Loops or Lather, Rinse, Repeat... CS4410: Spring 2013

Program Loops

- Reading: Appel Ch. 18
- Loop = a computation repeatedly executed until a terminating condition is reached
- High-level loop constructs:
 - While loop: while (e) s;
 - For loop: for(i=0; i<u; i+=c) s;</p>

Program Loops

- Why are loops important?
 - Most of the execution time is spent in loops
 - Typically: 90/10 rule, 10% code is a loop
- Therefore, loops are important targets of optimization

Loop Optimizations:

So we want techniques for improving them

- Low-level optimization:
 - Moving around code in a single loop
 - usually performed at 3-addr code stage or later
 - e.g., loop invariant removal, induction variable strength reduction & elimination, loop unrolling
- High-level optimization:
 - Restructuring loops, often affects multiple loops
 - -e.g., loop fusion, loop interchange, loop tiling

Example: invariant removal L0: t := 0

- L1: i := i + 1
 - t := a + b
 - *i := t
 - if i<N goto L1 else L2

Example: invariant removal

L0: t := 0

- L1: i := i + 1
 - t := a + b
 - *i := t
 - if i<N goto L1 else L2

Example: invariant removal L0: t := 0t := a + bL1: i := i + 1*i := t if i<N goto L1 else L2

- L0: i := 0 /* s=0; */ s := 0 /* for(i=0;i<100;i++)*/
 - jump L2 /* s += a[i]; */
- L1: t1 := i*4
 - t2 := a+t1
 - t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
- L2: if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

L0: i := 0/* s=0; */ /* for(i=0;i<100;i++)*/</pre> s := 0 /* jump L2 s += a[i]; */ L1: t1 := i*4 Note: t1 == i*4 at each point in loop t2 := a+t1t3 := *t2 s := s + t3i := i+1 L2: if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: . . .

- LO: i := 0
 - s := 0
 - t1 := 0
 - jump L2
- L1: t2 := a+t1
 - t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
 - t1 := t1+4
- L2: if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

- L0: i := 0
 - s := 0
 - t1 := 0
 - jump L2
- L1: t2 := a+t1 ; t2 == a+t1 == a+i*4
 - t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
 - t1 := t1+4
- L2: if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

| L0: | i := 0 |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| | s := 0 |
| | t1 := 0 |
| | t2 := a |
| | jump L2 |
| L1: | t3 := *t2 Notice $t1$ no longer used |
| | s := s + t3 |
| | i := i+1 |
| | t1 := t1+4 |
| | t2 := t2+4 ; t2 == a+t1 == a+i*4 |
| L2: | if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 |
| L3: | • • • |

- L0: i := 0
 - s := 0
 - t2 := a
 - jump L2
- L1: t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
 - t2 := t2+4
- L2: if i < 100 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

L0: i := 0

- s := 0
- t2 := a
- t5 := t2+400

jump L2

- L1: t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
 - t2 := t2+4

L2: if t2 < t5 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

LO: i := 0

t2 := a

t5 := t2+400

jump L2

- L1: t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3
 - i := i+1
 - t2 := t2+4
- L2: if t2 < t5 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

L0: s := 0

- t2 := a
- t5 := t2+400

jump L2

- L1: t3 := *t2
 - s := s + t3

t2 := t2+4

L2: if t2 < t5 goto L1 else goto L3 L3: ...

Gotta find loops first:

What is a loop?

- can't just "look" at graphs
- we're going to assume some additional structure

Defn: a *loop* is a subset S of nodes where:

- there is a distinguished header node h
- you can get from h to any node in S
- you can get from any node in S to h
- there's no edge from a node outside S to any other node than h.











Consider:



Does it have a "loop"?

This graph is called *irreducible*

a

b

• a can't be header: no edge from c or b to it.



c can't be header:
b has outside edge from a.

According to our definition, no loop. But obviously, there's a cycle...

С

Reducible Flow Graphs

So why did we define loops this way?

- header gives us a "handle" for the loop.
 - e.g., a good spot for hoisting invariant statements
- structured control-flow only produces reducible graphs.
 - a graph where all cycles are loops according to our definition.
 - Java: only reducible graphs

– C/C++: goto can produce irreducible graph

 many analyses & loop optimizations depend upon having reducible graphs.

Finding Loops

Defn: node d *dominates* node n if every path from the start node to n must go through d.

Defn: an edge from n to a dominator d is called a *back-edge*.

Defn: a *natural loop* of a back edge $n \rightarrow d$ is the set of nodes x such that d dominates x and there is a path from x to n not including d.

So that's how we find loops!

Example:



a dominates a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h b dominates b,c,d,e,f,g,h c dominates c,e d dominates d e dominates e f dominates f,g,h g dominates g,h h dominates h

back-edges? f->b, g->a

loops?

Calculating Dominators:

D[n] : the set of nodes that dominate n.
D[n0] = {n0}
D[n] = {n}
$$\cup$$
 (D[p₁] \cap D[p₂] \cap ... \cap D[p_m])
where pred[n] = {p₁,p₂,...,p_n}

It's pretty easy to solve this equation.

- start off assuming
 - D[n0] = {n0} (where n0 is start node, with no predecessors)
 - D[n] = all nodes (where n is not the start node)
- iteratively update D[n] based on predecessors until you reach a fixed point.

Representing Dominators

- We don't actually need to keep around the set of all dominators for each node.
- Instead, we construct a *dominator tree*.
 - if both d and e dominate n, then either d dominates e or vice versa.
 - that tells us there is a "closest" or *immediate dominator*.

Example:



Immediate Dominator Tree



Nested Loops

If loops A & B have headers a & b s.t.
 a != b and a dominates b, and all of the nodes in B are a subset of nodes in A, then we say B is *nested* within A.

 We usually concentrate our attention on nested loops first (since we spend more time in them.)

Disjoint and Nested Loops

- Property: for any two natural loops in a flow graph, one of the following is true:
 - 1. They are disjoint
 - 2. They are nested
 - 3. They have the same header
- Eliminate alternative 3: if two loops have the same header and none is nested in the other, combine all nodes into a single loop.

Loop Preheader

- Several optimizations add code before header
- Insert a new basic block (called preheader) in the CFG to hold this code





Loop Optimizations

- Now we know the loops
- Next: optimize these loops
 - Loop invariant code motion
 - Strength reduction of induction variables
 - Induction variable elimination

Loop Invariant Computation

A definition x:=... reaches a control-flow point if there is a path from the assignment to that point that contains no other assignment to x.

An assignment $x := v_1 \oplus v_2$ is *invariant* for a loop if for both operands $v_1 \& v_2$ either

- they are constant, or
- all of their definitions that reach the assignment are outside the loop, or
- only one definition reaches the assignment and it is loop invariant.

| Exa | mple: |
|-----|---|
| L0: | t := 0 |
| L1: | i := i + 1 t := a + b |
| | *i := t |
| | if i <n else="" goto="" l1="" l2<="" td=""></n> |
| L2: | $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{t}$ |

Calculating Reaching Defn's:

Assign a unique id to each definition. Define defs(x) to be the set of all definitions of the temp x.

| | <u>Gen</u> | <u>Kill</u> |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| $d: x := v_1 \oplus v_2$ | {d} | defs(x) - {d} |
| d : x := v | {d} | defs(x) - {d} |
| <everything else=""></everything> | { } | { } |

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{DefIn}[n] = \mathsf{DefOut}[p_1] \cap \ldots \cap \mathsf{DefOut}[p_n] \\ & \mathsf{where} \; \mathsf{Pred}[n] = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\} \\ & \mathsf{DefOut}[n] = \mathsf{Gen}[n] \cup (\mathsf{DefIn}[n] - \mathsf{Kill}[n]) \end{array}$

Hoisting / Code Motion

We would like to *hoist* invariant computations out of the loop.

But this is trickier than it sounds:

- We have already dealt with problem of where to place the hoisted statements by introducing preheader nodes
- Even then, we can run into trouble...

Valid Hoisting:

L0: t := 0

- L1: i := i + 1
 - t := a + b
 - *i := t
 - if i<N goto L1 else L2

Valid Hoisting:

- L0: t := 0
 - t := a + b

- L1: i := i + 1
 - *i := t
 - if i<N goto L1 else L2

Invalid Hoisting:

L0: t := 0

- L1: i := i + 1
 - *i := t *

t := a + b

t's definition is loop invariant but hoisting it conflicts with this use of the old t.

if i<N goto L1 else L2

Conditions for Safe Hoisting:

- An invariant assignment d:x:= $v_1 \oplus v_2$ is safe to hoist if:
 - d dominates all loop exits at which x is *live*out, and
 - there is only one definition of x in the loop, and
 - x is not live-out at the entry point for the loop (the pre-header.)

- An induction variable is a variable in a loop, whose value is a function of the loop iteration number: v = f(i)
- In compilers, this is a linear function:
 f(i) = c*i + d
- Observation: linear combinations of linear functions are linear functions
 - Consequence: linear combinations of induction variables are induction variables

Families of Induction Variables

- Basic induction variable: a variable whose only definition in the loop body is of the form i = i + c (where c is loop invariant)
- Derived induction variables: Each basic induction variable i defines a family of induction variables Fam(i)
 - i in Fam(i)
 - k in Fam(i) if there is only one defn of k in the loop body, and it has the form k = j*c or k = j+c, where
 - j in Fam(i)
 - c is loop invariant
 - The only defn of j that reaches defn of k is in the loop
 - There is no defn of I between the defns of j and k

- L1: if $i \ge n$ goto L2
 - j := i*4
 - k := j+a
 - x := k
 - s := s+x
 - i := i+1

L2:

We can express j & k as linear functions of i:

$$j = 4*i + 0$$

where the coefficients are either constants or loop-invariant.

| S | • | = | 0 |
|---|---|---|---|
| - | - | | - |

L1: if $i \ge n$ goto L2

- j := i*4
- k := j+a
- x := *k
- s := s+x

i := i+1

- So let's represent them as triples of the form (t, e_0, e_1) :
- j = (i, 0, 4) k = (i, a, 4)i = (i, 1, 1)

L1: if $i \ge n$ goto L2

- k := j+a
- x := k

Note that *i* only changes by the *same* amount each iteration of the loop.

We say that *i* is a *linear induction variable*.

So it's easy to express the change in j & k.

L1: if i >= n goto L2

:= i+1

S

i

If i changes by c, then since:

$$j = 4*i + 0$$

 $k = 4*i + a$

we know that j & k change by 4*c.

Finding Induction Variables

Scan loop body to find all basic induction variables do

Scan loop to find all variables k with one assignment of form $k = j^*b$, where j is an induction variable <i,c,d>, and make k an induction variable with triple <i,c*b,d>

Scan loop to find all variables k with one assignment of form k = j+/-b where j is an induction variable with triple <i,c,d>, and make k and induction variable with triple <i,c,d+/-b)

until no more induction variables found

Strength Reduction

For each derived induction variable j of the form (i, e_0 , e_1) make a fresh temp j'.

At the loop pre-header, initialize j' to e_0 .

After each i:=i+c, define j':=j'+(e_1 *c).

 note that e₁*c can be computed in the loop header (i.e., it's loop invariant.)

Replace the unique assignment of j in the loop with j := j'.

Example

s := 0 i := 0 j' := 0 k' := a L1: if $i \ge n$ goto L2 j := i*4 k := j+a x := ks := s+xi := i+1 L2: . . .

Example

| | s := 0 |
|-----|-------------------|
| | i := 0 |
| | j' := 0 |
| | k' := a |
| L1: | if i >= n goto L2 |
| | j := i*4 |
| | k := j+a |
| | x := *k |
| | s := s+x |
| | i := i+1 |
| | j' := j'+4 |
| | k' := k'+4 |
| - 0 | |

L2:

. . .

Example

| | s := 0 |
|-----|----------------------------|
| | i := 0 |
| | j' := 0 |
| | k' := a |
| L1: | if i >= n goto L2 |
| | j := j' |
| | k := k' |
| | $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{k}$ |
| | s := s + x |
| | i := i+1 |
| | j' := j'+4 |
| | k' := k'+4 |
| тО. | |

Copy-propagation or coalescing will eliminate the distinction between j/j' and **k**/**k**'.

Useless Variables

| | s := 0 |
|-----|-------------------|
| | i := 0 |
| | j' := 0 |
| | k' := a |
| L1: | if i >= n goto L2 |
| | x := *k' |
| | s := s+x |
| | i := i+1 |
| | j' := j'+4 |
| | k' := k'+4 |
| | |

A variable is *useless* for L if it is not live out at all exits from L and its only use is in a definition of itself.

For example, j' is useless.

We can delete useless variables from loops.

Useless Variables

| S | := | 0 |
|---|----|---|
| | | |

$$\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{k}'$$

$$k' := k'+4$$

L2:

DCE will pick up the dead initialization in the pre-header...

Almost Useless Variables

| | S 0 |
|------|-------------------|
| | i := 0 |
| | k' := a |
| L1: | if i >= n goto L2 |
| | x := *k' |
| | s := s+x |
| | i := i+1 |
| | k' := k'+4 |
| т.2. | |

The variable *i* is almost useless. It would be if it weren't used in the comparison...

See Appel for how to determine when/how it's safe to rewrite this test in terms of other induction variables in the family of *i*.

High-Level Loop Optimizations

- Require restructuring loops or sets of loops
 - Combining two loops (loop fusion)
 - Switching the order of a nested loop (loop interchange)
 - Completely changing the traversal order (loop tiling)
- These sorts of high level optimizations usually take place at the AST level (where loop structure is obvious)

Cache Behavior

Most loop transformations target cache behavior

- Attempt to increase *spatial* or *temporal* locality
- Locality can be exploited when there is *reuse* of data (for temporal locality) or recent access of nearby data (for spatial locality)

Loops are a good opportunity for this: many loops iterate through matrices or arrays

• Consider matrix-vector multiply example

Cache Behavior

Loops are a good opportunity for this: many loops iterate through matrices or arrays

- Consider matrix-vector multiply example
 - Multiple traversals or vector: opportunity for spatial and temporal locality
 - Regular access to array: opportunity for spatial locality



$$y = Ax$$

Loop Fusion

Combine two loops together into a single loop

• Why is this useful? Is it always legal?





Loop Interchange

Change the order of a nested loop

This is not always legal: it changes the order in which elements are accessed

Consider matrix-matrix multiply when A is stored in column-major order (i.e., each column is stored in contiguous memory)



Loop Interchange

Change the order of a nested loop

This is not always legal: it changes the order in which elements are accessed

Consider matrix-matrix multiply when A is stored in column-major order (i.e., each column is stored in contiguous memory)



Loop Tiling

Also called "loop blocking"

Goal: break up loop into smaller pieces to get for spatial & temporal locality

- One of the more complex
 loop transformations
- Create new inner loops so data accessed in inner loops fit in cache
- Also changes iteration order so may not be legal





Loop Tiling

Also called "loop blocking"

Goal: break up loop into smaller pieces to get for spatial & temporal locality for

- One of the more complex
 loop transformations
- Create new inner loops so data accessed in inner loops fit in cache
- Also changes iteration order so may not be legal

```
for (ii = 0; ii < N; ii += B)
  for (jj = 0; jj < N; jj += B)
   for (i = ii; i < ii+B; i++)
      for (j = jj; j < jj+B; j++)
      y[i] += A[i][j] * x[j]</pre>
```



Loop Optimizations

- Loop transformations can have dramatic effects on performance
- Transforming loops correctly and automatically is very difficult!
- Researchers have developed many techniques to determine legality of loop transformations and automatically transform loops.