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Abstract

Data-flow analyses that include some model of the data-flow between MPI sends and receives result in improved precision in the analysis results. One issue that arises with performing data-flow analyses on MPI programs is that the interprocedural control-flow graph ICFG is often irreducible due to call and return edges, and the MPI-ICFG adds further irreducibility due to communication edges. To provide an upper bound for iterative data-flow analysis complexity, one needs to have a general idea as to the depth of common flow graphs. Unfortunately, computing the depth of an irreducible graph is NP-complete.

In this paper, we compare the depth-based iteration bounds for several MPI benchmarks with the actual number of iterations required for two data-flow analyses. We are able to compute the depth despite the worst-case exponential complexity of the depth-analysis algorithm by first reducing the reducible parts of the flow graph and then explore paths in the reduced graph. Our results show that on average the reduced graphs are 80% smaller than the original graphs and have 90% fewer cycle-free paths, resulting in a 10x faster algorithm. We also observe that although the number of iterations over the flow graph is bounded by the lattice height multiplied by the graph depth, the graph depth is clearly the dominating factor and provides a close approximation to the complexity of iterative data-flow analysis over MPI programs.
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1. Introduction

Many parallel programs are written using MPI (Message Passing Interface) [23]. With the push for exascale computing, the expectation is that MPI will still be the main parallelization mechanism between nodes on a machine [17]. Therefore, techniques for statically and dynamically analyzing MPI programs will become ever more crucial.

Researchers have developed techniques for performing data-flow analysis on MPI programs [7, 26, 28]. Data-flow analysis is the basis for bug-finding analyses [18], analyses that find security issues such as buffer overflow [14], and performance optimizations such as those based on activity analysis in the context of automatic differentiation [6]. Our previous research involving data-flow analysis for MPI programs has shown that extending the data-flow analysis so that information flows over communication edges between MPI sends, receives, and reduction primitives enables more precise analysis.

A complication is that the modified interprocedural control-flow graphs (dubbed MPI-ICFGs) used in MPI-aware data-flow analysis are frequently irreducible. Many techniques for improving the efficiency of data-flow analysis, such as interval analysis [4, 8] and path compression [29], depend on the control-flow graph being reducible. This is not unreasonable as most programs are reducible [1, 3]. It has also been shown that techniques such as node splitting can make a control-flow graph reducible [1, 3, 10]. Unfortunately, these techniques do not generally apply to MPI-ICFGs.

This paper makes the following contributions:

- Description of why MPI-ICFGs are frequently irreducible.
- Explanation of why techniques such as node splitting are not applicable.
- An algorithm for computing the depth of a graph that leverages polynomial time algorithms for computing the reducible parts of the graph and therefore enables analyzing larger graphs more efficiently even though it is still worst-case exponential.
- Depth results using that algorithm for a collection of MPI benchmark programs, including several NPB benchmarks and small applications, along with a comparison of the depth-based upper bound with the actual data-flow analysis complexity.

In this paper we explore the algorithmic complexity of performing data-flow analysis on MPI programs. Section 2 reviews the MPI-ICFG and a data-flow analysis framework for the MPI-ICFG. Section 3 reviews the concept of depth and its relationship with the algorithmic complexity of iterative data-flow analysis. Section 4 describes why MPI-ICFGs are irreducible and presents an algorithm for computing the depth of an irreducible graph. Section 5 shows that although the depth analysis algorithm is worst-case exponential in the size of the graph, reducing the graph as much as possible enables us to present depth analysis results on a number of benchmarks. Section 6 concludes.

2. Data-Flow Analysis for MPI Programs

Data-flow analysis for MPI programs must capture the possible data flow between sending and receiving MPI calls, as well as the traditional data flow along control-flow paths. Most MPI programs do not have all of their MPI calls in one procedure; therefore, interprocedural data-flow analysis is necessary. This section reviews the MPI-ICFG, which is used to represent MPI programs, and a data-flow analysis framework for the MPI-ICFG [28].
2.1 Intraprocedural Data-Flow Analysis using the CFG

First we review data-flow analysis for a single procedure, which is also called intraprocedural data-flow analysis. To review, intraprocedural data-flow analysis is formulated over a control-flow graph (CFG), which represents a procedure with a node for each statement and edges between statements indicating possible control flow. Formally, a control-flow graph is specified as $\text{CFG} = \{V, E\}$, where $V$ is the set of nodes in the graph, and $E$ is the set of edges with $(n_1, n_2) \in E$ indicating that control can flow between the statement in node $n_1$ and the statement in node $n_2$. Each node $n$ has a set of predecessors $\text{pred}(n)$ and a set of successors $\text{succ}(n)$, such that $(n_1, n_2) \in E$ implies that $n_1 \in \text{pred}(n_2)$ and $n_2 \in \text{succ}(n_1)$.

Data-flow analysis involves assigning $\text{IN}(n)$ and $\text{OUT}(n)$ sets to each node $n$ in the control-flow graph $\text{CFG}$. The $\text{IN}$ and $\text{OUT}$ sets contain either program entities such as variables and statements or such program entities paired with information from a partially ordered set referred to as the lattice. Iterative data-flow analysis recalculates the $\text{IN}$ and $\text{OUT}$ sets until convergence occurs. When two or more control paths in the CFG merge, a meet operation occurs between the lattice values for a particular program entity. For a forward data-flow analysis, the result of a meet operation is the $\text{IN}(n)$ set for the node $n$ that directly succeeds the merging control-flow paths. In a forward analysis the $\text{OUT}(n)$ set for the node $n$ is calculated by applying a transfer function $f_s(\text{IN}(n))$ to the $\text{IN}(n)$ set, which depends on the semantics of the statement within $n$.

Reaching constants is a canonical example of a nonseparable, forward data-flow analysis. Each variable $v$ is paired with a lattice value $c_v$. The possible constant lattice values are top $\top$, which indicates that no information is known about the variable; bottom $\bot$, which indicates the variable is not constant; or a constant value $c$, which indicates the variable holds the value $c$. Before performing the analysis, every $\text{IN}$ and $\text{OUT}$ set is initialized with a pair $(v, c_v)$ for each variable $v$. The $\text{IN}$ set at the entry of the program is initialized with $(v, \bot)$ and all other sets are initialized with $(v, \top)$. The meet operation $\cap$ for reaching constants determines a lattice value for each variable when two $\text{OUT}$ sets are merged. The result of the meet operation $(v, c_1) \cap (v, c_2)$ is $(v, c_v)$, where $c_v$ is as follows: if $c_1$ equals $c_2$, then $c_v$ is $c_1$; if $c_1$ equals $\top$, or $c_2$ is $\bot$; if $c_1$ equals $\bot$, or $c_2$ is $\top$; otherwise, $c_v$ is $\bot$. At an assignment statement, the transfer function evaluates the right-hand side of the statement to a constant value $c$ or $\bot$ and then pairs that resulting lattice value with the left-hand-side variable in the $\text{OUT}$ set for the statement. In Figure 2, the variable $x$ will be paired with the constant value $1$ in the $\text{OUT}$ set for statement $x = x + 1$.

2.2 Interprocedural Data-Flow Analysis using the ICFG

For interprocedural data-flow analysis, we generate an interprocedural control-flow graph (ICFG) [21]. The ICFG includes control-flow edges between procedure calls and the control-flow graphs for the called procedures. The ICFG can be constructed as follows: (1) construct a control-flow graph for each procedure, (2) split each control-flow graph node containing a procedure call into a call node and a return node, (3) add an edge from the call node to the control-flow graph entry node of the called procedure, and (4) add an edge from the control-flow graph exit node of the called procedure to the return node. Data-flow analysis frameworks for control-flow graphs

1 This can be generalized to basic blocks.

2 A nonseparable analysis is one where the data-flow value associated with one entity like a variable is dependent on data-flow values associated with other entities. We are interested in nonseparable analyses, because their precision can improve when data-flow information is propagated between an MPI send and receive.

are typically implemented so that only the transfer and meet operations must be specified [11, 15, 29]. Data-flow analysis over ICFGs also requires a specification of how information is mapped from the caller to the callee, and vice versa.

2.3 Interprocedural Data-Flow Analysis using the MPI-ICFG

For data-flow analysis of MPI programs we use an MPI-ICFG, which augments an ICFG with communication edges between possible send and receive pairs, among all calls to broadcast, and among all calls to reduce. A communication edge connects the call node of the sending call to the return node of the receiving call. We perform an interprocedural reaching constants analysis and perform a matching using the MPI semantics to reduce the number of communication edges that are conservatively necessary. For broadcast and reduce, we eliminate communication edges where the root parameters statically evaluate to different constants. For send and receive pairs, we eliminate communication edges where the tag or communicator do not match.

The communication edges in an MPI-ICFG are not control-flow edges. Only the data specified in the sending call flows along a communication edge. Accordingly, a data-flow analysis on MPI programs should allow only a lattice value for the variable being sent/received to be transferred across a communication edge.

An MPI-ICFG is specified as $\text{ICFG}_{\text{MPI}} = \{V, E, C\}$, where $V$ is the set of nodes in the graph, $E$ is the set of control-flow edges and call and return edges, and $C$ is the set of communication edges in the graph. Extending any forward, nonseparable data-flow analysis for operation over the MPI-ICFG involves defining the communication transfer function $f_{\text{comm}}$ that calculates the lattice value to propagate over outgoing communication edges based on the $\text{IN}(n)$ set for a send node and the variable being sent (see Figure 1). For reaching constants, the communication transfer function is

$$ f_{\text{comm}}(\text{OUT}(n)) = f_{\text{comm}}(\text{IN}(n)) = \{c_e | (x, c_e) \in \text{IN}(n)\}, $$

where $n$ is the node containing the statement $\text{send}(x)$ and $c_e$ is the lattice value assigned to the variable $x$ in the $\text{IN}(n)$ data-flow set for the send node. In Figure 2, the lattice value $1$ will be propagated over the communication edge between $\text{send}(x)$ and $\text{receive}(y)$. Note that for simplicity, the example in Figure 2 does not include any call and return edges. Examples with call and return edges are provided in Section 4.2.

The transfer function for the receive statement must be defined so that it uses the lattice value propagated over all incoming communication edges as input. Assume that an MPI-ICFG has been constructed such that there are communication edges between send
begin program
x = 0
z = 2
b = 7
if (rank == 0) then
x = x + 1
b = x * 3
send(x)
else
receive(y)
z = b * y
endif
f = reduce(SUM,z)
end program

Figure 2. A small SPMD program and the corresponding simplified MPI-ICFG.

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 3. Control-flow edges and communication edges incident on a receive node.

![Figure 3](image)

3. Data-Flow Analysis, Complexity, and Depth

The algorithmic complexity of iterative data-flow analysis is determined based on lattice height and graph depth [2]. We use a forward data-flow analysis called vary analysis [16]. The example program in Figure 4 helps illustrate these concepts.

3.1 Vary Analysis

Vary analysis is a domain-specific forward data-flow analysis used in some implementations of automatic differentiation [13], a type of program transformation that transforms a subprogram that computes a mathematical function into a subprogram that computes the (partial) derivatives of that function. Vary analysis seeks to identify the set of variables that depend on the subset of input variables designated as independent variables for purposes of differentiation. This enables the automatic differentiation tool to avoid allocating space and performing intermediate computations for variables that can be statically proven to have zero derivatives. A more complete description of vary analysis can be found in [16].

For the example in Figure 4, assume that we apply vary analysis with the set of inputs designated as independent containing only the variable b. Table 1 shows the IN/OUT sets for this example. The assignment of a depends on the initial value of the variable b, and therefore a varies after statement 1. Since the variable b is reassigned in statement 2, the variable b will not vary after statements 2 and 3.
and computes the IN sets converge.

| | of a powerset lattice is the size of the original set (e.g., $2^{|V|}$). An iterative data-flow analysis algorithm visits each node in the control-flow graph, or in the case of MPI programs the MPI-ICFG, and computes the IN and OUT sets for the nodes until all IN and OUT sets converge. The upper-bound on the number of visits per node is $O(hd)$, where $h$ is the lattice height and $d$ is the depth of the graph.

### 3.3 Lattice Height

The lattice is a partially-ordered set of data-flow values. For vary analysis, the domain of possible data-flow values is the powerset of the set of all variables in the program, $2^V$. For the example program in Figure 4, the lattice is shown in Figure 5. The height of a powerset lattice is the size of the original set (e.g., $|V|$).

The height of the lattice affects the complexity because all of the IN and OUT sets excluding possibly those for the entry and exit nodes will start at the top value in the lattice and will stop when reaching the bottom value. Figure 4 provides an example where the full height of the lattice is traversed. Assume that instead of variable b being in the independent variables that variable d is in the initial IN set for the entry node. Table 2 shows the contents of all IN/OUT sets for this example. On the first iteration of the data-flow analysis, the variable c will join the vary set in the OUT set for statement 3. The second iteration over the nodes will propagate the set including variable d and c into the top of the loop and will result in b becoming vary after statement 2. The third iteration will propagate the set $\{bcd\}$ into the top of the loop and will result in a becoming vary after statement 1. A fourth iteration will propagate the set $\{abcd\}$ into the loop as well as the exit node. The final iteration will check convergence.

### 3.4 Depth of a Graph

The depth of a graph is the maximal number of retreating edges on any cycle-free path [2]. A retreating edge is an edge that is not a tree edge within a depth-first spanning tree of the graph and that targets a node that is an ancestor in the DFS. A cycle-free path is defined as a list of nodes in a graph $(n_0, n_1, ..., n_k)$ such that for each $n_i$ and $n_{i+1}$ in the list there is an edge $(n_i, n_{i+1})$ in the graph. Also, each of the $n_j$ must be unique.

The depth of the graph also affects the complexity of an iterative data-flow analysis algorithm in that each node could be visited lattice height multiplied by depth times $O(hd)$. In Figure 4, the depth of the graph is 1. The path $(3, 1, 2)$ is a cycle-free path containing the one retreating edge $3 \rightarrow 1$.

### 3.5 Reducible Graphs

In a structured program (i.e., one built with structured control-flow constructs), the depth of the control-flow graph is equivalent to the maximum loop depth. It is also possible to determine the depth of a

---

**Table 1.** Results of vary analysis with b as independent over the CFG in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Orig. #1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If...</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:a=b</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:b=c</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:c=d</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{a}</td>
<td>{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{b}</td>
<td>{ab}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Results of vary analysis with d as independent over the CFG in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Orig. #1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If...</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{cd}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{cd}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:a=b</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{cd}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{cd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:b=c</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:c=d</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>{}</td>
<td>{d}</td>
<td>{bcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
<td>{abcd}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
structured program’s control-flow graph in $O(N + E)$ time because such a control-flow graph is reducible [12].

A reducible graph is one where all retreating edges in any depth-first spanning tree (DFST) are edges between a node and one of the node’s dominators. A dominator for node X is a node Y that must be in any path from the entry of the flow graph to the node X. When a graph is reducible, it is possible to apply T1 and T2 transformations [30] so as to reduce the whole graph to one node. A T1 transformation removes self loops, and a T2 transformation collapses a child node into a parent node if the child only has edges from one parent node.

T1 and T2 transformations are useful because they enable the generation of data-flow summaries for a whole procedure and thus significantly reduce the cost of iterative data-flow analysis [4, 24]. T1 and T2 transformations can also be used to compute the depth of a reducible flow graph.

4. The Depth of Irreducible Graphs

The problem with MPI-ICFGs is that the communication edges often break the structure of the program and cause the MPI-ICFG to become irreducible. Using a reduction from the directed Hamiltonian cycle problem, Fong and Ullman [12] show that determining the depth for irreducible graphs is NP-complete. In this section, we describe some characteristics of irreducible graphs, explain in detail why MPI-ICFGs are irreducible, and then present a worst-case exponential algorithm for computing the depth of arbitrary graphs.

4.1 Irreducibility

All directed graphs can be categorized as being either reducible or irreducible. Therefore, any graph that is not reducible is irreducible. Irreducibility of a graph means that computing the graph’s depth is an NP-complete problem and therefore any such computation will have exponential worst-case complexity. Another difficulty that irreducible graphs introduce is that they can have a different set of retreating edges based on the depth-first spanning tree (DFST). Different sets of retreating edges can result in different depths for the same graph.

Figure 6 shows two DFSTs over the same graph that result in different depths. The bold edges are tree edges, and the number beside each tree edge indicates the order in which it was added to the DFST. The dashed edges are retreating edges. The rest are cross edges. The DFST on the left starts with the edge (A → B), and the DFST on the right starts with the edge (A → E). After the starting edge is selected, all other edges are visited in a depth-first manner; outgoing edges are visited in alphabetical order. The DFST on the left contains only one retreating edge, so its depth can be at most 1. The DFST on the right has two retreating edges, so its depth can be at most 2. Indeed, the cycle-free paths displayed in Figure 6 for each DFST confirm those depths.

To work around this issue in our computation of the depth of MPI-ICFGs, we ensure that the traversal order being used in the depth analysis is based on the same DFST as that used in the data-flow analysis.

4.2 Irreducibility of MPI-ICFGs

Irreducibility may be introduced into the MPI-ICFG graph in two ways. First, the MPI-ICFG is based on an ICFG, where we have one interconnected graph for the entire application program. When there are multiple calls to the same function, there will be multiple edges from the various call nodes to the entry of the called subroutine. An example of how this introduces irreducibility is seen in Figure 7. This example contains two calls to the same subroutine. One call is within a loop; the other call is outside the loop. Figure 7 also shows the ICFG for this example where each call node now has an outgoing edge to the entry node of the called subroutine and each return node has an in-coming edge from the exit node of the called subroutine. The edge from foo’s exit node to the in-loop return node constitutes an edge entering the middle of the loop from outside the loop, since there exists a path from the first call, through foo, into the loop. This situation with two entries into a loop is irreducible.

A second way that irreducibility may be introduced into the MPI-ICFG is through the use of communication edges. Commu-
communication edges connect the call nodes of communication sending calls to the return nodes of compatible communication receiving calls. An example of how this introduces irreducibility is seen in Figure 8. One branch of the if-statement contains a call to send(); the other branch contains a loop with a call to recv(). A communication from the send call node to the receive return node represents an edge entering the middle of a loop, which renders the graph irreducible.

4.3 Why Not Use Node Splitting?
Node splitting [1, 3, 10] is an analysis technique for making an irreducible graph reducible. Node splitting causes the duplication of one of the regions involved in an irreducible loop within the region graph. If the irreducible loop is due to a goto statement within one procedure, then the amount of duplication might not be that significant. Since irreducibility is introduced in MPI-ICFGs due to a communication edge leaving one procedure and entering a loop in another procedure, we hypothesize that the amount of duplication that would be needed to perform node splitting might be on the order of full procedures and therefore become possibly exponential in the size of the original flow graph [9].

4.4 Algorithm for Computing Depth of Irreducible Graphs
Fong and Ullman [12] present an algorithm that computes the depth of a reducible graph in $O(N + E)$ time by using T1 and T2 reductions. The result of their algorithm is the largest number of retreating edges on any path ending at each node. The depth is then the maximum of all those values.

We use their algorithm as a starting point on an irreducible graph so as to reduce the structured parts of the graph as much as possible. We present our algorithm in Figures 9, 10, and 11.

Figure 9. Variables used in the T1T2ComputeDepth, computeReducibleDepth, and maxDepthPath algorithms.

Figure 10. The T1T2 algorithm for computing the depth of an irreducible graph.
Algorithm computeReducibleDepth\( (G(V,E), v) \)

\[ C_v = \text{grey} \]

// Depth-first traversal and find retreating edges.
for each outgoing edge \((v, w)\) from \(v\)
if \(C_w \neq \text{grey}\) then // tree edge
\[ G' = \text{computeReducibleDepth}(G, w) \]
else if \(C_w = \text{grey}\) then // retreating edge
\[ R = R \cup (v, w) \]

// Apply T1 and T2 reductions as much as possible.
while reductions are still possible

// Check for T1 applicability.
if there is a self loop \((s, t)\) for region\((v)\) then

// First update the maximal reducible depth ending at any node in the region.
for each node \(n\) in this region

// The max depth path ending at \(n\) either
// stays the same or is the path that ends
// at node \(n\), goes through the self loop,
// and traverses tree edges to end at \(n\).
\[ Y_n = \text{max}(Y_n, 1 + X_{s, n}) \]

Remove the self loop from \(R\) and \(E'\).

// Check for T2 applicability.
if \(S = \text{region}(v)\) only has a single predecessor region \(P\) then

// All pairs of nodes in regions \(P\) and \(S\).
for each \(p \in P\) and for each \(m \in S\)
// All nodes at frontier of \(P\) that have
// outgoing edges into \(S\).
for each node \(p \in P\) such that \((p, \text{root}(S)) \in E'\)

// The largest depth path to \(n\) will be in
// region \(P\) and any path to \(m\) in region
// \(S\) must go through one of the \(p\) nodes.
\[ X_{n,m} = \text{max} ( X_{n,m}, X_{n,p} ) \]

// A node \(m\) in region \(S\) might have a
// larger depth path that ends at a \(p\)
// node and then traverses \(S\) tree edges.
\[ X_{m,n} = \text{max} ( Y_m, X_{p,n} ) \]

for all the nodes in \(S\)
for each node \(p \in P\) with an edge to \(S\)
\[ Y_n = \text{max} ( Y_n, Y_p ) \]

Merge regions \(P\) and \(S\) and remove edges from \(P\) to \(S\).

// Return the reduced graph where each region is a
// node and edges go between regions.
return \(G'(V', E')\)

Figure 11. The computeReducibleDepth algorithm uses T1 and T2 reductions to reduce as much of the graph as possible and to compute the maximum reducible depth that ends at each node. This is an implementation of the algorithm presented by Fong and Ullman [12].

Algorithm maxDepthPath\( (G'(V', E'), (v, w), \text{path}) \)

// For first edge, need to initialize the path.
if \(\text{PATH}\) is empty then

// Initialize maxDepth based on the max depth
// reducible path that ends at \(v\).
\[ \text{maxDepth} = Y_v \]

// Place the target of the edge on the current path.
Put \(w\) at end of \(\text{PATH}\).

// Find the max depth for any path that starts at \(w\).
\[ \text{maxDepth} = 0 \]
for each edge \((w, t)\)
if \(t\) is not in the path
\[ \text{depth} = \text{maxDepthPath}(G', (w, t)) \]
if \((\text{depth} > \text{maxDepth})\) \(\text{maxDepth} = \text{depth} \)
if \((v, w)\) is a retreating edge in \(R\)
\[ \text{maxDepth} = \text{maxDepth} + 1 \]
// Modify current path being investigated.
Take \(w\) off the path.

return \(\text{maxDepth}\)

Figure 12. The maxDepthPath algorithm adds the maximum depth for any reducible path that ends at the first node in the path to the maximum depth of any path in the irreducible graph.

adding in the reducible depth for the source node in the starting edge.

5. Depth Analysis Results

In this section, we compute the depth of a number of MPI benchmarks. We use the depth to calculate the worst-case number of iterations and compare those figures to actual numbers of iterations for analyses on both the ICFG and the MPI-ICFG. We present our methodology and discuss our results below.

5.1 Methodology

We implemented two algorithms to find the depth of a graph. The Direct algorithm explores all cycle-free paths starting from a retreating edge in the depth-first-spanning tree (DFST) of the dataflow graph. For reducible graphs, all DFSTs of the graph have the same depth. However, this situation is not true for irreducible graphs, as illustrated in Section 4.1. Thus, to find the true maximum depth of an irreducible graph, one would need to investigate all DFSTs of the graph. We limit our depth results to the DFSTs used in the data analysis runs, since those directly affect the actual number of iterations. Specifically, we ensure that the depth computed by our depth analysis uses the same DFST as that used by the reverse-post ordering in the iterative data-flow analysis.

The TT2Algorithm described in Section 4.4 uses T1 and T2 reductions to reduce the number of regions and inter-region edges, memoizing the reducible depth in each region, before traversing paths in the reduced graph. This algorithm also starts from the same DFST as that used in the actual data analysis runs.

We implemented the construction of the MPI-ICFG, the dataflow framework for an MPI-ICFG, and a handful of analyses using the OpenAnalysis toolkit [27] coupled with the Open64/SL compiler infrastructure [25]. We used the dataflow analysis framework to apply two data-flow analyses (reaching constants and vary) to various benchmarks. The NAS Parallel Benchmarks [5], labeled NASPB, were obtained from http://www.nas.nasa.gov/-vary) to various benchmarks. The NAS Parallel Benchmarks [5], labeled NASPB, were obtained from http://www.nas.nasa.gov/
and the benchmark labeled Biostat is a parallelized version of a biostatistical analysis function provided by D. Spiegelman [20]. Sweep3d [22] is a benchmark code derived from a real application, 3D Discrete Ordinates Neutron Transport, which solves a neutron transport problem. Table 3 summarizes our benchmarks. Column 2 indicates the source of the benchmark along with the procedure of interest at the top of the call graph. Columns 3 and 4 characterize the type and amount of MPI-communication calls in the benchmark that contributed to the communication edges listed in the last column. Columns 5 and 6 list the number of nodes and non-communication edges in the MPI-ICFG and ICFG graphs for each benchmark.

5.2 Results

In this section, we first present our results on the performance of both the T1T2Algorithm and the Direct algorithm, with special emphasis on the achieved potential of the T1T2Algorithm over the Direct algorithm. We then discuss our depth results and compare the depth-defined upper-bound number of iterations to actual numbers of data-flow analysis iterations.

5.2.1 Algorithm Evaluation

We calculated the depth of both the ICFG and MPI-ICFG for each benchmark using the Direct algorithm and then the T1T2Algorithm, for a total of four calculations per benchmark. In Figure 13, we show the number of cycle-free paths investigated by either algorithm versus the size of the graph (nodes + edges or regions + edges, as appropriate). The size of the graph is shown along the horizontal axis, and the number of paths is shown along the log-scale vertical axis. The upper-bound complexity of the Direct algorithm is exponential – on the order of \(E^{N+1}\). The time to traverse all paths prohibits the direct calculation of the depth on large graphs. Our benchmarks are medium-sized, but in some cases the calculations still took a while. The two marks in the far upper-right in Figure 13 represent the two Direct calculations on LU_2, our largest benchmark. Each calculation took more than 14 days to complete on a 2.6 GHz Intel Core 2 duo processor with 2GB 1067 MHz DDR3 memory running the Mac OS X (v 10.5.8) operating system.

The T1T2Algorithm uses T1 and T2 reductions to reduce the number of regions and interregion edges before traversing paths to calculate the graph depth. Figure 14 shows the reduction in the graph size for each benchmark for both the ICFG and MPI-ICFG graphs. On average, the T1T2Algorithm was able to reduce the graph size by 80% for MPI-ICFGs and by 86% for ICFGs, before traversing interregion edges. This algorithm is still worst-case exponential; however, it ultimately traverses fewer paths than does the Direct algorithm, enabling depth calculation on larger graphs.

As a last measure of the T1T2Algorithm, we compared the number of cycle-free paths traversed by both algorithms. In Figure 15, we display the number of paths traversed by the T1T2Algorithm as a percentage of the number of paths traversed by the Direct algorithm on the benchmark MPI-ICFGs. For MG_2, the T1T2Algorithm traversed as few as 3.5% of the number of paths traversed by the Direct algorithm. On average, the T1T2Algorithm traverses only 10% as many paths on the MPI-ICFGs and only 7% as many on the ICFGs as does the Direct algorithm.

5.2.2 Depth and Data-Flow Analysis Results

We calculated the depth of both the MPI-ICFG and ICFG for each benchmark. The results are shown in Figure 16. As expected, the MPI-ICFG is at least as deep as the ICFG for each benchmark. The depths ranged from a low of 4 in the ICFG of MG_2 to a high of 16 in the MPI-ICFG of LU_2. For Sw_1, with only one communication edge, the depth is the same for both graphs. CG and SOR are the benchmarks with the highest number of communication edges: 64 and 87, respectively. For both of these, the depth of the MPI-ICFG is at least twice that of the ICFG.

Let’s take a closer look at the LU benchmarks. LU_1 is a subset of LU_2 and all of the MPI-calls in LU_1 are made within the exchange_3 subroutine. exchange_3 performs either north-south

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Source</th>
<th># of Sends</th>
<th># of Recvs</th>
<th># of Nodes</th>
<th># of Edges</th>
<th># of Comm Edges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biostat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU_1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU_2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG_2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sw_1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Benchmark Description: Number of communication calls, nodes, edges and communication edges.

Figure 13. Graph size vs. number of paths traversed – includes output from both algorithms over ICFG and MPI-ICFG graphs.
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Figure 14. Reduction in graph size (regions + edges) by T1T2 algorithm.

![Figure 14](image-url)
Table 4. Depth, upper bound and actual iterations for ICFG and MPI-ICFG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Vars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biostat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW,1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Number of paths traversed by the T1T2Algorithm displayed as a percentage of those traversed by the Direct algorithm on the benchmark MPI-ICFGs.

Figure 16. Graph depth of the ICFG and additional depth due to communication edges in the MPI-ICFG.

communication or east-west communication depending upon a parameter value. For north-south communication, there are two calls to MPI-send, two calls to MPI-irecv, and two calls to MPI-wait. The east-west communication is similar. Since only one type of communication can occur per call to exchange,3, we will continue our discussion using the north-south communication. Each send and receive has a unique tag indicating direction (e.g. from north), which results in exactly two communication edges in the north-south communication. Interspersed between the send and receive calls are double-nested loops that copy sent and/or received data. The depth of exchange,3 itself is 7 and it breaks down as follows: 2 retreating edges due to the double-nested loops; 3 from the double calls to each of send, receive, and wait; and 2 from the communication edges.

The rhs subroutine is at the root of LU,1’s call graph and calls exchange,3 twice. rhs itself has quad-nested loops. Thus, the depth of LU,1 is 12, and it breaks down as follows: 7 retreating edges within exchange,3, 1 from the double call to exchange,3 within a single-nested loop, and 4 from the quad-nested loops.

The root of LU,2’s call graph, sor, calls rhs twice and itself has quad-nested loops. It also ultimately calls exchange,1, which has a similar structure to exchange,3, with four sends and four receives and single-nested loops. These calls combine with those in exchange,3 resulting in sixteen communication edges. Altogether, we see a depth of 16 for the MPI-ICFG of LU,2.

Once we have the depth for each graph, we are able to calculate the upper-bound number of iterations for a data-flow analysis per benchmark. We collected the number of variables per benchmark per graph as an expression of the lattice height and calculated the iteration upper bound as the product of the depth and the number of variables. Table 4 displays these results for each benchmark. The left half of the table contains results for the MPI-ICFG graph and the right half for the ICFG. In the first three columns for each graph we record the number of variables, the depth, and the iteration upper bound. For these benchmarks, the number of variables is much larger than the depth and has a larger impact on the iteration upper bound. The iteration upper bounds range from one to tens of thousands. Should the data-analysis actually approach these upper bounds, the data-analysis would be prohibitively time consuming.

Fortunately, the actual number of data-flow analysis iterations is strongly correlated with the depth and the lattice height does not have a significant effect. We performed two data-flow analyses, reaching constants and vary, on each graph per benchmark. In Table 4, we recorded the number of iterations of each analysis. The number of iterations for the reaching constants analysis is listed in the fourth column for each type of graph, with the number of iterations for the vary analysis listed in the last column. The actual number of iterations per analysis is far below the upper bound. The largest number of iterations was in the SOR benchmark, 17 for each graph and analysis. There was little difference between the actual number of iterations per analysis between the ICFG and the MPI-ICFG. The single difference occurred in the reaching constants analysis over the MPI-ICFG of LU,2, taking two more iterations than that over the ICFG.

6. Conclusions

This paper explores the algorithmic complexity of performing data-flow analysis on MPI programs when the program is modeled with an MPI-ICFG graph. An MPI-ICFG is an interprocedural control-flow graph with communication edges between sends and receives. More precise data-flow analysis is possible for nonseparable analyses when it is possible to model the flow of data over communication edges. Our results show that the depth of the MPI-ICFGs is a good indicator for how many iterations over the graph will be
needed for convergence. We compute the depth for some benchmark MPI programs despite the fact that computing the depth for irreducible graphs is NP-complete. We also present an algorithm that builds on the 1976 Fong-Ullman algorithm for computing the depth of a reducible graph. By reducing the reducible parts of the graphs first, the graphs on average become 80% smaller with 90% fewer cycle-free paths, resulting in a 10x faster algorithm.
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