of all unknowns whose value must be recomputed ...

## The Algorithm:

$W = [x_1, \dots, x_n];$

while ( $W \neq []$ ) {

$x_i = \text{extract } W;$

$t = f_i \text{ eval};$

    if ( $t \not\subseteq D[x_i]$ ) {

$D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t;$

$W = \text{append } I[x_i] \ W;$

    }

}

where :  $\text{eval } x_j = D[x_j]$

Example:

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

	$I$
$x_1$	$\{x_3\}$
$x_2$	$\emptyset$
$x_3$	$\{x_1, x_2\}$



## Example:

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

	$I$
$x_1$	$\{x_3\}$
$x_2$	$\emptyset$
$x_3$	$\{x_1, x_2\}$

$D[x_1]$	$D[x_2]$	$D[x_3]$	$W$
$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$x_1, x_2, x_3$
$\{a\}$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$x_2, x_3$
$\{a\}$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$x_3$
$\{a\}$	$\emptyset$	$\{a, c\}$	$x_1, x_2$
$\{a, c\}$	$\emptyset$	$\{a, c\}$	$x_3, x_2$
$\{a, c\}$	$\emptyset$	$\{a, c\}$	$x_2$
$\{a, c\}$	$\{a\}$	$\{a, c\}$	$[\ ]$

## Theorem

Let  $x_i \sqsupseteq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$  denote a constraint system over the complete lattice  $\mathbb{D}$  of height  $h > 0$ .

- (1) The algorithm terminates after at most  $h \cdot N$  evaluations of right-hand sides where

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + \#(\text{Dep } f_i)) \quad // \text{ size of the system } :-)$$

- (2) The algorithm returns a solution.  
If all  $f_i$  are monotonic, it returns the least one.

Proof:

Ad (1):

Every unknown  $x_i$  may change its value at most  $h$  times :-)

Each time, the list  $I[x_i]$  is added to  $W$ .

Thus, the total number of evaluations is:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq n + \sum_{i=1}^n (h \cdot \#(I[x_i])) \\ &= n + h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \#(I[x_i]) \\ &= n + h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \#(Dep f_i) \\ &\leq h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + \#(Dep f_i)) \\ &= h \cdot N \end{aligned}$$

Ad (2):

We only consider the assertion for monotonic  $f_i$ .

Let  $D_0$  denote the least solution. We show:

- $D_0[x_i] \sqsupseteq D[x_i]$  (all the time)
- $D[x_i] \not\sqsupseteq f_i \text{ eval} \implies x_i \in W$  (at exit of the loop body)
- On termination, the algo returns a solution  $:-))$

## Discussion:

- In the example, fewer evaluations of right-hand sides are required than for RR-iteration :-)
- The algo also works for non-monotonic  $f_i$  :-)
- For monotonic  $f_i$ , the algo can be simplified:

$$\boxed{D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t;} \implies \boxed{;}$$

- In presence of **widening**, we replace:

$$\boxed{D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t;} \implies \boxed{D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup\!\!\!\sqcup t;}$$

- In presence of **Narrowing**, we replace:

$$\boxed{D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t;} \implies \boxed{D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcap\!\!\!\sqcap t;}$$

... and update the test to  $t \sqsubseteq D[x_i]$ .

## Warning:

- The algorithm relies on explicit dependencies among the unknowns. So far in our applications, these were **obvious**. This need not always be the case :-)
- We need some **strategy** for **extract** which determines the next unknown to be evaluated.
- It would be ingenious if we always evaluated **first** and then accessed the result ... :-)

⇒ recursive evaluation ...

## Idea:

- If during evaluation of  $f_i$ , an unknown  $x_j$  is accessed,  $x_j$  is first solved recursively. Then  $x_i$  is added to  $I[x_j]$  :-)

$$\text{eval } x_i \ x_j = \text{solve } x_j;$$

$$I[x_j] = I[x_j] \cup \{x_i\};$$

$$D[x_j];$$

- In order to prevent recursion to descend infinitely, a set *Stable* of unknown is maintained for which *solve* just looks up their values :-)

Initially, *Stable* =  $\emptyset$  ...

## The Function `solve` :

```
solve  $x_i$  = if ( $x_i \notin Stable$ ) {  
     $Stable = Stable \cup \{x_i\}$ ;  
     $t = f_i(\text{eval } x_i)$ ;  
    if ( $t \not\subseteq D[x_i]$ ) {  
         $D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t$ ;  
         $W = I[x_i]; \quad I[x_i] = \emptyset$ ;  
         $Stable = Stable \setminus W$ ;  
        app solve  $W$ ;  
    }  
}
```





Helmut Seidl, TU München ;-)

## Example:

Consider our standard example:

$$x_1 \supseteq \{a\} \cup x_3$$

$$x_2 \supseteq x_3 \cap \{a, b\}$$

$$x_3 \supseteq x_1 \cup \{c\}$$

A trace of the fixpoint algorithm then looks as follows:

solve  $x_2$

eval  $x_2 x_3$

solve  $x_3$

eval  $x_3 x_1$

solve  $x_1$

eval  $x_1 x_3$

solve  $x_3$   
stable!

$$I[x_3] = \{x_1\}$$
$$\Rightarrow \emptyset$$

$$D[x_1] = \{a\}$$

$$I[x_1] = \{x_3\}$$
$$\Rightarrow \{a\}$$

$$D[x_3] = \{a, c\}$$

$$I[x_3] = \emptyset$$

solve  $x_1$

eval  $x_1 x_3$

solve  $x_3$   
stable!

$$I[x_3] = \{x_1\}$$
$$\Rightarrow \{a, c\}$$

$$D[x_1] = \{a, c\}$$

$$I[x_1] = \emptyset$$

solve  $x_3$

eval  $x_3 x_1$

solve  $x_1$   
stable!

$$I[x_1] = \{x_3\}$$
$$\Rightarrow \{a, c\}$$

ok

$$I[x_3] = \{x_1, x_2\}$$
$$\Rightarrow \{a, c\}$$

$$D[x_2] = \{a\}$$

- Evaluation starts with an **interesting** unknown  $x_i$  (e.g., the value at *stop* )
- Then **automatically** all unknowns are evaluated which influence  $x_i$  :-)
- The number of evaluations is often smaller than during worklist iteration ;-)
- The algorithm is more complex but does not rely on **pre-computation** of variable dependencies :-))
- It also works if variable dependencies during iteration **change** !!!

⇒ **interprocedural analysis**

## Warning II:

- The recursive algorithm may not evaluate right-hand sides atomically.
- Evaluations of right-hand sides may be continued which have been started with out-dated data.  $\implies$  in some cases, it may fail to determine the **least** solution **!?!**

## Idea:

- Identify outdated computations ...
- Abort **!!**

## Idea (cont.):

- Record when evaluation of a variable has started by means of a set *Called*.
- Whenever during evaluation of a rhs  $f_i$ , we detect that no longer  $x_i \in \text{Called}$ , we abort ...

```
eval  $x_i$   $x_j$  = solve  $x_j$ ;  
if ( $x_i \notin \text{Called}$ ) raise Abort;  
 $I[x_j] = I[x_j] \cup \{x_i\}$ ;  
 $D[x_j]$ ;
```

- Initially,  $\text{Called} = \emptyset$  ...

## The new Function `solve` :

```
solve  $x_i$  = if ( $x_i \notin Stable$ ) {  
     $Stable = Stable \cup \{x_i\}$ ;  $Called = Called \cup \{x_i\}$ ;  
     $t = \text{try } f_i(\text{eval } x_i)$   
    with Abort  $\rightarrow D[x_i]$ ;  
     $Called = Called \setminus \{x_i\}$ ;  
    if ( $t \not\subseteq D[x_i]$ ) {  
         $D[x_i] = D[x_i] \sqcup t$ ;  
         $W = I[x_i]$ ;  $I[x_i] = \emptyset$ ;  
         $Stable = Stable \setminus W$ ;  
        app solve  $W$ ;  
    }  
}
```




Aleks Karbyshev, TU München :-))



## 1.7 Eliminating Partial Redundancies


Example:



//  $x + 1$  is evaluated on every path ...

// on one path, however, even twice :-)

Goal:



## Idea:

- (1) Insert assignments  $T_e = e$ ; such that  $e$  is available at all points where the value of  $e$  is required.
- (2) Thereby spare program points where  $e$  either is already **available** or will **definitely be computed** in future.  
Expressions with the latter property are called **very busy**.
- (3) Replace the original evaluations of  $e$  by accesses to the variable  $T_e$ .

$\implies$  we require a novel analysis :-))

An expression  $e$  is called **busy** along a path  $\pi$ , if the expression  $e$  is evaluated before any of the variables  $x \in Vars(e)$  is overwritten.

// backward analysis!

$e$  is called **very busy** at  $u$ , if  $e$  is busy along every path  $\pi : u \rightarrow^* stop$ .

An expression  $e$  is called **busy** along a path  $\pi$ , if the expression  $e$  is evaluated before any of the variables  $x \in Vars(e)$  is overwritten.

// backward analysis!

$e$  is called **very busy** at  $u$ , if  $e$  is busy along every path  $\pi : u \rightarrow^* stop$ .

Accordingly, we require:

$$\mathcal{B}[u] = \bigcap \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# \emptyset \mid \pi : u \rightarrow^* stop \}$$

where for  $\pi = k_1 \dots k_m$ :

$$\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket k_1 \rrbracket^\# \circ \dots \circ \llbracket k_m \rrbracket^\#$$

Our complete lattice is given by:


$$\mathbb{B} = 2^{\text{Expr} \setminus \text{Vars}} \quad \text{with} \quad \sqsubseteq = \supseteq$$

The effect  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\#$  of an edge  $k = (u, \text{lab}, v)$  only depends on  $\text{lab}$ ,  
i.e.,  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# = \llbracket \text{lab} \rrbracket^\#$  where:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# B &= B \\ \llbracket \text{Pos}(e) \rrbracket^\# B &= \llbracket \text{Neg}(e) \rrbracket^\# B = B \cup \{e\} \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# B &= (B \setminus \text{Expr}_x) \cup \{e\} \\ \llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# B &= (B \setminus \text{Expr}_x) \cup \{e\} \\ \llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# B &= B \cup \{e_1, e_2\} \end{aligned}$$

These effects are all **distributive**. Thus, the least solution of the constraint system yields precisely the MOP — given that *stop* is reachable from every program point :-)

### Example:



7	$\emptyset$
6	$\{y_1 + y_2\}$
5	$\{x + 1\}$
4	$\{x + 1\}$
3	$\{x + 1\}$
2	$\{x + 1\}$
1	$\emptyset$
0	$\emptyset$

A point  $u$  is called **safe** for  $e$ , if  $e \in \mathcal{A}[u] \cup \mathcal{B}[u]$ , i.e.,  $e$  is either available or very busy.


### Idea:

- We insert computations of  $e$  such that  $e$  becomes available at all safe program points :-)
- We insert  $T_e = e$ ; after every edge  $(u, lab, v)$  with

$$e \in \mathcal{B}[v] \setminus \llbracket lab \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}(\mathcal{A}[u] \cup \mathcal{B}[u])$$



# Transformation 5.1:



## Transformation 5.2:



// analogously for the other uses of  $e$   
// at old edges of the program.




Bernhard Steffen, Dortmund




Jens Knoop, Wien

## In the Example:




	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
3	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
4	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{x + 1\}$
5	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
6	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{y_1 + y_2\}$
7	$\{x + 1, y_1 + y_2\}$	$\emptyset$

## In the Example:



	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
3	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
4	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{x + 1\}$
5	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
6	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{y_1 + y_2\}$
7	$\{x + 1, y_1 + y_2\}$	$\emptyset$

# Im Example:




	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
3	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
4	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{x + 1\}$
5	$\emptyset$	$\{x + 1\}$
6	$\{x + 1\}$	$\{y_1 + y_2\}$
7	$\{x + 1, y_1 + y_2\}$	$\emptyset$

## Correctness:

Let  $\pi$  denote a path reaching  $v$  after which a computation of an edge with  $e$  follows.

Then there is a maximal suffix of  $\pi$  such that for every edge  $k = (u, lab, u')$  in the suffix:

$$e \in \llbracket lab \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}(\mathcal{A}[u] \cup \mathcal{B}[u])$$



## Correctness:


Let  $\pi$  denote a path reaching  $v$  after which a computation of an edge with  $e$  follows.

Then there is a maximal suffix of  $\pi$  such that for every edge  $k = (u, lab, u')$  in the suffix:

$$e \in \llbracket lab \rrbracket_{\mathcal{A}}^{\#}(\mathcal{A}[u] \cup \mathcal{B}[u])$$

In particular, no variable in  $e$  receives a new value :-)

Then  $T_e = e;$  is inserted before the suffix :-))





We conclude:

- Whenever the value of  $e$  is required,  $e$  is available :-)  
⇒ correctness of the transformation
- Every  $T = e$ ; which is inserted into a path corresponds to an  $e$   
which is replaced with  $T$  :-))  
⇒ non-degradation of the efficiency

## 1.8 Application: Loop-invariant Code


Example:

```
for ( $i = 0; i < n; i++$ )  
     $a[i] = b + 3;$ 
```


// The expression  $b + 3$  is recomputed in every iteration :-)

// This should be avoided :-)

## The Control-flow Graph:




Warning:  $T = b + 3;$  may not be placed **before** the loop :




$\implies$  There is no **decent** place for  $T = b + 3;$  :-)


Idea: Transform into a **do-while**-loop ...



... now there is a place for  $T = e;$  :-)




Application of **T5** (PRE) :



	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\emptyset$	$\{b + 3\}$
3	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
4	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
5	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
6	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
7	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$

Application of **T5** (PRE) :



	$\mathcal{A}$	$\mathcal{B}$
0	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$\emptyset$	$\{b + 3\}$
3	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
4	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
5	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
6	$\{b + 3\}$	$\emptyset$
7	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$



## Conclusion:

- Elimination of partial redundancies may move loop-invariant code out of the loop :-))
- This only works properly for do-while-loops :-(  
:-)
- To optimize other loops, we transform them into do-while-loops before-hand:

`while (b) stmt`  $\implies$  `if (b)`  
`do stmt`  
`while (b);`

$\implies$  Loop Rotation

## Problem:

If we do not have the source program at hand, we must re-construct potential loop headers :-)

$\implies$  Pre-dominators

$u$  pre-dominates  $v$ , if every path  $\pi : start \rightarrow^* v$  contains  $u$ . We write:  $u \Rightarrow v$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” is reflexive, transitive and anti-symmetric :-)

## Computation:

We collect the nodes along paths by means of the analysis:


$$\mathbb{P} = 2^{\text{Nodes}}, \quad \sqsubseteq = \supseteq$$
$$\llbracket (-, -, v) \rrbracket^\# P = P \cup \{v\}$$

Then the set  $\mathcal{P}[v]$  of pre-dominators is given by:

$$\mathcal{P}[v] = \bigcap \{ \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^\# \{start\} \mid \pi : start \rightarrow^* v \}$$


Since  $\llbracket k \rrbracket^\sharp$  are distributive, the  $\mathcal{P}[v]$  can be computed by means of fixpoint iteration :-)

Example:



	$\mathcal{P}$
0	$\{0\}$
1	$\{0, 1\}$
2	$\{0, 1, 2\}$
3	$\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$
4	$\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$
5	$\{0, 1, 5\}$

The partial ordering “ $\Rightarrow$ ” in the example:



	$\mathcal{P}$
0	{0}
1	{0, 1}
2	{0, 1, 2}
3	{0, 1, 2, 3}
4	{0, 1, 2, 3, 4}
5	{0, 1, 5}

Apparently, the result is a tree :-)

In fact, we have:

### Theorem:

Every node  $v$  has at most one immediate pre-dominator.

### Proof:

Assume:

there are  $u_1 \neq u_2$  which immediately pre-dominate  $v$ .


If  $u_1 \Rightarrow u_2$  then  $u_1$  not immediate.

Consequently,  $u_1, u_2$  are incomparable :-)

Now for every  $\pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v$  :

$$\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_1 &: \textit{start} \rightarrow^* u_1 \\ \pi_2 &: u_1 \rightarrow^* v \end{aligned}$$


If, however,  $u_1, u_2$  are incomparable, then there is path:  $\textit{start} \rightarrow^* v$   
avoiding  $u_2$  :



Now for every  $\pi : \textit{start} \rightarrow^* v$  :

$$\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{aligned} \pi_1 &: \textit{start} \rightarrow^* u_1 \\ \pi_2 &: u_1 \rightarrow^* v \end{aligned}$$

If, however,  $u_1, u_2$  are incomparable, then there is path:  $\textit{start} \rightarrow^* v$   
avoiding  $u_2$  :





## Observation:

The loop head of a **while**-loop pre-dominates every node in the body.


A back edge from the exit  $u$  to the loop head  $v$  can be identified through

$$v \in \mathcal{P}[u]$$

:-)


Accordingly, we define:

## Transformation 6:




We duplicate the entry check to all back edges :-)


... in the Example:




... in the Example:



... in the Example:




... in the Example:




## Warning:


There are **unusual** loops which cannot be rotated:



Pre-dominators:




... but also **common ones** which cannot be rotated:



Here, the complete block between back edge and conditional jump should be duplicated :-(  
:-(




... but also **common ones** which cannot be rotated:



Here, the complete block between back edge and conditional jump should be duplicated :-(  
:-(


... but also **common ones** which cannot be rotated:



Here, the complete block between back edge and conditional jump should be duplicated :-)


## 1.9 Eliminating Partially Dead Code

Example:



$x + 1$  need only be computed along one path ;-(

Idea:



## Problem:

- The definition  $x = e;$  ( $x \notin Vars_e$ ) may only be moved to an edge where  $e$  is safe ;-)
- The definition must still be available for uses of  $x$  ;-)



We define an analysis which maximally delays computations:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket ; \rrbracket^\# D &= D \\ \llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# D &= \begin{cases} D \setminus (Use_e \cup Def_x) \cup \{x = e;\} & \text{if } x \notin Vars_e \\ D \setminus (Use_e \cup Def_x) & \text{if } x \in Vars_e \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

... where:

$$Use_e = \{y = e'; \mid y \in Vars_e\}$$

$$Def_x = \{y = e'; \mid y \equiv x \vee x \in Vars_{e'}\}$$

... where:

$$Use_e = \{y = e'; \mid y \in Vars_e\}$$

$$Def_x = \{y = e'; \mid y \equiv x \vee x \in Vars_{e'}\}$$

For the remaining edges, we define:


$$\llbracket x = M[e]; \rrbracket^\# D = D \setminus (Use_e \cup Def_x)$$

$$\llbracket M[e_1] = e_2; \rrbracket^\# D = D \setminus (Use_{e_1} \cup Use_{e_2})$$

$$\llbracket Pos(e) \rrbracket^\# D = \llbracket Neg(e) \rrbracket^\# D = D \setminus Use_e$$

## Warning:

We may move  $y = e;$  beyond a join only if  $y = e;$  can be delayed along all joining edges:




Here,  $T = x + 1;$  cannot be moved beyond 1 !!!




## We conclude:

- The partial ordering of the lattice for delayability is given by “ $\supseteq$ ”.
- At program start:  $D_0 = \emptyset$ .  
Therefore, the sets  $\mathcal{D}[u]$  of at  $u$  delayable assignments can be computed by solving a system of constraints.
- We delay only assignments  $a$  where  $a \ a$  has the same effect as  $a$  alone.
- The extra insertions render the original assignments as assignments to dead variables ...

## Transformation 7:







Note:

Transformation **T7** is only meaningful, if we subsequently eliminate assignments to dead variables by means of transformation **T2** :-)


In the example, the partially dead code is eliminated:



	$\mathcal{D}$
0	$\emptyset$
1	$\{T = x + 1;\}$
2	$\{T = x + 1;\}$
3	$\emptyset$
4	$\emptyset$



	$\mathcal{D}$
0	$\emptyset$
1	$\{T = x + 1;\}$
2	$\{T = x + 1;\}$
3	$\emptyset$
4	$\emptyset$



	$\mathcal{L}$
0	$\{x\}$
1	$\{x\}$
2	$\{x\}$
2'	$\{x, T\}$
3	$\emptyset$
4	$\emptyset$

## Remarks:

- After  $T7$ , all original assignments  $y = e;$  with  $y \notin Vars_e$  are assignments to dead variables and thus can always be eliminated :-)
- By this, it can be proven that the transformation is guaranteed to be non-degradating efficiency of the code :-))
- Similar to the elimination of partial redundancies, the transformation can be repeated :-}

## Conclusion:

- The design of a **meaningful** optimization is non-trivial.
- Many transformations are advantageous only in connection with other optimizations :-)
- The **ordering** of applied optimizations matters !!
- Some optimizations can be iterated !!!



... a meaningful ordering:

T4	Constant Propagation Interval Analysis Alias Analysis
T6	Loop Rotation
T1, T3, T2	Available Expressions
T2	Dead Variables
T7, T2	Partially Dead Code
T5, T3, T2	Partially Redundant Code

## 2 Replacing Expensive Operations by Cheaper Ones

### 2.1 Reduction of Strength

#### (1) Evaluation of Polynomials

$$f(x) = a_n \cdot x^n + a_{n-1} \cdot x^{n-1} + \dots + a_1 \cdot x + a_0$$

	Multiplications	Additions
naive	$\frac{1}{2}n(n+1)$	$n$
re-use	$2n-1$	$n$
Horner-Scheme	$n$	$n$

Idea:

$$f(x) = (\dots((a_n \cdot x + a_{n-1}) \cdot x + a_{n-2}) \dots) \cdot x + a_0$$

(2) Tabulation of a polynomial  $f(x)$  of degree  $n$ :

- To recompute  $f(x)$  for every argument  $x$  is too expensive :-)
- Luckily, the  $n$ -th differences are constant !!!

Example:

$$f(x) = 3x^3 - 5x^2 + 4x + 13$$


$n$	$f(n)$	$\Delta$	$\Delta^2$	$\Delta^3$
0	13	2	8	18
1	15	10	26	
2	25	36		
3	61			
4	...			

Here, the  $n$ -th difference is **always**

$$\Delta_h^n(f) = n! \cdot a_n \cdot h^n \quad (h \text{ step width})$$

## Costs:

- $n$  times evaluation of  $f$  ;
- $\frac{1}{2} \cdot (n - 1) \cdot n$  subtractions to determine the  $\Delta^k$  ;
- $n$  additions for every further value :-)



Number of multiplications only depends on  $n$  :-))

Simple Case:  $f(x) = a_1 \cdot x + a_0$


- ... naturally occurs in many numerical loops :-)
- The first differences are already constant:

$$f(x+h) - f(x) = a_1 \cdot h$$

- Instead of the sequence:  $y_i = f(x_0 + i \cdot h), i \geq 0$   
we compute:  $y_0 = f(x_0), \Delta = a_1 \cdot h$   
 $y_i = y_{i-1} + \Delta, i > 0$


## Example:

```
for ( $i = i_0; i < n; i = i + h$ ) {  
     $A = A_0 + b \cdot i;$   
     $M[A] = \dots;$   
}
```



... or, after loop rotation:

```
 $i = i_0;$   
if ( $i < n$ ) do {  
     $A = A_0 + b \cdot i;$   
     $M[A] = \dots;$   
     $i = i + h;$   
} while ( $i < n$ );
```






... and reduction of strength:

```

i = i0;
if (i < n) {
    Δ = b · h;
    A = A0 + b · i0;
    do {
        M[A] = ...;
        i = i + h;
        A = A + Δ;
    } while (i < n);
}

```



## Warning:

- The values  $b, h, A_0$  must not change their values during the loop.
- $i, A$  may be modified at exactly one position in the loop :-)
- One may try to eliminate the variable  $i$  altogether :
  - $i$  may not be used else-where.
  - The initialization must be transformed into:  
 $A = A_0 + b \cdot i_0$ .
  - The loop condition  $i < n$  must be transformed into:  
 $A < N$  for  $N = A_0 + b \cdot n$ .
  - $b$  must always be different from zero !!!

## Approach:

### Identify

- ... loops;
- ... iteration variables;
- ... constants;
- ... the matching use structures.


## Loops:

... are identified through the node  $v$  with back edge  $(\_, \_, v)$  :-)

For the sub-graph  $G_v$  of the cfg on  $\{w \mid v \Rightarrow w\}$ , we define:


$$\text{Loop}[v] = \{w \mid w \rightarrow^* v \text{ in } G_v\}$$

Example:




	$\mathcal{P}$
0	{0}
1	{0, 1}
2	{0, 1, 2}
3	{0, 1, 2, 3}
4	{0, 1, 2, 3, 4}
5	{0, 1, 5}

Example:




	$\mathcal{P}$
0	{0}
1	{0, 1}
2	{0, 1, 2}
3	{0, 1, 2, 3}
4	{0, 1, 2, 3, 4}
5	{0, 1, 5}

Example:



	$\mathcal{P}$
0	{0}
1	{0, 1}
2	{0, 1, 2}
3	{0, 1, 2, 3}
4	{0, 1, 2, 3, 4}
5	{0, 1, 5}

We are interested in edges which during each iteration are executed exactly once:



This property can be expressed by means of the pre-dominator relation ...



Assume that  $(u, \_, v)$  is the back edge.

Then edges  $k = (u_1, \_, v_1)$  could be selected such that:

- $v$  pre-dominates  $u_1$ ;
- $u_1$  pre-dominates  $v_1$ ;
- $v_1$  predominates  $u$ .

Assume that  $(u, \_, v)$  is the back edge.

Then edges  $k = (u_1, \_, v_1)$  could be selected such that:

- $v$  pre-dominates  $u_1$ ;
- $u_1$  pre-dominates  $v_1$ ;
- $v_1$  predominates  $u$ .

On the level of source programs, this is **trivial**:

```
do {  $s_1 \dots s_k$ 
    } while ( $e$ );
```

The desired assignments must be among the  $s_i$  :-)

## Iteration Variable:

$i$  is an iteration variable if the only **definition** of  $i$  inside the loop occurs at an edge which separates the body and is of the form:

$$i = i + h;$$

for some **loop constant**  $h$ .

A loop constant is simply a constant (e.g., **42**), or slightly more liberal, an expression which only depends on variables which are not modified during the loop **:-)**

### (3) Differences for Sets

Consider the fixpoint computation:

$$\begin{aligned} &x = \emptyset; \\ &\text{for } (t = F x; t \not\subseteq x; \boxed{t = F x};) \\ &\quad x = x \cup t; \end{aligned}$$

If  $F$  is **distributive**, it could be replaced by:

$$\begin{aligned} &x = \emptyset; \\ &\text{for } (\Delta = F x; \Delta \neq \emptyset; \boxed{\Delta = (F \Delta) \setminus x};) \\ &\quad x = x \cup \Delta; \end{aligned}$$

The function  $F$  must only be computed for the **smaller** sets  $\Delta$  :-)  
**semi-naive iteration**

Instead of the sequence:  $\emptyset \subseteq F(\emptyset) \subseteq F^2(\emptyset) \subseteq \dots$

we compute:  $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \cup \dots$

where: 
$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i+1} &= F(F^i(\emptyset)) \setminus F^i(\emptyset) \\ &= F(\Delta_i) \setminus (\Delta_1 \cup \dots \cup \Delta_i) \quad \text{with } \Delta_0 = \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

Assume that the costs of  $F x$  is  $1 + \#x$ .

Then the costs may sum up to:

naive	$1 + 2 + \dots + n + n = \frac{1}{2}n(n + 3)$
semi-naive	$2n$

where  $n$  is the cardinality of the result.

$\implies$  A linear factor is saved :-)

## 2.2 Peephole Optimization

Idea:

- Slide a **small** window over the program.
- Optimize aggressively inside the window, i.e.,
  - Eliminate redundancies!
  - Replace expensive operations inside the window by cheaper ones!

## Examples:

$$y = M[x]; x = x + 1; \quad \Longrightarrow \quad y = M[x++];$$

// given that there is a specific post-increment instruction :-)

$$z = y - a + a; \quad \Longrightarrow \quad z = y;$$

// algebraic simplifications :-)


$$x = x; \quad \Longrightarrow \quad ;$$

$$x = 0; \quad \Longrightarrow \quad x = x \oplus x;$$

$$x = 2 \cdot x; \quad \Longrightarrow \quad x = x + x;$$

## Important Subproblem:

## *nop*-Optimization



- If  $(v_1, ;, v)$  is an edge,  $v_1$  has no further out-going edge.
- Consequently, we can identify  $v_1$  and  $v$  :-)
- The ordering of the identifications does not matter :-))



## Implementation:

- We construct a function  $\text{next} : \text{Nodes} \rightarrow \text{Nodes}$  with:

$$\text{next } u = \begin{cases} \text{next } v & \text{if } (u, ;, v) \text{ edge} \\ u & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Warning:** This definition is only recursive if there are  $;$ -loops  
???


- We replace every edge:

$$(u, \text{lab}, v) \implies (u, \text{lab}, \text{next } v)$$

... whenever  $\text{lab} \neq ;$

- All  $;$ -edges are removed  $;-)$

Example:




next 1 = 1

next 3 = 4

next 5 = 6

Example:



next 1 = 1

next 3 = 4

next 5 = 6


## 2. Subproblem: Linearization

After optimization, the CFG must again be brought into a **linearly arrangement** of instructions :-)

**Warning:**

Not every linearization is equally efficient !!!


Example:



0:  
1: if ( $e_1$ ) goto 2;  
4: halt  
2: Rumpf  
3: if ( $e_2$ ) goto 4;  
goto 1;

**Bad:** The loop body is jumped into :-(  
:-(

## Example:



0:  
1: if (!e<sub>1</sub>) goto 4;  
2: Rumpf  
3: if (!e<sub>2</sub>) goto 1;  
4: halt



// better cache behavior :-)

## Idea:

- Assign to each node a **temperature!**
- always jumps to
  - (1) nodes which have already been handled;
  - (2) **colder** nodes.
- **Temperature**  $\approx$  nesting-depth

For the computation, we use the pre-dominator tree and strongly connected components ...



... in the Example:





The sub-tree with back edge is **hotter** ...





... in the Example:





## More Complicated Example:



## More Complicated Example:





## More Complicated Example:





Our definition of **Loop** implies that (detected) loops are necessarily nested :-)

Is is also meaningful for do-while-loops with breaks ...



Our definition of `Loop` implies that (detected) loops are necessarily nested :-)

Is is also meaningful for do-while-loops with breaks ...



## Summary: The Approach

- (1) For every node, determine a temperature;
- (2) Pre-order-DFS over the CFG;
  - If an edge leads to a node we already have generated code for, then we insert a jump.
  - If a node has two successors with different temperature, then we insert a jump to the **colder** of the two.
  - If both successors are equally warm, then it does not matter ;-)

## 2.3 Procedures

We extend our mini-programming language by procedures without parameters and procedure calls.

For that, we introduce a new statement:

$$f();$$

Every procedure  $f$  has a definition:

$$f () \{ stmt^* \}$$

Additionally, we distinguish between **global** and **local** variables.

Program execution starts with the call of a procedure `main ()`.



## Example:


```
int a, ret;
main () {
    a = 3;
    f();
    M[17] = ret;
    ret = 0;
}

f () {
    int b;
    if (a ≤ 1) {ret = 1; goto exit;}
    b = a;
    a = b - 1;
    f();
    ret = b · ret;

    exit :
}
```


Such programs can be represented by a **set** of CFGs: one for each procedure ...

... in the Example:




In order to optimize such programs, we require an extended operational semantics :-)

Program executions are no longer **paths**, but **forests**:



... in the Example:



The function  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  is extended to computation forests:  $w :$

$$\llbracket w \rrbracket : (Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow (Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$$

For a call  $k = (u, f();, v)$  we must:

- determine the initial values for the locals:

$$\text{enter } \rho = \{x \mapsto 0 \mid x \in Locals\} \oplus (\rho|_{Globals})$$

- ... combine the new values for the globals with the old values for the locals:

$$\text{combine } (\rho_1, \rho_2) = (\rho_1|_{Locals}) \oplus (\rho_2|_{Globals})$$

- ... evaluate the computation forest inbetween:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket k \langle w \rangle \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) &= \text{let } (\rho_1, \mu_1) = \llbracket w \rrbracket (\text{enter } \rho, \mu) \\ &\text{in } (\text{combine } (\rho, \rho_1), \mu_1) \end{aligned}$$

## Warning:

- In general,  $\llbracket w \rrbracket$  is only partially defined :-)
- Dedicated global/local variables  $a_i, b_i, \text{ret}$  can be used to simulate specific calling conventions.
- The **standard** operational semantics relies on configurations which maintain a **call stack**.
- Computation forests are better suited for the construction of analyses and correctness proofs :-)
- It is an awkward (but useful) exercise to prove the equivalence of the two approaches ...

## Configurations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{configuration} &= \text{stack} \times \text{store} \\ \text{store} &= \text{globals} \times (\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \\ \text{globals} &= (\text{Globals} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \\ \text{stack} &= \text{frame} \cdot \text{frame}^* \\ \text{frame} &= \text{point} \times \text{locals} \\ \text{locals} &= (\text{Locals} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \end{aligned}$$

A *frame* specifies the local state of computation inside a procedure call *:-)*

The **leftmost** frame corresponds to the current call.

Computation steps refer to the current call :-)

The novel kinds of steps:

call  $k = (u, f()); v$  :

$$((u, \rho) \cdot \sigma, \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle) \implies ((u_f, \{x \rightarrow 0 \mid x \in \text{Locals}\}) \cdot (v, \rho) \cdot \sigma, \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle)$$

$u_f$  entry point of  $f$

return:


$$((r_f, -) \cdot \sigma, \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle) \implies (\sigma, \langle \gamma, \mu \rangle)$$

$r_f$  return point of  $f$




The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:




The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:



The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:



The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

5	$b \mapsto 0$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	

The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

7	$b \mapsto 2$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	

The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

5	$b \mapsto 0$
9	$b \mapsto 2$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	

The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

11	$b \mapsto 0$
9	$b \mapsto 2$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	

The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

9	$b \mapsto 2$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	




The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:

11	$b \mapsto 2$
9	$b \mapsto 3$
2	


The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:




The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:



The call stack explicitly implements the DFS traversal through the computation forest :-)

... in the Example:



This operational semantics is quite **realistic** :-)

## Costs for a Procedure Call:

**Before entering the body:** ● Creating a stack frame;

- assigning of the parameters;
- Saving the registers;
- Saving the return address;
- Jump to the body.

**At procedure exit:** ● Freeing the stack frame.

- Restoring the registers.
- Passing of the result.
- Return behind the call.

⇒ ... quite expensive !!!

## 1. Idea: Inlining

Copy the procedure body at every call site !!!

Example:

```
abs () {  
     $a_2 = -a_1$ ;  
    max ();  
}  
  
max () {  
    if ( $a_1 < a_2$ ) { ret =  $a_2$ ; goto _exit; }  
    ret =  $a_1$ ;  
    _exit :  
}
```

... yields:

```
abs () {  
   $a_2 = -a_1$ ;  
  if ( $a_1 < a_2$ ) {  $ret = a_2$ ; goto _exit; }  
   $ret = a_1$ ;  
  _exit :  
}
```

## Problems:


- The copied block may modify the locals of the calling procedure  
???
- More general: Multiple use of local variable names may lead to errors.
- Multiple calls of a procedure may lead to code duplication :-((
- How can we handle **recursion** ???



## Detection of Recursion:

We construct the **call-graph** of the program.

In the Examples:



## Call-Graph:


- The nodes are the procedures.
- An edge connects  $g$  with  $h$ , whenever the body of  $g$  contains a call of  $h$ .

## Strategies for Inlining:

- Just copy nur **leaf**-procedures, i.e., procedures without further calls :-)
- Copy all non-recursive procedures!

... here, we consider just leaf-procedures ;-)

# Transformation 9:



## Note:

- The **Nop**-edge can be eliminated if the *stop*-node of  $f$  has no out-going edges ...
- The  $x_f$  are the copies of the locals of the procedure  $f$ .
- According to our semantics of procedure calls, these must be initialized with 0 :-)

## 2. Idea: Elimination of Tail Recursion

```
f () { int b;  
      if (a2 ≤ 1) { ret = a1; goto _exit; }  
      b = a1 · a2;  
      a2 = a2 - 1;  
      a1 = b;  
      f ();  
  
      _exit :  
    }
```

After the procedure call, nothing in the body remains to be done.

⇒ We may **directly** jump to the beginning :-)


... after having reset the locals to 0.

... this yields in the Example:

```
f () { int b;  
  _f :   if (a2 ≤ 1) { ret = a1; goto _exit; }  
        b = a1 · a2;  
        a2 = a2 − 1;  
        a1 = b;  
        b = 0; goto _f;  
  _exit :  
}
```

// It works, since we have ruled out **references to variables!**

## Transformation 11:



## Warning:

- This optimization is crucial for programming languages without iteration constructs !!!
- Duplication of code is not necessary :-)
- No variable renaming is necessary :-)
- The optimization may also be profitable for non-recursive tail calls :-)
- The corresponding code may contain jumps from the body of one procedure into the body of another ???



## Background 4: Interprocedural Analysis

So far, we can analyze each procedure separately.

- The costs are moderate :-)
- The methods also work in presence of separate compilation :-)
- At procedure calls, we must assume the worst case :-((
- Constant propagation only works for local constants :-(((

### Question:

How can recursive programs be analyzed ???



## Example: Constant Propagation

```
main() { int t;
        t = 0;
        if (t) M[17] = 3;
        a1 = t;
        work ();
        ret = 1 - ret;
    }

work() {
        if (a1) work();
        ret = a1;
    }
```


Example:

# Constant Propagation



Example:

# Constant Propagation




(1) **Functional Approach:**

Let  $\mathbb{D}$  denote a complete lattice of (abstract) states.

**Idea:**

Represent the effect of  $f()$  by a function:

$$\llbracket f \rrbracket^\# : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$$



Micha Sharir, Tel Aviv University



Amir Pnueli, Weizmann Institute

In order to determine the effect of a call edge  $k = (u, f();, v)$  we require abstract functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{enter}^\# & : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \\ \text{combine}^\# & : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \end{aligned}$$

Then we define:

$$\llbracket k \rrbracket^\# D = \text{combine}^\# (D, \llbracket f \rrbracket^\# (\text{enter}^\# D))$$

... for Constant Propagation:

$$\mathbb{D} = (\text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\top})_{\perp}$$

$$\text{enter}^{\#} D = \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } D = \perp \\ D|_{\text{Globals}} \oplus \{x \mapsto 0 \mid x \in \text{Locals}\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{combine}^{\#} (D_1, D_2) = \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } D_1 = \perp \vee D_2 = \perp \\ D_1|_{\text{Locals}} \oplus D_2|_{\text{Globals}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



The effects  $\llbracket f \rrbracket^\#$  then can be determined by a system of constraints over the complete lattice  $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket v \rrbracket^\# &\sqsupseteq \text{Id} && v \text{ entry point} \\ \llbracket v \rrbracket^\# &\sqsupseteq \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket^\# && k = (u, \_, v) \text{ edge} \\ \llbracket f \rrbracket^\# &\sqsupseteq \llbracket \text{stop}_f \rrbracket^\# && \text{stop}_f \text{ end point of } f \end{aligned}$$

$\llbracket v \rrbracket^\# : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  describes the effect of all prefixes of computation forests  $w$  of a procedure which lead from the entry point to  $v$  :-)

## Problems:

- How can we represent functions  $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} ???$
- If  $\#\mathbb{D} = \infty$ , then  $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  has **infinite** strictly increasing chains :-)

## Simplification: Copy-Constants

- Conditions are interpreted as ; :-)
- Only assignments  $x = e;$  with  $e \in Vars \cup \mathbb{Z}$  are treated exactly :-)

## Observation:

→ The effects of assignments are:

$$\llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# D = \begin{cases} D \oplus \{x \mapsto c\} & \text{if } e = c \in \mathbb{Z} \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto (D \ y)\} & \text{if } e = y \in \mathit{Vars} \\ D \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

→ Let  $\mathbb{V}$  denote the (finite !!!) set of **constant** right-hand sides. Then variables may only take values from  $\mathbb{V}^\top$  :-))

→ The occurring effects can be taken from

$$\mathbb{D}_f \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_f \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbb{D}_f = (\mathit{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}^\top)_\perp$$

→ The complete lattice is huge, but **finite !!!**

## Improvement:

- Not all functions from  $\mathbb{D}_f \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_f$  will occur :-)
- All occurring functions  $\lambda D. \perp \neq M$  are of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \{x \mapsto (b_x \sqcup \bigsqcup_{y \in I_x} y) \mid x \in Vars\} && \text{where:} \\ M D &= \{x \mapsto (b_x \sqcup \bigsqcup_{y \in I_x} D y) \mid x \in Vars\} && \text{für } D \neq \perp \end{aligned}$$

- Let  $\mathbb{M}$  denote the set of all these functions. Then for  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{M}$  ( $M_1 \neq \lambda D. \perp \neq M_2$ ):

$$(M_1 \sqcup M_2) x = (M_1 x) \sqcup (M_2 x)$$

- For  $k = \#Vars$ ,  $\mathbb{M}$  has height  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  :-)

## Improvement (Cont.):

→ Also, composition can be directly implemented:

$$(M_1 \circ M_2) x = b' \sqcup \bigsqcup_{y \in I'} y \quad \text{with}$$

$$b' = b \sqcup \bigsqcup_{z \in I} b_z$$

$$I' = \bigcup_{z \in I} I_z \quad \text{where}$$

$$M_1 x = b \sqcup \bigsqcup_{y \in I} y$$

$$M_2 z = b_z \sqcup \bigsqcup_{y \in I_z} y$$

→ The effects of assignments then are:

$$\llbracket x = e; \rrbracket^\# = \begin{cases} \text{Id}_{Vars} \oplus \{x \mapsto c\} & \text{if } e = c \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \text{Id}_{Vars} \oplus \{x \mapsto y\} & \text{if } e = y \in Vars \\ \text{Id}_{Vars} \oplus \{x \mapsto \top\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

... in the Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket t = 0; \rrbracket^\# &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto 0\} \\ \llbracket a_1 = t; \rrbracket^\# &= \{a_1 \mapsto t, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\} \end{aligned}$$


In order to implement the analysis, we additionally must construct the effect of a call  $k = (\_, f ();, \_)$  from the effect of a procedure  $f$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# &= H (\llbracket f \rrbracket^\#) && \text{where:} \\ H (M) &= \text{Id}|_{Locals} \oplus (M \circ \text{enter}^\#)|_{Globals} \\ \text{enter}^\# x &= \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \in Globals \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

... in the Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } \llbracket \text{work} \rrbracket^\# &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\} \\ \text{then } H \llbracket \text{work} \rrbracket^\# &= \text{Id}_{\{t\}} \oplus \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1\} \\ &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\} \end{aligned}$$


Now we can perform fixpoint iteration :-)



	1
7	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$
9	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$
10	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\}$
8	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket (8, \dots, 9) \rrbracket^\# \circ \llbracket 8 \rrbracket^\# &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\} \circ \\
 &\quad \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\} \\
 &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\}
 \end{aligned}$$






	2
7	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$
9	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1 \sqcup \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$
10	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\}$
8	$\{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket (8, \dots, 9) \rrbracket^\# \circ \llbracket 8 \rrbracket^\# &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\} \circ \\
 &\quad \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto \text{ret}, t \mapsto t\} \\
 &= \{a_1 \mapsto a_1, \text{ret} \mapsto a_1, t \mapsto t\}
 \end{aligned}$$

If we know the effects of procedure calls, we can put up a constraint system for determining the abstract state when reaching a program point:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 \mathcal{R}[\text{main}] & \sqsupseteq & \text{enter}^\# d_0 \\
 \mathcal{R}[f] & \sqsupseteq & \text{enter}^\# (\mathcal{R}[u]) \quad k = (u, f(), \_) \quad \text{call} \\
 \mathcal{R}[v] & \sqsupseteq & \mathcal{R}[f] \quad v \quad \text{entry point of } f \\
 \mathcal{R}[v] & \sqsupseteq & \llbracket k \rrbracket^\# (\mathcal{R}[u]) \quad k = (u, \_, v) \quad \text{edge}
 \end{array}$$

... in the Example:



0	$\{a_1 \mapsto \top, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$
1	$\{a_1 \mapsto \top, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$
2	$\{a_1 \mapsto \top, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$
3	$\{a_1 \mapsto \top, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$
4	$\{a_1 \mapsto 0, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$
5	$\{a_1 \mapsto 0, ret \mapsto 0, t \mapsto 0\}$
6	$\{a_1 \mapsto 0, ret \mapsto \top, t \mapsto 0\}$

## Discussion:

- At least **copy-constants** can be determined interprocedurally.
- For that, we had to ignore conditions and complex assignments :-)
- In the second phase, however, we could have been more precise :-)
- The extra abstractions were necessary for two reasons:
  - (1) The set of occurring transformers  $\mathbb{M} \subseteq \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$  must be **finite**;
  - (2) The functions  $M \in \mathbb{M}$  must be **efficiently** implementable :-)
- The second condition can, sometimes, be abandoned ...

## Observation:

Sharir/Pnueli, Cousot

- Often, procedures are only called for few distinct abstract arguments.
- Each procedure need only to be analyzed for these :-)
- Put up a constraint system:

$$\llbracket v, a \rrbracket^\# \sqsupseteq a \quad v \text{ entry point}$$

$$\llbracket v, a \rrbracket^\# \sqsupseteq \text{combine}^\# (\llbracket u, a \rrbracket, \llbracket f, \text{enter}^\# \llbracket u, a \rrbracket^\# \rrbracket^\#)$$

$(u, f ();, v)$  call

$$\llbracket v, a \rrbracket^\# \sqsupseteq \llbracket \text{lab} \rrbracket^\# \llbracket u, a \rrbracket^\# \quad k = (u, \text{lab}, v) \text{ edge}$$

$$\llbracket f, a \rrbracket^\# \sqsupseteq \llbracket \text{stop}_f, a \rrbracket^\# \quad \text{stop}_f \text{ end point of } f$$


$$// \llbracket v, a \rrbracket^\# = \text{value for the argument } a .$$

## Discussion:

- This constraint system may be **huge** :-)
- We do not want to solve it completely!!!
- It is sufficient to compute the correct values for all calls which **occur**, i.e., which are necessary to determine the value  $\llbracket \text{main}(), a_0 \rrbracket^\sharp \implies$  We apply our **local** fixpoint algorithm :-))
- The fixpoint algo provides us also with the **set** of actual parameters  $a \in \mathbb{D}$  for which procedures are (possibly) called and all abstract values at their program points for each of these calls :-)

... in the Example:

Let us try a **full** constant propagation ...



	$a_1$	ret	$a_1$	ret
0	T	T	T	T
1	T	T	T	T
2	T	T	⊥	
3	T	T	T	T
4	T	T	0	T
7	0	T	0	T
8	0	T	⊥	
9	0	T	0	T
10	0	T	0	0
5	T	T	0	0
main()	T	T	0	1

## Discussion:

- In the Example, the analysis terminates **quickly** :-)
- If  $\mathbb{D}$  has finite height, the analysis terminates if each procedure is only analyzed for **finitely many** arguments :-))
- Analogous analysis algorithms have proved very effective for the analysis of **Prolog** :-)
- Together with a points-to analysis and propagation of negative constant information, this algorithm is the heart of a very successful race analyzer for **C** with **Posix** threads :-)





## (2) The Call-String Approach:


### Idea:

- Compute the set of all reachable call stacks!
- In general, this is infinite :-)
- Only treat stacks up to a fixed depth  $d$  precisely! From longer stacks, we only keep the upper prefix of length  $d$  :-)
- Important special case:  $d = 0$ .
  - ⇒ Just track the current stack frame ...

... in the Example:



... in the Example:



The conditions for 5, 7, 10, e.g., are:

$$\mathcal{R}[5] \sqsupseteq \text{combine}^\# (\mathcal{R}[4], \mathcal{R}[10])$$

$$\mathcal{R}[7] \sqsupseteq \text{enter}^\# (\mathcal{R}[4])$$


$$\mathcal{R}[7] \sqsupseteq \text{enter}^\# (\mathcal{R}[8])$$

$$\mathcal{R}[9] \sqsupseteq \text{combine}^\# (\mathcal{R}[8], \mathcal{R}[10])$$


**Warning:**

The resulting super-graph contains obviously impossible paths ...

... in the Example this is:



... in the Example this is:



## Note:

- In the example, we find the same results:  
more paths render the results **less precise**.  
In particular, we provide for each procedure the result just for **one**  
(possibly very boring) argument :-)
- The analysis terminates — whenever  $\mathbb{D}$  has no infinite strictly  
ascending chains :-)
- The correctness is easily shown w.r.t. the operational semantics  
with call stacks.
- For the correctness of the functional approach, the semantics with  
computation forests is better suited :-)

## 3 Exploiting Hardware Features

Question: How can we optimally use:


- ... Registers
- ... Pipelines
- ... Caches
- ... Processors ???



## 3.1 Registers

Example:

```
read();  
 $x = M[A]$ ;  
 $y = x + 1$ ;  
if ( $y$ ) {  
     $z = x \cdot x$ ;  
     $M[A] = z$ ;  
} else {  
     $t = -y \cdot y$ ;  
     $M[A] = t$ ;  
}
```



The program uses 5 variables ...

Problem:

What if the program uses more variables than there are registers :-)

Idea:


Use one register for several variables :-)

In the example, e.g., one for  $x, t, z$  ...

```

read();
x = M[A];
y = x + 1;
if (y) {
    z = x · x;
    M[A] = z;
} else {
    t = -y · y;
    M[A] = t;
}


```



```

read();
R = M[A];
y = R + 1;
if (y) {
    R = R · R;
    M[A] = R;
} else {
    R = -y · y;
    M[A] = R;
}

```




Warning:

This is only possible if the **live ranges** do not overlap :-)


The (true) live range of  $x$  is defined by:

$$\mathcal{L}[x] = \{u \mid x \in \mathcal{L}[u]\}$$


... in the Example:



	$\mathcal{L}$
8	$\emptyset$
7	$\{A, z\}$
6	$\{A, x\}$
5	$\{A, t\}$
4	$\{A, y\}$
3	$\{A, x, y\}$
2	$\{A, x\}$
1	$\{A\}$
0	$\emptyset$



	$\mathcal{L}$
8	$\emptyset$
7	$\{A, z\}$
6	$\{A, x\}$
5	$\{A, t\}$
4	$\{A, y\}$
3	$\{A, x, y\}$
2	$\{A, x\}$
1	$\{A\}$
0	$\{A\}$



Live Ranges:

$A$	$\{0, \dots, 7\}$
$x$	$\{2, 3, 6\}$
$y$	$\{2, 4\}$
$t$	$\{5\}$
$z$	$\{7\}$




In order to determine sets of compatible variables, we construct the **Interference Graph**  $I = (Vars, E_I)$  where:


$$E_I = \{\{x, y\} \mid x \neq y, \mathcal{L}[x] \cap \mathcal{L}[y] \neq \emptyset\}$$

$E_I$  has an edge for  $x \neq y$  iff  $x, y$  are jointly live at some program point :-)


... in the Example:




Interference Graph:



Variables which are **not** connected with an edge can be assigned to the same register :-)




Variables which are **not** connected with an edge can be assigned to the same register :-)



Color == Register



Sviatoslav Sergeevich Lavrov,  
Russian Academy of Sciences (1962)



Gregory J. Chaitin, University of Maine (1981)


## Abstract Problem:

**Given:** Undirected Graph  $(V, E)$ .

**Wanted:** Minimal coloring, i.e., mapping  $c : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  mit

- (1)  $c(u) \neq c(v)$  for  $\{u, v\} \in E$ ;
- (2)  $\bigsqcup\{c(u) \mid u \in V\}$  minimal!

- In the example, 3 colors suffice :-) **But:**
- In general, the minimal coloring is not unique :-)
- It is NP-complete to determine whether there is a coloring with at most  $k$  colors :-((



We must rely on heuristics or special cases :-)

## Greedy Heuristics:

- Start somewhere with color 1;
- Next choose the smallest color which is different from the colors of all already colored neighbors;
- If a node is colored, color all neighbors which not yet have colors;
- Deal with one component after the other ...



... more concretely:

```
forall ( $v \in V$ )  $c[v] = 0$ ;  
forall ( $v \in V$ ) color ( $v$ );  
  
void color ( $v$ ) {  
    if ( $c[v] \neq 0$ ) return;  
    neighbors =  $\{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ ;  
     $c[v] = \prod \{k > 0 \mid \forall u \in \text{neighbors} : k \neq c(u)\}$ ;  
    forall ( $u \in \text{neighbors}$ )  
        if ( $c(u) == 0$ ) color ( $u$ );  
}
```

The new color can be easily determined once the neighbors are sorted according to their colors :-)

## Discussion:

- Essentially, this is a **Pre-order DFS** :-)
- In theory, the result may be arbitrarily far from the optimum :-(
- ... **in practice**, it may not be as bad :-)
- ... **Anecdote:** different variants have been **patented !!!**

## Discussion:

- Essentially, this is a **Pre-order DFS** :-)
- In theory, the result may be arbitrarily far from the optimum :-(
- ... **in practice**, it may not be as bad :-)
- ... **Anecdote**: different variants have been **patented !!!**


The algorithm works the better the smaller life ranges are ...

**Idea:**            **Life Range Splitting**

## Special Case:

## Basic Blocks


	$\mathcal{L}$
	$x, y, z$
$A_1 = x + y;$	$x, z$
$M[A_1] = z;$	$x$
$x = x + 1;$	$x$
$z = M[A_1];$	$x, z$
$t = M[x];$	$x, z, t$
$A_2 = x + t;$	$x, z, t$
$M[A_2] = z;$	$x, t$
$y = M[x];$	$y, t$
$M[y] = t;$	



## Special Case:


## Basic Blocks

	$\mathcal{L}$
	$x, y, z$
$A_1 = x + y;$	$x, z$
$M[A_1] = z;$	$x$
$x = x + 1;$	$x$
$z = M[A_1];$	$x, z$
$t = M[x];$	$x, z, t$
$A_2 = x + t;$	$x, z, t$
$M[A_2] = z;$	$x, t$
$y = M[x];$	$y, t$
$M[y] = t;$	




The live ranges of  $x$  and  $z$  can be split:

	$\mathcal{L}$
	$x, y, z$
$A_1 = x + y;$	$x, z$
$M[A_1] = z;$	$x$
$x_1 = x + 1;$	$x_1$
$z_1 = M[A_1];$	$x_1, z_1$
$t = M[x_1];$	$x_1, z_1, t$
$A_2 = x_1 + t;$	$x_1, z_1, t$
$M[A_2] = z_1;$	$x_1, t$
$y_1 = M[x_1];$	$y_1, t$
$M[y_1] = t;$	






The live ranges of  $x$  and  $z$  can be split:

	$\mathcal{L}$
	$x, y, z$
$A_1 = x + y;$	$x, z$
$M[A_1] = z;$	$x$
$x_1 = x + 1;$	$x_1$
$z_1 = M[A_1];$	$x_1, z_1$
$t = M[x_1];$	$x_1, z_1, t$
$A_2 = x_1 + t;$	$x_1, z_1, t$
$M[A_2] = z_1;$	$x_1, t$
$y_1 = M[x_1];$	$y_1, t$
$M[y_1] = t;$	



Interference graphs for minimal live ranges on basic blocks are known as **interval graphs**:



vertex        interval  
edge          joint vertex



The **covering number** of a vertex is given by the number of incident intervals.

## Theorem:

maximal covering number

==== size of the maximal clique

==== minimally necessary number of colors :-)

Graphs with this property (for every sub-graph) are called **perfect** ...

A minimal coloring can be found in polynomial time :-))

## Idea:

- Conceptually iterate over the vertices  $0, \dots, m - 1$  !
- Maintain a list of currently free colors.
- If an interval starts, allocate the next free color.
- If an interval ends, free its color.

This results in the following algorithm:

```

free = [1, ..., k];
for (i = 0; i < m; i++) {
    init[i] = []; exit[i] = [];
}
forall (I = [u, v] ∈ Intervals) {
    init[u] = (I :: init[u]); exit[v] = (I :: exit[v]);
}
for (i = 0; i < m; i++) {
    forall (I ∈ init[i]) {
        color[I] = hd free; free = tl free;
    }
    forall (I ∈ exit[i]) free = color[I] :: free;
}

```

## Discussion:

- For arbitrary programs, we thus may apply some heuristics for graph coloring ...
  - If the number of **real** register does not suffice, the remaining variables are spilled into a fixed area on the stack.
  - Generally, variables from inner loops are preferably held in registers.
  - For basic blocks we have succeeded to derive an optimal register allocation :-)
- The number of required registers could even be determined before-hand !
- This works only once live ranges have been split.
  - Splitting of live ranges for full programs results programs in **static single assignment** form ...

## Discussion

- Every live variable should be defined at most once ??
- Every live variable should have at most one definition ?
- All definitions of the same variable should have a common end point !!!

⇒ Static Single Assignment Form

## How to arrive at SSA Form:

We proceed in two phases:

### Step 1:

Transform the program such that each program point  $v$  is **reached** by at most one definition of a variable  $x$  which is **live** at  $v$ .

### Step 2:

- Introduce a separate variant  $x_i$  for every occurrence of a definition of a variable  $x$  !
- Replace every use of  $x$  with the use of the reaching variant  $x_h \dots$

## Implementing Step 1:

- Determine for every program point the set of **reaching definitions**.


- **Assumption**

All incoming edges of a join point  $v$  are labeled with the same parallel assignment  $x = x \mid x \in L_v$  for some set  $L_v$ .

Initially,  $L_v = \emptyset$  for all  $v$ .

- If the join point  $v$  is reached by more than one definition for the same variable  $x$  which is live at program point  $v$ , insert  $x$  into  $L_v$ , i.e., add definitions  $x = x;$  at the end of each incoming edge of  $v$ .

# Example




# Reaching Definitions

	$\mathcal{R}$
0	$\langle x, 0 \rangle, \langle y, 0 \rangle$
1	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle y, 0 \rangle$
2	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
3	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
4	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
5	$\langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
6	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
7	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$



# Example



where  $\psi \equiv x = x \mid y = y$

# Reaching Definitions

	$\mathcal{R}$
0	$\langle x, 0 \rangle, \langle y, 0 \rangle$
1	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle y, 0 \rangle$
2	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
3	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
4	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
5	$\langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
6	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$
7	$\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle x, 5 \rangle, \langle y, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 4 \rangle$

## Reaching Definitions

The complete lattice  $\mathbb{R}$  for this analysis is given by:

$$\mathbb{R} = 2^{Defs}$$

where


$$Defs = Vars \times Nodes \quad Defs(x) = \{x\} \times Nodes$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\_, x = r; , v) \rrbracket^{\#} R &= R \setminus Defs(x) \cup \{\langle x, v \rangle\} \\ \llbracket (\_, x = x \mid x \in L, v) \rrbracket^{\#} R &= R \setminus \bigcup_{x \in L} Defs(x) \cup \{\langle x, v \rangle \mid x \in L\} \end{aligned}$$

The ordering on  $\mathbb{R}$  is given by subset inclusion  $\subseteq$  where the value at program start is given by  $R_0 = \{\langle x, start \rangle \mid x \in Vars\}$ .

## The Transformation SSA, Step 1:




where  $k \geq 2$ .

The label  $\psi$  of the new in-going edges for  $v$  is given by:

$$\psi \equiv \{x = x \mid x \in \mathcal{L}[v], \#(\mathcal{R}[v] \cap Defs(x)) > 1\}$$

If the node  $v$  is the start point of the program, we add auxiliary edges whenever there are further ingoing edges into  $v$ :

## The Transformation SSA, Step 1 (cont.):



where  $k \geq 1$  and  $\psi$  of the new in-going edges for  $v$  is given by:

$$\psi \equiv \{x = x \mid x \in \mathcal{L}[v], \#(\mathcal{R}[v] \cap Defs(x)) > 1\}$$

## Discussion

- Program start is interpreted as (the end point of) a definition of every variable  $x$  :-)
- At some edges, parallel definitions  $\psi$  are introduced !
- Some of them may be useless :-)

## Discussion

- Program start is interpreted as (the end point of) a definition of every variable  $x$  :-)
- At some edges, parallel definitions  $\psi$  are introduced !
- Some of them may be useless :-)

## Improvement:

- We introduce assignments  $x = x$  before  $v$  only if the sets of reaching definitions for  $x$  at incoming edges of  $v$  differ !
- This introduction is repeated until every  $v$  is reached by exactly one definition for each variable live at  $v$ .

## Theorem

Assume that every program point in the controlflow graph is reachable from `start` and that every left-hand side of a definition is live. Then:

1. The algorithm for inserting definitions  $x = x$  terminates after at most  $n \cdot (m + 1)$  rounds where  $m$  is the number of program points with more than one in-going edges and  $n$  is the number of variables.
2. After termination, for every program point  $u$ , the set  $\mathcal{R}[u]$  has exactly one definition for every variable  $x$  which is live at  $u$ .

## Discussion

The efficiency crucially depends on the number of iterations. If the cfg is **well-structured**, it terminates already after **one** iteration !



## Discussion

The efficiency crucially depends on the number of iterations. If the cfg is **well-structured**, it terminates already after **one** iteration !


A **well-structured** cfg can be reduced to a single vertex or edge by:



## Discussion

The efficiency crucially depends on the number of iterations. If the cfg is **well-structured**, it terminates already after **one** iteration !

A **well-structured** cfg can be reduced to a single vertex or edge by:



## Discussion (cont.)

- Reducible cfgs are not the exception — but the rule :-)
- In **Java**, reducibility is only violated by loops with breaks/continues.
- If the insertion of definitions does not terminate after  $k$  iterations, we may immediately terminate the procedure by inserting definitions  $x = x$  before all nodes which are reached by more than one definition of  $x$ .

Assume now that every program point  $u$  is reached by exactly one definition for each variable which is live at  $u \dots$

## The Transformation SSA, Step 2:

Each edge  $(u, lab, v)$  is replaced with  $(u, \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[lab], v)$  where  $\phi x = x_{u'}$  if  $\langle x, u' \rangle \in \mathcal{R}[u]$  and:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[;] &= ; \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[\mathbf{Neg}(e)] &= \mathbf{Neg}(\phi(e)) \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[\mathbf{Pos}(e)] &= \mathbf{Pos}(\phi(e)) \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[x = e] &= x_v = \phi(e) \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[x = M[e]] &= x_v = M[\phi(e)] \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[M[e_1] = e_2] &= M[\phi(e_1)] = \phi(e_2) \\ \mathcal{T}_{v,\phi}[\{x = x \mid x \in L\}] &= \{x_v = \phi(x) \mid x \in L\}\end{aligned}$$

## Remark


The multiple assignments:

$$pa = x_v^{(1)} = x_{v_1}^{(1)} \mid \dots \mid x_v^{(k)} = x_{v_k}^{(k)}$$

in the last row are thought to be executed **in parallel**, i.e.,

$$\llbracket pa \rrbracket (\rho, \mu) = (\rho \oplus \{x_v^{(i)} \mapsto \rho(x_{v_i}^{(i)}) \mid i = 1, \dots, k\}, \mu)$$

# Example



## Theorem

Assume that every program point is reachable from `start` and the program is in SSA form without assignments to dead variables.

Let  $\lambda$  denote the maximal number of simultaneously live variables and  $G$  the interference graph of the program variables. Then:

$$\lambda = \omega(G) = \chi(G)$$

where  $\omega(G), \chi(G)$  are the maximal size of a clique in  $G$  and the minimal number of colors for  $G$ , respectively.

A minimal coloring of  $G$ , i.e., an optimal register allocation can be found in polynomial time.

## Discussion

- By the theorem, the number  $\lambda$  of required registers can be easily computed :-)
- Thus variables which are to be spilled to memory, can be determined ahead of the subsequent assignment of registers !
- Thus here, we may, e.g., insist on keeping iteration variables from inner loops.





## Discussion

- By the theorem, the number  $\lambda$  of required registers can be easily computed :-)
- Thus variables which are to be spilled to memory, can be determined ahead of the subsequent assignment of registers !
- Thus here, we may, e.g., insist on keeping iteration variables from inner loops.
- Clearly, always  $\lambda \leq \omega(G) \leq \chi(G)$  :-)  
Therefore, it suffices to color the interference graph with  $\lambda$  colors.
- Instead, we provide an algorithm which directly operates on the cfg  
...

## Observation

- Live ranges of variables in programs in SSA form behave similar to live ranges in basic blocks !
- Consider some dfs spanning tree  $T$  of the cfg with root  $start$ .
- For each variable  $x$ , the live range  $\mathcal{L}[x]$  forms a tree fragment of  $T$  !
- A tree fragment is a subtree from which some subtrees have been removed ...

# Example



## Discussion

- Although the example program is not in SSA form, all live ranges still form tree fragments :-)
- The intersection of tree fragments is again a tree fragment !
- A set  $C$  of tree fragments forms a clique iff their intersection is non-empty !!!
- The greedy algorithm will find an optimal coloring ...

## Proof of the Intersection Property

(1) Assume  $I_1 \cap I_2 \neq \emptyset$  and  $v_i$  is the root of  $I_i$ . Then:

$$v_1 \in I_2 \quad \text{or} \quad v_2 \in I_1$$

(2) Let  $C$  denote a clique of tree fragments.

Then there is an enumeration  $C = \{I_1, \dots, I_r\}$  with roots  $v_1, \dots, v_r$  such that


$$v_i \in I_j \quad \text{for all } j \leq i$$

In particular,  $v_r \in I_i$  for all  $i$ . :-)


## The Greedy Algorithm

```
forall ( $u \in Nodes$ )  $visited[u] = \mathbf{false}$ ;  
forall ( $x \in \mathcal{L}[start]$ )  $\Gamma(x) = \mathbf{extract}(free)$ ;  
alloc( $start$ );  
  
void alloc (Node  $u$ ) {  
     $visited[u] = \mathbf{true}$ ;  
    forall ( $(lab, v) \in edges[u]$ )  
        if ( $\neg visited[v]$ ) {  
            forall ( $x \in \mathcal{L}[u] \setminus \mathcal{L}[v]$ )  $\mathbf{insert}(free, \Gamma(x))$ ;  
            forall ( $x \in \mathcal{L}[v] \setminus \mathcal{L}[u]$ )  $\Gamma(x) = \mathbf{extract}(free)$ ;  
            alloc ( $v$ );  
        }  
}
```

# Example



# Example





## Remark:

- Intersection graphs for tree fragments are also known as **cordal graphs** ...
- A cordal graph is an undirected graph where every cycle with more than three nodes contains a **cord** :-)
- Cordal graphs are another sub-class of **perfect graphs** :-))
- Cheap register allocation comes at a price:

when transforming into **SSA** form, we have introduced parallel register-register moves :-)

## Problem

The parallel register assignment:

$$\psi_1 = R_1 = R_2 \mid R_2 = R_1$$

is meant to exchange the registers  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  :-)

There are at least two ways of implementing this exchange ...

## Problem

The parallel register assignment:

$$\psi_1 = R_1 = R_2 \mid R_2 = R_1$$

is meant to exchange the registers  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  :-)

There are at least two ways of implementing this exchange ...

### (1) Using an auxiliary register:

$$R = R_1;$$

$$R_1 = R_2;$$

$$R_2 = R;$$

(2) XOR:

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

(2) XOR:

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

But what about cyclic shifts such as:

$$\psi_k = R_1 = R_2 \mid \dots \mid R_{k-1} = R_k \mid R_k = R_1$$

for  $k > 2$  ??

## (2) XOR:

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_2 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

$$R_1 = R_1 \oplus R_2;$$

But what about cyclic shifts such as:

$$\psi_k = R_1 = R_2 \mid \dots \mid R_{k-1} = R_k \mid R_k = R_1$$

for  $k > 2$  ??

Then at most  $k - 1$  swaps of two registers are needed:

$$\psi_k = R_1 \leftrightarrow R_2;$$

$$R_2 \leftrightarrow R_3;$$

...

$$R_{k-1} \leftrightarrow R_k;$$

## Next complicated case: permutations.

- Every permutation can be decomposed into a set of disjoint shifts  
:-)
- Any permutation of  $n$  registers with  $r$  shifts can be realized by  $n - r$  swaps ...

## Next complicated case: permutations.

- Every permutation can be decomposed into a set of disjoint shifts :-)
- Any permutation of  $n$  registers with  $r$  shifts can be realized by  $n - r$  swaps ...

### Example

$$\psi = R_1 = R_2 \mid R_2 = R_5 \mid R_3 = R_4 \mid R_4 = R_3 \mid R_5 = R_1$$

consists of the cycles  $(R_1, R_2, R_5)$  and  $(R_3, R_4)$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi &= R_1 \leftrightarrow R_2; \\ &R_2 \leftrightarrow R_5; \\ &R_3 \leftrightarrow R_4;\end{aligned}$$



## The general case:

- Every register receives its value at most once.
- The assignment therefore can be decomposed into a permutation together with tree-like assignments (directed towards the leaves) ...

## Example

$$\psi = R_1 = R_2 \mid R_2 = R_4 \mid R_3 = R_5 \mid R_5 = R_3$$

The parallel assignment realizes the linear register moves for  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$  and  $R_4$  together with the cyclic shift for  $R_3$  and  $R_5$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\psi &= R_1 = R_2; \\ &R_2 = R_4; \\ &R_3 \leftrightarrow R_5;\end{aligned}$$

## Interprocedural Register Allocation:

- For every local variable, there is an entry in the stack frame.
- Before calling a function, the locals must be saved into the stack frame and be restored after the call.
- Sometimes there is hardware support :-)
- Then the call is **transparent** for all registers.
- If it is our responsibility to save and restore, we may ...
  - save only registers which are over-written :-)
  - restore overwritten registers only.
- Alternatively, we save only registers which are still live after the call — and then possibly into different registers ⇒  
reduction of life ranges :-)

## 3.2 Instruction Level Parallelism

Modern processors do not execute one instruction after the other strictly sequentially.

Here, we consider two approaches:

- (1) VLIW (Very Large Instruction Words)
- (2) Pipelining

## VLIW:

One instruction simultaneously executes up to  $k$  (e.g., 4:-) elementary Instructions.

## Pipelining:


Instruction execution may overlap.

## Example:

$$w = (R_1 = R_2 + R_3 \mid D = D_1 * D_2 \mid R_3 = M[R_4])$$

## Warning:

- Instructions occupy hardware resources.
- Instructions may access the same busses/registers  $\implies$  hazards
- Results of an instruction may be available only after some delay.
- During execution, different parts of the hardware are involved:



- During **Execute** and **Write** different internal registers/busses/alus may be used.

## We conclude:

Distributing the instruction sequence into sequences of words is amenable to various constraints ...

In the following, we ignore the phases **Fetch** und **Decode** :-)


## Examples for Constraints:

- (1) at most one load/store per word;
- (2) at most one jump;
- (3) at most one write into the same register.

## Example Timing:

Floating-point Operation	3
Load/Store	2
Integer Arithmetic	1

## Timing Diagram:



$R_3$  is over-written, after the addition has fetched 2 :-)

If a register is accessed simultaneously (here:  $R_3$ ), a strategy of **conflict solving** is required ...

## Conflicts:

**Read-Read:** A register is simultaneously read.

⇒ in general, unproblematic :-)

**Read-Write:** A register is simultaneously read and written.

### Conflict Resolution:

- ... ruled out!
- Read is delayed (**stalls**), until write has terminated!
- Read **before** write returns old value!



**Write-Write:** A register is simultaneously written to.

⇒ in general, unproblematic :-)

### **Conflict Resolutions:**

- ... ruled out!
- ...

### **In Our Examples ...**

- simultaneous read is permitted;
- simultaneous write/read and write/write is ruled out;
- no stalls are injected.

We first consider basic blocks only, i.e., linear sequences of assignments

...

Idea: Data Dependence Graph

Vertices	Instructions
Edges	Dependencies

Example:

(1)  $x = x + 1;$

(2)  $y = M[A];$

(3)  $t = z;$

(4)  $z = M[A + x];$

(5)  $t = y + z;$


## Possible Dependencies:

Definition	→	Use	//	Reaching Definitions
Use	→	Definition	//	???
Definition	→	Definition	//	Reaching Definitions

## Reaching Definitions:

Determine for each  $u$  which definitions may reach  $u$   $\implies$  can be determined by means of a system of constraints :-)

... in the Example:



	$\mathcal{R}$
1	$\{\langle x, 1 \rangle, \langle y, 1 \rangle, \langle z, 1 \rangle, \langle t, 1 \rangle\}$
2	$\{\langle x, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 1 \rangle, \langle z, 1 \rangle, \langle t, 1 \rangle\}$
3	$\{\langle x, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 3 \rangle, \langle z, 1 \rangle, \langle t, 1 \rangle\}$
4	$\{\langle x, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 3 \rangle, \langle z, 1 \rangle, \langle t, 4 \rangle\}$
5	$\{\langle x, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 3 \rangle, \langle z, 5 \rangle, \langle t, 4 \rangle\}$
6	$\{\langle x, 2 \rangle, \langle y, 3 \rangle, \langle z, 5 \rangle, \langle t, 6 \rangle\}$


Let  $U_i, D_i$  denote the sets of variables which are used or defined at the edge outgoing from  $u_i$ . Then:

$$(u_1, u_2) \in DD \quad \text{if } u_1 \in \mathcal{R}[u_2] \wedge D_1 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset$$

$$(u_1, u_2) \in DU \quad \text{if } u_1 \in \mathcal{R}[u_2] \wedge D_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$$

... in the Example:

		<i>Def</i>	<i>Use</i>
1	$x = x + 1;$	$\{x\}$	$\{x\}$
2	$y = M[A];$	$\{y\}$	$\{A\}$
3	$t = z;$	$\{t\}$	$\{z\}$
4	$z = M[A + x];$	$\{z\}$	$\{A, x\}$
5	$t = y + z;$	$\{t\}$	$\{y, z\}$



The **UD**-edge  $(3, 4)$  has been inserted to exclude that  $z$  is over-written before use **:-)**

In the next step, each instruction is annotated with its (required resources, in particular, its) execution time.

Our goal is a maximally parallel **correct** sequence of words.

For that, we maintain the current system state:

$$\Sigma : Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

$$\Sigma(x) \hat{=} \text{expected delay until } x \text{ is available}$$

**Initially:**

$$\Sigma(x) = 0$$

As an **invariant**, we guarantee on entry of the basic block, that all operations are terminated **:-)**

Then the slots of the word sequence are successively filled:

- We start with the minimal nodes in the dependence graph.
- If we fail to fill all slots of a word, we insert ; :-)
- After every inserted instruction, we re-compute  $\Sigma$ .

### Warning:

- The execution of two **VLIW**s can overlap !!!
- Determining an **optimal** sequence, is NP-hard ...

Example: Word width  $k = 2$

Word		State			
1	2	$x$	$y$	$z$	$t$
		0	0	0	0
$x = x + 1$	$y = M[A]$	0	1	0	0
$t = z$	$z = M[A + x]$	0	0	1	0
		0	0	0	0
$t = y + z$		0	0	0	0

In each cycle, the execution of a new word is triggered.

The state just records the number of cycles still to be waited for the result :-)



## Note:


- If instructions put constraints on future selection, we also record these in  $\Sigma$ .
- Overall, we still distinguish just **finitely many** system states :-)
- The computation of the effect of a **VLIW** onto  $\Sigma$  can be compiled into a **finite automaton !!!**
- This automaton, though, could be quite huge :-)
- The challenge of making choices still remains :-)
- Basic blocks usually are not very large  
 $\implies$  opportunities for parallelization are limited :-((

## Extension 1: Acyclic Code

```
if ( $x > 1$ ) {  
     $y = M[A]$ ;  
     $z = x - 1$ ;  
} else {  
     $y = M[A + 1]$ ;  
     $z = x - 1$ ;  
}  
 $y = y + 1$ ;
```

The dependence graph must be enriched with extra control-dependencies

...



The statement  $z = x - 1;$  is executed with the same arguments in both branches and does not modify any of the remaining variables :-)

We could have moved it **before** the if anyway :-))

The following code could be generated:

	$z = x - 1$	if $(!(x > 0))$ goto $A$
	$y = M[A]$	
	goto $B$	
$A :$	$y = M[A + 1]$	
$B :$	$y = y + 1$	

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant  $:-(\$

If we allow several (known) states on entry of a sub-block, we can generate code which complies with all of these.

... in the Example:

	$z = x - 1$	if $(!(x > 0))$ goto $A$
	$y = M[A]$	goto $B$
$A :$	$y = M[A + 1]$	
$B :$		
	$y = y + 1$	

If this parallelism is not yet sufficient, we could try to speculatively execute possibly useful tasks ...

For that, we require:

- an idea which alternative is executed more frequently;
- the wrong execution may not end in a **catastrophy**, i.e., run-time errors such as, e.g., division by 0;
- the wrong execution must allow roll-back (e.g., by delaying a **commit**) or may not have any observational effects ...

... in the Example:

	$z = x - 1$	$y = M[A]$	if $(x > 0)$ goto $B$
	$y = M[A + 1]$		
$B :$			
	$y = y + 1$		

In the case  $x \leq 0$  we have  $y = M[A]$  executed in advance.


This value, however, is overwritten in the next step :-)

In general:

$x = e;$  has no observable effect in a branch if  $x$  is **dead** in this branch :-)

## Extension 2: Unrolling of Loops

We may unrole **important**, i.e., inner loops several times:





Now it is clear which side of tests to prefer:


the side which stays within the unrolled body of the loop :-)

### Warning:

- The different instances of the body are translated relative to possibly different initial states :-)
- The code behind the loop must be correct relative to the exit state corresponding to every jump out of the loop!

Example:

for ( $x = 0; x < n; x++$ )  
     $M[A + x] = z;$




Duplication of the body yields:

```

for ( $x = 0; x < n; x++$ ) {
     $M[A + x] = z;$ 
     $x = x + 1;$ 
    if ( $!(x < n)$ ) break;
     $M[A + x] = z;$ 
}

```




It would be better if we could remove the assignment  $x = x + 1$ ; together with the test in the middle — since these serialize the execution of the copies !!

This is possible if we substitute  $x + 1$  for  $x$  in the second copy, transform the condition and add a compensation code:

```

for ( $x = 0$ ;  $x + 1 < n$ ;  $x = x + 2$ ) {
     $M[A + x] = z$ ;
     $M[A + x + 1] = z$ ;
}
if ( $x < n$ ) {
     $M[A + x] = z$ ;
     $x = x + 1$ ;
}

```



## Discussion:

- Elimination of the intermediate test together with the fusion of all increments at the end reveals that the different loop iterations are in fact independent :-)
- Nonetheless, we do not gain much since we only allow one store per word :-(
- If right-hand sides, however, are more complex, we can interleave their evaluation with the stores :-)

## Extension 3:

Sometimes, one loop alone does not provide enough opportunities for parallelization :-)

... but perhaps two successively in a row :-)

## Example:

```
for ( $x = 0; x < n; x++$ ) {  
     $R = B[x];$   
     $S = C[x];$   
     $T_1 = R + S;$   
     $A[x] = T_1;$   
}
```

```
for ( $x = 0; x < n; x++$ ) {  
     $R = B[x];$   
     $S = C[x];$   
     $T_2 = R - S;$   
     $C[x] = T_2;$   
}
```

In order to fuse two loops into one, we require that:

- the iteration schemes coincide;
- the two loops access different data.

In case of individual variables, this can easily be verified.

This is more difficult in presence of arrays.

Taking the source program into account, accesses to distinct statically allocated arrays can be identified.

An analysis of accesses to the same array is significantly more difficult ...

Assume that the blocks  $A, B, C$  are distinct.

Then we can combine the two loops into:

```
for ( $x = 0; x < n; x++$ ) {  
     $R = B[x];$             $R = B[x];$   
     $S = C[x];$             $S = C[x];$   
     $T_1 = R + S;$         $T_2 = R - S;$   
     $A[x] = T_1;$         $C[x] = T_2;$   
}
```



The first loop may in iteration  $x$  not read data which the second loop writes to in iterations  $< x$ .

The second loop may in iteration  $x$  not read data which the first loop writes to in iterations  $> x$ .

If the index expressions of jointly accessed arrays are **linear**, the given constraints can be verified through **integer linear programming ...**

$$\begin{array}{ll} i \geq 0 & x_{\text{write}} = i \\ i \leq x - 1 & x_{\text{read}} = x \\ & x_{\text{read}} = x_{\text{write}} \end{array}$$

//  $x_{\text{read}}$  read access to  $C$  by 1st loop

//  $x_{\text{write}}$  write access to  $C$  by 2nd loop

... obviously has no solution :-)

## General Form:

$$s \geq t_1$$

$$t_2 \geq s$$

$$y_1 = s_1$$

$$y_2 = s_2$$

$$y_1 = y_2$$

for linear expressions  $s, t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2$  over  $i$  and the iteration variables.

This can be simplified to:

$$0 \leq s - t_1 \quad 0 \leq t_2 - s \quad 0 = s_1 - s_2$$

What should we do with it ???

## Simple Case:

The two inequations have no solution over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Then they also have no solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  :-)

## ... in Our Example:

$$x = i$$

$$0 \leq i = x$$

$$0 \leq x - 1 - i = -1$$

The second inequation has no solution :-)

## One Variable:

The inequations where  $x$  occurs positive, provide **lower bounds**.

The inequations where  $x$  occurs negative, provide **upper bounds**.

If  $G, L$  are the greatest lower and the least upper bound, respectively, then all (integer) solution are in the interval  $[G, L]$  :-)

### Example:

$$\begin{array}{l} 0 \leq 13 - 7 \cdot x \\ 0 \leq -1 + 5 \cdot x \end{array} \iff \begin{array}{l} x \leq \frac{13}{7} \\ x \geq \frac{1}{5} \end{array}$$

The only **integer** solution of the system is  $x = 1$  :-)

## Discussion:

- Solutions only matter within the bounds to the iteration variables.
- Every **integer** solution there provides a conflict.
- Fusion of loops is possible if **no** conflicts occur :-)
- The given special case suffices to solve the case one variable over  $\mathbb{Z}$  :-)
- The number of variables in the inequations corresponds to the nesting-depth of for-loops  $\implies$  in general, is quite **small** :-)

## Discussion:

- **Integer Linear Programming (ILP)** can decide satisfiability of a finite set of equations/inequations over  $\mathbb{Z}$  of the form:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot x_i = b \quad \text{bzw.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \cdot x_i \geq b, \quad a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$$

- Moreover, a (linear) cost function can be optimized :-)
- **Warning:** The decision problem is in general, already NP-hard !!!
- Notwithstanding that, surprisingly efficient implementations exist.
- Not just loop fusion, but also other re-organizations of loops yield ILP problems ...

## Background 5: Presburger Arithmetic

Many problems in computer science can be formulated **without multiplication :-)**

Let us first consider two **simple** special cases ...

### 1. Linear Equations

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 2x & + & 3y & & = & 24 \\ x & - & y & + & 5z & = & 3 \end{array}$$

## Question:

- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Q}$  ?
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  ?
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{N}$  ?

Let us reconsider the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 2x + 3y &= 24 \\ x - y + 5z &= 3 \end{aligned}$$



## Answers:

- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Q}$  ? **Yes**
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  ? **No**
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{N}$  ? **No**

## Complexity:

- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Q}$  ? **Polynomial**
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  ? **Polynomial**
- Is there a solution over  $\mathbb{N}$  ? **NP-hard**

## Solution Method for Integers:

### Observation 1:

$$a_1x_1 + \dots + a_kx_k = b \quad (\forall i : a_i \neq 0)$$

has a solution iff

$$\gcd\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \mid b$$

Example:

$$5y - 10z = 18$$

has **no** solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  :-)

Example:

$$5y - 10z = 18$$

has no solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  :-)

Observation 2:

Adding a multiple of one equation to another does not change the set of solutions :-)

Example:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 2x & + & 3y & & = & 24 \\ x & - & y & + & 5z & = & 3 \end{array}$$

Example:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 2x & + & 3y & & = & 24 \\ x & - & y & + & 5z & = & 3 \end{array}$$




$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & 5y & - & 10z & = & 18 \\ x & - & y & + & 5z & = & 3 \end{array}$$

### Observation 3:

Adding multiples of columns to another column is an invertible transformation which we keep track of in a separate matrix ...

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} \begin{array}{l} -5y - 10z = 18 \\ -y + 5z = 3 \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} \begin{array}{l} 5y = 18 \\ -y + 3z = 3 \end{array}$$

### Observation 3:

Adding multiples of columns to another column is an invertible transformation which we keep track of in a separate matrix ...

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & 0 & 5y \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & x - y + 3z \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} \begin{array}{l} = 18 \\ = 3 \\ \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & -3 & 5y \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & x - y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} \begin{array}{l} = 18 \\ = 3 \\ \end{array}$$

 triangular form !!



## Observation 4:

- A special solution of a triangular system can be directly read off :-)
- All solutions of a homogeneous triangular system can be directly read off :-)
- All solutions of the original system can be recovered from the solutions of the triangular system by means of the accumulated transformation matrix:-))

## Example

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c} 1 & 0 & -3 & 5y \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & x - y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} 15 \\ 3 \end{array}$$

One special solution:

$$[6, 3, 0]^T$$

All solutions of the homogeneous system are spanned by:

$$[0, 0, 1]^T$$

## Solving over $\mathbb{N}$

- ... is of major practical importance;
- ... has led to the development of many new techniques;
- ... easily allows to encode **NP-hard** problems;
- ... remains difficult if just **three** variables are allowed per equation.


## 2. One Polynomial Special Case:

$$\begin{aligned}x &\geq y + 5 \\19 &\geq x \\y &\geq 13 \\y &\geq x - 7\end{aligned}$$

- There are at most 2 variables per **in**-equation;
- no scaling factors.


Idea:


Represent the system by a **graph**:




The in-equations are **satisfiable** iff


- the weight of every **cycle** are at most **0**;
- the weights of paths **reaching**  $x$  are bounded by the weights of edges from  $x$  into the **sink**.















The in-equations are **satisfiable** iff

- the weight of every **cycle** are at most **0**;
- the weights of paths **reaching**  $x$  are bounded by the weights of edges from  $x$  into the **sink**.



Compute the **reflexive** and **transitive** closure of the edge weights!

### 3. A General Solution Method:

Idea: **Fourier-Motzkin Elimination**

- Successively remove individual variables  $x$  !
- All in-equations with **positive** occurrences of  $x$  yield **lower bounds**.
- All in-equations with **negative** occurrences of  $x$  yield **upper bounds**.
- All lower bounds must be at most as big as all upper bounds ;-))



Jean Baptiste Joseph Fourier, 1768–1830

## Example:

$$9 \leq 4x_1 + x_2 \quad (1)$$

$$4 \leq x_1 + 2x_2 \quad (2)$$


$$0 \leq 2x_1 - x_2 \quad (3)$$

$$6 \leq x_1 + 6x_2 \quad (4)$$

$$-11 \leq -x_1 - 2x_2 \quad (5)$$

$$-17 \leq -6x_1 + 2x_2 \quad (6)$$

$$-4 \leq -x_2 \quad (7)$$



For  $x_1$  we obtain:

$$9 \leq 4x_1 + x_2 \quad (1) \qquad \frac{9}{4} - \frac{1}{4}x_2 \leq x_1 \quad (1)$$

$$4 \leq x_1 + 2x_2 \quad (2) \qquad 4 - 2x_2 \leq x_1 \quad (2)$$

$$0 \leq 2x_1 - x_2 \quad (3) \qquad \frac{1}{2}x_2 \leq x_1 \quad (3)$$

$$6 \leq x_1 + 6x_2 \quad (4) \qquad 6 - 6x_2 \leq x_1 \quad (4)$$

$$-11 \leq -x_1 - 2x_2 \quad (5) \qquad x_1 \leq 11 - 2x_2 \quad (5)$$

$$-17 \leq -6x_1 + 2x_2 \quad (6) \qquad x_1 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2 \quad (6)$$

$$-4 \leq -x_2 \quad (7) \qquad -4 \leq -x_2 \quad (7)$$

If such an  $x_1$  exists, all lower bounds must be bounded by all upper bounds, i.e.,



$\frac{9}{4} - \frac{1}{4}x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2$		$(1, 5)$		$-35 \leq -7x_2$		$(1, 5)$
$\frac{9}{4} - \frac{1}{4}x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2$		$(1, 6)$		$-\frac{7}{12} \leq \frac{7}{12}x_2$		$(1, 6)$
$4 - 2x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2$		$(2, 5)$		$-7 \leq 0$		$(2, 5)$
$4 - 2x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2$		$(2, 6)$		$\frac{7}{6} \leq \frac{7}{3}x_2$		$(2, 6)$
$\frac{1}{2}x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2$		$(3, 5)$	<b>or</b>	$-22 \leq -5x_2$		$(3, 5)$
$\frac{1}{2}x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2$		$(3, 6)$		$-\frac{17}{6} \leq -\frac{1}{6}x_2$		$(3, 6)$
$6 - 6x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2$		$(4, 5)$		$-5 \leq 4x_2$		$(4, 5)$
$6 - 6x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2$		$(4, 6)$		$\frac{19}{6} \leq \frac{19}{3}x_2$		$(4, 6)$
$-4 \leq -x_2$		$(7)$		$-4 \leq -x_2$		$(7)$

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\frac{9}{4} - \frac{1}{4}x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2 & (1, 5) & -5 \leq -x_2 & (1, 5) \\
\frac{9}{4} - \frac{1}{4}x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2 & (1, 6) & -1 \leq x_2 & (1, 6) \\
4 - 2x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2 & (2, 5) & -7 \leq 0 & (2, 5) \\
4 - 2x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2 & (2, 6) & \frac{1}{2} \leq x_2 & (2, 6) \\
\frac{1}{2}x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2 & (3, 5) & \text{or} & -\frac{22}{5} \leq -x_2 & (3, 5) \\
\frac{1}{2}x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2 & (3, 6) & -17 \leq -x_2 & (3, 6) \\
6 - 6x_2 \leq 11 - 2x_2 & (4, 5) & -\frac{5}{4} \leq x_2 & (4, 5) \\
6 - 6x_2 \leq \frac{17}{6} + \frac{1}{3}x_2 & (4, 6) & \frac{1}{2} \leq x_2 & (4, 6) \\
-4 \leq -x_2 & (7) & -4 \leq -x_2 & (7)
\end{array}$$

This is the **one-variable case** which we can solve exactly:

$$\max \left\{ -1, \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{5}{4}, \frac{1}{2} \right\} \leq x_2 \leq \min \left\{ 5, \frac{22}{5}, 17, 4 \right\}$$

From which we conclude:  $x_2 \in \left[ \frac{1}{2}, 4 \right] \quad :-)$

## In General:

- The original system has a solution over  $\mathbb{Q}$  iff the system after elimination of one variable has a solution over  $\mathbb{Q} \quad :-)$
- Every elimination step may **square** the number of in-equations  
 $\implies$  **exponential** run-time  $:-(($
- It can be modified such that it also decides satisfiability over  $\mathbb{Z}$   
 $\implies$  **Omega Test**



William Worthington Pugh, Jr.  
University of Maryland, College Park

## Idea:

- We successively remove variables. Thereby we omit division ...
- If  $x$  only occurs with coefficient  $\pm 1$ , we apply Fourier-Motzkin elimination :-)
- Otherwise, we provide a bound for a **positive** multiple of  $x$  ...

Consider, e.g., (1) and (6) :

$$\begin{aligned}6 \cdot x_1 &\leq 17 + 2x_2 \\9 - x_2 &\leq 4 \cdot x_1\end{aligned}$$

W.l.o.g., we only consider **strict** in-equations:

$$\begin{aligned}6 \cdot x_1 &< 18 + 2x_2 \\ 8 - x_2 &< 4 \cdot x_1\end{aligned}$$

... where we always divide by gcds:

$$\begin{aligned}3 \cdot x_1 &< 9 + x_2 \\ 8 - x_2 &< 4 \cdot x_1\end{aligned}$$

This implies:

$$3 \cdot (8 - x_2) < 4 \cdot (9 + x_2)$$

We thereby obtain:

- If one derived in-equation is **unsatisfiable**, then also the overall system :-)
- If all derived in-equations are satisfiable, then there is a solution which, however, need not be **integer** :-)
- An integer solution is guaranteed to exist if there is **sufficient separation** between lower and upper bound ...
- Assume  $\alpha < a \cdot x$        $b \cdot x < \beta$ .

Then it should hold that:

$$b \cdot \alpha < a \cdot \beta$$

and moreover:

$$\boxed{a \cdot b} < a \cdot \beta - b \cdot \alpha$$

... in the Example:

$$12 < 4 \cdot (9 + x_2) - 3 \cdot (8 - x_2)$$

or:

$$12 < 12 + 7x_2$$

or:

$$0 < x_2$$

In the example, also these **strengthened** in-equations are satisfiable

$\implies$  the system has a solution over  $\mathbb{Z}$  :-)



## Discussion:

- If the strengthened in-equations are satisfiable, then also the original system. The reverse implication may be wrong :-)
- In the case where upper and lower bound are **not sufficiently separated**, we have:

$$a \cdot \beta \leq b \cdot \alpha + \boxed{a \cdot b}$$

or:

$$b \cdot \alpha < ab \cdot x < b \cdot \alpha + \boxed{a \cdot b}$$

Division with  $b$  yields:

$$\alpha < a \cdot x < \alpha + \boxed{a}$$

$$\implies \boxed{\alpha + i = a \cdot x} \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, a - 1\} \quad !!!$$

## Discussion (cont.):

- Fourier-Motzkin Elimination is **not** the best method for rational systems of in-equations.
- The **Omega test** is necessarily exponential :-)  
If the system is **solvable**, the test generally terminates rapidly.  
It may have problems with **unsolvable** systems :-)
- Also for ILP, there are other/smarter algorithms ...
- For programming language problems, however, it seems to behave quite well :-)

## 4. Generalization to a Logic

Disjunction:

$$(x - 2y = 15 \quad \wedge \quad x + y = 7) \quad \vee$$

$$(x + y = 6 \quad \wedge \quad 3x + z = -8)$$

Quantors:

$$\exists x : z - 2x = 42 \quad \wedge \quad z + x = 19$$

## 4. Generalization to a Logic

Disjunction:

$$\begin{aligned} & (x - 2y = 15 \quad \wedge \quad x + y = 7) \quad \vee \\ & (x + y = 6 \quad \wedge \quad 3x + z = -8) \end{aligned}$$

Quantors:

$$\exists x : z - 2x = 42 \quad \wedge \quad z + x = 19$$



Presburger Arithmetic



Mojzesz Presburger, 1904–1943 (?)

Presburger Arithmetic  $\equiv$  full arithmetic  
without multiplication

Presburger Arithmetic = full arithmetic  
without multiplication

Arithmetic : highly undecidable :-(  
even incomplete :-((

Presburger Arithmetic = full arithmetic  
without multiplication

Arithmetic : highly undecidable :-(  
even incomplete :-((

⇒ Hilbert's 10th Problem

⇒ Gödel's Theorem



## Presburger Formulas over $\mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \phi & ::= x + y = z \mid x = n \mid \\ & \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \neg \phi \mid \\ & \exists x : \phi \end{aligned}$$

## Presburger Formulas over $\mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \quad ::= & \quad x + y = z \quad | \quad x = n \quad | \\ & \quad \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \quad | \quad \neg \phi \quad | \\ & \quad \exists x : \phi \end{aligned}$$

Goal: **PSAT**

Find values for the **free** variables in  $\mathbb{N}$  such that  $\phi$  holds ...

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as **Words** :-)

213	<b>t</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	<b>z</b>	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	<b>y</b>	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	<b>x</b>	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as **Words** :-)

213	<b>t</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	<b>z</b>	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	<b>y</b>	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	<b>x</b>	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0



Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Idea: Code the values of the variables as Words :-)

213	t	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	z	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	y	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	x	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

## Observation:

The set of satisfying variable assignments is **regular** :-))

## Observation:

The set of satisfying variable assignments is **regular** :-))

$$\begin{array}{llll} \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 & \implies & \mathcal{L}(\phi_1) \cap \mathcal{L}(\phi_2) & \text{(Intersection)} \\ \neg\phi & \implies & \overline{\mathcal{L}(\phi)} & \text{(Complement)} \\ \exists x : \phi & \implies & \pi_x(\mathcal{L}(\phi)) & \text{(Projection)} \end{array}$$

Projecting away the  $x$ -component:

213	$t$	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	$z$	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	$y$	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
17	$x$	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

Projecting away the  $x$ -component:

213	$t$	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
42	$z$	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
89	$y$	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0

---




## Warning:

- Our representation of numbers is not unique: 011101 should be accepted iff every word from  $011101 \cdot 0^*$  is accepted!
- This property is preserved by union, intersection and complement :-)
- It is lost by projection !!!

⇒⇒ The automaton for projection must be enriched such that the property is re-established !!


## Automata for Basic Predicates:

$$x = 5$$




## Automata for Basic Predicates:

$$x+x = y$$



## Automata for Basic Predicates:

$$x+y = z$$



## Results:

Ferrante, Rackoff, 1973 :  $\text{PSAT} \leq \text{DSPACE}(2^{2^{c \cdot n}})$

## Results:

Ferrante, Rackoff, 1973 :  $\text{PSAT} \leq \text{DSPACE}(2^{2^{c \cdot n}})$

Fischer, Rabin, 1974 :  $\text{PSAT} \geq \text{NTIME}(2^{2^{c \cdot n}})$

## 3.3 Improving the Memory Layout

### Goal:

- Better utilization of caches
  - ⇒ reduction of the number of cache misses
- Reduction of allocation/de-allocation costs
  - ⇒ replacing heap allocation by stack allocation
  - ⇒ support to free superfluous heap objects
- Reduction of access costs
  - ⇒ short-circuiting indirection chains (**Unboxing**)

## 1. Cache Optimization:

Idea: local memory access

- Loading from memory fetches not just one byte but fills a complete cache line.
- Access to neighbored cells become cheaper.
- If all data of an inner loop fits into the cache, the iteration becomes maximally memory-efficient ...



## Possible Solutions:

- Reorganize the data accesses !
- Reorganize the data !

Such optimizations can be made fully automatic only for **arrays** :-)

## Example:

```
for (j = 1; j < n; j++)  
    for (i = 1; i < m; i++)  
        a[i][j] = a[i - 1][j - 1] + a[i][j];
```

⇒ At first, always iterate over the **rows!**

⇒ Exchange the ordering of the iterations:


```
for ( $i = 1; i < m; i++$ )
```

```
    for ( $j = 1; j < n; j++$ )
```


```
         $a[i][j] = a[i - 1][j - 1] + a[i][j];$ 
```

When is this permitted???


Iteration Scheme: before:



Iteration Scheme:      after:



Iteration Scheme:      allowed dependencies:



In our case, we must check that the following equation systems have **no** solution:

Write		Read
$(i_1, j_1)$	=	$(i_2 - 1, j_2 - 1)$
$i_1$	≤	$i_2$
$j_2$	≤	$j_1$
$(i_1, j_1)$	=	$(i_2 - 1, j_2 - 1)$
$i_2$	≤	$i_1$
$j_1$	≤	$j_2$


The first implies:  $j_2 \leq j_2 - 1$  **Hurra!**

The second implies:  $i_2 \leq i_2 - 1$  **Hurra!**

**Example:**                    **Matrix-Matrix Multiplication**

```
for ( $i = 0; i < N; i++$ )  
    for ( $j = 0; j < M; j++$ )  
        for ( $k = 0; k < K; k++$ )  
             $c[i][j] = c[i][j] + a[i][k] \cdot b[k][j];$ 
```

Over  $b[][]$  the iteration is **columnwise** :-)





Exchange the two inner loops:

```
for ( $i = 0; i < N; i++$ )  
    for ( $k = 0; k < K; k++$ )  
        for ( $j = 0; j < M; j++$ )  
             $c[i][j] = c[i][j] + a[i][k] \cdot b[k][j];$ 
```

Is this permitted ???

				1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	1	4	9	16

## Discussion:

- Correctness follows as before :-)
- A similar idea can also be used for the implementation of multiplication for **row compressed** matrices :-))
- Sometimes, the program must be **massaged** such that the transformation becomes applicable :-)
- Matrix-matrix multiplication perhaps requires initialization of the result matrix first ...

```

for ( $i = 0; i < N; i++$ )
  for ( $j = 0; j < M; j++$ ) {
     $c[i][j] = 0;$ 
    for ( $k = 0; k < K; k++$ )
       $c[i][j] = c[i][j] + a[i][k] \cdot b[k][j];$ 
  }

```

- Now, the two iterations can no longer be exchanged :-)
- The iteration over  $j$ , however, can be duplicated ...

```

for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {
    for (j = 0; j < M; j++) c[i][j] = 0;
    for (j = 0; j < M; j++)
        for (k = 0; k < K; k++)
            c[i][j] = c[i][j] + a[i][k] · b[k][j];
}

```

## Correctness:

- ⇒ The read entries (here: no) may not be modified in the remaining body of the loop !!!
- ⇒ The ordering of the write accesses to a memory cell may not be changed :-)

We obtain:

```
for (i = 0; i < N; i++) {  
    for (j = 0; j < M; j++) c[i][j] = 0;  
    for (k = 0; k < K; k++)  
        for (j = 0; j < M; j++)  
            c[i][j] = c[i][j] + a[i][k] · b[k][j];  
}
```

Discussion:

- Instead of fusing several loops, we now have **distributed** the loops :-)
- Accordingly, conditionals may be moved out of the loop  $\implies$  if-distribution ...

## Warning:

Instead of using this transformation, the inner loop could also be optimized as follows:

```
for ( $i = 0; i < N; i++$ )  
  for ( $j = 0; j < M; j++$ ) {  
     $t = 0$ ;  
    for ( $k = 0; k < K; k++$ )  
       $t = t + a[i][k] \cdot b[k][j]$ ;  
     $c[i][j] = t$ ;  
  }
```

## Idea:

If we find **heavily used** array elements  $a[e_1] \dots [e_r]$  whose index expressions stay **constant** within the inner loop, we could instead also provide auxiliary registers :-)

## Warning:

The latter optimization prohibits the former and vice versa ...




## Discussion:

- so far, the optimizations are concerned with iterations over arrays.
- Cache-aware organization of other data-structures is possible, but in general not fully automatic ...

## Example:

### Stacks




## Advantage:

- + The implementation is simple :-)
- + The operations **push** / **pop** require constant time :-)
- + The data-structure may grow arbitrarily :-)

## Disadvantage:

- The individual list objects may be arbitrarily dispersed over the memory :-)

## Alternative:



## Advantage:

- + The implementation is also simple :-)
  - + The operations **push** / **pop** still require constant time :-)
  - + The data are consecutively allocated; stack oscillations are typically small
- ⇒ better Cache behavior !!!

## Disadvantage:

- The data-structure is **bounded** :-)

## Improvement:

- If the array is **full**, replace it with another of **double** size !!!
- If the array drops empty to **a quarter**, **halve** the array again !!!

⇒ The extra **amortized** costs are constant :-)

⇒ The implementation is no longer so trivial :-}

## Discussion:

- The same idea also works for **queues** :-)
- Other data-structures are attempted to organize blockwise.  
**Problem:** how can accesses be organized such that they refer **mostly** to the same block ???

⇒ Algorithms for external data

## 2. Stack Allocation instead of Heap Allocation

### Problem:

- Programming languages such as **Java** allocate **all** data-structures in the heap — even if they are only used within the current method :-)
- If no reference to these data survives the call, we want to allocate these on the stack :-)

⇒⇒⇒ **Escape Analysis**

## Idea:

Determine **points-to** information.

Determine if a created object is possibly reachable from the **out side** ...

## Example: Our Pointer Language

$x = \text{new}();$

$y = \text{new}();$

$x[A] = y;$

$z = y;$

**ret** =  $z;$

... could be a possible method body **;-)**

Accessible from the outside world are memory blocks which:

- are assigned to a global variable such as `ret`; or
- are `reachable` from global variables.

... in the Example:

```
x = new();
```

```
y = new();
```

```
x[A] = y;
```

```
z = y;
```

```
ret = z;
```



Accessible from the outside world are memory blocks which:

- are assigned to a global variable such as `ret`; or
- are `reachable` from global variables.

... in the Example:

```
x = new();
```

```
y = new();
```

```
x[A] = y;
```

```
z = y;
```

```
ret = z;
```

Accessible from the outside world are memory blocks which:

- are assigned to a global variable such as `ret`; or
- are `reachable` from global variables.

... in the Example:

```
 $x = \text{new}();$   
 $y = \boxed{\text{new}()};$   
 $x[A] = y;$   
 $z = \boxed{y};$   
 $\text{ret} = \boxed{z};$ 
```

Accessible from the outside world are memory blocks which:

- are assigned to a global variable such as `ret`; or
- are `reachable` from global variables.

... in the Example:

```
 $x = \text{new}();$   
 $y = \boxed{\text{new}()};$   
 $x[A] = y;$   
 $z = \boxed{y};$   
 $\text{ret} = \boxed{z};$ 
```

## We conclude:

- The objects which have been allocated by the first `new()` may never escape.
- They can be allocated on the stack :-)

## Warning:

This is only **meaningful** if only few such objects are allocated during a method call :-(

If a local `new()` occurs within a loop, we still may allocate the objects in the heap ;-)

## Extension: Procedures

- We require an **interprocedural** points-to analysis :-)
- We know the whole program, we can, e.g., merge the control-flow graphs of all procedures into one and compute the points-to information for this.
- **Warning:** If we always use **the same** global variables  $y_1, y_2, \dots$  for (the simulation of) parameter passing, the computed information is necessarily imprecise :-((
- If the whole program is **not** known, we must assume that **each** reference which is known to a procedure escapes :-(((

## 3.4 Wrap-Up

We have considered various optimizations for improving hardware utilization.

### Arrangement of the Optimizations:

- First, global restructuring of procedures/functions and of loops for better memory behavior ;-)
- Then local restructuring for better utilization of the instruction set and the processor parallelism :-)
- Then register allocation and finally,
- Peephole optimization for the final kick ...

<b>Procedures:</b>	Tail Recursion + Inlining Stack Allocation
<b>Loops:</b>	Iteration Reordering → if-Distribution → for-Distribution Value Caching
<b>Bodies:</b>	Life-Range Splitting (SSA) Instruction Selection Instruction Scheduling with → Loop Unrolling → Loop Fusion
<b>Instructions:</b>	Register Allocation Peephole Optimization

## 4 Optimization of Functional Programs

Example:

```
let rec fac x = if x ≤ 1 then 1
                else x · fac (x - 1)
```

- There are no basic blocks :-()
- There are no loops :-()
- Virtually all functions are recursive :-((



## Strategies for Optimization:

- ⇒ Improve **specific inefficiencies** such as:
- Pattern matching
  - Lazy evaluation (if supported ;-)
  - Indirections — Unboxing / Escape Analysis
  - Intermediate data-structures — Deforestation
- ⇒ Detect and/or **generate** loops with basic blocks :-)
- Tail recursion
  - Inlining
  - **let**-Floating

Then apply **general** optimization techniques

... e.g., by translation into **C** ;-)

Warning:


Novel analysis techniques are needed to collect information about functional programs.

Example: **Inlining**

```
let max (x, y) = if x > y then x
                  else y
let abs z      = max (z, -z)
```

As result of the optimization we expect ...





Nevin Heintze in the Australian team  
of the **Prolog**-Programming-Contest, 1998

The complete picture:



## 4.1 A Simple Functional Language

For *simplicity*, we consider:

$$\begin{aligned} e & ::= b \mid (e_1, \dots, e_k) \mid c \ e_1 \ \dots \ e_k \mid \mathbf{fun} \ x \rightarrow e \\ & \mid (e_1 \ e_2) \mid (\square_1 \ e) \mid (e_1 \ \square_2 \ e_2) \mid \\ & \mathbf{let} \ x_1 = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e_0 \mid \\ & \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \ \mid \dots \mid \ p_k \rightarrow e_k \\ p & ::= b \mid x \mid c \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_k \mid (x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ t & ::= \mathbf{let} \ \mathbf{rec} \ x_1 = e_1 \ \mathbf{and} \ \dots \ \mathbf{and} \ x_k = e_k \ \mathbf{in} \ e \end{aligned}$$

where  $b$  is a constant,  $x$  is a variable,  $c$  is a (data-)constructor and  $\square_i$  are  $i$ -ary operators.

## Discussion:

- **let rec** only occurs on top-level.
- Functions are always **unary**. Instead, there are explicit **tuples** :-)
- **if**-expressions and case distinction in function definitions is reduced to **match**-expressions.
- In case distinctions, we allow just **simple patterns**.  
⇒⇒⇒ Complex patterns must be decomposed ...
- **let**-definitions correspond to basic blocks :-)
- **Type-annotations** at variables, patterns or expressions could provide further useful information  
— which we ignore :-)

... in the Example:

A definition of `max` may look as follows:

```
let max = fun x → match x with (x1, x2) → (  
    match x1 < x2  
    with True → x2  
       | False → x1  
    )
```



Accordingly, we have for `abs` :

```
let abs = fun x → let z = (x, -x)
                  in max z
```

## 4.2 A Simple Value Analysis

Idea:

For every subexpression `e` we collect the set  $\llbracket e \rrbracket^\#$  of possible values of `e` ...

Let  $V$  denote the set of occurring (classes of) constants, functions as well as applications of constructors and operators. As our lattice, we choose:

$$\mathbb{V} = 2^V$$

As usual, we put up a **constraint system**:

- If  $e$  is a value, i.e., of the form:  $b, c e_1 \dots e_k, (e_1, \dots, e_k)$ , an operator application or  $\mathbf{fun} x \rightarrow e$  we generate the constraint:

$$\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \supseteq \{e\}$$

- If  $e \equiv (e_1 e_2)$  and  $f \equiv \mathbf{fun} x \rightarrow e'$ , then

$$\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \supseteq (f \in \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\#) ? \llbracket e' \rrbracket^\# : \emptyset$$

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket^\# \supseteq (f \in \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\#) ? \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# : \emptyset$$

...

- If  $e \equiv \text{let } x_1 = e_1 \text{ in } e_0$ , then we generate:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x_1 \rrbracket^\# &\supseteq \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \\ \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# &\supseteq \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \end{aligned}$$

- Analogously for  $t \equiv \text{letrec } x_1 = e_1 \dots x_k = e_k \text{ in } e_0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x_i \rrbracket^\# &\supseteq \llbracket e_i \rrbracket^\# \\ \llbracket t \rrbracket^\# &\supseteq \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \end{aligned}$$

- int-values returned by operators are described by the unevaluated expression;

Operator applications might return Boolean values or other basic values. Therefore, we do replace tests for basic values by **non-deterministic** choice ...

- Assume  $e \equiv \text{match } e_0 \text{ with } p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \mid \dots \mid p_k \rightarrow e_k .$   
Then we generate for  $p_i \equiv b$  (basic value),

$$\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \supseteq \llbracket e_i \rrbracket^\# : \emptyset$$

...

If  $p_i \equiv c y_1 \dots y_k$  and  $v \equiv c e'_1 \dots e'_k$  is a value, then

$$[[e]]^\# \supseteq (v \in [[e_0]]^\#) ? [[e_i]]^\# : \emptyset$$

$$[[y_j]]^\# \supseteq (v \in [[e_0]]^\#) ? [[e'_j]]^\# : \emptyset$$

If  $p_i \equiv (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  and  $v \equiv (e'_1, \dots, e'_k)$  is a value, then

$$[[e]]^\# \supseteq (v \in [[e_0]]^\#) ? [[e_i]]^\# : \emptyset$$

$$[[y_j]]^\# \supseteq (v \in [[e_0]]^\#) ? [[e'_j]]^\# : \emptyset$$

If  $p_i \equiv y$ , then

$$[[e]]^\# \supseteq [[e_i]]^\#$$

$$[[y]]^\# \supseteq [[e_0]]^\#$$

## Example      The `append`-Function

Consider the concatenation of two lists. In `OCaml`, we would write:

```
let rec app = fun x → match x with
    []      → fun y → y
  | h :: t → fun y → h :: app t y
in app [1; 2] [3]
```

The analysis then results in:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# &= \{ \text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{match } \dots \} \\ \llbracket x \rrbracket^\# &= \{ [1; 2], [2], [] \} \\ \llbracket \text{match } \dots \rrbracket^\# &= \{ \text{fun } y \rightarrow y, \text{fun } y \rightarrow h :: \text{app } \dots \} \\ \llbracket y \rrbracket^\# &= \{ [3] \} \\ \dots & \end{aligned}$$

...

$$\llbracket h \rrbracket^\# = \{1, 2\}$$

$$\llbracket t \rrbracket^\# = \{[2], []\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{app } t \rrbracket^\# =$$

$$\llbracket \text{app } [1; 2] \rrbracket^\# = \{\text{fun } y \rightarrow y, \text{fun } y \rightarrow h :: \text{app } \dots\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{app } t y \rrbracket^\# =$$

$$\llbracket \text{app } [1; 2] [3] \rrbracket^\# = \{[3], h :: \text{app } \dots\}$$

Values  $c e_1 \dots e_k$ ,  $(e_1, \dots, e_k)$  or operator applications  $e_1 \square e_2$   
now are interpreted as **recursive** calls  $c \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \dots \llbracket e_k \rrbracket^\#, (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\#, \dots, \llbracket e_k \rrbracket^\#)$   
or  $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \square \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\#,$  respectively.

$\implies$  regular tree grammar

... in the Example:

We obtain for  $A = \llbracket \text{app } t y \rrbracket^\#$  :

$$\begin{aligned} A &\rightarrow [3] \mid \llbracket h \rrbracket^\# :: A \\ \llbracket h \rrbracket^\# &\rightarrow 1 \mid 2 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}(e)$  denote the set of terms derivable from  $\llbracket e \rrbracket^\#$  w.r.t. the regular tree grammar. Thus, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(h) &= \{1, 2\} \\ \mathcal{L}(\text{app } t y) &= \{[a_1; \dots, a_r; 3] \mid r \geq 0, a_i \in \{1, 2\}\} \end{aligned}$$



## 4.3 An Operational Semantics

Idea:

We construct a **Big-Step** operational semantics which evaluates expressions w.r.t. an environment  $\rho$  :-)

**Values** are of the form:

$$v ::= b \mid c v_1 \dots c_k \mid (v_1, \dots, v_k) \mid (\mathbf{fun} x \rightarrow e, \eta)$$

Examples for Values:

$c\ 1$

$[1; 2] = ::\ 1\ (::\ 2\ [])$

$(\mathbf{fun} x \rightarrow x::y, \{y \mapsto [5]\})$

Expressions are evaluated w.r.t. an **environment**  $\eta : Vars \rightarrow Values$ .

The **Big-Step** operational semantics provides rules to infer the value to which an expression is evaluated w.r.t. a given environment, i.e., deals with statements of the form:

$$(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

**Values:**

$$(b, \eta) \Longrightarrow b$$

$$(\mathbf{fun} \ x \ \rightarrow \ e, \eta) \Longrightarrow (\mathbf{fun} \ x \ \rightarrow \ e, \eta)$$

$$(e_1, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_1 \ \dots \ (e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_k$$

---

$$(c \ e_1 \ \dots \ e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow c \ v_1 \ \dots \ v_k$$

Operator applications are treated analogously!

$$(e_1, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_1 \quad \dots \quad (e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_k$$

---

$$((e_1, \dots, e_k), \eta) \Longrightarrow (v_1, \dots, v_k)$$

**Global Definition:**

**let rec ...  $x = e$  ... in ...**

$$(e, \emptyset) \Longrightarrow v$$

---

$$(x, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

## Function Application:

$$(e_1, \eta) \Longrightarrow (\mathbf{fun} \ x \ \rightarrow \ e, \eta_1)$$

$$(e_2, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_2$$

$$(e, \eta_1 \oplus \{x \mapsto v_2\}) \Longrightarrow v_3$$

---

$$(e_1 \ e_2, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_3$$

## Case Distinction 1:

$$(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow b$$

$$(e_i, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

---

$$(\mathbf{match\ } e \mathbf{ with\ } p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \mid \dots \mid p_k \rightarrow e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

if  $p_i \equiv b$  is the first pattern which matches  $b$   $\text{: -}$ )

## Case Distinction 2:

$$(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow c v_1 \dots v_k$$

$$(e_i, \eta \oplus \{z_1 \mapsto v_1, \dots, z_k \mapsto v_k\}) \Longrightarrow v$$

---

$$(\mathbf{match} \ e \ \mathbf{with} \ p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \mid \dots \mid p_k \rightarrow e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

if  $p_i \equiv c z_1 \dots z_k$  is the first pattern which matches  $c v_1 \dots v_k$  :-)

### Case Distinction 3:

$$(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow (v_1, \dots, v_k)$$

$$(e_i, \eta \oplus \{y_1 \mapsto v_1, \dots, y_1 \mapsto v_k\}) \Longrightarrow v$$

---

$$(\mathbf{match} \ e \ \mathbf{with} \ p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \mid \dots \mid p_k \rightarrow e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

if  $p_i \equiv (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  is the first pattern which matches  $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$   
:-)

## Case Distinction 4:

$$(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow v'$$

$$(e_i, \eta \oplus \{x \mapsto v'\}) \Longrightarrow v$$

---

$$(\mathbf{match} \ e \ \mathbf{with} \ p_1 \rightarrow e_1 \mid \dots \mid p_k \rightarrow e_k, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$$

if  $p_i \equiv x$  is the first pattern which matches  $v'$  :-)



## Local Definitions:

$$\begin{array}{l} (e_1, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_1 \\ (e_0, \eta \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto v_1\}) \Longrightarrow v_0 \\ \hline (\mathbf{let } x_1 = e_1 \mathbf{ in } e_0, \eta) \Longrightarrow v_0 \end{array}$$

## Variables:

$$(x, \eta) \Longrightarrow \eta(x)$$

## Correctness of the Analysis:

For every  $(e, \eta)$  occurring in a proof for the program, it should hold:

- If  $\eta(x) = v$ , then  $[v] \Delta \mathcal{L}(x)$ .
- If  $(e, \eta) \Longrightarrow v$ , then  $[v] \Delta \mathcal{L}(e) \dots$
- where  $[v]$  is the **stripped** expression corresponding to  $v$ , i.e., obtained by removing all environments, and
- $v \Delta L$  iff  $v \in L$  or  $L$  has an expression  $v'$  which evaluates to  $v$ .

## Conclusion:

$\mathcal{L}(e)$  returns a **superset** of the values to which  $e$  is evaluated :-)

## 4.4 Application: Inlining

Problem:

- global variables. The program:

```
      let  $x = 1$   
in let  $f =$  let  $x = 2$   
      in fun  $y \rightarrow y + x$   
in  $f x$ 
```

... computes something else than:

```
    let x = 1
  in let f = let x = 2
        in fun y → y + x
  in     let y = x
      in y + x
```

- **recursive functions.** In the definition:

```
foo = fun y → foo y
```

foo should better not be substituted :-)

## Idea 1:

- First, we introduce **unique** variable names.
- Then, we only substitute functions which are **staticly** within the scope of the **same** global variables as the application :-)
- For every expression, we determine all function definitions with this property :-)

Let  $D = D[e]$  denote the set of definitions which statically arrive at  $e$ .

- If  $e \equiv \text{let } x_1 = e_1 \text{ in } e_0$  then:

$$D[e_1] = D$$

$$D[e_0] = D \cup \{x_1\}$$

- If  $e \equiv \text{fun } x \rightarrow e_1$  then:

$$D[e_1] = D \cup \{x\}$$

- Similarly, for  $e \equiv \text{match } \dots c x_1 \dots x_k \rightarrow e_i \dots,$

$$D[e_i] = D \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$$

In all other cases,  $D$  is propagated to the sub-expressions unchanged :-)

... in the Example:

```
    let  $x = 1$ 
  in let  $f = \text{let } x_1 = 2$ 
        in fun  $y \rightarrow y + x_1$ 
  in  $f x$ 
```

... the application  $f x$  is not in the scope of  $x_1$

$\implies$  we first duplicate the definition of  $x_1$  :

```
    let x = 1
  in let x1 = 2
    in let f = let x1 = 2
      in fun y → y + x1
  in f x
```

⇒ the inner definition becomes redundant !!!



```
let x = 1
in let x1 = 2
in let f = fun y → y + x1
in f x
```

⇒ now we can apply inlining :

```
let x = 1
in let x1 = 2
in let f = fun y → y + x1
in let y = x
in y + x1
```

Removing **variable-variable**-assignments, we arrive at:

let  $x = 1$   
in let  $x_1 = 2$   
in let  $f = \text{fun } y \rightarrow y + x_1$   
in  $x + x_1$

## Idea 2:

- We apply our value analysis.
- We ignore global variables :-)
- We only substitute functions without free variables :-))

## Example: The map-Function

```
let rec f = fun x → x · x
and map = fun g → fun x → match x
    with [] → []
         | x::xs → g x :: map g xs
in map f list
```

- The **actual** parameter `f` in the application `map g` is always `fun x → x · x :-)`
- Therefore, `map g` can be specialized to a new function `h` defined by:

```

h = let g = fun x → x · x
    in fun x → match x
                with [] → []
                 | x::xs → g x :: map g xs

```

The inner occurrence of `map g` can be replaced with `h`

$\implies$  fold-Transformation :-)

```
h = let g = fun x → x · x
    in fun x → match x
                with [] → []
                 | x::xs → g x :: h xs
```

Inlining the function  $g$  yields:

```
h = let  $g = \mathbf{fun} \ x \rightarrow x \cdot x$   
in fun  $x \rightarrow \mathbf{match} \ x$   
      with  $[] \rightarrow []$   
           $| \ x::xs \rightarrow (\mathbf{let} \ x = x$   
                        in  $x * x) :: \mathbf{h} \ xs$ 
```

Removing useless definitions and variable-variable assignments yields:

```
h = fun x → match x
      with [] → []
           | x::xs → x * x :: h xs
```



## 4.5 Deforestation

- Functional programmers love to collect intermediate results in lists which are processed by higher-order functions.
- Examples of such higher-order functions are:

```
map = fun f → fun l → match l with [] → []  
    | x::xs → f x :: map f xs)
```

```
filter = fun p → fun l → match l with [] → []  
      | x::xs → if p x then x :: filter p xs  
                else filter p xs)
```

```
foldl = fun f → fun a → fun l → match l with [] → a  
      | x::xs → foldl f (f a x) xs)
```

**id** = **fun**  $x \rightarrow x$

**comp** = **fun**  $f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } x \rightarrow f (g x)$

**comp<sub>1</sub>** = **fun**  $f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow$   
 $f (g x_1) x_2$

**comp<sub>2</sub>** = **fun**  $f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow$   
 $f x_1 (g x_2)$

## Example:

`sum` = `foldl (+) 0`

`length` = `let f = map (fun x → 1)`  
`in comp sum f`

`dev` = `fun l → let s1 = sum l`  
`n = length l`  
`mean = s1/n`  
`l1 = map (fun x → x - mean) l`  
`l2 = map (fun x → x · x) l1`  
`s2 = sum l2`  
`in s2/n`

## Observations:

- Explicit recursion does no longer occur!
- The implementation creates unnecessary intermediate data-structures!

`length` could also be implemented as:

```
length = let f = fun a → fun x → a + 1
         in foldl f 0
```

- This implementation avoids to create intermediate lists !!!

## Simplification Rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp id } f &= \text{comp } f \text{ id} = f \\ \text{comp}_1 f \text{ id} &= \text{comp}_2 f \text{ id} = f \\ \text{map id} &= \text{id} \\ \text{comp } (\text{map } f) (\text{map } g) &= \text{map } (\text{comp } f g) \\ \text{comp } (\text{foldl } f a) (\text{map } g) &= \text{foldl } (\text{comp}_2 f g) a \end{aligned}$$

## Simplification Rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp id } f &= \text{comp } f \text{ id} = f \\ \text{comp}_1 f \text{ id} &= \text{comp}_2 f \text{ id} = f \\ \text{map id} &= \text{id} \\ \text{comp (map } f) (\text{map } g) &= \text{map (comp } f g) \\ \text{comp (foldl } f a) (\text{map } g) &= \text{foldl (comp}_2 f g) a \\ \text{comp (filter } p_1) (\text{filter } p_2) &= \text{filter (fun } x \rightarrow \text{if } p_2 x \text{ then } p_1 x \\ &\quad \text{else false)} \\ \text{comp (foldl } f a) (\text{filter } p) &= \text{let } h = \text{fun } a \rightarrow \text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{if } p x \text{ then } f a x \\ &\quad \text{else } a \\ &\quad \text{in foldl } h a \end{aligned}$$

## Warning:

Function compositions also could occur as nested function calls ...

```
id x           = x
map id l       = l
map f (map g l) = map (comp f g) l
foldl f a (map g l) = foldl (comp2 f g) a l
filter p1 (filter p2 l) = filter (fun x → p1 x ∧ p2 x) l
foldl f a (filter p l) = let h = fun a → fun x → if p x then f a x
                           else a
                           in foldl h a l
```



## Example, optimized:

`sum` = `foldl (+) 0`

`length` = `let f = comp2 (+) (fun x → 1)`  
`in foldl f 0`

`dev` = `fun l → let s1 = sum l`  
`n = length l`  
`mean = s1/n`  
`f = comp (fun x → x · x)`  
`(fun x → x - mean)`  
`g = comp2 (+) f`  
`s2 = foldl g 0 l`  
`in s2/n`

## Remarks:

- All intermediate lists have disappeared :-)
- Only `foldl` remain — i.e., loops :-))
- Compositions of functions can be further simplified in the next step by `Inlining`.
- Inside `dev`, we then obtain:

$$g = \mathbf{fun} \ a \rightarrow \mathbf{fun} \ x \rightarrow \mathbf{let} \ x_1 = x - mean$$
$$x_2 = x_1 \cdot x_1$$
$$\mathbf{in} \ a + x_2$$

- The result is a sequence of **let**-definitions !!!

## Extension: Tabulation

If the list has been created by tabulation of a function, the creation of the list sometimes can be avoided ...

```
tabulate' = fun j → fun f → fun n →  
            if j ≥ n then []  
            else (f j) :: tabulate' (j + 1) f n  
tabulate  = tabulate' 0
```

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{comp } (\text{map } f) (\text{tabulate } g) &= \text{tabulate } (\text{comp } f g) \\ \text{comp } (\text{foldl } f a) (\text{tabulate } g) &= \text{loop } (\text{comp}_2 f g) a\end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{loop}' &= \text{fun } j \rightarrow \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } a \rightarrow \text{fun } n \rightarrow \\ &\quad \text{if } j \geq n \text{ then } a \\ &\quad \text{else } \text{loop}' (j + 1) f (f a j) n \\ \text{loop} &= \text{loop}' 0\end{aligned}$$

## Extension (2): List Reversals

Sometimes, the ordering of lists or arguments is reversed:

```
rev'           = fun a → fun l →  
                match l with [] → a  
                | x :: xs → rev' (x :: a) xs
```

```
rev           = rev' []
```

```
comp rev rev  = id
```

```
swap         = fun f → fun x → fun y → f y x
```

```
comp swap swap = id
```

$$\text{foldr } f \ a \ = \ \text{comp } (\text{foldl } (\text{swap } f) \ a) \ \text{rev}$$

## Discussion:

- The standard implementation of `foldr` is not tail-recursive.
- The last equation decomposes a `foldr` into two tail-recursive functions — at the price that an intermediate list is created.
- Therefore, the standard implementation is probably faster :-)
- Sometimes, the operation `rev` can also be optimized away ...

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{comp rev (map } f) &= \text{comp (map } f) \text{ rev} \\ \text{comp rev (filter } p) &= \text{comp (filter } p) \text{ rev} \\ \text{comp rev (tabulate } f) &= \text{rev\_tabulate } f\end{aligned}$$

Here, `rev_tabulate` tabulates in reverse ordering. This function has properties quite analogous to `tabulate`:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{comp (map } f) (\text{rev\_tabulate } g) &= \text{rev\_tabulate (comp}_2 f g) \\ \text{comp (foldl } f a) (\text{rev\_tabulate } g) &= \text{rev\_loop (comp}_2 f g) a\end{aligned}$$

## Extension (3): Dependencies on the Index

- Correctness is proven by induction on the lengths of occurring lists.
- Similar composition results also hold for transformations which take the current indices into account:

$$\text{map}' = \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } l \rightarrow \text{match } l \text{ with } [] \rightarrow []$$
$$| \quad x :: xs \rightarrow f \ i \ x) :: \text{map}' (i + 1) f \ xs$$
$$\text{map} = \text{map}' \ 0$$



Analogously, there is index-dependent accumulation:

```
foldli' = fun i → fun f → fun a → fun l →  
         match l with [] → a  
         | x :: xs → foldli' (i + 1) f (f i a x) xs  
foldli  = foldli' 0
```

For composition, we must take care that always the same indices are used.  
This is achieved by:

$$\text{comp}_i = \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } x \rightarrow f \ i \ (g \ i \ x)$$

$$\text{comp}_{i_1} = \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow \\ f \ i \ (g \ i \ x_1) \ x_2$$

$$\text{comp}_{i_2} = \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow \\ f \ i \ x_1 \ (g \ i \ x_2)$$

$$\text{cmp}_1 = \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow \\ f \ i \ x_1 \ (g \ x_2)$$

$$\text{cmp}_2 = \text{fun } f \rightarrow \text{fun } g \rightarrow \text{fun } i \rightarrow \text{fun } x_1 \rightarrow \text{fun } x_2 \rightarrow \\ f \ x_1 \ (g \ i \ x_2)$$

Then:

<code>comp (mapi f) (map g)</code>	<code>= mapi (comp<sub>2</sub> f g)</code>
<code>comp (map f) (mapi g)</code>	<code>= mapi (comp f g)</code>
<code>comp (mapi f) (mapi g)</code>	<code>= mapi (compi f g)</code>
<code>comp (foldli f a) (map g)</code>	<code>= foldli (cmp<sub>1</sub> f g) a</code>
<code>comp (foldl f a) (mapi g)</code>	<code>= foldli (cmp<sub>2</sub> f g) a</code>
<code>comp (foldli f a) (mapi g)</code>	<code>= foldli (compi<sub>2</sub> f g) a</code>
<code>comp (foldli f a) (tabulate g)</code>	<code>= let h = fun a → fun i →</code> <code>                  f i a (g i)</code> <code>   in loop h a</code>

## Discussion:

- Warning: index-dependent transformations may not commute with `rev` or `filter`.
- All our rules can only be applied if the functions `id`, `map`, `mapi`, `foldl`, `foldli`, `filter`, `rev`, `tabulate`, `rev_tabulate`, `loop`, `rev_loop`, ... are provided by a **standard library**: Only then the algebraic properties can be guaranteed !!!
- Similar simplification rules can be derived for any kind of tree-like data-structure `tree  $\alpha$` .
- These also provide operations `map`, `mapi` and `foldl`, `foldli` with corresponding rules.
- Further opportunities are opened up by functions `to_list` and `from_list` ...

## Example

`type tree α = Leaf | Node α (tree α) (tree α)`

`map = fun f → fun t → match t with Leaf → Leaf  
| Node x l r → let l' = map f l  
r' = map f r  
in Node (f x) l' r'`

`foldl = fun f → fun a → fun t → match t with Leaf → a  
| Node x l r → let a' = foldl f a l  
in foldl f (f a' x) r`

```
to_list' = fun a → fun t → match t with Leaf → a
          | Node x t1 t2 → let a' = to_list' a t2
                           in to_list' (x :: a') t1
```

```
to_list = to_list' []
```

```
from_list = fun l → match l
              with [] → Leaf
                 | x :: xs → Node x Leaf (from_list xs)
```

## Warning:

Not every natural equation is valid:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{comp to\_list from\_list} &= \text{id} \\ \text{comp from\_list to\_list} &\neq \text{id} \\ \text{comp to\_list (map } f) &= \text{comp (map } f) \text{ to\_list} \\ \text{comp from\_list (map } f) &= \text{comp (map } f) \text{ from\_list} \\ \text{comp (foldl } f \ a) \text{ to\_list} &= \text{foldl } f \ a \\ \text{comp (foldl } f \ a) \text{ from\_list} &= \text{foldl } f \ a \end{aligned}$$

In this case, there is even a `rev`:

```
rev = fun t →  
      match t with Leaf → Leaf  
      | Node x t1 t2 → let s1 = rev t1  
                          s2 = rev t2  
                          in Node x s2 s1
```

```
comp to_list rev = comp rev to_list  
comp from_list rev ≠ comp rev from_list
```



## 4.6 CBN vs. CBV: Strictness Analysis

### Problem:

- Programming languages such as **Haskell** evaluate expressions for **let**-defined variables and actual parameters not before their values are accessed.
- This allows for an elegant treatment of (possibly) infinite lists of which only small initial segments are required for computing the result :-)
- Delaying evaluation by default incurs, though, a non-trivial overhead ...

## Example

`from` = `fun n → n :: from (n + 1)`

`take` = `fun k → fun s → if k ≤ 0 then []`  
`else match s with [] → []`  
`| x :: xs → x :: take (k - 1) xs`

Then CBN yields:

`take 5 (from 0) = [0, 1, 2, 3, 4]`

— whereas evaluation with CBV does not terminate !!!

Then CBN yields:

`take 5 (from 0) = [0, 1, 2, 3, 4]`

— whereas evaluation with CBV does not terminate !!!

On the other hand, for CBN, tail-recursive functions may require non-constant space ???

```
fac2 = fun x → fun a → if x ≤ 0 then a
                        else fac2 (x - 1) (a · x)
```

## Discussion:

- The multiplications are collected in the accumulating parameter through nested closures.
- Only when the value of a call `fac2 x 1` is accessed, this dynamic data structure is evaluated.
- Instead, the accumulating parameter should have been passed directly by-value !!!
- This is the goal of the following optimization ...

## Simplification:

- At first, we rule out data structures, higher-order functions, and local function definitions.
- We introduce an unary operator  $\#$  which forces the evaluation of a variable.
- Goal of the transformation is to place  $\#$  at as many places as possible ...

## Simplification:

- At first, we rule out data structures, higher-order functions, and local function definitions.
- We introduce an unary operator  $\#$  which forces the evaluation of a variable.
- Goal of the transformation is to place  $\#$  at as many places as possible ...

$$e ::= c \mid x \mid e_1 \square_2 e_2 \mid \square_1 e \mid f \ e_1 \ \dots \ e_k \mid \mathbf{if} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{then} \ e_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ e_2 \\ \mid \mathbf{let} \ r_1 = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e$$
$$r ::= x \mid \#x$$
$$d ::= f \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_k = e$$
$$p ::= \mathbf{letrec} \ \mathbf{and} \ d_1 \ \dots \ \mathbf{and} \ d_n \ \mathbf{in} \ e$$

## Idea:

- Describe a  $k$ -ary function

$$f : \mathbf{int} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbf{int}$$

by a function

$$\llbracket f \rrbracket^\sharp : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$$

- $0$  means: evaluation does definitely not terminate.
- $1$  means: evaluation may terminate.
- $\llbracket f \rrbracket^\sharp 0 = 0$  means: If the function call returns a value, then the evaluation of the argument must have terminated and returned a value.

$\implies$   $f$  is **strict**.



## Idea (cont.):

- We determine the abstract semantics of all functions :-)
- For that, we put up a system of equations ...

## Auxiliary Function:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# & : (Vars \rightarrow \mathbb{B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{B} \\ \llbracket c \rrbracket^\# \rho & = 1 \\ \llbracket x \rrbracket^\# \rho & = \rho x \\ \llbracket \square_1 e \rrbracket^\# \rho & = \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \rho \\ \llbracket e_1 \square_2 e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho & = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho \\ \llbracket \text{if } e_0 \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho & = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \vee \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho) \\ \llbracket f e_1 \dots e_k \rrbracket^\# \rho & = \llbracket f \rrbracket^\# (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho) \dots (\llbracket e_k \rrbracket^\# \rho) \\ \dots & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{let} \ x_1 = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \llbracket e \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho\}) \\ \llbracket \mathbf{let} \ \#x_1 = e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e \rrbracket^\# \rho &= (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho) \wedge (\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto \mathbf{1}\})) \end{aligned}$$

## System of Equations:

$$\llbracket f_i \rrbracket^\# b_1 \ \dots \ b_k = \llbracket e_i \rrbracket^\# \{x_j \mapsto b_j \mid j = 1, \dots, k\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{B}$$

- The unknowns of the system of equations are the functions  $\llbracket f_i \rrbracket^\#$  or the individual entries  $\llbracket f_i \rrbracket^\# b_1 \ \dots \ b_k$  in the value table.
- All right-hand sides are **monotonic!**
- Consequently, there is a least solution **:-)**
- The complete lattice  $\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  has height  $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$  **:-(**

## Example:

For `fac2`, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{fac2} \rrbracket^\# b_1 b_2 &= b_1 \wedge (b_2 \vee \\ &\quad \llbracket \text{fac2} \rrbracket^\# b_1 (b_1 \wedge b_2)) \end{aligned}$$

Fixpoint iteration yields:

0	<code>fun x → fun a → 0</code>
1	<code>fun x → fun a → x ∧ a</code>
2	<code>fun x → fun a → x ∧ a</code>

## We conclude:

- The function `fac2` is strict in both arguments, i.e., if evaluation terminates, then also the evaluation of its arguments.
- Accordingly, we transform:

```
fac2 = fun x → fun a → if x ≤ 0 then a
                        else let #x' = x - 1
                                #a' = x · a
                        in fac2 x' a'
```

## Correctness of the Analysis:

- The system of equations is an abstract **denotational** semantics.
- The denotational semantics characterizes the meaning of functions as least solution of the corresponding equations for the concrete semantics.
- For values, the denotational semantics relies on the **complete** partial ordering  $\mathbb{Z}_\perp$ .
- For complete partial orderings, **Kleene's** fixpoint theorem is applicable **:-)**
- As description relation  $\Delta$  we use:

$$\perp \Delta 0 \quad \text{and} \quad z \Delta 1 \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{Z}$$

## Extension: Data Structures

- Functions may vary in the parts which they require from a data structure ...

`hd = fun l → match l with x :: xs → x`

- `hd` only accesses the first element of a list.
- `length` only accesses the backbone of its argument.
- `rev` forces the evaluation of the complete argument — given that the result is required completely ...

## Extension of the Syntax:

We additionally consider expression of the form:

$$e ::= \dots \mid [] \mid e_1 :: e_2 \mid \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ [] \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \mid x :: xs \ \rightarrow \ e_2 \\ \mid (e_1, e_2) \mid \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ (x_1, x_2) \ \rightarrow \ e_1$$

## Top Strictness

- We assume that the program is well-typed.
- We are only interested in top constructors.
- Again, we model this property with (monotonic) Boolean functions.
- For **int**-values, this coincides with strictness **:-)**
- We extend the abstract evaluation  $\llbracket e \rrbracket^\# \rho$  with rules for case-distinction ...

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ [] \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \ | \ x :: xs \ \rightarrow \ e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \\
&\llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \vee \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x, xs \mapsto 1\})) \\
\llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ (x_1, x_2) \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \\
&\llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1, x_2 \mapsto 1\}) \\
\llbracket [] \rrbracket^\# \rho = \llbracket e_1 :: e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho = \llbracket (e_1, e_2) \rrbracket^\# \rho &= 1
\end{aligned}$$

- The rules for **match** are analogous to those for **if**.
- In case of  $::$ , we know nothing about the values beneath the constructor; therefore  $\{x, xs \mapsto 1\}$ .
- We check our analysis on the function **app ...**



Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app} &= \text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow \text{match } x \text{ with } [] \rightarrow y \\ &\quad | x :: xs \rightarrow x :: \text{app } xs y \end{aligned}$$

Abstract interpretation yields the system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# b_1 b_2 &= b_1 \wedge (b_2 \vee \mathbf{1}) \\ &= b_1 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that we may conclude for sure only for the first argument that its top constructor is required :-)

## Total Strictness

Assume that the result of the function application is **totally** required.

Which arguments then are also totally required ?

We again refer to Boolean functions ...

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ [] \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \ | \ x, :: \ x s \ \rightarrow \ e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \mathbf{let} \ b = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \ \mathbf{in} \\
 &b \wedge \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \vee \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto b, xs \mapsto \mathbf{1}\}) \vee \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto \mathbf{1}, xs \mapsto b\}) \\
 \llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ (x_1, x_2) \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \mathbf{let} \ b = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \ \mathbf{in} \\
 &\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto \mathbf{1}, x_2 \mapsto b\}) \vee \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto b, x_2 \mapsto \mathbf{1}\}) \\
 \llbracket [] \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \mathbf{1} \\
 \llbracket e_1 :: e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho \\
 \llbracket (e_1, e_2) \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \wedge \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho
 \end{aligned}$$

## Discussion:

- The rules for constructor applications have changed.
- Also the treatment of **match** now involves the components  $z$  and  $x_1, x_2$ .
- Again, we check the approach for the function **app**.

## Example:

Abstract interpretation yields the system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{app} \rrbracket^\# b_1 b_2 &= b_1 \wedge b_2 \vee b_1 \wedge \llbracket \mathbf{app} \rrbracket^\# 1 b_2 \vee 1 \wedge \llbracket \mathbf{app} \rrbracket^\# b_1 b_2 \\ &= b_1 \wedge b_2 \vee b_1 \wedge \llbracket \mathbf{app} \rrbracket^\# 1 b_2 \vee \llbracket \mathbf{app} \rrbracket^\# b_1 b_2 \end{aligned}$$

This results in the following fixpoint iteration:

0	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow 0$
1	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow x \wedge y$
2	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow x \wedge y$

We deduce that both arguments are definitely totally required if the result is totally required :-)

**Warning:**

Whether or not the result is totally required, depends on the context of the function call!

In such a context, a specialized function may be called ...

```

app# = fun x → fun y → let #x' = x and #y' = y in
                           match 'x with [] → y'
                           | x :: xs → let #r = x :: app# xs y
                                       in r

```

## Discussion:

- Both strictness analyses employ the same complete lattice.
- Results and application, though, are quite different :-)
- Thereby, we use the following description relations:
  - Top Strictness :  $\perp \triangle 0$
  - Total Strictness :  $z \triangle 0$  if  $\perp$  occurs in  $z$ .
- Both analyses can also be combined to an a joint analysis ...

## Combined Strictness Analysis

- We use the complete lattice:

$$\mathbb{T} = \{0 \sqsubseteq 1 \sqsubseteq 2\}$$

- The description relation is given by:

$$\perp \triangle 0 \quad z \triangle 1 \text{ (} z \text{ contains } \perp\text{)} \quad z \triangle 2 \text{ (} z \text{ value)}$$

- The lattice is more informative, the functions, though, are no longer as efficiently representable, e.g., through Boolean expressions :-(  
  
- We require the auxiliary functions:

$$(i \sqsubseteq x); y = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } i \sqsubseteq x \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

## The Combined Evaluation Function:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ [ \ ] \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \ | \ x :: xs \ \rightarrow \ e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \mathbf{let} \ b = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \ \mathbf{in} \\
 &\quad (2 \sqsubseteq b) ; \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \sqcup \\
 &\quad (1 \sqsubseteq b) ; (\llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto 2, xs \mapsto b\}) \\
 &\quad \sqcup \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x \mapsto b, xs \mapsto 2\})) \\
 \llbracket \mathbf{match} \ e_0 \ \mathbf{with} \ (x_1, x_2) \ \rightarrow \ e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \mathbf{let} \ b = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket^\# \rho \ \mathbf{in} \\
 &\quad (1 \sqsubseteq b) ; (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto 2, x_2 \mapsto b\}) \\
 &\quad \sqcup \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# (\rho \oplus \{x_1 \mapsto b, x_2 \mapsto 2\})) \\
 \llbracket [ \ ] \rrbracket^\# \rho &= 2 \\
 \llbracket e_1 :: e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho &= \\
 \llbracket (e_1, e_2) \rrbracket^\# \rho &= 1 \sqcup (\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^\# \rho \sqcap \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket^\# \rho)
 \end{aligned}$$

## Example:

For our beloved function `app`, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# d_1 d_2 &= (2 \sqsubseteq d_1) ; d_2 \sqcup \\ &\quad (1 \sqsubseteq d_1) ; (1 \sqcup \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# d_1 d_2 \sqcup d_1 \sqcap \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# 2 d_2) \\ &= (2 \sqsubseteq d_1) ; d_2 \sqcup \\ &\quad (1 \sqsubseteq d_1) ; 1 \sqcup \\ &\quad (1 \sqsubseteq d_1) ; \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# d_1 d_2 \sqcup \\ &\quad d_1 \sqcap \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\# 2 d_2 \end{aligned}$$

this results in the fixpoint computation:



0	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow 0$
1	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow (2 \sqsubseteq x); y \sqcup (1 \sqsubseteq x); 1$
2	$\text{fun } x \rightarrow \text{fun } y \rightarrow (2 \sqsubseteq x); y \sqcup (1 \sqsubseteq x); 1$

We conclude

- that both arguments are totally required if the result is totally required; and
- that the root of the first argument is required if the root of the result is required :-)

**Remark:**

The analysis can be easily generalized such that it guarantees evaluation up to a depth  $d$  :-)

## Further Directions:

- Our Approach is also applicable to other data structures.
- In principle, also higher-order (monomorphic) functions can be analyzed in this way :-)
- Then, however, we require higher-order abstract functions — of which there are many :-)
- Such functions therefore are approximated by:

$$\mathbf{fun} \ x_1 \ \rightarrow \ \dots \ \mathbf{fun} \ x_r \ \rightarrow \ \top$$

:-)

- For some known higher-order functions such as `map`, `foldl`, `loop`, ... only unary or binary functional arguments are required — of which there are sufficiently few :-))

## 5 Optimization of Logic Programs

We only consider the mini language **PuP** (“Pure Prolog”). In particular, we do not consider:

- arithmetic;
- the cut-operator.
- Self-modification by means of **assert** and **retract**.

## Example:

`bigger(X, Y)` ←  $X = elephant, Y = horse$   
`bigger(X, Y)` ←  $X = horse, Y = donkey$   
`bigger(X, Y)` ←  $X = donkey, Y = dog$   
`bigger(X, Y)` ←  $X = donkey, Y = monkey$   
`is_bigger(X, Y)` ← `bigger(X, Y)`  
`is_bigger(X, Y)` ← `bigger(X, Z), is_bigger(Z, Y)`  
← `is_bigger(elephant, dog)`

## A more realistic Example:

$$\text{app}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = [], Y = Z$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app}(X, Y, Z) &\leftarrow X = [H|X'], Z = [H|Z'], \text{app}(X', Y, Z') \\ &\leftarrow \text{app}(X, [Y, c], [a, b, Z]) \end{aligned}$$

## A more realistic Example:

$\text{app}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = [], Y = Z$

$\text{app}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = [H|X'], Z = [H|Z'], \text{app}(X', Y, Z')$

$\leftarrow \text{app}(X, [Y, c], [a, b, Z])$

## Remark:

$[]$   $\equiv$  the atom **empty list**

$[H|Z]$   $\equiv$  **binary** constructor application

$[a, b, Z]$   $\equiv$  Abbreviation for:  $[a|[b|[Z|[ ]]]]$

Accordingly, a program  $p$  is constructed as follows:

$$t ::= a \mid X \mid \_ \mid f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$$

$$g ::= p(t_1, \dots, t_k) \mid X = t$$

$$c ::= p(X_1, \dots, X_k) \leftarrow g_1, \dots, g_r$$

$$q ::= \leftarrow g_1, \dots, g_r$$

$$p ::= c_1 \dots c_m q$$

- A **term**  $t$  either is an atom, a (possibly anonymous) variable or a constructor application.
- A **goal**  $g$  either is a literal, i.e., a predicate call, or a unification.
- A **clause**  $c$  consists of a **head**  $p(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  together with **body** consisting of a sequence of goals.
- A **program** consists of a sequence of clauses together with a sequence of goals as **query**.

## Procedural View of PuP-Programs:

literal	==	procedure call
predicate	==	procedure
definition	==	body
term	==	value
unification	==	basic computation step
binding of variables	==	side effect

### Warning: Predicate calls ...

- do not return results!
- modify the caller solely through side effects :-)
- may fail. Then, the following definition is tried  $\implies$   
backtracking



## Inefficiencies:

**Backtracking:** ● The matching alternative must be searched for  
⇒ Indexing

- Since a successful call may still fail later, the stack can only be cleared if there are no pending alternatives.

**Unification:** ● The translation possibly must switch between build and check several times.

- In case of unification with a variable, an **Occur Check** must be performed.

**Type Checking:** ● Since Prolog is untyped, it must be checked at run-time whether or not a term is of the desired form.

- Otherwise, ugly errors could show up.

## Some Optimizations:

- Replacing last calls with jumps;
- Compile-time type inference;
- Identification of deterministic predicates ...

## Example:

`app(X, Y, Z) ← X = [], Y = Z`

`app(X, Y, Z) ← X = [H|X'], Z = [H|Z'], app(X', Y, Z')`

`← app([a, b], [Y, c], Z)`

## Observation:

- In **PuP**, functions must be simulated through predicates.
- These then have designated **input-** and output parameters.
- **Input** parameters are those which are instantiated with a variable-free term whenever the predicate is called.  
These are also called **ground**.
- In the example, the first parameter of **app** is an input parameter.
- Unification with such a parameter can be implemented as **pattern matching !**
- Then we see that **app** in fact is deterministic **!!!**

## 5.1 Groundness Analysis

A variable  $X$  is called **ground** w.r.t. a program execution  $\pi$  starting program entry and entering a program point  $v$ , if  $X$  is bound to a variable-free term.

### Goal:

- Find all variables which are ground whenever a particular program point is reached !
- Find all arguments of a predicate which are ground whenever the predicate is called !

## Idea:

- Describe groundness by values from  $\mathbb{B}$ :
  - $1$   $\equiv$  variable-free term;
  - $0$   $\equiv$  term which contains variables.
- A set of variable assignments is described by Boolean functions  $:-)$ 
  - $X \leftrightarrow Y$   $\equiv$   $X$  is ground iff  $Y$  is ground.
  - $X \wedge Y$   $\equiv$   $X$  and  $Y$  are ground.

## Idea (cont.):

- The constant function  $0$  denotes an unreachable program point.
- Occurring sets of variable assignments are closed under substitution.

This means that for every occurring function  $\phi \neq 0$ ,

$$\phi(1, \dots, 1) = 1$$


These functions are called **positive**.

- The set of all positive functions is called **Pos**.

Ordering:  $\phi_1 \sqsubseteq \phi_2$  if  $\phi_1 \Rightarrow \phi_2$ .

- In particular, the least element is  $0$  :-)

Example:



## Remarks:

- Not all positive functions are monotonic !!!
- For  $k$  variables, there are  $2^{2^k-1} + 1$  many functions.
- The height of the complete lattice is  $2^k$ .
- We construct an interprocedural analysis which for every predicate  $p$  determines a (monotonic) transformation

$$\llbracket p \rrbracket^\# : \text{Pos} \rightarrow \text{Pos}$$

- For every clause,  $p(X_1, \dots, X_k) \Leftarrow g_1, \dots, g_n$  we obtain the constraint:

$$\llbracket p \rrbracket^\# \psi \sqsupseteq \exists X_{k+1}, \dots, X_m. \llbracket g_n \rrbracket^\# (\dots (\llbracket g_1 \rrbracket^\# \psi) \dots)$$

//  $m$  number of clause variables



## Abstract Unification:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket X = t \rrbracket^\# \psi &= \psi \wedge (X \leftrightarrow X_1 \wedge \dots \wedge X_r) \\ \text{if } & \text{Vars}(t) = \{X_1, \dots, X_r\}. \end{aligned}$$

## Abstract Literal:

$$\llbracket q(s_1, \dots, s_k) \rrbracket^\# \psi = \text{combine}_{s_1, \dots, s_k}^\# (\psi, \llbracket q \rrbracket^\# (\text{enter}_{s_1, \dots, s_k}^\# \psi))$$

// analogous to procedure call !!

Thereby:

$$\text{enter}_{s_1, \dots, s_k}^\# \psi = \text{ren} (\exists X_1, \dots, X_m. [\bar{X}_1 = s_1, \dots, \bar{X}_k = s_k]^\# \psi)$$

$$\text{combine}_{s_1, \dots, s_k}^\# (\psi, \psi_1) = \exists \bar{X}_1, \dots, \bar{X}_r. \psi \wedge [[\bar{X}_1 = s_1, \dots, \bar{X}_k = s_k]^\# (\overline{\text{ren}} \psi_1)]$$

where

$$\exists X. \phi = \phi[0/X] \vee \phi[1/X]$$

$$\text{ren} \phi = \phi[X_1/\bar{X}_1, \dots, X_k/\bar{X}_k]$$

$$\overline{\text{ren}} \phi = \phi[\bar{X}_1/X_1, \dots, \bar{X}_r/X_r]$$

## Example:

$$\text{app}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = [], Y = Z$$

$$\text{app}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = [H|X'], Z = [H|Z'], \text{app}(X', Y, Z')$$

Then

$$\llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(X) \sqsupseteq X \wedge (Y \leftrightarrow Z)$$

$$\llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(X) \sqsupseteq \text{let } \psi = X \wedge H \wedge X' \wedge (Z \leftrightarrow Z')$$

$$\text{in } \exists H, X', Z'. \text{combine}_{\dots}^\#(\psi, \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(\text{enter}_{\dots}^\#(\psi)))$$

where for  $\psi = X \wedge H \wedge X' \wedge (Z \leftrightarrow Z')$ :

$$\text{enter}_{\dots}^\#(\psi) = X$$

$$\text{combine}_{\dots}^\#(\psi, X \wedge (Y \leftrightarrow Z)) = (X \wedge H \wedge X' \wedge (Z \leftrightarrow Z') \wedge (Y \leftrightarrow Z'))$$

## Example (Cont.):

Furthermore,

$$\llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(Z) \sqsupseteq X \wedge Y \wedge Z$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(Z) \sqsupseteq & \text{let } \psi = H \wedge Z \wedge Z' \wedge (X \leftrightarrow X') \\ & \text{in } \exists H, X', Z'. \text{combine}_{\dots}^\#(\psi, \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(\text{enter}_{\dots}^\#(\psi))) \end{aligned}$$

where for  $\psi = Z \wedge H \wedge Z' \wedge (X \leftrightarrow X')$ :

$$\text{enter}_{\dots}^\#(\psi) = Z$$

$$\text{combine}_{\dots}^\#(\psi, X \wedge Y \wedge Z) = X \wedge H \wedge X' \wedge Y \wedge Z \wedge Z'$$

Fixpoint iteration therefore yields:

$$\llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(X) = X \wedge (Y \leftrightarrow Z) \quad \llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#(Z) = X \wedge Y \wedge Z$$

## Discussion:

- Exhaustive tabulation of the transformation  $\llbracket \text{app} \rrbracket^\#$  is not feasible.
- Therefore, we rely on **demand-driven** fixpoint iteration !
- The evaluation starts with the evaluation of the query  $g$ , i.e., with the evaluation of  $\llbracket g \rrbracket^\# 1$ .
- The set of inspected fixpoint variables  $\llbracket p \rrbracket^\# \psi$  yields a description of all possible calls **:-))**
- For an efficient representation of functions  $\psi \in \text{Pos}$  we rely on binary decision diagrams (**BDDs**).

# Background 6: Binary Decision Diagrams

## Idea (1):


- Choose an ordering  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  on the arguments ...
- Represent the function  $f : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$  by  $[f]_0$  where:

$$[b]_k = b$$

$$[f]_{i-1} = \text{fun } x_i \rightarrow \text{if } x_i \text{ then } [f \ 1]_i \\ \text{else } [f \ 0]_i$$


**Example:**  $f \ x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 = x_1 \wedge (x_2 \leftrightarrow x_3)$

... yields the tree:



## Idea (2):


- Decision trees are exponentially large :-)
- Often, however, many sub-trees are **isomorphic** :-)
- Isomorphic sub-trees need to be represented only once ...





## Idea (3):

- Nodes whose test is irrelevant, can also be abandoned ...



## Discussion:

- This representation of the Boolean function  $f$  is **unique** !



Equality of functions is efficiently decidable !!

- For the representation to be useful, it should support the basic operations:  $\wedge, \vee, \neg, \Rightarrow, \exists x_j \dots$


$$[b_1 \wedge b_2]_k = b_1 \wedge b_2$$

$$[f \wedge g]_{i-1} = \mathbf{fun} \ x_i \rightarrow \mathbf{if} \ x_i \ \mathbf{then} \ [f \ 1 \wedge g \ 1]_i \\ \mathbf{else} \ [f \ 0 \wedge g \ 0]_i$$

// analogous for the remaining operators

$$\begin{aligned}
[\exists x_j. f]_{i-1} &= \text{fun } x_i \rightarrow \text{if } x_i \text{ then } [\exists x_j. f \ 1]_i \\
&\quad \text{else } [\exists x_j. f \ 0]_i \quad \text{if } i < j \\
[\exists x_j. f]_{j-1} &= [f \ 0 \vee f \ 1]_j
\end{aligned}$$

- Operations are executed bottom-up.
- Root nodes of already constructed sub-graphs are stored in a **unique-table**





Isomorphy can be tested in constant time !

- The operations thus are **polynomial** in the size of the input **BDDs** :-)

## Discussion:

- Originally, **BDDs** have been developed for circuit verification.
- Today, they are also applied to the verification of software ...
- A system state is encoded by a sequence of bits.
- A **BDD** then describes the **set** of all reachable system states.
- **Warning:** Repeated application of Boolean operations may increase the size dramatically !
- The variable ordering may have a dramatic impact ...

Example:  $(x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2) \wedge (x_3 \leftrightarrow x_4)$



## Discussion (2):

- In general, consider the function:

$$(x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2) \wedge \dots \wedge (x_{2n-1} \leftrightarrow x_{2n})$$

W.r.t. the variable ordering:

$$x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{2n}$$

the **BDD** has  $3n$  internal nodes.

W.r.t. the variable ordering:

$$x_1 < x_3 < \dots < x_{2n-1} < x_2 < x_4 < \dots < x_{2n}$$

the **BDD** has more than  $2^n$  internal nodes !!

- A similar result holds for the implementation of Addition through **BDDs**.

## Discussion (3):

- Not all Boolean functions have small BDDs :-)
  - Difficult functions:
    - multiplication;
    - indirect addressing ...
- ⇒ data-intensive programs cannot be analyzed in this way :-)

## Perspectives: Further Properties of Programs

**Freeness:** Is  $X_i$  possibly/always unbound ?



If  $X_i$  is always unbound, no indexing for  $X_i$  is required :-)

If  $X_i$  is never unbound, indexing for  $X_i$  is complete :-)

**Pair Sharing:** Are  $X_i, X_j$  possibly bound to terms  $t_i, t_j$  with

$$\text{Vars}(t_i) \cap \text{Vars}(t_j) \neq \emptyset \quad ?$$



Literals without sharing can be executed in parallel :-)

**Remark:**

Both analyses may profit from **Groundness !**



## 5.2 Types for Prolog

Example:

$\text{nat}(X) \leftarrow X = 0$

$\text{nat}(X) \leftarrow X = s(Y), \text{nat}(Y)$

$\text{nat\_list}(X) \leftarrow X = []$

$\text{nat\_list}(X) \leftarrow X = [H|T], \text{nat}(H), \text{nat\_list}(T)$

## Discussion

- In Prolog, a **type** is a set of ground terms with a **simple** description.
- There is no common agreement what **simple** means :-)
- One possibility are (non-deterministic) **finite tree automata** or **normal** Horn clauses:

<code>nat_list([H T])</code>	<code>←</code>	<code>nat(H), nat_list(T)</code>	normal
<code>bin(node(T, T))</code>	<code>←</code>	<code>bin(T)</code>	nicht normal
<code>tree(node(T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>))</code>	<code>←</code>	<code>tree(T<sub>1</sub>), tree(T<sub>2</sub>)</code>	normal

## Comparison:

Normal clauses	Tree automaton
unary predicate	state
normal clause	transition
constructor in the head	input symbol
body	pre-condition

## General Form:

$$p(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_1(X_1), \dots, p_k(X_k)$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow$$

## Properties:

- Types then are in fact **regular tree languages** ;-)
- Types are closed under intersection:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle p, q \rangle(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) &\leftarrow \langle p_1, q_1 \rangle(X_1), \dots, \langle p_k, q_k \rangle(X_k) && \text{if} \\ p(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) &\leftarrow p_1(X_1), \dots, p_k(X_k) && \text{and} \\ q(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) &\leftarrow q_1(X_1), \dots, q_k(X_k)\end{aligned}$$

- Types are also closed under union :-)
- Queries  $p(X)$  and  $p(t)$  can be decided in polynomial time **but:**
- ... only in presence of tabulation !
- Or the program is **topdown** deterministic ...

## Example: Topdown vs. Bottom-up

$$p(a(X_1, X_2)) \leftarrow p_1(X_1), p_2(X_2)$$


$$p(a(X_1, X_2)) \leftarrow p_2(X_1), p_1(X_2)$$

$$p_1(b) \leftarrow$$

$$p_2(c) \leftarrow$$

... is **bottom-up**, but not **topdown** deterministic.

There is no topdown deterministic program for this type !



Topdown deterministic types are closed under intersection, but not under union !!!

For a set  $T$  of terms, we define the set  $\Pi(T)$  of **paths** in terms from  $T$ :

$$\Pi(T) = \bigcup \{ \Pi(t) \mid t \in T \}$$

$$\Pi(b) = \{b\}$$

$$\Pi(a(t_1, \dots, t_k)) = \{a_j w \mid w \in \Pi(t_j)\} \quad (k > 0)$$

// for new unary constructors  $a_j$

## Example

$$T = \{a(b, c), a(c, b)\}$$

$$\Pi(T) = \{a_1 b, a_2 c, a_1 c, a_2 b\}$$

Vice versa from a set  $P$  of paths, a set  $\Pi^-(P)$  of terms can be recovered:

$$\Pi^-(P) = \{t \mid \Pi(t) \subseteq P\}$$

Example (Cont.):

$$P = \{a_1b, a_2c, a_1c, a_2b\}$$

$$\Pi^-(P) = \{a(b, b), a(b, c), a(c, b), a(c, c)\}$$

The set has become larger !!

## Theorem:

Assume that  $T$  is a regular set of terms. Then:

- $\Pi(T)$  is regular :-)
- $T \subseteq \Pi^{-}(\Pi(T))$  :-)
- $T = \Pi^{-}(\Pi(T))$  iff  $T$  is topdown deterministic :-)
- $\Pi^{-}(\Pi(T))$  is the **smallest** superset of  $T$  which is topdown deterministic. :-)

## Consequence:

If we are interested in topdown deterministic types, it suffices to determine the set of paths in terms !!!



## Example (Cont.):

$\text{add}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = 0, \text{nat}(Y), Y = Z$

$\text{add}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow \text{nat}(X), X = s(X'), Z = s(Z'), \text{add}(X', Y, Z')$

$\text{mult}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow X = 0, \text{nat}(Y), Z = 0$

$\text{mult}(X, Y, Z) \leftarrow \text{nat}(X), X = s(X'), \text{mult}(X', Y, Z'), \text{add}(Z', Y, Z)$

## Question:

Which run-time checks are necessary?

## Idea:

- Approximate the semantics of predicates by means of topdown-deterministic regular tree languages !
- **Alternatively:** Approximate the set of paths in the semantics of predicates by regular word languages !

## Idea:

- All predicates  $p/k, k > 0$ , are split into predicates  $p_1/1, \dots, p_k/1$ .

## Semantics:

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote a set of clauses.

The set  $\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the set of tuples of ground terms  $(s_1, \dots, s_k)$ , for which  $p(s_1, \dots, s_k)$  is provable  $\text{: -)}$

$\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  ( $p$  predicate) thus is the smallest collection of sets of tuples for which:

$$\sigma(\underline{t}) \in \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}} \quad \text{when ever} \quad \forall i. \sigma(\underline{t}_i) \in \llbracket p_i \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$$

for clauses  $p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow p_1(\underline{t}_1), \dots, p_n(\underline{t}_n) \in \mathcal{C}$  and ground substitutions  $\sigma$ .

## Approximation of Paths:

Every clause

$$p(t_1, \dots, t_k) \leftarrow \alpha$$

is approximated by the clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} p_j(w) &\leftarrow \bigwedge \Pi(\alpha) \quad \text{where} \\ \Pi(g_1, \dots, g_m) &= \Pi(g_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi(g_m) \\ \Pi(q(s_1, \dots, s_n)) &= \{q_i(w) \mid w \in \Pi(s_i)\} \end{aligned}$$

( $j = 1, \dots, k, w \in \Pi(t_j)$ ).

**Example:**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(0, Y, Y) &\leftarrow \text{nat}(Y) \\ \text{add}(s(X), Y, s(Z)) &\leftarrow \text{add}(X, Y, Z) \end{aligned}$$

yields:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

## Discussion:

- Every literal has at most one occurrence of a variable.
- The literals  $q_j(w_j Y)$  where the variable  $Y$  does not occur in the head, represent tests:

If there is a  $w$  with  $w_j w \in \llbracket q_j \rrbracket_{c\#}$  for all such  $j$ , then we can cancel these literals.

If there is no such  $w$ , then we can cancel the clause ...

## ... in the Example:

The literals:

$\text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \text{add}_3(Z)$

are all satisfiable :-)

We conclude:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \quad \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_2(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_3(Z)$$

We conclude:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \quad \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{add}_3(Z)$$



We verify:

## Theorem

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of clauses.

Let  $\mathcal{C}^\#$  denote the corresponding set of clauses for the paths.

Then for all predicates  $p/k$ :

$$\Pi(\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}^\#} \cup \dots \cup \llbracket p_k \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}^\#}$$

## Proof:

Induction on the approximations of the respective fixpoints :-)

A set of clauses with unary predicates and unary constructors is called **Alternating Pushdown System (APS)**.

## Theorem

- Every APS is equivalent to a **simple** APS of the form:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_r(X)$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow$$

- Every APS is equivalent to a normal APS of the form:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X)$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow$$

## Step 1: Removal of complicated heads:

For  $w = a^{(1)} \dots a^{(m)}$  ( $m > 1$ ) we replace

$$p(w X) \leftarrow rhs \quad \text{with:}$$

$$p(a^{(1)} X) \leftarrow p_2(X)$$

$$p_2(a^{(2)} X) \leftarrow p_3(X)$$

...

$$p_{m-1}(a^{(m-1)} X) \leftarrow p_m(X)$$

$$p_m(a^{(m)} X) \leftarrow rhs$$

//  $p_j$  all new

## Step 1 (Cont.): Removal of complicated heads:

For  $w = a^{(1)} \dots a^{(m)} b$  ( $m > 0$ ) we replace

$$\begin{aligned} p(w) &\leftarrow rhs && \text{with:} \\ p(a^{(1)} X) &\leftarrow p_2(X) \\ p_2(a^{(2)} X) &\leftarrow p_3(X) \\ &\dots \\ p_{m-1}(a^{(m-1)} X) &\leftarrow p_m(X) \\ p_m(a^{(m)} X) &\leftarrow p_{m+1}(X) \\ p_{m+1}(b) &\leftarrow rhs \\ &&& // \quad p_j \text{ all new} \end{aligned}$$

## Step 2: Splitting

We separate independent parts of pre-conditions into auxiliary predicates:

$$\begin{aligned} head &\leftarrow rest, p_1(w_1 X), \dots, p_m(w_m X) \\ &\quad (X \text{ does not occur in } head, rest) \end{aligned}$$

is replaced with:

$$\begin{aligned} head &\leftarrow rest, q() \\ q() &\leftarrow p_1(w_1 X), \dots, p_m(w_m X) \end{aligned}$$

for a new predicate  $q/0$ .

### Step 3: Normalization

We add simpler derived clauses:

$$head \leftarrow p(a w), rest$$

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_r(X)$$

implies:

$$head \leftarrow p_1(w), \dots, p_r(w), rest$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$$

$$p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$$

implies:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_{11}(X), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X)$$

### Step 3 (Cont.): Normalization

$head \leftarrow p(w), rest$

$p(X) \leftarrow$  implies:

$head \leftarrow rest$

$head \leftarrow p(b), rest$

$p(b) \leftarrow$  implies:

$head \leftarrow rest$

$p() \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$

$p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$

implies:

$p() \leftarrow p_{11}(X), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X)$

Example:

$$\text{add}_1(X) \leftarrow \text{add}_0(X)$$

$$\text{add}_0(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_1(X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

... results in the new clause:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$



## Theorem

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a finite set of clauses for which steps 1 and 2 have been executed and which then has been saturated according to step 3.

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is the subset of normal clauses of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then for all occurring predicates  $p$ ,

$$\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_0} = \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$$

## Proof:

Induction on the depth of terms in  $\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  :-)

... in the Example:

For  $\text{add}_1(X)$  we obtain the following clauses:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

These clauses are already normal :-)

## Transforming into Normal Clauses:

Introduce new predicates for **conjunctions** of predicates.

Assume that  $A = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ . Then:

$[A](b) \leftarrow$  whenever  $p_i(b) \leftarrow$  for all  $i$ .

$[A](a X) \leftarrow [B](X)$  whenever  $B = \{p_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$  for  
 $p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$

## Last Step: Transformation into a Type

- First, the automaton is determinized ...

## Last Step: Transformation into a Type

- First, the automaton is determinized ...
- Then transitions for the components of constructors  $a$ :

$$p(a_j X) \leftarrow p^{(j)}(X)$$

are joined into a transition for  $a$ :

$$p(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p^{(1)}(X_1), \dots, p^{(k)}(X_k)$$

- Finally, the predicates  $p_j$  for the components of the predicate  $p/k$  are joined to a transition:

$$p(X_1, \dots, X_k) \leftarrow p_1(X_1), \dots, p_k(X_k)$$

In the Example we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(X, Y, Z) &\leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{nat}(Y), q'(Z) && \text{where} \\ q'(0) &\leftarrow \\ q'(s X) &\leftarrow q'(X) \\ q' &= \{\text{nat}, \text{add}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

In the Example we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(X, Y, Z) &\leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{nat}(Y), q'(Z) && \text{where} \\ q'(0) &\leftarrow \\ q'(s X) &\leftarrow q'(X) \\ q' &= \{\text{nat}, \text{add}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

The types  $\text{add}_1, q', \text{nat}$  are all equivalent :-)

## Discussion:

- For type-checking, it suffices to check for every predicate  $p/k$  that

$$\llbracket p_i \rrbracket_{c^\#} \subseteq \Pi(T_i)$$

- Since the  $T_i$  are topdown deterministic, we have a deterministic automaton for  $\Pi(T_i)$  :-)
- Therefore, we can **easily** construct a DFA for the complement  $\overline{\Pi(T_i)}$  !!
- Then we check whether

$$\llbracket p_i \rrbracket_{c^\#} \cap \overline{\Pi(T_i)} = \emptyset$$

$\implies$  this saves us determinization :-))



## Warning:

- The emptiness problem for APS is DEXPTIME-complete !
- In many cases, though, our method terminates quickly ;-)

## Warning:

- The emptiness problem for APS is DEXPTIME-complete !
- In many cases, though, our method terminates quickly ;-)
  
- Inferred types can also be used to understand legacy code.
- Then, however, they are only useful if they are not too complicated !
- Our type inference provides very precise information :-)
- In practical applications, further widenings are applied to accelerate the analysis, e.g., by reducing the number of occurring sets.

## 5.3 Goal-directed Type Inference

Prolog programs explore predicates only insofar as they contribute to answer a query.

Example: `append`

```
app([], Y, Y) ←  
app([H|T], Y, [H|Z]) ← app(T, Y, Z)  
← app([1, 2], [3], Z)
```

... results in:

## The *APS*-Approximation

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]_1(H)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]_2(T)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_3([\ ]_1(H)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2(Z)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{app}_2(X) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{app}_3(X) \leftarrow$$

$$\leftarrow \text{app}_1([\ ]_1(1)), \text{app}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_1(2))), \text{app}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_2([\ ]))), \\ \text{app}_2([\ ]_1(3)), \text{app}_2([\ ]_2([\ ])), \text{app}_3(X)$$

Ignoring the query, we find via normalization:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app}_2(X) &\leftarrow \\ \text{app}_3(X) &\leftarrow \\ \text{app}_1([]) &\leftarrow \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_0(X) \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_1(X) \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_2(X) \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_1 X) &\leftarrow \\ q_0([]) &\leftarrow \\ q_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_0(X) \\ q_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_1(X) \\ q_1([[ ]_2 X) &\leftarrow q_2(X) \\ q_2([[ ]_1 X) &\leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

## Discussion

- The second and third argument can be arbitrary.
- The first argument is a list where nothing is known about the elements :-)
- Ignoring the query, this result is the best we can hope for :-)
- Better results can be obtained if additionally **call patterns** are tracked !

⇒ Magic Set Transformation

## Magic Sets

- For every predicate  $p/k$ , we introduce a new predicate  $\text{called}_p/k$  with the clauses

$$\text{called}_p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow \text{for the query } \leftarrow p(\underline{t})$$

- 

$$\text{called}_{p_i}(\underline{t}_i) \leftarrow \text{called}_p(\underline{t}), p_1(\underline{t}_1), \dots, p_{i-1}(\underline{t}_{i-1})$$

$$p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow \text{called}_p(\underline{t}), p_1(\underline{t}_1), \dots, p_m(\underline{t}_m)$$

for every clause:

$$p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow p_1(\underline{t}_1), \dots, p_m(\underline{t}_m)$$

## Example: `append` (Cont.)

`app([], Y, Y)` ← `called([], Y, Y)`

`app([H|T], Y, [H|Z])` ← `called([H|T], Y, [H|Z]),`  
`app(T, Y, Z)`

`called(T, Y, Z)` ← `called([H|T], Y, [H|Z])`

`called([1, 2], [3], Z)` ←



## The *APS*-Approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app}_1([]) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_2(X) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_3(X) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_1 H) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([[ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([[ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 T) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([[ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([[ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_2(Y) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([[ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([[ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_3([[ ]_1 H) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([[ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([[ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_3([[ ]_2 Z) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([[ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([[ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([[ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \end{aligned}$$

$\dots$   
 $\text{called}_1(T) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_3(Z) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_1 1) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_1 2)) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_2[\ ]_2[]) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_2([\ ]_1 3) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_2([\ ]_2[]) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_3(X) \leftarrow$

## The Normalized *APS*-Approximation (Cont.)

$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_1(X)$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_3(X)$	$q_4(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_0(X)$
$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_2(X)$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_0(X)$	$q_5(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_2(X)$
$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket)$	$\leftarrow$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_4(X)$	$q_6(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_3(X)$
$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_4(X)$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_6(X)$	$q_7(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_1(X)$
$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_0(X)$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_7(X)$	$q_7(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_2(X)$
$\text{app}_1(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_5(X)$	$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_8(X)$	$q_8(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_4(X)$
$\text{app}_2(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_3(X)$	$q_0(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket)$	$\leftarrow$	$q_8(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_7(X)$
$\text{app}_2(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_0(X)$	$q_1(1)$	$\leftarrow$	$q_8(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_8(X)$
$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_1(X)$	$q_2(2)$	$\leftarrow$	$q_8(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_2 X)$	$\leftarrow q_6(X)$
$\text{app}_3(\llbracket \_ \rrbracket_1 X)$	$\leftarrow q_2(X)$	$q_3(3)$	$\leftarrow$		

## Discussion


- The result now is amazingly precise !!
- The correct values for the second parameter is inferred.
- For the result parameter, a list containing 1,2 and 3 is inferred.
- It only fails to infer that this list is finite and of length 3 :-)

## Perspective: Normal Horn Clauses

- Prolog may no longer be the sexiest programming language :-)
- Horn clauses, though, are very well suited for the **specification** of **analysis problems**.
- It is a separate problem then to **solve** the stated analysis problem :-)
- If the least solution cannot be computed exactly, approximate solutions may at least yield approximative answers ...

**Example:** Cryptographic Protocols

## Rules for the Exchange of Messages:



## Properties to be verified:

secrecy, authenticity, ...

## The Dolev-Yao Model:

- Messages are terms:

	Representation
$\{m\}_k$	$\text{encrypt}(m, k)$
$\langle m_1, m_2 \rangle$	$\text{pair}(m_1, m_2)$

$\implies$  Distinct terms represent distinct messages  $\text{: -)}$

$\implies$  perfect cryptography. Therefore, we have:

$$\{m\}_k = \{m'\}_{k'} \text{ iff } m = m' \text{ and } k = k'$$

- The attacker has full control over the network:  
All messages are exchanged with the attacker.

## Example: The Needham-Schroeder Protocol

1.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{a, n_a\}_{k_b}$
2.  $B \longrightarrow A : \{n_a, n_b\}_{k_a}$
3.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{n_b\}_{k_b}$

## Abstraction:

- Unbounded number of sessions !!
- Nonces are not necessarily fresh ??



## Idea:

Characterize the knowledge of the attacker by means of Horn clauses ...

1.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{a, n_a\}_{k_b}$      $\text{known}(\{a, n_a\}_{k_b}) \leftarrow$
2.  $B \longrightarrow A : \{n_a, n_b\}_{k_a}$      $\text{known}(\{X, n_b\}_{k_a}) \leftarrow \text{known}(\{a, X\}_{k_b})$
3.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{n_b\}_{k_b}$      $\text{known}(\{X\}_{k_b}) \leftarrow \text{known}(\{n_a, X\}_{k_a})$

Secrecy of  $N_b$  :     $\leftarrow \text{known}(n_b)$ .

## Discussion:

- We have abstracted all nonces with finitely many.
- Less restrictive (though still correct) abstractions are still possible ...

1.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{a, n_a\}_{k_b} \dots$
2.  $B \longrightarrow A : \{n_a, n_b\}_{k_a} \text{ known}(\{X, n_b(X)\}_{k_a}) \leftarrow \text{known}(\{a, X\}_{k_b})$
3.  $A \longrightarrow B : \{n_b\}_{k_b} \dots$

The fresh nonce is a **function** of the received nonce :-)

Blanchet 2001

## Further capabilities of the attacker:

$\text{known}(\{X\}_Y) \leftarrow \text{known}(X), \text{known}(Y)$

// The attacker can encode

$\text{known}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \leftarrow \text{known}(X), \text{known}(Y)$

// The attacker can construct pairs

$\text{known}(X) \leftarrow \text{known}(\{X\}_Y), \text{known}(Y)$

// The attacker can decode

$\text{known}(X) \leftarrow \text{known}(\langle X, Y \rangle)$

$\text{known}(Y) \leftarrow \text{known}(\langle X, Y \rangle)$

// The attacker can project

## Discussion

- Type inference for Prolog computed a regular abstraction of the set of paths of the denotational semantics.
- Sometimes, this is too imprecise :-(  
:-)
- Instead, we now approximate the denotational semantics directly :-)
- This, however, can be quite expensive
  - ⇒ not well suited for compilers :-(  
⇒ in general, much more precise :-)

## Simplification:

We only consider clauses whose heads are of the form:

$$p(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \quad \text{or} \quad p(b) \quad \text{or} \quad p(X_1, \dots, X_k)$$

Such clauses are called **H1**.

## Theorem

- Every finite set of H1-clauses is equivalent to a finite set of **simple** H1-clauses of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} p(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) &\leftarrow p_1(X_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(X_{i_1}) \\ p(X_1, \dots, X_k) &\leftarrow p_1(X_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(X_{i_1}) \\ p(b) &\leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

- ... or even to a finite set of **normal** H1-clauses.

## Idea:

We successively introduce simpler clauses until the complicated ones become **superfluous** ...

## Rule 1: Splitting

We separate independent parts from the pre-conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} head &\leftarrow rest, p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X) \\ &\quad (X \text{ does not occur in } head, rest) \end{aligned}$$

is replaced with:

$$\begin{aligned} head &\leftarrow rest, q() \\ q() &\leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X) \end{aligned}$$

for a new predicate  $q/0$ .

## Rule 2: Simplification

We introduce simpler derived clauses:

$$\textit{head} \leftarrow p(f(t_1, \dots, t_k)), \textit{rest}$$

$$p(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_1(X_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(X_{i_r})$$

implies:

$$\textit{head} \leftarrow p_1(t_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(t_{i_r}), \textit{rest}$$

$$\textit{head} \leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_k), \textit{rest}$$

$$p(X_1, \dots, X_k) \leftarrow p_1(X_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(X_{i_r})$$

implies:

$$\textit{head} \leftarrow p_1(t_{i_1}), \dots, p_r(t_{i_r}), \textit{rest}$$

## Rule 3 (Cont.): Simplification

$$p(X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$$

$$p_i(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X_{i1}), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X_{ir_i})$$

implies:

$$p(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_{11}(X_{11}), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X_{mr_m})$$

$$head \leftarrow p(b), rest$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow \text{implies:}$$

$$head \leftarrow rest$$



## Rule 4: Guard Simplification

$$p() \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$$

$$p_i(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X_{i1}), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X_{ir_i})$$

implies:

$$p() \leftarrow p_{11}(X_{11}), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X_{mr_m})$$

$$p() \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$$

$$p_i(b) \leftarrow \text{implies:}$$

$$p() \leftarrow$$

## Theorem

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a finite set of clauses which is closed under splitting and simplification and guard simplification.

Let  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  denote the subset of simple clauses of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then for all occurring predicates  $p$ ,

$$\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_0} = \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$$

## Proof:

Induction on the depth of terms in tuples of  $\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  :-)

## Transformation into normal clauses:

Introduce fresh predicates for **conjunctions** of unary predicates.

Assume  $A = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ . Then:

$[A](b) \leftarrow$  whenever  $p_i(b) \leftarrow$  for all  $i$ .

$[A](f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow [B_1](X_1), \dots, [B_k](X_k)$

whenever  $B_i = \{p_{jl} \mid X_{i_{jl}} = X_i\}$  for

$p_j(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p_{j1}(X_{i_{j1}}), \dots, p_{jr_j}(X_{i_{jr_j}})$

## Warning:

- The emptiness problem for Horn clauses in **H1** is **DEXPTIME-complete !**
- In many cases, our method still terminates quickly ;-)
  
- Not all Horn clauses are in H1 :-(  
     $\implies$  an approximation technique is required ...

# Approximation of Horn Clauses

## Step 1:

Simplification of pre-conditions by splitting, simplification and guard simplification (as before :-)

## Step 2:

Introduction of copies of variables  $X$ . Every copy receives all literals of  $X$  as pre-condition.

$$p(f(X, X)) \leftarrow q(X) \quad \text{yields :}$$

$$p(f(X, X')) \leftarrow q(X), q(X')$$

### Step 3:

Introduction of an auxiliary predicate for every non-variable subterm of the head.

$$p(f(g(X, Y), Z)) \leftarrow q_1(X), q_2(Y), q_3(Z) \quad \text{yields :}$$

$$p_1(g(X, Y)) \leftarrow q_1(X), q_2(Y), q_3(Z)$$

$$p(f(H, Z)) \leftarrow p_1(H), q_1(X), q_2(Y), q_3(Z)$$