Data-Flow Analysis for Hot-Spot Program Optimization

Jens Knoop

Technische Universität Wien

TECHNISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
WIEN

VIENNA
UNIVERSITY OF
TECHNOLOGY

Motivation



Motivation (Cont'd)



Motivation (Cont'd)



Motivation (Cont'd)



Motivation (Cont'd)



Why Standard Data-Flow Analysis Fails

Availability of terms...

$$\text{AVAIL}(n) = \begin{cases} false & \text{if } n = \mathbf{s} \\ \prod_{m \in pred(n)} [\![(m,n)]\!](\text{AVAIL}(n)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$[\![(m,n)]\!](b) = (\textbf{COMP}_{(m,n)} + b) * \textbf{TRANSP}_{(m,n)}$$

Availability at a Single Program Point



Outline of the Talk

Standard vs. Reverse Data-Flow Analysis...

- Background
- Essentials
- The Connecting Link
- The Clou: Why does it work?
- Applications
- Conclusions

Background

Demand-Driven Data-Flow Analysis...

- Agrawal (2000)
- Horwitz, Reps, Sagiv (1994+)
- Duesterwald, Gupta, Soffa (1995+)
- ...
- Knoop (Euro-Par 1999, KPS 2007)

Reverse Data-Flow Analysis: The Basics

(Standard) Data-Flow Analysis...

- *Data-Flow Lattice* $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = (\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top)$
- *Data-Flow Functional* $[\![\ ]\!] : E \to (\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C})$

Reverse Data-Flow Analysis...

- *Reverse Data-Flow Functional* (Hughes, Launchbury 1992+) $[\![\ ]\!]_R : E \to (\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C})$ defined by

$$\forall\, e \in E\, \forall\, c \in \mathcal{C}.\, [\![\, e\,]\!]_R(c) =_{df} \bigsqcap \{\, c' \mid [\![\, e\,]\!](c') \sqsupseteq c\,\}$$

Availability of Terms

- **Abstract semantics for *availability of terms***

  1. *Data-Flow Lattice*:

$$(\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top) =_{df} (\mathcal{B}, \wedge, \vee, \leq, false, true)$$

  2. *Data-Flow Functional*: $[\![\ ]\!]_{av} : E \rightarrow (\ \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\ )$ defined by

$$\forall\, e \in E.\, [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av} =_{df} \begin{cases} Cst_{true} & \text{if } \mathit{Comp}_{\,e} \wedge \mathit{Transp}_{\,e} \\ \mathit{Id}_{\mathcal{B}} & \text{if } \neg \mathit{Comp}_{\,e} \wedge \mathit{Transp}_{\,e} \\ Cst_{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

On the Relationship of $[\![\ ]\!]$ and $[\![\ ]\!]_R$

Lemma

1. $[\![\ e\ ]\!]_R$ is well-defined and monotonic.
2. $[\![\ e\ ]\!]_R$ is additive, if $[\![\ e\ ]\!]$ is distributive.

Monotonicity, Distributivity, and Additivity

...of data-flow functions.

Definition [Monotonicity, Distributivity, Additivity]
Let $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = (\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top)$ be a complete lattice and $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a function on $\mathcal{C}$. Then: f is

1. *monotonic* iff $\forall\, c, c' \in \mathcal{C}.\ c \sqsubseteq c' \Rightarrow f(c) \sqsubseteq f(c')$

   (Preserving the order of elements)

2. distributive iff $\forall\, C' \subseteq \mathcal{C}.\ \ f(\bigsqcap C') = \bigsqcap \{f(c) \mid c \in C'\}$

   (Preserving greatest lower bounds)

3. *additive* iff $\forall\, C' \subseteq \mathcal{C}.\ \ f(\bigsqcup C') = \bigsqcup \{f(c) \mid c \in C'\}$

   (Preserving least upper bounds)

Often useful

...the following equivalent characterization of monotonicity:

Lemma

Let $\hat{\mathcal{C}} = (\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top)$ be a complete lattice and $f : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ a function on $\mathcal{C}$. Then:

$$f \text{ is monotonic} \iff \forall\, C' \subseteq \mathcal{C}.\ \ f(\textstyle\bigsqcap C') \sqsubseteq \bigsqcap \{f(c) \mid c \in C'\}$$

$$\textbf{(}\iff \forall\, C' \subseteq \mathcal{C}.\ \ f(\textstyle\bigsqcup C') \sqsupseteq \bigsqcup \{f(c) \mid c \in C'\}\textbf{)}$$

On the Relationship of $[\![\ ]\!]$ and $[\![\ ]\!]_R$ (Cont'd)

Lemma

1. $[\![e]\!]_R \circ [\![e]\!] \sqsubseteq Id_{\mathcal{C}}$, if $[\![e]\!]$ is monotonic.
2. $[\![e]\!] \circ [\![e]\!]_R \sqsupseteq Id_{\mathcal{C}}$, if $[\![e]\!]$ is distributive.

In terms of the theory of "abstract interpretation":

- $[\![e]\!]$ and $[\![e]\!]_R$ form a Galois-connection.

Reverse DFA: The R-$MinFP$-Approach

The R-$MinFP$-Equation System:

$$\textbf{\textit{reqInf}}\,(n) = \begin{cases} c_q & \text{if } n = \mathbf{q} \\ \bigsqcup \{\, [\![\, (n,m) \,]\!]_R(\textbf{\textit{reqInf}}\,(m)) \mid m \in succ(n) \,\} & \\ & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The R-$MinFP$-Solution:

$$\forall\, c_q \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\; R\text{-}MinFP_{c_q}(n) =_{df} \textbf{\textit{reqInf}}^{\,*}_{c_q}(n)$$

where $\textbf{\textit{reqInf}}^{*}_{c_q}$ denotes the least solution of the R-$MinFP$-equation system wrt $c_q \in \mathcal{C}$.

Standard DFA: The $MaxFP$ -Approach

The $MaxFP$-Equation System:

$$\textbf{\textit{inf}}\,(n) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} c_{\mathbf{s}} & \text{if } n = \mathbf{s} \\ \bigsqcap \{\, [\![\, (m,n) \,]\!](\textbf{\textit{inf}}\,(m)) \mid m \in pred(n) \,\} & \\ & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The $MaxFP$-Solution:

$$\forall\, c_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\; MaxFP_{([\![\ ]\!], c_{\mathbf{s}})}(n) =_{df} \textbf{\textit{inf}}^{\,*}_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n)$$

where $\textbf{\textit{inf}}^{\,*}_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}$ denotes the greatest solution of the $MaxFP$ -equation system wrt $c_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{C}$.

The Connecting Link

Link Theorem

For distributive data-flow functionals $[\![\ ]\!]$, $q \in N$, and $c_{\mathbf{s}}, c_q \in \mathcal{C}$, we have:

$$R\text{-}MinFP_{c_q}(\mathbf{s}) \sqsubseteq c_{\mathbf{s}} \iff MaxFP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(q) \sqsupseteq c_q$$

Continuing the Analogy

...of Standard and Reverse Data-Flow Analysis regarding

- Soundness & Completeness (in terms of program verification) / Safety & Coincidence (Precision) (in terms of data-flow analysis)

Essential

...the extensibility of data-flow functionals to paths

$$[\![p]\!] =_{df} \begin{cases} Id_{\mathcal{C}} & \text{if } q < 1 \\ [\![\langle e_2, \ldots, e_q \rangle]\!] \circ [\![e_1]\!] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The MOP-Approach

$$\forall\, c_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{C}\ \forall\, n \in N.\ MOP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n) = \bigsqcap \{\, [\![\, p \,]\!](c_{\mathbf{s}}) \mid p \in \mathbf{P}[\mathbf{s}, n] \,\}$$

Standard DFA: Main Results

Theorem [Soundness / Safety]

$$\forall\, c_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\; MaxFP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n) \sqsubseteq MOP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n)$$

if the data-flow functional $[\![\ ]\!]$ is monotonic.

Theorem [Completeness / Coincidence (Precision)]

$$\forall\, c_{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\; MaxFP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n) = MOP_{c_{\mathbf{s}}}(n)$$

if the data-flow functional $[\![\ ]\!]$ is distributive.

Standard DFA: The Tool Kit View

...at a glance:



Of course...

Reverse data-flow functionals can be extended to paths, too:

$$[\![\, p \,]\!]_R =_{df} \begin{cases} Id_{\mathcal{C}} & \text{if } q < 1 \\ [\![\, \langle e_1, \ldots, e_{q-1} \rangle \,]\!]_R \circ [\![\, e_q \,]\!]_R & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The R-JOP-Approach

The R-JOP-Solution:

$$\forall c_q \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\, R\text{-}JOP_{c_q}(n) =_{df} \bigsqcup \{ [\![\, p \,]\!]_R(c_q) \mid p \in \mathbf{P}[n, \mathbf{q}] \}$$

Reverse DFA: Main Results

Theorem [Soundness / Reverse Safety]

$$\forall\, c_q \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\ R\text{-}MinFP_{c_q}(n) \sqsupseteq R\text{-}JOP_{c_q}(n)$$

Theorem [Completeness / Reverse Coincidence (Precision)]

$$\forall\, c_q \in \mathcal{C}\, \forall\, n \in N.\ R\text{-}MinFP_{c_q}(n) = R\text{-}JOP_{c_q}(n)$$

if $[\![\ ]\!]$ is distributive.

Putting it together...



Data-flow Analysis

Program Verification

MaxFP

$[\![e]\!] \in \lceil C \xrightarrow{\text{distributive}} C \rceil$

Strongest Postcondition View

Coincidence Theorem

$\mathrm{MOP}_{c_s}(q) \sqsupseteq c_q$

$\{p\}\,\pi\,\{?\}$

induces

Link Theorem

$\text{R-JOP}_{c_q}(s) \sqsubseteq c_s$

$[\![e]\!]_R(c) =_{df} \bigsqcap \{c' \mid [\![e]\!](c') \sqsupseteq c\}$

$\{?\}\,\pi\,\{q\}$

Reverse Coincidence Theorem

R-MinFP

Weakest Precondition View

Are We Done?

Recall the motivating example...



Mastering the Road to Success

...requires more. It requires us to conclude from “weakest pre-conditions” on “strongest post-conditions”.

...essentially, this means to replace the analysis problem by a verification problem.

Changing the Perspective

Implementation Problem



! **Given:** Context Information **cti**

? **Sought:** Strongest Component Information **sci**

Specification Problem



! **Given:** Component Information **cpi**

? **Sought:** Weakest Context Information **wci**

Verification Problem



! **Given:** Context Information **cti**
Component Information **cpi**

? **Sought:** Validity of **cpi** with respect of **cti**

Changing the Perspective: The Standard Taxonomy

Conventional

Classification of DFA Techniques



Exhaustive

DFA

Demand-Driven

DFA

Changing the Perspective: Conclusions Derived

The *specification* ***problem:***

{?} π {q}



The *verification* ***problem:***

{p} π {q} ?

... the domain of ***demand-driven DFA***

The *implementation* ***problem:***

{p} π {?}

... the domain of ***exhaustive DFA***

(R)DFA-Frameworks / (R)DFA-Tool Kits



Gen/Kill-Problems

...allow us to master *the road to success*: The SPC-analysis problem boils down to a WPC-verification problem.

This is important because...

- Redundant Expression/Assignment Elimination
- Dead-Code Elimination
- Strength Reduction
- ...

are based on Gen-Kill-problems.

Concluding the Example: Availability

Abstract semantics for *availability*

1. *Data-flow lattice*:

   $(\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top) =_{df} (\mathcal{B}_X\,,\ \wedge\,,\ \vee\,, \leq, false, failure)$

   with $\bot = false \sqsubset true \sqsubset failure = \top$

2. *Data-flow functional*: $[\![\ ]\!]_{av} : E \rightarrow (\ \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X\ )$ defined by

$$\forall\, e \in E.\, [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av} =_{df} \begin{cases} Cst^X_{true} & \text{if } \mathit{Comp}_{\,e} \wedge \mathit{Transp}_{\,e} \\ \mathit{Id}_{\mathcal{B}_X} & \text{if } \neg \mathit{Comp}_{\,e} \wedge \mathit{Transp}_{\,e} \\ Cst^X_{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Reverse Availability

Reverse abstract semantics for *availability*

1. *Data-flow lattice*:
   $(\mathcal{C}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \sqsubseteq, \bot, \top) =_{df} (\mathcal{B}_X\,,\ \wedge\,,\ \vee\,, \leq, false, failure)$
2. *Reverse data-flow functional*: $[\![\ ]\!]_{av_R} : E \rightarrow (\ \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_X\ )$
   defined by

$$\forall\, e \in E.\, [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av_R} =_{df} \begin{cases} R\text{-}Cst^X_{true} & \text{if } [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av} = Cst^X_{true} \\ R\text{-}Id_{\mathcal{B}_X} & \text{if } [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av} = Id_{\mathcal{B}_X} \\ R\text{-}Cst^X_{false} & \text{if } [\![\, e\,]\!]_{av} = Cst^X_{false} \end{cases}$$

Supporting Functions

$$\forall\, b \in \mathcal{B}_X .\ R\text{-}Cst^X_{true}(b) =_{df} \begin{cases} false & \text{if } b \in \mathcal{B} \\ failure & \text{otherwise} \\ & \text{(i.e., if } b = failure\text{)} \end{cases}$$

$$\forall\, b \in \mathcal{B}_X .\ R\text{-}Cst^X_{false}(b) =_{df} \begin{cases} false & \text{if } b = false \\ failure & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$R\text{-}Id_{\mathcal{B}_X} =_{df} Id_{\mathcal{B}_X}$$

Summing Up / Extensions

In this talk...

- The intraprocedural basic setting of (R)DFA (Knoop, KPS 2007)

Extensions are possible...

- Interprocedural setting (Knoop, CC 1992, LNCS 1428 (1998))
- Parallel setting (Knoop, Euro-Par 1999)
- ...

(R)DFA-Frameworks / (R)DFA-Tool Kits (Cont'd)

...the general pattern:



(R)DFA-Frameworks / (R)DFA-Tool Kits

...the general pattern more abstract:



Applications

a)



"Hot Spot" Optimizer

Program point ⬭ satisfies **availability**, while ● does not!

b)



Debugger

Variable c is not initialized along some paths reaching program point ●

From Applications towards Conclusions

Reverse Data-Flow Analysis especially well-suited for...

- Hot-Spot Optimization
- Debugging
- Just-in-time Compilation

based on answering data-flow queries.

Hence...

- Data-Flow Analysis for Debugging
- Data-Flow Analysis for Just-in-time Compilation

were titles considered optionally.

Conclusions (Cont'd)

As an appealing add-on...

- RDFA is tailored for parallelization!

Recall again...



Conclusions and Perspectives

Data-Flow Analysis for Multi-Core Architectures