



#### Faculty of Science

## Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs

Patrick Bahr University of Copenhagen, Department of Computer Science paba@di.ku.dk

#### Introduction

## Trade-off in software verification:





#### Introduction

## Trade-off in software verification:





#### Example: Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

Two compilers for a simple language with exceptions:



#### Example: Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

Two compilers for a simple language with exceptions:

Simple but unrealistic compiler (tree shaped code!)
 \$\simple\$ simple proofs



#### Example: Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

Two compilers for a simple language with exceptions:

- Simple but <u>unrealistic</u> compiler (tree shaped code!)
   \$\simple\$ simple proofs
- More realistic compiler with explicit jumps
   much more complicated proofs



#### Example: Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

Two compilers for a simple language with exceptions:

- Simple but <u>unrealistic</u> compiler (tree shaped code!)
   \$\simple\$ simple proofs
- More realistic compiler with explicit jumps
   much more complicated proofs

#### Our Proposal: an intermediate approach

- Transform compiler: use (acyclic) graphs instead of trees
- Lift the correctness property from the tree-based to the graph-based compiler.



## Example: A Simple Language with Exceptions

Based on Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

#### Source Language

Arithmetic expressions + exceptions:

data Expr = Val Int | Add Expr Expr | Throw | Catch Expr Expr



## Example: A Simple Language with Exceptions

Based on Hutton & Wright "Compiling Exceptions Correctly"

#### Source Language

Arithmetic expressions + exceptions:

data Expr = Val Int | Add Expr Expr | Throw | Catch Expr Expr

#### Target Language

Instruction set for a simple stack machine:

data Code = PUSH Int Code | ADD Code | HALT | MARK Code Code | UNMARK Code | THROW



Targeting A Stack Machine

 $\mathit{comp}^{\mathsf{A}} :: \mathit{Expr} \to \mathit{Code} \to \mathit{Code}$ 



Targeting A Stack Machine

 $comp^{A} :: Expr \rightarrow Code \rightarrow Code$ 

 $comp :: Expr \rightarrow Code$  $comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \ HALT$ 



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 5

Targeting A Stack Machine

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp^{A} :: Expr \rightarrow Code \rightarrow Code \\ comp^{A} \left( Val \ n \right) & c = PUSH \ n \ c \\ comp^{A} \left( Add \ x \ y \right) & c = comp^{A} \ x \left( comp^{A} \ y \ (ADD \ c) \right) \\ comp^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW \\ comp^{A} \left( Catch \ x \ h \right) \ c = MARK \ (comp^{A} \ h \ c) \left( comp^{A} \ x \ (UNMARK \ c) \right) \end{array}$$

 $comp :: Expr \rightarrow Code$  $comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \ HALT$ 



Targeting A Stack Machine

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp^{A} :: Expr \rightarrow Code \rightarrow Code \\ comp^{A} (Val \ n) & c = PUSH \ n \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp^{A} \ x \triangleright comp^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW \\ comp^{A} (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK \ (comp^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \triangleright comp^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK \triangleright c \end{array}$$

 $comp :: Expr \rightarrow Code$  $comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \triangleright HALT$ 



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 5

#### Semantics

Given by evaluator eval & virtual machine exec

 $\textit{eval} :: \textit{Expr} \rightarrow \textit{Maybe Int}$ 

 $\textit{exec} :: \textit{Code} \rightarrow \textit{Stack} \rightarrow \textit{Stack}$ 







#### Semantics

Given by evaluator eval & virtual machine exec

 $\textit{eval} :: \textit{Expr} \rightarrow \textit{Maybe Int}$ 

 $\textit{exec} :: \textit{Code} \rightarrow \textit{Stack} \rightarrow \textit{Stack}$ 



#### Semantics

Given by evaluator eval & virtual machine exec eval ::  $Expr \rightarrow Maybe$  Int exec ::  $Code \rightarrow Stack \rightarrow Stack$ 

#### Theorem (compiler correctness)

$$exec (comp e) [] = \begin{cases} [Val n] & if eval e = Just n \\ [] & if eval e = Nothing \end{cases}$$



#### Semantics

Given by evaluator eval & virtual machine exec eval ::  $Expr \rightarrow Maybe$  Int exec ::  $Code \rightarrow Stack \rightarrow Stack$ 

#### Theorem (compiler correctness)

$$exec (comp e) [] = \begin{cases} [Val n] & if eval e = Just n \\ [] & if eval e = Nothing \end{cases}$$

#### Goal

- Avoid the code duplication produced by the compiler.
- Retain the simple equational reasoning to prove correctness.

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 6



1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)



- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- The VM is a fold, i.e.

 $exec = fold \ execAlg$ 



- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- The VM is a fold, i.e. exec = fold execAlg
- On graphs, the VM is defined as a fold with the same algebra: exec<sub>G</sub> = fold<sub>G</sub> execAlg



- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- 2 The VM is a fold, i.e. exec = fold execAlg
- On graphs, the VM is defined as a fold with the same algebra: exec<sub>G</sub> = fold<sub>G</sub> execAlg
- **4** By parametricity, we obtain:

$$fold_G alg = fold alg \circ unravel$$
 for all alg

- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- The VM is a fold, i.e. exec = fold execAlg
- On graphs, the VM is defined as a fold with the same algebra: exec<sub>G</sub> = fold<sub>G</sub> execAlg
- Ø By parametricity, we obtain:

 $exec_{G} = exec \circ unravel$ 

- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- The VM is a fold, i.e. exec = fold execAlg
- On graphs, the VM is defined as a fold with the same algebra: exec<sub>G</sub> = fold<sub>G</sub> execAlg
- Ø By parametricity, we obtain:

 $exec_{G} = exec \circ unravel$ 

By simple equational reasoning we show

 $comp = unravel \circ comp_{\mathsf{G}}$ 



- 1 trees  $\Rightarrow$  structured graphs (trees + explicit let bindings)
- The VM is a fold, i.e. exec = fold execAlg
- On graphs, the VM is defined as a fold with the same algebra: exec<sub>G</sub> = fold<sub>G</sub> execAlg
- Ø By parametricity, we obtain:

 $exec_{G} = exec \circ unravel$ 

By simple equational reasoning we show

 $comp = unravel \circ comp_{G}$ 

**6** Hence:  $exec \circ comp = exec_G \circ comp_G$ 



#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))



#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))

#### Code data type

## data Code PUSH Int Code | ADD Code | HALT MARK Code Code | UNMARK Code | THROW Code | T



#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))

Code data type						
data Code a = Pl	USH Int	a	ADD	a	HALT	
M	ARK a	a	UNMARK	a	THROW	



#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))

# Code data typedata $Code_F a = PUSH_F$ Inta $| ADD_F$ a $| HALT_F$ $| MARK_F a$ a $| UNMARK_F a$ $| THROW_F$

#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))

# Code data typedata $Code_F a = PUSH_F$ Inta $| ADD_F$ a $| HALT_F$ $| MARK_F a$ a $| UNMARK_F a$ $| THROW_F$

 $\Rightarrow$  Code  $\simeq$  Tree Code<sub>F</sub>



#### Tree Type: fixed point of a functor

data Tree f = ln (f (Tree f))

#### Code data type

data $Code_F a = PUSH_F$ Int	а	ADD <sub>F</sub> a	HALT <sub>F</sub>
MARK <sub>F</sub> a	а	UNMARK <sub>F</sub> a	THROW <sub>F</sub>

$$\Rightarrow$$
 Code  $\simeq$  Tree Code<sub>F</sub>

#### Smart Constructors

 $PUSH_T :: Int \rightarrow Tree \ Code_F \rightarrow Tree \ Code_F$  $PUSH_T \ n \ c = In \ (PUSH_F \ n \ c)$ 

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 8

## Compiler with Explicit Tree Type

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp^{A} :: Expr \to Code & \to Code \\ comp^{A} (Val \ n) & c = PUSH \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp^{A} \ x \triangleright comp^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD \quad \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW \\ comp^{A} (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK \ (comp^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & \triangleright \ comp^{A} \ x \triangleright \ UNMARK \quad \triangleright c \\ comp \ :: Expr \to Code \end{array}$$

$$comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \triangleright HALT$$

## Compiler with Explicit Tree Type

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp^{A} :: Expr \to Tree \ Code_{F} \to Tree \ Code_{F} \\ comp^{A} \ (Val \ n) & c = PUSH \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp^{A} \ x \triangleright comp^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD \quad \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW \\ comp^{A} \ (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK \ (comp^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & & & & & & \\ \rho \ comp^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK \quad \triangleright c \\ \end{array}$$

$$comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \triangleright HALT$$



## Compiler with Explicit Tree Type

$$comp \ e = comp^{A} \ e \triangleright HALT_{T}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' 
$$f v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
 $| Let (Graph' f v) (v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
 $| Var v$ 



#### Definition

**data** Graph' 
$$f v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
 $| Let (Graph' f v) (v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
 $| Var v$ 



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v)  $(v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
| Var v

$$\begin{array}{lll} comp^{A} :: Expr \to Tree & Code_{F} \to Tree & Code_{F} \\ comp^{A} (Val \ n) & c = PUSH_{T} & n \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp^{A} \ x \triangleright comp^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{T} \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} & Throw & c = THROW_{T} \\ comp^{A} (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK_{T} (comp^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & \triangleright \ comp^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK_{T} \triangleright c \end{array}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v)  $(v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
| Var v

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp^{A} :: Expr \to Graph' \ Code_{\mathsf{F}} \ v \to Graph' \ Code_{\mathsf{F}} \ v \\ comp^{A} \ (Val \ n) & c = PUSH_{\mathsf{T}} \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp^{A} \ x \triangleright comp^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{\mathsf{T}} \triangleright c \\ comp^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW_{\mathsf{T}} \\ comp^{A} \ (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK_{\mathsf{T}} \ (comp^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & \triangleright \ comp^{A} \ x \triangleright \ UNMARK_{\mathsf{T}} \triangleright c \end{array}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v)  $(v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
| Var v

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp_{G}^{A} ::: Expr \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Val \ n) & c = PUSH_{G} \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright comp_{G}^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{G} \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW_{G} \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK_{G} \ (comp_{G}^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & \triangleright \ comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK_{G} \triangleright c \end{array}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v)  $(v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
| Var v

$$\begin{array}{l} comp_{G}^{A} :: Expr \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} & \overrightarrow{PUSH_{G}} \ n \ c = Gln \left( PUSH_{F} \ n \ c \right) \\ comp_{G}^{A} \left( Val \ n \right) & c = PUSH_{G} \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \left( Add \ x \ y \right) & c = comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright comp_{G}^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{G} \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW_{G} \\ comp_{G}^{A} \left( Catch \ x \ h \right) \ c = MARK_{G} \left( comp_{G}^{A} \ h \triangleright c \right) \\ & \triangleright \ comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK_{G} \triangleright c \end{array}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v)  $(v \rightarrow Graph' f v)$   
| Var v

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp_{G}^{A} ::: Expr \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Val \ n) & c = PUSH_{G} \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright comp_{G}^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{G} \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW_{G} \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = MARK_{G} \ (comp_{G}^{A} \ h \triangleright c) \\ & \triangleright \ comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK_{G} \triangleright c \end{array}$$



#### Definition

**data** Graph' f 
$$v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph' f v) ( $v \rightarrow$  Graph' f v)  
| Var v



#### Definition

**data** Graph' 
$$f v = Gln (f (Graph' f v))$$
  
| Let (Graph'  $f v$ ) ( $v \rightarrow$  Graph'  $f v$ )  
| Var  $v$ 

**newtype** Graph  $f = MkGraph (\forall v . Graph' f v)$ 

$$\begin{array}{ll} comp_{G}^{A} ::: Expr \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \rightarrow Graph' \ Code_{F} \ v \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Val \ n) & c = PUSH_{G} \quad n \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Add \ x \ y) & c = comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright comp_{G}^{A} \ y \triangleright ADD_{G} \triangleright c \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ Throw & c = THROW_{G} \\ comp_{G}^{A} \ (Catch \ x \ h) \ c = Let \ c \ (\lambda c' \rightarrow MARK_{G} \ (comp_{G}^{A} \ h \triangleright Var \ c') \\ & \triangleright \ comp_{G}^{A} \ x \triangleright UNMARK_{G} \triangleright Var \ c') \\ comp_{G} :: Expr \rightarrow Graph \ Code \\ comp_{G} \ e = MkGraph \ (comp_{G}^{A} \ e \triangleright HALT_{G}) \end{array}$$

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 10

#### 

 $\begin{array}{l} comp_{G} \left( \textit{Add} \left( \textit{Catch} \left( \textit{Val 1} \right) \left( \textit{Val 2} \right) \right) \left( \textit{Val 3} \right) \right) \\ \rightsquigarrow \textit{MkGraph} \left( \textit{Let} \left( \textit{PUSH}_{G} \ 3 \triangleright \textit{ADD}_{G} \triangleright \textit{HALT}_{G} \right) \left( \lambda \textit{v} \rightarrow \textit{MARK}_{G} \left( \textit{PUSH}_{G} \ 2 \triangleright \textit{Var v} \right) \right) \\ \triangleright \textit{PUSH}_{G} \ 1 \triangleright \textit{UNMARK}_{G} \triangleright \textit{Var v} \right) \end{array}$ 



#### Fold over Trees

fold :: Functor 
$$f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow$$
 Tree  $f \rightarrow r$   
fold alg (In t) = alg (fmap (fold alg) t)



#### Fold over Trees

fold :: Functor 
$$f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow$$
 Tree  $f \rightarrow r$   
fold alg (In t) = alg (fmap (fold alg) t)

#### Virtual Machine as a Fold

exec	:: Tree	$\mathit{Code}  ightarrow \mathit{Stack}  ightarrow \mathit{Stack}$
exec	= fold	execAlg

#### Fold over Trees

fold :: Functor 
$$f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow$$
 Tree  $f \rightarrow r$   
fold alg (In t) = alg (fmap (fold alg) t)

#### Virtual Machine as a Fold

$$exec :: Tree Code \rightarrow Stack \rightarrow Stack$$
  
 $exec = fold execAlg$ 

#### Folds on Graphs

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{fold}_{G} :: \text{Functor } f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow \text{Graph } f \rightarrow r \\ \text{fold}_{G} \ alg \ (\text{Graph } g) = \text{fold}'_{G} \ g \ \textbf{where} \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Gln } t) = alg \ (\text{fmap fold}'_{G} \ t) \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Let } e \ f) = \text{fold}'_{G} \ (f \ (\text{fold}'_{G} \ e)) \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Var } x) = x \end{array}$$

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 12



#### Fold over Trees

fold :: Functor 
$$f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow$$
 Tree  $f \rightarrow r$   
fold alg (In t) = alg (fmap (fold alg) t)

#### Virtual Machine as a Fold

$$exec_{G} :: Graph \ Code \rightarrow Stack \rightarrow Stack$$
  
 $exec_{G} = fold_{G} \ execAlg$ 

#### Folds on Graphs

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{fold}_{G} :: \text{Functor } f \Rightarrow (f \ r \rightarrow r) \rightarrow \text{Graph } f \rightarrow r \\ \text{fold}_{G} \ alg \ (\text{Graph } g) = \text{fold}'_{G} \ g \ \textbf{where} \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Gln } t) = alg \ (\text{fmap fold}'_{G} \ t) \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Let } e \ f) = \text{fold}'_{G} \ (f \ (\text{fold}'_{G} \ e)) \\ \text{fold}'_{G} \ (\text{Var } x) = x \end{array}$$

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 12

## Correctness Argument for *comp*<sub>G</sub>

Since, we know that *comp* is correct, it suffices to show that

 $\mathsf{exec}_{\mathsf{G}} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}} = \mathsf{exec} \circ \mathsf{comp}$ 



## Correctness Argument for *comp*<sub>G</sub>

Since, we know that *comp* is correct, it suffices to show that

 $\mathsf{exec}_{\mathsf{G}} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}} = \mathsf{exec} \circ \mathsf{comp}$ 



$$\mathsf{exec}_{\mathsf{G}} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \mathsf{exec} \circ \mathsf{unravel} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}}$$



## Correctness Argument for *comp*<sub>G</sub>

Since, we know that *comp* is correct, it suffices to show that

 $\mathsf{exec}_{\mathsf{G}} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}} = \mathsf{exec} \circ \mathsf{comp}$ 



$$fold_{G} alg = fold alg \circ unravel$$



(1)

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 13

(1)

## Correctness Argument for *comp*<sub>G</sub>

Since, we know that *comp* is correct, it suffices to show that

 $\mathsf{exec}_{\mathsf{G}} \circ \mathsf{comp}_{\mathsf{G}} = \mathsf{exec} \circ \mathsf{comp}$ 



Theorem

$$\mathit{fold}_{\mathsf{G}} \mathit{alg} = \mathit{fold} \mathit{alg} \circ \mathit{unravel}$$

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 13

## Proof of (2)

#### Lemma

unravel 
$$(comp_G e) = comp e$$



## Proof of (2)

#### Lemma

$$unravel (comp_G e) = comp e$$

#### Proof.

#### By induction on e.



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 14

## Proof of (2)

#### Lemma

$$unravel (comp_G e) = comp e$$

#### Proof.

By induction on *e*. The interesting part:

$$unravel (Let c (\lambda c' \rightarrow MARK_{G} (comp_{G}^{A} h \triangleright Var c')) \\ \triangleright comp_{G}^{A} \times \triangleright UNMARK_{G} \triangleright Var c')) \\ = MARK_{T} (comp^{A} h \triangleright unravel c) \\ \triangleright comp^{A} \times \triangleright UNMARK_{T} \triangleright unravel c \\ \end{cases}$$



## Summary

#### Our Approach

- Replace tree type with graph type
- Relate semantics of graph-based compiler via unravelling
- Exploit parametricity to drastically simplify proof

## Summary

#### Our Approach

- Replace tree type with graph type
- Relate semantics of graph-based compiler via unravelling
- Exploit parametricity to drastically simplify proof

#### Motivation: Derive Compiler from Specification

- Compilers can be derived by formal calculation
- The result is often unsatisfactory (e.g. code duplication)
- Goal: improve compilers by simple equational reasoning



## Open Questions / Future Work

#### Beyond folds

- What if the virtual machine is not a fold?
- This seems impossible with HOAS-style graphs
- Ad hoc reasoning for "Names for free"-style graphs possible

## Open Questions / Future Work

#### Beyond folds

- What if the virtual machine is not a fold?
- This seems impossible with HOAS-style graphs
- Ad hoc reasoning for "Names for free"-style graphs possible

#### Cyclic graphs

- Our method is restricted to acyclic graphs.
- Cyclic graphs require different reasoning principle. (fixed-point induction?)







#### Faculty of Science

## Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs

Patrick Bahr University of Copenhagen, Department of Computer Science paba@di.ku.dk

Symposium on Functional and Logic Programming, Kanazawa, Japan; 6th June, 2014 Slide 17  $\,$ 

## **Bonus Slides**



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 18

# comp (Add (Val 2) (Val 3)) $\rightsquigarrow PUSH 2 \triangleright PUSH 3 \triangleright ADD \triangleright HALT$



# comp (Add (Val 2) (Val 3)) $\rightsquigarrow PUSH 2 \triangleright PUSH 3 \triangleright ADD \triangleright HALT$

#### comp (Catch (Val 2) (Val 3)) $\rightsquigarrow$ MARK (PUSH 3 $\triangleright$ HALT) $\triangleright$ PUSH 2 $\triangleright$ UNMARK $\triangleright$ HALT



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 19

# comp (Add (Val 2) (Val 3)) $\rightsquigarrow PUSH 2 \triangleright PUSH 3 \triangleright ADD \triangleright HALT$

#### comp (Catch (Val 2) (Val 3)) $\rightsquigarrow$ MARK (PUSH 3 $\triangleright$ HALT) $\triangleright$ PUSH 2 $\triangleright$ UNMARK $\triangleright$ HALT

#### comp (Catch Throw (Val 3)) → MARK (PUSH 3 ▷ HALT) ▷ THROW



Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 19

#### Theorem (Short Cut Fusion Law)

b alg = fold alg (b ln) for all  $b :: \forall c . (f c \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c$ 



#### Theorem (Short Cut Fusion Law)

b alg = fold alg (b ln) for all  $b :: \forall c . (f c \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c$ 

• For any g :: Graph f, instantiate  $b = \lambda a \rightarrow fold_G a g$ :

 $(\lambda a \rightarrow \textit{fold}_{\mathsf{G}} a g) alg = \textit{fold} alg ((\lambda a \rightarrow \textit{fold}_{\mathsf{G}} a g) ln)$ 

#### Theorem (Short Cut Fusion Law)

b alg = fold alg (b ln) for all  $b :: \forall c . (f c \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c$ 

• For any g :: Graph f, instantiate  $b = \lambda a \rightarrow fold_{\mathsf{G}} a g$ :

 $(\lambda a \rightarrow \textit{fold}_{\mathsf{G}} \textit{ a g}) \textit{ alg} = \textit{fold} \textit{ alg} ((\lambda a \rightarrow \textit{fold}_{\mathsf{G}} \textit{ a g}) \textit{ In})$ 

• After beta reduction:

$$fold_{G} alg g = fold alg (fold_{G} ln g)$$

#### Theorem (Short Cut Fusion Law)

b alg = fold alg (b ln) for all  $b :: \forall c . (f c \rightarrow c) \rightarrow c$ 

- For any g :: Graph f, instantiate b = λa → fold<sub>G</sub> a g:
   (λa → fold<sub>G</sub> a g) alg = fold alg ((λa → fold<sub>G</sub> a g) ln)
- After beta reduction:

$$fold_{G} alg g = fold alg (fold_{G} ln g)$$

• By definition of *unravel*:

$$fold_G alg g = fold alg (unravel g)$$

Patrick Bahr — Proving Correctness of Compilers Using Structured Graphs — FLOPS '14, 6th June, 2014 Slide 20

