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Motivation

The compiler research has recently been enamored by the MLIR framework, whose first-class polyhedral representation may provide benefits on a variety of codes.

We can fully leverage decades of polyhedral research by connecting MLIR with existing polyhedral tools first.

Without MLIR-versions of standard polyhedral benchmarks, one cannot perform a fair assessment.

Goal of this work is not to use polyhedral tools to speedup MLIR, but to provide a fair baseline for subsequent work.
A platform to establish baselines for polyhedral transformations within MLIR

- Generic C or C++ frontend that generates "standard" MLIR
- Raising transformations for transforming "standard" MLIR to polyhedral MLIR (Affine)
- Embedding of existing polyhedral tools (Pluto, CLooG) into MLIR
- Polyhedral benchmarks for MLIR based off of Polybench
- End-to-end evaluation on standard polyhedral benchmarks
The MLIR Framework

• A toolkit for representing and transforming "code"
  • Modular and extensible via dialects (namespaces of operations/types and attributes)
  • Non-opinionated – choose the level of abstraction that is right for you
  • State-of-the-art SSA-based compiler technology

```mlir
%result = "dialect.operation"(%operand, %operand)
  {attribute = #dialect"value"}
  ^basic_block(%block_argument: !dialect.type):
    "another.operation"() : () -> ()
  ) : (!dialect.type) -> !dialect.result_type
```
The Affine dialect

- Represent SCoP with polyhedral-friendly loops and conditions
- Core Affine representation
  - **Symbols** - parameters
  - **Dimensions** - symbol extension that accepts induction variables
  - **Maps** - multi-dimensional function of symbols and dimensions
  - **Sets** - integer tuples constrained by a conjunction

```c
%c0 = constant 0 : index
%0 = dim %A, %c0 : memref<%xf32>
%1 = dim %B, %c0 : memref<%xf32>
affine.for %i = 0 to affine_map<>()[s0] -> (s0)>()[%0]
  affine.for %j = 0 to affine_map<>()[s0] -> (s0)>()[%1]
    %2 = affine.load %A[%i] : memref<%xf32>
    %3 = affine.load %B[%j] : memref<%xf32>
    %4 = mulf %2, %3 : f32
    %5 = affine.load %C[%i + %j] : memref<%xf32>
    %6 = addf %4, %5 : f32
    affine.store %6, %C[%i + %j] : memref<%xf32>
```

Polygeist Frontend

• Built a generic C or C++ frontend for MLIR, based off of Clang
• C control flow directly lowered to MLIR for, if, etc..
• Variables and arrays represented by MLIR `memref` (memory reference) construct
void set(int *arr, int val) {
    #pragma scop
    for(int i=0; i<10; i++){
        arr[2*i] = val;
    }
    #pragma endscop
}
Polygeist Raising

- Directly lowered constructs are not valid polyhedral programs
- Local variables eliminated, if possible, by new MLIR mem2reg pass
- Loads and stores are raised to affine loads, if possible
  - Detect if index calculation is a valid affine expression
  - Progressively fold index calculation into an affine operation
- if statements are changed to affine if their condition can be raised
func @set(%arg0: memref<?x i32>, %arg1: i32) {
    %c0 = constant 0 : index
    %0 = alloca() : memref<1x memref<?x i32>>
    store %arg0, %0[%c0] : memref<1x memref<?x i32>>
    %1 = alloca() : memref<1x i32>
    store %arg1, %1[%c0] : memref<1x i32>
    %c0_i32 = constant 0 : i32
    %c10_i32 = constant 10 : i32
    %2 = index_cast %c10_i32 : i32 to index
    affine.for %arg2 = %c0_i32 to %2 {
        %3 = index_cast %arg2 : index to i32
        %4 = alloca() : memref<1x i32>
        store %3, %4[%c0] : memref<1x i32>
        %5 = load %0[%c0] : memref<1x memref<?x i32>>
        %c2_i32 = constant 2 : i32
        %6 = load %4[%c0] : memref<1x i32>
        %7 = muli %c2_i32, %6 : i32
        %8 = index_cast %7 : i32 to index
        %9 = load %1[%c0] : memref<1x i32>
        store %9, %5[%8] : memref<?x i32>
    }
    return
}
Connecting MLIR to Polyhedral Tools

- Polygeist can obtain polyhedral representation in MLIR Affine
- But it is difficult to leverage existing polyhedral tools
- OpenScop is the interchangeable format among polyhedral tools
- How to translate between MLIR code and OpenScop representation?
Polyhedral Statement

• OpenScop expects C-like statements:
  \[ C[i][j] += A[i][k] \times B[k][j] \]

• MLIR is lower level and a store instruction alone does not specify how to compute the stored operand

• 1 OpenScop statement may correspond to N MLIR operations

• To match C-like statements:
  • Extract 1 MLIR memory write
  • Traverse SSA use-def chains
  • Continue until all operations are loads or symbols

```
affine.for %i = 0 to %N
  %0 = affine.load %A[%i]
  %1 = affine.load %B[%i]
  %2 = mulf %0, %1
  %3 = affine.load %C[%i]
  %4 = addf %2, %3
  affine.store %4, %C[%i]
affine.for %i = 0 to %N
call @S0(%A, %B, %C, %i)
```
Region-Spanning Problem

• A use-def chain may span multiple loops (regions).
  • e.g., A load op defines a register used by other ops in inner loops.

• Statement nesting in loops is ambiguous

• Difficult to reconstruct when converting back to MLIR

• Reg2mem pass: insert a scratchpad for each use-def across regions
Avoid RAW Hazard

• The RAW hazard problem:
  • A load op is duplicated for use in multiple statements
  • Intermediate writes may clobber
  • After extraction, later statements may load wrong values
• Simplified value analysis to detect
• Insert scratchpads
Outlining

• We outline statements into functions
• Opaque calls with known memory footprints
• Lift local stack allocations and symbol definitions

```rust
func @S0(%A: memref<?xf32>) {
    %c0 = constant 0 : index
    %s0 = dim %A, %c0 : index
    %l = affine.load %A[0]
    affine.store %l, %A[symbol(%s0) - 1]
    return
}
```

Lift local symbols to the function interface

```rust
func @S0(%A: memref<?xf32>, %s0: index) {
    %0 = affine.load %A[0]
    affine.store %0, %A[%s0 - 1]
    return
}
```
Translate to OpenScop

• First pre-process MLIR Affine code by previous passes
• For each extracted polyhedral statement:
  • Domain: get constraints from affine.for/if
  • Initial Schedule: derive from region nesting and operation order
  • Access: extract from affine load/stores
• Store symbols in OpenScop extensions
Translate to OpenScop

affine.for %i = 0 to %N

affine.for %j = 0 to %N

call @S0(%A, %i, %j)

func @S0(%A: memref<?x%xf32>, %i: index, %j: index) {
    %0 = affine.load %A[%i, %j]
    %1 = mulf %0, %0
    affine.store %1, %A[%i, %j]
    return
}
Regenerate MLIR Code

• Obtain a CLooG AST from an optimized OpenScop representation
• Regenerate MLIR code by traversing AST
• OpenScop symbols will be translated to MLIR values or operations based on a maintained symbol table.
Polyhedral Optimization Pipeline

After Polygeist's -raise-affine

MLIR Affine code

Translate to OpenScop

OpenScop representation

Translate back to MLIR

Polyhedral-optimized MLIR Affine code

MLIR -lower-affine

-reg2mem
-resolve-hazards
-extract-polystmt

-pluto-opt
Frontend Comparison with Clang

X denotes tests with runtime < 0.05s
Frontend Performance Differences

• Solved differences (removed prior to benchmarking):
  • 8% performance boost on Floyd-Warshall occurs if Polygeist generates a single MLIR module for both benchmarking and timing code by default
  • MLIR doesn't properly generate LLVM datalayout, preventing vectorization for MLIR-generated code (patched in our lowering)
Frontend Performance Differences

• Remaining gaps:
  • Different memory allocation function
    • ~48% of gap in adi benchmark
  • LLVM strength-reduction is fragile and sometimes misses reversed loop induction variable (remaining gap in adi)
  • Type of induction variables (MLIR index vs C int32) make it easier for LLVM loop analyses to analyze code generated from MLIR.
Polygeist vs Pluto

Polygeist faster

Pluto faster

Red X denotes test incompatible with Pluto
Green X denotes tests with runtime < 0.05s
Polyhedral Performance Differences

Besides previously mentioned issues:

• CLooG AST generation
  • We test Pluto by its CLI tool (polycc)
  • Polygeist uses libpluto's pluto_schedule_prog API together with CLooG
  • Pluto configure options & optimized schedules are identical between them
  • Different CLooG AST, e.g., 579 (Pluto) vs 78 (Polygeist) lines for jacobi-2d
  • Pluto CLI has finer-grained control over CLooG AST generation

• Induction variable types (Pluto int vs MLIR i64)

• Auto-vectorization triggered differently

More details in the paper
Conclusion

• Polygeist provides tools to fairly compare MLIR-based polyhedral flows with prior Polyhedral tools
  • C/C++ frontend for (Affine) MLIR
  • Integration of existing polyhedral tools for transforming MLIR (via OpenScop)
  • End-to-end comparison using existing Polyhedral benchmarks (Polybench)
• Polygeist enables future research on polyhedral MLIR transformations
• MLIR-based frontend differs from Clang by 1.25%
• Polygeist's polyhedral optimized code differs from Pluto by 7.76%
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func @set(%arg0: memref<?x i32>, %arg1: i32) {
    affine.for %arg2 = 0 to 10 {
        affine.store %arg1, %arg0[%arg2 * 2] : memref<?x i32>
    }
    return
}
Polygeist Raising

• Select statements must be represented by a C ternary operator
  • C ternaries have lazy-evaluation semantics which are replicated in the generated MLIR
  • Mem2Reg and code motion attempt to remove unnecessary loads within if's to generate a valid select.