



Static Program Analysis

Lecture 6: Dataflow Analysis V (MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution)

Summer Semester 2018

Thomas Noll

Software Modeling and Verification Group

RWTH Aachen University

<https://moves.rwth-aachen.de/teaching/ss-18/spa/>

Recap: The MOP Solution

The MOP Solution I

- Other **solution method** for dataflow systems
- MOP = **Meet Over all Paths**
- Analysis information for block B^l
 - = **least upper bound over all paths leading to l**
 - = **most precise** information for l (“reference solution”)

Definition (Paths)

Let $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ be a dataflow system. For every $l \in Lab$, the set of **paths up to l** is given by

$$Path(l) := \{[l_1, \dots, l_{k-1}] \mid k \geq 1, l_1 \in E, (l_i, l_{i+1}) \in F \text{ for every } 1 \leq i < k, l_k = l\}.$$

For a path $\pi = [l_1, \dots, l_{k-1}] \in Path(l)$, we define the **transfer function** $\varphi_\pi : D \rightarrow D$ by

$$\varphi_\pi := \varphi_{l_{k-1}} \circ \dots \circ \varphi_{l_1} \circ \text{id}_D$$

(and thus $\varphi_{\square} = \text{id}_D$).

Recap: The MOP Solution

The MOP Solution II

Definition (MOP solution)

Let $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ be a dataflow system where $Lab = \{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$. The **MOP solution** for S is determined by

$$\text{mop}(S) := (\text{mop}(l_1), \dots, \text{mop}(l_n)) \in D^n$$

where, for every $l \in Lab$,

$$\text{mop}(l) := \bigsqcup \{ \varphi_\pi(\iota) \mid \pi \in Path(l) \}.$$

Remark:

- $Path(l)$ is generally infinite
- ⇒ not clear how to compute $\text{mop}(l)$
- In fact: MOP solution generally undecidable (later)

Recap: Constant Propagation

Formalising Constant Propagation Analysis I

The **dataflow system** $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ is given by

- set of labels $Lab := Lab_c$,
- extremal labels $E := \{\text{init}(c)\}$ (forward problem)
- flow relation $F := \text{flow}(c)$ (forward problem)
- complete lattice (D, \sqsubseteq) where
 - $D := \{\delta \mid \delta : Var_c \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\perp, \top\}\}$
 - $\delta(x) = z \in \mathbb{Z}$: x has **constant value** z (i.e., possible values in $\{z\}$)
 - $\delta(x) = \perp$: x **undefined** (i.e., possible values in \emptyset)
 - $\delta(x) = \top$: x **overdefined** (i.e., possible values in \mathbb{Z})
 - $\sqsubseteq \subseteq D \times D$ defined by pointwise extension of $\perp \sqsubseteq z \sqsubseteq \top$ (for every $z \in \mathbb{Z}$)

Example

$$Var_c = \{w, x, y, z\}, \delta_1 = (\underbrace{\perp}_w, \underbrace{1}_x, \underbrace{2}_y, \underbrace{\top}_z), \delta_2 = (\underbrace{3}_w, \underbrace{1}_x, \underbrace{4}_y, \underbrace{\top}_z)$$
$$\implies \delta_1 \sqcup \delta_2 = (\underbrace{3}_w, \underbrace{1}_x, \underbrace{\top}_y, \underbrace{\top}_z)$$

Recap: Constant Propagation

Formalising Constant Propagation Analysis II

Dataflow system $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ (continued):

- extremal value $\iota := \delta_{\top} \in D$ where $\delta_{\top}(x) := \top$ for every $x \in Var_c$ (i.e., every x has (unknown) default value)
- transfer functions $\{\varphi_l \mid l \in Lab\}$ defined by

$$\varphi_l(\delta) := \begin{cases} \delta & \text{if } B' = \text{skip or } B' \in BExp \\ \delta[x \mapsto val_{\delta}(a)] & \text{if } B' = (x := a) \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} val_{\delta}(x) &:= \delta(x) \\ val_{\delta}(z) &:= z \end{aligned} \quad val_{\delta}(a_1 \text{ op } a_2) := \begin{cases} z_1 \text{ op } z_2 & \text{if } z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \perp & \text{if } z_1 = \perp \text{ or } z_2 = \perp \\ \top & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $z_1 := val_{\delta}(a_1)$ and $z_2 := val_{\delta}(a_2)$

MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution

MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution I

Example 6.1 (Constant Propagation)

```
c := if [z > 0]1 then
    [x := 2]2; [y := 3]3
else
    [x := 3]4; [y := 2]5
end;
[z := x+y]6; [...]7
```

Transfer functions

(for $\delta = (\delta(x), \delta(y), \delta(z)) \in D$):

$$\varphi_1(a, b, c) = (a, b, c)$$

$$\varphi_2(a, b, c) = (2, b, c)$$

$$\varphi_3(a, b, c) = (a, 3, c)$$

$$\varphi_4(a, b, c) = (3, b, c)$$

$$\varphi_5(a, b, c) = (a, 2, c)$$

$$\varphi_6(a, b, c) = (a, b, a + b)$$

1. Fixpoint solution:

$$CP_1 = \iota = (\top, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_2 = \varphi_1(CP_1) = (\top, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_3 = \varphi_2(CP_2) = (2, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_4 = \varphi_1(CP_3) = (\top, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_5 = \varphi_4(CP_4) = (3, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_6 = \varphi_3(CP_3) \sqcup \varphi_5(CP_5) \\ = (2, 3, \top) \sqcup (3, 2, \top) = (\top, \top, \top)$$

$$CP_7 = \varphi_6(CP_6) = (\top, \top, \top)$$

2. MOP solution:

$$\text{mop}(7) = \varphi_{[1,2,3,6]}(\top, \top, \top) \sqcup \\ \varphi_{[1,4,5,6]}(\top, \top, \top) \\ = (2, 3, 5) \sqcup (3, 2, 5) \\ = (\top, \top, 5)$$

MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution

MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution II

Theorem 6.2 (MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution)

Let $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ be a dataflow system. Then

$$\text{mop}(S) \sqsubseteq \text{fix}(\Phi_S)$$

Reminder: by Definition 4.3,

$$\Phi_S : D^n \rightarrow D^n : (d_1, \dots, d_n) \mapsto (d'_1, \dots, d'_n)$$

where $Lab = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and, for each $l \in Lab$,

$$d'_l := \begin{cases} \iota & \text{if } l \in E \\ \bigsqcup \{ \varphi_{l'}(d_{l'}) \mid (l', l) \in F \} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof.

on the board □

Remark: as Example 6.1 shows, $\text{mop}(S) \neq \text{fix}(\Phi_S)$ is possible

Coincidence of MOP and Fixpoint Solution

Distributivity of Transfer Functions I

A sufficient condition for the coincidence of MOP and Fixpoint Solution is the distributivity of the transfer functions.

Definition 6.3 (Distributivity)

- Let (D, \sqsubseteq) and (D', \sqsubseteq') be complete lattices. Function $F : D \rightarrow D'$ is called **distributive** (w.r.t. (D, \sqsubseteq) and (D', \sqsubseteq')) if, for every $d_1, d_2 \in D$,

$$F(d_1 \sqcup_D d_2) = F(d_1) \sqcup_{D'} F(d_2).$$

- A dataflow system $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ is called **distributive** if every $\varphi_l : D \rightarrow D$ ($l \in Lab$) is so.

Distributivity of Transfer Functions II

Example 6.4

1. The Available Expressions dataflow system is **distributive**:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_I(A_1 \sqcup A_2) &= ((A_1 \cap A_2) \setminus \text{kill}_{AE}(B')) \cup \text{gen}_{AE}(B') \\ &= ((A_1 \setminus \text{kill}_{AE}(B')) \cup \text{gen}_{AE}(B')) \cap \\ &\quad ((A_2 \setminus \text{kill}_{AE}(B')) \cup \text{gen}_{AE}(B')) \\ &= \varphi_I(A_1) \sqcup \varphi_I(A_2)\end{aligned}$$

2. The Live Variables dataflow system is **distributive**: similarly
3. The Constant Propagation dataflow system is **not distributive** (cf. Example 6.1):

$$\begin{aligned}(\top, \top, \top) &= \varphi_{z:=x+y}((2, 3, \top) \sqcup (3, 2, \top)) \\ &\neq \varphi_{z:=x+y}(2, 3, \top) \sqcup \varphi_{z:=x+y}(3, 2, \top) \\ &= (\top, \top, 5)\end{aligned}$$

Coincidence of MOP and Fixpoint Solution

Coincidence of MOP and Fixpoint Solution

Theorem 6.5 (MOP vs. Fixpoint Solution)

Let $S = (Lab, E, F, (D, \sqsubseteq), \iota, \varphi)$ be a distributive dataflow system. Then

$$\text{mop}(S) = \text{fix}(\Phi_S)$$

Proof.

- $\text{mop}(S) \sqsubseteq \text{fix}(\Phi_S)$: Theorem 6.2
- $\text{fix}(\Phi_S) \sqsubseteq \text{mop}(S)$: as $\text{fix}(\Phi_S)$ is the *least* fixpoint of Φ_S , it suffices to show that $\Phi_S(\text{mop}(S)) = \text{mop}(S)$ (on the board)



Undecidability of the MOP Solution

Undecidability of the MOP Solution I

Theorem 6.6 (Undecidability of MOP solution)

The MOP solution for Constant Propagation is undecidable.

Proof.

Based on undecidability of **Modified Post Correspondence Problem**:

Let Γ be some alphabet, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_n \in \Gamma^+$.

Do there exist $i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $m \geq 1$ and $i_1 = 1$ such that

$$u_{i_1} u_{i_2} \dots u_{i_m} = v_{i_1} v_{i_2} \dots v_{i_m}?$$

Given a MPCP, we construct a WHILE program (with strings and Booleans) whose MOP analysis detects a constant property iff the MPCP has no solution (see next slide). □

Undecidability of the MOP Solution

Undecidability of the MOP Solution II

Proof (continued).

```
x := u1; y := v1;
while ... do
  if ... then
    x := x ++ u1;
    y := y ++ v1;
  else if ... then
    ⋮
  else
    x := x ++ un;
    y := y ++ vn;
  end ... end
end;
z := (x = y);
[skip]'
```

Then: $\text{mop}(l)(z) = \text{false}$

$\iff x \neq y$ at the end of every path to l

\iff the MPCP has no solution

□

Dataflow Analysis with Non-ACC Domains

Dataflow Analysis with Non-ACC Domains

- **Reminder:** (D, \sqsubseteq) satisfies **ACC** if each ascending chain $d_0 \sqsubseteq d_1 \sqsubseteq \dots$ eventually stabilises, i.e., there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d_n = d_{n+1} = \dots$
- If **height** (= maximal chain size) of (D, \sqsubseteq) is m , then fixpoint computation terminates after at most $|Lab| \cdot m$ iterations
- **But:** if (D, \sqsubseteq) has **non-stabilising ascending chains**
 \implies algorithm may not terminate
- **Solution:** use **widening operators** to enforce termination

Dataflow Analysis with Non-ACC Domains

Example: Interval Analysis

Interval Analysis

The goal of **Interval Analysis** is to determine, for each (interesting) program point, a safe interval for the values of the (interesting) program variables.

Interval analysis is actually a generalisation of constant propagation (\approx interval analysis with one-element intervals)

Example 6.7 (Interval Analysis)

```
var a[100]: int;
i := 0;
while i <= 42 do
  if i >= 0 ^ i < 100 then
    a[i] := i
  end;
  i := i + 1;
end;
```

← redundant array bounds check

Dataflow Analysis with Non-ACC Domains

The Domain of Interval Analysis

- The domain (Int, \subseteq) of **intervals over** \mathbb{Z} is defined by

$$Int := \{[z_1, z_2] \mid z_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}, z_1 \leq z_2\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$$

where

- $-\infty \leq z \leq +\infty$ (for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$)
- $\emptyset \subseteq J$ (for all $J \in Int$)
- $[y_1, y_2] \subseteq [z_1, z_2]$ iff $z_1 \leq y_1$ and $y_2 \leq z_2$
- (Int, \subseteq) is a **complete lattice** with (for every $\mathcal{I} \subseteq Int$)

$$\bigsqcup \mathcal{I} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \mathcal{I} = \emptyset \text{ or } \mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset\} \\ [Z_1, Z_2] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$Z_1 := \bigsqcap_{\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}} \{z_1 \mid [z_1, z_2] \in \mathcal{I}\}$$
$$Z_2 := \bigsqcup_{\mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}} \{z_2 \mid [z_1, z_2] \in \mathcal{I}\}$$

(and thus $\perp = \emptyset$, $\top = [-\infty, +\infty]$)

- Clearly (Int, \subseteq) has **infinite ascending chains**, such as

$$\emptyset \subseteq [1, 1] \subseteq [1, 2] \subseteq [1, 3] \subseteq \dots$$

Dataflow Analysis with Non-ACC Domains

The Complete Lattice of Interval Analysis

