

## CS 701 Final Exam

Tuesday, December 18, 10 a.m.—noon,  
1325 Computer Sciences Bldg.

## Guest Lecture

Thursday, December 6,  
Professor Ras Bodik,  
“Path Sensitive Value-Flow  
Optimizations”

## Constant Propagation in SSA

In SSA form, constant propagation is simplified since values flow directly from assignments to uses, and phi functions represent natural “meet points” where values are combined (into a constant or  $\perp$ ).

Even conditional constant propagation fits in. As long as a path is considered unreachable, its variables are set to T (and therefore ignored at phi functions, which meet values together).

## Example

```

i=6          i1=6
j=1          j1=1
k=1          k1=1
repeat
  if (i==6)
    k=0
  else
    i=i+1
  i=i+k
  j=j+1
until (i==j)

repeat
  i2=φ(i1,i5)
  j2=φ(j1,j3)
  k2=φ(k1,k4)
  if (i2==6)
    k3=0
  else
    i3=i2+1
  i4=φ(i2,i3)
  k4=φ(k3,k2)
  i5=i4+k4
  j3=j2+1
until (i5==j3)
    
```

|       | i <sub>1</sub> | j <sub>1</sub> | k <sub>1</sub> | i <sub>2</sub> | j <sub>2</sub> | k <sub>2</sub> | k <sub>3</sub> | i <sub>3</sub> | i <sub>4</sub> | k <sub>4</sub> | i <sub>5</sub> | j <sub>3</sub> |
|-------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Pass1 | 6              | 1              | 1              | 6∧T            | 1∧T            | 1∧T            | 0              | T              | 6∧T            | 0              | 6              | 2              |
| Pass2 | 6              | 1              | 1              | 6∧6            | ⊥              | ⊥              | 0              | T              | 6              | 0              | 6              | ⊥              |

We have determined that  $i=6$  everywhere.

## Putting Programs into SSA Form

Assume we have the CFG for a program, which we want to put into SSA form. We must:

- Rename all definitions and uses of variables
- Decide where to add phi functions

Renaming variable definitions is trivial—each assignment is to a new, unique variable.

After phi functions are added (at the heads of selected basic blocks), only one variable definition (the most recent in the block) can reach any use. Thus renaming uses of variables is easy.

## Placing Phi Functions

Let  $b$  be a block with a definition to some variable,  $v$ . If  $b$  contains more than one definition to  $v$ , the last (or most recent) applies.

What is the first basic block following  $b$  where some other definition to  $v$  as well as  $b$ 's definition can reach?

In blocks dominated by  $b$ ,  $b$ 's definition *must* have been executed, though other later definitions may have overwritten  $b$ 's definition.

## Domination Frontiers (Again)

Recall that the Domination Frontier of a block  $b$ , is defined as

$$DF(N) = \{Z \mid M \rightarrow Z \ \& \ (N \text{ dom } M) \ \& \ \neg(N \text{ sdom } Z)\}$$

The Dominance Frontier of a basic block  $N$ ,  $DF(N)$ , is the set of all blocks that are immediate successors to blocks dominated by  $N$ , but which aren't themselves strictly dominated by  $N$ .

Assume that an initial assignment to all variables occurs in  $b_0$  (possibly of some special "uninitialized value.")

We will need to place a phi function at the start of all blocks in  $b$ 's Domination Frontier.


The phi functions will join the definition to  $v$  that occurred in  $b$  (or in a block dominated by  $v$ ) with definitions occurring on paths that don't include  $b$ .

After phi functions are added to blocks in  $DF(b)$ , the domination frontier of blocks with newly added phi's will need to be computed (since phi functions imply assignment to a new  $v_i$  variable).

## Examples of How Domination Frontiers Guide Phi Placement


$$DF(N) = \{Z \mid M \rightarrow Z \ \& \ (N \text{ dom } M) \ \& \ \neg(N \text{ sdom } Z)\}$$

Simple Case:



Here,  $(N \text{ dom } M)$  but  $\neg(N \text{ sdom } Z)$ , so a phi function is needed in  $Z$ .


## Loop:



Here, let  $M = Z = N$ .  $M \rightarrow Z$ ,  
 $(N \text{ dom } M)$  but  $\neg(N \text{ sdom } Z)$ ,  
 so a phi function *is* needed in  $Z$ .

$DF(N) =$   
 $\{Z \mid M \rightarrow Z \ \& \ (N \text{ dom } M) \ \& \ \neg(N \text{ sdom } Z)\}$

## Sometimes Phi's must be Placed Iteratively



Now,  $DF(b1) = \{b3\}$ , so we add a phi function in  $b3$ . This adds an assignment into  $b3$ . We then look at  $DF(b3) = \{b5\}$ , so another phi function must be added to  $b5$ .


## Phi Placement Algorithm

To decide what blocks require a phi function to join a definition to a variable  $v$  in block  $b$ :

1. Compute  $D_1 = DF(b)$ .  
Place Phi functions at the head of all members of  $D_1$ .
2. Compute  $D_2 = DF(D_1)$ .  
Place Phi functions at the head of all members of  $D_2 - D_1$ .
3. Compute  $D_3 = DF(D_2)$ .  
Place Phi functions at the head of all members of  $D_3 - D_2 - D_1$ .
4. Repeat until no additional Phi functions can be added.

```
PlacePhi{
  For (each variable v ∈ program) {
    For (each block b ∈ CFG) {
      PhiInserted(b) = false
      Added(b) = false }
    List = ∅
    For (each b ∈ CFG that assigns to v) {
      Added(b) = true
      List = List U {b} }
    While (List ≠ ∅) {
      Remove any b from List
      For (each d ∈ DF(b)) {
        If (! PhiInserted(d)) {
          Add a Phi Function to d
          PhiInserted(d) = true
          If (! Added(d)) {
            Added(d) = true
            List = List U {d}
          }
        }
      }
    }
  }
}
```

## Example



Initially, List={1,3,5,6}

Process 1:  $DF(1) = \phi$

Process 3:  $DF(3) = 4$ ,  
so add 4 to List and  
add phi fct to 4.


Process 5:  $DF(5) = \{4,5\}$   
so add phi fct to 5.

Process 5:  $DF(6) = \{5\}$

Process 4:  $DF(4) = \{4\}$

We will add Phi's into blocks 4 and 5.  
The arity of each phi is the number of

in-arcs to its block. To find the args  
to a phi, follow each arc "backwards"  
to the sole reaching def on that path.



## SSA and Value Numbering

We already know how to do available  
expression analysis to determine if a  
previous computation of an  
expression can be reused.

A limitation of this analysis is that it  
can't recognize that two expressions  
that aren't syntactically identical may  
actually still be equivalent.

For example, given

$$t1 = a + b$$

$$c = a$$

$$t2 = c + b$$

Available expression analysis won't  
recognize that  $t1$  and  $t2$  must be  
equivalent, since it doesn't track the  
fact that  $a = c$  at  $t2$ .

## Value Numbering

An early expression analysis technique called *value numbering* worked only at the level of basic blocks. The analysis was in terms of “values” rather than variable or temporary names.

Each non-trivial (non-copy) computation is given a number, called its *value number*.

Two expressions, using the same operators and operands with the same value numbers, must be equivalent.

For example,

$$t1 = a + b$$

$$c = a$$

$$t2 = c + b$$

is analyzed as

$$v1 = a$$

$$v2 = b$$

$$t1 = v1 + v2$$

$$c = v1$$

$$t2 = v1 + v2$$

Clearly  $t2$  is equivalent to  $t1$  (and hence need not be computed).

In contrast, given

$$t1 = a + b$$

$$a = 2$$

$$t2 = a + b$$

the analysis creates

$$v1 = a$$

$$v2 = b$$

$$t1 = v1 + v2$$

$$v3 = 2$$

$$t2 = v3 + v2$$

Clearly  $t2$  is not equivalent to  $t1$  (and hence will need to be recomputed).

## Extending Value Numbering to Entire CFGs

The problem with a global version of value numbering is how to reconcile values produced on different flow paths. But this is exactly what SSA is designed to do!

In particular, we know that an ordinary assignment

$$x = y$$

does *not* imply that all references to  $x$  can be replaced by  $y$  after the assignment. That is, an assignment *is not* an assertion of value equivalence.

But,  
in SSA form

$$x_i = y_j$$

does mean the two values are *always* equivalent after the assignment. If  $y_j$  reaches a use of  $x_i$ , that use of  $x_i$  can be replaced with  $y_j$ .

Thus in SSA form, an assignment is an assertion of value equivalence.

We will assume that simple variable to variable copies are removed by substituting equivalent SSA names.

This alone is enough to recognize some simple value equivalences.

As we saw,

$$t_1 = a_1 + b_1$$

$$c_1 = a_1$$

$$t_2 = c_1 + b_1$$

becomes

$$t_1 = a_1 + b_1$$

$$t_2 = a_1 + b_1$$

## Partitioning SSA Variables

Initially, all SSA variables will be partitioned by the *form* of the expression assigned to them.

Expressions involving different constants or operators won't (in general) be equivalent, even if their operands happen to be equivalent.

Thus

$$v_1 = 2 \text{ and } w_1 = a_2 + 1$$

are always considered inequivalent.

But,

$$v_3 = a_1 + b_2 \text{ and } w_1 = d_1 + e_2$$

may *possibly* be equivalent since both involve the same operator.

Phi functions are potentially equivalent only if they are in the same basic block.

All variables are initially considered equivalent (since they all initially are considered uninitialized until explicit initialization).

After SSA variables are grouped by assignment form, groups are split.

If  $a_i \text{ op } b_j$  and  $c_k \text{ op } d_l$

are in the same group (because they both have the same operator,  $\text{op}$ ) and  $a_i \neq c_k$  or  $b_j \neq d_l$

then we split the two expressions apart into different groups.

We continue splitting based on operand inequivalence, until no more splits are possible. Values still grouped are equivalent.

## Example

```

if (...) {
  a1=0
  if (...)
    b1=0
  else {
    a2=x0
    b2=x0 }
  a3=φ(a1, a2)
  b3=φ(b1, b2)
  c2=*a3
  d2=*b3 }
else {
  b4=10 }
a5=φ(a0, a3)
b5=φ(b3, b4)
c3=*a5
d3=*b5
e3=*a5

```

Initial Groupings:

```

G1=[a0, b0, c0, d0, e0, x0]
G2=[a1=0, b1=0]
G3=[a2=x0, b2=x0]
G4=[b4=10]
G5=[a3=φ(a1, a2),
      b3=φ(b1, b2)]
G6=[a5=φ(a0, a3),
      b5=φ(b3, b4)]
G7=[c2=*a3,
      d2=*b3,
      d3=*b5,
      c3=*a5,
      e3=*a5]

```

Now  $b_4$  isn't equivalent to anything, so split  $a_5$  and  $b_5$ . In  $G_7$  split operands  $b_3$ ,  $a_5$  and  $b_5$ . We now have

```

if (...) {
  a1=0
  if (...)
    b1=0
  else {
    a2=x0
    b2=x0 }
  a3=φ(a1, a2)
  b3=φ(b1, b2)
  c2=*a3
  d2=*b3 }
else {
  b4=10 }
a5=φ(a0, a3)
b5=φ(b3, b4)
c3=*a5
d3=*b5
e3=*a5

```

Final Groupings:

```

G1=[a0, b0, c0, d0, e0, x0]
G2=[a1=0, b1=0]
G3=[a2=x0, b2=x0]
G4=[b4=10]
G5=[a3=φ(a1, a2),
      b3=φ(b1, b2)]
G6a=[a5=φ(a0, a3)]
G6b=[b5=φ(b3, b4)]
G7a=[c2=*a3,
      d2=*b3]
G7b=[d3=*b5]
G7c=[c3=*a5,
      e3=*a5]


```

Variable  $e_3$  can use  $c_3$ 's value and  $d_2$  can use  $c_2$ 's value.

## Limitations of Global Value Numbering

As presented, our global value numbering technique doesn't recognize (or handle) computations of the same expression that produce different values along different paths.


Thus in



variable  $a_3$  isn't equivalent to either  $a_1$  or  $a_2$ .


*But,*

we can still remove a redundant computation of  $a+b$  by moving the computation of  $t_3$  to each of its predecessors:




Now a redundant computation of  $a+b$  is evident in each predecessor block. Note too that this has a nice register targeting effect— $e_1$ ,  $e_2$  and  $e_3$  can be readily mapped to the same live range.

The notion of moving expression computations above phi functions also meshes nicely with notion of partial redundancy elimination. Given



moving  $a+b$  above the phi produces



Now  $a+b$  is computed only once on each path, an improvement.