ILP Formulation of Loop Transformations
Goal:

1. formulate correctness of permutation as integer linear programming (ILP) problem
2. formulate code generation problem as ILP
Two problems:

Given a system of linear inequalities \(Ax \leq b\)
where \(A\) is a \(m \times n\) matrix of integers,
\(b\) is an \(m\) vector of integers,
\(x\) is an \(n\) vector of unknowns,

(i) Are there integer solutions?
(ii) Enumerate all integer solutions.

Most problems regarding correctness of transformations
and code generation can be reduced to these problems.
Intuition about systems of linear inequalities:

Equality: line (2D), plane (3D), hyperplane (> 3D)

Inequality: half-plane (2D), half-space (> 2D)

Region described by inequality is convex
(if two points are in region, all points in between them are in region)
Intuition about systems of linear inequalities:

Conjunction of inequalities = intersection of half-spaces
=> some convex region

Region described by inequalities is a convex polyhedron
(if two points are in region, all points in between them are in region)
Let us formulate correctness of loop permutation as ILP problem.

**Intuition:** If all iterations of a loop nest are independent, then permutation is certainly legal.

This is stronger than we need, but it is a good starting point.

What does independent mean?

Let us look at dependences.
Flow dependence: $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$
   (i) $S_1$ executes before $S_2$ in program order
   (ii) $S_1$ writes into a location that is read by $S_2$

Anti-dependence: $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$
   (i) $S_1$ executes before $S_2$
   (ii) $S_1$ reads from a location that is overwritten later by $S_2$

Output dependence: $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$
   (i) $S_1$ executes before $S_2$
   (ii) $S_1$ and $S_2$ write to the same location

Input dependence: $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$
   (i) $S_1$ executes before $S_2$
   (ii) $S_1$ and $S_2$ both read from the same location

Input dependence is not usually important for most applications.
Conservative Approximation:

- Real programs: imprecise information \( \Rightarrow \) need for safe approximation

‘When you are not sure whether a dependence exists, you must assume it does.’

Example:

```plaintext
procedure f (X,i,j)
    begin
        X(i) = 10;
        X(j) = 5;
    end
```

Question: Is there an output dependence from the first assignment to the second?

Answer: If \( i = j \), there is a dependence; otherwise, not.

\( \Rightarrow \) Unless we know from interprocedural analysis that the parameters \( i \) and \( j \) are always distinct, we must play it safe and insert the dependence.

Key notion: Aliasing : two program names may refer to the same location (like \( X(i) \) and \( X(j) \))

May-dependence vs must-dependence: More precise analysis may eliminate may-dependences
Loop level Analysis: granularity is a loop iteration

Dynamic instance of a statement:
Execution of a statement for given loop index values

Dependence between iterations:
Iteration \((I_1,J_1)\) is said to be dependent on iteration \((I_2,J_2)\) if a dynamic instance \((I_1,J_1)\) of a statement in loop body is dependent on a dynamic instance \((I_2,J_2)\) of a statement in the loop body.

How do we compute dependences between iterations of a loop nest?
Dependences in loops

DO 10 I = 1, N
    X(f(I)) = ...
10 = ...X(g(I))..

- Conditions for flow dependence from iteration $I_w$ to $I_r$:
  - $1 \leq I_w \leq I_r \leq N$ (write before read)
  - $f(I_w) = g(I_r)$ (same array location)

- Conditions for anti-dependence from iteration $I_g$ to $I_o$:
  - $1 \leq I_g < I_o \leq N$ (read before write)
  - $f(I_o) = g(I_g)$ (same array location)

- Conditions for output dependence from iteration $I_{w1}$ to $I_{w2}$:
  - $1 \leq I_{w1} < I_{w2} \leq N$ (write in program order)
  - $f(I_{w1}) = f(I_{w2})$ (same array location)
Dependences in nested loops

```
DO 10 I = 1, 100
  DO 10 J = 1, 200
    X(f(I,J),g(I,J)) = ...  
    10 = ...X(h(I,J),k(I,J))..
```

Conditions for flow dependence from iteration \((I_w, J_w)\) to \((I_r, J_r)\):
Recall: \(\leq\) is the lexicographic order on iterations of nested loops.

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \leq I_w \leq 100 & (I_1, J_1) & \leq (I_2, J_2) \\
1 & \leq J_w \leq 200 & f(I_1, J_1) & = h(I_2, J_2) \\
1 & \leq I_r \leq 100 & g(I_1, J_1) & = k(I_2, J_2) \\
1 & \leq J_r \leq 200 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Anti and output dependences can be defined analogously.
Array subscripts are affine functions of loop variables

=>

dependence testing can be formulated as a set of ILP problems
ILP Formulation

DO I = 1, 100
    X(2I) = .... X(2I+1)...

Is there a flow dependence between different iterations?

\[ 1 \leq I_w < I_r \leq 100 \]

\[ 2I_w = 2I_r + 1 \]

which can be written as

\[ 1 \leq I_w \]

\[ I_w \leq I_r - 1 \]

\[ I_r \leq 100 \]

\[ 2I_w \leq 2I_r + 1 \]

\[ 2I_r + 1 \leq 2I_w \]
The system

\[
1 \leq I_w \\
I_w \leq Ir - 1 \\
Ir \leq 100 \\
2I_w \leq 2Ir + 1 \\
2Ir + 1 \leq 2I_w
\]

can be expressed in the form \( Ax \leq b \) as follows

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 0 \\
1 & -1 \\
0 & 1 \\
2 & -2 \\
-2 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
I_w \\
Ir
\end{pmatrix}
\leq
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 \\
-1 \\
100 \\
1 \\
-1
\end{pmatrix}
\]
ILP Formulation for Nested Loops

DO I = 1, 100
   DO J = 1, 100
      X(I,J) = ..X(I-1,J+1)...
   END DO
END DO

Is there a flow dependence between different iterations?

\[ 1 \leq I_w \leq 100 \]
\[ 1 \leq I_r \leq 100 \]
\[ 1 \leq J_w \leq 100 \]
\[ 1 \leq J_r \leq 100 \]

\((I_w, J_w) \prec (I_r, J_r)\) (lexicographic order)

\[ I_r - 1 = I_w \]
\[ J_r + 1 = J_w \]

Convert lexicographic order \( \prec \) into integer equalities/inequalities.
(Iw, Jw) < (Ir, Jr) is equivalent to
Iw < Ir OR ((Iw = Ir) AND (Jw < Jr))

We end up with two systems of inequalities:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \leq Iw \leq 100 & 1 & \leq Iw \leq 100 \\
1 & \leq Ir \leq 100 & 1 & \leq Ir \leq 100 \\
1 & \leq Jw \leq 100 & 1 & \leq Jw \leq 100 \\
1 & \leq Jr \leq 100 & 1 & \leq Jr \leq 100 \\
Iw < Ir & & \text{OR} & & Iw = Ir \\
Ir - 1 = Iw & & & & Jw < Jr \\
Jr + 1 = Jw & & & & Ir - 1 = Iw \\
& & & & Jr + 1 = Jw
\end{align*}
\]

Dependence exists if either system has a solution.
What about affine loop bounds?

DO I = 1, 100
    DO J = 1, I
        X(I,J) = ..X(I-1,J+1)...
    END DO

1 \leq I_w \leq 100
1 \leq I_r \leq 100
1 \leq J_w \leq I_w
1 \leq J_r \leq I_r

(I_w, J_w) \prec (I_r, J_r)(lexicographic order)

I_r - 1 = I_w
J_r + 1 = J_w
We can actually handle fairly complicated bounds involving min’s and max’s.

DO I = 1, 100
    DO J = max(F1(I),F2(I)) , min(G1(I),G2(I))
    X(I,J) = X(I-1,J+1)...

....

\[ F1(I_r) \leq J_r \]
\[ F2(I_r) \leq J_r \]
\[ J_r \leq G1(I_r) \]
\[ J_r \leq G2(I_r) \]

....

Caveat: \( F1, F2 \) etc. must be affine functions.
For a given $I$, the $J$ co-ordinate of a point in the iteration space of the loop nest satisfies $\max(L_1(I), L_2(I)) \leq J \leq \min(U_1(I), U_2(I))$.

Min’s and max’s in loop bounds may seem weird, but actually they describe general polyhedral iteration spaces!
More important case in practice: variables in upper/lower bounds

DO I = 1, N
    DO J = 1 , N-1
        ....

Solution: Treat N as though it was an unknown in system

\[
1 \leq Iw \leq N \\
1 \leq Jw \leq N - 1 \\
....
\]

This is equivalent to seeing if there is a solution for any value of N.

Note: if we have more information about the range of N, we can easily add it as additional inequalities.
Summary

Problem of determining if a dependence exists between two iterations of a perfectly nested loop can be framed as ILP problem of the form

Is there an integer solution to system $Ax \leq b$?

How do we solve this decision problem?
Is there an integer solution to system $Ax \leq b$?

Oldest solution technique: Fourier-Motzkin elimination

Intuition: ”Gaussian elimination for inequalities”

More modern techniques exist, but all known solutions require time exponential in the number of inequalities

=>

Anything you can do to reduce the number of inequalities is good.

=>

Equalities should not be converted blindly into inequalities but handled separately.
Presentation sequence:

- one equation, several variables
  \[ 2x + 3y = 5 \]

- several equations, several variables
  \[ 2x + 3y + 5z = 5 \]
  \[ 3x + 4y = 3 \]

- equations & inequalities
  \[ 2x + 3y = 5 \]
  \[ x \leq 5 \]
  \[ y \leq -9 \]

Diophantine equations:
use integer Gaussian elimination

Solve equalities first
then use Fourier-Motzkin elimination
One equation, many variables:

Thm: The linear Diophantine equation \( a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n = c \) has integer solutions iff \( \gcd(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \) divides \( c \).

Examples:

1. \( 2x = 3 \) \hspace{1cm} \text{No solutions}
2. \( 2x = 6 \) \hspace{1cm} \text{One solution: } x = 3
3. \( 2x + y = 3 \)
   \( \gcd(2, 1) = 1 \) which divides 3.
   Solutions: \( x = t, \ y = (3 - 2t) \)
4. \( 2x + 3y = 3 \)
   \( \gcd(2, 3) = 1 \) which divides 3.
   Let \( z = x + \text{floor}(3/2) \)
   \( y = x + y \)
   Rewrite equation as \( 2z + y = 3 \)
   Solutions: \( z = t \)
   \( y = (3 - 2t) \)
   \( x = (3t - 3) \)

Intuition: Think of underdetermined systems of eqns over reals.
Caution: Integer constraint \( \Rightarrow \) Diophantine system may have no solns
Thm: The linear Diophantine equation \( a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n = c \) has integer solutions iff \( \gcd(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \) divides \( c \).

Proof: WLOG, assume that all coefficients \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \) are positive.

We prove only the IF case by induction, the proof in the other direction is trivial. Induction is on \( \min(\text{smallest coefficient, number of variables}) \).

Base case:

If (\# of variables = 1), then equation is \( a_1 x_1 = c \) which has integer solutions if \( a_1 \) divides \( c \).

If (smallest coefficient = 1), then \( \gcd(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = 1 \) which divides \( c \).

Wlog, assume that \( a_1 = 1 \), and observe that the equation has solutions of the form \( (c - a_2 t_2 - a_3 t_3 - \ldots - a_n t_n, t_2, t_3, \ldots t_n) \).

Inductive case:

Suppose smallest coefficient is \( a_1 \), and let \( t = x_1 + \text{floor}(a_2/a_1) x_2 + \ldots + \text{floor}(a_n/a_1) x_n \)

In terms of this variable, the equation can be rewritten as \( (a_1) t + (a_2 \mod a_1) x_2 + \ldots + (a_n \mod a_1) x_n = c \) (1)

where we assume that all terms with zero coefficient have been deleted.

Observe that (1) has integer solutions iff original equation does too.

Now \( \gcd(a, b) = \gcd(a \mod b, b) \Rightarrow \gcd(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = \gcd(a_1, (a_2 \mod a_1), \ldots, (a_n \mod a_1)) \)

\[ \Rightarrow \gcd(a_1, (a_2 \mod a_1), \ldots, (a_n \mod a_1)) \text{ divides } c. \]

If \( a_1 \) is the smallest co-efficient in (1), we are left with 1 variable base case. Otherwise, the size of the smallest co-efficient has decreased, so we have made progress in the induction.
Summary:

Eqn: \[ a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n = c \]

- Does this have integer solutions?
  
  \[ = \text{Does } \gcd(a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_n) \text{ divide } c \,? \]
It is useful to consider solution process in matrix-theoretic terms.

We can write single equation as

\[(3 \ 5 \ 8)(x \ y \ z)^T = 6\]

It is hard to read off solution from this, but for special matrices, it is easy.

\[(2 \ 0)(a \ b)^T = 8\]

Solution is \(a = 4\), \(b = t\)

looks lower triangular, right?

Key concept: column echelon form -
"lower triangular form for underdetermined systems"

For a matrix with a single row, column echelon form is
\[(x \ 0 \ 0 \ 0...0)\]
3x + 5y + 8z = 6
Substitution: t = x + y + 2z
New equation:
3t + 2y + 2z = 6
Substitution: u = y + z + t
New equation:
2u + t = 6
Solution:
\[ u = p_1 \]
\[ t = (6 - 2p_1) \]
Backsubstitution:
\[ y = p_2 \]
\[ t = (6 - 2p_1) \]
\[ z = (3p_1 - p_2 - 6) \]
Backsubstitution:
\[ x = (18 - 8p_1 + p_2) \]
\[ y = p_2 \]
\[ z = (3p_1 - p_2 - 6) \]
Systems of Diophantine Equations:

**Key idea:** use integer Gaussian elimination

Example:

\[
\begin{align*}
2x + 3y + 4z &= 5 \\
x - y + 2z &= 5
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2 & 3 & 4 \\
1 & -1 & 2
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
5 \\
5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

It is not easy to determine if this Diophantine system has solutions.

**Easy special case:** lower triangular matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 5 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
5 \\
5
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= 5 \\
y &= 3 \\
z &= \text{arbitrary integer}
\end{align*}
\]

Question: Can we convert general integer matrix into equivalent lower triangular system?

**INTEGER GAUSSIAN ELIMINATION**
**Integer gaussian Elimination**

- Use row/column operations to get matrix into triangular form
- For us, column operations are more important because we usually have more unknowns than equations

**Overall strategy: Given** $Ax = b$

Find matrices $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_k$ such that

$A*U_1*U_2*\ldots*U_k$ is lower triangular (say $L$)

Solve $Lx' = b$ (easy)

Compute $x = (U_1*U_2*\ldots*U_k)*x$

**Proof:**

$$(A*U_1*U_2*\ldots*U_k)x' = b$$

$=> A(U_1*U_2*\ldots*U_k)x' = b$

$=> x = (U_1*U_2*\ldots*U_k)x'$$
Caution: Not all column operations preserve integer solutions.

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2 & 3 \\
6 & 7 \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Solution: \( x = -8, \ y = 7 \)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & -3 \\
0 & 2 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2 & 0 \\
6 & -4 \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

which has no integer solutions!

Intuition: With some column operations, recovering solution of original system requires solving lower triangular system using rationals.

Question: Can we stay purely in the integer domain?

One solution: Use only unimodular column operations
Unimodular Column Operations:

(a) Interchange two columns

Check

Let \( x, y \) satisfy first eqn.
Let \( x', y' \) satisfy second eqn.

\[
\begin{align*}
x' &= y, \quad y' = x \\
2 & \quad 3 \\
6 & \quad 7 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(b) Negate a column

Check

\[
\begin{align*}
x' &= x, \quad y' = -y \\
2 & \quad 3 \\
6 & \quad 7 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(c) Add an integer multiple of one column to another

Check

\[
\begin{align*}
x &= x' + n y' \\
y &= y' \\
\end{align*}
\]
Example:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
2 & 3 & 4 \\
1 & -1 & 2
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
5 \\
5
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Facts:

1. The three unimodular column operations
   - interchanging two columns
   - negating a column
   - adding an integer multiple of one column to another
   on the matrix $A$ of the system $A \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$
   preserve integer solutions, as do sequences of these operations.

2. Unimodular column operations can be used to reduce
   a matrix $A$ into lower triangular form.

3. A unimodular matrix has integer entries and a determinant
   of +1 or -1.

4. The product of two unimodular matrices is also unimodular.
Algorithm: Given a system of Diophantine equations \( Ax = b \)

1. Use unimodular column operations to reduce matrix \( A \) to lower triangular form \( L \).
2. If \( Lx' = b \) has integer solutions, so does the original system.
3. If explicit form of solutions is desired, let \( U \) be the product of unimodular matrices corresponding to the column operations.
   \[ x = U x' \] where \( x' \) is the solution of the system \( Lx' = b \)

Detail: Instead of lower triangular matrix, you should to compute ‘column echelon form’ of matrix.

Column echelon form: Let \( r_j \) be the row containing the first non-zero in column \( j \).
   (i) \( r_{(j+1)} > r_j \) if column \( j \) is not entirely zero.
   (ii) column \( (j+1) \) is zero if column \( j \) is.

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  x & 0 & 0 \\
  x & 0 & 0 \\
  x & x & x \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
is lower triangular but not column echelon.

Point: writing down the solution for this system requires additional work with the last equation (1 equation, 2 variables). This work is precisely what is required to produce the column echelon form.

Note: Even in regular Gaussian elimination, we want column echelon form rather than lower triangular form when we have under-determined systems.