COL729 Major Exam Solutions Compiler Optimization Sem II, 2018-19

Answer all 5 questions

Max. Marks: 50

- 1. Provide one example of a program and a data-flow analysis formulation where a region-based analysis would yield better solutions than data-flow analysis.
 - a. Specify the data-flow analysis through the set of values, the partial-order operator, and the transfer functions
 - b. Specify the composition, meet, and closure operators for the transfer functions for the region-based analysis
 - c. Show an example, where the above-formulated region-based analysis would provide a more precise solution than the above-formulated data-flow analysis.

[10]

Constant-propagation

Data flow analysis

Domain : map (C) from program variable to a constant value

Bottom : NAC (not a constant)

Top : UI (uninitialized or not known)

Direction : Forward

Transfer function : For a statement (S), variable (x) and input map (in),

TF(S,in)(x) = identity, If S in not an assignment to x

else if S is an assignment to x, substitute the values present in input map (in) for each operand variable used by statement S,

- if any operand value is NAC => TF(S,in)(x) = NAC
- If any operand is UI => TF(S,in)(x) = UI
- else TF(S,in)(x) = value after substitution

Meet : If all predecessor send the variable to same constant C, then C else NAC

Region based analysis

Transfer function at exit of subregion S of a region R, $f_{R,OUT[s]} = \land$ (Compose the transfer function for predecessor basic blocks B_i and S along all possible paths from entry of R to S)

Meet : $(f_1 \land_F f_2)(v) = f_1(v) \land f_2(v)$

Composition: $(f_1 \circ f_2)(v) = f_1(f_2(v))$

BB1->BB2 BB2->BB3 BB1->BB3 BB1: x = 2; y = 3; BB2: x = 3; y = 2;

BB3:

z = x+y

- Using dataflow analysis at the OUT of BB3 will give z= NAC
- Using above described region based analysis at the OUT of BB3 will give z = 5

2. Consider the following loop nest:

1) for (ii = 0; ii < n; ii = ii+B)
2) for (jj = 0; jj < n; jj = jj+B)
3) for (kk = 0; kk < n; kk = kk+B)
4) for (i = ii; i < ii+B; i++)
5) for (j = jj; j < jj+B; j++)
6) for (k = kk; k < kk+B; k++)
7) Z[i,j] = Z[i,j] + X[i,k]*Y[k,j];</pre>

Express the iteration space and the data space of the loop-nest above through the four-tuples $\langle F, f, B, b \rangle$ to represent the data-spaces and the iteration space. How many matrices do you need to specify? What does each of them represent. What are the dimensions and the values of these matrices? [5]

Iteration space:

B,b for each loop nest specifying the lower and upper bound for iteration variable

B = [1 0 0 0 0 0 0			b = [0	
-1 0 0 0 0 0 1				-1	
0 1 0 0 0 0 0				0	
0-100001	i = [ii`		-1	
001000		jj`		0	
0 0 -1 0 0 0 1		kk`		-1	
-B 0 0 1 0 0 0		i		0	
B 0 0-1 0 0 0		j		B-1	
0-B 0 0 1 0 0		k		0	
0 B 0 0-1 0 0		n/B]		B-1	
0 0 - B 0 0 1 0				0	
00B00-10]				B-1]

Data space:

F,f for each static access specifying the affine function of loop index variables that produce the array index for all dimensions

Z[i , j]

		i = [ii`		
			jj`		
F = [0001000		kk`	f = [0
	0000100]		i		0]
			j		
			k		
			n/B]		

X[i , k]

		i = [ii`		
			jj`		
F = [0001000		kk`	f = [0
	0000010]		i		0]
			j		
			k		
			n/B]		

Y[k , j]

		i = [ii`		
		j	jj`		
F = [0000010		kk`	f = [0
	0000100]	i	i		0]
		j	j		
			k		
			n/B]		

3. Consider the following loop-nest

for (i = 0; i <= 1000; i++)
for (j = 0; j <= min(750,i); j++)
$$X[j+1] = (1 / 3) * (X[j] + X[j+1] + X[j+2]);$$

Use Fourier-Motzkin elimination to transform this loop with outer-axis k=i+j. Show the working of the algorithm succinctly, to show how you obtain the result. [8]

Iteration space:

 $i \ge 0, i \le 1000, j \ge 0, j \le 750, j \le i$

Introduce k = i+j

Let's eliminate variable j by using j = k-i

New iteration space constraints:

 $i \ge 0, i \le 1000, k-i \ge 0, k-i \le 750, k-i \le i$ or $i \ge 0, i \le 1000, k \ge i, k \le i+750, k \le 2^{*}i$ or $i \ge 0, i \le 1000, i \le k, i \ge k-750, 2^{*}i \ge k$ (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

k should be outer-axis, so project away i from constraints:

Using 1 and 2, $0 \le 1000$ Using 1 and 3, $0 \le k$ Using 4 and 2, k-750 $\le 1000 \implies k \le 1750$ Using 4 and 3, k-750 $\le k \implies -750 \le 0$ Using 5 and 2, $k \le 2*1000 \implies k \le 2000$ Using 5 and 3, $k \le 2*k$

Constraints for k:

 $k\geq 0,\,k\leq 1750$

Constraints for i: $i \ge 0, i \le 1000, i \le k, i \ge k-750, i \ge \lceil k/2 \rceil$

i ≥ max($\lceil k/2 \rceil$, k-750), i ≥ 0 is redundant as $\lceil k/2 \rceil$ ≥ 0 for k ≥ 0 i ≤ min(k,1000)

Similarly can be done for eliminating i instead of j

4. Suppose there are two array accesses

A[2*i, j, i + j] and A[2*i + 4, j - 2, i + j]

In a 3-deep loop nest, with indices i, j, and k from the outer to the inner loop. What are all the types of temporal reuse (self-temporal and group-temporal) in this loop nest? Ignore spatial reuse.

[10]

Self-temporal reuse

For A[2*i, j, i+j],

F = [2 0 0	f = [0
0 1 0	0
110]	0]

For A[2*i + 4, j-2, i+j],

F = [2 0 0	f = [4
010	-2
1 1 0]	0]

In both the above cases,

Rank of F, r= 2 and loop nest depth d = 3

The difference between iteration variables (i,j,k), $(i^{,j},k^{,})$ which access the same array index is given by nullspace of F :

 $2(i-i^{*}) = 0, (j-j^{*}) = 0; i.e. i = i^{*}, j = j^{*}$

O(n) self temporal reuse, i.e. an element is accessed O(n) times where n is the num of iterations in loop with iteration variable k

Group-temporal reuse

The access have group temporal reuse, if there exists (i,j,k) and (i`,j`,k`), such that $F * ([i,j,k]^T - [i`,j`,k`]^T) = f_2 - f_1$

[2	0	0		[i-i`		[4
	0	1	0	*	j-j`	=	-2
	1	1	0]	k-k`]		0]

or

j-j` = -2

k-k' can be arbitrary from 0 to n, where n is the number of iterations in loop with iteration variable ${\sf k}$

5. Consider the following program:

Apply the algorithm to find parallelism with a constant number of synchronizations to this loop nest.

- 1. Show the queries you make to construct the program dependence graph. How many ILP queries did you have to make? [4]
- 2. After inserting a constant number of synchronizations, parallelize each separate loop nest (with no synchronization) if possible.
 - a. What are the space-partition constraints? [3]
 - b. Show the steps involved in solving the space-partition constraints. [3]
 - c. What is the solution to your space-partition constraints [2]
 - d. What is the generated code before eliminating empty iterations and tests from the inner loop (i.e., before applying Fourier Motzkin and before doing case-analysis)? [1]
 - e. What is the generated code after applying Fourier Motzkin at each level of the iteration. Show the case analysis and the final generated code at each step.[4]

1. ILP Queries (Total 9 queries, one for each pair of statements)

Edge between S1,S1: For both array A $\exists i,i$, s.t. $0 \le i < n$, $0 \le i$ < n, i > i, i + 1 = i + 1

Edge between S2,S2: For both array C $\exists i,i^{,},j,j^{,} s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{,} < n, i \le j < n, i^{,} \le j^{,} < n, (i^{,},j^{,}) > (i,j), i^{,} = i, j^{,} = j$

Edge between S3,S3: For both array A $\exists i,i^{,}j,j^{,} s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{,} < n, i \le j < n, i^{,} \le j^{,} < n,$ $(i^{,},j^{,}) > (i, j) j^{,} = j$

Edge between S1,S2 and S2,S1: No dependency as different arrays are accessed

```
Edge between S1,S3:

\exists i,i^{*},j, s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{*} < n, i^{*} \le j < n, i < i^{*}, i + 1 = j
Edge between S3,S1:

\exists i,i^{*},j, s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{*} < n, i^{*} \le j < n, i^{*} < i, i + 1 = j
Edge between S2,S3:

\exists i,i^{*},j,j^{*} s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{*} < n, i \le j < n, i^{*} \le j < n, ((i < i^{*}) \text{ or } (i=i^{*} \text{ and } j \le j^{*})))
i = i^{*} \text{ and } j = j^{*}
Edge between S3,S2:

\exists i,i^{*},j,j^{*} s.t. 0 \le i < n, 0 \le i^{*} < n, i \le j < n, i^{*} \le j < n, ((i^{*} < i) \text{ or } (i=i^{*} \text{ and } j^{*} < j)))
i = i^{*} \text{ and } j = j^{*}
PDG:

S1 -> S3

S3 -> S1

S3 -> S3

S2 -> S3
```

2. Constant number of synchronizations:

We will have a separate loop nest for each SCC in the PDG. In this case, S1,S3 form 1 SCC and S2 is another SCC. Further, S3 depends on S2, so S2 loop will be executed first and S3 will be executed later after synchronization

```
Loop1:
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
for (j = i; j < n; j++) {
C[i,j] = C[i,j] + D[0,i+1,2^*j]; //S2
}
barrier();
Loop2:
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
A[i + 1] = A[i + 1] * B[i + 1]; //S1
for (j = i; j < n; j++) {
A[j] = A[j] * C[i,j]; //S3
}
```

Space partition constraints

For loop 1, S2 is not dependent on itself, so we can run all iterations in parallel. Assuming a 2-D processor space, The space partition constraints are: For all (i,j) and (i`,j`) such that, $i,i^{*} \ge 0, j \ge i, j^{*} \ge i^{*}, i,i^{*} < n, j,j^{*} < n, i = i^{*}, j=j^{*}$ [p1, p2 * [i + [p5 = [p1`, p2` * [i` + [p5` p3, p4] j] p6] p3`, p4`] j`] p6`] Substituting i = i and j=j, we get, (p1-p1`) * i + (p2-p2`) * j + (p5-p5`) = 0 (p3-p3`) * i + (p4-p4`) * j + (p6-p6`) = 0 The simplest solution to this is $[1 0 * [p_1 + [0 = [i]]]$ 0 1] p₂] 0] j] or $p_1 = i$ and $p_2 = j$ The processor space index variables $p_1 = i$ and $p_2 = j$ will have range

 $0 \le p_1 < n$, and $i \le p_2 < n$,

Applying Fourier-motzkin to eliminate i from constraints for p_2 , we get $0 \le p_1 \le n$, and $p_1 \le p_2 \le n$,

For loop2, S3 is dependent on itself and S1 and S3 are also interdependent.

For S1 to S3 interdependence, the space-partition constraint imposed are: For all (i) and (i`,j`) such that,

i,i` >= 0, j` >= i`, i,i` < n, j` < n, i+1 = j` [p1 * [i] + [p5 = [p1`, p2` * [i` + [p5` p3] p6] p3`, p4`] j`] p6`] p1 * i + p5 = p1` * i` + p2`*j` + p5` p3 * i + p6 = p3' * i' + p4'*j' + p6'or p1 * i + p5 = p1' * i' + p2'*(i+1) + p5'p3 * i + p6 = p3' * i' + p4'*(i+1) + p6'or $i^{*} (p1-p2') + p5 - p2' - p5' = p1' * i'$ $i^{*} (p3-p4') + p6 - p6' - p4' = p3' * i'$ or p1 = p2', p3 = p4', p5 = p2' + p5', p6 = p6' + p4', p1' = 0, p3' = 0The simplest solution for the above constraints are: p1 = p2' = 1, p3 = p4' = 1, p5 = 0, p5' = -1, p6 = 0, p6' = -1, p1' = 0, p3' = 0For S2, $[p_{1} = [1 * [i] + [0 = [i] \\ p_{2}] 1] 0] i]$

For S3, $[p_1 = [0, 1 * [i^{+} + [-1 = [j^{+}-1] p_2] 0, 1] j^{+} -1] j^{+} -1]$

The processor space index variables for S1, $p_1 = p_2 = i$ will have range $0 \le p_1, p_2 \le n$

The processor space index variables for S3, $p_1 = p_2 = j-1$ will have range $i-1 \le p_1, p_2 < n-1$

Applying Fourier-motzkin to eliminate i from constraints for p_1, p_2 , we get $-1 \le p_1, p_2 \le n-1$

The generated code is:

```
Loop1:
for (p_1 = 0; p_1 < n; p_1++) \{
for (p_2 = p_1; p_2 < n; p_2++) \{
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) \{
for (j = i; j < n; j++) \{
if (p_1 == i \text{ and } p_2 ==j)
C[i,j] = C[i,j] + D[0,i+1,2^*j]; //S2
}}
```

barrier();

```
Loop2:

for (p_1 = -1; p_1 < n; p_1++) {

for (p_2 = -1; p_2 < n; p_2++) {

for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {

if (p_1 == i \text{ and } p_1 == p_2)

A[i + 1] = A[i + 1] * B[i + 1]; //S1

for (j = i; j < n; j++) {

if (p_1 == j-1 \text{ and } p_1 == p_2)

A[j] = A[j] * C[i,j]; //S3

}

}
```

```
Fourier-Motzkin for S1

p_1 \le i \le p_1, 0 \le i < n, -1 \le p_1 < n, p_1 \le p_2 \le p_1, 1 \le p_2 < n

\Rightarrow 0 \le p_1 < n, p_2 = p_1
```

Fourier-Motzkin for S3 $0 \le i < n, p_1 + 1 \le j \le p_1 + 1, i \le j < n, -1 \le p_1 < n, p_1 \le p_2 \le p_1 1 \le p_2 < n$ $=> -1 \le p_1 < n - 1, p_2 = p_1$

```
Loop1:
for (p_1 = 0; p_1 < n; p_1++) {
for (p_2 = p_1; p_2 < n; p_2++) {
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
for (j = i; j < n; j++) {
if( p1 == i and p2 ==j)
C[p_1,p_2] = C[p_1,p_2] + D[0, p_1+1, 2*p_2]; //S2
}}
```

barrier();

```
Loop2: Case analysis
p<sub>1</sub> = -1;
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
   for (j = i; j < n; j++) {
      if(p_1 == j-1)
        A[j] = A[j] * C[i, j ]; //S3
   }
}
for (p_1 = 0; p_1 < n-1; p_1++) {
   for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
      if(p_1 == i)
         A[i + 1] = A[i + 1] * B[i + 1]; //S1
      for (j = i; j < n; j++) {
         if(p_1 == j-1)
            A[j] = A[j] * C[i,j]; //S3
   }
}
p_1 = n-1
for (i = 0; i < n; i++) {
   if(p_1 == i)
      A[i + 1] = A[i + 1] * B[i + 1]; //S1
}
```

Fourier Motzkin For S3 in case 1: $i\leq j\leq n{\text{-}}1, \quad p_1{\text{+}}1\leq j\leq p_1{\text{+}}1 \ =>$ $i \le p_1 + 1$, $p_1 + 1 \le n - 1$, $-1 \le p_1 \le -1 =>$ $i \le 0, 1 \le n, 0 \le i < n => i = 0, n > 0$ $// p_1 = -1;$ if(n > 0) A[0] = A[0] * C[0, 0]; //S3 For S1 in case 2: $0 \le i \le n-1$, $p_1 \le i \le p_1 \Longrightarrow$ $0 \le p_1, p_1 \le n-1, 0 \le p_1 \le n-2 =>$ $0 \le n-1$, $0 \le n-2 => n > 1$ For S3 in case 2: $i \leq j \leq n-1$, $p_1+1 \leq j \leq p_1+1 \Rightarrow$ $i \le p_1 + 1, 0 \le i \le n - 1 =>$ $0 \le i \le min(n-1, p_1+1) =>$ For S1 in case 3: $0 \le i \le n-1$, $p_1 \le i \le p_1 \Longrightarrow$ $0 \le p_1, p_1 \le n-1, n-1 \le p_1 \le n-1 =>$ $0 \le n - 1 => n > 1$ Loop2: // p₁ = -1; if(n > 0) A[0] = A[0] * C[0, 0]; //S3 for $(p_1 = 0; p_1 < n-1; p_1++)$ {

 $\begin{array}{l} A[p_1 + 1] = A[p_1 + 1] & * B[p_1 + 1]; \ //S1 \\ for (i = 0; i \le min(n-1, p_1 + 1); i++) \\ & A[p_1 + 1] = A[p_1 + 1] & * C[i,p_1 + 1]; \ //S3 \\ \\ \end{array}$