15-745 Lecture 7

Data Dependence in Loops – 2
Delta Test
Merging vectors

Based on slides from Allen&Kennedy

The General Problem

```
DO i1 = L1, U1
  DO i2 = L2, U2
        ...
      DO in = Ln, Un
 S1     A(f1(i1,...,in),...,fm(i1,...,in)) = ...
 S2      ... = A(g1(i1,...,in),...,gm(i1,...,in))
      ENDDO
      ...
  ENDDO
ENDDO
```

A dependence exists from S1 to S2 if:

– There exist α and β such that
  - $\alpha < \beta$ (control flow requirement)
  - $f_i(\alpha) = g_i(\beta)$ for all i, $1 \le i \le m$ (common access req)

ZIV Test

```
 DO j = 1, 100
S      A(e1) = A(e2) + B(j)
 ENDDO
```

e1,e2 are constants or loop invariant symbols

If (e1-e2)!=0 No Dependence exists

Strong SIV Test

```
DO i1 = L1, U1
  DO i2 = L2, U2
        ...
      DO in = Ln, Un
 S1     A(f1(i1,...,in),...,fm(i1,...,in)) = ...
 S2      ... = A(g1(i1,...,in),...,gm(i1,...,in))
      ENDDO
      ...
  ENDDO
ENDDO
```

- Strong SIV test when
  - $f(\ldots) = ai_k+c_1$ and $g(\ldots) = ai_k+c_2$
- Plug in α, β and solve for dependence:
  - $\beta-\alpha = (c_1 - c_2)/a$
- A dependence exists from S1 to S2 if:
  - $\beta-\alpha$ is an integer
  - $|\beta-\alpha| \le U_k - L_k$

Can extend to symbolic constants

- Determine d symbolically
- If d is a constant, use previous procedure
- Otherwise, calculate U-L symbolically
- Compare U-L and d symbolically (& hope)

- E.g.,

  for i=1 to N

  A[i+2*N] = A[i]

Weak-zero SIV Test

```
DO i1 = L1, U1
  DO i2 = L2, U2
      ...
      DO in = Ln, Un
 S1     A(f1(i1,...,in),...,fm(i1,...,in)) = ...
 S2     ... = A(g1(i1,...,in),...,gm(i1,...,in))
      ENDDO
      ...
  ENDDO
ENDDO
```

- Weak-Zero SIV test when
  - $f(\ldots) = ai_k+c_1$ and $g(\ldots) = c_2$
- Plug in α, β and solve for dependence:
  - $\alpha = (c_2 - c_1)/a$
- A dependence exists from S1 to S2 if:
  - α is an integer
  - $L_k \leq \alpha \leq U_k$

Weak-crossing SIV Test

```
DO i1 = L1, U1
  DO i2 = L2, U2
      ...
      DO in = Ln, Un
 S1     A(f1(i1,...,in),...,fm(i1,...,in)) = ...
 S2     ... = A(g1(i1,...,in),...,gm(i1,...,in))
      ENDDO
      ...
  ENDDO
ENDDO
```

- Weak-Zero SIV test when
  - $f(\ldots) = ai_k+c_1$ and $g(\ldots) = -ai_kc_2$
- To find crossing point, set $\alpha = \beta$ and solve:
  - $\alpha = (c_2 - c_1)/2a$
- A dependence exists from S1 to S2 if:
  - 2α is an integer
  - $L_k \leq \alpha \leq U_k$

Non-rectangular spaces

- Triangular iteration space when only one loop bound depends on an outer loop index
- Trapezoidal space when both loop bounds depend on an outer loop index

- Example:

  for i=1 to N

  for $j=L_0+L_1{*}I$ to $U_0+U_1{*}I$

  A[j+D] = …

  … = A[j]

  - **Is d in loop bounds?**

How are we doing so far?

- Empirical study froom Goff, Kennedy, & Tseng
  - Look at how often independence and exact dependence information is found in 4 suites of fortran programs
  - Compare ZIV, SIV (strong, weak-0, weak-crossing, exact), MIV, Delta
  - Check usefulness of symbolic analysis
- ZIV used 44% of time and proves 85% of indep
- Strong-SIV used 33% of time and proves 5% (success per application 97%)
- S-SIV, 0-SIV, x-SIV used 41%
- MIV used only 5% of time
- Delta used 8% of time, proves 5% of indep
- Coupled subscripts rare (20% overall, but concentrated)

Basics:Coupled Subscript Groups

- Why are they important?

  Coupling can cause imprecision in dependence testing

```
   DO I = 1, 100
S1   A(I+1,I) = B(I) + C
S2   D(I) = A(I,I) * E
   ENDDO
```

Dealing w/ Coupled Groups

- subscript-by-subscript testing to imprecise

  However, we could intersect deps

```
   DO I = 1, 100
S1   A(I+1,I) = B(I) + C
S2   D(I) = A(I,I) * E
   ENDDO
```

  first yields d=+1, second d=0. That's impossible. Therefore, no dependence
- Delta test uses this intuition when the subscripts are SIV to apply information between indices

Examples

For I

For J

A[I+1,I+J] = …

… = A[I, I+J-1]

Apply SIV to yield: $\Delta I=1$

$I_0+J_0 = I_0+\Delta I + J_0+\Delta J-1$

$0 = \Delta I + \Delta J-1$

$= 1 + \Delta J-1$

$\Delta J = 0$

For I, For J, For K

A[J-I,I+1,J+K] = A[J-I,I,J+K]

Apply SIV to yield: $\Delta I=1$

$J_0-I_0 = J_0+\Delta J-I_0-\Delta I$

$0 = \Delta J - \Delta I$

$0 = \Delta J-1$

$\Delta J = 1$

$J_0+K_0 = J_0+\Delta J+K_0+\Delta K$

$0 = \Delta J + \Delta K$

$0 = 1 + \Delta K$

$\Delta K = -1$

Constraints

- An assertion about an index that must hold for a dependence to exist.
- So, when intersection of constraints is empty, must be independent
- In Delta test we generate constraints from SIV tests, so distance (or direction vector) is sufficient

Delta Test

```
Procedure delta(subscr, constr)
   Init constraint vector C to <none>

   while exist untested SIV subscripts in subscr
        apply SIV test to all untested SIV subscripts
        return independence, or derive new constraint vector C'.
                C' <- C ∩ C'
        If C' = Ø then return independence
        else if C != C' then
                C <- C'
                propagate C into MIV subscripts
                apply ZIV test to untested ZIV subscripts
                return independence if no solution
   while exist untested RDIV subscripts
        test and propogate RDIV constants
   test remaining MIV subscripts using MIV tests
   intersect direction vectors with C, and return
```


Merging Results

- After we test all subscripts we have vectors for each partition. Now we need to merge these into a set of direction vectors for the memory reference
- Since we partitioned into separable sets we can do cross-product of vectors from each partition.
- Start with a single vector = (*,*,…,*) of length depth of loop nest.
- Foreach parition, for each index involved in vector create new set from
  old vector-these indicies x this set

Example Merge

For I
  For J
S_1 A[J-1] = …
S_2 … = A[J]

For 1st subscript in A using S_1 as source and S_2 as target: J has DV of -1

Merge -1 into (*,*) -> (*,-1). What does this mean?

- (<,-1): true dep in outer loop
- (=,-1): anti-dep from S_2 to S_1 → (=,1)
- (>,-1): anti-dep from S_2 to S_1 in outer loop → (<,-1)

Next Time...

- Improving cache locality using dependence information