

Merging Techniques for Faster Derivation of WCET Flow Information using Abstract Execution

Jan Gustafsson and Andreas Ermedahl

Mälardalen Real-Time Research Center (MRTC) Västerås, Sweden



#### Contents

- \* Abstract Execution finds loop bounds and infeasible paths
- \* Merging is used to speed up calculations (but may introduce pessimism)
- \* We show how different merge point placements affects speed and pessimism
- \* We present a new efficient merging technique based on *sorting of program points*



GSKOLA

## **Abstract Execution**



- Al gives safe (over)approximation of possible values of each variable at different program points
- **\*** "Executes" the program using abstract state(s)
  - Not using traditional AI fixpoint calculation, instead always running forward
- \* Result: an (over)approximation of possible execution paths
  - Might potentially include some infeasible paths
  - Infeasible paths found are guaranteed to be infeasible

# \* Implemented in SWEET (SWEdish Execution Time tool)



#### **Example: Loop bound analysis** ÏGSKOLA Abstract Abstract [1..4] Loop i = INPUT;iteration state at state at q //i = [1..4]р [5..8] while (i < 10) { i = [1..4] 1 $\bot$ [10..10] [7..9] //point p i = [3..6] [10..11] 2 [11..11] 3 i = [5..8] i = i + 2;i = [7..9] i = [10..10] **Result** 4 Min. #iterations: 3 i = [9..9] i = [10..11] 5 /point q Max. # iterations: 5 i = [11..11] 6

#### **\*** Result includes all possible loop executions

- \* Three new abstract states generated at q
  - Could be <u>merged</u> to one single abstract state:



#### **Problems with merging**

- \* May yield abstract values that represent concrete values in a less precise way
  - Merging [6..6] and [10..11] yields [6..11], which also contains the concrete values 7, 8, 9
- **\*** May lead to overestimated loop bounds
- \* May lead to that infeasible paths are missed



**IGSKOL** 

#### Example: Overestimated loop bound

```
int i, x;
// i = [-5..5]
if (i > 0) x=2;
else x=4;
// p
while (x < 10)
{ // q
    if (isOdd(x))
        x++;
    else x=x+2;
}</pre>
```

**\*** 11 possible runs

**\*** Concrete worst cases when

i = [1..5]

\* Max. iterations = 4



#### Example: Overestimated loop bound



\* Merging at p yields an overestimation

**MRTC \*** ...and a lot of states

MÄLARDALEN REAL-TIME RESEARCH CENTRE

7



#### \* Merging at q yields fewer states and a smaller overestimation



#### **Placement of Merge Points**

- **\*** The placement of merge points is important
- \* There is a trade-off between precision and speed
- Optimal selection depends on code structure and size
- **\*** SWEET allows the following placements:
  - at function entries
  - at function exits
  - at loop body termination, i.e., at the loop header
  - at loop exits
  - at joins after if-statements



ÏGSKOLA

#### **Problems to solve**

- **\*** AE may give many parallel states
- \* Merge reduces the number, but for some large programs the problem remains
- \* For programs with many variables, each abstract state can be large
- \* For programs with large input spaces, the number of parallel states can be large
- **\*** We need to minimize the number of parallel states



GSKAL

### Unordered and Ordered Merge



MÅI ARDALEN REAL-TIME

RESEARCH CENTRE



Unordered merge = all merged states are released

Ordered merge = only the state lagging behind (F) is released => fewer states



11

ÏGSKOLA





#### **Results - jcomplex**

Merge type		Merge node type							
		FE	FT	LBT	LT	LBI	ALL		
Unordered	ATime	8.7	15.0	0.72	0.18	0.84	0.77		
merge	WCET	918	918	1053	2087	1053	1053		
Ordered	ATime	8.7	8.3	0.13	0.18	0.18	0.16		
merge	WCET	918	918	3711	2087	5395	5395		

Table 1. Analysis results	for jcomplex
---------------------------	--------------

#### \* No merge: 7.2 seconds

- **\*** Unordered merge: fast and some overestimation
- **\*** Ordered merge: very fast but large overestimation





#### **Results - insertsort**

Merge type		Merge node type						
		FE	FT	LBT	LT	LBI	ALL	
Unordered	ATime	-	-	1.6	0.08	1.9	1.7	
merge	WCET	-	-	332	332	332	332	
Ordered	ATime	-	-	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	
merge	WCET	-	-	332	332	332	332	

Table 2. Analysis results for insertsort

- **\*** No merge: impossible to analyse (10<sup>93</sup> inputs)
- \* Unordered merge: fast and no overestimation
- **\*** Ordered merge: very fast and no overestimation





#### **Results – esab\_mod**

Merge type		Merge node type							
		FE	FT	LBT	LT	LBI	ALL		
Unordered	ATime	-	-	-	-	-	-		
merge	WCET	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Ordered	ATime	-	-	-	-	163	161		
merge	WCET	-	-	-	-	165795	165795		

Table 3. Analysis results for esab\_mod

- **\*** No merge: impossible to analyse (10<sup>12</sup> inputs)
- **\*** Unordered merge: impossible to analyse
- **\*** Ordered merge: gives a result in reasonable time



## Conclusions

- \* Merging of states is useful for large programs and programs with large input spaces
- **\*** Ordered merge is very efficient
- \* It is cruical to select optimal type of merging and placement of merge points
- \* Ordered merge technique has a general use



GSKOLA



# 

# For more information: www.mrtc.mdh.se/projects/wcet



### Unordered and Ordered Merge

- **\*** Run analysis to merge points
- **\*** Merge all states at merge points
- \* Let the analysis wait at the merge points
- **\*** Unordered merge:
  - \* When all states are at merge points, release all
- **\*** Ordered merge:
  - When all states are at merge points, release only the "state lagging behind"
  - ★ Gives fewer states



### **Flow Analysis**

- \* Most programs can execute in several ways, due to code structure and inputs
- \* A flow analysis should provide bounds on all possible execution paths
- **\*** Required output to bound WCET estimate:
  - Loop iteration bounds
  - Recursion depth bounds
- **\*** Additional output to tighten WCET estimate:
  - Input dependencies
  - Infeasible paths



GSKAL