**Reading Assignment**

- Read pages 31–62 of "Automatic Program Optimization," by Ron Cytron. (Linked from the class Web page.)

**Depth-First Spanning Trees**

Sometimes we want to "cover" the nodes of a control flow graph with an acyclic structure.

This allows us to visit nodes once, without worrying about cycles or infinite loops.

Also, a careful visitation order can approximate forward control flow (very useful in solving forward data flow problems).

A Depth–First Spanning Tree (DFST) is a tree structure that covers the nodes of a control flow graph, with the start node serving as root of the DFST.

**Building a DFST**

We will visit CFG nodes in depth–first order, keeping arcs if the visited node hasn't be reached before.

To create a DFST, T, from a CFG, G:

1. T ← empty tree
2. Mark all nodes in G as "unvisited."
3. Call DF(start node)

DF (node) {
    1. Mark node as visited.
    2. For each successor, s, of node in G:
        If s is unvisited
            (a) Add node → s to T
            (b) Call DF(s)

**Example**

Visit order is A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J, F
Categorizing Arcs using a DFST

Arcs in a CFG can be categorized by examining the corresponding DFST.

An arc $A \rightarrow B$ in a CFG is

(a) An *Advancing Edge* if $B$ is a proper descendant of $A$ in the DFST.

(b) A *Retreating Edge* if $B$ is an ancestor of $A$ in the DFST. (This includes the $A \rightarrow A$ case.)

(c) A *Cross Edge* if $B$ is neither a descendant nor an ancestor of $A$ in the DFST.

Depth-First Order

Once we have a DFST, we can label nodes with a *Depth-First Ordering* (DFO).

Let $i$ = the number of nodes in a CFG (= the number of nodes in its DFST).

DFO(node) {
  For (each successor s of node) do
    DFO(s);
  Mark node with i;
  i--;
}
**Example**

The number of nodes = 10.

```
1  A
  2  B
  3  C
  4  D
  6  E
  5  F
  7  G
  8  H
 10 I
  9  J
```

**Application of Depth-First Ordering**

- Retreating edges (a necessary component of loops) are easy to identify:
  \[ a \rightarrow b \text{ is a retreating edge if and only if } dfo(b) \leq dfo(a) \]

- A depth-first ordering is an excellent visit order for solving forward data flow problems. We want to visit nodes in essentially topological order, so that all predecessors of a node are visited (and evaluated) before the node itself is.

**Dominators**

A CFG node M *dominates* N \((M \text{ dom } N)\) if and only if all paths from the start node to N *must* pass through M.

A node trivially dominates itself. Thus \((N \text{ dom } N)\) is always true.

A CFG node M *strictly dominates* N \((M \text{ sdom } N)\) if and only if \((M \text{ dom } N)\) and \(M \neq N\).

A node can’t strictly dominates itself. Thus \((N \text{ sdom } N)\) is never true.

A CFG node may have many dominators.

```
A
  B
  C
  D
  E
  F
```

Node F is dominated by F, E, D and A.
**Immediate Dominators**

If a CFG node has more than one dominator (which is common), there is always a unique “closest” dominator called its immediate dominator.

\[(M \text{ idom } N) \text{ if and only if } (M \text{ sdom } N) \text{ and } (P \text{ sdom } N) \Rightarrow (P \text{ dom } M)\]

To see that an immediate dominator always exists (except for the start node) and is unique, assume that node \(N\) is strictly dominated by \(M_1, M_2, ..., M_p, P \geq 2\).

By definition, \(M_1, ..., M_p\) must appear on all paths to \(N\), including acyclic paths.

**Dominator Trees**

Using immediate dominators, we can create a dominator tree in which \(A \rightarrow B\) in the dominator tree if and only if \((A \text{ idom } B)\).

![Control Flow Graph](image1)

![Dominator Tree](image2)

Note that the Dominator Tree of a CFG and its DFST are distinct trees (though they have the same nodes).

![Depth-First Spanning Tree](image3)
A Dominator Tree is a compact and convenient representation of both the dom and idom relations. A node in a Dominator Tree dominates all its descendents in the tree, and immediately dominates all its children.

**Computing Dominators**

Dominators can be computed as a Set-valued Forward Data Flow Problem. If a node N dominates all of node M’s predecessors, then N appears on all paths to M. Hence \( (N \text{ dom } M) \).

Similarly, if M doesn’t dominate all of M’s predecessors, then there is a path to M that doesn’t include M. Hence \( \neg(N \text{ dom } M) \).

These observations give us a “data flow equation” for dominator sets:

\[
\text{dom}(N) = \{N\} \cup \bigcap_{M \in \text{Pred}(N)} \text{dom}(M)
\]

The analysis domain is the lattice of all subsets of nodes. Top is the set of all nodes; bottom is the empty set. The ordering relation is subset.

The meet operation is intersection.

The Initial Condition is that

\[
\text{DomIn}(b_0) = \emptyset
\]

\[
\text{DomIn}(b) = \bigcap_{c \in \text{Pred}(b)} \text{DomOut}(c)
\]

\[
\text{DomOut}(b) = \text{DomIn}(b) \cup \{b\}
\]

**Loops Require Care**

Loops in the Control Flow Graph induce circularities in the Data Flow equations for Dominators. In

\[
\text{DomOut}(B) = \text{DomOut}(B) \cup \text{DomOut}(A)
\]

we have the rule \( \text{dom}(B) = \text{DomOut}(B) = \{B\} \cup (\text{DomOut}(B) \cap \text{DomOut}(A)) \).

If we choose \( \text{DomOut}(B) = \emptyset \) initially, we get

\[
\text{DomOut}(B) = \{B\} \cup (\emptyset \cap \text{DomOut}(A)) = \{B\}
\]

which is *wrong*. 
Instead, we should use the Universal Set (of all nodes) which is the *identity* for \( \cap \).

Then we get \( \text{DomOut}(B) = \{B\} \cup (\{\text{all nodes}\} \cap \text{DomOut}(A)) = \{B\} \cup \text{DomOut}(A) \) which is correct.

---

**A Worklist Algorithm for Dominators**

The data flow equations we have developed for dominators can be evaluated using a simple Worklist Algorithm.

Initially, each node's dominator set is set to the set of all nodes. We add the start node to our worklist.

For each node on the worklist, we reevaluate its dominator set. If the set changes, the updated dominator set is used, and all the node's successors are added to the worklist (so that the updated dominator set can be propagated).

---

The algorithm terminates when the worklist becomes empty, indicating that a stable solution has been found.

Compute Dominators()

For (each \( n \in \text{NodeSet} \))

\( \text{Dom}(n) = \text{NodeSet} \)

\( \text{WorkList} = \{\text{StartNode}\} \)

While (WorkList \( \neq \phi \))

Remove any node \( Y \) from WorkList

\( \text{New} = \{Y\} \cup \text{Dom}(X) \)

\( X \in \text{Pred}(Y) \)

If New \( \neq \text{Dom}(Y) \) {

\( \text{Dom}(Y) = \text{New} \)

For (each \( Z \in \text{Succ}(Y) \))

\( \text{WorkList} = \text{WorkList} \cup \{Z\} \)

}\}

---

**Example**

Initially the WorkList = \{Start\}.

Be careful when \( \text{Pred(Node)} = \phi \).
**Postdominance**

A block Z postdominates a block Y (Z pdom Y) if and only if all paths from Y to an exit block must pass through Z. Notions of immediate postdominance and a postdominator tree carry over.

Note that if a CFG has a single exit node, then postdominance is equivalent to dominance if flow is reversed (going from the exit node to the start node).

**Dominance Frontiers**

Dominators and postdominators tell us which basic block must be executed prior to, or after, a block N.

It is interesting to consider blocks "just before" or "just after" blocks we're dominated by, or blocks we dominate.

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

The dominance frontier of N is the set of blocks that are not dominated N and which are "first reached" on paths from N.

**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance Frontier</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>{F}</td>
<td>{E}</td>
<td>{E}</td>
<td>{F}</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A block can be in its own Dominance Frontier:

Here, DF(A) = \{A\}

Why? Reconsider the definition:

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

Now B is dominated by A and B→A. Moreover, A does not strictly dominate itself. So, it meets the definition.