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Abstract. This paper presents a new approach for optimizing multithreaded programs with pointer constructs. The approach has applications in the area of certified code (proof-carrying code) where a justification or a proof for the correctness of each optimization is required. The optimization meant here is that of dead code elimination.

Towards optimizing multithreaded programs the paper presents a new operational semantics for parallel constructs like join-fork constructs, parallel loops, and conditionally spawned threads. The paper also presents a novel type system for flow-sensitive pointer analysis of multithreaded programs. This type system is extended to obtain a new type system for live-variables analysis of multithreaded programs. The live-variables type system is extended to build the third novel type system, proposed in this paper, which carries the optimization of dead code elimination. The justification mentioned above takes the form of type derivation in our approach.

1 Introduction

One of the mainstream programming approaches today is multithreading. Using multiple threads is useful in many ways like (a) concealing suspension caused by some commands, (b) making it easier to build huge software systems, (c) improving execution of programs especially those that are executed on multiprocessors, and (d) building advanced user interfaces.
The potential interaction between threads in a multithreaded program complicates both the compilation and the program analysis processes. Moreover this interaction also makes it difficult to extend the scope of program analysis techniques of sequential programs to cover multithreaded programs.

Typically optimizing multithreaded programs is achieved in an algorithmic form using data-flow analyses. This includes transforming the given program into a control-flow graph which is a convenient form for the algorithm to manipulate. For some applications like certified code, it is desirable to associate each program optimization with a justification or a proof for the correctness of the optimization. For these cases, the algorithmic approach to program analysis is not a good choice as it does not work on the syntactical structure of the program and hence does not reflect the transformation process. Moreover the desired justification must be relatively simple as it gets checked within a trusted computing base.

Type systems stand as a convenient alternative for the algorithmic approach of program analyses when a justification is necessary. In the type systems approach, analysis and optimization of programs are directed by the syntactical structure of the program. Inference rules of type systems are advantageously relatively simple and so is the justification which takes the form of a type derivation in this case. The adequacy of type systems for program analysis has already been studied for example in [1,2,3].

Pointer analysis is among the most important program analyses and it calculates information describing contents of pointers at different program points. The application of pointer analysis to multithreaded programs results in information that is required for program analyses and compiler optimizations such as live-variables analysis and dead code elimination, respectively. The live-variables analysis finds for each program point the set of variables whose values are used usefully in the rest of the program. The results of live-variables analysis is necessary for the optimization of dead code elimination which removes code that has no effect on values of variables of interest at the end of the program.

This paper presents a new approach for optimizing multithreaded programs with pointer constructs. The scope of the proposed approach is broad enough to include certified (proof-carrying) code applications where a justification for optimization is necessary. Type systems are basic tools of the new approach which considers structured parallel constructs such as join-fork constructs, parallel loops, and conditionally spawned threads. The justifications in our approach take the form of type derivations. More precisely, the paper presents a type system for flow-sensitive pointer analysis of multithreaded programs. The live-variables analysis of multithreaded programs is also treated in this paper by a type system which is an extension of the type system for pointer analysis. The extension has the form of another component being added to points-to types. The dead code elimination of multithreaded programs is then achieved using a type system which is again an extension of the type system for live-variables analysis. This time the extension takes the form of a transformation component...
added to inference rules of the type system for live-variables analysis. To prove
the soundness of the three proposed type systems, a novel operational semantics
for parallel constructs is proposed in this paper.

1. \( x := \& y \);  
2. \( \ast x := 2 \);  
3. \( \text{par} \{ \)  
4. \( \{ y := 4 \} \)  
5. \( \{ y := 5 ; \quad \Rightarrow \} \)  
6. \( \ast x := 6 \)  
7. \( \} ; \)  
8. \( x := 8 ; \)  
9. \( x := 9 \)

\( \Rightarrow \)  

\( x := \& y \);  
\( \text{skip} \);  
\( \text{par} \{ \)  
\( \{ y := 4 \} \)  
\( \text{skip} \);  
\( \text{par} \{ \)  
\( \{ \text{skip} \)  
\( \ast x := 6 \)  
\( \} ; \)  
\( x := 9 \)

\textbf{Fig. 1.} A motivating example

Some comments are in order. The language that we use does not allow
pointer arithmetic, so it can be thought of as a Pascal-style language. The parallel
construct assumes that each thread is executed atomically. This is a restriction
that is not very common to many implementation of threads. But based on our
construct, it should be easy to treat a more general construct. Writing computer
programs to efficiently calculate the types, using our type systems, is not hard.
This is so because each time the program calculates a type, the program will be
given a pre-type and seeking its post type or vice versa. In the semantics our
language, we assume that \( \mathbb{Z} \) and the set of addresses, \( \text{Addrs} \), are disjoint sets.

\textbf{Motivation}

Figure 1 presents a motivating example of the work presented in this paper.
Consider the program on the left-hand-side of the figure. Suppose that at the
end of the program we are interested in the values of \( x \) and \( y \). We note that the
assignment in line 8 is dead code as the variable \( x \) is modified in line 9 before we
make any use of the value that the variable gets in line 8. The assignment in line
2 indirectly modifies \( y \) which is modified again in the \text{par} command before any
useful use of the value that \( y \) gets in line 2. Therefore line 2 is dead code. The
\text{par} command has two threads which can be executed in any order. If the first
thread is executed first then assignments in lines 4 and 5 become dead code.
If the second thread is executed first then assignments in lines 5 and 6 become
dead code. Therefore the dead code in the \text{par} command is the assignment in
line 5 only.

This paper presents a technique that discovers and removes such dead code
in parallel structured programs with pointer constructs. The output of the tech-
nique is a program like that on the right-hand-side of Figure 1. In addition to
the join-fork construct (\text{par}), the paper also considers other parallel constructs
like conditionally spawned threads and parallel loops. With each such program
optimization, our technique presents a justification or a proof for the correctness of the optimization. The proof takes the form of a type derivation.

Contributions

Contributions of this paper are the following:

1. A simple yet powerful operational semantics for multi-threaded programs with pointer constructs.
2. A novel type system for pointer analysis of multithreaded programs. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to use type systems for pointer analysis of multithreaded programs.
3. A new type systems for live-variables analysis of multithreaded programs.
4. An original type system for the optimization of dead code elimination for multithreaded programs.

Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The language that we study (a while language enriched with pointer and parallel constructs) and an operational semantics for its constructs are presented in Section 2. Sections 3 and 4 present our type systems for flow-sensitive pointer and live-variables analyses, respectively. The type system carrying program optimization is introduced in Section 5. Related work is discussed in Section 6.

2 Programming language

This section presents the programming language (Figure 2) we use together with an operational semantics for its constructs. The language is the simple while language enriched with commands for pointer manipulations and structured parallel constructs.

\[
\begin{align*}
n \in \mathbb{Z}, & \ x \in \text{Var}, \text{ and } \oplus \in \{+, -, \times\} \\
e \in \text{Aexprs} & := x | n | e_1 \oplus e_2 \\
b \in \text{Bexprs} & := \text{true} | \text{false} | \neg b | e_1 = e_2 | e_1 \leq e_2 | b_1 \land b_2 | b_1 \lor b_2 \\
S \in \text{Stmts} & := x := e | x := & y | x := * y | \text{skip} | S_1 ; S_2 | \text{if } b \text{ then } S_t \text{ else } S_f | \\
& \quad \text{while } b \text{ do } S_t | \text{par}\{S_1, \ldots, S_n\} | \text{par-if}\{(b_1, S_1), \ldots, (b_n, S_n)\} | \text{par-for}\{S\}.
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 2. The programming language.

The parallel constructs include join-fork constructs, parallel loops, and conditionally spawned threads. The \text{par} (join-fork) construct starts executing many concurrent threads at the beginning of the \text{par} construct and then waits until the
completion of all these executions at the end of the \textit{par} construct. Semantically, the \textit{par} construct can be expressed approximately as if the threads are executed sequentially in an arbitrary order. The parallel loop construct included in our language is that of \textit{par}-\textit{for}. This construct executes, in parallel, a statically unknown number of threads each of which has the same code (the loop body). Therefore the semantics of \textit{par}-\textit{for} can be expressed using that of the \textit{par} construct. The construct including conditionally spawned threads is that of \textit{par-if}. This construct executes, in parallel, its \textit{n} concurrent threads. The execution of thread \((b_i, S_i)\) includes the execution of \(S_i\) only if \(b_i\) is true.

One way to define the meaning of the constructs of our programming language, including the parallel constructs, is by an operational semantics. This amounts to defining a transition relation \(\rightarrow\) between states which are defined as follows.

\textbf{Definition 1.}  
1. \(\text{Addrs} = \{x^* | x \in \text{Var}\}\) and \(\text{Val} = \mathbb{Z} \cup \text{Addrs}\).
2. \(\text{state} \in \text{States} = \{\text{abort}\} \cup \{\gamma | \gamma \in \Gamma = \text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Val}\}\).

The semantics of arithmetic and Boolean expressions are defined as usual except that arithmetic and Boolean operations are not allowed on pointers.

\[
\begin{align*}
\llbracket n \rrbracket y &= n & \llbracket x \rrbracket y &= x' & \llbracket x \rrbracket y &= \gamma(x) & \llbracket \text{true} \rrbracket y &= \text{true} & \llbracket \text{false} \rrbracket y &= \text{false} \\
\llbracket x \rrbracket y &= \{ \gamma(y) \text{ if } \gamma(x) = y', \text{ otherwise.} \} & \llbracket e_1 \oplus e_2 \rrbracket y &= \{ \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket y \oplus \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket y \text{ if } \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket y, \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket y \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ otherwise.} \} \\
\llbracket \neg A \rrbracket y &= \{ ! \text{ if } \llbracket A \rrbracket y \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}, \text{ otherwise.} \} & \llbracket e_1 \leq e_2 \rrbracket y &= \{ ! \text{ if } \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket y \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ or } \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket y \notin \mathbb{Z}, \text{ otherwise.} \}
\end{align*}
\]

For \(\circ \in \{\land, \lor\}, \llbracket b_1 \circ b_2 \rrbracket y = \{ ! \text{ if } \llbracket b_1 \rrbracket y = 1 \text{ or } \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket y = 1, \text{ otherwise.} \}
\]

The inference rules of our semantics (transition relation) are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if } x := e : y \rightarrow \text{abort} \text{ then } & \llbracket e \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } x := e : y \rightarrow \text{!} \text{ then } & \llbracket e \rrbracket y \neq \text{!} \\
\text{if } y(x) \notin \text{Addrs} \text{ then } & \llbracket \gamma(x) \rrbracket y = \text{!} \text{ if } \llbracket x \rrbracket y = \gamma(x) \\
\text{if } y(x) \notin \text{Addrs} \text{ then } & \llbracket x := \& y \rrbracket y = \gamma[x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket y] \\
\text{if } x := e : y \rightarrow \text{!} \text{ then } & \llbracket x := \& y \rrbracket y = \gamma[x \mapsto \llbracket x \rrbracket y] \\
\text{if } y \neq \text{!} \text{ then } & \llbracket \text{skip} : y \rightarrow \gamma \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{abort} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 ; S_2 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{abort} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 ; S_2 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 ; S_2 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 ; S_2 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket S_1 ; S_2 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{false} \text{ then } & \llbracket \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{false} \\
\text{if } \text{true} \text{ then } & \llbracket \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \gamma \rightarrow \text{state} \rrbracket y = \text{!} \\
\end{align*}
\]
• Join-fork:

\[
\text{par}([S_1, \ldots, S_n]) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma' \quad \text{par}([S_1, \ldots, S_n]) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \text{abort}
\]

† there exist a permutation \( \theta : \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( n + 1 \) states \( \gamma = \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n+1} = \gamma' \) such that for every \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), \( S_{\theta(i)} : \gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma_{i+1} \).

‡ there exist \( m \) such that \( 1 \leq m \leq n \), a one-to-one map \( \beta : \{1, \ldots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \ldots, n\} \), and \( m + 1 \) states \( \gamma = \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{m+1} = \text{abort} \) such that for every \( 1 \leq i \leq m \), \( S_{\beta(i)} : \gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma_{i+1} \).

• Conditionally spawned threads:

\[
\text{par}(\text{if } b_1 \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else skip}), \ldots, \text{par}(\text{if } b_n \text{ then } S_n \text{ else skip}) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'
\]

\[
\text{par-if}((b_1, S_1), \ldots, (b_n, S_n)) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'
\]

\[
\text{par}(\text{if } b_1 \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else skip}), \ldots, \text{par}(\text{if } b_n \text{ then } S_n \text{ else skip}) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \text{abort}
\]

\[
\text{par-if}((b_1, S_1), \ldots, (b_n, S_n)) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \text{abort}
\]

• Parallel loops:

\[
\text{n-times}
\]

\[
\exists n. \text{par}([S], \ldots, [S]) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'
\]

\[
\text{n-times}
\]

\[
\exists n. \text{par}([S], \ldots, [S]) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \text{abort}
\]

\[
\text{par-for}(S) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'
\]

\[
\text{par-for}(S) : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \text{abort}
\]

A simple example for the \text{par-for} command is \text{par-for}[x := 10]. The execution of this command amounts to fixing a number randomly, say 7, and then to concurrently execute the seven threads \([x := 10], \ldots, [x := 10]_7\).

3 Pointer analysis

In this section, we present a novel technique for flow-sensitive pointer analysis of structured parallel programs where shared pointers may be updated simultaneously. Our technique manipulates important parallel constructs; join-fork constructs, parallel loops, and conditionally spawned threads. The proposed technique has the form of a compositional type system which is simply structured. Consequently results of the analysis are in the form of types assigned to expressions and statements approved by type derivations. Therefore a type is assigned to each program point of a statement (program). This assigned type specifies for each variable in the program a conservative approximation of the addresses that may be assigned to the variable. The set of points-to types \( \text{PTS} \) and the relation \( \models \subseteq \Gamma \times \text{PTS} \) are defined as follows:

\textbf{Definition 2.}  
1. \( \text{PTS} = \{\text{pts} | \text{pts} : \text{Var} \rightarrow 2^{\text{Addrs}}\} \).
2. \( \text{pts} \leq \text{pts}' \overset{\text{def}}{\iff} \forall x \in \text{Var}. \text{pts}(x) \subseteq \text{pts}'(x) \).
3. \( \gamma \models \text{pts} \overset{\text{def}}{\iff} (\forall x \in \text{Var}. \gamma(x) \in \text{Addrs} \implies \gamma(x) \in \text{pts}(x)) \).
The judgement of an expression has the form \( e : \text{pts} \rightarrow A \). The intended meaning of this judgment, which is formalized in Lemma \( \text{I} \) is that \( A \) is the collection of addresses that \( e \) may evaluate to in a state of type \( \text{pts} \). The judgement of a statement has the form \( S : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \). This judgement simply guarantees that if \( S \) is executed in a state of type \( \text{pts} \) and the execution terminates in a state \( \gamma' \), then \( \gamma' \) has type \( \text{pts}' \). Typically, the pointer analysis for a program \( S \) is achieved via a post-type derivation for the bottom type (mapping variables to \( \emptyset \)) as the pre-type.

The inference rules of our type system for pointer analysis are the following:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{\( n : \text{pts} \rightarrow \emptyset \)} & \text{\( x : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}(x) \)} & \text{\( e_1 \oplus e_2 : \text{pts} \rightarrow \emptyset \)} & \text{\( e : \text{pts} \rightarrow A \)} \\
\hline
\text{\( x := y : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}[x \mapsto [y']] \)} & \text{\( \forall z \in \text{pts}(y), z := z : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \forall z \in \text{pts}(x), z := e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \forall x \vdash e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} \\
\text{\( S_1 : \text{pts} \cup \cup_i \text{pts}_i \rightarrow \text{pts}_j \)} & \text{\( \text{par}[[S_1], \ldots, [S_n]] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \cup_i \text{pts}_i \)} & \text{\( \text{par}[[\text{if } b_1 \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else skip}], \ldots, [\text{if } b_n \text{ then } S_n \text{ else skip}]] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \text{par-if}((b_1, S_1), \ldots, (b_n, S_n)) : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} \\
\text{\( S : \text{pts} \cup \text{pts}' \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( S : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( S_i : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \text{par-for}[S] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} \\
\text{\( S_i : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts} \)} & \text{\( \text{par-for}[S] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \text{par-for}[S] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( \text{par-for}[S] : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} \\
\text{\( \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts} \)} & \text{\( \text{while } b \text{ do } S_1 : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts} \)} & \text{\( S_i \leq S_i' \\Rightarrow S_i : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} & \text{\( S : \text{pts}' \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)} \\
\end{array}
\]

The inference rules corresponding to assignment commands are clear. For the rule \( \text{par}^n \) of the join-fork command, \( \text{par} \), one possibility is that the execution of a thread \( S_i \) starts before the execution of any other thread starts. Another possibility is that the execution starts after executions of all other threads end. Of course there are many other possibilities in between. Consequently, the analysis of the thread \( S_i \) must consider all such possibilities. This is reflected in the pre-type of \( S_i \) and the post-type of the \( \text{par} \) command. Clearly \( \text{pts} \), in \( \text{par}^n \), is the given pre-type for the \( \text{par} \) command and for which the rule calculates a post-type. The union operation in the rule \( \text{par}^n \) makes the pre-type of threads general enough. Similar explanations clarify the rules \( \text{par} - \text{if}^n \) and \( \text{par} - \text{for}^n \).

We note that a type invariant is required to type a \( \text{while} \) statement. Also to achieve the analysis for one of the \( \text{par} \)'s threads we need to know the analysis results for all other threads. However obtaining these results requires the result of analyzing the first thread. Therefore there is a kind of circularity in rule \( \text{par}^n \). Similar situations are in rules \( \text{par-if}^n \) and \( \text{par-for}^n \). Such issues can be treated using a fix-point algorithm. The convergence of this algorithm is guaranteed as the rules of our type system are monotone and the set of points-to types \( \text{PTS} \) is a complete lattice. What makes calculations actual simple is that for any given
program the lattice $PTS$ is finite. The rule $\text{csq}^+$ is necessary to calculate a type invariant.

**Lemma 1.** 1. Suppose $e : pts \rightarrow A$ and $\gamma \models pts$. Then $\llbracket e \rrbracket \gamma \in \text{Addr}$ implies $\llbracket e \rrbracket \gamma \in \text{Addr}$.
2. $\text{pts} \leq \text{pts}' \iff (\forall \gamma. \gamma \models \text{pts} \Rightarrow \gamma \models \text{pts}')$.

**Proof.** The first item is obvious. The left-to-right direction of (2) is easy. The other direction is proved as follows. Suppose $y' \in \text{pts}(x)$. Then the state $\{(x, y'), (t, 0) \mid t \in \text{Var} \setminus \{x\}\}$ is of type $\text{pts}$ and hence of type $\text{pts}'$ implying that $y' \in \text{pts}'(x)$. Therefore $\text{pts}(x) \subseteq \text{pts}'(x)$. Since $x$ is arbitrary, $\text{pts} \leq \text{pts}'$.

**Theorem 1.** (Soundness) Suppose that $S : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}'$, $S : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'$, and $\gamma \models \text{pts}$. Then $\gamma' \models \text{pts}'$.

**Proof.** The proof is by structural induction on the type derivation. We demonstrate some cases.

- The case of $\text{let}$: In this case $\text{pts}' = \text{pts}[x \rightarrow A]$ and $\gamma' = \gamma[x \mapsto \llbracket e \rrbracket \gamma]$. Therefore by the previous lemma $\gamma \models \text{pts}$ implies $\gamma' \models \text{pts}'$.
- The case of $\text{for}$: In this case there exists $z \in \text{Var}$ such that $\gamma(x) = \gamma' \text{ and } z \leftarrow e : \gamma' \rightsquigarrow \gamma'$. Because $\gamma \models \text{pts}$, $\gamma' \in \text{pts}(x)$ and hence by assumption $z \leftarrow e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}'$. Therefore by soundness of $\text{let}$, $\gamma' \models \text{pts}'$.
- The case of $\text{par}$: In this case there exist a permutation $\theta : \{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $n + 1$ states $\gamma = \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n+1} = \gamma'$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $S_{\theta(i)} : \gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma_{i+1}$. Also $\gamma_1 \models \text{pts}$ implies $\gamma_1 \models \text{pts} \cup \bigcup_{\theta(i)} \text{pts}_j$. Therefore by the induction hypothesis $\gamma_2 \models \text{pts}_{\theta(1)}$. This implies $\gamma_2 \models \text{pts} \cup \bigcup_{\theta(i)} \text{pts}_j$. Again by the induction hypothesis we get $\gamma_3 \models \text{pts}_{\theta(2)}$. Therefore by a simple induction on $n$, we can show that $\gamma' = \gamma_{n+1} \models \text{pts} \cup \bigcup_{\theta(i)} \text{pts}_j$. Which implies $\gamma' \models \text{pts}' = \bigcup_{\theta(n)} \text{pts}_j$.

- The case of $\text{par} - \text{for}$: In this case there exists $n$ such that $\text{par}([S], \ldots, [S]) : \gamma' \rightsquigarrow \gamma'$. By induction hypothesis we have $S : \text{pts} \cup \text{pts}' \rightarrow \text{pts}'$. By $\text{par}$ we conclude that $\text{par}([S], \ldots, [S]) : \text{pts} \rightsquigarrow \text{pts}'$. Therefore by the soundness of $\text{par}$, $\gamma' \models \text{pts}'$.

4 Live-variables analysis

In this section, we present a type system to perform live-variables analysis for pointer programs with structured parallel constructs. We start with defining live-variables:

**Definition 3.** – A variable is usefully used if it is used

- as the operand of the unary operation $\ast$.
- in an assignment to a variable that is live at the end of the assignment, or
in the guard of an if-statement or a while-statement,

- A variable is live at a program point if there is a computational path from that program point during which the variable gets usefully used before being modified.

**Definition 4.** The set of live types is denoted by \( L \) and equal to \( \text{PTS} \times \mathcal{P}(\text{Var}) \). The second component of a live type is termed a live-component. The subtyping relation \( \leq \) is defined as: \( (\text{pts}, l) \leq (\text{pts}', l') \) denotes \( \text{pts} \leq \text{pts}' \) and \( l \supseteq l' \).

The live-variables analysis is a backward analysis. For each program point, this analysis specifies the set of variables that may be live (according to the definition above) at that point.

Our type system for live-variables analysis is obtained as an enrichment of the type system for pointer analysis, presented in the previous section. Hence one can say that the type system presented here is a strict extension of that presented above. This is so because the result of pointer analysis is necessary to improve the precision of the live-variables analysis. This also gives an intuitive explanation of the definition of live types above.

The judgement of a statement \( S \) has the form \( S : (\text{pts}, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \). The intuition of the judgement is that the presence of live-variables at the post-state \((l')\) implies the presence of live-variables at the pre-state of this execution in \( l \). The intuition agrees with the fact that live-variables analysis is a backward analysis and gives an insight into the definition of \( y \models l \) below.

Suppose we have the set of variables \( l' \) that we have interest in their values at the end of executing a statement \( S \) and the result of pointer analysis of \( S \) (in the form \( S : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \)). The live-variables analysis takes the form of a pre-type derivation that calculates a set \( l \) such that \( S : (\text{pts}, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \). The idea here is that by proceeding from the last point of the program, calculating pre-types, we achieve the backward analysis.

The inference rules for our type system for live-variables analysis are as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
& x := e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \quad x \notin l' & \quad x := e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \quad x \in l' \\
& x := (\text{pts}, l') \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \quad (\equiv_1) & \quad x := e : (\text{pts}, (l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{FV}(e)) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \quad (\equiv_2) \\
& x := \& y : (\text{pts}, l' \setminus \{x\}) \rightarrow (\text{pts}[x \mapsto \{y\}], l') \quad (\equiv \&_{l}) & \quad \text{skip} : (\text{pts}, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}, l) \\
& x := \star y : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \quad x \notin l' & \quad x := \star y : (\text{pts}, (l' \setminus \{y\}) \cup \text{FV}(e)) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \quad (\equiv \star_{l}) \\
& x := \star y : (\text{pts}, l' \setminus \{x\}) \rightarrow (\text{pts}[x \mapsto \{y\}], l') \quad (\equiv \star_{l}) & \quad x := e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \quad \text{pts}(x) \cap l' \neq \emptyset \\
& \text{pts}(x) \cap \аст = \emptyset & \quad x := e : \text{pts} \rightarrow \text{pts}' \quad \text{pts}(x) \cap \аст \neq \emptyset \\
& S_i : (\text{pts} \cup \bigcup_{i \in \ast} \text{pts}_i, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}_i, l') & \quad S_i : (\text{pts}, l' \cup \text{FV}(e) \cup \{x\}) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \\
& \text{par}[\{S_1, \ldots, S_n]\] : (\text{pts}, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}, l') \quad (\text{par})
\end{align*}
\]
 sis, we introduce necessary definitions and results.

**Definition 6.** The expression \( \gamma \) at that state (computational point) and is not included in \( l \). A state to understand the rules for the parallel constructs, \( (\text{par-if}) \), \( (\text{par}) \).

**Lemma 2.** For the command \( \ast x := e \), we have two rules, namely \( (\ast :=_1) \) and \( (\ast :=_2) \). In both cases, calculating the pre-type from the post-type includes adding \( x \) to the post-type. This is so because according to Definition 3, \( x \) is live at the pre-state of any execution of the command. The rule \( (\ast :=_1) \) deals with the case that there is no possibility that the variable modified by this statement is live \( (\text{ weaken}) \) at the end of an execution. In this case there is no need to add any other variables to the post-type. The rule \( (\ast :=_2) \) deals with the case that there is a possibility that the variable modified by this statement is live \( (\text{ weakening}) \) at the end of an execution. In this case, there is a possibility that free variables of \( e \) are used usefully according to Definition 3. Therefore free variables of \( e \) are added to the post-type. This gives an intuitive explanation for rules of all the assignment commands. The intuition given in the previous section for the rules \( (\text{par-if}) \) helps to understand the rules for the parallel constructs, \( \text{(par'f)}, \text{(par')}, \text{and (par-for')}. \)

Towards proving the soundness of our type system for live-variables analysis, we introduce necessary definitions and results.

**Definition 5.**

1. \( \gamma \models_1 \text{pts} \quad \text{def} \quad \forall x \in l. \gamma(x) \in \text{Addr} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \gamma(x) \in \text{pts}(x). \)
2. \( \gamma \vdash_1 \gamma' \quad \text{def} \quad \forall x \in l. \gamma(x) = \gamma'(x). \)
3. \( \gamma \vdash_{(\text{pts},\text{tr}),} \gamma' \quad \text{def} \quad \gamma \models_1 \text{pts}, \gamma' \models_1 \text{pts}, \text{and } \gamma \vdash_1 \gamma'. \)

**Definition 6.** The expression \( \gamma \models l \) denotes the case when there is a variable that is live at that state (computational point) and is not included in \( l \). A state \( \gamma \) has type \( (\text{pts}, l) \), denoted by \( \gamma \models_{(\text{pts}, l)} \), if \( \gamma \models_1 \text{pts} \) and \( \gamma \models l \).

The following lemma is proved by structural induction on \( e \) and \( b \).

**Lemma 2.** Suppose that \( \gamma \) and \( \gamma' \) are states and \( l \) and \( l' \in \mathcal{P}(\text{Var}). \) Then

1. If \( l \supseteq l' \) and \( \gamma \vdash_1 \gamma' \), then \( \gamma \vdash_{(\text{tr})} \gamma' \).
2. If \( l = l' \cup \text{FV}(e) \) and \( \gamma \vdash_1 \gamma' \), then \( \llbracket e \rrbracket \gamma = \llbracket e \rrbracket \gamma' \) and \( \gamma \vdash_{(\text{tr})} \gamma' \).
3. If \( l = l' \cup \text{FV}(b) \) and \( \gamma \vdash_1 \gamma' \), then \( \llbracket b \rrbracket \gamma = \llbracket b \rrbracket \gamma' \) and \( \gamma \vdash_{(\text{tr})} \gamma' \).
The following lemma follows from Lemma 1.

**Lemma 3.** Suppose that $\gamma \models_1 pts, FV(e) \subseteq l$, and $e : pts \to A$. Then

\[
[e] \gamma \in \text{Addrs} \implies [e] \gamma \in A.
\]

**Proof.** Consider the state $\gamma'$, where $\gamma' = \lambda x. \text{if } x \in FV(e) \text{ then } \gamma(x) \text{ else } 0.$ It is not hard to see that $[e] \gamma = [e] \gamma'$ and $\gamma' \models pts$. Now by Lemma 1, $[e] \gamma' \in \text{Addrs}$ implies $[e] \gamma' \in A$ which completes the proof.

**Theorem 2.**

1. $(pts, l) \leq (pts', l') \implies (\forall \gamma. \gamma \models_1 pts \implies \gamma \models_1 pts').$
2. Suppose that $S : (pts, l) \to (pts', l')$ and $S : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'$. Then $\gamma \models_1 pts$ implies $\gamma' \models_1 pts'.$
3. Suppose that $S : (pts, l) \to (pts', l')$ and $S : \gamma \rightsquigarrow \gamma'$. Then $\gamma \models l$ implies $\gamma' \models l'$. This guarantees that if the set of variables live at $\gamma'$ is included in $l'$, then the set of variables live at $\gamma$ is included in $l$.

**Proof.**

1. Suppose $\gamma \models_1 pts$. This implies $\gamma \models_1 pts$ because $l' \subseteq l$. The last fact implies $\gamma \models_1 pts'$ because $pts \leq pts'$.
2. The proof is by induction on the structure of type derivation. We show some cases.

(a) The type derivation has the form $(=1)$. In this case, $pts' = pts[x \mapsto A]$ and $\gamma' = \gamma[x \mapsto [e] \gamma]$. Therefore $\gamma \models_1 pts$ implies $\gamma' \models_1 pts'$ because $x \notin l'$.

(b) The type derivation has the form $(=2)$. In this case, $e : pts \to A, pts' = pts[x \mapsto A]$, $\gamma' = \gamma[x \mapsto [e] \gamma]$, and $l = (l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup FV(e)$. Therefore by Lemma 3, it is not hard to see $\gamma' \models_1 pts'$.

(c) The type derivation has the form $(=3)$. In this case, for every $z' \in pts(y)$, we have $x := z : pts \to pts', \gamma(y) = z'$, and $x := z : \gamma \to \gamma'$. We have $z' \in pts(y)$, because $y \in l$ and $\gamma \models_1 pts$. Therefore by $(=1)$, we have $x := z : (pts, l') \to (pts', l')$. Now $\gamma \models_1 pts$ amounts to $\gamma \models_1 pts'$. Hence we get $\gamma' \models_1 pts'$ by soundness of $(=1)$.

(d) The type derivation has the form $(=4)$. In this case, for every $z' \in pts(y)$, we have $x := z : pts \to pts', \gamma(y) = z'$, $x := z : \gamma \to \gamma'$, and $l = (l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y, z \mid z' \in pts(y)\}$. We have $z \in pts(y)$ because $\gamma \models_1 pts$ and $y \in l$. Therefore by $(=2)$ we have $x := z : (pts, (l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{z\}) \to (pts', l')$. $\gamma \models_1 pts$ implies $\gamma' \models_1 (l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{z\}$ pts. Hence by soundness of $(=4)$, we get $\gamma' \models_1 pts'$.

(e) The type derivation has the form $(=5)$. In this case, for every $z' \in pts(x)$, we have $z := e : pts \to pts', \gamma(x) = z'$, and $z := e : \gamma \to \gamma'$. We have $z' \in pts(x)$, because $x \in l$ and $\gamma \models_1 pts$. Therefore by $(=1)$, we have $z := e : (pts, l') \to (pts', l')$ because $pts(x) \cap l' = \emptyset$. Now $\gamma \models_1 pts$ amounts to $\gamma \models_1 pts$. Hence we get $\gamma' \models_1 pts'$ because $z := e : (pts, l') \to (pts', l')$ and by soundness of $(=1)$.

(f) The type derivation has the form $(=6)$. In this case, for every $z' \in pts(x)$, we have $z := e : pts \to pts', \gamma(x) = z'$, $z := e : \gamma \to \gamma'$, and $l = l' \cup FV(e) \cup \{x\}$. We have $z \in pts(x)$ because $\gamma \models_1 pts$ and $x \in l$. Therefore by $(=2)$ we have $x := z : (pts, (l' \setminus \{z\}) \cup FV(e)) \to (pts', l')$. 

Corollary 1. Suppose \( \gamma \vdash \text{pts} \) implies \( \gamma \vdash \gamma' \text{pts} \). Hence by soundness of \( (\vdash) \), we get \( \gamma' \vdash \gamma' \text{pts} \).

The type derivation has the form \((\text{par}\, \gamma)\). In this case there exist a permutation \( \theta : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( n + 1 \) states \( \gamma = \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n+1} = \gamma' \) such that for every \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), \( S_{\theta(i)} : \gamma_i \to \gamma_{i+1} \). Also \( \gamma_1 \vdash \text{pts} \) implies \( \gamma_1 \vdash \gamma_1 \text{pts} \to \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(1)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \). Therefore by the induction hypothesis \( \gamma_2 \vdash \gamma_2 \text{pts} \to \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(2)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \). This implies \( \gamma_2 \vdash \gamma_2 \text{pts} \to \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(2)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \). Again by the induction hypothesis we get \( \gamma_3 \vdash \gamma_3 \text{pts} \to \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(3)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \). Therefore by a simple induction on \( n \), we can show that \( \gamma' = \gamma_{n+1} \vdash \gamma_{n+1} \text{pts} \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(n+1)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \), which implies \( \gamma' \vdash \gamma' \text{pts} \to \bigcup_{j \neq \theta(i)} \gamma_j \text{pts}_j \).

(h) The type derivation has the form \((\text{par-for}\, \gamma)\): In this case there exists \( n \)-times such that \( \text{par} \{ S_1, \ldots, S_n \} : \gamma \leadsto \gamma' \). By induction hypothesis we have \( S : (\text{pts} \cup \gamma_1 \text{pts}, l) \to (\gamma', l, l') \). By \((\text{par}\, \gamma)\) we conclude that \( \text{par} \{ S_1, \ldots, S_n \} : (\text{pts}, l) \to (\gamma', l, l') \). Therefore by soundness of \((\text{par}\, \gamma)\), we get \( \gamma' \vdash \gamma' \text{pts} \).

3. The proof is also by induction on the structure of type derivation and it is straightforward.

The proof of the following corollary follows from Theorem 2.

**Corollary 1.** Suppose \( S : (\text{pts}, l) \to (\gamma', l', l') \). Then \( \gamma \vdash (\text{pts}, l) \) implies \( \gamma' \vdash (\text{pts}, l') \).

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that \( S : (\text{pts}, l) \to (\gamma', l') \), \( S : \gamma \leadsto \gamma' \), \( \gamma \leadsto \gamma' \text{pts} \), and \( S \) does not abort at \( \gamma \). Then there exists a state \( \gamma' \), such that \( S : \gamma \to \gamma' \) and \( \gamma' \leadsto \gamma' \text{pts} \).

**Proof.** The proof is by induction on structure of type derivation. We demonstrate some cases:

1. The type derivation has one of the forms \((\text{=} \gamma_1)\) and \((\text{=} \gamma_2)\). In this case, \( \text{pts} = \text{pts}[x \to \gamma_1] \) and \( \gamma' = \gamma_2 \). We take \( \gamma_1 = \gamma_1 \).

2. The type derivation has the form \((\text{=} \gamma_1)\) or \((\text{=} \gamma_2)\). In this case, \( \forall z' \in \text{pts}(y) \), we have \( x := z : \gamma \to \text{pts} \), \( y(y) = z' \), and \( x := z : \gamma \to \gamma' \). We set \( \gamma' = \gamma_2 \).

3. The type derivation has one of the forms \((\text{=} \gamma_1)\) and \((\text{=} \gamma_2)\). In this case, \( \forall z' \in \text{ts}(x) \), we have \( z := e : \gamma \to \text{pts} \), \( y(x) = z' \), and \( z := e : \gamma \to \gamma' \). We let \( \gamma' = \gamma_2 \).

4. The type derivation has the form \((\text{par}\, \gamma)\). In this case there exist a permutation \( \theta : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( n + 1 \) states \( \gamma = \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n+1} = \gamma' \) such that for every \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), \( S_{\theta(i)} : \gamma_i \to \gamma_{i+1} \). We refer to \( \gamma \) as \( \gamma' \). We have \( \gamma_1 \sim (\text{par}, \gamma, l) \) \( \gamma_1 \). Therefore by induction hypothesis, there exists \( \gamma_{\gamma_2} \) such that \( \gamma_1 \to \gamma_{\gamma_2} \) and \( \gamma \sim (\text{par}, \gamma_1, \gamma_{\gamma_2}, \gamma_2) \). Therefore a simple induction on \( n \) proves the required.
5 Dead code elimination

This section introduces a type system for dead code elimination. Given a program and a set of variables whose values concern us at the end of the program, there may be some code in the program that has no effect on the values of these variables. Such code is called dead code. The type system presented here aims at optimizing structured parallel programs with pointer constructs via eliminating dead code. In the form of a type derivation, the type system associates each optimization with a proof for the soundness of the optimization. Optimizing a program may result in correcting it i.e. preventing it from aborting. Of course this happens if the removed dead code is the only cause of abortion.

The type system presented here has judgements of the the form: \( S : (\text{pts}, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}', l') \leadsto S' \). The intuition is that \( S' \) optimizes \( S \) towards dead code elimination (and may be program correction). As mentioned early in many occasions, the derivation of such judgement provides a justification for the optimization process. The form of the judgement makes it apparent that the type system presented in this section is built on the type system for live-variables analysis.

Algorithm: `parallel-optimize`

- **Input**: a statement \( S \) of the language presented in Section 2 and a set of variables \( l' \) that we consider live (their values concern us) at the end of executing \( S \);
- **Output**: an optimized and may be corrected version \( S' \) of \( S \) such that the relation between \( S \) and \( S' \) is as stated in Theorem 4.
- **Method**:
  1. Find \( \text{pts} \) such that \( S : \bot \rightarrow \text{pts} \) in the type system for pointer analysis.
  2. Find \( l \) such that \( S : (\bot, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}, l') \) in the type system for live-variables analysis.
  3. Find \( S' \) such that \( S : (\bot, l) \rightarrow (\text{pts}, l') \leadsto S' \) in the type system for dead code elimination.

**Fig. 3.** The algorithm `optimize-parallel`

Figure 3 outlines an algorithm, `parallel-optimize`, that summarizes the optimization process. A pointer analysis that annotates the points of the input program with pointer information is the first step of the algorithm. This step takes the form of a post type derivation of \( S \), in our type system for pointer analysis, using the bottom points-to type \( \bot = \{ x \mapsto \emptyset \mid x \in \text{Var} \} \) as the pre type. Secondly, the algorithm refines the pointer information obtained in the first step via annotating the pointer types with type components for live-variables. Using our type systems for live-variables analysis, this is done via a pre type derivation of \( S \) for the set \( l' \), the set of variables whose values concerns us at the end of execution, as the post type. Finally, the information obtained so far is utilized in the third step to find \( S' \) via using the type system for dead code elimination proposed in this section. Applying this algorithm to the program on the left-hand side of Figure 3 results in the program on the right-hand side of the same figure. The details of this application is a simple exercise.
The inference rules of our type system for dead code elimination are as follows:

\[
\frac{x := e : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \notin l'}{x := e : (pts, l') \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{skip}} \quad (\vdash_1)
\]

\[
\frac{x := e : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \in l'}{x := e : (pts, \{x\} \cup \text{FV}(e)) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{skip}} \quad (\vdash_2)
\]

\[
\frac{x := (pts, l' \setminus \{x\}) \cup \text{FV}(e))}{x := e : (pts, l') \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow e} \quad (\vdash_3)
\]

\[
\frac{x := \& y : (pts, l') \rightarrow (pts[x \mapsto \{y\}], l') \leftrightarrow \text{skip}}{x \in l'} \quad (\vdash_4)
\]

\[
\frac{x := \& y : (pts, l' \setminus \{x\}) \rightarrow (pts[x \mapsto \{y\}], l') \leftrightarrow x := \& y}{x := \& y : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \notin l'} \quad (\vdash_5)
\]

\[
\frac{x := \& y : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \in l'}{x := \& y : (pts, l' \cup \text{FV}(e)) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow x := \& y \quad (\vdash_6)}
\]

\[
\frac{x := \& y : (pts, l' \cup \{x\}) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{skip}}{x := \& y : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \notin l'} \quad (\vdash_7)
\]

\[
\frac{x := \& y : (pts, l' \cup \text{FV}(e)) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{skip}}{x := \& y : pts \rightarrow pts' \quad x \notin l'} \quad (\vdash_8)
\]

\[
\frac{\text{if } b \text{ then } S \text{ else } \text{skip}}{\text{par}[\{S_1, \ldots, S_n\}] : (pts, l) \rightarrow (\cup pts, l') \leftrightarrow \text{par}[\{S'_1, \ldots, S'_m\}] \quad (\text{par}^r)}
\]

\[
\frac{\text{par}[\text{if } b_1 \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else skip}], \ldots, [\text{if } b_n \text{ then } S_n \text{ else skip}] : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l')}{\text{par}[\text{if } b_1 \text{ then } S'_1 \text{ else skip}], \ldots, [\text{if } b_n \text{ then } S'_n \text{ else skip}] : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l')} \quad (\text{par-if}^r)
\]

\[
\frac{S : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{par-if}(b_1, S_1), \ldots, (b_n, S_n)}{(pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S} \quad (\text{par-if})
\]

\[
\frac{\text{par-for}(S) : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{par-for}[S]}{(pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S} \quad (\text{par-for}^r)
\]

\[
\frac{S_1 : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts'', l'') \leftrightarrow \text{seq}[S'; S'_1, S'_2]}{(pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S} \quad (\text{seq}^r)
\]

\[
\frac{S_1 : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{if } b \text{ then } S_f \text{ else } S_f' \quad \text{if } b \text{ then } S'_f \text{ else } S'_f'}{(pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S} \quad (\text{if}^r)
\]

\[
\frac{while \ b \ do \ S_1 : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow \text{while } b \ do \ S_1}{(pts'_1, l'_1) \leq (pts_1, l_1) \quad \text{if } l = l' \cup \text{FV}(b) \rightarrow (pts_{1'}, l'') \leftrightarrow \text{while } b \ do \ S_1 \quad (\text{while}^r)}
\]

\[
\frac{S : (pts', l') \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S'}{S : (pts', l') \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S'} \quad (\text{csq}^r)
\]

When optimizing programs it is important to guarantee that if (a) the original and optimized programs are executed in similar states, and (b) the original program ends at a state (rather than \textit{abort}), then (a) the optimized program does
not abort as well, and (b) the optimized program reaches a state similar to that reached by the original program. Indeed, this is guaranteed by the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.** (Soundness) Suppose that $S : (pts, l) \rightarrow (pts', l') \leftrightarrow S'$ and $\gamma \sim_{(pts,l)} \gamma'$. Then

1. If $S : \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma'$, then there exists a state $\gamma'$ such that $S' : \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma'$ and $\gamma \sim_{(pts,l)} \gamma'$.
2. If $S' : \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma'$ and $S$ does not abort at $\gamma$, then there exists a state $\gamma'$ such that $S : \gamma \Rightarrow \gamma'$ and $\gamma \sim_{(pts,l)} \gamma'$.

The proof of this theorem is by induction on the structure of type derivation and it follows smoothly from Theorem 3. More precisely, Theorem 3 is used when $S' = S$. When $S' = skip$, we take $\gamma' = \gamma'$ in 1. We note that the requirement of Theorem 3 that $S$ does not abort at $\gamma$ is guaranteed when this theorem is called in the proof of Theorem 4.

6 Related work

**Analysis of multithreaded programs:** The analysis of multithreaded programs is an area that receives growing interest. It is a challenging area [5] as the presence of threading complicates the program analysis. The work in this area can be classified into two main categories. One category includes techniques that were designed specifically to optimize or correct multithreaded programs. The other category includes techniques whose scope was extended from sequential programs to multithreaded programs.

The first category mentioned above covers several directions of research; synchronization analysis, deadlock, data race, and memory consistency. The purpose in the analysis of synchronization constructs [6,7] is to clarify how the synchronization actions apart executions of program segments. The result of this analysis can be used by compiler to conveniently add join-fork constructs. Clearly, adding such join-fork constructs will reduce the run time of the program. One problem of multithreading computing is deadlock which results from round waiting to gain resources. Researchers have developed various techniques for deadlock detection [8,9,10]. The situation when a memory location is accessed by two threads (one of them writes in the location) without synchronization is called data race. On direction of research in this category focuses on data race detection [11]. The analysis of multithreaded programs becomes even harder in the presence of a weak memory consistency model because such model does not guarantee that a write statement included in one thread is observed by other threads in the same order. However such model simplifies some issues on the hardware level. The work in this direction, like [12], aims at overcomes the drawbacks of using a simple consistency memory model. Asymmetric Distributed Shared Memory (ADSM), a programming model serving heterogeneous computing, is introduced in [12]. ADSM manages a shared virtual memory to enable CPUs-access to addresses on the accelerator real memory.
Under the second category mentioned above comes several directions of research. One such direction is the using of flow-insensitive analysis techniques to analyze multithreaded programs [13,14]. Although flow-insensitive techniques are not very precise, some applications can afford that. Examples of program analyses whose techniques were extended to cover multithreaded programs are code motion [15], constant propagation [16], data flow for multithreaded programs with copy-in and copy-out memory semantics [17,18], and concurrent static single assignment form [19].

The problem with almost all the work refereed to above is that it does not apply to pointer programs. More precisely, for some of the work the application is possible only if we have the result of a pointer analysis for the input pointer program. The technique presented in this paper for optimizing multithreaded programs has the advantage of being simpler and more reliable than the optimization techniques refereed to above that would work in the presence of a pointer analysis.

**Pointer analysis:** The pointer analysis for sequential programs has been studied extensively for decades [20]. One way to classify the work in this area is according to properties of flow-sensitivity and context-sensitivity. Hence the work is classified into flow-sensitivity, flow-insensitivity, context-sensitivity, and context-insensitivity.

Flow-sensitive analyses [21,22,23], which are more natural than flow-insensitive to most applications, consider the order of program commands. Mostly these analyses perform an abstract interpretation of program using dataflow analysis to associate each program point with a points-to relation. Flow-insensitive analyses [24,25] do not consider the order of program commands. Typically the output of these analyses, which are performed using a constraint-based approach, is a points-to relation that is valid all over the program. Clearly the flow-sensitive approach is more precise but less efficient than the flow-insensitive one. Moreover flow-insensitive techniques can be used to analyze multithreaded programs.

The idea of context-sensitive approach [26,23] is to produce a points-to relation for the context of each call site of each procedure. On the other hand, the context-insensitive [27] pointer analysis produces one points-to relation for each procedure to cover contexts of all call sites. As expected the context-sensitive approach is more precise but less efficient than the context-insensitive one.

Although the problem of pointer analysis for sequential programs was studied extensively, a little effort was done towards a pointer analysis for multithreaded programs. In [28], a flow sensitive analysis for multithreaded programs was introduced. This analysis associates each program point with a triple of points-to relations. This in turn complicates the the analysis and creates a sort of redundancy in the collected points-to information. Investigating the details of this approach and our work makes it apparent that our work is simpler and more accurate than this approach. Moreover our approach provides a proof for the correctness of the pointer analysis for each program. To the best of
our knowledge, such proof is not known to be provided by any other existing approach.

**Type systems in program analysis:** The work in [1,2,3,29,30,31] is among the closest work to ours in the sense that it uses type systems to achieve the program analysis in a way similar to the present paper. The work in [32] can be seen as a special case of our work for the case of while language where there is no threading nor pointer constructs.

The work in [2] shows that a good deal of program analysis can be done using type systems. More precisely, it proves that for every analysis in a certain class of data-flow analyses, there exists a type system such that a program checks with a type if and only if the type is a supertype for the set resulting from running the analysis on the program. The type system in [33] and the flow-logic work in [3], which is used in [34] to study security of the coordinated systems, are very similar to [2]. Moreover, the work [33] transforms logical statements about programs to statements about the program optimizations. For the simple while language, the work in [1] introduces type systems for constant folding and dead code elimination and also logically proves correctness of optimizations. The bidirectional data-flow analyses and their program optimizations are treated with type systems in [35]. Earlier, related work (with structurally-complex type systems) is [36]. The work in [30] presents type systems that checks memory safety of multithreaded programs using sensitive-nonsensitive pointer analysis.

To the best of our knowledge, our approach is the first attempt to use type systems to optimize multithreaded programs and associates every individual optimization with a justification for correctness.
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