Enum Translation with Type Constraints

Minwook Lee ryan-lee@kaist.ac.kr

I. NOTATION AND ASSUMPTIONS

- We consider a type as **a set of values**. Therefore, int is equivalent to \mathbb{Z} .
 - Every set operation can be applied to types as well. For example, int $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\epsilon \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.
 - Every unary or binary operation can be applied to types as well. For example:

```
\tau_1 \ binop \ \tau_2 = \{v_1 \ binop \ v_2 \mid v_1 \in \tau_1 \land v_2 \in \tau_2\}.
```

- Type constraint of the identifier x is of the form $[x] = \langle \lfloor x \rfloor, \lceil x \rangle \rangle$.
 - $-\lfloor x \rfloor$ is a set of possible values that can be assigned to the identifier.
 - [x] is the required type for x based on the type annotation and its usage context.
 - Every set operation can be applied to type constraints as well. For example:

```
 * [x] \subseteq [y] \text{ iff } [x] \subseteq [y] \land [x] \subseteq [y] 
 * [x] \cup [y] = \langle [x] \cup [y], [x] \cup [y] \rangle 
 * [x] binop [y] = \langle [x] binop [y], [x] binop [y] \rangle
```

II. BASIC MIR

A. Abstract Syntax

```
\begin{array}{rcl} n & \in & \mathbb{Z} \\ x,y & \in & \underline{Id} \\ f & := & \overline{B:b}; \overline{x:\tau} \\ b & := & \overline{s}; t \\ s & := & x = n \mid x = y \mid x = unop \ y \mid x = y_1 \ binop \ y_2 \\ t & := & \mathsf{goto} \ B \mid \mathsf{switch} \ x \ \overline{n:B} \mid \mathsf{return} \\ \epsilon & \in & Enum \\ \tau & := & \mathsf{int} \mid \epsilon \end{array}
```

Fig. 1. Basic MIR Abstract Syntax

The abstract syntax of the basic MIR is shown in Fig 1. In MIR, a function f is represented with the type $Body^1$, which denotes a control flow graph (CFG) consisting of multiple basic blocks. Each basic block b is represented with the type $BasicBlockData^2$ and consists of multiple statements followed by a single terminator. In a basic block, statements do not have any control flow effect, and only terminators affect the control flow. A basic block is associated with a unique identifier B, represented with the type $BasicBlock^3$. A statement s has the type $Statement^4$. While various kinds of statements exist in MIR, we only need to consider assignments. The left-hand side of an assignment is a variable x, and the right-hand side is either an integer n, a variable, a unary operation, or a binary operation. A terminator t has the type $Terminator^5$ and is either a jump to another basic block, a switch, or a return. When returning, the return value is always the value stored in the variable named 0. If a function has t0 parameters, their values are stored in the variables t1, t2, ..., t2. Note that a function declares the type of each variable as well. A type t1 is either int or a t2 enum type t3.

B. Generating Type Constraints

The rules for type constraints in basic MIR are shown in Fig 2.

 $^{^{1}} https://doc.rust-lang.org/beta/nightly-rustc/rustc_middle/mir/struct.Body.html\\$

²https://doc.rust-lang.org/beta/nightly-rustc/rustc_middle/mir/struct.BasicBlockData.html

³https://doc.rust-lang.org/beta/nightly-rustc/rustc_middle/mir/struct.BasicBlock.html

⁴https://doc.rust-lang.org/beta/nightly-rustc/rustc_middle/mir/struct.Statement.html

⁵https://doc.rust-lang.org/beta/nightly-rustc/rustc_middle/mir/struct.Terminator.html

For the function f:

 $\overline{B:b}; \overline{x:\tau} : [\overline{x}] \subseteq \overline{\tau}$

For the statement s:

 $\begin{array}{cccc} x = n & : & n \in \lfloor x \rfloor \\ x = y & : & \llbracket y \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket x \rrbracket \\ x = unop \ y & : & unop \ \lfloor y \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \\ x = y_1 \ binop \ y_2 & : & \lfloor y_1 \rfloor \ binop \ \lfloor y_2 \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \\ \end{array}$

Fig. 2. Basic MIR Type Constraints

C. Resolving Type Constraints

We resolve the type constraints with the following principles:

- We always choose the smallest set for |x| that satisfies the type constraints.
 - This increases the coverage where the enum translation can be applied.
- We always choose the largest set for [x] that satisfies the type constraints.
 - This prevents the redundant enum translation.

D. Examples

Assume $\epsilon = \{0, 1\}.$

1) Simple case: The following is an example of a basic MIR function:

$$x:\epsilon;\ y:\mathbb{Z};\ \{y=1;\ x=y;\ \mathrm{return}\}$$

We can derive the following conditions:

 $\begin{array}{lll} x : \epsilon & : & \lceil x \rceil \subseteq \epsilon \\ y : \mathbb{Z} & : & \lceil y \rceil \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \\ y = 1 & : & 1 \in \lfloor y \rfloor \\ x = y & : & \lVert y \rVert \subseteq \lVert x \rVert \\ \end{array}$

By resolving the type constraints we have:

$$[x] = \langle \{1\}, \epsilon \rangle$$
 $[y] = \langle \{1\}, \epsilon \rangle$.

Now we deduce that $\lfloor x \rfloor \subseteq \lceil x \rceil$ and $\lfloor y \rfloor \subseteq \lceil y \rceil$. Therefore, we now safely modify the function to:

$$\cdots$$
; $y:\epsilon$; \cdots .

Also, the translation doesn't introduce the unsafe code since all required types are valid Rust enum types.

2) Solving more cases with type constraints: The following is an example of a basic MIR function showing how deriving value constraints would work in case where subtype inference could not be applied:

$$x:\epsilon;\ y:\mathbb{Z};\ \{y=-1;\ x=-y;\ \mathrm{return}\}$$

We can derive the following conditions:

 $\begin{array}{cccc} x:\epsilon & : & \lceil x \rceil \subseteq \epsilon \\ y:\mathbb{Z} & : & \lceil y \rceil \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \\ y=-1 & : & -1 \in \lfloor y \rfloor \\ x=-y & : & -\lfloor y \rfloor \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \end{array}$

By resolving the type constraints we have:

$$[x] = \langle \{1\}, \epsilon \rangle \quad [y] = \langle \{-1\}, \mathbb{Z} \rangle.$$

Now we deduce that all $\lfloor x \rfloor \subseteq \lceil x \rceil$ and $\lfloor y \rfloor \subseteq \lceil y \rceil$. Therefore, we can translate the integer type to the Rust enum type. However, this procedure would introduce unsafe code on x = -y while translating the type of x to be ϵ .

```
s := \cdots \mid x = \& y \mid x = *y \mid *x = y
\tau := \cdots \mid *\tau
```

Fig. 3. MIR Abstract Syntax with Pointers

III. ADDING POINTERS

A. Abstract Syntax

The abstract syntax of MIR with pointers is shown in Fig 3.

We denote the abstract cell $c \in Cell$ as the set of all locations while $\llbracket c \rrbracket = \langle \lfloor c \rfloor, \lceil c \rceil \rangle$ denotes the type constraint of the value which is located on c. The pointer type $*\tau$ denotes the set of cells that can be dereferenced to a value of type τ . If x can be dereferenced to a value of type τ_1 and $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$, then x can also be dereferenced to a value of type τ_2 . This means that $*\tau_1 \subseteq *\tau_2$.

B. Generating Type Constraints

We choose an Andersen-style pointer analysis, since we do not expect real-world C code to use extensive pointer operations that would require flow-sensitive analysis for enum types.

The rules for type constraints in MIR with pointers are shown in Fig 4.

```
For the statement s:  x = \&y : \forall \tau, \qquad y \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \qquad \land \quad \tau \subseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow *\tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil   x = *y : \forall \tau \forall c, \quad c \in \lfloor y \rfloor \Rightarrow \llbracket c \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket x \rrbracket \quad \land \quad *\tau \subseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow \tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil   *x = y : \forall \tau \forall c, \quad c \in \lfloor x \rfloor \Rightarrow \llbracket y \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket c \rrbracket \quad \land \quad \tau \subseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow *\tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil
```

Fig. 4. MIR Type Constraints with Pointers

C. Examples

Assume $\epsilon = \{0, 1\}$. The following is an example of a basic MIR function with pointers:

$$x: \mathbb{Z}; \ y: \mathbb{Z}; \ z: \epsilon; \ \{y=1; \ x=\&y \ z=*x; \ \mathsf{return}\}$$

Each statement and variable declaration generates the following type constraints:

```
\begin{array}{lll} x: *\mathbb{Z} & : & \lceil x \rceil \subseteq *\mathbb{Z} \\ y: \mathbb{Z} & : & \lceil y \rceil \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \\ z: \epsilon & : & \lceil z \rceil \subseteq \epsilon \\ y = 1 & : & 1 \in \lfloor y \rfloor \\ x = \& y & : & \forall \tau, \ y \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \ \land \ \tau \subseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow *\tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil \\ z = *x & : & \forall \tau \forall c, \ c \in \lfloor x \rfloor \Rightarrow \llbracket c \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket z \rrbracket \ \land \ *\tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil \Rightarrow \tau \subseteq \lceil z \rceil \end{array}
```

Now we resolve the type constraints as follows:

By resolving the type constraints we have:

$$[\![x]\!] = \langle \{y\}, *\epsilon \rangle \quad [\![y]\!] = \langle \{1\}, \epsilon \rangle \quad [\![z]\!] = \langle \{1\}, \epsilon \rangle.$$

IV. ADDING STRUCTS AND ARRAYS

A. Abstract Syntax

The abstract syntax of MIR with structs and arrays is shown in Fig 5. The array type $\tau[]$ denotes the set of arrays whose elements are of type τ . i.e., if a variable x has the type $\tau[]$ and y has the type \mathbb{Z} , then $x[y] \subseteq \tau$.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F & \in & Field \\ S & \in & Struct \\ s & := & \cdots \mid x.F = y \mid x = y.F \mid x[x'] = y \mid x = y[y'] \\ \tau & := & \cdots \mid S \mid \tau \brack p & := & \overline{S\{\overline{F}:\tau\}}; \overline{f} \end{array}$$

Fig. 5. MIR Abstract Syntax with Structs and Arrays

B. Generating Type Constraints

The rules for type constraints in MIR with structs and arrays are shown in Fig 6.

```
For the struct definition S\{\overline{F:\tau}\}: S\{\overline{F:\tau}\} : \forall F \in S, \Rightarrow \lceil S.F \rceil \subseteq \tau For the statement s: \ldots x:S: \forall F \in S, \ \llbracket x.F \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket S.F \rrbracket x.F = y: \ \llbracket y \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket x.F \rrbracket x = y.F: \ \llbracket y.F \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket x \rrbracket x[x'] = y: \ \tau \subseteq \lfloor y \rfloor \Rightarrow \tau \rrbracket \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \quad \land \quad \forall \tau, \tau \subseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow \tau \rrbracket \subseteq \lceil x \rceil x = y[y']: \tau \rrbracket \subseteq \lfloor y \rfloor \Rightarrow \tau \subseteq \lfloor x \rfloor \quad \land \quad \forall \tau, \tau \sqsubseteq \lceil y \rceil \Rightarrow \tau \subseteq \lceil x \rceil
```

Fig. 6. MIR Type Constraints with Structs and Arrays

V. ADDING FUNCTION CALLS

A. Abstract Syntax

The abstract syntax of MIR with function calls is shown in Fig 7.

```
egin{array}{lcl} g & \in & Function \ p & := & S\{\overline{F:	au}\}; \overline{g:f} \ t & := & \cdots & \mid x=g(\overline{y}); B \end{array}
```

Fig. 7. MIR Abstract Syntax with Function Calls

We denote the local variable x in the function g as g.x. For the function call $x = g(\overline{y})$, we assume that y_r is the local variable in g function which is assigned as the return value. Also, we assume that $\overline{x_p}$ is the list of local variables in the current context, which is assigned to each parameter \overline{y} . The procedure of function application can be described as follows:

- We assign each value in $\overline{x_p}$ to the corresponding parameter in g. i.e., $\overline{g.y} = \overline{x_p}$.
- \bullet Evaluate the function g with the current context.
- Then assign the return value $g.y_r$ to x.

B. Generating Type Constraints

The rules for type constraints in MIR with function calls are shown in Fig 8.

$$x = g(\overline{y}); B : \overline{\llbracket x_p \rrbracket} \subseteq \overline{\llbracket g.y \rrbracket} \land \overline{\llbracket g.y_r \rrbracket} \subseteq \llbracket x \rrbracket$$

Fig. 8. MIR Type Constraints with Function Calls

VI. ADDING FUNCTION POINTERS

A. Abstract Syntax

The abstract syntax of MIR with function pointers is shown in Fig 9.

$$\begin{array}{lll} s & := & \cdots & \mid x = g \\ t & := & \cdots & \mid x = y(\overline{y'}); B \\ \tau & := & \cdots & \mid \overline{\tau} \rightarrow \tau' \end{array}$$

Fig. 9. MIR Abstract Syntax with Function Pointers