Solving Data-flow Problems in Syntax Trees

Sebastian Graf September 9, 2017

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

Introduction

- My master's thesis¹: Call Arity vs. Demand Analysis
 - Result: Usage Analysis generalising Call Arity
 - Precision of Call Arity without co-call graphs
- Requirements led to complex analysis order
- Specification of data-flow problem decoupled from its solution

https://pp.ipd.kit.edu/uploads/publikationen/graf17masterarbeit.pdf

Strictness Analysis

- Provides lower bounds on evaluation cardinality
- Which variables are evaluated at least once?

```
S Strict (Yes!)
L Lazy (Not sure)
```

Enables call-by-value, unboxing

```
main = do
let x = ... -- S
let y = ... -- S
let z = ... -- L
print (x + if odd y then y else z)
```

Strictness Analysis

- Provides lower bounds on evaluation cardinality
- Which variables are evaluated at least once?

```
S Strict (Yes!)
L Lazy (Not sure)
```

Enables call-by-value, unboxing

```
main = do
let !x = ... -- S
let !y = ... -- S
let z = ... -- L
print (x + if odd y then y else z)
```

GHC's Demand Analyser

- Performs strictness analysis (among other things)
- Fuels Worker/Wrapper transformation
- Backward analysis
 - Which strictness does an expression place on its free variables?
 - Which strictness does a function place its arguments?
- *Strictness type*: $StrType = \langle FVs \rightarrow Str, Str^* \rangle$

Strictness Signatures

- Looks at the right-hand side of const before the let body!
- Unleashes strictness type of const's RHS at call sites

```
let const a b = a -- const :: \langle [], [S, L] \rangle

in const

y -- S

4 (fac 1000) -- L
```

- Whole expression is strict in z
- Only digests f for manifest arity 1, can't look under lambda
- f is called with 2 arguments

```
let f x = -- f :: \langle [z \mapsto L], [S] \rangle

if odd x

then y \rightarrow y*z

else y \rightarrow y+z

in f 1 2
```

- Whole expression is strict in z
- Only digests f for manifest arity 1, can't look under lambda
- f is called with 2 arguments

```
let f x = -- f :: \langle [z \mapsto L], [S] \rangle

if odd x

then y \rightarrow y*z

else y \rightarrow y+z

in seq (f 1) 42
```

- Whole expression is strict in z
- Only digests f for manifest arity 1, can't look under lambda
- f is called with 2 arguments

```
let f x = -- f :: \langle [z \mapsto L], [S] \rangle

if odd x

then y \rightarrow y*z

else y \rightarrow y+z

in f 1 2
```

- Solution: Analyse RHS when incoming arity is known
- Formally: Finite approximation of strictness transformer
 - ullet StrTrans $= \mathbb{N} o \mathsf{StrType}$
- Exploit laziness to memoise results?

```
1 let f x = -- f<sub>1</sub> :: \langle [z \mapsto L], [S] \rangle

2 if odd x

3 then y \rightarrow y*z

4 else y \rightarrow y+z

5 in f 1 2
```

- Solution: Analyse RHS when incoming arity is known
- Formally: Finite approximation of strictness transformer
 - ullet StrTrans $=\mathbb{N} o \mathsf{StrType}$
- Exploit laziness to memoise results?

```
let f x = -- f<sub>2</sub> :: \langle [z \mapsto S], [S, S] \rangle

if odd x

then y \rightarrow y*z

else y \rightarrow y+z

in f 1 2
```

Recursion

- Exploit laziness to memoise approximations?
- X Recursion leads to termination problems
- Rediscovered fixed-point iteration, detached from the syntax tree
- Leads to data-flow network, solved by worklist algorithm

```
1 let fac n =
2          if n == 0
3          then 1
4          else n * fac (n-1)
5 in fac 12
```

- Allocate nodes to break recursion
 - One top-level node
 - One node per pair of (let binding, incoming arity)
- Initialise worklist to top-level node
- ullet Initialise nodes with ot

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2     f 1 = id
3     f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
```

- Allocate nodes to break recursion
 - One top-level node
 - One node per pair of (let binding, incoming arity)
- Initialise worklist to top-level node
- ullet Initialise nodes with ot

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2    f 1 = id
3    f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
<root>0
f_n
```

- Allocate nodes to break recursion
 - One top-level node
 - One node per pair of (let binding, incoming arity)
- Initialise worklist to top-level node
- ullet Initialise nodes with ot

Worklist: $\{\langle root \rangle_0\}$

- Allocate nodes to break recursion
 - One top-level node
 - One node per pair of (let binding, incoming arity)
- Initialise worklist to top-level node
- ullet Initialise nodes with ot

Worklist: $\{\langle root \rangle_0\}$

Worklist: $\{<root>_0\}$

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2    f 1 = id
3    f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z

L
(root>0
```

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2    f 1 = id
3    f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
```

```
1 let f 0 = const 0

2 f 1 = id

3 f n = f (n 'mod' 2)

4 in f y z
```

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2 f 1 = id
3 f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
\downarrow \qquad \qquad \perp = \langle [], [S, S] \rangle
\uparrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad \qquad
```

Worklist: $\{f_2\}$

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2 f 1 = id
3 f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
([],[S,L])
(root)_0
f_2
```

Worklist: $\{f_2\}$

8

```
1 let f 0 = const 0

2  f 1 = id
3  f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z

\langle [x \mapsto S, y \mapsto L], [] \rangle \qquad \langle [], [S, L] \rangle
```

Worklist: $\{f_2\}$

```
1 let f 0 = const 0
2 f 1 = id
3 f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
\langle [x \mapsto S, y \mapsto L], [] \rangle \qquad \langle [], [S, L] \rangle
```

Worklist: $\{f_2\}$

```
\langle [x \mapsto S, y \mapsto L], [] \rangle \qquad \langle [], [S, L] \rangle
1 let f 0 = const 0
2 f 1 = id
3 f n = f (n 'mod' 2)
4 in f y z
```

End