

CSE P 501 – Compilers

SSA

Hal Perkins

Autumn 2023

Agenda


- Overview of SSA IR
 - Constructing SSA graphs
 - Sample of SSA-based optimizations
 - Converting back from SSA form

- Sources: Appel ch. 19, also an extended discussion in Cooper-Torczon sec. 9.3

Def-Use (DU) Chains

- Common dataflow analysis problem: Find all sites where a variable is used, or find the definition sites of a variable used in an expression
- Traditional solution: def-use chains – additional data structure on top of the dataflow graph
 - Link each statement defining a variable to all statements that use it
 - Link each use of a variable to its definition

Def-Use (DU) Chains



In this example, two DU chains intersect

DU-Chain Drawbacks

- Expensive: if a typical variable has N uses and M definitions, the total cost *per-variable* is $O(N * M)$, i.e., $O(n^2)$
 - Would be nice if cost were proportional to the size of the program
- Unrelated uses of the same variable are mixed together
 - Complicates analysis – variable looks live across all uses even if unrelated

SSA: Static Single Assignment

- IR where each variable has only one definition in the program text
 - This is a single *static* definition, but that definition can be in a loop, function, or other code that is executed dynamically many times
- Makes many analyses (and related optimizations) more efficient
- Separates values from memory storage locations
- Complementary to CFG/DFG – better for some things, but cannot do everything

SSA in Basic Blocks

Idea: for each original variable x , create a new variable x_n at the n^{th} definition of the original x . Subsequent uses of x use x_n until the next definition point.

- Original


- $a := x + y$
- $b := a - 1$
- $a := y + b$
- $b := x * 4$
- $a := a + b$

- SSA

- $a_1 := x + y$
- $b_1 := a_1 - 1$
- $a_2 := y + b_1$
- $b_2 := x * 4$
- $a_3 := a_2 + b_2$


Merge Points

- The issue is how to handle merge points



Merge Points


- The issue is how to handle merge points




- Solution: introduce a Φ -function
 $a_3 := \Phi(a_1, a_2)$
- Meaning: a_3 is assigned either a_1 or a_2 depending on which control path is used to reach the Φ -function

Another Example

Original



SSA




How Does Φ “Know” What to Pick?


- It doesn't
- Φ -functions don't actually exist at runtime
 - When we're done using the SSA IR, we translate back out of SSA form, removing all Φ -functions
 - Basically by adding code to copy all SSA x_i values to the single, non-SSA, actual x
 - For analysis, all we typically need to know is the connection of uses to definitions – no need to “execute” anything

Example With a Loop

Original



SSA



Notes:

- Loop back edges are also merge points, so require Φ -functions
- a_0, b_0, c_0 are initial values of a, b, c on entry to initial block
- b_1 is dead – can delete later
- c is live on entry – either input parameter or uninitialized

What does SSA “buy” us?

- No need for DU or UD chains – implicit in SSA
- Compact representation
- SSA is “recent” (i.e., 80s)
- Prevalent in real compilers for { } languages

Converting To SSA Form


- Basic idea
 - First, add Φ -functions
 - Then, rename all definitions and uses of variables by adding subscripts

Inserting Φ -Functions

- Could simply add Φ -functions for every variable at every join point(!)
- Called “maximal SSA”
- But
 - Wastes *way* too much space and time
 - Not needed in many cases

Path-convergence criterion

- Insert a Φ -function for variable a at point z when:
 - There are blocks x and y , both containing definitions of a , and $x \neq y$
 - There are nonempty paths from x to z and from y to z
 - These paths have no common nodes other than z





Details

- The start node of the flow graph is considered to define every variable (even if “undefined”)
- Each Φ -function itself defines a variable, which may create the need for a new Φ -function
 - So we need to keep adding Φ -functions until things converge
- How can we do this efficiently?
Use a new concept: dominance frontiers

Dominators (review)

- Definition: a block x *dominates* a block y iff every path from the entry of the control-flow graph to y includes x
- So, by definition, x dominates x
- We can associate a Dom(inator) set with each CFG node x – set of all blocks *dominated by* x
 - $| \text{Dom}(x) | \geq 1$
- Properties:
 - Transitive: if $a \text{ dom } b$ and $b \text{ dom } c$, then $a \text{ dom } c$
 - There are no cycles, thus can represent the dominator relationship as a tree
- **WARNING**: this is different from the $\text{DOM}(x)$ relationship we use with loops – that is the set of all blocks that *dominate* x (sigh)

Example




Dominators and SSA

- One property of SSA is that definitions dominate uses; more specifically:
 - If $x := \Phi(\dots, x_i, \dots)$ is in block b , then the definition of x_i dominates the i^{th} predecessor of b
 - If x is used in a non- Φ statement in block b , then the definition of x dominates block b

Dominance Frontier (1)



- To get a practical algorithm for placing Φ -functions, we need to avoid looking at all combinations of nodes leading from x to y
- Instead, use the dominator tree in the flow graph

Dominance Frontier (2)





- Definitions
 - x *strictly dominates* y if x dominates y and $x \neq y$
 - The *dominance frontier* of a node x is the set of all nodes w such that x dominates a predecessor of w, but x does not strictly dominate w
 - \therefore if x and w are different, then x does not dominate w – there is some other path to w that does not go through x
 - But x can be in *it's own* dominance frontier! That can happen if there is a back edge to x from some node that x dominates (i.e., x is the head of a loop)
- Essentially, the dominance frontier is the border between dominated and undominated nodes




Example





- = x
- = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
- = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$




Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$




Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$




Example





- = x
- = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
- = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$




Example





- = x
- = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
- = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$




Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Example





-  = x
-  = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
-  = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Example




- = x
- = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
- = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Example



- = x
- = $\text{DomFrontier}(x)$
- = $\text{StrictDom}(x)$

Dominance Frontier Criterion for Placing Φ -Functions



- If a node x contains the definition of variable a , then every node in the dominance frontier of x needs a Φ -function for a
 - Idea: Everything dominated by x will see x 's definition of a . The dominance frontier represents the first nodes we could have reached via an alternative path, which *will* have an alternate reaching definition of a (recall the convention that the entry node defines all variables with version 0 - a_0)
 - Why is this right for loops? Hint: strict dominance...
 - Since the Φ -function itself is a definition, this placement rule needs to be iterated until it reaches a fixed-point
- Theorem: this algorithm places exactly the same set of Φ -functions as the path criterion given previously

Placing Φ -Functions: Details

- See the book for the full construction, but the basic steps are:
 1. Compute the dominance frontiers for each node in the flowgraph
 2. Insert just enough Φ -functions to satisfy the criterion. Use a worklist algorithm to avoid reexamining nodes unnecessarily
 3. Walk the dominator tree and rename the different definitions of each variable a to be a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots

Efficient Dominator Tree Computation

- Goal: SSA makes optimizing compilers faster since we can find definitions/uses without expensive bit-vector algorithms
- So, need to be able to compute SSA form quickly
- Computation of SSA from dominator trees are efficient, but...

Lengauer-Tarjan Algorithm

- Iterative set-based algorithm for finding dominator trees is slow in worst case
- Lengauer-Tarjan is near linear time
 - Uses depth-first spanning tree from start node of control flow graph
 - See books for details

SSA Optimizations

- Why go to the trouble of translating to SSA?
- Because SSA makes many optimizations and analyses simpler and more efficient
 - We'll give a couple of examples
- But first, what do we know? (i.e., what information is stored in the compiler SSA graph data structures?)

SSA Data Structures

For each ...

- Statement: links to: containing block, next and previous statements, variables defined, variables used
- Variable: link to its (single) definition and (possibly multiple) use sites
- Block: List of contained statements, ordered list of predecessor(s), successor(s) blocks

Dead-Code Elimination

- A variable is live \Leftrightarrow its list of uses is not empty(!)
 - That's it! Nothing further to compute
- Algorithm to delete dead code:
 - while there is some variable v with no uses
 - if the statement that defines v has no other side effects, then delete it
 - Need to remove this statement from the list of uses for its operand variables – which may cause those variables to become dead

Simple Constant Propagation

- If c is a constant in $v := c$, any use of v can be replaced by c
 - So update every use of v to use constant c
- If the c_i 's in $v := \Phi(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)$ are all the same constant c , we can replace this with $v := c$
- Incorporate copy propagation, constant folding, and others in the same worklist algorithm

Simple Constant Propagation

$W :=$ list of all statements in SSA program

while W is not empty

 remove some statement S from W

 if S is $v := \Phi(c, c, \dots, c)$, replace S with $v := c$

 if S is $v := c$

 delete S from the program

 for each statement T that uses v

 substitute c for v in T

 add T to W

Converting Back from SSA

- Unfortunately, real machines do not include a Φ instruction
- So after analysis, optimization, and transformation, need to convert back to a “ Φ -less” form for execution
 - (Also sometimes needed for different kinds of analysis or transformation. A production optimizer might convert the IR into and out of SSA form multiple times)

Translating Φ -functions

- The meaning of $x := \Phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is “set $x:=x_1$ if arriving on predecessor block edge 1, set $x:=x_2$ if arriving on edge 2, etc.”
- So, for each i , insert $x := x_i$ at the end of predecessor block i
- Rely on copy propagation and coalescing in register allocation to eliminate redundant copy instructions

SSA Wrapup

- More details needed to fully and efficiently implement SSA, but these are the main ideas
 - See recent compiler books (but not the Dragon book!)
- Allows efficient implementation of many optimizations
- SSA is used in most modern optimizing compilers (llvm is based on it) and has been retrofitted into many older ones (gcc is a well-known example)
- Not a silver bullet – some optimizations still need non-SSA forms, but very effective for many