Approaches to Instruction Selection

For **RISC** targets, translate one IR instruction to one or more target instructions.

For **CISC** targets, translate several IR instructions to one target instruction.

Example Source: \( a := b \) (assuming \( a, b \) in frame)

3-addr IR:
\[
\begin{align*}
t1 &= fp-12 \\
t2 &= *t1 \\
t3 &= fp+8 \\
*3 &= t2
\end{align*}
\]

Typical Tree IR:
\[
\text{mov}
\]
\[
/ \ \\
\text{mem} \ \
/ \\
\text{mem} \ \\
/ \ \\
| \\
| \\
/ \\
fp \ 8 \ fp \ -12
\]

Extreme RISC:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{add} & \%fp,-12,\%r3 \\
\text{ld} & [\%r3], \%r7 \\
\text{add} & \%fp,8,\%r4 \\
\text{st} & \%r7,[\%r4]
\end{align*}
\]

Moderate RISC:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ld} & [\%fp-12], \%r7 \\
\text{st} & \%r7, [\%fp + 8]
\end{align*}
\]

CISC:
\[
\text{move} \ [\%fp-12],[\%fp+8]
\]

Simplistic SPARC Instruction Selection for PCAT IR

Generate instructions from 3-address-style IR.

- Already includes explicit code for array and record calculations.
- Still needs to resolve variable addresses.

(Alternatively, could generate SPARC code directly from AST.)

Approach:
- Take advantage of SPARC’s \( M[\text{reg}+\text{const}] \) addressing mode to generate good code for frame references.

FOR THIS IR: \( \text{ld} \ [a], \%t20 \)

DO THIS: \( \text{ld} \ [\%fp-12], \%r7 \)

NOT THIS: \( \text{add} \ %fp,-12,\%r3 \\
\text{ld} \ [\%r3], \%r7 \)
• But don’t try to improve IR code that is already expanded:

  THIS PCAT: x.a (record dereference)

  GAVE THIS IR: ld [x], %t10
               adda %t10,3,%t11
               ld [%t11],%t12

  SETTLE FOR THIS:  ld [%fp+8], %r3
                    add %r3,12,%r3
                    ld [%r3],%r3

• Use (small) constants directly where possible.

  DO THIS: add %r1,42,%r1

  NOT: mov 42,%r2
       add %r1,%r2,%r1

• Fill delay slots with `nop`’s, unless producing a “canned” sequence that can use them.

Register Allocation and Assignment

Task: Manage scarce resources (registers) in environment with imperfect information (static program text) about dynamic program behavior.

General aim is to keep frequently-used values in registers as much as possible, to lower memory traffic. Can have a large effect on program performance.

Variety of approaches are possible, differing in sophistication and in scope of analysis used.

Allocator may be unable to keep every “live” variable in registers; must then “spill” variables to memory. Spilling adds new instructions, which often affects the allocation analysis, requiring a new iteration.

If spilling is necessary, what should we spill? Some heuristics:

• Don’t spill variables used in inner loops.
• Spill variables not used again for “longest” time.
• Spill variables which haven’t been updated since last read from memory.

Simplistic Register Management for PCAT

• Assume variables “normally” live in memory.
• Use existing (often redundant) fetches and stores present in IR.
• So: only need to allocate registers to IR temporaries (%t).
• Certain SPARC registers are reserved (see Sparc.regUsable).
• Ignore possibility of spills.
• Liveness information for all temporaries is already calculated for you (see Liveness).
• Use simple linear scan register allocator based on liveness intervals.

Liveness

To determine how long to keep a given variable (or temporary) in a register, need to know the range of instructions for which the variable is live.

A variable or temporary is live immediately following an instruction if its current value will be needed in the future (i.e., it will be used again, and it won’t be changed before that use).

Example:

```plaintext
mov 3, %t2   ! live after instruction:
mov %t2, %t3
add %t3, 4, %t4   ! %t2  %t3
add %t2, %t4, %t4   %t4
st %t4, [a]  | (nothing)
```

It’s easy to calculate liveness for a consecutive series of instructions without branches, just by working backwards.
Liveness (continued)

But if a value can stay in a register over a jump, things get harder. Example:

```
1 mov 0, %t1 ! %t1 %t3
2 L1: add %t1, 1, %t2 ! %t2 %t3
3 add %t3, %t2, %t3 ! %t2 %t3
4 mul %t2, 2, %t1 ! %t1 %t3
5 cmp %t1, 1000 ! %t1 %t3
6 bl L1 ! %t1 %t3
7 return %t3 ! (nothing)
```

To calculate liveness in this case requires *iterative flow analysis* and the result is only *conservative approximation* to true liveness (more later).

The **live range** of a variable is the set of instructions which leave it live. E.g. in 2nd example, live range of %t1 is \{1, 4, 5, 6\}; live range of %t3 is \{1, ..., 6\}.

Basic idea: If two variables have disjoint live ranges, they can occupy the same physical register.

So in both examples, 2 physical registers suffice to allocate all temporaries without spilling.

---

**Linear Scan Allocation**

Using live ranges turns out to be computationally expensive (more later).

A simple alternative is to approximate each live range by a **live interval**. This is the consecutive interval of instructions between the first and last use of each temporary. Example:

```
1 mov 0, %t1 ! %t1 %t3
2 L1: add %t1, 1, %t2 ! %t2 %t3
3 add %t3, %t2, %t3 ! %t2 %t3
4 mul %t2, 2, %t1 ! %t1 %t3
5 cmp %t1, 1000 ! %t1 %t3
6 bl L1 ! %t1 %t3
7 return %t3 ! (nothing)
```

Live ranges: %t1: 1,4,5,6 %t2:2,3 %t3:1,2,3,4,5,6

Live intervals: %t1: [1,6] %t2: [2,3] %t3: [1,6]

(Revised) Basic idea: if two temporaries have non-overlapping live intervals, they can occupy the same physical register.