Loop-invariant code motion

Two steps: analysis & transformation

Step 1: find invariant computations in loop
- invariant: computes same result each time evaluated

Step 2: move them outside loop
- to top: **code hoisting**
  - if used within loop
- to bottom: **code sinking**
  - if only used after loop

Example



Detecting loop-invariant expressions

An expression is invariant w.r.t. a loop *L* iff:

base cases:
- it's a constant
- it's a variable use, all of whose defs are outside *L*

inductive cases:
- it's an idempotent computation
  all of whose args are loop-invariant
- it's a variable use with only one reaching def,
  and that def is loop-invariant

A def is loop-invariant if its rhs is loop invariant

Computing loop-invariant expressions

Option 1:
- repeat iterative dfa
  until no more invariant expressions found

Option 2:
- build def/use chains,
  follow chains to identify & propagate
  invariant expressions

Option 3:
- convert to SSA form,
  then similar to def/use form

Example using def/use chains



Loop-invariant expression detection for SSA form

SSA form simplifies detection of loop invariants,
since each use has only one reaching definition

An expression is invariant w.r.t. a loop *L* iff:

base cases:

- it's a constant
- it's a variable use whose single def is outside *L*

inductive cases:

- it's an idempotent computation
  all of whose args are loop-invariant
- it's a variable use whose single def is loop-invariant

A def is loop-invariant if its rhs is loop invariant

ϕ functions are *not* idempotent

Example using SSA form



Example using SSA form & preheader



Code motion

When find invariant computation *S:* `z := x op y`,
want to move it out of loop (to loop preheader)

When is this legal?

Sufficient conditions:

- *S* **dominates** all loop exits
  [*A* dominates *B* when
  all paths to *B* must first pass through *A*]
- *S* is only assignment to `z` in loop
- no use of `z` in loop is reached by any def other than *S*

If met, then can move *S* to loop preheader

- but move in order discovered,
  to preserve data flow among moved statements

Example of domination



Avoiding domination restriction

Requirement that invariant computation dominates exit is strict

- nothing in conditional branch can be moved
- nothing after loop exit test can be moved

Can be circumvented through other transformations
such as **loop normalization**

- move loop exit test to bottom of loop

Use SSA form

- since definitions are unique and uses name which definition they're referencing, can reorder definitions "freely", if have no traps or side-effects
- may need to generate code for ϕ functions

Example of loop normalization



Example of domination in SSA form



Example of "only assignment in loop" restriction



Example in SSA form

Restriction unnecessary if in SSA form



Example of "no other reaching defs" restriction



Example in SSA form

Restriction unnecessary if in SSA form



Loop-invariant code copying

Alternative to code motion:
copy instruction to loop header, assigning to new temp, then do CSE & copy propagation to simplify in-loop version

Can always copy, unless instruction has side-effects

CSE & copy propagation will either eliminate in-loop instruction or replace with simple move instruction

Very similar to SSA-based code motion

Example