

COS320: Compiling Techniques

Zak Kincaid

April 16, 2019

Generic (forward) dataflow analysis algorithm

- Given:
 - Abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$
 - Transfer function
 $post_{\mathcal{L}} : \text{Basic Block} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$
 - Control flow graph $G = (N, E, s)$
- Compute: *least* function f such that
 - 1 $f(s) = \top$
 - 2 For all $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

Generic (forward) dataflow analysis algorithm

- Given:
 - Abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$
 - Transfer function
 $post_{\mathcal{L}} : \text{Basic Block} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$
 - Control flow graph $G = (N, E, s)$
- Compute: *least* function f such that
 - $f(s) = \top$
 - For all $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

```
 $f(s) \leftarrow \top;$   
 $f(n) = \perp$  for all other nodes;  
 $work \leftarrow N \setminus \{s\};$   
while  $work \neq \emptyset$  do  
    Pick some  $n$  from  $work$ ;  
     $work \leftarrow work \setminus \{n\};$   
     $v \leftarrow \bigsqcup_{p \in pred(n)} post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p));$   
    if  $v \neq f(n)$  then  
         $f(n) \leftarrow v;$   
         $work \leftarrow work \cup succ(n)$ 
```

Generic (forward) dataflow analysis algorithm

- Given:
 - Abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$
 - Transfer function
 $post_{\mathcal{L}} : \text{Basic Block} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$
 - Control flow graph $G = (N, E, s)$
- Compute: least function f such that
 - $f(s) = \top$
 - For all $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

```
 $f(s) \leftarrow \top;$   
 $f(n) = \perp$  for all other nodes;  
 $work \leftarrow N \setminus \{s\};$   
while  $work \neq \emptyset$  do  
    Pick some  $n$  from  $work$ ;  
     $work \leftarrow work \setminus \{n\};$   
     $v \leftarrow \bigsqcup_{p \in pred(n)} post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p));$   
    if  $v \neq f(n)$  then  
         $f(n) \leftarrow v;$   
         $work \leftarrow work \cup succ(n)$ 
```

Invariants:

- $work$ contains all $n \in N$ that may violate their constraints ($post(p, f(p)) \not\sqsubseteq f(n)$ for some $p \rightarrow n \in E$)
- Use f_i to denote f on the i th iteration and f^* to denote least solution to the constraint system. Then for all n , $f_i(n) \sqsubseteq f^*(n)$.

Generic (forward) dataflow analysis algorithm

- Given:
 - Abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$
 - Transfer function
 $post_{\mathcal{L}} : \text{Basic Block} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$
 - Control flow graph $G = (N, E, s)$
- Compute: least function f such that
 - $f(s) = \top$
 - For all $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

```
f(s) ← ⊤;
f(n) = ⊥ for all other nodes;
work ← N \ {s};
while work ≠ ∅ do
    Pick some n from work;
    work ← work \ {n};
    v ← ⋂p ∈ pred(n) postℒ(p, f(p));
    if v ≠ f(n) then
        f(n) ← v;
        work ← work ∪ succ(n)
```

Invariants:

- $work$ contains all $n \in N$ that may violate their constraints ($post(p, f(p)) \not\sqsubseteq f(n)$ for some $p \rightarrow n \in E$)
- Use f_i to denote f on the i th iteration and f^* to denote least solution to the constraint system. Then for all n , $f_i(n) \sqsubseteq f^*(n)$.

Termination:

- Why does this algorithm terminate?

Generic (forward) dataflow analysis algorithm

- Given:

- Abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$
- Transfer function
 $post_{\mathcal{L}} : \text{Basic Block} \times \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$
- Control flow graph $G = (N, E, s)$

- Compute: *least* function f such that

- 1 $f(s) = \top$
- 2 For all $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

```
f(s) ← ⊤;
f(n) = ⊥ for all other nodes;
work ← N \ {s};
while work ≠ ∅ do
    Pick some n from work;
    work ← work \ {n};
    v ← ⋃p ∈ pred(n) postℒ(p, f(p));
    if v ≠ f(n) then
        f(n) ← v;
        work ← work ∪ succ(n)
```

Invariants:

- $work$ contains all $n \in N$ that may violate their constraints ($post(p, f(p)) \not\sqsubseteq f(n)$ for some $p \rightarrow n \in E$)
- Use f_i to denote f on the i th iteration and f^* to denote least solution to the constraint system. Then for all n , $f_i(n) \sqsubseteq f^*(n)$.

Termination:

- Why does this algorithm terminate?
- Ascending chain condition \Rightarrow for each n , $f_1(n) \sqsubseteq f_2(n) \sqsubseteq f_3(n) \sqsubseteq \dots$ must eventually stabilize

Coincidence

- We had two specifications for available expressions
 - **Global:** $e \in \text{ae}(n)$ iff for every path from s to n in G :
 - 1 the expression e is evaluated along the path
 - 2 after the *last* evaluation of e along the path, no variables in e are overwritten
 - **Local:** ae is the *smallest* function such that
 - $\text{ae}(s) = \emptyset$
 - For each $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $\text{post}_{\text{AE}}(p, \text{ae}(p)) \supseteq \text{ae}(n)$
- *Why are these specifications the same?*

Coincidence

- We had two specifications for available expressions
 - **Global:** $e \in ae(n)$ iff for every path from s to n in G :
 - 1 the expression e is evaluated along the path
 - 2 after the *last* evaluation of e along the path, no variables in e are overwritten
 - **Local:** ae is the *smallest* function such that
 - $ae(s) = \emptyset$
 - For each $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{AE}(p, ae(p)) \supseteq ae(n)$
- *Why are these specifications the same?*
- **Coincidence theorem** (Kildall, Kam & Ullman): for any abstract domain $(\mathcal{L}, \sqsubseteq, \sqcup, \perp, \top)$ and **distributive** transfer function $post_{\mathcal{L}}$, the least solution f to the constraint system

- 1 $f(s) \sqsupseteq \top$
- 2 For each $p \rightarrow n \in E$, $post_{\mathcal{L}}(p, f(p)) \sqsubseteq f(n)$

coincides with the function $g(n) = \bigsqcup_{\pi \in Path(s, n)} post_{\mathcal{L}}(\pi, \top)$, where $post_{\mathcal{L}}$ is extended to paths by

taking

$$post_{\mathcal{L}}(n_1 n_2 \dots n_k, \top) = post_{\mathcal{L}}(n_{k-1}, \dots, post_{\mathcal{L}}(n_1, \top))$$

Gen/kill analyses

- Suppose we have a finite set of data flow “facts”
- Elements of the abstract domain are *sets* of facts
- For each basic block n , associate a set of *generated* facts $gen(n)$ and *killed* facts $kill(n)$
- Define $post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, F) = (F \setminus kill(n)) \cup gen(n)$.

Gen/kill analyses

- Suppose we have a finite set of data flow “facts”
- Elements of the abstract domain are *sets* of facts
- For each basic block n , associate a set of *generated* facts $gen(n)$ and *killed* facts $kill(n)$
- Define $post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, F) = (F \setminus kill(n)) \cup gen(n)$.
- The *order* on sets of facts may be \subseteq or \supseteq
 - \subseteq used for *existential* analyses: a fact holds at n if it holds along *some* path to n
 - E.g., a variable is possibly-uninitialized at n if it is possibly-uninitialized along some path to n .
 - \supseteq used for *universal* analyses: a fact holds at n if it holds along *all* paths to n
 - E.g., an expression is available at n if it is available along all paths to n

Gen/kill analyses

- Suppose we have a finite set of data flow “facts”
- Elements of the abstract domain are *sets* of facts
- For each basic block n , associate a set of *generated* facts $gen(n)$ and *killed* facts $kill(n)$
- Define $post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, F) = (F \setminus kill(n)) \cup gen(n)$.
- The *order* on sets of facts may be \subseteq or \supseteq
 - \subseteq used for *existential* analyses: a fact holds at n if it holds along *some* path to n
 - E.g., a variable is possibly-uninitialized at n if it is possibly-uninitialized along some path to n .
 - \supseteq used for *universal* analyses: a fact holds at n if it holds along *all* paths to n
 - E.g., an expression is available at n if it is available along all paths to n
- In either case $post_{\mathcal{L}}$ is monotone and distributive

$$\begin{aligned} post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, F \cup G) &= ((F \cup G) \setminus kill(n)) \cup gen(n) \\ &= ((F \setminus kill(n)) \cup (G \setminus kill(n))) \cup gen(n) \\ &= ((F \setminus kill(n)) \cup gen(n)) \cup (((G \setminus kill(n))) \cup gen(n)) \\ &= post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, F) \cup post_{\mathcal{L}}(n, G) \end{aligned}$$

Possibly-uninitialized variables analysis

- A variable x is **possibly-uninitialized** at a location n if there is some path from start to n along which x is never written to.
- If n uses an uninitialized variable, that could indicate undefined behavior
 - Can catch these errors at compile time using possibly-uninitialized variable analysis
 - E.g. javac does this by default
- Possibly-uninitialized variables as a dataflow analysis problem:

Possibly-uninitialized variables analysis

- A variable x is **possibly-uninitialized** at a location n if there is some path from start to n along which x is never written to.
- If n uses an uninitialized variable, that could indicate undefined behavior
 - Can catch these errors at compile time using possibly-uninitialized variable analysis
 - E.g. javac does this by default
- Possibly-uninitialized variables as a dataflow analysis problem:
 - Abstract domain 2^{Var} (each $V \in 2^{Var}$ represents a set of possibly-uninitialized vars)
 - *Existential* \Rightarrow order is \subseteq , join is \cup , \top is Var , \perp is \emptyset

Possibly-uninitialized variables analysis

- A variable x is **possibly-uninitialized** at a location n if there is some path from start to n along which x is never written to.
- If n uses an uninitialized variable, that could indicate undefined behavior
 - Can catch these errors at compile time using possibly-uninitialized variable analysis
 - E.g. javac does this by default
- Possibly-uninitialized variables as a dataflow analysis problem:
 - Abstract domain 2^{Var} (each $V \in 2^{Var}$ represents a set of possibly-uninitialized vars)
 - *Existential* \Rightarrow order is \subseteq , join is \cup , \top is Var , \perp is \emptyset
 - $kill(x := e) = \{x\}$
 - $gen(x := e) = \emptyset$

Reaching definitions analysis

- A *definition* is a pair (n, x) consisting of a basic block n , and a variable x such that n contains an assignment to x .
- We say that a definition (n, x) *reaches* a node m if there is a path from start to m such that the latest definition of x along the path is at n
- Reaching definitions as a data flow analysis:

Reaching definitions analysis

- A *definition* is a pair (n, x) consisting of a basic block n , and a variable x such that n contains an assignment to x .
- We say that a definition (n, x) *reaches* a node m if there is a path from start to m such that the latest definition of x along the path is at n
- Reaching definitions as a data flow analysis:
 - Abstract domain: $2^{N \times Var}$
 - *Existential* \Rightarrow order is \subseteq , join is \cup , \top is $N \times Var$, \perp is \emptyset
 - $kill(n) = \{(m, x) : m \in N, (x := e) \text{ in } n\}$
 - $gen(n) = \{(n, x) : (x := e) \text{ in } n\}$