Optimising Compilers

- (a) Summarise briefly the principles of strictness analysis, including descriptions of:
 - (i) the space of values used for analysis-time representation of a k-argument, 1-result function in the source language;
 - (*ii*) how a built-in function is given an abstract meaning;
 - (*iii*) how a recursive user-defined function is given an abstract meaning (it is acceptable to do this part by example);
 - (iv) the machine-level benefit of the associated optimisation.

[8 marks]

- (b) A problem amenable to similar treatment is that of *escape analysis*. Here we have a call-by-value language with **cons** and the question to be answered is "whether a value containing a cons-node passed as argument to a function *may* be returned ('escape') as part of the function's result".
 - (i) Choose (and state clearly) an appropriate set of abstract values and abstractions of functions to formalise the problem of escape analysis for a simple first-order language with integers and simple integer lists (but not lists of lists). Also give abstract interpretations of if-then-else, +, cons, hd and tl.

[Hint: to manage this system without using static types, you might best assume that *nil* is treated as 0, and that any type-error (dynamically detected) such as cons(1,nil)+3, tl(3) and even (because of the 'no-lists-of-lists' rule) cons(cons(1,nil),nil) gives result 0.] [8 marks]

 $(ii)\;$ Give without proof abstract meanings (resulting from your system) of the following functions:

```
\begin{array}{l} f(x,y,z) = cons(hd(tl(x)), \mbox{ if } hd(x) \mbox{ then } y \mbox{ else } tl(z)) \\ g(x,y) = \mbox{ if } x=0 \mbox{ then } 0 \mbox{ else } cons(hd \ x, \ g(tl \ x, \ y)) \\ h(x,y) = \mbox{ if } x=0 \mbox{ then } x \mbox{ else } cons(hd \ x, \ h(tl \ x, \ y)) \\ k(x,y) = \mbox{ if } x=0 \mbox{ then } y \mbox{ else } cons(hd \ x, \ k(tl \ x, \ y)) \end{array}
```

[4 marks]