Prof. Jingke Li (FAB120-06, lij@pdx.edu), Tue 10:00-11:50 @UTS 203, Labs: Tue 12:00-13:50 & Wed 12:00-13:50 @FAB 88-10

Assignment 2: IR Code Optimization

(Due 2/12/15 @ 11:59pm)

In this assignment, you are going to implement the three optimizations that we studied in class: *constant folding*, *address optimization*, and *comparison embedding*. A baseline version of an IR code generator is provided as the implementation platform.

The assignment carries a total of 100 points.

Preparation

Download the zip file "hw2.zip" from D2L. After unzipping, you should see a hw2 directory with the following items:

- hw2.pdf this document
- IROGen. java the baseline IR code generator
- ast0/ a directory containing the AST representation and its parser
- ir0/ a directory containing the target IR representation
- tst/ a subdirectory containing a set of test programs
- IR0Interp.jar an IR0 interpreter
- Makefile for compiling programs
- gen, run scripts for testing programs

Copy the baseline program IROGen.java to a new file, IROGenOpt.java, and implement the optimizations in this new program. (Don't forget to change the class name in the file accordingly.)

1. Constant Folding (50 points)

When seeing an AST expression "(Binop + 2 4)", the baseline code generator faithfully generates an IR0 instruction "t1 = 2 + 4".

Constant folding is to have the code generator evaluate constant expressions to their values, and/or to use the constant information to simplify the IR code. For the above example, the code generator would generate the instruction "t1 = 6", instead.

Constant folding can appear in many different forms and can be used to simplify IR code for many different AST nodes. The following are some areas you should pay attention to. The test suite include more examples you can use to improve your implementation.

• Constants may appear at multiple levels in an expression. Your program need to perform the optimization recursively on an expression AST tree from bottom up, so that cases such as the following can be recognized:

```
(Binop + (Binop * 2 3) (Binop - 4 1)) => (Binop + 6 3) => 9
```

• Constant folding applies to all types of constants and operations. Here are some examples:

```
(Binop < 1 2) => true
(Binop == (Binop + 1 2) 3) => (Binop == 3 3) => true
(Binop || true false) => true
```

• In Boolean expression case, due to short-circuit semantics, constant folding can simplify expressions that contain non-constant components:

The last example is an challenging case. It shows that even if a constant appears as the second operand, the code generator can use the information to simply the IR code:

```
"if false == false goto L0" becomes "goto L0" (See test10.ir.base and test10.ir.opt for this difference.)
```

• Constant folding can also simplify If and While statements:

Advice: Not all cases of constant folding are equally easy to implement. You should start with the simple ones, *e.g.* arithmetic cases, and incrementally progress to more challenging cases.

2. Address Optimization (25 points)

The baseline code generator uses a simple template to generate addresses for Load and Store instructions. It does not use the offset feature of the IrO.Addr instruction at all. Consider the following example,

What we'd like to have as output is the following IR code:

```
# IRO Program (optimized)
t1 = malloc (8)
a = t1
[a] = 3
4[a] = 4
```

This is what we call *address optimization*. The implementation of this optimization is quite simple. When generating IRO.Addr in the gen routine for the ArrayElm node, the code generator checks to see if the idx component is an integer literal; if so, it can take advantage of the offset form of IRO.Addr.

Note that in order to handle implicit constant idx components, such as

```
(ArrayElm a (Binop + 1 1))
```

constant folding optimization must be performed first.

3. Comparison Embedding (25 points)

For bpth the If and While statements, the IR code generated by the baseline generator evaluates the cond expression first; it then compares the value against false to decide whether to jump or to fall through.

Consider the following example:

The IR code is fine funtion-wise. However, a more efficient version exists:

```
# IRO Program (optimized)
if n <= 0 goto L0
x = 1
L0:</pre>
```

In this version, the comparison operation is embedded directly inside the CJump instruction.

This optimization is called *comparison embedding*.

To implement this optimization, the code generator needs to make changes in the gen routines for Ast0.If and Ast0.While. The idea is to perform a simple look-ahead on the cond expression before recursively invoking gen on it. If cond happens to be a relational expression, then the code generator will invoke gen on the expression's operands instead, and embed the relational operation directly into a CJump instruction.

Compiling and Testing

You may use the Makefile to compile your IROGenOpt.java program, and use the gen script to run it on the test AST inputs:

```
linux> make
linux> ./gen tst/test*.ast
```

The gen script will compare your IR code with a reference version in the corresponding .ir.opt file. Note that even if you have implement everything correctly, the comparison may show differences in label numbers and in instruction order. These differences are fine.

Requirements, Grading, and What to Turn In

Two sets of reference IR code are provided, the baseline version (in .ir.base files) and the optimized version (in .ir.opt files). You should set your goal to match the code quality in the optimized version, but any improvements over the baseline version will earn you partial credit. The more cases your program can handle, the more points you will get.

The **minimum requirement** for receiving a non-F grade on this assignment is that your IROGenOpt.java program compiles without error and performs correct optimization on at least one of the test programs.

Submit a single file, IROGenOpt.java, through the "Dropbox" on the D2L class website.