# EECS 583 – Class 4 If-conversion

University of Michigan

*September 16, 2019* 

# Announcements & Reading Material

- ✤ HW 1 Deadline Friday Sept 20, midnight
  - » Talk to Sung this week if you are having troubles with LLVM
  - » Refer to EECS 583 piazza group for tips and answers to questions
- Today's class
  - \* "The Program Dependence Graph and Its Use in Optimization",
    - J. Ferrante, K. Ottenstein, and J. Warren, ACM TOPLAS, 1987
      - This is a long paper the part we care about is the control dependence stuff. The PDG is interesting and you should skim it over.
      - "On Predicated Execution", Park and Schlansker, HPL Technical Report, 1991.
- Material for Wednesday
  - *Compilers: Principles, Techniques, and Tools,* A. Aho, R. Sethi, and J. Ullman, Addison-Wesley, 1988.
     (Sections: 10.5, 10.6 Edition 1) (Sections 9.2 Edition 2)

### From Last Time: Class Problem - Answer



#### An Alternative to Branches: Predicated Execution

- Hardware mechanism that allows operations to be conditionally executed
- Add an additional boolean source operand (predicate)
  - » ADD r1, r2, r3 if p1
    - if (p1 is True), r1 = r2 + r3
    - else if (p1 is False), do nothing (Add treated like a NOP)
    - p1 referred to as the <u>guarding predicate</u>
    - Predicated on True means always executed
    - Omitted predicated also means always executed
- Provides compiler with an alternative to using branches to selectively execute operations
  - » If statements in the source
  - » Realize with branches in the assembly code
  - » Could also realize with conditional instructions
  - » Or use a combination of both

### Predicated Execution Example

a = b + c
if (a > 0)
e = f + g
else
e = f / g
h = i - j

BB1	add a, b, c
BB1	bgt a, 0, L1
BB3	div e, f, g
BB3	jump L2
BB2	L1: add e, f, g
BB4	L2: sub h, i, j



Traditional branching code

	BB1	add a, b, c if T		
$p2 \rightarrow BB2$ p3 $\rightarrow BB3$	BB1	p2 = a > 0 if T	BB1	
	BB1	p3 = a <= 0 if T	BB2	
	BB3	div e, f, g if p3	BB3	
	BB2	add e, f, g if p2	BB4	
	BB4	sub h, i, j if T		

#### Predicated code

#### What About Nested If-then-else's?



#### Traditional branching code

#### Nested If-then-else's – No Problem

a = b + c	BB1	add a, b, c if T	
if (a > 0)	BB1	p2 = a > 0 if T	BB1
if (a > 25)	BB1	$p^{3} = a \le 0$ if T	BB2
e = f + g	BB3	div e, f, g if p3	BB3
else	BB3	p5 = a > 25 if p2	BB4
e = f * g	BB3	p6 = a <= 25 if p2	BB5
else	BB6	mpy e, f, g if p6	BB6
e = f / g	BB5	add e, f, g if p5	220
$\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}$	BB4	sub h, i, j if T	

#### Predicated code

What do we assume to make this work ?? if p2 is False, both p5 and p6 are False So, predicate setting instruction should set result to False if guarding predicate is false!!!

### Benefits/Costs of Predicated Execution



Benefits:

- No branches, no mispredicts

- Can freely reorder independent operations in the predicated block

- Overlap BB2 with BB5 and BB6

Costs (execute all paths) -worst case schedule length -worst case resources required

# HPL-PD Compare-to-Predicate Operations (CMPPs)

- How do we compute predicates
  - » Compare registers/literals like a branch would do
  - » Efficiency, code size, nested conditionals, etc
- 2 targets for computing taken/fall-through conditions with
   1 operation

p1, p2 = CMPP.cond.D1a.D2a (r1, r2) if p3

p1 = first destination predicate p2 = second destination predicate cond = compare condition (ie EQ, LT, GE, ...) D1a = action specifier for first destination D2a = action specifier for second destination (r1,r2) = data inputs to be compared (ie r1 < r2)p3 = guarding predicate

# **CMPP** Action Specifiers

Guarding predicate	Compare Result	UN	UC	ON	OC	AN	AC
0	0	0	0	_	_	_	_
0	1	0	Ô				_
1	0	0	1		1	0	_
1	1	1	<b>0</b>	1	-	-	0

UN/UC = Unconditional normal/complement This is what we used in the earlier examples guard = 0, both outputs are 0 guard = 1, UN = Compare result, UC = opposite ON/OC = OR-type normal/complement AN/AC = AND-type normal/complement

$$p1 = (r1 < r2) | (!(r3 < r4)) | (r5 < r5)$$

Wired-OR into p1

Generating predicated code for some source code requires OR-type predicates p1 = 1 p1 = cmpp\_AN (r1 < r2) if T p1 = cmpp\_AC (r3 < r4) if T p1 = cmpp\_AN (r5 < r6) if T

 $\begin{array}{l} p1 = (r1 < r2) \ \& \ (!(r3 < r4)) \ \& \\ (r5 < r5) \end{array}$ 

Wired-AND into p1

Talk about these later – used for control height reduction

#### Use of OR-type Predicates



# Homework Problem – Answer on next slide but don't cheat!

- a. Draw the CFG
- b. Predicate the code removing all branches

# Homework Problem Answer



p1 = cmpp.UN(a > 0) if T p2, p3 = cmpp.UNUC(b > 0) if p1 r = t + s if p2 u = v + 1 if p3y = x + 1 if p1

- a. Draw the CFG
- b. Predicate the code removing all branches

# If-conversion

- Algorithm for generating predicated code
  - » Automate what we've been doing by hand
  - » Handle arbitrary complex graphs
    - But, acyclic subgraph only!!
    - Need a branch to get you back to the top of a loop
  - » Efficient
- Roots are from Vector computer days
  - » Vectorize a loop with an if-statement in the body
- ✤ 4 steps
  - » 1. Loop backedge coalescing
  - » 2. Control dependence analysis
  - » 3. Control flow substitution
  - » 4. CMPP compaction
- My version of Park & Schlansker

# Running Example – Initial State



# Step 1: Backedge Coalescing

- Recall Loop backedge is branch from inside the loop back to the loop header
- This step only applicable for a loop body
  - » If not a loop body  $\rightarrow$  skip this step
- Process
  - » Create a new basic block
    - New BB contains an unconditional branch to the loop header
  - » Adjust all other backedges to go to new BB rather than header
- Why do this?
  - » Heuristic step Not essential for correctness
    - If-conversion cannot remove backedges (only forward edges)
    - But this allows the control logic to figure out which backedge you take to be eliminated
  - » Generally this is a good thing to do

# Running Example – Backedge Coalescing



# Step 2: Control Dependence Analysis (CD)

- Control flow Execution transfer from 1 BB to another via a taken branch or fallthrough path
- Dependence Ordering constraint between 2 operations
  - » Must execute in proper order to achieve the correct result
  - » O1: a = b + c
  - » O2: d = a e
  - » O2 dependent on O1
- Control dependence One operation controls the execution of another
  - » O1: blt a, 0, SKIP
  - » O2: b = c + d
  - » SKIP:
  - » O2 control dependent on O1
- Control dependence analysis derives these dependences

# Control Dependences

- Recall
  - » Post dominator BBX is post dominated by BBY if every path from BBX to EXIT contains BBY
  - » Immediate post dominator First breadth first successor of a block that is a post dominator
- Control dependence BBY is control dependent on BBX iff
  - There exists a directed path P from BBX to BBY with any BBZ in P (excluding BBX and BBY) post dominated by BBY
  - » 2. BBX is not post dominated by BBY
- In English,
  - » A BB is control dependent on the closest BB(s) that determine(s) its execution
  - » Its actually not a BB, it's a control flow edge coming out of a BB



# Running Example – CDs



First, nuke backedge(s)
Second, nuke exit edges
Then, Add pseudo entry/exit nodes
 - Entry → nodes with no predecessors

- Exit  $\rightarrow$  nodes with no successors

Control deps (left is taken) BB1: BB2: BB3: BB3: BB4: BB5: BB5: BB6: BB7: BB8: BB8: BB9:

# Algorithm for Control Dependence Analysis

```
for each basic block x in region
  for each outgoing control flow edge e of x
     y = destination basic block of e
     if (y not in pdom(x)) then
       lub = ipdom(x)
       if (e corresponds to a taken branch) then
          x id = -x.id
       else
                                                            Notes
          x id = x.id
        endif
                                            Compute cd(x) which contains those
       \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{y}
                                           BBs which x is control dependent on
        while (t != lub) do
          cd(t) += x_id;
                                              Iterate on per edge basis, adding
          t = ipdom(t)
                                            edge to each cd set it is a member of
        endwhile
     endif
   endfor
endfor
```

# Running Example – Post Dominators



	pdom	ipdom
<b>BB1</b> :	1, 9, ex	9
<b>BB2:</b>	2, 7, 8, 9, ex	7
<b>BB3</b> :	3, 9, ex	9
<b>BB4</b> :	4, 7, 8, 9, ex	7
<b>BB5</b> :	5, 7, 8, 9, ex	7
<b>BB6</b> :	6, 7, 8, 9, ex	7
<b>BB7</b> :	7, 8, 9, ex	8
<b>BB8</b> :	8, 9, ex	9
<b>BB9:</b>	9, ex	ex

# Running Example – CDs Via Algorithm



edge (ak	<u>ka –1)</u>	
	x = 1	
	e = taken edge 1	$\rightarrow 2$
	y = 2	
	y not in pdom(x	)
	lub = 9	
	$x_id = -1$	
	t = 2	
	2 != 9	
	cd(2) += -1	
	t = 7	
	7 != 9	
	cd(7) += -1	
	t = 8	
	8 != 9	
	cd(8) += -1	
	t = 9	
	9 == 9	

# Running Example – CDs Via Algorithm (2)



# Running Example – CDs Via Algorithm (3)





# Step 3: Control Flow Substitution

- Go from branching code  $\rightarrow$  sequential predicated code
- 5 baby steps
  - » 1. Create predicates
  - » 2. CMPP insertion
  - » 3. Guard operations
  - » 4. Remove branches
  - » 5. Initialize predicates

# Predicate Creation

- R/K calculation Mapping predicates to blocks
  - » Paper more complicated than it really is
  - » K = unique sets of control dependences
  - » Create a new predicate for each element of K
  - » R(bb) = predicate that represents CD set for bb, ie the bb's assigned predicate (all ops in that bb guarded by R(bb))

K = { $\{-1\}, \{1\}, \{-2\}, \{-4\}, \{2,4\}, \{-1,-3\}$ } predicates = p1, p2, p3, p4, p5, p6

#### For each control dependence set

- » For each edge in the control dependence set
  - Identify branch condition that causes edge to be traversed
  - Create CMPP to compute corresponding branch condition
    - OR-type handles worst case
    - guard = True
    - destination = predicate assigned to that CD set
    - Insert at end of BB that is the source of the edge

K = { $\{-1\}, \{1\}, \{-2\}, \{-4\}, \{2,4\}, \{-1,-3\}\}$ predicates = p1, p2, p3, p4, p5, p6

Example: 
$$p1 = cmpp.ON (b < 0)$$
 if T  $\longrightarrow$  BB1  
 $b < 0$   $b >= 0$ 

# Running Example – CMPP Creation



# Control Flow Substitution – The Rest

- Guard all operations in each bb by R(bb)
  - » Including the newly inserted CMPPs
- Nuke all the branches
  - » Except exit edges and backedges
- Initialize each predicate to 0 in first BB

# Running Example – Control Flow Substitution



# Step 4: CMPP Compaction

- Convert ON CMPPs to UN
  - » All singly defined predicates don't need to be OR-type
  - » OR of 1 condition → Just compute it !!!
  - » Remove initialization (Unconditional don't require init)
- Reduce number of CMPPs
  - » Utilize 2<sup>nd</sup> destination slot
  - » Combine any 2 CMPPs with:
    - Same source operands
    - Same guarding predicate
    - Same or opposite compare conditions

# Running Example - CMPP Compaction

```
Loop:
  p1 = p2 = p3 = p4 = p5 = p6 = 0
  b = load(a) if T
  p1 = cmpp.ON (b < 0) if T
  p2 = cmpp.ON (b \ge 0) if T
  p6 = cmpp.ON (b < 0) if T
  p3 = cmpp.ON (c > 0) if p1
  p5 = cmpp.ON (c <= 0) if p1
  p4 = cmpp.ON (b > 13) if p3
  p5 = cmpp.ON (b <= 13) if p3
  b = b + 1 if p4
  c = c + 1 if p5
  d = d + 1 if p1
  p6 = cmpp.ON (c <= 25) if p2
  e = e + 1 if p2
  a = a + 1 if p6
  bge e, 34, Done if p6
  jump Loop if T
Done:
```

Loop: p5 = p6 = 0b = load(a) if T p1,p2 = cmpp.UN.UC (b < 0) if Tp6 = cmpp.ON (b < 0) if Tp3,p5 = cmpp.UN.OC (c > 0) if p1p4,p5 = cmpp.UN.OC (b > 13) if p3b = b + 1 if p4 c = c + 1 if p5 d = d + 1 if p1 p6 = cmpp.ON (c <= 25) if p2 e = e + 1 if p2 a = a + 1 if p6 bge e, 34, Done if p6 jump Loop if T Done:

# Homework Problem – Answer Next Time

if 
$$(a > 0) \{$$
  
 $r = t + s$   
if  $(b > 0 \parallel c > 0)$   
 $u = v + 1$   
else if  $(d > 0)$   
 $x = y + 1$   
else  
 $z = z + 1$   
}

- a. Draw the CFG
- b. Compute CD
- c. If-convert the code