

Lazy Array Data-Flow Dependence Analysis

Anil Kumar
Bhaskar reddy
Narasimham.M
Ranjith kumar

Computer Science and Engineering
IIT Bombay

November 10, 2005

Outline

- Introduction
- Representation and Definitions
- Algorithm for finding Value based dependencies
- Non Affine fragment

Introduction

- Dependencies
- There is a flow dependence from an array access $A(I)$ to an array access $B(I')$ iff
 - A is executed with iteration vector I ,
 - B is executed with iteration vector I' ,
 - $A(I)$ writes to the same location as is read by $B(I')$,
 - $A(I)$ is executed before $B(I')$
 - there is no write to the location read by $B(I')$ between the execution of $A(I)$ and $B(I')$.
- Memory based Vs Value based Dependencis

QUAST/LWT

```

INTEGER rs, p, q, i
DO rs = 1, nrs
  DO q = 1, np
    DO i = 1, mb
S0:   XRSIQ(i,q) = 0
      END DO
    END DO
  DO p = 1, np
    DO q = 1, p
      ...
      DO i = 1, mb
S1:   XRSIQ(i,q) = XRSIQ(i,q) + ...
S2:   XRSIQ(i,p) = XRSIQ(i,p) + ...
      END DO
    END DO
  END DO
  ...
END DO

```

(a) Fragment of subroutine OLDA from TRFD

for the statement S_2 in Figure 1(a) is $\text{Src}(S_2[p, q, i]) =$

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } q=p & \text{then } S_1[p, q, i] \\ \text{elseif } q \geq 2 & \text{then } S_2[p, q-1, i] \\ \text{else} & \text{then } S_0[p, i] \end{cases}$$

QUAST Contd...

<pre> DO i = 0, M DO j = 0, N S1: A(2*i+j) = ... END DO END DO S2: ... = A(k) </pre>	$\text{Src}(S_2) = \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{if } (-k + 2M + N \geq 0) \\ \text{then if } (k - 2M \geq 0) \\ \text{then } S_1[M, k - 2M] \\ \text{else if } ((-k + N + 2(k \div 2)) \geq 0) \\ \text{then } S_1[k \div 2, k - 2(k \div 2)] \\ \text{else } \perp \\ \text{else } \perp \end{array} \right.$
--	---

Figure 6: Program and source function represented as a quast

Dependence Relation Representation

```

INTEGER rs, p, q, i
DO rs = 1, nrs
  DO q = 1, np
    DO i = 1, mb
S0:   XRSIQ(i,q) = 0
    END DO
  END DO
  DO p = 1, np
    DO q = 1, p
      ...
      DO i = 1, mb
S1:   XRSIQ(i,q) = XRSIQ(i,q) + ...
S2:   XRSIQ(i,p) = XRSIQ(i,p) + ...
      END DO
    END DO
  END DO
  ...
END DO
  
```

(a) Fragment of subroutine OLDA from TRFD

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_1[p, q, i] &\rightarrow S_2[p, q, i] \mid 1 \leq p = q \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb \\
 S_2[p, q-1, i] &\rightarrow S_2[p, q, i] \mid 2 \leq q < p \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb \\
 S_0[p, i] &\rightarrow S_2[p, 1, i] \mid 2 \leq p \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

Similarly, the source function for S_1 is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_2[p, q-1, i] &\rightarrow S_1[p, q, i] \mid 2 \leq p = q \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb \\
 S_2[p-1, q, i] &\rightarrow S_1[p, q, i] \mid 2 \leq p \leq np \wedge q = p-1 \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb \\
 S_1[p-1, q, i] &\rightarrow S_1[p, q, i] \mid p \leq np \wedge 1 \leq q \leq p-2 \wedge 1 \leq i \leq mb \\
 S_0[1, i] &\rightarrow S_1[1, 1, i] \mid 1 \leq i \leq mb
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

Dependence Relation Representation

```
DO i = 0, M
  DO j = 0, N
S1:   A(2*i+j) = ...
  END DO
END DO
S2: ... = A(k)
```

$$S_1[M, k-2M] \rightarrow S_2 \mid 2M \leq k \leq 2M+N \wedge M \geq 0$$

$$S_1[i, k-2i] \rightarrow S_2 \mid$$

$$2i+\alpha=k \wedge 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \wedge 0 \leq k \leq 2M+1 \wedge N \geq 1$$

$$S_1[i, 0] \rightarrow S_2 \mid$$

$$2i+\alpha=k \wedge 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \wedge 0 \leq k=2\delta \leq 2M \wedge N=0$$

Vectors And Statement Instances

- statement instance : The smallest unit of computation.
- Representation : $W[\mathbf{w},\mathbf{s}]$.
- W : statement of the program
- \mathbf{w} : vector of loop variable values
- \mathbf{s} : symbolic constant

Sequencing Predicate

$W[\mathbf{w},\mathbf{s}] \ll R[\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}]$ if and only if
 $w[1..n] \ll r[1..n] \vee w[1..n] = r[1..n] \wedge W \ll R$
where n is the no.of common loops surrounding W,R

Value based dependence definition And representation

$$\forall \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} : (V[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}] \rightarrow R.A[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}]) \in \text{DepRel}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \Leftrightarrow \\
 V[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}] = \max_{\ll} (W[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \mid \mathbf{w} \in [W, \mathbf{s}] \wedge \mathbf{r} \in [R, \mathbf{s}] \wedge \\
 \text{Arr}(W.B) = \text{Arr}(R.A) \wedge W.B(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) = R.A(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \wedge \\
 W[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \ll R[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}])$$

$$\text{DepRel} = \left[\begin{array}{l} W_1[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \rightarrow R.A[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}] \mid \text{DepRel}_1(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \\ \dots \\ W_m[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \rightarrow R.A[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}] \mid \text{DepRel}_m(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \end{array} \right]$$

where each DepRel_i is a conjunction of constraints and

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m \pi_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}(\text{DepRel}_i(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})) \subseteq [R, \mathbf{s}].$$

Algorithm for Value Based Dependence

Basic idea: To start searching for candidate writes in lexicographically close proximity of a read statement for which dependence is being computed.

- 1: **INPUT:** $R.A$: read reference surrounded by n loops with variables $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$.
 \mathbf{s} is a vector of symbolic constants.
- 2: **OUTPUT:** Dependence relation for the read reference $R.A$.
 That is, $\{W[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}] \rightarrow R[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}]\} \in DepRel \Leftrightarrow W[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}] = \max_{\ll} (W[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \mid \mathbf{w} \in [W, \mathbf{s}] \wedge \mathbf{r} \in [R, \mathbf{s}] \wedge Arr(W.B) = Arr(R.A) \wedge W.B(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}) = R.A(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \wedge W[\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{s}] \ll R[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}])$
- 4: Relation $DepRel := \{\emptyset\}$; Relation $WrMax$
- 5: Dnf $NotCovered(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) := lsExecuted(R[\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}])$
- 6: Integer $FixLoops := n$
- 7: Statement $W := R$
- 8: Boolean $SingleWrite := True$; Boolean $LessFlag := False$

Algorithm Contd...

```

10: While (NotCovered is feasible) do
11:    $W :=$  statement preceding statement  $W$ 
12:   Statement  $W$  is surrounded by  $m$  loops with variables  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ 
13:   (* Here unfixed zone consists of loops with depths from  $FixLoops + 1$  to  $n$ . *)
14:   If ( $W$  is assignment statement and it writes to  $Arr(R.A)$ ) then
15:     (* Find source function for instances of reference  $R.A[r, s]$  which are  $NotCovered(r, s)$  *)
16:     Dnf  $SameCell(\mathbf{w}, r, s) := NotCovered(r, s) \wedge R.A(r, s) = W.B(\mathbf{w}, s) \wedge IsExecuted(W[\mathbf{w}, s])$ 
17:     Conjunct  $Wsub(\mathbf{w}, r) := \mathbf{w}[1..FixLoops] = r[1..FixLoops] \wedge (LessFlag \Rightarrow w_{FixLoops+1} < r_{FixLoops+1})$ 
18:     Dnf  $DepProb(\mathbf{w}, r, s) := SameCell(\mathbf{w}, r, s) \wedge Wsub(\mathbf{w}, r)$ 
19:     Relation  $Cmax := RelMax1_{\leftarrow}(W[\mathbf{w}, s] \rightarrow R.A[r, s] \mid DepProb(\mathbf{w}, r, s))$ 
20:     If (SingleWrite) then
21:        $DepRel := DepRel \cup Cmax$ 
22:        $NotCovered := NotCovered \wedge \neg range(Cmax)$ 
23:     Else
24:        $WrMax := RelMax2_{\leftarrow}(WrMax, Cmax)$ 
25:     EndIf
26:   EndIf
  
```

Algorithm Contd...

```
30: ElseIf (statement  $W$  is EndDo or Do  $i=$ ) then (* Enter loop body through its end *)
31:   If ( $SingleWrite$ ) then
32:     If (statement  $W$  is Do  $i=$ ) then
33:        $FixLoops := FixLoops - 1$ ;  $LessFlag := True$ 
34:        $W := EndDo$  stmt for loop with header  $W$ 
35:     Else (* statement  $W$  is EndDo *)
36:        $LessFlag := False$ 
37:     EndIf
38:      $WrMax := \{\emptyset\}$ ;  $SingleWrite := False$ 
39:      $StopLoop := Do i=$  stmt of the loop whose EndDo stmt is  $W$ 
40:   ElseIf ( $\neg SingleWrite \wedge W = StopLoop$ ) then
41:      $DepRel := DepRel \cup WrMax$ 
42:      $NotCovered := NotCovered \wedge \neg range(WrMax)$ 
43:      $SingleWrite := True$ 
44:   EndIf
```

Algorithm Contd...

```
50:  ElseIf (statement  $W$  is entry to the subroutine) then
51:     $DepRel := DepRel \cup \{Entry \rightarrow R.A[r, s] \mid NotCovered(r, s)\}$ 
52:    Break out of While loop 10
55:  ElseIf (statement  $W$  is EndIf or Else or If (...) then) then
56:    (* Do nothing *)
60:  EndIf
61: EndDo
62: Return ( $DepRel$ )
```

Example for affine fragment

```

INTEGER rs, p, q, i
DO rs = 1, nrs
  DO q = 1, np
    DO i = 1, mb
S0:   XRSIQ(i,q) = 0
    END DO
  END DO
  DO p = 1, np
    DO q = 1, p
      ...
      DO i = 1, mb
S1:   XRSIQ(i,q) = XRSIQ(i,q) + ...
S2:   XRSIQ(i,p) = XRSIQ(i,p) + ...
      END DO
    END DO
  END DO
  ...
END DO
  
```

(a) Fragment of subroutine OLDA from TRFD

$C_0 : S_0 \rightarrow S_1$	$C_1 : S_1 \rightarrow S_1$	$C_2 : S_2 \rightarrow S_1$
$q_w = q_r$	$q_w = q_r$	$p_w = q_r$
$i_w = i_r$	$i_w = i_r$	$i_w = i_r$
$1 \leq q_r \leq p_r$	$1 \leq q_r \leq p_w, p_r$	$1 \leq q_w \leq q_r \leq p_r$
$p_r \leq np$	$p_w, p_r \leq np$	$p_r \leq np$
$1 \leq i_r \leq mb$	$1 \leq i_r \leq mb$	$1 \leq i_r \leq mb$

Example Contd...

The algorithm breaks a set of write statement instances into a sum of disjoint subsets $\omega_2(r), \dots, \omega_{ns}(r)$ such that for any r such that $R[r]$ is executed.

$$\omega_{ns}(r) \ll \dots \ll \omega_2(r) \ll R(r)$$

Example Contd...

$$S_1[rs_r, p_r, q_r, i_r] \mid 1 \leq rs_r \leq nrs \wedge 1 \leq q_r \leq p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \omega_2 &= S_2[rs_r, p_r, q_r, i_w] \mid 1 \leq i_w < i_r \\
 &\quad S_1[rs_r, p_r, q_r, i_w] \mid 1 \leq i_w < i_r \\
 \omega_3 &= S_2[rs_r, p_r, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq q_w < q_r \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 &\quad S_1[rs_r, p_r, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq q_w < q_r \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 \omega_4 &= S_2[rs_r, p_w, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq q_w \leq p_w < p_r \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 &\quad S_1[rs_r, p_w, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq q_w \leq p_w < p_r \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 \omega_5 &= S_0[rs_r, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq q_w \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 \omega_6 &= S_2[rs_w, p_w, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq rs_w < rs_r \wedge \\
 &\quad 1 \leq q_w \leq p_w \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 &\quad S_1[rs_w, p_w, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq rs_w < rs_r \wedge \\
 &\quad 1 \leq q_w \leq p_w \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb \\
 &\quad S_0[rs_w, q_w, i_w] \mid 1 \leq rs_w < rs_r \wedge \\
 &\quad 1 \leq q_w \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w \leq mb
 \end{aligned}$$

Example Contd...

$NotCovered(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = (1 \leq q_r \leq p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb).$

ω_2 : $\omega_2 \wedge C_1$ and $\omega_2 \wedge C_2$ have no solutions. So ω_2 doesn't contribute to dependence.

ω_3 : $C_1 \wedge \omega_3$ is not feasible, but $C_2 \wedge \omega_3 = (1 \leq q_w < p_w = q_r = p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w = i_r \leq mb)$. Computing $RelMax1_{\ll} (S_2[p_w, q_w, i_w] \rightarrow S_1[p_r, q_r, i_r] \mid C_2 \wedge \omega_3)$ we get

$$S_2[p_r, q_r - 1, i_r] \rightarrow S_1[p_r, q_r, i_r] \mid \\ 2 \leq p_r = q_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb$$

Example Contd...

Now we cover area $2 \leq p_r = q_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb$ and therefore $NotCovered = (p_r = q_r = 1 \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb) \vee (1 \leq q_r < p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb)$.

$\omega_4: (C_2 \wedge \omega_4 \wedge NotCovered) = (1 \leq q_w \leq p_w = q_r < p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w = i_r \leq mb)$. Maximum of this is $S_2[q_r, q_r, i_r] \mid 1 \leq q_r < p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb$.

$(C_1 \wedge \omega_4 \wedge NotCovered) = (1 \leq q_w = q_r \leq p_w < p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_w = i_r \leq mb)$ leading to maximum $S_1[p_r - 1, q_r, i_r] \mid 1 \leq q_r < p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb$.

Then we use $RelMax2_{\leftarrow}$ to compute \max_{\leftarrow} of two source functions (Appendix A.2). The result is

$$\begin{aligned} S_2[p_r-1, q_r, i_r] &\rightarrow S_1[p_r, q_r, i_r] \mid \\ &2 \leq p_r \leq np \wedge q_r = p_r-1 \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb \\ S_1[p_r-1, q_r, i_r] &\rightarrow S_1[p_r, q_r, i_r] \mid \\ &p_r \leq np \wedge 1 \leq q_r \leq p_r-2 \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$NotCovered = (p_r = q_r = 1 \wedge 1 \leq i_r \leq mb)$.

Example Contd...

$\omega_5: (C_0 \wedge \omega_5 \wedge \text{NotCovered}) = (q_w = q_r = p_r = 1 \wedge 1 \leq i_w = i_r \leq \text{mb})$. This easily computes to dependence relation $S_0[1, i_r] \rightarrow S_1[1, 1, i_r] \mid 1 \leq i_r \leq \text{mb}$. Finally $\text{NotCovered} = \text{False}$.

After ω_5 step all the read instances of S_1 are covered and we don't have to compute dependences for ω_6 and any writes which textually precede S_0 . The resulting source function for S_1 is given in (2).

Non Affine Fragments

```
DO i = 1, n
  DO j = 1, n
    x = F(i,j)
S0:   IF (x) THEN
S1:     A(j) = ...
      ELSE
S2:     A(j) = ...
      ENDIF
S3:     ... = A(j)
  END DO
END DO
(a) Non-affine IF condition
```

Non Affine Fragments

```
DO i = 1, n
  DO j = 1, n
    x = F(i,j)
S1:  A(x) = ...
S2:  ... = A(x)
  END DO
END DO
```

(b) Non-affine subscript function

Fixed and Unfixed Zones

- **Unfixed zone:** Around statement S of depth d (denoted by $\text{Unfixed}(S,d)$) is a loop nest which consists of statements belonging to d innermost loops surrounding S .
- **Fixed zone:** Statements not belonging to $\text{UnFixed}(S,d)$ affect.

Example

```

DO i = 1, n
  DO j = 1, n
    x = F(i, j)
S0:   IF (x) THEN
S1:     A(j) = ...
      ELSE
S2:     A(j) = ...
      ENDIF
S3:     ... = A(j)
  END DO
END DO

```

$$S_1[i, j] \rightarrow S_3[i, j] \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \wedge x$$

$$S_2[i, j] \rightarrow S_3[i, j] \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \wedge \neg x$$

$$S_1[i, j] \rightarrow S_3[i, j] \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \wedge x(i, j)$$

$$S_2[i, j] \rightarrow S_3[i, j] \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n \wedge \neg x(i, j).$$

Example

- To expand the search space only if non covered read instances remain.
- Compute the Upper bound on iteration space
- Computing the Lower and Upper bound on dependence

Conclusion

- Computes exact value based (data-flow) dependences for affine program fragments
- And good approximations of value based dependences for non affine program fragments
- Independent of program size
- Depends on how many writes reach the read and on how complicated the dependence relation is.

References

- Vadim Maslov, **Lazy Array Data-Flow Dependence Analysis**, Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages, p.311-325