Rebooting Supercompilation for Haskell

Ömer S. Ağacan oagacan@indiana.edu

Ryan R. Newton rrnewton@indiana.edu

August 23, 2015

■ An overview of supercompilation.

- An overview of supercompilation.
- What's interesting about it in the context of Haskell? Current state-of-the-art.

- An overview of supercompilation.
- What's interesting about it in the context of Haskell? Current state-of-the-art.
- Overview of how it works.

- An overview of supercompilation.
- What's interesting about it in the context of Haskell? Current state-of-the-art.
- Overview of how it works.
- "But where's my supercompiler for Haskell?" My preliminary work and research goals.

■ The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea:

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea:
 - Evaluate programs in compile-time, while making the most out of known inputs and definitions.

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea:
 - Evaluate programs in compile-time, while making the most out of known inputs and definitions.
 - Definitions of used functions.

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea:
 - Evaluate programs in compile-time, while making the most out of known inputs and definitions.
 - Definitions of used functions.
 - Statically known arguments of functions.

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea:
 - Evaluate programs in compile-time, while making the most out of known inputs and definitions.
 - Definitions of used functions.
 - Statically known arguments of functions.
 - When branching, propagate learned information through branches and make use of that information while compiling branches. (case expressions)

- The paper that describes the idea in English: "The Concept of a Supercompiler" Turchin [1986].
- High-level idea: (contd)
 - Evaluate programs in compile-time, while making the most out of known inputs and definitions.
 - Most of the time the goal is to generate more efficient programs.
 - (but see Klyuchnikov and Romanenko [2010] for a different use of supercompilation)

Supercompilation in the context of Haskell

- Why is it interesting?
- In a sense, it's the "ultimate" optimization. ("-O99")
- This optimizes in the sense that: If we have a programs \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 , and $\mathcal{P}_1 \Downarrow v$ in N steps and $\mathcal{P}_2 \Downarrow v$ in M steps, we consider \mathcal{P}_2 optimized if M < N.
- An approximation, but works well in practice.

Supercompilation in the context of Haskell

- It generalizes:
 - Deforestation(Wadler [1988])
 - Partial evaluation
 - Call-pattern specialization(Peyton Jones [2007])
 - Ad-hoc optimizations via rewrite rules, e.g. shortcut fusion (Gill et al. [1993]) or library-specific rewrite rules
 - "Optimizing SYB is Easy!" (Adams et al. [2014]) and
 "Optimizing Generics is Easy!" (Magalhães et al. [2010]) style
 "domain-specific" partial evaluators
 - Function specialization(SPECIALIZE pragmas)
 - ... and many more

Current state-of-the-art

- Bolingbroke [2013] shows some great potential:
 - Up to -95.1% runtime improvement.
 - Up to -100.0% allocation improvement.
- But it also suffers from problems that are inherent to supercompilation:
 - "We do not attempt to supercompile the full Nofib suite because the other Nofib benchmarks are considerably more complicated and generally suffer from extremely long supercompilation times."
 - (Jonsson [201?] focuses on compilation performance, and reports < 3 seconds for all the small programs from Nofib)
 - Up to +132002.0% in compile time.
 - Up to +188.9% in generated code size.

Bolingbroke [2013] laid out a great framework for supercompiling Haskell:

 Driving: Take steps according to operational semantics. Some additional steps like case-of-case transformation(Jones and Santos [1998]).

Bolingbroke [2013] laid out a great framework for supercompiling Haskell:

- Driving: Take steps according to operational semantics. Some additional steps like case-of-case transformation(Jones and Santos [1998]).
- Splitting: When stuck, keep evaluating sub-expressions.
 Propagate information. After evaluating sub-expressions combine results.

Bolingbroke [2013] laid out a great framework for supercompiling Haskell:

- Driving: Take steps according to operational semantics. Some additional steps like case-of-case transformation(Jones and Santos [1998]).
- Splitting: When stuck, keep evaluating sub-expressions.
 Propagate information. After evaluating sub-expressions combine results.
- Matching: Evaluating open terms lead to loops. Matcher tried to detect loops, returns information about how to refer to this new loop.

Bolingbroke [2013] laid out a great framework for supercompiling Haskell:

- Driving: Take steps according to operational semantics. Some additional steps like case-of-case transformation(Jones and Santos [1998]).
- Splitting: When stuck, keep evaluating sub-expressions.
 Propagate information. After evaluating sub-expressions combine results.
- Matching: Evaluating open terms lead to loops. Matcher tried to detect loops, returns information about how to refer to this new loop.
- Termination checking: Because perfect matcher is not possible, and some programs just loop.

```
mapOfMap f g = (.) (map f) (map g)
h1 f g a = map f (map g a)
h2 fga =
  (\f lst -> case lst of
                [] -> []
                h : t \rightarrow f h : map f t) f (map g a)
h3 fga =
  case (map g a) of
    [] -> []
    h : t \rightarrow f h : map f t
```

```
h3 fga =
 case (map g a) of
    [] -> []
   h : t -> f h : map f t
h4 fga =
  case (case a of
         [] -> []
         h1 : t1 -> g h1 : map g t1) of
         -> []
   h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
```

```
h4 fga =
  case (case a of
          [] -> []
          h1 : t1 -> g h1 : map g t1) of
          -> []
    h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
Case-of-case transformation: (Jones and Santos [1998])
h5 fga =
  case a of
    □ -> case □ of
            [] -> []
            h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
    h1: t1 ->
      case (g h1 : map g t1) of
             -> []
        h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
```

```
h5 fga =
  case a of
    [] -> case [] of
            [] -> []
           h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
   h1: t1 ->
     case (g h1 : map g t1) of
        [] -> []
       h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
h6 fga =
  case a of
    [] -> []
   h: t \rightarrow f (g h) : map f (map g t)
```

```
h6 f g a =
  case a of
    []    -> []
    h : t -> f (g h) : map f (map g t)
```

```
h6 fga =
  case a of
    [] -> []
    h : t \rightarrow f (g h) : map f (map g t)
    map f (map g t)
Looks similar to:
h1 f g a = map f (map g a)
```

At this point splitter tell us there's a loop.

```
h7 f g a =
case a of
[] -> []
h : t -> f (g h) : h7 f g t
```

Supercompiled version doesn't generate intermediate list.

Another example, growing arguments

```
reverse_acc [] acc = acc
reverse_acc (h : t) acc = reverse_acc t (h : acc)
goal lst = reverse_acc (reverse_acc lst []) []
h0 lst = reverse_acc (reverse_acc lst []) []
. . .
h5 lst = case lst of
    [] -> []
   h1 : t1 -> case (reverse_acc t1 (h1 : [])) of
        [] -> []
       h0 : t0 -> reverse_acc t0 (h0 : [])
. . .
h_ lst = ... reverse_acc t1 (h1 : []) ...
. . .
h_ lst = ... reverse_acc t2 (h2 : h1 : []) ...
```

Another example, growing arguments

What to do after stopping is completely different story.

Generalization

Rollback

Other/new ideas?

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication. Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication. Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

Matcher: Matching may lead to work sharing, which may increase memory residency. (Chitil [1997])

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication. Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

Matcher: Matching may lead to work sharing, which may increase memory residency. (Chitil [1997])

Termination checker: Need to be careful with growing arguments.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication. Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

Matcher: Matching may lead to work sharing, which may increase memory residency. (Chitil [1997])

Termination checker: Need to be careful with growing arguments.

Bolingbroke [2013] has some solutions, and documents it nicely.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication. Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

Matcher: Matching may lead to work sharing, which may increase memory residency. (Chitil [1997])

Termination checker: Need to be careful with growing arguments.

Bolingbroke [2013] has some solutions, and documents it nicely.

But we still don't have a working implementation.

"Where's my supercompiler for Haskell?"

I'm rebooting the supercompiler!

"Where's my supercompiler for Haskell?"

- I'm rebooting the supercompiler!
- The goal here is to distribute it as a package, downloadable from Hackage.

"Where's my supercompiler for Haskell?"

- I'm rebooting the supercompiler!
- The goal here is to distribute it as a package, downloadable from Hackage.
- Then the research will follow.

Problems

Thanks!

Github: osa1/sc-plugin

IRC: osa1

Email me your slow programs: oagacan@indiana.edu

References I

- M. D. Adams, A. Farmer, and J. P. Magalhães. Optimizing SYB is Easy! In Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2014 Workshop on Partial Evaluation and Program Manipulation, PEPM '14, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-2619-3. doi: 10.1145/2543728.2543730.
- M. C. Bolingbroke. Call-by-need supercompilation. Technical Report UCAM-CL-TR-835, University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory, May 2013. URL http:
 - //www.cl.cam.ac.uk/techreports/UCAM-CL-TR-835.pdf.
- O. Chitil. Common Subexpression Elimination in a Lazy Functional Language, 1997.

References II

- A. Gill, J. Launchbury, and S. L. Peyton Jones. A Short Cut to Deforestation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture*, FPCA '93, pages 223–232, New York, NY, USA, 1993. ACM. ISBN 0-89791-595-X. doi: 10.1145/165180.165214. URL http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/165180.165214.
- S. L. P. Jones and A. L. Santos. A transformation-based optimiser for Haskell. In SCIENCE OF COMPUTER PROGRAMMING, pages 3–47. Elsevier North-Holland, Inc., 1998.
- P. A. Jonsson. Time- and Size-Efficient Supercompilation, 201?
- Klyuchnikov and S. Romanenko. Proving the Equivalence of Higher-Order Terms by Means of Supercompilation. In A. Pnueli, I. Virbitskaite, and A. Voronkov, editors, *Perspectives of Systems Informatics*, volume 5947 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 193–205. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. ISBN 978-3-642-11485-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-11486-1_17. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11486-1_17.

References III

- J. P. Magalhães, S. Holdermans, J. Jeuring, and A. Löh. Optimizing Generics is Easy! In Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGPLAN Workshop on Partial Evaluation and Program Manipulation, PEPM '10, pages 33–42, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM. ISBN 978-1-60558-727-1. doi: 10.1145/1706356.1706366. URL http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1706356.1706366.
- S. Peyton Jones. Call-pattern Specialisation for Haskell Programs. In Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP '07, pages 327–337, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM. ISBN 978-1-59593-815-2. doi: 10.1145/1291151.1291200. URL http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1291151.1291200.
- V. F. Turchin. The Concept of a Supercompiler. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, 8:292–325, 1986.

References IV

P. Wadler. Deforestation: Transforming Programs to Eliminate Trees. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 73(2):231–248, Jan. 1988. ISSN 0304-3975. doi: 10.1016/0304-3975(90)90147-A. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(90)90147-A.