

CS-320

Computer Language Processing

Exercise Session 6

November 15, 2017

Overview

Today we'll explore a few more aspects of generating code for control flow constructs.

WebAssembly's *if*

WebAssembly has dedicated bytecodes for if expressions, i.e., *if*, *else*, *end*:

```
1  [econd]  
2  if  
3    [ethen]  
4  else  
5    [eelse]  
6  end  
7  [erest]
```

▷ Given the *block* and *br[_if]* instructions you saw this construct isn't necessary. How can we desugar snippets like the above?

WebAssembly's *if*

▷ Given the *block* and *br[_if]* instructions you saw this construct isn't necessary. How can we desugar snippets like the above?

```
1  block nAfter
2    block nElse
3      [!econd]
4      br_if nElse
5      [ethen]
6      br nAfter
7    end //nElse:
8      [eelse]
9  end //nAfter:
10 [erest]
```

WebAssembly's *if*

- ▷ Given the *block* and *br[_if]* instructions you saw this construct isn't necessary. How can we desugar snippets like the above?

```
1  block nAfter
2    block nElse
3      [!econd]
4      br_if nElse
5      [ethen]
6      br nAfter
7    end //nElse:
8      [eelse]
9  end //nAfter:
10 [erest]
```

- ▷ Can we avoid the negation on the branching condition *e_{cond}*?

Avoiding negation

- ▷ Can we avoid the negation on the branching condition e_{cond} ?

```
1  block nAfter
2    block nThen
3      [ $e_{cond}$ ]
4      br_if nThen
5      [ $e_{else}$ ]
6      br nAfter
7    end //nThen:
8      [ $e_{then}$ ]
9  end //nAfter:
10 [ $e_{rest}$ ]
```

Translating control flow structures more efficiently

Introduce an imaginary large instruction
branch(*c*, *nThen*, *nElse*).

Here *c* is a potentially complex boolean expression (the main reason why **branch** is not a built-in bytecode instruction), whereas *nTrue* and *nFalse* are the labels we jump to depending on the boolean value of *c*.

We will show how to

- ▶ use **branch** to compile **if** and short-circuiting operators,
- ▶ by expanding **branch** recursively into concrete bytecode instructions.

Translating control flow structures more efficiently

Implementing *if* using branch

```
[if (econd) ethen else eelse] :=
```

```
block nAfter
  block nElse
    block nThen
      branch(econd, nThen, nElse)
    end //nThen:
    [ethen]
  br nAfter
end //nElse:
[eelse]
end //nAfter:
[erest]
```


Decomposing conditions in branch

Negation and short-circuiting operators

```
branch(!e, nThen, nElse) :=  
  branch(e, nElse, nThen)
```

```
branch(e1 && e2, nThen, nElse) :=  
  block nLong  
    branch(e1, nLong, nElse)  
  end //nLong:  
  branch(e2, nThen, nElse)
```

```
branch(e1 || e2, nThen, nElse) :=  
  block nLong  
    branch(e1, nThen, nLong)  
  end //nLong:  
  branch(e2, nThen, nElse)
```

Decomposing conditions in branch

Constant case and variable loads

```
branch(true, nThen, nElse) :=  
  br nThen
```

```
branch(false, nThen, nElse) :=  
  br nElse
```

```
branch(b, nThen, nElse) := (where b is a local var)  
  get_local #b  
  br_if nThen  
  br nElse
```

Decomposing conditions in branch

Other built-in relations

`branch($e_1 == e_2$, nThen, nElse) :=` (*where e_1, e_2 are of type int*)

`[e_1]`

`[e_2]`

`i32.eq`

`br_if nThen`

`br nElse`

... (analogously for other relations)

Returning the result from branch

Consider storing $x = c$

where x, c are boolean and c contains $\&\&$ or $\|\|$.

How do we put the result of c on the stack so it can be stored in x ?

```
[x = c] :=  
  block nAfter  
    block nElse  
      block nThen  
        branch(c, nThen, nElse)  
      end //nThen:  
      i32.const 1  
    br nAfter  
  end //nElse:  
  i32.const 0  
end //nAfter:  
set_local #x
```

Destination label parameters

Recall that in **branch**(*c*, *nThen*, *nElse*) we had two arguments *nThen* and *nElse*, which told us where to jump to execute code of the corresponding branches.

Similarly, up until now we explicitly enclosed our translated program fragments in an *nAfter* block, so we could jump to the “rest” of the program.

Destination label parameters

Recall that in **branch**(c, nThen, nElse) we had two arguments nThen and nElse, which told us where to jump to execute code of the corresponding branches.

Similarly, up until now we explicitly enclosed our translated program fragments in an nAfter block, so we could jump to the “rest” of the program.

⇒ We can generalize our translation function $[\cdot]$ to take a destination label designating the “rest” in the surrounding code.

Destination label parameters

Recall that in **branch**(*c*, *nThen*, *nElse*) we had two arguments *nThen* and *nElse*, which told us where to jump to execute code of the corresponding branches.

Similarly, up until now we explicitly enclosed our translated program fragments in an *nAfter* block, so we could jump to the “rest” of the program.

⇒ We can generalize our translation function $[\cdot]$ to take a destination label designating the “rest” in the surrounding code.

$$[\cdot] \Rightarrow [\cdot] \text{ nAfter}$$

⇒ The caller of the translation function determines where to continue!

Translations with an nAfter label parameter (1)

```
[x = e] nAfter :=  
  block nSet  
    [e] nSet  
    // (note that the rest of this block is never reached!)  
  end //nSet:  
  set_local #x  
  br nAfter
```

```
[s1; s2] nAfter :=  
  block nSecond  
    [s1] nSecond  
  end //nSecond:  
  [s2] nAfter
```


Translations with an nAfter label parameter (2)

```
[if ( $e_{cond}$ )  $e_{then}$  else  $e_{else}$ ] nAfter :=  
  block nElse  
    block nThen  
      branch( $e_{cond}$ , nThen, nElse)  
    end //nThen:  
    [ $e_{then}$ ] nAfter  
  end //nElse:  
  [ $e_{else}$ ] nAfter
```

```
[return  $e$ ] nAfter :=  
  block nRet  
    [ $e$ ] nRet  
  end //nRet:  
  return
```

Switch statements

Let us assume our language had a switch statement (like C and Java do, for instance):

```
switch ( $e_{scrutinee}$ ) {  
  case  $c_1$ :  $e_1$   
  ...  
  case  $c_n$ :  $e_n$   
  default:  $e_{default}$   
}
```

▷ How can we compile such switch statements?

Compiling switch statements

```
[sswitch] nAfter :=  
  block nDefault  
    block nCasen  
      ...  
      block nCase1  
        block nTest  
          [escrutinee] nTest  
        end //nTest:  
        tee_local #s  (where s is some fresh local of type i32)  
        i32.const c1; i32.eq; br_if nCase1  
        get_local #s  
        i32.const c2; i32.eq; br_if nCase2  
        ...  
        br nDefault  
      end //nCase1:  
      [e1] nCase2  
      ...  
    end //nCasen:  
    [en] nDefault  
  end //nDefault:  
  [edefault] nAfter
```

Compiling switch statements

```
[sswitch] nAfter :=  
  block nDefault  
    block nCasen  
      ...  
      block nCase1  
        block nTest  
          [escrutinee] nTest  
        end //nTest:  
        tee_local #s (where s is some fresh local of type i32)  
        i32.const c1; i32.eq; br_if nCase1  
        get_local #s  
        i32.const c2; i32.eq; br_if nCase2  
        ...  
        br nDefault  
      end //nCase1:  
      [e1] nCase2  
      ...  
    end //nCasen:  
    [en] nDefault  
  end //nDefault:  
  [edefault] nAfter
```

▷ How do we translate break?

Compiling switch statements

Translating break

At any point during the translation of **switch** we want to keep track not only where to jump *after*, but also where to jump on a **break**!

Compiling switch statements

Translating break

At any point during the translation of **switch** we want to keep track not only where to jump *after*, but also where to jump on a **break**!

⇒ Let us extend the translation function by another label parameter.

Compiling switch statements

Translating break

At any point during the translation of **switch** we want to keep track not only where to jump *after*, but also where to jump on a **break**!

⇒ Let us extend the translation function by another label parameter.

$$[\cdot] \text{ nAfter} \Rightarrow [\cdot] \text{ nAfter nBreak}$$

⇒ The caller of the translation function determines where to continue in the “normal” case, but also when **break** is called!

Compiling switch statements

Translating break

Translating `break` then is straightforward: One simply ignores `nAfter` and follows `nBreak` instead.

```
[break] nAfter nBreak :=  
  br nBreak
```

▷ What do we have change in our translation of `switch` statements?

Compiling switch statements with breaks

```
[sswitch] nAfter nBreak :=  
  block nDefault  
    block nCasen  
      ...  
        block nCase1  
          block nTest  
            [escrutinee] nTest nBreak  
          end //nTest:  
          tee_local #s (where s is some fresh local of type i32)  
          i32.const c1; i32.eq; br_if nCase1  
          get_local #s  
          i32.const c2; i32.eq; br_if nCase2  
          ...  
          br nDefault  
        end //nCase1:  
        [e1] nCase2 nAfter  
      ...  
    end //nCasen:  
    [en] nDefault nAfter  
  end //nDefault:  
  [edefault] nAfter nAfter
```