### Rebooting Supercompilation for Haskell

Ömer S. Ağacan oagacan@indiana.edu

Ryan R. Newton rrnewton@indiana.edu

August 25, 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% reduction in runtime.
  - Up to 100.0% reduction in allocation.
- 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 tries 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 tries 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 fga = map f (map g a)
h4 fga =
  case (case a of
         [] -> []
        h1 : t1 -> g h1 : map g t1) of
    [] -> []
    h0 : t0 -> f h0 : map f t0
h6 fga =
 case a of
   [] -> []
   h: t \rightarrow f(gh): map f(map g t)
h7 f g a =
  case a of
   [] -> []
   h : t -> f(gh) : h7 fgt
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Each operation has hard problems to solve. Splitter: (from Bolingbroke [2013])

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Splitter: (from Bolingbroke [2013])

Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication.

```
let n = fib 100

b = n + 1

c = n + 2

in (b, c)
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

```
Splitter: (from Bolingbroke [2013])
```

Propagating too much information may lead to work duplication.

```
let n = fib 100
   b = n + 1
   c = n + 2
in (b, c)
```

Propagating too little information may lead to missing optimization opportunities.

```
let map = . . .
    ys = map f zs
    xs = map g ys
in Just xs
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Each operation has hard problems to solve. Matcher:

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

#### Matcher:

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

```
S0 =
    let a = fib y
        b = fib y
    in (a, b)

S1 =
    let a = fib y
    in (a, a)
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

#### Matcher:

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

```
S0 =
    let a = fib y
        b = fib y
        in (a, b)

S1 =
    let a = fib y
        in (a, a)
Or:
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

#### Matcher:

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

```
S0 =
    let a = fib y
        b = fib y
        in (a, b)

S1 =
    let a = fib y
        in (a, a)

Or:
S0 = sum [1 .. 1000] + prod [1 .. 1000]
S1 = let l = [1 .. 1000] in sum l + prod l
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

Termination checker:

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

#### Termination checker:

```
Some programs just loop.
```

```
loop n = loop (n + 1)
countFrom n = n : countFrom (n + 1)
```

Each operation has hard problems to solve.

#### Termination checker:

```
Some programs just loop.
loop n = loop (n + 1)
countFrom n = n : countFrom (n + 1)
Sometimes detecting loops is not so easy: (growing arguments)
reverse_acc [] acc = acc
reverse_acc (h : t) acc = reverse_acc t (h : acc)
goal lst = reverse_acc (reverse_acc lst []) []
. . .
h_ lst = ... reverse_acc t1 (h1 : []) ...
. . .
h_ lst = ... reverse_acc t2 (h2 : h1 : []) ...
. . .
```

# "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.

#### Current status and problems

#### There has been some changes in GHC:

- Some changes in the Core theory: Roles.
- Lots of refactoring.

#### GHC API related problems:

- Some needed internals are not exposed by GHC requires some modifications in GHC.
- No easy ways to do most basic stuff: Moving terms around(substitutions), known-case reduction, case-of-case, etc. (all done in some parts of Core-to-Core passes, need to reverse engineer)
- No easy way to annotate Core syntax. Duplicating the syntax means duplicating huge amounts of code.
- Working on Core is hard: Invariants are encoded as partial functions without any helpful error messages – if we're lucky, there's a NOTE.
- Some things are not clear. (Types are first-class, but can I use them wherever I want? The Core definition allows this)

#### **Conclusions**

Have a working implementation of supercompiler described in Bolingbroke [2013].

#### Conclusions

Have a working implementation of supercompiler described in Bolingbroke [2013].

(Maybe) Improve GHC plugin API on the way.

#### Conclusions

Have a working implementation of supercompiler described in Bolingbroke [2013].

(Maybe) Improve GHC plugin API on the way.

Collecting benchmark programs - send yours! (with expected optimizations)

We can create a benchmark suite like Nofib, but for supercompilation-specific problems. (pathological cases, programs with lots of intermediate data structures)

#### Once we have a working implementation:

- Focus on specific parts(matcher, splitter etc.). Try other ideas from the literature(e.g. homeomorphic embedding).
- Work on some of the obvious improvements, like parallelizing the matcher.
- More experimental ideas:
  - Can we formulate it as a search problem and apply ideas from the literature?
  - Are profile-driven decision making possible?
  - Are machine learning algorithms applicable?

# 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.