Introduction to Compiler Construction

Marvin Code Generation: High-level Intermediate Representation (HIR)

Outline

1 Control Flow Graph

2 High Level Intermediate Representation (HIR)

3 Local Optimizations

Control Flow Graph

Control Flow Graph

We scan through the intermediate JVM instructions and construct a flow graph of basic blocks

We scan through the intermediate JVM instructions and construct a flow graph of basic blocks

A basic block is a sequence of instructions with just one entry point at the start and one exit point at the end — there are no branches into or out of the instruction sequence

We scan through the intermediate JVM instructions and construct a flow graph of basic blocks

A basic block is a sequence of instructions with just one entry point at the start and one exit point at the end — there are no branches into or out of the instruction sequence

Next, we identify basic blocks that are loop headers (LH) and loop tails (LT)

We scan through the intermediate JVM instructions and construct a flow graph of basic blocks

A basic block is a sequence of instructions with just one entry point at the start and one exit point at the end — there are no branches into or out of the instruction sequence

Next, we identify basic blocks that are loop headers (LH) and loop tails (LT)

Next, we remove unreachable basic blocks (ie, basic blocks that are not reachable from the source block)

Control Flow Graph · Example (Factorial.iota)

Control Flow Graph · Example (Factorial.iota)

```
// Accepts n (int) from standard input and writes n! (computed iteratively) to standard output.
// Returns n! computed iteratively.
int factorial(int n) {
    int result = 1;
    int i = 1;
    while (i <= n) {
        result = result * i;
        i = i + 1;
    }
    return result;
}
// Entry point.
void main() {
    int n = read();
    write(factorial(n));
}</pre>
```

Control Flow Graph · Example (CFGs for Factorial.iota)

Control Flow Graph · Example (CFGs for Factorial.iota)

```
>>> factorial(I)I
 B0 (pred: [], succ: [B1]):
 B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [B2]):
 0: 1dc 1
 2: istore 1
  4: 1dc 1
  6: istore 2
 B2 (pred: [B1, B3], succ: [B3, B4], LH):
  8: iload 2
  10: iload 0
  12: if_icmpgt 32
 B3 (pred: [B2], succ: [B2], LT):
  15: iload 1
  17: iload 2
  19: imul
  20: istore 1
  22: iload 2
  24: ldc 1
  26: iadd
  27: istore 2
 29: goto 8
 B4 (pred: [B2], succ: []):
 32: iload 1
```

Control Flow Graph · Example (CFGs for Factorial.iota)

```
>>> main()V
B0 (pred: [], succ: [Bi]):
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: []):
0: invokestatic read()I
3: istore 0
5: iload 0
7: invokestatic factorial(I)I
10: invokestatic vrite(I)V
13: return
```

Next, we convert the tuples to HIR

Next, we convert the tuples to $\ensuremath{\mathsf{HIR}}$

HIR employs static single assignment (SSA) form, where for every variable, there is just one place in the method where that variable is assigned a value

Next, we convert the tuples to $\ensuremath{\mathsf{HIR}}$

HIR employs static single assignment (SSA) form, where for every variable, there is just one place in the method where that variable is assigned a value

For example, the following code

x = 3; x = x + y;

is expressed in SSA form as

x1 = 3; x2 = x1 + y1;

In the HIR we represent a variable's value by the instruction that computed it and we track these values in the state vector $% \left({{{\left[{{{C_{\rm{s}}}} \right]}_{\rm{stat}}}} \right)$

In the HIR we represent a variable's value by the instruction that computed it and we track these values in the state vector $% \left({{{\left[{{{C_{\rm{s}}}} \right]}_{\rm{stat}}}} \right)$

The values in a state vector may change as we sequence through the block's instructions

In the HIR we represent a variable's value by the instruction that computed it and we track these values in the state vector $% \left({{{\left[{{{C_{\rm{s}}}} \right]}_{\rm{stat}}}} \right)$

The values in a state vector may change as we sequence through the block's instructions

If the next block has just one predecessor, it can copy the predecessor's state vector at its start; if there are two or more predecessors, the states must be merged

For example, consider the following *iota* method, where the variables are in SSA form

int ss(int v1) {
 if (v1 > 5) {
 v2 = 0;
 } else if (v1 > 3) {
 u3 = 1;
 } else {
 u4 = 2;
 }
 return v?;
}

For example, consider the following iota method, where the variables are in SSA form

int ssa(int w1) {
 if (w1 > 5) {
 v2 = 0;
 } else if (w1 > 3) {
 w3 = 1;
 } else {
 w4 = 2;
 }
 return w?;
}

In the statement

return w?;

which w do we return?

For example, consider the following iota method, where the variables are in SSA form

int ssa(int u1) {
 if (u1 > 5) {
 v2 = 0;
 } else if (u1 > 3) {
 u3 = 1;
 } else {
 v4 = 2;
 }
 return w?;
}

In the statement

return w?;

which $_{\text{w}}$ do we return?

We solve this problem by using a Phi function, an HIR instruction that captures the possibility of a variable having one of several values

For example, consider the following iota method, where the variables are in SSA form

int esa(int u1) {
 if (u1 > 5) {
 v2 = 0;
 } else if (u1 > 3) {
 u3 = 1;
 } else {
 u4 = 2;
 }
 return w?;
}

In the statement

return w?;

which $_{w}$ do we return?

We solve this problem by using a Phi function, an HIR instruction that captures the possibility of a variable having one of several values

In our example, the final block would contain the following code

```
w5 = phi(w2, w3, w4);
return w5;
```

Another place where Phi functions are needed are in loop headers

Another place where Phi functions are needed are in loop headers

```
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [B2], locals: [w1, x1]):

w1 = 1

x1 = 1

B2 (pred: [B1], succ: [B3], LH, locals: [w2, x2]):

w2 = phi(w1, w3)

x2 = phi(x1, x2)

B3 (pred: [B2], succ: [B2], LT, locals: [w3, x2]):

w3 = w2 + 1
```

Another place where Phi functions are needed are in loop headers

```
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [B2], locals: [w1, x1]):

w1 = 1

x1 = 1

B2 (pred: [B1], succ: [B3], LH, locals: [w2, x2]):

w2 = phi(w1, w3)

x2 = phi(x1, x2)

B3 (pred: [B2], succ: [B2], LT, locals: [w3, x2]):

w3 = w2 + 1
```

Redundant phi functions, ie, phi functions of the form x = phi(y, x, x, ..., x), are replaced with y

Another place where Phi functions are needed are in loop headers

```
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [B2], locals: [w1, x1]):

w1 = 1

x1 = 1

B2 (pred: [B1], succ: [B3], LH, locals: [w2, x2]):

w2 = phi(w1, w3)

x2 = phi(x1, x2)

B3 (pred: [B2], succ: [B2], LT, locals: [w3, x2]):

w3 = w2 + 1
```

Redundant phi functions, ie, phi functions of the form x = phi(y, x, x, ..., x), are replaced with y

In the above example, x2 is replaced with x1

```
>>> factorial(I)I
 B0 (pred: [], succ: [B1], locals: [I0, ?, ?]):
  IO: ldparam 0
  B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [B2], locals: [I0, I1, I2]):
  I1: 1dc 1
  I2: 1dc 1
 B2 (pred: [B1, B3], succ: [B3, B4], LH, locals: [I0, I4, I5]):
 I4: phi(I1, I7)
  I5: phi(I2, I9)
  6: if I5 > I0 then B4 else B3
  B3 (pred: [B2], succ: [B2], LT, locals: [I0, I7, I9]):
  17: 14 * 15
  I8: 1dc 1
  I9: I5 + I8
  10: goto B2
  B4 (pred: [B2], succ: [], locals: [I0, I4, I5]):
  I11: ireturn I4
```

```
>>> main()V
B0 (pred: [], succ: [B1], locals: [?]):
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [], locals: [I0]):
I0: invoke read()
I1: invoke read()
I1: invoke factorial(I0)
V2: invoke write(I1)
3: return
```

That the HIR is in SSA form makes it amenable to several simple optimizations, which make for fewer instructions and/or faster programs

That the HIR is in SSA form makes it amenable to several simple optimizations, which make for fewer instructions and/or faster programs

Local optimizations are improvements made based on analysis of the linear sequence of instructions within a basic block

Expressions having operands that are both constants, or variables whose values are known to be constants, can be folded, that is replaced by their constant value

Expressions having operands that are both constants, or variables whose values are known to be constants, can be folded, that is replaced by their constant value

For example, consider the *iota* method

```
int f() {
    int i = 1;
    int j = 2;
    int k = i + j + 3;
    return k;
}
```

and the corresponding HIR code

B0 (pred: [], succ: [B1], locals: [?, ?, ?]):
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [], locals: [I0, I1, I4]):
I0: ldc 1
I1: ldc 2
I2: I0 + I1
I3: ldc 3
I4: I2 + I3
I5: ireturn I4

Expressions having operands that are both constants, or variables whose values are known to be constants, can be folded, that is replaced by their constant value

For example, consider the *iota* method

```
int f() {
    int i = 1;
    int j = 2;
    int k = i + j + 3;
    return k;
}
```

and the corresponding HIR code

```
B0 (pred: [], succ: [B1], locals: [?, ?, ?]):
B1 (pred: [B0], succ: [], locals: [I0, I1, I4]):
I0: ldc 1
I1: ldc 2
I2: I0 + I1
I3: ldc 3
I4: I2 + I3
I5: ireturn I4
```

The instruction IO + II at I2 can be replaced by the constant 3 and the instruction I2 + I3 at I4 can replaced by the constant 6

Another optimization one may consider is common subexpression elimination, where we identify expressions that are re-evaluated even if their operands are unchanged

Another optimization one may consider is common subexpression elimination, where we identify expressions that are re-evaluated even if their operands are unchanged

Example

void f(int i) {
 int j = i * i * i;
 int k = i * i * i;
}

can be optimized as

void f(int i) {
 int j = i * i * i;
 int k = j;
}

Common subexpressions do arise in places one might not expect them

Common subexpressions do arise in places one might not expect them

Example

```
for (i = 0; i < 1000; i++) {
   for (j = 0; j < 1000; j++) {
      c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];
   }
}</pre>
```

where a, b, and c are integer matrices

Common subexpressions do arise in places one might not expect them

Example

```
for (i = 0; i < 1000; i++) {
   for (j = 0; j < 1000; j++) {
      c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];
   }
}</pre>
```

where a, b, and c are integer matrices

If a^{\prime} , b^{\prime} , and c^{\prime} are their base addresses respectively, then the memory addresses of a[i][j], b[i][j], and c[i][j] are $a^{\prime} + i + 4 + 1000 + j + 4$, $b^{\prime} + i + 4 + 1000 + j + 4$; eliminating the common offsets, i + 4 + 1000 + j + 4, can save us a lot of computation