

Code Generation: Notation

We use brackets, $[s]$ to denote “result of compiling s ”.

For compilation of expressions, we can thus write as follows.

$$\begin{array}{l} [e_1 + e_2] = \\ \quad [e_1] \\ \quad [e_2] \\ \quad \mathbf{i32.add} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} [e_1 * e_2] = \\ \quad [e_1] \\ \quad [e_2] \\ \quad \mathbf{i32.mul} \end{array}$$

Sequential Composition

How to compile statement sequence?

$$s_1; s_2; \dots; s_N$$

Sequential Composition

How to compile statement sequence?

$$s_1; s_2; \dots; s_N$$

Solution: concatenate bytecodes for each statement:

$$\begin{bmatrix} s_1; s_2; \dots; s_N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} s_1 \\ s_2 \\ \dots \\ s_N \end{bmatrix}$$

Same Thing in Scala-Like Notation

```
def compileStmt(e: Stmt): List[Bytecode] = e match {  
  ...  
  case Sequence(sts) =>  
    for { st <- sts;  
          bcode <- compileStmt(st)  
        } yield bcode  
  ...  
}
```

In other words, the case of sequence returns flatMap with recursive call:

```
...  
case Sequence(sts) => sts.flatMap(compileStmt)  
...
```

In practice, concatenating lots of lists is inefficient.

We can use e.g. imperative append.

Compiling Control: Example

```
int count(int counter,  
          int to,  
          int step) {  
    int sum = 0;  
    do {  
        counter = counter + step;  
        sum = sum + counter;  
    } while (counter < to);  
    return sum; }
```

We need to see how to:

- translate boolean expressions
- generate jumps for control

```
(func $func0  
  (param $var0 i32) (param $var1 i32)  
  (param $var2 i32) (result i32)  
  (local $var3 i32)  
  i32.const 0  
  set_local $var3  
  loop $label0  
    get_local $var3  
    get_local $var0  
    get_local $var2  
    i32.add  
    tee_local $var0  
    i32.add  
    set_local $var3  
    get_local $var0  
    get_local $var1  
    i32.lt_s  
    br_if $label0  
  end $label0  
  get_local $var3 )
```

Representing Booleans

“All comparison operators yield 32-bit integer results with 1 representing true and 0 representing false.” – WebAssembly spec

Our generated code uses 32 bit int to represent boolean values in: **local variables, parameters, and intermediate stack values.**

1, representing true

0, representing false

i32.eq: sign-agnostic compare equal

i32.ne: sign-agnostic compare unequal

i32.lt_s: signed less than

i32.le_s: signed less than or equal

i32.gt_s: signed greater than

i32.ge_s: signed greater than or equal

i32.eqz: compare equal to zero (return 1 if operand is zero, 0 otherwise) // not

Truth Values for Relations: Example

```
int test(int x, int y){  
    return (x < y);  
}
```

```
(func $func0  
  (param $var0 i32)  
  (param $var1 i32)  
  (result i32)  
  
  get_local $var0  
  get_local $var1  
  i32.lt_s  
)
```

Comparisons, Conditionals, Scoped Labels

```
int fun(int x, int y){  
  int res = 0;  
  if (x < y) {  
    res = (y / x);  
  } else res = (x / y);  
  return res+x+y;  
}
```

```
(local $var2 i32)  
block $label1 block $label0  
  get_local $var0  
  get_local $var1  
  i32.ge_s  
  br_if $label0 // to else branch  
  get_local $var1  
  get_local $var0  
  i32.div_s  
  set_local $var2  
  br $label1 // done with if  
end $label0 // else branch  
  get_local $var0  
  get_local $var1  
  i32.div_s  
  set_local $var2  
end $label1 // end of if  
  get_local $var1  
  get_local $var0  
  i32.add  
  get_local $var2  
  i32.add
```


Main Instructions for Labels

- **block**: the beginning of a block construct, a sequence of instructions with a **label at the end**
- **loop**: a block with a label at the **beginning** which may be used to form loops
- **br**: branch to a given label in an enclosing construct
- • **br_if**: conditionally branch to a given label in an enclosing construct
- **return**: return zero or more values from this function
- **end**: an instruction that marks the end of a block, loop, if, or function

Compiling If Statement

Notation for compilation:

```
[ if (cond) tStmt else eStmt ] =  
    block $nAfter block $nElse  
    [ !cond ]  
    bf_if $nElse  
    [ tStmt ]  
    br $nAfter  
  
end $nElse:  
    [ eStmt ]  
end $nAfter:
```

```
block $label1 block $label0  
    (negated condition code)  
br_if $label0 // to else branch  
    (true case code)  
br $label1 // done with if  
end $label0 // else branch  
    (false case code)  
end $label1 // end of if
```

Is there alternative without negating condition?

How to introduce labels

- For forward jumps to \$label: use

block \$label

...

end \$label

- For backward jumps to \$label: use

loop \$label

...

end \$label

WebAssembly's *if*

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

```
[econd]  
if  
  [ethen]  
else  
  [eelse]  
end  
[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?

```
block nAfter
  block nElse
    [!econd]
    br_if nElse
    [ethen]
    br nAfter
  end //nElse:
  [eelse]
end //nAfter:
[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?

```
block nAfter
  block nElse
    [!econd]
    br_if nElse
    [ethen]
    br nAfter
  end //nElse:
  [eelse]
end //nAfter:
[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} ?

```
block nAfter
  block nThen
    [ $e_{cond}$ ]
    br_if nThen
      [ $e_{else}$ ]
      br nAfter
    end //nThen:
  [ $e_{then}$ ]
end //nAfter:
[ $e_{rest}$ ]
```

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

`[if (e_{cond}) e_{then} else e_{else}] :=`

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

Decomposing conditions in branch

```
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

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

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 (econd) ethen else eelse] nAfter :=  
  block nElse  
    block nThen  
      branch(econd,nThen,nElse)  
    end //nThen:  
    [ethen] nAfter  
  end //nElse:  
  [eelse] 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

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

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

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` 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
```

Translating While Statement

Consider translation of the **while** statement, which gets 'nextLabel' destination, specifying where to jump when exiting the loop.

We assume that the instructions emitted are inside the block that introduced nextLabel.

What is the translation schema?

[**while** (cond) stmt] nextLabel =

Translating While Statement

Consider translation of the **while** statement, which gets 'nextLabel' destination, specifying where to jump when exiting the loop.

We assume that the instructions emitted are inside the block that introduced nextLabel.

What is the translation schema?

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextLabel)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ] startLabel  
end
```

break Statement

In many languages, a break statement can be used to exit from the loop. For example, it is possible to write code such as this:

```
while (cond1) {  
    code1  
    if (cond2) break;  
    code2  
}
```

Loop executes code1 and checks the condition cond2. If condition holds, it exists. Otherwise, it continues and executes code2 and then goes to the beginning of the loop, repeating the process.

Give translation scheme for this loop construct and explain how the translation of other constructs needs to change.

break Statement - Propagating Exit Label

For a **break** statement to know where to jump, it needs to be given a label indicating the exit of the loop. When we translate a statement (such as **if**) potentially containing **break**, the translation of this statement needs both the parameter to pass on to **break** as well as the parameter to jump to during normal execution. Therefore, each statement needs two destination parameters: the 'nextLabel' and the 'loopExit' label. For example,

```
[ if (cond) thenC else elseC ] nextL loopExitL =
```

break Statement - Propagating Exit Label

For a **break** statement to know where to jump, it needs to be given a label indicating the exit of the loop. When we translate a statement (such as **if**) potentially containing **break**, the translation of this statement needs both the parameter to pass on to **break** as well as the parameter to jump to during normal execution. Therefore, each statement needs two destination parameters: the 'nextLabel' and the 'loopExit' label. For example,

```
[ if (cond) thenC else elseC ] nextL loopExitL =  
  block elseL  
    block thenL  
      branch(cond, thenL, elseL)  
    end // thenL  
  [thenC] nextL loopExitL  
end // elseL  
[elseC] nextL loopExitL
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =
```


break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextLabel)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ]
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextLabel)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ] startLabel
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextLabel)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ] startLabel nextLabel  
end
```

break Statement - Using and Setting Labels

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  br loopExitLabel
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextLabel loopExitLabel =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextLabel)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ] startLabel nextLabel  
end
```

What if we want to have **continue** that goes to beginning of the loop?

Loops with break and continue

Translating **break**:

```
[ break ] nextL loopExitL loopStartL =  
  br loopExitL
```

Translating **continue**:

```
[ continue ] nextL loopExitL loopStartL =  
  br loopStartL
```

Translating while:

```
[ while (cond) stmt ] nextL loopExitL loopStartL =  
  loop startLabel  
    block bodyLabel  
      branch(cond, bodyLabel, nextL)  
    end // bodyLabel  
  [ stmt ] startLabel nextL startLabel  
end
```

Explain difference between labels loopStartL and startLabel