CS450

Structure of Higher Level Languages

Lecture 27: Mark and sweep; sets; refactoring evaluation

Tiago Cogumbreiro

Garbage Collection

and our implementation of Heap

Handle creation problem

Before garbage collection

```
'[(E0 . [(x . 10)])
  (E1 . [E0 (x . 20) ])
  (E2 . [E0 (x . 30) ])
]
```

After garbage collection

```
'[(E0 . [(x . 10)])
  (E2 . [E0 (x . 30) ])
```

> What happens if we allocate some data in the heap above?

```
(define (heap-alloc h v)
  (define new-id (handle (hash-count (heap-data h))))
  (define new-heap (heap (hash-set (heap-data h) new-id v)))
  (eff new-heap new-id))
```

Handle creation problem

- What happens if we allocate frame `[E0 (x . 9)]` (some frame without bidings)?

Before adding a frame

```
'[(E0 . [(x . 10)])
  (E2 . [E0 (x . 30) ])]
```

Handle creation problem

- What happens if we allocate frame `[E0 (x . 9)]` (some frame without bidings)?

Before adding a frame

```
'[(E0 . [(x . 10)])
  (E2 . [E0 (x . 30) ])]
```

After adding a frame

```
'[(E0 . [(x . 10)])
  (E2 . [E0 (x . 9) ])]
```

Using `hash-count` is not enough!

We must ensure that handle creation plays well with GC

Moving versus non-moving garbage collection

- **Non-moving.** If garbage collection simply claims unreachable data, then garbage collection faces the problem of fragmentation (which we noticed in the previous example)
- **Moving.** Alternatively, garbage collection may choose to "move" the references around by placing data in different locations, which handles the problem of fragmentation, but now it must be able to translate the references in the data

Homework 6

Homework 6

1. `frame-refs` given a frame return a set of handles contained in that frame
2. `mem-mark` given a function that returns the contained handles of an element, and an initial handle, returns the set of reachable handles (including the initial handle).
3. `mem-sweep` given a heap and a set of handles returns a new heap which only contains the handles in the given set.

Specifying Mark-and-sweep

Specifying Mark

Given an initial handle, collect the set of reachable handles.
We say that a handle x directly connects to a handle y if handle y is ***contained*** in the frame addressed by x. We say that a handle is contained in frame in either situation:

1. If the frame has a parent, then that handle is contained in the frame.
2. If a closure is a local value of the frame, and that closure captures handle x, then x is contained in the frame.

Specifying Mark

Homework 6

Function `frame-refs` must return the set of contained handles.

Example 1

```
(check-equal?
 (frame-refs
   (parse-frame
    '(E2
      (x . 0)
      (y . (closure E0 (lambda (x) x)))
      (z . (closure E1 (lambda (x) x))))))
 (set (handle 0) (handle 1) (handle 2)))
```

Example 2

```
(check-equal?
 (frame-refs
  (parse-frame
    ; no parent!
    '((x . 0)
      (y . (closure E0 (lambda (x) x)))
      (z . (closure E1 (lambda (x) x))))))
 (set (handle 0) (handle 1)))
```

Sets in Racket

```
(require racket/set) ; ← do not forget to load the sets library
```

Constructors

- `(set v1 v2 v3 ...)` creates a (possibly empty) set of values, corresponds to $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, \ldots\}$
- `(set-union s1 s2)` returns a new set that holds the union of sets s1 and s2, corresponds to $s_1 \cup s_2$
- `(set-add s x)` returns a new set that holds the elements of s and also element x, corresponds to $s \cup \{x\}$
- `(set-subtract s1 s2)` returns a new set that consists of all elements that are in s1 but are not in s2, corresponds to $\{x \mid x \in s_1 \wedge x \notin s_2\}$

Sets in Racket

Selectors

- `(set-member? s x)` returns if `x` is a member of set `s`, corresponds to $x \in s$
- `(set->list s)` converts set `s` into a list

Homework 6

> **How do you iterate over the values of a frame?** You might want to look at function `frame-fold` or function `frame-values`.

Specifying Mark-and-sweep

Specifying Sweep

1. **What is the input?**

Specifying Mark-and-sweep

Specifying Sweep

1. **What is the input?** heap? and set of handles
2. **Which functional pattern?**

Specifying Mark-and-sweep

Specifying Sweep

1. **What is the input?** `heap?` and set of handles
2. **Which functional pattern?** A `filter`. See `heap-filter`.
3. **What are we keeping?**

Specifying Mark-and-sweep

Specifying Sweep

1. **What is the input?** `heap?` and set of handles
2. **Which functional pattern?** A `filter`. See `heap-filter`.
3. **What are we keeping?** All handles in the input set

Today we will...

- Introduce a functional pattern monads
- Introduce state monads

Revisiting our reduction rules

$$\blacktriangleright_H\ v \Downarrow_E v \blacktriangleright_H$$

$$\frac{\blacktriangleright_{H_1}\ e_f \Downarrow_E (E_f, \lambda x.t_b)\ \blacktriangleright_{H_2}\ e_a \Downarrow_E v_a\ \blacktriangleright_{H_3}\ E_b \leftarrow E_f + [x := v_a]\ \blacktriangleright_{H_4}\ t_b \Downarrow_{E_b} v_b \blacktriangleright_{H_5}}{\blacktriangleright_{H_1}\ (e_f\ e_a) \Downarrow_E v_b \blacktriangleright_{H_5}}$$

Effectful computation can be divided into three categories:

- Side-effect free computation in blue
- Computation that directly produces side effect in red
- Computation that indirectly produces some side-effect in black

We are ▶ chaining ▶ effectful ▶ computations ▶, that is the variables declared on the left-hand side of ▶ should be accessible in the right-hand side.

Refactoring memory-based operations

```
;; e1 ⇓E v1
(define v1+mem1 (d:eval-exp mem env e1))
(define mem1 (eff-state v1+mem1))
(define v1 (eff-result v1+mem1))
;; E' ← E + [x := v1]
(define env2+mem2 (environ-push mem1 env y v1)
(define env2 (eff-result env2+mem2))
(define mem2 (eff-state env2+mem2))
;; e2 ⇓E' v2
(define v2+mem3 (d:eval-exp mem2 env2 e2))
(define mem3 (eff-state v+mem1))
(define v2 (eff-result v+mem1))
```

> The memory needs to be passed along from one function call to the next. How can we refactor this code so that some function does that for us?

Refactoring evaluation of application

```
;; e1 ⇓E v1
(define* v1 (d:eval-exp* env e1))
;; E' ← E + [x := v1]
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1)
;; e2 ⇓E' v2
(define* v2 (d:eval-exp* env2 e2))
```

> At each step we separate the result from the state.
> Our goal is to **abstract** the memory threading, that is to refactor away this mechanic unpacking of the side effect structure.

Abstracting the state

Ideal pseudo code

> In today's class, we introduce an abstraction that allows us to achieve something similar to the pseudo-code below. We highlight in yellow effectful definitions and operations.

```
;; e1 ⇓E v1
(define* v1 (d:eval-exp* env e1))
;; E' ← E + [x := v1]
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1)
;; e2 ⇓E' v2
(define* v2 (d:eval-exp* env2 e2))
```

Roadmap: abstracting effectful computation

Combining:

- **Effectful operations:** `s:eval-exp` and `environ-push`, with
- **Effectful variable declaration:** `v1`, `env2`, and `v2`

```
;; e1 ⇓E v1
(define* v1 (d:eval-exp* env e1))
;; E' ← E + [x := v1]
(define* env2 (environ-push* env y v1))
;; e2 ⇓E' v2
(define* v2 (d:eval-exp* env2 e2))
```

$$e_1 \Downarrow_E v_1 \blacktriangleright E' \leftarrow E + [y := v] \blacktriangleright e_2 \Downarrow_{E'} v_2$$

A proxy example

Arithmetic on the heap

Example

Consider a heap of integers. We allocate two integers and then a third integer that holds the some of the first two.

```
(define (prog1 h1)
  ;; allocate x with 1
  (define eff-x (heap-alloc h1 1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  ;; allocate y with 2
  (define eff-y (heap-alloc h2 2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-y))
  ;; allocate z with (+ x y)
  (heap-alloc h3 (+ (heap-get h3 y) (heap-get h3 x))))
(define (run-state h op) (eff-state (op h)))
(define H (heap (hash (handle 0) 1 (handle 1) 2 (handle 2) 3)))
(check-equal? (run-state empty-heap prog1) H)
```

Effectful operations

- An **effectful operation** takes a state and returns an effect `eff` that pairs some state with some result. An effectful operation is parameterized by the state type and by the result type.
- Below we define two effectful operations where the state is a heap.

Add

```
(define (num x)
  (lambda (h)
    (heap-alloc h x)))
```

Alloc

```
(define (add x y)
  (lambda (h)
    (heap-alloc h (+ (heap-get h y) (heap-get h x)))))
```

Did you know?

- The state (heap) is a parameter, so that we can combine effectful operations.
- Functions `num` and `add` each returns an effectful operation

Sequencing effectful operations

Example

```
(define (prog2 h1)
  ;; allocate x with 1
  (define eff-x ((num 1) h1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  ;; allocate x with 2
  (define eff-y ((num 2) h2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-y))
  ;; allocate y with (+ x y)
  ((add x y) h3))
```

The bind operator

```
(define (bind o1 o2)
  (lambda (h1)
    (define eff-r (o1 h1))
    (define r (eff-result eff-r))
    (define h2 (eff-state eff-r))
    ((o2 r) h2)))
```

> We highlight in yellow an example of redundant code. Function `bind` abstracts away the redundant code.

Abstracting with bind

Before

```
(define (prog2 h1)
  ;; allocate x with 1
  (define eff-x ((num 1) h1))
  (define x (eff-result eff-x))
  (define h2 (eff-state eff-x))
  ;; allocate x with 2
  (define eff-y ((num 2) h2))
  (define y (eff-result eff-y))
  (define h3 (eff-state eff-y))
  ;; allocate y with (+ x y)
  ((add x y) h3))
```

After

```
(define prog3
  ;; allocate x with 1
  (bind (num 1)
    (lambda (x)
      ;; allocate x with 2
      (bind (num 2)
        (lambda (y)
          ;; allocate y with (+ x y)
          (add x y))))))
```

Using the `bind` operator we remove redundant code. You can think of `bind` as a variable declaration, akin to an effectful `define`.