Compiling Simple Assignments

Moo y Sagiv Te Aviv University sagiv@math.tau.ac.il and Reinhard Wi he m Universität des Saar andes wilhelm@cs.uni-sb.de

Apri 21, 1997

Subjects

- Compile vs Run Time nformation
- L va ues vs R va ues
- The P machine
- Code generation for expressions and assignments

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Compile- vs. Run-Time Information

compile-time-information (static): nformation contained

in or derivab e from the source program

- The source code
- The types of variables (in most languages)
- The scope of variab es
- The values of constants
- The addresses of static variab es
- The reative addresses of automatic variables
- The size of static data (sca ars, stat arrays, records)

٠

run-time-information (dynamic): nformation on y avai ab e at run time

- The values of variables
- The values of conditions
- The depth of recursion
- The size of dynamic data (dyn arrays, ists, trees)
- •

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

2

L-values vs. R-values

- Assignment x := exp is compiled into:
 - 1 Compute the **address** of x
 - 2 Compute the value of exp
 - 3 Store the value of exp at the address of x
- Genera ization **R-value**

r va(x) = va ue of x r va(5) = 5r va(x + y) = r va(x) + r va(y)

L-value

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

The P-Machine



- Memory
- nstructions operate on the stack
- Typed instructions (using Pasca ordina types)
 - $+_i$ 1 adds the two top most int values on the stack;
 - 2 removes these from the stack;
 - 3 stores (pushes) the resu t on the stack
- Operand types in the P machine
 - i integer
 - r rea
 - a address
 - b boo ean
- Type indications in the instruction definitions T a types
 - N numerica types

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

4

P-machine main loop

while true do begin PC := PC + 1; execute instruction in ocation CODE[PC - 1]end;

Why PC increment before instruction execution? Reason: jumps and procedure ca s

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Example Program

Pascal-program

end.

P-code-program

| | _ | | |
|-----|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| р | | initia ization code | |
| ssp | 8 | | a ocate stack space |
| sep | 3 | | space for intermediate computations |
| ldc | а | 5 | pushes the address of x |
| ldc | i | 3 | pushes 3 |
| sto | i | | stores 3 in x |
| ldc | а | 6 | pushes the address of y |
| ldo | i | 5 | pushes the va ue of x |
| ldc | i | 7 | pushes 7 |
| add | i | | pushes $x + 7$ |
| sto | i | | stores x+7 in y |
| stp | | | |
| | | | |

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

6

The definition of P-instructions

Instruction Meaning Condition Result

Instruction: name of the instruction and ist of its parameters,

Meaning: program in a very reduced imperative anguage consisting of assignments between machine ressources and conditiona s,

Condition: condition on the execution of the instruction, often a pattern describing the expected contents of the top end of the stack, i e , the types of the ce contents,

Result: description of the resu t, a pattern describing the resu ting stack contents

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

P-instructions for Arithmetic



P-instructions for Boolean Operations

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Res. |
|--------|---|--|------|
| and | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP \ 1] and STORE[SP];$ | $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ | (b) |
| | SP := SP 1 | (b) | |
| or | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP \ 1] \text{ or } STORE[SP];$ $SP := SP \ 1$ | $\binom{b}{b}$ | (b) |
| not | STORE[SP] := not STORE[SP] | (b) | (b) |



Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

8

9

P-instructions for comparisons

| Instr | Mooning | | Cond | Dec | lda / |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|------------|-------|
| mstr. | | | $\left(T \right)$ | rtes. | IC. |
| equ T | $STOKE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | $I] =_T STORE[SP];$ | (T) | (6) | ind (|
| Ŧ | SP := SP - 1 | | (T) | (1) | sro . |
| geq T | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | $1] \geq_T STORE[SP];$ | $\left(\frac{-}{T} \right)$ | (b) | sto (|
| | SP := SP 1 | | (T) | | |
| leq T | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | $1] \leq_T STORE[SP]$; | $\begin{pmatrix} I \\ T \end{pmatrix}$ | (b) | |
| | SP := SP 1 | | | | |
| les T | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | 1] $<_T STORE[SP]$; | $\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T \end{pmatrix}$ | (b) | |
| | SP := SP 1 | | | | |
| grt T | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | $1] >_T STORE[SP]$; | $\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T \end{pmatrix}$ | <i>(b)</i> | |
| | SP := SP 1 | | (-) | | |
| neq T | $STORE[SP \ 1] := STORE[SP$ | 1] $\neq_T STORE[SP]$; | $\begin{pmatrix} T \\ T \end{pmatrix}$ | <i>(b)</i> | |
| | SP := SP 1 | | (1) | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 14/5 | ao m/Mauror: Compiler Decign | | 10 | ` | |
| VVI | ie m/maurer. Comprer Design | | IC |) | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

P-instructions for load/store

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Res. |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|
| ldo Tq | SP := SP + 1; | $q \in [0, maxstr]$ | (T) |
| | STORE[SP] := STORE[q] | | |
| $\operatorname{Idc} Tq$ | SP := SP + 1; | Typ(q) = T | (T) |
| | STORE[SP] := q | | |
| ind T | STORE[SP] := STORE[STORE[SP]] | (a) | (T) |
| sro Tq | STORE[q] := STORE[SP]; | (T) | |
| | SP := SP - 1 | $q \in [0, maxstr]$ | |
| sto T | STORE[STORE[SP 1]] - STORE[SP] | $\begin{pmatrix} a \end{pmatrix}$ | |
| 310 1 | | $\langle T \rangle$ | |
| | SP := SP - 2 | | |





Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

11

Printed with FinePrint - purchase at www.fineprint.com

Code Generation

- Assumptions about the input program:
 - No errors (syntax, types)
 - Structure and type information is avai ab e
 - No procedures (for now)
- $\rho(v)$ is the relative address of program variable v
- nvariant *I*⁰ about the state of the P machine: Let $code_R e \ \rho = is$,

et sp be the value of SP before the execution of is

The execution of is wi eave the value of e in STORE[sp + 1], and SP's value will be sp + 1STORE is otherwise unchanged

The translation of assignments and expressions

1 . . .

Fi

| Function | | Condition |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| $code_R(e_1 = e_2) \ \rho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ equ \ T$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = T$ |
| $code_R(e_1 \neq e_2) ho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ neq \ T$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = T$ |
| | | |
| $\mathit{code}_R(e_1+e_2) ho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ add \ N$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = N$ |
| $code_R(e_1 e_2) ho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ sub \ N$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = N$ |
| $\mathit{code}_R(e_1 * e_2) ho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ \mathbf{mul} \ N$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = N$ |
| $\mathit{code}_R(e_1/e_2) ho$ | $= code_R \ e_1 \ \rho; code_R \ e_2 \ \rho; \ \operatorname{div} N$ | $Typ(e_1) = Typ(e_2) = N$ |
| $code_R(-e) ho$ | $= code_R \ e \ \rho; \ \mathbf{neg} \ N$ | Typ(e) = N |
| $\mathit{code}_R \; x \; ho$ | $= code_L x ho; $ ind T | x is a variab e of type $\ T$ |
| $code_R \ c \ ho$ | = ldc T c | $c \ { m is} \ { m a} \ { m constant} \ { m of} \ { m type} \ \ T$ |
| code(x:=e) ho | $= code_L \ x \ \rho; \ code_R \ e \ \rho; \ sto \ T$ | Typ(e) = T, |
| | | x is a variab e |
| $code_L \; x \; ho$ | = ldc a $\rho(x)$ | x is a variab e |
| | | |

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

12

Correctness of the code generation scheme

Proof by induction of the invariant I_0

Base cases:

 $code_R \ x \ \rho \text{ and } code_R \ c \ \rho$

Inductive step:

```
Example: code_R(e_1+e_2) \rho = code_R e_1 \rho; code_R e_2 \rho; add =
is
Let sp be the value of SP before the execution of
is
nd Assumptions:
```

- The execution of $code_R e_1 \rho$ eaves the value of e_1 in STORE[SP + 1] and SP has value sp + 1
- The execution of $code_R e_2 \rho$ eaves the value of e_2 in STORE[SP + 2] and SP has value sp + 2

Step:

• add adds the topmost values and eaves the result, i.e. the value of e in $STORE[SP\ +1]$ and SP has value $sp\ +1$

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

14

Example

Assume that Typ(x) = int and $\rho(x) = 5$

```
\begin{array}{l} code(x:=3) \ \rho \\ = code_L \ x \ \rho; \ code_R \ 3 \ \rho; \ \textbf{sto} \ \textbf{i} \\ = \textbf{ldc} \ \textbf{a} \ 5; \ \textbf{code}_R(3) \ \rho; \ \textbf{sto} \ \textbf{i} \\ = \textbf{ldc} \ \textbf{a} \ 5; \ \textbf{ldc} \ \textbf{i} \ 3; \ \textbf{sto} \ \textbf{i} \end{array}
```

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Example 2.1

Interpretation of the generated code

| Assume that $\rho(a) = 5$, $\rho(b) = 6$, and $\rho(c) = 7$ and the Typ(a) = Typ(b) = Typ(c) = Typ(b*c) = Typ(b+b*c) $code(a := (b + (b * c))) \rho$ $= code_L a \rho; code_R (b + (b * c)) \rho;$ sto i $= Idc a 5; code_R(b + (b * c)) \rho;$ sto i $= Idc a 5; code_R(b) \rho;$ $code_R(b * c) \rho;$ add i; sto i $= Idc a 5; code_L(b) \rho;$ ind i; $code_R(b * c) \rho;$ add i; sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; $code_R(b * c) \rho;$ add i; sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; $code_R(b) \rho;$ $code_R(c) \rho;$ mul i; ad sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; $code_L(b) \rho;$ ind i; $code_R(c) \rho;$ mul i; ad sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; $code_R(c) \rho;$ mul i; a sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; $code_R(c) \rho;$ mul i; a sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; $code_R(c) \rho;$ mul i; a sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; $code_L(c) \rho;$ ind i; mul i; sto i $= Idc a 5;$ Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; code_L(c) \rho; ind i; mul i; sto i = Idc a 5; Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 6; ind i; Idc a 7; ind i; mul i; | at :c) = int d i; I i; add i; ndd i; nul i; add i; ; add i; | q ssp 9 sep 4 ldc a 5 ldc a 6 ind i ldc a 7 ind i ldc a 7 ind i sto i |
|---|---|---|
| Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design | 16 | Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design |

(Non-)Optimality of the generated code

- Examp e 1: a := b
 - Generated code: Idc a $\rho(a)$; Idc a $\rho(b)$; ind i; sto
 - Minima code Ido i $\rho(b)$; sro i $\rho(a)$
- Example 2: a := a * a;
 - Generated code:
 Idc a ρ(a)
 Idc a ρ(a)
 ind i
 Idc a ρ(a)
 ind i
 sto
 Minima code
 Ido i ρ(a)
 dpl i
 mul i
 - sro i $\rho(a)$

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Summary

- An inductive definition of the generated code
- Assuming that the reative addresses of variables are known at compile time
- The stack machine simp ifies the task of hand ing complex expressions

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Compiling Control Flow Statements

Moo y Sagiv Te Aviv University sagiv@math.tau.ac.il and Reinhard Wi he m Universität des Saar andes wilhelm@cs.uni-sb.de

Apri 21, 1997

Subjects

- Syntax of contro flow statements
- Sequence of statements
- Conditiona Statements
- Case statements
- terative Statements

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

Sequence of statements **Syntax** Sequence of Statements $st_1; st_2; \cdots; st_n$ • $code(st_1; st_2)\rho = code(st_1)\rho; code(st_2)\rho$ contro drops through from the ast instruction generated for st_1 to the first instruction generated **Conditional Statements** for st_2 • if e then st fi st_1 and st_2 are compiled in the same ρ • if e then st else st fi • case e of • Examp e: Assume that Typ(x) = Typ(y) = int0: st_1 ; 1: st_2 ; $code(x := 3; y := x + 1) \rho$ $= code(x := 3) \rho; code(y := x + 1) \rho$ k: st_k $= code_L x \rho; code_R 3 \rho;$ sto i; code $(y := x + 1) \rho$ = Idc a $\rho(x)$; code_R(3) ρ ; sto i code (y := x + 1) ρ end = Idc a $\rho(x)$; Idc i 3; sto i code (y := x + 1) ρ = Idc a $\rho(x)$; Idc i 3; sto i $code_L y \rho$; $code_R (x+1) \rho$; sto i **Iterative Statements** = Idc a $\rho(x)$; Idc i 3; sto i Idc a $\rho(y)$; $code_R(x+1) \rho$; sto • while $e \operatorname{do} st \operatorname{od}$ • repeat st until eWi he m/Maurer: Compiler Design Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design 2 3

Conditional Statements

Machine ressources to implement control statements: unconditional and conditional jumps P-code Instructions for Branches

Inst.MeaningCond.Resultujp qPC := q $q \in [0, codemax]$ fjp qif STORE[SP] = false(b)()then PC := q $q \in [0, codemax]$ fi;SP := SP - 1

fjp consumes the boo ean value on top of the stack

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

4

Conditional Statements

- $code(if e then st fi) \rho = code_R e \rho; fjp l; code st \rho; l:$
- $code(if e then st_1 else st_2 fi) \rho = code_R e \rho;$ fjp $l_1; code st_1 \rho;$ ujp $l_2; l_1 : code st_2 \rho; l_2:$



Examples

Examp e1: if a > b then c := a else c := b fi

Examp e2: if x < 5 then if y < 7 then c := a fi fi

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design

6

Case Statement

Restricted form: nitia section of the natura numbers

Input

```
case e of
0: st<sub>1</sub> ;
1: st<sub>2</sub> ;
```

```
k : st_k end
```

Two Solutions

Generate nested conditionals
if e = 0 then st₁
else if e = 1 then st₂

else if e = n then st_k
else run time error: unmatched case abe fi fi ··· fi
Jump tab e: PC := tab e(e)

Wi he m/Maurer: Compi er Design



Memory Allocation

Mooly Sagiv Tel Aviv University sagiv@math.tau.ac.il and Reinhard Wilhelm Universität des Saarlandes wilhelm@cs.uni-sb.de

April 24, 1997

Subjects

- Fixed size data
- Static aays
- Dynamic" Arrays
- Records
- Pointers

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Compile-Time Information on Variables

- Name
- Type
- Dimension of arrays
- Selectors in records
- Scope when is it recognized
- Size How many bytes are required at run-time to represent the object

Assumptions

- Code generation for a single procedure
- The first 5 stack locations are reserved; they will later be needed for procedure organization.

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

The function ρ

- For every data type t size(t) is the number of bytes required at run-time to represent objects of (static) type t
- Assumption: size(integer) = size(real) = size(char) =size(boolean) = 1
- Memory allocation for variables in order of appearance
 var v₀: t₀; v₁: t₂;...; v_k: t_k;

$$\rho(v_i) = 5 + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} size(t_j)$$

• Example: var x, y : real; z : boolean

$$\rho = [x \mapsto 5, y \mapsto 6, z \mapsto 7]$$

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

4

Static Arrays

- The function *size* is defined inductively
- Example:
 var a : array [-1..5, 6..7, 3..8] of integer
 consists of 5 (-1) + 1 = 7 subarrays of type array [6..7, 3..8] of integer
 - which consist of 7 6 + 1 = 2 subarrays of type array [3..8] of integer
 - whose sizes are $(8 3 + 1) \times size(int) = 6$.

Thus size(a) = 7 * 2 * 6 words.

• For an array type

$$at: array[l_1...u_1, l_2...u_2, ..., l_k...u_k]$$
of t

 $size(at) = (u_1-l_1+1)*size(\operatorname{array}[l_2..u_2,...,l_k..u_k]oft)$ Therefore

$$size(at) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} d_j * size(t)$$
 where
 $d_j = u_j - l_j + 1$

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

5

Row Major Array Ordering

var a: array[-5..5, 1..9] of integer $a[-5,1], a[-5,2], \ldots, a[-5,9],$ $a[-4,1], a[-4,2], \ldots, a[-4,9],$ $a[5,1], \quad a[5,2], \quad \dots, a[5,9],$ I-val(a[i, j]) = I-val(a)+ pos. in 1st dimen. * size of 1-dim. subarray + pos. in 2nd dimen. * size of int = I-val(a)+ (i - (-5)) * (9 - 1 + 1)+ j - 1= I-val(a)+ (i+5) * 9 + i - 1= I-val(a)+ 9 * i + j + 44

Row Major General Array Ordering

var a: array $[l_1...u_1, l_2...u_2, ..., l_n...u_n]$ of t $a[l_1, ..., l_n], ..., a[l_1, ..., l_{n-1}, u_n],$ \vdots $a[u_1, ..., u_{n-1}, l_n], ..., a[u_1, ..., u_{n-1}, u_n]$

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

6

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Indexing Static Arrays

Colors: dynamic – static

 $l-val(a[\hat{i}_1,\ldots,\hat{i}_n])$ = l-val(a)+ $(\hat{i}_1 - l_1) * size(array[l_2...u_2, ..., l_n...u_n] \text{ of } t) +$ $(\hat{i}_2 - l_2) * size(\operatorname{array}[l_3..u_3, \ldots, l_n..u_n] \text{ of } t) + \cdots +$ $(\hat{\boldsymbol{i}}_n - \boldsymbol{l}_n) * size(t)$ = -val(a)+ $(\hat{i}_1 - l_1) * (\prod_{j=2}^n d_j) * size(t) +$ $(\hat{i}_2 - l_2) * (\prod_{i=3}^n d_i) * size(t) + \cdots +$ $(\hat{i}_n - l_n) * size(t)$ = -val(a)+ $\hat{i}_1 * (\prod_{j=2}^n d_j) * size(t) +$ $\hat{i}_{2} * (\prod_{i=3}^{n} d_{i}) * size(t) + \cdots +$ $\hat{i}_n * size(t) (l_1 * \prod_{i=2}^n d_i + l_2 * \prod_{i=3}^n d_i + l_n) * size(t)$ = I-val(a)+ $\hat{i}_1 * q * d^{(1)} + \hat{i}_2 * q * d^{(2)} + \dots + \hat{i}_n * q - d * q$ where $\hat{i}_j = r\text{-val}(i_j), \quad d^{(i)} = \prod_{i=i+1}^n, \quad g = size(t).$ - Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -8

P-Code for Array Indexing

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Result |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| ixa q | STORE[SP - 1] := | $\begin{pmatrix} i \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ | (<i>a</i>) |
| | STORE[SP - 1] + | | |
| | STORE[SP] * q; | | |
| | SP := SP - 1 | | |
| inc Tq | STORE[SP] := | | |
| doc Ta | $\begin{bmatrix} STORE[SP] + q \\ STORE[SP] & - \end{bmatrix}$ | (T), Typ(q) = i | (T) |
| uec 1 q | STORE[SP] - a | (T). $Tup(a) = i$ | (T) |
| $code_I [i_1$ | $[i_1, \dots, i_n] g \rho = code$ code \vdots code | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ | ; |
| $code_I [i_1$ | $[i_1, \dots, i_n] g \rho = code$ $[i_1, \dots, i_n] g \rho$ $[i_1, \dots, i_n] g $ | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ a $g * d;$ | ; |
| $code_I [i_1$ | $[i_1, \dots, i_n] g \rho = code$: code : code dec | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ a $g * d;$ | ; |
| code _I [i ₁ | $[\dots, i_n] g \rho = code$ [code] [code] [code] [code] [code] | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ a $g * d;$ | ; |
| code _I [i ₁ | $[\ldots, i_n] g \rho = code$ [code] [code] [code] [code] | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ a $g * d;$ | ;;; |
| code _I [i ₁ | $[\dots, i_n] g \rho = code$ [code] [code] [code] [code] [code] | $e_R i_1 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(1)}$ $e_R i_2 ho;$ ixa $g * d^{(2)}$ $e_R i_n ho;$ ixa $g;$ a $g * d;$ | ;;; |

Approaches to Array Bound Checking

- No checking at run-time (C)
- Generate a run-time check that the overall index expression is in range (PL1)
- Generate a run-time check that every array index is within range (Pascal, Java)

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

10

P-code for Array Checking

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Result |
|-----------|--|-------|--------|
| chk $p q$ | if not $(p \leq STORE[SP] \leq q)$ then $error("value out of range")$ | (i) | (i) |
| | fi | | |

New code for indexing including array bound checks

```
code_{I} [i_{1}, \dots, i_{n}] desc \rho = 
code_{R} i_{1} \rho; chk l_{1} u_{1}; ixa g \cdot d^{(1)}; 
code_{R} i_{2} \rho; chk l_{2} u_{2}; ixa g \cdot d^{(2)}; 
: 
code_{R} i_{n} \rho; chk l_{n} u_{n}; ixa g; 
dec a g \cdot d;
```

where $desc = (g; l_1, u_1, ..., l_n, u_n)$

This array description is made available through the symbol table, c.f. Semantic Analysis.

| Example | | Dynamic Arrays |
|--|----|---|
| var i, j : integer; a: array[-55, 19] of integer $code(a[i+1,j] := 0) \rho =$ Idc a 7 Idc a 5 ind i Idc i 1 add i chk -5 5 ixa 9 Idc a 6 ind i chk 1 9 ixa 1 dec a -44 Idc i 0 sto i | | The size of the array is determined when the procedure is entered Compile-time information: Dimension, i.e. the number of indices Size of the components (if they are not and don't contain dynamic arrays) Run-time information: Array bounds Index ranges Size of the array Relative address where the array begins Value of index expressions |
| – Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design – | 12 | – Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design – 13 |

Indexing Dynamic Arrays

Colors now: known at indexing – known at creation I-val $(a[\hat{i}_1, \dots, \hat{i}_n])$

$$= \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{val}(a) + (\hat{i}_1 - l_1) * (\prod_{j=2}^n d_j) * size(t) + (\hat{i}_2 - l_2) * (\prod_{j=3}^n d_j) * size(t) + \dots + (\hat{i}_n - l_n) * size(t) \\ = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{val}(a) + (\dots + (\hat{i}_1 * d_2 + \hat{i}_2) * d_3 + \dots + \hat{i}_n) * d_n * size(t) - (\dots + ((l_1 * d_2 + l_2) * d_3 + \dots + l_n) * d_n * size(t)) \\ = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{val}(a) + d_a - d_c$$

where \hat{i}_j is an abbreviation for $rval(i_j)$. $d_j = u_j - l_j + 1$ and d_c are computed once, upon array creation.

 d_a is computed for each array access.

Computing d_a by a Horner scheme saves multiplications.

Subtracting d_c from the array address yields the "adjusted address".

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Array Descriptor

| 0 | Adjusted Address :a |
|--------|---------------------|
| 1 | Array size :i |
| 2 | Subtr. part :i |
| 3 | l_1 :i |
| 4 | u_1 :i |
| ÷ | : |
| 2n + 1 | l_n :i |
| 2n+2 | u_n :i |
| 2n + 3 | d_2 :i |
| : | : |
| 3n + 1 | d_n :i |

 $code_{Ld} c[i_1, \ldots, i_k] \rho = \operatorname{Idc} a \rho(c); code_{Id} [i_1, \ldots, i_k] g \rho$ $code_{Id} [i_1, \ldots, i_n] g \rho =$

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

Additional P-code instructions

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Result |
|------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| dpl T | SP := SP + 1; | T | $\left(\begin{array}{c}T\\T\end{array}\right)$ |
| | $STORE[SP] := \\STORE[SP - 1]$ | | |
| ldd q | SP := SP + 1; | $\begin{pmatrix} T_2 \\ T_1 \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}i\\T_2\\T_1\\a\end{array}\right)$ |
| | STORE[SP] := STORE[STORE[SP - 3] + q] | | |
| sli T_2 | STORE[SP - 1] := $STORE[SP];$ | $\begin{pmatrix} T_2 \\ T_1 \end{pmatrix}$ | (T_1) |
| L | | 1 | LJ |
| – Wilhelm/ | 'Maurer: Compiler Design – | | 16 |

A Simplified Example

```
program test;
var i : integer ; /* \rho(i) = 5 */
procedure p;
var j, a[1..5, 1..i] of integer ; /* \rho(j) = 5, \rho(a) = 6 */
begin a[3, j] := · · · /*
                        Idc a 6
                        dpl i
                        ind i
                        ldc i 0
                        Idc i 3
                        add i
                        Idd 2 * 2 + 3
                        mul i
                        ldc a 5
                        ind i
                        add i
                        ixa 1
                        sli a
                        . . .
                        sto i */
end;
begin read(i); p end.
```

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Records

- Size known at compile time
- We assume "unique names"
- Example:

var v : record /* $\rho(v) = 5^*/$ a : integer ; /* $\rho(a) = 0^*/$ b : integer /* $\rho(b) = 1^*/$

end

```
code_L(v.b) = \mathbf{ldc} \ \mathbf{a} \ \mathbf{5} \ ; \mathbf{inc} \ \mathbf{a} \ \mathbf{1}
```

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Pointers and dynamic memory allocation

- Dynamic duration (lifetime) of the memory
- Storage can be freed in one of the following cases:
 - Can no longer be referenced ("garbage collection")
 - Explicit deallocation (cfree, dispose)
- Space cannot be allocated on the "stack"



Complex Pointer Expressions The Generated P-Code Assume that $Typ(x) = \uparrow t$ $code(\mathbf{new}(x)) \rho =$ • Examples: **ldc** a $\rho(x)$ - $x \uparrow [i+1, j].a \uparrow [i] \uparrow$ - $y.a.b.c \uparrow [i, j+1].d$ **ldc** i size(t)• Recursive translation new $code_L(xr) \rho = \operatorname{Idc} a \rho(x); \text{ for name } x$ $\mathit{code}_M(.xr) ho$ $code_M(\uparrow r) \ ho =$ ind a; $code_M([i_1,\ldots,i_n]r) \rho = code_{Id} [i_1,\ldots,i_n] g \rho;$ $code_M(\varepsilon) ho$ - Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -22 - Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

 $code_M(r) \rho$

 $code_M(r) \rho$

 $code_M(r) \rho$

 $= \varepsilon$

= inc a $\rho(x)$; for name x

 $code_M(r) \rho$ for array

23

Example

```
code_L pt \uparrow .b \uparrow .a[i+1,j]
```

| ldc a $\rho(pt)$; | Load Address of pt |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| ind a; | Load start address of the record |
| inc a 99; | The start address of b |
| ind a; | Dereference pointer |
| inc $a 0;$ | The start address of a |
| $code_{Id}[i+1,j] \perp \rho$ | |

Handling Procedures

Mooly Sagiv Tel Aviv University sagiv@math.tau.ac.il and Reinhard Wilhelm Universität des Saarlandes wilhelm@cs.uni-sb.de

April 29, 1997

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Subjects

- Scoping
- Static vs. Dynamic Binding
- Calling Trees
- Static Predecessor Tree
- Parameter Passing Mechanisms
- The Run-Time Stack Frame
- Addressing of Variables
- Computing the Address Environment
- Procedures as Parameters

Procedure Incarnations

- Calling a procedure p creates an incarnation \hat{p}
- An incarnation of a procedure contains incarnations of the formal parameters and the local variables
- Control
 - 1. enters the incarnation \hat{p} from the caller \hat{q} ,
 - 2. may pass to a procedure incarnation \hat{r} created by a call,
 - 3. returns from \hat{r} ,
 - 4. returns from \hat{p} to \hat{q} .

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

Calling Tree

- Defined for an execution sequence
- An ordered tree
- The root is the main program
- There is a node for every procedure incarnation
- If p calls p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n , then incarnations of the p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n are the children of p

A path starting with the root is called an **incarnation path**.



- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

3

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

Static vs. Dynamic Binding

Binding strategy (*scope rules*) relates *applied* occurrences of names to *defining* occurrences.

- **Static:** Applied occurrence of x denotes the defining occurrence of x in the next enclosing scope,
- **Dynamic:** Applied occurrence of x denotes the last created incarnation of x.

 $[\]operatorname{var} x$





Static Binding



– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Static Predecessor Tree

- Defined for an incarnation path of a call tree
- Its root is the main program
- There is a node for every procedure incarnation of the path
- \hat{p} is parent of \hat{q} , iff q is declared directly inside p and \hat{p} is the first incarnation of p "above" \hat{q} in the path

Warning! In general only true for programs without formal procedures.

Example: Static Predecessor Trees



8

7

Parameter Passing Mechanisms

value: The r-value of the actual parameter is passed.

- **value-result:** Only variable actual parameters allowed. Their r-value is passed to and returned from the callee.
- var/reference: Only variable actual parameters allowed. Their I-value is passed to the callee.

name: Actual parameter is evaluated every time execution needs it.

"Thunk"" (pointer to evaluation code and pointer to caller's frame) is passed.

9

Example

```
program test ;
var i : integer ;
procedure p(..., x, y: integer);
begin
      while x > 0 do
             x := x - 1;
             y := y + 1
      end
end
begin
      i := 3;
      p(i,i)
end
\ldots = value:
\ldots = var:
\ldots = value-result:
- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -
```

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

Implementing Recursion

- Traversing the call tree with a nonrecursive program,
- needs a stack,
- elements in the stack are nodes of the call tree (i.e. procedure incarnations),
- stack content is prefix of an incarnation path (starting at the root),
- structure of this stack is isomorphic to the *run-time stack* for implementing procedures.

The Structure of an Activation Record

The representation of a procedure incarnation



- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

11

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Further outline

- Conceptual view of addressing
- Adapt memory allocation scheme ρ
- Adapt code for I-values
- Code for function/procedure calls/return
- Code for parameter passing
- Code for the function/procedure body

Addressing Global Variables

Using *nesting depth* of name occurrences Inductively defined

- nd(main) = 0
- \bullet Types, variables, and procedures declared inside procedure p have nesting depth nd(p)+1
- Applied occurrences of names inside procedure p have nesting depth nd(p)+1

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -





Three different calls and stack configurations.

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Adapt Memory Allocation Scheme

- $\rho(x) = \langle relative-address, nesting \ depth \rangle$
- Setting relative address remains:

$$\rho_1(v_i) = 5 + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} size(t_j)$$

for var $v_0: t_0; v_1: t_2; \ldots; v_k: t_k;$

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

17

Size Setting

Static sizes:

Parameters

var-parameters size = 1value-dyn-array-parameters size = 3 * n + 2other-value-parameters size is unchanged

Locals

static-array size = 3 * n + 2 + old-sizeother-local size is unchanged

3 * n + 2 size of array descriptor

Dynamic sizes:

Dynamic arrays (locals+parameters) as given by old *size* formula, but evaluated at runtime.

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Adapt *code*_L

| Instr. | Meaning |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| $\int \mathbf{lod} \ T \ p \ q$ | SP := SP + 1; |
| | STORE[SP] := STORE[base(p, MP) + q] |
| Ida $p q$ | SP := SP + 1; |
| | STORE[SP] := base(p, MP) + q |
| str $T p q$ | STORE[base(p, MP) + q] := STORE[SP]; |
| | SP := SP - 1 |

base(p, a) = if p = 0 then a else base(p-1, STORE[a+1])

| $code_L(x \ r) \ \rho \ nd = Ida \ a \ d \ ra;$ | |
|--|--|
| $code_M \; r \; ho \; nd$, | |
| where $\rho(x) = (ra, nd')$, $d = nd - nd'$ and | |
| x is variable or formal value parameter | |
| $code_L(x \ r) \ \rho \ nd = lod a \ d \ ra;$ | |
| $code_M \ r \ ho \ nd$ | |
| where $\rho(x) = (ra, nd')$, $d = nd - nd'$, | |
| and x is formal var parameter | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| – Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design – 19 | |

Code for Procedure/Function Call

- 1. Set static link of callee
- 2. Set dynamic link of callee
- 3. Save *EP*
- 4. Evaluate parameters (I-values, r-values)
- 5. Set *MP*
- 6. Save PC as return-address
- 7. Jump to code of callee
- 8. Set SP to end of static part
- 9. Allocate space for dynamic value arrays; copy
- 10. Set *EP*
- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Procedure Call

 $code \ p(e_1, \dots, e_k) \ \rho \ nd =$ $mst \ nd - nd';$ $code_A \ e_1 \ \rho \ nd;$ \vdots $code_A \ e_k \ \rho \ nd;$ $cup \ s \ l \qquad (* \ \rho(p) = (l, nd) \ *)$

P-instructions for call and entry

| Instr. | Meaning | Comment |
|---------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| mst p | STORE[SP+2] := base(p, MP); | Static link |
| | STORE[SP+3] := MP; | Dynamic link |
| | STORE[SP+4] := EP; | Save EP |
| | SP := SP + 5 | |
| $cup \ p \ q$ | MP := SP - (p+4); | p space |
| | | for parameters |
| | STORE[MP+4] := PC; | Return address |
| | PC := q | Jump to q |
| ssp p | SP := MP + p - 1 | alloc. static area |
| sep p | EP := SP + p; | alloc. temp. area |
| | if $EP \ge NP$ | Check collision |
| | then error ("store overflow") | stack and heap |
| | fi | |

base(p, a) = if p = 0 then a else base(p-1, STORE[a+1])fi

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

P-instruction mst



nd (applied occurrence of q) - nd (defining occurrence of q) = 3





– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

Code for Procedure/Function Return

- 1. Restore SP to the beginning of current stack frame
- 2. Restore PC to return-address
- 3. Restore EP and check for heap-stack collision
- 4. Release frame, i.e. set MP to dynamic link

P-instructions for Return

| Instr. | Meaning | Comment |
|--------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| retf | SP := MP ; | result is on top |
| | PC := STORE[MP + 4]; | return address |
| | EP := STORE[MP + 3]; | Restore EP |
| | if $EP \geq NP$ | |
| | then error("store overflow") | |
| | fi | |
| | MP := STORE[MP + 2] | Release frame |
| retp | SP := MP -1; | No return value |
| | PC := STORE[MP + 4]; | return address |
| | EP := STORE[MP + 3]; | Restore EP |
| | if $EP \geq NP$ | |
| | then error ("store overflow") | |
| | fi | |
| | MP := STORE[MP + 2] | Release frame |

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

23

Procedure/Function Code

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

24

| $elab_specs$ | $elab_pdecls$ |
|---|---|
| $\begin{aligned} elab_specs: & Spec^* \times Addr_Env \times Addr \times ND \rightarrow \\ & Addr_Env \times Addr \end{aligned}$ $\begin{aligned} elab_specs (\mathbf{var} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: \ \mathbf{array}[l_1u_1,, l_ku_k] \ \mathbf{of} \ t'; \ specs) \end{aligned}$ $\begin{aligned} \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ specs \ \rho' \ (n_a+3k+2) \ nd \ where \\ \rho' = \rho[(n_a, nd)/x] \\ & [(n_a+2i+1, nd)/l_i]_{i=1}^k \\ & [(n_a+2i+2, nd)/u_i]_{i=1}^k \end{aligned}$ $\begin{aligned} elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ \rho \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \\ & elab_specs \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n_a \ nd = \ (\mathbf{value} \ x: t; \ specs) \ n$ | $elab_pdecls \text{ processes procedure declarations}$ $elab_pdecls : Pdecl^* \times Addr_Env \times ND \rightarrow Addr_Env \times Code$ $elab_pdecls (\text{ proc } p_1(\ldots);\ldots; \\ \vdots \\ \text{ proc } p_k(\ldots);\ldots;) \rho nd =$ $(\rho', l_1: code (\text{proc } p_1(\ldots);\ldots) \rho' nd + 1; \\ \vdots \\ l_k: code (\text{proc } p_k(\ldots);\ldots) \rho' nd + 1)$ where $\rho' = \rho[(l_1, nd)/p_1,\ldots,(l_k, nd)/p_k]$ $elab_pdecls() \rho nd = (\rho,())$ |
| – Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design – 25 | – Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design – 26 |

Parameter Passing

var-actual-parameters

 $code_A \ x \ \rho \ nd = \\ code_L \ x \ \rho \ nd$

value-actual-parameters

 $code_A \ e \ \rho \ nd = \\ code_R \ e \ \rho \ nd$

value-actual-structural-parameters

 $code_A \ x \ \rho \ nd =$ $code_L \ x \ \rho \ nd;$ **movs** g

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

27

P-code for moves

| Instr. | Meaning | Cond. | Res. |
|---------------------|--|-------|------|
| movs q | for $i := q - 1$ down to 0 do | (a) | |
| | STORE[SP + i] := | | |
| | STORE[STORE[SP] + i] | | |
| | od; | | |
| | SP := SP + q - 1 | | |
| $\mathbf{movd} \ q$ | for $i := 1$ to $STORE[MP + q + 1]$ do | | |
| | STORE[SP + i] := | | |
| | STORE[STORE[MP + q]] | | |
| | +STORE[MP + q + 2] + i - 1] | | |
| | od; | | |
| | STORE[MP + q] := | | |
| | SP + 1 - STORE[MP + q + 2] | | |
| | SP := SP + STORE[MP + q + 1] | | |

Copying Dynamic Arrays

 $code_P$ (value $x : array[u_1..o_1, ..., u_k..o_k]$ of $t) \rho nd = movd ra;$

27

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

The Main Program

 $code (program p (specs); vdecls; pdecls; body) \rho 0 = ssp n_a; code_P vdecls \rho 1; sep k; ujp l; proc_code; l: code body \rho' 1; stp where (\rho, n_a) = elab_vdecls vdecls Ø 5 1 and (\rho', proc_code) = elab_pdecls pdecls \rho 1$

- Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design -

```
Input Example
```

```
program foo;
var i : integer ;
ssp 10; sep 7; ujp l_1;
function fact( n: integer): integer;
l_2: ssp 6; sep 9; ujp l_3;
begin l_3:
      if n = 1
        Ida a 2 – 2 5; ind i; Idc i 1; equ i; fjp l_4
        then fact := 1
        Ida a 2 – 2 0; Idc i 1; sto i; ujp l_5:
        else fact := n * fact(n - 1) fi
        l_4: Ida a 2 - 2 0; Ida a 2 - 2 5; ind i;
        mst 2 – 1; Ida a 2 – 2 5; ind i; Idc i 1; sub i; cup 1 l_2
        mul i; sto i; l_5:
end; retf
begin l_1:
      i := fact(2)
      Ida a 1 – 1 9;
      mst 1 - 1; ldc i 2; cup 1 l_2
      sto i
end. stp
```

– Wilhelm/Maurer: Compiler Design –

29

30

Procedures/Functions as Parameters



EECS 583 – Lecture 15 Machine Information, Scheduling a Basic Block

University of Michigan

March 5, 2003

Machine Information

- Each step of code generation requires knowledge of the machine
 - » Hard code it? used to be common practice
 - » Retargetability, then cannot
- What does the code generator need to know about the target processor?
 - » Structural information?
 - No
 - » For each opcode
 - What registers can be accessed as each of its operands
 - Other operand encoding limitations
 - » Operation latencies
 - Read inputs, write outputs
 - » Resources utilized
 - Which ones, when

- 1 -

Machine Description (mdes)

- Elcor mdes supports very general class of EPIC processors
 - » Probably more general than you need \bigcirc
 - » Weakness Does not support ISA changes like GCC
- Terminology
 - » <u>Generic opcode</u>
 - Virtual opcode, machine supports k versions of it
 - ADD_W
 - » Architecture opcode or unit specific opcode or sched opcode
 - Specific assembly operation of the processor
 - ADD_W.0 = add on function unit 0
- Each unit specific opcode has 3 properties
 - » IO format
 - » Latency
 - » Resource usage

- 2 -

IO Format

- Registers, register files
 - » Number, width, static or rotating
 - » Read-only (hardwired 0) or read-write
- Operation
 - » Number of source/dests
 - » Predicated or not
 - » For each source/dest/pred
 - What register file(s) can be read/written
 - Literals, if so, how big

Multicluster machine example:

ADD_W.0gpr1, gpr1 : gpr1ADD_W_L.0gpr1, lit6 : gpr1ADD_W.1gpr2, gpr2 : gpr2

Latency Information

- Multiply takes 3 cycles
 - » No, not that simple!!!
- Differential input/output latencies
 - » Earliest read latency for each source operand
 - » Latest read latency for each source operand
 - Earliest write latency for each destination operand
 - » Latest write latency for each destination operand
- ✤ Why all this?
 - Unexpected events may make operands arrive late or be produced early

- Compound op: part may finish early or start late
- Instruction re-execution by
 - » Exception handlers
 - » Interupt handlers
- Ex: mpyadd(d1, d2, s1, s2, s3)
 - » d1 = s1 * s2, d2 = d1 + s3



- 4 -

Memory Serialization Latency

- Ensuring the proper ordering of dependent memory operations
- Not the memory latency
 - » But, point in the memory pipeline where 2 ops are guaranteed to be processed in sequential order
- Page fault memory op is re-executed, so need
 - » Earliest mem serialization latency
 - » Latest mem serialization latency
- Remember
 - » Compiler will use this, so any 2 memory ops that cannot be proven independent, must be separated by mem serialization latency.

Branch Latency

- Time relative to the initiation time of a branch at which the target of the branch is initiated
- What about branch prediction?
 - » Can reduce branch latency
 - » But, may not make it 1
- We will assume branch latency is 1 for this class (ie no delay slots!)

Example:

0: branch 1: xxx 2: yyy 3: target

branch latency = k (3) delay slots = k - 1 (2) Note xxx and yyy are multiOps

- 6 -

Resources

- A <u>machine resource</u> is any aspect of the target processor for which over-subscription is possible if not explicitly managed by the compiler
 - » Scheduler must pick conflict free combinations
- 3 kinds of machine resources
 - » <u>Hardware resources</u> are hardware entities that would be occupied or used during the execution of an opcode
 - Integer ALUS, pipeline stages, register ports, busses, etc.
 - » <u>Abstract resources</u> are conceptual entities that are used to model operation conflicts or sharing constraints that do not directly correspond to any hardware resource
 - Sharing an instruction field
 - » <u>Counted resources</u> are identical resources such that k are required to do something
 - Any 2 input busses

Reservation Tables

For each opcode, the resources used at each cycle relative to its initiation time are specified in the form of a table

Res1, Res2 are abstract resources to model issue constraints



Non-pipelined multiply



Load, uses ALU for addr calculation, can't issue load with add or multiply

- 8 -

Now, Lets Get Back to Scheduling...

- Scheduling constraints
 - What limits the operations that can be concurrently executed or reordered?
 - » Processor resources modeled by mdes
 - » Dependences between operations
 - Data, memory, control
- Processor resources
 - » Manage using resource usage map (RU_map)
 - » When each resource will be used by already scheduled ops
 - » Considering an operation at time t
 - See if each resource in reservation table is free
 - » Schedule an operation at time t
 - Update RU_map by marking resources used by op busy

Data Dependences

- Data dependences
 - » If 2 operations access the same register, they are dependent
 - » However, only keep dependences to most recent producer/consumer as other edges are redundant
 - » Types of data dependences



- 10 -

More Dependences

- Memory dependences
 - » Similar as register, but through memory
 - » Memory dependences may be certain or maybe
- Control dependences
 - » We discussed this earlier
 - » Branch determines whether an operation is executed or not
 - » Operation must execute after/before a branch
 - » Note, control flow (C0) is not a dependence



Dependence Graph

| * | Represent dependences between op a DAG | erations in a block via |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| | » Nodes = operations» Edges = dependences | |
| * | Single-pass traversal required to insert dependences | |
| * | Example | 2 |
| | 1: $r1 = load(r2)$ 2: $r2 = r1 + r4$ | 3 |
| | 3: store (r4, r2) 4: $p1 = cmpp (r2 < 0)$ | 4 |
| | 5: branch if p1 to BB3 6: store (r1, r2) | 5 |
| | BB3: | (6) |

- 12 -

Dependence Edge Latencies

- <u>Edge latency</u> = minimum number of cycles necessary between initiation of the predecessor and successor in order to satisfy the dependence
- ♦ Register flow dependence, $a \rightarrow b$
 - » Latest_write(a) Earliest_read(b)
- ♦ Register anti dependence, a → b
 - » Latest_read(a) Earliest_write(b) + 1
- ♦ Register output dependence, $a \rightarrow b$
 - » Latest_write(a) Earliest_write(b) + 1
- Negative latency
 - Possible, means successor can start before predecessor
 - » We will only deal with latency ≥ 0 , so MAX any latency with 0

Dependence Edge Latencies (2)

| * | Memory dependences, $a \rightarrow b$ (all types, flow, anti, |
|---|--|
| | output) |
| | » latency = latest_serialization_latency(a) – earliest_serialization_latency(b) + 1 |
| | » Prioritized memory operations |
| | Hardware orders memory ops by order in MultiOp |
| | • Latency can be 0 with this support |
| * | Control dependences |
| | » branch \rightarrow b |
| | • Op b cannot issue until prior branch completed |
| | latency = branch_latency |
| | » a → branch |
| | • Op a must be issued before the branch completes |
| | latency = 1 – branch_latency (can be negative) |
| | conservative, latency = MAX(0, 1-branch_latency) |
| | |

- 14 -

Class Problem

| min/max read/write latencies $r1 = load(r2)$ add: src 0/1 dst 1/1 $r2 = r2 + 1$ mpy: src 0/2 dst 2/3 $r3 = load(r2)$ load: src 0/0 $r4 = r1 * r3$ | machine model | Draw dependence graph Label edges with type and latencies |
|--|--|--|
| | min/max read/write latencies add: src 0/1 dst 1/1 mpy: src 0/2 dst 2/3 load: src 0/0 dst 2/2 sync 1/1 store: src 0/0 dst - sync 1/1 | r1 = load(r2) r2 = r2 + 1 store (r8, r2) r3 = load(r2) r4 = r1 * r3 r5 = r5 + r4 r2 = r6 + 4 store (r2, r5) |

Dependence Graph Properties - Estart

- Estart = earliest start time, (as soon as possible ASAP)
 - » Schedule length with infinite resources (dependence height)
 - » Estart = 0 if node has no predecessors
 - » Estart = MAX(Estart(pred) + latency) for each predecessor node
 - » Example



- 16 -

Lstart

- Lstart = latest start time, ALAP
 - » Latest time a node can be scheduled s.t. sched length not increased beyond infinite resource schedule length
 - » Lstart = Estart if node has no successors
 - » Lstart = MIN(Lstart(succ) latency) for each successor node
 - » Example



Slack

- Slack = measure of the scheduling freedom
 - » Slack = Lstart Estart for each node
 - » Larger slack means more mobility
 - » Example



- 18 -

Critical Path

- Critical operations = Operations with slack = 0
 - » No mobility, cannot be delayed without extending the schedule length of the block
 - » Critical path = sequence of critical operations from node with no predecessors to exit node, can be multiple crit paths



Class Problem



| Node | Estart | Lstart | Slack |
|------|--------|--------|-------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |

Critical path(s) =



Operation Priority

- Priority Need a mechanism to decide which ops to schedule first (when you have multiple choices)
- Common priority functions
 - » Height Distance from exit node
 - Give priority to amount of work left to do
 - » Slackness inversely proportional to slack
 - Give priority to ops on the critical path
 - » Register use priority to nodes with more source operands and fewer destination operands
 - Reduces number of live registers
 - » Uncover high priority to nodes with many children
 - Frees up more nodes
 - » Original order when all else fails

Height-Based Priority

Height-based is the most common

» priority(op) = MaxLstart - Lstart(op) + 1



- 22 -

List Scheduling (Cycle Scheduler)

- Build dependence graph, calculate priority
- Add all ops to UNSCHEDULED set
- time = -1

while (UNSCHEDULED is not empty)

- » time++
- » READY = UNSCHEDULED ops whose incoming dependences have been satisfied
- » Sort READY using priority function
- » For each op in READY (highest to lowest priority)
 - op can be scheduled at current time? (are the resources free?)
 - Yes, schedule it, op.issue_time = time
 - \checkmark Mark resources busy in RU_map relative to issue time
 - ↓ Remove op from UNSCHEDULED/READY sets
 - No, continue

Cycle Scheduling Example



Cycle Scheduling Example (3)



| time | Ready | Placed |
|------|-------|--------|
| 0 | 1,2,7 | 1,2 |
| 1 | 7 | - |
| 2 | 3,4,7 | 3,4 |
| 3 | 7 | - |
| 4 | 5,7,8 | 5,8 |
| 5 | 7 | - |
| 6 | 6,7 | 6,7 |
| 7 | - | |
| 8 | 9 | 9 |
| 9 | 10 | 10 |
| | | |

Schedule

- 26 -

Class Problem

Machine: 2 issue, 1 memory port, 1 ALU Memory port = 2 cycles, pipelined ALU = 1 cycle



- 1. Calculate height-based priorities
- 2. Schedule using cycle scheduler