Possible Dependencies:

Definition → Use  // Reaching Definitions
Use    → Definition // ???
Definition → Definition // Reaching Definitions

Reaching Definitions:

Determine for each $u$ which definitions may reach $v$ can be determined by means of a system of constraints.

... in the Example:
The UD-edge \((3, 4)\) has been inserted to exclude that \(z\) is overwritten before use \(\therefore\).

In the next step, each instruction is annotated with its (required resources, in particular, its) execution time.

Our goal is a maximally parallel correct sequence of words.

For that, we maintain the current system state:

\[
\Sigma : \text{Vars} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}
\]

\(\Sigma(x) \doteq \) expected delay until \(x\) is available

Initially:

\(\Sigma(x) = 0\)

As an invariant, we guarantee on entry of the basic block, that all operations are terminated \(\therefore\)

Let \(U_i, D_i\) denote the sets of variables which are used or defined at the edge outgoing from \(u_i\). Then:

\[
\begin{align*}
(u_1, u_2) \in DD & \quad \text{if} \quad u_1 \in \mathcal{R}[v_2] \land D_1 \cap D_2 \neq \emptyset \\
(u_1, u_2) \in DU & \quad \text{if} \quad u_1 \in \mathcal{R}[v_2] \land D_1 \cup U_2 \neq \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]

... in the Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(x = x + 1;)</td>
<td>({x})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(y = M[A];)</td>
<td>({y})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(t = z;)</td>
<td>({t})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(z = M[A + x];)</td>
<td>({z})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(t = y + z;)</td>
<td>({t})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then the slots of the word sequence are successively filled:

- We start with the minimal nodes in the dependence graph.
- If we fail to fill all slots of a word, we insert \(\therefore\)
- After every inserted instruction, we re-compute \(\Sigma\).

Warning:

\(\rightarrow\) The execution of two VLIWs can overlap \(!!!\)
\(\rightarrow\) Determining an optimal sequence, is NP-hard \(\therefore\)
Example: \( k = 2 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x = x + 1 ) ( y = M[A] )</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = z ) ( z = M[A + x] )</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t = y + z )</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each cycle, the execution of a new word is triggered. The state just records the number of cycles still to be waited for the result.

Note:
- If instructions put constraints on future selection, we also record these in \( \Sigma \).
- Overall, we distinguish just finitely many system states. 
- The computation of the effect of a VLIW onto \( \Sigma \) can be compiled into a finite automaton, as demonstrated.
- This automaton, though, could be quite huge.
- The challenge of making choices still remains.
- Basic blocks usually are not very large.

\[ \Rightarrow \text{opportunities for parallelization are limited} \]
Example: \( k = 2 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 2 | \( x \ y \ z \ t \) | 0 0 0 0  
| \( x = x + 1 \) | \( y = M[A] \) | 0 1 0 0  
| \( t = z \) | \( z = M[A + x] \) | 0 0 1 0  
| \( t = y + z \) | 0 0 0 0  

In each cycle, the execution of a new word is triggered.
The state just records the number of cycles still to be waited for the result  

Note:

- If instructions put constraints on future selection, we also record these in \( \Sigma \).
- Overall, we still distinguish just finitely many system states  
- The computation of the effect of a VLIW onto \( \Sigma \) can be compiled into a finite automaton  
- This automaton, though, could be quite huge  
- The challenge of making choices still remains  
- Basic blocks usually are not very large  
  \( \Rightarrow \) opportunities for parallelization are limited  

Extension 1: Acyclic Code

```c
if (x > 1) {
    y = M[A];
    z = x - 1;
} else {
    y = M[A + 1];
    z = x - 1;
}
y = y + 1;
```

The dependence graph must be enriched with extra control-dependencies...

The statement \( z = x - 1; \) is executed with the same arguments in both branches and does not modify any of the remaining variables  

We could have moved it before the if anyway  

...
The statement $z = x - 1$ is executed with the same arguments in both branches and does not modify any of the remaining variables.

We could have moved it before the `if` anyway.

---

The following code could be generated:

```
if (!x > 0) goto A
```

|
|---|
| $z = x - 1$ |
| $y = M[A]$ |
| goto $B$ |
| $A: y = M[A] + 1$ |
| $B: y = y + 1$ |

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant.

---

The statement $z = x - 1$ is executed with the same arguments in both branches and does not modify any of the remaining variables.

We could have moved it before the `if` anyway.

---

The following code could be generated:

```
if (!x > 0) goto A
```

|
|---|
| $z = x - 1$ |
| $y = M[A]$ |
| goto $B$ |
| $A: y = M[A] + 1$ |
| $B: y = y + 1$ |

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant.
The following code could be generated:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
z &= x - 1 & \text{if } (x > 0) \text{ goto } A \\
\hline
y &= M[A] \\
\hline
goto &= B \\
\hline
A & : y &= M[A + 1] \\
\hline
B & : y &= y + 1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant:\n
\[
\vdash
\]

If we allow several (known) states on entry of a sub-block, we can generate code which complies with all of these.

... in the Example:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
z &= x - 1 & \text{if } (x > 0) \text{ goto } A \\
\hline
y &= M[A] \\
\hline
goto &= B \\
\hline
A & : y &= M[A + 1] \\
\hline
B & : y &= y + 1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant:\n
\[
\vdash
\]

The following code could be generated:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
z &= x - 1 & \text{if } (x > 0) \text{ goto } A \\
\hline
y &= M[A] \\
\hline
goto &= B \\
\hline
A & : y &= M[A + 1] \\
\hline
B & : y &= y + 1 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

At every jump target, we guarantee the invariant:\n
\[
\vdash
\]
If we allow several (known) states on entry of a sub-block, we can generate code which complies with all of these.

... in the Example:

| $z = x - 1$ | if $(!(x > 0))$ goto $A$ |
| $y = M[A]$ | goto $B$ |

$A$: $y = M[A + 1]$

$B$: $y = y + 1$

If this parallelism is not yet sufficient, we could try to speculatively execute possibly useful tasks...

For that, we require:

- an idea which alternative is executed more frequently;
- the wrong execution may not end in a catastrophe, i.e., run-time errors such as, e.g., division by 0;
- the wrong execution must allow roll-back (e.g., by delaying a commit) or may not have any observational effects ...

If we allow several (known) states on entry of a sub-block, we can generate code which complies with all of these.

... in the Example:

| $z = x - 1$ | if $(!(x > 0))$ goto $A$ |
| $y = M[A]$ | goto $B$ |

$A$: $y = M[A + 1]$

$B$: $y = y + 1$
If this parallelism is not yet sufficient, we could try to speculatively execute possibly useful tasks ...

For that, we require:

- an idea which alternative is executed more frequently;
- the wrong execution may not end in a catastrophe, i.e., run-time errors such as, e.g., division by 0;
- the wrong execution must allow roll-back (e.g., by delaying a commit) or may not have any observational effects ...

---

... in the Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$z = x - 1$</th>
<th>$y = M[A]$</th>
<th>if $(x &gt; 0)$ goto $B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y = M[A + 1]$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$B :$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$y = y + 1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case $x \leq 0$ we have $y = M[A]$ executed in advance. This value, however, is overwritten in the next step.

In general:

$x = e; \quad$ has no observable effect in a branch if $x$ is dead in this branch.

---

If we allow several (known) states on entry of a sub-block, we can generate code which complies with all of these.

... in the Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$z = x - 1$</th>
<th>$y = M[A]$</th>
<th>if $(x &gt; 0)$ goto $B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y = M[A]$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$B :$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A :$</td>
<td>$y = M[A + 1]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B :$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$y = y + 1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case $x \leq 0$ we have $y = M[A]$ executed in advance. This value, however, is overwritten in the next step.

In general:

$x = e; \quad$ has no observable effect in a branch if $x$ is dead in this branch.
Extension 2: Unrolling of Loops

We may unrole *important*, i.e., inner loops several times:

Now it is clear which side of tests to prefer:
the side which stays within the unrolled body of the loop :-)

Warning:
- The different instances of the body are translated relative to possibly different initial states :-)
- The code behind the loop must be correct relative to the exit state corresponding to every jump out of the loop!
Example:

for \( (x = 0; x < n; x++) \)
\[
M[A+x] = z;
\]

Duplication of the body yields:

for \( (x = 0; x < n; x++) \) {
    \[
    M[A+x] = z;
    \]
    \[
    x = x + 1;
    \]
    if \( (! (x < n)) \) break;
    \[
    M[A+x] = z;
    \]
}

It would be better if we could remove the assignment \( x = x + 1; \)
together with the test in the middle — since these serialize the execution
of the copies !!

This is possible if we substitute \( x + 1 \) for \( x \) in the second copy,
transform the condition and add a compensation code:

for \( (x = 0; x + 1 < n; x = x + 2) \) {
    \[
    M[A+x] = z;
    \]
    \[
    M[A+x+1] = z;
    \]
}
for \((x = 0; x < n; x++)\) {
    \(M[A + x] = z;\)
    \(x = x + 1;\)
    if \(!(x < n))\) break;
    \(M[A + x] = z;\)
}\n
\[
A[x; A] = A[x]
\]

Discussion:

- Elimination of the intermediate test together with the the fusion of all increments at the end reveals that the different loop iterations are in fact independent.
- Nonetheless, we do not gain much since we only allow one store per word.
- If right-hand sides, however, are more complex, we can interleave their evaluation with the stores.

It would be better if we could remove the assignment \(x = x + 1;\) together with the test in the middle — since these serialize the execution of the copies!!

This is possible if we substitute \(x + 1\) for \(x\) in the second copy, transform the condition and add a compensation code.

for \((x = 0; x + 1 < n; x = x + 2)\) {
    \(M[A + x] = z;\)
    \(M[A + x + 1] = z;\)
}\n
if \((x < n)\) {
    \(M[A + x] = z;\)
    \(x = x + 1;\)
}\n
Extension 3:

Sometimes, one loop alone does not provide enough opportunities for parallelization :::
... but perhaps two successively in a row :::

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ & \quad \text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ \\
R &= B[x]; & R &= B[x]; \\
S &= C[x]; & S &= C[x]; \\
T_1 &= R + S; & T_2 &= R - S; \\
A[x] &= T_1; & C[x] &= T_2; \\
\} & \quad \} 
\end{align*}
\]
Extension 3:

Sometimes, one loop alone does not provide enough opportunities for parallelization.

... but perhaps two successively in a row.

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } & x = 0; x < n; x++ \{ \\
R & = B[x]; \\
S & = C[x]; \\
T_1 & = R + S; \\
A[x] & = T_1; \\
\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In order to fuse two loops into one, we require that:

- the iteration schemes coincide;
- the two loops access different data.

In case of individual variables, this can easily be verified.

This is more difficult in presence of arrays.

Taking the source program into account, accesses to distinct statically allocated arrays can be identified.

An analysis of accesses to the same array is significantly more difficult ...

Extension 3:

Sometimes, one loop alone does not provide enough opportunities for parallelization.

... but perhaps two successively in a row.

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } & x = 0; x < n; x++ \{ \\
R & = B[x]; \\
S & = C[x]; \\
T_1 & = R + S; \\
A[x] & = T_1; \\
\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Assume that the blocks \( A, B, C \) are distinct.

Then we can combine the two loops into:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } & x = 0; x < n; x++ \{ \\
R & = B[x]; \\
S & = C[x]; \\
T_1 & = R + S; \\
A[x] & = T_1; \\
\} \\
\end{align*}
\]
The first loop may in iteration \( x \) not read data which the second loop writes to in iterations \( < x \).

The second loop may in iteration \( x \) not read data which the first loop writes to in iterations \( > x \).

If the index expressions of jointly accessed arrays are linear, the given constraints can be verified through integer linear programming ...

\[
\begin{align*}
 i \geq 0 & \quad x_{\text{write}} = i \\
 i \leq x - 1 & \quad x_{\text{read}} = x \\
 l & \quad x_{\text{read}} \text{ read access to } C \text{ by 1st loop} \\
 l & \quad x_{\text{write}} \text{ write access to } C \text{ by 2nd loop} \\
 & \quad \text{... obviously has no solution :-(}
\end{align*}
\]

Extension 3:

Sometimes, one loop alone does not provide enough opportunities for parallelization :-(

... but perhaps two successively in a row :-(

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) & \{ \\
\hspace{1cm} & \text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ \\
\hspace{2cm} R = B[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} S \leftarrow C[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} T_1 = R + S; \\
\hspace{2cm} A[x] = T_1; \\
\hspace{2cm} \} \\
\hspace{1cm} & \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In order to fuse two loops into one, we require that:

- the iteration schemes coincide;
- the two loops access different data.

In case of individual variables, this can easily be verified.

This is more difficult in presence of arrays.

Taking the source program into account, accesses to distinct statically allocated arrays can be identified.

An analysis of accesses to the same array is significantly more difficult ...

Assume that the blocks \( A, B, C \) are distinct.

Then we can combine the two loops into:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) & \{ \\
\hspace{1cm} & \text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ \\
\hspace{2cm} R = B[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} R = B[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} S \leftarrow C[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} S = C[x]; \\
\hspace{2cm} T_1 = R + S; \\
\hspace{2cm} T_2 = R - S; \\
\hspace{2cm} A[x] = T_1; \\
\hspace{2cm} C[x] = T_2; \\
\hspace{2cm} \} \\
\hspace{1cm} & \} \\
\end{align*}
\]
The first loop may in iteration $x$ not read data which the second loop writes to in iterations $< x$.

The second loop may in iteration $x$ not read data which the first loop writes to in iterations $> x$.

If the index expressions of jointly accessed arrays are linear, the given constraints can be verified through integer linear programming...

\[
\begin{align*}
  i & \geq 0 & x_{\text{write}} &= i \\
  i & \leq x - 1 & x_{\text{read}} &= x \\
 & & x_{\text{read}} &= x_{\text{write}}
\end{align*}
\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item $x_{\text{read}}$ read access to $C$ by 1st loop
  \item $x_{\text{write}}$ write access to $C$ by 2nd loop
\end{itemize}

... obviously has no solution :-)

Assume that the blocks $A, B, C$ are distinct.

Then we can combine the two loops into:

\[
\begin{align*}
  &\text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ \\
  &\quad R = B[x]; \\
  &\quad S = C[x]; \\
  &\quad T_1 = R + S; \\
  &\quad A[x] = T_1; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_2; \\
  &\quad T_2 = R - S; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_3; \\
  &\quad R = B[x]; \\
  &\quad S = C[x]; \\
  &\quad T_1 = R + S; \\
  &\quad A[x] = T_1; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_3; \\
  &\quad \}
\end{align*}
\]

Assume that the blocks $A, B, C$ are distinct.

Then we can combine the two loops into:

\[
\begin{align*}
  &\text{for } (x = 0; x < n; x++) \{ \\
  &\quad R = B[x]; \\
  &\quad S = C[x]; \\
  &\quad T_1 = R + S; \\
  &\quad A[x] = T_1; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_2; \\
  &\quad T_2 = R - S; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_3; \\
  &\quad R = B[x]; \\
  &\quad S = C[x]; \\
  &\quad T_1 = R + S; \\
  &\quad A[x] = T_1; \\
  &\quad C[x] = T_3; \\
  &\quad \}
\end{align*}
\]

... obviously has no solution :-)}
General Form:

\[
\begin{align*}
    s & \geq t_1 \\
    t_2 & \geq s \\
    y_1 & = s_1 \\
    y_2 & = s_2 \\
    y_1 & = y_2
\end{align*}
\]

for linear expressions \( s, t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \) over \( i \) and the iteration variables.

This can be simplified to:

\[
\begin{align*}
    0 & \leq s - t_1 \\
    0 & \leq t_2 - s \\
    0 & = s_1 - s_2
\end{align*}
\]

What should we do with it???

---

Simple Case:

The two inequations have no solution over \( \mathbb{Q} \).

Then they also have no solution over \( \mathbb{Z} \) :)

... in Our Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
    x & = i \\
    0 & \leq i = x \\
    0 & \leq x - 1 - i = -1
\end{align*}
\]

The second inequation has no solution :)

---

General Form:

\[
\begin{align*}
    s & \geq t_1 \\
    t_2 & \geq s \\
    y_1 & = s_1 \\
    y_2 & = s_2 \\
    y_1 & = y_2
\end{align*}
\]

for linear expressions \( s, t_1, t_2, s_1, s_2 \) over \( i \) and the iteration variables.

This can be simplified to:

\[
\begin{align*}
    0 & \leq s - t_1 \\
    0 & \leq t_2 - s \\
    0 & = s_1 - s_2
\end{align*}
\]

What should we do with it???
Simple Case:
The two inequations have no solution over $\mathbb{Q}$.
Then they also have no solution over $\mathbb{Z}$.

... in Our Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= i \\
0 &\leq i &= x \\
0 &\leq x - 1 - i &= -1
\end{align*}
\]

The second inequation has no solution.

One Variable:

The inequations where $x$ occurs positive, provide lower bounds.
The inequations where $x$ occurs negative, provide upper bounds.

If $G, L$ are the greatest lower and the least upper bound, respectively, then all (integer) solution are in the interval $[G, L]$.

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &\leq 13 - 7 \cdot x &\iff x &\leq \frac{13}{7} \\
0 &\leq -1 + 5 \cdot x &\iff x &\geq \frac{1}{5}
\end{align*}
\]

The only integer solution of the system is $x = 1$.

Discussion:

- Solutions only matter within the bounds to the iteration variables.
- Every integer solution there provides a conflict.
- Fusion of loops is possible if no conflicts occur.
- The given special case suffices to solve the case one variable over $\mathbb{Z}$.
- The number of variables in the inequations corresponds to the nesting-depth of for-loops in general, is quite small.

Integr Linear Programming (ILP) can decide satisfiability of a finite set of equations/inequations over $\mathbb{Z}$ of the form:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot x_i = b \quad \text{hzw.} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot x_i \geq b, \quad a_i \in \mathbb{Z}
\]

Moreover, a (linear) cost function can be optimized.

Warning: The decision problem is in general, already NP-hard!!

Notwithstanding that, surprisingly efficient implementations exist.

Not just loop fusion, but also other reorganizations of loops yield ILP problems...
Background 5: Presburger Arithmetic

Many problems in computer science can be formulated without multiplication :-)

Let us first consider two simple special cases …

1. Linear Equations

\[ 2x + 3y = 24 \]
\[ 3x - 2y + 5z = 3 \]